

Village of Lemont
Planning and Zoning Commission
Regular Meeting of February 5, 2020

A regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission for the Village of Lemont was held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, February 5, 2020 in the second floor Board Room of the Village Hall, 418 Main Street, Lemont, Illinois.

I. CALL TO ORDER

A. Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Studebaker called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. He then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. Verify Quorum

Upon roll call the following were:

Present: Carmody, Cunningham, McGleam, O'Connor, Pawlak, Zolecki, Studebaker

Absent: None

Community Development Manager Mark Herman, Consulting Planner Jamie Tate, and Village Trustee Ron Stapleton were also present.

C. Approval of Minutes - January 8, 2020 Special Called Meeting

Commissioner Pawlak made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Zolecki to approve the minutes from the January 8, 2020 special called meeting with no changes. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

II. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

Chairman Studebaker greeted the audience and asked if anyone was planning on speaking in regards to the public hearing this evening to please stand and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 2020-01 CENTRAL SCHOOL REZONING

Chairman Studebaker called for a motion to open the public hearing for Case 2020-01.

Commissioner O'Connor made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Carmody to open the public hearing for Case 2020-01. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Staff Presentation

Jamie Tate, Consulting Planner, said the applicant is requesting to rezone Central School located at 410 McCarthy Road from R-4A Single-Family Infill and Preservation District to Institutional District (INT). The property is approximately 5.3 acres of School District owned land. It is surrounded by R-4A which is mostly existing single-family homes. There are condos to the west of the subject property in the former school building. There are also baseball fields and what they call the "bowl" located to the west. The Comprehensive Plan does label it as Institutional Land Use on the Future Land Use Map. The school has not submitted any additional proposals or plans for the property that accompanies the rezoning of the land. The purpose of the request is so the District can further utilize Central School for further activities.

The property consists of a school, parking, an accessory building, and open space. The school closed in June of 2011 and has been vacant since. To the west is the "bowl" and this request does not include that property because it is owned by the Village of Lemont. It was transferred to the Village on December 19, 2005. At that time it was for the purpose of flood control and in the form of an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA). The school still has access rights and easements to this property. It is in the best interest typically in the Village to bring the zoning map in line with the Comprehensive Plan when both parties are willing to and able. The Village just saw recently another Institutional Zoning with the Hindu Temple on Lemont Road. It also had residential zoning and it was changed to Institutional as well.

Mrs. Tate stated if you read the purpose of the different zonings in the UDO you would find that the school building and associated uses fall more in line with the Institutional District. The institutional district is designed to provide an environment for land uses of a civic, educational, governmental, recreational and religious nature. When you read through the residential district it is more focused for residential buildings and structures. Staff did provide a use comparison in staff's packet. Schools are allowed in residential district but only as a special use. Typically you do find schools in residential districts when they have special use permits. Then over time you can rezone them to a private institutional zoning district or a public private one. The zoning change would remove the possibility of any residential uses in this building. It also removes daycare and child care facility or lodge at this time. It does allow for hospital or large entertainment complex but these large style uses would require a public hearing with a special use process and not allowed by right.

The La Salle Factors are used when evaluating the validity of zoning changes. Staff did find the zoning change compatible with the existing use and zoning of nearby property and rezoning the property will not diminish property values. The public will gain the assurance that the property will stay more of an institutional type use rather than a use only found in residential districts such as homes, a bed and breakfast or a lodge. The zoning change will be more suitable for the subject property rather than residential zoning. The zoning change will be more in line with the Comprehensive Plan since it designates the subject property Institutional.

Mrs. Tate said in conclusion, staff recommends approval of the zoning change. The rezoning would allow the school district flexibility to utilize the school for various activities that meet the UDO assisting in the utilization of a vacant building.

Chairman Studebaker asked if there were any questions from the Commission for staff.

Commissioner McGleam asked when did the property change to R-4A.

Mark Herman, Community Development Manager, said the initial building was constructed in possibly the 1940's with an addition in the 60's. The zoning must have predated the creation of the Institutional Zoning District.

Commissioner Zolecki stated it is very typical seeing school's in residential districts. He asked if staff knew what some of the activities might be for the school.

Mrs. Tate said someone from the school district is here this evening and they might be able to answer the question.

Commissioner O'Connor asked if the garage storage building was going to be allowed.

