

**Village of Lemont**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
Regular Meeting of February 19, 2014

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, February 19, 2014 in the second floor Board Room of the Village Hall, 418 Main Street, Lemont, Illinois.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**A. Pledge of Allegiance**

Commissioner Sanderson 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, Maher, McGleam, Messer, Sanderson

Absent: Sullivan and Spinelli

Planner Martha Glas was also present.

**C. Approval of Minutes: January 15, 2014 Meeting**

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Messer to approve the minutes from the January 15, 2014 meeting with no changes. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

**II. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS**

Commissioner Sanderson stated he will be filling in as Chairman tonight for Chairman Spinelli.

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. Case 14-01 – 410 Main St. Variation**

A public hearing for variation to allow a residential unit on the first floor of a property located on the Main Street street type in the Downtown District.

Commissioner Sanderson called for a motion to open the public hearing.

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to open the public hearing for Case 14-01. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

Commissioner Sanderson then asked for the audience to stand and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath.

Mrs. Glas said the case before them is a variation request to allow a residential unit on the first floor of a property that is subject to the Main Street street type standards in the Downtown District. She stated she was going to show on the overhead what is in the Unified Development Ordinance in terms of a regulating plan for the downtown district. It is done by street types which is different than the rest of the Village. The property is located on the Main Street street type, which is the central business district. She said anything happening on those properties have specific regulations. The first being that you want to maintain the historic character of the area. She stated being a central business district commercial area you want it to flow in terms of the commercial uses. So if there was a residence on the first floor it is something that is not supported in this district.

Mrs. Glas stated the variance request to allow for a residential use on this property is unique. There are two commercial units on the first floor. The front commercial unit that faces Main Street is currently occupied. There is a second commercial unit that is in the rear that hasn't been used commercially, but has been used just for storage. She said the front unit is about 930 square feet and the rear unit is about 730 square feet. Laundry facilities are also on the first floor. The request is unique in that it is not a residential unit that would face Main Street and would not away the commercial feel.

Mrs. Glas said there is an east and west entrance on the building. The east entrance provides access to the commercial unit in the front. The west entrance provides access to the laundry facility, the stairs for the residential units on the second and third floor, and also the rear unit. She stated there are separate utilities for both units and this door is a security entrance for the residences. Since this is a unique configuration and the conditions are existing, staff is recommending approval of the variation.

Commissioner Maher asked what used to be in the back.

Mrs. Glas stated at one time a State Senator had the front office and they just used the back for storage. She said they do not have any record of it being used as a commercial use.

Commissioner Maher asked if it was going to require a build out.

Mrs. Glas said it is somewhat already built out and the only addition would be to add a shower and kitchenette.

Commissioner Messer stated the staff report talked about the parking. He asked where the current residents are parking.

Mrs. Glas said she is not sure where those particular tenants are parking. She showed on the overhead areas that are public parking in the downtown. Residents are able to park there over night, but during the day it is limited to four hour parking.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if any other Commissioners had questions for staff. None responded. He then asked if the applicant wanted to speak.

John Savarino stated he is the owner of 410 Main Street which is attached to the Village Hall. He said the issue that he has is there is no accessibility unless you go through the residential. There are two security doors that you have to go through and once you are past those you have access to the residences. He stated it will jeopardize the safety and security of the tenants to allow commercial there. The way it is constructed they should have made it a whole unit from front to rear but it is actually divided.

Commissioner Maher asked if there is no other access point between the two units besides the hallway.

Mr. Savarino said that is correct. There are separate utilities and doors.

Commissioner Sanderson asked what the variation would be.

Mrs. Glas stated it would be to allow residential on the first floor of the commercial building. She said it is not specified in the UDO whether it is the front or rear of the building, but in this case it would be limited to the rear.

Mr. Savarino said from the front of the building you would never know that there was commercial space back there.

Commissioner Sanderson stated if this was a new building they would like the whole first floor to be commercial versus residential on the first floor in the Downtown area.

Mr. Savarino said the building is only 12 or 13 years old. There was a fire in the original building and it burned down. This is the new building they constructed which has a sprinkler system. He stated when they divided it that is the way they constructed the building.

Mrs. Glas stated if someone came in requesting to do this, then that would be a different case but this already exists and the units are separated.

Commissioner Sanderson said his problem is if someone has an existing building, they put up a wall, and state now that it is an existing condition.

Mrs. Glas stated this one has utilities for two spaces. It was developed with two utilities. Someone just putting up a dividing wall would not be able to convert it to two uses.

Mr. Savarino said the entrance is the problem because you have to go through two security doors. The doors are coded doors so you would not be able to have customers go through them to get to the business.

