



**DES PLAINES PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING**  
**April 8, 2025**  
**MINUTES**

The Des Plaines Planning and Zoning Board held its regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, April 8, 2025, at 7:00 p.m. in Room 102 of the Des Plaines Civic Center.

Chairman Szabo called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. and a roll call was established.

PRESENT: Bronakowski, Fowler, Zadrozny, Veremis, Weaver, Szabo  
ABSENT: Catalano  
ALSO PRESENT: Samantha Redman, Senior Planner  
Jonathan Mendel, Assistant Director of Community & Economic Development  
Jeff Rogers, Director of Community & Economic Development

A quorum was present.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Veremis had a comment that she had voted against the 200 Howard case and the draft minutes state otherwise. Staff will correct to note Bronakowski and Veremis as nays for the conditional use request.

A motion was made by Board Member Fowler, seconded by Board Member Veremis to approve the meeting minutes of March 25, 2025.

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

**PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEM**

There was no public comment.

**GENERAL COMMUNICATIONS – ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS**

None at this time.

Chairman Szabo introduced the two agenda items.

**Pending Applications:**

1. **Address:** 1244 Brown Street      **Case Number:** 25-015-V

The petitioner requests: (i) a major variation to reduce the total required lot area within the R-4 zoning district; (ii) a major variation to reduce the minimum required parking; and (iii) any other variations, waivers, and zoning relief as may be necessary.

**PIN:** 09-17-400-032-0000

**Petitioner:** The Patricia E. Kearney Trust, 650 Mooring Line Drive, Naples, Florida 34102 (Representative: Gene S. Bobroff, 701 W. Golf Rd, Mount Prospect, Illinois 60056)

**Owner:** The Patricia E. Kearney Trust, 650 Mooring Line Drive, Naples, Florida 34102

Chairman Szabo swore-in petitioner Gene Bobroff. Gene Bobroff is here on behalf of the petitioner Patricia Kearney. He outlined the proposal and the specific major variation request. The request is to reduce the minimum lot size within the R-4 zoning. The public notice previously included a parking variation. Currently a parking variation is not required due to sufficient parking spots. The building is currently a 4-unit building consisting of 2 units on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, 1 unit on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor and 1-unit on the garden level. The client has lived at this property for 40 years and moved out last year. They would like to add 1 unit to the 1<sup>st</sup> floor to mimic what is currently on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor and add a studio apartment to the garden area.

Member Weaver inquired about one of the floors that has two units. Was that originally constructed as one unit on that floor? Mr. Bobroff stated that as long as Patricia has owned it, it has been two units and they have owned it for 40 years.

Senior Planner Redman presented the staff report.

**Issue:** The petitioner requests a major variation to the lot area requirement.

**PIN:** 09-17-400-032-0000

**Petitioner/Owner:** The Patricia E. Kearney Trust, 650 Mooring Line Drive, Naples, FL 34102 (Representative: Gene S. Bobroff, 701 W. Golf Rd, Mt Prospect, IL 60056)

**Case Number:** #25-015-V

**Ward Number:** #1, Alderman Mark Lysakowski

**Existing Zoning:** R-4, Central Core Residential District

**Surrounding Zoning:** North: R-4, Central Core Residential District  
South: R-4, Central Core Residential District  
East: R-4, Central Core Residential District

West: R-4, Central Core Residential District

**Surrounding Land Uses:** North: Multifamily residence  
South: Multifamily residence  
East: Multifamily residence  
West: Multifamily residence

**Street Classification:** Brown Street is classified as a local road.

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

**Property/Zoning History:** According to the original 1955 building permit, this building was constructed with four bedrooms and bathrooms, reflecting its current unit mix. Since its construction, minimal alterations have been made, with most building permits on file for this building related to maintenance activities such as roof repairs, plumbing work, and hard surface replacements.

City records indicate that the property has been zoned for multifamily residential use throughout its history. At the time of construction, the 1923 Zoning Ordinance was in effect, and the property was subject to regulations under “Area District B – Multiple Family.” Rather than using lot area restrictions to regulate density, the 1923 ordinance set a density limit, stating that no dwelling could be built or altered to accommodate more than eight families per acre, or a proportional number for smaller lots. Given the property's size of 0.14 acres, a maximum of 11 dwelling units would have been permitted. The current minimum lot area requirement was introduced in the 1960 Zoning Ordinance, after this building's construction.

Based on these regulations, the existing multifamily building is classified as a legal non-conforming structure under Section 12-5-5 of the current Zoning Ordinance. The lot area does not meet the current R-4 district minimum required 10,000 square feet. However, the existing five parking spaces comply with zoning regulations. The most recent zoning ordinance update occurred in 1998, and any modifications to this building must adhere to its requirements.