Mr. Herman stated it would be an accessory use to the principle use of the property. It could be utilized as part of reestablishing a school at some future date.

Chairman Studebaker asked if there are any further questions from the Commission for staff. None responded. He said he would be abstaining from voting on this public hearing because he has a potential conflict of interest since he does attend the start-up church that will be meeting there at the school. He then asked if there is someone from the School District present to make a presentation. He then asked all of the public that arrived late to please stand and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath.

Applicant Presentation

Dr. Courtney Orzel, Superintendent, said she did not plan a presentation. The school is looking for more flexibility. There is a religious education that wants to utilize the

property. There is no intent of opening Central School for full day Kindergarten for the upcoming school year. In the future with the increasing enrollment the Board has conducted a facility study of Central, in the event that they would need to re-open it because they have reached the capacity at the three other schools. As a result, the Board would like to rezone not only to align to the Village's Comprehensive Plan but for their future so they don't need to come back and rezone once again if they ever decided to reopen Central. This would give them more flexibility other than that there are no other recent activities that have been presented to them that they would want to rent out Central for.

Chairman Studebaker asked if the Commission had any questions for the applicant.

Commissioner Cunningham asked what religious organization is planning on using the building.

Chairman Studebaker stated it is called The Table.

Commissioner Pawlak asked if this organization was going to utilize the facility would they be doing anything that would incur costs to the school if it was converted back to a school.

Ms. Orzel said no. If they convert it back to a school they would have to do a full renovation of the building.

Chairman Studebaker asked if there were any further questions from the Commission. None responded. He then asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak in regards to this public hearing.

Public Comment

Mark Raines asked if this religious group was currently using Central School.

Mr. Herman stated yes and that is what brought the rezoning forward. When they realized given the existing zoning it would require some sort of zoning action whether through a special use process or the rezoning. Staff had told the School District that the zoning change would make the most sense.

Commissioner Pawlak asked who pays for the cost of electric or gas when the school is being utilized.

Ms. Orzel said there is a rental process that they do with any of the organizations. The School District has been able to keep up some of the main Central pieces. They do have maintenance people that will go to the facility.

Jodi Richert asked if this change will prevent it from becoming residential property.

Mr. Herman stated it is currently zoned residential which then it is allowed. If the application is approved by the Village Board then residential would not be allowed.

Ms. Richert asked what is the likelihood of the school reopening.

Commissioner Pawlak said it was stated based on the studies that they were doing and as the population is increasing there may be a need.

Ms. Richert confirmed that The Table is currently renting from the school and will continue to rent.

Mr. Herman stated yes that is their understanding.

Chairman Studebaker asked if there is anyone else in the audience that wanted to speak in regards to this public hearing. None responded. He then called for a motion to close the public hearing for Case 2020-01.

Commissioner Pawlak made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to close the public hearing for Case 2020-01. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Plan Commission Discussion

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

Plan Commission Recommendation

Commissioner Cunningham made a motion, seconded by Commissioner O'Connor to recommend to the Mayor and Board of Trustees approval of Case 2020-01 Central School Rezoning. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Cunningham, O'Connor, Zolecki, McGleam, Pawlak, Carmody

Nays: None

Abstain: Studebaker

Motion passed

Findings of Fact

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Pawlak to authorize the Chairman to approve the Findings of Fact for Case 2020-01 as prepared by staff. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. 19-03 TIMBER RUN FINAL PLAT AND PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

Staff Presentation

Jamie Tate said on November 27, 2019 Taylor Morrison filed an application requesting a Final Plat of Subdivision and Final Planned Unit Development for a 52 unit attached single-family and 42 unit detached single-family residential subdivision. On June 10, 2019 Timber Run was rezoned to R-5A Single-Family Detached and Residential District. At that time it was approved for a Preliminary PUD and Plat for a residential subdivision. The review of the Final PUD and Plat is to verify the plans are in conformance with the previous approvals.

Substantial compliance must be found with the Final PUD and Plat, so they cannot change the number of dwelling units, can't increase the height of the buildings, building materials need to be the same or equal quality and the quality of landscaping materials need to be the same. Any changes to final engineering cannot change any design characteristics. The reason they were approved as a PUD had to do with the number of units and also the size of the property. The subdivision does meet all of the lot and dimensional standards of the R-5A District. There were some departures from the UDO which are listed in staff's report. She then read those departures.

