



**DES PLAINES PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING  
November 12, 2024  
MINUTES**

The Des Plaines Planning and Zoning Board held its regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, November 12, 2024, at 7:00 p.m. in Room 102 of the Des Plaines Civic Center.

Chairman Szabo called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and roll call was established.

PRESENT: Bronakowski, Catalano, Saletnik, Szabo, Veremis, Weaver  
ABSENT: Fowler  
ALSO PRESENT: Samantha Redman, Senior Planner  
Jonathan Stytz, Senior Planner  
Jonathan Mendel, Assistant Director of CED  
Jeff Rogers, Director of CED

A quorum was present.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion was made by Board Member Weaver, seconded by Board Member Bronakowski to approve the meeting minutes of October 22, 2024, as amended in the draft provided to staff.

AYES: Bronakowski, Catalano, Saletnik, Veremis, Weaver, Szabo  
NAYS: None  
ABSTAIN: None

\*\*\*MOTION CARRIED\*\*\*

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEM**

There was no public comment.

**General Communications – Administrative Decisions:**

Chairman Szabo summarized the list of administrative decisions for license agreements and minor variation requests. The current agenda notes Case #24-064-LA: 560 W. Kathleen Drive – License Agreement for Brick Paver Driveway Apron in the Public Right-of-Way.

**Pending Applications:**

1. **Address:** 1655 & 1695 S. Des Plaines River Road **Case Number:** 24-054-TSUB

The applicant requests a Tentative Plat of Subdivision to consolidate the existing two lots into one lot of record, and any other variations, waivers, and zoning relief as may be necessary.

**PINs:** 09-28-107-008-0000; 09-28-107-009-0000

**Applicant:** Brickton Montessori (Representative: Erica Lane, 8622 W. Catalpa Ave, Chicago, IL 60656)

**Owner:** Brickton Montessori (Representative: Erica Lane, 8622 W. Catalpa Ave, Chicago, IL 60656)

Chairman Szabo introduced the case on the agenda and swore in petitioner, Rebecca Leslie.

Rebecca Leslie, Board of Directors for Brickton Montessori, was present. She stated that Brickton Montessori currently operates from a location on Cumberland Avenue south of the I-90 Kennedy expressway and plans to relocate to this location. At the time of the prior considerations by the Planning & Zoning Board, Brickton was under contract to purchase the property. They have since completed the purchase and are requesting consideration of the proposed tentative plat of subdivision at this time. Ms. Leslie reviewed the proposed site plan, site improvements, and building improvements including a small area of remediation where an underground heating oil tank was stored. The existing building was renovated approximately ten years ago and would be remodeling to accommodate the proposed Montessori. The Brickton team is working through the development review process and would proceed to the building permit process after final financing for the project is secured. Anticipated construction is between 12-18 months. The plan is to move students in for Summer Camp 2026.

Chairman Szabo inquired about the timing of the discovery of the underground storage tank.

Ms. Leslie clarified that the storage tank was removed previously, however there remains a limited scope of remnant soil contaminants that would need to be remediated.

Member Saletnik inquired about the previously proposed floodplain management solution.

Manny Garcia from Wheeler Kearns Architects was sworn in.

Mr. Garcia summarized the proposed floodplain requirements and proposed improvements. The applicant's plan would be to remove the first floor of the building's crawl space and pouring new walls in a design to establish a waterproof "bath tub" to prevent water from entering the building while providing sufficient improvements to prevent infiltration through the ground during flood conditions.

Chairman Szabo asked how the water is ultimately released.

Mr. Garcia stated the water would never come into the building. There is a plan to provide a sump pump, so if any water were to ever come in, it would be pumped out.

Member Bronakowski inquired about ComEd's approval of service to the proposed development.

Member Leslie stated she will obtain the correct letter and needs to get in touch with the correct individual.

Member Catalano inquired about a highlighted area on the proposed site plan noting that the playground would be comprised of impervious surfaces.

Mr. Garcia noted that the playground area would include gravel over a rubber membrane which would be included among the impervious surfaces across the site.

Member Catalano inquired about a condition of the memo included in the Public Works and Engineering memo (Exhibit 7) regarding FEMA approval.

Senior Planner Jonathan Stytz confirmed that the comment is related to the proposed floodwall.

Chairman Szabo requested a summary of the case from staff.

Senior Planner Stytz presented details relating to the proposed tentative plat request.

**Issue:** The applicant requests a Tentative Plat of Subdivision to consolidate the existing two lots into one lot of record.

**Applicant:** Brickton Montessori (Representative: Erica Lane, 8622 W. Catalpa Ave, Chicago, IL 60656)

**Owner:** Brickton Montessori (Representative: Erica Lane, 8622 W. Catalpa Ave, Chicago, IL 60656)

**Case Number:** 24-054-TSUB

**PINs:** 09-28-107-008-0000; -009

**Ward:** #2, Alderman Colt Moylan

**Existing Zoning:** I-1, Institutional District (both properties)

**Existing Land Use:** Vacant property (1655 S. Des Plaines River Road); office building and parking lot (1695 S. Des Plaines River Road)

**Surrounding Zoning:** North: C-3 General Commercial District  
 South: Single Family Residential District (R4) (Unincorporated Cook County)  
 East: Single Family Residential District (R4) (Unincorporated Cook County)  
 West: C-3 General Commercial District

**Surrounding Land Use:** North: Multi-tenant Office Building (Commercial)  
 South: Cook County Forest Preserve (Recreation)  
 East: Des Plaines River; then Cook County Forest Preserve (Recreation)  
 West: Retail and Service Establishments (Commercial)

**Street Classification:** Des Plaines River Road is a minor arterial road under City of Des Plaines jurisdiction.

**Comprehensive Plan:** The subject property is illustrated as Open Space on the Future Land Use map in the 2019 Comprehensive Plan.

**Zoning/Property History:** *Overview*

The subject properties described below are both located along Des Plaines River Road in the City of Des Plaines but are bounded by the Des Plaines River and the Cook County Forest Preserve in unincorporated Cook County.

Address	PIN	Current Zoning District	Lot Size
1655 S. Des Plaines River Rd	09-28-107-008-0000	I-1, Institutional district	30,592.48 SF (0.70 acres)
1695 S. Des Plaines River Rd	09-28-107-009-0000	I-1, Institutional district	58,478.31 SF (1.34 acres)

The property at 1655 S. Des Plaines River Road is currently unimproved. However, the property at 1695 S. Des Plaines River Road is improved with a two-story, 19,000-square-foot commercial building with a surface parking area as shown on the attached ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey.

*Development Proposal and Previous Approvals*

The applicant is interested in locating a private school and childcare center within the existing building on the subject properties. On June 3, 2024, City Council approved a text amendment to allow a childcare center in the I-1 district via Ordinance Z-8-24 and the following items via Ordinance Z-9-24: (i) map amendments to rezone both properties to I-1; (ii) a conditional use to allow a childcare center on the subject property; and (iii) five separate major variations related to parking lot location, setback, and landscaping.

*Current Entitlement Request*

The applicant requests the consolidation plat, which is the last required entitlement for this development. Section 13-1-2 of the Subdivision Regulations requires a subdivision or consolidation of a zoning lot or lots in a nonresidential zoned area and that are not a lot of record. for the applicant requests the tentative plat of consolidation, which is part one of the two-part process identified in Section 13-2-2 of the Subdivision Regulations.

