



Planning and Community Development Department

10631 Main Street, Roscoe, IL 61073

tel: 815-623-2829 fax: 815-623-1360

permits@roscoeil.gov

Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting of June 11th, 2025

Application No. ZBA 2025-009

Applicant: Tony Pipitone, Jeff Linkenheld with ARC Design

Location: PINs 04-29-251-010, 04-29-251-013, 04-29-251-011, 04-29-251-014, 04-29-251-012, 04-29-277-003, 04-29-277-007, 04-29-277-004, 04-29-277-008, 04-29-277-009, 04-29-277-005, and 04-29-277-006

Requested Action: Planned Unit Development and Tentative Plat Approval

Existing Use: Vacant

Proposed Use: One- and Two-Family Residential

Existing Zoning: Commercial-Planned (CPD)

Adjacent Zoning: Commercial-Planned (All directions)

Addendum: On May 20th, Jeff Linkenheld and Tony Pipitone (the applicants) met with staff regarding the Pipitone PUD project. This meeting was to meet with staff regarding some of the issues raised by nearby citizens, the ZBA, and staff regarding fencing, a walking path, and the design of the buildings. Based on this meeting, staff's initial recommendation and report can be updated with the following information.

Fencing & Screening.

The property owner for the quarry immediately to the rear of the proposed development notified staff and the ZBA about concerns over trespassing by individuals onto quarry property. Possible solutions to this problem included the installation of fencing, signage, and other preventive measures. In the applicant's meeting with staff, the applicant agreed to the installation of a 6-foot tall fence for privacy, screening, and to prevent concerns of trespassing. Staff believes this will be sufficient to address neighbor concerns.

Recreation Path.

Other property owners and residents of other multifamily properties within the Prairie Garden subdivision expressed concern about this project's need to install a walking and biking path on the north side of Prairie Rose Drive. The owners and residents cited that the installation of the walking path on the south side of Prairie Rose Drive was required by the Village and this project should follow the same requirement. In reviewing the original and past PUD approvals for the area, staff found that the walking and biking path on the south side of the road only was a requirement for the entire PUD

area. Not having this path reflected on the north side of Prairie Rose Drive would fit the original development plan for the property.

Design Review.

The final topic of discussion at the May 20th meeting was the design of the buildings for the project. In staff's report for the May 14th ZBA meeting, a condition was placed on the recommendation of approval for staff and the applicant to meet regarding the design of the buildings in the development. Staff originally had concerns due to the absence of windows, detail, and trim on the walls of the buildings. Staff and the applicant agreed to the following:

1. Installation of an additional window on the side of each garage.
2. Installation of decorative trim on the perimeter of windows to complement each building's siding color palette.
3. Upgraded siding material.
4. Installation of shutters where appropriate (OPTIONAL).

Overall, staff believes that the existing concerns from the ZBA members, neighbors, residents, and staff have been adequately addressed by the applicant and the recommendation below has been updated to reflect this. Please see below for staff's original report from the 5/14/2025 ZBA meeting. Note that the section on architectural detail has been removed to make this report more clear.

STAFF REPORT FROM MAY 14TH ZBA MEETING:

Description: The applicant is requesting tentative plat approval and a Planned Unit Development (PUD) located within the Prairie Garden subdivision on the western side of the Village. This subdivision is zoned as Commercial – Planned (CPD). This development would create 14 new duplexes and 1 new single-family home, resulting in 29 new dwelling units. These units would be located along two private drives throughout the development, with the majority of units located running west to east along “Private Drive A”. The applicant noted in their application that the buildings would be generally consistent in both design and unit type as other multi-family developments within the subdivision. The tentative plat approval is being requested to combine the properties located within the development area and the PUD is being requested to allow for multiple buildings on one parcel.

Site Analysis: The property, if combined, would be 5.474 acres in size. The applicant provided the following measurements and standards for the development:

Standard	Measurement	Consistent with Surroundings?
Front Yard Setback	33 feet from ROW.	Yes.

Side Yard Setback	15 feet from property lines.	Yes.
Rear Yard Setback	30 feet from property lines.	Yes.
Impervious Surface Percentage	47%	Yes.
Height of Buildings	20 feet.	Yes.
Unit Square Footage	1,558 square feet.	Yes.
Lot Coverage Percentage	26%	Yes.
Parking Spaces	58 garage parking stalls. 58 driveway parking stalls. 5 additional surface parking spaces.	Yes. Consistent with Section 15-619 <i>Off-Street Parking Requirements</i> as well.

The Village's zoning map designates this area "Commercial-Planned" or CPD. However, there is no such district referenced in the zoning ordinance. This creates an issue within the PUD process since there's no underlying zoning district to request flexibilities from. PUDs often act as a negotiation between municipalities and developers, where variances from the zoning ordinance are requested in exchange for projects that represent some sort public benefit like infill development, market-rate housing, etc. Without these base standards, it's difficult to determine what the developer needs this relief from.

In this case, staff took measurements from surrounding properties within the subdivision to determine if the bulk, dimensional, and size of the proposed development is consistent with the neighborhood. Staff found that these criteria matched the surrounding neighborhood.

Tentative Plat: As noted above, there is currently no underlying zoning district to compare the tentative plat to. In this case, taking into account the other parcel throughout the subdivision and general area is important to ensure there's consistency. Based on staff's review, parcels within the subdivision are much smaller than the one being proposed in the applicant's tentative plat. This proposal includes combining the following parcel numbers into one parcel:

- NO. 04-29-251-010
- NO. 04-29-251-013
- NO. 04-29-251-011
- NO. 04-29-251-014
- NO. 04-29-251-012
- NO. 04-29-277-003
- NO. 04-29-277-007
- NO. 04-29-277-004
- NO. 04-29-277-008

- NO. 04-29-277-009
- NO. 04-29-277-005
- NO. 04-29-277-006

In addition, there are other parcels that contain multiple buildings as well. This further justifies the proposed tentative plat and PUD requested by the applicant.

Landscaping: The applicant provided staff with a landscaping plan as part of their submittal. While the landscaping standards in the zoning ordinance under Article XI don't apply to two-family or one-family residential development, Section 15-321 *Street Trees* does require plantings along public rights-of-way. Trees must be at least 12 inches in trunk diameter and spaced not less than 30 feet and not more than 75 feet apart. The applicant's landscaping plan both inventories existing trees on the property and illustrates where new plantings will be located. Based on this information, staff finds that the landscaping plan is consistent with the landscaping requirements in the zoning ordinance.

Updated Recommendation (6/11/2025): Staff recommends **approval** of the proposed Planned Unit Development and tentative plat, subject to the following conditions:

1. All agreed-to elements from the May 20th meeting between the applicant and staff are provided as outlined in the addendum section above.