

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
 OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

A MEETING HELD ON:

February 12, 2025

Project Title: 770 W. Dundee Road

Address: 770 W. Dundee Road

Petitioner: Alexander Lapshin
Studio SAF

Address: 1750 Charles Dr.
Wheeling, IL 60090

Requested Action:

1. Amendment to PUD Ordinance #85-014, to allow the enclosure of the drive-through facility.
2. Removal of the Special Use for a drive-through facility at a financial institution (Ord. 86-19)

Variations Required: None identified at this time.

Attendees:	Roman Moroz, Petitioner	Michael Lysicatos, Planning Department
	Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner	*Rachel Hitzemann, Planning Department
	Jay Cherwin, Plan Commissioner	Dan Osoba, Planning Department
	Bruce Green, Plan Commissioner	

Project Summary:

The subject property is approximately 37,929 sf and is occupied by TM Accountants, an accounting firm. Previously, a bank occupied the space. The property exists as part of the Ridge Plaza Planned Unit Development (PUD), which was originally approved in 1985.

The subject property contains a 14,503-sf building with a drive-through facility. When the previous bank occupied the building, the drive-through was utilized for its intended use. The current accounting firm has no need for the drive-through and is currently using it as additional parking.

The petitioner would like to enclose the drive-through to create an additional office space. The existing footprint of the building will remain the same. As part of the initial proposal, the petitioner proposed to install an additional 11 parking spaces on the site, however after their parking study was completed, they have requested to remove those spaces from the plan.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Moroz – would like alter the current drive-thru by closing it off and adding additional office space.

Ms. Hitzemann – The subject property is located in the B-2 general business district and also located within a PUD. It will require an amendment to the PUD to enclose a drive through facility, and then also of removal of the special use for a drive through facility that will be done as part of the PUD at a financial institution. The enclosure of the drive-thru has already been reviewed by the Design Commission and has received an administrative approval for the design. An issue with this project is the traffic on site in terms of fire truck access. A turning radius will be important as we move through the Plan Commission process. The petitioner will be completing interior work to the building, meet building codes in terms of restrooms and sprinklers and things of that nature. Staff is generally in favor of the petition.

Commissioner Cherwin – what did the parking study provide.

Ms. Hitzemann – The original plan was proposing eleven additional parking spaces as part of this project. As they move forward, they've decided to remove those parking spaces. It is located within a PUD that does have shared parking, so there is that aspect of it. Ideally, they would be able to accommodate their parking needs on their own property right now with their current use. They do exceed the requirement in terms of the parking study that they provided. They were using more spaces right now than is technically required; however, it was accommodated on site because they did have additional spaces. By adding eleven more staff, our staff would prefer to see them add additional spaces, maybe not as many as they were originally proposing, maybe three or four. We are going to use that auto turn to determine what would fit in terms of access for the fire truck. If we are not able to add that many, then we will defer to the fire department.

Commissioner Jensen – great use of the drive-thru.

Commissioner Green – agreed that it would be good use of the old bank and to move forward with the project.

Public Comment – None

RECOMMENDATION

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee encouraged the petitioner to proceed forward with their application.

Bruce Green, Chair
CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Kendra Maher, Recorder

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

A MEETING HELD ON:

February 12, 2025

Project Title: Daycare @ 1000 W. Northwest Hwy

Address: 1000 W. Northwest Hwy

Petitioner: Sean Graham, P.E.

Address: 1400 16th Street, Suite 300
Oak Brook, IL 60523

Requested Action:

1. Special Use Permit for a Day Care Center and Playground on subject property.

Variations Required:

1. Land Use Variation for Daycare in the R-3 district
2. Parking Variation

Attendees:

Sean Graham, Project Manager
Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner
Jay Cherwin, Plan Commissioner
Bruce Green, Plan Commissioner

Michael Lysicatos, Planning Department
*Rachel Hitzemann, Planning Department
Dan Osoba, Planning Department

Project Summary:

The subject property is a vacant commercial building of approximately 12,243 square feet located at 1000 W Northwest Highway. The building is currently vacant, but was previously the location of Windy City RC, a remote-controlled car business. The site is uniquely configured in that the primary portion along Northwest Highway is zoned B-2, however, there is an auxiliary portion at the rear along N Kennicott Avenue which is within the R-3 district and is currently occupied by an overflow parking lot with access to N Kennicott Avenue. Access currently comes from two curb cuts on Northwest Highway and the aforementioned curb cut.

