Village of Lincolnwood
Plan Commission

Meeting
Wednesday, December 4, 2019
7:00 P.M.

in the
Council Chambers Room
Lincolnwood Village Hall - 6900 North Lincoln Avenue

Agenda

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of Minutes
   November 6, 2019 Meeting Minutes

4. Case #PC-21-19: Subdivision Text Amendment – Consideration of a Text Amendment to Establish Minimum Lot Widths in the R-2, R-3, and R-4 Residential Districts

   Request: Village Board referral to consider a Subdivision Code Text Amendment establishing minimum lot width requirements in the R-2 Residential, R-3 Residential, and R-4 Residential Zoning Districts.

5. Discussion: 2020 Proposed Plan Commission Meeting Calendar

6. Next Regular Meeting:
   Wednesday, January 8, 2020 (proposed)

7. Public Comment

8. Adjournment

POSTED: November 27, 2019
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
OF THE
PLAN COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 6, 2019 – 7:00 P.M.
LINCOLNWOOD VILLAGE HALL
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
6900 NORTH LINCOLN AVENUE
LINCOLNWOOD, ILLINOIS 60712

MEMBERS PRESENT:                                         MEMBERS ABSENT:
Chairman Mark Yohanna                                                        Anthony Pauletto
Sue Auerbach                               Don Sampen
Steven Jakubowski
Adi Kohn
Henry Novoselsky

STAFF PRESENT:
Steve McNellis, Community Development Director
Doug Hammel, Community Development Manager
Kathryn Kasprzyk, Community Development Coordinator
Benjamin Schuster, Holland & Knight
James Amelio, Christopher Burke Engineering

I. Call to Order
Chairman Yohanna noted a quorum of five members and called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Approval of Minutes

Motion to recommend approval of the October 6, 2019 Plan Commission Minutes was made by Commissioner Jakubowski and seconded by Commissioner Auerbach.

Aye: Jakubowski, Auerbach, Kohn, and Yohanna
Nay: None
Abstained: Novoselsky
Motion Approved: 4-0

IV. Case #PC-10-18: 4500-4560 West Touhy Avenue & 7350 North Lincoln Avenue
Review of an Amendment to the Approved Preliminary Development Plan for a Proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) to Allow Additional Zoning Modifications
Chairman Yohanna announced Case #PC-10-18 for consideration of a request by Touhy & Lincoln, LLC, Property Owner, to amend the Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for a Proposed Planned Unit Development, to permit additional modifications related to: 1) a further reduction in the Build-to-line on Touhy Avenue; 2) a further reduction in the width of Perimeter Screening Area along the west property line; 3) a reduction in the required height of planting materials in the Perimeter Screening Area; 4) a further modification to eliminate parkway tree planting in a portion of the Touhy Avenue right-of-way; and 5) a revision to the Development Plan that would allow a previously approved one-story commercial building to increase in size from 22,500-square feet to approximately 35,000-square feet.

Background was provided by Development Director McNellis. Staff noted this item is a two-step process. The first step is approval of the Preliminary Development Plan Review. If approved, the Commission will go forward with Final Development Plan Review and Final Plat of Subdivision. The Preliminary Development Plan was approved by the Plan Commission on October 4, 2018 and a Resolution approved by the Village Board on November 20, 2018. The purpose of the Preliminary Development Plan is to “obtain tentative approvals and/or commitments from the Village that the plans, design, and program that the developer intends to build and follow are acceptable and that the developer can reasonably proceed into the final detailed architecture, engineering, surveying, and landscape architecture...and that the applicant can...prepare final plans with the assurance that the final plans will be accepted if they substantially conform to the preliminary plans”. Staff noted there were five Modifications stated in the published legal notice. Since then, the Modification to permit a reduction in the required height of planting materials in the Perimeter Screening Area has been modified to comply with Village Code and no longer necessary.

Amendments to the Preliminary Development Plan include a Modification to the minimum “build-to-line” to permit a setback of 6 feet (revised from the previously-approved modification of 10 feet, 2 inches) on Touhy Avenue, rather than the required minimum setback of 15 feet; a Modification to reduce the width of the required perimeter screening area for an off-street parking lot, along the west property line, to 3 feet, 6 inches (from the previously-approved modification of 5 feet), rather than the required 8 feet; a Variation to reduce the required number of parkway trees in a portion of the Touhy Avenue right-of-way; and a Revision to the Approved Preliminary Development Plan to increase the building footprint of the proposed one-story commercial building fronting on Touhy Avenue, from 22,500-square feet to approximately 35,000-square feet.

