PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Wednesday, March 21, 2018
6:30 p.m.

Planning and Zoning Commission

Anthony Spinelli, Chairman

Commission Members:
Sean Cunningham
Sam Forzley
Jerry McGleam
Samuel Glomp
Joe Plahm
Matthew Zolecki

Community Development: Planning Division Staff

Jason Berry, AICP, Community Development Director
Jamie Tate, AICP, Consulting Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Pledge of Allegiance

B. Verify Quorum

C. Approval of Minutes: February 21, 2018 meeting

II. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

IV. ACTION ITEMS

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

A. Update from Village Board

i. UDO Code Updates

1. **Setbacks**
2. **Lot Coverage (Residential)**
3. **ROW Widths, Pavement Widths (conflicts)**
4. **Duplex/Townhome architectural standards**
5. **Canal Industry Zoning Updates**

iv. Downtown TOD Discussion

VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Village of Lemont
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting of February 21, 2018

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, February 21, 2018 in the second floor Board Room of the Village Hall, 418 Main Street, Lemont, Illinois.

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Spinelli called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. He then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Verify Quorum

Upon roll call the following were:
Present: Cunningham, Glomp, McGleam, Zolecki, Spinelli
Absent: Plahm, Forzley

Community Development Director Jason Berry, Consulting Planner Jamie Tate and Village Trustee Ron Stapleton were also present.

C. Approval of Minutes: January 17, 2018

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to approve the minutes from January 17, 2018 meeting with no changes. A voice vote was taken:
Ayes: All
Nays: None
Motion passed

II. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Chairman Spinelli greeted the audience. He then asked everyone in the audience to stand and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath. He stated if there were no objections from the Commissioners, he would like to move Action Item 17-14 as the first item of discussion.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. 17-14 1166 McCarthy Road Mierzwa Subdivision (continued from January 17, 2018 PZC Meeting)

Staff Presentation

Jamie Tate, Consulting Planner, said the subject property is being represented by attorney John Antonopoulos. The applicant is seeking a Final Plat of Subdivision for the purpose of creating an additional lot to construct a single-family detached residence. The existing lot is 0.9 acres and is being proposed to be divided into two single-family lots. There is not a proposal for the new lot at this time. Lot 1 will have the existing residence and Lot 2 will be created for the new single-family residence. Impact fees will be calculated and paid at time of construction for a home on Lot 2.

At the previous PZC meeting there were questions on the well for water on the lot. The applicant's engineer, Morris Engineering, has stated that the County will not give formal approval without submitting plans to construct a new home. At this time, there are no plans to construct a home as the applicant is looking to subdivide and then sell the vacant lot. Morris Engineering has been in communication with the Village Public Works department and has received verbal approval to install a well on this property. The Village will be required to sign off on the application to Cook County when applying for a new well. Staff is recommending approval and the applicants attorney is here this evening.

Applicant Presentation

John Antonopoulos, attorney for applicant, stated Cook County does not require a minimum lot width for the placement of the well. They do require a separation from where the well is located and to where the sanitary sewer is at.

Chairman Spinelli said he wants the applicant to understand that this will fall back on them if Cook County does not approve a well.

Mr. Antonopoulos stated he understands.

Chairman Spinelli asked if any of the Commissioners had any questions for the applicant. None responded. He then asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to come up and speak in regards to this case.

Public Comment

None

Plan Commissioner Recommendation

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion for recommendation.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to recommend to the Mayor and Board of Trustees approval of Case 17-14. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: McGleam, Cunningham, Zolecki, Glomp, Spinelli
Nays: None
Motion passed

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 18-03 12630 Archer Avenue Carlson Rezoning

Staff Presentation

Jamie Tate, Consulting Planner, said Mark and Stephanie Carlson, owners of the subject property, are seeking rezoning from B-1 Office/Retail Transitional District to R-4 Single-Family Detached Residential District. The purpose of the rezoning is to construct one single-family detached residence. The home site was originally proposed as Lot 1 in Castlewood Estates. The subject property is on 2.10 acre lot with a large pond in the center of the lot, which makes a portion of the lot unbuildable. The home will be constructed on the northwest corner of the site along Castlewood Drive and to leave the remaining portion of the site undeveloped, therefore taking advantage of the existing trees and vegetation. The subject property is surrounded by single-family residences.

On February 12, 1990 there was an 8,000 square foot office building that was approved with a park for the subject property. On October 26, 1992 there was a resolution approving the Final Plat for Castlewood Estates and the subject site, which was Lot 1, was not included on the Final Plat that was approved by the Village. Castlewood Estates was constructed and the B-1 zoning remained for the subject site.