The petitioner, InSite, is looking to open a new Daycare Center at this location. They intend to utilize the current building and add a 7,898 square foot playground on the northern side of the property adjacent to N Kennicott Avenue. The facility anticipates having 188 children and 35 employees.

A daycare was approved for this site in 2012 (St. Dominick's) but was never established. Another daycare was approved by the Plan Commission in 2022 (Guidepost Montessori), but did not finalize their Village Board approval due to issues with the seller.

There is currently a restrictive covenant from 1920 on the R-3 parcel of this property. The covenant requires the parcel to only be used as residential. Staff has consulted with the Village Attorney, and it has been determined that the Village would be able to approve the Special Use and Land Use Variation on this property despite the covenant.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Graham – would like to renovate the existing building at 1000 West Northwest Highway. Site work would be redoing the parking lot, building new playground for a new commercial daycare end user in the existing space. We will be scrapping the entire interior of building and new floor plan. Per our parking study we are over parked for the tenant requirements would be.

Ms. Hitzemann – the subject property is located in the B-2, but a section of it is also located in the R-3 district. The location of the proposed playground is in R-3 and that will require a land use variation for a daycare use in the R-3 district and then it will require a special use for a daycare in the B-2 district. Staff is requiring a market and parking study, and staff suggests that they engage the neighborhood to the north, perhaps a whole neighborhood meeting, but at the minimum engage the north property, as they are pretty active in kind of the development of this site in the past. They are under parked, so they will require a parking variation for four spaces of parking requirements, 53, and they're proposing 49. Staff is generally positive of the project and recommending that it moves forward, subject to what we have discussed, as well as, working with IDOT for any right of way work along Northwest Highway and then obviously meeting building code for the daycare inside.

Commissioner Jensen – what type of analysis has been done for this site.

Mr. Graham – for the past 2 years our main focus is day cares. There is a large demand for daycare, this being our fourth in Illinois. Our project management side is working on the market study, there is a demand for it specifically here in the Village, and that will be provided as part of the formal Plan Commission application.

Commissioner Jensen – what has been the issues with the neighbors to the north of this property in the past.

Ms. Hitzemann – the previous projects got Village approval, but never moved forward with actually doing the construction of it. The project before that they were proposing a parking lot along that area where the playground is currently being proposed. Staff is not sure if they were issues with the neighborhood, but they have been very involved in terms of coming to the meetings and speaking on the project.

Commissioner Cherwin – staff has provided you a long list of recommendations, do you have concerns with any of those.

Mr. Graham – we have the benefit of learning from past mistakes ourselves, kind enough to provide us with basically all the materials the last application we put together. We are preparing for them and I think most of them will be worked out before we get to the formal application.

Commissioner Cherwin – reiterated how important it is to work with the neighborhood, be proactive and not reactive to their concerns. Could this property be re-zoned versus having a land use variation?

Ms. Hitzemann – staff is open to either one. The petitioner will have the option to do either one.

Mr. Graham – we do have certified mail going out to the neighbors on February 27, and it would be our preference to rezone the property, and possibly consolidate the two parcels. We have a really tight purchase agreement as far as our timing, so if this would add months to the process that might be an issue from our end, but we're certainly flexible.

Commissioner Green – work with the neighbors and make sure there is not a noise problem. It will be a great project.

Public Comment – None

RECOMMENDATION

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee encouraged the petitioner to proceed forward with their application.

Bruce Green, Chair
CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Kendra Maher, Recorder

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

A MEETING HELD ON:

February 12, 2025

Project Title: Walnut Ridge Subdivision

Address: 2016 N. Chestnut Ave.