Chairman Yohanna swore in the witnesses.

Richard Tucker, CEO of Tucker Development, made a brief introduction and turned the presentation over to Keith Campbell, Vice President with CallisonRTKL, the project’s architect.

Mr. Campbell presented the proposed Modifications for review and discussion. The first Modification pertains to the six-foot build-to-line. This issue came about due to the additional right turn in lane on westbound Touhy Avenue. The Preliminary PUD Plan originally anticipated an eight-foot dedication. After review, IDOT now requires an 11-foot dedication. This is not a
physical change; only a property line movement change. The sidewalk width will continue to be 10.2 feet.

The Modifications to eliminate parkway tree plantings and reduction in the required height of planting materials came about due to ADA requirements. The sidewalk will now be level adjacent to the storefronts. This change was necessary as the cross slope from the door sill to the curb would be in excess of what is allowed. The sidewalk adjacent the storefronts will be 6.2 feet and 4 feet by the curb. The four-foot planting strip by the curb will include salt-tolerant, hardy plantings. A railing will separate the storefront sidewalk from this planting area. Trees were eliminated as they would not thrive or survive being too close to the roadway. Also, IDOT will not allow trees to be planted that close to the street.

A Modification to further reduce the width of Perimeter Screening Area along the west property line to screen the service parking area and property line had to be moved westward a foot and a half in order to provide the required parking.

The last Modification is a revision to the Development Plan that would allow a previously-approved one-story commercial building to increase in size from 22,500-square feet to approximately 35,000-square feet. Mr. Tucker stated this increase is in response to market demand. This increase will reduce the amount of surface parking but are proposing an additional 93 parking spaces on the roof resulting in a net increase of 7 parking spaces.

Miscellaneous site plan changes include the elimination of a traffic signal at Chase and Lincoln Avenues. In response, entry into the Village Green will include a right in and right out turning lane and left in turning lane from northbound Lincoln Avenue, but no left turn lane out of the project itself. The hotel footprint is not part of this final PUD approval. There are no changes to the residential element of the project. Additional changes to the Village Green include a fire pit at the south end, more trees, turf, and perennials, permeable pavers, retractable bollards, and a more flexible design to accommodate a greater variety of events. There are no architectural changes since Preliminary Plan Approval. The signage package will include individual illuminated lettering instead of box-type signs to achieve a consistent look throughout the property.

Requested action by the Plan Commission includes approval of an Amendment to the Approved Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat of Subdivision which granted Preliminary Planned Unit Development Approval, to permit further Modifications related to the build-to-line on Touhy Avenue, perimeter parking lot screening on the west property line, a larger one-story commercial building footprint, and a reduction in the number of parkway trees on Touhy Avenue.

Chairman Yohanna asked if there was anyone from the audience who would like to address the Plan Commission.

Mr. Larry Teren, 4601 West Touhy Avenue, had concerns about traffic congestion if construction vehicles are allowed to block lanes on Touhy Avenue and how close the buildings are to the sidewalk. Mr. Tucker responded they will provide a logistics plans to be approved by Village staff.
Chairman Yohanna asked if there was anyone from the audience who would like to address the Plan Commission. Let the record state no one came forward. With no further discussion, Chairman Yohanna requested a motion.

**Motion to recommend approval** of an Amendment to the Approved Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat of Subdivision which granted Preliminary Planned Unit Development Approval, to permit further Modifications related to the build-to-line on Touhy Avenue, perimeter parking lot screening on the west property line, a larger one-story commercial building footprint, and a reduction in the number of parkway trees on Touhy Avenue was made by Commissioner Jakubowski and seconded by Commissioner Novoselsky.