Mrs. Tate stated staff finds the proposed zoning amendment from B-1 to R-4 meets the LaSalle factors which are listed in staff's report. The Lemont 2030 Comprehensive Plan Map envisions this area as Infill Residential land use. There are no compatibility issues with surrounding land uses. In regards to landscaping, the existing vegetation should be saved as much as possible and the applicant should adhere to the Tree Preservation code found in the UDO.

Engineering is requesting a full current topo of the site so that the high water level of the existing lake can be determined. The Village Engineer also recommends soil borings at the proposed home site, due to possible poor local soil conditions and a potential high water table that could affect basement drainage. The Village Engineer also requested the applicant to consider providing a sidewalk along Archer Avenue. Staff is recommending approval with the condition that the owners will meet all requirements of the Village's UDO at time of permit.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the UDO requires on corner lots sidewalks must be installed on both sides.

Mrs. Tate said staff was discussing as to whether it is appropriate and is not sure if it is a requirement.

Chairman Spinelli stated it seems that the existing sidewalk on Castlewood is not in good condition. It might want to be considered that the current sidewalk is replaced rather than adding a sidewalk onto Archer Avenue, which will require them to get a permit from the State. The parcel that is to the north of the subject site is an existing residence that does not have an existing fence at this time. He asked if the homeowner or future homeowner would come in to request a fence, would the fence only be allowed at four feet and with an open design. The driveway on the subject site is shown very close to the common property line which can be a site-line issue.

Chairman Spinelli asked if any of the Commissioners had any questions for staff. None responded. He then asked the applicant to come up and make a presentation.

Applicant Presentation

Mark Carlson, applicant, said there might be an issue trying to put a sidewalk along Archer with the ditch system that is there. They have no issue with replacing the sidewalk along Castlewood instead.

Chairman Spinelli asked if any of the Commissioners had any questions for the applicant. None responded. He then asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak in regards to this public hearing.

Public Comment

Amy Grubisic stated she lived next door to the subject property. She asked what is the distance from the end of their lot to the proposed home.

Chairman Spinelli said there will be 20 feet between the property and the face of the house. The minimum side yard setback is 15 feet but they will be at 20 feet.

Mrs. Grubisic asked if she will be able to see the final drawing before it is situated.

Chairman Spinelli stated that is something she can request at the Village once the permit has been issued.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there was anyone else in the audience that wanted to speak in regards to this public hearing. None responded. He then called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Glomp to close the public hearing for Case 18-03. A voice vote was taken:
Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion passed

Plan Commission Discussion

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further comments or questions from the Commissioners. None responded. He then called for a motion for recommendation.

Plan Commission Recommendation

Commissioner Zolecki made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to recommend to the Mayor and Board of Trustees approval of Case 18-03 Rezoning with staff's recommendation:
1. Owners will meet all requirements of the Village's UDO at time of permit.

A roll call vote was taken:
Ayes: Zolecki, McGleam, Glomp, Cunningham, Spinelli
Nays: None
Motion passed

Findings of Fact

Commissioner Glomp made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 18-03 as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:
Ayes: All
Nays: None
Motion passed

B. 18-04 Willow Pointe Duplexes Annexation Agreement Amendment, Rezoning and Preliminary PUD/Plat

Chairman Spinelli asked anyone who was not present at the beginning of the meeting to please stand and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath. He then called for a motion to open the public hearing.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to open the public hearing for Case 18-04. A voice vote was taken:
Ayes: All
Nays: None
Motion passed

Staff Presentation

Jamie Tate, Consulting Planner, said Matthew Dill of Teton Development, LLC, the contract purchaser of the subject property, is seeking rezoning to R-5 Single-Family Attached Residential District from R-4 Single-Family Detached Residential District, a

Preliminary PUD, and Preliminary Plat of Subdivision. The purpose of the requested zoning entitlements is to allow the construction of 42 single-family duplexes. The surrounding properties to the north, south and east are zoned R-3 and R-4 Unincorporated Cook County Single-Family Residence and to the west is R-4 Single-Family District in the Village.

The subject property was annexed to the Village and zoned R-5 Single-Family Attached Residential in June 2008 for a senior assisted living development called Paradise Park. The senior development never came forward and eight years later in June 2016, the Village approved a rezoning of the subject property from R-5 Single-Family Attached Residential to R-4 Single-Family Detached Residential and a preliminary PUD/Plat. This was to allow the construction of a 27 single-family detached subdivision known as Fox Meadows by Tempo Development, Inc. Tempo Development did not move forward with its purchase contract and never began the construction.

