

Village of Lemont
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting of February15, 2017

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, February15, 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 6:34 p.m. He then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Verify Quorum

Upon roll call the following were:

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

Absent: Maher

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

C. Approval of Minutes: January 18, 2017 Meeting

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to approve the minutes from the January 18, 2017 meeting with no changes. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

II. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Chairman Spinelli said the public hearing tonight is a continuation from the last two meetings. At the last meeting, the Commission did not vote on this Case, but what they did vote on was closing the public hearing. There were various comments and conditions that the Commissioners talked about and presented to the developer for them to consider. At that time, the developer requested that we continue the meeting to this meeting to give them the opportunity to consider and decide on what conditions they wanted to comply with partially, fully or not at all.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 16-10 Vistancia Annexation, Rezoning, and Preliminary, PUD. (Cont.)

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to open the continued public hearing\ for Case 16-10.

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

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Chairman Spinelli stated prior to turning this over to staff, he would like to go through 12 primary conditions that were presented to the developer. He will not go into detail in regards to their response to these conditions. He would like the residents that are in the audience that might not of been able to attend last month's meeting or for those who were not able to stay till the end of the meeting be able to hear what was said.

1. Interior side yard setbacks on all lots should be 10 feet. A revised configuration showing the configuration with these side yards should be developed. Potential conflict between foundations and interior side yard utilities should be prioritized.
2. The proposed buffer along the east property line adjacent to Timberline should be listed as a landscape easement on the proposed lots, rather than a separate outlot that is to be maintained by the HOA. These lots adjacent to Timberline will have a 40 foot rear yard setback, 20 feet of that setback will be a public utility and drainage easement and the 20 feet immediately adjacent to Timberline will be a landscape easement.
3. The gap between lots 35-36 should be eliminated and lots 33-35 reconfigured.
4. Lots 44 and 45 should be eliminated to allow emergency services to easily access the open space behind these lots.
5. Lots 85-87 must be reconfigured to remove the open space behind them.
6. The gap between lots 72 and 27 should be eliminated.
7. The park site should be moved and designed per the direction of the Park District.
8. Review the information provided regarding a potential wetland near Alba Street on the Township property.
9. Traffic calming near the dog park should be reviewed by the traffic engineer.
10. Update the box culvert, which is the ravine crossing that is on Vistancia drive, to reduce the amount of filling of the ravine.
11. The duplexes on Alba Street entrance should have all brick.
12. The subdivision should have 100% brick on all four, first floor elevation.

These were the primary conditions placed and do not included any staff recommendations. At this time he will turn it over to staff.

Staff Presentation

Mrs. Valone stated she is going to go through a little history on the application and then the proposed changes. The application started from a proposed concept plan back in August of 2016. It was brought before the TRC (Technical Review Committee), which consists of staff and outside taxing agency review. The applicant applied for a formal application in November of 2016 and has appeared before two Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) meetings. This evening it will be reviewed for a third time. The application itself has been revised four times since the TRC and three times for the Planning and Zoning Commission. Once the application leaves the Planning and Zoning Commission it will go before the Committee of the Whole (COW) which is the non-voting workshop of the Village Board and then onto a Village Board meeting for denial or approval.

At the last meeting, staff was recommending approval with 18 conditions. The Planning and Zoning Commission also added an additional 12, which were just read by the Chairman. Of the 12, the applicant has complied with 7 of the items and has partially complied with 5 of the items. The applicant has revised the lot configuration and is now proposing 94 lots in the Summit, 64 Ridgeline lots, and 122 units of the Duplexes. This is a reduction of 14 lots since the original TRC concept plan. The average lot size in the Summit neighborhood is 10,597 square feet which is roughly a 10% increase in the average lot size since the review by the PZC in December. Additionally, the average lot size of the Ridgeline neighborhood has increased to 8,346 square feet, which is a 6% increase.

The applicant is proposing a product book for the subdivision. All of the proposed models have some brick or stone on the front façade of them. The applicant has also agreed to correct some of the brick and stone returns on the front elevations on 20 of their model elevations. She showed on the overhead an example of the corrections. The applicant has agreed to correct these items. The applicant has also revised their key lot plan to include brick. In the Summit neighborhood 24 are key lots so they will have first floor brick on all elevations. Additionally, there are 8 lots that are proposed as wainscot. The applicant has also revised 22 of the Ridgeline lots to have the wainscot, which again is the three foot brick on all four sides. Lastly, the applicant has revised the Villas to include a wainscot as well on a total of 54 lots.

Mrs. Valone said the applicant has also revised their interior side yard setbacks. The applicant is proposing that the interior side yard setback for the duplexes are all ten feet across the board. In the Summit neighborhood, all of the lots that back up to the existing Timberline lots are now ten feet. The remaining lots are seven and half feet feet, with the exception where utilities are placed on the side yard and then they are proposed at 10 feet. In the Ridgeline they are also proposing seven and half feet yard setbacks again with the exception where utilities are placed on side yard then a 10 foot side yard is placed. The applicant is also requesting increases to the permitted impervious coverage of both the front and rear yards of the single-family, which would be the Ridgeline and Summit lots. The applicant is requesting a 40% impervious coverage of the rear yard for these two neighborhoods. The UDO permits 36% so they are asking for a 4% increase. They are also asking for an increase on the

front yard setbacks for only the three car front load Summit lots. They are asking for a 48% lot coverage and the UDO allows 36%. Lastly, the applicant is asking for the front yard coverage for the Villas to be 40% impervious coverage. Again, the UDO allows 36%. The increases in the front yard coverage for the Summit and the Villas is to accommodate driveways. The rear request for the Ridgeline and the Summit is for additional accessory rear yard obstructions to be placed.

