



AGENDA
REGULAR ZONING BOARD MEETING
Public Meeting Room, Village Hall
Tuesday, June 9, 2015
7:00 p.m.

Reasonable accommodations or auxiliary aids will be provided to enable persons with disabilities to effectively participate in any public meetings. Please contact the Village Administrative Office (847.883.8600) 48 hours in advance if you need any special services or accommodations.

CALL TO ORDER

1.0 ROLL CALL

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the regular Zoning Board Meeting held on Thursday, May 21, 2015.

3.0 GENERAL BUSINESS

3.1 PUBLIC HEARING regarding text amendments to Chapter 10, PD Planned Development District, and any associated code sections and cross-references, in Title 6- Zoning of the Lincolnshire Village Code to revise and update regulations of the Planned Development (PD) Zoning District (Village of Lincolnshire).

4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

6.0 CITIZEN COMMENTS

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

The Zoning Board will not proceed past 10:30 p.m. unless a motion is made and approved by a majority of the Zoning Board members to extend the meeting one-half hour to 11:00 p.m. Any agenda items or other business that are not addressed within this time frame will be continued to the next regularly scheduled Zoning Board Meeting.



UNAPPROVED Minutes of the **REGULAR MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD** held on Thursday, May 21, 2015, in the Public Meeting Room in the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL.

PRESENT: Chairman Manion, Members Kalina, Leider, Van de Kerckhove, and Bichkoff.

STAFF PRESENT: Stephen Robles, Village Planner.

ABSENT: Mayor Brandt.

CALL TO ORDER: **Chairman Manion** called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

1.0 ROLL CALL

The roll was called by **Village Planner Robles** and **Chairman Manion** declared a quorum to be present.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Approval of the Minutes related to the Zoning Board Meeting held on Tuesday, April 14, 2015.

Member Van de Kerckhove moved and **Member Leider** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Zoning Board, as submitted. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS:

3.1 PUBLIC HEARING regarding a rezoning from the R1, Single-Family Residence District, to the R2A, Single-Family Residence District, to permit the development of an environmentally sensitive large lot subdivision containing 17 single-family residential lots (Arthur J. Greene Construction Company).

Chairman Manion recessed the Zoning Board meeting and opened the Public Hearing. **Jeff Greene**, President of Arthur J. Greene Construction Company, introduced the proposed single-family residential subdivision associated with the R2A rezoning request and identified the proposed name would be Manors of Whytegate. He continued that A.J. Greene Construction had built the subdivisions north, south and west of the subject parcel and was originally proposed at 19 single-family lots and made adjustments to the plan, which reduced the number of lots to 17. **Mr. Greene** presented the subject site had been designed as an R2A subdivision based on such designation in the Village's Comprehensive Plan.

Glen Christensen, Land Planner with Manhard Consulting, Ltd., explained the subdivision had been designed over the past year and a half, and included comments provided by the Village Staff. He presented the current conditions of the property, the current zoning of surrounding subdivisions, and the elements of the proposed subdivision.

Member Van de Kerckhove sought clarification on the petitioner's presentation regarding the infiltration of ground water as it related to the proposed stormwater management system. **Mr. Christensen** explained the general process of stormwater management through the use of native plantings and their ability to allow infiltration of ground water due to their large root systems.

Member Leider sought further explanation why the vehicular access was not from the west or another location, and why the subdivision entrance was aligned with Briarwoods Lane to the east. He further expressed that the Briarwoods of Lincolnshire Subdivision contained larger sized single-family lots and the proposed road was essentially extending the street across Riverwoods Road; therefore, the lot sizes of the proposed subdivision should be consistent with the Briarwoods Subdivision. **Mr. Christensen** explained the proposed subdivision entrance was oriented to Riverwoods Road based on land planning and traffic management principles. As required by Lake County Department of Transportation regulations, the entrance was lined up with Briarwoods Lane to provide a suitable intersection in this area.

Chairman Manion sought verification by the petitioner to incorporate the rezoning findings of fact into the record. **Mr. Greene** confirmed.

Member Leider expressed his concern with proposed Lot 1 being located immediately adjacent to the Riverwoods Road, with no buffer or separation space like had been accomplished in the adjoining subdivision to the north. He further noted the proposed density was too much and by extending Briarwoods Lane from the west, there was no consistency with the existing lots in the Briarwoods Subdivision.

Mr. Greene explained the proposed subdivision was to fill a gap in the Whytegate Unit subdivisions, which was to match those adjacent subdivisions in design and density. However, he noted the proposed lot sizes would be slightly larger than that of the existing subdivisions to the north and south. He expressed any subdivision with larger lot sizes and reduced density would appear out of character from the existing development pattern along the west side of Riverwoods Road.

Chairman Manion questioned what the anticipated home size would be. **Mr. Greene** responded the typical home would range from 3,500 square feet to 4,000 square feet, pending customer demand. **Chairman Manion** then inquired about the expected price point of the proposed homes. **Mr. Greene** noted the anticipated price would start at one million dollars, pending market demand.