Mrs. Tate stated they did meet all the general conditions that were listed which mostly had to do with the submittal of plans. The applicant will meet all the specific conditions that were found in the preliminary PUD. She then read through the specific conditions. No changes have been proposed with the Final PUD and Plat. The applicant had stated the Park District agreement is in final stages and under review. Staff is recommending approval of the Final PUD and Plat with conditions that are listed in staff's report.

Chairman Studebaker asked if any of the Commissioners had any questions for staff.

Commissioner Zolecki said since this is the Final PUD and Plat the Commission is here this evening to verify that this application is in compliance to what was approved for the Preliminary.

Mrs. Tate stated that is correct. The applicant is not changing the number of units or any of the architectural standards.

Commissioner Zolecki clarified that what was approved by the Village Board in June 2019 had a lot of information that this Commission did not see.

Mrs. Tate said correct. This Commission saw the original and a lot of the comments that were heard at that meeting were incorporated into the plans that ultimately went before the Village Board. So what they are seeing in the Final might be a little different than what the Commission originally saw.

Mr. Herman stated an example would be the architectural standards. This was something that was not presented before this Commission last April. There was discussion at the Planning and Zoning Meeting and at their Committee of the Whole meeting. As part of the process they refined their plans and provided some architectural guidelines that are more stringent than what would otherwise be found in the code. These guidelines were incorporated in the ordinances that was approved by the Board in June.

Commissioner Zolecki said another example is that the Village hired KLOA to do somewhat of a review of the traffic study and the design. He stated KLOA did have a recommendation for consideration of the four-way stop. He asked if that was being pursued.

Mr. Herman stated the intersection didn't warrant a four-way stop sign, but to promote safety and reduce speeds on Timberline, KLOA's response was if they were to pursue additional measures this is what they would recommend.

Commissioner Zolecki asked if that path was chosen.

Mr. Herman said yes it was.

Chairman Studebaker confirmed that Lot 98 was going to be a park.

Mrs. Tate stated yes it is.

Chairman Studebaker asked about the sidewalk coming from Timberline into the subdivision.

Mr. Herman said they are asking for a variance or departure from putting a sidewalk in from the north side of Timberline into the subdivision because of the topography and there is no connectivity.

Chairman Studebaker asked if the Commissioners had any further questions for staff. None responded. He then asked the applicant to come up and make a presentation.

Applicant Presentation

Vince Rosanova stated he is here this evening on behalf of Taylor Morrison and he is available to answer any questions that the Commission might have.

Commissioner Cunningham said there are few items that are still waiting to be finalized like the maintenance of the retaining walls and the detention basin for the HOA. He asked if it has been formalized.

Mr. Rosanova stated the HOA will be responsible for the maintenance of the retaining walls as well as the detention basin. The provisions will be incorporated into the declarations of restrictions that the HOA will enforce.

Chairman Studebaker asked if there were any further questions for the applicant from the Commission. None responded. He said this is not a public hearing but the Commission will allow anyone that wants to make a statement to do so at this time.

Public Comment

Kathy Hendrickson said she was at the first public hearing and she remembers the detention ponds being mentioned and the slope. She is concerned that this area is going to have issues with the run-off. She is in charge of the Woodland Trails by the Township so she is aware of how much run-off there can be. She is concerned that the HOA is going to be maintaining it and it might cause problems for the homeowners and also for the homeowners on New Avenue. She would suggest they look at this again to make sure they are aware of any issues before turning it over to the HOA. The homeowners should be made aware that they will be in charge of that retaining wall and basin.

Commissioner McGleam clarified that the detention basins are going to be dry detention basins.

Mr. Rosanova stated they are dry basins.

Eric Schmidt asked with the dry detention basins are there ever water in them.

Mr. Herman said they are designed to be dry. A wet detention basin is designed to have water in it all the time. A dry basin would only have water in it during a storm event and then release it into the storm system.

Mr. Schmidt asked how do they build that on the hill with the slope. The applicant is also asking for a slope of 8 instead of 4. It is a very steep hill to put a detention pond there.