The applicant also revised the right-of-way (ROW) and road sizing. The applicant is now proposing that the main streets, Vistancia Drive, Woodward Drive and Alba Drive, are 66 feet of ROW with 33 feet pavement widths. They have increased the remaining smaller side streets to a 60 feet ROW with 30 feet pavement widths. The applicant has also revised the ravine crossing. Previously they were proposing more of a box culvert, which would be cement all the way around. Now they are proposing that the cement will only be on the top of it and on the sides, leaving the actual creek and the bed of the creek natural. The applicant has also changed the proposed buffering along the tollway. Previously, the applicant was requesting a landscape berm along the tollway. Now they have revised their request to put in a 12 foot, at its maximum height, fence wall to buffer on top of a landscape berm.

Mrs. Valone stated lastly, the applicant has revised the proposed park site. Previously from the last meeting, the park site was proposed between lots 41 and 42. They have now moved it across the street, which she showed on the overhead. Staff is recommending approval with the following conditions. She then read the updated conditions listed in staff's report dated February 10, 2017 on pages 19 through 21. The applicant has indicated that they are willing to comply with conditions 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 15. The applicant has already revised their plans to already include revisions for conditions 1 through 3, 7, 17 and 18. This would conclude staff's report and they will be able to answer any questions that the Commission might have.

Commissioner McGleam asked what is the reason for the increase of the impervious coverage in the rear yard.

Mrs. Valone said the applicant has taken a look at the rear yards of the single-family and modeled putting a very large impervious surface, which is typically a pool. They found that 36% would not allow a standard pool to fit, so they are asking for the increase to 40%. As indicated in the staff report, staff would be willing to see this increase if they are willing to update their detention to accommodate that extra impervious surface.

Chairman Spinelli asked what is the permitted height for the precast wall they are proposing.

Mrs. Valone stated there is no standard for this. The height has been proposed in the plans. Based on some additional comment it could potentially change. She will let the applicant talk about that.

Commissioner Zolecki asked if it was safe to say, whether it is brick or stone wainscot, it is continuous through the entire front elevation on all models.

Mrs. Valone said the 20 model elevations does correlate to these nine. The nine is the overarching model and within those are the different elevations, so it is the same number. They are indicating that they will return the wainscot into the entry porch.

Commissioner Zolecki stated but not first floor brick.

Mrs. Valone said they indicated on first floor brick, that is not required on all four sides, they would still return a wainscot.

Commissioner McGleam asked how many lots are going too impacted by the conservation easement that was recommended by the Village Engineer.

Mrs. Valone stated the applicant had revised some of their plans to move them further out of the area that would be buffered. There are still a couple of them, and she will let the applicant answer to that. Additionally, the Army Core of Engineers is only ruling that two of them are waterways of the U.S. and the other two are not, but staff is still recommending those have an easement restriction as well. She does not think that the applicant has modeled the two additional ravines, and she will let the applicant address that.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were further questions for staff. None responded. He then asked if the Park District would like to elaborate on their memo.

Louise Egofske, Executive Director of the Lemont Park District, said late last week they had their architects take a look at what is now the four proposed sight. After, they took a closer look at the sight that has moved from across the street, they now have some concerns about that particular sight. One is that the culvert is in that southeast corner, which can be a safety hazard for them. There are grading challenges there which could potentially impact a play area that may need to be supported by a possible retaining wall. They are now requesting that lots 255 and 256 be considered for the park parcel. That would provide the same central park location that they agreed upon at the last meeting, but would also provide some additional accessibility and create a safe suitable play area for that neighborhood versus the lot that is now noted.

Chairman Spinelli asked if this was to move forward this evening, does the Park District feel confident that you will be able to come to some type of agreement with the developer. From the meetings that they have had, do they feel that they can work something out?

Mrs. Egofske stated she feels they would be able to agree upon the process to install the park and selecting a play piece. However, at this point, she is concerned about the topography and the existing site that is noted for them to receive.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the Township had anything to add.

Kathy Henrikson, Lemont Township, said she would like to request that the Township has the opportunity to have an environmental engineer finalize all the plans, because she is concerned about the drainage. She just wants to be sure that the runoff, drainage, or the storage that is currently being planned will not affect the prairie and its growth. She would also like to thank the Commission for their service. The public comes here because of their concerns, but she would like to remind the public that the Commission is all volunteer and they do not get paid. The Commission is here to look out for us and to pave the way for better development for all of us.

Chairman Spinelli stated at this time the applicant has only provided them with preliminary engineering. He said he feels this is something they can work out as they move forward with this. Once the Village receives engineering plans, the Township could also get a set a drawings to review.

Ms. Henrikson said the Township is also currently in negotiations with the developer. She said this is a big development and they are directly affected.

Chairman Spinelli asked staff if this could be worked out to have another taxing body review engineering plans. With the placement of this subdivision, it might be appropriate.

Mr. Stein stated he has no problem sending anything over to the Township.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any other Village Officials that would like to comment in regards to this case. None responded. He then asked the applicant to come up and speak.

Applicant Presentation

Dan LeClair, Green Tech Engineering, said he would like to thank staff for their prompt and diligent responses to their questions and communication. It is very helpful for them to know what the intentions and expectations are for the community and having an understanding of the ordinances. He has a quick presentation and a lot of it will look familiar. They are still developing this project in two phases. The first phase will have the roadway that connects Alba Road, at the southern end, to the northeast portion of the property. It will also include all the utilities, paving, and stubs for the second phase. As staff has noted, from the initial stage to today they have done a pretty substantial lot reduction. They went from 294 units down to 281 units.

