

Village of Lemont
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting of December 21, 2016

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, December 21, 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 6:34 p.m. He then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Verify Quorum

Upon roll call the following were:

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

Absent: None

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

C. Approval of Minutes for the November 16, 2016 Meeting

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to approve the minutes from the November 16, 2016 meeting with no changes. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

II. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Chairman Spinelli greeted the audience and stated that there is a large agenda this evening. Do to the several public hearings this evening the meeting will be cut off at 10:30 pm regardless of the status. If they have not come to a conclusion on all the cases, any case that has not come to a conclusion, will be continued until the January meeting. He then asked everyone in the audience to stand and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 23-18 Old Town Square PUD Amendments and Final Plat

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to open the public hearing for Case 23-18.

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Maher to open the public hearing for Case 23-18. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Public Hearing

Mrs. Valone said application for PUD was originally filed in 2003. Jerry Kulhanek, owner of the subject property, is requesting an amendment to the PUD and a Final Plat. The purpose of the entitlements are to convert an eight unit building to a seven unit building and to plat all the units as townhomes. She stated she will discuss the PUD first then move into the Final Plat.

In 2004, the property was granted a PUD and a rezoning to allow it for a partial mixed use and then a residential use. She showed on the screen what was previously allowed. Building A was proposed at 11 units, building B was proposed at 11 units and building C was proposed at 8 units. The only constructed buildings are building D and building A. Building B and C were never constructed, but the foundation for building C was constructed however, it did not construct any further. The applicant is now requesting that the 8 unit building be converted into 7 units and keep the same footprint for the foundation. The applicant is proposing relatively the same architecture. The only change is the removal of the penthouse. The top has this penthouse bump-out which is vinyl sided.

A Final Plat also known as a resubdivision, was approved in 2006 with a re-subdivision. The applicant had platted building D and building A as condominiums. Since building B and C were not constructed they were not platted as condominiums. The applicant has found that selling them as condominiums has been relatively difficult. Now he asking to switch to townhomes rather than condominiums. The buildings are set up more as townhomes. Previously in 2006 all the Outlots A, B, C, D, and E were all considered one outlot. Now the applicant is asking to break them up into separate pieces. The applicant is requesting that the Village take possession of Outlot D. She shown on the overhead where it was located. He is also proposing that the Village take possession of Outlot E and F which is the parkway along Talcott. Staff is recommending that they only take possession of Outlot D and only the portion where the canal path travels. Staff is not recommending to take possession of the Home Street Corridor and the Outlots E and F. This is consistent with other developments.

Mrs. Valone stated in 2006, the Village had an easement in Outlot D ranging from about 20 feet to 22 feet. This was to get the utilities into the area. The applicant is now proposing 15 feet. Since the area is already under an easement and needs to be larger to accommodate the utilities, staff is recommending that it goes back to the

original and remain as an easement. The Fire Marshall had no objections to the plan. Staff is recommending approval with the reduction in the units and Final Plat with the following recommendation:

1. The architectural plans be updated to remove any unnecessary information.
 2. The plat will be updated with the correct width of the Home Street Corridor.
 3. The plat will be revised to indicate that only a portion of Outlot D will be dedicated and Outlots E and F will not be dedicated to the Village. The applicant will address all the comments from the Village Engineer.
 4. The applicant will agree to submit a complete building application for building C within a year.
 5. The applicant agrees to submit an escrow for the required sidewalk and landscaping that will go in the area along the Home Street Corridor.
- She said this would conclude staff's presentation.

Chairman Spinelli asked when does the one year commencement for the building plans submitted begin.

Mrs. Valone said at Village Board approval.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the ingress/egress is sufficient for Outlot A.

Mr. Stein stated yes it was.

Commissioner McGleam asked if the penthouse has any functional use.

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

Commissioner Zolecki said it was recommended that the Village only take a portion of Outlot D, along the canal, but in the recommendations it states that D through F be dedicated to the Village.

Mrs. Valone stated there has been some changes since the staff report had gone out. It's only the portion of Outlot D along the canal.

Jerry Kulhanek, applicant, said staff did cover everything that they are trying to do. They are just trying to make them easier to sell and increase the size of the units.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any plans for the other lot.

Mr. Kulhanek stated no

Commissioner McGleam asked what function did the penthouse serve.

Mr. Kulhanek said it was an accent. There was storage up there with a washer and dryer. It had access to the roof which had wood decks up there.

Commissioner Maher asked if they were still going to have access to the roof.

Mr. Kulhanek stated that they would not.

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

Commissioner Maher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sanderson to close the public hearing for Case 23-18. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Plan Commission Discussion

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further questions or comments from the Commission.

Commissioner Maher asked if there was an easier way to indicate what portion is going to become part of the Village.

Mrs. Valone stated they were going to take out the portion that the Village will be taking over and give it a new letter so there is no confusion.

Commissioner Maher asked if this needs to be part of their condition.

Mrs. Valone said if they would like it clarified otherwise staff will make require the application to revise it before the next submittal. The portion along the canal can be Outlot G.

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 Maher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to recommend to the Mayor and Village Board approval of Case 23-18, Old Town Square Amendments and Final Plat with the following

1. The architectural plans be updated to remove any unnecessary information.
2. The plat will be updated with the correct width of the Home Street Corridor.
3. The plat will be revised to indicate that Outlot D, along the corridor of the canal, be changed to Outlot G which will be dedicated to the Village.
4. Outlots D, E, and F will not be dedicated to the Village.
5. The applicant will address all the comments from the Village Engineer.

6. The applicant will agree to submit a complete building application for building C within a year.
7. The applicant agrees to submit an escrow for the required sidewalk and landscaping that will go in the area along the Home Street Corridor.

A roll call vote was taken:

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

Nays: None

Motion passed

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sanderson to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 23-18 as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

B. 92-03 Rolling Meadows Annexation, Rezoning, and Annexation Agreement Amendments

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to open the public hearing for Case 92-03.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to open the public hearing for Case 92-03. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Public Hearing

Mrs. Valone stated Pat and John Jurinek of New Horizon Homes, owners of the subject property are requesting approval of an amendment to the Annexation Agreement that currently controls the property. The purpose of the amendment is to remove an earth and berm landscaping which was required in 2002. The applicant is also requesting annexation of an additional parcel and asking for a rezoning of that additional parcel.

The applicant recently purchased a section of Tollway. She showed on the overhead the portion that was recently purchased. They would like to combine this with the existing Outlot A to make one more additional lot to the subdivisions. The portion that they purchased was about .3 acres and is located at the end of Willow Drive. The existing Outlot A is approximately 114 feet wide and roughly 50 feet deep. Right now it does not currently meet standards to be developed as a residential home. Combined it would make a 17,000 square foot lot. The applicant is requesting R-4 zoning for it, so they are able to develop a single-family home. This new lot would exceed requirements for R-4A and they are not asking for any reductions for setbacks. Staff

also reviewed the standards for rezoning with the property and finds it meet standards.

Mrs. Valone said now she will discuss the request for the removal of the berm. Rolling Meadows was originally annexed into the Village in 1996. There is no PUD for the subject property. Prior to 2002 the majority of the area was zoned R-4 with a portion of the north property zoned B-3. In 2002, the applicant requested that the area be rezoned R-4 to have additional residential lots. At that time it was required that they put in a berm to buffer themselves from the potential of the future development of the commercial property. The berm was six feet high and 40 feet wide which required landscaping. The bulk of the landscaping is on the commercial portion. Only a few trees per lot were on the residential portion.

The applicant is requesting that the requirement for the berm be waived because Village Code, which came into effect after 2002, now requires a transitional yard between any commercial development and residential development. The Code itself would require one of the following options:

1. A wood fence with a minimum of 95% opacity and with a minimum height of five feet plus at least two plant units per 100 linear feet; or
2. An earthen berm at least three feet in height plus at least one plant unit per 100 linear feet along the rear lot line and side lot lines; or
3. Four plant units per 100 linear feet plus an additional two evergreen trees per 100 linear feet along the rear lot line and side lot lines.

Since the UDO already has this provision built into it, even without the current annexation agreement, staff finds the request acceptable. Additionally, this would push the berm onto the commercial piece allowing for flatter rear yards for the residents along Willow Drive. The complaint right now is that they don't have flat yards and are losing some area of the rear yards. Staff has no objection to allowing the transitional yards to govern the buffering between the two land uses. The applicant has also amended his landscape plans to include trees in the corners of each lots on the residential. It will increase the amount landscaping on the residential side that is already in place.

The Village Engineer had no objections to the removal of the berm. His major concerns were with Outlot A. Outlot A has a public utility and drainage easement. It would be required prior to the platting of this in the annexation that the applicant get all the necessary signatures from all the utility companies to vacate that utility easement and agree to relocate the utilities to the back of the lot. The Fire Marshall had no issues with this. Staff finds the request for Annexation and Rezoning are consistent with the surrounding area and the Lemont Comprehensive Plan. The removal of the berm is a minor alteration as the UDO requires transitional yard requirements. Staff is recommending approval with the following conditions:

1. The master grading plan be revised and approved by the Village Engineer prior to final approvals.

2. The revised landscape plan be approved by the Village Arborist prior to final approvals.
 3. The storm sewer utility plans be updated to indicate the new path on the rear of the proposed prior to final approvals.
 4. A plat of vacation be created for the easement on Outlot A.
 5. The applicant must secure the approvals and signatures from all the utility agencies to vacate that easement.
 6. All comments from the Village Engineer and Village Arborist be addressed.
- This would conclude staff's report.

