



Village of Hanover Park Administration

Municipal Building
2121 West Lake Street, Hanover Park, IL 60133
630-823-5600 tel. 630-823-5786 fax

hpil.org

Village President
Rodney S. Craig

Village Clerk
Kristy Merrill

Trustees
Yasmeen Bankole
Liza Gutierrez
Syed Hussaini
James Kemper
Herb Porter
Bob Prigge

Village Manager
Juliana A. Maller

VILLAGE OF HANOVER PARK DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION WORKSHOP

**2121 Lake Street, Hanover Park, IL 60133
Municipal Building, Room 214**

**Monday, January 24, 2022
6:00 p.m.**

AGENDA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL**
- 2. ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA**
- 3. DISCUSSION TOPICS:**
 - 3-a. Village Center Zoning**
- 4. ADJOURNMENT**

Village of Hanover Park
Community & Economic Development Department



STAFF MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairman Serauskas & members of the Development Commission
FROM: Shubhra Govind, Director of Community & Economic Development
SUBJECT: Village Center / TOD Zoning District
ACTION REQUESTED: Approval Disapproval Discussion
MEETING DATE: Special Workshop Meeting January 24, 2022

REQUEST SUMMARY:

Please review the attached commission feedback.

BACKGROUND:

The Development Commission has held two workshops (4/21/2021 and 12/6/21) where there was discussion regarding creation of new zoning districts in the Village Center area to enable implementation of the Village's Comprehensive Plan and the TOD Plan.

As has been discussed previously, the Village's Zoning Code is not conducive to enabling the Village's current vision and needs to be amended in order to support best practices and TOD practices. The Village Center is an area where some development requirements could be justifiably different compared to the remainder of the Village.

Major goals of the proposed code include instilling a 'sense of place' with development, encouraging connectivity and walkability, and to enable mixed-use development. Detailed design, planning and building materials for development are laid upfront, rather than having to negotiate with every potential developer, and provide a clear vision of the Village's expectations. "Master plan" is required in key areas, to ensure the site is designed in its context. There are requirements for several elements that are typical of a 'downtown' area, such as 'build to' zones instead of minimum setbacks, streetscape requirements, pedestrian paths, creation of blocks for connectivity, minimum amount of courtyards/open space, guidelines for storefronts, location of parking, etc.

Please note, the Village does NOT own the all the land within the Village Center area. In the draft code document, please note the following:

Pg. 6 has a description of all the new zoning districts proposed.

Pg. 8 has the map of the proposed zoning districts.

Pg. 68 has parking requirements for all uses – retail/restaurants will all still be required to provide parking.

Pg. 73 and 74 explain which specific 'Minor Exceptions' are permitted.

During the workshop on December 6th consultant Leslie Oberholtzer of Codametrics provided an overview of key concepts in the new village center zoning code and reviewed the draft code. There were six items that required additional input from the Commission before the draft could be finalized. Staff requested written feedback from the Commission on these items, so that we could hold a follow up meeting and provide Codametrics with a response to those items.

The items that required further discussion are outlined below with a summary of the comments from commissioners. We received feedback from five commissioners:

1. **Master Planned Development Process:** When is a Master Planned Development (MPD) required? Master Planned Developments are intended to require larger parcels to provide a system of blocks and open space; complete streets including streetscape, pedestrian-ways, and bicycle access; and a mix of building types and uses within new, walkable neighborhoods.
 - a. Should it be regulated by a minimum site size of three acres or more? **OR**
 - b. Should the regulating plan (map) control where MPDs are required?

Commission Feedback: *The Commission feedback was generally supportive of regulating the MPDs by a site size of three acres or more. One commissioner suggested different sizes for different zones in the district.*

2. **Building Height:** The draft code has a proposed height of 5.5 stories in the Village Center – Mixed Use core. During the development of the original TOD plan in 2012, there were discussions about building heights of 9-13 stories. Would the commission be comfortable with heights in excess of 5.5 stories? If there are heights in excess of 5.5 stories proposed, Village Board approval would be required.

