

Village of Lemont
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting of May 21, 2014

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 21, 2014 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 greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. He then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Verify Quorum

Upon roll call the following were:

Present: Kwasneski, Maher, McGleam, Messer, Sanderson, Sullivan, Spinelli

Absent: None

Planning and Economic Development Director Charity Jones, Planner Martha Glas, and Village Trustee Ron Stapleton were also present

C. Approval of Minutes from the March 19, 2014 Meeting

Commissioner Messer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sanderson to approve the minutes from the March 19, 2014 meeting with no changes. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

II. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Chairman Spinelli stated they have a long meeting ahead of them so they will get started right away.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Case 14-03 – Chicago Blaze Rugby Club PUD.

A PUD for redevelopment including the construction of a new clubhouse facility and associated parking.

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to open the public hearing for Case 14-03.

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Maher to open the public hearing for Case 14-03. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Mrs. Glas said this Case came before the Commission back in March of 2014. The applicant has since revised his plans and is now requesting a Planned Unit Development (PUD). She showed an aerial view of the sight on the overhead. There are four structures on the property which included the existing clubhouse, garage, shelter and another framed building. The proposal is to demolish two of those structures and leave two.

Mrs. Glas stated she will go through what was previously proposed then go through what is currently being proposed. The previous proposal was a request for 10 variations. She showed on the overhead the proposed building and the parking layout. The parking was suppose to be mainly all gravel with only the access points paved and the handicapped parking areas. A chain link fence is not permitted and their previous request was to keep the fence and to allow reconstruction of the fence when construction was completed. Another variation was for illumination standards where their entire parking lot was not illuminated. There was a landscape variation for landscaping around the parking lot and detention pond. The variations for the building proposal were in regards to design standards. One was a roof line standard, another was for building entrance design, and lastly was the window standards. Mrs. Glas said another site design standard that was not met was the public sidewalk. The owner at the time did not wish to include a public sidewalk or an interior sidewalk. The last standard was for parking, which exceeded the maximum amount allowed.

Mrs. Glas said staff worked with the applicant in regards to their revised plans. In the new plans, the applicant is proposing to pave the entire west lot in front of the building. The applicant did add a sidewalk from Smith Farms to the second driveway. However, it is not extended the full length of the property. A five foot stripped pedestrian walkway was added to the entrance of the building. She stated the chain link fence has remained as they have originally proposed. The three design standards that they did not meet originally have been left as is with no changes made.

Mrs. Glas stated the applicant did increase the landscaping to the amount that staff recommended. She then showed on the overhead the areas along with the detention pond where they added landscaping. The landscaping in the detention area may be problematic because there is a small portion of land that is part of a property line dispute with neighboring Smith Farms. The detention area is outside of the area but any grading in that area might fall into that area including the landscaping. She showed where staff recommended the majority of the perimeter landscaping should go. However, the applicant chooses to put most of the landscaping along the perimeter where it abuts a vacant parcel. There is no changes happening in that area in regards to the development so it is workable to allow sidewalks and landscaping to be added at a

later date for that area. However, how it is enforced is an issue. Mrs. Glas stated typically if they have conditions on a PUD or special use it is based on the subject property. With this case it would be based on a development of a property north of the subject property. The Village Attorney did respond after staff's report was prepared and stated the recommendation would be that the sidewalk should be installed now or the other option being to do an escrow. Without having the Village Attorney's response staff requested that the sidewalk be put in completely and add a landscape strip that matches. She said staff would recommend approval based on those two conditions.

Commissioner McGleam asked if the gravel lot was included in the PUD.

Mrs. Glas stated it is.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the applicant could step up to the podium. He then asked everyone in the audience to stand and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath.

Walt Rebenson, President of the Chicago Blaze Building Corporation, said he won't go into much detail because Mrs. Glas covered everything that they modified. As far as the landscaping on the south edge of the detention area, there is a boundary dispute with Stone Lake Survey Co. They had incorrectly done their survey which included a plat of subdivision. It affects the ten lots on the north side of Pasture Drive. The dispute is about two feet at Smith Road and ten or eleven feet up in the eastern corner. He said the landscaping is outside of the area.

Mr. Rebenson stated their request to not put in the northern most portion of the sidewalk was because there is extensive vegetation that they had put in over the past 20 some years. He did not want to have to remove it, however if they are required to put up an escrow or bond then they would be better off putting it in. He said everything else he feels they had reached an agreement with staff. Once they are approved they will be going forward with getting approval from the Village Board. They are hoping to break ground sometime in August so the building can be up before the winter hits.

Mr. Rebenson said he wanted to thank Mrs. Glas and staff for working with them to resolve some of these issues. He stated he feels they were able to reach agreement in regards to the design standards.

Chairman Spinelli stated he applauds him for working with staff to address a lot of the concerns that were brought up in the last meeting. He likes the new parking lot layout in front and feels it flows a little better. The pavement out in front of the building and along the handicap stalls is good.

Chairman Spinelli asked if any of the Commissioners had any questions. None responded. He then asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak in regards to this case. None responded.

Chairman Spinelli said the sidewalk is required per Village code. If you have to put up an escrow then you might as well put it in. He stated he understands the owners concern and it was the same concern when Smith Farms came in. Eventually the property to the north of him will connect to it. If people continue to park on Smith Road even though they are not supposed to, at least it will give the pedestrians an escape from Smith Road.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any more questions or comments. None responded. He then called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kwasneski to close the public hearing for Case 14-03. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Chairman Spinelli then called for a motion for recommendation to the Mayor and Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Maher to recommend to the Mayor and Village Board approval for Chicago Blaze Rugby Club PUD with the following recommendation:

1. A landscaping strip is added in the gravel lot along the west property line to match what was done in front of the west parking lot along Smith Road.
2. The public sidewalk is extended to the lot line.

A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: McGleam, Kwasneski, Sanderson, Maher, Messer, Sullivan, Spinelli

Nays: None

Motion passed

Commissioner Maher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 14-03 as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

B. Case 14-05 – Kohl’s Target PUD Amendment.

A PUD amendment to allow for exterior façade improvements to the Kohl’s Store.

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to open the public hearing for Case 14-05.

Commissioner Maher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kwasneski to open the public hearing for Case 14-05. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None
Motion passed

Mrs. Glas said the original Ordinance approving the PUD had building elevations included so any changes to the elevation would require an amendment to the PUD. In addition to exhibits that showed elevations, there was also a paragraph that was descriptive requiring certain items. It included incorporating rough limestone features, a stepped back entryway, an elliptical canopy and horizontal bands of limestone or limestone like material, and a spring arch supported by columns at either side of the Kohl's entryway.