Aye: Jakubowski, Novoselsky, Auerbach, Kohn, and Yohanna

Nay: None

Motion Approved: 5-0

V. **Case #PC-10-18: 4500-4560 West Touhy Avenue & 7350 North Lincoln Avenue**

Review of a Special Use Approving a Final Development Plan and Final Plat of Subdivision for a Planned Unit Development (PUD)

Chairman Yohanna announced Case #PC-10-18 for consideration of a request by Touhy & Lincoln, LLC, property owner, for a Special Use Approving a Final Development Plan and Final Plat of Subdivision for a Planned Unit Development (PUD), in accordance with the Planned Unit Development review procedures in Section 8.05(4) of the Zoning Code.

Development Director McNellis stated the purpose of the Final Development Plan and PUD documents is to “designate with particularity the development of the PUD...The final PUD documents depict the exact location of facilities, while the preliminary PUD documents show the general location of the same facilities”. Further, “The final PUD documents shall conform substantially to the plans preliminarily approved by the Board of Trustees”. This phase of the PUD review is to ensure the detailed final plans are in **substantial conformance** with the approved Preliminary Development Plans.

The Approved Preliminary Development Plan contained several stipulations to be met in the Final Development Plan phase to include: unique or special landscape plantings at the entry of the Village Green; permanent bollards in the Village Green; collapsible bollards in the roadway at appropriate locations; approval subject to review and approval by IDOT (review ongoing); covenants previously required in the Preliminary Development phase to be provided prior to final approval (submitted and reviewed); a Fiscal Impact Study (submitted and approved); and a unified business center sign plan (submitted and approved). Staff believes these requirements have been met.

Don Matthews, Civil Engineer with Gewalt Hamilton, spoke about the status of the signal design plan for Touhy and Lincoln Avenues. An Intersection Design Study Plan has been completed and approved by IDOT. They are now working on the construction document phase for roadway
improvements. These improvements include new traffic signals at Lincoln and Touhy Avenues. The northbound Lincoln Avenue configuration will change from a left turn with a left/through lane, the new configuration will have a dual left turn lanes and two through lanes. The signals at the Barclay, District 1860, Kilbourn and Kostner Avenues are all being revamped and modernized. Chairman Yohanna asked if there was anyone from the audience who would like to address the Plan Commission.

Staff confirmed the hotel is still part of the project. The Village Code envisions and allows phasing. Mr. Tucker replied the location, size, height, and design of the hotel is not changing. Director McNellis stated the hotel developer, Marriott, will present their final design to the Plan Commission at a future date. The Redevelopment Agreement and approval of TIF funds is dependent upon the hotel as part of the project.

Staff believes the Preliminary Development Plan is in substantial conformance with the previously-approved Preliminary Development Plan and modifications and recommends approval. Staff provided the following conditions, for review and discussion, be included for Final PUD approval:

1. Delineate the crosswalks through the entry driveways from Lincoln Avenue into the Village Green (developer agrees and will revise plans);
2. Reconfigure the Chase Avenue intersection with Lincoln Avenue to provide appropriate barriers to a westbound left turn from Chase Avenue to southbound Lincoln Avenue (developer agrees to work with staff in pursuit of a reconfiguration that IDOT will approve);
3. Provide two-three street trees, where appropriate, along the east side of the entry driveway from Touhy Avenue into the development (developer agrees and will revise plans);
4. Revise the sidewalk configuration along the Touhy Avenue frontage of the one-story commercial building to relocate the proposed sidewalk from the area immediately adjacent to the Touhy Avenue curb line, so that a grass parkway with parkway trees is provided between the sidewalk and Touhy Avenue (developer agrees and will revise plans);
5. Provide foundation landscaping or constructed planters along the north façade of the one-story commercial building (developer agrees to add planters to the north façade once the tenant entrances have been confirmed);
6. Revise the landscape screening hedge, along the parking garage screen wall on the Lincoln Avenue frontage of the mixed-use building, to revise the ratio of upright junipers to hydrangea to 2:1 (developer agrees and will ensure the ratio is 2:1);
7. Revise the proposed landscaped median on Lincoln Avenue, south of Village Green entry, to conform with median width proposed in Preliminary Development Plan, effectively eliminating on-street parking on the east side of Lincoln Avenue in this area (developer agrees to work with staff and IDOT in pursuit of a solution to the median width);
8. Ensure that all new light poles/fixtures in the Touhy and Lincoln Avenue rights-of-way conform to the Village standard (developer agrees and will make revisions where necessary); and
9. Adjust parking lot light poles where there are conflicts with proposed parking lot trees (developer agrees and will make revisions where necessary).
Commissioner Jakubowski expressed concern with traffic flow. Mr. Tucker replied traffic flow, pedestrian safety, and circulation issues have all been addressed according to the approved Preliminary Development Plan’s traffic study. The Village’s Engineer, Jim Amelio, confirmed he is satisfied with the footprint revisions as it relates to traffic flow.

