

**Village of Lemont**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
Regular Meeting of July 19, 2017

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, July 19, 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 6:30 p.m. He then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**B. Verify Quorum**

Upon roll call the following were:

Present: Cunningham, Forzley, McGleam, Plahm, Zolecki, Spinelli

Absent: Glomp

Community Development Director Jason Berry, Village Planner Heather Valone, and Village Trustee Ron Stapleton were also present.

**C. Approval of Minutes: June 21, 2017 meeting**

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to approve the minutes from the June 21, 2017 meeting with no changes. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: Forzley, McGleam, Plahm, Zolecki, Spinelli*

*Nays: None*

*Abstain: Cunningham*

*Motion passed*

**II. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS**

Chairman Spinelli greeted the audience. He then asked everyone in the audience to please stand and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath.

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. 17-05 Derby Pines Subdivision Rezoning**

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to open the public hearing for Case 17-05.

Commissioner Forzley made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to open the public hearing for Case 17-05. A roll call vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

### **Staff Presentation**

Heather Valone, Village Planner, said Frank Caruso of C3 Development is acting on behalf for the owner of the property, is requesting rezoning from R-1 Single-Family to R-4 Single-Family. The requested rezoning is being pursued to construct an eight unit residential subdivision. Staff is recommending approval.

The Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) reviewed a different portion of this case in June. They reviewed the portion for the subdivision and variations. At the time there were some confusion as to the zoning and that is why they are bringing the rezoning before the Commission now. The subject property is currently zoned partially R-4 and partially R-1. She showed on the overhead the which parts of the subject property are zoned R-4 and R-1. It was brought into the Village in 1998 through annexation and was given the default zoning of R-1 for the majority of the property. The requested rezoning is the same exact zoning as the neighboring properties.

Mrs. Valone stated the applicant's requests that were made for variations at the last hearing have no bearing on the rezoning. The variations were for length of cul-de-sac, width of the right-of-way, width of the parkway, and water main looping. The applicant is meeting all lot size requirements, setbacks, and all other requirements of the R-4 district. Staff reviewed the application with the standards for rezoning and found that they met all standards, thus staff is recommending approval.

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

### **Applicant Presentation**

Frank Caruso, C3 Development, said he does not have anything further to add, but is present this evening to answer any questions.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any questions for the applicant at this time. None responded.

### **Public Comment**

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

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

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

### **Plan Commission Recommendation**

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion for recommendation.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Forzley to recommend to the Mayor and Board of Trustees approval of Case 17-05 Derby Pines Subdivision Rezoning. A roll call vote was taken:

*Ayes: McGleam, Forzley, Cunningham, Zolecki, Plahm, Spinelli*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded Commissioner Cunningham to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 17-05 as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

### **B. 17-08 Hartz Homes Annexation, Rezoning and Preliminary PUD**

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to open the public hearing for Case 17-08.

Commissioner Forzley made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to open the public hearing for Case 17-08. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

Commissioner McGleam said he wanted to disclose that he previously worked on a project with the applicant's engineer group.

Mrs. Valone asked how many years ago.

Commissioner McGleam stated it was in 2015 and 2016.

Mrs. Valone asked if the project was completed.

Commissioner McGleam said yes.

Chairman Spinelli asked if he was currently working with them now.

Commissioner McGleam stated no.

### **Staff Presentation**

Heather Valone, Village Planner, stated Thomas McSharry of Hartz Construction Company, Inc., the contact purchaser of the subject property, is seeking annexation to the Village of Lemont, Rezoning to R-4 and R-5, and a Preliminary PUD. The purpose of the requested zoning entitlements is to allow the construction of a residential subdivision comprised of 22 single-family attached units and 22 single-family detached units. Staff is recommending approval with conditions.

The Comprehensive Plan does designate the northern portion of the site as Contemporary for future designated land use. This is characterized by single-family detached homes with single-family attached and multi-family incorporated with an average gross density of 5 dwelling units throughout the district. The Comprehensive Plan has a different designated land use for the southern portion. It is designated Conventional Neighborhood. It is still characterized by single-family detached homes with some single-family attached and multi-family, however it is a slightly lower density, between two and four dwelling units per acre. The proposed development is consistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan for both future land use designations. The entire proposed development will have less dwelling units per acre that is permitted by the Comprehensive Plan.

Additionally, the surrounding properties are consistent with the proposed land use. The property to the east is large lot single-family rural unincorporated neighbored by the Keepataw Trails Subdivision. To the south is large lot rural subdivision. The west is large lot rural subdivision neighbored by Chestnut Crossing and Krystyna Crossing, which are two developed subdivisions inside the Village of Lemont. The large lot rural are not incorporated into the Village.

Mrs. Valone said the applicant is looking for a series of variations to the code for his PUD request. The applicant is looking for reduced rear setbacks for the R-5 property he is requesting, which is in the northern portion of the property. The applicant is proposing 22 single-family attached units in that portion of the site. The code requires a minimum of 30 feet for rear yard setbacks and they are requesting 25 feet. Staff finds this deviation acceptable as the lots back up to open spaces in their plan which will further buffer the lots from their neighbors to the east and west. The applicant is requesting a reduced minimum lot size. In the UDO it is 10,000 square feet for R-5 single-family attached. The applicant is proposing lots ranging from 8,500 to 9,400 square feet. Staff finds this deviation acceptable as there are number

of outlots that surround the duplex units giving more open space to account for the slightly smaller lots.

The applicant is also seeking deviations to the R-4 zoning classification. The applicant is proposing 22 single-family detached units in the southern portion of the site. The applicant is looking for a reduced lot size for the R-4 as well. The minimum lot size is 12,500 and the applicant is looking for lot sizes that range from 10,200 square feet to 11,000 square feet. Staff finds the deviation acceptable given the guidance and the dwelling units prescribed for the Lemont 2030 Plan. Since the applicant is looking for smaller lot sizes they are also looking for smaller lot widths as well. The UDO requires a minimum of 90 feet for width and the applicant is proposing 80 foot wide lots. Again, staff finds this deviation acceptable based on the Lemont 2030 Comprehensive Plan. The next deviation is for a minimum reduction to the interior side setback for the single-family detached lots. The UDO requires a minimum of 15 feet and the applicant is requesting 10 feet. Staff finds this deviation acceptable based on other subdivisions that were approved with similar setbacks, such as the Glens of Connemara, the Estates of Montefiori, and Covington Knolls. The last variation that the applicant is looking for with the R-4 is minimum rear setback. Code requires a minimum of 30 feet and the applicant is asking for 25 feet. Staff would find this deviation acceptable if the applicant is willing to comply with some masonry requirements on the side, rear and front elevations. This would ensure if the lots were closer to other properties that surround it, then they will be more appealing.

