

PLANNING, ZONING &
ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

I

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF THE
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
HELD AT THE ROBERT J. HOMOLA
MUNICIPAL BUILDING, DUPAGE COUNTY
201 SOUTH BLOOMINGDALE, ILLINOIS 60108 ON
MAY 3, 2016 AT 7:00 P.M.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was called to order by at 7:00
p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon roll call by the recording secretary, the following Commissioners were:

Present: Commissioners Jaster, Coleman, Shannon, Smith and Vice
Chairman King

Absent: Chairman Brice

Quorum Present

Also Present: Mr. S. Gascoigne – Village Development & Planning
Mr. B. Prohaska - Assistant Village Engineer
Mr. M. Castaldo – Village Attorney

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Due to Chairman Brice not being present tonight, a motion was made to elect
a Vice Chairman.

Moved by Commissioner Jaster, seconded by Commissioner Coleman to name
Commissioner King to Vice Chair the meeting tonight.

Ayes: Commissioners Jaster, Coleman, Shannon, Smith and Vice
Chairman King

Nays: None

Absent: Chairman Brice

Motion Declared Carried

Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

May 3, 2016

Page | 2

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MARCH 15, 2016

Moved by Commissioner Jaster, seconded by Commissioner Shannon to approve the March 15, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting minutes.

Ayes: Commissioners Jaster, Shannon, Coleman, Smith and Vice
Chairman King

Nays: None

Absent: Chairman Brice

Motion Declared Carried

5. CIRCLE K/250 E. ARMY TRAIL ROAD/EXCEPTIONS TO SIGN ORDINANCE –
(FIRST HEARING) – 2016-105

The following exhibits were entered into the record.

Exhibit # 1 - Application for Hearing, dated March 4, 2016

Exhibit # 2 - Notice of Public Hearing, dated March 15, 2016

Exhibit # 3 - Affidavit of Compliance, dated March 25, 2016

Exhibit # 4 - Application Agreement, dated March 3, 2016

Exhibit # 5 - Affidavit of Disclosure, dated March 24, 2016

Exhibit # 6 - Notice to Surrounding Property Owners
(37) Notices Received, (8) Notices Not Received

Exhibit # 1 is introduced into the record, which is the Application for Hearing, dated March 4, 2016.

Exhibit # 2 is introduced into the record, which is the Notice of Public Hearing, dated March 15, 2016.

Exhibit # 3 is introduced into the record, which is the Affidavit of Compliance, dated March 25, 2016.

Exhibit # 4 is introduced into the record, which is the Application Agreement, dated March 3, 2016.

Exhibit # 5 is introduced into the record, which is the Affidavit of Disclosure, dated March 24, 2016.

Exhibit # 6 is introduced into the record, which is the Notice to Surrounding Property Owners with (37) Notices Received and (8) Notices Not Received

The following people were sworn in for the hearing.

Mr. Auna Foote – Here on behalf of Circle K, 5563 Elston, Chicago, IL

Mr. Gascoigne stated that this location is on the southeast corner of Army Trail Road. When you have a convenient center that is located within a gas station or a service center like this, it is owned and operated by the same person. In the case of Shell and Circle K, it is two separate operator owners. This is a recent situation that has come up so they have taken over the convenient center within the Shell shopping center. Shell obviously has the two Chevrons on the canopy itself; Circle K would be allowed to have one sign on the wall, but the ordinance that was approved because it was originally just for one tenant, only permitted for the three wall signs. This would be to allow for the fourth wall sign, and they could put that fourth wall sign along Army Trail Road and get that exposure on Army Trail Road as well. He shows the Planning and Zoning Commission the sign that would be permitted and are going to be putting on the west elevation; they would like to mirror that on the roof elevation as well. He stated that the request itself would be just to amend the ordinance to allow that fourth sign versus the three that were originally approved.

The ordinance that was originally approved in 1990 approved the original development, and then in 2005 they amended it and it included the approval of the three walls signs, including the two Shell Chevrons and then simply had "Food Mart" on it originally. The original Food Mart was owned and operated by Shell so the current partnership did not exist; the applicant has indicated that the current partnership that exists between Shell and Circle K is unique to the extent that the establishment owns both the station and ancillary food and concession areas.