Chairman Yohanna asked if there was anyone from the audience who would like to address the Plan Commission. Let the record state no one came forward. With no further discussion, Chairman Yohanna requested a motion.

Motion to recommend approval for a Special Use approving a Final Development Plan and Final Plat of Subdivision for a Planned Unit Development (PUD), in accordance with the Planned Unit Development review procedures in Section 8.05(4) of the Zoning Code, subject to staff’s stated conditions. This recommended approval includes the condition that the developer and staff will work together in an attempt to persuade IDOT to grant the maximum extent possible the reconfiguration of the Chase Avenue and Lincoln Avenue intersection as set forth in #2 of staff’s concerns and to provide a revised landscape median on Lincoln Avenue which will eliminate on-street parking on the east side of Lincoln Avenue consistent with the original Preliminary Development Plan was made by Commissioner Novoselsky and seconded by Commissioner Kohn. Case #PC-10-18 will be heard at the November 19, 2019 meeting of the Village Board.

Aye: Novoselsky, Kohn, Auerbach, Jakubowski, and Yohanna
Nay: None
Motion Approved: 5-0

VI. Case #PC-19-19: Zoning Code Text Amendment – Consideration of a Text Amendment to Clarify the Permissibility of Tattoo Parlors in the B-1, B-2, B-3, and M-B Zoning Districts

VII. Case #PC-20-19: 3940 West Touhy Avenue – Special Use request for a Tattoo Parlor at 3940-46 West Touhy Avenue

Chairman Yohanna announced Case #PC-19-19 for consideration of a request by Damien Kardaras, Property Owner at 3940 West Touhy Avenue, to consider a Zoning Code Text Amendment clarifying the permissibility of tattoo parlors in the B-1 Traditional Business, B-2 General Business, B-3 Village Center PD, and M-B Manufacturing and Business Zoning Districts, and Case #PC-20-19 for consideration of a request by Damien Kardaras, Property Owner, to approve a Special Use to allow a tattoo parlor 3940-46 West Touhy Avenue.

Development Manager Hammel provided background on this proposed Text Amendment and whether or not a tattoo parlor would be considered under the definition of a “personal service establishment”. The only instance where tattoo parlors are explicitly mentioned is in Section 4.07(2)d, where they are specifically listed as a prohibited use in the B-1 Traditional Business Zoning District, Business/Residential Transition Overlay. Ben Schuster confirmed that since the definition of a “personal service establishment” does not specifically mention tattoo parlors, it is
staff’s belief, since the use is not explicitly designed as permitted, that it would be prohibited by default.

Discussion items include what zoning districts are most appropriate should tattoo parlors be considered a permitted use similar to personal service establishments, or should any special regulations or considerations apply. Another option is to create a new line item in Table 4.01.1 Permitted and Special Uses in All Zoning Districts that specifically regulates tattoo parlors in different zoning districts as its own distinct use. The definition of a “personal service establishment” is “a business that provides personal services directly to customers at the site of the business or that receives goods from or returns goods to the customer which have been treated or processed at another location, including, without limitation, travel agencies, dry cleaning and laundry drop-off and pickup stations, tailors, hair stylists, cosmeticians, toning or tanning salons, currency exchanges, postal substations, package delivery and pickup stations, shoe repair shops, interior design studios, dance and martial arts studios, and domestic pet services.”

Other policy considerations may include if such uses could be regulated by drafting a use definition that more broadly covers invasive or semi-invasive procedures that require specific certifications and oversight by the Illinois Department of Public Health, if such uses could be regulated as “personal service establishments” by amending the definition to include semi-invasive procedures, thereby recognizing them as services that could be available as part of traditional salons, or if such uses could be regulated independently of tattoo parlors and “personal service establishments” based on where they may be permitted or any specific use regulations deemed appropriate.

