Village of Lincolnwood
Plan Commission

Meeting
Tuesday, July 24, 2018
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
   July 10, 2018 Special Meeting Minutes
4. Case #PC-10-18: Conceptual Plan Review of a Preliminary Development Concept for 4500 West Touhy Avenue
   Request: Consideration of a request by Tucker Development Group, Inc., contract purchaser, as authorized by Romspen Club Holdings, Inc., property owner, for Conceptual Plan Review of a development proposal on the former Purple Hotel site, in accordance with the Planned Unit Development review procedures in Section 8.05(2) of the Zoning Code.
5. Case #PC-06-18: Zoning Code Text Amendment – Sign Regulations for Large-Scale Developments, Freestanding Sign Location, Portable Sign Requirements, and Temporary Signage
   (Continued from May 2, 2018, June 6 2018, July 5, 2018, and July 10, 2018)
   Request: Consideration of a Village Board Referral of Zoning Code Text Amendments proposed to modify the permissibility and requirements for certain signage including: 1) Permitting Electronic Message Signs, with specific regulations, for properties and/or developments deemed to be “large-scale”; 2) Amending existing regulations related to Temporary Signs for Special Events and Grand Openings; 3) Permitting Temporary Sign Coverings/Panels on Freestanding Signs; 4) Amending required setbacks for Temporary and Permanent Freestanding Signs; and 5) Amending existing regulations related to specific design limitations for Portable Signs.
   Request: Consideration of a request by Onsite Healthcare Inc., SC, property owner, to approve a Special Use to permit two on-site parking spaces to be located in the Front Yard, and Variations to: 1) allow the building to be set back greater than the required 15-foot build-to line along Touhy Avenue in the B-3 Zoning District; 2) reduce the number of on-site parking by fourteen spaces; 3) waive the requirement of a ten-foot-wide landscape setback along the north lot line abutting a residential zoning district; and 4) allow the reduction in the minimum width of a drive aisle from twenty-four feet to twenty-one feet, two inches. Note: Staff has requested that this matter be continued to September 5, 2018.
7. Next Meeting: September 5, 2018 (The Regularly Scheduled August 1, 2018 Meeting has been Canceled)
8. Public Comment
9. Adjournment

POSTED: July 19, 2018
I. Call to Order

Chairman Yohanna noted a quorum of six members and called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Approval of Minutes

Motion to recommend approval of the June 6, 2018 Plan Commission Minutes was made by Commissioner Pauletto and seconded by Commissioner Auerbach.

Aye: Pauletto, Auerbach, Kohn, Novoselsky, Sampen, and Yohanna
Nay: None
Motion Approved: 6-0

IV. Approval of Minutes

Motion to recommend approval of the June 28, 2018 Joint Village Board and Plan Commission Workshop Minutes was made by Commissioner Kohn and seconded by Commissioner Auerbach.
V. Case #PC-07-18: 6739 North Longmeadow Avenue – Review of a Final Plat of Subdivision

Chairman Yohanna announced Case #PC-07-18 for consideration of a request by John Pikarski, Petitioner, on behalf of Willis Jones, Executor of the Estate of Mary M. McDonald as property owner of existing Lot 7, and Chicago Title Land Trust, Trustee, for existing Lot 8 under the Trust Agreement #121437 dated 12/29/97 to approve a Final Plat of Subdivision.

Chairman Yohanna swore in the Petitioner’s representative, Mr. John Pikarski.

The property is made up of two parcels totaling 37,200-square feet comprising of one single-family home located in the R-1, Residential Zoning District. The request is to consolidate the two parcels into one and resubdivide the consolidated lot to conform with a Side Yard setback of ten percent of the lot width of the new western parcel. A Subdivision Variation request to resubdivide the two parcels, with the west parcel totaling 17,485-square feet and an east parcel totaling 19,746-square feet, and a Variation for the east parcel frontage of 34.15 feet instead of the required 50 feet, was approved at the June 6, 2018 Plan Commission meeting and subsequently approved by the Village Board.

Development Manager Hammel reviewed the Subdivision Design Standards and Required Approvals for a Final Plat of Subdivision as per Section 16-4-5(E) of the Subdivision Ordinance.

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

Motion to recommend approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision was made by Commissioner Pauletto and seconded by Commissioner Sampen. Case #PC-07-18 will be heard at the July 17, 2018 meeting of the Village Board.

Aye: Pauletto, Sampen, Auerbach, Jakubowski, Kohn, Novoselsky, and Yohanna
Nay: None
Motion Approved: 7-0

VI. Case #PC-08-18: 6636 North Leroy Avenue – Review of a Final Plat of Subdivision

Chairman Yohanna announced Case #PC-08-18 for consideration of a request by Erik Tibu, Petitioner, on behalf of Mihai (Mike) Smalberger, property owner, to approve a Final Plat of Subdivision that would result in two parcels being created from one existing parcel in the R-1, Residential Zoning District at the property commonly known as 6636 North Leroy Avenue.
The Petitioner is proposing to subdivide the lot into two parcels; the north lot will be 9,903-square feet and the south lot will be 9,243-square feet. The minimum lot size in the R-1 District is 9,000-square feet. There is no standard related to minimum lot width.

Public Input consisted of seven emails opposing the proposed Subdivision and four residents spoke opposing the request at the June 6, 2018 Plan Commission meeting. Concerns included reduced housing values, incompatibility with surrounding properties, flooding and stormwater management, loss of mature trees, sewer capacity, and the potential to subdivide other lots in the area.

Required Approval is for a Final Plat of Subdivision as per Section 16-4-5 of the Subdivision Ordinance. This request has been determined to be a Minor Subdivision and is waived from the Preliminary Plat of Approval requirement. All Subdivision requests are subject to the same Standards whether it is classified as a Major or Minor Subdivision. The following considerations determine whether the request is a Minor or Major Subdivision: a) is located in a Residential Zoning District; b) will not contain more than two lots upon approval by the Village; c) fronts on an existing improved street; d) does not involve any new right-of-way or the extension or installation of any public improvements; e) does not adversely affect the development of the remainder of the parcel or adjoining property; f) does not require a Variation; and g) is not in conflict with any provision or portion of the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Jakubowski believes this request should be considered a Major Subdivision, and the Petitioner should provide plans for Plan Commission review.

There was discussion regarding the Minor or Major Subdivision classification and if a Development Agreement should be required. Mr. Passman confirmed Minor Subdivision approval is the responsibility of the Community Development Department. Under Illinois law, if a requested Subdivision meets all local regulations, the municipality lacks discretion regarding approval of the request. Staff did not find any conflict with the Subdivision or Zoning Codes.

Mr. Smalberger reiterated the design of the two homes will be completely different in response to Chairman Yohanna’s concern for “tract” housing. Chairman Yohanna would like a Village official to confirm the houses will be distinctly different. Mr. Smalberger agreed to this condition. One of the new homes will be used for Mr. Smalberger’s new residence.

There was continuing discussion as to provision (e) which states “does not adversely affect the development of the remainder of the parcel or adjoining property”.

Development Manager Hammel presented the development impacts whether the existing home was demolished and rebuilt or resubdivided as requested. The incremental impact would be minimal for either scenario. It was noted that there are four lots in the vicinity that could be subdivided with no additional approval. Commissioner Sampen did not believe all the criteria for administrative approval has been met.

Chairman Yohanna requested comments from the audience.

Mr. Florin Cimpean, 6440 North Leroy Avenue, spoke in favor of the proposal. The property has been an eyesore for a long time. Mr. Cimpean stated he knows Mr. Smalberger personally and he builds quality homes.
Mr. Lee Harris, 6635 North Leroy Avenue, stated this proposal does not conform to the aesthetics of the Towers and, specifically, the homes on Leroy Avenue.

Mr. Joel Perzov, 6650 North Leroy Avenue, did not believe the burden has been met and the project will adversely affect the neighborhood.

Mr. Dorin Candea, 6542 North Leroy Avenue, whose lot is also 75-feet wide, built a new home in 2012. New homes add value.

Ms. Michelle Cimpean 6440 North Leroy Avenue, said their home is on a 75-foot lot. The Village should not discriminate.

Chairman Yohanna has asked the Village Board to amend the Code so this type of request will not happen in the future.

Commissioner Auerbach stated the Village has no right to refuse his request as there are no adverse effects. There is the same amount of buildable area whether there is one lot or two.

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

Motion to recommend approval a Final Plat of Subdivision was made by Commissioner Auerbach, with the condition that the two houses cannot be similar in design and must be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Administrator. If the homes are deemed too similar, no building permits will be issued. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Novoselsky. Case #PC-08-18 will be heard at the July 17, 2018 meeting of the Village Board.

