



APPROVED Minutes of the **REGULAR MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD** held on Tuesday, June 9, 2015, in the Public Meeting Room in the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL.

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

STAFF PRESENT: Stephen Robles, Village Planner.

ABSENT: Member Kalina and Trustee McDonough.

CALL TO ORDER: **Chairman Manion** called the meeting to order at 7:00 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 Thursday, May 21, 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 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).

Chairman Manion recessed the Zoning Board meeting and opened the Public Hearing.

Village Planner Robles presented Staff's memorandum and explained the The PD Planned Development Zoning District was established in 1973, in conjunction with annexation of the property commonly known as the Hewitt Half Day campus, and was recently purchased by Medline Industries. The PD Zoning District was designed specifically for that property, where the code referenced showplace office and research laboratories adjacent to the Tollway. Medline's purchase of the property led to discussions with Staff on the out-dated requirements of the PD District, and resulted in the proposed comprehensive text amendments. He continued, Medline had requested two specific revisions to the PD zoning district which were noted in their attached letter, and Staff believed were appropriate for discussion along with the additional Staff proposed updates.

Village Planner Robles presented Problem 1 of the existing PD District, and explained that the PD – Planned Development District name was often confused with "PUD's",

Planned Unit Developments, amongst the development community where the name should accurately reflect its purpose. The proposed solution was to rename the District based on the five options presented. Minor discussion ensued regarding the appropriate zoning title, with the Zoning Board reaching a consensus of the OC - Office Campus title.

Village Planner Robles continued with Problem 2, the General Section 6-10-1 was a blend of purpose statement and general regulations, and also included single-family detached dwellings land uses to support mixed-use development, which was no longer consistent with the Village's vision for this property. The proposed solution was to rename the Section to "Intent and Scope of Regulations" to follow the other zoning districts and further revised to reflect the intended purpose of the PD District. The Zoning Board was in agreement with the Staff proposed revisions.

Problem 3 was identified by **Village Planner Robles** that the current Permitted Uses Section 6-10-2 included uses such as single-family dwellings and restrictions such as limitation on multi-tenant office buildings that were contradictory to the District's purpose. Since the Village had recently relaxed restrictions on multi-tenant office/warehouse buildings, he noted it was counter-productive to continue that restriction in office developments. The proposed solution was to revise the permitted uses section to follow the intended purpose of the District. **Member Leider** expressed concern with the research and development laboratories land use and noted his preference to prevent chemical testing. **Village Planner Robles** clarified that the research use was a current use of the existing PD District and the update was simply a name change for consistency with other zoning district that permitted the same use. He noted Staff could further revise the definition to include a prohibition on chemical testing. **Member Bichkoff** sought clarification on whether the research and development use permitted medical testing. **Village Planner Robles** explained as defined, medical testing would be permitted. Minor discussion ensued regarding concerns over the potential of research and development of hazardous materials, and the Zoning Board concluded the Research and Development Laboratories land use should be permitted by Special Use Permit, rather than a Permitted Use.

Village Planner Robles continued with Problem 4 and described that Section 6-10-1 required property in the PD District must not exceed 25 acres. However, he explained the land in the zoning district was greater than 40 acres. Medline sought to remove the 25 acre limitation since it did not reflect the actual acreage within the Zoning District. **Village Planner Robles** expressed that the request was appropriate since there was no valid reason for limiting the size of this zoning district. The proposed solution was to revise Section 6-10-3 to keep the current 400,000 square foot minimum lot size and the existing minimum 500' lot width, and remove the 25 acre limitation. **Member Bichkoff** questioned what would happen if another business purchased the property within the zoning district and expanded the district. **Village Planner Robles** explained under that scenario, the new owner would be required to rezone the additional land to the same zoning district, which would be subject to a public hearing to determine compatibility with the Village's Update 2012 Comprehensive Plan. **Member Leider** questioned should the 400,000 square foot minimum lot area be increased to prevent the carving of land into smaller lots. **Village Planner Robles** noted that provided the minimum lot area and frontage were achieved, the property could be further subdivided into smaller lots, which is common with all other zoning districts in the Village. However, based on conversations with Medline representatives, it was Medline's intent to use the entirety of the site for their purposes. **Member Leider** requested the amount of linear frontage of the current

properties within the PD Districts, as well as the adjacent lot to the west, and the current property owners for further review.

