

Responses to the standards

EXHIBIT 2: Section 6-4-7:1: Standards for Granting or Amending a Planned Unit Development

1. The design of the planned unit development presents an innovative and creative approach to the development of land and living environments.

Response: Increased cost of construction, growing property tax and maintenance cost would require developer to put the building in use as soon as possible. By limiting its uses, finding tenant becomes challenging which would restrict the development. It was witnessed with lack of interest on developing this land (LOT D) and adjacent out lots (F,G & J) . By allowing restaurant uses in this lot with the proposed parking deviation, this development would be financially feasible, and this proposal is supported by the parking study.

2. The planned unit development meets the requirements and standards of the planned unit development regulations.

Response: Restaurant use is allowed in this PUD. And all parking stalls are shared with easement and maintained by CAM expenses which is shared by all lots. Parking study also confirms surplus parking would be available even after this proposed development. Hence, this proposal meets all requirements and standards.

By allowing mixed uses such as retail, office, dental and restaurant as mentioned in the PUD for this lot D, this development would adhere to PUD's allowed use requirements and maintain existing shopping center mix of tenants and serve better for our neighborhood.

3. The physical design of the planned unit development efficiently utilizes the land and adequately provides for transportation and public facilities while preserving the natural features of the site.

Response: Yes, land is utilized fully per B2 zoning requirements and also preserving natural features as designed in PUD.

4. Open space, outdoor common area, and recreational facilities are provided.

Response: This proposal would not alter any of the existing common area or open space and everything would be maintained as is.

Since one monument sign is allowed for a lot more than 100' frontage on Route 59 and like other lots such as Mcdonalds in the shopping center, requesting new

monument sign for this lot D which spans 177' on route 59. Since Route 59 is 3 lanes road, proposed monument sign would facilitate customers to locate the businesses on building ahead and moving to right lane without affecting traffics.

Since portion of the shopping center land on Route 59 was taken for Route 59 sidewalk project, requesting variance from 10' setback required from property line similar to other lots such as Mcdonalds in this shopping center. Please note Mcdonalds sign is located 6' away from sidewalk but we are proposing 15' away from sidewalk. Also, proposing small monument sign for this lot with size of 10' X6' comparing to McDonald's 10'X11' monument sign.

In order to provide maximum clearance from sidewalk , we are requesting variance from 40' setback required from the interior property line. Also we approached JULIE and ComEd and received clearance for this proposed location.

5. The modifications in design standards from the subdivision control regulations and the waivers in bulk regulations from the zoning regulations fulfill the intent of those regulations.

Response: The proposed parking deviation would not undermine the purpose of the B2 zoning district as the request is supported by the parking study.

6. The planned unit development is compatible with the adjacent properties and nearby land uses.

Response: This mixed use proposal would be compatible with the adjacent properties and nearby land uses. In fact, this would complement and enhance the existing shopping center land uses.

7. The planned unit development fulfills the objectives of the comprehensive plan and planning policies of the city.

Response: As shown in the parking study, the existing development was at 29% occupancy. With the peak month adjustment and vacancy considerations, the base conditions resulted in a 199-space demand at 43% occupancy. With the proposed development, the demand will rise by 63 spaces to 53% occupancy. Assuming that 38 parking spaces will be added, the development will still experience a parking surplus of about 236 spaces. For this reason, it is determined that the development fulfills the objectives of the comprehensive plan and planning policies of the city.

By doing this initiative, this proposed land development would be viable and it would complete this shopping center instead of having undeveloped land in middle of the shopping center and would support to City's objective of the continuous growth plan.

EXHIBIT 6: Section 6-4-3:12.1: Standards for Approving a PUD Deviation

1. Whether the requested deviation would undermine the intent and purpose of the underlying zoning district; and

Response: This shopping center is zoned B2 and allows restaurant uses. Also, this shopping center has surplus number of parking stalls and it is confirmed with the enclosed parking study as well.

According to PUD, all parking stalls are shared among all out lots. Hence this proposal does not deviate the intent of this PUD. In addition, it would bring more customers to this shopping center which benefits all businesses in this shopping center.

2. Whether the requested deviation would be a detriment to the provision of municipal services and infrastructure; and

Response: It would not because PUD allows restaurant uses and parking study confirms surplus parking.

3. Whether the requested deviation would contribute a planned unit development which offers a superior level of design, amenity enhancement, or environmental benefit; or would enhance community vitality through the inclusion of attainable or barrier free housing.

Response: This proposed mixed use building would complement the entire shopping center design and allows to provide better comprehensive shopping experience to local community.

EXHIBIT 6: Section 6-16-5:2.2.5.1: Standards for approving deviation from 10' setback required for monument signs when fronting a major arterial road

1. Whether the requested deviation would undermine the intent and purpose of the underlying zoning district; and

Response: Design pointe shopping center out lots on route 59 don't have 10' setback from property line because significant amount of land was taken for sidewalk & Route 59 expansion project. For example, 32' width of this lot is taken for the Route 59 expansion project. However existing sidewalk provides more than required spacing from the road. we do have more than 15' clearance from sidewalk itself by comparing neighboring lot monument sign has only 6' clearance from sidewalk and proposed monument sign aligns with already existing monument signs in the Design Pointe shopping center. If we include sidewalk, we do have

more than 30' clearance from the road. To support our request, Mcdonalds sign is only located 6' away from sidewalk but we are proposing 15' away from sidewalk. Also, proposing small monument sign for this lot with size of 10' X 6' comparing to McDonald's 10'X11' monument sign.

2. Whether the requested deviation would be a detriment to the provision of municipal services and infrastructure; and

Response: Proposed monument sign location would not affect municipal services and infrastructures. JULIE and ComEd verified our proposed location and issued clearances.

3. Whether the requested deviation would contribute a planned unit development which offers a superior level of design, amenity enhancement, or environmental benefit; or would enhance community vitality through the inclusion of attainable or barrier free housing.

Response: Proposed monument sign would enhance the design by facilitating customers to locate the businesses on building ahead and moving to right lane after yielding to others. It helps drivers to locate the businesses in ahead and promotes safety driving by avoiding sudden change of lanes and offers better experiences to entire neighborhood

EXHIBIT 6: Section 6-16-5:2.2.5.3: Standards for Approving deviation from 40' setback required from the interior property line for monument signs

1. Whether the requested deviation would undermine the intent and purpose of the underlying zoning district; and

Response: Allowing deviation of 40' setback from interior property line would allow more than 15' clearance from sidewalk by comparing neighboring Mcdonalds lot has only 6' clearance from sidewalk and provides more clearance from the road as well.

2. Whether the requested deviation would be a detriment to the provision of municipal services and infrastructure; and

Response: Proposed monument sign location would not affect municipal services and infrastructures. JULIE and ComEd verified our proposed location and issued clearances.

3. Whether the requested deviation would contribute a planned unit development which offers a superior level of design, amenity enhancement, or environmental benefit; or would enhance community vitality through the inclusion of attainable or barrier free housing.

Response: Proposed monument sign location would enhance the design by allowing 6' wide sign and facilitate customers to locate the businesses on building ahead and moving to right lane after yielding to others. It helps drivers to locate the businesses in ahead and promotes safety driving by avoiding sudden change of lanes and offers better experiences to entire neighborhood