**Project Description:** The property is within the R-4, Central Core Residential Zoning District, which permits multifamily buildings. The petitioner seeks to alter the basement and first floor to create a new unit on each floor, proposing to add a studio in the basement and divide the first floor from one two-bedroom apartment to two one-bedroom apartments. Refer to Floor Plan attachment.

To accommodate the revised unit mix, a zoning variation is required to reduce the lot area. The current four-unit building can continue as a non-conforming structure per Section 12-5-5 of the Zoning Ordinance; however, it cannot undergo improvements beyond ordinary repair and maintenance without zoning relief. Increasing the total units from four to six would eliminate the property’s legal non-conforming status. Approval of this request would allow the property to be legally recognized with six dwelling units, without the limitations imposed on non-conforming structures.

<b>R-4 – Townhome Residential District Bulk Standards</b>		
<i>Bulk Controls</i>	<i>Regulations</i>	<i>Subject Property Existing Conditions</i>
Maximum height	80 ft	≤ 35 ft
Minimum front yard	12 ft	18 ft
Minimum side yard	5 ft.	5 ft.
Minimum rear yard	25 ft. or 20% of lot depth, whichever is less	48 ft.
Minimum lot width	50 ft.	50 ft
Minimum lot area	10,000 sq ft	6,250 sq ft

<sup>1</sup> Calculation: Total Lot Area (6250 sq. ft.) divided by proposed six units. Variation requested to provide relief from this requirement.

*Minimum Lot Area*

The R-4 Zoning District establishes minimum lot area requirements based on either a fixed lot size of 10,000 square feet or a total determined by the unit mix, whichever is greater. In this case, the 10,000 square foot minimum applies. The existing lot does not meet this requirement, meaning it could not be newly created, nor could the building be constructed today as originally built, based on the current zoning ordinance. Because the property owner proposes to alter the unit mix and increase the number of units, the modifications would eliminate the building’s legal non-conforming status. As a result, a variation is necessary to allow for the proposed changes.

As a matter of record, many lots within this zoning district,

particularly those with similar-scale multifamily buildings, do not meet the minimum lot area requirement and are classified as "non-conforming." In the downtown area, including the vicinity of this property, there are over 100 properties ranging from 6,250 square feet to 9,999 square feet in size and many include this type of multifamily building.

#### *Off-Street Parking*

The off-street parking requirement for efficiency (studio) and one-bedroom units in the R-4 zoning district is 1 space per dwelling unit and 1.5 spaces for each two bedroom unit. The existing unit mix is 2 two-bedroom units and 2 one-bedroom units, requiring five spaces. With the five spaces in the rear parking area and one driveway space, parking is currently compliant.

For the proposed six one-bedroom units, six parking spaces would be required. Per the Petitioner's Narrative, five off-street parking spaces are provided in the rear, and several additional vehicles can park in the driveway accessed by Brown Street. The zoning ordinance does not allow tandem parking spaces, so only one space in the driveway can be counted towards the minimum off-street parking requirement.

Although the public notice for this case originally included a parking variation, staff have determined with the proposed unit mix and available spaces that this proposal would be code compliant with the off-street parking requirements with six spaces available.

#### **Standards for Variation:**

Variation requests are subject to the standards set forth in Section 12-3-6(H) of the Zoning Ordinance. Rationale for how the proposed amendments would or would not satisfy the standards is provided below and in the attached petitioner responses to standards. The Board may use the provided staff comments as its rationale, modify, or adopt its own.

- 1. Hardship: No variation shall be granted pursuant to this subsection H unless the applicant shall establish that carrying out the strict letter of the provisions of this title would create a particular hardship or a practical difficulty.**

*Staff Comment:* Without the variation, the property would be unable to operate as proposed. The inability to re-configure the existing unit mix may not constitute a "hardship." The property can continue to operate as is, if the variation is not approved.

- 2. Unique Physical Condition: The subject lot is exceptional as compared to other lots subject to the same provision by reason of a unique physical condition, including presence of an existing use, structure, or sign, whether conforming or nonconforming;**

**irregular or substandard shape or size; exceptional topographical features; or other extraordinary physical conditions peculiar to and inherent in the subject lot that amount to more than a mere inconvenience to the owner and that relate to or arise out of the lot rather than the personal situation of the current owner of the lot.**

Staff Comment: The subject property is a typical rectangular lot that is neither exceptional to the surrounding lots nor contains unique physical features that prevent the petitioner from complying with the appropriate regulations.