In regards to the correspondence from the Park District, they took a look at the park area, and what they are contemplating is eliminating a duplex unit where the park is going to be. They will put two single-family units where the park was previously located. With respect to the ravine crossing, it is 45 feet from the channel bottom up

to the top of the bank. As you go further south towards the township park it obviously gets shallower and gets a little bit wider. The location that they chose is where the top of the bank is narrowest. They are proposing to do what is called a con-span culvert, which is a concrete section that has no bottom in it. He showed on the overhead what it would look like. It a precast structure and is set up with a crane. Because of the structural integratory of this concrete structure you can't really do much with the structure itself. The headwalls and wing walls can have different facades on them. That is why they are able to comply with one of staff's conditions and will work with staff as to what would be added on to it. At the lowest point it is probably about 35 feet and they will have a fence at the top of the headwall.

Mr. LeClair stated the front lot coverage that they asking relief from the UDO, is for the three car front load garage. They had located that particular building on the smallest Summit lot and it had increased that impervious surface, so it is just on that standard rectangular lot. So it is only for the two units that have the three car garage. As they get into the different units within the Summit that have the pie shape, corner, or larger lots they would have a larger front area so they would not need relief on those. In regards to the roadways, the 60 foot ROW roadways they are planning a 33 foot back-to-back and the 66 foot ROW will be 36 feet back-to-back. The conservation easements, there are about a dozen of the proposed units that are within the 50 foot barrier to the natural waters of the U.S. They will be working with them and as they proceed farther they can negotiate the grading around to keep those lots off of the buffer. As they get further into the grading they will looking at that even more.

With respect to the Township Park property, they did do a site visit last week. For the drainage, it is their intention, and per the UDO, they will be picking up all the stormwater runoff. They do not anticipate discharging any water over the property lines and into the park area. Any water that comes upon them from the Township will be transmitted through their stormwater system as well. This site is a little unique because there is a big valley along the western side of the Township Park property so there is not a lot of water that goes either way. They will be working with the Township on constructing an additional driveway into the Community Center. They are doing a little renegotiating of the Alba Road ROW. He will now have Mr. Tremulis come up and speak.

Peter Tremulis, Vice President of Land for Pulte Homes, said they have updated their product book and have provided copies to staff. They have updated the key lot map that is included in the book. It does indicate 9 foot four sided brick elevations on the lots that have the X's, and the O's are four sided wainscoting. There is a large percentage of the lots are look-out and walk-out so they are carrying down the brick to the look-out or walk-out level on lots that back up to open space that carry this requirement. He also wanted to note that they did include a significant percentage of the duplex units with the wainscot brick, including the entrance to the community and at all intersections. They are deferring color until final and they are in the process of revising their entire color palate for Pulte Homes.

The anti-monotony code is included and has grown in terms of the conditions, many of which are recommendations from staff. This would include the grouping of elevations by certain plan types to help reduce any repetitiveness that they might see. They are also looking to, when it is appropriate, introduce a new plan called the Waverly, which will be added to the Ridgeline plan set. This will add further variation because the Waverly plan has different gabling appearance. It is very different than the three plans that staff has identified as being too similar which are the Continental, Newbury, and the Mercer. They are looking to agree to the 40% of limitation on any home model that will be built within the community. The biggest concern was in the Ridgeline neighborhood, with the addition of this plan that should solve that issue.

Mr. Tremulis stated they updated the book to include notations on all elevations where they will be adding the wainscot brick. The wainscoting at the entry will match the wainscoting in the front. If it is full height brick then it will be carried through the entry. In regards to the wetland on the township property, it is located on township property away from any proposed development. As far as the wall, they are looking for approval to put the wall up. They have a feeling people will rather see that up rather than a landscape berm. He said this would conclude his presentation.

Chairman Spinelli asked if any of the Commissioners had any questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Zolecki asked in regards to the request for the impervious surface, do they know how many lots or how many models.

Mr. LeClair said the Summit is the portion of the development that will have the three-car garage. The three-car front garage and the walk adds a total of 850 square feet of pavement with the driveway and the front sidewalk. On the standard unit that represents about 49% of the front yard, this is the standard rectangular lot. The UDO allows a total of 36%, so they are looking for about a 13.5% relief.

Commissioner Zolecki asked how many models does this apply to.

Mr. LeClair said two out of seven. It only applies to the rectangular lots.

Commissioner Zolecki stated this only applies to the Summit, two of the seven models of the three-car nature, but do they know how many lots.

Mr. LeClair said each of those models can take place on only 40% of the maximum lots per the UDO requirements. Without actually going and looking at it he would have to say about 15 lots.

Commissioner Zolecki stated he understands that there is a monotony code that Pulte has developed and use. He asked what portion of condition number 9 are they objecting to and/or do they agree to any of it.

Mr. Tremulis said they have tried to adapt to everything that staff has offered to them. In regards to the cul-de-sacs, there is only one in the subdivision so they can agree to that. Secondly, it was suggested that every model be separated by two next to each other and across the street, which they have included this in the monotony code as well. The third thing that was asked is to group elevations that are similar so they can police how they are sold. They have agreed to group them, but the one thing they are asking for is to allow those different elevations to be sited rather than two between them, as they were different models. This will allow for a little more flexibility than just considering each of the style of elevation as an individual model.

Commissioner Zolecki stated last month there was a concern about the color.

Mr. Tremulis said they are intending to introduce a brand new color package at final, which will be much more diverse than what was presented. Staff had some concern on a color for the elevation on siding that was too dominant in the color scheme, so they are going to revamp and come out with a new book.

Commissioner Zolecki stated the colors in the book, which the colors have been expanded, are very similar.

Mr. Tremulis said they are looking at a whole new color palette and plan on continuing to work with staff.

Commissioner Zolecki stated in regards to the brick, he did not see it listed in the book.

Mrs. Valone said it was updated and submitted today.

Mr. Tremulis stated he apologizes but he had to work with his staff.

Commissioner Zolecki said on the Riverton elevations, page 88 in the book, the elevation option on the bottom left HR3M, the brick would continue across the garage and return back to the two story element.

