

MINUTES CITY OF DARIEN

PLANNING, ZONING, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Wednesday, April 16, 2025

PRESENT: Lou Mallers – Chairperson, Jonathan Christ, Shari Gillespie, Chris Green, Jonathan Johnson, Chris Jackson, Mark Kazich

ABSENT: None

OTHERS: Ryan Murphy – City Planner

Chairperson Lou Mallers called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Darien City Hall, 1702 Plainfield Road, Darien, Illinois. Chairperson Mallers declared a quorum present.

Regular Meeting – New Business

- a. **PZC2025-06 – 1220-1225 Plainfield Rd – Atlantic Homes Inc. – A petition for a rezone of Parcel 1 from Single Family Residence District (R-2) to Multi-Family Residence District (R-3), a plat of consolidation to combine the two subject parcels for development purposes, and the construction of two new eight (8) unit, two-story condominium buildings totaling 16,491 square feet, with sixteen (16) 2-car garages, along with associated site and utility improvements. The property is located at 1220-1225 Plainfield Road, Darien, Illinois 60561 (PINs 09-28-410-001 and 09-28-410-043). Multiple zoning variations are included in the request.**

Mr. Ryan Murphy, City Planner reported that the petitioner seeks a rezone, special use permit, variations and preliminary plat of consolidation and that the rezone on the Westerly property would be a single-family R-2 to a multi-family R-3. He reported that the petitioner would combine the two subject properties for development and construct two new, two-story, eight-unit condominium buildings.

Mr. Murphy reported that since publication, the request had been updated to include the option to construct apartments. He reported that they had consulted the City attorney, who had advised that though the Code does not distinguish between condos and apartments as land use, due to the public notice stating condos the petitioner would have two options:

1. If the applicant wishes to proceed with apartments, a new public notice would need to be posted and the meeting would be continued at a later date, or
2. Proceed with the project as described in the public notice, which did not include an option for apartments and would pertain only to condos.

Mr. Murphy reported that the 1.35-acre subject property is located on the Southeast corner of Plainfield Road and Lester Lane, which is a private street. He reported that the property had been vacant and became a public hazard. He further reported that the petitioner had gone through great lengths to be the contract purchaser of the property and had expressed willingness to work with the City of any issues.

Mr. Murphy presented a summary of the project to the Commission and audience members. He reported that the following variations would be included in the request: a minimum lot area per unit requirement per section 5A-7-3-5D, a 3-acre requirement for new R-3 district areas per section 5A-7-3-1, and side yard requirements per section 5A-7-3-6A and 5A-7-3-5B to allow for garages to be placed 5 feet from the interior property lines.

Mr. Murphy reported that the proposal had been limited to land-use changes, variations and site design and if approved, the petitioner would be required to return to administrative bodies for review and approval of plat documents and final engineering plans.

Mr. Murphy reported that the project site would have split zoning, with the West half in the single-family R-2 and the East in the multi-family R-3, and that the petitioner had proposed a zone change to bring the whole property into R-3 for multi-family use.

Mr. Murphy reported that the comprehensive plan designates the site as low density residential, however it should be noted that the site operated as commercial use for over 30 years and it had been likely the owner never pursued a zoning change because it had not been required to continue.

Mr. Murphy presented the site plan to the Commission and audience members. He reported that the two residential buildings on site would front Plainfield Road and be staggered, and that guest parking and garages would be placed to the rear and side of the site. He further reported that the three buildings would provide two-car garages for each unit and a single full-service driveway would be proposed on Plainfield Road.

Mr. Murphy reported that except as it pertains to density restrictions and setback requirements for two-car garages, the project had been found to meet or exceed design and development standards for the zone. He reported that section 5A-7-3-5D would require 4,500 square feet of lot area be provided for each two-bedroom unit. He further reported that with a lot area of 54,805 square feet, the resulting density for the project site under the normal code would be 12 units.

Mr. Murphy presented the floor plan to the Commission and audience members. He reported that the buildings would be symmetrical and square, with each floor having four units of two bedrooms, a bathroom and full kitchen.