Mrs. Glas showed on the overhead what the Kohl's currently looks like and then what they are proposing. The upgrades are part of a nationwide upgrade program that they have. It coincides with some of the interior remodeling that they are doing. Staff is recommending approval with two conditions. One being to maintain the existing masonry at all locations labeled "8" on the new side elevation depicted in Exhibit "A". She showed on the overhead the location. The second is incorporate limestone or limestone-like architectural elements in the entryway. That was in the original PUD and the columns were the particular feature that had the limestone-like element. She said some of the notations on the elevations currently show that areas "10" and "11" will have panels with a limestone finish, but it is unclear as to whether it is a finish or will it look like limestone. Mrs. Glas stated that the applicant might be able to expand on that a little. She said this would conclude staff's report.

Commissioner Messer asked in the new proposal is there a canopy that is coming away from the building.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the applicant would step up to the podium.

Frank Evans stated he is with Casco who is the architect and engineer for Kohl's. He said they are located in St. Louis. He stated it is an eyebrow which is a metal band and it does not have a roof. It is very similar as to what is located at the Target currently. The element that they were discussing, the lower portions of the gateway, Kohl's likes to continue their finish all the way to the ground. That lower section is not really an EFIS but a DEFS which is an impact product that has a cement board imbedded in the outer surface. This product has been used throughout the country and has not been an issue. As far as the limestone, the white band that is around perimeter of the gateway opening the lower section of that is also made out of DEFS and has a limestone finish with a lotusan coating on it. The coating is a breathable finish so it is very easy for them to maintain. The columns and eyebrow are their current design elements which are aluminum clad fins and snap covers to the existing steel columns as well as base covers. The steel eyebrow is epoxy-coated paint.

Mr. Evans said when he went out to the building he realized he forgot to subtract the extra 72 feet for the topping section that they removed. So they are at about 687 square feet of new EFIS material. The brick that is on the stair step is not coming off they are

just applying the new panels directly adhere over the face. The only removal of masonry would be to the two bottom corners and the two top corners in each of the gateway elements. He asked if the Commission had any questions.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if he brought any of the material with him.

Mr. Evans stated he did forget the material but he is willing to send it.

Chairman Spinelli said that would be good because the Village Board will want to see it. He then asked in regards to the DEFS material what type of warranty is on the product and what is it.

Mr. Evans stated it is an EFIS backer with a 3/8 inch cement board face and the lotusan coating and limestone finish go on top of that to create a nice smooth finish. The manufacture has their standard manufacturing warranty on it. As far as if damage happens to it, Kohl's own this facility. It will get repaired within days and not weeks or months.

Commissioner Maher asked if he could show him where the panel was just going to be put over.

Mr. Evans showed him on the overhead where that will go. He stated there is a mechanical fastener that is temporary until the adhesive sets up. It is a water drain EFIS that goes over the top.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if we allow this.

Mrs. Jones said they do allow it on commercial buildings. She said minor changes to exterior materials on a PUD would make the process a minor amendment. This however, is a pretty significant amount of materials changing. This PUD was specific with requiring limestone and brick with their design elements so that is why it is going through this process.

Mr. Evans stated after going out there today, he noticed that Office Max and Home Goods had a significant amount of EFIS on their façade. They are maintaining the limestone rock-faced element that is throughout the shopping center. The only thing they have done is on the decorative pylaster elements they have painted the lower portion in the perimeter to match the Kohl's standardize colors, but the actual construction remains the same.

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

Commissioner Messer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sullivan to close the public hearing for Case 14-05. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any further discussion.

Commissioner Maher asked if staff could elaborate on the requirement for limestone in the existing PUD.

Mrs. Glas said there was paragraph included in the elevation that read: Building elevations shall be amended to incorporate limestone like columns on the western section of the center, elevations should include the specific materials and design features to be incorporated on the centers façade including rough limestone features, stepped back entryway, an elliptical canopy, and horizontal bands of limestone or limestone like material, and a spring arch supported by columns at either side of the Kohl's entryway.

Chairman Spinelli stated she mentioned that limestone must be in the western section of the center. He asked would that be Target's building.

Mrs. Glas said the ordinance refers to the Target center as the entire center.

Chairman Spinelli stated then that comment was for the western portion of the center. He said that would be for Target.

Mrs. Glas said the entryway for Kohl's is specific with the spring arch supported by columns and three entryways that will include limestone pierced through the stepped back entry for the largest of the three smaller users, which is Kohl's.

Commissioner Messer asked what the date of the original PUD was.

Mrs. Glas stated it was 1999.

Commissioner Sanderson said when he goes to Kohl's he does not get a limestone feel from the columns. He said he is okay with the way they have it proposed. He stated he is glad that Kohl's is reinvesting in their town and what they are proposing looks current and nice.

Commissioner Sullivan asked if the material between the two entrances was going to change. He said it looks like a planter box under the sign.

Mr. Evans stated it is brick right now and that is not proposed to change.

Chairman Spinelli said they are varying from the original PUD, however if Kohl's is wanting to invest in this store then they apparently want to stay here. As far as the project as a whole it is not a lot of money, but it is still money they are spending to upgrade their entrance. He stated he does not feel that it is a large change that would negatively impact the original PUD. He then called for a recommendation to the Mayor and Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Sullivan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sanderson to recommend to the Mayor and Village Board approval of the PUD amendment to allow for exterior façade improvements to the Kohl's Store. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: McGleam, Kwasneski, Sanderson, Maher, Messer, Sullivan, Spinelli

Nays: None

Motion passed

Commissioner Maher made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 14-03 as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. FINAL PLAT/PLAN Approval for the Kettering subdivision and discussion on the residential design proposal

Mrs. Jones said some brief history on the project is that the property was originally known as Leona Farm. The planned subdivision was known as Glen Oak Estates and Montalbano was the developer. Mr. Perino ended up acquiring the property and found that there were some errors in the survey and the engineering needed to be redone for the property. So he took that opportunity to create a new site plan that was vastly improved upon from the old Glen Oak Estates plan. In December of 2012 the Village board approved the amended annexation and Preliminary PUD for the development, now known as Kettering.

Mrs. Jones stated M/I Homes have submitted an application for Final PUD approval, as the contract purchaser of the property. They are proposing no changes to the site plan. She said what they are looking at this evening is to review the Final Plans to ensure consistency with the Preliminary approved plans, so things like final landscaping, engineering, stormwater management. Review the residential design proposal as presented and review sign plan as presented. There were no sign plan or residential guidelines that were included as part of the preliminary.

Mrs. Jones said in regards to the site plan and phasing, they are not proposing any changes to the site plan. They did propose a certain phasing arrangement which differs slightly from the terms of the annexation agreement but staff feels they are equally

acceptable. In regards to engineering, the Village Engineer has been working with the project engineer for some time now. They have applied for site development permit just so they can start that engineering review process and they have been in that process for months. The Village Engineer is confident and satisfied with the engineering plans that have been submitted thus far for the Final PUD approval. The Village Engineer has sent some minor changes to the actual plat of annexation itself which has to do with certificates and such. She stated those changes will be made prior to approval of the Village Board.

