



**DES PLAINES PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING  
JANUARY 14, 2025  
MINUTES**

The Des Plaines Planning and Zoning Board held its regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, January 14, 2025, at 7:00 p.m. in Room 102 of the Des Plaines Civic Center.

**GENERAL COMMUNICATIONS**

Chairman Szabo gave a remembrance statement for recently passed PZB Member Paul Saletnik. Director Jeff Rogers gave a statement of remembrance. Chairman Szabo requested a moment of silence in honor of PZB Member Paul Saletnik's memory.

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

PRESENT: Bronakowski, Catalano, Fowler, Szabo, Veremis, Weaver

ABSENT: None

ALSO PRESENT: Jonathan Mendel, AICP, Assistant CED Director  
Samantha Redman, AICP, Senior Planner  
Jeff Rogers, AICP, CED Director  
Jonathan Stytz, AICP, Senior Planner

A quorum was present.

**APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 26, 2024 PZB MEETING MINUTES**

A motion was made by Board Member Bronakowski, seconded by Member Veremis, to approve the meeting minutes.

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

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

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

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEM**

There was no public comment.

**PENDING APPLICATIONS**

**1. Address: 2134 Sprucewood Ave.**

**Case Number: 24-058-TSUB-FPLAT**

The applicant requests Tentative and Final Plat of Subdivision under Section 13-2 of the Subdivision Regulations to subdivide one existing lot into two lots of record.

**PIN: 09-30-403-009-0000**

**Proceedings/Discussion:**

Chair Szabo introduced the case on the agenda and swore in petitioners Irene and Zenon Heldak.

Irene Heldak presented the proposed subdivision of a residential lot into two lots of record.

Chair Szabo asked for Board comments and asked why the subdivision wasn't two equal width lots.

Irene Heldak explained they need one wider lot for a planned ranch house, necessitating the wider lot.

Senior Planner Sam Redman presented the staff report and packet:

- Applicant:** Irene Heldak, 2294 Westview Dr, Des Plaines, IL 60018
- Owner:** Irene and Zenon Heldak, 2294 Westview Dr, Des Plaines, IL 60018
- Case Number:** 24-058-TSUB-FPLAT
- PIN:** 09-30-403-009-0000
- Ward:** #5, Carla Brookman
- Existing Zoning:** R-1, Single Family Residential
- Existing Land Use:** Single family residence
- Surrounding Zoning:** North: R-1 Single Family Residential District  
South: R-1 Single Family Residential District  
East: R-1 Single Family Residential District  
West: R-1 Single Family Residential District
- Surrounding Land Use:** North: Single Family Dwellings (Residential)  
South: Single Family Dwellings (Residential)  
East: Single Family Dwellings (Residential)  
West: Single Family Dwellings (Residential)

**Street Classification:** Sprucewood Avenue is classified as a local road.

**Comprehensive Plan:** The Comprehensive Plan illustrates the site as single family residential.

**Zoning/Property History:** Based on City records, the subject property has been one parcel throughout known history. A single-family detached home has been located on the property since around the early 1960s. The property owners have received a demolition permit for the current house intending to subdivide the property into two lots and construct a new single family, detached residence on each lot.

### **Tentative and Final Plat of Subdivision Report**

The petitioner, Irene Heldak, requests a Tentative and Final Plat of Subdivision for the 19,983 square foot (0.45 acre) property located at 2134 Sprucewood Avenue. The petitioner's Final Plat shows the subdivision of the existing lot into two lots, one 75 feet wide and 11,529 square feet in area and the other 55 feet wide and 8,454 square feet in area. All required yards and building lines are noted on the plat of subdivision and meet R-1, Single Family Residential Zoning requirements.

The Preliminary Site Improvement Plan includes installation of necessary water, sanitary sewer, and stormwater infrastructure for the new lots as well as erosion control during construction and installation of a new concrete apron for access to the second lot and any associated replacement of sidewalk, curb and gutter, and parkway restoration. The required improvements were approved by the Director of Engineering (Refer to Final Engineering Plans). A financial security in the amount of 125% of the approved engineer's estimate of cost of the public improvements will be collected in a form approved by the City Attorney prior to recordation of the final plat of subdivision. The total amount of the estimated improvements and the required financial securities are noted in the Engineering Letter and EOPC attachment. The petitioner provided correspondence from required utilities demonstrating they would serve this property and future easements would be determined when new structures are proposed to be constructed.

### **PZB Procedure:**

Under Section 13-2-7 of the Subdivision Regulations, the PZB has the authority to recommend approval, approval subject to conditions, or denial of the request: A Tentative and Final Plat of Subdivision to split an existing lot into two lots of record at 2134 Sprucewood Avenue.

The decision should be based on review of the information presented by the applicant and meet requirements of Section 13-2-7 as outlined in the Subdivision Regulations. Staff has no suggested conditions.

Chairman Szabo asked for comments from the PZB and there were none.

Member Weaver motioned to approve as presented and Member Fowler seconded the motion.

AYES: Bronakowski, Catalano, Fowler, Szabo, Veremis, Weaver  
NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

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

**2. Address: 10 W. Algonquin Road Case Number: 24-063-PUD-V**

The petitioner requests: (i.) a Conditional Use for a Preliminary & Final Planned Unit Development; (ii.) Major Variations to allow a.) loading spaces that open onto or face a public right-of-way, and b.) fencing with an open design instead of solid opaque fencing abutting existing residential uses; and (iii.) any other exceptions, variations, waivers, and zoning relief as may be necessary.

**PINs: 08-24-201-052-0000 & 08-24-201-053-0000**

**Proceedings/Discussion:**

Chairman Szabo introduced the case in the agenda and swore in the 8 applicants giving testimony.

Tom Kikta (Legat) introduced meeting and speakers.

Nick Zasada of 8025 Lamon Ave, Skokie IL. He explained the nature of Vetter Inc and their services. Outlined their history and current US location in Skokie. Vetter is a family owned, German based contract manufacturer where injectable drugs are filled for clients. It is a converter of drug substance into injectable units. There is a total of 6600 employees, most of those are based in Germany. The facility in Skokie has about 100 employees. Vetter is a 100% service provider meaning they do not have their own product and is a pure contract manufacturer. Headquarters are in Ravensbruck, Germany and these services have been performed for over 40 years and 15 years at the Skokie facility. Main line of business is aseptic filling of injectable drugs. Product is then returned to the customer where they are responsible for marketing sales distribution and getting the injectables to the patients. The facility is working in a clinical trial phase. Vetter is hired for the more complex products that are targeting many diseases that currently have no treatment for. Vetter delivers critical medications to patients that are in need of treatment where Vetter is the key step in this process. Medication batch sizes are small since this is a clinical trial phase. Ranges from 1 L to maximum of 200 L (=50 gallons) Plan for Des Plaines facility is to have 140 employees. There is no 24 hr operation here since there is only 1 batch daily. Filling operation takes place during the day. Earliest arrival to facility is 6 am and latest they would leave is 8 pm. There are no products of Vetter, so there is no research done here and no animal testing. The only visitors will be the clients that would come to observe their product being manufactured.

