

Village of Lemont
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting of May 18, 2016

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 18, 2016 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 6:32 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Verify Quorum

Upon roll call the following were:

Present: Kwasneski, Maher, McGleam, Sanderson, Andrysiak, Spinelli

Absent: Zolecki

Village Planner Heather Valone and Village Trustee Ron Stapleton were also present.

C. Approval of Minutes from the April 20, 2016 Meeting

Commissioner Maher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to approve the minutes from the April 20, 2016 meeting. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

II. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Chairman Spinelli welcomed Commissioner Andrysiak to the Commission.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 15-14 Equestrian Meadows Final PUD

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to open the public hearing for Case 15-14.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Andrysiak to open the public hearing for Case 15-14. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Heather Valone, Village Planner, said in December of 2015 the Village approved the Preliminary Planned Unit Development for a 34 single-family residential planned unit development. It is located 12150 Bell Road. The applicant is Equestrian Meadows Company, LLC and they submitted an application for final PUD approvals for just Phase I of the development. Phase I includes 22 single-family lots, avoiding the existing wetland in the southeast corner of the subject property. Staff is recommending approval with conditions.

The preliminary PUD approval allowed the development to have 10 foot interior side setbacks and a minimum lot size of approximately 11,000 square feet. The preliminary plat identified one condition for final approval that the applicant provide a tree mitigation plan be submitted to comply with the UDO requirement. The ordinance also required anti-monotony standards for the single family homes, three car front-load garages, and masonry. The submitted final PUD plan is just for Phase I and it does include a minor change to the small detention pond, detention pond B, located in the northwest corner of the site. Although a minor change was made to the application for Phase I it is substantially conforming to the preliminary PUD. Additionally, a tree preservation and landscape plan was submitted and found to be acceptable by the Village Arborist. Therefore, Planning and Zoning's scope of review is limited to reviewing the minor change to the detention pond B, the final engineering plans and the residential design requirements as presented for consistency with the preliminary PUD.

Mrs. Valone stated the site plan is substantially conforming to the approved PUD. Since the Commission had seen it at preliminary there has been some changes. The applicant has revised the plans to remove the street names for lots 9-12 and 10-16 and made them different. Additionally they had complied with all of the Planning and Zoning Commissions requirements.

The applicant had removed detention B, however the area previously indicated as the detention pond remains open space. Mrs. Valone showed on the overhead where the previous pond was located. The stormwater volume that was supposed to be retained in detention pond B has been routed to the other two facilities, thus the pond is no longer needed. The detention pond would have been deeded to the Village. Staff sees no issue with the removal. The Village Engineer is generally satisfied with the engineering plans and his full comments are included in the staff report. The engineer does provide comments detailing items related to the site development permitting. Additionally, the engineer notes there are four minor revisions to the final plat. Staff did find one error on lot 2. The lengths of the north property line along Belmont Parkway appears to be missing a dimension. The Fire Marshall generally approves of the plans and which is indicated in the staff report. The Fire Marshall did indicate that he was concerned about the fire hydrants near the intersection of Saddlebrooke and Fairmont Lane exceeding the 300 feet maximum spacing. These fire hydrants will need to be revised before Final PUD approval.

Mrs. Valone said as stated previously a section of the residential design standards were approved as part of the Preliminary PUD Ordinance. Staff is proposing just a couple of minor changes to the ones that were proposed. Staff is recommending that no more than 64.7% of the single-family detached units in the subdivision shall have three car front-loaded garages. So in Phase I that equates to no more than 15 three car front-loaded garages and in Phase II it is no more than 7 three car front-loaded garages. The other requirement that staff added was if there was siding being used it be cement fiber board or LP siding.

Mrs. Valone stated as the application is substantially conforming to the preliminary PUD staff is recommending approval with the following conditions.

1. The engineering plans are revised to the Village Engineer and Fire Marshall's comments.
2. The Final plat is revised per the Village Engineer and staff's comments.
3. The applicant complies with the final residential design guidelines.

This would conclude staff's presentation.

Chairman Spinelli said a couple of things that he noticed where they indicated on the plat that lots 35, 36, and 38 are detention easement. The plat correctly represents lots 36, 37 and 38. He asked if the drawing was correct or the text.

Mrs. Valone stated she thinks that the drawing is correct.

Chairman Spinelli said on the bottom text to the right of the drawing scale it states 35, 36, and 38. The rear lots of 10 through 16 and the rear of 23 is showing a 10 foot utility easement even though a standard detail shows 15 foot on a rear yard. He asked why they would do that when the storm sewer is offset from the rear property line. He is not sure why they would want to reduce that down to a 10 foot. The lots are not that shallow to not handle the extra five feet. Lot 16 on the utility plan shows a storm sewer cutting a corner on the northeast corner. That seems to exceed the 15 foot easement that is shown on the standard detail. He showed on the overhead where he was talking about.

Chairman Spinelli asked if any of the Commissioners had any questions for staff at this time. None responded. He then asked everyone in the audience to stand and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath. He asked if the applicant wanted to come up and make a presentation.

