

Village of Lemont
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting of September 18, 2013

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, September 18, 2013 in the second floor Board Room of the Village Hall, 418 Main Street, Lemont, Illinois.

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Spinelli called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m. He then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Verify Quorum

Upon roll call the following were:

Present: Kwasneski, McGleam, Messer, Sanderson, Spinelli

Absent: Maher and Sullivan

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

C. Approval of Minutes: August 21, 2013 Meeting

Commissioner Sanderson made a motion, seconded by Commissioner McGleam to approve the minutes from the August 21, 2013 meeting with no changes. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

II. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Chairman Spinelli thanked Commissioner Sanderson for filling in for him at last month's meeting.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Lemont 2030 – Transportation and Mobility Element

Mrs. Jones said she will just touch on the highlights of the major recommendations, and then she will go over the individual action steps. She presented on the overhead a map from IDOT of the functional classifications of the roadways in and around Lemont.

Commissioner Spinelli asked if they were all of IDOT's roads.

Mrs. Jones stated they classify all the roads as principle, arterial, minor arterial, collector or local whether they are their jurisdiction or not.

Mrs. Jones said the Mobility Element starts with the vision and the guiding principles which remain unchanged from last month. Then there is an introduction that talks about some of the existing conditions. She stated it includes a description of the functional classification of the roadways and where our roads fall in that classification. She said then it talks about some of the characteristics of the transportation network here in town.

Mrs. Jones stated there are five (5) major recommendations with the first being the implementation of the Lemont Active Transportation Plan (ATP). She said there are specific action steps that talk about how they are going to go about implementing that plan. She stated the Element does not get into reiterating a lot of the content of the ATP but talks more about implementing the recommendations of that Plan.

Mrs. Jones said the second recommendation is provide a highly connected roadway network. She stated this relates to what they had talked about with the streets connecting and not having gated communities. Third, is ensuring context sensitive right of way design. She said they talked about functional classification of roadways, but there is nothing in there that tells you that the "feel" of McCarthy road is any different out by Bell Road than down by Illinois Street. Mrs. Jones stated looking at the context sensitive right away design takes those things into consideration. She said it may be a minor arterial all the way from where it meets Illinois Street out past Bell Road, but the design of that right of way is going to be different based on context.

Mrs. Jones stated the next recommendation is support regional transportation projects with positive local impacts. She said there are two items in here. One is the I-55 manage lane which was talked about last month, which will provide an obvious benefit to Lemont. She stated it makes Lemont's access to the City of Chicago faster, better and more reliable. Mrs. Jones stated the second item is the south suburban airport. She said in the 2002 Comprehensive Plan there were policies in support of the airport saying it would be a benefit to Lemont. She stated she wanted to bring it up to the Commission tonight to see if the feeling of a south suburban airport is going to be a positive impact knowing that the location is going to be outside of Peotone and should it still be included in the Comprehensive Plan. Mrs. Jones said she can see the effects being either way but wanted to get the Commission's thoughts.

Chairman Spinelli said being located in Peotone you would get more impact using Lewis or Midway. He stated he does not feel it is necessary for Lemont's Comprehensive Plan.

All Commissioners agreed.

Mrs. Jones stated the next recommendation is maintain the local roadway network in good repair. She said as they are looking ahead and planning new growth, they should also be maintaining what they have. She said the last recommendation is to support the Sanitary and Ship Canal as an important regional transportation corridor. Mrs. Jones stated with the Asian Carp and blocking off the Sanitary and Ship Canal, the Village's position has been to support keeping the Canal open. She said with this they would just continue with this recommendation.

Mrs. Jones said the other item she wanted to discuss with the Commission was the talk about truck traffic and the conflict between truck traffic and pedestrian traffic. She stated it is not represented as recommendation here but she is still trying to separate it. She said she is having difficulty determining the official truck routes and classification through Lemont. She stated she is still researching this and will come back to them next month.

Chairman Spinelli stated they will define a truck route but if you are within a certain distance from an interstate you can't restrict trucks from certain roadways.

Mrs. Jones said you can't restrict if you get FHWA money. She stated she is struggling with the idea of wanting to minimize or separate truck traffic with all the limitations set on them. She said she is still researching the issue though.

Chairman Spinelli stated a way a Village gets around that is by making it an inconvenience for a truck to travel a certain way. He said you can do this by slowing down speed limits or adding traffic controls.

