

APPROVED

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE COMMUNITY ROOM, VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS MAY 14, 2025 AT 6:15 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bruce Green, Chair
Jay Cherwin
John Sigalos

MEMBERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Rachel Hitzemann, Michael Lysicatos & Dan Osoba

ALSO PRESENT: Ross Grande, resident; Thomas Budzek, Thomas Architects for Tasty Breads and Royce Thomas, Tasty Breads; Chris Niro, Driven Car Wash; Casey Kenny & Laura Stark with Logistics Property Co.; Mike Antonelli, Brown Commercial Group, Inc.

Call to Order

Chairman Green called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The meeting minutes of April 9, 2025 meeting were reviewed.

SIGALOS MOVED AND CHERWIN SECONDED A MOTION TO APPROVE THE APRIL 9, 2025 MEETING MINUTES. MINUTES WERE APPROVED 3-0.

NEW BUSINESS

T1879 – Tasty Breads, 600 W. University Drive

Project Background: The 4.5-acre subject property is located approximately 350 feet east of the intersection of N. Kennicott Avenue and W. University Drive at 600 W. University Drive. The property contains a vacant 194,000 square-foot building, three access drives, front and rear loading docks and 131 existing parking spaces. The property is within the University Subdivision Planned Unit Development (PUD) with the property immediately adjacent to the east at 580 W. University Drive.

Tasty Breads International is proposing to occupy the vacant building and add a 30-foot tall, 13,000 square-foot freezer as part of a building addition on the east side of the building, which will reduce parking by 26 spaces. Tasty Breads is a food processor that produces dough then freezes and packages it for wholesale. This process does not include any baking. Tasty Breads has existing production facilities in Franklin Park and Northbrook. This proposed location is anticipated to employ 150 employees within five years of opening and will operate on two shifts.

Mr. Budzek explained that his firm has worked with Tasty Breads in other locations and is currently under contract to purchase 600 W. University. They are looking to move their operations into this building. They plan to make internal alterations to the building, along with an addition to the east side of the building to expand the freezer capacity for the building. This building used to be a vitamin supplement manufacturing company, so this building has more than adequate power for their needs. Tasty breads do not actually do any baking, they basically make frozen dough that then gets shipped to a place and they bake the dough on onsite.

APPROVED

This operation it is considered a bakery according to the zoning ordinance. We will be requesting land use variation, and the property directly to the east of this property is part of this PUD. We do not personally know what the purpose was behind this PUD. We have been in contact with that property owner and we will work with them to get whatever applications are necessary so this will also be a PUD amendment.

Site plans were shared showing the flour tanker delivery process, and other dry goods. Receiving is minimal. The flour tankers would basically maneuver on site, with a manifold pump system, which pumps flour inside and then the truck leaves on the shipping side could see on the southeast corner of building there are 4 existing shipping docks. The site is over parked, 105 spaces. Tasty Breads expects at full capacity to have maximum of 75 employees per shift.

The freezer addition is planned on the east side where there appears to be some sort of detention, we have a civil engineer who is looking at the entire site to determine if there is enough capacity or if we have to offset elsewhere on site. The addition itself will be about 30 feet, a little bit taller than the existing building, but still well specified in the zoning ordinance.

We would like to see if we could waive the parking study for this project given that it is a very comparable use to what was there previously there.

Mr. Osoba gave an overview of the project, stating the subject site is located at 600 W. University Drive within the M-1 district. The petitioner is proposing to occupy that vacant space and add a 30-foot tall 13,000 square foot freezer addition to the east of the building. The proposed use is food processing that processes the dough, freezes it, and packages it for wholesale which would be considered the land use categories of bakery products, production, and wholesale, which would require land use variation.

The overall scope would also require that amendment to the University Subdivision PUD for the leading overall site, which includes this in the site to the east. A Design Commission application will be required for the expanded building before the Planning Commission hearing. The staff will be reviewing landscaping within the site to ensure landscaping and parking lot screening is compliant with current Village standards, and as stated the parking will be reduced by this addition, however, there is a surplus of 67 parking spaces on site and that would be pending the final floor plan that the petitioner submits based on their office space. Overall, the SDC has generally supportive of the proposal subject to the resolution of the items listed in the Staff Report.