Matthew Kline, attorney for the applicant, said he has the engineer of record present with him and representatives for the owners of the land. He stated if they wanted to go through their questions they would be happy to respond to them.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there was anything that he might want to add to the staff report.

Mr. Kline stated there is nothing really for them to add. The plan that they have submitted conforms to the ordinance. He feels they could address the questions that have been raised and could modify the plans before recording it. In regards to lot 16 the way they can handle it is take the curved sidewalk and make it a right angle on the sidewalk. They could move the storm sewer slightly to the northeast to make sure it is within the easement.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there has been any discussion with staff or the Village Engineer in regards to the placement of the keywalks on the sidewalks.

Sean Dudek, Engineer of Record, stated they have not received any comments from the Village Engineer regarding them.

Chairman Spinelli asked if staff can take a look at the placement of the keywalks. Right now there is nothing between the intersection of Fairmont and Saddlebrooke. There is nothing up Saddlebrooke around to Belmont until you get again to Fairmont. One might need to be added by Lot 10 near the detention pond because it seems like a long way. He asked if they could review the configuration at the intersection of Belmont and Fairmont. He understands the need to push the keywalk south, but there is nothing at the actual intersection on Fairmont.

Chairman Spinelli stated a question for Mr. Dudek, coming out of Outlot B, since it is no longer a detention basin, the storm sewer is up close to the buildable area on lots 3 and 4. He asked if that could be shifted north to avoid the buildable area. He stated it is on page nine of the utility plan.

Mr. Dudek said it was due to the elevation change at the existing property line to the north. They had to berm and then come back with a rear yard swale. When you berm up from the north property line then come back down to the swale that is how much room they needed. The storm sewer structure falls within the rear yard swale.

Chairman Spinelli stated his concern is the buildable depth of lot 3 and 4 should be evaluated. If a home is built from front to rear yard setback it will be immediate adjacent to a drainage swale and storm sewer. So they will not be able to get a deck or a patio. He asked if they could look at the rear yard setbacks for those two lots. He said the main line storm could be moved north or maybe put a lateral coming in.

Mr. Dudek said they could "T" it in.

Discussion continued as to how this would be done.

Chairman Spinelli stated there is one last thing he had in regards to engineering. On the grading plan, pond A conforms to your typical cross section with regards to wetland bottoms at 713 and the outflow pipes are at 714. If you look at pond C, on page 26, it shows a pond bottom of 723 but there is a contour of 722. When you look at the detail on page 15 it does not match. He said whichever way is correct it needs

to be correct before the next submittal with their responses back to the Village Engineer. As far as the subdivision, he was on the Commission for Preliminary approval and he does not have any issues with the configurations since it is substantially in compliance with what was originally submitted.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any other questions or comments for the applicant.

Commissioner Andrysiak asked if there was anything mentioned about changing one lot size so there was less maintenance for the Village.

Mr. Kline said in the northeast corner of the subdivision which used to be the outlot B, it was suggested that it would be incorporated into lots.

Mrs. Valone stated the Village Engineer recommended that the outlot B be incorporated into another lot. Staff is not recommending the combining of the lot with the open space. It would be a very irregular lot shape, additionally the perspective property owners could place yard obstruction right near the entrance of the subdivision. Staff and public works is content to have the open space remain the Village's under Village maintenance requirements.

Mr. Kline said they can talk with staff about maybe incorporating it into the first two lots to make them slightly wider.

Mrs. Valone stated they are not interested in that. Right now the shape of the lots are relatively regular.

Chairman Spinelli said he agrees with staff. One other thing on the subdivision plat is the easement shown in future Phase II, it might be for information only, but it should not be included on the plat since it is not part of the legal description. It's along the rear yard that he was questioning about where it went down to ten feet.

Mr. Dudek asked if he was talking about lots 11 through 16. The surveyor of record put it on there but he does not call it out so they should probably take the line off.

Chairman Spinelli stated he does call it out with a leader tag. That line should come off since it is not within the boundaries of Phase I. He asked if they had any comments as to why that one easement was reduced to ten feet on the standard detail.

Mr. Dudek said he is not the land surveyor of record and could not answer for him.

Mr. Kline asked if they were looking for 15 feet on each side of the boundary.

Chairman Spinelli stated yes. It would conform to your standard detail. The reason he is suggesting that is they are going to have a storm sewer running in that 7 ½ feet off the property line and if there is only a ten foot easement it will not be sufficient.

Mr. Kline said there will still be the other side.

Chairman Spinelli stated utilities are going to be buried and that will probably go on the other side but if it is in Phase I you are going to have storm sewer and electric in the same easement.