Commissioner Maher asked if there was a bathroom in the front unit.

Mr. Savarino stated there was and showed on the diagram where it was located.

Commissioner McGleam asked if there was existing storage space for the commercial tenant on the first floor.

Mr. Savarino said there are two small offices and a small storage room. He stated the space is leased currently. He stated every time he tried to lease both spaces as commercial he would get shot down once they saw the security doors.

Commissioner McGleam asked if any future lease opportunities would be restricted to the current size of that commercial space. He said by converting the back you will never be able to increase the size of the commercial space.

Mr. Savarino stated unless someone wanted to live in the back and lease the front.

Commissioner Messer asked if he knew where the current tenants were parking.

Mr. Savarino said it is his understanding that there is an issue with the parking especially with all the snow. The tenants are allowed to park for only four hours in the main parking lot right here at Village Hall. He stated the tenants have been told to park in the lot across the street from the post office. He asked what the parking is across the street from the Village Hall.

Mrs. Glas stated that is public parking also which has the four hour limit during the day but they can park over night.

Mr. Savarino said they could use some additional parking.

Commissioner Kwasneski asked if he had received any complaints about this.

Mr. Savarino stated no because you can't even tell that there is a unit back there.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if anyone in the audience wanted to come up and speak. None responded. He then called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Messer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to close the public hearing for Case 14-01. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

Commissioner Sanderson then called for a recommendation to the Mayor and Village Board.

Commissioner Maher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kwasneski to recommend to the Mayor and Village Board approval for a variation to allow a residential unit on the first floor of a property located on the Main Street street type in the Downtown District. A roll call vote was taken:

*Ayes: McGleam, Kwasneski, Maher, Messer, Sanderson*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

Commissioner Messer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Maher to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 14-01 as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

#### **IV. ACTION ITEMS**

Mr. Savarino stated they were in the process of working on a small restaurant on the corner of Main Street. He said they were actually concerned about parking. He asked if there was anything on the agenda for the Village to purchase additional parcels for parking.

Commissioner Sanderson said there is public parking by The Lofts.

Mrs. Glas stated there is nothing besides the public parking that currently exists and the Village is not looking to purchase any property for additional parking.

Mr. Savarino said he was just asking because there has been mention of the 2030 plan.

Mrs. Glas stated the UDO currently has a whole section on what the Village envisions the Downtown to be developed like. She said she can send the link to him and that would give him an idea of what the vision is for the downtown. In terms of the future land use map it is not specific for the downtown but rather looks at Lemont and a mile and half beyond Lemont. Mrs. Glas stated there are sub plans that have been developed in the past couple of years that the Village uses as a guide for development. So that would be a starting point to see what the direction was for the Downtown area.

Commissioner Maher said the Village is looking into getting a Sports Complex in the Downtown area. He stated if that went through there would also be a significant amount of parking.

Mr. Savarino thanked the Commission for their information.

## V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

### A. Status of Comprehensive Plan Update

Mrs. Glas said in February they had a meeting with the Committee of the Whole (COW). In preparation for that they refined their existing five elements which the Commission has seen a draft to all of those. She stated in the Natural Resources they had added a level of service standards for parks. It was not included in there before, but they feel it should be added now. She said the intent was to go through all five elements at the COW, but they were only able to get through three.

Mrs. Glas stated they did have the two Land Use workshops. The meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup> was better attended which had 10 participants and the meeting on the 3<sup>rd</sup> there were 5 participants. She said they had maps set up at different tables with different land use categories. The participants were suppose to put those land use categories on the map where they thought was appropriate. She said they will synthesize that and add some to it. At the March Planning and Zoning meeting they will have the first rendition of what the future land use map may look like. In preparation for March's meeting she would like to go through the categories with the Commission.

Mrs. Glas said there were seven land use categories with some sub-categories for retail and residential. The residents were given a flier with information and the photos. In the fliers it had illustrations on building scale and type and the site plans they would expect based on what the Comprehensive Plan vision is. She said everything they are going to see in terms of land use categories is informed by the guiding principles of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mrs. Glas stated she is going to start with the industrial land use category. This district is characterized by well designed sites that include suitable buildings for modern functional features, screening for outdoor storage, equipment, and landscaping to create curb appeal. Included are some pictures of what that type of development would look like. She said when you are thinking about the map of Lemont and designating areas for industrial, this is the type of industrial they would hope to go there.