They stated that the current sign on the west elevation is mostly obstructed by the existing canopy so having a second sign on the north elevation is necessary, especially given the volume of traffic and speed limits on the two roads. The newly proposed sign will be the same dimensions as the sign on the west elevation, and due to the location of the business and the nature of the request, the Commission should consider the appropriateness of the sign request itself, as well as the specific exception being requested.

Ms. Auna Foote introduced herself to the Planning and Zoning Commission. She is here on behalf of Circle K with offices at 5563 Elston, Chicago, Illinois. She stated that more and more gas stations are having convenience stores and offering sandwiches for maybe dinner on the way home. She said given this location being on the corner and the way the building is laid out they miss all of the traffic that is north and all of the traffic that is east, and this is why they are requesting a sign there. They will have a sign with a flat panel with channel letters that will be within the ordinance. The current building also has an illuminated sign that has been there a while, but they are going to remove this to be within the ordinance.

Moved by Commissioner Jaster, seconded by Commissioner Shannon to open up the floor to the public.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Chairman Brice

Motion Carried

No one came forward to address this hearing.

Moved by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Shannon to close the floor to the public.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Chairman Brice

Motion Carried

Moved by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Jaster to recommend approval of the following requests and relief relative to the request of the installation of a fourth wall sign at the property commonly referred to as 250 E. Army Trail Road which includes amending Ordinance No. 2005-15 which approved an amendment of Ordinance 90-48 for final site plan and exceptions to the Zoning and Sign Ordinance for Shell to allow a fourth wall sign on the north elevation of the existing Circle K building as depicted in the petitioner's exhibits as presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission this evening. The recommendation of approval

being hereby shall be and is hereby made subject to the following conditions; no conditions to meet.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Chairman Brice

Motion Carried

6. SPRINGFIELD POINTE (FORMERLY ATRIUMS ON SPRINGFIELD) – PARCELS 2 & 4 STRATFORD COMMONS – FINAL SUBDIVISION & SITE PLAN APPROVAL – EXCEPTIONS – (FIRST HEARING) – 2015-113

The following exhibits were entered into the record:

Exhibit # 1 - Application for Hearing – Not Applicable

Exhibit # 2 - Notice of Public Hearing, dated March 16, 2016

Exhibit # 3 - Affidavit of Compliance – Not Applicable

Exhibit # 4 - Application Agreement – Not Applicable

Exhibit # 5 - Affidavit of Disclosure – Not Applicable

Exhibit # 6 - Notice to Surrounding Property Owners
(20) Notices Received, (1) Notice Not Received

Exhibit # 16 - Vinyl siding sample

Exhibit # 17 – Group Exhibit (29) items in plans submitted by the petitioner

Mr. Gascoigne stated that this hearing is coming before the Planning and Zoning Commission for the second time. However, the first time it was called the “Atriums on Springfield” and was a two unit with some additional single-family, up to 79 units, on the same site. The applicant has since changed the produce and is going with entirely single-family reducing the number of units from a maximum of 79 units down to as many as 60 units. This property is zoned Stratford Planned Unit Development District of 250 acres or more. The two parcels total about 14.5 acres with 60 single-family residences comprised of one-story ranch, one-story loft and two-story floor plans. The

unit ranges are from 1,600 square feet to 3,400 square feet with optional basements and brick facades with vinyl exteriors.