Mrs. Jones stated in regards to stormwater management and native plantings, this PUD is a little different from others regarding the detention facility. The detentions for Kettering are proposed to be naturalized so they are planted with native landscape materials. Those materials will help filter out contaminants to improve water quality in stormwater detention basin. She said this is not the way they have done things in the past. There were detailed provisions in the annexation agreement with regards to the naturalized landscaping in those detention basins. The applicant in their initial proposal submitted something that differed substantial with what had been discussed previously with the Village's consultant. Apparently there was some communication after annexation agreement was approved regarding the particular naturalized plantings. That information was not forwarded to the applicant and their consultant. She stated staff feels confident that it will get worked out prior to Village Board approval. Staff has not yet reviewed the proposed street names to ensure there are no conflicts with any existing streets in Lemont or Homer Glen.

Mrs. Jones said the Fire Marshal did note a concern with some of the phasing. When you look at the proposed phasing for Unit 3, Anne Circle would be half done. They would ask that all of Anne Circle be completed during the Unit 3 construction to accommodate and facilitate emergency vehicle access.

Mrs. Jones stated in regards to landscaping and tree preservation, this site includes a large area of preserved trees. The Village Arborist had made some recommendations on how to identify those trees that are near the line between the lot that encompasses all of the woodland preserve area and the lots that are being built upon. She said this is something to take into consideration if site development precedes, otherwise just a note at this time. The Arborist also noted for the areas that are going to be maintained by the HOA, there should be a maintenance plan submitted. There were also a few notes about some parkway trees that are not allowed in the UDO. Staff feels these are not large issues and if the applicant feels differently he can speak in regards to them.

Mrs. Jones said moving on to the residential home design. The annexation agreement and Preliminary PUD did not include residential design guidelines. Staff had spoken with the applicant and discussed the normal process for reviewing anti-monotony. In order to stream line the process, M/I Homes is very eager and capable of executing this development in a quick timeframe. Staff and the applicant has worked to come up with some residential guidelines that would be included as part of the Final PUD that will expedite the building permit. The first design variety is anti-monotony. The applicant

had proposed certain guidelines and after staff reviewed those a recommendation was made. The applicant was amendable to really relying on the models that they have submitted as how staff would review for anti-monotony rather than looking at certain design elements. She stated what staff has proposed is the follows:

- A model cannot be located immediately next to the same model
- If a model is located within two lots or across the street from the same model, it must be a different elevation option of that model and must have a different color package.
- No one model can account for 40% or more of the homes on the small lots (28 lots max.); 35% or more of the medium lots (26 lots max.); or 25% or more of the large lots (23 lots max.).
- Some of the large lots may be sold to other builders. For any homes constructed within the development that are not a model contained within the Final PUD plans, the Village's anti-monotony provisions of the Unified Development Ordinance shall be used in that home's permit review. Additionally, if any of the models included in the Final PUD plans are to be built on a lot that is within two lots or across the street from a home that is not a model contained within the Final PUD plans, the Village's anti-monotony provisions of the Unified Development Ordinance shall be used in that model's permit review.

She said staff and the applicant are in agreement on this matter.

Mrs. Jones stated in regards to materials the applicant has brought with him samples for the Commission to see. The horizontal siding would be a wood composite or cement fiber board. A shake siding is proposed rather than vinyl and the applicant intends to use aluminum soffit and fascia. Staff is not proposing for the small or medium size lots that there be any minimum of brick or stone on the elevations. However, for the large lots staff recommended for first floor brick on all elevations of at least half the lots. She said the applicant stated they would be amendable to 33% of all the lots having a minimum of first floor brick for the large lots. Staff would be comfortable with that since the applicant is giving on some of the other concessions.

The next issue is what Mrs. Jones called 360 degree architecture. The models that they saw where there was a lot of care put into the design of the front elevations, staff felt those elements were not carried through to the side and rear elevations. In order to ensure good quality design, staff feels some of those elements should be carried around the entirety of the home. Mrs. Jones said staff had some initial comments which they provided back to the applicant and they had responded. There is a table on page 5 of staff's report. She stated they did make some concessions in the first go around. She spoke with the applicant today and the applicant has agreed to incorporate some design elements on the side and rear of the home when they are present on the front of the home. She stated she will let the applicant elaborate on that more. What they had already agreed to, which is reflected in the staff report, is providing an additional boarder around all of the windows and providing a decorative vent with trim on the side elevations. Mrs. Jones said what they discussed today was rather than doing a decorative vent on each of the side elevations was to include some of the things that are on the front elevations. If the front elevation included shake siding and there is an

opportunity to continue it on the side or gable then they would.

Mrs. Jones said then they have the issue of what they refer to as high visibility lots. High visibility lots are those along Parker, corner lots and any lot that has their rear on the park site (which is the east/west linear green space). The applicant suggested that the high visibility lot should be only those with a rear lot line facing 131st or Parker Road. She stated she is amendable to that change of definition if the sides and rear elevations of all of the homes are brought up to a higher level than what they were in the initial proposal. If the applicant does include elements from the front façade on the side and rear trim boards then she would be amendable to having the high visibility lots be just those that front 131st and Parker. In the Commissions packet there are revised enhanced side and rear elevations which include the enhanced entryways with either stone or brick. Staff feels this is an appropriate kind of improvement to make to a high visibility lot. What she does not want to see is every lot along 131st and Parker with the same improvement. The applicant is amendable to include other options such as a morning room, so you would have more of a variety on those lots.

Mrs. Jones stated the last issue relates to streetscape and garages. Many of the models have front porches with the garages either inline or recessed a little. The ones that do protrude do so by no more than 10 feet which are all good things. The applicant has also indicated that all of their garage doors would have windows and optional hardware. The only issue staff has is with the number of three car garages on the medium lots. The applicant is not proposing any three car garages for the smaller lots. The medium lots are 75 feet wide, all being front load garages, and with a three car garage it would occupy 40% of the front yard. Therefore, staff feels the three car garages on the medium lots should be limited. Staff is proposing 15% of the medium size lots. Again depending on the additional elements that the applicant is willing to provide on the side and rear elevations to improve the 360 degree architecture of the homes staff might be willing to negotiate that higher. For the large lots staff is recommending a minimum of 33% of the lots should be side load. The orientation of the side load should be varied along the street so that all side loads do not face the same direction.

Mrs. Jones said some of the minor issues staff has been working with the applicant and they have been very agreeable in making some minor revisions to some of the models. She stated she will not go through them in detail but if the Commission wants she can talk about them in more detail. The other new element is the Sign Plan which is more of a vertical column sign. Staff sees no issue with the sign itself, but it will need some proposed landscaping around the base of the sign. She said it will need to be reviewed for compliance with the vision triangle setback requirements.

Mrs. Jones stated this development is like night and day from where it began. Staff feels it will be a great asset to Lemont as a new neighborhood of choice for people. With some of the revisions and conditions noted by staff, the residential design can compliment the excellent site design. The applicant is present and can answer any questions.