Petitioner: Ross Grande
Crane Construction Co., LLC

Address: 343 Wainwright Dr., Ste. B
Northbrook, IL 60062

Requested Action:

1. Preliminary & Final Plat of Subdivision to subdivide five tax parcels into four platted lots and right-of-way dedication.
2. An amendment to the Village's Comprehensive Plan to remove the future Norman Street Extension.

Variations Required:

1. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-2.2, Minimum Lot Width at Building Line to allow a reduction to the minimum lot area from 10,000 to 7,395 square-feet for lot 1 and lot 2.
2. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-2.2, Minimum Lot Width at Building to allow a reduction to the minimum lot width from 75 feet to 49 feet.
3. Variation from Chapter 29, Section 29-307, Residential Lot Standards to allow a reduction to the minimum lot width from 75 feet to 49 feet.
4. Additional variations may be required upon review of more detailed plans.

Attendees:	Ross Grande, Petitioner	Brendan Penny, Attorney
	Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner	Michael Lysicatos, Planning Department
	Jay Cherwin, Plan Commissioner	Rachael Hitzemann, Planning Department
	Bruce Green, Plan Commissioner	*Dan Osoba, Planning Department
	Diana Grande, Petitioner	Eileen McCullough, Resident

Project Summary:

The subject site, which consists of five tax parcels, is zoned R-2, One Family Dwelling District and is bounded by N. Chestnut Avenue to the east, an unimproved segment of N. Ridge Avenue to the west, and a single-family home to the north. To the south of the subject site there is a dedicated section of land to construct Norman Street that would run east to west and connect to N Ridge Avenue and N Fernandez Avenue. The property is 100 feet wide (from north to south) and 685 feet deep with a total land area of 68,500 square-feet or 1.57 acres. The existing lot has been tax parceled into separate PINs; however, those tax parcels are not individually subdivided lots. The petitioner is proposing to subdivide the whole property at 2016 N. Chestnut Avenue from one lot into four lots and dedicate right-of-way for N. Ridge Avenue and N. Walnut Avenue. The existing single-family home at 2016 N. Chestnut Avenue is proposed to remain and three new homes are proposed to be constructed.

Access to the proposed homes would be provided from newly constructed right-of-way for N. Walnut Avenue to lots 2 and 4. Access to lot 1 would typically be from N. Ridge Avenue; however, the petitioner has indicated that the right-of-way would be dedicated to the Village for N. Ridge Avenue, but not improved.

The Village has reviewed proposals on the subject site previously and developed a desired redevelopment plan, which is attached to this report as **(Exhibit #2. Possible Redevelopment Plan)**. This plan has been vetted with Village Staff to provide east/west access in the neighborhood and allow future redevelopment of lots along N. Ridge Avenue by providing a cul-de-sac for N. Walnut Avenue. This cul-de-sac would also provide necessary fire access and turnaround to serve the vicinity that lacks existing public infrastructure.

Meeting Discussion:

Brendan Penny, the attorney for the petitioner, presented the petitioner's concept plan which involves a portion of the west parcel, one being dedicated as right away for Ridge, and three separate lots, and another lot for the extension of Walnut. This concept plan and the subdivision that was submitted to Village staff was designed to honor and respect to the Village's zoning, subdivision and stormwater management ordinances. This was designed to comply with those requirements. He mentioned that only because there were details in the staff report mentioning certain variations that would be required. For the purpose of the presentation, it was noted that those variations would be required if they amend the plan to extend Norman to the east, as is requested by staff. This was not proposed in their presentation, their proposal does comply with the Village's subdivision and zoning regulations.

The property is zoned R-2 residential district. Mr. Penny acknowledged that this differs from the 2000 Walnut/Ridge subdivision plan that was reported in 2008, which was also part of the staff report. We are proposing an alternative plan that proposes dividing two parcels for right away, and part of one parcel for right away on the west side for Ridge, and a separate parcel for Walnut. We are proposing to extend on this parcel three, part of Walnut which would allow for further northern access. We are not as part of this present proposal, proposing to develop this portion for Ridge Ave. The reason for that being that there's obviously substantial land that still needs to be developed here to the north and to the west to operate this extension. Given the relative minor portion of that roadway, that would be encompassed in this right-of-way, the petitioner did not believe it is appropriate at this time. The petitioner believes a vital first step and pathway into developing these north areas by developing these first lots and extending Walnut, opening the area that has remained largely undeveloped for over 20 years. The design was completed with that in mind, so as to leave that option open for further development in the future.