Both properties abut the Des Plaines River on their eastern boundaries and, based on the current Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood hazard maps, are located entirely within a flood hazard zone and a portion of the regulatory floodway. As such, any proposal is required to conform with all FEMA and City of Des Plaines Flood Control regulations prior to the construction of any improvements on either property. The applicant has been working with staff to address the various flood hazard zone concerns and will be required to obtain approval from the Public Works and Engineering (PWE) department prior to processing the final plat of consolidation.

**TENTATIVE PLAT OF SUBDIVISION****Request Description: Overview**

The proposal includes the consolidation of the two existing lots into one 3.14-acre lot. The attached Tentative Plat of Brickton Montessori Subdivision shows the location, boundary, and size of the proposed consolidated lot. The plat also notes the previously vacated Springer Street right-of-way located at the southern portion of the subdivision that abuts the Cook County Forest Preserve District property.

*Building Lines and Easements*

The subdivision plat shows the following easements and building lines: (i) a new 50-foot front building setback line along Des Plaines River Road where the proposed subdivision abuts the street; (ii) new 25-foot side building setback lines along the north and south side property lines of the proposed subdivision; (iii) existing 12-foot and 15-foot by 15-foot public utility easements at the northwest corner of the subdivision; (iv) a permanent subterranean easement for the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (MWRD) along the west side of the subdivision; (v) an 84-inch MWRD Storm Line along the south portion of the subdivision; and (vi) a notation related to a portion of the subdivision on the northwest corner that was taken by the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) for roadway purposes.

The plat notes that the rear property line of the subdivision is located at the center thread of the Des Plaines River. As such, the rear 50-foot rear building setback line along the east boundary of the proposed subdivision is not shown. However, the existing office building is setback substantially further than 50 feet from the rear property line.

*Utility Poles, Cables, and Structures; Utility Easements*

The plat indicates the location of all public utilities and the size of the public storm sewer and water mains. In addition, the private utilities such as electric, gas, water, and storm sewer are also shown in compliance with Section 13-2-2.G of the Subdivision Regulations.

Section 13-2-2.E requires that the tentative approval of utility easements by all privately owned utility companies shall be indicated via written correspondence either via “will-serve” letters or lettered directly on the plat. The attached Private Utility Company Will Serve Letters for AT&T and Nicor are provided in conformance with this regulation. However, despite attempts from the petitioner, a “will-serve” letter from ComEd cannot be obtained at this time requiring the petitioner to seek a waiver from this requirement to the PZB. The PZB may approve of this waiver as noted or require the requirement to be met prior to the approval of the Tentative plat.

*Subdivision Process, Required Public Improvements*

Although the applicant’s request is for a Tentative Plat only at this time, the Board and public may benefit from understanding the requirements of a Final Plat, which is the second step in the subdivision approval process. The steps for Final Plat are articulated in Sections 13-2-4 through 13-2-8 of the Subdivision Regulations and requires engineering plans that must be approved by PWE.

Ultimately a MWRD permit will be required for construction. Tentative Plat approval does not require submittal of engineering plans. However, the applicant has provided the attached Preliminary Engineering Plans. The Engineering review is more detailed for plans at the Final Plat stage, as those are accompanied by civil drawings, which are not required at the Tentative Plat stage. Regardless, the PWE Department has provided brief comments in the attached PWE Department Memo based on the submittal.

**PZB Procedure and Recommended Conditions:** Under Section 13-2-3 (Planning and Zoning Board’s Procedure) of the Subdivision Regulations, the PZB has the final authority to approve, approve with conditions, or deny the Tentative Plat of Consolidation request at 1655 and 1695 S. Des Plaines River Road. Since a final plat will be required to consolidate these lots, there are no staff recommended conditions related to the Tentative plat request.

The petitioner has requested a waiver from Section 13-2-2.E of the Subdivision Regulations related to the securing of tentative approval of utility easements by all privately owned utility companies. Under Section 13-2-2 (Tentative Plat) of the Subdivision Regulations, the PZB has the final authority to waive the following requirements at the Tentative plat stage conditioned upon the applicant obtaining approval through the Final plat process. As such, the PZB should provide its determination of the waiver request as part of its decision on the Tentative Plat.

Chairman Szabo requested any questions from the PZB members.

Chairman Szabo invited public comments, but no one came forward.

Member Weaver asked for clarification about whether the petitioner was made aware of the waiver requiring the outstanding letter from ComEd be a condition of approval prior to final plat of subdivision.

Member Weaver moved to recommend approval of the tentative plat, with the waiver for the requirement for utility easements

Member Catalano seconded the motion.

AYES: Bronakowski, Catalano, Saletnik, Veremis, Weaver, Szabo

NAYES: None

ABSTAIN: None

\*\*\*MOTION CARRIED\*\*\*

**Addresses:** 728, 734, 750, 760 Lee Street, 1371, 1373, 1381, 1383, 1395, 1397, 1403, 1405 Prairie Ave, and 731, 735, 737 Graceland

**Case Number:** 24-047-PUD-TPLAT-VAC

The petitioner is requesting the following items: (i) Preliminary Planned Unit Development for seven story, mixed use building with exceptions; (ii) Tentative Plat of Subdivision to consolidate into one lot of record; (iii) any other variations, waivers or zoning relief as may be necessary.

**PINs:** 09-17-425-001-0000, 09-17-425-002-0000, 09-17-425-020-0000, 09-17-425-039-0000, 09-17-425-040-0000, 09-17-425-050-0000, 09-17-425-051-0000, 09-17-425-023-0000, 09-17-425-024-0000, 09-17-425-007-0000, 09-17-425-006-0000, 09-17-425-038-0000, 09-17-425-003-0000

**Petitioner:** Advent Properties, LLC, 4042 North Pulaski Rd., Chicago, IL

**Owner:** 750 Lee LLC & Prairie Graceland LLC, 401 Huehl Rd., Ste 1A, Northbrook, IL 60062

Chairman Szabo introduced the case on the agenda and swore in petitioner's representatives, Rolando Acosta and John Hanna, Architect and Paul Dukach of Advent Properties, LLC, petitioner.

Mr. Acosta summarized the petitioner's request. The project would include the redevelopment of the property bound generally by Prairie Avenue on the north, Graceland Avenue on the west, and Lee Street on the east. The proposed tentative plat depicts the lot extents including consolidation of six existing lots and a portion of public alley right-of-way to be vacated by the City. The proposed redevelopment would eliminate all access from Prairie Avenue. South of a new dedicated public alley right-of-way, Lot 2 would be improved with a private park accessible and open to the public during park district hours.

Mr. Acosta summarized the proposed building design including two stories of parking and commercial space with two residential towers, above including rooftop amenity space including a swimming pool.

The proposed first floor commercial uses would be oriented to Lee Street and the intersection of Prairie Avenue and Lee Street to otherwise prevent the introduction of new commercial along Graceland Avenue which is currently primarily residential in nature. A limited extent of commercial space is proposed in order to minimize competition with other commercial space downtown.

Mr. Acosta summarized the proposed request to reduce required parking for the project from a 380-parking space requirement to 298 parking spaces.

The third floor of the building includes two community gathering spaces, one at each end of the proposed swimming pool. The remainder of the third floor would be comprised of residential

units. Floors four, five, six, and seven would be comprised entirely of residential units in a mix of 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom, and 3-bedroom units.

The proposed building materials would include masonry and fiber cement panels. The design is intended to break up the massing of the building.

The applicant has tried to address all comments previously presented by staff through preliminary review. The proposed traffic study indicates that the proposed conditions would not reduce the levels of service at any of the nearby intersections.