Mr. Tremulis stated the note now states that the brick shown at 70% of the front elevation and then add return brick on the garage wall and entry door. This will be at the full height.

Commissioner Zolecki asked what about the small gable on the second floor.

Mr. Tremulis said he does not think so because it would require support, but if they are wanting to see that they can accommodate it.

Commissioner Zolecki asked if they would be okay with accommodating this.

Mr. Tremulis stated yes.

Chairman Spinelli asked in regards to the brick or stone that they are proposing, is it a true face brick or are they proposing a brick veneer.

Mr. Tremulis said it is a full face brick. The stone is a veneer stone and it is two inches.

Commissioner McGleam asked what the height is of the wainscot.

Mr. Tremulis stated it is about 30 inches and topped with a stone cap.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the wainscot would be set at the windowsill height.

Mr. Tremulis said it would come up to the bottom of the window. If you look at the Hilltop elevation, the home is not any wider for the three-car. It is just a modification to an interior space.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further questions from the Commission for the applicant. None responded. Since there are a lot of new residents in the audience he will call for a motion to reopen the public hearing.

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

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Public Hearing

Chairman Spinelli asked everyone in the audience to please stand and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath. He reminded anyone that was at the previous meetings and had spoken, their comments have been recorded and are part of the minutes from that meeting. If there are people that haven't been to any of the meetings and have not had the opportunity to speak, he would ask that they would come up and speak first.

Noel Cornwell, 102 Timberline Drive, said she has just recently found out about this. She asked if this was a private sale or did the Village own the land.

Chairman Spinelli stated the Village did not own the land and it is a private property owner. The developer is the contract purchaser and they have an agreement with Pulte Homes to build the homes.

Ms. Cornwell asked if there was a price range for the homes.

Mr. Tremulis said the duplexes would be an average price of \$350,000 and the Summit, which are the largest homes, would go up to about \$600,000.

Ms. Cornwell asked what is the square footage of the homes.

Mr. Tremulis stated the duplexes are 2,100 square feet and the largest home is 3,800 square feet.

Ms. Cornwell asked if there is anything going to be done in regards to the wildlife that is there.

Chairman Spinelli said every property has the opportunity to develop their property. There is a large portion of open space at the north end of the property, areas throughout the middle that are remaining open, and there is also the Township property.

Gerald Reid, 72 Timberline Drive, stated he is concerned about flooding.

Chairman Spinelli said this development, when they provide final engineering, will be providing storm sewer, drainage swales, and manage their storm water. Any rain water that hits their property must be controlled on their property prior to letting it leave their site.

Mr. Reid stated his second concern is Timberline Drive and all the construction truck traffic. He asked who is going to have to repair the road.

Mr. Stein said they will try and reroute construction traffic as best as they could off of Timberline. There will be a construction bond that they can pull on if they had to for the damage road.

Tomasz Janowski, 20 Evergreen Place, Lemont, stated from the minutes, from a few months ago, the Village talked about on Bell Road one of the developers were going to put a bike path along the power lines. He asked if this was something feasible to connect to the existing bicycle path that is by the Township.

Mrs. Valone said the applicant is providing bike paths. There will be a shared bike lane through the Summit neighborhood and there will be bike paths that connect to the Township. Once hitting Timberline there is not another path, so that would be a future project at some point.

Jeanette Daubaras 13490 Derby Road, asked if they had checked the soil. This is Lemont and there is a lot of limestone. There is a stream that runs through there so sometimes the soil around the streams are unstable.

Mr. Michaels stated they have done about 60 holes with some going all the way down to the bedrock. The design reflects that they are staying away from the steep slope areas.

Ms. Daubaras said one of her concerns is the quality of the homes and that they don't fall apart. Also, the Township property keeps being referred to as a park and it is not a park. It is an open space and she feels this development does not fit in this area at all. It is a difficult piece of property to develop and it will cost a lot of money to develop it. She believes it is not in the best interest of the Village to develop this property. In regards to the wildlife, just like the property on 131st and Bell, the wildlife is gone.

John Ganey, 86 Logan, asked how are they going to handle the traffic with so many lots.

Chairman Spinelli stated right now this property has legal access to Timberline Drive and it is the only access this property has. There is an access point to the north and then one off of Alba Drive.

Mr. Ganey asked if there were any plans to enhance it.

Chairman Spinelli said the Village has no plans at this time for changing Timberline Drive.

Mrs. Valone stated the applicant submitted a traffic study that indicates how the road system currently functions and with the new demands on the road. Based on the design of the road already the only thing that is warranted is a left turn lane from New Avenue onto Timberline. As they are increasing traffic about 50%, they have indicated in conversations, that they are willing to contribute to the left hand turn lane. Other than that, the road is sized to accommodate the amount the traffic currently and by the amount of increased traffic.

Mr. Ganey said when this development gets completed it could be 1,000 cars every day.

Mrs. Valone stated their traffic engineer has run their analysis based on full occupancy.

Mr. Ganey asked if they looked at the traffic on 127th Street and New Avenue.

Mrs. Valone said they looked at both.

Mr. Ganey asked if they were going to put in a light at New Avenue and Timberline.

Mrs. Valone stated a traffic light is not warranted at this time.

Steve Cornwell said there are about 300 homes which will generate about 600 cars going to work in the morning. He asked the Commission what benefit does this development bring to the community.

Chairman Spinelli stated any type of development in a community is a benefit in some way. The Village will get tax dollars from real estate taxes. The additional roof tops help maintain retail places similar to Target or Kohl's. Whenever properties develop there are negatives but there also benefits. A negative is the wildlife but unfortunately this cannot be controlled.

Mike Parafink asked why are we making concessions and if we do make them what is it we get in return.