Mr. Penny continued with part of the staff report states that the throughfare and transportation policy plan from 2012 identifies this area for additional connections and extensions of existing local streets to complete the local grid. This transportation policy plan is referenced in the comprehensive plan, and explains the rationale underlying that plan. Staff has indicated a request to amend the comprehensive plan on that basis. Based on the language in the transportation plan; the petitioner believes that a full amendment would be required to complete the subdivision as proposed. The petitioner offered to work with the staff.

Mr. Penny added that the petitioner would like to respect of the original concept from the Village, however, the prior plan for one reason or another over the past 20 years, plan has not come to fruition. The petitioner believes that the infrastructure requests and some of the design layouts imposed some challenges for developers and certainly went into the diligence that we talked through before we put this plan together and before this proposal.

Mr. Osoba provided the staff report for at 2016 N. Chestnut Avenue. The zoning is R-2, one family dwelling district, and currently the site contains five tax parcels on one lot. They have pins registered with the county, but they are not legal lots, and therefore they cannot be built on without first obtaining approval of a plat of subdivision. The property is bound by Chestnut on the east side, a single-family home on the north, unimproved segments of Ridge to the west, and an unimproved segment of a partially dedicated Norman Street to the south. Based on the petitioner's request, their requested approval here would be a preliminary and final plan of subdivision, to subdivide the single lot into 4 platted lots and right away dedication. In addition, the petitioner would need to request an amendment to the Village's comprehensive plan to remove the Norman Street extension as indicated on the comprehensive plan future land use map, and the thoroughfare and transportation policy plan.

The key issue here is the dedication and extension of Norman Street. According to the Village's comprehensive plan, Norman Street is to be extended from Chestnut to Fernandez. The Villages expectation at this time is that Norman Street would connect from Walnut to an existing home at 2016 N. Chestnut, which would preclude the extension of that right of way. The existing home was permitted to be constructed as mentioned, based on the home meeting all of the zoning lot requirements. Currently, the dedicated right of way for Norman Street, which is to the south of this project between Chestnut and Ridge is only 15 feet and according to code the right of way width would need to be 66 feet for that dedication. In order to comply with code, the petitioner would need to dedicate an additional 51 feet. As stated in the staff report, all of those variation requests would be applicable if that was the case and the dedication had to go through. The petitioner would need to fully improve both sides of Norman Street and N. Walnut Avenue, as well as the west side of Chestnut Avenue is that is not a complete roadway on the east side of Ridge Avenue. These improvements would include the roadway, utilities, curb and gutter,

sidewalks, parkway trees and sod, water main, sanitation, storm sewers to main, and streetlights.

The Village has reviewed other proposals on the subject site and have a desired redevelopment plan, which was mentioned, that is exhibit two in the agenda packet. This plan has been vetted with Village staff to provide an east/west access, which is severely lacking in this neighborhood, and allow future redevelopment of lots along Ridge. A cul-de-sac would also provide a necessary fire access and turn around to serve the vicinity that lacks existing public infrastructure. This cul-de-sac extension would be from the parcel three as proposed on this plan would discontinue north and turn into a cul-de-sac.

The staff development committee reviewed the proposal for a 4-lot subdivision with variations as proposed from chapter 28 & 29, given the lot width and lot size, staff does not support the proposal for the reasons that were stated in the staff report. The petitioner would need to identify how access to that first lot would be provided, as there would not be any right of way constructed in that location.

Commissioner Jensen inquired about the access to the properties that were part of the proposal and the surrounding area. Mr. Penny provided that only one home was being proposed and an extension of Walnut Avenue to access that property and that extending Norman Street would eliminate the ability to use the lots in question. Staff added that the intent of extending Norman Street as part of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map was to provide east/west connectivity which has been lacking since the areas was originally annexed. If the street were to be extended the remaining parcels would not meet code.