Commissioner Maher entered the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

Mrs. Jones said she will now hit some highlights in the implementation action area. She stated there is a five year capital plan of active transportation improvements and implement the policy recommendations of the ATP. She said the implementation of "create a connection to the Centennial Trail" is an important link to a major trail but also the ATP does not specify how to connect to this trail. She stated this implementation states they need to look sooner rather than later at the options listed in the ATP and start to pursue it.

Mrs. Jones stated implementation action area two (2) is to provide a highly connective roadway network. She said one of the bigger items she is suggesting is to require new developments to meet some kind of connectivity index. She stated she has not defined exactly what that is, but to put some sort of standard in the Comprehensive Plan that would be a measure of connectivity. Mrs. Jones said it would not be in the UDO so it is not regulatory. She stated she has calculated the way this could be done. She said you would take the total number of street segments divided by the number of intersections.

Or it could be a ratio of intersections divided by intersections plus dead-ends. She stated there are various ways to do this and she needs to examine and research this. Mrs. Jones said she wanted to get the Commission's opinion as to whether they liked this concept.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if she seen this elsewhere and if so where.

Mrs. Jones stated EPA had several suggestions, but she has seen it in other Comprehensive Plans.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they were looking at pedestrian or just street.

Mrs. Jones said this was geared toward street activity.

Commissioner Messer stated under Action Area 2 it says to make connections between existing streets. He asked can staff share with the Commission what happened at the last Village Board meeting regarding First Street.

Trustee Stapleton said they had about 13 to 15 people show up at the meeting that were against it. However, the Board had received petitions signed by more people than that that wanted it open. He stated they have started construction on the street already and should be done sometime in October.

Discussion continued in regard to connectivity of streets with First Street, Fourth Street, and 129th Street being discussed.

Mrs. Jones stated this is why she wants to make sure there are several recommendations regarding connectivity in existing and new developments so as they can they can make those connections.

Mrs. Jones said next is Action Area 3 – context sensitive right of way design. She said she talks about amending the UDO to create a variety of permitted street arrangements. She stated what that means is in the UDO right now we have one street cross section. She feels the UDO is lacking in design guidance for the design of streets. Mrs. Jones said she is not stating what types they should have, but the UDO should be amended to adopt a pallet of different road types. She stated in addition to functional classification, road types should be based on characteristics including adjacent land use, types of access, number of dwelling units, etc.

Chairman Spinelli stated in regards to the cross section comment it talks about the code requires 27 feet of pavement from back of curb to back of curb. He said if you include the curbing you are only getting 24 feet of asphalt, which is not sufficient for parking on the street.

Mrs. Jones said this section of pavement also conflicts with a another section of the Code. She stated it is not clear in the Code and it needs to be addressed.

Chairman Spinelli stated most municipalities have the pavement itself as 27 feet minimum then you add curb and gutter. He said that needs to be looked at either here or a separate issue with the Code.

Mrs. Jones said as they are doing these varieties of street arrangements they should come up with design guidelines for streets with on-street parking both sides and one side and streets with no on-street parking. She stated it should be delineate in the UDO where they expect those to occur.

Mrs. Jones stated some other things in Action Area 3; seek to reduce turning radii where appropriate. She said she does not feel it is appropriate everywhere, but it is appropriate in some cases. She stated it might not be appropriate where they have truck traffic, but it might be important in pedestrian areas. Mrs. Jones said in regards to allowing for alleys, there are alleys in the older parts of town. She stated if someone came in with a design where it had alleys, there are no guidelines in the UDO as to how those should be built or fit in. She said it should be addressed just in case someone wanted to address the possibility and have standards for them.

Mrs. Jones said another implementation is amending requirements on limited access on commercial streets. She stated again the UDO's language is vague. She said it talks about limits for major streets and other streets that are commercial but not a collector. Mrs. Jones stated it never defines what major streets are, so it makes it hard to apply.

Mrs. Jones stated the next one is turning Illinois Street into a one-way street. She said this was brought up by Trustee Sniegowski when talking about Illinois Street and the escalating costs of improving it due to ADA compliance issues. She stated she is not sure if it is a good idea, but it is a good enough suggestion that it warrants an investigation. She said that is what the recommendation is, but if the Commission felt strongly that it shouldn't be in the plan then lets discuss it. Mrs. Jones stated it may allow them to accomplish some of the things for an ADA standpoint, and still provide on-street parking. She said it also may provide benefits with truck routing if it is a one-way. She stated it would also force people to go down Main Street in the downtown. Mrs. Jones said she is not sure how all those will work out and weigh against the draw backs of reducing drive-by traffic for the businesses on Illinois Street.

