



**DES PLAINES PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING
October 22, 2024
MINUTES**

The Des Plaines Planning and Zoning Board held its regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, October 22, 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, Fowler, Saletnik, Szabo, Veremis,
Weaver

ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: Samantha Redman, Senior Planner
Jonathan Mendel, Assistant Director of CED

A quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Board Member Fowler, seconded by Board Member Saletnik to approve the meeting minutes of October 8, 2024.

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

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED

PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEM

There was no public comment.

General Communications – Administrative Decisions:

Chairman Szabo stated the list of administrative decisions is now located on the agenda for each meeting for approvals or denials of minor variations.

Pending Applications:**1. Address:** 1387 Prospect Avenue**Case Number:** 24-052-CU-V

The petitioner is requesting the following: (i) conditional use for a trade contractor use; (ii) standard variation to reduce the required front yard; (iii) a major variation to vary from loading space requirements; and (iv) any other variations, waivers, and zoning relief as may be necessary.

PIN: 09-29-228-034-0000

Petitioner: Vasile Haures, 1980 Pine Street, Des Plaines, IL 60018

Owner: 1387 Prospect Ave LLC, 1980 Pine Street, Des Plaines, IL 60018

Chairman Szabo introduced the case on the agenda and swore in petitioner Vasile Haures and petitioner's architect Rob Utyro.

Mr. Haures presents their proposal and its difference from the prior approval earlier in 2024. The change was due to financing challenges resulting in amendments to the approved plan. During the last PZB meeting at which the petitioner appeared, the petitioner was approved for a bigger building on the lot, and due to finances, petitioner requests downsizing the building. With this downsize, the petitioner is able to add five additional parking stalls behind the building. Petitioner was originally approved for a two-unit building, and now would like to downsize to a one-unit.

Member Bronakowski asked how much larger the first building was compared to this one.

Mr. Haures explained the first one was double in size. Rob added that original plan took up most of the lot with two accessible spots in the back with no off-street parking. There will no longer be parking spots inside the building since there will be an additional five parking spots added with the building being smaller.

Member Saletnik asked for a clarification that the bulk of materials for the jobs are delivered to the jobsites and that the only activity at this location will be loading and unloading tools.

Mr. Haures confirms that is correct.

Chairman Szabo inquired about the look of the building.

Mr. Utyro clarified the look/shape is the same along with the windows and fenestration. However, some masonry has been taken off due to costs.

Chairman Szabo expressed concerns about the exterior façade materials' aesthetics and compliance with the building design guidelines.

Member Weaver inquired about the color of building. Mr. Utyro answered that color has not been decided yet.

Member Weaver also asked what color the petitioner considered as compatible color with the neighborhood. Mr. Utyro responded with an earthtone color.

Member Saletnik asked staff if the architectural review requirements apply to this case since this is C-3.

Senior Planner Redman confirmed this would be subject to our building design standards and is included in the report. In order to construct the building as original proposal with aluminum siding, the petitioner would need to apply for a minor variation which would be an administrative decision.

Member Saletnik reiterated the already expressed concerns regarding building design compliance and neighborhood consistency.

Member Fowler asked whether the material compliance be a condition of approval.

Senior Planner Redman stated it can be if the PZB wished.

Member Fowler asked if any fencing will be put up.

Mr. Haures answered that there will be an eight-foot-tall fence on the neighbor's side and Mr. Utyro added the back of the property will also be enclosed.

Member Weaver inquired about some work that needs to be done in the alley way.

Senior Planner Redman clarified that this was a suggested condition of approval that came from our engineering department. There are improvements that need to be made to the alley and would be required to make those improvements as a part of their improvements to this property.

Member Catalano asked why the City would require the petitioner to repair the alleyway.

Senior Planner Redman clarified that this condition can be modified by the PZB members. Staff suggested this condition because the petitioner will have access from the alley to their building. The City does have the ability to require someone to make these types of improvements.

Member Weaver and Member Catalano are concerned about fairness in applying responsibilities to the petitioner. Having the petitioner hire someone to rebuild a small portion of the alley—which is used by others as well—may significantly raise the petitioner's costs, and it does not seem fair that the petitioner is asked to shoulder this cost.

Member Weaver also asked if anyone else's vehicle will be going over the space that the petitioner is asked to fix.

Senior Planner Redman stated this would be continued to be used as an alleyway for access for the other residents. The petitioner would be responsible for improvement for the area that fronts their property.

