

**Village of Lemont**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
Regular Meeting of February 17, 2010

A meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, February 17, 2010 in the second floor Board Room of the Village Hall, 418 Main Street, Lemont, Illinois.

**I. CALL TO ORDER** Meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

**A. Pledge of Allegiance**

Commissioner Schubert led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**B. Verify Quorum**

Upon roll call the following were:

Present: Armijo, Maher, Erber, Spinelli, Murphy, Schubert

Absent: Predey

Village Planner Charity Jones and Village Trustee Ron Stapleton were also present

**C. Approve Minutes**

Commissioner Murphy made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Maher to approve the minutes of December 16, 2009 with no changes. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion carried*

**II. CHAIRMAN COMMENTS**

**III. OLD BUSINESS**

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

**V. GENERAL DISCUSSION**

**A. UDO Sign Placement/ Sight Line Issues**

Mrs. Jones stated that at the past couple of meetings, safety issues were brought up in regards to the placement of monument signs. Members had expressed concern that there could be a potential obstruction to a driver's sight line. Mrs. Jones said that she spoke with Jim Cainkar, Village Engineer, and he has proposed a revision to the UDO. For signs near the intersection of a street and a driveway, the vision triangle would be measured from the intersection of a parcel's lot line with its driveway. For signs near the intersection of two streets, the vision triangle would be measured from the corner of the parcel in question. Mrs. Jones asked the Commissioners to look at the illustrations

that were included in their packet. The illustrations showed the current UDO requirement and the proposed revision. Mrs. Jones stated that on the illustration for the corner lot she did not have a distance listed. She said Mr. Cainkar had suggested that the Board might want to propose different measurements depending on the right-of-way.

Commissioner Spinelli stated that it would be confusing using different measurements. He suggested using eight feet for a minimum requirement for the vision triangle or to eliminate the vision triangle and just have no sign within 10 feet of a property line.

Mrs. Jones stated that business owners would not agree with putting a sign 10 feet off of a property line.

Mr. Stapleton stated that a sign does have to be set back half the distance of the height. If the sign is eight feet high it would have to be set back four feet and outside of the vision triangle.

Commissioner Spinelli stated that the triangle is good, but if you have a sidewalk that is designated as a bike path then you need a six-foot clear zone. He said that there should just be a minimum requirement from the property line along with the vision triangle. Commissioner Spinelli said that if you looked at Aurelio's sign, that sign is about eight feet off the sidewalk. There is no problem seeing that sign from the street. He said for a safety standpoint, the sign has to be off the sidewalk eight to ten feet.

Mrs. Jones stated that she understands the safety issue and maybe five feet is not sufficient time for a car to see someone on a bicycle. However, during this current economic climate we might want to tailor our restrictions as narrowly as possible to achieve our goal of safety without being overly burdensome.

Commissioner Armijo stated that he agreed with Mrs. Jones.

Discussion continued as to what the measurement of the vision triangle should be and what the minimum requirement should be from the property line.

Chairman Schubert stated that they would take a vote.

First vote would be for the proposed revision with one recommendation to the vision triangle:

1. Change the measurement from five feet to eight feet.

A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

Second vote would be to set a minimum requirement from the property line. There would be two choices of either a four or six-foot minimum. A roll call vote was taken:

*Those in favor of a four-foot minimum requirement from the property line:  
Commissioner Maher, Commissioner Armijo, and Chairman Schubert.*

*Those in favor of a six-foot minimum requirement from the property line: Commissioner Spinelli, Commissioner Erber, and Commissioner Murphy.*

*Three to three tie.*

Mrs. Jones stated that in regards to the placement of trees near stop signs, Mr. Cainkar recommends that the issue be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. She said the reasoning is because of the timing of when street signs go up to when trees get planted.

Commissioner Spinelli stated that then it would be up to staff to determine if a tree has to be moved. He said that developers would not comply due to the fact that they have planted accordingly with their landscape plan. He asked why don't they just give credit for one tree if it is close to a stop sign.

Mrs. Jones stated that the problem is more with residential subdivisions, where the parkway trees go in when the homes are being constructed.

Commissioner Spinelli stated that the Village would end up having to pay to remove that tree because the homeowners will say that the builder put it there. He said that it is easier putting text in the UDO or a clause in the landscape ordinance saying that trees can't be planted within so many feet of a regulatory sign.

Commissioner Maher stated that he agreed with Commissioner Spinelli. He also would like to see some kind of minimum put in the UDO.

Commissioner Armijo asked if Commissioner Spinelli was asking for a 30-foot setback.

Commissioner Spinelli responded yes.

Commissioner Erber agreed that there should be a minimum, but feels that 30 feet is too much.

Chairman Schubert stated that there are multiple trees in the area that are blocking stop signs. The ones that he has seen, the trees are about 10 feet away from the sign. He said that if they went with 20 feet it would be more aesthetically pleasing and then you could put two trees in the parkway, which is required.

Chairman Schubert said that they would vote for either a 15 or 20-foot minimum. A roll call vote was taken:

*Those in favor of a 15-foot minimum:*

*Commissioner Maher, Commissioner Erber, Commissioner Murphy, and Chairman Schubert.*

*Those in favor of a 20-foot minimum:  
Commissioner Armijo and Commissioner Spinelli.*

*Four to two vote.*

**B. Allowable Commercial Building Materials**

Mrs. Jones gave a brief description as to what the UDO allows for building materials and what it doesn't. She said that Chairman Schubert has asked to talk about what is allowed and has some ideas on further restrictions.

Chairman Schubert stated that people have complained in the past about allowing split-face block on buildings. He said that he does not like split-face block and that it does not belong anywhere near homes or small industries. He stated that quick brick should also not be used. Chairman Schubert stated that they have already asked a few businesses to remove the material because they were PUD's.

Discussion then continued in regards to the building of Firestone and conditions placed on variations and special uses.

Mr. Stapleton asked Chairman Schubert that if they did not allow this type of brick, what would be the extra cost.

Chairman Schubert stated that the cost isn't that much different. The labor cost is the difference. You can get a lot more square footage done with a block rather than a brick. Chairman Schubert stated that there are a lot better looking man-made stone instead of using split-face block. He said that the split-face block is very coarse and it holds water, which will later discolor.

Mrs. Jones asked the Board how they felt about using metal in manufacturing districts. She said they had some people interest in property adjacent from ACL, but MWRD only issues leases for a 40-year period. The business doesn't want to put up a brick building that they are going to have to take down in 40 years.

Chairman Schubert stated that he did not agree with using metal. He said that airborne salts could do a lot of damage.

Commissioner Murphy also did not agree with using metal in manufacturing districts. She said that the Board shouldn't be over restrictive, but in some areas it lacks aesthetics. These buildings are going to be around for a long time.

Discussion then continued on the definition of quick brick and split-face block.

Chairman Schubert asked who inspects building sites and do they have written down what was approved by the Village Board. That way they know if they are using the wrong material.

Mrs. Jones stated that the building inspectors go out there but she could not comment as to what information they would have with them.

Chairman Schubert stated that a development should have a mock up panel on sight that was approved by the Village inspector, before the project has any brick put up on the building.

Chairman Schubert stated that they would take a vote to amend the UDO to only allow split-face block and quick brick to be used in the manufacturing and B-4 district. A voice vote was taken:

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

### **C. IL Open Meeting Act**

Mrs. Jones stated that the Village Attorney might be requesting a Commissioner to serve as a designated Open Meetings Act representative for the Planning and Zoning Committee.

## **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

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

*Ayes: All*

*Nays: None*

*Motion passed*

*Minutes prepared by Peggy Halper*