There being no further Zoning Board comments, **Chairman Manion** sought Staff's comments.

Village Planner Robles presented Staff's memorandum and explained the request was to rezone the subject site from the R1 Single-Family Residence District to the R2A Single-Family Residence District. The R2A District was designed to permit the development of environmentally sensitive large lot areas through responsible environmental preservation and other planning criteria. He continued that the intent of such zoning was to encourage a creative approach to the use of land, preserve natural vegetation, enhance the appearance of the neighborhoods by the conservation of forested areas and advance the various Lincolnshire planning policies of the Comprehensive Plan. **Village Planner Robles** explained that developments seeking

R2A zoning required a two-phase review process; the first was the policy phase and the second was the technical phase. In the first policy phase, the Zoning Board provides a recommendation on the proposed zoning change to the R2A District, based on conceptual subdivisions plans. A full analysis of the subdivision would not occur until the technical phase. However, he noted that any Zoning Board concerns regarding the proposed subdivision should be expressed and discussed during the rezoning consideration. **Village Planner Robles** continued that the parcel was identified as Critical Area 2 in the Update 2012 Comprehensive Plan due to the high level of visibility and potential level of impact upon adjacent residential subdivisions. He continued that the Comprehensive Plan recommended rezoning of the site to the R2A District to support *“development consistent with the existing neighborhoods to ensure uniformity, consistency and cohesion as an integrated component of the residential community”*. The proposed R2A zoning was not uncharacteristic with the adjacent residential developments and the proposed environmental enhancements were essential to demonstrating the environmental character of this area.

There being no questions to Staff from the Zoning Board, **Chairman Manion** sought any public comments.

Steve Mikus, 306 Whitmore Lane, sought clarification of a bioswale and the types of plants used in the bioswales. **Mr. Christensen** responded that a bioswale was essentially a ditch with native plants, where the plants specifically used were mixture of native plant types that had been shown to thrive in such conditions. **Mr. Mikus** also questioned where the proposed bike paths would be located. **Mr. Christensen** pointed out on the presentation board the proposed location of the bike path starting at the west end of the cul-de-sac and extended northwest to connect with Brampton Lane within existing dedicated right-of-way. **Mr. Mikus** inquired about the average lot size, to which **Mr. Greene** responded the proposed lots were bigger than the existing Whytegate subdivisions to allow for larger homes. **Mr. Mikus** expressed his concerns over the appearance of smaller lots with larger homes compared to the adjacent subdivisions. He then inquired about the anticipated timeline of construction. **Mr. Greene** identified a two year construction window and expressed they were seeking to start construction before winter.

Ken Ainger, 316 Whitmore Lane, questioned if the developer had experience with bioswales given that sub-soils in the area were very hard and stressed his concern over standing water that may result. **Jesse Conrad**, Project Engineer with Manhard Consulting, Ltd., noted Manhard's experience in the installation of bioswales and described their function to prevent standing water. **Mr. Ainger** inquired if the installation of bioswales was something that was required to be installed. **Mr. Conrad** affirmed and noted that both Lake County Stormwater Management Commission and the Village required bioswales. **Mr. Ainger** questioned if Manhard had experience with bioswales in the immediate area. **Mr. Conrad** responded that they have not constructed any bioswales in Lincolnshire, but in surrounding communities. **Mr. Ainger** then inquired about the location of utilities and whether they would be installed within the proposed street. **Mr. Conrad** confirmed the water and sanitary service lines would be within the street right-of-way. **Mr. Greene** commented that gas and electric would be in the front of each lot. **Mr. Ainger** questioned if any trees were being removed along the north side of the proposed development. **Mr. Greene** explained that all the existing trees along the north boundary of the subdivision would remain. **Mr. Ainger** concluded by noting his concerns regarding the proposed density and of the larger building footprints compared

to the lot sizes. He also expressed that without the presence of existing woodlands, the density would feel much higher.

Harry Goldshall, 315 Whytegate Court, expressed concerns about the current stormwater drainage and standing water during rain storms. **Mr. Conrad** explained that all stormwater would be redirected east to the proposed detention basin at the southeast corner of the subdivision. **Mr. Goldshall** expressed his support over the proposed lot sizes noting they would be bigger than the surrounding subdivisions.