Chairman Szabo welcomed questions from the PZB members.

Member Weaver inquired about hours of operation of the proposed dog park.

Mr. Acosta stated that the intent would be to secure the park nightly, but that residents of the building could be given fobs for after-hours access. The petitioner would need to explore this idea.

Member Veremis inquired about the type of proposed commercial tenant, quantity of tenants, and location of parking for the commercial tenants.

Mr. Acosta noted that the building manager does not anticipate any “black iron” restaurant tenants. The proposed commercial tenant spaces are divisible, and parking specific for the commercial tenants is proposed on the ground floor near the retail space.

Member Veremis requested confirmation that units would be rented and that an additional fee would be required for rental of off-street parking stalls.

Mr. Acosta confirmed that the building manager would charge for parking in the building.

Mr. Dukach confirmed that rents would be approximately \$2.90 per square foot: 1-BR would be \$1,800-\$2,000; 2-BR would be \$2,600-\$2,800; and 3-BR would be \$3,100. Parking would be an additional \$100-\$200 monthly.

Member Veremis inquired whether a previously proposed children’s museum was part of this proposed plan.

Mr. Dukach confirmed that he had not had additional communication with the prospective museum tenant since the workshop, but he intends to engage them again now that the project is further along.

Member Weaver inquired about an estimate or assumption as to how many residents from this building would not be driving to work and use the Metra instead.

Mr. Acosta replied he believes it will be more than 25 percent of the units will be using the Metra or bicycles due to available city bike routes.

Member Bronakowski reviewed the proposed parking stall quantity compared to other recent developments as outlined in the staff report. He inquired whether the applicant has considered solutions for additional off-street parking in the vicinity.

Mr. Acosta noted that some tenant spaces may need multiple parking stalls while others may have no off-street parking stalls. Additional off-street bicycle parking is proposed.

Member Veremis inquired about parking utilization by other recent developments.

Director Rogers noted that recent rental mixed-use apartment developments throughout the downtown have high occupancies. An audit of current parking utilization is not feasible since various parking areas are located behind secure access gates. However, off-street parking is anticipated to be well-utilized. As a rental community, the applicant would have an interest in ensuring parking was well managed to ensure that prospective tenants would have opportunity to reserve an off-street parking stall and that prospective tenants with parking concerns may choose to lease elsewhere. However, tenants who chose not to pay the monthly rate for a parking stall would likely seek alternative on-street parking elsewhere in the vicinity.

Chairman Szabo requested a summary of the case from staff.

Senior Planner Sam Redman summarized the details of the request.

Senior Planner Redman noted that correspondence relating to the case was included among the exhibits included in the PZB's packet.

**Issue:** The petitioner is requesting the following for the properties between the intersections of Prairie Avenue, Graceland Avenue, and Lee Street: (i) a Preliminary PUD, with an exception requesting a reduction in the required parking minimum to allow a seven story mixed use building with 278 multi-family residential units and 8,500 square feet of commercial space; and (ii) a Tentative Plat of Subdivision to consolidate thirteen lots into two lots and dedicate a new public right-of-way (ROW).

**Petitioner:** Advent Properties, LLC, 4042 North Pulaski Rd., Chicago, IL

**Owner:** 750 Lee LLC & Prairie Graceland LLC, 401 Huehl Rd., Ste 1A, Northbrook, IL 60062

**Case Number:** 24-047-PUD-TPLAT-VAC

**PINs:** 09-17-425-001-0000, 09-17-425-002-0000, 09-17-425-020-0000, 09-17-425-039-0000, 09-17-425-040-0000, 09-17-425-050-0000, 09-17-425-051-0000, 09-17-425-023-0000, 09-17-425-024-0000, 09-17-425-007-0000, 09-17-425-006-0000, 09-17-425-038-0000, & 09-17-425-003-0000

**Ward:** #2, Alderman Colt Moylan

- Existing Zoning:** C-5, Central Business District
- Existing Land Use:** Surface parking lot and undeveloped land
- Surrounding Zoning:** North: C-5, Central Business District  
South: C-5, Central Business District  
East: R-4, Central Core Residential  
West: C-5, Central Business District
- Surrounding Land Use:** North: Commercial buildings and Paroubek Park  
South: Funeral home and commercial building  
East: Commercial buildings  
West: Multi-family residential buildings
- Street Classification:** Graceland Avenue and Lee Street are classified as major roads and under the jurisdiction of the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT); Prairie Avenue is classified as a local road and is under the jurisdiction of the City of Des Plaines.
- Comprehensive Plan:** “Higher Density Urban Mix with Residential” is the use illustrated in the Comprehensive Plan.
- Property/Zoning History:** Per the Cook County Tax map, the subject properties were originally subdivided in 1873 into the Parson & Lee’s Addition. Per historic aerials, single family detached residences occupied this location from at least 1938 to the 1950s, when the property began to be developed with surface parking lots and commercial buildings. Since the 1950s, several commercial buildings have been constructed and demolished on the site. Most recently, the property featured a commercial shopping center on the northeast parcels, which was demolished in 2021. Since that time, the property has consisted of surface parking spaces and undeveloped land. The City previously leased portions of the subject properties from the property owner for use as public parking, but the lease was not renewed after it expired in 2020.
- Project Overview:** The petitioner is Advent Properties, LLC, the contract purchaser of the privately-owned subject properties. A mixed-use residential and commercial building is proposed on this site as well as a publicly accessible, private park. This proposal requires a re-orientation of the alley. Details on the project are included below and in relevant attachments. Refer to Public Works and Engineering (PWE),

Building, and Fire Department Memo attachments for review comments from other city departments.

### Site Development

The site encompasses approximately 124,000 square feet (2.84 acres), which includes 13 parcels and a public alley right-of-way that divides the properties. To optimize the area available for development, the petitioner proposes to vacate the existing alley connecting to Prairie Avenue (5600 square feet) and dedicate a new public alley right-of-way (7,598 square feet) oriented to open onto Lee Street and Graceland Avenue. A consolidation of the thirteen parcels into two lots is proposed with a Tentative Plat of Subdivision. The proposed building, approximately 92,000 square feet in size, would occupy roughly 75 percent of the site, leaving 25 percent designated for the proposed park space and new alley.

One lot would contain the proposed mixed-use building and one lot would contain a privately owned, publicly accessible park, separated by the proposed public ROW alley. The Park Design attachment notes the amenities of this park, including a dog run, patio, benches and landscaping. A 5-foot-tall, metal fence is proposed surrounding the dog park area and along the south property line adjacent to the park.

### Height, Setbacks, and Density

The table below illustrates staff's interpretation of the required yards (i.e., building setbacks) for this property and the proposed building setbacks as noted in Section 12-7-3 and defined in Section 12-13-3.