In regard to the bulk regulations, anything listed in red will be a required exception. He also stated that anything that has a code section after it, because it is in the Planned Development of 250 acres or more, that section of the code specifically states that they take the Residential Zoning District that most closely applies to the lot sizes and bulk regulations that they are proposing. That being said, that closest district is the R2-C. It also goes on to state that there are additional bulk requirements in the Planned Development section of the code as well, and the stricter of the two applies. He said in a couple of these where they have the minimum lot area and the typical R2-C would only be required to be 6,000 square feet; whereas, because it is in the Planned Development section and it is more restrictive, it is actually 9,000 square feet. The same thing with the separation between units. R2-C actually just has side yard setbacks; it does not have a separation requirement. The others, including the minimum lot width and corner side yards, not all of those are going to have exception requests; it is just going to be some of those based on the information contained in the packet. Quite a few of the lots exceed the 60-foot minimum lot width requirement, but there are a few that do not. He said it is the same with the minimum floor area per dwelling. It is one-story dwelling, not less than 1,800 square feet; two-story dwellings, not less than 1,000 square feet on ground floor and 2,200 square feet for all floors. As with some of these other bulk regulations that are double asterisked, with the maximum building height and maximum floor area, the two coverage requirements they really do not know what that is going to be right now because they have to wait until the product is submitted and all of the lot sizes vary. The applicant has indicated that they will comply with the regulations when they come in for permits. He said because there is a minimum 1,800 square foot requirement for the minimum floor area per dwelling unit, and at least some of the units are proposed to be 1,600 square feet, at the end of the day, there may not be a demand for any 1,600 square feet.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that the four units that they are proposing have mainly ranch style; one of the single levels has an option for a loft and then a fourth option with a second story. This particular unit has two options in terms of a floor plan; there is a den and a couple of other options that they would have with the same basic floor plans. This will allow the purchaser to have a little more flexibility in terms of what they are purchasing. Model One is a one story with two bedrooms. Model two is similar to the first elevation, but this model is also a one story, but contains a loft with a third bedroom. Model three is a slightly narrower option than elevation one. This unit is a two bedroom with the option of a den or a third bedroom. Model four is a two

story with a three bedroom providing the option of a partial second floor and a loft overlooking the main level. All of these models will primarily be brick with vinyl accents.

In regard to landscaping, Mr. Gascoigne stated that they have the typical site landscaping. They do list the different plant materials here, but they have provided in the packet a more diverse planting schedule containing more plants and more options that they will provide to the homeowners. They will have trees, perennials, shrubs, and things of that sort that they will be able to pick out and plant in order to accommodate the tastes of whoever decides to purchase the home.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that one of the waivers as requested is for the Planned Development it is not required for the R2-C, but the Planned Development there is a requirement that 30 percent of the site being utilized or committed to recreational area. It is not specific to every development; it is specific to the zoning area. His personal opinion is that he wanted to show this. He said they have Stratford Park right over there, and he does not think it is a huge detriment that they do not have. They have Stratford Park with a lot of open space, and both of these paths on both sides of the retention pond are accessible from Springfield Drive and are very walkable.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that the original proposal was to make that access and share the access with DuPage Medical Group, but that since has been removed. DuPage Medical Group is going to do its own access. This subdivision has removed that. The original density was for 79 two family units whereas this proposal is for 60 single-family units.

Mr. Gascoigne pointed to a lot, which is referred to as "Lot 5". Currently, the applicant is not showing that on the plat. That parcel belongs to DuPage Medical Group. They do have easement rights to it. The intent of the subdivision is to dedicate only the roads within the subdivision. His understanding is that they are in conversation with DuPage Medical Group. If and when DuPage Medical Group determines that they are willing to dedicate that or not dedicate that, the road should be all or none. They do not want to mix and match private versus public roads. They do not want this parcel to remain private and leave the rest of the roads in there; that becomes a liability, which becomes a maintenance nightmare for the Village. He said if and when that decision is made to dedicate or not dedicate it, it will be well after this process is over so moving forward the direction should be that they just make the stipulation if that it is going to be dedicated then all of the roads become public, and if it is not going to be dedicated then all of the roads stay private.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that the Fire Department's comments are the same as the original plan proposal.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that in their site plans they will note that there is a squiggly line on some of the items; there are some areas of their site plan that identify the fence all along Knollwood. Just the rear yards along Stratford Square the intent was to obviously buffer Stratford Square and the DuPage Medical Group use. He said staff spoke with them and the 6-foot vinyl fence that is proposed, especially given the location of where it is going to be, and the fact that it is right next to Stratford Square along that major thoroughfare; it is probably not the best option in terms of materials. He said one of the recommendations that came back was more heavily berming and landscaping the areas versus putting fences up. They are doing something similar as they have on Medinah Road where there is a combination of the two where some of the residents have actually taken aluminum fences that look wrought iron with the pillars and fenced in their own yard. The Commission needs to decide which they would prefer and feel more appropriate. He stated that if there are fences proposed and there is a position on the fences, possibly including language in the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CCR) that indicate if there is a preference that all fences be identical similar to what is on Medinah Road.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that the petitioner is proposing to use brick on the front elevations while the remainder of the elevations will be vinyl siding. The Commission needs to discuss the appropriateness of the materials and whether they are okay with those selected materials. They will have samples of them when the petitioner comes up to present tonight.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that they have identified the landscaping along both Springfield and Knollwood. Should the Commission feel that the landscape areas along Springfield Drive are appropriate, they should consider including language in the covenants establishing that the HOA will be responsible for maintenance of these areas rather than the Village.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that based on the information provided the applicant has identified 188 square inches of trees being removed, and they are proposing to replace a minimum of 385 square inches.