Chairman Spinelli asked if staff had a copy of the Preliminary Plat. He said he has seen many versions of the subdivision but he does not remember seeing this final version.

Mrs. Jones stated this conceptual neighborhood plan is what was included in the annexation agreement and Preliminary PUD approval.

Commissioner Maher said this is not what was seen when it came before the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mrs. Jones apologized and stated that her predecessor was handling this development.

Chairman Spinelli said that he and Commissioner Maher were on the Planning Board the second time it had come through. He stated both of them do not recall that configuration being the final configuration. He said he does like the configuration on the south end but the plat they had reviewed and voted on had many more lots on that south property line.

Mrs. Jones stated she does know that it went through revisions after the Planning and Zoning Board. It was April of 2011 when Mr. Perino applied, then before the Planning and Zoning in May or June, before it was finally approved in December of 2012.

Chairman Spinelli said if he remembers correctly, when it came before the Planning and Zoning Board they had given it a negative recommendation.

Mrs. Jones stated that does sound correct. She said some of the revisions were guided by stormwater management.

Commissioner Maher asked if there was a park.

Mrs. Jones said there is space for a park. It is the green space that runs east and west and it will be dedicated to the Park District.

Commissioner Maher asked if the area would be just field grass or a park and who will be seeding the area.

Mrs. Jones stated when she is talking about naturalized areas she is referring to the detention basins. The open space will be deeded to the Park District and would be seeded with grass for them.

Commissioner Maher said he wanted clarification because he feels field grass is not really grass for a park. He stated the other areas like the neighborhood commons area are marked as formalized open space which would be turf grass.

Mrs. Jones said she would have to check the specifics of the landscape plan unless the applicant can answer that question specifically.

Commissioner Messer said he sees that most of the side yard setback are at five feet.

Mrs. Jones stated on the smaller lots there is a six foot minimum side yard setback, on the medium lot it is seven and half foot setback. However, they are not maxing out their setbacks. The applicant is proposing 40 foot models on the 65 foot wide lots.

Commissioner Messer said there was expressed concern about wrapping around the architectural design. He asked if the houses are so close together what the concern is if nobody can see it.

Mrs. Jones stated the neighbor sees it.

Commissioner Messer said he would like to see more examples with a color scheme. The examples provided only show the front of the house in color.

Commissioner Sullivan asked what the density will be.

Mrs. Jones stated 1.92 dwelling units an acre. It is 131 acres and there will be 241 units. She said this is a true conservation design subdivision. Instead of having larger lots and no common green space, you will have smaller lots clustered together with larger green space.

Commissioner Sullivan said you have smaller lots with larger homes.

Mrs. Jones stated some of the homes are comparable to the homes being built in the Glens of Connemara, but some are definitely smaller.

Chairman Spinelli asked what the original density was.

Mrs. Jones said she is not really sure but does know that it did decrease with this site plan. She stated with the Glen Oaks proposal it was at 251 units and this one is at 241 units.

Commissioner McGleam stated he feels this is a good example of conservation design.

Mrs. Jones said she agrees and is excited to see this development happen in Lemont.

Commissioner McGleam said she had mentioned that the Village has their own design guidelines.

Mrs. Jones stated they have minimal design guidelines. What they do have is anti-monotony standards which are cumbersome during the permit review process. In order to expedite their review process, staff recommended to the applicant to develop anti-monotony standards based on the models that they are proposing. In regard to actual residential design guidelines it is limited. It has been customary in the Village that when they have a development this size and it is a PUD there are design guidelines.

Typically they are in the form of required brick or stone that has been incorporated into the annexation agreement or PUD approval. For this case, it was not discussed at the preliminary stage but instead is being discussed now at the Final.

Commissioner Maher asked what percentage of subdivisions that were approved in the last five to six years didn't have brick on three sides of the house.

Mrs. Jones said Krystyna Crossing is 50% brick required and Glens of Connemara is first floor all brick. She stated they are requesting on the larger lots, which are like the R-4 lots, that 33% of the homes would have first floor brick around the home. The small and medium size lots there would not be a minimum brick or stone wrap.

Commissioner Maher asked that staff is willing to work with that.

Mrs. Jones stated she was as long as they are willing to incorporate the front façade elements on the sides and rear of the small and medium size lots. This may not be masonry, but instead colored siding or a piece of trim board that differentiates the first and second floor of the home. She said she personally does not have an issue with a home that is all siding or that has limited brick accent. If they are looking to add variety to their housing stock or diversity of price points then having some of that isn't a bad thing. On the other hand brick and stone are a large part of the community character. Therefore she felt it was reasonable to ask for a brick component on some of the larger lots.

Chairman Spinelli said there are a few municipalities that do not require brick at all and they allow vinyl siding. He stated watching those homes go up over the past 19 years, they are using fiber board behind it and they have minimal structure strength to the siding. The homes have a lot of issues with cold in the winter and heat in the summer. He said he has an issue with going cheap.

Mrs. Jones stated this applicant is not proposing to use vinyl siding with the exception of where they have shake siding in some of the gables. They are proposing to use hardy board or smart side which is a wood composite.

Chairman Spinelli said the Village went to great strides improving building quality and with requiring brick on the first floor. This was one of the many issues with this development when it first came before the Board. He stated he feels that now they are taking a step back.

Commissioner Sanderson stated the whole Country took a step back since 2007. He said there is a reason why this land has sat since 2007 and that is why we are looking at new models. He said he sees some similarities with the houses at Krystyna Crossing and some new urban design with these models. The hardy siding is not a cheap material. He stated he would like to see more stone but you are talking about 240 houses. It was stated by the Mayor that times have changed and the sizes of houses have changed. There has been talk about trying to appeal to younger families that are

trying to buy their first homes.

Mrs. Jones said as she was looking at the proposed models and she was trying to have a more of a holistic approach. She stated she was looking at all four sides of the home and ensuring that it had a cohesive look to it. She said this fits in with aesthetics so in some way it is the eye of the beholder. If you have a full brick and stone front façade and then siding all around that shares no relationship to the front façade, it can seem a little off. In her opinion, if you were able to use a little less brick or stone and continue some of the front façade elements all around it would look better.

Commissioner Sanderson stated he agreed and you do see a lot of the craftsman style around right now, which is not an all brick house.

Commissioner McGleam said his opinion is that the large lots should all be first floor masonry. He stated the compromise should be on the medium size lots. He said he does not understand why the builder could not do masonry on the entire first floor and sell those houses. He stated this is a great conservation design and he can't see only 10% of the houses with only brick.

Commissioner Messer stated he feels there is a confidence level in the homebuyer knowing that the house is made of brick that the maintenance is manageable. If you look at the homes in Chestnut Crossing they still look new. He said he is very happy with the design of the subdivision, but is concerned about the longevity of the subdivision.