Aye: Auerbach, Novoselsky, Kohn, Pauletto, and Yohanna
Nay: Jakubowski and Sampen
Motion Approved: 5-2

VII. 4656 West Touhy Avenue – Review of a Special Use Related to Parking in the Front Yard and Variations Related to Building Setback, On-Site Parking Capacity, Landscaping Adjacent to a Residential Property, and Minimum Drive Aisle Width

Chairman Yohanna announced Case #PC-09-18 for consideration of a request by Onsite Healthcare Inc., SC, property owner, to approve a Special Use to permit two on-site parking spaces to be located in the Front Yard, and Variations to: 1) allow the building to be set back greater than the required 15-foot build-to line along Touhy Avenue in the B-3 Zoning District; 2) reduce the number of on-site parking by fourteen spaces; 3) waive the requirement of a ten-foot-wide landscape setback along the north lot line abutting a residential zoning district; and 4) allow the reduction in the minimum width of a drive aisle from twenty-four feet to twenty-one feet, two inches.

Chairman Yohanna swore in the Petitioner’s representatives, Mr. Eric Bernardo, Associate General Counsel for Onsite Healthcare, Mr. Michael Raiz, Onsite Healthcare Senior Vice President, and Mr. William Woodward, Senior Consultant for KLOA.
The property is in the B-3, Village Center PD Zoning District. The lot is approximately 23,400-square feet with a one-story office building. Proposed improvements include a two-story masonry medical office building with 17,800-square feet which will be rebuilt on the existing building’s footprint. Parking will be accessed off of Touhy Avenue. The twenty-foot alley on the back of the property will remain.

A Special Use is requested to allow open-air parking in the Front Yard. Variations are requested for building setback, required on-site parking spaces, the required ten-foot landscaping setback, and driveway aisle width. Based on the proposed demolition of the existing building, the existing conditions are no longer relevant, and the site must be brought into general zoning compliance. The Zoning Code requires a 15-foot build-to line along Touhy Avenue for properties in the B3 District; the Petitioner is proposing a 25-foot setback to accommodate the existing building’s footprint. A ten-foot landscaping setback is required for properties adjacent to residentially zoned properties; the Petitioner is proposing no landscaping. The minimum number of on-site parking spaces establishes a ratio of 4 spaces per 1,000-square feet of GFA (gross floor area). The Zoning Code exempts certain interior spaces from the parking requirement resulting in a GFA of 8,133-square feet or 33 spaces; the Petitioner is proposing 19 parking spaces. The minimum drive aisle width is 24 feet; the Petitioner is proposing a drive aisle width of 21 feet 2 inches due to the installation of a new 5-foot sidewalk.

The Village Code requires 33 spaces or 4 spaces per 1,000-square feet of GFA. The industry standard is 26 spaces or 3.2 spaces per 1,000-square feet of GFA. Operational peak demand is 23 spaces based on occupancy of employees and patients. The Petitioner has a total of 19 spaces on their property and has a non-permanent agreement with 4600 West Touhy Avenue for 7 dedicated parking spaces and 25 shared parking spaces. The 12 public parking spaces on Kilpatrick Avenue cannot be considered for their exclusive use. Mr. Woodward said their traffic studies show the national average for medical office buildings and general office buildings would generally be the same.

The majority of patients are seen in their own homes. There will be minimal exam rooms for basic checkups. There will be no surgical or in-patient procedures. The use is mostly Onsite Healthcare’s administrative staff with approximately 14-16 employees. There was discussion regarding future parking needs if the building was sold and occupied by a new use that would require more available parking.

Mr. Raiz stated Onsite’s hardship is the use of the existing building’s footprint. All other hardship standards have been met.

Chairman Yohanna asked for comments from the audience.

Mr. Nawal Gupta, 7215 North Kilpatrick Avenue, said it is hard to find parking already. Mr. Gupta presented a signed petition against this proposal.

Mr. Julian Covaci, 7221 North Kilpatrick Avenue, said this use will make the parking situation worse.

Ms. Pauline Dreuth, 4601 West Touhy Avenue, also spoke about how this use will worsen the parking situation.
There was discussion as to whether both properties have enough parking. Questions raised included to what extent does 4600 Touhy use their own lot and the shared parking at 4656 Touhy, does Psistaria have a formal right to any of the parking spaces in this area, if any other entity has a specific right to the 12 public spaces on Kilpatrick Avenue, or if the Petitioner will need to secure off-site parking to alleviate parking on Kilpatrick Avenue. The Petitioner was asked to provide information parking and storage of medical transport vehicles.

Alternatives to consider regarding drive aisle width included angled parking, compact vehicle only parking, or a reduction in the proposed sidewalk. Commissioner Auerbach asked if the Petitioner would be agreeable to modify their design plans to increase drive aisle width. Chairman Yohanna swore in the project’s architect, Mr. Mike Maj said modifications to the existing plan would create a financial hardship.

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

**Motion to continue** this matter was made by Commissioner Sampen and seconded by Commissioner Pauletto to a date certain of July 24, 2018.

Aye: Sampen, Pauletto, Auerbach, Jakubowski, Kohn, Novoselsky, and Yohanna
Nay: Nay
Motion Approved: 7-0

VIII. **Case #PC-06-18: Zoning Code Text Amendment – Sign Regulations for Large-Scale Developments, Freestanding Sign Location, Portable Sign Requirements, and Temporary Signage**

Chairman Yohanna announced Case #PC-04-18 for consideration of a Village Board Referral of Zoning Code Text Amendments to consider modifying the permissibility and requirements for certain signage including: 1) permitting Electronic Message Signs, with specific regulations, for properties and/or developments deemed to be “large-scale”; 2) amending existing regulations related to Temporary Signs for Special Events and Grand Openings; 3) permitting Temporary Sign Coverings/Panels on Freestanding Signs; 4) amending required setbacks for Temporary and Permanent Freestanding Signs; and 5) amending existing regulations related to specific design limitations for Portable Signs.

**Motion to continue** the matter without discussion was made by Commissioner Pauletto and seconded by Commissioner Kohn.

Aye: Pauletto, Kohn, Auerbach, Jakubowski, Novoselsky, Sampen, and Yohanna
Nay: None
Motion Approved: 7-0

IX. **Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Plan Commission is scheduled for Tuesday, July 24, 2018.
X. **Public Comment**

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

XI. **Adjournment**

**Motion to recommend adjournment** was made by Commissioner Pauletto and seconded by Commissioner Kohn. Meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

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

Nay: None

**Motion Approved: 7-0**

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn Kasprzyk
Community Development Coordinator
Subject Property:
4500 West Touhy Avenue - Northwest Corner of Lincoln and Touhy Avenues

Zoning District:
B3, Village Center PD

Petitioner:
Tucker Development Group, Inc., Contract Purchaser, as authorized by Romspen Club Holdings, Inc., Property Owner

Nature of Request:
Conceptual Plan Review step in the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process.

Notification:
This is an optional initial step in the PUD process that entails review by the Plan Commission at a public meeting. Therefore, no notification is required. However, the Village has announced this review on the Village website, at the July 17, 2018 Village Board meeting, and on all social media platforms. A Public Hearing will be scheduled for the Preliminary PUD review, which is the next step in this process, and will require public notification through the Lincolnwood Review and notice to all property owners within 250 feet of the boundary of the project area.

Summary of Request:
This optional step in the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process (see attached Section 8.05 of the Zoning Code, detailing the PUD review process) is being undertaken in order to allow the Plan Commission the opportunity to review concept plans before decisions need to be made on engineering, traffic, and architectural details and specifications. Given the scope of this project, the history, and the importance of this key corner in Lincolnwood, Staff and the Petitioner would like to provide the Plan Commission the opportunity to offer comments and suggestions as early in the process as possible. This also provides an opportunity to direct Staff and the Petitioner to gather information you will need in carrying out the Preliminary PUD review, which is anticipated for the September Plan Commission meeting.
Background
The 8.47-acre former “Purple Hotel” site has been vacant and available for redevelopment since its demolition in 2013. Over the past two years, the property has gone into foreclosure and eventually was acquired by Romspen Club Holdings, lender for the former prospective developer North Capital Group. On April 15, 2018, Romspen executed a Purchase and Sale Agreement with Tucker Development Group (TDG) of Chicago to buy and develop the former Purple Hotel property. TDG began the PUD process with the Pre-Application Conference, which was held at the June 5, 2018 Committee of the Whole meeting. Mayor Bass subsequently recommended a Workshop session with TDG, which was held on June 28, 2018 and attended by invited representatives from several Boards and Commissions, with the goal of providing additional feedback to help refine the concept plan. Comments from both of these meetings are summarized in this memorandum. The Plan Commission’s review on July 24, 2018, as well as a Development Review Team meeting (an internal review with representatives of all Village departments) on July 25, 2018, will complete the Conceptual Plan Review process.

Project Summary
The attached concept plans for the development dubbed “District 1860” from TDG depict a site that is approximately 8.47 acres in size, in contrast with the previous 10.71-acre North Capital Group proposal, which included two additional lots north on Lincoln Avenue, where existing one-story and four-story office buildings are located. Tucker Development has been in contact with the owner of the southernmost of these two properties (outlined in red dashes with a gray building footprint) and continues to seek the opportunity to acquire it for future inclusion in this project. At this time, however, that property will not be included in the concept plan. The proposed use types in the concept plan are all permitted as part of a PUD.

