

**Village of Lemont**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
Regular Meeting of January 18, 2017

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, January 18, 2017 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 pm. He then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**B. Verify Quorum**

Upon roll call the following were:

Present: Kwasneski, Cunningham, McGleam, Maher, Zolecki, Spinelli

Absent: Sanderson

Village Planner Heather Valone, Deputy Village Administrator Jeff Stein and Village Trustee Ron Stapleton were also present.

**C. Approval of Minutes: December 21, 2016 Meeting**

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to approve the minutes from the December 21, 2016 meeting with no changes. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

**II. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS**

Chairman Spinelli stated there are five items on the agenda this evening. He asked everyone to stand and raise his/her hand to be sworn in for the public hearing. He then administered the oath. Due to the long meeting they will be closing all public hearings at 10:30 p.m. Any agenda items that do not get heard will be continued until the next available meeting.

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. 16-09 SMALL CELL ANTENNA NEAR 111 MAIN ST. SPECIAL USE**

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to open the public hearing.

## **Public Hearing**

Commissioner Maher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to open the public hearing for Case 16-09. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

Adewale Adetunji, intern for the Village of Lemont, stated Tom Ferry of Buell Consulting, is acting on behalf of the applicant. The applicant is requesting a special use to install a small cell antenna and associated equipment to be installed on a ComEd utility pole near 111 Main Street. Verizon Wireless had made the request to improve data services for their customers. This location was selected due to the amount of traffic generated near the Metra Station and downtown business. The area was also selected due to the limited number of obstructions such as trees and buildings that could affect the coverage area.

The proposed project would include an antenna that would be placed on top of the pole, which will reduce the appearance to passing pedestrians and prevent non-authorized interference with equipment. He showed on the overhead what the equipment will look like.

Mr. Adetunji stated on December 8<sup>th</sup> the applicant presented to the Historical Preservation Committee. At the time the equipment was to be painted to match the pole and also placed at 10 feet above grade. The Commission discussed that although the equipment at the top of the pole is not visually intrusive, the associated equipment is and should be placed higher on the pole. The applicant revised the plans and shifted the associated equipment to 18.5 feet above grade. The HPC has issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application pending Village Board approval.

The applicant has demonstrated the need of the proposed special use and that it will not affect traffic or pedestrian conditions. Staff recommends approval of the special use with the following conditions:

1. The antenna and associated equipment will be painted to match the color of the existing ComEd utility pole. All the equipment appearance will be maintained to ensure the approved color is retained.
2. The minimum permitted height of the associated equipment above grade will be 18.5 feet.
3. The equipment will be maintained in compliance with the Village of Lemont municipal and Building codes.

Chairman Spinelli asked if this was an existing utility pole and the equipment will be mounted above the wires.

Mr. Adetunji said it is an existing utility pole. The equipment is placed below the wires.

Mrs. Valone stated there are two parts that are attached to the pole. The antenna will be at the top and the associated equipment is right below the wires at 18.5 feet.

Commissioner Kwasneski asked how they came up with the minimum.

Mrs. Valone said the HPC came up with the minimum. They wanted it raised above the building line. The 18.5 feet was as high as they could go without interfering with existing wires on the pole.

Commissioner McGleam asked if the applicant had secured approval from ComEd to install the antenna.

Mrs. Valone stated they did. The applicant had to secure that before they could come before the Commission.

Commissioner Cunningham asked if one antenna is enough to meet the current demand needs.

Mrs. Valone said she is going to have the applicant answer that question.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any more questions for staff. None responded. He then asked for the applicant to come up.

Tom Ferry, Buell Consulting, stated he was representing Verizon Wireless. This is a new small cell antenna technology. What Verizon is attempting to do with this instillation and the others that they are deploying throughout Chicago and surrounding areas, is to pinpoint areas where they see spikes in data demand. With the larger traditional tower and antenna instillation they can create an umbrella to give the coverage that is needed, but they are now finding out that the increase in data usage is overloading those existing sites. The target area for this is the Metra Station as well as the downtown area.

Commissioner Cunningham asked what the range on the antenna is.

Mr. Ferry said the search area that the radio frequency gives us is about two-tenths of a mile. It is about less than a half of a mile in diameter that is being covered. It is affected by impediments like trees and buildings and that is why it is imperative to get the location that is needed.

Commissioner McGleam asked if there were other locations identified in Lemont.

Mr. Ferry stated not that he is aware of.

Mr. Stein, Deputy Village Administrator for the Village of Lemont, said there are other major carriers besides Verizon. Staff has met with another consultant that is also looking to put a small cell antenna up.

Mrs. Valone stated this is not like the larger mono poles where they could co-locate another service on top of it.

Commissioner Cunningham asked if this location was chosen due to the lack of obstructions or is there a higher point that will provide better service.

Mr. Ferry stated it was a combination of things. One is the location, then the lack of obstructions and lastly it was meeting the ComEd standards. ComEd has very strict characteristics as to which poles they will and will not allow for them to go on. They were only able to move the equipment up to the 18 feet because there is a communication line at 21 feet and ComEd dictates where it can be placed. One thing he wanted to clarify, is in the staff report it states that no equipment will be located no lower than 18.5 feet above grade. There are two small pieces of equipment that will be flush mounted to the pole. One is the power disc connect which measures 12 inches high, eight inches wide and four inches deep then there is the fiber enclosure.

Mrs. Valone said the staff recommendation is for the larger equipment.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further 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. None responded. He then called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kwasneski to close the public hearing for Case 16-09. 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 in regards to this public hearing. None responded. He then called for a recommendation to the Village Board.

### **Plan Commission Recommendation**

Commissioner Maher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to recommend to the Mayor and Village Board of Trustees approval of Case 16-09 special use of a small cell antenna near 111 Main Street based on staff's conditions listed in staff's report. A roll call vote was taken:

*Ayes: Maher, McGleam, Kwasneski, Zolecki, Cunningham, Spinelli*

*Nays: None*  
*Motion passed*

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 16-09 as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*  
*Nays: None*  
*Motion passed*

**B. 16-11 St. Alphonsus' Parking Lot**

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to open the public hearing for Case 16-11.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commission Zolecki to open the public hearing for Case 16-11. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*  
*Nays: None*  
*Motion passed*

**Public Hearing**

Heather Valone, Planner for the Village of Lemont, said Rev. Brian Ardagh, acting on behalf of the Archdiocese of Chicago, the owner of the subject property, is requesting approvals of a Special Use and Variations to construct a 27 stall parking lot. Staff is recommending approval with conditions. St. Alphonsus (St. Als) main function is the church and the parish but there are some supporting activities that go along with it. Such uses as offices, parish services, Sunday school activities and other associated uses. Prior to submitting a formal application the applicant submitted for TRC (Technical Review Committee) in September. Staff raised some concerns over the lighting, the design of the entrances, and stormwater management. The applicant has made significant changes to revise the application per staff's comments.

Mrs. Valone stated that she will first discuss the Special Use then the variation. The location of the parking lot is at State and Logan Street. The proposed lot is currently vacant with a few trees. St. Als currently has about 55 off-street parking spaces. Village code would require a minimum of 141 parking stalls for the Church sanctuary and the office uses. Even with the 27 parking spots they would be 59 parking stalls deficient per the Code. The proposed parking lot is consistent with the Lemont 2030 Plan which designates this as an institutional area able to expand. The parking lot is just to support existing operations that go on right now. The applicant has proposed to put in a privacy wood fence to shield any headlights going to the south.

Mrs. Valone stated the applicant is seeking two variations. The first is the exterior of parking lots are required to be landscaped with three plant units per 100 feet. This is quite a bit of landscaping for a smaller lot such as this one and is relatively difficult to

accommodate. The application is deficient by a plant unit and a half, which means they are deficient in two canopy trees, two evergreen trees and half of an understory tree. Staff finds this deviation acceptable. It is a hardship trying to meet all the landscape requirements for this small of a lot. Additionally, a reason why the applicant cannot meet the landscaping is because along the south property line instead of putting trees they are putting a six foot wood fence to shield headlights.

The second variation they are asking for is the site is currently zoned R-4A and in that zoning district 65% of the total lot area is permitted to be impervious. They are asking for 68.5% impervious coverage. They are exceeding the Code by 3.5%. Staff finds this deviation acceptable as they providing stormwater management for all of the impervious surfaces and there will be no additional impacts on the neighbors. The Village Engineer reviewed the application and has no objections to the special use or the variations. The Fire Protection District generally approves of the plans. Staff is recommending approval with the following conditions:

1. The plans need to include a “No Left Turn on Sundays” sign at the east access driveway.
2. Remove the three trees along the north property line and revise the plant to include 18 shrubs/grasses where the trees were proposed.
3. Extend photometric plan calculations to five feet past the property lines.
4. Address all comments from the Village Engineer and the Village Arborist.

Chairman Spinelli asked for the lighting code, what is the requirement for at the property line.