Member Weaver inquires if that means that anything to the West would be required to be repaired with this condition.

Senior Planner Redman confirms the condition is written so the petitioner is only responsible for this portion.

Member Fowler asks why the City doesn't just repair the whole alley at this point. It will not look good if only a portion is repaired.

Senior Planner Redman responded that there is always potential to coordinate with the engineering department for any future improvements. This condition came from our Public Works and Engineering department.

Member Bronakowski inquired once this condition is approved and area is repaved, if it is the city's responsibility.

Senior Planner Redman confirmed that this is correct, it remains the City's property. The way the condition is written, it does state it would need to be full reconstruction of that alley.

Member Saletnik mentions that the City does have a Concrete/Alley Program where his alley was repaired about 5 years ago and all the water issues have went away.

Member Fowler would hate to see the petitioner put all this money in to repairing a portion of this alley when eventually this alley would be repaired by the City. She feels that the petitioner should put the money into the building/masonry and make the building look better than take their money and fix the alley. Water issues in the alley need to be fixed one way or another.

Member Bronakowski agrees with Member Fowler. He does not believe that the petitioner should be responsible for fixing the alley.

Member Weaver asked if engineering department's recommendation enforces or suggests a policy that is uniform across all properties across the City, if what they are proposing here is exactly what they would do everywhere else to make sure that no one is treated differently. Are they being consistent with other petitioners who are in similar situations?

Senior Planner Redman agrees and is unable to answer that question comprehensively, but we can always modify this condition of approval and state an alternative plan to mitigate drainage issues can be approved by the Director of Public Works.

Member Veremis added that the wording should be changed on condition 1 as to what engineering wants to do.

Senior Planner Redman reads her staff report.

Issue: The petitioner requests the following: (i) conditional use for a trade contractor use; (ii) standard variation to reduce the required front yard; and (iii) a major variation to allow the loading space to face a public way (alley).

PIN: 09-29-228-034-0000

Petitioner/Owner: Vasile Haures (1387 Prospect Ave. LLC), 1980 Pine Street, Des Plaines, IL 60018

Case Number: #24-014-CU-V

Ward Number: #5, Alderman Carla Brookman

Existing Zoning: C-3, General Commercial

Surrounding Zoning: North: R-3, Townhouse Residential District
South: R-3, Townhouse Residential District
East: C-3, General Commercial District
West: R-1, Single Family Residential District

Surrounding Land Uses: North: Townhouses
South: Townhouses
East: Vacant
West: Single Family Residence

Street Classification: Prospect Avenue and Chestnut Street are classified as local roads.

Comprehensive Plan: The Comprehensive Plan illustrates this site as commercial.

Property/Zoning History: The property is currently undeveloped and located at the southwest corner of the Prospect Avenue and Chestnut Street intersection. In 2022, a zoning map amendment was approved to change the zoning of this property from C-1, Neighborhood Shopping to C-3, General Commercial. A multitenant office building was contemplated when the property was re-zoned. Since 2022, this property was sold to the petitioner. Historic aerials and city records do not indicate any structure has existed on this property in known history.

The area surrounding the property is generally commercial properties and townhouses. However, the property immediately adjacent to the subject project, 1383 Prospect Avenue, is a single-family house re-zoned from C-1, Neighborhood Commercial to R-1, Single Family Residential in 2016. The presence of an adjacent

single family residential property creates additional requirements in terms of the required front yard and requires a landscape and fence buffer between the properties.

Project Description:

In May 2024, an identical request with a different building and site plan was recommended by PZB and approved by City Council. The petitioner, Vasile Haures, proposes a one-story commercial building for a trade contractor use. The new plan is one tenant space, including a showroom, office, and fabrication/storage for a hardwood flooring business.

Trade Contractor Use

A business classified as a “trade contractor” is defined in the zoning ordinance as,

“A building or portion thereof where building and construction trade services are provided to the public. "Trade contractor" shall include, but will not be limited to, contractor offices, including landscaper's showrooms, construction supplies and storage including plumbing, heating, air conditioning, and building equipment, materials, sales, and other uses similar in nature and impact.” (Section 12-13-3).

Refer to the Petitioner’s Letter of Intent for business operation information. The petitioner describes their business as a hardwood flooring company. Customers will be able to access the showroom by appointment only. Other services performed onsite will be deliveries and pickups of materials and limited fabrication work (e.g. custom cutting of hardwood planks). Activities would primarily include performing installation and finishing pre-made materials offsite at customer locations. The business currently includes two employees and four subcontractors.