Mrs. Tate stated the proposal today will be called Willow Pointe subdivision and will consist of 42 dwelling units on 21 duplex lots. The average lot size will be approximately 13,356 square feet. Each home will range in variety from a single story ranch to a 1.5 story home. The square footage of each home will generally range between 1,900 square feet to 2,200 square feet. Prior to submitting a formal application, the applicant submitted plans to the Technical Review Committee (TRC) on October 3, 2017. The TRC raised concerns about open space, setbacks, landscaping, access points, lighting, stormwater, pathway connections and tree preservation. Since then the applicant has revised the subdivision layout, provided information on existing trees, delivered preliminary engineering, and updated the landscape plan.

Within the PUD the applicant is requesting some variations from zoning standards. The first is a request for 25 feet rear yard setbacks, when the standard for the UDO is 30 feet. Staff is recommending approval since the deviation only applies to the interior lots and therefore will not affect the existing adjacent properties. Another is the request for 10 foot interior side yard setbacks when the minimum in the UDO is 15 feet. Staff finds this deviation acceptable as the R-5 zoning district is considered medium density and a 10 foot setback still provides 20 feet between each duplex. The Lemont 2030 Plan recommends compact and efficient design for these types of parcels and subdivision. The proposed cul-de-sac is greater than 300 feet in length when it should not be. Staff recommends approval as long as emergency vehicles can safely maneuver the area and the plan is approved by the Fire Marshall.

Mrs. Tate said with all PUDs with a residential component it must include 15% open space for the benefit of the residents. The applicant is providing 2.16 acres, however the code does not count detention space as part of the open space. With the limited area for open space staff, would find a deviation of less than 15% acceptable if a plan for a common amenity is placed on Lot 22 and in the stormwater/detention area. The last deviation would be the minimum pavement width for right-of-way (ROW). The

pavement width is 30 feet which will meet code. The 60 foot ROW is consistent with the prior approved single-family subdivision.

Mrs. Tate then read through the standards for rezoning and the PUD objectives which are listed in staff's packet. The proposed development is consistent with the goals of the Lemont 2030 Comprehensive Plan. The proposed development falls in line with typical gross density at 3.5 dwelling units per acre. The applicant is proposing a higher residential density than the properties immediately adjacent, however; the distance between the actual buildings will be sufficient. Additionally, staff is recommending a landscape buffer along the property line that abuts the existing residences and the applicant has been agreeable to the suggestion.

The site will have one access point off of Parker Road fatherst from the intersection of 131st Street. With this new subdivision proposal, staff was looking for less movement conflicts nearest the intersection of 131st and Parker Road. The applicant provided a trip generation comparison in the Petition for Rezoning.

Mrs. Tate stated the applicant has submitted a landscape plan and existing tree survey. The majority of the trees are of poor quality species, in poor condition, and in the construction area. There is an opportunity to save more trees if the proper precautions are taken by the applicant's arborist along the east edge of the trench for the storm sewer. There are some trees noted that need to be removed and all of the Village Arborist's comments are attached in staff's packet. The Village Ecologist also provided comments on the landscape plan. The detention facility is indicated as natural; however, a full maintenance plan was not submitted for review. The Ecologist found the plan acceptable for Preliminary PUD approval but also provided some comments that must be addressed. The development will require a full native planting maintenance and monitoring plan at the time of Final PUD submittal.

The applicant has submitted a rendering of the type of housing unit proposed. The duplexes are to be constructed with brick and masonry material, engineered wood, architectural shingles and decorative accents. There will be front elevation options for homebuyers, but the changes in elevation will be minimal because the applicant wishes to maintain a uniform and complimentary feel throughout the subdivision.

Mrs. Tate said the Village Engineer has completed two reviews of the preliminary engineering plans and stormwater calculations. He has requested more information regarding drainage calculations and the method being used to determine the calculations. The Village Engineer's full comments are attached. The Fire Marshal generally finds the plans acceptable. However, he does mention that additional hydrants may be required so that no portions of the buildings will be more than 300 feet from any hydrant.

Overall, the proposed development is well-designed considering the size of the site and the natural wetland area. The proposal complies with most requirements of the UDO considering the challenges the site contains. The proposal also achieves the

goals of the Lemont 2030 Comprehensive Plan. The subdivision provides a diverse high-quality housing choice allowing current Lemont residents the opportunity to downsize and not relocate out of the Village. Therefore, staff recommends approval with the conditions that are listed in staff's report. She then read the 13 conditions and said this would conclude staff's presentation.

Chairman Spinelli asked in regards to condition number 11 if staff was talking about the elongated island on Eliza Court.

Mrs. Tate stated it is a requirement in the UDO.