Chairman Szabo asked for PZB questions.

Member Veremis asked if this facility is like the current Skokie facility

Nick Zasada stated they provide the same production

Member Weaver asked for the phasing out of Skokie to Des Plaines.

Nick Zasada stated that they will eventually phase out Skokie and move completely to Des Plaines. The Skokie location is being leased and improvements that need to be made to maintain property and not having full control of building is a challenge and concern.

Tom Kikta outlined the development plan and the planned operational and non-operational portion of the site. Outlined the general location and the intent for the two site access driveways to be split between Algonquin for staff and Mount Prospect Rd for truck and delivery access. Outlined the proposed site plan details specifically regarding the site perimeter landscaping, open fence requiring a variation and NW berm, wall and fence. Also describe the general site circulation around and throughout the entire site. Described the variation for loading bays facing Mount Prospect and how to mitigate the aesthetic impact. Lastly outlined the ground sign number variation to permit four ground signs when only three are permitted.

Trudy Buehler (Civil Engineer) of 9575 W Higgins Rd. Suite 500 in Rosemont. Trudy outlined the site civil engineering requirement in accordance with MWRD, City of Des Plaines and IDOT regulations.

Rachel Foster (Legat Architect) of 549 Randolph Street in Chicago, outlined the tree survey and site landscaping findings and outcome as well as preservation and protection for remaining trees. Proposed landscaping will be appropriate to region and provide nice aesthetics for the neighboring residential properties. Described the site lighting and compliance with City Code. Then described the general architecture of the proposed building and the built-in sound attenuation architecture. Outlined the building architecture's aesthetics, materials and details. Specifically stated the building will have bird safe window glass. Lastly outlined the construction schedule and timeline.

Micheal Werthmann (KLOA) outlined the traffic study details, findings and recommendations.

Brendan Penny (Meltzer Purtill & Stelle LLC) of 125 S Wacker Dr. In Chicago, outlined the requests being sought. CU-PUD request, fencing variation, ground sign number variation and loading docks orientation variation. Conclude the applicant presentation

Chairman Szabo asked for PZB comments.

Member Catalano asked about parking needs related to employee numbers

Tom Kikta explained that 140 parking is requested

Member Fowler asked about hours of operation is confusing between various applicant presenters

Nick Zasada answered current operations begin at 6 am, second shift that comes in at 11 am and ends at 7:30 pm.

Member Fowler asked about next development phase when Skokie closed at maximum development on Des Plaines site.

Nick Zasada explained the timing of Skokie phase out and Des Plaines expansion beyond the current development proposal.

Member Weaver asked about the layout and configuration of proposed building and why it was designed and existing buildings remaining. Interested in need/use of existing southern buildings.

Tom Kikta explained that the existing buildings will be demolished when next phase of site development occurs.

Member Veremis asked about time for drug approval.

Nick Zasada explained that drug approval can be about 10-20 years and they have multiple customers and described the product approval process in the applicant's presentation.

Member Veremis asked whether the proposed 140 employees should be static at this location.

Member Bronakowski questioned why the proposed building was placed closer to the residential neighborhood.

Tom Kikta stated the proposed building is sited this way to accommodate production needs and site circulation

Chairman Szabo asked for more PZB comments and passed to Director Jeff Rogers.

Director Jeff Rogers outlined the staff report and packet as amended by the applicant prior to meeting:

**Petitioner:** Legat Architects, 549 W. Randolph Street, Chicago, IL, as agent for Vetter Commercial Manufacturing USA, LLC, 10 W. Algonquin Road, Des Plaines, IL 60016

**Owner:** Vetter Commercial Manufacturing USA, LLC, 10 W. Algonquin Road, Des Plaines, IL 60016

**Case Number:** 24-063-PUD-V

**PINs:** 08-24-201-052-0000 & 08-24-201-053-0000

**Ward:** #8, Alderman Mike Charewicz

**Existing Zoning:** M-3, Special Manufacturing District

**Existing Land Use:** Vacant office buildings, surface parking lots, and undeveloped land

**Surrounding Zoning:** North: R-1, Single Family Residential District  
South: R-1, Single Family Residential District  
East: M-3, Special Manufacturing District  
West: R-1, Single Family Residential District

**Surrounding Land Use:** North: Single-family detached residences  
South: Single-family detached residences  
East: Commercial buildings  
West: Single-family detached residences

**Street Classification:** Algonquin Road is classified as a Major Collector and is under the jurisdiction of the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT); and Mount Prospect Road is classified as a Major Collector and is under the jurisdiction of Cook County.

**Comprehensive Plan:** The Comprehensive Plan's future land use designation for the property is "Commercial."

**Property/Zoning History:** Per the Cook County Tax map, the subject property is comprised of unsubdivided parcels. The existing vacant office buildings, an underground parking structure, surface parking lots, and an area of undeveloped land were established over time beginning in the late 1960s through the mid-1970s in accordance with a Planned Unit Development approved via Ordinance Z-9-69.

Prior to the current proposal, a prior application for a Planned Unit Development for the subject property was approved via Ordinance Z-19-16 in 2016. The current property owner acquired the subject property in 2017. The term of the approvals associated with the 2016 PUD Ordinance were extended via Ordinance Z-17-17 in 2017 but were not pursued further by the property owner and subsequently expired in 2018.

**Project Overview:** The petitioner is Legat Architects as agent for Vetter Commercial Manufacturing USA, LLC, the property owner. The proposed improvements would be comprised of a new building generally at the north end of the site to be comprised of approximately 158,000 square feet. The existing office buildings would remain vacant at this time except for a temporary occupancy of the north office building by the construction contractors as a site office for the duration of the construction activities on site. Details of the project are included below and in relevant attachments.

Site Development

The site is comprised of two parcels together totaling approximately 17.84 acres. A consolidation of the two parcels into one lot will be required prior to approval of final engineering design and prior to issuance of permits for the project. The proposed building would be situated in an area of existing open space at the north end of the property and would add approximately 158,000 square feet of new floor area including new mechanical space, laboratory space, office space, and logistics space.

Three existing buildings would remain. The floor area of the five-story west building, Building A, is approximately 22,350 square feet. The floor area of the two-story south building, Building B, is approximately 22,350 square feet. The floor area of the one-story east building, Building C, is approximately 46,620 square feet. The applicant proposes minor remodeling improvements to accommodate a temporary occupancy of a portion of Building A for the purpose of offices for the onsite construction management personnel.

*Bulk Regulations*

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 12-7-4 and defined in Section 12-13-3.