- 3. Not Self-Created: The aforesaid unique physical condition is not the result of any action or inaction of the owner or its predecessors in title and existed at the time of the enactment of the provisions from which a variance is sought or was created by natural forces or was the result of governmental action, other than the adoption of this title.**

Staff Comment: Any perceived unique physical conditions or hardships created from these items are a direct result of the actions of the property owner. The property owner is seeking to increase the number of units by re-configuring the existing units. The property owner is able to continue to rent this property with the existing unit mix as a non-conforming structure if the variation is not granted. However, as outlined in the property history section of this report, changes to the zoning ordinance over time have resulted in the building's current nonconforming status. Because the property owner proposes to modify the unit mix and increase the number of units, these changes would eliminate the building's legal nonconforming status. As a result, a variation is required to allow the proposed modifications.

- 4. Denied Substantial Rights: The carrying out of the strict letter of the provision from which a variance is sought would deprive the owner of the subject lot of substantial rights commonly enjoyed by owners of other lots subject to the same provision.**

Staff Comment: The rights denied to the property owner would be the ability to reconfigure the existing building to increase the number of tenants, but the property could continue as a non-conforming use. under Section 12-5-5 of the Zoning Ordinance limiting the building to only ordinary repair and maintenance of the existing four units and not allowing any structural alterations or enlargement of the structure. Denial of the variation means it would continue to be subject to the non-conforming use regulations.

- 5. Not Merely Special Privilege: The alleged hardship or difficulty is neither merely the inability of the owner or occupant to enjoy some special privilege or additional right not available to owners or occupants of other lots subject to the same provision, nor merely the inability of the owner to make more money from the use of the subject lot.**

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

Staff Comment: Granting this variation may, in fact, provide a special privilege for the property owner not available to other properties in this zoning district. Variation decisions

are made on a case-by-case, project-by-project basis upon applying the variation standards. In those evaluations, the determining body (e.g., PZB and/or City Council) usually determines if the applicant has exhausted design options that do not require a variation. The PZB may ask the petitioner to explain whether they have exhausted other alternatives.

- 6. Title And Plan Purposes: The variation would not result in a use or development of the subject lot that would be not in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this title and the provision from which a variation is sought were enacted or the general purpose and intent of the comprehensive plan.**

Staff Comment: With the variation sought, it would meet all other applicable requirements for the R-4 zoning district. No exterior changes are proposed. It is also important to note that many lots in the city within this zoning district, particularly those with similar-scale multifamily buildings, do not meet the minimum lot area requirement and are classified as "non-conforming." In the downtown area, including the vicinity of this property, there are over 100 properties ranging from 6,250 square feet to 9,999 square feet in size. Although each variation request is determined on a case-by-case basis, the overall context and constraints placed by the zoning ordinance may be an important consideration for this type of request.

- 7. No Other Remedy: There is no means other than the requested variation by which the alleged hardship or difficulty can be avoided or remedied to a degree sufficient to permit a reasonable use of the subject lot.**

Staff Comment: In this case, one clear remedy is not to change the unit mix. There is no other remedy for the lot area variation; this property is landlocked with no readily available opportunities to acquire additional property.

- 8. Minimum Required: The requested variation is the minimum measure of relief necessary to alleviate the alleged hardship or difficulty presented by the strict application of this title.**

Staff Comment: The variation may provide the minimum relief necessary.

**PZB Procedure and Recommended Conditions:** Under Section 12-3-6.F of the Zoning Ordinance (Major Variations), the PZB has the authority to *recommend* approval, approval subject to conditions, or denial of the request to City Council. 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 12-3-6.F (Standards for Variations) of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff does not have any recommended conditions of approval.

Member Weaver asked about other similar properties in the City that are built as 2-flats or 3-flats that have added more units in the recent years.

Senior Planner Redman responded, yes and gave two examples: One on Linden St and the other on Illinois St.

Member Weaver asked if staff sees this request as similar. Senior Planner Redman stated this request is simpler, because a zoning map amendment is not required.

Chair Szabo asked if current tenants would stay during proposed construction. Mr. Bobroff stated he doesn't have that information.

Chair Szabo if there were any public comments. No one responded.

A motion was made by Member Weaver and seconded by Member Zadrozny to recommend approval of the major variation to the City Council.

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

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

2. **Address:** 2200 E Golf Rd. **Case Number:** 25-014-PPUD-CU

The petitioner requests: (i) a Preliminary Planned Unit Development with a height exception, (ii) a Conditional Use for an Assisted Living Facility; and (iii) 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 all individuals presenting for this case.

Bob Helle represented the petitioner and introduced his team. He then continued to outline and present the proposed conditional use and PUD request of the assisted living facility development – location, design, operations and targeted market segment and area.

The facility will consist of 150 units. The property will include 91-bedroom units (60%) and 60-studios (40%) with extensive community spaces including communal dining, bistro, commercial kitchen, living room, library, physical therapy, outdoor garden space with raised planting beds.