Chairman Spinelli asked why it needs to be part of the Comprehensive Plan. He stated can't it just be a goal for staff to evaluate.

Mrs. Jones said it does not have to be if they felt it was to project specific. She stated the Comprehensive Plan serves two purposes. It sets the goals and aspirations, but it is also their work program.

Chairman Spinelli stated even if it was in the Comprehensive Plan they would still have to go for a public opinion. He said if existing conditions don't allow for ADA

accessibility, then they can't be forced to apply. He stated if you have a road that is too steep like State Street for ADA, then they can't make you put in a bunch of ramps.

Mrs. Jones said their problem is Illinois Street isn't sloped.

Chairman Spinelli stated the existing terrain and right-of-way does not allow you to change that to make it ADA compliant.

Mrs. Jones said if he doesn't think it is appropriate for the Comprehensive Plan then it can be deleted.

Chairman Spinelli stated his initial reaction is why is that project part of the Comprehensive Plan. He said maybe it should be more of a wider picture of evaluating the downtown roadway pattern rather than Illinois Street specifically. He stated you might only need one or two sections of Illinois Street to be one-way instead of all the way from State Street to Main heading west.

Mrs. Jones said she agrees and they can revise it and make it broader. She stated the last implementation area to talk about is maintaining the local roadway network in good repair. She said they had talked about annexing in existing subdivisions. Also, requiring special service areas or other mechanisms in place to ensure roads are contained and the burden is not shifted to existing taxpayers. Mrs. Jones stated the next two are just continuing existing policies of requiring developers to mitigate their off-site impacts and bring roads up to Village current standards.

Mrs. Jones stated the last is to establish and maintain a desired level of maintenance for all local roads. She said they have adopted their first three year strategic plan for the Village. She stated as part of that there were some goals for road maintenance, so that would provide the basis for long term desired levels of maintenance. Mrs. Jones said ideally she would love to have those levels of maintenance in the Comprehensive Plan, but she feels that is not going to happen.

Chairman Spinelli stated in the minutes last month there was talk about an intersection "B" level of service. He said when traffic engineers design subdivisions and the signal coordination, the level of service is the amount of time a vehicle waits at a traffic signal. He stated if we were to require a level "B" at all intersections it would cost a ton of money. He said you would have to expand turning lanes. Chairman Spinelli stated sometimes the difference between a "B" and a "C" is 20 seconds.

Mrs. Jones said she did not bring over that recommendation.

Discussion continued on intersection level of service.

Mrs. Jones said one thing that she talks about in the Connected Street Network is a possibility to include a Conceptual Generalized Future Roadway Map. She showed the Commission on the overhead an example of what it would look like. She stated it

would include our existing roads and their functional classifications. Then it would show generalized locations of new collector and arterial roads. Mrs. Jones said the benefit to it would be to show a developer coming into the area what they are thinking. She stated by calling it generalized or conceptual does not lock them into those roads.

Chairman Spinelli stated he liked it because it shows the developer what we are already planning.

All Commissioners agreed.

Commissioner McGleam asked if the Village Engineer had a chance to look at this.

Mrs. Jones said he had an opportunity to have an input.

Trustee Stapleton asked if streetscape lighting fell under that. He said is there anything in there about where they can plant trees. He stated now that the trees are 20 years old the lights are buried in trees.

Mrs. Jones said there was something put in about pedestrian scale lighting. She stated she feels there should be some standards for that and it should be encouraged. She said they should then be retroactively put into places that the ATP designates as a pedestrian corridor. She said this would be around schools, parks or down 127th. Mrs. Jones stated there are standards in the UDO for the trees and stop signs.

Mrs. Jones stated that would conclude the section on transportation. She said she appreciates the Commission's feedback.

B. Lemont 2030 – Natural Resources and Recreation preliminary recommendations

Mrs. Glas stated she will cover the next section. She said at the last meeting she had stated the previous Comprehensive Plan was very limited in scope when it came to the Natural Resource Section. She stated it just described some of the natural features in Lemont like the bluffs and the waterways. Mrs. Glas said also it did not have a section on recreation and with this new Plan they would like to have a section that specifically focuses on recreation opportunities in the Village. She stated what was put together is preliminary and it is based on what is existing out there in terms of the Comprehensive Plan. Mrs. Glas said there was the Green Plan that was adopted so there are some features that are being transferred to this Plan. She stated there was not a lot of analysis done as of yet for this element.