A parking study is required by code, because of the PUD amendment. The petitioner has the option to request a variation, that can be evaluated as part of that Plan Commission submittal given the parking surplus on site it's something that would be relatively amenable.

Commissioner Sigalos inquired about the amount of truck traffic for two shifts. Great location for what you want to do.

Mr. Thomas explained that yes there will shipping in and out of the facility, 6 production lines, at most 12-15 trucks between shipping and receiving. There will be two shifts of production and one shift for the shipping and receiving.

Commissioner Cherwin inquired about the actual process that occurs and any risks with storage of the materials. Also, agreed it is a good project, parking should not be a problem.

Mr. Budzek explained flour that has already been milled, mixed with water on a big scale, with no odor. No issues, no dust due to all being directly piped.

APPROVED

Commissioner Green agreed that it is a great use and agrees that the parking study is not warranted. Recommended by all three commissioners present to move forward to their Plan Commission application.

T1881 – Driven Car Wash, 1912 N. Arlington Heights Road

Project Background: The subject site is zoned B-2, General Business District and is 29,169 square feet in size. The lot is currently a vacant parcel. The property is located along N. Arlington Heights Rd., northwest of the intersection with Palatine Rd. The site is north of Palm Court and the Speedway and south of McDonalds. Single Family homes are located to the west and a vacant parcel across S. Arlington Heights Rd to the east.

The petitioner is proposing to construct an automated express car wash. The proposed hours of operation are 7am to 8pm, with an anticipated 3 employees per shift.

Several other developers have considered constructing car washes in this general corridor, but none at this specific location. Staff advised those developers that due to the prime commercial location between several highly successful shopping centers, car washes are not appropriate for this area.

With this specific site, Staff is especially concerned about the proximity to the residential use to the west, due to the noise, light and intensity of the car wash use. This concern was also expressed during the public hearings for the development of the McDonald's to the north. Lastly, staff has significant concerns about full access to the site within such close proximity to the intersection with Palatine Road and Rand Road.

Mr. Niro is interested in opening a second car wash in the Village. The vacant land has been available for a very long time and would service the north end of Arlington Heights. This location would work with the existing use of a gas station and open parking lot to the south, as well as, the McDonald's to the north, which staff has pointed out and we are working on a cross-access easement with the McDonald's Corporation.

Mr. Niro used a site plan diagram to discuss the traffic plan. An access point from Palm Court on the south of property, and on the west side of the property there will be 2 fences, the existing fence by the residential and the alleyway which is an easement on the property, and then another fence it would further screen from our property. People can access by going through the McDonald's, as well as coming up through that through the back area, as well as coming off of Arlington Heights Road at the McDonald's exit and coming onto our site at the north end which is further away from the intersection of Palatine and Arlington Road. Cross access easement with Palm Court at the exit of our facility we would propose it to be an exit from there so people could use that easement to go off of our property through the Palm Court and then exit right onto Palatine Road, not enter through Palm Court on the southeast corner and go past the exit of the car wash. People will be able to exit out to Arlington Heights Road on right turn only in the existing curb cut and exit towards the south.

Mr. Nico addressed staff concerns on managing traffic. Having multiple entrance and exit points of our facility will reduce the possibility of having traffic back up on Arlington Heights Road. For example, using the access through the McDonald's parking lot that gives us enough stacking for another 8 cars just in that area and we can close the Arlington Heights Road entrance at our facility on the existing curb cut if the traffic is getting up to a point on a very busy day. It is not a common occurrence, but can happen, so we are very sensitive about how we can manage traffic on and off of this site and based on the reciprocal easements that we have with our neighbors. We have the ability to speed up our chain to 160 cars per hour

APPROVED

and move people on and off to manage traffic going on to the site, as well as off the site.

We are very good members of the community, we are very active, and we enjoy being headquartered here. I walked over from our office over at 44 S. Vail and it's been a great time in this community and we want to expand our footprint and continue serving the community.

Ms. Hitzemann reviewed the staff report before the committee. The subject property is located at 1912 N Arlington Heights Road, located in our B-2 general business district. The property approximately 29,169 square feet and is currently a vacant parcel. The petitioner is proposing an automated express car wash and the proposed hours of operation are 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM. Several other developers have considered constructing car washes in this general corridor, but none at this specific location. Staff has advised those developers are due to the prime commercial location between several highly successful shopping centers, car washes are not appropriate use for this area.