Mr. Murphy presented the elevations to the Commission and audience members. He reported that the building would have brick façades and hipped roofs, incorporating prominent gabled entryways with vertical stone banding between the 1st and 2nd floors and decorative light

fixtures used on the exterior. He further reported that the garage buildings would be typical wood frame structures with gabled roofs and cemented board siding and concrete foundations. Mr. Murphy presented photos of the petitioner's existing buildings in Lisle.

Mr. Murphy reported that the petitioner had provided a justification letter for the variation and the project and that the project review criteria had been included in the packet. He reported that staff's finding would be that the rezone may merit consideration given past flexibility in applying the minimum area standard. He further reported that the site context and broader goals related to support of the infill development and provision of housing diversity.

Mr. Murphy reported that a public notice had been posted on site and sent to all property owners within 250 feet of the site boundary. He reported that the petitioner had opted to expand the public notice to include all residents on Lester Lane. He further reported that the petitioner had conducted outreach to Lester Lane residents and sent a photo packet of the site in Lisle.

Mr. Murphy reported that there had been no written public comments to date, but he had received other communications from residents containing questions and concerns. He reported that there had been a question about the amendment of the application to include apartments and that other residents had requested clarification of density increase, potential traffic impacts and site drainage requirements.

Commissioner Jonathan Johnson questioned if the zoning variation would include Section 8 housing.

Mr. Murphy stated that there would not be anything to prevent someone from doing Section 8 house, but the product is not proposed. He stated that petitioner would be able to address the nature of the project. He further stated that if it turns out to be condos, it would be highly unlikely that the petitioner would receive enough of a return on the project if made available for Section 8 because it is a for-sale product.

Chairperson Lou Mallers stated that Section 8 housing can be utilized basically anywhere and that it's part of a federal housing requirement, but that doesn't necessarily mean it will be used. He stated that Darien had had similar situations with apartments off South Frontage Road.

Mr. Murphy stated that it would certainly not be a public housing project and would be a for-profit development.

Commissioner Johnson stated he had been questioning Section 8 in general, not necessarily pertaining to this specific project.

Mr. Murphy stated that there is enough affordable housing stock in Darien that we would not need to require affordable housing to new construction. He stated that he did not anticipate that changing anytime soon and that there is enough affordability within the City.

Chairperson Mallers stated that each community would be required to have a certain percentage of the type of housing Mr. Murphy had referred to and that Darien does meet said requirements.

Chairperson Mallers swore in audience members wishing to present public testimony.

Mr. Christian Smith, Ridgeline Consultants on behalf of Atlantic Homes, provided a brief presentation about the project and displayed the topographic map. He stated that this project would intend to preserve the drainage characteristics that generally work from Northwest to Southeast. He stated that the drainage characteristics would be intended to minimize direct flow onto the adjacent property and would be less than the threshold for detention. Mr. Smith stated that the water and sanitary on the West side would connect to existing sanitary on Lester Lane, and that there would be no expectation for lack of capacity. He further stated that there would be utility on the East side of the property behind the garages, and that the roadway would be connected to Plainfield road, in coordination with I.D.O.T.

Commissioner Chris Green questioned how the petitioner would be coordinating with the owners from Lester Lane regarding tying in utilities on the East side.

Mr. Richard Grant, primary petitioner and owner, stated that he had spoken with Jackie, who is the head of the association, so she is aware of the project. He stated that as far as the water goes, he knew that some people from the City would be talking to those on Lester Lane regarding tapping on to City water. He stated that he believed the tap at the end of his property would allow residents on Lester Lane to use in the future.

Commissioner Chris Jackson referred to a mention of the grading of the property and how the natural grade would be approximately nine feet from the street.

Mr. Smith stated it would be if you take it from the house contours.

Commissioner Jackson stated that in front they would have roughly nine feet and that in the back sliver of parcel two they would have nine private garages all with access off a center driveway which is about 24 feet wide. He stated that according to the topography, it would slope about four feet from corner to corner of those garages, and he questioned how that would work.

Mr. Grant stated that there would be a six-foot foundation underneath it, the bottom three feet for frost and the other three exposed so as to not change the grade on the East side.