Commissioner Sanderson said you are striking a balance by getting a lot of green space. A lot of these other developments it is just all houses and no open space. He stated they are not here to talk about finances but you are trying to balance those two out. He said we can tell him we want it all and we might get nothing then.

Commissioner Messer stated staff did state that the developer might sell some of the lots.

Mrs. Jones said the UDO is not tougher when it comes to materials. It does not require a minimum for brick. Vinyl siding does have to be limited to 30% and no EFIS. The minimum brick has also been negotiated as part of annexation or PUD's.

Commissioner Messer asked since there is a HOA is there a covenants with restrictions drafted already.

Mrs. Jones said the covenants are not part of the annexation agreement. She stated they have gotten away from that practice because it created administrative nightmares for the Village

Chairman Spinelli stated the Village will not enforce HOA ordinance.

Commissioner Sanderson said whatever restrictions they are holding the builder to should be applied to whomever he is selling the lots to. He stated he thought the UDO would be more restrictive.

Mrs. Jones stated the anti-monotony is more stringent in UDO than what they are allowing for the applicant. The applicant has indicated that they may sell a couple of large lots off to local builders in the area. All of the requirements that she is discussing in regards to the materials, garages, side loads, etc., would apply throughout the development regardless of whoever was building the home. The area where it would be different is the anti-monotony provisions whether we are using models or what is in the UDO standards. The other thing would be on the medium or small lots if they wanted to see a percentage on that because it is not addressed. The idea is that the builder will build all of his small and medium size lots.

Commissioner Sanderson said he would like to address it now rather than leave it open.

Mrs. Jones stated it could be handled by only approving the models that are seen and so if anyone wants to build any other type of model then they would have to amend the PUD.

Commissioner Maher asked how they would handle side load garages.

Mrs. Jones said they would keep a spread sheet on how many side loads have been built. It is a first come first serve basis.

Commissioner Sullivan stated the builder is able to put a lot of homes in here because of the smaller side yard setbacks. He feels that they should not lessen their standards because they are getting some open space. He said he feels the developer has not suffered at all because of the side yards. The previous case for Kohl's had a requirement for brick or stone on it. Lemont is mostly residential and if there is a standard that has been set then it should not be lowered. He stated he has seen subdivisions that have been built with the hardy board and if they are not maintained over the years then they don't look good later. There are a huge amount of homes that are facing south and west that will get beat on by the sun.

Commissioner Sanderson said the hardy board is cement and not wood. He asked if they are allowing him the LP Smartsiding.

Mrs. Jones stated it will be allowed and it is allowed under the UDO.

Commissioner Messer asked which loop was she talking about in regards to the Fire Department.

Mrs. Jones said it is the one on the south end. The issue would be if it would remain half done for a long period of time.

Chairman Spinelli stated what they are approving is the Final plat and they are not approving the phasing.

Mrs. Jones said her suggestions are to have a phasing plan as part of the Final PUD. There are two components that they are reviewing tonight. The first being the actual plat of subdivision for the first phase and the other is the Final PUD for the entire development. She feels there should be a phasing plan for the entire subdivision for the Final PUD.

Commissioner McGleam stated that Mrs. Jones had made a very good comment when she said that brick or stone don't make good architecture. Maybe a good compromise would be to increase the percentage of large lots for first floor masonry to about 60% or 70%. Then set a minimum masonry square foot standard for the rest of the other 30%.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the applicant could step up to the podium.

Matt Pagoria, Vice President of Land Acquisitions for M/I Homes, 400 E. Diehl, Naperville, thanked staff for all their hard work. He said they had started out with a long list of comments and have worked that down to about one issue. He stated they are not changing anything from what was previously approved. There is a phasing exhibit which is in staff's packet which shows the eastern half as phase one. When you look at the engineering of the sight, phase one and two, there are natural breaks in the underground utilities and the stormwater management. Mr. Pagoria stated you can physically build phase one by itself or phase two by itself. Unit three requires more of two to be done in order to accomplish it.

Mr. Pagoria said one of the good things about this plan besides the conservation design, is it gives them various product opportunities. The plan is divided into three lot sizes which have been marked as small, medium, and large. There are 7,500 square foot lots on the south half which will have a 40 foot wide product. The setbacks would be at a six foot side yard. As you move into the medium size lots, they are proposing a 50 foot wide product. If a third car garage is added it might get them to 60 foot wide product and a seven and half foot side yard. He stated when you get to the larger lots there should be no problems with the setbacks.

Mr. Pagoria stated in regards to the comment about what turf would be used, in the back of the landscape plan there is a turf exhibit. On the exhibit you can see that linear park site and it is labeled as Lemont Park District seed mix. He said they will work with the Park District to find out how they want it seeded. They will grade it, seed it and turn it over to the Park District. All of the detention ponds are naturalized and they will be having talks with the Village's consultant in regard to the seed mix. The overall idea of the naturalized pond is something they are very familiarized with from other developments. The only discussion they need to have is the actual seed mix itself.

Mr. Pagoria said as he has stated there are three different lots sizes and they would be proposing three different products. On the south side with the 7,500 square foot lots

they are looking at a 40 foot wide product. In the packet there are six different plans that would range from 1,797 square feet to a little over 3,300 square feet. There are a couple of ranch plans included in there and they do have a two car standard. For the smaller lots they would not be offering any three car garages because of the size lots. In the medium size lots there are seven plans that they are proposing with two of them being ranches. They range in size from 2,200 square feet to 3,800 square feet. The top three homes have a standard three car garage. The other homes are two car standard with a third car option. In that medium size with the seven plans that they are proposing they would also offer the larger 40 foot wide product with a three car.

Mr. Pagoria stated on the larger lots they are proposing all side load homes. They would have the four largest floor plans with side load garages. It creates additional square footage in the house. They would be at 3,100 square feet to over 4,000 square feet. They have been contemplating offering to sell some of the larger lots to local builders in the area. This might help diversify some of the product mix. He said they do not need to sell any of these lots, but thought it would be a benefit. He stated they will develop all of phase one and if they bring in another builder then they would buy a developed lot from them.

Mr. Pagoria said they are proposing LP Smartside or hardy board for their siding. They do have brick and stone on the front elevations. They are wrapping that masonry element to the side elevation a couple of feet. They are not proposing to do on the small or medium size houses any first floor brick wrap. There would be a vinyl shake on some elevations to provide an accent. All of the windows will be trimmed on all four sides that will have grids. Some of the elevations on the front would have shutters, which would be carried around to the sides and rear. He stated staff had mentioned about carrying some of the elements to the sides and rear and they have agreed to do so. Mr. Pagoria showed the Commission using the Grady example from staff's report how they would incorporate the front elevation to the side and rear of a home. He also showed the Commission the material board which had the materials they would be using.

Mr. Pagoria stated in regards to the high visibility lots, they are proposing that everything along 131st and Parker they would incorporate all the details with the windows and detailed elevation elements. However they also offered doing a rear bay extension which is a two foot extension. When they do that whatever masonry that they did on the front elevations would be done with the same on the extension. It might not have a first floor wrap, but it would have brick or masonry on the back. He said this option or one of the other options would be on all of those high visibility lots. He stated someone may choose for a sunroom or morning room for that option. Whether it is chosen by a consumer or not, one of those options would be on the home.