Mrs. Valone stated at the property line it must be .1 foot candles in a residential zone.

Chairman Spinelli asked if this was the only configuration that applicant had submitted to the Village.

Mrs. Valone said this is the only configuration that they applicant submitted to the Village.

Chairman Spinelli asked if staff received any soil borings.

Mrs. Valone stated they did not receive any soil borings and the applicant has not taken any soil borings at this time.

Chairman Spinelli said one of his concerns is with the underground detention, not knowing if that is a clay material or how deep the top soil goes. If the area of excavations for the chambers is actually surrounded by top soil and does not have a permeable clay perimeter the water will leach out and affect the neighbor to the south and the church property to the east.

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.

Dave Zientek, Ruettiger, Tonelli & Associates, Inc., stated he was the civil engineer for the project. They will be addressing and updating staff comments to the lighting plan, the landscape plan and the underground water detention. He said they will get soil borings.

Chairman Spinelli said even if they get test pits. This property had a lot of trees and scrub trees on the perimeter near the south. His concern is with the roots that are remaining that may allow additional water to leak to the south. His other concern is the flow of traffic and they are trying to restrict the right-in/right-out on the west entrance. He feels that there should be angle parking instead of the 90 degree parking so they can control the flow of traffic. Eliminating two lane traffic through the drive isles which will allow them to narrow up the drive isles. The parking access sits five feet from the property line to the south, which is too close to the residential house that is there. By doing the angle parking it should allow you to pull that curb line further to the north. In order to get the brick pillar in for the fence, so it is not put right on the property line the parking lot should be pulled further north. He has seen people ignore the smaller pork chops or get confused if it is not a big enough pork chop. With this entrance being so close to State Street he feels they need to control the flow of traffic and eliminate two way traffic throughout this parking lot.

Mr. Zientek stated they did look at some different configurations. They were trying to maximize the number of spaces. With the one way traffic and angle parking it would significantly reduce the number of spaces. He is willing to show that to staff and discuss some of those samples.

Chairman Spinelli said if they are going to keep the 90 degree parking then he is going to recommend that one stall on each east and west bay be removed so the parking lot can be moved north. He also recommends that since they are still working through the design, he would recommend putting it east/west to make it longer and move excavation limits further north so it will be further away from the resident. He asked if any of the Commissioners had questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Zolecki asked if there was full cut-off on the lighting fixtures.

Mr. Zientek stated he is not sure what was actually provided as far as the fixture itself

Commissioner Zolecki said if it is extended past the five feet then Code will dictate that, but his recommendation would be for full cut-off. His other comment is in regards to headlights. There is the six foot fence for the headlights to the south but there should be some consideration for the headlights onto State Street. This might be able to be handled with some landscaping. He is just concerned with the crossing and the amount of traffic right there.

Mrs. Valone stated they could do evergreen shrub rather than grass.

Mr. Zientek said he will work with their landscape architect.

Chairman Spinelli asked when staff looked at the landscaping did they evaluate the vision triangle from the residential driveway also.

Mrs. Valone stated they did not.

Chairman Spinelli asked if staff can take a look at that also. He asked if there were any further 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.

Charles Cicora, 309 Logan Street, said in regards to the deficient parking spaces, the people that go to church are parked on both sides between Walnut and Chestnut. A fire truck or an ambulance would not be able to make it through there on a Sunday during Church. On Walnut there is a sign that says "No Parking" on one side of the street from Saturday night and Sunday morning. He is suggesting that a sign is also placed on Logan Street between Walnut and Hickory for one side parking. There is a lot of congestion there and people are blocking driveways. There is not much residential past Chestnut or Hickory.

Chairman Spinelli asked staff if that can be an action by the Village Board.

Mr. Stein stated it would have to be enacted by the Village Board. They can ask the Public Works Department, Police Department and the Fire Protection to take a look.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there was anyone else in the audience that wanted to speak in regards to this public hearing. None responded.

Commissioner Maher asked on the angle parking does he know how much the parking was reduced by.

Mr. Zientek stated he does not know but they have some documents that they created early on and can share them with staff.

Mrs. Valone asked if it was more than two spaces.

Mr. Zientek said yes it was.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further questions. None responded. He then called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to close the public hearing for Case 16-11. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*



### **Plan Commission Discussion**

Chairman Spinelli said his whole purpose is to try to put more space between the resident to the south and the parking lot. They are asking for a parking lot on a residential lot in close proximity to a resident to the south. Whether it is changing the configuration to angle parking or reducing some east/west parking stalls to allow that south edge to be moved forward, he will leave that up to staff and the engineer to come up with a good solution. He understands that the Church is trying to gain as many parking spaces as they can, but anything put on this property is a gain in parking stalls.

Mrs. Valone asked if he prefers to do the angle parking or lose two stalls.

Chairman Spinelli stated he does not want to say lose two because you will probably have to lose that center median on the bottom part of the "I" or two stalls there also to maintain 24 foot.

Mrs. Valone asked if he would want a measurement from the property line. She asked if he wanted 10 feet from the property line.

Chairman Spinelli said 10 feet would be sufficient.

Mrs. Valone stated then the parking stall will be shifted ten feet to the north and leave a ten foot landscape area along the south property line.

Mr. Zientek said if they are going to work on reconfiguring that south line and there was mentioning of getting rid of that "I" that right now is designed to that Village standard for that landscape island.

Mrs. Valone stated islands are required to be at least nine feet wide. If that is eliminated then that would increase their variation request.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the Commissioners agreed to give the applicant relief to give more space to the resident to the south.

All Commissioners agreed.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further questions of comments. None responded. He then called for a recommendation to the Village Board.

Mr. Zientek asked when he would need to submit soil borings by.

Chairman Spinelli stated prior to receiving their permit to construct the parking lot.

Mrs. Valone said they will need to know prior to their approval if they have to move it off site, which would increase the variation request. So it will be needed before Final approval of the Special Use.

### **Plan Commission Recommendation**

Commissioner Maher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to recommend to the Mayor and Village Board of Trustees approval of Case 16-11 St. Alphonsus Parking Lot Special Use and Variations, based on the following conditions:

1. The plans need to include a “No Left Turn on Sundays” sign at the east access driveway.
2. Remove the three trees along the north property line and revise the plant to include 18 shrubs/grasses where the trees were proposed.
3. Extend photometric plan calculations to five feet past the property lines.
4. Address all comments from the Village Engineer and the Village Arborist.
5. Modify the south property line to create a ten foot separation. They can minimize the middle island based on staff’s recommendations.
6. Add a hedge line along the west side of the lot to shield headlights.
7. Provide soil borings prior to Final approval to ensure that under detention can be handled.
8. Adjust southwest corner to ensure vision triangle is maintained.
9. Provide a full cutoff for light heads.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Ayes: Maher, McGleam, Kwasneski, Zolecki, Cunningham, Spinelli*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 16-11 as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

### **C. 21-15 Look Nu Car Wash PUD and Preliminary Plat**

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to open the public hearing for Case 21-15.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commission Zolecki to open the public hearing for Case 21-15. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

### **Public Hearing**

Mrs. Valone stated that Steven and Wendy Peebles, owners of the subject property, are requesting approval of amendments to the existing Planned Unit Development (PUD). The purpose of the request is to construct outdoor vacuuming units and gates with automated pay stations. They are also requesting to update some of the other items in their PUD. Staff is recommending approval with conditions.

In 2002 the property was rezoned to a commercial use and was also given entitlements. At that time it was called the Nu Look Carwash. The PUD defined standards for the appearance of the building, landscaping, setbacks, and other site improvements. The PUD also restricted all operation to be inside other than the queuing of cars into the car wash and hand drying. It also regulated the hours of operations for the facility. She showed on the overhead a picture of what the site looks like currently. The rear of the facility has some additional parking and then just the landscaping along the back of it.

Mrs. Valone said all of the standards for the landscaping setbacks that are currently on the property were required because to the west and north of the property is residential uses. The applicant is requesting amendment to update their site and two more standard items. The applicant is asking for automated pay stations and gates. She showed on the overhead where they will be located. She showed on the overhead where the vacuuming area would be that is attached to the building and another vacuuming area that is located outside the building.

The existing PUD on the property has a number of standards as well as the UDO. She will go through the changes of the PUD that they are asking for. Right now the PUD restricts the hours of operations to 7 am to 8 pm in the summer and 7 am to 6 pm in the winter. The applicant is asking for the same hours in winter as summer. Staff finds this deviation acceptable. There is not much difference besides headlights but by looking the site the area is well screened to the areas that are residential.

The second is that the PUD restricts all operations to be inside the building. The applicant is proposing these vacuuming units which are technically outside of the building. This also conflicts with the UDO code. The UDO requires that any noise that is being emitted from a commercial district to a residential district that the maximum decibel that is able to be permitted out of a machine is about 57 decibels, which is relatively low. The vacuum that they are proposing, the lowest decibel is 64 thus it does exceed the UDO. Staff finds the vacuuming units outside the building as unacceptable, but not the hoses themselves. The other detail area has the vacuuming unit inside the building and the hoses stick out so they can use them outside. The noise generating vacuuming unit is inside the building for those hoses. The outside unit (shown on the overhead) is unacceptable because it will be permitting too much noise per the UDO and should be moved inside the building. The hoses and the other supporting equipment can remain outside because it does not generate as much noise.

