



Village of Arlington Heights
Conceptual Plan Review Committee
Virtual Meeting
February 10, 2021
6:45 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

- A. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting is being held virtually which permits the public to fully participate via their computers or using their phones.

To participate in the virtual meeting, please follow these instructions: <https://bit.ly/3cvhDVc>

Individuals who wish to comment or ask a question on an item on the Agenda may either participate virtually or send an email to the Village at shubbard@vah.com. Please limit emails to 200 words or less. To be shared at the meeting, the email must be received by 3:00 p.m. on February 10, 2021.

II. ROLL CALL

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. 2123 S. Arlington Heights Rd. - 9/9/20

IV. REPORTS

V. OLD BUSINESS

VI. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Ford Auto Repair - 3456 N. Ridge Ave/Unit 100 - T1727
LUV for Motor Vehicle Repair and Car Wash/Detailing in M-1

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Persons with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services, such as an American Sign Language interpreter or written materials in accessible formats, should contact David Robb, Disability Services Coordinator, at 33 S. Arlington Heights Road, Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005, (847)368-5793 (Voice), (847)368-5980 (Fax) or drobb@vah.com.



**Conceptual Plan Review Committee
2/10/2021**

Item: 2123 S. Arlington Heights Rd. - 9/9/20

Department: Planning & Community Development

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type
2123 S. Arlington Heights Rd. - 9/9/20	Minutes

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

A VIRTUAL MEETING VIA ZOOM WAS HELD ON:

September 9, 2020

Project Title: 2123 S. Arlington Heights Rd – Wingspan Mixed Uses

Address: 2121-2123 S. Arlington Heights Rd.

Petitioner: Jason Macklin
Wingspan Development Group

Address: 1001 Feehanville Drive
Mount Prospect, IL 60056

Requested Action:

1. A rezoning from the R-1, One-Family Dwelling District, the B-3, General Service, Wholesale, and Motor Vehicles District, and the R-6, Multi-Family Dwelling District into the R-7, Multi-Family Dwelling District and the B-2, General Business District.
2. A Planned Unit Development (PUD) to allow a mixed-use development.
3. Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision approval to subdivide the subject property into multiple lots.
4. Conceptual Special Use Permit approval to allow a restaurant with a drive through.

Variations Required:

- Section 5.1-7.10, to allow principal multi-family buildings to be spaced 12 feet apart where code requires 25 feet of separation between principal multi-family buildings.
- Section 5.1-6.3(a)4, to allow a 20.5-foot rear yard setback for the townhomes where a 30-foot rear yard setback is required.
- Section 5.1-7.1 to allow R-7 Zoning with a Comprehensive Plan designation of "Mixed Use" where a designation of "High Density Multi-Family" is required.
- Section 10.2-13, to allow an excess of parking above code requirements of 61% where code allows a max of 50%.
- Should each individual townhome be placed on its own platted lot, multiple variations shall be required.

Attendees: Jason Macklin, Wingspan Development Group
Bruce Green, Plan Commissioner
Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner
John Sigalos, Plan Commissioner
Sam Hubbard, Development Planner

Project Summary:

The subject property is located within the southern end of Arlington Heights, and is on the east side of South Arlington Heights Road approximately 400 feet north of the intersection of South Arlington Heights Road and Algonquin Road. The southern portion of the property is currently occupied by a two-story office building with a maintenance yard at the rear, which served as the administrative offices for School District 59. The northern side of the property is developed with a parking field, which used to serve The Wellington restaurant and banquet hall that was demolished approximately six years ago. Additionally, there is an existing open space/detention area located at the northeast of the site abutting Tonne Drive.

Wingspan Development Group would like to redevelop the property as a mixed use development, with 58 townhomes along the east of the property adjacent Tonne Road, and two commercial buildings totaling up to 21,200 square feet of commercial space on the Arlington Heights Road side of the site. Each commercial building would be located on a

separate platted lot, and the southern building (of up to 14,000 square feet) would include a restaurant with a drive-through. The townhome side of the site would be separated from the commercial side of the site via a landscape buffer between the two, and no vehicular connection between the two uses on the site would exist. However, emergency access would be possible. An interior pedestrian network would connect the two uses. Upon redevelopment, access to the commercial side would come from a single full access curb cut along Arlington Height Road, and access to the townhome side of the site would come from two non-signalized full access driveway connections with Tonne Road.