<b><i>Bulk Controls</i></b>	<b><i>Required</i></b>	<b><i>Proposed</i></b>
Lot size	5 acres (min.)	18 acres
Building Height	50 ft. (max.)	46 ft.
Front yard building setback (south & east)	60 ft. (min.)	169 ft.
Side yard building setback (west)	60 ft. (min.)	92.9 ft.
Rear yard building setback (north)	60 ft. (min.)	80.3 ft.
Building Coverage	75% (max.)	27.6%

*Off-Street Parking*

In accordance with the requirements of the Code, the following quantities of off-street parking stalls are required:

<b><i>Parking</i></b>	<b><i>Requirement</i></b>	<b><i>Total</i></b>
Office Uses	1 space per 250 square feet of gross floor area	82,964 square feet = 332 stalls
Industrial and Manufacturing Uses	1 space for every 1,500 square feet of gross floor area	78,266 square feet = 53 stalls
Accessible Spaces	Between 301-400 spaces provided	8 accessible stalls

<b>Total Accessible Proposed:</b>	14 stalls
<b>Total Required:</b>	385 stalls
<b>Total Proposed:</b>	298 surface stalls + 20 underground stalls = 318 stalls

Sec. 12-3-5.C.4. of the Code allows for consideration of reductions in required parking associated with a PUD by up to 25% of the total collective parking requirement. In conjunction with the PUD request, the applicant requests an exception to reduce the minimum parking requirement to one stall per employee plus one stall per visitor.

The applicant proposes up to 72 employees plus up to 10 visitors during their busiest shift with 48 employees arriving at a 3 p.m. shift change for a total of 130 simultaneous individuals daily. The proposed site plan design would provide 318 parking stalls including both surface and underground parking, a reduction from the minimum required quantity of parking stalls of 17.5%.

If the exception is approved, the applicant will need to maintain compliance with this minimum parking ratio prior to occupying the existing buildings upon the property any new uses. Although land-banking of parking is not permissible in the M-3 District per Sec. 12-9-10 of the Code, there remain areas of open space across the property which could be improved in the future to accommodate additional off-street parking should additional parking be required to allow a future use to occupy existing space on the subject property.

A similar exception was included in the PUD Ordinance adopted in 2016 which has since expired.

Off-street Loading

In accordance with the requirements of the Code, the following quantities of off-street loading stalls are required:

<i>Loading</i>	<i>Requirement</i>	<i>Total</i>
Building Size	200,001-300,000 sq. ft.	3 loading stalls
<b>Total Proposed:</b>		5 loading stalls

Site Access

The subject property is currently accessible via two full access curb cuts including one unsignalized access to E. Algonquin Road at the southwest corner of the property and one signalized access to S.

Mount Prospect Road. The proposed improvements would add one additional full access curb cut to S. Mount Prospect Road for visitors to the site at the northeast corner of the site.

Traffic

The applicant provided a traffic impact study prepared by Kenig, Lindgren, O’Hara, Aboona, Inc, a copy of which is attached to this report. The study includes results from a traffic survey of existing conditions with the current building vacancies on the property and among other buildings in the vicinity in addition to projections of future traffic volumes assuming the proposed building improvements and occupancy of other buildings in the area. The proposed weekday morning peak hour of traffic is estimated to generate 65 inbound & 5 outbound traffic movements (approximately 1.2 vehicles per minute). The proposed weekday afternoon peak hour of traffic is estimated to generate 45 inbound and 65 outbound traffic movements (approximately 1.8 vehicles per minute). Most of these traffic movements would utilize the existing Algonquin Road access drive.

Proposed logistics deliveries, refuse management, and other truck trips would primarily utilize the signalized access to S. Mount Prospect Road.

Transparency & Building Materials

Section 12-3-11 requires the facades of the office components of the new building to be comprised of a minimum of 20% window glass on all floors. Ground floor elevations must be comprised of face brick, stucco, metal, and/or concrete masonry units while upper floors may additionally feature painted or stained wood and/or exterior insulation and finishing systems (EIFS).

	<b>Required</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<b>Ground Floor Office Space Transparency</b>	20% (min.)	97.5% (behind curtainwall)
<b>Upper Floor Office Space Transparency</b>	20% (min.)	97.5% (behind curtainwall)
<b>Ground Floor Building Materials</b>	Face brick, stucco, metal, and/or concrete masonry units	Metal panels & louvers and concrete masonry units
<b>Upper Floor Building Materials</b>	Face brick, stucco, metal, and/or concrete masonry units, painted	Metal panels & louvers and concrete masonry units

	or stained wood and/or exterior insulation and finishing systems (EIFS)	
--	---	--

Site Lighting

The applicant has provided a site photometric plan and catalog cuts of the proposed light fixtures. The proposed design features pole-mounted light fixtures with LED light elements at a height of 20.0 feet designed to direct light inward toward the perimeter circulation drive and building exterior. In the proposed locations, the light fixtures would not cast light beyond the lot lines and would be expected not to create glare visible from adjacent properties.

Tree Preservation, Removal, & Landscaping

The applicant proposes to retain the existing perimeter fencing which features a transparent design rather than an opaque design. The applicant has provided a tree survey identifying 96 existing trees that would be retained and 50 existing trees and stumps that would be removed. The proposed landscaping plan would introduce 261 new shrubs and 133 new trees including 39 new deciduous trees, 45 new evergreen trees, and 49 new “Techny” arborvitae.

Mechanical and Dumpster Screening

Section 12-10-11 of the Code requires screening of roof-top mechanical units and utility areas. The proposed design utilizes rooftop parapets to screen mechanical units from line-of-sight from adjacent properties and is intended to provide additional sound attenuation. Refuse management is proposed within two compactor units proposed within the two northernmost loading berths.

Stormwater Management

In accordance with the requirements of Title 14 of the City Code and the Cook County Watershed Management Ordinance, the applicant is proposing the installation of two new underground vaults near the south end of the property to provide additional stormwater detention volume as required for the proposed scope of site modifications. If the project is approved, additional analysis of the proposed design would be completed during review of final engineering plans in advance of the finalization of the Tentative & Final Plat of Subdivision and prior to the approval of any final designs in advance of the issuance of grading & site work permits or building permits.

**Major Variations**

The applicant requests several major zoning variations. The variation requests are summarized as follows:

Loading Berth Orientation

Per Code, loading berths are not permitted to be oriented toward the public right-of-way. The applicant proposes to orient the loading stalls for the proposed building at the southeast corner of the building facing the existing signalized intersection at S. Mount Prospect Road. The proposed location would be arguably less impactful than alternate locations along the west or north side of the building which abut existing residences. The applicant has not identified a future use of the proposed open space south of the proposed building, however relocation of loading berths to this side of the building may inhibit future opportunities for a building expansion in this direction.