Mrs. Valone stated the applicant is seeking other variations to code. The first is minimum sidewalk length along a collector street. The applicant is not proposing sidewalks along Archer. There is an existing sidewalk along 127<sup>th</sup> Street; however it is only four feet eleven inches wide. Staff is finding this deviation unacceptable because the Comprehensive Plan does require walkable neighborhoods. Staff is recommending eight feet along Archer Avenue and eight feet along 127<sup>th</sup> Street. All PUDs are required to have 15% open space. The applicant has a total of 37% open space, however only 12% usable. As there is a limited area for open space with the configuration of the properties as well as the wetlands in the northern portion of the site, staff would find this deviation acceptable if some sort of common amenity was placed in outlot 36 behind the townhome units. This can be something like benches, a gazebo, flower garden, etc.

The applicant is also proposing some of their models to have garages that protrude more than ten feet from the plan of the house. As the applicant has not turned in plans for the full range of product that they are going to be looking for, staff was not able to do a full review of this. Staff would want before preliminary PUD to understand how many will protrude and how many will be three-car garages. The applicant is also looking for reductions to the design of the street. The applicant is proposing a minimum pavement width of 27 feet. Code does allow this for smaller local street, however there is another section of the code that does require 30 feet. As they are meeting one section of the code that is a local collector street, staff does not find this as a deviation. The other variation they are looking for is a reduced right-of-

way width. Code requires 66 feet and they are looking for 60 feet. Staff finds this deviation acceptable as they are providing off street parking in the townhome area in addition to what they are required for code.

Mrs. Valone said the site is accessed through 128<sup>th</sup> Street. She showed on the overhead where 128<sup>th</sup> Street was located. There are a series of wetlands along 127<sup>th</sup> Street that the Army Core of Engineers has taken jurisdiction of and the applicant is not looking to affect those wetlands. The applicant has submitted a traffic analysis showing that the current infrastructure can accommodate the traffic that will be generated from this subdivision. The increase in traffic is marginal compared to what the actual predicted traffic is without the subdivision. Additionally, the majority of the traffic is predicted to utilize the Archer Avenue access not the 128<sup>th</sup> Street access. The traffic analysis was preliminary and staff will be requiring a final traffic analysis. Archer Avenue is an IDOT (Illinois Department of Transportation) road and they will have to get a permit to put the entrance along Archer. There might be a couple of items that might be required like a left hand turn lane or additional signage. However, IDOT will be permitting so they will be the ones that will be requiring it.

The applicant also submitted a landscape plan showing existing trees on the site. They provided information on 64 trees on the existing site. However, there are several areas that are heavily wooded that did not have detail information on them. Two of the areas are in the wetland area, and therefore will not be impacted. The remaining three areas are indicated to be completely removed. Staff will need information submitted on these areas prior to approval of preliminary PUD to determine if additional trees can be saved or if mitigation is required. Staff is also recommending that five trees be saved on the site and the tag numbers are listed in the staff report. These trees are of size and quality that are worth preserving or should be mitigated for if they are not able to be preserved.

Mrs. Valone stated the applicant submitted a landscape plan indicated parkway trees, landscaping along the detention areas and landscaping along Archer. The landscape plan meets UDO standards for parkway trees and landscaping along Archer. The applicant is proposing to leave the existing trees along 127<sup>th</sup> Street, thus no additionally landscaping is required in that area. On the proposed detention outlots in the single-family attached area additional plant units need to be added. One plant unit per detention pond needs to be added to the property. Additionally, the off-street parking bank areas are not shown on the landscape plan and need to be added to the plan. Staff is recommending that the parking bank area be lined with evergreen shrubs to prevent the headlights from entering any of the units.

The applicant has submitted some preliminary indication of what the single-family attached and detached homes will be. At this time the applicant is not proposing final architecture for either of the products and is looking to finalize it at Final PUD. This is standard at preliminary PUD the applicant submits preliminary architectural plans and finalize the architectural plans, either via product book or anti-monotony standards, at the time of Final PUD. The applicant is proposing the attached

townhome units with roughly about 90% of brick on all elevations. The applicant is proposing some of the detached units with some sort of masonry on the front, side and rear elevations were not submitted so staff cannot determine what they will look like.

Mrs. Valone said the Village Engineer has reviewed the subdivision and had a number of comments which are listed in staff's packet. The engineer had commented on the impacts of the BP pipeline on the grading of lots 10 and 11 which are not communicated and therefore need to be flushed out. Additionally, the proposed sewer placement adjacent to the pipeline is a concern. Lastly, the Village Engineer had commented that a stop sign might be needed at 128<sup>th</sup> Street; however the final traffic analysis will be needed to be completed to determine that.

The Fire District is present tonight and she will let them comment. They have generally approved of the plans; however the hammerhead near lots 28D and 29D must be increased to accommodate the fire apparatus. The plans do indicate that there is room to increase the hammerhead. The overall proposed subdivision is well designed and complies with most of the requirements of the UDO. Considering the unique challenges the site contains, the applicant is meeting the parkway landscaping, major street landscaping, and interior side yard setbacks for the single-family attached. The proposal achieves the goals of the Lemont 2030 Comprehensive Plan. The subdivision also mimics the density and the lot sizes of the nearby developed properties. Additionally, the applicant meets all the standards for rezoning. Therefore, staff is recommending approval with the following ten conditions. The ten conditions are listed on pages 12 and 13 of staff's report. She then read through each condition.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the Fire Marshall had any comments.

Ben Deanda, Fire Marshall, said as a whole the Fire Department is fine with the plan except for the hammerhead that was talked about earlier. They are going to be looking for that to meet code which is about 120 feet wide. It is needed so that their biggest vehicle can turn around with no issues and not have to back out of that section.

Chairman Spinelli asked if this was a standard cul-de-sac what the pavement radius or diameter would have to be.

Mr. Deanda stated it would have to 96 feet curb-to-curb.

Chairman Spinelli said he is leaning towards a cul-de-sac because he knows that the Board does not like hammerheads in a permanent condition. He asked what would the fire department need to meet the new vehicles if it was a full radius.