<b><i>Bulk Controls</i></b>	<b><i>Required</i></b>	<b><i>Proposed</i></b>
Maximum height	100 ft.	77' 6" ft.
Minimum front yards (Graceland Avenue and Lee Street)	5 ft.	Graceland Ave: 6 ft. Lee Street: 6 ft.
Minimum side yards (Prairie Avenue and Proposed Alley)	5 ft.	Prairie Avenue: 6 ft Alley: 41'6"

### *Off-Street Parking and Traffic*

To support multi-family and commercial development within the C-5 Zoning District, amended parking requirements were adopted in 2020. In light of the proximity of the development to public transit, the parking requirements for multi-family dwellings in this zoning district have been reduced, and the first 2,500 square feet of certain

uses are exempt from parking regulations. For this proposal, the following off-street parking is required:

	<i>Requirement</i>	<i>Total</i>
Commercial spaces	1 space per 300 square feet (first 2500 sq ft excluded)	Total space: 8500 sq. ft. Total with 2500 sq ft excluded: 5,900 sq. ft = 20 spaces
Residential spaces	Efficiency one-bedroom units = 1 space per dwelling	130 units = 130 spaces
	One-bedroom and two- bedroom units = 1.5 spaces per dwelling	138 units = 207 spaces
	Three + bedrooms = 2.25 spaces per dwelling	10 units = 23 spaces
Accessible Spaces	201 to 300 spaces provided = 7 accessible spaces	7 accessible spaces
	<b>Total Required:</b>	380 spaces
	<b>Total Proposed:</b>	<b>298 spaces, exception requested</b>

The 20 spaces for the commercial tenants would be spaces available for the customers and employees located in the southeast corner of the ground floor parking area. As proposed, one off-street parking stall is proposed per residential unit. Given the proposed unit mix of 130 one-bedroom units, 138 two-bedroom units, and 10 three-bedroom units, 0.63 off-street parking stalls are proposed for each bedroom, and the proposed garage would accommodate only one off-street parking stall for each of the proposed 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom units. In addition, 109 interior bicycle parking storage spaces are provided within the building for residents.

For comparison, recently approved mixed-use developments throughout downtown Des Plaines provided the following quantities of off-street parking stalls:

<b>Development</b>	<b>Unit Mix</b>	<b>Stalls per Unit</b>	<b>Stalls per Bedroom</b>
Ellison (2016)	20 Studio units 55 1-BR units 38 2-BR units 0 3-BR units	1.94 stalls/unit (220 stalls/ 113 units)	1.45 stalls/bedroom (220 stalls/ 151 bedrooms)
Welkin (2018)	28 Studio units 139 1-BR units 45 2-BR units 0 3-BR units	1.56 stalls/unit (330 stalls/ 212 units)	1.28 stalls/bedroom (330 stalls/ 257 bedrooms)
Mylo (2024)	75 Studio units 41 1-BR units 13 2-BR units 0 3-BR units	1.37 stalls/unit (178 stalls/ 129 units)	1.25 stalls/bedroom (178 stalls/ 142 bedrooms)
Advent (Proposed)	0 Studio units 130 1-BR units 138 2-BR units 10 3-BR units	1.00 stalls/unit (278 stalls/ 278 units)	0.63 stalls/bedroom (278 stalls/ 436 bedrooms)

As noted, an exception from the total quantity of required off-street parking stalls is requested with the Preliminary PUD. Per Section 12-3-5, an applicant can request a reduction of up to 25 percent of the required quantity of off-street parking stalls. In this case, the applicant could request consideration of a reduction in required parking to as few as 285 spaces. The petitioner is seeking an exception to allow a reduction of 82 parking stalls from 380 stalls to 298 parking stalls, reflecting a 22 percent reduction from the required minimum parking stall quantity.

As indicated by the petitioner in the Amenities and Services Map attachment and by the traffic engineer in the Traffic Study attachment, the close proximity to transit options and the amenities and services available within walking distance are expected to decrease the reliance on automobiles for the occupants of this building. The traffic study provided by the petitioner asserts that the proposed off-street parking and available on-street parking will be needed to serve the demands of the building. Modifications to existing parking on-street regulations may be necessary to support the requested exception since current regulations along Graceland Ave, Prairie Ave, and Lee Street near the subject property variably forbid parking in certain locations, limit parking to 90 minutes at all times, or limit parking to 3 hours between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m.

*Building*

This project is proposed to include one building, constructed in two phases, with podium parking (i.e. parking on the interior of the building). The petitioner did not indicate any tentative agreements for leasing the commercial spaces within application materials. Below is a table with building details:

	<b>Proposed</b>
<b>Height</b>	71 ft. 7 in.
<b>Residential Units</b>	
One-bedroom (660 to 675 sq ft)	130 units
Two-bedroom (1045 to 1280 sq ft)	138 units
Three-bedroom (1425 sq ft)	10 units
Total	278 units
<b>Commercial Spaces</b>	
Tenant Space on Corner of Prairie and Lee	7,100 sq. ft.
Tenant Space on Lee St	1,400 sq. ft.

*Access*

Section 12-3-11 of the Zoning Ordinance specifies that the principal building entrance point for multi-family residential and commercial buildings must be located along the front, corner, or corner side of the building. The Site Plan indicates pedestrian access points to the building would be located along each of the street frontages of Graceland Avenue, Prairie Avenue, Lee Street, and along the alley. Vehicular access is provided along the proposed alley with entrances to the garage on the ground level.

*Transparency*

Section 12-3-11 also requires a certain amount of transparency (i.e., windows) and limits blank walls on a building. For this proposed building, windows along the commercial spaces must have a minimum of 75 percent transparency from 2'-9' above sidewalk for retail, restaurant, or service uses, and 50 percent for other commercial uses. Windows on the residential portion of the property must abide by the multi-family residential regulations for transparency, requiring a minimum of 20 percent of each story of street-facing facades to have windows.

Blank walls along street frontages are also limited by Section 12-3-11, prohibiting any street facing facades from having any windowless area

greater than 30 percent of a story’s façade or being windowless for a horizontal distance greater than 15 feet. While the building elevations seem to align with this requirement, this detail will be verified at the time of building permit issuance, with the proposed use taken into consideration.

Note the sizes and types of windows are not explicitly restricted by the zoning ordinance if the other requirements are met.

*Materials*

The proposed materials for the building will include brick and fiber cement panels (on upper story). Section 12-3-11 specifies the permitted materials for multi-family residential and commercial buildings. While the building elevations appear to be in compliance with these regulations, an additional review at time of building permit will confirm compliance.

	<b>Permitted Ground Story Materials</b>	<b>Permitted Upper Story Materials</b>
<b>Multifamily residential</b>	Natural stone, face brick, and anchored or adhered masonry veneer	Ground story materials plus: painted or stained wood, stucco, vinyl siding, and fiber cement board
<b>Commercial</b>	Face brick, stucco, metal, and concrete masonry units	Ground story materials plus: painted or stained wood, exterior insulation and finishing systems (EIFS)

*Mechanical and Dumpster Screening*

At time of building permit, plans must indicate compliance with Section 12-10-11, requiring screening of any rooftop mechanical units and any ground level generators or other similar mechanical equipment. The proposed plans do not indicate any mechanical equipment to be located within public view at this time.

**Site Plan Review**

The table below combines a zoning analysis of both the site plan and the buildings. A Site Plan Review is required for all development application requests to assess how the request meets the characteristics identified in Section 12-3-2, which are listed below along with staff’s assessment of each in relation to the current Site Plan provided by the petitioner, located in the Site Plan attachment.