Chairman Spinelli said at this point they have not made any concessions. All the concessions that they have heard are requests from the developer. At no point in the meeting have they agreed to any of these concessions. If at some point tonight they do decide to vote, they will hear the Commissions concerns, and they will vote based on their concerns.

Mr. Parafink asked if there will be another public hearing when they do vote.

Chairman Spinelli stated he is anticipating that a vote will happen this evening.

Mr. Parafink said he agrees with the concerns about the traffic. He asked has anyone vetted the study or the company that did it.

Chairman Spinelli stated the company that did it is a professional engineering firm. If anyone wanted to verify the validity of it they are more than welcome to on their own dime.

Mrs. Valone said the traffic study is also reviewed by staff and the Village Engineer.

Mr. Janowski stated he is a Deportation Officer with Immigration Custom Enforcement. Over the past 11 years he has seen an increase in crime in newly constructed affordable housing. The most crimes, drugs and gangs, related activities occur in the densely populated areas of the suburbs. To name a few Villages would be Streamwood, Carol Stream, Huntley, Carpentersville, Elgin, South Elgin, Hanover Park, Romeoville and Bolingbrook. New construction affordable housing attracts consumers who can barely afford it but it is still something within their reach. Parts of this subdivision, especially the duplexes, will be the new breeding ground for drugs and gang activity. The worst part is it is located right across the school and the Park District. Over the past ten years he has not arrested anyone here in Lemont, but he has done about 10 to 15 in Romeoville and Bolingbrook. He feels that the regulations should not be changed for the duplex part of the subdivision.

Chairman Spinelli said for the record this is not an affordable housing project.

Eric Schmidt, 47 Timberline, stated within 300 feet of each other there is the entrance to Timberline Knolls, Evergreen Place, Evergreen Terrace and then Vistancia. He knows there was a traffic study done there, but if stand where Vistancia is going to be and look south you can't see anything around that corner. It is a very dangerous area. He is concerned about the grade, the curve and the distance. He feels they are benefiting the builder at the expense of the safety of the residents. In his opinion, the entrance would be better off further north.

John Horwath, 12 Evergreen Place, said he lives just above the hill. If you go up and down Timberline, look at all the homes, there are very few homes that are alike. The public hearing sign that was placed is leaning at a 45 degree angle because of all the wetness there. He is not sure how the retention pond is going to hold all that water that is going down that hill. He had watched them take about six to seven soil samples. If you look where the rigging was you will see great depression marks in the hill. He asked if the Fire Department was going to have an issue maneuvering around in the subdivision.

Chairman Spinelli stated the public streets are designed so that the Fire Department can maneuver within the subdivision. The Fire Department has reviewed this several times and each time it comes back.

Mr. Horwath said that corner is going to be a very busy corner with all the trucks and cars going up and down Timberline.

Karen Knack stated she apologizes for not making the meeting in December. Her husband will not take Timberline anymore. She will only take that way to get to the Library or the Core and depending on the time of day, she will go down State Street. During the winter, she will not drive down Timberline at all anymore because she was in an accident on Timberline after it had snowed. It is very hard to turn onto New Avenue with all the traffic and the cars parked on the street. She said she has been very frustrated trying to get answers from either the Village or the Township regarding cleaning out the area by the railroad. A gentleman from the Township finally contacted her today stating that someone from the railroad is coming out on Thursday to look at it. They did come out and take pictures and they are supposed to do something about it. The water keeps going up on New Avenue because of the culvert. They have moved stuff out of their basement because they are concerned about flooding. She understands that this is not their problem, but with this property developing she is worried about drainage and flooding.

Mrs. Knack said Lemont found out about flooding back in the mid 90's when the retention pond overflowed and broke. Water was coming up in town in everyone's basement. That is when they went with dry ponds and no more retention ponds. She asked where is the water going to go from this property.

Chairman Spinelli stated it was called a culvert structure that will span across the two existing ravines. The one that they showed would be coming off of the street from Timberline. There is drainage there now that is going north to the pond. Any improvements done on this property, whether it is this developer or another developer, they are required by the Village Ordinance and MWRD to have storm water controls. They have to detain the water, control it for a certain amount of time, and then release it at a slower rate. When properties are developed there is an increase in runoff but the water that leaves the property is leaving at a slower rate.

Mrs. Knack said that is what the rules are, but when they did Timberline Drive she was told that the water was not supposed to go into the pond. She has looked at the areas where they are proposing the detention ponds. If the water table is high it doesn't have far to go to get to a lot. She does not want to take up any more time and would like to be able to email someone regarding her other concerns.

Colleen Amberg, 112 Timberline Drive, thanked the Commission for opening up the public hearing again tonight. She asked who places the notice that is on Timberline. It was very awkwardly placed and the notice is for the date of December 21, 2016. She asked how she can find out more information, such as how this meeting was extended to the January meeting.

Chairman Spinelli stated the public notice sign has to be posted before the first public hearing. They do not need to re-notify by mailing or change the signs to next date. It is the responsibility of the concerned citizens to go the Village website.

Mr. Stein said there are three forms of notification for the first public hearing. One is newspaper notice, second mailing, and third is the sign. If that meeting is continued it does not need to be re-notified.

Ms. Amberg stated she had missed the history of the land. She had moved to Lemont because of the topography and because it was not overdeveloped. She was under the impression that Lemont Township owned that land and it would not be developed.

Mrs. Valone showed on the overhead an aerial view of the property. She showed what area belongs to the Township. The property being developed is owned by four different owners. The property being developed is in unincorporated Cook County and they are requesting to come into Lemont.

Ms. Amberg asked if they could look again at the site access and the traffic on page 12 of the new packet. She is shocked that near the entrance of Alba Street and Timberline it currently operates at a level of service "A" and the proposed development will not change the level of service of either street. She cannot believe that with this many homes it would not change that.