Fence Opacity

Per Code, a solid privacy fence with a minimum height of 8.0 feet is required between the subject property and adjacent residential properties. In light of comments from adjacent property owners provided during the consideration of the 2016 PUD request, the applicant proposes to retain the existing 8-foot transparent mesh perimeter fence. The applicant proposes landscaping in a pattern of three rows with various spacings in the attempt to provide landscape buffer between the proposed perimeter circulation drive and the property line.

Fence Height

The applicant proposes a second area of fencing along the northwest corner of the new building on top of a proposed retaining wall. This fencing would feature a similar transparent mesh style as the existing perimeter fence, but would be installed on top of a new retaining wall. The height of the fence on top of the wall would stand up to 10.0 feet in height from the lowest adjacent grade.

**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>• The existing buildings would remain in their current locations.</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new building would occupy an area of open space at the north end of the site.</li> </ul>
The arrangement of open space and landscape improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed site plan would maintain open space within setbacks along the north and west lot lines, south of the new building, and between the existing office buildings in the south half of the property.</li> <li>• The applicant proposes a new landscaped buffer yard comprised of three rows of landscaping along the north and west lot lines.</li> </ul>
The adequacy of the proposed circulation system on the site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed site plan separates truck movements to and from the site at the signalized intersection from passenger vehicles at both the primary employee entrance at the southwest corner and the visitor entrance at the northeast corner of the property.</li> <li>• The applicant has located certain service access areas at the northwest corner of the new building. The applicant should describe the frequency of truck movements to these areas of the building and how noise impacts upon adjacent properties will be mitigated.</li> </ul>
The location, design, and screening of proposed off-street parking areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant proposes three primary off-street parking areas including the primary employee parking field on the interior of the property south of the proposed building and west of the existing building, a new visitor parking area east of the new building, and an existing underground parking structure.</li> </ul>
The adequacy of the proposed landscaping design on the site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant proposes the removal of approximately 50 existing trees and stumps across the site.</li> <li>• The proposed landscaping plan includes shrubs plus approximately 133 new trees intended to establish a landscape buffer yard along the north and west lot lines.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Per Code, a solid privacy fence with a height of 8.0 feet would be required along the north and west lot lines. The applicant instead requests approval of a variation to allow the existing 8-foot transparent mesh fence to remain.</li> </ul>
The design, location, and installation of proposed site illumination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed site illumination plan would comply with Code requirements for site lighting &amp; mitigation of potential glare onto adjacent properties.</li> </ul>
The correlation of the proposed site plan with adopted land use policies, goals, and objectives of the comprehensive plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Comprehensive Plan recommends promoting employment growth in industrial areas.</li> <li>• Site design abutting residential areas is encouraged to incorporate treatments along the property’s edge to screen the property from view.</li> <li>• Fencing serving as a physical barrier should be attractive while facilitating safe operations.</li> <li>• Industrial property is encouraged to include additional stormwater management infrastructure. Two new underground vaults are proposed at the south end of the property.</li> </ul>

**ENTITLEMENT REQUESTS AND ANALYSIS**

**Overview of Requests**

The petitioner requests consideration of the following items to facilitate the proposed development:

1. A Conditional Use for a Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) in the M-3 Special Manufacturing District;
2. Major zoning variations for the following:
  - a. Five (5) loading spaces that open onto or face a public right-of-way;
  - b. Fencing with an open design instead of solid opaque fencing abutting existing residential uses;
3. A Minor zoning variation for fencing with a height of up to 10.0 feet instead of a maximum of 8.0 feet; and

**Preliminary & Final PUD** A planned development, as defined below, was requested to accommodate the existing and proposed improvements across the property, including previously approved relief from bulk regulations of the Code applicable in the M-3 District for building height, parking, and other site characteristics.

Per Code, the Planned Unit Development allows for the following:

*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 &amp; Final 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	The subject property was developed in accordance with a prior PUD which allowed for a concentration of buildings on the south half of the site at heights which would not have been permissible by right. Although the new building would comply with the bulk regulations of the M-3 District, a PUD is required to include the new improvements on the same property with the prior improvements.
Permanent preservation of common open space and recreation areas and facilities	The proposed site design includes several areas of open space around the perimeter and among the proposed buildings.
A pattern of development to preserve natural vegetation, topographic and geologic features	The currently proposed site improvements would involve remediation of various issues with site trees including removal &

	replacement of dead trees, existing tree stumps, and trees in poor condition. The proposed tree removal activities would be accompanied by new tree plantings at a ratio of 2.67 new trees per tree removed.
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	Although not currently proposed, the site design establishes opportunities for future office uses and additional employment opportunities in addition to those associated with the manufacturing, office, and logistics uses currently proposed.
An efficient use of the land resulting in more economic networks of utilities, streets and other facilities	The proposed plan supplements the existing utility designs and would not substantially increase traffic or congestion in the area.
A land use which promotes the public health, safety, and general welfare	The applicant's application materials attest that cleaning agents would exclude hazardous chemicals like ethylene oxide and instead would feature water and hydrogen peroxide. No site design elements would introduce factors which would detract from the public health, safety, or general welfare.

*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.

*PUD Bulk Exceptions*

The requested PUD would include both the existing and proposed improvements, including previously approved relief from bulk regulations of the M-3 District to accommodate the height and other characteristics of the existing office buildings.

**Plat of Subdivision**

The proposal includes a consolidation of two original unsubdivided parcels into one new lot of record. The attached Tentative Plat of Planned Unit Development shows the dimensions of the proposed lot.

*Subdivision Improvements*

Public right-of-way was dedicated previously and various public improvements are existing along both E. Algonquin Road and S. Mount Prospect Road.

In addition, the memo states required public improvements for this development will include new watermain through the site, new underground stormwater detention vaults, in addition to work within Cook County & IDOT rights-of-way. 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 required prior to the issuance of building permits for the proposed development. All necessary dedications, fees, and necessary improvements, if any, would be outlined in the final subdivision resolution.

**Proposed Schedule**

*Entitlement Schedule*

The proposed requests for Preliminary & Final Planned Unit Development, Major Variations, and a Minor Variation are the first of two phases of required entitlements.

The Tentative & Final Plat of Subdivision needed to consolidate the existing parcels and memorialize new easements and a Conditional Use for a Localized Alternative Sign Regulation (LASR) to allow a custom signage plan for the property including more ground signs than would be permissible by right and any other wayfinding and wall signage would need to be finalized after the current requests are reviewed by City Council and prior to the approval of final plans and issuance of permits.

After a 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 & Final PUD is recommended by PZB and approved by the City Council, the Final Plat of Subdivision will need to be submitted for review & approval prior to recording

subsequent to the collection of required financial securities associated with the engineering improvements.

#### *Construction Schedule*

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 applicant has provided a Preliminary Construction Schedule attachment which outlines their projected project schedule for construction of site & building improvements. The proposed construction would be initiated in 2025 and would continue for approximately 24 months into late 2027.

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

#### **Engagement Summary**

On June 25, 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.