<b>Site Plan Review</b>	
<i>Item</i>	<i>Analysis (based on Proposal)</i>
The arrangement of structures on the site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Places buildings along the street frontage, rather than garages or surface parking. Access to the parking garage is through the proposed public ROW alley, with entrances along Lee Street and Graceland Avenue. The proximity of the building to the street would improve surveillance within the neighborhood, with windows facing the neighborhood and providing additional “eyes on the street.”</li> <li>• The building will be the primary focus along the street. Parking will be inside the building, within the podium.</li> <li>• A subdivision is requested as part of this request. Improvements deemed necessary in the area adjacent to a subdivision can be required pursuant to Section 13-3-2.L. The improvements required to serve this development are discussed in the Public Works and Engineering (PWE) Department Memo attachment. Improvements are required prior to completion of the development or within 2 years of the recorded subdivision.</li> </ul>
The arrangement of open space and landscape improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A park space is proposed, as noted on the plans and the Park Concept Plan attachment. This space will include a dog park and passive recreation space (i.e. tables and benches). Lighting will be examined with a photometric plan at time of Final PUD.</li> <li>• Green roofs are proposed on each tower. The roofs will also include a swimming pool and patio for residents. An additional swimming pool is also proposed inside the building.</li> <li>• Area to the south of the building, adjacent to the loading areas, will be grass, as noted on the site plan.</li> <li>• At time of building permit, a landscape plan must be submitted demonstrating a minimum of 35 percent of the foundation of the building, focused on street elevations, include landscaping, or a variation requested.</li> </ul>
The adequacy of the proposed circulation system on the site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several driveways will be closed surrounding the property, with access points to be added for the public ROW alley along Graceland Avenue and Lee Street. Three separate vehicular entrances are provided along the proposed alley. Pedestrian circulation surrounding the</li> </ul>

	<p>property will be improved with this closure of driveways and restoration of parkways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connection between the building and the park appears to be provided by a door along the southwest corner, adjacent to the driveway to the parking garage. However, staff includes a condition of approval requiring final plans to require an accessible route from this door, including a striped crosswalk across the alley to the park area.</li> <li>• The proposed off-street parking stall quantity would require a PUD exception to reduce the required total by 22 percent (82 stalls) to allow 298 parking spaces for both residents and the commercial spaces. Although it is anticipated, as discussed in the petitioner’s response to standards and the provided traffic study, that the proximity of the site to numerous transit options will reduce dependence on automobiles for this project, the proposed parking stall quantity provides less than half as many parking stalls per bedroom on average than recent mixed-use developments. The applicant should elaborate further upon the significant reduction in the parking stall quantity proposed versus other similar local mixed-use developments.</li> <li>• Refuse containers will be stored inside the building for residents and commercial tenants. The petitioner indicates in the narrative that waste management pickup will involve building maintenance staff pushing the dumpster into the loading zones in the alley for pickup.</li> </ul>
<p>The location, design, and screening of proposed off-street parking areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All parking will be located inside the building. The building elevations note that overhead garage doors will enclose the parking area. A suggested condition of approval states that, if a door is proposed for the garage portion connecting to the parking spaces for the commercial use, adequate signage must be included indicating the entrance procedure for vehicles entering/exiting the building.</li> </ul>
<p>The adequacy of the proposed landscaping design on the site</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At time of building permit, a landscape plan must be submitted demonstrating a minimum of 35 percent of the foundation of the building, focused on street elevations, include landscaping. In addition, a suggested condition of approval requires a detailed landscape plan to be submitted with the Final PUD application.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The park located on the southeast parcel will include a dog park and passive recreation space (i.e., tables and benches). The proposed green roof on the building will be accessible to residents.</li> </ul>
The design, location, and installation of proposed site illumination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At time of building permit, a photometric plan will be required for any proposed exterior lighting at this property that demonstrates conformance with Section 12-12-10, with no more than more than 0.2-foot candles spilling over the property line fronting Graceland Avenue and no more than 2.0-foot candles spilling over the other property lines.</li> </ul>
The correlation of the proposed site plan with adopted land use policies, goals, and objectives of the comp. plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed plan supports the following goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Goal 4.1. Ensure the City has several housing options to fit diverse needs.</li> <li>Goal 4.3 Provide new housing at different price points</li> </ul> </li> <li>In addition to housing goals, the proposed development meets economic goals of the city by providing additional property tax revenue compared to the existing use of the site.</li> <li>The creation of a separate parcel for a privately owned, publicly accessible park provides additional recreational opportunities, which is supported by the Comprehensive Plan.</li> </ul>
Compatibility with Business District Design Guidelines (2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Business District Design Guidelines include this property within the boundary of the “Downtown Business District.” The 2005 guidelines were generally incorporated into the update of Section 12-3-11 – Building Design Standards, and most suggested building design elements of this document are already met, including window transparency requirements and building materials (see “Project Overview” section of this report).</li> <li>In terms of site planning, the 2005 guidelines state the following that may or may not be reflected in the design: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zero-foot setbacks are encouraged for corner buildings. When buildings are set back 5 feet or more, a landscape buffer is encouraged in this area. A detailed landscape plan was not provided with this application, and therefore a suggested condition of</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>approval requires a landscape plan with the application for the Final PUD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Articulation and attention to appropriate massing is encouraged rather than flat building facades.</li> <li>- Parking curb cuts along Downtown streets should be minimized. As discussed, several curb cuts would be closed by this development, with two new curb cuts added for access to the new alley.</li> <li>- Although site signage was not submitted with this application, there are suggested guidelines for the Downtown Business District that can be used to encourage cohesive signage on the building with the surrounding area. A suggested condition of approval is the inclusion of a conceptual sign plan with the Final PUD application.</li> <li>- Streetscape requirements from the 2005 guidelines or as otherwise specified by Public Works and Engineering will be provided as part of required public improvements for this proposed development.</li> </ul>
--	--

**ENTITLEMENT REQUESTS AND ANALYSIS**

**Overview of Requests**

The petitioner requests three items to achieve the contemplated development:

1. Vacation of existing 5,600-square-foot public ROW alley – This request will be considered by the City Council. Abrogation of easements will additionally be required after relocation of existing utilities and dedication of new alley right-of-way and/or grant of utility easements for all relocated utility infrastructure. Section 8-1-9 of the Municipal Code specifies the procedure for vacation of public ROW alleys, which requires determination by the City Council of the nature and extent of the public interest served by the vacation of a public ROW alley and an appraisal to determine compensation. No Planning and Zoning Board action will be taken on this request. It is anticipated the Plat of Vacation will appear on a City Council agenda by the end of 2024.

2. Tentative Plat of Subdivision (Tentative Plat) to combine 13 lots into two lots. One lot would be 112,059 square feet, proposed to be developed with the building. A second lot comprised of 3,807 square feet is proposed to be a publicly accessible, private park space. A new 7,598 public alley ROW is proposed to be dedicated to the City with this subdivision.
  
3. Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) with one exception: Reduction of the minimum quantity of required off-street parking stalls from 380 spaces to 298 spaces.
  - a. Note: The original application requests included exceptions for lot area and reduction in required side yard. However, staff review determined the project is compliant with these requirements in the C-5 zoning district.

**Preliminary PUD**

A planned development, as defined below, was requested due to the residential and commercial uses in the building and the unique elements of the proposed site plan with the alley relocation and park:

*A development occurring on a parcel under single ownership or unified control which is developed as a unit and includes two (2) or more principal buildings or uses and is processed under the planned development procedure of this title” (Section 12-13-3).*

The purpose of a PUD is to promote a unified development by providing flexibility in development standards to accommodate site conditions and encourage innovative use of land. Certain characteristics are required by Section 12-3-5.A of the Zoning Ordinance, which are listed below along with staff’s assessment of each in relation to the attached Preliminary PUD Plat provided by the petitioner.