Mrs. Valone stated the Village Engineer and Fire District generally approves of the plan. Staff is recommending approval with the following conditions:

1. The outdoor vacuum unit must be revised to either utilize different equipment, utilize sound reducing equipment to meet the 57 maximum permitted decibels per the UDO, or the vacuum unit must be moved to the interior.
2. The canopy on the vacuuming stations must be removed and all the outdoor vacuuming station equipment must be either a neutral gray or black color.
3. The applicant will comply with a landscaping inspection for the exterior landscaping.

Commissioner Kwasneski asked what the reason was for not wanting the canopy.

Mrs. Valone stated the canopy is visually intrusive. She showed on the overhead what it would look like. Other car washes in town were not permitted to have these as well so they would not look visually unattractive.

Chairman Spinelli asked where is the location of the existing storm water area.

Mrs. Valone said the perimeter of the site is a swale.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they already had plans to put the vacuum head unit for the vacuum at the building inside.

Mrs. Valone stated that is correct.

Chairman Spinelli said it was recommended to move the vacuum head for the south bay of vacuums into the building. He asked if there has been any feedback from the applicant regarding this.

Mrs. Valone stated staff did indicate to the applicant that sound will be a concern and if it is too loud of a decibel for the surrounding areas it could be required to be moved inside. She will let the applicant speak as to whether they can comply to the conditions.

Commissioner Kwasneski asked if staff received any comments or concerns from the surrounding residents.

Mrs. Valone said not prior to the meeting. She did not know if anyone in the audience was here to speak.

Commissioner McGleam asked if staff knew what the distance was from the vacuuming units to the nearest resident.

Mrs. Valone stated it is about 95 feet.

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

Mike Carey and Steven Peebles came up to speak.

Mr. Carey said the vacuum that they are proposing inside has already existed since the car wash opened and there has never been any complaints. If you look where the entrance is to the car wash, there are currently four drops there and it is relatively close to the residential area. They have never had a complaint or issues with that. They are planning on taking those four away from there and moving them further away from the home to the front of the entrance. They are probably moving it 100 feet further than the current location. They originally asked for the vacuum outside but can't get it down to the decibel rating, so they are going to put it inside the building at the other entrance.

Chairman Spinelli clarified that the unit on the south side which is proposed to be outside is going to be moved inside.

Mr. Carey stated talking to staff earlier it was stated to bring it down to 57 decibels or move it in. They informed staff that they aren't even going to try to get it down so they will just move it inside. As far as the trees, when the place was originally built there were 5 to 6 trees that were required. They are probably 15 to 18 feet currently so you won't see any of that from the road. Currently in that corner they stack 15 to 20 cars for the drying procedure, so there are cars currently there, except now there will be cars there vacuuming free of charge for themselves.

Commissioner Maher asked to clarify that the vacuums on the south will be moved inside. He asked how the hose will be run.

Mr. Carey said there is a concrete apron that comes out from the door that is about 16 feet and it runs all the way out to the curb and the rest of the parking lot is asphalt. What they plan on doing is running a trench from the curb so you will not see it from the street.

Commissioner Maher asked the three stalls that they have in the middle is where they will have the hose coming out.

Mr. Carey stated with the attachments that will be available on the south end of the parking lot and there will be three lanes on the front of the building as well, which will come from the internal vacuum as well.

Commissioner Maher asked if that was going to be for general self-serve customers or is that going to be for detailing work.

Mr. Carey said all the detailing work is done inside so it will be primarily for self-serve. The front is if there is an overflow and someone needs it.

Commissioner Zolecki stated he had mentioned the staging for the dry-off and there is the vacuums. He asked how is this going to work.

Mr. Carey said the new scheme is that they are going to be fully automated and the only drying off they are going to be doing is in the front bays itself.

Commissioner Zolecki asked if they are changing the equipment.

Mr. Carey stated they are changing the equipment and design. They will still be offering the full service but it will be done in the front detail bays. He showed on the overhead where some of the full service will be done.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they were planning on changing any of the perimeter of the building structurally.

Mr. Carey said they are not doing any additions and the only modification they are doing is to the south entrance. The door there is 16 feet and they will shrink it down to 12 feet. The door on the north end has two doors and they are just going to shift the doors.

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

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kwasneski to close the public hearing. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

### **Plan Commission Recommendation**

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further questions or comments. None responded. He then called for a recommendation to the Mayor and Village Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Zolecki made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kwasneski to recommend to the Mayor and Village Board of Trustees approval of Case 21-15 PUD Amendments based on staff recommendations:

1. The outdoor vacuum unit must be revised to either utilize different equipment, utilize sound reducing equipment to meet the 57 maximum permitted decibels per the UDO, or the vacuum unit must be moved to the interior.
2. The canopy on the vacuuming stations must be removed and all the outdoor vacuuming station equipment must be either a neutral gray or black color.

3. The applicant will comply with a landscaping inspection for the exterior landscaping.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Ayes: Zolecki, Kwasneski, McGleam, Maher, Cunningham, Spinelli*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 21-15 as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

#### **D. 16-10 Vistancia Annexation, Rezoning, and Preliminary PUD (Cont.)**

Chairman Spinelli asked anyone who entered the meeting after everyone was sworn in to please rise and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath to those people. He then called for a motion to open the continued public hearing for Case 16-10.

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to re-open the continued public hearing for Case 16-10. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

Mrs. Valone said as stated this case is being continued from the regular meeting of December 21, 2016. The applicant has revised the engineering plans, the architectural product book and a few other items to meet staff's recommendations. She stated that she will only discuss the changes. The applicant has made changes to the lot configuration, the number of lots, setback requests, the location of the proposed park and the proposed product book.

Previously, the applicant was asking for seven and half foot side yard interior setbacks for the duplexes and have since revised their plans to be ten feet between the duplexes. They are still requesting 25 foot rear yard setback in lieu of 30 feet for the duplexes. Staff has updated the recommendation and finds this deviation acceptable for the duplexes that are along the open spaces or the tollway. However, staff finds this deviation unacceptable for duplex units 257-260 and duplexes 265-278. She showed on the overhead where these duplexes were located.

The applicant was also looking for deviations from the UDO for the single-family detached product. Previously, they were asking for eight foot side yard setbacks and now they are asking for seven and half to comply with potential brick requirements. Staff has also updated their requirements for these reduced setbacks. Staff finds these

deviations acceptable if the high profile lots, which are now number 1-20, 35-57, and 100-113 had brick on all first floor elevations.

Mrs. Valone stated the applicant has revised their request and is now requesting 25 foot rear yard setbacks in lieu of 30 for the single-family as well. Staff finds this deviation acceptable for the majority of the homes that back up to open spaces. Staff does not find this deviation acceptable for lots 35-39, 51-56, 129-135, and 279-287. These units either back up to existing single-family homes, proposed single-family homes, or duplexes.

The last item was that the applicant was asking for narrower interior roads. The applicant has now changed their request to meet a minimum of 30 foot pavement width of back to back curb, but has asked for reduce right-of-way of 60 feet. Staff is still requesting that Alba Drive, Woodview Drive and portions of Vistancia Drive be 60 feet of right-of-way and 33 feet of back to back curb as they could be consider larger streets.

As mentioned earlier the applicant has shifted the location of the proposed park site. She showed on the overhead where the park site was previously located and where it is currently being proposed. She said she will let the Park District comment on this later.

Mrs. Valone said the applicant has revised their product book. The applicant is still proposing three sub-neighborhoods. The first neighborhood is located near the Timberline Drive entrance known as the Summit neighborhood which now consists of 97 lots. The second neighborhood is the Ridgeline neighborhood, which is located in the middle of the subdivision, which is now comprised of 68 units, down from 75 units. The third neighborhood is known as the Villas, which is the duplex product. This has increased to 122 units which is up by two units at 61 lots.

The applicant is proposing a product book to address the appearance and the anti-monotony. The product book does contain all the proposed materials for the residences and the dominant material is the LP siding. The product book contains seven models with five elevations for the Summit neighborhood. All seven models include some level of masonry on the front façade. Staff is still recommending that the applicant work to finalize the product book. As an example, the Greenfield model needs some adjustment to its front elevations. The applicant is also proposing five models with five elevations for the Ridgeline neighborhood. All five models include some type of masonry on the front façade. The product book was revised to change the previous Mercer, Continental, Newberry issues that staff indicated. However, staff is recommending that the applicant continue to finalize the product book. Additionally, staff is recommending the high profile lots, 1-20, 35-57, 100-113 be required to have masonry from top of grade to first story on all elevations. This is an increase from the previous staff report because the configuration pushed more of the lots to meet the criteria of either being against single-family or along the bluff line. It was previously at 30% and is now roughly at 34.5%.



