



**DES PLAINES PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING
Tuesday, September 9, 2025
MINUTES**

The Des Plaines Planning and Zoning Board held its regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, September 9, 2025, 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 a roll call was established.

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

A quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF AUGUST 26, 2025 PZB MEETING MINUTES

Member Fallico moved and Member Catalano seconded a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

AYES: Fallico, Catalano, Zadrozny & Szabo
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: Fowler & Veremis

MOTION CARRIED

PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEM

There was no public comment.

GENERAL COMMUNICATIONS:

Chairman Szabo outlined the results of the September 2, 2025 City Council meeting regarding the PZB cases that were reviewed:

- 1634 E. Oakton St. – CU for Trade Contractor – Approved at 2nd reading
- Text Amendments to Section 12-3-11 Related to Building Design Review Standards for Single-Family and Two-Family Residences – Approved at 1st & 2nd reading
- Major Variations for Site Landscaping at 555 Howard Avenue – Approved at 1st & 2nd reading

ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS:

Chairman Szabo noted there were no final Administrative Decisions available for this agenda.

Pending Applications:

Chairman Szabo introduced the cases on the agenda.

- 1. Addresses:** 9535, 9575, 9585, and 9601 East Golf Road – **Request Continuance to September 30, 2025 PZB meeting**

Case Number: 25-046-TPLAT-PPUD

The petitioner requests the following: i) a Tentative Plat of Subdivision to consolidate nine lots into one lot; ii) a Preliminary Planned Unit Development with a height, lot area, and required off-street parking exception for a proposed multifamily residential and single family attached residential development; and iii) any other variations, waivers, and zoning relief as may be necessary.

PIN: 09-16-201-011-0000, 09-16-201-014-0000, 09-16-201-013-0000, 09-16-201-016-0000, 09-16-201-015-0000, 09-16-201-003-0000, 09-15-100-033-0000, 09-15-100-032-0000, 09-15-100-035-0000

Petitioner/Owner: EFN Des Plaines Property LLC, One Oakbrook Terr., Ste 600, Oakbrook Terrace, IL 60181

Chairman Szabo outlined the request to continue to the September 30, 2025 PZB meeting and asked for a motion. Staff clarified the agenda misstated October 28, 2025 as the requested continuance date, but the correct date is September 30, 2025.

Member Catalano moved and Member Fowler seconded a motion to approve a continuance to the September 30, 2025 PZB meeting

AYES: Fallico, Catalano, Zadrozny, Fowler, Veremis & Szabo
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED

- 2. Address:** 2200 E Golf Rd **Case Number:** 25-047-FPUD

The petitioner requests a Final Planned Unit Development with a height exception for a proposed Assisted Living Facility, and any other variations, waivers, and zoning relief as may be necessary.

PIN: 09-09-402-010-0000

Petitioner: Heritage Woods Northwest LLC, 1016 W. Jackson Blvd, Chicago, IL 60607

Owner: RJB-II LP and First American Self-Storage Group, LLC, 1731 N. Marcey St., #200, Chicago, IL 60614

Chairman Szabo swore in the petitioner's representatives – Robert Helle, Bernie Citron, Developer, Jane Sloss & Judd Barron.

Robert Helle outlined the public meeting history for this project to date and mentioned that the major issue in the preliminary PUD stage surrounded building exterior materials and design. Mr. Helle then read from the current staff report confirming that the building plans submitted for the Final PUD request are fully compliant with the building design standards.

Jane Sloss (architect with WJW Architects) represented the petitioner. Ms. Sloss outlined the final PUD plans' changes that occurred since the June 2025 City Council PPUD and Conditional Use approved. She outlined that they reconfigured the loading and trash enclosure to be fully screened from adjacent streets, east parking area is double loaded to maintain the number of parking spaces while reducing the impervious area, and additional landscaping was added throughout the site for the enjoyment of the residents and the adjacent properties. The building facades and design are compliant, and the overall development remains consistent with the PPUD. The intent with the exterior building design was an inviting residential look with base, sills and multiple materials and colors.

Chairman Szabo asked for PZB member questions and there were none.

Senior Planner Samantha Redman presented the staff analysis.

Issue: The petitioner requests a Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) with an exception for height from 45 feet to 50.5 feet.