Commissioner Jackson questioned as one would go down the driveway going downhill, how one would get all of the garage doors to be flat.

Mr. Grant stated that it works now.

Commissioner Jackson questioned how.

Mr. Grant stated there would be certain levels and certain spaces.

Mr. Smith stated that they would warp the pavement.

Commissioner Jackson stated he was referring to the doors, and that they would have a sloped driveway at the doors with flat garage doors. He questioned how this would work.

Mr. Grant stated that they would step the garages as necessary.

Commissioner Jackson stated that they would only be 19 feet wide. He questioned how they would step those accurately. He further stated that he would be concerned about that and that this issue should be explored.

Mr. Grant stated that it will be caught up in engineering, but it is not a big issue at the moment.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if it would be possible to add finished floor elevations in each garage.

Mr. Grant stated that it would be in final engineering.

Commissioner Jackson stated that he did not see how that would work and that it looks more like a swale.

Mr. Smith stated that it would be a swale and that there would be a variation between the two drives as you go down. He stated that would all be detailed in the final.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if the succeeding garage door would be lower than the one before.

Mr. Grant stated that yes, they would be gradual.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if the 19 by 20 garage would back out on a slope for about 24 feet.

Mr. Grant confirmed. He stated that the normal width of a driveway is 23 feet and if he was doing a residential project he would do 23 feet. He stated that the minimum is 24 feet on a commercial piece of property.

There was some discussion regarding the length of a driveway.

Commissioner Jackson stated that there does not seem to be enough room between garage doors to flatten them and make it across.

Mr. Smith stated that was why they would have stepped foundations.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if the driveway would step similarly. He stated that between the garage doors they would have to make up that step and would only be 20 feet wide. He questioned if that would be practical if a garage door is 16 feet.

Mr. Grant stated that he had done this before with another company on seven-unit buildings and he is not worried. He stated that the problem he had run into is that the rear of the garages instead of being flat with next door neighbors had three feet exposed.

Commissioner Jackson stated that he would not be worried about the back sides. He stated that he would be worried about not being able to park a car in it and then the car ending up on the street.

Mr. Grant stated that one of the reasons for the five-foot easement would be for ComEd, Comcast or any other company to get back there, but otherwise it would not be used.

Chairperson Mallers questioned how far to the East the trees would go from the home that is currently on the property.

Mr. Grant stated that he was not sure but that probably 99% of the trees on the site would have to be removed. He stated that was why they would need to get back to existing grade, so that the neighbors' trees would stay, and they don't annoy anyone. He stated that they would have a landscaping plan following approval.

Commissioner Jackson questioned why two buildings.

Mr. Grant stated that if you go with a three-story building it would stick out like a sore thumb.

Commissioner Jackson questioned why not just one building that is connected.

Mr. Grant stated that he had found that a two-story building would fit better with the ranches and other buildings on Plainfield Road.

Commissioner Jackson clarified he did not mean two stories, but two separate buildings.

Mr. Grant stated that he had built them before. He stated that when you have so many units and floors in a building, no one gets to know their neighbors. He stated that he has these buildings in Lisle and everyone knows each other in the building so it is more of a home.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if it would be the exact building displayed on the screen as built in Lisle.

Mr. Grant stated it would be exactly like that. He stated that they found an eight-unit much homelier and everyone having a corner is an easier and better product.

Commissioner Jackson questioned why 16 units. He questioned if the reason would be because he had a proof of concept and it's easy to drop on to the site.

Mr. Grant stated that not only that, it would be eight and eight.

Commissioner Jackson questioned why not six and six.

Mr. Grant stated that six and six would take you back to three stories.

Commissioner Jackson stated it would not necessarily result in that.

Mr. Grant questioned how they would get three in one floor.

Commissioner Jackson stated they could do three across or one building instead of two.

Chairperson Mallers stated that given the size of the property with two buildings and the 16 two-car garages it would be tight.

Mr. Grant stated that they would be allowed 60 and they were at 56% covered.

Mr. Murphy stated that would be from a lot coverage standpoint and had been stated on the plan.