This facility is designed for residents to live in a residential facility rather than a nursing facility.

The average age of the residents is roughly 85 years old at the time of moving in. At this specific facility, they will serve residents earning up to \$62,800 a year in 2024, but that number will slightly increase in 2025.

In 2024, within a 3-mile radius of the property there are over 8,000 residents who are age and income qualified. 2,000 of these people would benefit from this facility.

Bernie Citron, attorney for petitioner, outlines the specific zoning actions requested. Two primary actions – Conditional Use for Assisted Living Facility and a Preliminary PUD with maximum building height exception. Seeking approval to increase the height by 5 ft.

Jane Sloss, architect with WJW Architects, presented the specific project building design, location and site planning.

The site is located at the corner of Golf Rd and East River Rd. with the existing Monarch building to the North, Forest Preserve land to the West and South and I-294 to the East. Proposed main entry would be located on the west side of the site, with storm water detention on the east portion of the site. 80 parking spaces are proposed including 4 accessible spaces. There will also be a courtyard including patio space, walking paths, and other landscaped areas. Building size is about 123,000 sq ft. with a large number of amenity spaces for the residents.

Most of the sleeping units will be located on floors 2-4 with distributed common areas on those floors as well.

Sleeping units will consist of a private bathroom, sleeping area, sitting area, and kitchenette. Main elevation is on the west side with an entry and port-cochere. This design will include heavy timber trusses and cedar sunshades to bring warmth and a welcoming feel to the entrance of the building. Material palette is comprised of low maintenance and high-quality materials including brick and fiber cement siding.

Building height is proposed to be 50 ft ½ in., which exceeds the 45 ft maximum allowed in R-3 zoning district and requires a PUD exception. Design of building is intended to be contemporary in nature and to emphasize its residential character. Tim Brown and Stephen Corcoran (Eriksson Engineering) were available to answer any questions.

Member Weaver asked about the direction of vehicles using the port-cochere. Helle stated northbound vehicles navigate into the port-cochere.

Member Fowler asked about using The Monarch to access northbound N. East River Road. Bob Helle stated there is a pre-existing easement built into it.

Member Fowler likes the project and thinks it will be a nice addition.

Member Weaver asked about the amount of stone and brick on the building's facades. Jane Sloss further described the location and amount of façade brick on the entire first floor going up to the third story in some bay. The dark blue color is Hardie board panel siding.

Member Zadrozny asked about the height of The Monarch building. Asst. Director Mendel stated that it is compliant with the R-3 zoning – at or less than the maximum 45 foot building height.

Member Bronakowski asked about the amount of masonry and non-masonry. He has concerns about the proposed materials and how similar materials have been implemented elsewhere in the City. Jane Sloss stated she does not have that percentage number available at this time.

Chairman Szabo and Member Bronakowski stated both are not fans of Hardie-board type material. Member Bronakowski states he is unable to support this project unless there is additional brick on the building.

Bob Helle will go back to the design team and discuss possible changes to incorporate more brick into the building. Member Bronakowski wants the City and the Economic Development Department to further review our development standards.

Member Weaver stated he understood the opinions of Member Bronakowski and Chairman Szabo regarding the exterior building materials requirements but appreciated the petitioner's effort to maximize the brick materials on the primary exterior building facades.

Member Fowler also agrees with other members and encourages the City to further review our exterior building standards. Helle stated he understands the PZB's comments but also states such materials can be high quality when used in an appropriate manner.

Chair Szabo reiterates the desire to update the City's building design and review material requirements.

Senior Planner Redman presented the staff report.

**Issue:** The petitioner requests: (i) Conditional Use for an Assisted Living Facility with 150 units in the R-3 zoning district; and (ii) a Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) with an exception for height from 45 feet to 50.5 feet.

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

**Owner:** RJB-11 LP & First American Self-Storage Group, LLC; 1731 N. Marcey St., #200, Chicago, IL 60614

**Case Number:** 25-014-PPUD-CU

**PIN:** 09-09-402-010-0000

**Ward:** #1, Alderman Mark Lysakowski

**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). North 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/Zoning 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 Overview:** The petitioner, Heritage Woods Northwest LLC, is the contract purchaser of 2200 E Golf Road. On January 7, 2025, the Planning and Zoning Board hosted a special workshop to discuss the proposed development. The developer delivered a presentation and hosted an open house for the Board and the public to discuss the proposed facility. No public comments have been received for the proposed development at the time of this report.
- Overview of Requests:** To allow this use in this location, the applicant requests the following:
1. Conditional Use for an Assisted Living Facility in the R-3 zoning district.
  2. Preliminary Planned Unit Development to construct a 150 unit assisted living facility, with an exception to allow the height to be 50.5 feet exceeding the maximum height of 45 feet in the R-3 zoning district.
- Conditional Use Request:** Assisted Living Facilities are a conditional use within the R-3 zoning district. The use is defined in the zoning code as,
- “ASSISTED LIVING: A facility for adults in need of some

protective oversight or assistance due to functional limitation that provides a living arrangement integrating shelter, food and other supportive services to maintain a functional residential status.”