Problem 5 was identified by **Village Planner Robles** as the second request of Medline to increase the current building height limitation in the PD District which was 2 stories or 40 feet whichever was lower. He continued, the height limitation was obsolete with modern office buildings especially along high visibility corridors, such as the Tollway and was also lower than two of the three existing buildings on the property at 3-stories. **Village Planner Robles** presented the solution that building heights of up to 5-stories were not unreasonable based on the height of the existing woodland forest on the campus, as well as the height of signature headquarters-style buildings elsewhere in the Village. Therefore, the minimum building height requirements were proposed to be placed into a new stand-alone Section 6-10-6 to follow the current zoning code format and to increase the maximum building height to five stories or seventy-five feet, including rooftop equipment and screening. Building height for attached and detached structured parking garages were proposed to be subordinate to the principal structure. **Chairman Manion** sought clarification on the current height of the AONHewitt building located at 4 Overlook Point in the Village. **Village Planner Robles** noted that building height at 6-stories. **Member Leider** questioned the building heights for the office buildings located within the Tri-State International Office Center across Route 22. **Village Planner Robles** identified the building heights of 4-stories, but noted that height was not reflective of modern day office buildings, especially along the Tollway. **Chairman Manion** expressed his support for 5-story building heights. **Member Leider** expressed his preference for 4-story building heights as being more reasonable. Minor discussion ensued regarding the difference between building heights at 4-stories and 5-stories and the existing woodland forest on the property. The Zoning Board requested Staff seek Medline's desire for 5-story building heights and whether 4-stories would be acceptable.

Village Planner Robles proceeded with Problem 6, where Section 6-10-4 required a minimum 100 foot side yard setback, which increased to 150 feet when abutting a street or residential zoning district. Such setback was greater than other Office/Industrial zoning districts that permit building heights of up to 6 stories. In addition, the property was described as unique since it is forested with 60-80 foot tall trees that provided a substantial screen from surrounding properties. The proposed solution was to relocate building setback requirements to Section 6-10-5 and cap the side yard setback at 100 feet which would provide more than adequate separation of any future land uses west and north of this District. The front and rear yard building setbacks remained unchanged and a corner side setback of 150 feet was added. **Chairman Manion** questioned the potential for residential development west of the PD District and if the proposed building setbacks would be sufficient. **Village Planner Robles** noted the future land use of the adjacent property was identified for residential per the Village's Comprehensive Plan and the proposed setbacks were far more substantial than any other zoning district in the Village. Following a minor discussion regarding setbacks, the Zoning Board unanimously agreed with the Staff proposed revisions.

Village Planner Robles presented the Findings of Fact for the proposed text amendments and requested to be entered in the public record.

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

Additional discussion ensued regarding the proposed text amendments. At the conclusion, the Zoning Board requested the public hearing be continued for Staff to return with additional information.

Chairman Manion closed the Zoning Board meeting and reconvened the Public Hearing, and continued the public hearing in order for Staff to return with the following additional information:

1. Linear frontage of the property within the PD District and property ownership information of the adjacent parcels to the west.
2. Confirm with Medline Industries representatives if 5-story building heights are necessary or if 4-stories would be acceptable.

4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

Village Planner Robles updated the Zoning Board on the reappointment of **Member Van de Kerckhove** and the appointment of new Zoning Board **Member Scott Brady** who would be attending the next regularly scheduled Zoning Board meeting.

6.0 CITIZENS COMMENTS

Member Leider questioned the status of the subdivision request for the property located at 1700 Riverwoods Road. **Village Planner Robles** updated the Zoning Board that the applicant was in the process of revising their rezoning request based on the Zoning Board's comments and anticipated presented to the Committee of the Whole at the end of July or August.

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, **Chairman Manion** sought a motion for adjournment. **Member Van de Kerckhove** moved, and **Member Bickkoff** seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Minutes Submitted by Stephen Robles, Village Planner