Commissioner Jackson stated that would be in compliance for lot coverage, but there would be a variance for lot area per dwelling unit and the compliant solution would be 12 units. He questioned why not 12 units.

Mr. Grant stated that this had been a proven problem that would work.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if the reason would be that he had built it somewhere else and it would be easy to drop here.

Mr. Grant stated that it also works and is a good building that people love.

Ms. Beata Pacura, Atlantic Homes, Inc., stated that they have two buildings in Lisle and those are apartments where they have had the same tenants for the past five years. She stated that it is a home for these people and everyone wants to renew.

Commissioner Jackson questioned why they would need this much density.

Ms. Pacura questioned if he had been asking why 16 units.

Commissioner Jackson confirmed the question.

Ms. Pacura stated that they are investing their life savings into this. She stated that the developing cost is huge and that 12 units would not work for them.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if 12 units would work if it was just one building.

Mr. Grant stated that he would not want three stories.

Commissioner Jackson stated it would not have to be three stories. He questioned if their reasoning for density would be to make more profit.

Chairperson Mallers clarified that the petitioner's property in Lisle would be very similar to the proposed project and that it had been very successful. He clarified that Commissioner Jackson had been concerned that the two buildings and 16 garages would be too much for the size of the property.

Commissioner Jackson questioned what the acreage of the Lisle property was.

Mr. Grant stated it is under an acre.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if there were two buildings or one.

Mr. Grant stated that there are two.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if the entrances would be the bump outs on the East and West of the buildings.

Mr. Grant confirmed.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if, in the proposed scenario, those would be facing the sides and in one case each other.

Mr. Grant confirmed.

Commissioner Jackson questioned which elevation would be facing Plainfield.

Mr. Grant stated that they would both be side elevations.

Commissioner Jackson questioned why he would not rotate them.

Mr. Grant stated that he had moved the buildings from one another so that they wouldn't be looking directly into someone else's property.

Commissioner Mark Kazich questioned who they would be marketing the condos to.

Mr. Grant stated that it would likely be younger first-time buyers. He stated that they had noticed the tenants in Lisle had been mostly 25-30 years old with good paying jobs. He further stated that they don't want homes right away and some are just starting families.

Commissioner Johnson questioned what the average cost of the unit would be and if it would be rental.

Mr. Grant stated that the ones in Lisle are rented at \$2,400 a month. He stated that he would most likely market these for \$350,000 to \$370,000.

Commissioner Shari Gillespie questioned if they were apartments or condos.

Mr. Grant stated that the ones in Lisle are apartments.

Commissioner Johnson questioned what the ones here would be.

Mr. Grant stated that the reason they included apartments at the end had been because they saw the markets go crazy and he became concerned they wouldn't sell. He stated they would not have a plan b. He stated if there were a recession they would have to rent them.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if the buildings in Lisle were eight-unit rentals.

Mr. Grant confirmed.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if they have any wheelchair accessible units.

Mr. Grant stated that they did not and that by law they did not need them.

Commissioner Jackson stated that he would according to the Fair Housing Act.

Commissioner Kazich stated that there would be an issue with the steps on the West side of the proposed structure.

Commissioner Jackson stated that there would be a curb ramp on the other side of accessible parking, but once inside the building nothing would be accessible. He stated that they would have to comply with Fair Housing.

Mr. Grant stated that he had double checked with the state when building the Lisle property.

Commissioner Kazich stated that there would be steps going from the first to second floor.

Commissioner Jackson stated there would be no elevator service.

Mr. Grant stated that would only be required in three or more.

Commissioner Jackson stated that, by law, elevators would be required for an accessible floor if the first floor would not be accessible.

Mr. Grant stated that all the doors would be three feet wide.

Commissioner Johnson questioned if that would apply to rental properties.

Commissioner Jackson stated that it would only apply to rental properties, but condos would be fine without. He stated that anything for rent would have to be available for everybody and that it would be a civil rights issue. He stated that if they were to go rental they would have to look into it.

Commissioner Jackson questioned what amenities they would provide besides covered garages.

Mr. Grant stated that the covered garages would be ideal because it was not offered in Lisle.