The Committee expressed concern regarding the feasibility of providing enhanced east/west accessibility while balancing the ability to subdivide and develop parcels over time and the requirement to complete the infrastructure improvements. The attorney for the petitioner provided an alternative concept for subdividing the parcels at the meeting for the Committee consider. Staff provided that any proposal would need to be reviewed by the appropriate Village departments and likely some level of amendment to the comprehensive plan. Based on the preliminary comments on the existing proposal from various Village Departments, the east/west connection is a vital component of any future redevelopment plans. Staff recommended additional due diligence amongst the Village departments which would include the concept that was distributed at the meeting to consider how short and long-term development based on the comprehensive plan. Staff would make this coordination a priority

Public Comment – None

RECOMMENDATION

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee requested that the petitioner continue to work together with Village Staff on the policy discussion of public improvements surrounding the proposal.

**Bruce Green, Chair
CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Kendra Maher, Recorder**

**REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION**

A MEETING HELD ON:

February 12, 2025

Project Title: Arlington Ridge Center (ARC)

Address: 660 N. Ridge Avenue

Petitioner: Arlington Heights Park District

Address: 410 N. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Requested Action:

1. Planned Unit Development (PUD) Amendment to Arlington Ridge Center PUD (Ord. 18-009 and/or amendment of in-review PC24-019 ARC Signage PUD Amendment)
2. Special Use Permit Amendment to amend the original "Community Center, Recreation Building" SUP

Variations Required:

1. A variation to exceed the parking variation allowed per Ord. 18-009 which allowed 291 parking spaces where 757 spaces were required
2. Variation to permit a 12-foot-high fence where the maximum fence height is 6 feet.
3. Additional variations may be required upon review of a full Plan Commission submittal.

Attendees:

John Kramer, Petitioner
Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner
Jay Cherwin, Plan Commissioner
Bruce Green, Plan Commissioner

John Dzarnowski, FGM Architects
Michael Lysicatos, Planning Department
Rachael Hitzemann, Planning Department
*Dan Osoba, Planning Department

Project Summary:

The subject property is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of W. Euclid Ave and N. Ridge Avenue. The Arlington Heights Park District owns the property and recreational facility at Arlington Ridge Center (ARC) which is located at 660 N Ridge Avenue. The overall site is approximately 10.34 acres and contains an existing recreation center, surface parking, outdoor fields and on-site detention.

The ARC was originally approved and rezoned to the P-L Public Lands District in 1978 along with all other Arlington Heights Park District owned properties within the Village (Ord. 78-019). A Planned Unit Development and Special Use Permit for a "Community Center, Recreation Building" was approved in 2003 per Ord. 03-036 and subsequently amended in 2018 per Ord. 18-019.

The Petitioner is proposing a 6,150 square-foot, two-story building addition on the northwest corner of the building. The addition is proposed to be dedicated space to improve fitness classes and children's programming within the facility. The building addition will require the existing outdoor basketball court to be relocated from the northwest corner of the building to the southwest corner of the building adjacent to the parking lot. The existing playground will also be removed and reinstalled on the site in the same location but with park equipment upgrades.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Kramer – seeking to do a remodel inside and an addition, looking for amendments and variations based on the plans.

Mr. Osoba – the subject property here is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Euclid and Ridge, and is zoned Public Lands district, the Park District owns the property. It is a recreational facility, the Arlington Ridge Center and located specifically at 660 N. Ridge. The overall site is about ten acres and it contains surface parking, outdoor fields, on site detention, and the recreation facility. It is within a planned unit development and there is an existing special use permit for a community center recreation building, which was approved in 2003, and then subsequently amended in 2018. Based on the petitioner's proposal, they are going to be requesting approval of a planned unit development amendment to the Arlington Ridge Center planned unit development. Plus, a special use amendment to amend the original community center recreation building special use permit. There are variations needed to exceed the parking variation, which was allowed per Ordinance 18-009, which allowed a parking reduction to 291 spaces, where 757 spaces are required. An additional variation would be required for a 12-foot-high fence around the basketball court, where the maximum is 6 feet.