Highlights of the “District 1860” proposal include:
- Commercial buildings located in a traditional urban layout with buildings fronting Touhy and Lincoln Avenues;
- Incorporation of public space, including a “Village Green” at the main entrance to the development from Lincoln Avenue and a small plaza as a focal point at the intersection of Lincoln and Touhy Avenues;
- A 22,500-square-foot one-story retail/commercial building that could potentially be utilized for a grocer or single/multi-tenant retail or commercial service use, with significant surface parking adjacent;
- A seven-story hotel with its entrance fronting the Village Green and the opportunity for ground-level restaurant(s), with room for outdoor dining areas facing the green;
- A large two-story covered parking garage with 506 parking spaces incorporated into a commercial/apartment building;
- A six- to seven-story building at the corner of Lincoln and Touhy, with frontage on both Touhy and Lincoln Avenues, with commercial space on the ground floor, and apartments on the top four-five floors of the building;
- Three signalized intersections; two existing on Touhy Avenue and one new on Lincoln Avenue;
- A total of 524 “living units” (224 hotel rooms and 300 apartments) on-site, which increases the number of residents/guests in the immediate area making the commercial space more attractive; and
- A bicycle/pedestrian-focused pocket park, located between the Valley Line Trail/Touhy Bridge Overpass and the westernmost building in the proposed development.
The previous North Capital Group plans, and current Tucker Development plan, are both mixed-use developments, with some similar uses, but different densities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>91,200-square feet</td>
<td>90,100-square feet*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>35,000-square feet</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery</td>
<td>30,300-square feet</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>160 rooms</td>
<td>224 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Club</td>
<td>22,700-square feet</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Office</td>
<td>31,200-square feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (Apartments)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>300 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Square Footage (retail, restaurant &amp; grocery)</td>
<td>156,500 -square feet</td>
<td>90,100-square feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tucker Concept Plan lists all commercial (potentially including retail, restaurant, grocer, health club, etc.) as “Retail/Commercial”

While the District 1860 proposal presents less commercial density than contemplated in previous proposals, it is consistent with the retail industry mantra and experience shared by other developers interested in this site who have noted that the previous Shoppes at Lincoln Pointe proposed significantly more commercial space than this area could support. This proposal also allows the opportunity for a grocery store as well as possible entertainment uses, both of which are desired in the community. Finally, the addition of an apartment building, along with the continued interest in incorporating a hotel, helps provide greater resident/guest density, making the commercial space more attractive for lease.

Anticipated Relief from the Zoning Code
The nature of a PUD is that it is a unique area which warrants, and typically requests, relief from the Zoning Code requirements that apply to all other general conditions throughout the Village, creating its own “neighborhood” standards. As the proposed concept plan is preliminary in nature, it is difficult to produce a detailed list of all deviations from the Zoning Code that would be necessary as part of the proposed PUD. However, it is likely the following code requirements, at a minimum, will require relief as part of the Preliminary PUD request:

- Off-street parking
- Building height
- Building setback
- Signage

Background Materials & Additional Information:

Touhy-Lincoln Development Study (2017)
In 2017, the Village Board endorsed the (attached) Touhy-Lincoln Development Study and Preferred Plan. This Study was prepared by Planning Consultant Lakota Group, in conjunction with a Task Force consisting of two Village Trustees, Plan Commission Chairman Yohanna, the Economic Development Commission Chairman and Village staff. That document was intended to articulate a vision for the former Purple Hotel site and establish a series of principles that the future development of the property should strive to integrate, recognizing that market viability and unforeseen site factors may require the physical
characteristics of the concept plan to change. As stated, when this plan was endorsed, it was intended to act as a guideline to interested developers and not a hard-lined blueprint. The Touhy-Lincoln Development Study includes the following design principles which the Plan Commission should keep in mind when reviewing the attached concept plans:

- Create a consistent street wall along Lincoln Avenue;
- Introduce a mix of uses including commercial, residential, and a potential hotel;
- Establish a simple street framework that allows for smooth circulation and access within and to the site;
- Include active uses at the ground level;
- Integrate high-quality public spaces throughout the site;
- Integrate parking within buildings to allow for a more effective use of land and establish a pedestrian-oriented environment;
- Create walkable street and streetscapes with ample street trees and site amenities; and
- Consider linking to Chase Avenue to the west (only).

Summary of Village Board Pre-Application Conference and Workshop
On June 5, 2018, the Committee of the Whole held a Pre-Application Conference, the first step in the PUD process with TDG. Following is a summary of general comments:

- A higher-end hotel and venue (such as a conference center or event space) would be an attractive amenity in this development;
- Program outdoor activities in the green spaces of the development;
- Further study the dimensions of the Village Green and the corner plaza at Touhy and Lincoln Avenues to ensure sufficient public green space;
- Consider traffic circulation in the area surrounding the development, especially on Touhy Avenue;
- Consider greater setbacks from the street for the main building in the development, to provide additional greenspace and landscaping to soften the streetscape; and
- Review access points in the Touhy-Lincoln Development Study Preferred Plan, specifically the western-most access point, and consider alternate access from Touhy.

On June 28, 2018, a Workshop Session was held, attended by the Mayor and Board and select Plan Commissioners and Economic Development Commissioners, with the goal of providing additional feedback to help refine the concept plan. Following is a summary of general comments:

- Consider additional green space and a possible sculpture along the “spine road,” south of the proposed Village Green;
- Design buildings with greater height to create a landmark;
- Tie-in the southwest corner building to the Valley Line trail by adding a use or amenity in that location that will provide a reason for users of the path to interact with this development, such as restroom facilities, a coffee shop, bike racks, etc.;
- Provide an infill park on the ComEd property, linking the bridge and path to this development. It is important to embrace the ComEd property and the opportunities there, rather than allowing the development to turn its back on this area;
• “Activate” the roof of the hotel and/or apartment building, with space open to the public and rooftop amenities;
• Architectural design and materials should be unique and distinguishable from nearby suburbs; and
• Sustainability (in building materials, design, landscape, and alternative transportation such as bike and pedestrian use) is important.

The comments received from the Pre-Application Conference and Workshop were considered by TDG in the District 1860 conceptual plans provided in this packet for review. Some revisions have occurred as a result of these comments. Others may be better addressed when the plans become more detailed.

**Timeline & Next Steps:**
At the July 24, 2018 meeting, the Petitioner and Staff are seeking the Plan Commission’s initial feedback, including comments, questions, and recommended revisions. That feedback will be utilized to further develop and refine the plans in anticipation of a Public Hearing for a Preliminary PUD in September. The Preliminary PUD will consider all development plans; such as a Site Plan, Landscaping, Preliminary Engineering, Signage, Preliminary Plat, and a Traffic Study. The Petitioner will be seeking a recommendation for the Preliminary PUD, which will ultimately be voted upon by the Village Board. The Petitioner will then finalize their architectural and engineering plans, as well as a Final Plat for approval. The finalized documents will again be reviewed by the Plan Commission, with final consideration by the Village Board. The proposed timeline envisions a final determination in December of this year. The review of any financial incentive requests (including TIF funds) will be on a separate but concurrent track through the Economic Development Commission. In addition, the Village has undertaken an Eligibility Study to consider re-starting the existing Lincoln-Touhy TIF, within which boundaries this project site is located.

**Documents Attached**
1. Tucker Development Concept Plan Submittals
2. Zoning Code Section 8.05 PUD (Review) Procedures
3. Touhy-Lincoln Development Study
FIRST FLOOR PLAN

- RETAIL: 90,100 SF TOTAL
- PARKING: 276 SURFACE PARKING SPACES
  - 136 FIRST FLOOR GARAGE SPACES
  - 370 GARAGE PARKING SPACES
  - 782 TOTAL PARKING SPACES
- 300 RESIDENTIAL (ISP: DU)
- 314 RETAIL (3.5:1,000)
- 168 HOTEL (0.75: Key)

- RETAIL/COMMERCIAL: 90,100 SF TOTAL
- PARKING: 240 SURFACE PARKING SPACES
  - 136 FIRST FLOOR GARAGE SPACES
  - 370 GARAGE PARKING SPACES
  - 782 TOTAL PARKING SPACES
- 300 RESIDENTIAL (ISP: DU)
- 314 RETAIL (3.5:1,000)
- 168 HOTEL (0.75: Key)

- Retail/Commercial
- Retail/Commercial
- Retail/Commercial

- New Park (By Village of Lincolnwood)
- New Lincolnwood Valley Line Trail and Overpass

- Sculpture

- Commonwealth Edison
- Edison Commonwealth

- Retail/Commercial
- Retail/Commercial
- Retail/Commercial

- Ride-Sharing Stations/Res.
- Drop-off
- Bicycle Sharing Station
Chapter 15. Zoning

Article VIII. SPECIAL DISTRICTS

Part A. Planned Unit Developments

8.05. Procedure.

A planned unit development may be allowed as a special use in accordance with the procedures and standards set forth in this article. To the extent that the procedures, standards, and requirements set forth in this article conflict with the procedures, standards, and requirements set forth elsewhere in this Zoning Ordinance, the procedure, standards, and requirements of this article shall control.[1]

(1) Step 1. Preapplication procedure (mandatory).

a. Preapplication conference. Prior to the filing of an application for approval of a planned unit development, the developer shall file a request with the Zoning Officer for a preapplication conference with the Board of Trustees to discuss the proposed development of the subject property, which request shall be accompanied by two paper copies, and one electronic copy in a form approved by the Zoning Officer, of each of the materials listed in Section 8.06(1) of this article.

b. The preapplication conference shall be held during a regularly scheduled Board of Trustees meeting and shall be open to the public.

c. The preapplication conference shall be an informal communication and discussion, at which no commitments shall be given. Statements or opinions of the Village President or of any Village Trustee that are expressed at the preapplication conference shall not be deemed binding. No recommendations need be made to, or acted upon by, the Board of Trustees.

d. The preapplication conference shall be completed prior to (i) the filing of an application for a planned unit development, and (ii) the Development Review Team meeting required pursuant to Section 5.05(4) of this Zoning Ordinance.