Commissioner Jackson stated that the two-building concept offers the ability to spread out and have a communal space. He questioned why they wouldn't provide one.

Mr. Grant stated that he had considered putting up a gazebo, but he would not want other people besides residents using it.

Commissioner Jackson stated his concern with a lack of amenities.

Chairperson Mallers stated that that would be up to the individual to decide on.

Ms. Pacura stated that she had heard from their renters that they would rather live in a smaller building than a big one with all the amenities.

There was some discussion regarding the location of the Lisle apartments.

Commissioner Jonathan Christ questioned if the area is similar in density to the subject property.

Mr. Grant stated that it is heavier density than the subject property.

There was some discussion regarding the properties surrounding the Lisle apartments.

Commissioner Gillespie questioned if there was any way to have the buildings face Plainfield Road.

Mr. Grant stated that he would not want it to face Plainfield Road.

Commissioner Jackson questioned why not.

Mr. Grant stated that he would not want to look at Plainfield Road from his balcony.

Commissioner Gillespie stated she would not want to look at the other residents from her balcony.

Mr. Grant stated that they would not be in the proposed buildings.

Commissioner Christ questioned if the covered parking would be a new thing.

Mr. Grant confirmed and stated that he would want covered parking because the kids that rent from them have expensive cars that they want in a garage.

Commissioner Kazich questioned how many school-aged kids they have.

Ms. Pacura stated that they only have three babies.

Commissioner Kazich stated that apartments would bring in more school-aged kids than condos.

Commissioner Johnson questioned if the Lisle property is rental and this would be purchase.

Mr. Grant stated that this would be a purchase property. He stated that he would like to be flexible and have a plan b on such an expensive development.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if they had done any research with realtors on the market of a for-sale unit like the proposed.

Mr. Grant stated that he had an appraiser run the numbers.

There was some discussion regarding real estate prices.

Commissioner Christ questioned if there would be a lot of water coming down from the incline off Plainfield. He questioned if there would be drainage built in on the plan.

Mr. Smith stated that the drainage would be directed to the post construction and there would be allowance for drainage to go into the ground which would prevent immediate runoff.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if the surface water would go underground.

Mr. Smith stated that there would be a small drainage pipe and that the plan shows the collection system with grading arrows to show drainage flow. He stated that there would be little crescents in the roadway on the way down to collect and store more surcharge for significant events.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if it would flow East.

Mr. Smith stated that it would flow Southeast.

Commissioner Jackson questioned what was there now.

Mr. Smith stated that it is parking.

Commissioner Johnson questioned if there was a drain it would lead to.

Mr. Smith stated yes, in the drive aisle.

Mr. Grant stated that they had not done a percolation test.

Mr. Smith stated that they would put down a stone base and have 40% voids to collect the storm water. He stated that there would be a certain amount of collection volume that is part of the post-construction best management practices.

Ms. Jackie Price, 7731 Lester Lane, stated that she has spoken to Mr. Grant and Mr. Murphy regarding the project and stated how thankful she was to the City for removing the eyesore on the subject property. She stated that she manages the community well and coordinates street maintenance, and that many of the residents on Lester Lane had been excited about the new project. She further stated that the property on the Southeast corner is always flooded and that they had a surveyor come out who said the neighbor may be draining back there but there is consistently water on the property that she would like to be addressed. Ms. Price further stated that some of the residents would be concerned with traffic coming in and out of Plainfield Road due to the density. She stated that those on Lester Lane would also be interested in having sewer and City water access. She further stated her concern with the density of the project.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if the water main extension that is proposed would be a sufficient main to continue down the street for all the residents to pick up.

Mr. Smith stated that he did not have the numbers.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if the existing would be an eight-inch. He further questioned if the size in the street was a ten-inch.

Mr. Grant stated that there would be a ten-inch main and an eight-inch stub.

Commissioner Jackson stated that bringing in a new stub may be worth looking into.

Mr. Grant stated that that would be for the City to handle.

Commissioner Jackson questioned how many houses are on Lester Lane.

Ms. Price stated that there are seven on the well and ten on the road. She questioned if a fire hydrant would be put in.