Chairman Spinelli said it was indicated that the developer was going to provide evergreen trees on the residential properties.

Mrs. Valone stated that is correct.

Chairman Spinelli said Lot 37 is already closed on and there is a resident already living in there with a fence around the rear yard. He asked if there was any discussion on how this is going to be achieved.

Mrs. Valone stated she would like to have the applicant answer that.

Chairman Spinelli said the Village Engineer did not comment on the berm with regards to drainage. He asked if drainage was an issue.

Mrs. Valone stated it is still achievable even without the berm.

Chairman Spinelli said Lot 38 on the corner is a spec home for New Horizon and the Village Engineer should review those final grades if they have been submitted. The drawing that was provided to the Commission, from visual perspective, does not seem to match what is out in the field.

Mrs. Valone stated that is correct. In 2002, when they required this berm to be constructed, although it is not in the annexation agreement, they were not required to construct the berm until the property was developed. There could be some changes there but for the most part the applicant has indicated that the already existing portions will remain.

Chairman Spinelli said he is just looking at the grading at Lot 38. If this moves forward and gets approved he requests that the Village Engineer look at the "as built grades" if they were provided to make sure they conform to what they are proposing for this new drainage scenario. Also, he believes it was indicated that Outlot A was dedicated to the Park District. He asked if it was or will it be vacated.

Mrs. Valone stated the dedication in that area was not executed as originally planned. There are two lots south of there that was dedicated to the Park District. She shown

on the overhead where these lots were located. The Outlot A is still being held by the applicant and the Park District has no issues with it.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the stub street will remain that is east of the parcel in question.

Mrs. Valone said staff sees no reason for it staying. If the commercial property were to ever develop the Village would not recommend any traffic from that be directed down this way and out to the side. Staff will be recommending that it be removed.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they should vacate that portion of right-of-way then.

Mrs. Valone stated they can do that. They have not had the opportunity to discuss that with the Village Board but she does not see an issue with it.

Chairman Spinelli said if the Fire Department needs a "T" hammerhead for turnaround then they should only vacate the northern portion of it.

Commissioner Zolecki stated on the landscape plan it references the berm grading exhibit dated 10/28.

Mrs. Valone said the current landscape plan that governs it actually indicates the grading. What they are indicating is that they didn't have time prior to the meeting to update the grading portion of it. What they are indicating is that they will comply with staff's recommendation.

Mr. Zolecki stated it is indicated in the packet that it is all deciduous trees.

Mrs. Valone said that is an error in the staff report. What is shown on the plan is accurate.

Commissioner Sanderson asked what is required by code.

Mrs. Valone stated on the residential lots there is no requirements. On the commercial piece it is plant units which is a series of a half of canopy tree, an evergreen tree, 1.5 understory trees and then six shrubs or grasses.

Commissioner Sanderson said so in time they could get that.

Mrs. Valone stated yes.

Commissioner McGleam asked if a payment is required for them to release that easement.

Mr. Stein said it is usually requiring them to move something.

Commissioner Maher asked if the stub street needs to be a recommendation or is that something staff will follow-up on.

Chairman Spinelli stated that is something that the Village needs to do.

Mr. Stein said he would not make it a condition, but staff received the direction to follow-up on it.

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

John Jurinek, applicant, stated in regards to Lot 37 they have talked to them and are aware that they do already have a fence up. They are going to install the deciduous trees in the northwest and northeast corner of their lot inside the fence.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the berm was mostly on the commercial lot or was it split.

Mr. Jurinek said it is split between the two, residential and commercial.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they were going to do some shifting to get it out of the way when they do fine grade the remaining lots. There are some ComEd and AT&T pedestals back there and some are on the side of the hill which may need to be adjusted.

Mr. Jurinek stated as each house is built they are going to adjust the berm.

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

Commissioner Sanderson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to close the public hearing for Case 92-03. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Plan Commission Discussion

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

Plan Commission Recommendation

Commissioner Zolecki made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sanderson to recommend to the Mayor and Village Board approval of Case 92-03 Rolling Meadows Annexation, Rezoning, and Annexation Agreement Amendments with the following conditions:

1. The master grading plan be revised and approved by the Village Engineer prior to final approvals.
2. The revised landscape plan be approved by the Village Arborist prior to final approvals.
3. The storm sewer utility plans be updated to indicate the new path on the rear of the proposed prior to final approvals.
4. A plat of vacation be created for the easement on Outlot A.
5. The applicant must secure the approvals and signatures from all the utility agencies to vacate that easement.
6. All comments from the Village Engineer and Village Arborist be addressed.

A roll call vote was taken:

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

Nays: None

Motion passed

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Maher to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 92-03 as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

C. 16-10 Vistancia Annexation, Rezoning and Preliminary PUD

Chairman Spinelli asked everyone in the audience who was not here at the beginning of the meeting, and has not been sworn in already, to stand and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath. He then called for a motion to open the public hearing for Case 16-10.

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

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Mrs. Valone said Bruce Michael of Intrepid Investment Partners Lion's Park, LLC, the contract purchaser of the subject property, is requesting a preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval for 294 dwelling units. The applicant is requesting entitlements to construct a single-family subdivision comprised of single-family detached homes and single-family attached homes, known as duplexes. The applicant is also requesting annexation to the Village of Lemont and rezoning of the property to R-4 and R-5. Staff is recommending approval with conditions.

The proposed development consists of three general neighborhoods. She showed on the overhead where they were located. The first is called the Summit neighborhood which is 99 lots. The second area is single-family homes which is called the Ridgeline neighborhood and has 75 lots. The remaining neighborhood called the Villas are the duplexes which is 120 dwelling units but only 60 lots. The applicant did come before the Technical Review Committee (TRC) on August 8, 2016. This is an informal staff review with other outside agencies like the Park District, School Districts, Township, and etc. to review the plans to see if there are any major problems. Based on staff's comments and outside agencies comments the applicant had worked extremely hard to revise a number of items on their plans. They revised items like increase proposed lot sizes that back up to existing lots, screening the lots, changing their entrance, and other things along those lines.

Mrs. Valone stated as part of the PUD the applicant is requesting deviations from the Lemont Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). The applicant is requesting two variations for the attached single-family, which are the duplexes. They are asking for reduced interior side yard setback. It is required to have 15 feet side yard setbacks and they are requesting 7.5 feet. Staff finds the deviation unacceptable due to the fact most other developments in Lemont are along the lines of 10 feet. Additionally, the duplexes proposed to back up to some of the single-family units in Ridgeline. The average home width in the Ridgeline area is 40 feet and the average width in the duplex unit is 80 feet. Staff is asking for larger building separation to prevent a lot of larger buildings being masked behind these smaller buildings. The applicant is also requesting reduced rear setbacks. They are asking for 25 foot rear yard setbacks and the UDO requires 30 feet. Staff does not find an issue with the lots that back up to the Tollway. Staff does have an issue with the lots that back up to the single-family homes. Those lots should maintain 30 feet rear yard setbacks.

The applicant is requesting three variations for the single-family detached homes. They are asking for reduced lot sizes and widths. Although for the R-4, the minimum lot size is 12,500 square feet. The applicant does not want to impact the sensitive areas of the ravine and some of the other recreational features. The Comprehensive Plan actually indicates that five dwelling units per acre can be placed on these properties and the applicant is only proposing 2.9 dwelling units per acre. The applicant is also requesting reduced interior side yard setbacks. Standard is 15 feet and they are requesting 8 feet. Staff does not have an issue with this since the Estates of Montefiori had 9 foot setbacks and Kettering has a series of setbacks that are smaller. The last variation they are asking for is reduced pavement width for the streets. The UDO has conflicting standards for the streets. In the text of the code it says the streets can be 27 feet back to back curb pavement width. The engineering standards said they need to be a minimum of 30 feet. Staff is recommending that all these streets be a minimum of 30 feet. Potentially Alba and Vistancia should be increased to 33 feet as they could be considered as collector streets. The applicant is also requesting variations from the sign provisions of the UDO, which she will discuss later.

The site is supposed to be accessed from Alba Street and Timberline Drive. She showed on the overhead where the access points are located. Based on the traffic analysis the existing traffic control structures that are already in place on Timberline, Alba and 127th Street are able to accommodate the traffic. However, there is one traffic warrant that is already met without the subdivision. Along New Avenue warrants are already met for a left turn lane from New Avenue onto Timberline. So since it is already met without the help of the development, staff is only requesting a minor contribution to that left turn lane. The proposed subdivision increases the usage of the area by about 50%. The Village Engineer estimated the cost of the improvement for the turn lane is about \$300,000. Thus staff is recommending that the applicant contribute \$150,000 to the turn lane.

Mrs. Valone said the applicant has been working with Timberline Knolls project team. Timberline Knolls had requested a new entrance along Timberline Drive to have access to three new buildings. The applicant and Timberline Knolls have been able to come to an agreement to shift both of their accesses to line up. It will be shifted away from the homes and Evergreen Place about 20 feet. Additionally, the existing grades on the site make it difficult for these entrances so staff has some concerns with the entrances. Based on the driveway, staff would be requesting that the applicant remove some of the landscaping along the drive leading to Timberline Drive to prevent any sight-line issues. The subdivision entrance sign would also need to be moved further in.