Commission Feedback: *The feedback related to height was split with three commissioners expressing concern about 5.5 stories and two noting that they would be comfortable with heights in excess of 5.5 stories with Board approval. Two commissioners suggested that Village commission a full-scale model of the plan area to demonstrate the Village's design concept for the area.*

Staff Comment: Please note that the proposed code is NOT a development proposal, and therefore it is difficult to generate a model. However, we can identify several existing developments in other communities that would be illustrative of the bulk, height, and general characteristics that are proposed in our code. This would provide the Commission real life examples of what potential developments could look like.

3. **Drive-Throughs:** Currently, drive-thrus are not permitted in the proposed code. Since Hanover Park has a fairly stable suburban development pattern, should we allow drive-through uses at the periphery of the Village Center zone with appropriate design guidelines for how the drive-through should be placed on site? There can also be potential of limiting drive-throughs to service uses such as banks, dry cleaners, drug stores (not restaurants) and if allowed add design standards to limit locations.

Commission Feedback: *The general consensus was that drive-throughs at the periphery of the Village Center with appropriate design guidelines would be acceptable. One suggested pick-up window located in the rear. One commissioner noted that there should be a special use required for drive-throughs and one other commissioner was not in favor of them in the Village Center zone.*

Staff Comment: Consensus is needed in order to provide feedback. Drive-thrus in the periphery of the Village Center, located in the rear of the building, could be acceptable. Currently, all drive-thrus are Special Uses, and require a public hearing.

4. **Building Materials:** Review the major materials being allowed and consider the minimum percentage of major materials required (currently set at 70% but could be 60-65% for about 2/3rds of the facades). Does the commission have any concerns with the building materials outlined in the draft document? Should we allow concrete masonry units (CMU)?

Commission Feedback: *The feedback received indicates that the Commission is generally comfortable with the building materials outlined in the draft code. Concrete masonry units were split with some ok and some concerned by their use. One commissioner suggested that the Commission be able to provide suggestions/conditional approvals for building materials.*

Staff Comment: Please note that CMUs come in many colors and looks, and as the industry is evolving, can sometimes mimic traditional brick and limestone look. There are examples of the material being allowed in Historic Districts, in some downtowns (Muskego, WI). An alternative could be to limit the use of CMUs to a small percentage, instead of prohibiting. Here are a couple interesting examples:

- <https://www.echelonmasonry.com/standard-masonry-brick/greenline-cmu>
- [Concrete Masonry Meets Historic Design Requirements](#)

5. **Parking:** Best practices in TOD areas is to reduce parking standards (typically less than 1.45 spaces per unit) not only to encourage the use of public transit because it is also assumed that some people in the development will utilize public transit in lieu of owning a car. Is the Commission comfortable with the parking standards outlined in the draft code? There was also discussion regarding the availability of the commuter parking spaces after hours and on weekends, which is when guest parking may be needed. This would reduce the need for adding significantly more surface parking or requiring construction of underground/under-building parking, which is expensive to construct and maintain.

Commission Feedback: *The Commission had mixed comments regarding parking. While some commissioners were supportive of the proposed parking requirements, some were concerned regarding lack of parking for shoppers – especially those from outside of the community, if parking was limited.*

One commissioner had no concerns related to parking and noted “Parking has numerous interactive components that make for a complex discussion. In an attempt to keep it brief, I have a couple of main thoughts on residential parking. First of all, the current ordinance is way outside any reasonable requirement for a condo or apartment buildout in a Village Center. This is just keeping projects from happening. Many suburban areas have these projects (even without a direct connection to Chicago's downtown). This is because this type of housing has become a lifestyle choice for many. Many people living in this type of housing stay local with their work and shopping. It is a bonus if your project is directly on a Metra line because of additional options offered in the Chicago (i.e., eating, entertainment, and cultural options). Current energy issues developing in this country are going to further impact the number of cars on the street.