Susan Banas, 224 Brampton Lane, inquired as to whether there was any historic designation on the home or the property. **Mr. Conrad** responded that a historic study was currently being conducted on the property. **Mrs. Banas** expressed her concerns of the Village discussing zoning without confirmation of any historic designation. She continued noting her concern of the proposed density and number of lots related to the Riverwoods Road traffic. **Mr. Greene** responded that the proposed subdivision was intentionally designed to provide the largest lots of the subdivision at the western end, adjacent to her property, and would be near 40,000 square feet in lot area. He further expressed that traffic would be less than any other of the Whytegate subdivisions. **Mrs. Banas** noted traffic on Riverwoods Road north of Route 22 was becoming very congested. She questioned how a rain event would be handled when grading on the western lots was shown to pitch to the west towards the back of her home. **Mr. Christensen** explained that the proposed grading was designed to direct rain water away from the homes and towards the rear of the lots, which would then be funneled towards the detention basin at the front of the subdivision. **Mrs. Banas** inquired if a berm was going to be installed for those lots next to the bike path.

Julie Galassini, 311 Whytegate Court, questioned if the proposed bioswales were the same as rain gardens. **Mr. Christensen** explained the difference was that rain gardens tended to be at the end of the line, rather than bioswales that are in-line of the drainage system and clean the water before it's released. She noted that as a real estate attorney, she had observed failed bioswales and further expressed her concerns with flooding on her property that had been received from the subject property. **Mr. Christensen** noted the proposed subdivision presents the opportunity to collect the rain water and direct to the basin. **Mrs. Galassini** expressed the current traffic on Riverwoods Road was beyond the road's capabilities and would not be able to support further traffic. **Mr. Greene** pointed to the other surrounding subdivision and noted the number of homes was higher than that being proposed. **Mrs. Galassini** lastly expressed her support for the addition of berming along the southern perimeter. **Mr. Christensen** noted that they will review the landscaping plan to look for additional opportunities for screening but that berming would not solve any drainage problems.

Linda Spungen, 219 Brampton Lane, expressed her concerns regarding drainage impacting her property to the west. She continued that when she purchased her property, she understood the property across the street to the east was not buildable, and although not constructing any buildings, a bike path would be constructed and questioned how many trees would be removed. **Mr. Greene** explained the bike path was requested by the Village to provide connection between subdivisions, rather than constructing a road. **Mr. Christensen** noted that a survey of tree removal had not been conducted and they would need to review the existing tree growth before constructing the path to understand how many trees would need to be removed. **Ms. Spungen** also reiterated the traffic conditions of Riverwoods Road, especially in the morning when trying to take her children to Stevenson High School. **Mr. Greene** commented that

Riverwoods Road served as a main thoroughfare for the school buses and served a high number of outside traffic.

Mr. Mikus (306 Whitmore Lane) inquired if the Village had a zoning district for $\frac{3}{4}$ acre lots. **Village Planner Robles** explained there was no such zoning and that while the minimum lot size of the requested R2A District was 20,000 square feet, the petitioner was proposing a variety of lots sizes, including at the $\frac{3}{4}$ acre size.

Mrs. Banas (224 Brampton Lane) inquired to the location of the right-of-way and how close it was to her property line. **Mr. Christensen** responded the right-of-way was immediately adjacent to her northern property line. Minor discussion ensued regarding the right-of-way location related to **Mrs. Banas'** property, and the question was clarified as to the location of the bike path and how close it would be to **Mrs. Banas'** property. **Village Planner Robles** clarified the final location of the bike path had not been established as that would occur in the technical phase. He continued, since the existing right-of-way was 60 feet wide, the developer would have flexibility in placing the bike path so far as 50 feet away from her property. **Mrs. Banas** questioned who owned the property within the right-of-way. **Chairman Manion** confirmed the Village was the owner. **Member Leider** noted a similar situation of two properties on Pembroke Drive that were divided by right-of-way. In that situation, a road was built between those two properties based on the right-of-way, and that could happen on the subject property if the Riverwoods Road access was questioned and determined access should be provided from Brampton Lane. **Mrs. Banas** questioned the integrity of the zoning application being considered before determining the historical significance of the existing estate on the property. **Village Planner Robles** explained that since the property or the home was not designated as a historical landmark, the Village could consider the rezoning and subdivision request as presented. However, if during the Village's zoning review, the historical designation changes on the property, such review would need to consider any change in historical status.

Joseph Cloonan, 302 Whitmore Lane, explained the R2A zoning is for environmentally sensitive development and the proposal did not seem to provide that given removal of various wetlands. **Village Planner Robles** noted the petitioner had provided an environmental study, which identified the presence of wetlands on the property. The study noted the wetlands were under the authority of Lake County Stormwater Manager Commission and it would be their determination if the wetlands had to remain or could be remediated elsewhere. He continued, the largest wetland was being preserved and was incorporated into the proposed subdivision design. Additional discussion ensued regarding the various location and qualities of the wetlands on the subject property. **Mr. Cloonan** echoed the concerns of ratio of lot size to the home, but noted there had not been any discussion on house placement to prevent the appearance of row homes. He continued to present his concerns regarding the lack of open space within the proposed subdivision plan, and appeared to be designed with as many homes that could be placed on the property.