The petitioner would need to provide us with information on the occupancy of the existing facility, as well as, the proposed addition. This would be used for to calculate parking and match future building permit submittals. The petitioner would be encouraged to discuss those occupancies with the Building and Life Safety Department prior to submittal to make sure everybody is on board with the occupancy designations. A Design Commission application has been reviewed by Village staff and received a recommendation of approval for the proposed building addition that would go with the entitlements that we are discussing. Part of the planned unit development amendment in 2018, the parking variation went from 757 to 291 spaces, this building would further increase that variation that we'd have to verify that amount based on the occupancy of the building. There are specific requirements and conditions of approval relative to parking in the ordinance, staff will be evaluating those parking conditions with this application, and a parking survey on the property over a five-day period, including Saturday and Sunday. Staff is interested in any events that will be occurring at the ARC and those events should be noted in the report. A projected demand analysis for the park based on the parking survey and ITE demand models for recreation facilities, so that we have an idea of what the actual parking demand is. And an evaluation of the parking related conditions that were mentioned from the prior approval. The staff development committee has reviewed the proposed amendment to the PUD and SUP, and is generally supportive of the application.

Commissioner Jensen – clarified that the number of parking spaces is not going down, the number of uses is going up.

Mr. Osoba – the parking requirement is going up, so therefore the variation is increasing in percentage. That justification for a parking variation in what was used last time that the ARC and Park District would not operate at full capacity, and would stagger events if needed.

Mr. Dzarnowski – we are not adding bathrooms, we are remodeling bathrooms.

Commissioner Cherwin – I have used the facility and the parking remains to be pretty good on a Saturday morning.

Mr. Kramer – staggered programming will be in place to accommodate the capacity. This renovated multi-purpose space will allow for classes and move them off the gym floor.

Commissioner Cherwin – inquired about the increase in fence height to 12 feet.

Mr. Kramer – due to the area being adjacent to the parking lot and not having the balls go over the fence. Proposing a 12-foot chain link fence for safety.

Commissioner Green – this project will be great, keep moving forward.

Public Comment – None

RECOMMENDATION

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee encouraged the petitioner to proceed forward with their application.

Bruce Green, Chair
CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Kendra Maher, Recorder

**REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION**

A MEETING HELD ON:

February 12, 2025

Project Title: Recreation Park Phase II & III

Address: 500 E. Miner Street

Petitioner: Arlington Heights Park District

Address: 410 N. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, IL 60004

Requested Action:

1. Planned Unit Development Amendment to the Recreation Park PUD for Phase II and Phase III (Ord. 24-052)
2. Special Use Permit for a "Facility Owned by the Arlington Heights Park District"

Variations Required:

1. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3. b to allow a fence height greater than 6 feet for the existing fence on the ball field (Petitioner to verify height).
2. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.5-2 to permit accessory structures partially located in the front yard where accessory structures are only permitted in the rear yard.
3. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.5-2 to permit accessory structures partially located in the side yard where accessory structures are only permitted in the rear (ball field, bleachers and dugout located within 10 feet of the side property line).
4. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.5-2 to permit additional accessory structures on the property (above the previously approved 12).
5. Additional variations may be applicable upon review of a formal Plan Commission application.

Attendees:

John Kramer, Petitioner

Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner

Jay Cherwin, Plan Commissioner

Bruce Green, Plan Commissioner

Michael Lysicatos, Planning Department

Rachael Hitzemann, Planning Department

*Dan Osoba, Planning Department

Project Summary:

The subject property, Recreation Park, is a regional park located at 500 E. Miner Street which is owned and operated by the Arlington Heights Park District (AHPD). The property is bound by E. Miner Street to the north, Douglas Avenue to the east, E. Northwest Highway to the south, and Belmont Avenue to the west. Recreation Park also includes the area to the east of N. Douglas Avenue consisting of a smaller ball field, turf soccer fields and open space. The American Legion building at 121 N. Douglas Avenue is not a part of Recreation Park. There is one single-family home that is not part of the Park District property at 15 S. Belmont Avenue as well.