Mrs. Valone stated the applicant is proposing in lieu of a key lot configuration for the subdivision to have additional features such as trim, rear enhancement, additional windows and brick as an option. The applicant is proposing that the lots seen in red (on the overhead), which are lots 1-9, 19, 20, 21-23, 35-39, 51-57, 72, 73, 80, 99, 98, 124, 134, 135, 145, 146, 157, 287, and 279 be the key lots that the applicant would have additional features in the product book

The proposed Villas would have three possible elevations. Staff does not have an issue with these but would like to work with them on color packages. Staff is recommending that the duplexes that back up to single-family lots, 257-260 and 265-278, be required to have masonry extending from grade to first floor on all elevations. This is roughly 18% of the duplex units. The total percentage for the entire subdivision for first floor brick on all elevations is 25.5%. The applicant did update their Stonebrook elevation to include a gable on the rear of it to give it a more balanced appearance.

Mrs. Valone said the Village Engineer has commented that portions of Vistancia Drive, Woodward and Alba, as discussed earlier, be considered collector streets and should be increased to 33 feet back-to-back pavement width. Additionally, the Engineer had reviewed the proposed detention facility at the Timberline entrance. It still does not meet IDOT (Illinois Department of Transportation) requirements for distance from road. Street lights are still missing from subdivision plans. Lastly, there are four ravines on the property, the applicant has shifted the lots to move them out of the ravine area so they are not in the buffer area. The Village Engineer is still recommending that on that outlot area there still be an easement included to ensure that no future impacts are done in that area. She showed on the overhead where she was talking about.

School District 113A and 210 provided comments. District 210 provided comments that they do have impact fees for the subdivision. Also, the phase approach will allow them additional time to adjust staffing and facility needs for the projected increase enrollment. District 113A provided comments that the Board of Education has been diligent and mindful of trying to reduce class sizes over the last three years and remains committed to doing so. District 113A will see a higher enrollment than District 210 but the District will receive impact fees.

Mrs. Valone stated that staff is recommending approval with the following conditions, which are listed on pages 14 and 15 of staff's report and have been modified since last month. She then read through the conditions. She asked if the Commission had any questions.

Chairman Spinelli asked what is the definition as to where a cul-de-sac starts.

Mrs. Valone said the Village's definition as to where a cul-de-sac starts is at the neck of the cul-de-sac. She showed on the overhead where the neck would start.

Chairman Spinelli asked where what he calls the “eyebrow” or “knuckle” east of the cul-de-sac that was used as an example, would be considered a cul-de-sac.

Mrs. Valone showed on the overhead how the anti-monotony would work for a cul-de-sac.

Chairman Spinelli asked for staff to clarify what the Engineer wants for the roadways.

Mrs. Valone said the streets that are not part of the spine of the neighborhood are 33 feet back-to-back curb.

Chairman Spinelli clarified that it would give them 27 feet of pavement. He stated in the staff report it is not clear. If it is a 30 foot pavement width, then it is 33 feet back-to-back on curbs.

Mrs. Valone stated on the side streets they are wanting 30 feet of pavement which will make curb-to-curb 33 feet. The collector roads will be 33 feet pavement with 36 curb-to-curb pavement.

Chairman Spinelli asked what the applicant was requesting for rear yard setbacks for the Villas and the Ridgeline.

Mrs. Valone said 25 foot rear yards setbacks across the board. Staff is recommending anything that backs up to an existing home or another dwelling unit be 30 feet.

Commissioner Maher asked why staff is not recommending the duplexes along the highway to be 30 feet rear yard setbacks.

Mrs. Valone stated even though it backs up to the tollway there is a lot of right-of-way there for the tollway.

Commissioner Maher asked if there was a buffer from the rear yard to the fence of the tollway.

Mrs. Valone said she will let the applicant answer that question.

Commissioner Kwasneski asked if staff could clarify the number of units gained/lost with the revision.

Mrs. Valone stated they lost seven units in the single-family and they are gaining two duplexes, so they are still losing five lots.

Commissioner Maher said last month the applicant stated there will be a bike lane through part of the subdivision. He asked what is the requirement for a dedicated bike lane on a street.

Mrs. Valone stated a dedicated bike lane, versus a shared lane, is a minimum of seven feet. If it is shared it needs to be indicated in the pavement widths and it is a minimum of 30 feet.

Commissioner Maher asked if parking is allowed on the street.

Mrs. Valone said it is in designated places but not along the actual bike lane. She showed on the overhead which streets will have the bike path.

Chairman Spinelli said on one of the applicants' prints, they are showing a driveway to the Township Community Center which does not exist. He asked who is proposing this driveway.

Mrs. Valone stated it is a revision and she will let the applicant answer that question.

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

Dan LeClair, Green Tech Engineering, introduced his team that is present this evening. He would like to go over some of the changes since the last meeting. He put together a presentation that would go over the previous layout and the current layout. On the previous layout there was one thorough street that went through the whole subdivision. On the new layout they introduced another intersection primarily as a traffic calming device to get people to stop as they are going through the development. The primary changes are right where that reconfiguration of the intersection is.

This project is proposed as a two stage project. The unit mix did change a little bit with the first phase. The total number of units have been reduced from the previous plan. In regards to the single-family units they had revised some of the rear yards setbacks and the lot areas. The primary change was with the Vistas with the increase in the side yard setbacks at 10 feet, which gives them a 20 foot separation between the units.

Mr. LeClair stated the play area was originally located across the road from the new plan. The infrastructure within the play area would be the same. They like that the new play area backs up to the open space as well as having a common area to the Township area. He showed on the overhead the open space areas. The brighter green area is the area that will be transferred to the Township.

The landscaping has changed throughout the site. They are maintaining the buffer areas as well as the plantings along the east property line. In addition to that, on the southside of their entrance, coming off of Timberline Drive, they are proposing some

retaining walls because there is a significant grade change there. At the top of those retaining walls they are proposing some pretty intensive landscaping.

In regards to the valley crossing, they are working with their environmental and wetlands consultant with respect to that crossing. The plan that is before the Commission is showing a box culvert, but they are looking at different options trying to minimize the impact to that valley. The valley is about 45 feet deep which is a big drop in grade there. They are looking at a more natural bottom. The woodland preservation stays the same with the new layout. They are going to be saving two extra trees after final count.

Mr. LeClair said for the street pavement it is 33 feet back-to-back pavement on the major roads, which gives them 27 feet edge to edge of asphalt. This would be for the non-collector roads. For the main roads it is a little bit wider, but he would have to look at that. He is a little bit concerned having to increase the width to 36 feet back-to-back.

Chairman Spinelli asked the applicant to not reference the same dimension for back-to-back and pavement.

Mr. LeClair stated all of his references are for back-to-back. What he finds with residential subdivisions, is when they increase that width if there are no other elements in there like stop signs, then you will see an increase in speed of traffic. One of the ways they keep it reduced is by reducing the pavement. The canopy from the trees or the landscaping make it a little more narrow, rather than making it more open like an expressway. He respects the desire to widen it, but he simply asks to take this into consideration.

Some of the neighbors had mentioned about bringing another roadway access into this property, unfortunately this property does not extend up to New Avenue. They actually looked at the visual impact of this neighborhood by looking at it from the outside. When driving down New Avenue there are a couple of places where you can see the property. There is the edge of the bluff on the hillside that is currently wooded and there are several trees along the bluff that they are wanting to preserve. This will help with the buffer and preserving that visual effect. Once trees start getting planted in the backyards it will also help with the reduced visualization from the tollway.

Mr. LeClair said there was discussion at the last meeting in regards to where driveways were going to be located. They were able to locate driveways on every one of these lots. There are two locations at this preliminary stage where they see the driveways coming close to the intersection. Those would be lots 116 and 156. He thinks they might be able to adjust lot 116.

Chairman Spinelli stated the U.S. Postal Service requires cluster boxes now, so the driveway configuration might have to be adjusted again. When they meet with the Post Office regarding these cluster boxes, he would like to see the driveways

straddling the cluster boxes. There are too many times where people park to close or block mailboxes. If the cluster box is straddled by driveways this should help prevent that.

Mr. LeClair said they handed out a couple of papers to the Commission tonight that have a couple of definitions or descriptions of the ordinance. Essentially there are a few items that they are asking variations from the UDO. Some have to do with lot widths, lot area because they are doing a PUD and they are doing a lot of preservations. One of the site variations that he has listed on here is the ordinance requires the maximum depth of the detention basin of four feet, specifically under the dry detention basin. Technically they are not sure of which type of basin because on this site these stormwater ponds are sitting right at the edge of the bluff. They want to make sure they do everything they can to protect the bluff from any type of water penetration. They would like to reserve the right that if they make that a dry basin then they could make it a little deeper. They plan on working with the Village Engineer in regards to that.