<b>Preliminary PUD Plat Review</b>	
<i>Item</i>	<i>Analysis (based on Proposal)</i>
A maximum choice in the types of environment available to the public by allowing a development that would not be possible under the strict application of the other sections of this title	Although this type of project would be permitted by right in this zoning district, this entitlement strategy was chosen to provide a streamlined process for requesting any exceptions, including the parking reduction and increase in density, and to provide the

	ability for the PZB and City Council to engage in meaningful dialogue during the review process regarding the proposed public alley ROW vacation, abrogation of easements, proposed park space, and proposed parking demands and associated on-street parking regulations.
Permanent preservation of common open space and recreation areas and facilities	Creates a publicly accessible, private park where none exists currently. A green roof and several swimming pools and other community spaces are included within the building for residents.
A pattern of development to preserve natural vegetation, topographic and geologic features	No significant natural vegetation, topographic or geologic features exist on site that would be beneficial to maintain.
A creative approach to the use of land and related physical facilities that results in better development and design and the construction of aesthetic amenities	The vacation of the public alley ROW and re-orientation to allow for the building to encompass a larger area than would be possible separately demonstrates a creative assemblage of properties to facilitate an ideally more cohesive development.
An efficient use of the land resulting in more economic networks of utilities, streets and other facilities	Reduces curb cuts onto both streets. Utilities will be placed underground. Public improvements would include replacement of water mains in this location and tying into existing water, sanitary sewer, and stormwater infrastructure.  The traffic study provided by the petitioner (refer to attachments) did not indicate any disproportionate impact to traffic in the area.
A land use which promotes the public health, safety, and general welfare	Transforms a surface parking lot and vacant space into a more visual appealing development, with additional landscaping and recreational opportunities, and adds additional residential housing stock in a suitable area.

*Prerequisites: Location, Ownership, and Size*

PUDs are authorized in all zoning districts in the City subject to the regulations in Section 12-3-5 of the Zoning Ordinance and must be under single ownership and/or unified control. While the subject property is currently not owned by the petitioner, the petitioner does intend to take ownership of the property upon approval of the requests in this application.

*PUD Bulk Exceptions*

As identified in the Project Overview section, the proposal does not meet the minimum required parking, requiring PUD exceptions from Section 12-3-5.C. The exceptions allow for a development that uses the property in a way that would not be possible in accordance with the strict application of the code.

**Plat of Subdivision**

The proposal includes a consolidation of the property from thirteen lots to two lots. One lot would be 112,059 square feet, proposed to be developed with the building. A second lot comprised of 3,807 square feet is proposed to be a publicly accessible, private park space. A 20-foot-wide public alley ROW connecting between Graceland Avenue and Lee Street would be dedicated to the City. The attached Tentative Plat of Subdivision shows the location and boundaries of each lot.

*Alley and Park*

A new 7,598 public alley ROW is proposed to be dedicated between Lot 1 and Lot 2 (please refer to the Tentative Subdivision Plat). The Plat of Vacation and abrogation of surviving utility easements for the existing public alley ROW must be approved by the City Council to facilitate the proposed subdivision. This request is tentatively scheduled to be presented to the Council in late 2024, during the same meeting at which the remainder of this request would be reviewed.

The proposed publicly accessible, private park will be required to be delineated as an easement on the Final Plat of Subdivision stating that ingress/egress for public access to this area is granted. Section 13-4-2 of the Subdivision Ordinance discusses dedication of park lands and/or fees in lieu for subdivisions. The publicly accessible, private park may count for a portion of the required park land dedication as will other recreational features within the building. Any remainder will require a fee in lieu, to be calculated at the time of final plat of subdivision, approved by the Park District, and

included with the final approved City Council resolution to subdivide the property.

#### *Waiver for Utility Easements*

The petitioner has requested a waiver from the utility easements until time of Final Plat of Subdivision. The Planning and Zoning Board can grant this waiver, with the recommendation from the city engineer, if a condition of approval states the utility information as required by Section 13-2-2.E. The Department of Public Works and Engineering (PWE) provided a memo (refer to attachments) stating there are no concerns with supporting this waiver, if conditioned that this information is provided with the Final Plat of Subdivision.

#### *Subdivision Improvements*

PWE provided comments (attached) based on the submittal. PWE provided a suggested condition of approval requiring relocation of overhead utilities underground and construction of the new public alley ROW to be completed prior to abrogation of surviving easements and development of the remainder of the property.

In addition, the memo states required public improvements for this development will include replacement of water mains connecting to the project, where applicable, and installation of streetscape elements and decorative lighting, as applicable, in parkways adjacent to the property. In addition, Section 13-3-2 of the Subdivision Ordinance discusses required improvements for subdivided properties and timelines for the improvements. Improvements are approved by the City Council during the final plat of subdivision process and financial guarantees for improvements are included within the resolution at that stage in the process.

Note the petitioner's request at this time is for a Tentative Plat only. The steps for Final Plat are articulated in Sections 13-2-4 through 13-2-8. The Final Plat of Subdivision would occur at a later date and would be a concurrent process with the Final PUD plat. All necessary dedications, fees, and necessary improvements would be outlined in the final subdivision resolution.

### **Proposed Schedule**

#### *Entitlement Schedule*

The proposed requests for the Tentative Plat of Subdivision and Preliminary Planned Unit Development are the first of two phases for these entitlements. The Plat of Vacation is the only item with the potential to be finalized after this request is reviewed by City

Council.

If the Tentative Plat of Subdivision is approved by the Planning and Zoning Board, the next step is a Final Plat of Subdivision. A Final Plat of Subdivision must be submitted within 12 months of the approval of the Tentative Plat.

If the Preliminary PUD is recommended by PZB and approved by the City Council, the next step is a Final PUD. The Final PUD must be submitted within 12 months of the preliminary plat approval by the City Council. Upon approval of the Final Plat of Subdivision and Final PUD, final recording procedures and collection of any financial securities will occur.

#### *Construction Schedule*

The current request is for a Tentative Plat of Subdivision. After this stage, a Final Plat of Subdivision would be reviewed by PZB and Council and the required public improvements determined prior to approval. With any subdivision, construction must commence on any required public improvements within one year. A financial security is collected by the City to guarantee improvements and released after inspection of completed improvements. An additional warranty security is collected by the City to ensure the public improvements will not require repair after installation, any funds from which that remain unused are returned after 18 months after completion of the project.

The Preliminary Construction Schedule attachment provides information about building construction. The petitioner states that, due to financing associated with this project, a two-phase development is proposed. The first phase proposes construction of the entire podium and the east tower. The second phase of construction would include construction of the west tower, and would occur within approximately six months of the completion of Phase 1. The proposed construction for each phase of the project would be 12-24 months.

### **PUBLIC INPUT AND COMMUNITY CONTEXT**

#### **Engagement Summary**

On March 5, 2024, the Planning and Zoning Board hosted a public workshop for the developer, PZB, and the public. A City webpage shared details about the proposed project and included a public input

form to continuously gather community comments. This case was noticed pursuant to the requirement in Section 12-3-1.C, including publication in a local newspaper, notice signs on the property, and a mailed notice to residents within 500 feet of the property.

### **Summary of Comments**

Refer to Public Comment attachment for all public comments. Discussion surrounding this property and the proposed development had several general themes. Below provides a summary of the themes and commentary on how the developer addressed or did not address these items.

#### *Commercial Spaces*

Several board members stated a disappointment in the lack of commercial space within the building, stating that the expectation with mixed use includes more substantial ground-floor commercial areas. The petitioner attempted to address this comment by adding an additional small commercial space along Lee Street. Refer to the Architectural Drawings attachment. In addition, a museum space was originally proposed during the March workshop, but the plans have since been amended to note this area as a general commercial space.