The Petitioner, Arlington Heights Park District, is proposing to continue the improvements and redevelopment of Recreation Park with Phase II and Phase III. These phases were conceptually shown with the PUD from Phase I, which was approved in August 2024 (Ord. 24-052). Phase I of the project included the western and southern portions of the property. Sidewalk improvements were required along E. Northwest Highway after the demolition of the existing commercial buildings were completed. These commercial properties were rezoned from B-3 to PP-L and the Comprehensive Plan amended to reflect the existing land use as "Parks". (Note that the zoning map on page 1 of this report is not up-to-date to reflect the zoning changes).

Phase II includes ball field improvements and new dugouts, an updated basketball court, new on-site restroom buildings, new water service, and a reconfigured parking lot and access from N. Douglas Avenue. The location of structures is not changing with Phase II, with the exception of the parking lot. The parking lot is being relocated along N. Douglas Avenue instead of adjacent to the ball field. This will allow for more effective access to the parking lot and Phase III improvements such as the bathhouse. It will also move parked vehicles further out of the way from foul balls from the ball field.

Phase III includes upgrades to the existing pool and pool deck, demolition of the existing bathhouse building on the eastern side of the property and the reconstruction of a new bathhouse, locker room and concession building. Renovations to the existing Community Building at 500 E. Miner Street include accessibility improvements and interior/exterior renovations, and a new parking lot along the circular drive on E. Miner Street. Phase III is the last phase of improvements and redevelopment planned by the Park District at this time.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Kramer – presented a Phase II & III – remodeling of the community center, a new bath house, and additional remodel of existing park to add more amenities. We are looking for PUD amendment and we are looking for various variations relative to accessory structures. At a high level these have been discussed at various past meetings to some degree and now we are here to formalize those locations.

Mr. Osoba – the subject property, Recreation Park, is the original park located at 500 E. Miner and is owned again by Arlington Heights Park District. It's bound by Miner Street to the north, Douglas to the east, Northwest Highway to the south, and Belmont Avenue to the west. The property is zoned P-L public lands. Phase II & III of Recreation Park, that is to include ball field improvements, new dugouts, updated basketball court. New onsite restroom buildings, new water service and reconfigured parking lot on Douglas Avenue. Phase III includes updates to the existing pool and pool deck, demolition of the existing bathhouse building on the eastern side of the property, and reconstruction of a new bathhouse which would include locker rooms and a concession building, and then renovations to the main community building on Miner Street, including accessibility improvements, interior and exterior renovations, and a new parking lot along the circular drive. Based on that scope of the project, a petitioner would need approval of a PUD amendment for the Recreation Park PUD for Phase II and Phase III specifically. A special use permit for facilities owned by the Arlington Heights Park District for Phase II & III specifically. As Mr. Kramer mentioned, there are several or several variations identified, including fence height for several of the fences around the ball field and accessory structures that are located in yards that are not the rear yard, and additional accessory structures than were previously permitted, which was twelve. The proposed Phase III building improvements, including the new bath house and concessions building, and renovations to the community building do require Design Commission application, which has been submitted. The petitioner is working with staff, that review is ongoing, and as with any Design Commission recommendation, it will go to Village Board with the entitlements that are as part of this application. As for parking, staff is evaluating the parking requirement based on the occupancy of the primary building on site, which is the main community building that 500 E. Miner. The petitioner will need to verify the occupancy of the building after all the renovations are completed. The proposed occupancy is approximately 400 people, which yields a parking requirement of 120. Neighbors have shared concerns to the Plan Commission and Village Board during the phase one approvals, Village staff will be expecting a traffic and parking study with the formal Plan Commission application to identify potential traffic concerns adjacent to the park, to ensure that the parking is adequate to serve all of the features that Recreation Park has. The staff development committee reviewed the proposal for the amendment to the PUD and the special use permit with variations, and is generally supportive.

Commissioner Green – with no further questions, we suggest that you continue to move forward.

RECOMMENDATION

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee encouraged the petitioner to proceed forward with their application.

Bruce Green, Chair
CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Kendra Maher, Recorder