They plan on working with the Village in respect to street lights. They want to make sure they get the development layout firmed up and driveway locations situated. With respect to staff's conclusions 1 through 6 and 14 through 17 those are site related and they can pretty much handle every one of those. He will now have Peter Tremulis come up and talk about the architectural standards.

Commissioner Maher asked if he could ask him some questions first. He asked how much land are they planning on giving to the Township.

Mr. LeClair stated there is little under four acres.

Commissioner Maher asked where was it at last month.

Mr. LeClair said he is not sure but he thinks it went up a little bit.

Commissioner Maher asked if any of the area donated part of the ravines.

Mr. LeClair stated there is a ravine there.

Commissioner Maher asked if a lot of the area is the ravine or is it usable as a passive park.

Mr. LeClair said when they started this project he had walked through that particular ravine. There are parts of it that are steep but a lot of the area is very usable.

Mrs. Valone stated some of that area is being proposed for a land swap with other areas. The only area that is being donated as part of the impact fees is the park site.

Mr. LeClair said there are three different areas that they are working with. He showed one area on the overhead that will be going to the Township. There is another area south, where they were planning on vacating a portion of Alba Road. As part of that vacated portion they would donate a small portion to the Township. He showed on the overhead where he was talking about. The Township was looking for a new driveway down in that area. There is a third area that will have a connection to the park, but this is a portion of land that they are going to be taking in trade from the Township in lieu of the property that they are donating to them.

Commissioner Maher asked what is the net in property for the Township.

Mr. LeClair stated about three acres.

Commissioner Maher asked how big is the land that the Park District is getting.

Mr. LeClair said there is 26.5 acres of open space on this land that is not included in the area that is going to the Township.

Commissioner Maher asked how much of it is usable. He asked how much of it can be used as a passive park.

Bruce Michael, applicant, stated they had met with the Township and they had agreed that they could do this land trade which has about 3.4 acres that is located near the Summit neighborhood. They would get from them a small .75 acre triangle that is located down in the southwest portion of their park and they would also receive a .37 acre parcel. He showed on the overhead where everything was located. In addition, they have been talking with them and they are contemplating taking over the rest of the open space. They have not given them an answer as of yet.

Commissioner Maher said the reason why he is asking the question is when you look at the lot sizes and the side and rear setbacks they are significantly smaller than any subdivision he has seen come through here within the last eight years. When they have gone significantly smaller on the minimum sizes they have gone to the clustering subdivisions that allowed for parks that weren't necessarily Park District land but more passive parks. What he was looking for is if the lots are smaller there is a trade off with more passive park land for the neighborhood to use. What he is seeing is that they are going significantly smaller on the lots and most of the land that is being given to Township, Village or HOA is not really usable. This does not seem to be a trade-off for him. This is not a good trade for 6,900 square feet on a lot size when the requirement is 12,500. He would like to keep the ravines and the topography, but this is not usable area. He asked how high is the retaining wall near Timberline.

Mr. LeClair stated it will probably end up being two walls about ten feet high.

Commissioner Maher asked why did they go to the steepest part of that curve rather than going further north where it might flatten down a little.

Mr. LeClair said they have done several analysis of this. Timberline Drive is very steep going down that hill. When they take the elevation at the existing road, whether it is where they are proposing it or if you go down vertically, there is about 20 feet where it enters the development and the existing ground. They had looked at putting the entrance on the outside part of the curve and there is a very significant change in grade that would require them to make some severe cuts. They had analyzed the vertical separation between where they want to be coming into the main portion of the property versus bringing the entrance out to the inside portion of the curve. In addition, they have been working with the developer across the street in lining up their entrance with them.

Commissioner Maher clarified that the entrance where it is located keeps the entrance drive at a smaller grade.

Mr. LeClair stated the vertical requirements of the road fits much better here than if they were to slide the road to the north.

Commissioner Maher asked the houses to the south of that road, that are not part of the subdivision, what is the offset going to be from their property line to the start of the wall.

Mr. LeClair said it will be 20 feet. It gives them a buffer and allows them to put plenty of landscape on top of the wall.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they are going to be providing safety railings on the top of those walls.

Mr. LeClair stated their goal is to incorporate the safety rail into the landscaping.

Commissioner Maher said his concern is that this is a very steep part of the hill and there can be a lot of ice on the roads.

Mr. LeClair stated he understands and this is not something they normally do. They generally try to keep a roadway on the straight away. The existing roadway that is out there and the vertical incline makes it very tough.

Chairman Spinelli said the Village Engineer had commented on the proximity to the stormwater basin number two to the road right-of-way on Timberline. It does not appear that any modifications have been made. This will need to be addressed.

Mr. LeClair stated he will go back and look at it again.

Commissioner Zolecki said on the summary sheet of the UDO standards, the side yards for the R-4 the commentary column states that the Summit lot typical equals 10.7 and the Ridgeline is typically 9.2. He asked what is typical.

Mrs. Valone stated what they are referencing is that the Village code indicates that R-4 lots that are under 70 feet is 16.5% of the lot width. They are saying that their lot width would range from 9 to 11 feet. It is a percentage of the lot width, so the larger the width the larger the setback becomes. What they are saying is if they allowed them to go under the R-4 existing lot width section of the code it would require 9 to 11 feet and they are proposing 7.5. They are trying to indicate based off that code section, instead of 15 feet for new development, it is not as large of a variation.

Mr. Michael

said the Master Plan for this area calls for a 5 unit per acre density and they are asking for 2.7 unit per acre. There are a lot of areas that are hard to develop, very expensive to develop, or cannot be developed. They have clustered stuff to avoid the area that cannot be developed and they still have a very low density compared to what the Master Plan says.

Peter Tremulis, Vice President of Land for Pulte Homes, stated when they started this project looking to come into Lemont it was based upon the work that was done with Kettering and M/I Homes. They are trying to be as consistent as they can relative to the requests that they have filed for to the Village for elevations, brick accents, and optional features. They have updated their book and it is presented to the Commission. He would like to clarify a couple of things. The first is they are looking to have a water table brick for the first floor rear and sides be options rather than be standard for the community. The approach for the high visibility lots is to label them as key lots and have those identified on a map. They have done their own key lot map with an effort of trying to be responsive to the commentary that came from this Commission and identify the lots that were responsive to the concern.

The design elements for the homes that are to be included on the key lots are marked in red in the book with the exception of the gable that was requested on the Stonebrook model which now includes a standard rear facing gable and volume space in the family room. The reason for this is to try and compete from a market base approach with M/I Homes and to ensure that their underwriting for this acquisition remains intact. They are the contract purchaser, but are not truly applicant, and have been asked to fill the role relative to architectural submissions and approvals for the community. Their market in Chicago is still in recovery, so he has put together a few slides to try and illustrate that.

Mr. Tremulis said there are a few additional slides that he is hoping to try and illustrate why they want to work with Lemont on specific architectural modifications but try to handle them in a cost effective manner. He then went through the book that was presented on the overhead showing products, the layout of the different neighborhoods, and home styles. They did note that brick and stone elements to



return two feet on side elevations and match front elevation height. On the high visibility lots which they are calling key lots, their proposal is that the homes will have architectural features to break up the flat plain of the rear. He stated that 60% of consumers that they do sell to do include in their purchase an optional sunroom. Realizing that it was not enough to provide more articulation to the rear elevation they have now included a café bump out in the kitchen and have included windows on side elevations. They are also including ban boards and trim around the windows.

He showed the key lot exhibit on the overhead. He stated that the key lots are in the high visibility area along the bluff and along the existing residents along Timberline Drive. The few lots that they have pulled out of the list of lots in that area have to do with the fact the triangular area on the east side of the site has a rather pronounced hill. It serves as a significant buffer between the proposed homes and the existing homes to the east. Staff had suggested including brick requirements for the attached product, they do not have any proposed brick elements as a standard item on side and rear elevations for the attached product. They do have the option to buy brick water table or brick full height for any home in the community, but they would rather keep that as an option.

Chairman Spinelli asked them to confirm that they are not offering vinyl as an option.

Mr. Tremulis stated they are not. All elements are LP smart siding. They are also not offering hardy board. They are trying to make sure the lots that are marked as key lots are truly high visibility lots. Any lot that goes from townhome to single-family or single-family to townhome are considered high visibility. A number of trees that are within the hillside area of the property will provide significant cover for rear elevations within the community especially along areas of internal bluff to bluff area.

He included documents in the presentation to help make the case that brick is an expensive item to include as a standard feature in a home. Brick is only one element that drives value. Schools, proximity to employment, relocations, and livability in the community help drive housing values more effectively. He continued to talk and provided data about other communities that require brick and peak values in communities. He said in essence there has been very little to no appreciation over the past ten years with the value of a four bedroom house. Some houses are a little higher and some a little lower, but over the past twelve months there really hasn't been much movement in housing values. He provided a slide that was provided by the brick institute that identifies what the average cost is to wrap a home in brick including sides and rear. He did talk to the people at M/I Homes to see what percentage of people have taken the brick wrap and there has only been a handful of people.