The petitioner’s narrative describes the proposed “Senior Living Facility.” This type of facility provides services for senior residents requiring assistance with two or more activities of daily living (including cooking, bathing, dressing, etc.). Although the facility will serve residents 65 years of age or older, its primary clientele are the “frail elderly” with an average age of 85 or older. This developer has constructed several similar senior living facilities, including Illinois locations in McHenry, Batavia, Downers Grove, Gurnee, South Elgin, and Rockford.

Employees of this facility will include CNAs, RNs, and other support and office staff. The petitioner states they estimate approximately 22 employees will work at this facility and it will operate 24/7.

***Transportation and Parking***

Pursuant to Section 12-9-7, assisted living facilities require 1 space for each 5 beds, plus 2 spaces for every 3 employees.

Use		Required parking <sup>1</sup>
Assisted Living Facility	1 space for each 5 beds	150 beds = 30 spaces
	2 spaces for every 3 employees	22 employees = 15 spaces
	<b>Total Required Spaces</b>	45 spaces
	<b>Total Proposed Spaces</b>	80 standard spaces 4 accessible spaces
<sup>1</sup> Spaces rounded up to next whole number		

The petitioner’s narrative states the residents of this type of facility, due to age and frailty, typically do not drive. PACE Route 240 runs along North East River Road to the east of this property, with a stop located in front of The Monarch, approximately 400 feet from the property line of 2200 E Golf Road. PACE Route 208 runs along E Golf Road; although a bus stop is located at the northeast intersection of North East River Road, an accessible route to this stop is not available from this location.

The facility will provide a private shuttle to transport residents to doctor’s appointments, shopping and other activities. A condition of approval states this private transportation option must be available to residents throughout the operation of this use. Amenities on site will include a commercial kitchen and dining facility, a hair salon, exercise room, and other living amenities for residents, limiting the amount of vehicle trips necessary off-site for residents to complete activities of daily living. Three meals a day as well as snacks and drinks will be provided to residents at the facility. Kitchenettes are present in each room, but no full oven or cooking facilities, with the exception of a microwave, are available in each unit.

### ***Traffic***

Access will continue to be provided to this property through the existing right in/right out controlled 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 North East River Road.

Refer to the Traffic Impact Study attachment for information regarding traffic related to this use. The Erikson Engineering Associates study was prepared in February 2025. Per the report, the estimated traffic volume in the report was generated by estimating employee trips, service or vendor trips, and visitor trips. Traffic volume was observed in December 2024 and the report states 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. The Public Works and Engineering Department (PWE) reviewed the traffic study and did not indicate specific concerns regarding its findings.

### ***Emergency Services***

The Fire Prevention Division did not indicate any concerns regarding the site plan and emergency access. However, assisted living facilities, particularly facilities such as the proposed that specialize in the frail elderly, may generate additional demand on emergency services due to the nature of this use and the average age of the occupants.

This property is within the boundary of Des Plaines Fire Department Station 61 response area. There are three stations within the City and Station 61 had the highest call volume between 2021 and 2024. The Emergency Response Map attachment includes the travel time and call volume of each station.

The Assisted Living Facility Response Volume Map attachment includes the location of all existing facilities and a table of the call volume. Of the seven assisted living facilities in the city, four are located within the response area of Fire Station 61. The addition of this proposed facility would be the fifth.

Details on the proposed project's internal emergency management strategy was provided by the management company, Gardant Management Solutions, in the Emergency Management Plan Attachment. This describes the availability of staff and a private ambulance for non-emergent calls (i.e. lift assists from falls not requiring transportation to a medical facility.) Gardant Management Solutions provided a letter detailing the 911 call volume of existing facilities in other communities (Refer to Emergency Management Plan), generally resulting in nine to eighteen calls a month, or 108 to 180 calls a year per facility.

Based on this memo and consultation with the Fire Department, several suggested conditions of approval were developed for the Board and Councils' review. These conditions include requiring an active contract with a private ambulance company for non-emergent calls, as well as quarterly meetings during the first year of operation between the operator of the facility and the Fire Department, followed by semiannual meetings after the first year.