With this specific site, staff is concerned with the proximity to the residential use to the west due to the noise, light, and intensity of a car wash use. This concern was also expressed during the public hearings for the development of the McDonald's to the north. This property is zoned B-2 which does not allow car washes, the petitioner would be requesting to rezone the property to B-3 which is our auto industry district, and as such a special use would be provided in the B-3 district. As part of any Planning Commission application the petitioner shall provide a written response to 3 hardship criteria necessary for special use approval. The existing residential to the west zoned R-3, and to the east zoned R-1, but the majority of the other remaining properties in the area are zoned B-2. This would then become what we consider a spot zone, which we are not in favor of at this location. SDC feels a rezoning to the B-3 district would be inappropriate for this property, as we fill the property to the east when and if that should be redeveloped will be rezoned to a B-2 general commercial district. If the petitioner chooses to move forward a market study will be required.

A design for the building is similar to the current Driven Car Wash located at 2100 S. Arlington Heights Road a design Commission application would be required. In terms of the site planning and landscaping, the property owners to the west when the McDonald's was built expressed concerns about noise and lighting. As a part of that approval, there were specific noise and lighting standards in the ordinance, these included regulations on speaker volume, signage asking patrons to be courteous to their neighbors, locating rooftop HVAC units at the front of the building, and light poles not exceeding 18 feet. Automatic car washes and outdoor vacuums generate significant noise and since this project is right adjacent to that fixed single family residential, we expect that they will pose opposition similar to what they did for the McDonald's.

North Arlington Heights Road is IDOT so the petitioner will have to seek approval from them for any access onto the property. SDC does have concerns with the proposed southern cross access location along the north Arlington Heights Road frontage as it necessitates vehicles exiting the site first path in front of the exit to the car wash. There is also concerns with the full access driveway less than 400 feet of the intersection with Palatine Road less than 600 feet south of Rand Road. If there is a backup, it blocks the right turn lane onto to Palatine Road.

A fire lane will need to be added to the perimeter of the site to allow fire trucks to circulate the entire building. A landscape plan meeting all Village standards will be required, as well as photometric plan. Per code detailed traffic and parking study from a certified traffic engineer must be provided, that should determine access locations design and level of service. Per the Village code the proposed use requires one space per employee, while they are providing 2

APPROVED

parking stalls and one handicapped stall, SDC recommends adding additional employee parking stall to accommodate the 3 proposed employees as handicapped stalls may or be utilized by those with appropriate issued identification.

The staff development committee reviewed the proposal for rezoning and special use and does not support the proposal for the following reasons:

- 1) the location of this site is not suitable for a car wash due to the successful development of commercial uses in the surrounding B-2 district
- 2) potential impacts of light, noise, and traffic from the car wash use within the close proximity to single family residential
- 3) access concerns for the fire department navigating around the building
- 4) traffic safety concerns with cars backing onto north Arlington Heights Road in both directions
- 5) impacting access to surrounding businesses turning movements
- 6) access to drive turn lanes at the intersection of Palatine Road and Rand Road

Commissioner Cherwin commented that this is a great local business in the community and in Rolling Meadows. Expressed some concerns about the noise that comes from the car wash itself, and the circulation of traffic that will be an issue on this small site. Shared with concerns with the shared access with Palm Court for entering and exiting.

Mr. Niro explained that the traffic ambient noise will be more from the Arlington Heights Road noise than the car wash itself, based on the equipment they use. The speed of the drive thru helps in the concern of circulation. This would be monitored in peak times to eliminate traffic back up.

Commissioner Sigalos would like to see a car wash on the north side of Arlington Heights, but feels that the is not the right site for this, busy intersection and weekends would be very busy, with stop light location to the entrance and exit of the business.

Commissioner Green add that when we reviewed this location for a different party interested in a car wash, the concern was ice. Ice is created that coming out of the wash on a cold day and onto Arlington Heights Road in the intersection creates ice. Adding drive time to the vehicle circulating on your property before exiting would help the dripping before creating ice on the roads could be helpful.