If there is a desire to keep the residential requirement on the high end (like or similar to our current standards), one of two things are going to happen. Either projects are not going to happen because the financial burden is too great or the ones that occur are not going to have the feel of a TOD development. They will not have a feel of a TOD because the density has to come way down to meet the parking ordinance requirements. In turn, any vision of a Village Center is not going to be realized. This would be a mistake. I would also encourage Commission members to become educated on what the rest of suburbia has done in this area. These parking issues have been put in place and tested throughout the suburbs for decades now...we are simply way behind the times on our parking standards.”

Staff Comments: It should be noted that the code is not eliminating parking requirements for retail and commercial uses within the Village Center. For instance, a retail store will still be required to provide 1 space per 400 sq. ft. Staff gathered information from 20+ other developments in the Chicagoland area and compared parking requirements. They range from 0.55 spaces to 1.7 spaces per unit, ranging from 1 to 3 bedroom units.

6. **Approval Process:** The draft code lays out very detailed design, material, and layout requirements, to make the Village’s vision clear and the process more straight-forward – if a proposal meets these requirements. The approval process for the Master Planned Development is outlined in section 110-9.7 of the document. The draft code states that there is a pre-application meeting, staff review, Development Commission review and recommendation and Village Administrator approval.
- a. Is the Commission comfortable with the Village Administrator approving MPDs or should the Village Board be the group approving them?
 - b. There is a provision for minor exceptions to be approved by the Zoning Administrator and Design Exceptions to be reviewed by the Development Commission with approval by the Village Board. Is the Commission comfortable with allowing staff to approve minor exceptions?

Commission Feedback: *In general, the Commissioners were not comfortable with the Village Administrator approving the MPDs or allowing staff discretion to approve minor exceptions. One Commissioner did indicate that they had no concerns allowing Administrator or Village Staff approvals, noting that this could “provide a huge advantage when recruiting development for our Village. Time is money to the private sector and anything that saves steps and unknown outcomes (that can occur from public hearings) are regarded highly favorable from the private sectors standpoint. Providing this latitude could be an incredible recruiting advantage for the Village...yet obviously there is a huge loss concerning control by the Village.”*

Staff Comments: Please review a limited and very specific list of items on Pg. 73 and 74 that would qualify under “Minor Exceptions”.

RECOMMENDATION

This is an important meeting, and your participation and feedback are very valuable. Please review the background materials provided. Staff will be at hand to discuss and answer questions. Feel free to send any questions in advance.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Att. 1 - Staff memo and Mtg Minutes from 12/6/21 Development Commission workshop
- Att. 2 - Spreadsheet comparing TOD developments

Village of Hanover Park
Community & Economic Development Department



Hanover Park^{USA}

STAFF MEMORANDUM

TO: Chairman Serauskas & members of the Development Commission
FROM: Shubhra Govind, Director of Community & Economic Development
SUBJECT: **Village Center / TOD Zoning District**

ACTION

REQUESTED: Approval Disapproval Discussion

MEETING DATE: **Special Workshop Meeting December 6, 2021**

REQUEST SUMMARY:

Please review the attached draft Zoning Code. A presentation will be made during the workshop for discussion.

BACKGROUND:

On April 21, 2021, the Development Commission held a workshop where there was discussion regarding creation of new zoning districts in the Village Center area to enable implementation of the Village's Comprehensive Plan and the TOD Plan. (See attached memo from the 4/21/21 mtg for more details.)

Leslie Oberholtzer, of Codametrics, is the selected consultant (via an RTA grant), who is assisting the Village in drafting the regulations based on our adopted plans, and TOD principles in a limited, geographically defined area – our 'Village Center'.

The intent of the Village Center zones includes instilling a 'sense of place' with development, to enable and ensure connectivity and walkability, and also allow for mixed-use development. The proposed code puts forth design guidelines and criteria for development upfront, rather than having to negotiate with every potential developer. By laying the guidelines and development criteria upfront, it provides a clear vision and expectations that the Village has.