Chairman Spinelli said when traffic studies are done they determine what the peak hours are for the intersections and the level of service is defined by the volume of

traffic during those certain time periods. There will be more cars over the entire day but what you look at is the peak hours at an intersection to design traffic control. The level of service "A" is at the peak hours of am and pm and not throughout the whole day.

Ms. Amberg asked if he was saying that over the course of the day the level of traffic will be about the same.

Chairman Spinelli stated the study highlights the peak hours and recognizes that there will be more traffic on these streets. The peak hours are the ones that will affect the intersections the most.

Commissioner McGleam asked if the traffic engineer was present tonight.

Mr. Michaels said no he was not.

Ms. Amberg asked when was the date that they last traffic study was done. There is a lot of traffic and there are a lot of kids that walk to school. She just does not see how this development will not increase the traffic.

Chairman Spinelli stated there was an updated traffic study that is dated January 23, 2017 and they did updated traffic counts on Tuesday, January 10, 2017. This information is located in staff's packet.

Mrs. Valone said additionally the study found that the counts they had were lower than what they had estimated so the report was more conservative than what was actually calculated.

Ms. Amberg asked what if they are wrong, and is there any recourse for the residents that live on Timberline. She also asked if there were any wetlands on the site.

Chairman Spinelli stated he will have the developer comment on that in a little bit.

Jeanette Daubaras said she was going through the ecology section, and this development is planning on removing 1,000 Oak trees and 700 Hickory trees. This is very upsetting for her because with the Kettering subdivision she had watched them take down 100 old Oak trees. She asked how this could be beneficial to the Village or the people. She asked where the water is going to go that these trees are absorbing now. She cannot understand how this subdivision is going to be beneficial to the Village or the community. This is why people moved here and it will all be taken away just to make money. She took pictures when they removed the trees in Kettering and they did this removal on Veteran's Day when everything is closed and she could do nothing to stop it. She stated she had spoken to the mayor regarding this and she was told that they were only interested in economic development and nothing else.

Chairman Spinelli stated in response to the question about wetlands, in the February 7th review letter from Novotony Engineering, it indicates that ravine 1 and 4 contains jurisdictional wetland and conservation is too be considered for all of the ravines to protect those slopes.

Joe Martello thanked Chairman Spinelli for opening up the public hearing. He asked if there were any other developers that were looking at this parcel.

Chairman Spinelli said he has been on the Commission since about 2005 and this is the first time he has seen any petition coming to the Village for this property.

Mr. Martello stated growing up in Lemont, one of the parts that makes Lemont unique is when you are driving over I355 you don't really see house after house that are all the same. Pulte Homes are probably very nice but they do look a little monotonous. As someone who is not involved in construction, looking at the six models that they brought up they generally look the same. He asks with the recommendation going forward, keep in mind that this town is not a cookie cutter community. Lemont is unique and that needs to be preserved.

Kara Knutte, 95 Doolin, said she has lived in Lemont for over 23 years. She is glad to see that they are getting a little larger with the lot sizes. She asked how many lots will be 12,500 square feet.

Chairman Spinelli stated he is counting 18 of the homes immediately adjacent to Timberline.

Ms. Knutte said out of 281 lots only 18 of them are meeting the minimum requirement for lot sizes. In her opinion, that is far below what the Lemont standards should be. Everyone else in this community has met the minimum lot size and the brick requirement. At the previous meeting, it was mentioned that the entrance to Alba Street would not be widen. She still feels this corner needs to be looked at with this increased traffic. There are no sidewalks from Evergreen down to New Avenue for pedestrian traffic. She stated that she had mentioned this before at the last meeting.

Bill Grand, 66 Deborah, stated he lives right off of Timberline. He thanked the Commission for their time and assistance with the Village. One of the reasons why he moved to Lemont was because this community was not a cookie cutter like the gentleman before him said. He is concerned about this development and the standard needs to be maintained. The lot sizes should not be downsized. With this development we have to take a look at not only police and fire but will our school district be able to handle the influx. There is a lot of development going on and even though there is an increase in the tax base we need to make sure we can handle it. He knows some type of project will go there but we need to make it good for everyone. There are a lot of people of concerned that live in Timberline that have not come

tonight because they don't think their voice will be heard. He on the other hand feels that it will.

Chairman Spinelli said the High School and School District 113A were at the last meeting. In general, the High School stated that they would welcome the students. District 113A stated as long as they can plan for the students then they will welcome the students. You will not get instantly 280 some houses, this will take time to develop. 113A also indicated, whether it is this development, Kettering, or any other thing that will happen with the Palos property, as long as the school Board knows it is coming, they can plan for the students. If he wants to see their exact comments he would recommend that they go to the January minutes. As far as infrastructure, this development will have to put in storm sewers, sanitary sewers and water main. They have an engineering consultant that verifies all the capacities. Nothing can be built if the current infrastructure cannot handle it.

Mr. Grand asked if there was going to be any other way into this subdivision other than Timberline.

Chairman Spinelli stated it is only through Timberline. This property does not own anything north that would connect them to New Avenue and they cannot make them buy any property. They have two access points to Timberline.

Kate Manner said she grew up in Lemont and liked it so much she currently still lives in Lemont. She feels they really need to consider the lot size. If they let more houses go in there then it will stretch more resources. There has always been these standards for lot sizes and does not know why we would want to make any concessions for lot sizes.

Ann Desmond, 89 Rose Court, stated in relation to what she said, how many homes would be built if they had to maintain the 12,500 lot size.

Chairman Spinelli said the developer has not presented anything to them for that.

Mr. Michaels stated they have not done a plan that does that specifically. He would like to remind everyone that the Lemont Comprehensive Plan does call for this area to be developed at 5 units to the acre. They are currently at 2.8 units per acre.