Petitioner: Heritage Woods Northwest LLC, 1016 W. Jackson Boulevard., Chicago, IL 60607

Owner: RJB-11 LP & First American Self-Storage Group, LLC, 1731 N. Marcey Street, Suite 200, Chicago, IL 60614

Case Number: 25-047-FPUD

PIN: 09-09-402-010-0000

Ward: #1, Alderman Margaret Chlebek

Existing Zoning: R-3, Townhouse Residential

Existing Land Use: Surface parking lot and undeveloped land

Surrounding Zoning: North: R-3, Townhouse Residential
South: R-1, Single Family Residential

East: R-3, Townhouse Residential; C-3, General Commercial District
West: P1, Public Land District (Unincorporated Cook County)

Surrounding Land Use: North: Multifamily Building (The Monarch)
South: Forest preserve
East: Undeveloped land
West: Forest preserve

Street Classification: Golf Road is classified as a principal arterial road and is under the jurisdiction of the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT). N. East River Road is classified as local road and is under the jurisdiction of Cook County.

Comprehensive Plan: “Multi-Family Residential” is the use illustrated in the Comprehensive Plan.

Property History: In 1984, this site was annexed into the city (Ordinance A-2-83) and the building for the United Stationers Corporate Headquarters was constructed. This building was occupied by the United Stationers until approximately 2007. The building was demolished in 2009, and the site has remained vacant for approximately fourteen years.

Project Summary: *Overview*

The petitioner, Heritage Woods Northwest LLC, is the contract purchaser of 2200 E. Golf Road. On June 2, 2025, the City Council granted preliminary approval for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Conditional Use for a 150-unit assisted living facility. The proposed building footprint is approximately 32,000 square feet and will include three residential floors above one floor of resident amenities. The site plan provides 150 sleeping units, an 80-space parking lot with loading/unloading areas, and a large detention basin on the east side of the property. The building is designed around a central courtyard, with landscaping and walkways throughout the site for residents and staff. Refer to Site Plan in the attachments.

The Conditional Use for the assisted living facility was approved with the Preliminary PUD, subject to conditions outlined in Ordinance Z-12-25. These include updating the property address, coordinating regularly with the Fire Department, maintaining a private ambulance contract for non-emergent calls, and providing a private resident transportation option. At the final City Council meeting, two additional conditions were added: compliance with the Zoning Ordinance’s Building Design Standards and a \$200,000 donation to the City toward the purchase of an ambulance or related equipment or programs. All conditions remain in effect and will be enforced at the time of operation.

Concurrence with Preliminary Plat

Pursuant to Section 12-3-5.D.3,

“Approval of a preliminary plat for a planned unit development shall not constitute approval of the final plat. Rather it shall be deemed an expression of approval of the layout submitted on the preliminary plat as a guide to the preparation of the final plat, which shall be submitted by the developer not later than 12 months after approval of the preliminary plat. The final plat shall be

approved as the final land use and zoning plat if it conforms with the preliminary land use and zoning plat.”

The Final PUD Plat, including final engineering plans, has been reviewed by staff. Refer to PUD Plat attachments. The proposal is consistent with the preliminary plans and includes the height exception acknowledged in Ordinance Z-12-25, which granted preliminary approval. This exception, permitted under Section 12-3-5, grants relief from the maximum height allowed in the R-3 district. No additional exceptions have been requested.

Streets, Parking and Access

Access will continue to be provided to this property through the existing full-access driveway along Golf Road to the southwest of the property. Additional access points will connect to the existing multifamily development to the north, The Monarch. Per the petitioner, easement and access agreements already exist allowing for this connection from the proposed development. No driveways will open to N. East River Road.

Pursuant to Section 12-9-7, assisted living facilities require 1 space for each 5 beds, plus 2 spaces for every 3 employees. The proposed plan provides 80 standard spaces, and four accessible spaces will be provided, which will exceed the minimum required off-street parking requirement for this use. A condition of the approved Conditional Use ordinance states a private transportation option must be available to residents throughout the operation of this use, to ensure adequate access to services is provided for a site with minimal public transportation access.