Legal notice for this case was provided pursuant to the requirements of Section 12-3-1.C. of the Code, including publication in a local newspaper, posting of notice signs on the property, and a notice mailed 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. The summary below includes themes and commentary from public comments.

#### *Use of Cleaning Agents*

The use of ethylene oxide should be prohibited. The operator should be transparent regarding the types of cleaning agents that will be used and no harmful chemicals should be released into the ground water or the air. The Petitioner's Narrative provides details on cleaning operations, describing the decontamination process with hydrogen peroxide. In addition, the petitioner provided information regarding hazardous waste in the Waste Profile attachment.

#### *Traffic Impacts*

There are concerns regarding an increase in traffic congestion originating from the proposed development. Respondents noted a preference for all traffic to enter the site at the traffic signal on S. Mount Prospect Road rather than at multiple proposed site entrances. There are concerns regarding impacts from the proximity of the proposed circulation drive around the new building to the existing residences. Refer to the petitioner's Traffic Study attachment.

*Lighting*

Increased light from the existing and proposed site improvements was identified as a concern. Compliance with International Dark Sky Association outdoor lighting principles was requested by one respondent. Refer to the Photometric Plan attachment provided by the petitioner. Note that during the building permit process, the photometric plan will be further examined to determine compliance with Section 12-12-10 of the Zoning Ordinance which limit light spillage onto adjacent properties.

*Landscaping*

Removal of existing mature trees to accommodate the proposed building is considered unfortunate. There are concerns that proposed landscaping will not provide a sufficient buffer separation from existing residences. Refer to the Landscape Plan and the Tree Survey attachments for landscaping details from the petitioner.

**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 modified, or adopt its own to represent its rationale.

**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 PUD generally aligns with the stated purposes of PUDs as analyzed in the Preliminary & Final PUD Plat Review table above with a proposed office & manufacturing development, designated open spaces, and landscaping. 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 new site and building improvements meet the bulk regulations outlined in Section 12-7-4.F. of the Zoning Ordinance (See Site Plan Review section above), however the original existing building improvements were developed in accordance with a prior PUD Ordinance (ca. 1969) and several major variations relating to design elements of the proposal are required.

**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 introduces one new curb cut to aid in separating passenger vehicles from truck traffic and maintains areas of open space among the existing and proposed buildings. 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. Refer to the Petitioner's Response to PUD Standards attachment 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 subject property is positioned at the boundary of an existing area of M-3 District office/industrial development and an existing R-1 Residential District. The mix of office and manufacturing uses and proposed landscape buffer yards is intended to serve as a transition from the predominantly industrial uses to the east and the residential uses to the west. The proposed scope of operations associated with the new improvements would not of themselves introduce substantial additional vehicular traffic or congestion in area streets.

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

The proposed development would increase the value of the property and site improvements and thereby increase the taxes generated by the property. Additionally, the proposed land use would introduce new employment within the community.

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

Site design elements of the proposed manufacturing and office improvements would comply with the recommendations of the 2019 Comprehensive Plan particularly including Goals 3.10. and 3.11.

**PZB Procedure and Recommended Conditions:**

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 & Final Planned Unit Development (PUD). The City Council has final authority on this request.

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

*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 requests for a Conditional Use for a Preliminary & Final PUD, Major Variations and a Minor Variation including the following:
  - A. An exception is granted to reduce the minimum required parking stall quantity to one stall per employee plus one stall per site visitor.
  - B. Five (5) loading spaces shall be allowed to face a public right-of-way;
  - C. Perimeter fencing along the north and west lot lines abutting existing residential uses shall be allowed to feature an open design instead of solid opaque design;
  - D. Fencing near the northwest corner of the site abutting the circulation drive shall be allowed a height of up to 10.0 feet instead of a maximum height of 8.0 feet; and

If the PZB recommends approval, staff recommends the following conditions for the Preliminary & Final PUD, Major Variations, and Minor Variation.

**Condition(s) of Approval:**

1. Ordinance Z-9-69 shall be repealed and the previously approved bulk regulations and improvements authorized by Ordinance Z-9-69 shall be incorporated in the new PUD Ordinance.
2. At time of both Tentative & Final Plat of Subdivision, approval of utility easements by all privately owned utility companies shall be indicated via written correspondence or lettered on the final document.
3. Final signage shall be considered in accordance with a Conditional Use for a Localized Alternative Sign Regulation (LASR) Ordinance after all site signage has been finalized.
4. The Petitioner must maintain the Property and operate the Proposed Use in compliance with the Performance Standards in Chapter 12 of Title 12 of the City Code, including, without limitation, light, odor, and noise. Upon the receipt of complaints regarding the operation of the Proposed Use, the City will investigate and apply the appropriate provisions, If City code enforcement staff observes or detects a violation of the Performance Standards (“Original Violation”), it will notify the Petitioner in writing and

provide a 14-day period for compliance, which compliance must be verified at a follow-up inspection. If upon follow-up inspection the Original Violation is still observed and uncorrected, a citation will be issued to Petitioner, which may result in a fine in a final amount to be determined by the City's administrative hearing officer.

Chair Szabo asked for PZB comments for staff

Member Weaver clarified the actions currently before them as amended during the meeting and outlined by the applicant. Specifically, regarding the ground signs.

Member Bronakowski asked about the distance between the proposed building and the nearest residential building to the west. Rachel Foster stated that the distance is 80 feet.

Chair Szabo for public comment and polled the audience for opposed, for or simply have comments.

John (Jack) Grooms (public) asked about the occupancy and hours of operation for the proposed development. Stated his perceived understanding of the presentation from the applicant regarding the use of the existing buildings and regarding the height of the proposed perimeter fencing.

Steven Vincenzo- [didn't give his name] (public) statement about the 1969 approval and stated that the development history of the subject property and the proposed development. Stated that the previous owner reason for the selling the property. Concerned about the design of the perimeter fence.

Member Weaver asked Director Rogers to confirm that the subject property was annexed in 1958. Director Rogers confirmed.

Szabo swore in all remaining public commenters

Frieda Hyrc (public) stated she worked for the Salvation Army and the existing buildings are nice in her opinion. Concerned about

Holly Boers (public) an employee of Vetter, but commenting as a community member. Likes the company and states Vetter is a good community member. Szabo asked if she worked at the Skokie facility

Donna Diamond (public) asked about the stormwater management for the proposed development and is there plans for stormwater management for the existing site improvements. Asked about the perimeter fence at the end dead end residential street and concerns about fence damage from snowplow piling. Concerned about the sound impacts and light spillage on the neighboring residential properties.

Chair Szabo asked civil engineer to address Diamond stormwater management for existing and proposed.

Trudy Buehler stated that the existing and proposed stormwater management will be managed by the proposed site improvements.

Donna Diamond asked about the removal of the existing large grass area and its stormwater management. Trudy Buehler stated it's accounted for.

Donna Diamond asked whether the proposed building could be moved to the east and still provide truck turning radius.