The applicant also submitted information on the existing trees on the site. There are about 6,000 trees on the site, roughly 20% of the trees are in poor condition or invasive species. The applicant is proposing to preserve about 2,900 of the trees which is about 48% of them being preserved. The applicant is also proposing a buffer area between the existing residents on Timberline and the new proposed subdivision. From their analysis of the existing trees there were not enough trees in that area to really buffer between the two, so they are proposing to plant evergreen trees roughly every 20 to 25 feet. She showed on the overhead where this will occur.

There is a product book that is being proposed by the applicant. The Village has an anti-monotony code, but for other PUD's they have allowed product books. The product book is broken up into three parts. The first part would be the homes in the Summit neighborhood, which has seven models with five elevations each. The product book indicates that all models will be constructed with either masonry or LP board. There is an error on the applicant's plan where it reads "optional vinyl shake siding" which is incorrect. The applicant has been made aware of this and will correct it with their next set of plans. The applicant is proposing five models with five elevations each for the Ridgeline area. Staff has an issue with the Mercer, Continental and the Newberry, they need to be reorganized to prevent houses that look to similar from being located close together. Staff has already discussed this with the applicant, so they are recommending that the applicant continue to work with staff to resolve the issues with these three models. The last part of the product book is the duplexes

known as the Villa's. The applicant is proposing several possible elevations. Staff does not see an issue with these and they will be constructed with either LP board or masonry. Staff is hoping that the applicant will work with them further in regards to the color packages of these. Although, they will be attached duplexes and they will look a little more similar to one another, staff is hoping that using more versions of the color packages might help break up the anti-monotony of them.

Mrs. Valone stated that staff is also recommending masonry requirements for both the single-family and the duplexes. For the single-family that is the most visible from either the bluff or from existing homes are lots 1-21, 35-57, 98, 106, 111, 133, and 152. She showed on the overhead where they were located. They are requiring them to have first floor masonry on all elevations whether that be stone or brick. Staff is also recommending that some of the duplexes units have to have first floor masonry on all elevation. This would include units 280 to 294 that back up to the single-family homes. Staff is also recommending anti-monotony requirements over the entire product book. They include no one model in the Summit neighborhood shall be constructed on more than 30% of the lots. Another, no one model in the Ridgeline shall be constructed on more than 30% of the lots. No one model in either the Summit or Ridgeline shall be constructed with the same elevation or color package within two lots or directly across the street from one another, in the event of a cul-de-sac it would be three lots. Lastly, staff would like to work with the applicant further on the color packages.

The applicant is also proposing a series of signs in the development. There are two permanent subdivision signs being proposed. She showed on the overhead where they are located. There are fourteen signs being proposed to advertise the development during the time of construction. Currently the code does not allow anyone to have signs advertising for a piece of property on other properties. There are two signs being proposed that are about 8 feet wide and about 8 feet tall that are being proposed on private property. Staff does not have an issue with the signs being placed out there, however the applicant would need to demonstrate an agreement with the other properties to place those signs there. The applicant is proposing two additional signs on their property. They are about six feet by four feet and they would be advertising their property. Near the actual model and sales office they are requesting a series of directional signs. Village Code does not allow directional signs to have any type of logo on them. The applicant is requesting to have their logo on them and either advertise their models or are directional signage. Staff does not see any issues with these, pending removal requirements. The last two sign types. One is the flexible living space signs which are posted throughout the interior of the development. Staff finds these signs to be unnecessary and finds this request unacceptable. The applicant is also proposing two billboards along I-355. The UDO does not permit any billboards so this should be removed from their request.

Mrs. Valone said the entrance along Timberline Drive there is a detention facility proposed there. The location of it violates IDOT's berm requirements. IDOT requires it to be pushed back so many feet from the street for safety issues and it will need to

be adjusted. The applicant is only proposing street lights at the entrance of the facility and they are required throughout the subdivision. Lastly, the Village Engineer had commented that since two of the four ravines on the property are considered waters of the U.S., conservation easements will have to be placed on those two ravines that have any lots that back up to them. Additionally, he would like to work further with the applicant on whether or not if the other two ravines need conservation easements as well. The applicant has already reached out to the Army Corps of Engineers for the ravines and have received a jurisdictional letter that two of them are in fact waters of the U.S. and they will have to permit through the USACE.

The Fire Marshall generally approved of the plans and more of his comments are applicable during site development and building permit phases. Those comments are attached to the memo. The last item is that the applicant is proposing a series of dedications for recreational and park space. She showed on the overhead the area that is being dedicated to the Lemont Park District for a park ages two to twelve. She showed on the overhead where the areas are located for trails to be constructed which will meet up with the existing trails within the Township facility. She showed on the overhead the area that is being deeded to the Township. Overall, the proposal achieves the goals of the Lemont 2030 Plan and is consistent with the neighboring properties. The properties to the north are large lots single-family residences or vacant land, the property to the south is the Township Recreational Facility, the property to the west is the Tollway, and the properties to the east are single-family homes along Timberline Drive. The applicant did revise their plans to increase the widths and lots to those homes that are against those existing lots in the cul-de-sacs. The applicant was proposing roughly three new lots to one existing lot and staff had them change it to two proposed lot to one existing lot.

Mrs. Valone stated the applicant is requesting a rezoning to the property to R-4 and R-5. Staff reviewed this request and found that it met the standards for granting rezoning. In conclusion, the proposed development is well designed and complies with most of the requirements of the UDO. There are large challenges on the site with the relief and the topography. Additionally, it is constrained by the Tollway and other properties to the north. She said staff is recommending approval with conditions. She then read the conditions that were listed on pages 12 through 14 in staff's report.

Chairman Spinelli asked if staff received an updated drawing or exhibit with regards to the modification of the park plan and the entrance to Timberline.

Mrs. Valone said the applicant has updated their plans and only the locations marked in the red and green arrows will be dedicated to the Park District and Township. The rest is to be maintained by the homeowner's association (HOA).

Commissioner Kwasneski stated his concern is the additional traffic that will be coming out of this development and going into the existing subdivision. He asked if it could be requested to have a right turn only coming out of Alba onto Timberline and

a left turn only from Vistancia onto Timberline. This would avoid people going through existing neighborhoods.

Mrs. Valone said she is not sure if the Fire Department would be in support of that. It could prevent their access to the subdivision. The traffic that is going to be going to Timberline and New Avenue is going to be significantly less than what is going to be going to 355.

Ben Deanda, Fire Marshall, stated because of the size of the development they are pushing for the two full accesses in order to protect and get in on both sides.

Chairman Spinelli said he is looking to restrict access going out of the subdivision. His concern with that is that the north entrance on Timberline would be difficult to configure.

Commissioner Kwasneski asked with the permanent sign on Alba, how close is that going to be to the Township sign.

Mrs. Valone said it is out of the vision triangle which is required for code and it is placed where it is permitted.

Commissioner Kwasneski asked, for the temporary signs, can they be required to have them taken down.

Mrs. Valone stated the code requires that when the subdivision reaches 90% occupancy any advertising signs be removed. Additionally, it sounds like the two off-site signs, especially the one by Pepper's property, may only have an agreement for three years of placement.

Commissioner Kwasneski asked if they could put a hard date on the removal of the temporary signs.

Mr. Stein said he is okay with the Commission or Village Board giving a date with the option to extend without having to come back for a public hearing.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the permanent entrance sign on Alba was located closer to the subdivision or near Timberline.

Mrs. Valone stated it will be past the Township Facility.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the applicant had to provide something showing where the driveway placements are going to be. He wants to make sure they are not placed near intersections for safety.

Mrs. Valone said they do not have something. The Village Engineer will review it at time of site development. If he would like to make that part of his recommendation that can be accommodated.

Chairman Spinelli stated he would before they start pulling building permits.

Mrs. Valone asked if he would like this to take effect prior to the final PUD or prior to Preliminary approvals.

Chairman Spinelli said he would be fine with prior to Final PUD. He asked if staff could take a look at their Stonebrook elevation. One thing he does not like about it is that it is very “front heavy”. From the side it would appear that it could almost tip over which is giving a false opinion of a very large house. If they can’t make changes to it then he would recommend that it be eliminated from the package. He asked if they received anything from the Park District or the School Boards as far as comments.

Mr. Stein stated they have had several discussions with the Park District as well as the Township. He feels the Park District is in-line with the proposal. There is also an additional contribution to the Park District which will help with restoring parks that are close to the proposed development.

Louise Egofske, Executive Director for the Lemont Park District, said their first objective was to establish a park for this size of a community. The Lions Park which is very close by has a basketball court which is in need of renovation. They plan on using some of the monies from the contribution to refurbish that basketball court. This development is also very close to the Centennial Park entrance. Centennial is in need of repairs in the front part of the campus with such items like the basketball courts. School District 113A uses the basketball courts and tennis courts. They are looking into adding in-line skating and lights for the basketball and tennis courts. They would also like to work with the Township in improving some of their amenities under the Park contributions. They have had some discussions and they are still working on it.

Chairman Spinelli asked from the Park District’s perspective, if this moves forward, are you acceptable with the land and contribution in order to reach your goals for the park and improvements.