Prior to approval of the Conditional Use, a Traffic Impact Study was submitted and reviewed. The report stated the combination of the existing traffic volume and the predicted increase generated by this site could be accommodated by the existing street network and intersections without affecting the Level of Service (LOS) on any adjacent streets. Refer to the Traffic Impact Study attachment for information regarding traffic related to this use. The Public Works and Engineering Department (PWE) reviewed the traffic study and did not indicate specific concerns regarding its findings.

PUD Bulk Exceptions

As identified in the Project Overview section, the proposal exceeds the maximum height permitted in the R-3 zoning district, requiring PUD exceptions from Section 12-3-5.C. All bulk exceptions, including required yards, are met except for the height. A height of 50'-6" is requested, which is taller than the permitted 45 feet in this zoning district. This exception allowing for increased height for a PUD reduces the overall building footprint by allowing for increased development vertically rather than horizontally and allowing for a pitching of the roof to create a more residential appearance to the building.

Building Materials

At the June 12, 2025 meeting, the Council added a condition to the approved Preliminary PUD ordinance stating the development must comply with Section 12-3-11 – Building Design Standards. The plans within the Final PUD submitted are fully compliant with this requirement, including the required amount of masonry on the exterior facades.

Construction Schedule and Phasing Plan

The petitioner has submitted a construction schedule as required by Section 12-3-5.H, refer to the Construction Schedule attachment. The building will be constructed in one phase, with a projected start date of March 2026 and construction end date of May 2027, with project completion and opening in August 2027. A construction schedule is required pursuant Section 12-3-5.H, which authorizes the City Council to revoke the PUD if the construction falls more than 18 months behind the submitted construction schedule.

Pursuant to Section 12-3-5, the PZB may recommend approval when the following standards are met. The following standards were met with the Preliminary PUD and remain unchanged with the Final PUD.

Final PUD Plat Review	
<i>Item</i>	<i>Analysis (based on Proposal)</i>
A maximum choice in the types of environments available to the public by allowing a development that would not be possible under the strict application of the other sections of this title	Combined with the Conditional Use in the Preliminary PUD stage, this entitlement strategy was chosen to provide a streamlined process for requesting any exceptions, including the increased height, and to provide the ability for the PZB and City Council to engage in meaningful dialogue during the review process about the overall site plan.
Permanent preservation of common open space and recreation areas and facilities	The Final PUD plat includes proposed modifications along the gravel path along the south boundary of the property, to be determined after consultation with Public Works and Engineering, IDOT, and Cook County Forest Preserve. This path connects to a paved multi-use path along N. East River Road and connects to the forest preserve trail network to the west.
A pattern of development to preserve natural vegetation, topographic and geologic features	No significant natural vegetation, topographic or geologic features exist on site that would be beneficial to maintain. New landscaping is proposed throughout the development, reducing the amount of impervious surface currently located on the site.
A creative approach to the use of land and related physical facilities that results in better development and design and the construction of aesthetic amenities	The proposed building is constructed on a vacant property previously occupied by an office building. The new development will include significantly more landscaping than the previous development (Refer to Landscape Plan), and the residents will have access to an interior courtyard for recreation, as well as access to the forest preserve trail network adjacent to this property.

<p>An efficient use of the land resulting in more economic networks of utilities, streets and other facilities</p>	<p>No new driveways onto public streets are proposed, and all utilities will be placed underground. According to the petitioner’s traffic study (see attachments), the development is not expected to disproportionately impact traffic in the area. Compared to a traditional multifamily development, which is permitted by right in this zoning district, this use may generate less traffic, as most residents are not expected to rely on personal vehicles. Instead, the primary sources of site traffic will be employees, deliveries, and the shuttle service.</p>
<p>A land use which promotes the public health, safety, and general welfare</p>	<p>This development develops long-vacant land to serve the region’s growing senior population, addressing the need for specialized housing and services described in the Comprehensive Plan. While the nature of this use may increase demand on emergency services, the proposed conditions of approval may help mitigate potential impacts, ensuring continued service efficiency.</p> <p>Additionally, the development fully complies with fire code regulations, and its access design—maintaining the existing entrance and utilizing the internal road network connected to The Monarch development—supports safe and efficient emergency response. By providing housing and services tailored to seniors while maintaining adherence to safety standards, the project promotes public health, safety, and general welfare.</p>

Findings of Fact for Planned Unit Development:

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 responses provided as written as its rationale, modify, or adopt its own.