Mr. Deanda stated it would be 96 feet curb-to-curb in the center of it. He said that is their only concern.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any questions from the Commission for staff.

Commissioner Zolecki asked in regards to the anti-monotony he understands that the reviews will come at the Final PUD, but are the goals of the 2030 Plan going to be instilled with that review as well. What he is referencing to is the four sided elevations.

Mrs. Valone said yes. The Lemont 2030 Plan really requires that if there are single-family detached and attached, they are supposed to look like one type of product.

Commissioner Forzley asked if Keepataw Trails and Krystyna Crossing have townhomes or duplexes on either side of it.

Mrs. Valone stated the beginning portion of Keepataw Trails have townhomes. Krystyna Crossing is all single-family and it will connect with this project where the wetlands and the street are. No proposed units are directly adjacent to the Krystyna Crossing lots.

Commissioner Forzley asked if duplexes would increase the density compared to townhomes.

Mrs. Valone said townhomes would have a higher density than duplexes.

Chairman Spinelli stated looking at the plan they should be able to put in a cul-de-sac at the end by shifting lot 28D towards the north.

Commissioner McGleam asked for staff to go over the process of the PUD for the audience so they know what is being heard and what is going to be voted on.

Mrs. Valone then explained the process to the audience.

Commissioner McGleam asked what are the rear and side yard setbacks in Krystyna Crossing.

Mrs. Valone said it is 25 feet in the front, the sides are 15 feet and the rears do vary depending on the lot but mostly follow 30 feet.

Chairman Spinelli stated he has a few questions regarding the variances that are being requested. For the R-5 the minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet, they are below that, but it appears from the drawing that if they increase in the depth of the lot to meet the ordinance all they are doing is taking away from the open space. He asked if this was why staff found it acceptable.

Mrs. Valone said that is correct.



Chairman Spinelli asked if the front load issue should wait till they have house plans.

Mrs. Valone said that is why staff is recommending for additional information to be submitted.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they could proceed and just remove this variance request at this time.

Mrs. Valone stated the commissioners could.

Commissioner McGleam asked if staff could provide some additional information regarding the parking stalls. He asked if this was an attempt to satisfy zoning or UDO requirements.

Mrs. Valone said no. They are already meeting their requirement by having two car garages and driveways for the attached units. The reason why they are providing off-street parking in that area is because typically in those areas you find that more people are parking off-street. Additionally, because they have a smaller right-of-way it gives people a place to park without blocking any kind of the street or proposing any type of hazard.

Commissioner Cunningham asked if parking will be allowed on the street.

Mrs. Valone stated parking will still be allowed on the street.

Commissioner McGleam asked if the HOA was going to have maintain that area.

Mrs. Valone said it is a common area. They have not worked it out yet with the applicant if those spaces would be dedicated or private.

Commissioner McGleam asked how was the number of spaces determined.

Mrs. Valone stated she will have the applicant answer that.

Commissioner McGleam said in the Village Engineer's comments he stated that a stop sign might be needed at the 128<sup>th</sup> connection. He asked who will determine if it is needed.

Mrs. Valone stated she would like the final traffic study to be submitted then they would make a decision. The decision would be made by the Village Engineer prior to Final PUD approval.

Chairman Spinelli asked if prior to Final PUD can they make sure that parkway trees, shown on the final landscape plan are spaced properly away from regulatory street signs.

Mrs. Valone said they will look at that.

Commissioner McGleam asked who will be responsible for maintaining the detention ponds.

Mrs. Valone stated the outlots in the attached area it will be the HOA. The applicant has not approached the Village in regards to the single-family detached outlot area. If it does meet standards the Village can potentially maintain the ponds.

Commissioner Cunningham asked if staff can clarify the standards for the sidewalk width.

Mrs. Valone said staff is recommending above the UDO for the sidewalks on 127<sup>th</sup> Street. These sidewalks are major thorough fairs where a wider sidewalk would be more appropriate for pedestrians. So staff is recommending eight foot wide sidewalks for these areas.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any additional questions for staff or the Fire Department at this time. None responded. He then asked if the applicant wanted to make a presentation.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Thomas McSharry, Hartz Construction Company, introduced his team to the Commission. He stated that Mrs. Valone did a very thorough presentation and they are present this evening to answer any of their questions.

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

Commissioner McGleam asked if they had a traffic engineer present this evening.

Mr. McSharry said no.

Commissioner McGleam asked if they could get some response to the Village Engineer's comments. Item five states the water main loop needs to be looped to Chestnut Crossing's 12 inch stub on Archer Avenue at the west side of the property. He does not believe that is what is shown in the plans.

Brian Hertz, MG2A Engineering, stated he does not believe there are any issues with that.

Commissioner McGleam said the Village Engineer is proposing that the sanitary sewer needs to connect to the lift station in Keepataw Trails. He asked if they had looked at that.

Mr. Hertz stated they did look at that. There is the permit information that they received from MWRD which indicated that there was a service area established at that lift station and the majority of the property is included in that service area.

Commissioner McGleam asked if they could talk about item ten of the Village Engineer's comments. It states to provide an analysis of the proposed impacts to the existing homes and yards on lots 5, 6, 7, and 8 of Keepataw Trails that would be affected by the relatively deep off-site sanitary sewer connections on those lots.

Mr. Hertz said that is connected to the other comment. With their survey work that they will do they will have to pick up any information in that area. They will have to come up with a plan for how it is going to happen.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they had considered horizontal directional drilling for any of those deep sewers.

Mr. McSharry stated they have not. When they talked with the technical review committee there was talk about a lift station being needed. The engineers at MG2A were able to find the information off-site that is still within easement and not have any impact on the neighboring lots. They can take a look at that but he has a fear that the depth would not work.

Chairman Spinelli said as opposed to restoring a 30 foot trench.

Mr. McSharry stated they are open cutting that, but they won't know what is down there. They are hoping that they have decent soils and they can do a double trench box which will minimize any disturbance along in that easement.

Chairman Spinelli said if they do open cut he hopes they plan to compact the soils as they go back instead of letting gravity do it. In regards to the sanitary sewer, he is not pleased with the starting manhole at the south end of the property at four feet deep. It causes a lot of problems with water main clearance. He asked why they are using a 10 inch sewer and feels that it does not provide an adequate flow.

Mr. Hertz stated they had looked at doing a standard eight inch gravity sewer starting at the lift station at Keepataw Trails and it is going to depend on the final survey work. The minimum soak of an eight inch gravity sewer is .40% where a ten inch is .28%. By the time they run however many feet at that grade with an eight inch they are coming out of the ground.