Mrs. Egofske stated yes and they would like that contribution upfront.

Mr. Stein said they will work that out with the Park District. The schools will also be getting a cash contribution.

Chairman Spinelli asked what other impact fees are they required to pay besides Park District, Township, and schools.

Mrs. Valone stated they are required to pay impact fees for public safety, Fire Protection District and Library besides Park District and Township.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if the park was in Phase I or in Phase II.

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

Commissioner Zolecki asked if the model portfolio that was attached, is that the current portfolio.

Mrs. Valone stated the one included in the report is the most up-to-date version with the error including the vinyl.

Commissioner Zolecki said it was identified that the high visibility lots have masonry on them. He asked if this recommendation included all five front elevation options or all four elevation sides.

Mrs. Valone said it is all four sides of the home.

Commissioner Maher asked if there was any other masonry recommendation for the other lots.

Mrs. Valone stated if you look at what staff is recommending for the single-family homes it is roughly 30% . If you look at the duplexes it is a smaller percentage because they are only requiring it for ones that back up to single-family homes.

Commissioner Maher asked if the percentage was based on those specific lots or on the rest of the filler lots.

Mrs. Valone said looking at Summit and Ridgeline as a whole there are some lots in both areas. The percentage is roughly 30% of the single-family units.

Commissioner Maher stated so none of the interior lots have masonry requirements. He asked what are some of the other requirements for subdivisions since they started getting rid of the requirement of 100% masonry on the homes.

Mrs. Valone said for Kettering and Estates of Montefiori they had roughly required about 30%. There were some as low as 25% and some as high as 33%.

Commissioner Maher asked for all three subdivisions, where are they at as a whole.

Mrs. Valone stated 16% roughly

Commissioner Zolecki said from his count there are about 174 single-family lots. There are about 48 high visibility lots which comes to 26%. If you factor in all the lots it comes to about 16%. He asked with the exception of lots 98, 152, and 133, is

there any way staff can work with the applicant to look for other means instead of the pure masonry requirement in terms of premium elevations and different model units.

Mrs. Valone stated staff can work with the applicant on that, but the only thing is the home builder tries to leave as much as possible up to the purchaser. From an enforcement standpoint with the PUD and based on their selling requirements, she feels it would be better to work something into the PUD for the monotony. She asked what did he mean by premium elevation.

Commissioner Zolecki said there are other options like gables, garage doors, glazing and accessories which can enhance an elevation. He stated it is more of a comment and he understands it would be hard to work into the PUD.

Mrs. Valone stated in the front part of their product book there are options for glazing for doors. If the Commission and the Board is leaning to swapping those considerations of masonry for those it could definitely be done.

Commissioner Maher said his opinion is he does not understand why they keep getting less and less with masonry. They had started at 100% but now they are going down significantly in an area where there is a significant amount of masonry. To be at 16% when the last few subdivisions they were at 25 to 30% is a big drop and he feels they are going the wrong way. In those subdivision for the anti-monotony they can't have more than 30% of one model. He asked if that is typical.

Mrs. Valone stated Kettering was the only other one that had a product book and that is what was required for them.

Chairman Spinelli said there are five elevations and different color packages.

Mrs. Valone stated they require that the same model cannot have the same elevation and color package within so many lots. It would be difficult to have but it could potentially happen.

Commissioner Maher asked what is typical with surrounding areas.

Mrs. Valone said Woodridge has a Pulte development now. They were more restrictive on their masonry. Based on Lemont's standards, they had a different take on anti-monotony and they required a product book. She feels that Lemont is asking for more than what Woodridge did. The applicant is also developing in Naperville and in Hawthorn Woods. She can let them talk about what they were required by them. However, from visiting the subdivisions they have not been required as much.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the contribution for the turn lane on New Avenue be provided in an escrow account or direct cash.

Mrs. Valone stated it will be in an escrow account. The funding mechanism for the other portion of it will need to be discussed with the Village.

Chairman Spinelli asked if this was a Pulte development or is it Intrepid.

Mrs. Valone said Intrepid will be doing all the land development such as the grading, utilities and the crossing. Pulte will be buying the lots and developing the lots.

Chairman Spinelli asked if she saw any kind of purchasing agreement between the two parties.

Mrs. Valone stated it is not required at this time.

Commissioner Maher asked if Pulte was under contract then.

Mrs. Valone said she will let the applicant speak in regards to that.

Commissioner Zolecki stated it is typical in other municipalities that if there is masonry then there is some sort of wrap or return. That way you don't see the edge of a brick veneer. In a lot of these elevations you can see that this is where its born from. It should return in all areas namely the returns on a lot of the models back to the entry door on the garage so you don't see that edge. An example would be the Continental HR3T-C which does not comply.

Commissioner McGleam asked what is the subdivision to the east zoned and what are the lot sizes.

Mrs. Valone said they are zoned R-4. The cul-de-sac lots are much larger than the interior ones. The cul-de-sac are a minimum of 12,500 which back up to this development.

Commissioner McGleam asked what kind of side yard setback and rear yard setbacks do they have.

Mrs. Valone stated the side yard is 10 feet and the rear yards are 30 feet.

Commissioner McGleam asked what kind of masonry requirements did they have.

Mrs. Valone said it was not developed as a PUD so they did not have a masonry requirement. Some of them that developed early in the subdivision, under the old Village code, were required to have some level of masonry. The ones that were developed later were not required because there was no PUD in place. Primarily it is siding, but there are plenty that do have brick on them, it really varies.

Commissioner McGleam asked if they were wanting to rezone to R-4.

Mrs. Valone stated it is R-4 for the Summit and Ridgeland neighborhoods and R-5 for the duplexes.

Commissioner McGleam said but nothing here is meeting the R-4.

Mrs. Valone stated they do not meet all the R-4 but they meet the Comprehensive Plan requirements.

Commissioner Kwasneski asked if they could add in the word “work” into the fourth condition.

Mrs. Valone said yes.

Commissioner Cunningham stated there seems to be a high percentage of trees that are going to be saved. It looks like most of them are going to be in the ravines and the other area is what is going to be donated to the Township. He asked do they have plans to save that and identify the mature trees in the developed areas so they don't have these huge pockets of mature trees being saved.

Mrs. Valone said with the amount of grading that needs to be done on the site it is difficult to save a lot of the mature trees. Fortunately, a lot of the mature trees that are worth saving are in the ravines. The ones that are up top are in poor condition and many are ash trees. There are a number of oak trees that are being saved in the development, but there are some that cannot be preserved.

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

Dan LeClair, Green Tech Engineer, introduced everyone from the project that is present this evening. He said that he did put together a slide presentation so some of the information will be redundant. The property is 105 acres and is bounded by I-355 Tollway as well as the neighbors to the east. He showed an aerial photograph of the property.

This development is going to be a two phase development. The development is composed of three different villages that offer a combination of different products. They are proposing to incorporate some of the development for each of the three different villages as part of the first phase. The first phase will make a street connection all the way through the development to existing infrastructure both on the north side as well as the south side of the property. In addition to that they will be making a water connection for the existing water structure. They will be putting together the infrastructure for the sewer system and the stormwater detention basins to service all of the Phase I lots.

Mr. LeClair stated they are proposing 99 units in the Summit phase of the development. There will be 39 units in Phase I and 60 units in Phase II. The area

adjacent to the neighbors to the east will be developed as part of the Phase II construction. The ratios are the same on the Ridgeline as well as the Vista product. The primary infrastructure is going to be developed on all the lots along the primary corridor that runs through the development.

Looking back at all of the development objectives and their overall preparation for this plan, it was to put more of the dense duplexes along the westerly side of the development against the Tollway. That way the lots will increase in size as they go easterly. Typical lots are 65 foot wide lots in Summit which is on the east side and 56 wide lots in the Ridgeline, then the duplexes are a little larger because they are two units per lot.

There has been a lot of discussion with the Timberline Knolls project. He showed on the overhead the revised location of the entrance off of Timberline. They are planning on lining up their entranceway with the Timberline Knolls project. He said Mr. Michaels had a neighborhood meeting with the neighbors in the area especially with the ones along the entranceway in regards to buffering. They were able to move that road 20 feet to the north which allows them to put more vegetation. There will be retaining walls to hold that embankment up from the roadway. As you are coming up Timberline from the north you are going to see some retaining walls on the backside of the proposed roadway and there will be an eight foot buffer zone that will be landscaped. They are proposing to add some intense landscaping along the top of that wall.

Mr. LeClair stated this property in its existing state has some very unique features. One being a very large valley that dissects the property. There was discussion on how they get across this valley. What they are anticipating is a box culvert. They will be doing an intense fill and cross section to that roadway. They are hoping to add a lot of landscape to the area to create a natural area. Even at this preliminary stage they have done some grading across that valley so they can see what kind of landscape and natural features they are going to be able to save.

One of their goals with this development was to be able to connect to the Township property. There are several pathways at the Township property that are paved. Their objective is to connect to some of these pathways. They will be paving additional pathways into their development. They are planning to add a bike lane to the road that will connect to the main road. He showed on the overhead where the lanes will be and how they will connect. They are proposing three different pathway connections for either biking or walking. They have had several discussions in regards to the width of the roadways. He will have their traffic engineer come up and talk more in regards to where they are at. Alba Drive when they measured it is 27 feet back to back. They took that assumption that the road was not a collector road and they would carry that road through their development. As part of this property they are anticipating a little over 4,000 linear feet of bike path.