Member Leider requested Staff provide the audience with a description of the various single-family zoning district based and the frequency of zoning terminology used. **Village Planner Robles** explained the various single-family zoning district and their corresponding lots sizes.

Mrs. Banas inquired if there was any reason why the property could not be developed under the R1 requirements. **Village Planner Robles** noted the property is currently

zoned R1 and he did not see any reason why the property could not be developed in per the R1 regulations. However, since the Village has received an application for a zoning change to the R2A District, the Village must consider the suitability of the requested R2A zoning based on the findings of fact and consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Cloonan expressed his support for the Village acquiring the subject property and turning it into a natural area.

Chairman Manion sought any further comments from the public. There being no further comments, **Chairman Manion** closed the public hearing and reconvened the Zoning Board meeting.

Member Leider expressed he would not support an R2A zoning, but felt the R2 District would be suitable. He also conveyed his concerns regarding Riverwoods Road traffic and stormwater management related to the proposed subdivision.

Member Bichkoff sought clarification on comments regarding density and lot sizes based on the exhibit provided by the petitioner comparing lot sizes of surrounding subdivision, as the proposal provided the second largest average lot size. He also questioned if the development's density were cut in half, would that make that significant of impact on the Riverwoods Road traffic. Discussion ensued over comparable lot sizes and density to surrounding subdivisions and the compatibility of the proposed subdivision.

Member Van de Kerckhove commented that the proposed R2A District was consistent with past trends and the Village's Comprehensive Plan.

Member Kalina expressed his two issues regarding the request as traffic and the best use of the property. He continued that a zoning change from the R1 to the R2A District was too big of a step, which the R2 was a better step in development as there needed to be control in growth and density.

Chairman Manion commented the economic aspect of the development is part of the overall decision, and he felt the rezoning was reasonable as the proposed subdivision was consistent with the adjoining lots. He further noted that the development would not add any major amounts of traffic to Riverwoods Road.

Member Bichkoff summarized the three key issues expressed by public comment of traffic, stormwater, and historic designation that could have big impacts on development of the property and until resolved, the Zoning Board may be spinning its wheels. **Member Van de Kerckhove** noted that traffic and stormwater are technical issues that would be addressed during the technical review of the subdivision.

Chairman Manion sought any further comments from the Zoning Board. **Member Leider** expressed his support of a zoning to the R2 District. **Member Van de Kerckhove** commented the application met the standards of the R2A District. **Member Kalina** expressed that R2A seem, begrudgingly, reasonable.

There being no further comments, **Chairman Manion** sought a motion from the Zoning Board.

Member Van de Kerckhove moved and Member Bichkoff seconded a motion to recommend approval to the Village Board, based on facts covered in a Public Hearing held on May 21, 2015, of a rezoning from the R1, Single-Family Residence District, to the R2A, Single-Family Residence District, in conjunction with approval of the Policy Phase, to permit the development of an environmentally sensitive large lot subdivision, subject to Staff's memorandum.

The roll call vote was as follows:

Ayes: Chairman Manion, Members Van de Kerckhove, Bichkoff, and Kalina.
Nays: Member Leider.

- 4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)**
- 5.0 NEW BUSINESS (None)**
- 6.0 CITIZENS COMMENTS (None)**
- 7.0 ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, **Chairman Manion** sought a motion for adjournment. **Member Kalina** moved, and **Member Van de Kerckhove** seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Minutes Submitted by Stephen Robles, Village Planner

**REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION
Zoning Board
June 9, 2015**

Subject:	Text Amendments to Planned Development (PD) Zoning District
Action Requested:	Public Hearing of Text Amendments to Chapter 10, PD Planned Development District, and associated code sections and cross-references, in Title 6 - Zoning of the Lincolnshire Village Code, to revise and update specific code regulations.
Originated By/Contact:	Stephen Robles, Village Planner Department of Community & Economic Development
Advisory Board Review:	Zoning Board

Background:

- The PD Planned Development Zoning District was established in 1973, in conjunction with annexation of a 22-acre property at the northwest corner of Rt.22 and Illinois Tollway 94. That property was originally owned by Trans Union, subsequently by Hewitt Associates (where it was increased to over 40 total acres), and now by Medline Industries (see inset map).
- The PD Zoning District was designed specifically for this property, and references “showplace” office and research laboratories adjacent to the Tollway.
- In the past 40+ years, no other property has been designated as a PD District.
- Medline’s recent purchase of this property and their discussions with Staff regarding outdated requirements in this District, results in the presented comprehensive text amendments for consideration.
- Medline has requested two specific revisions to the PD zoning district (see attached letter), which Staff believes are appropriate for discussion in conjunction with additional Staff proposed updates.



Project Summary:

Following, is a summary of major areas incorporated into the attached Draft Code Language for Zoning Board review and consideration (*for specific detail, please see attached Draft Code*):

- **Problem 1 - District name:** The “PD – Planned Development District” title often creates confusion with “PUD’s” (Planned Unit Developments) amongst the development community. The name of this district should more accurately reflect the purpose of the District (unified office developments).