There was discussion whether or not establishments that puncture the skin be treated the same as cosmeticians or estheticians and if the definition of a “personal service establishment” already includes tattoo parlors. Chairman Yohanna asked staff to clarify the words “without limitation” in this definition. The Village’s interpretation of the definition is not inclusive, and tattoo parlors are considered a distinct and separate use. Staff presented research of how other neighboring communities regulate tattoo parlors. It is staff’s recommendation the definition should state specifically whether or not tattoo parlors should or should not be included so as to remove any ambiguity. Development Manager Hammel reviewed the Special Use Standards.

Chairman Yohanna swore in the Petitioners Damien Kardaras and Kaitlyn Moskowitz.

The space was previously occupied by a salon that included aestheticians. An aesthetician is a person who deals with skin issues including fading of scarring, the application of acids in order to peel skin tissue, and puncturing of the skin to remove blemishes. Aestheticians are licensed by the State of Illinois Department of Public Health and require yearly training and certification. Ms. Moskowitz stated the difference between aestheticians and tattoo parlors is aestheticians sanitize their equipment where tattoo parlors use disposable equipment. Most body art establishments utilize an all disposable type of system, further eliminating the chance for contamination.

Chairman Yohanna announced the discussion will include Case #PC-20-19 as this case is dependent upon approval of the Text Amendment. Development Manager Hammel stated the existing facility
would be used largely as is and operational characteristics of the proposed use are similar to other uses permitted in this area. Public comment consisted of one call from a neighbor.

Chairman Yohanna asked if there was anyone from the audience who would like to address the Plan Commission. Chairman Yohanna swore in the witnesses.

Reverend and Mrs. Samkuttty, 3938 West Fitch Avenue, expressed their concerns about a tattoo parlor located in Lincolnwood.

Village Trustee Georjean Hlepas Nickell spoke to clarify the statement from Mr. Kardaris that there was unanimous approval from the Committee of the Whole. The consensus was to direct the issue of tattoo parlors to the Plan Commission for discussion. Furthermore, there was no decision made by the Committee of the Whole for this specific request.

Development Manager Hammel recommended that, based on the discussion among the Plan Commission, the “personal service establishment” definition in Section 2.02 could be amended to include the words “dermal pigmentation establishment”. Chairman Yohanna believes the inclusion “without limitation” means no personal service establishments should be excluded.

Chairman Yohanna asked if there was anyone from the audience who would like to address the Plan Commission. Let the record state no one came forward. With no further discussion, Chairman Yohanna requested a motion.

**Motion to recommend** approval of a Zoning Code Text Amendment to include “dermal pigmentation establishments, generally to include tattoo parlors, microblading services, and other similar activities, in the definition of “personal service establishments” and to keep the prohibition of tattoo parlors in the B-1 Traditional Business Zoning District, Business/Residential Transition Overlay District, was made by Commissioner Jakubowski and seconded by Commissioner Novoselsky. Case #PC-19-19 will be heard at the November 19, 2019 meeting of the Village Board.

Aye: Jakubowski, Novoselsky, Auerbach, Kohn, and Yohanna  
Nay: None  
Motion Approved: 5-0

**Motion to recommend** approval for a Special Use to operate a tattoo parlor at 3940-46 West Touhy Avenue was made by Commissioner Jakubowski and seconded by Commissioner Novoselsky. Commissioner Jakubowski reviewed the Standards for Granting Special Uses. Case #PC-20-19 will be heard at the November 19, 2019 meeting of the Village Board.

Aye: Jakubowski, Novoselsky, Auerbach, Kohn, and Yohanna  
Nay: None  
Motion Approved: 5-0

VIII. **Next Meeting**
The next meeting of the Plan Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, December 4, 2019.

IX. Public Comment

Chairman Yohanna asked if there was anyone from the audience who would like to address the Plan Commission. Let the record state no one came forward.

X. Adjournment

Motion to recommend adjournment was made by Commissioner Auerbach and seconded by Commissioner Novoselsky. Meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

Aye: Auerbach, Novoselsky, Jakubowski, Kohn, and Yohanna
Nay: None

Motion Approved: 5-0

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn Kasprzyk
Community Development Coordinator
Subject:
Consideration of a Village Board referral to consider a Subdivision Code Text Amendment establishing minimum lot width requirements in the R-2, R-3, and R-4 Residential zoning districts

Notification:
Notice was published in the Lincolnwood Review on November 14, 2019.