Chairman Spinelli said he would also like to see parking there. There are a lot of driveways and there is nowhere for visitors to park. He then asked for clarification on the measurement for pavement width.

Mrs. Tate stated that she is aware that there are conflicting numbers in the code.

Chairman Spinelli said the drawing is indicating 30 feet back-to-back on the roadway which is only 27 feet of pavement. This needs to be clarified so we are not showing two dimensions for the road. In regards to the responses for the UDO objectives, he has an issue with calling this project a cluster design. Asking for smaller setbacks to gain more lots, would not be considered a cluster design. He asked if this development was going to have an HOA.

Mrs. Tate stated there will be an HOA.

Commissioner McGleam asked if staff can clarify what the variance is that the applicant is asking for with open space.

Mrs. Tate said they are looking for not meeting the 15%. They are technically at 0% with the way the code is written.

Commissioner McGleam asked if staff could comment in regards to the importance of open space within the UDO.

Mrs. Tate stated it is used to allow the residents to gather outside in gathering points. They do have personal space in their backyards, but this is so they can enjoy amenities within a close proximity of their residence.

Mr. Berry said in the UDO it does make a distinction between private open space and public open space.

Commissioner McGleam stated according to his calculation for this PUD the open space should be 1.88 acres, but they are providing zero.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the applicant was proposing to offset that with a cash donation to the Village or the Park District.

Mrs. Tate stated not that she is aware of.

Commissioner McGleam said in regards to putting benches along the detention pond, on the landscape plan it shows detention basin landscaping that goes right up to the lot line and he does not see any landscape plan that shows any benches.

Mrs. Tate said this was more of a discussion with the applicant and was not specifically shown in a plan yet.

Commissioner McGleam stated the slopes start right at the lot line.

Mr. Berry said he would like to add in regards to land cash fees, during the TRC meeting when the Park District and School Boards were there; nothing was brought up about additional impact fees. He also looks at the two failed attempts to develop this site. There is a recapture fee on this site from the Glens of Connemara when sewer and water was run down 131st. There are significant barriers to develop this site otherwise it would have been developed.

Commissioner Zolecki asked if staff discussed with the applicant about design variety.

Mrs. Tate said the code only addresses single-family residences with the anti-monotony.

Commissioner Zolecki stated he thought it does and if it does not then they need to look at that. He understands that they are providing a buffer between subdivisions, but the rear elevations that are being proposed are exactly the same.

Mr. Berry then read the code. He said they did address this with the applicant. Staff did go back and look at other approvals and it was not addressed with the duplexes in Vistancia or the duplexes in Hartz.

Commissioner Zolecki stated the difference here is that there is a high percentage of these homes where the rear yards face inward due to the cul-de-sac.

Mrs. Tate said there will be some options for homebuyers to change some things on there. The applicant is looking for a more uniformed look. It is something that they can bring forward to the applicant to address.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further questions or comments for staff. None responded. He then asked the applicant to come up and make a presentation.

Applicant Presentation

Vince Rosanova, Attorney with Rosanova & Whitaker, LTD., said he is present tonight representing the applicant which is Teton Development, LLC. He then introduced his team that was present this evening. Beechen and Dill Homes is a local, independently owned home builder that has been building in the Chicago suburbs since the 1970's. Beechen and Dill is a step up home builder who is currently building homes in the adjacent Kettering subdivision. The enclave at Kettering has been well received in the community and they are expecting to be sold out by the end of the year. Upon completion of the enclave development, Beechen and Dill hope to stay in the community with this new age targeted duplex community.

The proposed development is surrounded on all four sides with residential uses which makes this a harmonious land use. The development will have a unique appeal to the fastest growing segment of the population, which would be characterized for those over the age of 55 with no children living in the home. For those who are looking to downsize but have no interest in downgrading. These folks are usually living in the community and don't want to leave their children or grandchildren. To appeal to their target market, Willow Point will be designed as a maintenance free community to allow for aging in place and maximum the number of years that residents can live in their home so they can stay independent before they have to move out. The HOA will be responsible to all exterior maintenance and repairs. All the homes will be designed with living necessities on the first floor. The future park in the Kettering subdivision will be appealing to the future residents as well. It is already estimated that 38% of Lemont residents are over the age of 55. The Lemont 2030 Plan speaks of concepts about expanding the range of quality housing option as well as creating a variety of housing types to allow family members to live near each other through various stages of their life.