Chairman Spinelli said he agrees with him, but that is why at the TRC the Village Engineer recommended a lift station. His concern is that at the very south end where they are starting this, there are maybe four to five homes connected to the first run of sewer between manholes. There might not be enough flow in that ten inch sewer to support the flow and get all of the solids moving.

Mr. Hertz stated it is going to be up to their final engineering.

Chairman Spinelli asked what additional survey work do they need to do.

Mr. Hertz said they need to do topographic surveys.

Chairman Spinelli asked how is this put together then.

Mr. Hertz stated it is based on the best information that they have which is Cook County GIS.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there was a ground survey at this point.

Mr. Hertz said there is no land survey at this point.

Mr. McSharry stated there is a lot of overgrowth on the site. As contract purchaser they did not feel comfortable extending the money at this time to clear the site until they owned the land. In addition to that, he is not sure if the sellers would be on board with that should something be unveiled. They were able to take shots of the open areas and compare them with the data at hand. They did find that the data at hand is largely inline. Once they do own the land they will be able to clear it and do a topographic survey and get everything ready for Final Engineering.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they get approved for preliminary PUD when do they plan on doing this clearing survey work.

Mr. McSharry said once they get approval for preliminary, they will close on the property and then start survey clearing work.

Chairman Spinelli stated earlier he had mentioned about having an actual cul-de-sac rather than a hammerhead. He feels that they can accommodate that by shifting lot 28D.

Mr. McSharry said everything that they are looking at they are looking at future expansion. He understands that they don't like hammerheads. What they were looking at was there was a potential for future development. They will look at putting a radius in there.

Chairman Spinelli stated he understands that nobody can predict the future, but he does not see how this street would be connected to Keepataw Trails.

Mr. McSharry said it would not be a straight shot but something similar like 128<sup>th</sup> Street with a jog in the road. However, they are more than willing to look at putting in a cul-de-sac.

Commissioner McGleam asked if they had submitted anything to IDOT.

Mr. McSharry stated no they have not. They did submit to the Army Core of Engineers. With them they are looking at nine month submitting process. Once they receive feedback from the Village then they will start that process.

Commissioner McGleam asked if there was any way they can explain the results of the traffic analysis.

Mr. Hertz said the study concluded that the additional volume of traffic that will be generated by the development of the subdivision is minimal compared to the projected traffic volume for the area. The roadways that are adjacent and serving the site now can handle the increase traffic volume.

Chairman Spinelli asked if staff had the history as to why Ashbury Drive is a right-in/right-out onto Archer. He asked if it was a State requirement or a development request.

Mrs. Valone stated it was a State requirement; however there has been a lot of observed traffic not correctly using it. The Village has reached out to the Chief of Police and he has indicated that he is not interested in having another one. In theory IDOT has no reason to deny a full-in/full-out unless they potentially find that the entrances are too close.

Chairman Spinelli asked Trustee Stapleton if he knew if that street entrance went in prior to that street light.

Trustee Stapleton said he is not sure.

Mrs. Valone stated in regards to the traffic study, they first look at existing traffic on the roads and how well that it is being accommodated. Then it projects out the same traffic in 2020 by not even including the impact of the new subdivision. It looks at this information and adds the projected traffic for this subdivision. Their study predicted that the amount of traffic that is predicted in 2020 without the subdivision was more significant than the amount that would be added with the subdivision traffic.

Chairman Spinelli said he had noticed that some of the proposed slopes on the southern portion of the roadway is at an 8% slope. He asked if this meets code.

Mrs. Valone stated she would have the Village Engineer look at that.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further questions from the Commission for the applicant. None responded. He then asked if there was anyone in the audience that would like to come up and speak in regards to this public hearing.

### **Public Comment**

Michael Pensinger said he lives in Krystyna Crossing subdivision. Instead of having all of them come up and speak they organized to have three people come up and discuss some issues that they have with the new development. He is a business owner in Lemont, a Board of Director for the Chamber of Commerce, and a volunteer for the Open Space Committee. He is very involved with Lemont and cares about Lemont. One thing he and his neighbors are concerned about is the traffic impact from the new subdivision. There are about 25 homes in their subdivision and there are about 35 kids. They are not concerned about the traffic the subdivision will generate. They are concerned about people using their subdivision as a cut through. He uses First Street in Covington as a cut through to get to downtown Lemont and knows that other people do this as well. He is not sure if the traffic analysis can predict this. There are new subdivisions going up and will they use their roads to get their kids to school in the morning trying to avoid traffic. He wants the traffic analysis and the Planning Commission to analysis whether this is going to be the new cut through from Archer. They welcome the new subdivision and want to see growth here in Lemont but they want to make sure the PZC, the applicant and the Village Board aware of the impact of this cut through.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there was a three-way stop at 128<sup>th</sup> and Krystyna Place.

Mr. Pensinger stated at 128<sup>th</sup> and Krystyna Place there is no stop sign.

Chairman Spinelli asked staff if they could have the Village Engineer look at that. There is no way they can predict cut through. He agrees with him that it will probably happen, but he can't say to what extent it will happen. They can have the Village Engineer evaluate and come up with ideas to deter people from cutting through there by adding things like stop controls.

Mr. Pensinger said the people that live in the subdivision will generally drive slowly. It is the people that are cutting through there that will be rushing to get somewhere that will be driving fast.

Chairman Spinelli stated if there is a project northbound turn during the am/pm rush hours maybe they could restrict hours. It might be inconvenient for the homeowners but it might be something to consider. He would prefer the additional stop signs over the controlled access.

Paul Maksimovic asked why they don't have an entrance on 127<sup>th</sup> for this development.

Chairman Spinelli said there is jurisdictional wetlands.

Mrs. Valone showed on the overhead where the wetlands were located.

Chairman Spinelli stated if you put it along the western edge it would conflict with the Krystyna Place entrance.

Mr. Maksimovic said it looks like they are giving the applicant a break on everything possible. He asked if there were going to be any restrictions with the entrance on Archer.

Chairman Spinelli stated that intersection would be the jurisdiction of IDOT and it would be their determination as to what is permitted for that entrance.

Mr. Maksimovic said it states they are saving five trees, but there are thousands of trees there.

Mrs. Valone stated it is eight trees from the current existing survey. They have not submitted information on the heavily wooded areas. That is why staff is requesting the additional information to see if there is anything additional that can be saved.