Solution 1: Staff seeks the Zoning Board’s input on the following new naming options proposed by Staff:

Option 1: OC – Office Campus.

Option 2: OP – Office Park (used in the attached Draft Code as “place holder”).

Option 3: UOC – Unified Office Campus.

Option 4: UOP – Unified Office Park.

Option 5: UO – Unified Office

- **Problem 2 – Purpose:** The General Section (6-10-1) is a blend of purpose statement and general regulations, which has not changed since the last revision in 1975. Additionally, the current inclusion of “single-family detached dwellings” to support mixed-use development is no longer consistent with the Village’s vision, as described in the Updated Comprehensive Plan.

Solution 2: This Section has been retitled to “Intent and Scope of Regulations” to align with the format of the other zoning districts within the Zoning Code and revised to reflect the intended purpose of the PD District.

- **Problem 3 - Permitted Uses:** The current list in the Permitted Uses Section (6-10-2) includes uses (single-family detached dwellings) and restrictions (limitation on multi-tenant office buildings) which are contradictory to the PD District purpose. As the Village has relaxed restrictions on multi-tenant office/warehouse buildings, it seems counter-productive to continue such restrictions in office developments.

Solution 3: The permitted uses Section has been revised to include uses aligned with the intended purpose of this District, as follows:

Uses

Accessory uses and buildings

Attached or detached structured parking garages (accessory to principal use)

Office; business, professional and corporate headquarters

Research and development laboratories

- **Problem 4 - Lot Area:** Section 6-10-1 describes property in the PD District as “not exceeding 25 acres...” However, the land encompassed in this zoning district is greater than 40 acres. The current property owner seeks to remove the 25 acre limitation since it does not reflect the actual acreage within this Zoning District.

Solution 4: Staff feels this request is appropriate, as there is no valid reason for limiting the size of this zoning district. Therefore, Section 6-10-3 (Lot Size) of the Draft Code has been revised to retain the current 400,000 square foot **minimum** lot size. The existing minimum 500’ lot width has also been retained. The lot area and width establish minimum lot size criterion, while maintaining consistency with the current property within this District.

- **Problem 5 - Building Height:** The second request of the property owner is to increase the current height limitation in this district of two (2) stories or 40 feet (whichever is lower). The height limitation is obsolete with modern office buildings (especially along high visibility corridors, such as the Tollway) and is also lower than two of the three existing buildings on the property (both buildings are three-stories, approximately 45’ in height). Multiple office buildings in the O/I district and along the Tollway exceed this height, such as:

Building	Height
Tri-State Tollway Office center	Up to 4-stories (65' tall)
System of America, 557 Aptaksic Rd	4-stories (68')
Zebra Headquarters, 3 Overlook Pt	6-stories (83')
AonHewitt Headquarters, 4 Overlook Pt	6-stories (85')

Solution 5: Given the height of the existing woodland forest on this campus, as well as the height of signature “headquarters-style” buildings elsewhere in the Village, building heights of up to 5-stories, as requested in Medline’s attached letter, are not unreasonable. Staff has revised the minimum building height requirements by pulling out such requirements (previously located within Sec. 6-10-3) and placing into a new stand-alone Section 6-10-6 to align with current zoning code format. Permitted building heights have been revised as follows:

- A. The maximum building height shall be (5) stories or seventy-five feet (75’), including rooftop equipment and screening.
 - B. Attached or detached structured parking garages building height shall be subordinate to the principal structure to which it serves.
- **Problem 6 – Setbacks:** Currently, Section 6-10-4 (Yards) requires a minimum 100’ side yard building setback, with an increase to 150’ when abutting a street or residential zoning district. Such regulation is greater than setbacks permitted in other Office/Industrial zoning districts which permit building heights of up to 6 stories (85’ maximum height). In addition, the property in this District is unique from other office zoning districts since it is forested with 60-80’ tall trees providing a substantial screen from surrounding properties.

Solution 6: With the other formatting revisions to this District, building setbacks have been moved to Section 6-10-5 and retitled “Building Setbacks” for consistency with current zoning code format. The side yard setback has been fixed at 100’ for consistency as such setback provides more than adequate separation of any future land uses west and north of this District, as well as screening. The front and rear yard building setbacks remain unchanged and a “corner side setback” of 150 feet has been included.

- **Cross-Referencing:** Additional clean-up of this District includes updating cross-references to other Zoning Code Sections which have changed due to recent code amendments.
- **Definition:** Proposed revisions to permitted uses (Section 6-10-2) includes a name change from “Research Laboratory” to “Research and Development Laboratory”. As a result, Chapter 2, Definitions, of the Zoning Code has been amended to reflect the name change and cleanup of the definition, as follows:

**RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT
LABORATORY**

A building or group of buildings ~~in which are located with facilities for providing scientific, medical, or product research, investigation, testing, or experimentation, but no exclude facilities for manufacture manufacturing or sale of products.~~

Recommendation:

Approval of text amendments to Chapter 2, Definitions, and Chapter 10, formerly PD Planned Development District, of Title 6 - Zoning of the Lincolnshire Village Code to revise and update specific code regulations.