Mr. Rosanova stated the lots will range in size from 12,500 square feet to 25,000 square feet. There will be an open space area in the northwest quadrant of the property. The primary function will be to provide onsite detention. In addition, there are wetlands there so they will do native plantings in the basin. There will be a seating area which he will show on the landscape plan. There is also an open space area in the northeast quadrant, which the primary function will be emergency access from 131st Street to the subdivision. There will be a gazebo area for future residents to socialize and relax. Adjacent to Parker Road there will be an 8 foot wide path to enhance the overall pedestrian connectivity.

He showed on the overhead the landscape plan the dense landscape that will be installed on Parker Road as well as 131st Street. By the request of staff, there will be additional landscape treatments along the south and east property line to create an additional buffer. There will be an entrance monument that will be heavily landscaped. Each individual home will have parkway trees, decorative trees, foundation plantings which will enhance the overall aesthetics. They believe the quality of the homes will be apparent with the materials they are utilizing. The homes will be large and will range from 1,900 square feet to 2,200 square feet. They will generally be 40 feet wide by 65 feet deep. They will be less than 30 feet in height and

will have a two car garage. He then showed some slides of some recently built homes that they had constructed. He thanked the Commission for their time.

Chairman Spinelli asked if this was restricted or age targeted.

Mr. Rosanova said it is not restricted.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they could talk about snowplowing.

Mr. Rosanova stated the roadways will be dedicated to the Village. The driveways and the sidewalks will be the responsibility of the HOA.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they object with adding parking to the cul-de-sac island.

Mr. Rosanova said they do not object and think it would be a great idea.

Chairman Spinelli asked staff if there were any provisions for snow removal or were there any discussions with public works as to how they were going to remove the snow from this subdivision.

Mrs. Tate stated she is not sure if it was brought up yet.

Chairman Spinelli said it is indicated that the smart siding will be starting at the top of the windows on the first floor. He asked why it is not brick up to the first floor and the smart siding starting 18 inches higher.

Mr. Rosanova stated that it could be changed.

Chairman Spinelli said on the preliminary PUD plan there are little boxes on the side of all the units. He asked if those were all the window wells and basement egress.

Mr. Rosanova stated that is correct.

Chairman Spinelli asked staff if the window wells had to be outside of the side yard setbacks.

Mr. Berry said that is permitted.

Mike Ford, DesignTech Engineering, stated the window wells and basement egress extend about a foot and a half beyond the foundation.

Chairman Spinelli said the reason why he is asking is because he is not sold on 10 foot side yard setbacks. He then asked if they had addressed the Village Engineer's comment regarding the berm rule for the setback off of public right-of-way for Parker Road and 131st Street.

Mr. Ford stated yes that will be taken into account.

Chairman Spinelli said in the southeast corner there is a storm drain that is close to units 10 and 11. That space will need to be increased.

Mr. Ford stated they will look at that.

Commissioner McGleam asked what is prohibiting them from meeting the requirement for open space.

Mr. Rosanova said when he reads the requirement for open space with the UDO it really speaks of active recreation. This is a unique community and when he looks at the target demographic situation they feel a gazebo would be a better fit rather than a swing set which is an option in the UDO. Having a place to gather makes more sense for this community or having more of a buffer area between Parker and 131st Street. They did meet with the Park District to see if their land cash contribution would help expedite the park in Kettering. In the UDO it talks about what qualifies as open space and would the Board consider if there is a national feature preserved. On Lot 23 there is a considerable wetland. They will be turning that into a naturalized detention basin and enhancing water qualities. He feels some of the elements in the UDO are subjective and in most ways they do satisfy that requirement.

Commissioner McGleam stated he respectively disagrees with him. He asked if they feel a ten foot side yard setback is enough when the duplexes are 80 feet wide.

Mr. Rosanova said yes he does. That is 20 feet of building separation. Most of the municipalities that he works with are at six feet for single-family detached homes.

Commissioner McGleam stated there is a distinction between reducing a side yard setback from 15 to 10 for a single-family home. There is a difference between that and an 80 foot wide duplex. He asked if there was a traffic study that went along with the trip generation exhibit in the packet and what is the source of the document.

Mr. Rosanova said it is the traffic manuals in the ULI (Urban Land Use).

Commissioner McGleam asked how is the number of trips less for a 42 unit development compared to a 27 unit development.

Mr. Rosanova stated with this being age targeted there are generally 2.1 to 2.3 residents living at home. In a single-family traditional home there could be 4 to 5 people living at home so there are a chance of more drivers. So this would reduce that number.

Commissioner McGleam said he could understand that if it was age restricted, but it is not.

Mr. Rosanova stated they have done many of these subdivisions and they are not appealing to families. If a family has $450,000 to spend they will go to Kettering and spend it there to get the different amenities.

Commissioner McGleam said there is not a traffic study to support that estimate.