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

The Planned Unit Development (PUD) process is available to any property owner seeking approval for a proposed project. PUDs are permitted in all zoning districts within the City, subject to the regulations outlined in Section 12-3-5 of the Zoning Ordinance. To qualify, a PUD must be under single ownership or unified control, and the petitioner intends to purchase the property after receiving necessary approvals.

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 attached Petitioner's Response to Standards for Planned Unit Development provides their response to this standard.

Staff Comments: The proposal complies with the majority of bulk regulations outlined in Section 12-7-2.J of the Zoning Ordinance but requires an exception for building height. Specifically, the development seeks approval for a height of 50.5 feet, exceeding the 45-foot maximum permitted in the R-3 zoning district by 5.5 feet, or approximately 12%, with building setbacks of 53'-7" from north property line, 30'-1" from south property line, 167'-4" from the west property line, and 219'-1" from east property line.

This height exception may allow a more efficient building design, minimizing the development's overall footprint and allowing for a more residential style of the roof and architecture of the building. By slightly increasing the height, the project can provide necessary amenities, improved unit layouts, and enhanced accessibility features without requiring a larger building footprint, thereby preserving open space and reducing impervious surface coverage. Additionally, the proposed height is compatible with the surrounding built environment and does not create adverse impacts on adjacent properties.

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 attached Petitioner's Response to Standards for Planned Unit Development provides their response to this standard.

Staff Comments: The physical design of the proposed development provides adequate consideration for public services, vehicular traffic control, open space, and amenities such as light, air, recreation, and visual enjoyment. The project includes underground utilities, which reduces visual clutter and maintains the area's aesthetic quality. Vehicular access is provided through the existing full access driveway and an internal road network connecting to The Monarch development, which helps mitigate potential traffic impacts on surrounding public streets. According to the petitioner's traffic study, the development is not expected to result in a disproportionate impact on local traffic, with the primary sources of traffic being employees, deliveries, and shuttle service. The amount of landscaped area will be increased with this development, as illustrated in the Landscape Plan attachment.

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

The attached Petitioner's Response to Standards for Planned Unit Development provides their response to this standard.

Staff Comments: The project is located within a zoning district that permits multifamily residential uses, and the petitioner has made efforts to align with the existing built environment. Access to the site is provided through an entrance and an internal road network connected to The Monarch development to the north, which minimizes disruption to surrounding streets and ensures efficient traffic flow. The height of the building is slightly above the district's maximum allowable height, but the design is intended to minimize visual impact and maintain adequate light and air circulation for surrounding properties.

The project also incorporates landscaping and open space amenities for residents, which contribute to the aesthetic value of the area and improve the visual appeal that has not existed for this vacant property since the building was demolished fourteen years ago. Overall, the proposed development is not expected to create adverse impacts on adjacent properties or the neighborhood.

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

The attached Petitioner's Response to Standards for Conditional Use provides their response to this standard.

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

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

The attached Petitioner's Response to Standards for Conditional Use provides their response to this standard.

Staff comments: The proposed use aligns with the housing goals and objectives of the 2019 Comprehensive Plan by increasing the housing stock and providing additional options for senior residents. While not a traditional multifamily development, the proposed use supports the Comprehensive Plan's vision for this property as a multifamily residential site. Additionally, the development advances several key goals, including pursuing high-quality housing for residents at all stages of life, particularly older adults; ensuring a diverse range of housing options to accommodate varying needs within the community; and planning for accessibility by creating a facility that, by its nature, must be accessible to older residents. By addressing these priorities, the

proposal contributes to the City's long-term vision for balanced and inclusive housing development.

PZB Procedure and Recommended Conditions: Under Section 12-3-5.D (Procedure for Review and Decision for Planned Unit Developments) of the Zoning Ordinance, the PZB has the authority to *recommend* that the City Council approve, approve subject to conditions, or deny the Final Planned Unit Development. City Council has final authority on the proposal.

Consideration of the request should be based on a review of the information presented by the applicant and the findings made above, as specified in Section 12-3-5.E (Standards for Planned Unit Developments) of the Zoning Ordinance. If the PZB recommends and City Council ultimately approves the request, staff recommends the following conditions.