(2) Step 2. Conceptual plan procedure (optional).

a. Purpose. The purpose of the conceptual plan submission is to obtain approval of the Village for the development of a parcel of land in accord with the plans, programs and schedule submitted as a part of the planned unit development application. It is intended that the proposal submitted will be in preliminary conceptual form and that, if approved, the developer will proceed with preparing detailed plans for all or a portion of the subject property for formal preliminary approval of the proposed PUD. This procedure allows for approval of an overall concept without the necessity of prejudging long-range markets and
preparing precise plans for unknown quantities. The conceptual plan procedure is not mandatory.

b. Procedure. A request for the approval of a conceptual plan, as a step in the planned unit development procedure, shall be submitted to the Zoning Officer who shall refer the conceptual plan to the Plan Commission for review at a regularly scheduled public meeting.

c. The conceptual plan submittal shall consist of 15 copies of each of the materials listed in Section 8.06(2) of this article.

(3) Step 3. Preliminary approval procedure (required).

a. Purpose. The purpose of the preliminary approval submission is to obtain tentative approval 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 in anticipation of final approval and subsequent construction. This is a relatively detailed submission that assures the applicant that the proposed PUD is preliminarily acceptable, and that the applicant can invest the money necessary to prepare final plans with the assurance that the final plans will be accepted if they substantially conform to the preliminary plans.

b. Procedure. An application for preliminary approval of the planned unit development shall be submitted to the Zoning Officer who shall refer the application to the Plan Commission for a public hearing and a report and recommendation to the Board of Trustees. All applications for preliminary approval of a planned unit development shall be subject to the site plan review procedures and standards set forth in Article V of this Zoning Ordinance.

c. The application for preliminary approval of the planned unit development shall consist of 15 copies of each of the materials listed in Section 8.06(3) of this article, and the fees required pursuant to the Annual Fee Resolution. [2]

[Amended 12-6-2011 by Ord. No. 2011-2979]


d. The Plan Commission shall hold a public hearing regarding the preliminary approval of the proposed planned unit development. Notices shall be delivered in accordance with Section 5.20 of this Zoning Ordinance.

e. Within 45 days after the completion of the public hearing, or such further time to which the applicant may agree, the Plan Commission shall make findings and recommend whether the proposed PUD should be preliminarily approved, and shall submit such findings and recommendations in writing to the Board of Trustees.

f. The Board of Trustees, within 90 days after receipt of the findings and recommendations of the Plan Commission, shall either grant or deny preliminary approval of the proposed PUD, via resolution duly adopted. The failure of the Board of Trustees to act within the time period specified in this Section 8.05(3)f, or such further time to which the applicant may agree, shall be deemed to be a decision of the Board of Trustees denying preliminary approval of the proposed PUD.

g. Preliminary approval of a planned unit development shall not constitute approval of the final PUD. Rather, it shall be deemed an expression of approval of the proposed development and a guide to the preparation of the final PUD plans and documents to be submitted pursuant to the procedures set forth in this article.

h.
Notwithstanding any provision of this Article IX to the contrary, the applicant may request, in its application for approval of a preliminary PUD, that the Plan Commission approve of a combined preliminary and final PUD review. Such approval shall be in the sole discretion of the PUD and shall be granted only if the PUD determines that the proposed PUD can be effectively and fully considered through a combined review. If approval is granted by the PUD, the proposed PUD shall be reviewed at a subsequent public hearing of the Plan Commission, in accordance with and pursuant to the notice and hearing requirements set forth in Section 8.05(3) of this article and the final approval procedures set forth in Section 8.05(4) of this article.

(4) Step 4. Final approval procedure (required).

a. Purpose. The purpose of the final approval submission is to designate with particularity the development of the proposed PUD, including the subdivision of the subject property into conventional lots, as well as the division of other lands, not so subdivided, into common open space and building sites. The final PUD documents depict the exact location of facilities, while the preliminary PUD documents show the general location of the same facilities.

b. Procedure. The final PUD documents shall conform substantially to the plans preliminarily approved by the Board of Trustees. If desired by the developer, the final PUD documents may be submitted and reviewed in stages, with each stage reflecting that portion of the subject property proposed to be approved and developed; provided, however, that the first application for final approval must be submitted not later than three years from the date of adoption of the resolution granting preliminary approval of the proposed planned unit development.

c. The application for final approval of the planned unit development shall consist of 15 copies of each of the materials listed in Section 8.06(4) of this article.

d. The application for final approval of the planned unit development shall be submitted to the Zoning Officer who shall refer the application to the Plan Commission for review at a regularly scheduled public meeting.

e. Within 45 days after its receipt of a completed application for final approval of the planned unit development, or such further time to which the Applicant may agree, the Plan Commission shall either (i) recommend approval of the final planned unit development, if the application is in substantial conformance with the approved preliminary PUD, or (ii) recommend disapproval of the final planned united development, if the final approval application is not in substantial conformance with the approved preliminary PUD.

f. Within 90 days after receipt of the recommendation of the Plan Commission, or such further time to which the applicant may agree, the Board of Trustees shall approve or deny the final PUD, via ordinance duly adopted. The failure of the Board of Trustees to act within the time period specified in this Section 8.05(4)f, or such further time to which the applicant may agree, shall be deemed to be a decision of the Board of Trustees denying final approval of the proposed PUD.

g. Permits are to be issued only after the ordinance approving the final planned unit development and supporting data have been recorded with the County Recorder of Deeds, and shall be issued in full conformance with all applicable ordinances. The ordinance approving the final planned unit development shall be effective only upon its recording with the County Recorder of Deeds.
Changes in the planned unit development. The planned unit development shall be developed only according to the approved and recorded ordinance approving the final PUD. Changes to the approved planned unit development may be made as follows:

a. Major changes. Changes which alter the concept or intent of the planned unit development, including increases in density, increases in the height of buildings, reduction of proposed open space, substantial changes in the development schedule, changes in road standards, or substantial changes in the final governing agreements, provisions or covenants, may be approved only upon submission of all required documents, and review by the Plan Commission and approval by the Board of Trustees, in the manner set forth in Section 8.05(4) of this article.

b. Minor changes. The Zoning Officer may approve minor changes in the planned unit development which do not change the concept or intent of the development. Minor changes shall be any change not defined in this Section 8.05(5) as a major change. Specifically, and without limitation of the foregoing, changes in signage which do not increase the height, area, number and location of previously approved signage shall be considered minor changes.

(6) Construction schedule requirements. Construction of an approved planned unit development must begin within two years after of the date adoption of the ordinance approving the final PUD. The Village shall have the right to revoke any approved planned unit development for which construction does not begin within two years after the date of adoption of the ordinance approving the final PUD, or for which construction falls more than three years behind the approved construction schedule, upon a public hearing before the Board of Trustees.

[1] Editor’s Note: A diagram depicting the planned unit development procedure is included at the end of this chapter.
study area context map

notes

- The primary site is approximately 8.4 acres.
- The ComEd property is 2.8 acres but is limited to overflow parking and green/open space.
- The potential expansion area is 2.25 acres with primary frontage along Lincoln Ave.
- A bike bridge is planned over Touhy Ave. to the west of the site.
- The site is bordered by larger scale office, commercial, and multi-family residential buildings along the Lincoln/Touhy corridors (5-7 stories)
- To the west is a light industrial manufacturing area buffered by the utility easement.
preferred concept - site plan

notes

A  POTENTIAL CONNECTION TO CHASE AVE.  
   POTENTIAL OVERFLOW PARKING (100 SPACES)

B  7 TO 8-STORY HOTEL DEVELOPMENT  
   160 TO 200 ROOMS (4 TO 5 FLOORS)  
   • RETAIL/RESTAURANTS (12,500 SF)  
   • FLOOR 2 BANQUET FACILITY (20,000 SF)  
   • INTEGRATED PARKING DECK (36 SPACES)  
   • ROOFTOP AMENITY DECK  
   • OVERFLOW PARKING ON UTLITY CORRIDOR  
   • 410 TOTAL PARKING SPACES  
      • ROOMS: 160 - 200 SPACES  
      • EVENTS: 100 SPACES (250 GUESTS)  
      • DINING: 125 SPACES  
      • REQUIRED OVERFLOW: 15 SPACES