Motion:

Having made findings based on facts covered in a Public Hearing held on June 9, 2015, the Zoning Board recommends approval to the Village Board of amendments to Chapter 2, Definitions, and Chapter 10, formerly PD Planned Development District, of the Lincolnshire Zoning Code, as presented in a Draft Code to revise and update specific code regulations, and further subject to. . . .

{Insert any additional conditions or modification desired by the Zoning Board}

Reports and Documents Attached:

- Request letter from William J. Abrams of Medline, dated April 27, 2015.
- Chapter 10, PD Planned Development District, of the Lincolnshire Zoning Code.
- Draft Chapter 10 Code, tracked edits and clean version, prepared by Staff.

Meeting History	
Preliminary Evaluation (COW):	May 11, 2015
Current Zoning Board Public Hearing:	June 9, 2015



Medline Industries, Inc.
One Medline Place
Mundelein, IL 60060-4486

1.847.949.5500
1.800.MEDLINE (633.5463)

medline.com

April 27, 2015

Mayor and Village Board of Trustees
Village of Lincolnshire
One Olde Half Day Road
Lincolnshire, IL 60069

**RE: 90, 98, 100 Half Day Road, Lincolnshire
PD Planned Development District**

Dear Mayor and Village Board,

With Medline's recent purchase of the subject property, we request the Village's consideration to allow an amendment of the PD Planned Development District, specifically Title 6, Chapter 10.

Consistent with the development today, Medline's vision for this property is to create a suitable work environment for its corporate office employees. To allow for Medline's steady growth, expansion on this property is inevitable. To achieve that in the most efficient way possible, there are two (2) specific items which should be considered for text amendment.

6-10-1 GENERAL. Deletion of the text in the fifth line beginning with "on parcels not exceeding twenty five (25) acres."

This property happens to be comprised of twelve (12) small parcels. While it is Medline's intention to modify that, those plans are still under development. We are confident this deletion will have no negative impact on the development and in fact allow for a more cohesive campus plan.

6-10-3 LOT AREA, SETBACK AND HEIGHT REQUIREMENTS, C. Modify the allowable building height from 2 to 5 stories.

Commensurate with other developments up and down the toll way we request permission for the ability to construct greater than 2 stories. Today's standards of corporate office space are well illustrated both north and south along the I-94 corridor and allowing for like expansion on this campus is of critical importance to Medline. Further, the natural landscape that exists around this campus allows for premium screening in all directions.

We sincerely appreciate the Village's consideration of the update to this PD Planned Development District. We are phenomenally excited about the possibilities here for Medline and we are grateful for your support and partnership in this improvement project.

Sincerely,

William J. Abrams

TITLE 6

CHAPTER 10

PD PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

SECTION:

- 6-10-1: General Requirements**
- 6-10-2: Permitted Uses**
- 6-10-3: Lot Area, Setback and Height Requirements**
- 6-10-4: Yards**
- 6-10-5: Off-Street Parking and Loading**

6-10-1: GENERAL: The Planned Development District is established to provide large, landscaped sites, either open or with natural features preserved, immediately adjacent to tollways, or within one thousand five hundred feet (1,500') thereof, for "showplace" operations such as offices and research laboratories, and including single-family detached dwellings, with the developments being conceived and implemented as comprehensive and cohesive unified projects, on parcels not exceeding twenty five (25) acres and under single ownership, with every possible assurance that the high quality of the environment will be maintained within the district and in the surrounding residential districts upon which the Planned Development District may abut. (Ord. 75-408-38)

6-10-2: PERMITTED USES:

- A. Executive offices - business and professional.
- B. Research laboratories.
- C. Single-family detached dwellings. Single-family detached dwellings shall be permitted only under, and governed by, the provisions and conditions contained in the R-3 Single-Family Residence District classification under this Zoning Code.
- D. Accessory uses and buildings incidental to and on the same lot as a permitted use.
- E. A combination of single-family detached dwellings and either an office building or research laboratory. (Ord. 73-309-24)
- F. Except as permitted in subsection (E) above, multiple uses in a single building are not permitted unless such multiple uses are made by a single business entity (user).