Background
In September 2018, the Village Board adopted a Subdivision Ordinance Text Amendment stating that new subdivisions in the R-1 residential zoning district must include lots with a minimum lot width of 75 feet. This was done in response to concerns specifically related to the potential for lots in that zoning district to be subdivided in a manner that is not consistent with the character of the area. As part of the deliberations related to that Text Amendment, the Village Board requested that staff consider a Text Amendment related to minimum lot width in the other residential zoning districts (R-2, R-3, and R-4).

Currently, minimum lot area is the only metric included in the Zoning or Subdivision Ordinances related to the physical dimensions of a parcel and its ability to be subdivided. The following table indicates the current minimum lot size for each relevant zoning district, and the number of existing parcels that are large enough to be legally subdivided based on this metric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Required Minimum Lot Area (for single-family homes)</th>
<th>Number of Private Subdividable Parcels*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>7,000 square feet</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>5,400 square feet</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>5,400 square feet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Maps showing the locations of these parcels are included as attachments to this report. This amount does not include publicly-owned parcels that appear on the maps.
Village Board Referral
On October 2, 2019, the Village Board considered a series of policy questions regarding this topic. Trustees stated concerns regarding the possibility of several lots being consolidated and resubdivided into lots that are relatively narrow compared to other lots in the same district.

Trustees clarified the intent of addressing this issue through a Subdivision Code Text Amendment rather than a Zoning Code Text Amendment. Staff stated that a Subdivision Code Text Amendment would allow the Village to ensure future parcels are consistent with neighborhood character without creating zoning non-conformity for existing lots that may not meet minimum lot width requirements.

Staff Analysis and Recommendations
Based on the input of the Village Board and subsequent analysis, staff recommends the following:

Amend the Subdivision Ordinance, rather than the Zoning Ordinance, in order to meet the goal of regulating minimum lot width for future development. As described above, amending the Subdivision will provide adequate protection to ensure that future subvisions, or consolidations and resubdivisions, meet minimum lot width standards. Amending the Zoning Ordinance to include minimum lot widths will create non-conformity for existing lots that do not meet proposed standards. This can result in challenges to reinvestment in the properties in the future.

Apply the minimum lot width standards in the R-4 residential zoning district to single-family development and multi-family development. The R-4 zoning district is the only residential district where lots can have more than one dwelling unit. For such development, a lot area of 3,000 square feet per dwelling unit must be provided. Therefore, for a two-unit development, a 6,000-square foot lot is required. When divided by the typical lot depth of 132’, the resulting lot width is just over 45 feet. As described below, the recommended minimum lot width in the R-4 district is 45 feet. Therefore, applying the minimum lot width to all residential development will have no detrimental impacts on multi-family development, but will ensure unusually shaped lots are developed in a manner that is inconsistent with surrounding neighborhood character.

Consider the following minimum lots widths in the R-2, R-3, and R-4 zoning districts. Staff inventoried the existing residential lots in each zoning district to determine what minimum lot width threshold would be appropriate. In making that determination, staff considered two factors; 1) the prevailing lot widths in each district, and 2) the widths of lots that are currently subdividable based on minimum lot area and the widths of those lots surrounding them. Staff’s recommendations are as follows:

In the R-2 district, consider a minimum lot width of 65 feet. This threshold reflects the fact that the majority of lots in this district (56.4%) are greater than 65 feet in width, and would prohibit the subdivision of parcels that are currently subdividable based simply on lot area. This recommended lot width is consistent with the lot widths of properties near these currently subdividable lots.
In the R-3 district, consider a minimum lot width of 50 feet. This threshold reflects the fact that the majority of lots in this district (55.1%) are greater than 50 feet in width. Regarding lots that are currently sub dividable based on minimum lot area, seven lots would remain sub dividable of a minimum lot width of 50 feet is established. These lots are surrounded by properties with lot widths consistent with this proposed standard.

In the R-4 district, consider a minimum lot width of 45 feet. This threshold reflects the fact that the majority of lots in this district (59.7%) are greater than 45 feet in width. There are currently no single-family lots that can be subdivided based on minimum lot width, so this recommended minimum lot width is based more on the predominant minimum lot widths throughout the district.