C  7-STORY MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT  
   128 TO 136 UNITS (32-34 UNITS/FLOOR)  
   • RETAIL ANCHOR (20,000 SF)  
   • GROUND-FLOOR RETAIL (23,000 SF)  
   • ROOFTOP AMENITY DECK  
   • 39 SURFACE PARKING SPACES  
   • 330 INTERNAL PARKING SPACES  
   • TOTAL PARKING: 669 SPACES  
   • UNITS: 175 SPACES (1.4 TO 1.5/UNIT)  
   • RETAIL: 194 SPACES (4.5 TO 10,000 SF)

D  4-STORY MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT  
   36 UNITS (9 UNITS/FLOOR)  
   • GROUND-FLOOR RETAIL (4,500 SF)  
   • 20 SURFACE SPACES (4 / 1,000 SF)  
   • 36 INTERNAL PARKING SPACES  
   • UNITS: 38 SPACES (1 / UNIT + 2 GUEST)

E  CORNER GATEWAY PLAZA

F  1-STORY COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT  
   4,500 SF WITH DRIVE THRU  
   • 18 SPACES (4 SPACES / 1,000 SF)

G  1-STORY COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT  
   5,500 SF WITH OUTDOOR PATIO  
   • 22 SPACES (4 SPACES / 1,000 SF)

H  COMMUNITY OPEN SPACE (0.83 ACRES)

I  PLANNED TOUHY AVENUE BIKE BRIDGE

site data

PRESENTED APRIL 2017

COMBINED RETAIL: 70,500 SF
RETAIL PARKING: 379 SPACES
(5.4 SPACES / 1,000 SF)
HOTEL ROOMS: 160-200 ROOMS
HOTEL PARKING: 160-200 SPACES / ROOM
RESIDENTIAL: 164 TO 172 UNITS
RES. PARKING: 213 SPACES (1.3 TO 1.2 / UNIT)
preferred concept - alt site plan

notes

A. Potential connection to Chase Ave.
   - Potential overflow parking (936 spaces)

B. 7 to 9-story hotel development
   - 196 rooms (4 to 6 floors)
   - Retail/restaurants (12,000 SF)
   - Floor 2 banquet facility (28,000 SF)
   - Integrated parking deck with 1 floor below grade (435 spaces)
   - Rooftop amenity deck
   - Overflow parking on utility corridor
   - 452 total parking spaces
   - Rooms: 196 spaces
   - Events: 150 spaces (435 guests)
   - Dining: 120 spaces
   - Required overflow: 14 spaces

C. 1-story commercial development
   - 7,500 SF with dining patios
   - 17 spaces (2.3 spaces / 1,000 SF)

D. 1-story mixed-use development
   - 129 to 135 units (32 - 34 units / floor)
   - Retail anchor (20,000 SF)
   - Ground-floor retail (23,000 SF)
   - Rooftop amenity deck
   - 39 surface parking spaces
   - 150 internal parking spaces
   - Total parking (369 spaces)
   - Units: 175 spaces (1.4 to 1.3 / unit)
   - Retail: 196 spaces (4.5 / 1,000 SF)

E. 4-story mixed-use development
   - 36 units (12 units / floor)
   - Ground-floor retail (5,000 SF)
   - 20 surface spaces (4 / 1,000 SF)
   - 38 internal parking spaces
   - Units: 38 units (1 / unit + 2 guest)

F. Corner gateway plaza

G. 1-story commercial development
   - 4,500 SF with drive thru
   - 18 spaces (4 spaces / 1,000 SF)

H. 1-story commercial development
   - 5,500 SF with outdoor patio
   - 22 spaces (4 spaces / 1,000 SF)

I. Community open space (0.83 acres)

J. Planned Touhy Avenue bike bridge

site data

- Combined retail: 70,500 SF
- Retail parking: 399 spaces (5 spaces / 1,000 SF)
- Hotel rooms: 196 rooms
- Hotel parking: 196 spaces (4.5 / room)
- Residential: 164 to 172 units
- Res. parking: 213 spaces (13 to 12 / unit)
preferred concept - alt birdseye
Subject: Consideration of Text Amendments to Modify the Permissibility of Electronic Signs, Certain Temporary Signs, and the Location of Permanent/Temporary Signs on Non-Residential Properties

Requested Action: Text Amendments to Article XI, Signs, of the Village Zoning Code to modify the permissibility of Electronic Signs, certain Temporary Signs, and the location of Permanent/Temporary Signs on Non-Residential Properties.

Petitioner: Village Board

Summary:
At the December 5, 2017 and January 2, 2018 Committee of the Whole meetings, Staff presented the Village Board with a series of proposed Sign Code Amendments for consideration in order to reduce unnecessary restrictions and provide more business-friendly regulations. The goal of these Amendments is to: 1) provide appropriate flexibility for commercial signage, especially for larger properties that require a certain level of visibility; and 2) reasonably expand opportunities for commercial businesses to promote their products and services. The Village Board was in agreement that additional consideration and discussion was warranted and referred this matter to the Plan Commission for a Public Hearing.

The Plan Commission subsequently held a Workshop at the March 7, 2018 meeting. It was the consensus of the Plan Commission that staff should survey surrounding communities, analyze those areas where existing Village requirements could reasonably be amended, and schedule a Public Hearing for consideration of new and amended Code requirements (see attached memo from the June 6, 2018 Plan Commission meeting for a summary of results from the survey of surrounding communities). A Public Hearing was held at the June 6, 2018 meeting. At that time, the Plan Commission determined that it was most appropriate to defer consideration of revisions to permit electronic signs until after a recommendation had been made on the remainder of the proposed Code revisions related to signs. The Plan Commission then requested staff survey local businesses for feedback on the proposed Code revisions and work with the Village Attorney on Code language for further Plan Commission review.

The specific Amendments for consideration at this time include the following:

1. Temporary Signs for Special Events/Grand Openings
2. Temporary Sign Covers/Panels
3. Sign Location
4. Portable Sign Design
Survey of Local Businesses
Per Plan Commission direction at the June 6, 2018 meeting, staff compiled a list of 22 businesses/property owners, who are representative of different business types in different areas of the Village, all of which could be impacted from the proposed Code amendments. The respondents and responses are summarized in the attached report. In general, the comments were focused on the following:

- Timeframe for Temporary Signs
- Permitted size of Temporary Signs
- Permissibility of Temporary & Portable Signs on multi-tenant properties
- Permitted materials for temporary sign covers/panels
- Lack of permissibility for feather signs

Universally, there was a positive response regarding the proposed reduced setback requirement for monument/ground signs, as well as the proposal to permit temporary sign coverings/panels for sale/lease information and to identify new businesses (on a short-term basis) prior to fabrication of their permanent signage.

Given the comments received, staff recommends the Plan Commission reconsider the following:

- Increase the duration of Temporary Signs (advertising Special Events) from the current 30 to 45 (instead of the 60 days previously discussed at the June 6, 2018 meeting). *This is reflected in the attached proposed Code Language;*
- Tie the size of a Temporary Sign (advertising Special Events) to the size of a property, e.g. properties over one acre in area are permitted a sixteen-square-foot sign, whereas properties under one acre in area are permitted a nine-square-foot sign. *This is not reflected in the attached proposed Code language;* and
- Remove “shrink wrap” as a permitted material for Temporary Sign covers/panels. *This is reflected in the attached proposed Code Language.*

Proposed Code Language
The Village Attorney worked with staff to draft the attached proposed Code revisions incorporating staff recommendations from the June 6, 2018 Plan Commission memo for Plan Commission consideration.

Staff Recommendation
Staff recommends approval of the attached Draft Code language, with direction regarding an appropriate methodology for determining the size of Temporary Signs for advertising special events.

Documents Attached
1. Survey of Local Businesses
2. Proposed Draft Code Language
3. June 6, 2018 Plan Commission Staff Report
Proposed Sign Code Revisions, July 24, 2018
Survey of Selected Businesses

In accordance with direction at the June 6th Plan Commission meeting, staff prepared a list of selected businesses/property owners to whom a survey was sent. This survey provided a detailed explanation of Sign Code revisions that are under consideration by the Plan Commission and sought feedback on these proposals. Staff sent the survey to the following 22 businesses/property owners on major commercial corridors, in different areas of the Village:

| Multi-Tenant Center at 3750-74 Devon Ave. | Stefani Prime Restaurant |
| Tucker Development Group | Loeber Motors |
| Alphameric Accounting (3940 Touhy Ave.) | Lincolnwood Town Center Mall |
| Binny’s | Zeigler Automotive Dealerships |
| Planet Fitness Ctr. (6850 McCormick Ave.) | Airoom & Airoom Plaza |
| Psistaria Restaurant | Fast Signs (3450 Devon Ave.) |
| Studio 41 (4767 Touhy Ave.) | CIBC Bank (4007 Touhy Ave.) |
| AT&T Store (3701 Touhy Ave.) | Lowe’s Home Improvement Store |
| Lou Malnati’s Restaurant | Walgreen’s |
| Shore Gallery (3318 Devon Ave.) | L. Woods Restaurant |
| Mobil Gas Station (6401 Cicero Ave.) | Long John Silvers Restaurant |

Staff received comments from 7 of the 22 businesses/property owners, which are summarized below:

1. From our standpoint, the temporary signs suggested may not be the best idea. We certainly would always be in favor of a “business friendly environment” but unfortunately once you start down this path, you might not like the end result. Our concern is that Lincolnwood should “show off” its quality, this would detract from that image.
   a. Temporary signs should be limited to 30 days maximum, with no minimum.
   b. Temporary signs should be limited to Grand Openings and a one-time per year sale or event.
   c. Temporary signs (free-standing) should not be permitted to be 16 square feet. That is too big.
   d. Temporary signs should not be allowed at multi-tenant properties, except for a Grand Opening.
   e. Temporary sign panels/coverings should not be permitted to be made of shrink-wrap or plastic.
   f. Portable signs should not be allowed at multi-tenant properties.