Mr. Pagoria said as far as the first floor wrap of brick. He stated they did agree to having 33% of the larger homes to have a first floor wrap. If they were to sell some of the lots to builders, then there is nothing to say that they would require those lots to have the first floor wrap. On the other lots they are not proposing to do a standard brick

wrap. As one of the Commissioners stated, this is kind of a balancing act of lot sizes, pricing, aesthetics, and architecture. The last thing they would want to do is make something standard that they don't believe they need to. If the comment is all of the buyers looking in this subdivision want that, then he does not have a problem building that type of home. He stated they do not have a problem working with individual buyers if they want to do something that they are not specifically proposing. If people want a first floor brick wrap then he would build that. He said he does not want it a standard for every house that they do.

Mr. Pagoria stated the one issue that they are not in agreement on is the restriction on three car garages. If you look at the subdivision as a whole, 71 of the lots, which are the smaller lots on the south end, are two car garages. All of the large lots, which are 93 lots, are going to be side loads. In the medium size lots there are seven plans they are proposing. Out of the seven there are three that have a standard three car garage. If everyone bought these homes as they are proposing them you are going to have a natural mix of two car and three car garages. They feel this is more market driven rather than architectural driven buy a community. The majority of their buyers want a three car garage. He said he hopes to proceed with the idea that they don't want to limit the medium size lots in regards to how many three car garages they can or can't have.

Trustee Stapleton asked if all the utilities would run through the rear of the lot.

Mr. Pagoria said he has not brought the plans over to NICOR or ComEd but he believes that it would be in the rear.

Trustee Stapleton asked what the price points are at this time.

Mr. Pagoria stated that the small lots would have a base price of \$300,000; medium size lots base price is in the \$400,000, the larger lots would be more than that. He said he hopes he has addressed all their questions. They feel this is a great project and they have had a great experience with building here in Lemont. He stated all of their homes are 100% energy star certified. This means they are as tight as you can get with the appliances, windows, wrap, etc. They have a third party consultant that comes in and certify each of the homes.

Chairman Spinelli said he is glad to hear that it is a third party that is certifying them.

Mr. Pagoria said you can even check with the Village Building department.

Mrs. Jones stated they Building department has had a very good experience with M/I Homes.

Commissioner McGleam asked what their response to the Fire District concern is.

Mr. Pagoria stated he would like to have a conversation with the Fire Department. He said if you look at the phasing, unit two stops right before that circle. He stated he can

build all of that, everything in unit one and two right now. To go in and complete that circle now all of a sudden drainage goes to a different area that he is not building yet. He stated maybe they can do some kind of turn around at the end.

Dan Tholotowsky, Fire Marshall for the Village of Lemont, said their concern is for emergency access and turnaround. A temporary turnaround can be put in as long as they are able to move fire trucks and ambulances through there. The other concern would be during the winter and making sure that it is plowed.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they would prefer something like a "T" at the end.

Mr. Tholotowsky stated they would prefer more of a circle as a temporary basis. The "T" is too difficult when you have a big apparatus.

Chairman Spinelli asked if it could be gravel or do they want something that is asphalt.

Mr. Tholotowsky said it should be able to support the weight of the fire apparatus and be able to be plowed in the winter. He stated he is not sure of the timing of the different phases.

Mr. Pagoria stated they will work with the Fire Department and the engineering department to come up with a temporary solve for that.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to come up and make a comment. None responded.

Chairman Spinelli said as far as the phasing plan with this unit division, why in unit two , phase one are lots 42 through 47 not included.

Mr. Pagoria stated if you look at lots 48 through 51 the rear lot storm sewer goes to outlot A, the pond along 131st. The lots 42 through 47 drains into the pond on the west property line. He said that is were the break in drainage is.

Chairman Spinelli said he is seeing outlot G detention basin connecting to a storm sewer behind lot 50.

Mr. Pagoria showed him on the plans how the drainage is connected and where they all drain off too.

Chairman Spinelli stated if they included those six lots, where they are hooked up to outlot G, it would complete unit two instead of having another unit for five lots.

Mr. Pagoria said phase two you have these five lots but it attaches into the rest of the stuff south and it gives access to phase two down the road.

Chairman Spinelli asked in regards to these naturalized detention areas, who will be taking care of those in regards to the yearly burns.

Mrs. Jones said it is stated in the annexation agreement that there is a three year period where the developer is responsible for the initial maintenance and monitoring. Then the Village will be taking over. This is the first naturalized detention basin that the Village will taking care of so they are making sure they know how to do this and have contacted a developer consultant in regards to this.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they are getting any impact fees for this forever maintenance.

Mrs. Jones said the residents that are buying in the area should know that they are buying into a more naturalized setting.

Discussion continued in regards to the naturalized detention basin and its maintenance.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they used vinyl windows.

Mr. Pagoria stated they use vinyl windows.

Chairman Spinelli stated on the subdivision platting at the south end the lots are “U” shaped. He would suggest extending the lots for lots 184, 185, 189, and 193 to the south property line. There is a similar situation on lot 228 and 227. Wherever that tight basin is on the plat, because if the Village or Park District has to maintain these basins there would be areas that they would not be able to mow if the homeowner puts up a fence. Chairman Spinelli said he understands that he would like all of the large lots to have a side load garage. His concern with requiring it for every lot is the lots are only 135 feet deep with the side load garage and the house you start to encroach in the rear yard. A house this size there might be about 20% of the people that will want to put pools in. They will have to ask the Village for a variance because they will not have enough room to put a pool in. He stated he would careful about requiring every single one of those houses to be a side load.

Mr. Pagoria said right now staff is wanting only 33% to be a side load. At this time they are showing them as being side loads, but they do not have a problem with bringing in three of their larger plans that have front load garages.

Chairman Spinelli stated he sees this problem happening in his neighborhood and the lot depth is 140. The pool goes from house to easement and they have no backyard. He said a question for staff, he noticed that the Final Plat does not have consecutive lot numbering and do they allow that. He said he is specifically looking at Anne Circle were there is lot 189 then lot 193. Another is on Anne Drive where you go from lot 164 to lot 210. A lot of taxing bodies do not allow this.

Mrs. Jones said it has not been an issue that she has dealt with before. However, she will check with the Village Engineer. Even though it may not be an issue for them it may be an issue with Cook County.

Mr. Pagoria stated the engineering plan set was numbered from 1 to 241 and when they came in instead of revising numbers they had broken it up. It is nothing for them to change the numbering if it needs to be sequential.