Mr. Niro our drying technology significantly reduces the amount of water that is on the car, almost dripless. Those that exit immediately, most of the water will drip before exiting on the radiant heated surface.

Commissioner Green agreed with the other commissioners that it is a small lot for what you want to out here, and circulation is a concern.

Commissioner Cherwin asked about a one-way entrance from Palatine Road behind Palm Court with a better stacking opportunity.

Mr. Niro yes, and through the easement of the McDonald's.

Mr. Lysicatos suggested to the committee that the petitioner get feedback from IDOT on what kind of access they will be allowed. The Village will also need more information on the cross easements, and access through the neighboring properties. A noise study will need to be done for the residents nearby. You are a valuable business but we need more information.

Commissioner Green reiterated the commissioners concerns about the site and moving

APPROVED

forward.

T1862 – 2625-2635 Clearbrook Drive

Project Background: The subject site, which consists of 5 parcels, is zoned M-2, Limited Heavy Manufacturing District. The property is roughly 10.2 acres. The existing site contains two office buildings, a detention pond in the southeast corner and older growth trees in the north portion of the lot. The building located at 2635 Clearbrook Drive is one story and approximately 11,230 square feet. The building located at 2625 Clearbrook Drive is two stories and approximately 11,076 square feet. Most of the current site is open greenfield. The subject property is bordered by industrial / office uses to the north and west, I-90 to the south, and Lost Creek Subdivision, which comprises 155 units of two-story townhomes, to the east.

Access to the site is provided from Clearbrook Drive, which connects to E. Algonquin Road to the north.

The Petitioner is proposing to construct a 120,257 square foot warehouse / manufacturing building in the center of the combined parcels. The proposed building is 41 feet tall with predominately smooth painted concrete wall panels. The Petitioner has not identified any user(s) at this time, so the building will be built on spec, with the interior being finished out as user(s) are identified. The building will have twenty-nine loading docks and two drive-in bays to accommodate the future use(s). The loading docks are located in the rear of the building, which is adjacent to I-90. On the north side of the building, the Petitioner is proposing to construct a 100-space parking lot. To accommodate the drainage from the additional lot coverage, the Petitioner is proposing to construct an additional detention pond in the northern part of the combined lot, which currently has a large number of mature trees. Lastly, the Petitioner is proposing to construct a 10-foot-tall berm on the east of the site, which is directly adjacent to four, three-story townhomes that are part of the larger multi-family development to the east.

Ms. Stark explained the proposed development will not require a rezoning but the development is required to undergo a PUD due to the size of the site exceeding 4 acres. We are requesting a consolidation of 5 parcels into one, so we intend to buy both properties and consolidate into one parcel.

Mr. Kenny reviewed the project as stated in the project background and hand out that was distributed. The project would be LEED certified aligning with national green building practices and reducing the long-term environmental footprint. We are currently working with Village staff with their various concerns, incorporating some of the requested changes in good faith. This project would bring good economic value with more jobs during construction and operations, as well as, increase in tax revenue.

Ms. Hitzemann reviewed the staff report before the committee. The subject property is located at 2625-2635 Clearbrook Drive, and the requested action is a preliminary and final file subdivision to consolidate the five parcels into one parcel. A PUD for a property in the M-2 district more than 4 acres, a variance would need to be requested Sec. 28 5.1 - 15.3 required minimum yards to reduce the front yard setback. This property is roughly 10.2 acres, the existing site contains two office buildings, a detention pond in the southeast corner and older growth trees in the north portion of the lot. The current buildings are roughly 11,230 square feet and 11,076 square feet, with most of the current site as open green field. The subject property is boarded by industrial and office uses to the north and west, I-90 to the south and Lost Creek subdivision which comprises 155 units of 2 story townhomes to the

APPROVED

east. Access to the site is provided from Clearbrook Drive, which connects to east Algonquin Road to the north. The petitioner is proposing to construct 120,257 square foot warehouse/manufacturing building in the center of the combined parcels. The proposed building would be 41 feet tall with currently smooth painted concrete wall panels. The petitioner has not identified any users at this time to the building will be built on spec, and they are proposing to build 100 space parking to accommodate drainage from the additional coverage that the petitioner is proposing to construct an additional detention pond in the northern part of the combined lot which currently has a large number of mature trees that blocks the rest of the residential area essentially from these townhomes.