The subject property is located at the southeast corner of South Arlington Heights Road and Seegers Road. The property is currently occupied by a four-building single-story flex office/industrial campus consisting of just under 100,000 square feet of leasable floor area. The overall site is approximately 361,548 square feet (8.3 acres) in size and has access off Arlington Heights Road, which abuts to the west, Seegers Road, which abuts to the north, and Tonne Road, which abuts to the east. The buildings on the site were developed over 40 years ago.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Macklin introduced himself and Wingspan, stating that the company was a Mount Prospect based development group that currently had active projects in Des Plaines and Mount Prospect. He was excited at the possibility of a project in Arlington Heights. In June of 2020, Wingspan purchased the 6.5 acre District 59 property, and they are proposing the demolition of the existing two-story building on the site and the construction of 58 townhome units, as well as two retail buildings. One of the retail buildings would be around 7,200 square feet, and the second would be up to 14,000 square feet but more realistically would be around 7,000-8,000 square feet. The second building would include a drive-through lane for a quick service restaurant. No specific retail tenants had signed on to the development as Wingspan was still early in the process.

He stated that Wingspan would obtain the zoning entitlements for the townhomes and subdivide the site, but would then sell the building pads to a national homebuilder that would construct the townhomes and sell them to the buyers. In their Mount Prospect and Des Plaines developments they have worked with Ryan Homes for the townhomes, who builds a first class product. Access to the rowhomes would come from Tonne Drive, and access to the retail portion would come from Arlington Heights Road. They have designed the overall development to comply with the Arlington Heights Road Corridor Plan. The entrance drive for the retail would align with the access drive on the west side of the road, and if warrants were met, a traffic signal would be constructed in this location. They would provide a north/south access road, which would separate the retail from the townhomes, and this access road would also provide a connection to the properties at the north and south of the development.

Mr. Hubbard explained that the site was the former home of the Wellington Banquet facility and District 59 administrative offices. The site is currently a patchwork of different zoning districts, including R-6, R-1, and B-3. The townhome portion would need to be rezoned into the R-7 District, and the commercial portion would need to be rezoned into the B-2 District. PUD approval would be required, and the site would need to be re-subdivided. Conceptual special use approval would be granted to the drive-through and quick service restaurant, but actual special use permit approval could not be processed until a tenant was identified and their traffic generation and demand was known.

The need for several variations have been identified during this preliminary review. The R-7 district requires buildings to be separated by 25 feet from each other, and the proposed development shows certain buildings at a 12-foot setback. Staff has traditionally been supportive of these variations as the buildings could, in theory, be built connecting to where the variation would be negated. However, the 12-foot separation still provides some open space, access to light, and airflow between the buildings where had they been built all as one building, which would be code compliant, the variation would be unnecessary. On the western side of the townhome site a setback variation was necessary, where 30 feet of setback is required and the townhome building is proposed at a 20-foot setback. Staff has asked the petitioner to explore compliance in this area, which would help to segregate the residential uses from the commercial uses and allow for a denser landscape buffer. A variation from the locational standards in the R-7 District is required, as well as a parking variation to exceed to maximum allowable parking spaces for the townhome portion. If the townhomes are each on a separate platted lot, additional variations will be required.

Generally speaking, staff is supportive of this development proposal; the site design takes into account many of the recommendations of the South Arlington Heights Road Corridor Plan, as well as the Villages' desire to have north-south

connectivity through the site and beyond. The proposed uses are a good fit for the area, and northern portion of the site has been vacant for several years. The proposed uses are compatible with the TIF redevelopment plan. Staff would like to know if the Conceptual Plan Review members think a neighborhood meeting would be beneficial for this project, prior to appearing before the Plan Commission for a formal public hearing.

Commissioner Sigalos stated that he thought the proposed development was a good use for this property. However, he thought that the townhome portion seemed a little congested. There was guest parking proposed in the southeast corner of the townhomes, which was too far from the townhomes at the north side of the site. There did not appear to be enough space in the rear of the townhome buildings to allow for parking outside of the garage.

Mr. Macklin explained that each townhome unit would have two garage spaces, and there would be just enough space to parallel park a car in front of the garage. The main onsite guest parking would be located at the townhome entrance along Tonne, and there was street parking available along Tonne as well.

Commissioner Sigalos said that the site plan did not appear to show much room for parallel parking at the rear of the townhomes and if cars ended up parking there, they might encroach out into the drive aisles.