They have the minimum required setbacks to discuss, structure separations, lot area, recreational area and the minimum floor area per dwelling unit. On the engineering side, they have the right-of-way width. They are not providing parkway trees even though they will recall at the last one, they were proposing carriage walks, and they were going to but right up against the street and provide no parkway, but they now have 5 feet for parkway and

the sidewalks are offset 5 feet off of that. There will be concern in terms of that being enough for a parkway tree so the requirement is a parkway tree every 40 feet because most of those trees will grow larger than what that 5-foot will accommodate. The applicant is agreeing to put the equivalent in the front yards and on the properties of the homes versus putting them in the parkway. They will still meet the engineering standard deviation.

Mr. Gascoigne stated that this request is for final subdivision approval with those exceptions just listed and the same deviations from the engineering standards, final site plan review and Comprehensive Plan Amendment. The Comprehensive Plan Amendment back in 2000 called for a mixed use development so the comprehensive plan that was done in 2010, that mixed use development concept kind of carried through the comprehensive plan, and obviously does not fit within there, but still fits within the scope of what is over in the area.

Exhibit #'s 1, 3, 4 and 5 are not applicable.

Exhibit # 2 was introduced into the record, which is the Notice of Public Hearing, dated March 18, 2016.

Exhibit # 6 was introduced into the record, which are the (20) Notices to Surrounding Property Owners Received and (1) Notice to Surrounding Property Owner was not Received.

Exhibit # 16 is introduced into the record, which is the vinyl siding sample.

Exhibit # 17 is a group exhibit consisting of the 29 items in the plans submitted by the petitioner.

Mr. Prohaska referred to his engineering memorandum, dated April 27, 2016.

Mr. Prohaska stated that there is a lot of information contained in his report so the Commission should read it carefully and ask questions if there are items in it that they have questions about.

He stated that the changes to the site plan before them now since the last submittal include some changes affecting the local traffic so there is no access to the site from Springfield Drive proposed any longer. One of the access points to Knollwood Drive has been eliminated. There is a connection to the subdivision from the Mall Ring Road, which will require authorization from the mall ownership to tie into that private road, and there will have to be a permit from ownership of the mall to connect to that road. They are recommending that Knollwood Drive be restriped in order to accommodate

the left turn lane access into the new subdivision. He stated that Mr. Gascoigne had previously mentioned some of the difficulties with the existing Stonington Drive and its placement on Lot #5. They are recommending that the streets either be all private or all public, and you cannot have sections of the streets that are dedicated as public streets and then a little piece on Lot #5 as private and part on Lot #6, which is nearer to the hotels, which is also not part of this application. In discussions, there has been talk that the roads would all be dedicated as public streets, but there are some hoops for the developer to jump through in order to obtain control or ability to dedicate those streets.

He said street names should be proposed. Right now it is labeled on the new plat as "new street".

On the plat, there is a buildable area depicted on Lots #3 and #4, which are irregularly shaped lots. They should take a look at the handouts that they have for those home sites.