Mr. Herman stated civil engineers are designing the plan and the Village's Engineer is reviewing the plan. The storm water is regulated by MWRD (Metropolitan Water Reclamation Department) and the applicant is working with them to get the permitting for it. The engineers at MWRD would not approve a permit if they felt it didn't work.

Mr. Schmidt asked if there was a reason why the detention basin is supposed have a four foot max.

Mrs. Tate said the variance has already been approved.

Mr. Schmidt stated this was a concern from this Commission when they voted against this. He just wanted to know why the code was specific with four feet. We are not talking about building material or the width of a street which is more for aesthetics. He is wanting to get it on record as to why they are asking for double then what the code allows. He asked what residents did Taylor Morrison meet with, when he is not aware of them meeting with any residents in the area.

Mr. Herman said they were referring to the feedback that was provided from the public hearings.

Dennis Doornbos stated at the last meeting there was comment from the Fire Department about this being a cul-de-sac with only one entrance and exit. He asked if this was ever addressed.

Mr. Herman said the Fire District did not attend any of the previous meetings but did attend the TRC (Technical Review Committee) meeting back 2018. All plans have been sent to the Fire District for their review and they communicated no issues with this. It was debatable if it is considered a cul-de-sac with the definition in the code. The Fire District approved the plans with comments in regards to placement of fire hydrants.

Mr. Doornbos stated his other comment is in regards to the sidewalk along the hill. It was granted a variance to not put a sidewalk in because it was too difficult but yet we can put an 8 foot detention pond there.

Commissioner Zolecki said at the last Planning and Zoning meeting for this application that was not something this Commission agreed upon.

Mr. Doornbos stated the stop signs that they have listed in the KLOA report do not make any sense for someone who lives there. A person is not going to be able to stop on a hill during a snow storm. He thinks this needs to be reviewed to make sure it is in a safe spot.

Mr. Schmidt said in regards to the one way in/out, on November 20, 2019 Timberline was shut down because of a gas issue at Timberline Knolls across the street. An emergency vehicle was not able to get through the area. He wants to get it on record that it has already happened in the area and with this subdivision only having one entrance it could prevent emergency vehicles from getting through.

Joan Walsh stated she lives on Timberline and will be directly affected by this development. She has lived in the area for 32 years and have seen the problems with

that hill. She strongly feels that a four way stop is not the smartest thing to do. The traffic study was done mid-June when school was not in session and there was no snow. There is no way someone is going to be able to stop at that stop sign coming up that hill during a snow storm. There was a stop there a long time ago and it was only there very briefly because it was too dangerous. She was trying to get home on that November 20th day and had to go all the way around just to get to her house. She is concerned about the amount of traffic that not only this subdivision will create but also from the two new buildings that Timberline Knolls just built. Lemont is great with removing the snow but having a stop sign there on a hill during a snow storm is not a good idea.

Mrs. Walsh asked at what stage does the HOA become responsible for those retaining walls.

Mr. Rosanova said the developer is responsible for the retaining walls and detention basin until they turn it over to the HOA. That happens when the development reaches 75% occupancy.

Mrs. Walsh asked what if 75% isn't reached for years down the road and can the developer back out of this.

Mr. Rosanova stated the detention basin will be built before the first occupancy permit is issued which is part of the site improvement plans along with the roads, sewer and water.

Mrs. Walsh asked if this is approved when does the ground breaking taking place.

Mr. Rosanova said they anticipate late spring or summer of this year.

Mrs. Walsh asked when was the most recent traffic study done for this development.

Mr. Herman stated May 17th was the date of KLOA's response. They made a number of recommendations and one was putting a stop a sign there.

Mrs. Walsh said when she visualizes pulling out of that subdivision and you are facing east, she feels the site lines are going to be obstructed and you will not see the oncoming traffic. She cannot stress how dangerous this situation is going to be. She asked how come there is no longer a left turning lane on New Avenue that was proposed with the first development for this area.

Mr. Herman stated this is a different development that has half the number of dwelling units being proposed so there is a less of a traffic impact.

Mrs. Walsh said she rides the Metra train and she understands that apparently Metra cannot increase the number of trains coming in/out of Lemont. More people are commuting to the city and that train is packed. If you are adding more homes this is

going to increase the means of transportation and this needs to be looked at. She asked if the Army Core of Engineers were brought in because of all of the ravines.