The park area for the Park District will be developed as part as Phase I. The eastern part of the park area will be paved but the westerly part will be part of the second phase of the development. The play structure and pavement will be part of Phase I but the connection to the new road will be part of Phase II. He showed on the overhead the area that will donated to the Township. They are about 25% open space on this project and the tree preservation is up to about 50%. He showed where they were going to saving the majority of the trees.

Mr. LeClair said in regards to buffering, there is a significant amount of buffering to the northeast part of the property. There is an area along the east where there is some power lines. It looks like it was cleared for those power lines, so what they are proposing to do is a series of evergreen trees that are eight feet tall, as well as a heavily dense type of bush or shrubbery along their property line. There will be a clear designation for their property owners where the property ends and the open space begins. There are some large trees along the east property line that they will be saving and they are going to try and compliment those with evergreen plantings.

In regards to the sewer system mostly everything, except a few duplex units to the south, will be going to the north. All of the that infrastructure will be built as part of Phase I. He showed on the overhead where the water connection will be at and how that will be connected. They plan on having all the stormwater maintained in three detention basins. One in the northeast part of the property which will service just that road in that area. He showed on the overhead where they are located. Mr. LeClair stated there was a comment in regards to the pond in the northeast corner and moving it. He feels that they could certainly adjust that pond to come in compliance with requirements. The will go through and add a street light plan. As far as driveway locations, it would be pretty easy for them to know with respect to the lot lines. They always try to put the driveway locations on the high side of the lot. They are very consciences of locations of intersections with respect to driveways.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they would be able to provide staff an exhibit of that.

Mr. LeClair said yes they would. They appreciate the opportunity to present this project to the Commission. He thanked everyone for coming out right before the holiday. They are hoping they can get all the comments from the neighbors tonight so then they can come back next month with a full package for the Commission. He then stated he would like to have Pete Tremulis come up and speak.

Peter Tremulis, Vice President of Land for Pulte Homes, stated Pulte Homes is the contract purchaser with Intrepid. The purchase agreement with them is to acquire finish lots, quarterly take downs, spread through-out all three neighborhoods. They are looking to build a model complex on the west side of the property.

Chairman Spinelli asked if their purchase agreement required that the developer sell all the lots to them.

Mr. Tremulis said it does.

Chairman Spinelli stated then you have first right to refuse but their intention is to purchase all the lots in the development and do the building.

Mr. Tremulis said they plan on closing and building 40 to 60 homes a year. They are anticipating a five year project for them. He stated he will go through the product book. Things have changed over the years. More people are looking for the master bedroom on the first floor. He presented a power point presentation showing the different homes. The newest version was dated December 12, 2016. Their intent is to just give an overview this evening. They are meeting with Village staff in early January to go through page by page review of each of the elevations and address any questions or comments from staff. They would prefer, rather than doing first floor brick on all four sides for 30% of the homes, to do architectural features. He invited the Commissioners to visit their other developments in Hawthorn Hills, Naperville, and in Woodridge. They do have first floor brick on their development in Woodridge, but some people feel that it is a little monotonous. There might be a different way to create a design variation and they would like the chance to discuss this.

They are building about 20,000 homes a year right now and they have been in the Illinois market since 1972. The presentation talked about the three different neighborhoods and location. He showed several different types of homes for each of the neighborhoods. He showed how the elevations vary along with the different front porch columns. They have a separate exhibit on the specifications of the homes. Information is provided in the packet on garage doors and window glazing. A color palate is provided in excel which identifies materials and colors. They have asked their supplier of the LP siding to provide something in more detail and color samples for them.

Mr. Tremulis showed their proposed monotony code which varies slightly from what staff had provided. They are looking for two homes on either side or three across the street that are not the same elevation or color. It does not call out anything specific with cul-de-sac. This same monotony code was approved in their Hawthorn Hills development so if they wanted to see how that applies. They do have a number of options for each floor plan. They do offer sun rooms, in some instances café kitchens, extended family rooms. They do have certain take rates on options for their consumers. They also do patios and decks. He knows there were concerns in regards to the flatness on the rear of homes but they offer a variety of options to help make sure that the rear elevations are interesting. They are also willing to work with staff on this.

He showed on the overhead the Stonebrook home and its elevations and explained the floor plan.

Chairman Spinelli said when working with staff, to break up the rear sloping roof if they could add some dormers. The house seems front heavy and someone looking at the rear of the house is looking at a lot of roof.

Mr. Tremulis stated they will work with staff. They do offer a ranch plan. There are three car garages whether they are tandem or front loads in the Summit neighborhood. The duplexes are paired garage to garage. The duplexes can be built as ranches also. He then showed what the elevations will look like on the duplexes.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if the ranch duplexes are at his other developments.

Mr. Tremulis said they would be new to the development. They are proposing them for a development in Naperville and in Plainfield as well. He stated this would conclude his presentation.

Commissioner McGleam asked what the square foot range was for each development.

Mr. Tremulis said for the duplexes it is 1,450 to 2,300 square feet. The Ridgeline is 2,100 to 2,900 square feet and the Summit is 2,600 to 3,400 square feet. All homes will have full basements.

Commissioner McGleam asked if the interior non-load-bearing stud walls are to be 24 inches on center with a single two by four top plate, and will it meet Village code.

Mr. Tremulis stated they already have a handful of comments from the building department on code related issues. They are detailing out some of the code items to make sure that they will meet code. That is why they wanted to provide that, so when they come in with architectural plan sets they will be complete on the first submission. They are also looking for Master Plan approval as part of their architectural review. If they can get an accommodation on a Master Plan it should take some of the load off of the plan reviewer and help speed permitting process.

Mr. Stein said whatever happens here today will not affect the building codes and they must be met.

Mrs. Valone stated the building inspector did review the information. He did comment that there are some issues, but based on the building code, they do depend on other factors. Through a Master Plan review they will be able to work those out.

Commissioner Zolecki said he would like to comment quickly in regards to the aesthetics. He knows that they will be working with staff and he appreciates them acknowledging them. He would like to go through some of these as they relate to elevations. Some could be siding size, larger freeze boards, trim sizes and details at the windows and corners, ban boards that some of the elevations have, commitment to various options to sun rooms and bay options as acknowledged, gable siding

features, window buttons on various style of homes, porch accents, dormer opportunities, etc.

Mr. Tremulis stated what they are looking at trying to do is develop some very attractive four sided elevations. They will work with them on various material components.

Commissioner Kwasneski asked if they had met with any of the neighbors and what was their feedback.

Mr. Tremulis said he had a brief encounter at the review desk downstairs about a week and half ago. Their questions had more to do with drainage.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further questions from the Commissioners for the applicant or engineer. None responded. He then asked if there were any Village Officials that wanted to speak in regards to this case.

Steve Rosendahl, Supervisor for the Lemont Township, stated he lived at 104 Doolin Street. He was present tonight more so as a resident of the Timberline subdivision. He had some discussions with the applicant and will continue to have discussion with dealing with the Township. His comments are as a resident and he has lived in town for about 30 years. There are three points he would like to make The first is he never heard the term “premium view”. There are thousands of people that visit the community center and open sanctuary. They should not discount the view from there just because they don’t live there. They are at one the highest points in Cook County so they will see all the houses up there and they need to take that into consideration. His second comment is in regards to Alba. That road was put in to service one house that tragically burnt down. That road is not a template for how the roads should be. Lastly, he agrees with Commissioner Maher in regards to the continued erosion of brick and the design standards that they had in the Village. He would caution and encourage everyone to hold a higher standard. If they are going to use the last subdivision as a model he will be disappointed. He is not happy looking at the back of that going down 131st Street.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any other residents that would like to ask questions or make comments in regards to this public hearing.

Benton Bullwinkle, 37 East Logan, said he brought a couple of letters from residents on East Logan Street. They feel there is a deficiency in the traffic study. Currently there is a lot of traffic that comes from Timberline and goes to Logan Street trying to avoid the backups on New Avenue. People believe that there are a lot of people that use the Tollway, but it is expensive so a lot of traffic comes their way trying to get out of town. He would like the Commission to take a look at the traffic that is coming down Logan Street.

Jim Connelly, 58 Timberline Drive, thanked the Commission for their time. He wanted to address the traffic especially between the time of 7:30 am and 9 am. In the evening is about the same. There are about 300 homes that they are proposing, with a two income family, it makes about 500 to 600 cars. This is an additional 500 cars coming out of that neighborhood. When the tornado came through Lemont he couldn't even get out of his driveway because of all the cars coming in all directions. He is asking if there is any way they could consider a road that went directly to New Avenue from the subdivision instead of Timberline. That way it will take some of the pressure off of Timberline with all that traffic.

Mrs. Valone stated when they reviewed another subdivision on Main Street which has less traffic, IDOT did not request an access there. The conservation they had was that it would be a low likelihood that they would be interested because the applicant does not own any land to connect to it. It would require other property owners to get involved.

Dennis Doornbos, 26 Evergreen Place, asked how tall will the retaining wall be to the north.