For the Plan Commission application, the petitioner will need to provide responses to the four hardship criteria necessary approval for the variation front yard setback. Staff's biggest issue with this proposal is the size of the buildings. The buildings within this industrial area increase in size and mass as you move further west into the industrial area. This step-up approach allows for two uses, the residential and warehouse/manufacturing to coexist without the residential properties dwarfed by larger industrial buildings or adversely impacted by more intensive industrial uses located further to the west. Without identified users it is hard for staff to determine what impact this development will have on the neighboring properties, in terms of parking demand, traffic, operation noise, and any other critical functions of business that could impact residents. Without knowing the type of user, it is hard to determine the parking needs. As mentioned, the detention pond provides a nice buffer for those residential uses and with the large increased surface area, the detention pond could be smaller, potentially with less parking or things along those lines, that detention could be decreased for more of the trees to remain.

The proposed plan does include a 10-foot berm with an 8-foot-high fence along the southeast side of the property, which will screen those southern townhomes from this property, but with the 41-foot-tall building, it will still tower over those residential spaces. Per village code, a detailed traffic and parking study from a certified traffic engineer must be provided as part of any Planning Commission application.

The staff development committee reviewed the proposal for PUD and lot consolidation with variations from chapter 28 for the front yard setback, and does not support the proposal as designed for the following reasons:

- the proposed request does not meet the standards outlined in the village code regarding PUD's in terms of design preservation of natural areas, innovative design for compatibility with adjacent development;
- the footprint and height of the building are too large for the space as configured and SDC would not support of variance request to support the current design;
- without knowing the intended users SDC cannot calculate the traffic parking or operational impact users will have on the neighboring properties;
- the design of the building does not meet the Village's PUD regulations in terms of innovative design;
- believed to bring negative impact on the surrounding properties.

Commissioner Sigalos asked about who might be interested in a building like this. Also shared staff concerns with all the unknowns at this point.

Mr. Kenny explained that this is the market standard right now for industrial, most developers are building on the house, so there are some pending with the build to suit with the tenant in mind, but for this particular property we do not have anyone that we're currently engaged with, but on that point, we would be happy to come back to you if we were to find a tenant with their intended use. We feel this location for industrial is needed. We would be the long-term holders of the property.

APPROVED

Commissioner Cherwin shared that he is not so much concerned with the end user, it is going to be a big industrial looking box. Concern over the residential issue. These people are going to have an opinion. We need to look at the project for what it is, traffic is a concern, getting in and out of this area will be difficult. He does not feel it is an absolute "no", but there is a lot of work to be done to make it a success.

Mr. Kenny expressed their willingness to work with the neighboring design and traffic flow. Willing to do a traffic study.

Mr. Lysicatos reiterated that we have had great conversations with the petitioner and they have made changes based on our feedback.

Commissioner Green that this is M-2 limited heavy manufacturing. The townhome people know that this is M-2, but not yet developed, but there still maybe push back. Traffic will be an issue, really need a traffic study. Expressed that we have shared our concerns. Does not have a problem with the concept, hoping changes can be made for the concerns.

Mr. Lysicatos reiterated that staff would like to see what else could be done on the east side, possible of a step down in that direction with the townhomes in that direction. The intensity of this district goes from small to big, so respecting M-1/M-2 small to big.

Ms. Hitzemann made it clear that staff is not against this use, as it is currently designed there are tweaks that could be made and hopefully can meet in the middle to come up with something that is viable for the petitioner and residents in this area.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ross Grande representing Walnut Subdivision project. Would like clarity and alignment with the Village staff around our project. Upset with the timeline that the staff, subcommittee, and commission.

Mr. Lysicatos this is a very complicated project. Staff has met to discuss the long-term comprehensive plan elements fit. We have received significant concerns from public safety and public works. If you would like to move forward with a public hearing you can do so.

Adjournment

SIGALOS MOVED AND CHERWIN SECONDED A MOTION TO ADJOURN. ALL MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR OF THE MOTION.

The meeting adjourned at 7:29 p.m.

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