Commissioner Jackson stated that it had been proposed.

There was some discussion regarding a fire hydrant.

Mr. Frank Modelski, 7710 S Cass Ave, Modell Funeral Home, stated that he owns the property continuous to the subject property on the East side and that during rainstorms he gets a torrent through his property. He stated that he had built four drainages to accept all the water and that his property drops 9.5 feet from the Northwest corner to the Southeast corner. He further stated that his neighbor's backyard would be a foot deep with water during substantial rain. Mr. Modelski stated that if there is so much density on the property to the West, he would receive a flood of additional water that he could not handle. He further stated his concern with parking for all 16 units.

Mr. Grant stated that they would have 16 units and 8 visitor parking spaces.

Mr. Modelski stated that there would be no place for people to park if the residents were to entertain and that he would be concerned that they would look to his property for parking. He further stated his concern with children playing on his property and stated that he would not be able to afford the liability. He stated that he would like to see a nice project on the subject property, but this would be too much for what is proposed.

Mr. Smith stated that a detention is not required for the imperviousness that is being proposed. He stated that the post-construction best management practices would be designed to take frequent rain events and allow for infiltration, and that the expectation from the county would be that infiltration can be achieved at some fashion, partially by providing volume within stone course. He further stated that water would infiltrate through pavers to bring water subsurface during common storms, and when there are significant storms it would come off.

Chairperson Mallers stated that if the rain isn't that heavy, they would eliminate water coming onto Mr. Modelski's property, but if the rain is heavier it may not.

Mr. Smith stated that it would go along the natural course of drainage according to Illinois drainage law.

Mr. Murphy stated that the City has adopted the DuPage County stormwater ordinance, which says there is a certain amount they would be required to capture for frequent rain events, but for the more rare storm events the amount of impervious area that's increasing would not meet the threshold for more than just the regular storage. He stated that there is surface flow now during extreme rain events, but what is proposed does not require them to do more than what is there now.

Mr. Modelski stated that this happens during any rain event and that he has two drainage sewers behind his building and he is concerned he may get flow into his back doors.

Chairperson Mallers questioned what his main concerns were.

Mr. Modelski stated water and not having enough parking.

Commissioner Jackson stated that he appreciates someone wanting to do something with the subject property and that on a high level the proposal is good. He stated that multi-family residential would be nice here, but there are a lot of things he is not in support of. He further stated that the density is overbuilt, and he does not like the cookie-cutter nature of it, regarding choosing 16 units because it had been done before. Commissioner Jackson stated that, architecturally, he doesn't like that the buildings face one another and that there had not been much thought as to orientation or placement. He stated that this all comes back to density and that he would still be concerned about the grading of the garage doors.

Commissioner Johnson stated that he has an issue with the drainage of water and does not see how they would divert the flow of water.

Commissioner Jackson stated that the issue with density would compound other issues. He stated that he would have liked it to be approached differently to offer 12 units and that it would mitigate some of the other snowball issues being created. He further stated that he would love the covered parking, but it is very cramped and would create a logistical issue for potential buyers.

Commissioner Kazich stated that he would support the rezoning but not the variation due to density.

There was some clarifying conversation regarding drainage flow.

Chairperson Mallers stated that based on Mr. Murphy's opening comments, the decision would be looking at condos versus apartments.

Mr. Murphy stated that the Commission may only make a decision on the project as it was publicly noticed, which would only be condominiums. He stated that continuing with a motion would be continuing with the project as it was described in the notice.

Chairperson Mallers questioned if they would potentially be looking at apartments.

Mr. Murphy stated that it would not. He stated that if there is a decision made on the project, it would only be relevant to condominiums.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if the petitioner would prefer the flexibility of both.

Mr. Grant stated that he would.

Chairperson Mallers clarified that the Commission would have to vote on what the proposal was, and the proposal was for condominiums.

Commissioner Kazich clarified that if they were looking for an alternate, they would have to reapply and hold another public hearing strictly as an apartment.

Mr. Murphy confirmed this and stated that staff would do a new notice and there would be another meeting for the same item just with an updated project description.