Mr. Rosanova stated if they want one he can have a formal traffic study prepared.

Commissioner McGleam asked what is the difference between the finished grade elevation and the inverted pipe elevation for the stormsewer that goes between unit 38-39 and 40-41.

Mr. Ford said he is not sure of the exact depth because they have not received final engineering. If it's a storm pipe they will make sure it is filled with stone and properly constructed.

Commissioner McGleam stated their concern is when they see stormsewers in side yard setbacks, is the depth and if the sewer has to be repaired at any point.

Chairman Spinelli said he does not support reduced setbacks when there are storm drains or flood routes. There is at least one flood route between building two and three and you are requesting to reduce setbacks along with ingress/egress points on those buildings. There is only about 17 feet for flood water to get through there. It is also seen coming off of the cul-de-sac between 28-29.

Mr. Ford stated with the pipe between unit 2-3 the stormsewer was going to be sized to carry the 100 year storm so it would not be over land. As they get into final engineering they will look at that more closely.

Commissioner Zolecki asked what other kind of design aesthetic options do they offer for the rear elevations.

Matt Dill, Beechen & Dill Homes, said they are going to have an option on all of the units a covered outdoor living area with a gable roof. It will protrude out about ten feet. He showed on the overhead where it would be located. The key has been the front elevations and they wrapped them all in brick. He stated they could look at putting shutters on the back.

Commissioner Zolecki said when you look at the front elevations it shows that they put a lot of work into them. Eighteen of the units face inward for the homeowners which will be a nice streetscape for those purchasing the buildings. All the units to the east and south have their backs to the neighbors. He has an issue with the excessive similarity on the back of the homes.

Mr. Dill stated they can take it back to the architect and work on a different design feature. They can add shutters to the back of the homes on the east and south and look at redoing the roof line.

Commissioner Zolecki said he is not sure if shutters will do it. He feels this is the epitome of excessive similarity on the rear elevation. If you make them options then there is the chance that they do not get chosen.

Mr. Dill stated they could do something and make it standard. One thing he would like to point out is all the windows on the back of the home.

Commissioner Zolecki said he is sure the outdoor feature is popular and might help break things up a little, but feels that a number of them should be standard. He likes the windows and the brick, however all together it is a little monotonous.

Commissioner Glomp stated the open space is an issue for him. He asked if Lots 29-30 had to be there. That might be an opportunity for some open space. The spot could also then be used for snow removal.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further questions or comments from the Commission. None responded. He then asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak in regards to this public hearing.

Public Comment

David Mullin, 13200 Silver Fox, said his property is adjacent to the east side of this proposed subdivision. He has lived at his residence for 25 years and have seen several developers come forward trying to develop this property. Originally, a developer had tried to put townhomes on this property, but with over 500 petitions against the development it was voted down. When Paradise Park Nursing Home came before the Planning and Zoning Commission, they voted against it. However, the Village Board voted in favor of it. The zoning got changed but they never developed the property. Next, Tempo Homes tried to come in with 27 single-family homes. The density was too much, the homes were not that great, but at least they were homes.

Mr. Mullin stated here are some of the arguments with what is being proposed. There has been no traffic study and the traffic at Parker and 131st is dangerous. There are several accidents there and with Kettering there the traffic has increased. He does not feel the development is compatible with the existing neighborhood, which are all acre lots. Kettering has all the smaller lots on the inside. They are nice homes but they are lacking brick. This is why he moved out here because the lots are bigger and there is more open space. He applauds that they are proposing brick all the way around, but if you look at the back of the homes it looks like a "dentist office". They are trying to build as many buildings as possible by requesting reduced side yards. The building should be as far apart from each other as their homes are.

He understands that they are targeting 55 and over, but there is a potential for younger people to purchase these homes. The grade schools are already overcrowded in Lemont. He is not sure if the Fire Department is able to maneuver around in the cul-de-sac and he applauds the comment about snow removal. Lastly, if this does go through his concern is with the drainage. There is a pond to the south and the northeast. They accept all the water from his subdivision and the subdivision directly east of his. The water is constantly flowing in his neighbor's yard across the street. He feels the buildings are way to plain, he is concerned about flooding, and it does not fit in with the surrounding neighborhood. He asked the Commission to vote no to this project.

Chairman Spinelli said in response to drainage, whether this or another developer moves forward, the design engineer is required by the ordinances to accept the drainage if they are downhill from his property. The Village Engineer will review this and ensure they comply with this along with the accommodations of the detention basin.