Mr. Maksimovic asked why are they giving them so many different variances.

Chairman Spinelli said at this time they are not giving them anything, and the applicant is requesting these variances. The Commission is a recommending body to the Village Board, so until this goes to the Village Board nothing is granted.

Mr. Maksimovic stated there are five power poles that are on this property that supply power to him. He has not heard anything about those poles. He is concerned that he is going to be without power.

Commissioner McGleam said those poles should be in existing ComEd easements. They cannot be removed or relocated without a permit from ComEd.

Ron Simmons, 12962 Archer Avenue, stated a few years ago one of the poles was destroyed by lightning and both of their properties without power. ComEd came out and said that these poles are customer owned and they cannot do anything. ComEd told them that they are responsible for replacing them. They paid and had a pole put up. They want assurances that if and when this development goes up they will have power supplied to them.

Chairman Spinelli said hearing that, this is a private service to their two homes through this property. This development will have power and it will be most likely buried. When ComEd does their master plan for the development they will incorporate your service into the plan and when the entire switch is made there will be power. They will not be able to shut the power off during construction.

Mr. Simmons said his phone line is on those poles also. He also stated there is a wetland on his property which is a home for some endangered species. He wants to make sure that since it is a wetland it won't be disturbed.

Chairman Spinelli stated if it is on his property then it cannot be disturbed.

Mr. Simmons said several years ago the property east of him was developed. The contractor graded it perfectly for those homes but the drainage was disturbed. The drainage was coming down his driveway and destroyed it. He hopes that when they are doing the grading they are careful about the drainage.

Chairman Spinelli stated once their final engineering plans are prepared and submitted to the Village that is one of many things that the Village Engineer reviews.

Mr. Simmons said he would like the traffic engineer to come and see the amount of traffic that comes through on Archer between four and six p.m.

Chairman Spinelli stated he has not reviewed the traffic study at this time but it is preliminary at this time. It is however, one of the things that is incorporated into the traffic study. They review current and anticipated growth.

Jeff Zogby, 1306 Krystyna Crossing, said Mr. Pensinger did a great job and he would like to echo the concern about traffic. There are a lot of kids in the neighborhood. One thing that was not discussed is traffic coming from Target and using their subdivision as a cut through if a left hand turn is allowed. If you look at the site plan it does not look like it allows for future connectivity to Ashford Drive. The property immediately east of the proposed development, which is not planning on being developed right now, dead ends to the west and it looks like there might have been some thought for future connection. Given the location of the detention area on the east side of the development it does not appear that the plans are very conducive for something in the future.

Chairman Spinelli stated he would concur with him and why he questioned what he calls a temporary hammerhead. He agrees that there might be a connection for the property east of this development, but they are hearing this proposal tonight and he is not aware of any future development for that property. At this point, all he can say is there does not seem like there is a roadway connection from Keepataw Trails to this development.

Mr. Zogby said that is not what he is suggesting. He stated the site plan is adjusted as such to allow for connectivity in the future when the property east of this proposed development is developed. The reason why this is important is that Ashford Drive allows for another connection to Archer Ave, which helps alleviate some of the traffic concerns that they have.

Chairman Spinelli stated at this point this is where they are showing they need to place their stormwater management. There may be an opportunity in the future when that parcel develops to reconfigure the stormwater detention so that there is a connection.



Mr. Zogby said the site plan does not accommodate future connection of 129<sup>th</sup> Street to the west. There is some closed mindedness to some degree for this site plan and how it was developed in regard to future connection. These other arteries help alleviate the pressure on Krystyna Place. There is nothing from a legal standpoint that would prevent the developer of this property to impact those wetlands. It might impact them financially but there is nothing legally.

Chairman Spinelli stated those are jurisdictional wetlands so they are controlled by the Army Core of Engineers. Once they become jurisdictional they are very hard to be removed.

Mr. Zogby said he would like KLOA that did the traffic study reanalysis the average vehicles per day on Archer. Right now the report shows that there is a higher traffic count on 127<sup>th</sup> Street than on Archer which is hard to believe.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the applicant would have to submit another traffic study prior to final.

Mrs. Valone stated staff is requiring it.

Mr. Zogby asked if they are not able to get full opening at Archer, how will it impact their development.

Mr. McSharry said they will have to see what IDOT says. He does not feel it will be a right-in/right-out. He stated whatever they decided would not impact their development.

Jim Abraham, 14940 West 131<sup>st</sup>, stated his property is south of this development. He is concerned about traffic but also he is concerned about drainage to the south. His property sits lower than this development.

Chairman Spinelli said the developer's engineer will have to have a set of plans that meet Village code and MWRD's stormwater management ordinance. They do evaluate how their property discharges and impacts other properties.

Mr. Abraham asked what the price of the townhomes are going to be.

Chairman Spinelli stated they do not ask the price.

Mike Presbitero said \$400,000 for single-family and he is not sure of the duplexes.

Mr. Abraham asked if they were to eliminate some of the townhomes would it kill the deal.

Mr. McSharry stated yes it would. Duplexes tend to have a negative connotation to them. There is a base price on them, but once a buyer gets in there the price can go up depending on that buyer. So it is hard to say what the price will be. They have noticed that there is a certain buyer for these. It is a ranch unit so generally it is empty nesters or people that are about to become empty nesters.

Nancy Uznanski said she is concerned with having 80 homes having access to Archer Avenue. She asked if any of them tried to get onto Archer Avenue during rush hour.

Mr. McSharry stated they are not proposing 80 homes.

Mrs. Uznanski said it does not matter how many. There is a lot of traffic on Archer and the terrain with the turns there is very dangerous.

Chairman Spinelli stated IDOT will look at the terrain and will determine what can be put there.

Mrs. Uznanski said there are a lot of old growth trees on that land and she can't believe they want to cut them all down.

Mr. McSharry stated they are looking to save whatever trees they can save. With a development there are going to be trees taken down. The majority of the trees that are there are not high quality. As many trees as they can keep is an amenity for their potential buyers.