Mrs. Glas said at last months meeting there was discussion in regard as to whether or not the Village wanted to become a Tree City. She stated the Commission didn't really agree with that however, they are looking into options for Urban Forestry Principles for our Village trees. She stated it would have a canopy where there is some sort of policy or maintenance for taking care of the Village stock of trees.

Mrs. Glas stated the element starts out with the vision and guiding principles. She said these were taken from the earlier public input sessions. She stated it was a draft form so if the Commission felt that there was anything missing from either section this would be a good opportunity to talk through those. Or as staff is working on the element if they think of anything to please let them know.

Ms. Glas said generally for natural resources some of the key issues were just making sure that development respects Lemont's natural key features, whether that is topography, stream courses or critical habitats. She said another comment that came from the visioning sessions were ensuring that we have safe and clean drinking water and where is our supply going to be even beyond 2030. Mrs. Glas stated another is a conservation ethic which is looking at more brown fields and air quality. She said there is an odor network in Lemont that tackles any kind of issues with air quality.

Mrs. Glas stated in the recreation section, the Village does have the Heritage Quarries Recreation Area. She said that is something that still needs a lot of development; however there is a Master Plan that has been developed by the Heritage Commission. She stated working with them and ensuring that what is being developed meets a multitude of uses. She said that is actually one of the guiding principles because there is a lot of potential there as a recreational area.

Mrs. Glas said there are guiding principles around recreational facilities that are water based and that private recreational facilities be encouraged. She stated also partnering with other agencies such as the Park District. This helps make sure that we are all on the same page with our development goals in regards to open space. Mrs. Glas said there is a principle about having development be within easy access of recreational amenities and facilities. She said this creates a nice nexus with some of the things Mrs. Jones talked about with connectivity. Mrs. Glas stated you would want bike trails to connect to green spaces. She said this will help when a developer comes in and we can connect to an existing trail.

Mrs. Glas stated another guiding principle is to maintain the current levels of open space and again look at the linkages of what they currently have. She said based on those guiding principles there are some recommendations and implementations. She asked the Commission if they had any questions or comments. Mrs. Glas stated this is just a preliminary and it still needs more analysis.

Mrs. Glas said in regards to the recreation piece there is going to be a lot of need for collaborating with other agencies like the Park District. She stated making sure that the public is involved in that process is important because you want to make sure that the public is using it.

Commissioner Messer asked if there was a liaison officer for Village of Lemont with MWRD.

Mrs. Jones stated it most likely would be the Village Administrator and the Mayor. She said in regards to the Park District, her and Mrs. Glas met with Dawn Banks from the Park District a couple of weeks ago. She stated the Park District did a public survey in regards to recreation. She said their take away from that is the community wants trail connections. Mrs. Jones stated they are going to continue to work with them to find out their long term goals. She said they are starting to work on a Master Plan.

Commissioner McGleam asked if there was an existing trail map.

Mrs. Jones said there is not, but there is a map of the I&M trail. She said the Township has a map of their walking trail.

Mrs. Glas stated again if there is anything that they missed that the Commission feels should be in here to please let her know.

Commissioner Maher asked when Mrs. Jones had mentioned having more parks in the downtown area was she referring to the area where the sports fields were going to go.

Mrs. Jones stated no. She said their discussion with the Park District was a recreation like a playground geared toward kids. She stated the families that live in the downtown are most in need of a park and least served by a park.

Commissioner Maher asked if the Park District owned any land in the downtown area.

Mrs. Jones said no and that is why they were talking about it as a goal to find a site.

Commissioner Maher asked about the water based recreation.

Mrs. Glas stated that had come from the visioning sessions that were early on in the process.

Mrs. Jones said that might have to be re-evaluated.

Commissioner Maher stated the reason why that one interested him was because it hasn't really been encouraged.

Mrs. Glas said that can be reworded and they can come back to that area.

C. Lemont 2030 – Civic Engagement and Governance element introduction

Mrs. Glas stated the last Comprehensive Plan did not have a section on civic engagement. It did have a section on community facilities in which they described existing school, park, fire, water and sewer. She said it was a catch all of what types of services the Village has to offer.