The draft code requires a developer to present a 'master plan' in key areas, to ensure they are looking at the site in its context. There are requirements for several elements that are typical of a 'downtown' area, such as 'build to' zones instead of minimum setbacks, streetscape requirements, pedestrian paths, creation of blocks for connectivity, minimum amount of courtyards/open space, guidelines for storefronts, location of parking, etc. Several images are included in the code to illustrate the requirements and guidelines.

There are four new zoning districts proposed for the Village Center:

- **VC-C, Village Center - Mixed-Use Core.** The VC-C zone is intended for use in the core of the Village Center, along major streets and adjacent to the station, supporting developments with a wide mix of uses.
- **VC-R, Village Center - Mixed Residential.** The VC-R zone is intended for use in areas adjacent to the village core, supporting a mix of residential housing types and mostly residential uses.
- **VC-N, Village Center - Neighborhood Mix.** The VC-N zone is intended for use in new neighborhood areas, focusing predominantly on a mix of single-family attached and detached houses.
- **VC-P, Village Center - Public and Institutional.** The VC-P zone is intended for parks, civic uses, and other institutional uses.

KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE EXISTING ZONING AND PROPOSED CODE:

Some of the key differences between the existing zoning code and the proposed village center code include:

- Design and building requirements are very detailed, enabling the development of sites if the development proposal meets the zoning code requirements, following inter-departmental review and approval. Public Hearing is still required for zone changes, and any major exceptions requested in the design.
- Focuses on building form as it relates to streetscape and adjacent uses. Encourages mixed use.
- Design regulations address such elements as allowable major and minor building facade materials, balcony design, and window design.
- Design standards include separate landscape standards, off-street parking regulations, and sign regulations as they differ from other areas of the village. (Table 9.6.A (page 68) for residential and non-resi uses, bike parking)
- Certain areas will require storefronts on the first floor (along Devon Avenue and at the intersection of Church Rd and the proposed new east-west street and in the south commuter lot). This will help to create a walkable, pedestrian environment and encourage downtown streetscape with shops on the ground level.
- Criteria is included for: Building siting as it relates to street frontage, setbacks, impervious surface coverage, location of parking lot and driveways, building height, street facade, permitted and prohibited facade and building materials, etc.
- Rooftop gardens and terraces are allowed on any roof.
- Similar to variations, major or minor 'exceptions' are proposed.
- Prohibited uses: No drive-throughs, personal credit establishments (for e.g. pawn shops), vehicle sales/service uses, marijuana dispensaries, smoke/vape shops, sexually oriented businesses

A pre-application meeting is required. Procedurally, this code sets development requirements, including design, aesthetic, functionality, and bulk requirements **upfront**. If a proposal meets these, then a development can move forward following a review and recommendation by an inter-department staff committee and the Village Manager. Discussion is still under way regarding process. Please see Pg. 72 for the review process.

PROCESS:

The Development Commission was sent the draft Village Center Zoning Code on November 19, 2021, with a request to review and provide feedback on the draft regulations. While the Village Center Zoning is an implementation tool for a previously adopted vision, any amendments to the Zoning Code will follow the required Public Hearing process – with ample opportunity for additional discussion and public input.

On 12/6/21, the consultant will make a presentation to the Development Commission highlighting the regulations in the proposed code.

RECOMMENDATION

This is an important meeting, and your participation and feedback are very valuable. Please review the background materials provided. Consultant and staff will be at hand to discuss and answer questions. Feel free to send any questions in advance.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Att. 1 - Staff memo from 4/21/21 Development Commission workshop
- Att. 2 - Draft Village Center Zoning Code