Samantha Burns, 1149 128<sup>th</sup> Street, said behind the treelike area there is a creek there with a whole bunch of wildlife. They have taken steps to certify that area as a recognized wildlife habitat by the National Wildlife Federation. This means that the area provides the four basic habitat elements needed for wildlife to thrive. The process was directly identified in the Lemont Green Plan established in 2009 by the Village of Lemont Community Development Department. The plan outlined goals and objectives for a creative and environmentally friendly community. Its intention was to promote an initiative that seeks to create conservation ethics within the Village. The Green Plan was a deciding factor when their family choose to move here. This Plan also identifies Lemont as a signed partner to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service which provides protection for species that are endangered and extinction of habitats. They have identified countless species that inhabit the area east of their home. She then listed all the species. If the goals in Lemont are to create an environmental friendly community, why would they destroy a recognized habitat that houses endangered species? This is all to build a road into a subdivision which is already going to destroy hundreds of trees. The thought process behind this does not align with the Lemont Green Plan nor does it strive to seek out a creative solution that takes into account the wildlife in that area. We need to set boundaries and promote successful conservation action towards our environment without destroying crucial habitats. They cannot allow big companies to buy into our small community without

respecting the precedence that is already established. She asked if anyone, even the ACOE, looked at that area.

Mr. McSharry stated that they did look at that area and it was created by one of the sellers 30 years ago. It was a manmade excavated ditch because the neighbor that had a parcel east of them put a driveway in and stopped drainage. So in order to keep water flowing off of his property he dug a trench.

Mrs. Burns said but there is wildlife there now and endangered species.

Mr. McSharry stated he is going to have Carl Peterson, Ecologist, speak in regards to this.

Chairman Spinelli asked if an EcoCat was done.

Carl Peterson, Ecologist, said the EcoCat did not give them any findings of endangered species. As they go through ACOE process the U.S. Fish and Wildlife will weigh in on their permit and that is where the potential for endangered species would come into play. There is a five mile radius along the I & M Canal area where the Hine's Emerald Dragonfly is known to exist and if you are within that range Fish and Wildlife have to a look

Chairman Spinelli asked if they come out to the site.

Mr. Peterson stated if they feel it is warranted then they do. They will comment on their permit process. There are many agencies that come out and look at it. The developer is proposing to preserve the wetlands and that is a lot of area. He showed on the overhead where the culvert ditch exists on the overhead. The basin in the northwest corner is going to be a naturalized basin to filter water and discharge at a reduced rate into that stream.

Mrs. Burns said that area is constantly filled with water, cattails, and algae. She asked what is the exact plan. Are they planning on building a road over it?

Mr. Peterson stated they would put a culvert over it.

Mrs. Burns said she feels they are downplaying this. There is going to be a huge impact.

Mr. Peterson stated they are preserving the other wetlands, creating detention areas and they are being diligent about protecting downstream.

Matt Holland said the road going back there why are they not using that for an entrance.

Mr. Peterson stated if you widen the road out you will be impacting the wetland.

Mr. McSharry said they did propose that to the ACOE and it was going to a full 60 foot right-of-way. However, there is a 100 foot buffer that is needed away from the wetlands. That buffer is going into the backyards of the other homeowners. It is not feasible to put a road there. They did do soil borings out there and there are terrible soils past 25 feet.

Mr. Holland asked if there could only be access off of Archer, rather than also on 127<sup>th</sup> Street.

Chairman Spinelli stated there does have to be two accesses and 128<sup>th</sup> Street is a stub street that was meant to connect to this parcel.

Jessica Zogby said they do encourage growth in Lemont and want to see it succeed and thrive. They also value the sanctity of their neighborhoods. They are really concerned about the safety of their children. This plan proposes a direct connection to two of Lemont's busiest roadways, Archer Avenue and 127<sup>th</sup>. We can hope and pray that stop signs will slow people down. Many neighborhoods are setup to prevent thoroughfares. She has to wonder if something can be proposed to help prevent this cut through.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they can work with the developer and see if there is a potential plan that does eliminate the fully connected north south street, not a disconnect between the two neighborhoods. Maybe as they come north there is an offset knuckle right where the duplexes start, head east and then sweep that around. He stated he can show her and it might be something they can consider. All of the Commissioners had thought the same thing as the residents about the cut through. We want to make it as less convenient for people to cut through.

Commissioner Forzley asked with the gravel road, what percent would affect the wetlands.

Mr. McSharry stated there is a buffer of 100 feet. He showed on the overhead where 100 feet would be located east and west on the property.

Discussion continued in regards to the access to this subdivision and cut throughs.

Mike Pensinger said you have to take into account the feasibility to turn right versus turning left and crossing traffic. As residents they know what it is like and how to travel to get to the school or Homer Glen. They are asking that the PZC consider the real world impact of traveling through there.

Mr. McSharry stated they are committed to whatever studies they have to do. This is a preliminary stage and they did their preliminary traffic study.

Discussion continued in regards to the data for the traffic study.

Jeanette Debaris was sworn in and said she lives in unincorporated Cook County of Lemont. She lives across from Kettering Estates. She asked what is the location of the gas pipeline that goes through there.

Chairman Spinelli stated right now it goes through the space between the single-family and the duplex units running east/west.

Ms. Debaris asked what kind of an easement does it have.

Chairman Spinelli said that is one of the requirements that staff and the Village Engineer are requiring. The developer and their engineer have to reach out to the pipeline owner to verify the clear zones they will be required for the pipeline. The Village is watching this issue.

Ms. Debaris stated when Kettering Estates was being developed, in one day they came in and took down 100 old oak growth trees. She has pictures of the piles of wood chips from the trees. There was nothing wrong with the trees that they took down. They did this on Veterans Day so it could not be stopped. She explained how they took the trees down. The reason why they do this is because they have to grade the entire section to put their houses up.

Chairman Spinelli said Kettering Estates is different than this subdivision. The process might be the same but it may not be the same.

Ms. Debaris stated she wants people to know that they don't look at every single tree.

Chairman Spinelli said staff is requiring an additional tree survey once they own the property and then it will be evaluated by the Village Arborist.

Ms. Debaris asked if they did soil borings on the entire property or just near the wetlands.

Mr. McSharry stated they did the entire property.

Mr. Simmons said he has a pond on his property and it borders the property that is going to be developed. He asked if there is going to be any buffer on the edge of that pond. He showed on the overhead where the pond is located.

Mr. Peterson stated there is a 20 foot setback behind the lot that would be owned by the HOA. There would be at least 25 feet from the property line. It will definitely be considered during the permitting process.

Chairman Spinelli said that will be addressed when they do the ground survey.

Jim Abraham stated there is a lot traffic and drainage problems with this development. He asked is it worth building 44 homes. He does not see the benefit for the residents.

Chairman Spinelli said any property owner has the right to petition to improve their property. They have to follow the rules.