Christine Hare, 13205 Silver Fox, stated she also does deal with a lot water retention on her property which she feels comes from Fox Pointe which is directly east of her. Her concern is with this high density development they will take on more water onto their property. She asked if the water retention for this property is going to consider more than just properties adjacent to it. With the current rain conditions and the melting from winter, her property will not dry out until May or June. She would like to make note in the lawyer's presentation in regards to Lemont's population, he referenced the 2000 census. She would like to know what the current population is because she feels that the residents of Lemont are not getting older but rather younger. There are younger people coming into Lemont who are interested in living in condominiums and townhomes that have properties that are lower maintenance. With this property not being restricted it is concerning for the schools and with the traffic.

Chairman Spinelli said this development has to take care of its stormwater and whatever comes onto their property.

Ms. Hare asked how they take that measurement and do they survey the neighboring properties.

Chairman Spinelli stated there are many calculations that the engineer has to do for stormwater. Part of their drainage study would have them looking at the drainage that is coming to them so they know how to size the swales and the storm pipes along the perimeter property lines. The detention basin only has to be sized for their development but all the pipes leaving it have to accommodate everything that is coming on and being bypassed through the development.

Donna Mullin, 13200 Silver Fox, said in regards to the common area at 131st and Parker that is the noisiest area for a gazebo and benches. She asked if Lot 22 was where they were proposing the other open area.

Commissioner McGleam stated the primary purpose of that Lot is for emergency access. They are proposing to have grasscrete which is like an invisible structure that allows grass to grow through but will support a vehicle.

Mrs. Mullin stated this location is still off of 131st Street which is a busy area. If the residents are 65 they are not going to want to walk all the way over to Kettering to sit with a bunch of little kids.

Bruce Kipley, 13120 Silver Fox, said he is adjacent to this proposal on the east. He asked what are they going to do for a buffer because he also has a pond on his lot and behind the pond is a 6 foot culvert.

Chairman Spinelli stated they will only be providing landscape screening.

Mr. Kipley said there is a pond also to the south. He is happy they are all brick, but does not like the design to the back of the townhomes. He feels it is too much density for this property. He asked why there is a cul-de-sac instead of another entrance.

Chairman Spinelli stated the original drawings did show another entrance onto Parker. Due to the proximity of the intersection and 131st it was felt as unsafe and was advised to remove it.

Mr. Kipley said he disagrees and feels it will be too much for the Fire Department. It could have been a right turn only. He asked if they were putting a left turn only for residents that were coming south on Parker.

Chairman Spinelli stated according to the drawings he does not see any additional lanes to Parker.

Mr. Kipley said they are creating more traffic problems rather than solving.

Ron Rodi, Kettering Estates, asked if the open space was going to be the pond and are they proposing cash for green space.

Chairman Spinelli stated what they are proposing is that their open space is the detention basin, which does not meet the UDO. Cash for green space has not been offered and is not being considered.

Mr. Rodi asked if at their entrance are they going to be restricted going north or south on Parker because in Kettering on Eliza they are. He feels that this might cause problems and congestion. When the older residents of this subdivision pass and their heirs can't afford to keep up their homes this will bring down their property values.

Jeanette Daubaras stated she has lived in unincorporated Lemont for almost 30 years. She has worked for 20 years to keep a subdivision out where Kettering was put in. She showed on a drawing all the zoning areas for Cook County that are surrounding the subject property. She asked why are they wanting to put something so dense in this area. She said zoning is designed to protect the people that are already there. If this gets passed they will have 200 to 300 people at the meeting protesting this development. She can't believe that it made it this far. She does not understand how you can put a detention pond in where there are wetlands already. She asked where does the detention pond drain to because with all these buildings there is going to be a lot of water. She stated several times that this development is too dense and she does not care about economic development. If this development goes through then the property values in Kettering are going to go down.

George Vranas, 13125 Silver Fox, said he concurs with his neighbors comments. He said this lot is subject to the Cook County State's Attorney lawsuit challenging annexation of the 17 lots around Lemont. The lawsuit is still pending. He asked if this was premature and maybe this should be tabled until Cook County has ruled on this parcel.

Chairman Spinelli stated because that is an ongoing legal issue they cannot comment on it.

Lisa Bitsky said she has lived in this area for 35 years, first in Fox Hills and now in Fox Hills Estate. The developer is asking for a lot of variances and all they are going to do is hurt the people that live there now. She has a retention area on her property and there are specific rules that she must adhere to. She can't imagine that a retention pond would even be considered as open space. There was a comment that this development would increase property values. After talking to the largest real estate law firm in Illinois she was informed that her property value would go down the minute townhomes are put in. With 42 additional homes being added, she cannot understand why an intersection light is not being installed at Parker and 131st. There is an accident there every two weeks. She is 60 years old and loves her acre lot. She is not interested in downsizing to a townhome. Even with Kettering they agreed to put the smaller lots on the inside, and the homes on the outside would look more like the surrounding area. They are still dealing with the land grab from Palos and are going to be stuck with all the homes down in that area, which should have been stopped. She stated this needs to be stopped now. This is a problem piece of land and there is a reason why it sat vacant. The townhomes do not belong here.