Community	Barrington	Itasca	Elmhurst	Elmhurst	Elmhurst	Bartlett	Lisle	Glen Ellyn	Glen Ellyn	Glen Ellyn	Glen Ellyn	Lombard	Lombard	Villa Park
Project Name	"Broom Factory"	"Resi at Hamilton Lakes"	Elmhurst 255	The Marke	Crescent Court	Bartlett Town Center	Marq on Main	Apex 400	Glenwood Station	Avere on Forest	Avere on Duane	Lilac Station	Oakview Estates	Garden Station
Address	101 W. Liberty	1133 N Arlington Hts	255 N Addison Av	100 N. Addison Av	135 S York St	201 S Main St	4755 Main St	418-424 N. Main Street	460 Crescent Blvd	576 Duane St	576 Duane St	101-109 S Main St	400 E St Charles Rd	
General Location	SW corner of Liberty and Hough Street	Arlington Hts Rd & Prospect Avenue	Addison Av, just south of North Av	NWC Addison Av & 1st St	York St & Robert Palmer Drive	Railroad Ave., E of Main.	Main St and Burlington Av	NWC of Hillside Avenue and Main Street (Former Giesche Shoe site and the Village owned parking lot)	NWC Crescent St & Glenwood av (Vacant McChesney & Miller Inc. Grocery Store site)	NEC Forest Av & Duane St	Melrose St & Duane St, Prospect St	SEC Main St & Parkside Av	NEC Grace St & St Charles Rd	Ardmore Ave & Train Tracks
Approval Date/Status			Approved 2014, completed 2016	Approved in 2017, Currently under construction-Projected Delivery April 2019	Built 2005/2006	Completed 2006. *Original concept not completed due to recession. 72 built	Completed in June 2019	4/2019 PUD Approved by Village, there was a lawsuit, 6/14/21 Illinois Apellate Court found in favor of village and developer	12/14/20 VB approved the SU Demolition is expected to begin as early as November 2021, with construction of the building beginning in April 2022. Developers anticipate substantial completion of the project by December 2023.	9/20/21 VB reviewed the concept, the committees are now reviewing	Completed 2021	Sitework is underway	Condos Built 2006, 1/24/22 public hearing to amend PUD to include a 30 unit senior apt bldg	8/26/21 Developm ent agreement approved and TIF Incentives approved
Developer	Monroe Resi Partners	Hamilton + M&R	Morningside Group	Opus	Morningside Group	New England Builders	Marquette Properties & Principal Real Estate Investors	GSP Development	Holladay Properties	Reva Development Partners	Reva Development Partners			Hawthorne Developm ent Corp
Number of Units	64	297	192	164	123	120	202	107	86	77	48	118	30	348
Site Size	1.17	10.7	2.77	1.26	3.29	6.9	2.37	1.55		1.25	1.18			1.6
DU/Acre	54.70	27.76	69.31	130.16	37.39	17.39	85.23	69.03	#DIV/0!	61.60	40.68	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	217.50
Building Height	4 stories		6 Stories	6 stories	5 stories	4 Stories	5 stories	5 stories	5-story (+/- 67 ft.)	4 stories with underground parking	4 stories with underground parking		2 & 3 stories	7 stories
Unit Types		Studio, 1, 2, 3-bedroom units	Studio, 1, 2, 3-bedroom units	1 & 2 bedroom units	1 & 2 bedroom units		1 & 2 bedroom units	Studio, 1, 2-bedroom units			1, 2, 3-bedroom units		1, 2, 3-bedroom units	Studio, 1, 2-bedroom units
Retail SF			12,000	7,600	No Retail	24,530	13,000	8,850	1,490	1,150	None	Yes	None	8,653
Rental/Condo	Rental	Rental Apartments	Rental	Rental	Condo	Condo/Rental	Rental	Rental	Rental	Rental townhomes and apartments	Rental	Rental	Rental	Rental
Number of Parking Spaces							237	137 Public/139 Residential	102	131	82		45	440
Parking spaces/unit	1.35 / unit		1.74 spaces/unit	1.2 spaces/unit		1.44 approved (171 spaces/120 units); code required 240 spaces.	1.17 spaces/unit	1.29 spaces/unit	1.19 spaces/unit	1.7 spaces/unit	1.7 spaces/unit			1.26 spaces/unit
Total Project Cost			\$57.4M	\$53.4M				\$40M						\$119M