Mr. Tremulis said he did provide color samples and a chart of detail colors for staff to review, which includes brick as well as siding and roof materials. They did redo the elevation lineup and model lineup in a couple of instances to reduce monotony. Their goal is to have this plan book approved as part of this PUD. He showed the model that was called out last month as being lopsided. He showed how they added volume

space above the great room. He stated this would conclude the architect portion. They are wanting to maintain signage visible throughout the sale program. They are not used to having to remove signs before everything is sold. He said he is available to answer any questions that the Commission might have.

Commissioner Zolecki stated at the beginning it was mentioned that they would accommodate the continuous brick returns. At least on the sides most of the plans already had that. The return back to the main entry on most of the plans still shows no masonry or stone when that option is shown.

Mr. Tremulis said it could be continuous. They want to make sure that they don't get hammered with the full sided brick requirements. He had not detailed that out. When the comments came back in December that they were going to be looking at mandatory 75 lots with brick, this is a show stopper for them. He is happy to make adjustments to the front elevations.

Commissioner Zolecki stated he could appreciate the conversation about brick cost from a market standpoint. However, it is also about when it is used and used smartly of any aspect of the design. They agree on it but he is not seeing it. It does not make it very attractive as an option, where it maybe could be to the buyer as an option.

Mr. Tremulis said they are happy to continue working on elevations as long as they could set some ground rules on that. Right now they did do simple math and it is about a 1.7 million as it relates to in terms of extra cost.

Commissioner Zolecki stated his other question is in regards to cost data. He asked where he got that data from.

Mr. Tremulis said it was from the brick institute.

Commissioner Zolecki asked if it was based on one unit from the brick industry.

Mr. Tremulis said it is for one house, which is \$25,000 in brick.

Commissioner Zolecki stated the brick industry is looking at this as one unit versus the economy scale.

Mr. Tremulis said he could not comment on that, but he did get the opportunity to speak to the masonry person who is working in three subdivision locally. That person is going to look at this subdivision and hopefully get a good value for brick that they are ultimately going to contract for work in Lemont. There are a lot constituencies out there that they have to deal with in various municipalities and this is a particular threshold on how to craft the elevations and also make sure they are market sensitive.

Commissioner Zolecki stated the one slide says the variance from a total cost to construction per square foot to a home in brick versus fiber cement is \$10 plus or minus .06 cents.

Mr. Tremulis said they were estimating the brick at about \$20 a square foot whereas the siding is \$4 a square foot.

Commissioner Zolecki stated he is just going off of his slides. It states that the masonry institute is basically saying a variance of cost per square foot of total home construction of brick versus fiber cement is \$10.43.

Mr. Tremulis said they don't look at it the same way. They have included their slides so the Commission can see that he is not trying to hide any numbers.

Commissioner Zolecki stated it was mentioned about people's lifestyles in choice of their budgets. He total agrees and this also works towards total square footage of homes and those choices as well that if offered with smart design options of lesser square footages.

Mr. Tremulis said homes have gotten much larger over the past 10 years. They are trying to offer a wide variety of homes with three different neighborhoods. The approach that they are looking to do is maintain simparity with the M/I Homes which they also offer a 40 foot product and a 50 foot product. They use hardy and we are planning on using LP. They do think the market is here and it demonstrated that they are selling about 8 a month. Their goal is to do 15 a quarter so they are not overly aggressive in terms of what they are trying to accomplish in terms of sales, but they do want to make sure it is consistent sales.

Chairman Spinelli asked with the stone features are they natural or manmade.

Mr. Tremulis stated it is a culture stone product that it is made of real stone but not full depth stone.

Commissioner Maher asked if they are required to put brick up in the subdivision that they are building in Woodridge.

Mr. Tremulis said no. There is one subdivision that is existing and that is Timber's Edge which has brick on first floor on all elevations. For that community Woodridge required it and they knew that going in. They knew their costs so they knew they could afford it there and still make sales. This particular property is a little bit different then your typical property in Lemont. It has been called out specifically in the Comprehensive Plan update as a property that has the features that they have been looking for to try and provide a range of houses that address different price points. When they looked at the site they felt it was appropriate for the site. It is in a great location of town but the topography makes it challenging. The land development costs are quite high. The recognition of the fact that it is a challenging property and it

is noted in the Comprehensive Plan. To afford the higher density and the cluster of lots is very attractive to them.

Commissioner Maher stated there are other developments in town that they have higher requirements other than M/I. From his perspective on a development coming in what he is looking for is consistency with some of the developments that they have. What they are showing and going against staff's recommendations is significantly different than some of the other developments that were approved even for M/I.

Mr. Tremulis said yes and they would be quite pleased if it is right on with M/I. Where the discussion has gone is very much farther than where M/I is right now in terms of requirements and placing the burden on as many lots that were identified. This is something they can't do.

Commissioner Maher stated he thinks M/I has a higher percentage of brick that was required. He also thinks that M/I, excluding townhomes, has a higher average square footage per lot as well. He thinks that the density in the areas that they are building is higher than M/I.

Mr. Tremulis said he thinks that their Ridgeline lots are very similar to their 40 foot product lots.

Commissioner Maher stated that is just a third of the property. He had gone through the models for the Ridgeline homes, and he appreciates that there is five different models, but he feels the Mercer, Continental and Newbury are very similar from an outside perspective. His request would be to add some more variety. When he looks at the Summit a couple of the other units are completely different.

Mr. Tremulis said staff and he had spent some time trying to pick elevations out of the portfolio. He will continue to work through the elevations. What they are trying to work on is the anti-monotony code.

Commissioner Maher stated on the color slides for the siding, when he looks at the M/I homes they have a shade of blue, grey and white. So when he looks at it, it will be three colors. When he looks at the siding for Pulte the blue and grey are very similar.

Mr. Tremulis said they can look at other colors. The ones that are shown are just standard.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further questions for the applicant. None responded. He then asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak.

Louise Egofske, Lemont Park District Executive Director, stated the lots that are being proposed towards the back are in wetlands. They will need to look at those lots for improving them due to the wetlands.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the central location was okay.

Mrs. Egofske said the location was fine.

Chairman Spinelli asked the applicant if the lot that was indicated for the Park District is in waters of the U.S., would they be covering the 404 Permit for that.

Mr. LeClair stated yes they would.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the Park District had any suggestions or requests.

Mrs. Egofske said they haven't had the opportunity to look at an alternate lot. They have explored about three to four different locations. They just need some time to look at the lot and find out what options they have to make the lot more flat and usable.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the applicant was providing the equipment with this lot.

Mrs. Egofske stated that is something they can continue having discussions on. They have not worked out the terms yet.

Mr. Stein said the amount of the impact fees are set. How they get allocated and for what purposes they were going to work that out with the annexation agreement.

Kathy Henrikson, Lemont Township, stated in the Villa area she is concerned about a wetland right off of Alba that they have been restoring with the High School students. They have worked on it for two years and have invested a lot of money there. She would like this area protected. She said she is speaking on behalf of the Township and the Open Space Committee. On Alba she would like to see some speed bumps put in around the dog park area. The marketing signs that they are presenting at Timberline and Alba on the west side, she feels would be better on the east side. The visibility is not really that good and they have a lot of seniors that are coming in and out of the building all day. She saw that the Village hired the Ecology and Vision Group. She would have liked to have the Open Space Committee involved in that a bit so she could have shown them some of the natural features. Before any buffers or berms are planted she would like their Prairie Manager to approve any plantings and try to keep them in line there. The backyards to some of these homes are backing up to the township.

At this point they have had verbal agreements with the supervisor. Any final approvals for land swaps will have to be approved by the Township Board. She does not want them to think it is a done deal. The land that they are proposing to give to the Township is not really land that they need. They want to co-operate and make this a good subdivision. Right now they are giving them the land to make the entrance work at Alba, which changes the natural front to the park that is there. She would like

to continue to work and improve the Community Center area with a public gathering area which would have a greater community use.

Dave Molitor said as far as the brick, there was a large conversation in regards as to how much it was going to cost them. They do recuperate that cost when they sell the house. It also adds a good aesthetic value to not only the individuals that live there who are backing up to those homes but it gives a nice look to the subdivision. The applicant talked about corner lots that tie in the old to the new, and he would say to tie those in. In regards to Commissioner Maher's comment about usable space, this tends to be a big issue. He lives up in Fordham and the Park District did an amazing job with Northview Park and he can't wait for it to be open. He hopes that they have the opportunity to make something nice in this area also.

Jim Connelly, 58 Timberline, stated he is asking that the Village Board work with the developer in creating an extra street to access the development from New Avenue. He understands that this Commission recommends to the Village Board, but the Village Board has to make the initiation. This subdivision is like putting 20 pounds of nails in a 5 pound bag. It doesn't work especially in an emergency. There are opportunities now before this development is finished. There is also Fourth Street that is east of the Village and Wheeler Drive.