A business entity shall be construed to include any parent company and any related companies which fall within the definition of "affiliated group" as defined in section 1504(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as amended, and any parent company and any related companies which fall within the definition of "affiliated service group" as defined in section 414(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as amended. (Ord. 83-764-18)

6-10-3: LOT AREA, SETBACK AND HEIGHT REQUIREMENTS:

- A. Lot Area for Offices and Research Laboratories: The area of a lot shall not be less than four hundred thousand (400,000) square feet.
- B. Lot Width for Offices and Research Laboratories: The average width of the lot shall not be less than five hundred feet (500').
- C. Building Height for Offices and Research Laboratories: No building shall exceed two (2) stories or forty feet (40') in height, whichever is lower.
- D. Floor Area Ratio for Offices and Research Laboratories: The combined floor area ratio for any principal building together with all accessory buildings shall not exceed five-tenths (.50).
- E. Ground Floor Area for Offices and Research Laboratories: The lot area covered by all buildings shall not exceed thirty percent (30%) of the total area of the lot.

6-10-4: YARDS:

- A. Front Yard for Offices and Research Laboratories: The front yard shall not be less than one hundred fifty feet (150') deep.
- B. Side Yard for Offices and Research Laboratories: The side yard shall not be less than one hundred feet (100') wide except that on a side which abuts a street or a residential district the side yard shall not be less than one hundred fifty feet (150') wide.
- C. Rear Yard for Offices and Research Laboratories: The rear yard shall not be less than one hundred feet (100') deep.

6-10-5: OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING:

- A. Off-Street Parking:
 - 1. Off-street parking spaces, open to the sky, shall not be located in the front yard or a side yard abutting a residential district. Enclosed buildings and other structures containing off-street parking shall be subject to applicable yard requirements.
 - 2. One parking space shall be provided for each four hundred (400) square feet of floor area except for single-family detached dwellings.
 - 3. Except as provided in subsections A and B above, off-street parking shall be in accordance with the provisions set forth in Section 6-11-3 of this Zoning Code.
- B. Off-Street Loading: Off-street loading shall be in accordance with the provisions set forth in Section 6-11-2 of this Zoning Code. (Ord. 73-309-24)

TITLE: 6
CHAPTER 10: Office Park



Sections:

- 6-10-1: Intent and Scope of Regulations
- 6-10-2: Permitted Uses
- 6-10-3: Lot Size
- 6-10-4: Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
- 6-10-5: Building Setbacks
- 6-10-6: Building Height
- 6-10-7: Signs
- 6-10-8: Off-Street Parking and Loading
- 6-10-9: Landscaping

6-10-1: Intent and Scope of Regulations

The OP District is intended primarily to provide large, planned corporate campus sites immediately adjacent to interstates or within one thousand five hundred feet (1,500') thereof, for professional office centers and research laboratories. These developments are to be conceived and implemented as comprehensive and unified developments, through conscientious preservation/enhancement of the high quality natural environment and buffering of surrounding residential neighborhoods.

6-10-2: Uses

Uses permitted in the OP Office Park District are identified in the table below:

Uses

Accessory uses and structures
Attached or detached structured parking garages (accessory to principal use)
Office; business, professional and corporate headquarters
Research and development laboratory

6-10-3: Lot Size

- A. Lot Area shall not be less than four hundred thousand (400,000) square feet.
- B. Lot Width shall not be less than five hundred feet (500').

6-10-4: Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

The maximum allowable floor area ratio (FAR), including all accessory buildings, shall be 0.50 of the gross lot area.

6-10-5: Building Setbacks

Front	Side	Corner Side	Rear
150 ft.	100 ft.	150 ft.	100 ft.

6-10-6: Building Height

- A. The maximum building height shall be (5) stories or seventy-five feet (75'), including rooftop equipment and screening.
- B. Attached or detached structured parking garages building height shall be subordinate to the principal structure to which it serves.

6-10-7: Signs

Signs shall be subject to the regulations contained in Title 12 of this Code.

6-10-8: Off-Street Parking & Loading

Off-street parking and loading facilities shall be provided as required in Chapter 11 of this Title.

6-10-9: Landscaping

Landscaping shall be subject to the regulations contained in Title 13 of this Code.

[Title: 6](#)

CHAPTER 10:
Office Park

SECTION:

6-10-1: ~~General Requirements~~ [Intent and Scope of Regulations](#)

6-10-2: Permitted Uses

6-10-3: ~~Lot Area~~ [Size, Setback and Height Requirements](#)

6-10-4: ~~Yards~~ [Floor Area Ratio \(FAR\)](#)

6-10-5: [Building Setbacks](#)

6-10-6: [Building Height](#)

6-10-7: [Signs](#)

6-10-~~5~~8: Off-Street Parking and Loading

6-10-9: [Landscaping](#)

6-10-1: ~~GENERAL:~~ [Intent and Scope of Regulations](#)