Mrs. Glas said with this element their approach is a little different. She stated they would like to focus on civic engagement as to what the Village's role is in getting people involved. She said the idea is the more the community residents are involved, the more invested they are in the community.

Mrs. Glas stated there is a vision statement and guiding principles. She said both are still a work in progress, so if there are any questions or comments please let them know. She stated from the last Comprehensive Plan the community facilities piece and the intergovernmental coordination were all over the place. Mrs. Glas said there are a couple of different sections that this is drawing from. She stated the first section will be Intergovernmental Coordination. She stated there is one recommendation which is to build a consensus vision of future public improvements, land use and development in Lemont Township between Cook County, and Village and Township governments. Mrs. Glas said this makes it sound like they will all get together and come up with a consensus vision, which will not happen. She stated this might be a goal but definitely not a recommendation. She said she is not sure if the Village would even want to do that. She had asked for feedback from the Commissioners.

Chairman Spinelli said it would be very tough to get all those agencies together.

Mrs. Glas stated there are other recommendations that speak about other intergovernmental coordination.

Commissioner Maher said he agrees it would be hard with the Township or County, but having it with the Fire District, Park District, and maybe Library are important.

Mrs. Glas stated there is a section that says solicits intergovernmental endorsement of the Comprehensive Plan and its future amendments. She said that might cover the Park District.

Commissioner Maher said he thinks it should have stated Park District because there is a lot of talk about open space, parks, trails, and active transportation. He stated the Park District would be an active participant. He said he feels it is relevant but just has the wrong municipalities or government bodies.

Mrs. Jones stated there might be some language that they can use from the Village's strategic plan that relates to intergovernmental coordination specifically with the entities that they are talking about. She said they do want to ensure that they talk about a working partnership with those other agencies, but don't advocate our role as the Village to do future induced planning. Mrs. Jones stated it would be using the correct verbiage.

Mrs. Glas said the second one is obtain official recognition of the Lemont Comprehensive Plan by County government in the form of a resolution or memorandum of agreement, or other mechanism, which effectively amends the Cook County Comprehensive Plan for Lemont Township. She stated she could not find the Cook

County Comprehensive Plan for Lemont Township and is not sure that it is even possible to ask them to amend their Plan. She said again the language can be changed.

Discussion continued in regards to what role Lemont has in the CMAP Go To 2040.

Mrs. Glas stated the third would be to file written protest to any Cook County subdivisions planned unit developments, and proposed zoning amendments found to be inconsistent with the recommendations of this plan. She said she could see this one in some form being a benefit, because there was something similar when the billboard proposal was submitted. Mrs. Glas stated it might not be only Cook County. She said it could also be Will and DuPage County or municipalities.

All Commissioners agreed.

Mrs. Glas said fourth is identify and create common goals, objectives and policies for the Village and other taxing districts on all issues of mutual concern. She stated this is generally the practice and they will keep it in the Plan. She said the fifth is to amend the Land and Cash Donation Ordinance to satisfy legal requirements and to comply. Mrs. Glas stated this was already addressed in the UDO.

Mrs. Jones stated she is not sure what the legal requirements were in this circumstance, but there is a Land and Cash Ordinance. She said she does not see it as an issue.

Mrs. Glas said the next is soliciting inter-governmental endorsement of the Comprehensive Plan and its future amendments. She stated this touches on a few of the previous comments, but this would be more of an active step that they would take. She said they would seek an endorsement rather than finding out whatever everyone is doing. Mrs. Glas asked if the Commissioners agreed with this one.

Commissioner McGleam asked what other bodies of government they would be seeking endorsement from.

Mrs. Glas stated the Township and County. She said the impact fees are generally covered in the UDO or development ordinance. She stated we would be asking them to sign off on how the Village wants Lemont to develop.

Commissioner Sanderson asked if we are wanting them to sign off or get together with them.

Mrs. Jones stated we are asking them to endorse it. She said she is all for inter-governmental cooperation, but feels this is a bit to much. She stated what do you do if they don't endorse it or want to change something.

Commissioner Sanderson asked about having them sit down and go over it.

Mrs. Glas said they are invited to the public meeting and we can make it a point to invite them. She stated she feels it would be better just discussing with them where they are going or their plan rather than asking them to endorse or sign off.

Mrs. Jones stated if the Commission felt that it was of value and it's important for staff to reach to each of the local taxing bodies, then she would rather do it during the development of the Plan then after. She said if they did have input, then staff has the opportunity to address that and incorporate it or not.