Mr. Macklin responded that there was adequate space for a car to park at the rear of the townhomes, which would block the garage entrance. However, the main guest parking would occur in the 24 dedicated guest parking areas within the townhome portion of the site.

Commissioner Sigalos stated that he would like to see more greenspace between the rear of the townhome buildings and the retail portion of the development, which he believed would enhance the development. Given the surplus of parking spaces, he thought this would be viable.

Mr. Macklin said that one of the driving principals in the site design was to provide for the “midblock” connection road, and that if they moved the connection road over, they could add additional greenspace. They would defer to the direction from staff and the Plan Commission to determine how best to proceed.

Commissioner Sigalos reiterated that he believed the proposed uses to be a good fit for the area, and he was looking forward to the petitioner further developing their plans and presenting them to the Design Commission and Plan Commission.

Commissioner Jensen asked about townhome ownership.

Mr. Macklin replied that the townhomes would be sold to individual owners as opposed to being a rental community.

Commissioner Jensen asked about vacancy rates for townhomes and commercial space in other Wingspan developments.

Mr. Macklin responded that they do not have a lot of retail within their Illinois projects, but that in Des Plaines their project included rental apartments and owner-occupied townhomes. The townhomes were one of the fastest selling products in Illinois and they are three months ahead of projected sales at this point. In Mount Prospect they are still in the development stages, but expect the townhomes there to sell very quickly.

Commissioner Jensen asked about the Des Plaines project and whether it was before or after CoVid-19.

Mr. Macklin stated that it was pre-CoVid.

Commissioner Jensen said that he thought a market study which reflected current conditions would be helpful in his analysis of the project. He thought it would be important to have the market study evaluate the commercial portion as well, and he suspected that there was not much demand for retail in the current market. He thought that this might not be the best time to be building commercial space given market uncertainties. While staff had only asked for a market study on the townhomes, he thought that the market study should also analyze the commercial component as well. He was looking for

some level of assurance that the Village would not be left with a built-out development that struggled with vacancy.

Mr. Macklin stated that Wingspan had a commercial development in Arlington Heights on Northwest Highway, which was 100% occupied. Wingspan was moving forward under the assumption that after the project is entitled, permitted, and eventually constructed, the commercial environment would look a lot different than it does today.

Commissioner Jensen asked for clarification on the code requirement for building separation.

Mr. Hubbard explained that code allowed townhomes to be built as one large building. However, if one larger townhome building was built as two separate and smaller townhome buildings, they were required to be separated by 25 feet. So while one larger building versus two smaller buildings were both acceptable from a code standpoint, if the buildings were built separate they needed to be built with at least 25 feet of separation.

Commissioner Jensen asked about the maximum allowable parking space restriction.

Mr. Hubbard responded that only in certain zoning district was there a maximum number of parking spaces allowed beyond what code required, and the R-7 District was one of the districts that had this restriction.

Commissioner Jensen asked about the TIF and whether it could benefit this development.

Mr. Hubbard responded that if TIF assistance was requested, the developer would need to substantiate a need for any funding and make a formal request for TIF assistance. They would need to provide data showing the need.

Mr. Macklin stated that they are intending to seek TIF assistance. If the retail spaces were priced right, he had no doubt that they would be leased, however, the pricing could have an effect on their pro-forma. TIF assistance could help fill in any gap.

Commissioner Jensen said that this made sense to him. He said he thought the uses were good and that he was generally favorable of this development. He looked forward to the further development of the plans and formal presentation of the project to the Plan Commission. The plan has done a good job of taking into consideration the elements of the Arlington Heights Corridor Plan.

Commissioner Green said that he thought this was a good use of the site, but that he took issue with the lack of additional space in front of the townhome garages that would allow parking. The parallel parking spaces in front of the garage would be heavily used and would clutter up the rear drive aisles. In his experience, garages often end up as additional storage areas and there may end up being enough space for only one car in the garage if it becomes heavily used for storage. The guest parking spaces would therefore be crucial, and they wouldn't be successful if there wasn't enough and they were too far away from the townhomes. He asked if there was a backdoor entrance to the townhome units, or whether the garage door would be the only method of entry through the rear.

Mr. Macklin explained that the garage door would be the only means of rear entry, or a guest could also walk to the front of the building.