Storage of materials must occur indoors, except as permitted by Section 12-7-F.5.d. Trade contractor businesses in the C-3 district can display materials outside of the building, although they cannot be displayed within any required yards. With the current site plan, there are few locations on the property where outdoor display would be possible. The petitioner has not indicated any intent to display materials outdoors; if this changes, all requirements of Section 12-7-3.F.5.d must be followed, limiting the location, height, and types of material displayed.

Proposed Building and Front Yard Variation

The proposed building on the site will be 4,512 square feet in size and one story, 17 feet 9 inches in height. One overhead door and loading zone is located adjacent to the alley. Landscaping and

fencing are noted on the site plan to meet landscape buffer requirements pursuant to Section 12-10-9.

In the C-3 zoning district, the required front yard must equal the required setback of any adjacent residential district, or 5 feet if it is not adjacent to residential. This property is adjacent to an R-1 zoned property on the west side, thus requiring a 25-foot front yard setback. A standard variation to reduce the required front yard is requested to allow the building to be setback 5 feet instead of 25 feet from the property line. The proposed setback of the building from the property line is consistent with the other commercial properties on this block.

The current building design does not meet Section 12-3-11 – Building Design Standards. The proposed materials meet requirements, with brick and metal proposed on the façade. However, for street-facing elevations (north and east facades) a minimum of 50% transparency from 2 feet to 9 feet above the sidewalk is required for this type of use. The petitioner may request a minor variation, reviewed administratively by zoning staff, to vary from this requirement.

Off-Street Parking

One accessible parking space and six standard parking spaces are provided on the site plan. The trade contractor use does not require a specific amount of off-street parking per Section 12-9-7. Because trade contractor is a conditional use within the C-3 Zoning District, a specific amount or location of off-street parking can be a condition of approval. On-street parking is available on Prospect Avenue and on the west side of Chestnut Street.

If the PZB requires modifications to the parking plan or if it is determined that parking agreements should be sought to relieve parking concerns associated with this use, a condition of approval can be suggested with the recommendation to City Council.

Traffic and Loading

Access to the property will be provided by the existing 16-foot-wide alley accessed from Chestnut Street. Traffic generated by this use would include vehicle trips associated with employees, customers, and deliveries and loading of materials. A major variation is requested to permit the loading zones to open onto the alley. Due to the location and size of the property, the loading zone area opening into the alley provides access without requiring an additional curb cut along Chestnut Street or Prospect Avenue.

The Letter of Intent provided by the petitioner (refer to attachments) states deliveries will occur between 8 A.M. and 5 P.M. on weekdays, and larger deliveries would be scheduled outside of peak traffic hours. Loading and unloading will occur within the designated loading zones. A suggested condition of approval states that any loading and unloading outside of the building may not occur between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M.

The petitioner proposes an eight-foot-tall fence around the rear of the building, enclosing the parking lot and loading space. A gate is proposed at the entrance from the public alley. To prevent any issues with visibility for motorists or pedestrians navigating within and around the property, a proposed condition of approval is that the fencing within the ten-foot sight triangle must be partially transparent, and landscaping must be maintained to a height of no taller than three feet. Chain link, wrought iron, or another type of partially open fencing option must be located in this area. Note Section 12-8-2 of the Zoning Ordinance allows nonresidential properties to have fences up to eight feet tall, without specific requirements for the sight triangle. The suggested condition of approval provides greater certainty that adequate visibility will be present with the development of this property.

Due to the proposed use of the alley for entrance and exit for all loading, deliveries and parking, and the poor condition of the existing pavement, a suggested condition of approval is to complete alley improvements. The petitioner acknowledges this condition in the Letter of Intent and states plans for the improvements will be provided at time of building permit.

Standards for Conditional Use

The following is a discussion of standards for conditional uses from Section 12-3-4(E) of the Zoning Ordinance. Rationale for how the proposed use would satisfy the standards is provided below and in the petitioner's response to standards. The PZB may use this rationale toward its recommendation, or the Board may make up its own.

1. The proposed Conditional Use is in fact a Conditional Use established within the specific Zoning district involved:

Comment: Trade contractor is a conditional use within the C-3, General Commercial District.