Suggested Condition of Approval:

1. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the petitioner shall construct a walkway or pedestrian path along the southern boundary of the property, generally following the alignment of the existing gravel path, unless otherwise directed by the Public Works and Engineering (PWE) Director. The PWE Director, or their designee, shall determine the required size and materials of the path. Upon written request, the PWE Director, or their designee, may grant a one-year extension to this requirement.

Member Catalano asked staff to define the review of final PUD submittals to verify consistency with the Conditional Use and Preliminary PUD approval from June 2025.

Senior Planner Redman outlined staff's method for FPUD review for consistency with the PPUD and the codified FPUD requirement and procedural. The FPUD process primarily requires full engineering plans and construction schedule. The engineering plans must be reviewed and approved by PWE, and the developer must substantively adhere to the approved construction schedule.

Member Fallico asked about the condition of approval for paving the Golf Road public sidewalk is regarding keeping the sidewalk as is.

Senior Planner Redman described the details of the existing gravel path and stated the Petitioner would be required to pave the Golf Road path during the project's construction, but there is still ongoing coordination between various agencies on the final alignment and dimensions. The condition of approval included by staff provides an expanded timeline for the petitioner to complete coordination and permitting for the final design of the path, with a final determination by Public Works and Engineering.

Chairman Szabo asked if the bike/ped path along Golf Road would remain open during construction.

Senior Planner Redman stated she understands the intent is that the path would remain open during the project's main construction and may only be closed during paving of the path by the Petitioner.

Chairman Szabo asked for PZB questions for staff. There were none.

Mr. Helle stated that they will plan to keep the Golf Road path open during construction and they will make sure to treat it appropriately as directed by the applicable regulatory jurisdiction.

Chairman Szabo asked for any public comments and there were none.

Member Catalano moved and Member Veremis seconded a motion to recommend the City Council approve the Final PUD as proposed with the condition of approval drafted by staff.

AYES: Zadrozny, Catalano, Fowler, Veremis, Fallico & Szabo
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED

3. Address: Citywide **Case Number:** 25-051-TA

The petitioner is requesting text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance including i) amending the definition for "government facility" in Section 12-13-3; and ii) adding "government facility" as a land use in various residential, commercial, manufacturing and/or institutional zoning districts as permitted or conditional uses.

PIN: Citywide

Petitioner: City of Des Plaines

Chairman Szabo introduced staff presentation

Director Jeff Rogers presented the staff analysis.

Issue: Consideration of Text Amendments modifying regulations of the Zoning Ordinance applicable to City Facilities including those districts where government services are provided or conducted.

Background

The purpose of the City's zoning ordinance is to regulate and control the use and development of land within the City of Des Plaines. The City's zoning ordinance is codified as Title 12 of the City Code of Des Plaines.

Section 12-13-2 of the Code includes various definitions of terms including the following excerpt defining the term "government facility":

12-13-3: DEFINITION OF TERMS:

For the purposes of this title, the following terms shall have the following meanings:

* * *

GOVERNMENT FACILITY: A building or structure owned and operated by a Municipal, State, Federal, or other taxing body institution in which governmental services are provided or conducted.

* * *

This definition and regulations relating thereto are differentiated from definitions and regulations for other regulated land uses including the following:

- a. “colleges and universities”
- b. “libraries, public”
- c. “parks”
- d. “post office”
- e. “public utilities” and
- f. “schools, public – elementary and high school.”

Considering the current variety of land use listings in the Code, the various specific uses which would be classified as a “government facility” include existing and proposed administrative offices, government service centers, fleet dispatch & maintenance operations and similar uses comprised of operations and services of government agencies.