Chairman Spinelli said there will be multiple retaining walls there. One of his requirements for the applicant is that the retaining walls will have to have a structural evaluation. Illinois Law requires anything above three feet has to have an evaluation. Also, to review and apply any potential loading from the foundations that are immediately south of it.

Mr. Doornbos stated he is also concerned about the amount of traffic that is going to come out of there with the kids that live in the cul-de-sac. It is all parking up and down Timberline and now traffic is going to increase by 50%. He asked if they were going to change the parking regulations for the guys who park their trucks on the street. The people on Timberline are going to be locked in with construction traffic for the next five years. If you drive down Timberline any morning in the week towards Old Quarry the traffic is always backed up with buses. Now you are going to have all this traffic coming out of a street that leads to a dog park. He agrees that there should be another entrance to this subdivision from New Avenue or 127th. His main concerns are the safety for people who live in Timberline. He asked if there is going to be a street light on New Avenue. Also, nobody has talked about Timberline Knolls and their new entrance. He asked how much traffic is that going to add. He hopes they take into consideration the families that live around there.

Chairman Spinelli asked if Alba was a dedicated right-of-way all the way to the Community Center.

Mrs. Valone said yes.

Chairman Spinelli stated they might want to recommend to the Village Board restricting the construction access.

Mr. Stein said they will definitely look into that. They can restrict access and time.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the New Avenue improvements would be an undertaking of the Village at some point.

Mr. Stein stated IDOT itself would have to weigh in on the warrants for those improvements. The one warrant that is coming in is a left turn lane as you are heading west on New Avenue and another turn lane as you are going east. Other types of stop signs or lights can't be done without IDOT's approval indicating such.

Mary Ameriks, 12354 Thornberry Drive, said she agrees with the traffic, Kettering, and the construction traffic. She asked staff if this is going to be seen from I-355.

Mrs. Valone stated yes it would.

Ms. Ameriks stated 294 homes is a lot of homes and \$500,000 to \$600,000 homes that have siding. She does not understand who they are selling to. She lives in Briarcliff and there are still about seven lots available in her subdivision. They are beautiful homes and she has seen charming homes done in siding in Frankfort and other subdivisions. However, this is a lot of homes and she is not sure who they are going to sell them to. The Village is not going to get any more lines on the Metra. A lot of corporations are moving from the suburbs and into the city. It was mentioned that it will not affect our schools but there are 9 fourth grade classes and 11 fifth grade classes. They can't even have an all-day kindergarten because they don't have the room.

Mr. Stein said he did not say that there will not be an impact on schools. What he said is there will be an impact on schools and that is going to be attributed by a cash donation. They are not going to be building a new school because of this development.

Ms. Ameriks stated so they give a cash donation and instead of having 9 fourth grades they will have twelve.

Chairman Spinelli said that would be a discussion for the school board.

Ms. Ameriks stated it needs to be taken into consideration because everyone's children are going to be affected by this. One of the reasons why she moved here was because of the schools. This amount of homes is going to have a negative impact on her kids and she is not sure what the point was investing in this neighborhood now.

Chairman Spinelli said it was stated that you just recently moved into town.

Ms. Ameriks stated it was a year ago.

Chairman Spinelli asked where did she move from.

Ms. Ameriks said from Chicago. She asked if that had any bearing on what she said.

Chairman Spinelli stated no it did not.

Kara Knutte, Doolin Street, said she has lived in this town for over 22 years and have seen Lemont grow. This development has her a little worried. Her kids walk to and from the school and will be going by all this traffic that will be coming out onto Timberline. In just the 174 single-family homes, if each household has 2 to 3 kids that means they are going to be adding 350 to 522 more kids that they will be adding to the school district. That is not including the duplexes. That would be 30 to 35 kids per grade from kindergarten to the high school. There is not enough room in the schools for this. They are going to have to open up Central which will be a whole new cost. This will be passed down to all the taxpayers. We really need to think about this especially with all the issues with Palos. There can be a whole bunch of kids coming from whatever development happens there.

She stated she is not thrilled with the lot sizes. She doesn't understand why they are allowing them to build so many houses on so many tiny lots. If larger streets are requested then the lots will be even smaller. She always thought Lemont prided itself on the large lots and higher ended homes. This whole area if there are kids in the development, they will have to walk to Old Quarry or be driven to school. The traffic is already backed-up on Timberline in the morning. The school is not really set up for the drop-off and pick-up there. She agrees with the comments about traffic. A lot of people cut down Wend instead of using 127th Street.

Chairman Spinelli said in regards to the street size they are not changing the right-of-way. The right-of-way they are proposing from sidewalk to sidewalk is 66 feet.

Mrs. Knutte asked what do they usually have in Lemont.

Chairman Spinelli stated 60 feet. They are proposing wider streets than in Timberline. The pavement is going to get wider, so they going to require them to widen the streets within that same right-of-way. The lots will not get smaller.

Mrs. Knutte asked if the lot sizes are going to be same as in Timberline.

Chairman Spinelli said these lots are less than 10,000 square feet on the average.

Mrs. Knutte stated they need to think about how they want to development Lemont. This is a huge subdivision that they are talking about. It was mentioned about the bikers that ride on Timberline. Those bikers purposely come here because of the hill and like to ride on that hill not the bike trails.

Chairman Spinelli said in response to whoever shouted out about R-4 zoning, the current R-4 zoning is 12,500 square feet. When the Comprehensive Plan was recently redone, due to the proximity to 355 this area is a transition area between Timberline and the Tollway. The Comprehensive Plan shows it as 5 units per acre and however you want to figure this out, it is less than 3 units per acre. Timberline, if he had to guess, is at about 2.75 to a 3. So it is about the same density as Timberline. Anything that develops here is going to be adding traffic, so unless the community comes together and gives the Township more money to buy this, it will not stay as open space.

Cory Anco, 16 Evergreen Place, stated he had trouble finding out information in regards to Intrepid Investment, LLC. This developer is out of southwestern Michigan and has changed names several times. What he did find in his research is that Ojibway in Grand Rapids, Michigan was worked on by Bruce Michaels. In 2012, the Ojibway development under the applicants lead purchased three school buildings. It was pitched to the Grand Rapids Board in Michigan to be turned into apartment buildings. According to the county register of deeds office that same day that Mr. Michaels closed on the buildings, all three were sold to a charter school group. The point of all this is that the city officials in Grand Rapids felt deceived, duped and their trust was broken in the switch by Mr. Michaels. When it comes in multi-million transactions pertaining to the Vistancia Development, he would like to think that the Village would want to know a little about the recent history here. He submitted documents to the Commission for their review and he encourages them to take a closer look at the individuals involved with this development.

Colleen Amberg, 112 Timberline Drive, said she would like to reiterate all of the concerns that have already been expressed. This is a very large and unusual subdivision in their town. She is shocked that Lemont would entertain a subdivision of this size with the Villas that they are proposing, the construction that they are proposing, the back bending modifications for so many homes to be built, the impact of the traffic and the impact on the schools. She thinks they really need to consider why people move to Lemont. She and her husband are newer residents to Lemont but her parents have lived here for many years. The reason why they moved here was the open space, lot sizes, and the community. She feels something like this will radically change the community. She is concerned about the placement of the retaining walls and feels that they will radically change the landscape. She would encourage the builders to meet the standards that were set-up instead of squeezing so many homes into one area that is very much valued by the residents of Lemont. She asked the Commission to put themselves in their position and if they would want this going up near their subdivision.

Eric Schmidt, 47 Timberline Drive, stated he has done some research on this and went through the Comprehensive Plan that was adopted November of 2014. He has a fair amount of comments based on that and some other things. From the Village Economics and Public Impression Standpoint on page 63 of the Comprehensive Plan it says, "concern over the disperse large lot development patterns in the region and

throughout the nation led to campaigns for smart growth and transient oriented development. On page 63 it notes the two plans that examined development of the underutilized downtown properties. There are 82 condos near the Metra station several of them are no vacancy or sale and there are 23 retail store fronts that are vacant in that project. He feels it was attributed due to the Metra.

He said a decade ago the plan notes that housing was considered excellent investment when credit was easy and homes could be purchased. Since 2008, as everyone knows the housing market has changed dramatically. Foreclosures have hit this region very hard with many properties throughout the region still vacant and bank owned. His question is who is going to buy these homes. On page 66 the Plan notes that “young people are increasing more mobile and willing to move to more cities for jobs as of this past June”. Per the Chicago Tribune, “52 companies leasing 10,000 square feet or more have either moved or have plans to move from the suburbs to Chicago, companies like McDonald’s, Motorola, Sara Lee, United Airlines, etc”. These are ones in our general vicinity where people who might buy these homes could potentially work. Jobs are not coming to the suburbs right now and people are moving closer to the city. The question is do we want to repeat the errors of our neighboring cities like Plainfield and Crest Hill. They had grew new construction to quickly without any strategic thought of vacant homes and foreclosure and not bringing any revenue to their perspective communities. They are more similar to Lemont than LaGrange or Hinsdale because they have the same transportation access issues that Lemont has. Census bureau numbers came out yesterday showing that Illinois has lost more than 37,000 in the past year which is more than any other state. It states that Illinois is losing one resident every 4.6 minutes and has lost more than 1.66 million since 2000. Crain’s says the housing downturn is one of the six issues that will still be making news in 2017.