Mr. Abraham stated the residents are concerned about safety, flooding, and traffic.

Chairman Spinelli said he did not hear any concerns about flooding.

Mr. Abraham stated he is concerned about flooding because he is on the other side of Archer and he sits below this subdivision.

Chairman Spinelli said there are controls in place that require the water to leave the site at a slower rate than it currently is.

Darius Drilinga, 1327 Krystyna Place, stated they said the house are going be starting at \$400,000. He said all of their houses are worth more than \$500,000.

Chairman Spinelli stated at this point in the process a price point has not been determined. The Commission's decision has nothing to do with price points.

Mr. Drilinga said he does not see any pluses for the residents with this development.

Jackie Uznanski, 12925 Archer Avenue, stated they are all concerned about the traffic and the traffic movement. Looking at the picture it looks like a lot of density for the single-family homes and there are a lot of trees on the property. She wanted to mention there might be a couple streams near the bottom of the development. She asked if all of the final hearings are public hearings.

Chairman Spinelli said any meetings that come before the Planning and Zoning are public hearings. When it goes to the Village Board they have a Committee of the Whole meeting which is an open discussion between the Village Board members. Typically, they do open it up to the public.

Ms. Uznanski asked if the Village was annexing the single-family homes.

Mrs. Valone stated the whole piece would be annexed into the Village.

Ms. Uznanski asked what is the benefit for being annexed into the Village.

Mrs. Valone said the main key is that they are able to connect to the Village's utilities.

Jeanette Debaris stated this is a PUD because there is a mixed use. There are a lot of things that they are accepting that were not included in the rules. The reason why we have the rules is to protect the people that are here in the Village. If you are going to give them all these opportunities to not comply with the rules then it is going to affect them. She asked what is the density on this property.

Mrs. Valone said the total density combined is 3.67, Krystyna Crossing is 1.2, Keepataw Trails is 3.34 and Chestnut Crossing is 2.4. Forty percent of the lots are the same size as in Chestnut Crossing and Keepataw Trails is 25% the same size lots.

Ms. Debaris stated it is pretty much the same density.

Mrs. Valone said yes except for Krystyna Crossing, however the only thing that buffers them is the wetlands and the street.

Ms. Debaris stated she hopes this Board and the Village Board take into consideration what Planning and Zoning is all about.

Dave Kalkowski said he thought he read that the total density was going to be 5.67.

Mrs. Valone stated 5 dwelling units is what the Comprehensive Plan allows for the north portion. The actual density for the whole subdivision is 3.67.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further questions or comments 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 Case17-08. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

### **Plan Commission Discussion**

Chairman Spinelli said that he went through the engineering plans and he has several comments and concerns. He knows that this is preliminary stage but he does want to make sure it becomes part of the record.

In regards to the Landscape Plan

1. Confirm compliance with the vision triangle requirements at all intersections.
2. Adjust parkway tree spacing for compliance with correct spacing to regulatory street signage.

Plan Sheet C1

3. Eliminate the hammerhead and convert it into a cul-de-sac

4. The propose 15 foot public utility easement (PUE) across the adjacent property to the east should be a minimum 25 feet PUE due to the extreme depth of the sanitary sewer and to match the existing 25 PUE in Keepataw Trails Subdivision.

#### Plan Sheet C3

5. Provide a roadway C/L tangent North of the Archer Road ROW (sta 0+49) that conforms to the UDO.
6. Verify the roadway C/L tangent between sta. 1+52 to 1+91 conforms to the UDO.
7. All rear yard PUE's should be 20 feet minimum to accommodate storm sewer and buried utilities (electric/phone/CATV).
8. Verify required pipeline clear zone.
9. Add sidewalk per staff recommendations at Archer.

#### Plan Sheet C4

10. Relocate the carriage walk to a standard sidewalk location within the Duplexes.
11. Relocate the sidewalk around the front side of the off street parking stalls.
12. Relocate off-street parking stalls near 32-D to 26-D. The current location conflicts with the roadway intersection.

#### Plan Sheet C5

13. Demonstrate compliance with Illinois Highway Code 605 ILCS 5/9-115.1 for all stormwater management facilities.
14. The southernmost sanitary sewer manhole is 4.2' rim to invert. This depth is too shallow and will create unnecessary conflicts with other utilities and water services.
15. Justify use of a 10" diameter sanitary sewer for the entire project. It is my opinion that there will insufficient flows within the 10" pipe. Insufficient flows will cause blockages and introduce maintenance issues for public works and future residents within the subdivision.
16. Verify pipeline clear-zone for utility installations (horizontal and vertical).

#### Plan Sheet C6

17. Shift Lot 27-D north to provide additional space for the sewer and water installations.
18. Consider horizontal directional drilling (HDD) for the installation of the sanitary sewer across the existing lots within Keepataw Trails subdivision.

#### Plan Sheet C7

19. Verify the proposed roadway slope of 8% conforms to the UDO.
20. Additional free board in the two southern stormwater management basins may be required to comply with IDOT drainage rules.



Commissioner Cunningham said he has one recommendation to add on to that. He would recommend for the single-family housing a reduction from 22 to 20 which will help with the requests from the standards. It would address the side setbacks, the minimum width standards and the minimum lot size. It might not bring them all up to code but it will bring them a lot closer.

Commissioner McGleam said he still has questions regarding the 22-23 off-street parking spaces.

Mrs. Valone asked if they could reopen the public hearing for that question.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to reopen the public hearing for Case 17-08. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

### **Public Hearing Reopened**

Mrs. Valone asked the applicant what the thought process was for the 23 off-street parking spaces.

Mr. McSharry stated it was what they could fit in the area. They have found that off-street parking is usually beneficial for a community that has this type of product.

Commissioner McGleam asked if this was their proposal and not a requirement from the TRC.

Mr. McSharry said yes. It is something that they have seen as beneficial. It helps around the holidays when there is not enough off-street parking.

Commissioner McGleam asked how they came up with the quantity.

Mr. McSharry stated it was what they could fit in there.

Commissioner McGleam asked if they would be open to doing permeable pavers there.

Mr. McSharry said they could take a look at that.

Commissioner McGleam stated otherwise they look like parking lots. If so, then they should have to meet the parking lot standards.

Mrs. Valone said they are already meeting the parking standards for residential. This is all extra parking.

Commissioner McGleam stated his recommendation is that they be treated as parking lots.

Mrs. Valone said if they are permeable pavers then the Village is going to require them to go to the HOA.