#### *Traffic and Parking*

The public workshop included a traffic engineer to discuss the proposed circulation and impact on the street network. Generally, concerns involved the increase in traffic resulting from this project.

The petitioner attempted to address traffic concerns with the Traffic Study attachment with their application, which states development traffic will not have a significant impact on the area roadways. The report states the total traffic generated will also be reduced by the proximity to the train station. The applicant's traffic engineer's report suggests parking would be adequate if coupled with available on-street parking, although existing regulations governing nearby on-street parking stalls would need to be amended to accommodate overnight parking by residents of the building. The Petitioner's Narrative attachment restates the Traffic Study's conclusion.

#### *Park and Landscaping*

Recreational opportunities were discussed by many public commentors. The petitioner attempted to address these comments by including a dog run within the proposed publicly accessible, private park as well as a patio and landscaping in this area.

**PUD Findings of Fact:**

The following is a discussion of standards for PUDs from Section 12-3-5 of the Zoning Ordinance. Rationale for how well the proposal addresses the standards is provided below and in the attached petitioner responses to standards. The Board may use the provided responses as written as its rationale, modify, or adopt its own.

**1. The extent to which the Proposed Plan is or is not consistent with the stated purpose of the PUD regulations in Section 12-3-5.A of this title:**

The proposed mixed-use PUD generally aligns with the stated purposes of PUDs as analyzed in the Preliminary PUD Plat Review table above with a proposed mixed use development, designated open spaces, and landscaping. Although generally the closure of multiple driveways along the property would improve pedestrian circulation, one suggested condition of approval about the pedestrian connection between the building and the proposed park is included to ensure separate vehicular and pedestrian areas. Refer to Petitioner's Response to Standards for a full analysis of how the development meets each standard.

**2. The extent to which the proposed plan meets the prerequisites and standards of the planned unit development regulations:**

The proposal meets the ownership/unified control and size requirements in the Zoning Ordinance.

**3. The extent to which the proposed plan departs from the applicable zoning and subdivision regulations otherwise applicable to the subject property, including, but not limited to the density, dimension, area, bulk, and use and the reasons why such departures are or are not deemed to be in the public interest:**

The proposal meets the majority of the bulk regulations in Section 12-7-2.J of the Zoning Ordinance (See Site Plan Review section above), but requires exceptions from the minimum quantity of required off-street parking stalls. The proposed density is consistent with the surrounding mixed-use developments in the area, providing additional housing stock in the City. As indicated by the Amenities and Services Map attachment provided by the petitioner, the proximity to the train station, bus lines, and walkable services and amenities within one-half mile of this property provide support for an argument to reduce the required amount of parking, however the proposed parking reduction would yield approximately half as many parking stalls per bedroom than recent mixed-use development throughout downtown Des Plaines.

**4. The extent to which the physical design of the proposed development does or does not make adequate provision for public services, provide adequate control of vehicular traffic, provide for, protect open space, and further the amenities of light and air, recreation and visual enjoyment:**

The proposed design of the PUD reduces the number of curb cuts, concentrates vehicular traffic in the public alley ROW of the development, and provides for a new park amenity accessible for both occupants of the building and the public. Any impact to air or light quality from this

development is not anticipated to be greater than any similar development of this nature or permitted in this zoning district and will be controlled by the environmental performance standards of Chapter 12 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Refer to the Traffic Study for details on anticipated traffic impact. The report states the development will not generate a disproportionate impact to the street network and effects will be reduced by proximity to the Metra station. Refer to the Petitioner's Narrative and Response to Standards attachments for further discussion of traffic generated and parking demands of the proposed uses.

**5. The extent to which the relationship and compatibility of the proposed development is beneficial or adverse to adjacent properties and neighborhood:**

The proposal creates a compatible mixed-use development similar to the surrounding multi-family developments in the area and provides additional housing stock in the City similar to other recent developments. The proposed development redevelops a surface parking lot and undeveloped land that is near the commercial, recreational, and institutional areas in downtown Des Plaines, with close proximity to transit options.

**6. The extent to which the proposed plan is not desirable to physical development, tax base, and economic well-being of the entire community:**

The proposal would provide additional housing stock that helps to increase the tax base for the City and improve the economic well-being of Des Plaines. It would also provide extra economic benefit through utility and public service fees that are currently not eligible for the subject property at this time.

**7. The extent to which the proposed plan is in conformity with the recommendations of the 2019 Comprehensive Plan:**

The proposal increases housing stock and creates additional housing options for residents, which aligns with the housing goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. It also redevelops unoccupied property in an area close to commercial and transit opportunities, which is promoted by the Comprehensive Plan.

**PZB Procedure and Recommended Conditions:**

Under Section 13-2-3 (Planning and Zoning Board's Procedure) of the Subdivision Regulations, the PZB has the final authority to approve, approve with conditions, or deny the Tentative Plat of Subdivision request.

Under Section 12-3-5.D.2.c (Procedure for Review and Decision for PUDs) of the Zoning Ordinance, the PZB has the authority to *recommend* that the City Council approve, approve with modifications, or deny the Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD). The City Council has final authority on these requests.

The PZB should take the following motions. The zoning motions can be combined or taken individually:

*Subdivision Approval (Tentative Plat)*

- A motion pursuant to Section 13-2-2 of the Subdivision Regulations to approve, approve with condition, or deny the waiver to allow consideration of utility easements and service details to be deferred to the Final Plat of Subdivision stage.
- A motion pursuant to Section 13-2-2 of the Subdivision Regulations to approve, approve with conditions, or deny the Tentative Plat of Subdivision.

If the PZB recommends approval, staff recommends the following conditions for the Tentative Plat of Subdivision.

**Conditions of Approval:**

1. At time of Final Plat of Subdivision, tentative approval of utility easements by all privately owned utility companies shall be indicated via written correspondence or lettered on the final document.
2. At time of Final Plat of Subdivision, an easement granting public access to the privately owned, publicly accessible park space must be lettered on the plat.

*Zoning Recommendations to City Council*

- A motion pursuant to Section 12-3-5.E of the Zoning Ordinance to *recommend* to City Council to approve, approve with modifications, or deny the request for a Conditional Use for a Preliminary PUD, with exception to reduce the minimum off-street parking stall quantity.

If the PZB recommends approval, staff recommends the following conditions for the Preliminary PUD.

**Conditions of Approval:**

1. During any construction that may result in a hazard or nuisance from debris falling onto the public sidewalk, the sidewalk must either be closed or a protective barrier provided. Any closure of sidewalk must follow proper city procedures for closure and detour. A sidewalk detour plan, as appropriate for each phase of construction activity, must be submitted with building permit and approved by the Community and Economic Development Director or their designee prior to issuance.
2. Overhead utility relocation and new east-west concrete public alley ROW construction (with storm sewer-inverted crown and street lighting) to occur before abrogation of surviving utility easements and any other development takes place. A construction schedule

demonstrating this condition is satisfied must be provided with approval of plans for Final Planned Unit Development.

3. At time of Final Planned Unit Development, appropriate access from the building to the proposed park must be demonstrated on plans, noting an accessible route through paving, depressed curbs, striping, or a combination thereof.
4. At time of Final Planned Unit Development, a conceptual sign plan must be submitted indicating the location and proposed size of signs for commercial tenants and building identification, as well as signs indicating appropriate entrance/exit from the parking garage in the alley through any overhead doors.
5. At time of Final Planned Unit Development, a landscape plan must be submitted demonstrating all appropriate landscape buffers and foundation landscaping are provided.
6. At time of Final Planned Unit Development, the approved construction schedule must indicate that all cladding, roof, walls, windows and doors will be complete before any drywall is installed.