The meetings are intended to ensure that clear, established communication between the operator

and the Fire Department, particularly during the beginning stages of operation when there tend to be a higher number of emergency calls for these types of facilities. Although the proposed operator does not have any facilities within Des Plaines, there is precedent that new assisted living facilities opening within the city result in higher call volume initially, but then a reduction after working with Fire Department staff to coordinate staffing and response for non-emergent versus emergent calls.

A final condition from emergency services requests the address be changed prior to building permit. An unrelated assisted living facility is located at 2200 E Golf Road in the Village of Glenview and changing the address prevents confusion during emergency response. This is an administrative process through the City; the Cook County PIN would be unchanged.

### **Preliminary PUD**

A planned development, as defined below, was requested by the petitioner:

*A development occurring on a parcel under single ownership or unified control which is developed as a unit and includes two (2) or more principal buildings or uses and is processed under the planned development procedure of this title” (Section 12-13-3).*

The purpose of a PUD is to promote a unified development by providing flexibility in development standards to accommodate site conditions and encourage innovative use of land. Certain characteristics are required by Section 12-3-5.A of the Zoning Ordinance, which are listed below along with staff’s assessment of each in relation to the attached Preliminary PUD Plat provided by the petitioner.

#### *Prerequisites: Location, Ownership, and Size*

PUDs are authorized in all zoning districts in the City subject to the regulations in Section 12-3-5 of the Zoning Ordinance and must be under single ownership and/or unified control. While the subject property is currently not owned by the petitioner, the petitioner does intend to take ownership of the property upon approval of the requests in this application.

#### *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. An exception allowing for increased height for a PUD can be considered beneficial for reducing the overall building footprint by allowing for increased development vertically rather than horizontally.

#### *Building Materials*

The petitioner has requested a minor variation for building materials to deviate from the below requirement:

*“Multi-family residential shall be constructed with one hundred percent (100%) face brick, natural stone, or anchored or adhered masonry veneer on all street facing and side elevations with at least two (2) complimentary colors or materials and a minimum of eight feet (8') from the top of foundation on all remaining elevations. (Section 12-3-11.D.2.a.3)*

Several elevations do not meet this requirement and a minor variation is requested. The Planning and Zoning Board unanimously suggested the building should contain additional brick and

suggested a condition requiring the elevations to be primarily masonry on all exterior elevations. Refer to Suggested Conditions of Approval for the PUD.

<b>Preliminary PUD Plat Review</b>	
<i>Item</i>	<i>Analysis (based on Proposal)</i>
A maximum choice in the types of environment available to the public by allowing a development that would not be possible under the strict application of the other sections of this title	Despite this use being a Conditional Use in this zoning district, this additional 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 Preliminary PUD plat and site plan include proposed modifications along the gravel path along the south boundary of the property, to be determined after consultation with Public Works and Engineering and the Forest Preserve prior to Final PUD Plat. This path connects to a paved multi-use path along North 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.
An efficient use of the land resulting in more economic networks of utilities, streets and other facilities	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>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 right-in/right-out 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>
---	--

**Standards for Conditional Use**

The following is a discussion of standards for zoning amendments from Section 12-3-4(E) of the Zoning Ordinance. Rationale for how the proposed amendments may or may not satisfy the standards is provided below and in the petitioner’s response to standards. The PZB may use this rationale toward its recommendation, or the Board may make up its own.

**1. The proposed Conditional Use is in fact a Conditional Use established within the specific Zoning district involved:**

Assisted living facilities are a conditional use within the R-3 zoning district.

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

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

*Staff Comments:* The Comprehensive Plan supports the use of this property for multifamily residential. Although not the traditional multifamily residential development, the proposed use serves to address several goals including: Pursue high quality housing for residents in all stages of life, specifically older adults and young families; Ensure the City has several housing options to fit diverse needs; Plan for and identify policies and tools that ensure accessibility.

**3. The proposed Conditional Use is designed, constructed, operated and maintained to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity:**

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

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

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

*Staff Comments:* As discussed in the Traffic section of this report, the petitioner provided a traffic study to discuss any impact to the adjacent street network. No additional driveways will be added connecting to the adjacent street network, preventing the creation of an additional potential traffic hazard.

**5. The proposed Conditional Use is to be served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer, and schools; or, agencies responsible for establishing the Conditional Use shall provide adequately any such services:**

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

*Staff Comments:* Refer to the "Emergency Services" section of this report. With the suggested conditions of approval from staff, the increased demand on emergency services may be mitigated, particularly with the requirement to maintain a private ambulance contract for non-emergent calls. No other public facilities or services were identified as significantly affected by this proposal. This use would not generate additional students and all necessary utilities will be connected to this site.

**6. The proposed Conditional Use does not create excessive additional requirements at public expense for public facilities and services and will not be detrimental to the economic well-being of the entire community:**

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

*Staff Comments:* Refer to Standard 5 above for commentary on public facilities and services as well as the "Emergency Services" section of this report.