Joan Walsh, 3 Timberline Place, said she has lived in Lemont for about 40 years and her kids have been raised here. Her home backs up to this proposed development. What she is getting out of this is that the applicant is looking to do quantity and not quality. They need to look at how it is going to affect everyone in the area. She does not think this development should be compared to M/I Homes. It should be compared to homes in the area like the ones west of I-355. Those homes don't compare to what they are trying to do here.

Mrs. Walsh stated the ravines that are back there are spectacular. Her fear is that they are putting homes around this area. When it rains that water runs very rapidly. She feels it is dangerous and it is a bad location for the Park District to put a park for 2 to 12 year olds. She is concerned that they are going to ruin the ecosystem by filling this or developing it. When 355 came in, Lemont fought tooth and nail to not allow billboards be put in that area for the beautification for the area. Now they want to put in mass quantities of duplexes. Which was never shown during the presentation. She asked what is the end result and it goes back to quantity and not quality. She feels they are going to run into more problems with selling these lots. She does not like having the entrances onto Timberline Drive. At any time if there is any bit of snow then you have no control going down that hill. She feels that there should a different entrance. She understands that there is a grading issue, but there is a safety issue here.

Mary Ameriks, 12354 Thornberry Drive, said they had talked about the key lots along 355. She asked how visible are the duplexes along 355. Her only concern is that there are the houses west at Briarcliffe, Rolling Meadows, and Mayfair and they are comparing themselves to Kettering Estates. She is not sure if her neighbors would be

happy to be across from there. When you are driving down 355 you see Mayfair and Briarcliffe but from the east you will see these Villas, unless they are covered then she would not have a problem with that.

Mr. Tremulis stated there is a berm and landscaping. The other thing that is important to know is that the property sits much higher than the tollway. The Villas are offered as ranches so they are low profile. A second floor bedroom and bath is offered.

Colleen Amberg, 112 Timberline, said she had some questions regarding the traffic analysis. The previous one was done sometime over the summer when school was not in session. She asked if the applicant has redone the traffic analysis.

Mrs. Valone stated the applicant did get updated traffic data just after school came back into session. They were not able to submit the memo prior to the meeting tonight. Their Traffic Engineer is here and can answer questions.

Ms. Amberg said in regards to the school district comments, it was mentioned that the High School does have the capacity. However, when she read 113A's comments she did not see anything regarding capacity and what their comments are.

Dr. Courtney Orzel, Superintendent for District 113A, stated the Board is aware of the development. As far as capacity, the Board has been really diligent in trying to reduce class sizes over the past three years. They are anticipating an increase in enrollment over the next three years, whether it is this development or other developments in the area. They do enrollment studies to figure out how many children will be coming into the school. They do have Central School and they are doing a survey now to see what it would take to reopen that facility. They anticipate that eventually they will need to do that, but they are not sure when that is going to be. The Board is prepared to do what they have to do regardless as to how many students that they get. Historically, over the past 10 years the enrollment has been declining. They are preparing to get roughly 160 students over a five year time frame. The Board is prepared to do what they need to do to service those children.

Howard Amberg, 112 Timberline, asked if the area behind the Community Center was labeled as not visible. When you are looking from that park you will see nothing but the backs of those homes. No matter what you do you will not be able to hide it because of the elevation. He would ask that those homes be marked as key lots. In regards to the numbers for brick, analysis are easy to make numbers look a certain way. He asked how many three sided brick subdivisions went into Palos Park. There are none. So it is not possible to calculate the value over a ten year period. It was never stated the age of the home. You can't compare a 50 year old home to a newer home.

Mr. Amberg stated while sitting here he just did a Google search on Pulte Homes and there are several reviews with one star. There are complaints regarding the quality of the homes and no response back. All through this meeting there has been nothing but

talk of downgrading and shorten up these lots. He is not taking this as fact, but he feels that the builder needs to speak in regards to the quality of the homes. He did not see one review where someone liked it. The developer has chosen Pulte to build these homes. All he has heard tonight was that they are going to give some unusable land, give the Park District a small area, downsize lots, and no brick so they can make the homes more economical. He would recommend that the Commission hold them to meeting the requirements as to how the community is built.

Kara Knutte, 95 Doolin Street, said she agrees with everything that Mr. Amberg stated. She asked if Alba Street was going to be widened to accommodate the new subdivision.

Chairman Spinelli stated right now there is no proposal to change the width of Alba from the dog park all the way to Timberline.

Mrs. Knutte said that might be something to consider since that is a primary entrance and exit. There are a lot of employees from Peppers that park on that street. It makes it impossible to get two cars through there so they might want to look at that. Also, on Timberline from Pfeiffer to New Avenue there is no sidewalk. There is going to be a lot of traffic so they might want to continue that sidewalk all the way down. She feels the entrance on Timberline is very dangerous especially in the winter. Lemont is very good about salting but over the years there have been several times where she has slide down that hill. With the curve and having that retaining wall she is not sure if people are going to be able to stop.

Chairman Spinelli stated the retaining wall will be west of Timberline. Staff and the Village Engineer have reviewed the vision and sight triangle and they meet State standards.

Mrs. Knutte said she feels that this subdivision is way too dense. She does not understand why we would require a 12,500 square foot lot and then consider anything smaller than that, especially when it is so out of character to surrounding subdivisions.

Joan Walsh, 3 Timberline Place, stated she had gone onto the Village's website today and there is about an eight minute video. If someone was coming to Lemont this is what they would want to show them. It had a panoramic view of a pretty serene area. She is sure a subdivision of this density would not be shown on that video.

Jeff Leise, 14 Timberline Court, said he would like to speak in regards to the lot sizes. He put together the R-4 Zoning right next to what is being proposed. Right now the minimum lot size is 12,500 square feet. There are 23 new homes being proposed, lots 35-57. Right now on Timberline there are 12 homes, which is 2 to 1. Out of those homes that are being proposed to be built 21 of the lots are below the 12,500 square feet which is 91% of them. The only two lots that meet the standard is the corner lot 57 and the bottom 35. His recommendation is to reduce by five lots, which will get



you down to 18 homes. If that is done it will give about 2,695 additional square feet and add that to the 9,700 average square feet being proposed in the Summit area and it will still get you under the R-4 minimum at 12,394. His back yard faces this so he will not see the front. What it sounds like is that he will see the back of siding so he would like to get these spread out a little more. He understands that this will be developed, but he does not understand why it has to be so dense. He submitted his drawings to the Commission.

Chairman Spinelli asked where he got these square footages from.

Mr. Leise stated he got them from the County website. Also, the existing lots that are there only 3 lots are below the existing 12,500.

Corey Anco, 16 Evergreen Place, said he would like to see them replace Vistancia Drive with lot parcel number one. He asked if the Commission could talk about what the practicality of this would take and the feasibility. His main thought is safety and with Evergreen Drive, Timberline Knolls entrance and this new entrance it is too much.

Dominick Anco, 16 Evergreen Place, stated he would like to say that the construction of the homes looks very cheap in appearance without any brick and they are put on very dense lots. He feels it is degrading Lemont and all the existing homes around it.

Dennis Legan, 85 Timberline Drive, asked if there was an update on the water plans.

Mrs. Valone said HR Green took a look at the Village's ability to service the development. Since then they took a look at the interior configuration of the development. They have some recommendations which can be achieved through other means than the way they are indicating. Right now it is not the policy not to interrupt any of the existing lots unless there was no other alternate means. At this time they have some direction from an outside consultant but it has not been incorporated into staff findings.

Mr. Legan asked if they are going to use the easement by lot 35.

Mr. Stein stated they are doing their absolute best to make sure that his lot and the other lots are not going too disrupted.

Mr. Legan asked if that was based on the drawing between his lot and his neighbor's lot.

Mrs. Valone said all single-family lots are required to have utility easements. In the event that there is a necessary use for it or if utility already runs through the area that is what they are for. The main reason to why these are called out is because we have well water and looping the water is crucial for water quality. The concern is the

phasing and where the loops will be put in. The direction right now is staff would prefer requiring the looping in phase I to avoid any impacts on existing lots.

Chairman Spinelli stated he does not have an engineering scale but to answer Mr. Anco's question, it appears if they were to come through, as he was suggesting, it would be at about an 18 to 20 percent slope on that roadway. There is no way that would be allowed. If you look at Fourth Street coming off of Main Street there are all the switchbacks. If that road was straight it would be at about a 30% slope.

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 asked if the developer want to speak in regards to any of the comments or questions asked. They declined. He asked if any of the Commissioners had any questions for the developer. 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 16-10. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

### **Plan Commission Discussion**

Chairman Spinelli stated there are a bunch of items that he would like to see done. With side yard setbacks, nothing should be less than 10 foot side yard. The reasoning is when you have a 7.5 foot side yard setback that means there is 15 feet between houses. That is only measured from the foundation that is above grade. All foundations have spread footings, because of this it will only leave you 12 feet between foundation footings. Any place that a sewer goes through a side yard it will impact that foundation footing. Additionally, if there is a sewer that goes through there or a ComEd line it would be very difficult for someone to get in there to repair or replace anything. At 20 feet between buildings you at least get an additional five feet plus the foundation footings are not impacted by any sewers.