Mrs. Glas said for open space and recreation it is characterized by large parks, open green space, and outdoor commercial recreation. The sites can range from 25 acres to more. Smaller parks that are part of residential would not be classified because they are more of an amenity to a neighborhood. She stated some local examples include Heritage Quarries, the Centennial Campus, Ruffled Feathers Golf Course, and any other area that would be suitable for the map.

Mrs. Glas stated the next section is employment center. It is a mix of uses which all generate high employment per square foot of building. This district has a primary benefit of generating local employment and a secondary benefit of providing useful services to the local residents. She said the building would vary in design but the size would be no taller than a three story building. She stated some local examples would be Advocate Good Samaritan Outpatient Center, Timberline Knolls, or Palos Community Hospital Home Health Care.

Mrs. Glas said the next one is multi-family midrise. This district is characterized by larger scale multi-family developments such as apartment complexes or condominiums. They are usually on sites of 10 acres and would have amenities such as club houses or swimming pools that are specific to that community. The buildings within this district would be three to six stories and there are no local examples. She stated if they felt a certain area of Lemont would be suited for that type of development then they would like to see it on the map.

Mrs. Glas stated the mixed use district is characterized by the presence of buildings that house a mix of commercial and residential use. They can be similar to what they find in the historic district or they can be new construction. She said it can be as small as a 1,000 square foot structure or as large as 250,000 square feet on a newly developed retail shopping center. These sights are well suited for areas that are around transit stops. Some examples of this would be Front Street Lofts, Budnik Building and Callahan Plumbing.

Mrs. Glas said in the commercial district there are two subsets, the neighborhood retail and the community retail. The neighborhood retail is characterized by retail uses that are convenience orientated which are shops and offices that need to be visited on regular basis. The commercial building is usually occupied by a single business, a stand alone site or a small shopping center. They are located on arterial streets but easily accessed by walking, bicycling, or transit and the sizes vary from 30,000 square feet to 125,000 square feet on sites up to five acres. She stated examples of this type of retail would be Riley's Point with Three Corners or Lemont Village Square. Mrs. Glas stated community retail would be bigger and it draws from the bigger area. She said examples would be the Target/Kohl's area or Lemont Plaza.

Mrs. Glas stated that there would be four different categories identified for the residential land use category. She said one being the conventional neighborhood with mostly single-family detached homes, some single-family attached homes with multi-family homes mixed in. It would have two to four dwelling units per acre. She stated most of the open space is private yards and some may feature common open space. Some examples of this type would be Covington Knolls, Briarcliffe including The Courtyards, and Woodglen. Another category that is identified is the contemporary neighborhood. Those have a typical density of four to eight dwelling units per acre. The private open space is smaller but the offset is more common open space. Mrs. Glas said with an average of five to six dwelling units per acre more of the residents would

likely live within walkable or biking distances of other amenities. She stated some examples are Brown Park block or Bailey's Crossing Townhomes.

Discussion continued in regards to trails and paths for connectivity.

Mrs. Glas said another type of residential design is the large lot subdivision. They would be single-family detached homes and the density is less than two dwelling units per acre. She stated you find this in the unincorporated areas of Lemont. The last residential design type is the conservation design. This is typical for areas you would want to preserve some natural features. She said this might be areas that have wetlands or areas that have significant ecological features. So if there are any areas in Lemont that are not developed or if they have something significant that you would not want to see completely leveled this is the designation you would want to put there.

Mrs. Glas stated that is a synopsis of what the land use categories are. If you have seen the 2002 Comprehensive Plan it just gives the density and the raw terms. She said it does not state much else in regards to walkability or design intents. She stated if they have any feedback it would be appreciated, otherwise they will come back in March with the first rendition of the Land Use Map. Mrs. Glas said this would conclude her presentation.

Commissioner Messer asked if 604-606 State Street was approved.

Mrs. Glas stated it was. She said next month the Chicago Blaze Club might be coming in asking for some variations.

Commissioner Sanderson asked what happened to the Birchpath Preliminary PUD/Plat.

Mrs. Glas said it did not get approved. She stated at the COW he had submitted an alternate plan that addressed some of the things that were concerns of the Planning Commission. She said staff had stipulations in there prior to getting Preliminary approval they had to provide certain things. The applicant is working on revisions to get preliminary approval.

Commissioner Sanderson stated then he was not denied but instead he needs to come back with more.

Mrs. Glas said yes he does need to come back with more. She stated he has opted to do a shared detention with Mayfair. This will allow them to expand the lot width. She said once they get all of things that they have asked of them then it will go to the Village Board for approval. She stated it will come back before the Planning Commission Board for Final PUD/Plat approval.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Sanderson called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.



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

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

*Minutes prepared by Peggy Halper*