Mr. Schmidt asked instead of new growth why are they not investing in new properties. On page 66, the wellbeing of neighborhoods, local governments, and regions is linked to reinvestment in structures. Continued on the next page, “Lemont’s existing housing stock continues to age and the availability of new homes increases. Reinvestment in the older homes in town will remain important. Village should seek to preserve the community’s existing housing stock”. On page 81 the plan discusses, “perusing mass transit improvement particularly increased Metra Service. The Village should continue to hold improved Metra Service as the highest priority because improved service is integral in supporting Lemont’s other goals related to economic and downtown development”.

He stated there has been little to no investment or growth to the downtown area and 3 Metra trains each day is not attractive to potential residents. This all ties back to page 5 where it is noted that Chicago Metropolitan Agency Planning calls for more jobs near to where they live, more parks and open space, more plentiful and cleaner water, healthier air and a better quality of life. The Comprehensive Plan suggests local solutions in support of these regional aspirations while protecting and enhancing the characteristics of Lemont that make it a community. Natural Resources and

Recreation on page 9 notes that “Lemont will be known as a community with exceptional opportunities for outdoor recreation defining natural characteristics and quality open space”. This plan calls for a road to be built right through one of the Village’s defining characteristics. The hill at the north end of the Timberline subdivision is used as a youth sledding hill. In the Natural Resources and Recreation page 43, the first guiding principal is “Lemont’s natural features and topography have value and should not be comprised by development. In addition, natural areas and ecosystems should be managed to respect natural processes. Ample recreational amenities contributes to a high quality of life and supports healthy living”. Under current conditions on page 44, “trees improve air quality and the Village has taken several measures to ensure that trees are taken into consideration during a development process. New development proposals are required to submit a tree preservation plan”. When he looked at the plan he did not see 6,000. The plan has characterized and tagged, approximately 3,600 trees which 3,100 are being removed.

Mr. Schmidt said on page 97 the plan discusses “protecting and enhancing our unique community assets including new development, minimizing disturbances to areas natural topography. The Village should ensure for site design, annexations and PUD’s take our natural topography into account”. This project by clearing so much wooded area will flush all the wildlife in this area out, including a Federally threatened species of bat. The IDNR has recommended for project 1701446 that tree clearing should not occur between April 1st through October 14th. He does have a copy of this document and it is dated October 14th.

He stated let’s assume that this does get approved and they actually sell. On page 7, “Lemont will be known for its thriving downtown, excellent schools, successful businesses and a strong sense of community”. This plan per the applicant’s own estimate will bring nearly 1,000 people to the community increasing it by 5% based on Lemont’s 2014 population. With 16,600 residents and 3,500 students in both school districts, holding those ratios means nearly 200 new students if all those homes are sold. He is anticipating younger people moving in here which might make those numbers a little higher. In 2016, class sizes in both school districts are already beyond State averages with 21-25 students in the grammar school and about 21-23 in the high school. As of 2014 the grammar school district data board shows that they have a people expenditure of \$15,800 per student. With those ratios, a 120 new students in this school will have additional cost of 1.9 million annually. This is a district finally making strides after being on the State watch list. The one time impact money being offered in this project is \$563,587. In 2015, Lemont High School has a per pupil expenditure of \$18, 590, ratios would add 80 students costing 1.5 million annually and the one time impact money will be \$284, 784. These additional students don’t take any consideration for the potential additional students that could end up here based on the Palos Park annexation issue, which none of those tax dollars would come here to support those children. Both school boards have noted any additional property tax revenue from residential developments will not offset the cost that is associated with dramatic enrollment increases. One cost saving measure that has been noted is to reopen an outdate school building built in 1869. With all this information

they want to know how they will pay for these students. He asked if they think State or Federal money is going to come in. One time impact money is a fraction of the cost to educate new children for just one year. Existing residents are going to feel the burden of higher taxes. He asked with stressed schools, high student ratios and less resources will our schools districts remain attractive to new and current residents.

Mr. Schmidt said lastly, from a traffic and safety standpoint, the traffic study was done on June 14, 2016 when no school was in session impacting the entire southern end of the study at Timberline and 127th. Legally they did get additional information during school peak traffic patterns and that was taken in 2008. On page 7, the analysis results note that the proposed residential development will not have significant impact on the intersection. Currently, because of additional access at Walter Street, which is noted how people will go through side streets, there are approximately 250 homes now that utilize Timberline Drive to exit onto 127th or New Avenue. This project is going to add 294 new households which sounds like a significant impact on traffic. He believes the sight distance analysis is flawed at the north end. It takes into account sight and stopping distance but not the elevation or existing homes and landscaping which makes the visibility around that corner more difficult than simple elevation and distance numbers used in the study. Coming northbound on Timberline as you come to the proposed Vistancia Lane especially when coupled with the new entrance for Timberline Knolls, it will be dangerous to drivers as well as the children in the area. He asked what will the impact be for police, fire and other public safety departments. Lastly, how will existing homes hold value when we are unsure who is going to purchase 300 homes in this area with predicted rising interest rates, inflation, plus an exit of people leaving Illinois. Anyone in Timberline thinking of selling in the next five years will not get the value of their home, what they expect, or the value they deserve.

Jeff Leise, 14 Timberline Court, stated he just wanted to share why he moved here and chose Lemont. Lemont does not have the boxy feel like Lockport or Plainfield. He works in Arlington Heights and he chose here because there are a lot of open spaces and bigger lots. He fears that this development is going to all look the same and Kettering is a big example of that. He hopes that they don't make that same mistake again. As a young buyer that is why he moved here and hopes that his opinion matters.

Alison Fudacz, 89 Timberline Drive, said she has just closed on her house in August. One of the reasons why they moved here was because of the amazing school district. Where they previously lived, on their block every house looked the same. Moving here it was refreshing and wonderful. All the houses in the proposed development looked the same. All they did was change some paint and trim and it does not fit in the area where they are at. She asked when is the one time impact money given to the schools. She agrees with Mr. Schmidt that it does not sound like enough money. \

Chairman Spinelli stated in addition to the impact fees, all these taxing bodies will receive real estate taxes from every single house that is built. It is not just a one-time

contribution to the school district. There is a timeline as to when the developer has to pay these taxing bodies. Everyone pays real estate taxes that goes to these taxing bodies so when someone purchases a house they will be paying also. He said there was a comment that was mentioned regarding the Palos issue, the school and Park District boundaries are independent of the municipal boundaries. So if they are part of the Lemont School District they will pay taxes for Lemont School District.

Mrs. Fudacz stated they could pay this money but the classrooms are already going at full capacity. She asked if they are looking at opening up more schools.

Chairman Spinelli said they had not received any support or rejection from the school district on this development that he is aware of.

Mr. Stein stated municipalities have no control over the schools. It is a separate board that is elected. There are two separate schools for the grammar schools then the high school. They receive a significant portion of that property tax bill. If you look at your property tax they are number one. Each property whether it is in Lemont or Palos will pay to the school district. The impact fees are used to fill the gap. You will have students entering these schools before the years taxes have been given. The impact is only for that one year until taxes start getting collected. The addition of classes or schools they can't answer that and that is a question for the school district.

Carl Zajac, 59 Timberline Drive, said he has been a resident here for 30 years. There are a lot of concerns and people have brought up very good valuable points. Some other things that he would like the Commission to consider is that New Avenue is a flood plain. If it rains, Timberline is like a flowing river. New Avenue has been flooded numerous times from Station One all the way west. He does not see this water run-off being handled. The other issue he has is that for a number of years they have been on odd/even days for watering. They have improved the water over the years because there was radon in the water and the Village has addressed these issues. He asked how are they going to handle this additional demand for water.

Chairman Spinelli stated in regards to the water supply, the Village had hired a consultant to do a water supply study. The Village Engineer, as part of his review, indicated that he was going to have him evaluate piping sizes needed and to confirm capacity for this development.

Mr. Zajac said the plumbing in this area is very old and they continue to have water main breaks. All of these issues have to be looked at. In many of the suburban areas where developers have purchased property and built, they only build a certain percentage then walk away from the development and sell it to another developer. There are two phases here but he does not hear what percentage that they are going to sell out on Phase I before they start Phase II. Thirty-five years ago Timberline was a ghost town when it went bankrupt. There were about eight or ten developers that came in that started building Timberline Drive. This is a five year project, so there is no guarantee that this developer is going to be here.

Chairman Spinelli asked for the annexation, can it be required that Pulte share their purchase agreement.

Mr. Stein stated it can be done but there are some things that are confidential that would not be disclosed. In regards to the phasing, it is a big important item, so they cannot start Phase II until the majority of Phase I is substantially completed and occupied.

Chairman Spinelli said Mr. Tremulis did indicate at this time that it is their intent to build on all the lots in the development.

Mr. Stein stated the product book that they are proposing is a product book for the entire project.

Mrs. Murray, 83 Timberline Drive, said her concern is the traffic and having the only access through Timberline Drive. Her other concern is with the water. The Village has wells and they pride themselves that they don't have Michigan water. She asked if the wells will be able to support all the new growth. There is the concern of traffic with the school being right there, but there is the Park District also right there. The Park District is well used and getting in/out of there is not that easy.

Chairman Spinelli stated in regards to the water supply, he cannot speak for the director of Public Works, all communities are doing studies and watching water levels in their wells.