Nam Nguyen (public) asked about timing for perimeter fence installation.

Rich Malinowski (public) stated this proposal should be denied and not appropriate for this location and other locations are more appropriate. Concerned about the construction timeline and likely 25 months of construction activity next to a residential neighborhood.

Chair Szabo asked for more public comment. There were none. Asked applicant to address public comments.

Tom Kikta answered the employee counts and number of shifts. Stated that the 140 employees are the maximum number for this site at any given time. The fence variation request was an outcome of the 2024 workshop. Existing buildings do have asbestos throughout the building and primarily part of the structure fireproofing.

Member Fowler asked about other hazardous materials in existing buildings.

Member Catalano asked about underground fuel tank storage concerns at UOP to the east across Mount Prospect and stated the environmental report stated that UOP underground petroleum storage could have migrated west to the subject property.

Nick Zasada outlined the process and rigor for sanitation and clean room procedures. Any gases within the clean room are kept within the room and air recirculated and gases contained.

Tom Kikta stated they would be willing to change to a solid site perimeter fence, but the proposed 8 foot tall fence was chosen with location and environmental impacts.

Member Fowler stated that the fence was part of neighbors' input in 2016 public hearing and 2024 workshop.

Various public comments from the audience regarding the proposed fence.

Tom Kikta stated the proposed site perimeter fence is consistent with the proposed fence in 2016, but open to a code compliance perimeter fence. Addressed sound creation and where. The sound would be air handlers and cooling towers in the building roof and will be shielded and muffled within the building and through the use of large building wall to direct sound vertically above the building and not horizontally toward the residential neighborhood to the west and

north. Trucks coming to the site will primarily be smaller box trucks, but need to assume a site turn design to accommodate a 65 foot delivery truck. Reinforced reason by Trudy Buehler.

Ryan Christiansen (applicant general contractor) stated the perimeter fence replacement will be over a short period that while fence is removed and new installed in same day. Tom Kikta stated it's a horizontal mesh with 1 inch gaps between mesh.

Chair Szabo stated that changing solid fence up for review by PZB.

Member Weaver stated the variations presented and the open perimeter fence. Stated the fence design question is still open for clarification and concerned about the seeming confusion.

Chair Szabo stated that there is this fence design confusion and asked Rachel Foster to state the number of trees and landscaping proposed.

Donna Diamond stated that she is concerned about the durability of the fence at the dead end residential street, the fence design and working with the neighbors.

Member Fowler stated that for the planned fence removal and construction the applicant must bring a specific plan for communicating with the affected neighbors.

Tom Kikta concluded addressing the applicant responses.

Member Veremis asked if the 140 new jobs in Des Plaines all coming from Skokie facility and educational requirements. Nick Zasada stated that there are about 100 jobs at Skokie and the Des Plaines site will

Member Weaver stated he is impressed about the rigor and thought put into the proposal. Does have concerns about the status of some proposed variations that need to be further reviewed.

Brendan Penny discussed the fence design and working with staff, neighbors and City Council but at this time would like to keep fence variation request.

Director Rogers stated the fence could be a factor for PZB to continue to permit further review,

Member Weaver further delineates the fence variation request.

Chair Szabo reaffirmed possible processes

Director Rogers restated the possible PZB actions and recommendations to City Council.

Member Weaver asked staff: if PZB makes formal recommendation tonight when would the application go to the City Council?

Director Rogers stated if recommendation made by PZB next City Council meeting would be Feb. 3<sup>rd</sup> or Feb 18<sup>th</sup>.

Member Weaver detailed the timing that three weeks for today for City Council review would be minimum needed.

Brendan Penny requests the fence design variation be retained by PZB recommendation to City Council and permit applicant time to address fence design concerns and maintain a judicious timeline.

Member Weaver reiterated a need for working with the neighbors to gain better acceptance of the fence design through a fair and accessible process. Not ready to continue forward as is.

Chair Szabo was concerned about timing and process but wishes to continue forward with a recommendation as proposed and continue the analysis at City Council.

Member Veremis agreed.

Chair Szabo desires moving the request forward tonight.

Member Fowler agreed to move forward with requested zoning actions.

Member Weaver motioned to recommend City Council approval with exceptions B, C, D, and E (ground sign count variation) and condition 1 through 4 as drafted by Staff.

Member Catalano seconded.

Motion passed 5-0 with 1 abstention (Bronakowski)

3. **Address:** 1685 E. Oakton Street      **Case Number:** 25-001-CU

The petitioner requests: (i) a Conditional Use for an Auto Service Repair use; (ii) a Conditional Use for an auto body repair use, and (iii) any other variations, waivers, and zoning relief as may be necessary.

**PIN:** 09-28-101-084-0000

**Proceedings/Discussion:**

Colleen Doherty, attorney for the applicant, 6767 N. Milwaukee Avenue, Suite 202, in Niles and Vechean Shamoan, the applicant for the proposed business at 1685 E Oakton Avenue were sworn by Chairman Szabo.

Chairman Szabo requested the applicant's summary of their request.

Ms. Doherty noted the current property zoning of C-3 and the need for two conditional uses to allow proposed auto service and auto body repair upon the property. She reviewed the proposed

uses of the various areas of the site plan and noted the plan to close an existing curb cut to the side street and replacement of this area with new parkway landscaping. There are various automobile and motorcycle repair and service uses within the vicinity of the property. The prior use was an auto body and auto sales operation. The building includes three (3) bays, one each for auto service, auto body repair, and paint spraying. The applicant would both own the property and operate the business on the site. Damaged and inoperable vehicles would be stored in the enclosed area south of the building. The applicant is interested in improving the property and operating in compliance with City requirements. A letter of support from a neighbor of his existing business outside of Des Plaines was entered into the record.

Member Weaver asked about the site plan details and about the use of the enclosed area at the rear of the building.

Mr. Shamoan stated the area would be used for the storage of damaged vehicles with room for approximately 6-8 vehicles in rows and in tandem. The fence would accommodate movement of vehicles.

Member Weaver asked about the use of the parking spaces along the east lot line.

Mr. Shamoan noted that these spaces would be used for the parking of customers' vehicles during their visit and while awaiting service.

Ms. Doherty added that the intention would be for vehicles with significant damage to be stored behind the building within the fenced storage area. The proposed site plan would accommodate more off-street parking stalls than the minimum quantity required per Code.

Mr. Shamoan stated that he does not expect to operate the site at full capacity with more vehicles than parking stalls. The operations will likely involve himself and one mechanic.

Member Veremis asked if the existing building would be painted, the existing red fence will be removed, and whether the sign would be replaced.

Mr. Shamoan confirmed he intended to improve the look of the property with new exterior paint, a new sign, and new fencing in the rear.

Chair Szabo asked if there would be auto sales.