2. I believe these regulations look very fair and reasonable and are a good show of support for the businesses in your community. I really don’t have anything to add or adjust.

3. The limitation of the square footage to 16 feet (for free-standing temporary signs) is too restrictive. I would suggest that this is somehow correlated to the size of the building or
tenancy being advertised. If the tenant is a 1500sf user, then a 16sf sign may be appropriate, but is 16sf really appropriate for a 50,000sf or even a 10,000sf retailer? It needs to be related to the size of the tenant or building. A business with a 120ft x 20ft frontage is 2400 sf of building frontage, I think a 20ft x 5 ft temporary sign is very appropriate, and only 100sf, a mere 4% coverage. I applaud the step forward, but think it be scaled towards the size of the business exterior.

a. Businesses should be allowed to install feather flags to advertise. Many other Villages and Towns have these as permissible signage and especially for temp sales, etc. they should be allowed.

4. Thank you for allowing me to provide a little input on this issue and also thank you for taking the time to both identify the current sign regulations and to create a set of updated regulations that will ultimately benefit everyone in the business community within the Village of Lincolnwood. While I do agree that loosening the restrictions on temporary signs is a benefit for the business community, I still agree that some restrictions should continue to be enforced. For instance, I have noticed that many business owners leave their A-Frame signs out on the street permanently, even when the business is closed. I believe that those signs should be brought inside after the business closes to prevent any theft or loss of the sign due to heavy winds. Allowing hand written signage is beneficial to all businesses especially those that have a one or two day sale on a particular item since ordering prints for new signage is not cost effective given the time frame. I would argue that those signs need to be legibly written and large enough in Font Size so that drivers passing by those signs are not slowing down or stopping in front of the sign to read it as that could potentially cause accidents on major roadways within the Village.

a. The temporary sign panel changes all seem to be geared toward helping the business community inform others of business changes or the sale/lease of a property and as such are all positive improvements to the current code.

b. The sign location changes will also greatly benefit business owners that do not have the proper setbacks to allow for any signage to be displayed in front of their business offices. The current setback distance requirements create an unfair disadvantage to those businesses that cannot display temporary signs due to the lack of setback in front of their stores so providing relief to that regulation will even the playing field so that all businesses can be allowed to display temporary signs if they so desire.

5. Thanks for reaching out. The Temporary Signs for Special Events and Sales section states they shall be permitted for a max of 60 days/YR. Is that all Temp Signs, or merely a single temp sign? We have lots of tenants, and I can see potential for several to have signage needs throughout a given year. If 5 folks (or the mall team) need to market various events, each for 2 weeks (14 days) in advance, we would bust the 60 day cap. Is that the intent, or is the clause intending to limit a single temp sign to no more than 60 days per year... regardless of number of separate postings?

6. Thanks for offering the opportunity to provide feedback. Overall, I think the relaxation of sign restrictions is a positive thing, especially in cases where buildings are for sale/lease. The added visibility should help get new occupants in place more quickly which is beneficial for all concerned. Also, relaxing some sign restrictions will help Lincolnwood be on more competitive
footing with neighboring communities like Skokie which has much less restrictive requirements. While Lincolnwood is its own community with unique characteristics, the reality is that businesses here compete with those in different communities and tight restrictions put them at a disadvantage.

a. Temporary signs - The maximum size of 16sf isn't too large so it should result in a visible sign but also not be excessively intrusive. I assume that a "free-standing sign" can be one installed in the ground with ground stakes?

b. Temporary sign panels - Where you discuss permitted materials, do you want to add banner?

c. Sign location - For signs at intersections, a 30" maximum is pretty small. I certainly understand why you'd want to have maximum visibility in intersections where safety is paramount for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists. I'll be interested in seeing how many people went ahead with a sign this small.

7. No real questions or comments. Everything is clearly explained and we welcome the changes.
Amend Sec. 2.02

2.02 Definitions.

TEMPORARY SIGN: Any sign allowed for a limited period of display that advertises a temporary event, product, or service, and is not intended or designed for permanent display.

Amend Sec. 11.04

11.04 Permitted on premises signs.

Upon issuance of a permit therefor pursuant to Section 11.09 of this article, the following signs shall be permitted in the business and manufacturing non-Residential districts of the Village as accessory structures, subject to all applicable standards and the following additional regulations:

(1) Monument signs.

*  *  *

v. Setback. No monument sign shall be located closer than 10 feet one foot to an exterior property line, nor closer than 50 feet to an interior property line. For a monument sign constructed at a unified business center, under multiple ownerships, interior lot lines shall only pertain to the outermost lot line. No monument sign may project into any public right-of-way.

*  *  *

xiii. Temporary monument sign covers. Monument signs may be covered with temporary materials, but only upon issuance of separate permits therefor, and in accordance with the following:

1. Temporary covers may display either: (a) only the name and logo of a new occupant of a commercial property; or (b) if no real estate sign has been installed on the property pursuant to Section 11.05(17) of this Code, information identifying that all or a portion of the property is for sale or lease.

2. Temporary covers must be professionally designed, and may be constructed only of vinyl, canvas, or a similar material.

3. Temporary covers installed pursuant to Section 11.04(1)(xiii)(1)(a) of this Code may not be displayed for a period exceeding 120 days. Temporary covers installed pursuant to Section 11.04(1)(xiii)(1)(b) of this Code may be displayed until such time as the property or portion thereof has been sold or leased.
4. Temporary covers must be securely and tightly attached to the existing monument sign, so that they completely cover and conform to the underlying sign shape, all in order to maintain a safe, neat, and orderly condition and appearance.

5. Temporary covers may neither increase the size of the monument sign face to which they are attached, nor cover an area greater than such sign face.

* * *

(8) Special event/grand opening signs. The following temporary, special event signs shall be permitted on private property only for a total of two nonconsecutive events per year, but shall not be erected or maintained for a period exceeding 15 consecutive days per event, and must be removed if wind gusts exceed safety guidelines or design standards for the sign, or the standards for safety tie downs to or by which they are affixed or secured. Temporary signs. Temporary signs advertising special events may be installed in accordance with the following:

i. Pennant/streamer signs;

ii. Temporary banner signs; and

iii. Other temporary signs for special events not requiring a special sign permit, and as may be approved by the Zoning Officer.

i. Number.

1. On single-tenant properties, a maximum of one temporary sign may be installed at any time.

2. On multi-tenant properties, a maximum of two temporary signs may be installed at any time.

ii. Sign location and setback.

1. On multi-tenant properties with two temporary signs, the signs must be separated by a distance of at least 50 feet.

2. Temporary signs must comply with the setback regulations applicable to monument signs, as set forth in Section 11.04(1) of this Code; provided, however, that no portion of any temporary sign may be located within a sight triangle.

iii. Sign area. The maximum area of a temporary sign is 16 square feet.

iv. Height. The maximum height of a temporary sign is six feet above finished grade.
v. Sign duration.

1. No temporary sign may be displayed for a period longer than 20 days, except that temporary signs advertising a grand opening or anniversary date may be displayed for a period of up to 30 days.

2. No property may display temporary signs for more than 45 days during any calendar year.

3. No property may display temporary signs for more than nine special events during any calendar year.

vi. Sign type. Temporary signs must be freestanding, except that temporary signs advertising a grand opening may be secured to a building wall.

* * *

Amend Sec. 11.05

11.05 Exempt signs.

The following signs, while subject to any other Village ordinance which may apply, are exempt from the permit requirements set forth in this article.

* * *

(17) Real estate sign: one sign used to offer for sale, lease or rent the land or buildings upon which the sign is located, in compliance with the following:

i. In residential district:

1. A ground sign shall not exceed six square feet in area per side, five feet in height above finished grade and shall not be closer than five feet **one foot** to any property line; or

2. A wall sign shall not exceed six square feet in area and shall not exceed six feet in height from the finished floor elevation of any relevant space.

ii. In business and manufacturing districts:

1. A ground sign shall not exceed 16 square feet in area per side for a property with 50 feet or less of lot frontage, or 32 square feet in area per side for a property with more than 50 feet of lot frontage. Ground signs shall not exceed six feet in height above finished grade and shall not be closer than **10 feet one foot** to any property line.