2. The proposed Conditional Use is in accordance with the objectives of the City's Comprehensive Plan:

Comment: The 2019 Comprehensive Plan designates the subject site as Commercial. This business would create a commercial use for this vacant, commercially zoned property. A zoning map amendment was approved in 2022 to

re-zone this property from C-1 to C-3 to expand the permitted uses for this parcel. Per historic aerials and City records, the property has been undeveloped for known history. The zoning was changed from residential to commercial for this block of Prospect Avenue in 1989; despite the commercial zoning, no commercial building has been constructed on this site. The conditional use would provide a commercial use for this property for the first time in known history.

3. The proposed Conditional Use is designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity:

Comment: Many suggested conditions of approval are included with this case to provide assurances about the use being compliant with applicable zoning requirements and minimize impact in terms of noise. Suggested conditions include limitations on the timeframe for loading and unloading at the exterior of the building, improvements to the alley, and providing information at time of building permit to ensure the turning radius of trucks will be adequate in the loading zones.

4. The proposed Conditional Use is not hazardous or disturbing to existing neighboring uses:

Comment: As discussed in the Petitioner's Letter of Intent, the business will operate Monday through Saturday 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. and closed on Sunday. See the Petitioner's Letter of Intent and Response to Standards for additional information about business operations. The suggested conditions of approval are meant to provide assurances that limit any disturbance or nuisance to the neighborhood.

5. The proposed Conditional Use is to be served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer, and schools; or, agencies responsible for establishing the Conditional Use shall provide adequately any such services:

Comment: The subject site is adequately served by essential public facilities and services. During the permitting and construction phase and business registration approval, the petitioner must undergo an inspection of the building by the fire, building, and zoning divisions to determine compliance with this conditional use and all applicable local, state, and federal regulations.

6. The proposed Conditional Use does not create excessive additional requirements at public expense for public facilities and services and will not be detrimental to the economic well-being of the entire community:

Comment: The proposed use would not create a burden on public facilities or services. This business would be located within a new building, and it is not anticipated that this use would generate additional need for public facilities or services compared to any other building constructed in this area.

7. The proposed Conditional Use does not involve uses, activities, processes, materials,

equipment and conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any persons, property, or the general welfare by reason of excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke fumes, glare or odors:

Comment: Traffic generated by this use will include trips generated for employees, deliveries, and customers (by appointment). The Letter of Intent by the petitioner states deliveries would occur between 8 A.M. and 5 P.M. A suggested condition of approval states that any loading and unloading outside of the building may not occur between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M., intended to limit the amount of noise associated with the business impacting neighboring properties. No extraordinary glare, smoke fumes, or odors are anticipated to occur with the operation of this business; however, any business within Des Plaines must meet Chapter 12 – Environmental Performance Standards of the Zoning Ordinance regulating noise, odor, glare, and any other specified nuisances, otherwise enforcement action can be taken.

8. The proposed Conditional Use provides vehicular access to the property designed so that it does not create an interference with traffic on surrounding public thoroughfares:

Comment: Access to the building will be provided through the existing alley accessed from Chestnut Street. No additional curb cuts are proposed for this property. A suggested condition of approval will require a turning radii analysis submitted to City staff prior to building permit issuance to ensure adequate space is available for trucks entering/exiting the loading zone and any vehicles entering or exiting through the overhead doors.

9. The proposed Conditional Use does not result in the destruction, loss, or damage of natural, scenic, or historic features of major importance:

Comment: The proposed project would not result in the damage of natural, scenic, or historic features. A large parkway tree is present in the public right of way in front of the property, which is within public property and required to be preserved regardless of this development unless otherwise authorized by the City. Section 8-4-4 of the Public Ways and Property title of the municipal code prevents any injury or movement of this tree without authorization by the city.

10. The proposed Conditional Use complies with all additional regulations in the Zoning Ordinance specific to the Conditional Use requested:

Comment: The proposed use complies with all applicable requirements as stated in the Zoning Ordinance. Two variations are proposed with this application associated with the required front yard and the loading zone and one minor variation may be requested upon approval of this conditional use to vary from building design standards in Section 12-3-11.

Standards for Variation:

Variation requests are subject to the standards set forth in Section 12-3-6(H) of the Zoning Ordinance. Rationale for how the proposed requests would or would not satisfy the standards is

provided below and in the attached petitioner responses to standards. The Board may use the provided staff comments as its rationale, modify, or adopt its own.