Commissioner McGleam asked if the driveways will be concrete or asphalt.

Mr. McSharry stated for the multi-family they are looking at asphalt.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there is going to be a service for the driveway or are the individually owned.

Mr. McSharry said there is going to be a service.

Chairman Spinelli stated since the HOA is going to be doing the driveways they should then be in charge of these off-street parking areas.

Commissioner McGleam asked to confirm that they are not entertaining variances for minimum distance between front faced façade for garages and primary structure.

Mrs. Valone said they can eliminate that and it will be addressed at Final PUD.

Chairman Spinelli 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 17-08. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

### **Plan Commission Discussion**

Commissioner Zolecki said the traffic standpoint is a top priority concern not only for the residents but also for him. There was talk about additional stop signs and re-engineering the roads and they are not here tonight to do that for them. When they see the Final PUD Engineering Plans they need to see a strong consideration for that. The one jog at 128<sup>th</sup> Street is not going to be enough. He knows that this was mentioned a lot but if it is not addressed in some form or manner at Final PUD then they will risk having to go back to preliminary PUD to get it addressed.

Commissioner McGleam stated he agreed and they need to discuss how they want to phrase this.

Commissioner Forzley said there are a lot of issues here and a lot of variations to the code. He has a lot of concerns with the traffic, pipeline, cul-de-sac, survey, endangered species and the grade plan. He is not comfortable with all these loose ends.

Chairman Spinelli asked Commissioner Forzley if based on his comments would he recommend tabling or recommend proceeding as they presented.

Commissioner Forzley stated he is all for economic growth. He would recommend tabling this because he is not comfortable voting on so many issues here that are not specific.

Mrs. Valone said the applicant did contact the pipeline and is aware of the clearances that are needed. It is not included in their submittals and they felt that it was more of a Final PUD item.

Chairman Spinelli explained to the audience and to the new Commissioners what the process was for Preliminary and Final PUD.

Mrs. Valone asked if they can go over what the recommendations are at this time, not including Chairman Spinelli's list.

Commissioner McGleam stated they are:

1. Traffic control/calming measures throughout the proposed subdivision and at 128<sup>th</sup> and Krystyna Place is included in the Final Engineering and it must be supported by a report from the traffic engineer.
2. Recommending reducing the number of single-family homes from 22 to 20.
3. Permeable pavers must be used at all off-street parking in the single-family attached areas.
4. Eliminate staff's recommendation number three at this time.

Commissioner McGleam asked staff to explain why they can't meet the minimum rear yard setback for the attached homes that back up to common areas.

Mrs. Valone said staff does not have an issue with that deviation because it is not relevant. They could require them to meet it, however that is just additional area that becomes private and then those people have to maintain the area. If it is a common outlot then all that area is being maintained.

Commissioner McGleam stated he looks at it the other way, that it is an additional burden on the HOA.

Chairman Spinelli asked if setbacks stayed where they are at, are decks permitted in the rear yard setback.

Mrs. Valone said yes.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the decks had to stay on the private portion.

Mrs. Valone stated yes depending on the HOA.

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

### **Plan Commission Recommendation**

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to approve Case 17-08 Hartz Homes Annexation, Rezoning and Preliminary PUD with staff's conditions listed on pages 12 and 13 of staff's report and with the following conditions added:

1. Traffic control/calming measures throughout the proposed subdivision and at 128<sup>th</sup> and Krystyna Place be included in the Final Engineering and it must be supported by a report from the traffic engineer.
2. Recommending reducing the number of single-family homes from 22 to 20.
3. Permeable pavers must be used at all off-street parking in the single-family attached areas.
4. Eliminate staff's recommendation number three at this time.
5. Concrete driveways at all single-family attached and detached units.

In regards to the Landscape Plan

6. Confirm compliance with the vision triangle requirements at all intersections.
7. Adjust parkway tree spacing for compliance with correct spacing to regulatory street signage.

Plan Sheet C1

8. Eliminate the hammerhead and convert it into a cul-de-sac
9. The propose 15 foot public utility easement (PUE) across the adjacent property to the east should be a minimum 25 feet PUE due to the extreme depth of the sanitary sewer and to match the existing 25 PUE in Keepataw Trails Subdivision.

Plan Sheet C3

10. Provide a roadway C/L tangent North of the Archer Road ROW (sta 0+49) that conforms to the UDO.
11. Verify the roadway C/L tangent between sta. 1+52 to 1+91 conforms to the UDO.
12. All rear yard PUE's should be 20 feet minimum to accommodate storm sewer and buried utilities (electric/phone/CATV).
13. Verify required pipeline clear zone.
14. Add sidewalk per staff recommendations at Archer.

Plan Sheet C4

15. Relocate the carriage walk to a standard sidewalk location within the Duplexes.
16. Relocate the sidewalk around the front side of the off street parking stalls.
17. Relocate off-street parking stalls near 32-D to 26-D. The current location conflicts with the roadway intersection.

Plan Sheet C5

18. Demonstrate compliance with Illinois Highway Code 605 ILCS 5/9-115.1 for all stormwater management facilities.
19. The southernmost sanitary sewer manhole is 4.2' rim to invert. This depth is too shallow and will create unnecessary conflicts with other utilities and water services.
20. Justify use of a 10" diameter sanitary sewer for the entire project. It is my opinion that there will insufficient flows within the 10" pipe. Insufficient flows will cause blockages and introduce maintenance issues for public works and future residents within the subdivision.
21. Verify pipeline clear-zone for utility installations (horizontal and vertical).

Plan Sheet C6

22. Shift Lot 27-D north to provide additional space for the sewer and water installations.
23. Consider horizontal directional drilling (HDD) for the installation of the sanitary sewer across the existing lots within Keepataw Trails subdivision.

Plan Sheet C7

24. Verify the proposed roadway slope of 8% conforms to the UDO.
25. Additional free board in the two southern stormwater management basins may be required to comply with IDOT drainage rules.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Ayes: McGleam, Cunningham, Zolecki, Forzley, Plahm, Spinelli*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Forzley to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 17-08 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 Village Board had a multitude of discussion on Wend Fence variation at the last Committee of the Whole meeting. It was recommended by the Mayor to put two votes on the agenda to vote on. The Derby Pines Subdivision is proceeding to the Village Board on August 14. The New Avenue Annexation and Rezoning is also progressing to Village Board on August 14.

**VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION**

None

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

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

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

*Minutes prepared by Peggy Halper*