2. A wall sign shall not exceed 16 square feet in area for a property with 50 feet or less of lot frontage, or 32 square feet in area per side for a property
with more than 50 feet of lot frontage. Wall signs shall not exceed 20 feet in height above finished grade.

* * *

(20) Noncommercial opinion signs: In addition to all other signs permitted under this article, each privately owned lot may contain one noncommercial opinion sign for each street frontage. Such signs may be placed only upon approval of the property owner, may not exceed six square feet in area or four feet in height, may not be located closer than seven feet to the public right-of-way and must be at least five feet one foot from any property line.

* * *

(24) Portable signs. Portable signs, such as A-frame signs or sandwich boards, are permitted in front of business or commercial establishments on private property only, subject to the following limitations:

* * *

v. Portable signs, or changeable copy board for use in connection with portable signs, must be professionally printed and must not be written by hand, except for chalkboards, dry-erase boards, and other similar sign types;

* * *

Amend Sec. 11.08

11.08 Sign design.

* * *

(7) Shape and silhouette:

i. Freestanding signs. The silhouette and outlined shape of freestanding signs shall be simple and compatible with the building to which it relates. Signs of excessively complicated outline or composed of many different connected shapes are unacceptable. Freestanding signs should have an attractive combination of pole skirts, landscaping, berms and/or similar treatments to provide a visual base for the sign and integrate the sign into the overall architecture, landscaping and topography on the site. Brick, wood, stone walls or properly treated metal will be acceptable materials to be used for pole skirts and must be compatible with the material used in the sign. Freestanding signs may not obstruct or limit the sight distance of motorists within any sight triangle, and may not exceed three feet in height within any sight triangle.

* * *
Subject: Consideration of Text Amendments to Modify the Permissibility of Electronic Signs, Certain Temporary Signs, and the Location of Permanent/Temporary Signs on Non-Residential Properties

Requested Action: Text Amendments to Article XI, Signs, of the Village Zoning Code to modify the permissibility of Electronic Signs, certain Temporary Signs, and the location of Permanent/Temporary Signs on Non-Residential Properties.

Petitioner: Village Board

Summary:
At the December 5, 2017 and January 2, 2018 Committee of the Whole meetings, staff presented the Village Board with a series of proposed Sign Code Amendments for consideration in order to reduce unnecessary restrictions and provide more business-friendly regulations. The goal of these Amendments is to: 1) provide appropriate flexibility for commercial signage, especially for larger properties that require a certain level of visibility; and 2) reasonably expand opportunities for commercial businesses to promote their products and services. The Village Board was in agreement that additional consideration and discussion was warranted and referred this matter to the Plan Commission for a Public Hearing. The Plan Commission subsequently held a Workshop at the March 7, 2018 meeting, at which time the topics to be considered were introduced. It was the consensus of the Plan Commission that staff should survey surrounding communities, analyze those areas where existing Village requirements could reasonable be amended, and schedule a Public Hearing for consideration of new and amended Code requirements.

The specific Amendments for consideration include the following:

1. Electronic Signs for Large-Scale Developments
2. Temporary Signs for Special Events/Grand Openings
3. Temporary Sign Panels
4. Sign Location
5. Portable Sign Design

Staff conducted a survey of our comparison communities in May and have received responses from only four of those eight communities (Des Plaines, Glenview, Skokie, and Wilmette). Given the lower response rate, we have also added Lincolnshire to the list, for a total of five communities. The responses are summarized in the pages ahead, for each of the five proposed amendments.
1. Electronic Signs for Large-Scale Developments

Section 11.06 of the Zoning Code (see Attachment #1) specifically prohibits “electronic message signs” and “animated signs”. Staff understands that these prohibitions were likely enacted specifically with an older style of digital sign (designed with individual light bulbs programmed to form a message) in mind. These signs were prevalent in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s throughout the country in the form of time/temperature signs and single-color scrolling message signs. As the Plan Commission is aware, the technology behind electronic message board signs has grown exponentially in the past ten years to the point that many of these signs are of the same quality as the high-definition video boards that can be found at major stadiums. Given the overall aesthetic improvement in these types of signs, and the prevalence of this type of messaging in today’s commercial environment, it is appropriate to consider permitting electronic message boards (aka Electronic Message Centers), under certain conditions.

Survey of Surrounding Communities:
The five comparison communities are mixed on their permissibility of these signs types. Three of the five communities allow such signs in some form, with some limitations on zoning district (all allow commercial, one allows residential), setbacks from residential properties (0 - 250’), illumination levels (5,000 nits during the day and 500-1,000 nits at night), and size (can be no larger than 50% of the total sign area). Wilmette prohibits all such signs and Skokie is updating their Electronic Message Center code requirements to broaden permissibility.

Issues to be Addressed:
Following, is a list of issues that can/should be addressed should the Plan Commission wish to consider permitting Electronic Message Center signs:

- Lot size (All lots? Lots of a minimum acreage?)
- Sign type (Wall Signs? Monument Signs? Both?)
- Sign area and height (Same as a permissible Monument Sign? Larger?)
- Minimum distance from a property line (Same as any other Monument Sign? Increased setback from residential uses?)
- Permit by right or special zoning relief (Special Use) required?
- Moving images (animated) permitted or static images only?
- Illumination levels (measured in nits or footcandles)?
- Hours of operation (24 hours a day? Only during business hours?)

Examples of Electronic Message Board Signs for Private and Public Uses
Proposed Code Requirements:
Staff recommends the following Code requirements, designed to limit the permissibility of signs with Electronic Message Centers (EMC) to large properties with multiple tenants, or significant programming and/or informational needs to be disseminated:

- Monument Signs incorporating EMC are considered Special Signs, requiring Special Sign Approval;
- Monument Signs incorporating EMC may be permitted on individual lots, or a unified campus under the same ownership, when said lot/campus has a minimum area of five (5) acres;
- No more than one Monument Sign incorporating an EMC may be permitted per lot, or unified campus under the same ownership;
- Monument Signs incorporating EMC are permitted only on lots in the B1, B2, B3, S and PUD Zoning Districts;
- EMC are permitted only as part of a Monument Sign;
- Monument Signs incorporating EMC are permitted up to a maximum height of 18 feet from grade, and a maximum area of 72-square feet per sign face, where the electronic message board is no greater than 50 percent of the overall area of the Monument Sign face;
- Monument Signs incorporating EMC shall be set back a minimum of 10 feet from an exterior property line and 50 feet from an interior property line;
- Monument Signs incorporating EMC shall be located a minimum of 150 feet from a property line of a lot used for residential purposes;
- Monument Signs incorporating EMC shall be permitted to be illuminated only during those hours in which the business is open and shall not exceed an illumination level of 5,000 nits during daylight hours and 500 nits between dusk and dawn, with the electronic panels equipped with a light sensor to automatically adjust brightness based on ambient light levels; and
- Monument Signs incorporating EMC may present static images only. No flashing, moving pictures, or animation is permitted. A minimum time limit/interval of no less than ten seconds between images or text shall be required.

2. Temporary Signs for Special Events/Grand Openings

Zoning Code Section 11.04(8) (see Attachment #2) provides specific limitations on the number of events and number of days per event in which a “special event” temporary sign is permitted. Currently, that limitation is for two nonconsecutive events, for no more than 15 days per event (for a total of 30 days per year). There are no other limitations on the permissible parameters of these signs, which has led to some confusion, both internally and externally. In addition, the current Code requirements have greatly limited the ability of larger properties to not only provide specialized advertising, but also to advertise more than two events/sales per year.

Survey of Surrounding Communities:
The five comparison communities offer a variety of different regulations for temporary signage. All five permit temporary signage of some sort; however, the time limitation is different in almost every community, ranging from 42 days in Skokie to 56 days in Glenview to 90 days in Lincolnshire and 120 days in Des Plaines and Wilmette. None of the comparison communities limit temporary signage to special events and grand openings, instead permitting any sale, event, or advertising. Most communities limit the number of events to three, four, or five per year.
Permissible sign areas range from 20-square feet to 64-square feet, with every community dictating a different size requirement.

Issues to be Addressed:
Following is a list of issues that can/should be addressed should the Plan Commission wish to consider expanding some permissibility for Temporary Signs, while better defining others:

- Permissible Zoning Districts (Commercial? Industrial? Institutional?)
- Eligible events (Special event? Grand opening? Sale? No limitation?)
- Timeframe (30, 60, 90, or 120 days?)
- Regulate by number of “events” per year or minimum number of days per event?
- Permissible sign area (16 sq. ft.? 20? 32? 64?)
- Permissible Height?
- Sign type (Banners? Free-standing signs? Both?)
- Permissible number of Temporary Signs per property, single-tenant vs. multi-tenant?
- Minimum distance from a property line (Same as any Monument Sign? Smaller setback?)