He stated that they are recommending some easements for access by the public across parts of Lots #33 through #37 for a sidewalk for the existing trail at the southeast corner of the subdivision on Lots #1 through #4 where the existing trail will actually be located at the back yard of those lots. The trails there cannot be moved, and the lots are platted with the trail across a section of the back yard. They are recommending the typical easement of 10 feet wide for public utilities wherever they are located on private property. There are some other lots that are listed under (4) Plat of Subdivision, item (e) where they are recommending some easements for utilities, which are not shown in a public utility easement. Some of those utilities that are shown to be very close to the foundation of the houses. They are recommending a minimum setback from the foundation of the house to the public utilities so that decks and patios can fit in the back yard without being located on top of the underground public utilities. Those should be moved further away from the house.

He stated that the covenants that were handed out in the distribution packet are mostly adaptable to this project, but there was some specific language from another project, which is not really applicable to this project and that should be fixed up so that they have a proper document for this project.

For this project, there was no street lighting plan submitted so they do not know if it is a public street lighting system that is being proposed or a private street lighting system that is being proposed. They should have exhibits of the type of poles and fixtures that goes up on the pole. As always the Village will pay for the electrical cost for the electric to the street lighting system. If

it is a public system, they will own, operate and maintain the pole and fixture as well. If it is a private system, that should be worked into the CC&R for the maintenance provisions to be provided by the Homeowner's Association.

They are recommending that the Homeowner's Association maintain all landscaping, including lawn mowing on the public right-of-way adjacent to the subdivision, including Springfield Drive and Knollwood Drive. They are recommending that the Homeowner's Association provide all snow removal from all public or private streets and trails and sidewalks within and adjacent to the subdivision, including the trail around the main detention pond at the center of the subdivision, the trail around the wetland at the southeast corner of the subdivision and the interior sidewalks and sidewalks on Knollwood Drive and the Mall Ring Road. This needs to be placed into the CC&R for clarity.

They are recommending that the Homeowner's Association maintain storm water storage and BMP facilities, the outlet/volume control structures and their operation. It should also be placed into the CC&R.

They are also recommending that the Homeowner's Association maintain all lawn areas, including those along the public streets within or adjacent to the development, including Knollwood Drive and Springfield Drive right-of-way.

He stated that the demolition plan that was submitted shows trees to be removed, but it does not have the tree replacement plan.

He stated in addition to what Mr. Gascoigne had discussed in regard to fencing, the plat or the CC&R are required that no fencing to be placed in the front yards so on a corner lot the fencing should not be allowed to extend past the front façade of the building. No fencing shall be installed at or near the line of sight triangle formed by intersecting roads. There is an existing utility easement that traverses the site between the pond and Springfield Drive. It is a 40-foot wide utility easement that contains a large sanitary sewer and force main from the pump station. For access and maintenance purposes they are recommending that this remain as an unfenced area so that they have unobstructed access to those utilities in the event of an emergency and they need to get in there for some type of maintenance.

He stated that there is a fence proposed between this property and the DuPage Medical Group property. On the east boundary of this site and the west boundary of the DuPage Medical Group facility property, there is an 84-inch diameter storm sewer that basically drains the entire Stratford Square Mall, and everything to the north of this subdivision. They are

recommending that the fences not be placed on top of that pipe so that you cannot drill the foundations through the pipe or cause damage to that pipe by placing the fence at that location. They are also recommending that at the southeast corner of the subdivision at Lots #1 through 4 that the recreational trail remain on the outside of any fences so that they do not end up passing a fence into someone's back yard if they were using that trail. They are also recommending that the fences along Springfield Drive and Knollwood Drive where the Mall Ring Road meets setback from the property line to allow some buffering opportunity with landscaping between the sidewalk or street and the fence.

On the landscape plan, they are showing some symbols, which are located in the Village right-of-way that appear to represent trees or shrubs to act as landscaped screening for the back yards of some of the houses. That landscaping is probably in great jeopardy during Village snow removal operations so the landscaping should not be placed in the Village right-of-way for that purpose.

In regard to the geometric plan, the proposed road alignment has some curves, which are sub-standard to the Village code. The curves are relatively small radius so that you can have some difficulty with motorists operating on these types of streets that have difficulty negotiating the sharp curves. Basically, they do not want to slow down. The curve is sub-standard for the intended operating speed of the road. The roads are probably going to be set to 25 mph, and when the radius becomes too small it becomes difficult for some people to properly maneuver their car through the curves. They are recommending in conformance with the code a minimum of 150-foot radius on the curves and 50-foot tangent between reverse curves.