Recommended Text Amendments

Staff recommends the following Text Amendments to Section 15-5-2 of the Subdivision Ordinance:

* * *

16-5-2 Lots.

(C) Lot width.

(1) Residential districts. All lots located in residential districts shall be of a minimum width in accordance with the applicable standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance. In addition, all lots created through subdivision or resubdivision shall meet the following minimum lot width standards:

(a) In the R-1 Residential Zoning District, all lots shall have a minimum lot width of 75 feet.

(b) In the R-2 Residential Zoning District, all lots shall have a minimum lot width of 65 feet.

(c) In the R-3 Residential Zoning District, all lots shall have a minimum lot width of 50 feet.

(d) In the R-4 Residential Zoning District, all lots shall have a minimum lot width of 45 feet.

(2) Culs-de-sac. All lots located on the radius of a cul-de-sac shall have a minimum front lot line of 50 feet.

* * *
**Requested Action**
Discussion related to and recommendation of a proposed Subdivision Code Text Amendment establishing minimum lot width requirements in the R-2, R-3, and R-4 Residential zoning districts.

**Documents Attached**
1. October 2, 2019 Village Board Committee of the Whole Staff Report
2. Village of Lincolnwood Zoning Map
3. Map of Existing Subdividable Parcels in the R-2 Residential Zoning District
4. Map of Existing Subdividable Parcels in the R-3 Residential Zoning District
5. Map of Existing Subdividable Parcels in the R-4 Residential Zoning District
MEMORANDUM

TO: Anne Marie Gaura, Village Manager
FROM: Douglas Hammel, AICP, Community Development Manager
DATE: October 2, 2019
SUBJECT: Text Amendment Regarding Minimum Lot Width in the R-2, R-3, and R-4 Residential Zoning Districts

Background
In September 2018, the Village Board adopted a Subdivision Ordinance Text Amendment stating that new subdivisions in the R-1 residential zoning district must include lots with a minimum lot width of 75 feet. This was done in response to concerns specifically related to the potential for lots in that zoning district to be subdivided in a manner that is not consistent with the character of the area. As part of the deliberations related to that Text Amendment, the Village Board requested that staff consider a Text Amendment related to minimum lot width in the other residential zoning districts (R-2, R-3, and R-4).

Currently, the only metric related to the physical dimensions of a parcel that dictate its ability to be subdivided is minimum lot area. The following table indicates the current minimum lot size for each relevant zoning district, and the number of existing parcels that are large enough to be legally subdivided based on this metric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Required Minimum Lot Area (for single-family homes)</th>
<th>Number of Private Subdividable Parcels*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>7,000 square feet</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>5,400 square feet</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>5,400 square feet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Maps showing the locations of these parcels are included as attachments to this report. This amount does not include publicly-owned parcels that appear on the maps.

Staff believes that establishing a minimum lot width requirement for new subdivisions is an appropriate way to ensure development on newly created parcels is consistent with the desired character of the community. Staff is requesting that the Village Board refer this matter
to the Plan Commission in order to initiate the formal Text Amendment process. Should the Village Board deem it appropriate to refer this matter to the Plan Commission, staff anticipates that the Plan Commission public hearing process and deliberations would explore the following policy questions:

- What portion of the code – either Chapter 15 Zoning or Chapter 16 Subdivision Regulations – would be the appropriate place for a potential Text Amendment related to minimum lot width? When the Board approved the Text Amendment establishing a minimum lot width for the R-1 zoning district, the Text Amendment was done in the Subdivision Ordinance. The primary reason for this was that, by establishing the minimum lot width requirement in the Subdivision Ordinance, it ensures that future lots created through subdivision will be compliant, but existing lots are not made non-compliant. Staff recommends that a similar approach be used for establishing a minimum lot width for new parcels in the R-2, R-3, and R-4 zoning districts.

- What are appropriate minimum lot widths for the R-2, R-3, and R-4 zoning districts? The typical sizes of parcels, zoning lots, and residential structures in these districts vary. As part of the preparation of materials for the Plan Commission public hearing, staff would conduct research to identify the typical development patterns that currently exist and the potential impacts of various minimum lot width thresholds.