Mr. Herman stated that is noted on the Village Engineer's comment letter from January 13, 2020 that it is in progress. There are several outside entities that would be involved in the review process.

Chairman Studebaker asked if there was anyone else in the audience that would like to ask questions or make comments. None responded.

Larry Rizzo, Lemont Park District, said the Park District is in the process of completing negotiations with Taylor Morrison in regards to a park. This should be completed before the Committee of the Whole meeting on February 28, 2020. Back in April there were some concerns in regards to the retaining walls at the park property. The Park District did choose the option that totally eliminated the retaining walls.

Mrs. Walsh asked if there were sidewalks coming out of this subdivision.

Mr. Rosanova stated on the south side of the road there is a sidewalk that extends all the way out and aligns with the crosswalk.

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

Plan Commission Recommendation

Commissioner McGleam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Cunningham to recommend to the Mayor and Board of Trustees approval of Case 19-03 Timber Run Final Plat and Planned Unit Development with staff's conditions 1 through 6 listed in staff's report. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: McGleam, Cunningham, Zolecki, O'Connor, Carmody, Pawlak, Studebaker

Nays: None

Motion passed

V. GENERAL DISCUSSION

A. TRAFFIC STUDY THRESHOLDS AND DISCUSSION

Mr. Herman said after last month's meeting staff felt it would be good to discuss thresholds for traffic studies and be able to get on the same page with the Commission. Traffic studies are only mentioned in two spots in the UDO. One of the them is with a PUD they should provide a traffic study. There are some PUD's that warrant them and some that don't. The other spot it is mentioned is in the streets

and alley section. With that it is very broad and would require a traffic study with any engineering plan. The Planning and Economic Development Director has the authority to waive this request so they do not get hundreds of traffic studies every year. There were items such as the Kiddie Academy, that have come before the PZC and there were no issues and there was Hamilton's just recently were it was mentioned having a traffic study.

Mrs. Tate stated she has talked with a traffic engineer who has worked with other communities in Illinois. With DeKalb they use a threshold of 100 new peaks to and from a property during a peak hour but he also stated if it is a complex traffic location that has a history of accidents. The applicant would have to turn in a statement from a licensed traffic engineer stating whether or not they feel it does or does not meet this requirement. The Village's engineer would review this and either agree or not and determine if a further traffic study is needed. Staff would like to get the Commission's opinion as to whether the Village has thresholds or if it is a policy.

Commissioner O'Connor asked if they are doing a basic study to determine this 100 new peaks or just a guess.

Commissioner Zolecki said he has talked with traffic engineers and most municipalities can identify quickly as to whether a traffic study is needed or not. There is a certain point of common sense and there is some reasonableness at a staff level. If the Village was going to retain a traffic engineer at a low hourly cost this is something they can quickly look at and reference their standards to determine whether the applicant needs to do a further traffic study or not.

Mr. Herman stated he believed they have formulas that they can use and look at.

Commissioner Zolecki asked if they would leave the requirement and the waiver process would come by way of a traffic engineer, hired by the applicant, to provide a letter stating that a traffic study is not needed.

Commissioner Pawlak asked if the Village had a traffic engineer.

Mr. Herman said they do not have a traffic engineer. The Village's consulting engineer is with Novotny Engineer and Jim Caincar is not a traffic engineer. He remembers having discussions with Mr. Caincar for Timber Run recommending to send it out to a firm for a traffic study. There are multiple engineers that they know of that they could send stuff out to, but as of right now they do not have anyone on retainer.

Commissioner McGleam asked if the Village Engineer has the capacity or expertise to make that call as to whether a traffic study is needed or not.

Commissioner Zolecki stated if the community is raising concerns then you have to do a traffic study and that is the cost of doing business for the planned development.

Timber Run is a good example where what they saw in April was a regurgitation of Vistancia's traffic study which was not applicable. Then in late April they went out and got one and presented it to the Board. The Village then went above and beyond and had KLOA do a third party assessment of that traffic study.

Mr. Herman said KLOA was primarily looking at the entrance because there was such a concern. He and Mrs. Tate were not here for the Vistancia traffic study, but Taylor Morrison hired a different traffic firm and they updated it.