All Commissioners agreed.

Mrs. Glas said one of the guiding principles is the Village will work with other governmental entities across political jurisdiction to address issues affecting multiple jurisdictions and to achieve the vision of this plan. The Village will seek cooperation with other government bodies to address common issues and to achieve the vision of this plan. She stated the principle is there so it will just be a matter of doing the implementation of the steps.

Commissioner McGleam suggested instead of using "endorsement" to put "input".

Mrs. Glas stated the next one is to encourage all taxing districts to participate in the review of new development. She said this generally is the practice and they have a technical review committee. She stated it is also in the UDO.

Mrs. Glas said number eight is use annexation agreements to obtain negotiated fees from developers to pay for needed capital improvements. She stated they already do annexation agreements.

Mrs. Glas stated the next section draws from a section in the 2002 Comprehensive Plan that was under the title of Public Involvement. She said the first is when zoning public hearings are required, make public notice statements that are written in everyday language, not zoning jargon, explaining the actions requested and the reason public testimony is invited. She stated this is generally the practice. Mrs. Glas said they will keep it and revise it within the current framework.

Mrs. Glas said the next would be before plan approval of major public works projects, hold public information meetings for residents, property owners and business owners in the geographic areas affected. She stated she feels this is important and something they should do by utilizing the web more.

Mrs. Glas stated the third recommendation for this area is refer major project proposals to the appropriate Village commission whenever a project is within that commission's area of interest. She said she feels this should be kept and just expanded. She stated it should list the different Commissions and what their roles are.

Mrs. Glas said next would be to seek public input in the form of surveys, public information meetings, focus group meetings, and comment cards whenever specialized plans are proposed. She stated it is always important to keep the public engaged and should be kept in the Plan.

Mrs. Glas stated it moves on to another section of the old Comprehensive Plan that was labeled; Village grounds, water and sewer, School, Park, Library, Township, and Fire Protection. She said it was a catch all for all the services. Mrs. Glas stated on some of these she referred to Public Works staff to find out more details on them. She said the first three recommendations have already been done.

Mrs. Glas stated the fourth recommendation is help maintain a uniformly high level of fire protection service for residents and property owners in the planning area. She said this staff recommends to keep and they do inform the Fire Marshall every time there is a new development. She stated fifth is to expand fire protection district facilities. Mrs. Glas said this was done in 2006 with their expansion of Station 4 on Walker Road. She stated they can keep this if the Commission wanted to.

Mrs. Glas said the next one states to assist the fire protection district to respond to both long-term needs for fire prevention and protection capacity. She stated they can keep this one and eliminate the other one which would address any space issues all in one recommendation.

All Commissioners agreed.

Mrs. Glas stated the next is assisting the library in expansion to meet the needs of a growing population. She said this facility was remodeled in 2008 and they do have an east section of the property that is reserved for future expansion.

Commissioner Maher asked if they were proposing to take that one out.

Mrs. Glas said she was considering that as done. She stated they have the space for expansion so it is just a matter of whether they have the funds, which the Village does not have control over.

Commissioner Maher stated he feels it should be stated that the Village does support the growth of the Library.

Mrs. Jones said they can draft something in general that addresses all the taxing bodies that provide services stating they support their continued growth and expansion.

Mrs. Glas stated the next one is expand the Village water supply service area to include all of Lemont Township except areas already served by Illinois American. She said she reached out to public works and they suggested removing this. She stated there isn't a comprehensive water supply study to indicate that would even be supported.

Commissioner Maher said isn't the Village of Lemont part of the eminent domain of the Illinois Waterways so shouldn't there be something in there stating the Village supports that.

Mrs. Jones stated that is a good point and she will look into that.

Mrs. Glas said next is revising the 1994 report on Water Utility to make an up-to-date plan for future water supply system improvements. She stated Public Works did reply that an updated water supply study is needed. She said another is requiring public water supply to all new developments, which they will keep in there.

Chairman Spinelli stated this is a design requirement for all subdivisions. He said he is not sure if it is necessary in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mrs. Glas said the UDO was done in 2008 so it might not have been in there.

Commissioner Maher asked why it would not be available.

Chairman Spinelli said if they want to build houses on 2 acres lots and have private wells because the public water supply is 2 miles away, he does not understand why they would not let that happen. He stated the Comprehensive Plan is saying we are requiring water supply on all new developments.

Mrs. Jones stated it is a policy decision. She said do we want to allow leap frog development from the Village perimeter.