Mr. Shamoan stated he would not selling automobiles at this property. In addition to customers' vehicles, the business would source vehicles from auctions for repair & restoration. After restoration in accordance with State requirements, restored vehicles would be sent back to the auction for sale.

Senior Planner Jonathan Stytz outlined staff report and packet:

**Petitioner:** Vechean Shamoan, 9219 N. Ashland Avenue, Niles, IL 60714

**Owner:** Chicago Title Land Trust #128422 (Representative: Trustee Steven Malina, 4075 E. Estes Avenue, Lincolnwood, IL 60712)

**Case Number:** 25-001-CU

**PIN:** 09-28-101-084-0000

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

**Existing Zoning:** C-3, General Commercial District

**Existing Land Use:** Vacant (former auto service repair and motor vehicle sales uses)

**Surrounding Zoning:**  
North: C-3, General Commercial District  
South: R-2, Two Family Residential District  
East: C-3 General Commercial District  
West: C-3 General Commercial District

**Surrounding Land Use:**  
North: Tavern (Commercial); Trade Contractor (Commercial)  
South: Duplex (Residential)  
East: Multi-tenant Shopping Center (Commercial)  
West: Multi-tenant Shopping Center (Commercial)

**Street Classification:** Oakton Street is classified as a minor arterial road and Orchard Street is classified as a local road, both under City of Des Plaines jurisdiction.

**Comprehensive Plan:** Commercial is the designated use of the property.

**Zoning/Property History:** *Property Background*  
Based on City records, the subject property was developed around 1961 and originally utilized as a gas station. On November 6, 2017, City Council approved conditional uses for motor vehicle sales and auto service repair uses via Ordinance Z-27-17 to allow the business Des Plaines Auto Sales & Repair to operate on the subject property. This approval was conditioned upon the following provisions:

- All drive aisles must remain clear of vehicles and other obstructions;
- The parking lot must be striped in accordance with the Site Plan; and
- No body work is conducted on the subject property.

*Previous Code Enforcement Issues*

The subject property has had a few code enforcement issues related to the previous auto service repair and motor vehicle sales uses including:

- Overparking the lot where vehicles were not parked in striped spaces, drive aisles were blocked, and site circulation was severely impacted;
- Parking vehicles related to the business operations on the public street whether they were serviced or waiting to be serviced;
- Landscape bed maintenance throughout the subject property; and
- Rubbish and debris throughout the subject property.

The previous business owner was recently evicted from the subject property due to the issues identified above and the property has been cleaned up to some extent. However, the PZB and City Council may wish to ascertain whether auto-oriented uses are ideal for this property given the property size, location, and issues with the previous user.

### **CONDITIONAL USES**

#### **Request Summary:**

##### *Overview*

The subject property consists of one 13,521-square-foot parcel located in the C-3 General Commercial district at the southwest corner of the Oakton Street/Orchard Street intersection. It currently contains an off-street parking area, pole sign, and 2,045-square-foot, one-story commercial building with three service bays, office area, restroom, mechanical room, and stock room as illustrated on the attached Site and Floor Plan. The rear of the subject property includes a non-paved fenced area accessible from the south building elevation and gate on the east side of the enclosure.

The petitioner proposes to operate both an auto service repair use and auto body repair use simultaneously on the subject property. Both uses, as defined below, require a separate conditional use permit pursuant to Section 12-7-3.K of the Zoning Ordinance prior to their operation on the subject property:

**AUTO SERVICE REPAIR:** A building, property, or activity the principal use of which is the repair or replacement of parts, oils, coolants, lubricants, tires, and other similar services. "Auto service repair", shall include, but is not limited to, muffler shops, oil change shops, car care centers, tire centers and other uses similar in nature and impact.

**AUTO BODY REPAIR:** A building, property, or activity the principal use of which is automotive body repair or auto detailing other than those types of repairs permitted at automobile filling stations and auto service repair establishments.

As noted in the attached Project Narrative, the petitioner intends to utilize one of the existing service bays for mechanical repairs (i.e., auto service repair) and the remaining two bays for auto body repair (i.e., frame machine and spray booth). The existing rear enclosure will be utilized for the storage of damaged vehicles waiting to be serviced to ensure all vehicles are kept on the subject property before and after servicing. The petitioner has noted that his business will repair tires but will not sell or replace tires on vehicles. The proposed business will operate Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. and will be closed on the weekends. The petitioner and one employee will be onsite at all times with additional employees added in the future as necessary.

#### *Floor Plan and Elevations*

The attached Site and Floor Plan details the dimensions and uses of the individual rooms of the existing building. The interior rooms of the building will generally remain the same with some adjustments as necessary to meet the applicable building and fire codes. The existing restroom and compressor room on the east building elevation will be converted into a single, accessible restroom accessed from inside the building. The western and center bays will be utilized for auto body repair and the eastern bay will be solely for auto service repair. The petitioner intends to retain the existing exterior building improvements without any changes.

#### *Off-Streeting Parking*

Pursuant to Section 12-9-7, automotive repair shops, including auto service repair and auto body repair uses, require a minimum of one off-street parking space per service bay plus one space for every 200 square feet of accessory retail. There are three service bays which will be utilized, and the petitioner does not intend to have accessory retail on site at this time. As such, a total of six off-street parking spaces including one accessible space are required. The attached Site and Floor Plan illustrates that 12 off-street parking spaces—including one accessible space—are proposed for the subject property, which meets this standard. In addition, if accessory retail were to be added in the proposed 268-square-foot office/reception area in the future, the proposed number of off-street parking spaces would accommodate the additional two spaces required. All off-street parking spaces on site are oriented 90-degrees and designed

to comply with all standards in Sections 12-9-6 and 12-9-8 of the Zoning Ordinance.

*Access and Circulation*

The subject property currently contains three separate access points, one on each public right-of-way that the property fronts. Both access points on Oakton Street and Orchard Street are located in close proximity to the Oakton/Orchard street intersection, creating potential unsafe vehicular/pedestrian interactions. To address and improve this existing condition, the petitioner has worked with staff and proposes blocking the existing access point on Orchard Street with a landscape bed as shown on the attached Landscape Plan.

The existing two-way travel access from Oakton Street will remain. However, the existing two-way travel access from the alley into the subject property will be converted into a one-way travel as exit only. Both the Oakton Street access and alley access drive aisles are proposed to comply with the minimum drive aisle width for two-way and one-way travel respectively, as noted in Section 12-9-6 of the Zoning Ordinance.

In addition, the existing tandem parking spaces along the north property line will be removed and replaced with a single row of parking spaces providing for ample access and circulation between the access points, service bays, and parking spaces.