He has seen several complaints from residents about sump pumps running constantly. With doing investigations that he has been involved with, the majority of those come back to a sewer drain that is too close to the foundation over dig and the sewer drain is acting like a fence dig then providing ground water into the foundation drains. Twenty feet is not a lot and it helps. A lot of subdivisions that were built before the crash were 30 feet total. He just cannot accept 7.5 feet side yard because there are too many potential problems that can develop for these homeowners. To make it simple for staff he would like to have 10 feet as a blanket for the side yard setbacks. This also falls into line with the chart that they received this evening going by the existing 16.5% of an existing R-4 lot, which these are not existing R-4 lots, if they were to except that analogy, the developers own chart indicates a 9 to 11 foot side yard requirement. He is recommending 10 and it is only two and half additional feet.

Chairman Spinelli said he would like to see the 20 foot gap that was supposed to be maintained by the HOA, eliminated and added to the existing lot configuration. His concern is when you get a home in the existing development adjacent to a new home and they both put up fences. There will be a 20 foot strip of no man land that over time the HOA will forget about. He has seen it happen in many developments. For those lots incorporate that strip to the proposed lots. For those lots you will maintain the 20 foot public utility easement and you can have the additional 20 feet as a landscape easement. By adding the landscape easement it prevents the engineering plans from pushing the storm sewer up to the property line, it still creates the buffer, but it takes the responsibility off of the HOA to maintain this. By doing this you can eliminate the gap that is between lot 35 and 36. When reconfiguring this to get what he recommended as the side yard setbacks, he is proposing that one to two lots will be lost in the middle of the bump out. This will allow for access to the open space and for public officials to see a good portion of that open space from the runway. Without having some type of access in there it becomes a dead space also.

Also, lots 85, 86, and 87, those side lot lines need to be extended to hit the lots in the 70's. Incorporate the open space into those lots. To have that open space in the middle of the lots just creates a problem. He is not a fan of HOA's, but he understands that they need to exist. Situations like this create maintenance problems for the HOA if they do remain intact. If the HOA fails then this piece belongs to nobody and becomes overgrown.

Chairman Spinelli stated the park site for the Park District has to be worked out further. Currently lot 98 is facing Woodview Lane, immediately adjacent to all the fill in the ravine. He would like to see that lot removed and lot 99 rotated clockwise so it actually accesses off of Ridgeline. If they agree to incorporating that 20 foot strip into the lots on Timberline, there will be a 40 foot easement so those house should have a 40 foot rear yard setback. That should not impede any of those homes from having a deck or shed. In regards to the Township's comment on the wetland project with the High School, it needs to be looked into. Lastly, there was comments about speed bumps near the dog park, he does not feel that is ideal for public roadways. There should be other ideas that they can come up with.

Chairman Spinelli said they will continue on with their comments, however they are going to have cut the meeting off at 11 p.m.

Commissioner Maher stated he would like them to work on the colors and model selection. His concern is the density here. The only access point is Timberline and this is very dense which is not ideal for us. He understands that this is the only access point but that then forces them to try and decrease the density or to come up with other creative ways to get out of the subdivision to the north. He needs to see the lot sizes closer to where they are supposed to be at and not half of the R-4 zoning. In regards to the brick, he understands his comments on the brick. His concern is this is a standard that they have in Lemont and they have acted on it with recent

developments. He feels this is something that they should keep. There is nothing in the solid homes that are being offered that would make them say that brick isn't allowed. He is for full wraps around them and the percentage of brick needs to be going up and not down. He asked what the percentage was for full wrap on Montefiore Subdivision.

Mrs. Valone said there is no requirement for full wrap and Seven Oaks was not required to have full wrap.

Commissioner Maher stated Briarcliffe, Covington and Singer Landing all have brick. He believes that they have to have a standard on brick and it should not be an option. It is something that they do in Lemont and it should be continued in Lemont. He would like to see other options for the road over the ravines. He would like to see how much of that ravine can be maintained instead of filling. He feels that this is a nice area and it should be something that is maintained.

Commissioner Kwasneski said he is fine with keeping the signs up till the property is 90% sold, but he would like to see it at 80% to 85%. He feels doing digital marketing should help make up for that.

Mrs. Valone stated 90% is the UDO standards, so if the commission recommends anything less than that it should be made as a condition.

Commissioner Kwasneski said he is fine with it at 90%.

Commissioner Cunningham stated key properties have been identified to have brick or masonry on them. Mostly that is to satisfy current homeowners so they are viewing properties that have brick on them. This is a big development and there are no key properties identified on the south end of the Vista development. That is one of the entrances. You would have to go through half of the development before you get to any key properties that have masonry. Even the people that live there will be driving down the street and they are all going to be siding. He feels a good portion of the Vistas on Alba Street need to be identified as key properties so there is more brick toward the entrances where people will be coming and leaving. \

Commissioner Zolecki said they talked a lot about the how and the what, but it all goes back to the why. It all goes back to the 2030 Plan and the spirit of it. He believes that this development and the spirit of it towards the 2030 Plan aligns. However, a lot was talked about market predictions and by definition that is speculative. There is plenty of market data that speaks to other trends, other sizes, and the fact that millennials are moving out to the suburbs. This could be a missed opportunity in his opinion for what that generation really values.

He stated there was a lot of talk about side yards with the specific of supporting the ten feet. They are down to inches and these homes are going to be maxed out. The side yard is a minimum of 10 feet and that is the lowest it should be across the board.

Brick cost was talked a lot about in regards to price points, but he can't help but feel that it is just an indicator of some of these other compromises or lack of compromise. So instead of trying to define what some of these density changes can be, he would ask that they make a decision to come back with something closer inline than with lots that are 6,900 square feet. Finally, precedent has been talked a lot about tonight with M/I Homes. This is further precedent with a 300 unit development. It will be setting precedent in R-4 with lot sizes that are half of the requirement. He asked them to come back with what would be their final compromise on these density issues.

Mrs. Valone asked if the Commission could give a more specific number of what they are looking for on brick.

Commissioner Maher said his starting point is 100%. This is what they have subdivisions at in this area. If they are starting at 16% on their side, then he is starting at 100%. The duplexes that are facing 355 are visible to 355 and that is representation of our community. If you look at the west side of 355 you have a subdivision there that is 100% brick. Timberline has a significant portion of homes that are brick. He would like to see new designs. He knows his fellow Commissioners might go less but right now they are below 20%. He had issues with Kettering and when he looks at it he feels it was too low. He would also prefer that it is wrapped rather than just a front façade.

Commissioner McGleam stated he agrees that Kettering from an aesthetic standpoint is a huge disappointment. He feels that it is a bad comparison for Lemont.

Chairman Spinelli said he and his fellow Commissioners are not anti-development. They are a recommending body and they are trying to find a happy medium for everyone. They know that this property is eventually going to develop. It is just how it is going to develop the best. We understand the issues with trying to get to Timberline. It is the only access point, short of buying additional property which they can't be forced to do, they are not going to get access to New Avenue. He leaves it up to them. They have heard everyone's position on the Commission. There are two options in front of them and he is seeking to find out how they would like the Commission to proceed. The case can be continued for another month, which will allow them to evaluate and see what they are willing to come back with. Or they can ask the Commission to vote as it has been presented.

The applicant asked for a few minutes to discuss with his team as to how they would like to proceed.

Mr. Stein stated the applicant is willing to come back in a month. In the meantime, he is suggesting that they work with staff to come up with some sort of compromise to present to the Commission.

Chairman Spinelli then called for a motion to continue Case 16-10 to the February 15, 2017 meeting.

Commissioner Maher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to continue Case 16-10 to the regular meeting on February 15, 2017 meeting. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

**E. 14-12 Donegal Excavating Final PUD and Preliminary Plat**

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to open the public hearing.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to open the public hearing for Case 14-12. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

Chairman Spinelli said the developer has requested the continuance of this case. A motion is needed to continue this case to the February 1, 2017 special meeting.

Commissioner Cunningham made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to continue the public hearing for Case 14-12 to the February 1, 2017 special meeting. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

**IV. ACTION ITEMS**

None

**V. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

**A. Update from Village Board**

Mrs. Valone stated the Rolling Meadows case is scheduled be approved on the February 13<sup>th</sup> Village Board Meeting. Old Town Square will be on the February 27<sup>th</sup> Committee of the Whole Meeting and then on a subsequent Village Board Meeting after that.

Commissioner McGleam encouraged his fellow Commissioners to go out and see some of the subdivisions that have been approved already.

**VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

None

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner Cunningham made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kwasneski to adjourn the meeting. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

*Minutes prepared by Peggy Halper*