Chairman Spinelli said stating that it is required on all new developments might be too much. He stated a two lot subdivision is a new development. He said if the Health Department Regulations allow a well and the public water supply is not accessible, then he feels it should not be required.

Discussion continued on whether to require water supply to all new developments. Commissioners agreed that the element needs to be reworded.

Mrs. Glas stated next is requiring disconnection of individual wells when a connection to public water supply is made. She said Public Works stated that should be kept.

Chairman Spinelli said he does not see the purpose in this. He stated the yearly inspection fee that is required for having both would make people think twice on having it.

Mrs. Jones stated that is an interesting approach.

Chairman Spinelli stated when he was in Downers Grove he had connected to public water. He said he was going to keep his well until he saw how much of an annual fee he

would have to pay to have it inspected. He stated it is the same with the water sprinklers.

Trustee Stapleton asked if the well went bad or dried up would you then lose it.

Chairman Spinelli said yes you would and you could not drill for a new well.

Mrs. Glas stated she has seen it done more for a water conservation aspect.

Discussion continued as to whether this should be included in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mrs. Jones stated they will do some research.

Commissioner Maher stated he feels it should be left in.

Mrs. Glas said the next two elements are about the sanitary sewer service area and bringing it to all of Lemont Township. She stated there needs to be an updated sewer study done before that kind of goal is made.

Chairman Spinelli asked if the area north of the canal was part of Lemont Township.

Mrs. Jones stated no.

Chairman Spinelli said there are some areas that are not serviceable so to say all is too broad of a statement.

Mrs. Glas stated next is requiring developers to install improvements recommended by the Sanitary Sewer Plan for the geographic area of their projects. She said Public Works suggested keeping this.

Mrs. Glas continued with avoid granting "recapture" ordinances that reimburse subdividers and developers for their excess costs unless the recapture can be related to an economic development goal or objective of this plan, or to an environmental goal or objective. She said with this one she was directed to speak to the Village Administrator which she has not had time to do just yet.

Trustee Stapleton stated they have run into headaches over those.

Mrs. Jones said she has strong thoughts on recapture agreements. She stated enforcement is difficult. She said it is also a deterrent for future growth and development.

Commissioner Maher asked if she felt this statement was good or bad.

Commissioner Messer stated there is a contradiction. He said you can't have a requirement in the Sewer Plan and then say we are not going to help you. He stated so

you might have to remove that requirement. He stated it should be either the developer does it on their own time or they don't develop the property. Commissioner Messer stated the problem is with administration of the recapture fees. He said if there is not a good mechanism to recapture the fees then there shouldn't be any.

Trustee Stapleton said he feels the Village should not be the one to administrate it.

Commissioner Messer stated than a trust should handle it.

Mrs. Jones stated either way it still discourages development down the line.

Chairman Spinelli said that is why sometimes there is a cap on the recapture.

Mrs. Jones stated if they were going to allow them, then it should be only to recoup cost and not interest.

Chairman Spinelli said it should only be the upsize, no interest and have a cap on it. He stated if someone does not tie on in 10 years or whatever is determined then they are done. He stated a way you can avoid recaptures is by offering developers incentives for building permit fees to offset the upcharge.

Mrs. Jones stated she would like to see the Village get involved to help fund that improvement that will help with future development.

Discussion continued in regards to recapture fees.

Mrs. Jones said they will have to reword this.

Mrs. Glas stated continuing, avoiding lift stations, except in those areas where a comprehensive sanitary sewer report recommends their installation. She said this one they will keep.

Mrs. Glas said the next couple of them pertain to flooding, storm water, and rain fall events. She stated the way they are structuring the natural resources element and the water piece these recommendations would probably be in those sections of the Plan. However, they were not presented at the last meeting because they were under Community Facilities. She said they will go through them, but they might end up in the Natural Resource section.

Mrs. Glas stated first is eliminating all significant risk of property damage and personal injury due to flooding. She said this is more of a guiding principle and it is under the stormwater management framework. She stated there are things in the UDO that limit construction in a flood plain. Mrs. Glas said so the next three recommendations would stay but will be worked into the stormwater management recommendations.

Chairman Spinelli asked in general with the Comprehensive Plan and this comment of eliminate all significant risk of property damage due to flooding, are they opening themselves up for a potential lawsuit. He suggested not using the word “eliminate” and maybe have our Village Attorney look at the wording to make sure the Village can’t be held responsible.