**7. The proposed Conditional Use does not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, equipment and conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any persons, property, or the general welfare by reason of excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke fumes, glare or odors:**

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

*Staff Comments:* All activities are proposed to occur inside the building. Any uses must be in compliance with the Environmental Performance Standards in Title 12, Chapter 12 of the City Code. Noise level for any activities on the site will be regulated by Section 6-2-7 of the Police Regulations in the City's municipal code. Refer to the Traffic section of this report for additional discussion regarding traffic.

**8. The proposed Conditional Use provides vehicular access to the property designed so that it does not create an interference with traffic on surrounding public thoroughfares:**

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

*Staff Comments:* The proposed development provides vehicular access that minimizes interference with surrounding public thoroughfares. No new driveways onto public streets are proposed, reducing the impact on existing traffic. The site will be accessed via a right-in/right-out entrance and an internal road network connecting to The Monarch development to the north, facilitating smooth traffic flow. Additionally, the petitioner's traffic study (see attachments) indicates that the development states this use would not disproportionately affect traffic. 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, which will be managed to prevent congestion on public streets.

**9. The proposed Conditional Use does not result in the destruction, loss, or damage of natural, scenic, or historic features of major importance:**

No natural, scenic, or historic features of major importance have been identified on this site and thus will not be affected by this development.

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

With the exception requested with the Planned Unit Development and a minor variation for building materials to allow fiber cement siding in locations where brick is required (unless alternative elevations are proposed at time of building permit), this development would be considered zoning code compliant if reviewed for building permit.

**Standards for Planned Unit Development:**

The following is a discussion of standards for PUDs from Section 12-3-5 of the Zoning Ordinance. Rationale for how well the proposal addresses the standards is provided below and in the attached petitioner responses to standards. The Board may use the provided responses as written as 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 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 that accommodates the needs of senior residents while minimizing the development's overall footprint. 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 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 an existing right-in/right-out entrance 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, refer to 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 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 existing right-in/right-out 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.

While the development introduces a use that may increase demand on emergency services and traffic, these impacts are mitigated through proposed conditions of approval. 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 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 Petitioner's Response to Standards for Conditional Use provides their response to this standard.

*Staff comments:* The proposal 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:**

#### Conditional Use and PUD

Pursuant to Sections 12-3-4(E) of the Zoning Ordinance, the PZB may vote to *recommend* the City Council approve, approve with conditions, or deny the conditional use and PUD. A continuance may also be requested. The City Council has final authority over both requests.

However, should the PZB recommend approval of the PUD and the conditional use, staff suggests the following conditions for the conditional use request.

#### **Suggested Conditions of Approval:**

1. The property address shall be updated to the assigned address prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
2. During the first year of operation, the operator of the assisted living facility shall meet quarterly with the Fire Department to discuss emergency response procedures and other operational matters related to City services. Following the first year, meetings shall be held semiannually unless the Fire Chief specifies an alternative meeting frequency.
3. The operator shall maintain an active contract with a private ambulance service for non-emergent calls for the duration of the use.
4. The operator shall provide a shuttle service or an alternative private transportation option for residents.
5. At the time of final approval for the Planned Unit Development, the site plan shall include a designated walkway or pedestrian path along the southern boundary of the property unless otherwise determined by the Public Works and Engineering Director.

Senior Planner Redman stated the petitioner has requested a minor variation for building materials, which is not reviewed by the PZB or City Council, but is a decision made by the Zoning Administrator. She provides the required materials per the Zoning Ordinance.

Member Weaver asked about the difference between the minor variation for building materials and the PUD exception for height.

Member Fowler asked about where Station 61 is located. Senior Planner Redman stated it is on Oakton Street.

Member Bronakowski asked the distance between this proposed facility and the Glenview facility. Senior Planner Redman states she does not have the distance at hand, but the facility is close enough for the Fire Dept to have concerns about possible confusing.

Member Zadrozny about the difference between assisted and supportive living. Helle outlined the difference between the two types of facilities.

Member Weaver described the needs for accessible parking spaces and resident functions and suggests more accessible parking for residents.

Bob Helle outlined the operational requirements for these types of these facilities.

Member Veremis asked about the need for private transportation for residents.

Bob Helle stated that the on-site transportation is provided at no cost and all the vehicles are accessible buses and vans.

Member Bronakowski asked about the petitioner's experience with developing these types of facilities and asked if this proposal is similar in exterior materials with the other properties he has developed.

Bob Helle stated that cement fiber is often more expensive than brick.

Member Bronakowski states he would like to see more brick on the building and may not be able to support this proposal as currently designed.