He stated that Stonington Drive has a variable width in its present form. The piece on Lot #5 is 31 feet wide; the proposed streets in the internal subdivision are 28 feet wide; the Stonington Drive over by the hotels is again 31 feet wide. There has to be some uniformity to the street width that gets put in. The piece on Lot #5 should probably be removed in its entirety and replaced at a uniform width.

In regard to drainage, there are five items on this. One of them is covering the required Best Management Practices for water quality, which he has had discussions with the engineer. There has not been a final detail prepared for that; there has been some kind of concepts that they have talked about. They had some concerns about how that gets finalized. He sent his concerns over to the engineer's office. Also, there is a discussion about allowing off-site water to pass through the subdivision. The drainage law requires lower properties to accept the water from higher properties; the Village and County

Ordinance dictate the required rate of flow. Basically, where the 40-foot utility easement is that he mentioned earlier, that is the route through the subdivision. It has to be designed for this off-site flow. There has to be some shape of the land in order to accommodate this off site-flow. The shape of the land is the pitch or the running slope from the high site to the low site, and the other shape factor is how wide is the ditch or swale that would have to be in there. This needs to be incorporated into the final plans.

In regard to utilities, there are a number of items that the Commission should consider. He said because of the small space between some of the buildings' storm sewer that is run between the buildings should be made of a water main quality pipe so that there is no leaks from the storm sewer into the over dig of the foundation or into the gravel drainage system surrounding the house where you would end up having problems with the sump pumps. There are the BMP pipes which are sketched into the plans they have, but it really does not identify the pipe slope diameter and material, which he thinks is still a work in progress. They are working with the engineer on this in order to get the final details of that out. He said there are some existing utility stubs that were put in many years ago for a water and sanitary sewer to service the property. Because of the new land plan, some of them are not really in the proper location to be used or they are not really necessary based on the land plan. Those should be abandoned at the main, and if that is at the far side street they should be abandoned at their point of connection to the existing main.

In regard to grading and drainage, there are some interesting things on the plan. In regard to the pedestrian path, the path of travel cannot exceed 2% for the slope in certain areas and that needs to be detailed on the plans. Maximum driveway slope is permitted to be 8% although no slopes exceeding 5% are strongly recommended.

There are some lots that are side by side. The plans show the proposed top of foundation and the finished grading, but it looks like there are some houses proposed along the block or one that is much higher than the other. There will be a grading issue between the two houses where all the water from the higher lot is going to flow right to the foundation of the lower lot. He thinks there needs to be some step foundations introduced into the plan on certain lots. This needs to be looked at closer.

In regard to the lighting plan, he mentioned earlier that there has not been one submitted.

He stated that under the recommendation he wrote two recommendations; one being either to move forward tonight based on what they have seen and heard or request additional information to address any of their questions.

Commissioner Jaster inquired if Mr. Prohaska's report has been shared with the petitioner. Mr. Prohaska stated that it was finished last week so it should have been out to them. He said he thinks the petitioner has had four people from their team preoccupied with more important business; they can speak for themselves. He said they have been working with them for months. The project was originally the Atriums; they had plan reviews, and now it is single-family. They have had meetings. The land plan is slightly different, but it is not like they started from scratch. They have been corresponding and discussing by phone and email, and the really heavy items he talked to them about. Commissioner Jaster said it appears that there is going to be a lot of discussion needed as far as their willingness to go along with Mr. Prohaska's recommendations or modify their original plans based upon the needs of the Village. Mr. Prohaska stated that the Springfield Place project was interesting on how they got through their final plan approval. He thinks the project was approved here by the Planning & Zoning Commission and Village Board in the fall of whatever year that was, and the final plans issued for construction were not approved until May if he has the dates correct. Between the two time periods that he can recall at least three written reviews of those plans in order to get details or all of the issues addressed for the Village. He said they did not have as detail plans on that project as they have now. He thinks that they are a little bit ahead of the game if they were to compare the two projects. These are more detailed, but there are some issues that they should consider.