Mrs. Valone said in 2012 the Village updated its Comprehensive Plan and went through a series of public hearings. At the beginning of 2015 it was adopted and implemented. The Comprehensive Plan indicates future land use for all the areas inside of the Village and the areas a mile and half to its current boundaries. In the Plan it does indicate this property could be up to five dwelling units per acre. The Village code has very specific details. The Comprehensive Plan is a guiding tool, meaning when new items come in such as this, it is a matchup between the existing and the future land use category that is indicated for the area. There were three years' worth of public comment and interaction when creating the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Desmond stated the Summit homes was mentioned to be selling at \$600,000, she asked have they looked at what you can, for that amount of money, buy in this town. She does not feel that they will sell anywhere near that.

Steve Cornwell asked who hired the traffic study and who paid for it.

Chairman Spinelli said the developer. The Village is not responsible for this. This is standard in all communities.

Mr. Cornwell asked isn't this a conflict of interest.

Chairman Spinelli stated this is a firm that the Village has used in the past. It is a professional engineering firm and have been doing business for a long time. They are not going to jeopardize their license to practice in the State of Illinois to lie about one project on a traffic count.

Howie Amberg asked in regards to the 2.8, that would be based on the parcel as a whole, but how much of the land is buildable. There is a great big portion that is unusable and that was the issue the Park District was having. You would have to take that out to get an actual buildable number.

Chairman Spinelli said when the Comprehensive Plan was prepared and adopted the recommended land uses and density did not take into account topography. Whatever is around these properties is what you take into consideration. The 5 units to the acre was based on the entire property. So based on that you might be up to 8 units to the acre once you take in what is not buildable. With planning it is common practice, with all communities, to take the number of units over the entire property and that is how you come up with the density for that property.

Mr. Amberg stated he completely understands that. However, with everything there is an exception to the rule. This property would be one of those exceptions because of the topography.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there was anyone else in the audience that wanted to comment or ask questions regarding this public hearing. None responded. He then called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to close the public hearing for Case 16-10. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Plan Commission Discussion

Commissioner Sanderson asked if staff can elaborate on the Comprehensive Plan and Contemporary neighborhoods.

Mrs. Valone said if anyone is interested in looking at the Comprehensive Plan it is on the website or there is a paper copy at the Village. The Comprehensive Plan does designate the subject property as a higher density development. It additionally, is an overlay district to maintain the natural topography. The Comprehensive Plan does take into account the unique topography for this area and wants any developer to preserve it. This developer is wanting to do just that. The Contemporary neighborhood is a mix of housing styles which will be able to give a range of housing in the area and not one specific type of housing. This is how the developer is somewhat developing it.

Commissioner McGleam asked if staff could pull up the letter from the Village Engineer.

Mrs. Valone stated the third letter states that the applicant has already complied with some of his requirements from his previous letters.

Commissioner McGleam said the Village Engineer is requiring that the full water main loop for the entire development be installed as part as Phase I.

Mrs. Valone stated that is correct and that is the developers plan.

Commissioner McGleam said the next one is that the Village Engineer is recommending maintenance access to the upstream and downstream side of the culvert.

Mrs. Valone stated staff is waiting to see this access as well.

Mr. LeClair said if this Case moves forward from this Commission, what they are intending is to get the roadway and lot layout set. Then they will develop a full set of grading plans.

Commissioner McGleam stated the Village Engineer asks for some velocity attenuation.

Mr. LeClair said as part of their program for this type of culvert they are proposing to not touch the existing channel way through the bottom of that valley. They are hoping to not impact that at all. The layout they proposed require some pretty expensive head walls and wing walls. They are trying to leave less of an impact as possible.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the 4 x 6 con-span was the one that is being proposed by the Park District.

Mr. LeClair said that is actually going to be about a 12 foot span with no bottom so they can preserve the bottom.

Chairman Spinelli stated there needs to be clarification from the Village Engineer as to which structure he is talking about in item number eight. He then stated that Commissioner Maher could not be here this evening however, he did submit some comments. He then briefly went through his points or comments and stated his comments will be part of the public record.

Chairman Spinelli said he will go through his comments in regards to the engineering plans. All lots need numbers or identifiers, there are nine outlots that have no lot number. On 3.0 there is an impervious calculation reference in the lot detail drawing, that conflicts with the note in table C1. On 3.0 it indicates that decks are included in the impervious but the chart in front says they are not. He knows that these are preliminary drawings but he has two pages worth of conflict. He understands that our Village Engineer has not had the opportunity to fully review this which was indicated in the February letter. He will just highlight some of the significant ones.

Chairman Spinelli stated between this development and Timberline there is a boundary gap. That boundary gap needs to be resolved before going to any kind of Final Plat. There is not an overlap but rather a gap and it needs to be fixed. In regards to stormwater basin number one, the ordinance allows a four foot maximum storage from normal water to high water. Historically, they have granted variances to a five foot storage height. The drawings have indicated that they are looking for a variance to five feet. For stormwater basin number one, all of the pages are indicating six feet storage, so this needs to be corrected. Stormwater basin number two, on two of the plans it is indicated at five foot storage but two additional pages indicated six foot storage that needs to be corrected. Storm basin number three is one of his biggest concerns. Currently, it is being proposed with seven feet of storage on the side of a hill. Soil reports indicated a concern and that the basins need to be lined. Since being on the Commission, he does not remember ever granting that large of a variance for storage.

There are some issues with some of the sidewalk keywalks that are not ADA compliant at the intersections. The crossroad culvert, at what he would call the park lot, could be eliminated. If that is the lot the Park District is going to get from them, it is creating a liability for the public entity so it should be resolved. Along with the purpose of getting rid of the culvert due to the liability there, lot 281 is going to be filled which is south of park lot, so he does not see the need for the culvert. The only reason would be to avoid the wetlands and drain anything west of the road. In general, throughout pages C1 to 5.1, manhole and fire hydrant placement along the roadways should be located as close as possible to lot lines.