Commissioner Zolecki stated what he is saying for that case the Village was doing a commendable job doing their due diligence. It is a validation based on two different professional companies of something that did not happen initially from the applicant as they came before the Commission in April. It was a non-applicable traffic study from a different development. The diligence there helps protect the Village and helps answer to the community. He feels it is dangerous to get into this threshold determination because you never know every situation.

Mr. Herman said that is what is happening right now. With Hamilton's the applicant is not a developer and one estimate for a traffic study was \$8,000, which is a difficult burden to put on someone who isn't a developer.

Commissioner Zolecki stated that might be where a firm like KLOA might be able to give advice. There are different levels of analysis that can be done, which might not include an analysis of someone clicking cars all week. It might be more economical than a full blown traffic study.

Mr. Herman said staff does not have the guidance that is why they thought maybe having a threshold would help determine. At least they could have a traffic engineer state whether or not it would be a minimal or substantial traffic impact.

Commissioner McGleam stated the recommendation sounds reasonable to him, but there may be some very small developments where it is not reasonable.

Commissioner Pawlak said he feels there should be a more simple process where there should be some common sense. For Hamilton's they should be able to hire a traffic engineer for an hour and based on information they submit to them about how many customers they bring in during their peak time they could determine if there is a problem or not. All that information could then be brought before the Commission for them to determine if a traffic study is warranted or not.

Commissioner Zolecki stated if they had a traffic engineer on call for the Village they could ask the applicant if they want to have them look at the application for a low price. The traffic engineer could assess quickly and determine if a traffic study is warranted or not then the applicant can decide if they want to waive that requirement. At least then they have something from a professional's point of view and reviewed.

Commissioner Pawlak said when a developer comes in and before it comes before the Commission it should be asked of the applicant so it is not a surprise when they come before the Commission.

Commissioner Carmody asked what is the threshold they should allow when referencing another traffic study. He remembers Willow Pointe referencing a traffic study that was done about 10 years ago. He asked at what point do they recognize that traffic is going to spill over into other areas and they need to reevaluate some of the impacts to other areas.

Mr. Herman stated that is something they did talk about with Hamilton's and if other developments come forward in the area.

Chairman Studebaker said they should ask for the traffic study to be updated.

Commissioner Zolecki asked if they could talk with a traffic engineer about a fixed fee for preliminary reviews of any developments that staff feels are on the boarder and then that fee is passed on to the applicant.

Mr. Herman stated they can reach out to some traffic engineers.

Discussion continued in regards to the timing of when this preliminary review would be done and when the traffic study would be done by.

Commissioner Cunningham said you need to take out the subjectivity and that is what a traffic engineer is going to do.

Commissioner Zolecki stated he understands that there is concern regarding the timing of when a traffic study would be done if needed. However, it will prove that due diligence is being done and it is just like all these other reviews that need to be done.

Chairman Studebaker said there is always the option of tabling the case until the applicant is able to provide a traffic study.

Mrs. Tate stated if they can make the applicant aware of it at TRC meeting that would be ideal and help with timing.

Mr. Herman said it would be ideal to have a traffic engineer at TRC however that would be at the Village's cost.

Commissioner Zolecki stated it would be a more economical way to have them at the TRC meeting. He does know that KLOA does do this for other municipalities.

Commissioner Pawlak said it would be a recommended approach because you can use the same person and they would get familiar with the town and streets.

Commissioner Cunningham stated that would remove the subjectivity as to whether it is needed or not.

Mr. Herman said staff can look further into this and follow-up at the next meeting.

Chairman Studebaker asked if there was any further discussion regarding traffic studies. None responded. He then asked if any of the Commissioners had any further questions or comments.

Commissioner Carmody asked what is the standard for street width and at what point do they consider the variance.

Mr. Herman said the Comprehensive Plan calls for having a palate of different street types. There might need to be some talk with the Village Engineer about what the standard is along with MWRD's new standards coming. This might initiate some code changes. The code says for a local street it is 27 feet of pavement width. Pavement width shall mean from edge to edge of pavement and does not include the curb.

Mrs. Tate stated they are starting to look at what other municipalities have.

Mr. Herman said the problem is ComEd is going to want to start putting everything in the front so there are going to be front easements. They will have to be careful with front easements and how small they are because of this and public utilities.

VI. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

VII. ADJOURMENT

Chairman Studebaker called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

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

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion passed

Minutes prepared by Peggy Halper