Existing uses throughout the community including buildings, structures, and properties operated by the State, Township, Park District, and the City are currently regulated as a “government facility.” These existing uses include the following:

Facility	Address	Current Zoning	Current Use Regulation
Des Plaines Park District Administrative Center	2222 Birch St	R-1 Single-Family Residential	<i>Legal Nonconforming</i>
Fire Station 62	1313 E. Oakton Ave	R-1 Single-Family Residential	<i>Legal Nonconforming</i>
Fire Station 63	130 E. Thacker St	R-1 Single-Family Residential	<i>Legal Nonconforming</i>
Fire Station 61	405 S. Des Plaines River Rd	C-3 General Commercial	<i>Legal Nonconforming</i>
Des Plaines Park District Maintenance Facility	1300-1350 Oakwood Ave	C-3 General Commercial	<i>Legal Nonconforming</i>
Illinois Secretary of State Driver Services	1462 Lee St	C-4 Regional Shopping	<i>Legal Nonconforming</i>

City Hall & Police Station	1420 Miner St	C-5 Central Business	Permitted
Maine Township Highway Department	1387 Redeker Rd	M-1 Limited Manufacturing	<i>Legal Nonconforming</i>
Fire Station 64	877 Central Rd	I-1 Institutional	<i>Legal Nonconforming</i> (Government offices)
Public Works Department	1111 Joseph Schwab Rd	I-1 Institutional	<i>Legal Nonconforming</i> (Government offices)
Cook County Highway Department	2101 Ballard Rd	I-1 Institutional	<i>Legal Nonconforming</i> (Government offices)

As outlined in the table above, several existing government facilities are noted as “legal nonconforming” uses in the zoning districts in which they are located.

The proposed amendments are an attempt to remedy many of these legal nonconformities while also providing reasonable regulations for future government facilities across the City’s various zoning districts.

Proposed Amendments

To align requirements for government facilities with other similar land uses, text amendments are proposed to several sections of the City Code.

The following amendments would apply to the Residential Districts Use Matrix included in Sec. 12-7-2.I. Table 1:

12-7-2: RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS REGULATIONS:

I. Residential Use Matrix:

TABLE 1

RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS USE MATRIX

P = Permitted use

C = Conditional use permit required

Uses	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4
* * *				
<u>Government facility</u>	<u>P³</u>			
* * *				

Note:

* * *

3. On sites of 0.5 acre or more with frontage on a collector or arterial street.

* * *

Staff Commentary: Staff recommends adding “Government facility” as a listed land use in the Residential Districts Use Matrix as a “Permitted use” in the R-1 Single-Family Residential District only. The text amendment would authorize the Des Plaines Park District Administrative Center and Fire Stations 62 & 63. The classification of the use as a “Permitted use” would align with other land uses which are permitted in the R-1 District including public libraries, parks, playgrounds, and public schools.

The following amendments would apply to the Commercial Districts Use Matrix included in Sec. 12-7-3.K. Table 3:

12-7-3: COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS REGULATIONS:

K. Commercial Use Matrix:

TABLE 3

COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS USE MATRIX

P = Permitted use

C = Conditional use permit required

Uses	C-1	C-2	C-3	C-4	C-5	C-6	C-7
	*	*	*				
Government facility		P	<u>P</u>	<u>P</u>	P		
	*	*	*				

Notes:

- * * *
- 25. **Reserved.**
- * * *

Staff Commentary: Staff recommends amending current regulations regarding “Government facility” the Commercial Districts Use Matrix to allow the use as a “Permitted use” in the C-3 and C-4 Districts in addition to current allowances in the C-2 and C-5 Districts. The text amendment would authorize the State of Illinois Secretary of State Driver Services Facility and Fire Station 61. The classification of the use as a “Permitted use” would align with other land uses which are permitted in the C-3 & C-4 Districts including public libraries, parks, post offices, and public utilities. The amendment to the “Notes” section is intended as a “housekeeping” measure to restore a placeholder for a previous Note which was removed from the Code in accordance with a prior text amendment.

No changes are proposed to the Manufacturing Districts Use Matrix included in Sec. 12-7-4.G. Table 5.

12-7-4: MANUFACTURING DISTRICTS REGULATIONS:

G. Manufacturing Use Matrix:

TABLE 5

MANUFACTURING DISTRICTS USE MATRIX

P = Permitted use

C = Conditional use permit required

Uses	M-1	M-2	M-3
* * *			

Staff Commentary: More so than any other category of zoning, properties throughout the City’s manufacturing zoning districts provide the majority of revenues for the area’s various taxing districts which generate revenues via real estate property taxes. As such, introducing new government facilities in manufacturing districts is not recommended. As proposed, the existing Maine Township Highway Department use would remain legal nonconforming and be subject to the requirements of Title 12 Zoning, Chapter 5 Nonconforming Uses and Structures. Future government facility uses upon property currently zoned for manufacturing district uses would require rezoning to a classification that allows government facilities such as the I-1 Institutional District.