Mr. Dudek said you can't count Phase II easement because they are only doing Phase I.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any other questions or comments. None responded. He then asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted make a comment or ask questions. None responded. He then called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Andrysiak to close the public hearing for Case 15-14. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

B. Plan Commission Recommendation

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to recommend approval to the Mayor and Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Sanderson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Maher to recommend to the Mayor and Board of Trustees approval of Final PUD for Equestrian Meadows with the following conditions:

1. Revise the Engineering plans per the Village Engineer and Fire Marshals comments.
2. Revise the final plat per the Village Engineer and staff's comments.
3. Comply with the final residential design guidelines as noted earlier.
4. The easements on the rear yards of lots 10-16 should follow the standard detail of 15 foot rear yard easement.
5. Consider relocating the storm sewer location for lot 16, possibly bringing the sidewalk to a 90 degree angle or whatever is necessary to ensure space so the storm sewer is within the easement.
6. Correct the elevation for the grading on the grading plan and detail for outlot C. It needs to be indicated which one is correct.
7. Make sure easements are written in such a way that they are recorded with the plat as part of Phase I. Lots 10 through 16, Lot 23 and future lots 17 to 22.
8. Correct storm sewer for lots 3 and 4. The 18 inch storm sewer pipe should be pushed to the north to avoid the proximity to lot 3.
9. Evaluate the keywalks, the connection from the sidewalk to the streets, specifically near lot 10 and the intersection of Belmont and Fairmont.

A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Andrysiak, Maher, Sanderson, Kwasneski, McGleam, Spinelli

Nays: None

Motion passed

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 15-14 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 stated Fox Meadows went before the Committee of the Whole (COW) on May 9th. They did not conform to any of the PZC's conditions and came back with a plan that was completely different. Staff informed them that they would not be on the agenda because it was a completely different plan. They revised the plans to meet most of the Commission conditions but they still had some changes remaining. They went before the COW, which had roughly eight recommendations. They would need to comply to these before they could get their Final PUD approval.

Mrs. Valone said the first condition was they had to eliminate lot 11. When the applicant revised the plans he removed the conservation easements so lot 5 turned into lot 11. The applicant put the smallest lot on the exterior of the subdivision so recommended that the applicant remove the lot. The COW is willing to see more density with the site but not along those larger lots. The next condition is implementing a plan on how they are going to provide a cross walk to Parker. The applicant has to revise the landscape plan and it must meet code. The next requirement is that prior to application for Final PUD they must secure a permit from Army Corps of Engineers for the wetland. They also required rerouting the storm sewer per Commission's requirements and address any minor requirements from the Village Arborist.

Mrs. Valone stated additionally they made some changes to the residential design criteria. They removed the restrictions of the three car front loads, reduced the number of required side load garages to six, and the applicant is proposing to put a knee-wall around the house. Staff was recommending if there was 40% of masonry on the front then it must be carried around to all elevations. The applicant was not

welcoming to that idea so the Village Board said if there is 40% or more on the front façade then the knee-wall has to be all the way around.

Chairman Spinelli asked if it was defined what the height of the knee-wall would be.

Trustee Stapleton said about the window sill.

Mrs. Valone said this has the potential to be approved on the June 13th meeting.

Chairman Spinelli asked if it was a wet bottom detention basin and did it get adjusted according to State statute.

Mrs. Valone stated yes it is a wet bottom basin and the Village Engineer stated they would adjust at the time of Final PUD if it was necessary.

Mrs. Valone said the next case was 480 5th Street. That sparked the same discussion with the COW that the Commission had. This item has been tabled until the June COW so that the Village Board can possibly have a meeting on site.

Commissioner Maher asked what they were hoping to accomplish by going out there.

Trustee Stapleton stated they want to see what they can possible do to make it a decent street. The Mayor did state if those lots do split they would have to be on Lemont water.

Discussion continued in regards to easements and how water can be brought out to the subject site.

Mrs. Valone said in regards to the UDO Amendments, the Village Board had the same findings except for the gazebos. They felt that it should be a maximum of 320 square feet.

Commissioner Andrysiak asked if that included the outdoor seating.

Mrs. Valone stated yes it does. The COW felt that they were going to pass it as it was so they allowed staff to start to enforce it. Rustic Knead has started having the outdoor seating.

Chairman Spinelli asked if it was still nine and do they have to keep them out in front of their business.

Mrs. Valone said yes it is nine and they have to keep it out in front of their business.

Commissioner McGleam stated he knows they have recently struggled with setting a requirement for front-load garages. He feels that this is an aesthetic issue. In his opinion, there is a difference in the type of overhead doors that are used in front-load

garages that can be changed for an aesthetic standpoint. There is a difference in a plain white solid garage door and an architectural overhead garage door. He then named some different types of architectural garage doors and applications that can be used to improve the aesthetic. He said maybe they should look into requiring some type aesthetic improvements to a garage door to help with the front-load garage issue.

Chairman Spinelli said this would help instead of trying to force a side load garage midblock.

Mrs. Valone stated she will bring it up with staff.

Chairman Spinelli asked in regards to garages, how do they address a “snout nose” garage that is a side load.

Mrs. Valone said those are allowed according to code.

Chairman Spinelli stated he feels they stick out more and feels that this is counterproductive to him. They got rid of the “snout nose” because some people did not like it, but we allow it when it is a side load garage. He feels they need to re-evaluate that restriction.

Discussion continued in regards to “snout nose” garages.

VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Spinelli called for motion to adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner Maher 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