The ~~Planned Development~~ OP District is ~~established~~ [intended primarily](#) to provide large, ~~landscaped planned corporate campus~~ sites, ~~either open or with natural features preserved~~, immediately adjacent to ~~tollways~~ [interstates](#), or within one thousand five hundred feet (1,500') thereof, for ~~"showplace" operations such as~~ [professional](#) office ~~centers~~ and research laboratories. ~~These developments are to be, and including single-family detached dwellings, with the developments being~~ conceived and implemented as comprehensive and ~~cohesive~~ unified ~~projects~~ [developments](#), on parcels not exceeding twenty five (25) acres and under single ownership, with ~~through conscientious every possible assurance that the~~ [preservation/enhancement of the](#) high quality of ~~the~~ [natural](#) environment ~~will be maintained within the district and buffering in of the~~ surrounding residential ~~districts upon which the Planned Development District may abut~~ [neighborhoods](#). (~~Ord. 75-408-38~~)

6-10-2: ~~PERMITTED USES:~~ [Uses](#)

[Uses permitted in the OP Office Park District are identified in the table below:](#)

Uses

Office; ~~business, professional and corporate headquarters~~

Research and development laboratories; ~~iesy~~

Accessory uses and ~~buildings~~ [structures](#)

[Attached or detached structured parking garages \(accessory to principal use\)](#)

~~A. — Executive offices - business and professional.~~

~~B. — Research laboratories.~~

~~C. — Single-family detached dwellings. Single-family detached dwellings shall be permitted only under, and governed by, the provisions and conditions contained in the R-3 Single-Family Residence District classification under this Zoning Code.~~

~~D. — Accessory uses and buildings incidental to and on the same lot as a permitted use.~~

~~E. A combination of single-family detached dwellings and either an office building or research laboratory. (Ord. 73-309-24)~~

~~F. Except as permitted in subsection (E) above, multiple uses in a single building are not permitted unless such multiple uses are made by a single business entity (user).~~

~~A business entity shall be construed to include any parent company and any related companies which fall within the definition of "affiliated group" as defined in section 1504(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as amended, and any parent company and any related companies which fall within the definition of "affiliated service group" as defined in section 414(m) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as amended. (Ord. 83-764-18)~~

~~6-10-3: LOT AREA, SETBACK AND HEIGHT REQUIREMENTS: Lot Size~~

~~A. Lot Area for Offices and Research Laboratories: The area of a lot shall not be less than four hundred thousand (400,000) square feet.~~

~~B. Lot Width for Offices and Research Laboratories: The average width of the lot shall not be less than five hundred feet (500').~~

~~C. Building Height for Offices and Research Laboratories: No building shall exceed two (2) stories or forty feet (40') in height, whichever is lower.~~

~~D. Floor Area Ratio for Offices and Research Laboratories: The combined floor area ratio for any principal building together with all accessory buildings shall not exceed five-tenths (.50).~~

~~CE. Ground Floor Area for Offices and Research Laboratories: The lot area covered by all buildings shall not exceed thirty percent (30%) of the total area of the lot.~~

6-10-4: Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

The maximum allowable floor area ratio (FAR), including all accessory buildings, shall be 0.50 of the gross lot area.

~~6-10-45: YARDS: Building Setbacks~~

~~A. Front Yard for Offices and Research Laboratories: The front yard shall not be less than one hundred fifty feet (150') deep.~~

~~B. Side Yard for Offices and Research Laboratories: The side yard shall not be less than one hundred feet (100') wide except that on a side which abuts a street or a residential district the side yard shall not be less than one hundred fifty feet (150') wide.~~

~~C. Rear Yard for Offices and Research Laboratories: The rear yard shall not be less than one~~

~~hundred feet (100') deep.~~

Front	Side	Corner Side	Rear
150 ft.	100 ft.	150 ft.	100 ft.

6-10-6: Building Height

A. The maximum building height shall be (5) stories or seventy-five feet (75'), including rooftop equipment and screening.

B. Attached or detached structured parking garages building height shall be subordinate to the principal structure to which it serves.

~~A. Accessory Building Height?~~

6-10-7: Signs

Signs shall be subject to the regulations contained in Title 12 of this Code.

6-10-58: ~~OFF-STREET PARKING AND LOADING:~~ Off-Street Parking & Loading

Off-street parking and loading facilities shall be provided as required in Chapter 11 of this Title.

~~A. Off-Street Parking:~~

~~1. Off-street parking spaces, open to the sky, shall not be located in the front yard or a side yard abutting a residential district. Enclosed buildings and other structures containing off-street parking shall be subject to applicable yard requirements.~~

~~A. 2. Office (business or professional): One parking space shall be provided for eachper four hundred (400) square feet of gross floor area except for single-family detached dwellings.~~

~~B. 3. Except as provided in subsections A and B above, All other uses: eOff-street parking and loading shall be in accordance with the provisions set forth provided as required in Section 6-11-3 2 of this Zoning Code.~~

~~C. B. Off-Street Loading: Off-street loading shall be provided in accordance with the provisions set forth as required in Section 6-11-23 of this Zoning Code. (Ord. 73-309-24)~~

6-10-9: Landscaping

Landscaping shall be subject to the regulations contained in Title 13 of this Code.