Chairman Spinelli said when it comes to lot sizes, he is not sure how any of his fellow Commissioners feel. He appreciates that he did seven of the 12 conditions that he had asked for. He appreciates that they added the additional depth to the lots that are

adjacent to Timberline and cleaning up the extra spaces in between lots. What he is offended by is that he clearly stated at the last meeting that side yard setbacks should be no less than ten feet. The code is 15 feet and they are requesting a 7.5 foot which is a 50% reduction. This Commission has never permitted a 50% reduction in side yard setbacks. It might have changed when it went before the Village Board. He understands that developers have the right to ask for concessions, but the side yard setbacks are a huge sticking point with him. If 10 foot side yards were done on all the single-family homes it would take down the subdivision to 265 lots. It would be an additional loss of 16 homes, but otherwise it is a huge burden on the developer to make sure they have the setbacks correct.

Lot sizes for the Summit is an average of 10,500 square feet, with a minimum of 7,981 square feet and a maximum of 21,664 square feet, but the lot size that comes up the most out of the 94 lots is 8,450 square feet. This is significantly less than the zoning code. The width on those lots is 65 feet wide and the code is currently 90 feet wide. The Ridgeline average lot width is 56 square feet. The average lot size 8,300, with a minimum of 6,977 square feet and maximum of approximately 14,000 square feet, but the number that comes up the most is 7,280 square feet. That is half of what is required by the code. If going to the table titled "Relief from UDO Standards", it states the minimum lot size for R-4 is 12,500 square feet and they are proposing 6,980 square feet which is 44% reduction from the code. For the R-5 lots, the requirement is 10,000 square foot requirement, and they are proposing 5,770 square feet, which is a reduction of 42%. The lot width for an R-4 is supposed to be at 90 feet and they are requesting 56 feet as a minimum, which is a 38% reduction. The minimum side yard setback that was referenced was 16.5% of lot width, which is actually in the code for existing platted lots. These are new lots here and for new lots it is 15 feet. The applicant is requesting 7.5 feet, which is a 50% reduction. Side yard setbacks for R-5 is 33% reduction.

Chairman Spinelli stated he is not happy with these reductions. He understands that this property is hard to develop. He has seen a drawing with 16 less lots if they went with the 10 foot side yard setbacks. He likes the layout with the bigger houses next to Timberline and the duplexes closer to the highway. His opinion is there are too many concessions on the Village's part that they are requesting. He does not understand why he should even consider granting these concessions when he has not seen any concessions made on the developers end. They are giving 25 acres of open space, but when you look at it from an engineering perspective, it is land that can't be built on. He does not see any justification for these concessions and he has never seen anything this severe.

Mrs. Valone said she would like to clarify that the townhouse lots would actually be looked at by the code as the two put together, which would be a minimum of 10,500 square feet and per lot it would be a minimum of 3,000 square feet. The applicant does meet the code for the duplexes.

Mr. Tremulis stated the premise for the development is based on the Comprehensive Plan. They realize that this development is not your typically 12,500 square foot subdivision. They chose this property based on the guidance of the Comprehensive Plan and feel that they are meeting the intent of the Plan. It does provide a mix of housing, price points, and a mix of demographic profiles for people who are living in the community and want to stay. They feel it is a very low impact plan based upon the reservation of open space and the technique that are looking to employ for a grading perspective. The site will have dramatic appeal from a view perspective. The lots have a redundancy of look-out and walk-out elevations and these will be expensive housing. A lot of the home buyers will most likely finish their basements which will add additional cost to a home. They think they are working with the property and working with the grades. They are designing a community that will be hugely beneficial, not just economically, but a beautiful community. There is some challenging geometry to deal with along the tollway so they think the best use is for an empty nester type of product and a ranch style product. The elevation will be lower so it will provide a low impact visually to Lemont. Pulte Homes has won the National Housing Award many times and builds great homes. He does not feel that they could find a better builder to deliver such a mix of products for this property. Although, the clustering of the lots is a significant concern for the Commission, it is within the density of the Comprehensive Plan. There really isn't another site in Lemont that offers this opportunity. They would appreciate a positive recommendation but if there are conditions that they would want to put on their recommendation then they would encourage them to do so.

Commissioner Zolecki said he would like to echo what Chairman Spinelli said and add a little to their comment just made. He appreciates the work that they have done with staff and what they presented here. From his perspective, at the last meeting they went into some pretty specific details on some of the issues. Most notably, the detail that Chairman Spinelli had gone into this evening for the audience that is here today, which has been talked over at the December and January meeting, with clear expectations. What was presented here today, he can appreciate, but also feels that concessions at this point don't need to be discussed, this is what you put forward for the Commission. If this is what best matches with their marketing strategies or financials, he respects that, but at the same time there has been multiple opportunities with very specific details. He appreciates Chairman Spinelli going through them again, but these have been presented. He feels that what is being presented here before them is the developers and builders proposal.

Chairman Spinelli then called for a recommendation to the Village Board.

Plan Commission Recommendation

Commissioner Sanderson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to recommend to the Mayor and Village Board of Trustees approval of Case 16-10 Vistancia Annexation, Rezoning, and Preliminary PUD based on what has been

presented this evening and staff's comments and recommendations. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: None

Nays: Sanderson, Cunningham, McGleam, Kwasneski, Zolecki, Spinelli

Motion denied

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 16-10 as prepared by staff. 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 said the St. Alphonsus' parking lot, the small cell antennae, and Look Nu Car Wash went before the Committee of the Whole two days prior. They are looking for approvals for the parking lot and the small antennae on the March 13th Village Board meeting and Look Nu will go before the Village Board on February 27th.

VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

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

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Minutes prepared by Peggy Halper