Mrs. Murray asked if this gets approved, they will know that we can support the growth and the rest of the Village.

Chairman Spinelli said the studies would have told us five years ago how much development we can handle at one time.

Mrs. Valone stated the Village Engineer had reached out to our consultant for two items. One making sure we can supply the water and secondly to make sure their interior configuration was acceptable. Staff did hear back from HR Green and we can supply the water. The second thing they are waiting on is to make sure their pipe sizes are appropriate.

Joe Murray, 83 Timberline Drive, said he knows in the Comprehensive Plan it allows lot sizes to drop from 12,500 to approximately 9,000 which the gentleman here are working it. About 10 to 12 years ago another group had tried to come in and develop this subdivision. The main reason why they were trying to drop the lot size was because there was about 23 acres that they could not build on. He does not feel that the lot sizes should be dropped so the developer can make money. The Board did not approve them at that time because of the lot sizes. He suggests that they should investigate the applicant before any final decisions are made. He commends the

gentleman that did all the research in regards to the Comprehensive Plan. He would like to know what the Commission's comment is in regards to the lot sizes dropping from 12,500 to 9,000.

Mr. Stein stated he has no comment. This development fits within the Comprehensive Plan. There are portions of the Comprehensive Plan that can be taken out and made to sound anyway you want. It is 147 pages and this fits within the Comprehensive Plan. He is not stating whether he is in support or not of this development. All he is stating is that it fits within the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Ameriks asked if Mr. Stein lived in Lemont.

Mr. Stein said no he does not.

Commissioner Maher stated he lives in Lemont and he does ride his bike up and down Timberline all the time. This is a residential area and he was on the Commission when they did the Comprehensive Plan. This property is private property and it is zoned residential. This land can be developed as residential and they don't have a choice. What they do have a choice on is impacting what they are building. They look at density and what they are building. They don't have access to 127th or New Avenue. The questions that they are asking are great questions but they have to look at what they can influence. Their influence is density, the development that is being done, and does it fit in their environment. Right now they can go into the County and submit a plan that meets the County requirements for the zoning and not have any comments from Lemont. No influence on our schools or impact fees. He listened to what Mr. Schmidt said and feels that he made some great points. Just because they didn't comment does not mean they did or didn't agree with him and he appreciates the research he put into it.

Commissioner Sanderson said this is open to the public to comment. When they close the public hearing the Commission will debate amongst themselves. Right now they are listening to what the public has to say.

Alan Brown, 5 Timberline Place, stated he is very interested in this development since it is in his backyard. He is really disappointed in the downsizing of the lots. It was referenced as 2 to 1 so there could potentially be two houses behind him. Making the lots smaller so you could fit more homes in because you bought land that has a ravine in it is not their problem. Build less homes, make them nicer and charge more money. The one reason why he likes Lemont is because of the standards. If you drive around other areas all you see is vinyl siding. He is disappointed with the downgrading of brick. The other concern is that they will have new taxpayers and they will be paying taxes, but will their taxes cover all the extras like police, fire, and public works.

Chairman Spinelli said the property will be assessed.

Mr. Brown stated but if it comes up short then everyone's taxes are going to go up.

Chairman Spinelli said they are not downgrading anything right now. They are hearing the petitioner's request.

Mr. Brown stated it was mentioned that other developments have done less on brick.

Chairman Spinelli said as development trends change, codes have to change. Lemont is not the only community that adjust development codes to meet the current trends.

Mr. Brown stated just because everyone else has done it doesn't mean they have to do it. There can be a higher standard. That is why he lives in this town. His concerns are the brick, lot size, infrastructure, open space and environmental impact. There are deer, coyotes, and foxes all in the area. He asked if there have been any type of studies done.

Chairman Spinelli said the developer is required to do environmental studies and have done them which were submitted to the Village Engineer.

Mr. Brown asked if those are available to be read.

Mr. Stein stated they are present on the table this evening.

Commissioner Maher said in regards to the two backyards to one yard, this was just referencing that the backyards might not line up directly to their backyard.

Mr. Schmidt stated he wanted to apologize about the taxes and the Commission is correct on those. He thanked Commission Maher on his comments. There are a lot of conflicting pieces to the Comprehensive Plan. He does want to clarify the school board's position on growth here. This is found on the high school's web page. It says, "if school populations grow it could necessitate the construction of additional school buildings. It would almost assuredly result in additional tax burden on the community. Any additional property tax revenue that would result from the development of these properties would not offset the costs associated with such a dramatic enrollment increase. An increase of this magnitude would cost the community millions of dollars more than property tax revenue that would be generated from the residential development." It does talk a lot in regards to the Palos issue. He understands that they are separate from this, and shame on them if they have not prepared for this. However, it is stating here that they didn't prepare. If they grow too quickly then they might have a problem.

Chairman Spinelli said they are not growing too quickly.

Mr. Schmidt stated the school seems to think so.

Chairman Spinelli said that is why they are different taxing body then them. They work with all these taxing bodies to try and find the best solution for everybody including the residents. The issue with the property out in Palos is that they don't have control over the density. The school does not know if the property out in Palos is going to be 3 units to the acre or 7 units to the acre. Every type of development is going to have an impact to public service that is why everyone pays real estate taxes.

Mr. Schmidt asked how many current developments are going on right now.

Mr. Stein stated the only big developments going on right now is the Kettering development and Montefiori.

Mr. Schmidt said we know right now what is coming in, so it is something to think about if you have kids in the school district. He asked what the property is zoned for right now.

Commissioner Maher stated it is zoned Cook County residential.

Mr. Schmidt asked why is the hearing for a residential change.

Mr. Stein said any unincorporated territory that comes into Lemont is automatically defaulted to R-1.

Commissioner Maher stated we have talked about school boards and there are a number of Commissioners that have kids in the school district. He believes that residents and parents should go to their school boards and talk to them about the impact that is here. The Board does go and have joint sessions with the school boards, Park District boards and library board to talk about impacts. These Boards are available to come to these meet sessions to talk about the impact of the subdivision. One of the biggest concerns that they have with Palos is the loss of impact fees. Palos annexed those properties in, yet the schools are in Lemont, the Board controls the impact fees. If you look through this packet the builder is investing a significant amount of money in the impact fees. Palos has the ability to waive all impact fees and this is a major concern.

Jim Connelly, 58 Timberline, said there was a comment about the builder not having access to 127th or New Avenue. He asked doesn't the Commission or Board have impact over the safety of the community. He asked would they be able to work with other agencies to develop a road.

Chairman Spinelli stated they cannot control any property that is not owned by the developer or the Village. They have impact on the design which affects the safety and can improve safety. The development has two access points which is required by the Fire Department. If there is only one access point then that would be a different story because they can deny it due to the requirements of the Fire Department and safety.

Dominic Anco, 16 Evergreen Place, said his main concern, other than lot size, is access on Timberline Drive. He asked why they can't go through Lot 1 to access New Avenue.

Commission Sanderson stated there are other properties there that are not shown.

Mr. Anco said there is going to be way too much traffic coming through on both ends. He feels that they need a current traffic study.

Chairman Spinelli stated it is a current traffic study, but there was additional information that was added from an earlier traffic study.

Mr. Bullwinkle asked if their duty is to look over the design for approval, then why is the traffic study even done.

Chairman Spinelli said part of the submittal requirement is to provide all of this documentation. They are not appointed to review the engineering studies but they are provided the information. The applicant is required to submit the documents, and then it goes to the Village Engineer to review this information.

Mr. Bullwinkle stated it seems like the Commission has a lot of input on the design and interpretation, but when looking at how the traffic effects the function of the Village it is left up to an engineer to review.

Chairman Spinelli said for transportation engineers there are guidelines that are setup that are adopted by all the States. This way you are not getting different information from different companies. They have to provide a certain amount of information for a complete traffic study. There are certain guidelines in the traffic manual that defines a certain level of service that must be met.

Mr. Bullwinkle asked if this Commission, as an advisory group, could say that there is a traffic problem and feel that this situation is going to make matters worse. At least say there are issues with the traffic, with the schools and the flooding on New Avenue and there is a concern.

Chairman Spinelli stated because they are not traffic professionals, he could give an opinion but he cannot say without a doubt that there is a problem or not.

Commissioner Sanderson said all these comments are being collected and the Village Board will see all of the concerns.

Mr. Stein stated the reason for the public hearing is so we can hear about the issues and get all these great comments. This Commission will discuss all the different reports and public comments and then provide a recommendation to the Village Board. This is a preliminary PUD and nothing is final today. This Commission makes a recommendation and then it has to go to the Village Board. Even if the preliminary

gets approved by the Village Board, the Final PUD is where all the issues get worked out.

Chairman Spinelli said it is 10:30 p.m. and it was stated that the meeting will be cut off at that time. He then called for a motion to continue the public hearing for Case 16-10 to the January meeting.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Maher to continue the public hearing for Case 16-10 to the January 18, 2017 meeting. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

IV. ACTION ITEMS

None

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

A. Update from Village Board

Mrs. Valone stated 645 4th Street came before the Village Board. The Board was in agreement with the lot sizes, but did make them maintain 20 feet for setbacks between buildings. The two homeowners on the sides were in agreement with it. She said someone had asked in regards to the 5th Street case and there has still been no resolution.

VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Spinelli called for a 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