Proposed Code Requirements:
Staff recommends the following Code requirements, designed to expand the opportunities for temporary signage, while defining the parameters for these sign types to insure they are reasonably-sized:

- Temporary signs shall be re-defined as: *A sign advertising a temporary event or product/service that is allowed for a limited period of display and is not intended or designed for permanent display.*
- Temporary Signs shall be permitted on all properties other than those zoned Residential;
- Temporary Signs shall be permitted for a maximum of sixty (60) days per year, with a minimum of ten (10) days and maximum of twenty (20) days per event;
- Temporary Signs advertising a grand opening may be secured to a building wall. All other Temporary Signs must be free-standing;
- Temporary Signs advertising a grand opening or anniversary date are permitted for up to thirty (30) days;
- Temporary Signs may be a maximum of sixteen (16)-square feet in area, at a height no taller than six feet (6’) from finished grade;
- Temporary Signs on single-tenant properties shall be limited to a maximum of one (1) at any one time;
- Temporary Signs on multi-tenant properties shall be limited to a maximum of two (2) at any one time and shall be spaced a minimum of fifty feet (50) apart; and
- Temporary Signs shall maintain the same setback from a property line as a Monument Sign, and may not be located in the sight triangle

3. Temporary Sign Panels

Temporary Signs that cover existing Monument Sign panels may be appropriate under certain circumstances. Zoning Code Section 11.08(11)(iii) (see Attachment #3) currently does not permit existing monument signs to be covered with a material of a temporary nature. This is regulated primarily through a requirement that signs be designed “for permanence.” In addition, Temporary Sign coverings/panels are not specifically noted in the Sign section of the Village
Code as being permitted, which, by default, prohibits them. Cases in which such signage may be appropriate include: 1) New Tenant Identification; and 2) Properties For Sale/Lease.

New tenant identification may be necessary when a company is rebranded but still working on designing new permanent signs. It also could occur when a new company takes over an old space and either remains open or reopens shortly thereafter. In some cases, there may be lag time between opening/reopening and the new permanent sign being manufactured and installed.

Survey of Surrounding Communities:
The five comparison communities are again inconsistent on the permissibility of these types of signs. Lincolnshire permits a temporary sign for temporary identification (associated with a new tenant), Wilmette permits such signs on a case-by-case basis, Des Plaines permits only “For Sale/Lease” signs, Glenview does not permit such signs at all, and Skokie permits both sign types with certain conditions.

Issues to be Addressed:
Following is a list of issues that can/should be addressed should the Plan Commission wish to consider permitting Temporary Sign panels on permanent Monument Signs:

- Temporary material coverings permitted for Temporary Identification signs? For Sale/Lease signs? Both?
- Professional design requirement?
- Message limitations (Name of Business & logo only? Or permit same information as a permanent Monument Sign?)
- Material limitations (vinyl, canvas, shrink-wrap)?
- Permitted time frame for Temporary Identification signs (60 days? 90? 120?)
- Allow “For Sale/Lease” signs covering a Monument Sign to be displayed until the property is sold/leased?

Proposed Code Requirements:
Staff recommends the following Code requirements, designed to permit temporary sign panels, with certain stipulations:

- Temporary Sign Panels shall be permitted for the purpose of identifying a change in occupancy for a commercial property that results in an immediate need to identify the new occupant;
- Temporary Sign Panels shall be permitted to advertise a property “For Sale or Lease”, but shall only be permitted in lieu of any other Code-permitted Real Estate signs;
- Temporary Sign Panels shall be professionally designed;
- Temporary Sign Panels identifying a change in occupancy shall be permitted to display only the name of the business and company logo, and are permitted for no more than 120 days;
- Temporary Sign Panels advertising a property “For Sale or Lease” shall be permitted until such time as the property is sold/leased;
- Temporary Sign Panels shall not increase the size of the Monument Sign face they are covering, nor shall they cover an area greater than the existing sign face;
- Temporary Sign Panels shall be securely and tightly attached to the existing permanent identification Monument Sign, so that they completely cover and conform to the underlying sign shape, to maintain a safe, neat, and orderly condition and appearance; and
- Temporary Sign Panels may be constructed only of vinyl, canvas, shrink-wrap, or similar material.

4. Sign Location

The Village currently regulates the location of certain temporary and permanent signage in relation to a property line. Zoning Code Sections 11.04(1)(v) & 11.05(17)(ii)(1) (see Attachment #4) state that both Monument Signs and Exempt Signs (i.e. Real Estate Signs) are required to be set back a minimum of ten feet from the exterior property line. This can be a difficult setback to meet on the small commercial lots typically found throughout the Village. When a building footprint and required parking are designed for a site, there is often very little room remaining to locate a monument sign with a ten-foot setback. Similarly, Real Estate signs cannot meet the ten-foot setback given the close proximity of parking areas to the street. Variations for the location of these types of signs are not uncommon.

Survey of Surrounding Communities:
Four of the five comparison communities generally require Monument Signs in commercial zoning districts to be setback a minimum of 5’ or less, while one (Lincolnshire) requires a minimum setback of 15’. Unlike the other comparison communities, Lincolnshire tends to have significantly larger commercial lots, where a 15’ setback is much easier to provide.

Issues to be Addressed:
Following, is a list of issues that can/should be addressed should the Plan Commission wish to consider reducing the minimum required sign setback:
• Consistent Sign Setbacks (same setback for all zoning districts or different for commercial versus industrial or other Zoning Districts?)
• Different Permanent Sign setback than Temporary Sign setback?
• Sight Triangle requirements.

Proposed Code Requirements:
Staff recommends the following Code requirements designed to amend sign location requirements:

- No part of any Free-standing Sign, permanent or temporary, shall be located closer than one foot (1’) to any property line; and
- Free-standing signs located in the sight triangle (defined below) must be no taller than 30 inches from grade (the diagram on the right, depicting alleys, will be modified to include driveways).

5. Portable Sign Design

Zoning Code Section 11.05(24) (see Attachment #5) requires that portable signs (including A-frame signs and sandwich boards) be professionally printed and not hand written. However, there are a number of portable sign designs available that consist of dry-erase or chalk boards which permit businesses to write specials messages for the day. This provides the opportunity to immediately advertise a daily special, rather than waiting for a professionally-printed sign to be produced. Restaurants often use these dry-erase or chalk boards to advertise their daily specials, as do certain service industries, such as salons. This can provide businesses greater flexibility without the additional cost of having professionally-printed inserts for an A-frame or sandwich board.
Survey of Surrounding Communities:
Three of the five comparison communities do not permit portable signs. The remaining two (Skokie and Wilmette) permit such signs and also allow hand-written messages, rather than requiring portable signs to be professionally-printed.

Issues to be Addressed:
The primary issue here is whether or not the professional-printing requirement should be maintained or eliminated.

Proposed Code Requirements:
Staff recommends the following Code requirement, designed to relax a limited component of portable signs:

- Portable Signs, or changeable copy board for use in connection with portable signs, may be professionally printed, or written by hand when the sign design (i.e. chalkboard or dry-erase board) permits such media.

Public Notification
Notification of the meeting was previously provided in the Lincolnwood Review, and has since been provided on the Village Website, the Village’s Linked In page, the Lincolnwood Local e-blast and on the Lincolnwood Chamber of Commerce social media platforms.

Staff Recommendation
Given the volume of Code revision details being proposed, and the necessity to cross-reference these revisions with various requirements throughout the Zoning Code, staff is recommending the Plan Commission first provide direction regarding the specific proposals listed in this memo at Wednesday night’s meeting. Staff will then work with the Village Attorney on specific Code language that memorializes the Plan Commission direction, while also ensuring First Amendment rights are not impinged in any way, in light of recent court decisions related to free speech rights as they relate to signage.

Documents Attached
1. Pertinent Village Code Sections
MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairman Yohanna
   Member of the Plan Commission

FROM: Doug Hammel, AICP
       Development Manager

DATE: July 24, 2018

SUBJECT: Case #PC-09-18: 4656 West Touhy Avenue – Review of a Special Use
          Related to Parking in the Front Yard and Variations Related to Building
          Setback, On-Site Parking Capacity, Landscaping Adjacent to a
          Residential Property, and Minimum Drive Aisle Width

Consideration of a request by Onsite Healthcare Inc., SC, property owner, to
approve a Special Use to permit two on-site parking spaces to be located in the
Front Yard, and Variations to: 1) allow the building to be set back greater than
the required 15-foot build-to line along Touhy Avenue in the B-3 Zoning District;
2) reduce the number of on-site parking by fourteen spaces; 3) waive the
requirement of a ten-foot-wide landscape setback along the north lot line abutting
a residential zoning district; and 4) allow the reduction in the minimum width of a
drive aisle from twenty-four feet to twenty-one feet, two inches.

At its July 10, 2018 special meeting, the Plan Commission deliberated regarding the subject case
and encouraged the Petitioner to explore the viability of alternatives and provide additional
information to the Plan Commission to determine if the magnitude of Variations requested and
potential impacts on other properties could be minimized. The Petitioner agreed to do so. Given
the time necessary for the Petitioner to do so, staff recommends that this case be continued to the
September 5, 2018, regular meeting of the Plan Commission.

RECOMMENDED MOTION:
Move to continue, without discussion, Case #PC-09-18, to the September 5, 2018 regular
meeting of the Plan Commission.