General discussion between petitioner and the PZB occurred regarding the petitioner's experience in nearby communities and whether City Des Plaines should receive same or similar treatment

Senior Planner Redman states options for the PZB, either by drafting recommend conditions and/or continuing the request to another agenda.

Chair Szabo asked for public comment. No members of the audience spoke during public comment.

Member Weaver communicated preference for more brick on the building and within the City. If developers are constructing buildings in other communities with more brick, those communities probably have another type of review board different than our PZB. He asked staff about building design standards.

Senior Planner Redman stated the current code requirements for this type of development and how it is addressed by this request, requiring a minor variation for the design.

Member Weaver asked about the minor variation process and whether PZB or City Council review these variations.

Senior Planner Redman stated the Minor Variation process is reviewed by the Zoning Administrator for final decision, and does not come before PZB or City Council. Assistant Director Mendel restated what Senior Planner Redman stated.

Member Weaver asked about how the variation process works when something is not within a PUD request.

Assistant Director Mendel stated that if a variation is not part of this PUD request, it goes through the minor variation process and staff reviews against variation standards.

Member Weaver asked whether it is appropriate to apply a condition of approval for an item that is not under the purview of the PZB.

Assistant Director Mendel stated that the PZB can state their views on the record and there can be further discussion on building materials requirements and policy at a later time.

Stephen Barron, a member of the petitioner's development group, outlines the development financing and importance of the development. He stated that they will be looking at possible changes to the exterior building materials and will consider changes prior to City Council.

Member Weaver asked about whether there needs to be a formal motion about the building materials or whether stating their views "on the record" is sufficient.

Assistant Director Mendel stated that a simple discussion on a meeting record is sufficient and doesn't necessarily need to be a formal motion.

Chair Szabo asked if a condition of approval requiring "additional masonry" can be added.

Senior Planner Redman stated the PZB are able to add these types of conditions and asked to clarify if they just want masonry around the entire building, or if the courtyard needs to meet this requirement too.

Member Fowler stated she has asked multiple times for the City to overall discuss building materials.

Member Bronakowski stated he has often heard developers state that financing is pending and developers create a sense of urgency. He doesn't believe this is valid imposition and wants transparency across remainder of the process.

Member Szabo stated he doesn't want to provide specific percentage of masonry but rather direct the petitioner to proceed with the PZB discussion as direction.

Senior Planner Redman stated that the PZB can add a building materials condition, but it would be advantageous for the PZB to define and specify clear bounds for the petitioner.

Member Bronakowski stated he would like to condition the approval requiring all exterior public ROW facing to be masonry. Chair Szabo stated he would like to see the entire exterior and interior courtyard perimeter contain masonry too.

Bob Helle stated he is ok with “primarily” masonry, but desires for definition from the PZB. He doesn’t want to be caught within a policy discussion when we have a specific project under review.

Member Weaver stated that he would like to think we could have attractive buildings between staff and City Council and would like to make a motion without additional building materials’ condition.

Member Bronakowski stated he doesn’t agree with such a motion as it would be not be appropriate at this time.

Member Weaver stated that staff would use the same criteria as the PZB would if it were in front of them.

Member Veremis suggested a condition for building exteriors to be primarily masonry.

Senior Planner Redman asked PZB to more clearly define ‘primarily’ and provided some possible options.

Chair Szabo stated that the PZB doesn’t want to provide a detailed definition of ‘primarily masonry’. Member Veremis, Fowler and Bronakowski want to keep it more general.

Member Veremis confirms with the petitioner they understand the “primarily masonry” condition.

A motion was made by Member Veremis and seconded by Member Weaver to recommend approval of the conditional use for assisted living facility to the City Council with conditions 1-4 drafted by staff.

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

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

A motion was made by Member Veremis and seconded by Member Bronakowski to recommend approval of the conditional use for preliminary PUD with building height exception to the City Council with conditions 5 and 6 and read into the record by Member Veremis as follows:

5. At the time of final approval for the Planned Unit Development, the site plan shall include a designated walkway or pedestrian path along the southern boundary of the property unless otherwise determined by the Public Works and Engineering Director.
6. Petitioner will change the design of all exterior walls to be primarily masonry materials.

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

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

**FURTHER DISCUSSION ON BUILDING DESIGN REVIEW CODES**

Staff and the PZB members discussed a process for evaluating the codes and procedures. Staff stated they will bring a discussion item at a near future meeting date.

Additionally, staff reminded the PZB about the required Statement of Economic Interest required by the State.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Szabo adjourned the meeting by affirmative voice vote at 8:50 p.m.

Sincerely,  
Jonathan Mendel/Recording Secretary  
cc: City Officials, Aldermen, Planning & Zoning Board, Petitioners