James Vinci, Kettering Estates, stated he agrees that this is way too dense. He feels the age targeted reference is just their way of getting around things. This could impact the schools. He feels it is ridiculous that they are not going to have any open space. He feels they are trying to use the open space in Kettering as part of this developments open space.

Doug Wright said the snow removal for this subdivision is going to be an issue because there is no place to go with it. It becomes a safety issue for the residents. He asked how are the residents from this subdivision supposed to get to the open space in Kettering.

Chairman Spinelli stated the land that they are proposing has access to the public right-of-way.

Mr. Wright said the community of Lemont spoke clearly about 10 years ago of the importance of having open space, which should not be compromised.

Kevin O'Connor, 13220 Silver Fox, stated they moved in the area in 1977. The property that is being proposed looks very well done when compared to previous proposals. The concern is the water flow. The pond in the corner near 131st gets water flow. He himself has 100 feet of pond frontage, which is the pond to the south that gets no water flow. When they regraded the subdivision they had dumped truckloads of dirt in his backyard. By doing this they had screwed up the flow of water so the pond gets no water. His backyard will face the back of these buildings. He asked how close will these patios be to the east property line.

Chairman Spinelli said they will be 30 feet.

Mr. O'Connor stated the residents in the area moved here for a reason. They are pleased with Lemont and the Township. They like the area rural with no streetlights or sidewalks. He understands the first floor master bedrooms and the target age. He is not in favor of the townhomes, but they are better than the prior proposals that were made.

Rich Kuczkowski, 12975 Parker Road, said the proposed development would tie into the sanitary sewer system on 131st Street. He asked what study has been done with MWRD to assure that the sewer system is adequate.

Chairman Spinelli stated nothing has been submitted to MWRD because there is no final engineering. When the sewers are proposed they are evaluated and sized accordingly for all the properties they are intended to serve.

Mr. Kuczkowski said he agrees with his neighbors and their concerns are extremely important.

Robert Kossak, 13323 Red Coat Drive, stated he agrees with the other residents. He does not understand how this is similar to the surrounding homes. This proposal is too dense for this lot and he strongly opposes this development.

Chairman Spinelli said the similarity they were talking about is the fact it is a residential proposal and not commercial. He then asked if there was anyone else in

the audience that wanted to speak in regards to this public hearing. None responded. He then called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to close the public hearing for Case 18-04. A voice vote was taken:
Ayes: All
Nays: None
Motion passed

Plan Commission Discussion

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further questions or comments from the Commission. None responded. He then called for a motion for recommendation.

Plan Commission Recommendation

Commissioner Cunningham made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Glomp to recommend to the Mayor and Board of Trustees approval of Case 18-04 Willow Pointe Duplexes Rezoning and Preliminary PUD with staff recommendations 1 through 13 listed in staff's report on pages 10 and 11. A roll call vote was taken:
Ayes: None
Nays: Cunningham, Glomp, McGleam, Zolecki, Spinelli
Motion denied

Findings of Fact

Commissioner Glomp made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 18-04 as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:
Ayes: All
Nays: None
Motion passed

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

A. Update From Village Board

Mr. Berry stated the Rolling Meadows Rezoning will be coming before the Committee of the Whole. They are trying to acquire property from the tollway. SS Cyril will also be coming before the COW.

Chairman Spinelli said the text on pavement width needs to be clarified for roadways.

Discussion continued in regards to pavement width for roadways and other possible text amendments that the Commission want to look at.

Chairman Spinelli asked if public works was at the TRC meeting and did they question parking or snow removal.

Mrs. Tate said they were there but did not mention anything.

Chairman Spinelli asked if staff had talked to public works about putting a no parking sign up at the round-about on Christopher in Rolling Meadows.

Mr. Berry stated he did talk to public works and they had advised if it does happen to call the police.

Commissioner McGleam asked if staff heard anything in regards to Ruffled Feathers easement.

Mr. Berry said when he talked to public works they stated that they did get an easement.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they got an easement for water also.

Mr. Berry stated he is not sure and will have to check with public works.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they can let New Horizon know to take down their public notice sign.

VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Glomp to adjourn the meeting. A voice vote was taken:
Ayes: All
Nays: None
Motion passed

Minutes prepared by Peggy Halper