Senior Planner Redman noted that the proposed podium, including the parking garage and commercial tenant spaces, and the east residential tower would be constructed as part of the initial phase of the project followed by the west tower. She outlined the sample motion and proposed draft conditions of approval.

Member Catalano inquired whether any prior developments have been approved with as few parking stalls as proposed.

Senior Planner Redman stated she is not familiar with any specific cases.

Member Veremis inquired whether information could be prepared regarding the extent of parking relief granted previously or by other area municipalities.

Senior Planner Redman confirmed that additional research could be conducted if the PZB requested this.

Chairman Szabo welcomed public comment.

Marian Cosmides of 570 Webford, was sworn in. Ms. Cosmides noted concerns with the proposed reduction in required off-street parking stalls. She agreed that additional research regarding other developments regarding minimum parking requirements would be warranted. She was concerned that the additional commercial space added since was minimal.

Robert Flinn of 102 Jeanette Street was sworn in. Mr. Flinn was excited for the project and was concerned that off-street parking stall requirements are too restrictive. He cited several examples of underutilized parking lots and parking garages including the Butera shopping center, U.S. Bank, Metropolitan Square, and the library parking garage. He recommended trusting the architect and developer for the proposed project.

Julie Radakovic of 1063 Walter Avenue was sworn in. Ms. Radakovic noted that buildings near transit stations in the City of Chicago have reduced parking requirements. The U.S. Bank property often has a full parking lot during business hours, but utilization drops at night when the business is closed. She requested consideration of utilization of the property instead as a public open space.

Ahmed Qadir of 880 Lee Street was sworn in. Mr. Qadir supported the proposed development and suggested that increased tax revenue from the project would contribute to the community. He requested consideration of a speed bump at the garage entrances and exits to provide additional traffic calming and opportunity for pedestrians to respond. He supported relief from minimum required parking.

Gufrana Baig of 880 Lee Street was sworn in. Ms. Baig suggested that people and activity benefit downtowns and provide more opportunities for businesses and revitalization of the downtown area. She supports the apartment development. She supports the apartment complex and good opportunity and will bring more community to DP.

Lauren Streff of 1258 E Prairie Avenue was sworn in. Ms. Streff advocated for more green space in the neighborhood which presently seems to have a shortage.

George Carrera of 855 S. Second Street was sworn in. Mr. Carrera was concerned with the proposed parking relief. He advocated for leasing of currently available nearby parking stalls for the residents on this property. He was concerned with the potential use of a museum of the commercial space on the property. He preferred more viable uses which would remain in place, even if this meant dividing the proposed area into multiple tenants. He inquired whether additional improvements could be provided to accommodate restaurants.

Mr. Acosta noted that the proposed design would support a use like a coffee shop or sandwich shop but not necessarily a commercial kitchen.

Mr. Carrera also commented on the proposed building design and color scheme which he supported.

Member Saletnik inquired about the proposed project phasing and separating of the west tower to follow the first tower.

Mr. Acosta noted that the proposed phasing is based primarily upon financing for the project. The revenue from the initial phase of the project will assist with the financing for the second phase of the project.

Member Bronakowski stated he is aware of four parks located within one mile of the subject property.

Chairman Szabo noted concerns with proposed parking. He had concerns with the extent of cementitious siding rather than masonry.

Member Saletnik requested additional data regarding developments in area communities and required parking stalls.

Mr. Acosta noted several examples from Evanston where proposed developments include fewer than 0.5 parking stalls per unit.

Member Veremis requested additional data regarding parking.

Director Rogers summarized the relationship between unit mix and off-street parking stalls.

Mr. Acosta noted that the current contract is in effect through the end of this year. He also noted that parking relief for transit-oriented development is an available request stipulated in the Code.

Senior Planner Redman mentioned that with the final PUD approval, if there are any major changes associated with their plan, for example requiring additional parking, the petitioner would have to come back for a preliminary and final PUD potentially.

Director Rogers added that it would put the developer at a disadvantage to approve something at this stage if there is an anticipation that the approval of that condition would be removed at a later stage. This is information that can be presented at the next meeting if this is something that the board feels strongly about.

Chairman Szabo asked if this is something that can be continued in two weeks.

Mr. Acosta stated that this would be up to the seller. He states they were under an obligation to close by the end of the year.

Mr. Acosta added that this project is near the train station and available bus lines. There is an ordinance that provides for a reduction in parking for transit-oriented properties. Mr. Acosta noted that the parking concerns were not necessarily expressed in the workshop, and they have attempted to address parking concerns, and many urban communities have examples of minimal parking with parking management strategies.

Mr. Weaver stated an appreciation for the effort completed by applicant to recognize the location of this project near the train station, in a downtown environment. He was concerned about decisions made in the past by the City that have led to an autocratic environment, including the placement of high trafficked roadways in the downtown and a continuous surplus of parking stalls. He provided Park Ridge as an example of a successful downtown, and stated that making the downtown more pedestrian friendly would encourage people to be in the downtown area. He supported the project in a general manner as that presented, and states that this project is a movement in the right direction, and the obsession with high speed cars and parking is hurting downtown. This C-5 zoned land should be commensurate with a suburban downtown by a train station, and this project is a step in the right direction.

Member Saletnik differentiated the current conditions downtown to the more active uses. He mentions we need more shops, restaurants, and coffee shops comparing to Park Ridge. He stated he would like to see more commercial spaces for more opportunities. With the increase in projects in the downtown, more commercial spaces will be needed.

Chairman Szabo closed the public hearing and welcomed a motion regarding the case.

Member Weaver moved to approve the tentative plat, including the requested waiver to allow the deferment of utility details to the final plat of subdivision and with the two conditions of approval, as drafted in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Member Veremis.

AYES: Bronakowski, Catalano, Saletnik, Veremis, Weaver, Szabo  
NAYES: None  
ABSTAIN: None

\*\*\*MOTION CARRIED\*\*\*

Member Weaver moved to recommend City Council approval of the preliminary planned unit development with a reduction in required off-street parking and in accordance with the six conditions as drafted in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Bronakowski.

AYES: Bronakowski, Catalano, Saletnik, Veremis, Weaver, Szabo  
NAYES: None  
ABSTAIN: None

\*\*\*MOTION CARRIED\*\*\*

**Discussion of proposed 2025 Meeting Schedule**

Assistant Director Jonathan Mendel summarized several regularly scheduled meeting dates of the PZB in 2025. He requested consideration of potential modifications to the schedule relating to two dates, September 23, 2025 and November 11, 2025. Alternate dates could include September 30, 2025 and either November 4 or November 18.

Chairman Szabo suggested September 30, 2025 and November 4, 2025 and the Board agreed.

Assistant Director Mendel noted that a revised copy would be distributed for finalization.

Downtown Economic Development Strategic Plan Workshop

An announcement was made by Assistant Director Mendel that the City Council will be hosting a public workshop to hear a presentation from the City's consultant regarding the direction of an economic development strategic plan on Wednesday, November 20, 2024 at 6 p.m. in Council Chambers. The meeting is a special City Council meeting with the consultant, Teska and Associates, and staff. Several Board members expressed interest in attending the meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Szabo adjourned the meeting by affirmative voice vote at 8:58 p.m.

Sincerely,  
Jeff Rogers, Recording Secretary  
cc: City Officials, Aldermen, Planning & Zoning Board, Petitioners