- How might the R-4 district be regulated to specifically respond to townhouse or multi-family development? The R-2 and R-3 zoning districts only allow for single-family residential uses. However, R-4 allows for attached single-family and multi-family uses. Staff recommends that only single-family uses in the R-4 zoning district be subject to minimum lot width requirements, and that townhouse or multi-family uses be governed based on the existing regulations related to minimum lot area per dwelling unit.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT:**

None

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends that the Village Board referring to the Plan Commission a potential Text Amendment to the Subdivision Ordinance to establish a minimum lot width requirement in the R-2, R-3, and R-4 residential zoning districts.

**DOCUMENTS ATTACHED:**

1. Village of Lincolnwood Zoning Map
2. Map of Existing Subdividable Parcels in the R-2 Residential Zoning District
3. Map of Existing Subdividable Parcels in the R-3 Residential Zoning District
4. Map of Existing Subdividable Parcels in the R-4 Residential Zoning District
Village of Lincolnwood
Parcels in the R-2 Zoning District with a Minimum Lot Area of at Least 14,000 Square Feet
Village of Lincolnwood
Parcels in the R-3 Zoning District with a Minimum Lot Area of at Least 10,800 Square Feet
Village of Lincolnwood
Parcels in the R-4 Zoning District with a Minimum Lot Area of at Least 10,800 Square Feet
Memorandum

To: Chair and Members
   Plan Commission

From: Doug Hammel, AICP
       Development Manager

Date: December 4, 2018

Subject: 2020 Meeting Schedule and Dates Reserved for Workshops

Once again, it is that time of year to consider next year’s meeting dates!

Attached, for your consideration, is the proposed 2020 schedule of Commission meetings. These Commission meetings are primarily for the Commission to conduct public hearings on petitions made by applicants. This meeting schedule generally follows the Commission’s practice of meeting on the first Wednesday of each month. For 2020, Staff found one instance where a regular meeting is recommended for a different date:

- Wednesday, January 8: The first Wednesday in January falls on New Year’s Day. Staff recommends holding the January regular meeting on January 8 to allow adequate time from the holiday.

If Commissioners find there are no conflicts with these proposed dates, Staff recommends the Plan Commission adopt this meeting schedule as presented.

The attached schedule also includes dates to be reserved by the Plan Commission for Workshops, as needed. Workshop dates generally fall on the fourth Wednesday of the month, although none are envisioned in March, November, or December due to Spring Break, Thanksgiving, and Christmas. If Commissioners find there are no conflicts with these proposed dates, Staff recommends the Plan Commission formally reserve these dates, so that the meeting room can be reserved, should they be necessary. The pragmatic difference between adopting a meeting schedule and reserving Workshop dates is that no formal cancellation notice is required for dates that are reserved but not held, whereas for meetings that are scheduled but not held, a cancellation notice is required.

Recommendations

1) Move and second to Adopt the 2020 Plan Commission meeting schedule as proposed.
2) Move and second to Reserve proposed dates for possible workshops in calendar year 2020.
Lincolnwood Plan Commission

2020 Meeting Schedule

Monthly Plan Commission meetings are generally held on the first Wednesday of each month with the fourth Wednesday of each month reserved for Workshops. (Workshop meetings are not scheduled in March, November, or December due to Spring Break, Thanksgiving, and Christmas holidays.) Unless otherwise posted, all Commission meetings begin at **7:00 p.m.** and are held in the Council Chambers Room of Village Hall, 6900 North Lincoln Avenue, Lincolnwood, Illinois.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020 Calendar of Meetings</th>
<th>2020 Calendar of Workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, January 8*</td>
<td>Wednesday, January 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 5</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, March 4</td>
<td>March – None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, April 1</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, May 6</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, June 3</td>
<td>Wednesday, June 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, July 1</td>
<td>Wednesday, July 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, August 5</td>
<td>Wednesday, August 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, September 2</td>
<td>Wednesday, September 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, October 7</td>
<td>Wednesday, October 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 4</td>
<td>November – None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, December 2</td>
<td>December – None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes dates that are proposed for meetings on a date other than the first Wednesday of each month based on the following factors:
  - Wednesday, January 8: The first Wednesday of the month is New Year’s Day.