Mrs. Glas said next is the Village shall accept ownership and maintenance of detention basins in single-family residential subdivisions, subject to compliance with the Standard Specifications. She stated Public Works had commented only where homeowner’s associations do not exist. She said in developments that have HOA’s it would be their responsibility to maintain.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they can require them to make an HOA. He said if a development comes in that does not have a HOA and they convince whoever to have a wet detention basin, he feels the Village should not take ownership on that and instead require a HOA.

Mrs. Jones asked naturalized detention or wet.

Chairman Spinelli stated a pond, which the Village discourages. He said the Village should not take responsibility of a wet basin only because the developer does not want a HOA. He stated it would encourage the developer to find a way to put in a dry detention basin.

Mrs. Jones said that is fine and feels Public Works would agree with it. She stated staff will talk with Public Works more on this issue. She said they would have to differentiate between the ponds and naturalized detention basin.

Discussion continued on homeowner associations.

Mrs. Glas stated continuing on, where detention basins are planned in commercial, industrial, multiple-family residential or institutional developments, the basins shall be owned and maintained by the property owners, subject to compliance with the Standard Specifications. She said this will be kept but under the stormwater management framework.

Mrs. Glas said there is a section in 2002 Plan under Telecommunications and Energy. She stated the first recommendation is do all things possible to facilitate efficient, cost effective and timely service delivery to residents. She said this seems like a general goal.

Mrs. Glas stated next is creating and maintain franchise agreements favorable to the Village.

Commissioner Maher said it should say favorable to residents.

Mrs. Jones said the three were it states they already do, they weren't necessarily going to keep them in the Plan because it is already part of their practice.

Commissioner Maher stated he feels that one should be in there.

Mrs. Glas stated next is requiring utility companies to follow aesthetic standards for design above ground structures, no less stringent than standards for non-utility structures. She said this one they already do, but can be kept in there. Another, encourage co-location of communications antennas to centralize their locations and to avoid multiplying the number of towers located in the Village.

Mrs. Glas said next is insuring that pipelines are compatible with the community. She stated she is not sure what this meant and Public Works didn't seem to know either.

Mrs. Jones stated the pipeline reviews any proposed development to make sure it is compatible. She said aside from that she is not sure what it is recommending.

Chairman Spinelli said further south pipelines vary so maybe it was suppose to be in there to make sure they stay underground. He said on Bell Road by the Fire Department it does come out of the ground, so they might want to leave it say compatible. He stated there might be circumstances where it might have to come above ground.

Mrs. Glas said another is creating and maintain up-to-date records of pipelines, pipeline easements, and pipeline company contacts etc. She said according to Public Works it has been competed so it can be removed. She stated in their system there is also a flag letting them know if there is a pipeline.

Mrs. Glas stated lastly, requiring written comments from the applicable pipeline company for a construction project proposed over or adjacent to a pipeline easement. She said again they have the properties flagged in their system.

Chairman Spinelli said can we change it from "require" to "request". He stated there is not guarantee that the pipeline will respond.

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Commissioner Maher asked who was responsible for cutting down the Ash Trees.

Mrs. Jones stated it is Public Works, but they are hiring a tree service to do it.

Commissioner Maher asked if the Village had anything in writing to fund the replacement of trees.

Mrs. Jones said there is not enough money to replace all of them. She stated if the homeowner wanted to replace the tree, Public Works would come out and help mark an appropriate spot to put in the tree.

Commissioner Messer stated there should be information on the website informing residents as to what they should expect or do.

Commissioner Maher said the Village should look into getting a fund for the tree replacement due to the number of ash trees they have to take down. He stated whether it is a 50/50 or 75/25 program to encourage replacement of those trees. He said there are going to streets that are completely empty. Commissioner Maher stated they need to inform residents that there are programs to help save these trees. He said there might be people out there don't know even why their tree is dying. He asked can't there be something in the next bulletin.

Mrs. Jones stated according to Public Works it was not cost effective to treat the trees.

Commissioner Kwasneski said they need to educate the community.

Chairman Spinelli asked if they have done anything more on increasing fees for public notice signs. He said the sign on 131st and Parker is still there. He asked if we can take down our own sign. He stated they need to revisit increasing these fees where it is refundable if they take their sign down, but after 30 days of the meeting if the sign is not down then the Village keeps their deposit.

Mrs. Jones stated they can change their requirement and just charge a fee.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Maher 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