Commissioner McGleam said he feels they need to discuss the masonry. His opinion is there needs to be a compromise whether it is 60 or 70 percent brick then set a minimum square footage for the rest of them. He stated he likes the concept of the masonry wrapping of the patio doors in back and maybe that is a good option for the remaining 30%. In terms of the high visibility lots, he feels those have to be a high percentage of masonry. Out of the 96 large lots there may be 43 that are high visibility so that puts you in the 46% range.

Commissioner Maher stated he has an issue with setting precedence at this point by giving into the masonry. All of the PUD's that have come in were brick. By going in and making a change and compromising at this point they are starting to set standards for masonry. He said Covington Knolls, Krystyna Crossing, and Glens of Connemara are all brick. This is a guideline that they have set in their town and he has a problem with changing that.

Commissioner McGleam asked how he felt in regards to the small lots.

Commissioner Maher said the houses that we have in this town and the PUD's all have brick. He stated there is brick even on the townhouses. He said they have talked about doing different things and maybe it would be different if he could visualize them. However, they do not have any drawings showing what this would look like. There are other subdivisions that have small lots that will have small homes coming in. He asked is this the precedence they want to set.

Commissioner Sanderson stated you can say that the PUD's of the past there was a requirement for brick. However, in the UDO they don't even require brick on the first floor so he finds it hard to say the standard is brick. He said he does not feel that they are setting precedence.

Commissioner Maher said if you have so many PUD's come through over the past so many years where 50% of the façade is brick on the home and then they go in and change that then that is setting precedence. He stated he understands the changes they are talking about on the homes but he does not have a visual. When he looks through the drawings he is only seeing siding on the side. He likes the homes that have brick on the side.

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

Commissioner Sullivan asked if it was mentioned that most of their buyers that they have experienced recently want three car garages. He asked if he has seen a trend where buyers prefer homes with or without brick. Or is their desire to have less brick based on a cost standpoint.

Mr. Pagoria stated the brick component is geographic. He can go build a house in Downers Grove or Hinsdale and not have one piece of brick or stone. If you go anywhere south of I55 it seems like they require you to have a first floor brick. It is not the buyer and he has never had a buyer ask him for first floor brick wrap. A lot of buyers depending on the price point will want a vinyl house. When talking about maintenance there is no maintenance with a vinyl house, but he is not asking for vinyl.

Commissioner Sullivan said but you can offer a vinyl house for less than a brick house.

Mr. Pagoria stated yes that is true.

Commissioner Sullivan said you can offer more square footage for that vinyl house.

Mr. Pagoria stated yes, but he can also take that same square footage house and go into Downers Grove and sell it for ten times more than if building in Joliet. A lot of this is a geographic conversation. He said he knows a person will buy a single family home here without a brick first floor wrap. If they buyer comes in and wants a first floor brick wrap he will build it for them. He stated buy requiring the first floor brick wrap they are inflating the price of that home. He said the developer is not going to absorb the cost of the brick. It was his understanding when talking to everyone about this community was that Lemont was interested in offering something different then what was done in the past. By not requiring first floor brick wraps he is able to offer single-family homes in Lemont in the \$300,000's. This does not mean they are cheap, because they are not.

Commissioner Sullivan said the Village has given him something that they have not done in the past and that was offering these tight side yards.

Mr. Pagoria stated they are not tight side yards. In his eyes this is a package where you have the design of the land plan, the open space, and the different architectural design. There might be a couple of different builders which will give more diversity and you also have a spread in your price points, which is not currently offered in Lemont.

Commissioner Kwasneski said if they require first floor wrap then they will be pricing out the younger families.

Mr. Pagoria stated by requiring first floor brick wrap they are mandating that the price of the home will be increased. He said they have been adding things since they got here and he feels the plan has been done in a positive manner. The product is better than what it was before. By adding a first floor wrap will not make this a better community. He came into this knowing that this would not be required and when this

was originally approved the brick was not something that was attached to it. He stated he is interested in building in this community, however if this is going to be a requirement then they might not be interested.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the PUD that was approved did require brick.

Mrs. Jones said no. There is no material specification at all in the annexation agreement or the Preliminary PUD approval. It was just the land plan that was approved and there was nothing about the residential design.

Commissioner Sanderson stated if they wanted to restrict anything they could have done it at that time.

Mrs. Jones said yes. Whether it was done intentional or not she is unsure. She is assuming that they figured the residential design would be addressed at the Final stage. She stated she knows that anti-monotony is a concern in the neighborhood. So she would recommend staying away from stating that all of the front of the homes need to be brick or stone. There is a nice variety where some have a three foot brick wall or some have brick first floor and not second floor. There is a nice variety to add to the streetscape. If you require all of them to be 100% brick elevation you are already reducing that variety. If there are particular elevations that was specifically presented where they did not feel there was enough brick for that front elevation, she would prefer they call that out.

Commissioner Messer stated he wanted to commend them on putting this together. He said it is difficult for him to visualize what is going on the side of the homes. He stated it would be easier for them to see if they had colored pictures of what they are trying to do.

Mr. Pagoria said the reason why they do not have that was because of time. They had a very finite window of getting this project started and under construction. He presented as much as he could in the time he was allowed to have. To visualize if you drive by Krystyna Crossing on 127th Street and close your eyes to the first floor wrap, the top of the home has hardy siding. The window on the back would be wrapped in a different color than the siding. He explained to the Commission using the material boards how something would be done differently with the architectural design. He stated he would be happy to colorize the pictures for staff so they could see, but he hopes that it will not hold the Commission up to vote on this tonight.

Commissioner McGleam asked if they were going to have any lighting for the signage.

Mr. Pagoria stated there is no lighting for the signage.

Commissioner McGleam said he would recommend having lighting on the signage.

Commissioner Maher asked if there was any consideration in regards to adding parking for the area that is designated for the Park District.

Mr. Pagoria stated if you look at the size it is not a place where you would have facilities. It is going to be an open space common share area. He said you will not be able to have ball parks or soccer fields there and there is no room to put in a parking lot. The parking on the street will be sufficient.

Commissioner McGleam asked if they were going to have a playground area there.

Mrs. Jones said her conversations with Ms. Egofske, who is the Executive Director for the Park District, is that eventually they vision a play ground there with walking paths. They did express some concerns with parking because they envision residents from Homer Glen to the south possibly using the walking trails.

Mr. Pagoria stated in order to provide parking you would have to eliminate lots.

Commissioner Sullivan asked where all the rain water goes that ends up in the naturalized detention area. He said he was concerned about the large open space in the middle.

Chairman Spinelli said the eastern third would go to the southeast corner of the development.

Mr. Pagoria stated there is rear yard storm sewer around all of those lots.

Commissioner Messer said they have talked about connectivity with multiple subdivisions specifically with walking paths. He asked if this subdivision was going to have any of that connectivity.

Mrs. Jones stated in the requirements for the development it does include construction for a future bike path along the west side of Parker Road.

Chairman Spinelli said is this in lieu of them putting in a sidewalk along Parker. He stated a development like this would the Village not require a sidewalk being putting in along Parker.