*Landscaping and Screening*

The subject property contains some landscape beds along the north and east parking space rows. However, it does not fully comply with the landscaping and screening standards in Chapter 10 of the Zoning Ordinance. The petitioner worked with staff to expand existing landscape beds and add new landscaping areas between the parking spaces and the property lines to comply with the screening requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

In summary, the following landscaping and screening improvements are proposed for the subject property:

- Expanding the existing north and east landscape areas to five feet in width for the full extent of the parking row;
- Adding eight-foot-wide, minimum 100-square-foot landscape beds at the end of each parking row;
- Adding a minimum three-foot-wide landscape bed around the base of the existing pole sign, which is to remain; and
- Removing the existing barbed wire from the rear fenced

enclosure located behind the existing building.

**Conditional Use Findings:** Conditional Use requests are subject to the standards set forth in Section 12-3- 4(E) of the Zoning Ordinance. Rationale for how the proposed amendments would satisfy 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 proposed Conditional Use is in fact a Conditional Use established within the specific Zoning district involved:**

*Comment:* Both the auto service repair and auto body repair uses are a Conditional Use as specified in Section 12-7-3.K of the Zoning Ordinance for properties in the C-3 District.

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

*Comment:* The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as commercial and strives to foster growth and retention of existing commercial businesses in Des Plaines. This property is positioned along the Oakton Street corridor and is surrounded on all sides by commercial development with the exception of the south side, which abuts two-family residential. The approval of a new commercial uses at the subject property generally falls within the general principles and goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

**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:* The subject property has been utilized for auto service uses in past and was most recently vacated by an auto service repair and motor vehicle sales business. This is consistent with other auto-oriented commercial uses currently operating along the Oakton Street corridor. However, the PZB and City Council may also consider future plans for the Oakton Street corridor in its determination of the conditional use requests for additional auto-oriented uses in this corridor.

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

*Comment:* Given that the subject property was recently utilized for auto-oriented uses, there is no indication that this proposal would be any more hazardous or disturbing to neighboring uses than another auto-oriented use. Aside from tow-truck deliveries of vehicles in need of service, all of the proposed auto service operations will be conducted within the building reducing any hazardous or distributing effects on neighboring properties. Much of the circulation and operational movements outside the building will occur in front of the building at the entrance to the three service bays, an area shielded by buildings on the west and south sides and separated by streets on the north and east sides. While this proposal does include the use of a frame machine and spray booth, the petitioner will need to comply with all applicable building and fire codes to ensure safety and nuisance standards are met. The petitioner has also stated that they will not be selling or replacing tires and will not have a space dedicated to or utilized for tire storage. However,

staff have received complaints from neighboring residents regarding the past conditions on the subject property, so operational conditions have been suggested by staff to minimize adverse effects that are often attributed to auto-oriented uses.

**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 previous auto service repair and motor vehicle sales uses on this site were adequately served by essential public facilities and services. While the proposal replaces the previous motor vehicle sales use with an auto body repair use, staff do not have concerns that this will impact the essential public facilities and services that are currently serving the subject property.

**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:* As noted in the *Zoning/Property History* section above, the previous auto service repair and motor vehicle sales uses did create a burden on public facilities and the conditions on site were arguably detrimental to the economic well-being of the community requiring code enforcement action. While there is no indication that the new user and proposed auto service repair and auto body repair uses will have the same effect on public facilities and the community as a whole, PZB and City Council should consider whether the uses are feasible for the subject property given its size and location in the Oakton corridor.

**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:* Auto-oriented uses do by their nature involve activities, processes, materials, equipment, and conditions of operation that can be considered detrimental to any persons, property, or the general welfare by many different means. The two separate auto-oriented uses—similar to the two auto-oriented uses before them—can be expected to result in increased vehicular traffic to and from the site throughout the day, which can impact surrounding thoroughfares. The tools and machinery utilized for operations of both uses create noise, fumes, odors, or a combination thereof, which may impact neighboring properties depending on business operations and proper disposal or venting of resulting byproducts. In particular, the paint booth requires certain venting requirements and can, based on its design and location, create negative effects to neighboring property owners that were not present when the previous uses were in operation.

It is anticipated that all auto-oriented service will be conducted inside the building and tire storage will not be present on the subject property. However, the proposed vehicle storage at the rear of the property and the resulting byproducts from work done inside the building

could create negative effects on the neighboring properties, in which the PZB and City Council should consider.

**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:* The subject property contains three separate access points, one on each of the public rights-of-way fronting the site. However, the existing site design presents some access and circulation concerns, a condition that was exasperated by the operations of the previous business owner and created fairly substantial interferences to traffic on surrounding thoroughfares. That said, the proposal includes improvements to reduce the number of access points and redesign the parking and drive aisle layout to provide more adequate space for circulation and operation of the proposed auto-oriented uses. It also utilizes the existing fenced enclosure at the rear of the property to store vehicles to be repaired or those that have recently been repaired to free up parking space for customers and employees in the parking areas. These improvements help correct the existing issues on the site to minimize any foreseen interferences with traffic surrounding thoroughfares. However, as staff have noted, the nature in which business operations are conducted on site is imperative to ensure conditions on site are maintained in a compliant manner, permitting adequate access, circulation, and parking on the site and reduce traffic interferences.

**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 proposal would not cause the destruction, loss, or damage of any natural, scenic or historic features of major importance as the building and site were already developed for similar uses. Furthermore, the proposal does include additional landscaping and screening improvements that will help soften the transition between the commercial lot itself and the neighboring residential lots to the south.

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

*Comment:* This proposal is anticipated will meet all other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for the C-3 General Commercial District.

**PZB Procedure and Recommended Condition:** Pursuant to Section 12-3-4 of the Zoning Ordinance, the PZB may vote to recommend approval, approval with conditions, or denial of the conditional use requests. If the PZB chooses to recommend approval of the requests, staff recommends the following conditions.

**Recommended Conditions of Approval:**

1. The gravel area in the rear enclosure shall be paved with a dust-free hard surface in conformance with all City of Des Plaines regulations prior to the use of this space.
2. No motor vehicle sales are permitted on the subject property at any time for any reason.
3. The parking area must be restriped in accordance with all City of Des Plaines regulations. All drive aisles must be kept clear of any obstructions at all times.

Member Weaver asked about the status of the Oakton Street Corridor planning process.

Director Rogers explained the corridor plan project was delayed from 2024 and is currently planned to restart in 2025. The draft plan would likely be available for public comment & subsequent consideration by the City Council in the fall of 2025.

Chair Szabo asked the applicant to clarify proposed changes to the current sign.

Mr. Shamoan stated the existing sign face would be replaced and the frame would be refinished. The tentative name for the proposed business is “Carmix.”

Member Catalano motioned to recommend approval as presented in the sample motion.

Member Weaver seconded the motion.

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

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Planning & Zoning Board meeting on Tuesday, January 28, 2025 is planned and there are four cases.

Chairman Szabo adjourned the meeting by voice vote at 9:42 p.m.

Sincerely,  
Jonathan Mendel, AICP, Assistant Director of CED/Recording Secretary  
cc: City Officials, Aldermen, Planning & Zoning Board, Petitioners