1. Hardship: No variation shall be granted pursuant to this subsection H unless the petitioner shall establish that carrying out the strict letter of the provisions of this title would create a particular hardship or a practical difficulty.

Comment: Without the variation to reduce the required front yard, the buildable area of this relatively small C-3 zoned property would be further reduced. Hardships were imposed on this property in 2016 when the adjacent property, 1383 Prospect Avenue, petitioned for a zoning map amendment from C-1, Neighborhood Commercial to R-1, Single-Family Residential. Commercially zoned properties adjacent to residentially zoned properties are required to meet certain setback and screening/landscaping requirements. Prior to 2016, the front yard would have been required to be 5 feet for this property.

The major variation for the loading zone is necessary due to the size of the property. This property is relatively small for a C-3 zoned property and this specific use requires more dedicated areas for loading/unloading than other businesses. There is insufficient space for this loading space with the proposed size of the building, unless the petitioner chose to have loading space within the building. However, loading within the building would be challenging due to the size of the property.

2. Unique Physical Condition: The subject lot is exceptional as compared to other lots subject to the same provision by reason of a unique physical condition, including presence of an existing use, structure, or sign, whether conforming or nonconforming; irregular or substandard shape or size; exceptional topographical features; or other extraordinary physical conditions peculiar to and inherent in the subject lot that amount to more than a mere inconvenience to the owner and that relate to or arise out of the lot rather than the personal situation of the current owner of the lot.

Comment: This commercial property is unique in this neighborhood due to its location adjacent to an R-1 zoned property. Refer to the Zoning Map attachment. Other parcels in this area are zoned commercial or townhouse residential. The other commercial properties have smaller front yard setbacks along Prospect Avenue, like what is requested by this petitioner.

The location of the loading zone facing the alley is primarily due to size limitations of the property. Unless the petitioner chose to have loading inside the building, there are few design alternatives to add the necessary loading areas for the business without requiring the driveway to face a public way. This orientation of the loading zone presents a less significant impact compared to a loading zone along the public streets.

3. Not Self-Created: The aforesaid unique physical condition is not the result of any action or inaction of the owner or its predecessors in title and existed at the time of the enactment of the provisions from which a variance is sought or was

created by natural forces or was the result of governmental action, other than the adoption of this title.

Comment: With the re-zoning of the adjacent property (1383 Prospect Avenue) to residential, a hardship was imposed on this property requiring a larger front yard setback for a new building than other commercial properties along this block.

The property owner was aware of the size limitations when purchasing this property and because this is a new building, the hardship related to the loading zone is related to their chosen site design, rather than a hardship imposed by the physical property. However, any commercial property on this site would require a loading space, pursuant to Section 12-9-9, and may face similar challenges with its orientation on the small property away from a public way.

4. Denied Substantial Rights: The carrying out of the strict letter of the provision from which a variance is sought would deprive the owner of the subject lot of substantial rights commonly enjoyed by owners of other lots subject to the same provision.

Comment: The rights denied to the property owner could be the ability to develop this building as proposed. However, it is conceivable that additional options exist to redesign the property to be compliant with all zoning ordinance standards. The PZB may ask the petitioner if this property is suitable for this type of use and clarify why specific decisions were chosen regarding the building design.

5. Not Merely Special Privilege: The alleged hardship or difficulty is neither merely the inability of the owner or occupant to enjoy some special privilege or additional right not available to owners or occupants of other lots subject to the same provision, nor merely the inability of the owner to make more money from the use of the subject lot.

Comment: Variation decisions are made on a case-by-case, project-by-project basis upon applying the variation standards. In those evaluations, the determining body (e.g., PZB and/or City Council) usually determines the petitioner has exhausted design options that do not require a variation. The PZB may ask the petitioner to explain whether they have exhausted other alternatives.

6. Title And Plan Purposes: The variation would not result in a use or development of the subject lot that would be not in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this title and the provision from which a variation is sought were enacted or the general purpose and intent of the comprehensive plan.

Comment: If the variations and conditional use were approved, it would meet all applicable requirements except for a minor variation required for the proposed building design.

7. No Other Remedy: There is no means other than the requested variation by which the alleged hardship or difficulty can be avoided or remedied to a degree sufficient to permit a reasonable use of the subject lot.

Comment: A remedy to relieve necessary relief for the required front yard would be to locate the building further from the property line along Prospect Avenue. However, the property is small, and this would further reduce the buildable area of the parcel.