Mrs. Jones stated it was written in the original annexation agreement. She thinks the idea is it might be awhile before Homer Glen develops to the south. The idea would be to construct it when it develops so it connects.

Chairman Spinelli said we had this issue earlier this evening and the Village normally requires it.

Mr. Pagoria stated he did not have the annexation agreement with him, but he believes that there is funding set aside for that path.

Trustee Stapleton said M/I Homes has 21 subdivisions being built currently in the Chicagoland area. He asked which of the subdivisions would they go to for comparison for what is being built in Lemont.

Mr. Pagoria stated the closest one would be at 91st and Clarendon Road. He said it is in unincorporated DuPage County and it is a small subdivision with 22 lots that has just started construction. They have eight lots in Willow Springs which is a custom development where they sold one house already and another is at foundation stage. They have two models in Joliet which are a different spec level but it will give you an idea of what the house looks like as well as the interior.

Mrs. Jones said she went and saw the models out in Oswego. The materials are not the same but if you wanted to get a feel of what the homes would look like in regards to massing or the interior. She does have photos of all the models.

Chairman Spinelli asked if Mrs. Jones had a copy of staff's recommendations.

Mrs. Jones stated there is not a list in the staff report. The applicant has agreed to certain things since writing the staff report. The outstanding issues would be brick or stone on side and rear elevations, or if they want more on the front elevations then what is shown and the three car garage issue.

Mr. Pagoria said there is no recommendation for first floor brick as far as staff and he is concerned, they are on the same page.

Mrs. Jones stated for the large lots staff was recommending that 33% must have full wrap on the first floor, but that is contingent on that 360 architect.

Commissioner McGleam asked if she could go over the recommendation for two and three car garage.

Mrs. Jones said for the small lots there are no three car garage proposed, the large lots there is no need to be a maximum, for the medium size lots staff recommends to limit it to 15% so 11 lots. That was not including any of the other concessions that the applicant made.

Commissioner Sanderson asked the applicant what he wanted on the medium size lots with the garages.

Mr. Pagoria stated he wanted to sell whatever he can. He said he does not believe it will all be three car garages but he does not want any restriction.

Chairman Spinelli asked if there were any more questions for the applicant. None responded.

Commissioner Maher said he wants it noted that this plan is not the plan that they had seen the last time.

Commissioner McGleam stated he would like to go through staff's recommendations to see where they are in agreement. He asked if everyone was in agreement with the three car garages for the medium size lots.

Chairman Spinelli said he feels the market should dictate that.

Mrs. Jones stated it is the three car garage she has an issue with but rather the particular arrangement of three car garages the models include. They only include a front load three car garage which is somewhat recessed or in-line with the home. If you have 90% medium size lots with three car garages then the garage becomes more dominant on these lots that are smaller than the typical lot.

Chairman Spinelli said they are only five feet narrower than his subdivision. He does not have an issue with the three car garage.

All Commissioners agreed.

Commissioner McGleam stated the next would be the 360 architect features.

All the Commissioners agreed it should have those features.

Commissioner McGleam said the masonry is remaining and staff is recommending 33% of the large lots have full wrap first floor masonry.

Commissioner Messer stated the best predictor of the future is the past. We live in a town that has a long past. He said if they drove around town through the historic district there would be a consensus that the brick homes look better, they are better maintained and have a good longevity to them. What the Commission and Village Board are voting on is something that goes way beyond ten years. He said they are voting on something that will impact the Village for a 100 years or more. This is a stellar plan and if they can do just a little bit more to influence what that will look like in a 100 years from now would be well worth it.

Mrs. Jones said 33% would be 31 lots and 50% would be 47 lots.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if the other Commissioners felt that they were only talking about the large lots having the first floor brick wrap.

Commissioner Maher stated he would want it around all the lots which would be consistent to all the PUD's that they have issued.

Chairman Spinelli said he doesn't understand why they can't say 50% for all the lots. He stated you can't base this on price points. Staff would like to see features on the

rear of the houses. A possible concession on the brick wrap would be these additional features that staff is looking for. If he was going to concede less than 100% of the lots having full wrap, he would have to go with 50% to 60%. If 50% of the lots are his large lots then it could be on all the large lots. He stated he is torn because he agrees with Commissioner Maher but also with staff in regards to these additional features.

Commissioner Kwasneski stated the large lots are 38% of the entire subdivision.

Mrs. Jones said one of the things that she talked about with the developer in regards to the 360 architecture was there is another point in between a whole first floor brick and no brick. She stated that would be wainscoting or a knee wall.

Commissioner Messer stated it does not have to be all brick there is also stone.

Chairman Spinelli said he would like to keep it simple for staff to be able to check it.

Commissioner Maher stated the medium size homes are not medium size homes. They are consistent to what is being built in Lemont. There are surrounding towns locally where 10,000 square feet is the standard for their lots. He said we can't get hung up on the small, medium and large. The medium size homes are still large homes.

Commissioner Sanderson said he understands the point they are making in regards to the history. This is a different development and the architecture is different. He asked why they are just requiring the brick on the bottom half. If there is concern about maintenance why wouldn't you do the whole thing in brick then? He stated he feels the hardy board is a newer style and the question it comes down to is are they trying to lower the set point on the development.

Discussion continued in regards to price points.

Chairman Spinelli stated everyone has their opinion on the brick and he feels they need to move forward.

Commissioner McGleam said if the Village made a decision to allow a 7,500 square foot lot instead of 12,500, there was the intention that there would be a house on it that did not match the homes on the 12,500 square foot lot. He stated these previous PUD's were approved but were they approved for the larger lots. There is a relationship there with the size of the lots and the materials that are used on the house.

Commissioner Maher stated it is enforced on townhomes also.

Commissioner Sanderson asked they are enforcing brick but for what reason.

Commissioner Messer said it is for the longevity of the home and for the general neighborhood lifespan.

Commissioner Sanderson stated Smartsiding carries a 50 year warranty.

Commissioner Messer said he is talking about 100 years.

Chairman Spinelli stated we are not going to change opinions and called for a motion for recommendation to the Mayor and Village Board.

Commissioner Kwasneski made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sanderson to recommend to the Mayor and Village Board approval of the Final Plat/Plan for Kettering subdivision with the following conditions:

1. A turnaround needs to be put in on Anne Circle so Fire and Ambulance Equipment will be able to turnaround during construction.
2. Signage for subdivision must be lit.
3. Requiring 33% of large lots to have first floor brick wrap.
4. There will be no restriction on the three car garages for the medium lots.

A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: McGleam, Kwasneski, Sanderson, Messer, Sullivan

Nays: Maher, Spinelli

Motion passed

Commissioner Messer made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sanderson to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact if required for the Final Plat/Plan for Kettering subdivision as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Mrs. Glas said there will be a specially called meeting for June 4, 2014 to cover the Comprehensive Plan.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Spinelli called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

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

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Minutes were prepared by Peggy Halper