Commissioner Green said that he did not like the idea of letting guests into the home through the garage, and that walking all the way around the building to the front could be an inconvenience. The development may be a little too dense, and it would be an eyesore to have cars parked throughout the rear drive aisle in front of all the garages. While he understood that from a code standpoint they had more parking than allowed, he believed that 24 guest parking spaces for 54 units was not sufficient. A reduction in density might allow a different layout that would better address his concerns, although he acknowledged that he was only one out of nine Plan Commissioners who would be voting on the project.

Commissioner Jensen asked about the north-south connection and whether this developer would be responsible to implement the entire connection as shown in the Village concept provided to the Plan Commission.

Mr. Hubbard replied that the developer would only be responsible for the portion that was on their site, but that they had designed the development in a manner that enables this connection beyond their site to the north and south. This drive aisle would create better connectivity through-out the area as the properties to the north and south redevelop and provide reciprocal access. Relative to east-west connectivity, the developer has aligned their main entrance on Arlington Heights Road with the drive aisle on the opposite side of the street, which would potentially enable a traffic signal at this location, either in the future when warrants are met, or at the time of development of the subject property if warrants are met. There was no internal east-west connection between the commercial portion and the residential portion, and staff did not take issue with the lack of connection. Segregation of these uses was practical, and vehicular access would allow ingress and egress of commercial traffic through the townhome site; however, pedestrian access and connections would be provided between the two uses.

Commissioner Green asked about the northernmost east-west drive aisle for the townhomes and whether it was a dead end.

Mr. Macklin replied that the drive aisle in question did not connect further west of the site.

Commissioner Green said that this dead end would require cars to do a three-point turn to exit the site in this area.

Commissioner Sigalos stated that all east-west drive aisles on the townhome site ended in a dead ends that were usable by emergency vehicles only. Therefore, guests or cars that were parallel parked adjacent to the garage doors would need to either reverse out of these areas or do a U-turn to exit.

Mr. Macklin explained that the rear drive aisles would be 24 feet wide, so although a three-point turn would be required to reverse, it would not be a difficult maneuver. Beyond the 24 feet, there was eight feet of space between the drive aisle and the garage door for the parallel parking.

Commissioner Green commented that he liked the mix of uses, but the townhomes appeared a little too dense and the layout a little awkward for vehicular traffic.

Commissioner Jensen asked about affordable housing.

Mr. Hubbard clarified that the new Inclusionary Housing regulations required a fee-in-lieu of affordable units given that this would be a for-sale development and would not be rental. All contributions collected as part of the affordable housing program were reserved for future use. The Village had not yet collected a large enough amount to enable a project of substance.

Commissioner Sigalos summarized his position, explaining that he liked the proposed uses, but it may be too dense, the rear parallel parking spaces were not well designed, and the dead ends did not provide good maneuverability through the townhomes portion of the development. He encouraged the petitioner to further develop their plan to address some of these concerns as they moved forward.

Mr. Macklin stated that they had prepared a number of different site layouts for the townhome portion and that they would revisit the plan and explore a reduction in density to see what effect it may have on their financial model. This would likely equate to a larger TIF ask.

Commissioner Green asked about Ryan Homes and how they would compare to other national builders, such as Pulte.

Mr. Macklin replied that both of those developers were top notch, upper echelon developers. Ryan Homes builds a great product and they sell very quickly.

Commissioner Green commented that the townhome site plan included a lot of straight lines and uniformity, and the project would need to go to the Design Commission for approval. The architecture would be very important to the success of the project; there were similar townhome projects that he felt were less than they could have been relative to architecture and site design.

Commissioner Jensen asked if Ryan Homes did any developments in Denver. If they were the developer he was thinking of in Denver, he thought they had done some very nice homes there.

Mr. Macklin stated that Ryan Homes was a national builder and they were involved in many of the growth markets in the United States. It was likely they were in Denver but he was not entirely certain.

Commissioner Green explained that the builder was not usually at fault for a poor design and that he held the architect accountable in most circumstances. He reiterated his feeling that the uses and general concept was good, but that some of the details still needed further development.

RECOMMENDATION

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee encouraged the petitioner to proceed forward with their application while taking the comments from the Conceptual Plan Review Committee into consideration.

Bruce Green, Chair
CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Sam Hubbard, Recorder



Conceptual Plan Review Committee
2/10/2021

Item: Ford Auto Repair - 3456 N. Ridge Ave/Unit 100 - T1727

Department: Planning & Community Development

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Type

No Attachments Available