Unless the petitioner chose to have loading inside the building, there are few design alternatives to adding the necessary loading areas for the property without requiring the driveway to face a public way. This orientation of the loading zone presents a smaller impact compared to a loading zone along the public streets.

8. Minimum Required: The requested variation is the minimum measure of relief necessary to alleviate the alleged hardship or difficulty presented by the strict application of this title.

Comment: With the variations sought, it would meet all applicable requirements with the exception of a minor variation required for the proposed building design.

PZB Procedure and Recommended Conditions: Under Section 12-3-7.D (Procedure for Review and Decision for Amendments) and Section 12-3-6.F (Major Variations) of the Zoning Ordinance, the PZB has the authority to *recommend* approval, approval subject to conditions, or denial of the request to City Council. City Council has final authority on these requests.

Under Section 12-3-6.F.2.b (Standard Variations) of the Zoning Ordinance, the PZB has the authority to approve, approve subject to conditions, or deny the standard variation request. However, under Section 12-2-2 (Legislative and Administrative Authority), when other relief requiring city council approval is sought, such as conditional uses or major variations, the PZB serves as the *recommending* body for all requests.

The PZB has the final authority to *recommend* approval, approval subject to conditions, or denial of all requests to City Council. All requests can be reviewed and recommended in separate motions or combined into one motion. Staff recommends the following conditions:

Conditions of Approval:

1. Full reconstruction of the portion of alley along the rear frontage is required, with a catch basin connected to the storm sewer in Chestnut Street. The improvements must be demonstrated on plans prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, replacement of existing public sidewalks deemed unsatisfactory must be demonstrated on plans, as determined by the Director of Public Works and Engineering or their designee.
3. A turning radii exhibit is required to be submitted prior to issuance of building permit demonstrating acceptable turning radiuses for loading/unloading, to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works and Engineering or their designee.
4. Loading and unloading of materials outside of the building is prohibited between the hours of 10:00 P.M. and 7:00 A.M. No loading and unloading can occur within any public ways.

5. Fencing within the ten-foot sight triangle at the intersection of the driveway, Chestnut Street, and the alley must be chain link, wrought iron, or another type of fencing that provides sufficient transparency for motorist and pedestrian visibility. Any landscaping within this sight triangle must be three feet in height or shorter.

Member Weaver expressed concerns about the funding arrangement. He asked if it is possible for petitioner to pay for the drainage and that the repaving may be a minor part of the cost, but it would be a good idea to have the whole alley uniform and all done at the same time.

Member Weaver is also not convinced that the petitioner should be paying for one piece of repaving in the alley.

Member Saletnik discussed the impact on the entire alley in relation to the required improvement adjacent to only the subject property.

Chairman Szabo swore in Maria Lomblad of 1382 Prospect Ave, Des Plaines, IL

Ms. Lomblad asked if the alley will be extended since the day care is located there and wanted confirmation if that belonged to the City. Staff confirmed “yes” this is City property.

Ms. Lomblad also asked about parking the cars. Will there be enough parking spaces for employees? She is concerned about the congestion and traffic.

Mr. Haures clarified that there will be five parking spots on the property and they only have three cars. No street parking is expected to be used.

Ms. Lomblad also inquired asked about hours of operation and when the construction is expected to finish.

Mr. Haures stated 7 a.m.-5 p.m. Construction expected to be completed by end of 2025.

Member Veremis inquired about weekend hours and Mr Haures confirmed no operations on Saturdays or Sundays.

Member Veremis suggested weekend hours be explicitly limited as part of the approval.

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

Member Saletnik asked if there is any suggestion to change the verbiage on condition 1.

Member Veremis suggested an agreement with public works on drainage requirements.

Senior Planner Redman provided the following text encapsulating Member Weaver’s intended alternative conditions:

1. Improvements of the portion of the alley and drainage along the rear frontage are required for approval of the Director of Public Works and Engineering.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, replacement of existing public sidewalks adjacent to this property deemed unsatisfactory must be demonstrated on plans, as determined by the Director of Public Works and Engineering or their designee.

A motion was made by Member Weaver and seconded by Member Saletnik to recommend approval of the conditional use to the City Council with the staff recommended conditions Nos.3-5 as written and amended conditions Nos. 1 and 2.

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

NAYES: Szabo

ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Szabo adjourned the meeting by affirmative voice vote at 7:51 p.m.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Mendel, Recording Secretary

cc: City Officials, Aldermen, Planning & Zoning Board, Petitioners