Commissioner Jackson questioned if the project could be continued and amended.

Mr. Murphy stated that he would defer to the applicant or the Commission, and that they would have the ability to do so.

Commissioner Jackson stated that he would want to give the petitioner the opportunity to address some of the issues.

Mr. Grant stated that he has a big issue because the owner only gave them 45 days.

Ms. Pacura stated that the owner is impossible to work with and that they would need a decision today.

Mr. Grant stated that they had paid \$20,000 to \$25,000 for engineering because they knew this may be a lengthy process and they only have 45 days.

Chairperson Mallers stated due to the timing of the situation, the decision would need to be made upon what had been presented this evening. He questioned if anyone would like to make a motion for the proposal.

Commission Jackson stated that there had not been a lot of discussion regarding conditions or modifications.

Chairperson Mallers stated that there wouldn't be at this point because they were just looking at rezoning.

Commissioner Jackson stated yes, exactly as presented.

Commissioner Kazich questioned if they could make two motions, one for rezoning and one for density.

Mr. Murphy stated that the Planning Commission would just make one motion, and that if the project was later approved, there may be multiple ordinances.

Commissioner Jackson stated that he would be in full support of the rezoning, but he did not think the property and the project would support the density.

Commissioner Jackson made a motion, and it was seconded by Commissioner Gillespie to approve PZC2025-06 – 1220-1225 Plainfield Rd – Atlantic Homes Inc. – A petition for a rezone of Parcel 1 from Single Family Residence District (R-2) to Multi-Family Residence District (R-3), a plat of consolidation to combine the two subject parcels for development purposes, and the construction of two new eight (8) unit, two-story condominium buildings totaling 16,491 square feet, with sixteen (16) 2-car garages, along with associated site and utility improvements. The property is located at 1220-1225 Plainfield Road, Darien, Illinois 60561 (PINs 09-28-410-001 and 09-28-410-043). Multiple zoning variations are included in the request.

Chairperson Mallers questioned if the motion had been made on the proposal.

Commissioner Jackson confirmed that it had been just as submitted.

Commissioner Gillespie confirmed as well.

Chairperson Mallers clarified that as submitted, the approval would change the rezoning to a multi-family under condominiums.

The Commission confirmed his statement.

Commissioner Kazich questioned if they would not allow the variance due to density.

Commissioner Gillespie stated that they would not be able to.

Commissioner Jackson stated that they had not discussed this yet.

Chairperson Mallers stated that this would just be the rezoning.

Commissioner Jackson stated it would be the rezoning and the variances, and that they would have to make an affirmative recommendation.

Chairperson Mallers stated that at the moment, they had made a motion on what had come before the Commission this event, which would be the rezoning and 16 units of condominiums.

Commissioner Jackson stated that it would include the variances as well.

Upon roll call vote, the MOTION CARRIED 6-1.

AYES: Christ, Gillespie, Green, Johnson, Kazich, Mallers

NAYS: Jackson

Mr. Murphy stated that there would be a Municipal Services Committee meeting for this item on April 28, 2025. He stated that if it moves forward it would go to City Council on May 5, 2025.

Regular Meeting – Old Business

There was no old business to discuss.

Staff Updates & Correspondence

Mr. Murphy reported that they had rescheduled the Chestnut Court project for May 7, 2025. He reported that because of the rescheduling, he would expect more people in attendance, giving more opportunity for public comment.

Mr. Murphy reported that going forward, he would continue doing a PowerPoint for big projects and would provide the commissioners with hard cover packets.

Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Gillespie made a motion, and it was seconded by Commissioner Jackson to approve the March 5, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes.

Upon voice vote, the MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY 7-0.

Next Meeting

Mr. Ryan Murphy announced that the next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, May 7, 2025.

Public Comments (On Any Topic Related to Planning and Zoning)

There was no one in the audience wishing to present public comment.

Adjournment

With no further business before the Commission, Commissioner Christ made a motion, and it was seconded by Commissioner Johnson. Upon voice vote, the MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, and the meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Approved:

X

Jessica Plzak
Secretary

X

Lou Mallers
Chairperson