The following amendments would apply to the Institutional Districts Use Matrix included in Sec. 12-7-5.A.6. Table 7:

12-7-5: SPECIAL DISTRICTS REGULATIONS:

A. Institutional District:

6. Institutional Use Matrix:

TABLE 7

INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT USE MATRIX

P = Permitted use

C = Conditional use permit required

Use	I-1
-----	-----

land use regulations were introduced with consideration of current regulations applicable to the closest comparable uses in the affected districts, including libraries, parks, public schools, etc.

5. Whether the proposed amendment reflects responsible standards for development and growth.

The proposed amendments are intended to ensure responsible maintenance, improvements, expansion, and replacement of existing government facilities in their current locations as well as potential new government facilities which may enhance government operations and delivery of government services.

PZB Procedure and Recommended Conditions: Per Section 12-3-7.D.3. of the Code, the PZB has the authority to recommend approval, approval with modification, or disapproval of the proposed text amendments to the City Council. Per Section 12-3-7.D.4. of the Code, City Council has final authority regarding whether to adopt the proposed text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

Member Fowler asked if there are any sites where new City facilities are proposed.

Director Rogers described the proposed Central Road fire station and the replacement of another fire station on Oakton St. There may be other government facilities in the future, but there are no pending applications.

Chairman Szabo asked how long other example municipalities have had their land use regulations relating to government facilities.

Director Rogers stated that the cited municipalities have had their applicable regulatory frameworks for many years and complete text amendments over time in the same manner as the City currently does.

Chair Szabo asked whether there were any further questions and there were none by PZB members.

Member Zadrozny moved and Member Fallico seconded a motion to recommend the City Council approve the proposed Text Amendments as drafted by staff.

AYES: Zadrozny, Fallico, Catalano, Fowler, Veremis & Szabo
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED

OTHER DISCUSSION

Member Fowler asked if staff has proceeded with changes to the multi-family, commercial, industrial building design regulations and procedures.

Senior Planner Redman outlined the current regulatory framework has not changed for those development categories. Staff drafted a discussion item at a prior PZB meeting describing the existing Building Design Standards.

Member Fowler asked if the 622 Graceland development would have to comply with updated or existing building design and materials codes now that there is a new owner.

Senior Planner Redman stated this project would have to comply with the current building and design regulations. If a proposal doesn't comply, the applicant would likely have to request a major variation which would be reviewed for recommendation by the PZB and City Council approval.

Member Veremis asked about previously approved but not constructed developments.

Senior Planner Redman stated there have not been any proposed changes to the multi-family and non-residential building design regulations. The recent text amendment recommended by PZB and approved by City Council related only to single family detached and two-family residential.

Member Fowler asked about the process for proposing changes to the multi-family and non-residential building design regulations.

Director Rogers outlined the process to determine policy direction on this item from City Council and through the 2026 Budget creation process to identify the bounds of the project requirements and hiring a consultant to amend the architectural design related requirements. If that is prioritized, then it would proceed through an RFP process and would involve working with the consultant on research, public engagement, and then developing amended language to be presented to PZB and Council.

Member Fowler stated she still gets comments from people regarding the Welkin and the aesthetics of the building.

Chairman Szabo asked for examples of requirements from other municipalities for building design and exterior materials especially the recent developments in downtown Mount Prospect and Glenview, where buildings are primarily masonry.

Senior Planner Redman stated that staff could collate the other municipalities' material and design review procedures and provide the details for the PZB as a sample and possible discussion item. She also reiterated that zoning and design regulations are often shaped by community context and provided information on the origin of the existing code requirements.

Chairman Szabo asked for the information over the next couple months.

Member Veremis asked about whether developments the PZB has reviewed are stalled or canceled.

Director Rogers outlined the details of the status for several specific projects and their status.

Member Veremis asked specifically about the 414 E. Golf Road development.

Director Rogers stated that 414 E. Golf Road development has no active development application.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Szabo adjourned the meeting by affirmative voice vote at 7:45 P.M.

Sincerely,

Jonthan Mendel, AICP, Assistant Director/Recording Secretary

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