Commissioner Smith said this looks like an outstanding project, but in a sense it looks like they are dealing with a draft of some sort. Mr. Prohaska stated that the engineering plans are thorough and well detailed, but he has concerns and issues and has written them and discussed them. The following people were sworn in for the hearing. The rest of the plans are not his area of expertise to know if they are complete or thorough. He thinks they have presented them with a complete packet that they would normally get.

Commissioner Shannon stated that they have talked an awful lot about the road, and where are they with this now. Mr. Prohaska said Springfield Drive when it was the Atriums was proposed to have a curb cut access to Springfield Drive. They talked about that, and the Village conceded that the curb cut access as specific point, which is basically where the 40-foot utility easement was located. It was all going to be under a road. They would have the road from Springfield Drive into the subdivision, and it was going to

access their utilities. He said the developer should speak to what exactly happened, but LLT changed the land plan and decided they no longer needed the curb cut access to Springfield Drive. In that same time period, the DuPage Medical Group was in for their project, and they were going to share an access with LLT, but when LLT was reformulating their land plan, the DuPage Medical Group still wanted the access to Springfield so the access has been changed to be on the DuPage Medical Group property. The DuPage Medical Group will have its own private driveway into the DuPage Medical Group facility and that property will not be connected to this proposed subdivision. This project is not proposing any access from Springfield; they can access it at Knollwood at two points and one at the mall.

Ms. Terry Buno - 1 Tiffany Pointe, Bloomingdale, IL

Mr. Mike Anderson - Haeger Engineering, 1304 N. Plum Grove Road,
Schaumburg, IL

Ms. Terry Buno introduced herself to the Planning & Zoning Commission. She has offices at 1 Tiffany Pointe in Bloomingdale, Illinois. She stated that they are doing a modification from the original plan because of calls that they have received from a sign that they put up. The purchasers seem to be interested in the small single-family lots. They thought it would better suit the demand to provide more single-family homes and less duplex. This is the reason they are back here tonight with a change.

She said they have seen the reports from Mr. Prohaska and the Village, and basically, are in agreement with working through all of those details. Her engineer has been working with DuPage Medical Group and engineering to address that section of Lot #5 to benefit both of them where they would incur the cost to raise the road.

As far as the landscaping and what has been proposed, she stated that the landscape architect is going to address the perimeter of the screening along Springfield, along Knollwood, Stratford Drive, but also need to provide for privacy and a residential feel for those homes that back up to those areas.

They are proposing mostly ranches; ranches with more options as far as a loft situation or allowing a two story. These homes will be open to any one; no age restriction. There will be a Homeowner's Association that will address a lot of the issues that Mr. Prohaska brought up about the 40-foot easement that the Village has, which will restrict the fencing.

Mr. Mike Anderson introduced himself to the Planning & Zoning Commission. He is with Haeger Engineering with offices at 1304 N. Plum Grove Road,

Schaumburg, Illinois. He said they submitted an initial set of final engineering plans to Mr. Prohaska. He said all of the items that they have talked about they do not have a problem with complying with but with the exception of the recommendation on the road geometry curve street. He explained this to the Planning and Zoning Commission. They are asking that the 100 feet remain for this. He goes on to say that there are other neighborhoods that have similar situations to this; these are local streets.

Mr. Prohaska said the issue is the curve linear nature of the roads interior to the subdivision. He thinks the code even says it is desirable to have curve linear roads, and there are certain standards in the code. They are trying to keep the speed of the cars uniform and that the people do not have to constantly be adjusting the way they are driving to adapt to changes that are presented to them in the road such as rain or snow. The curve-linear nature of the roads covers things like what is your sight distance and your reaction time based on the operating speed of the vehicle. He said if your vision is obstructed, you have less time to react to things that might be in the road.

Commissioner Jaster inquired if there are other streets in town like this. Mr. Prohaska said they do. He said just because something was done once before does not necessarily mean it was a good idea or a bad idea. They have had complaints about different intersections. He is bringing this up to the Commission so they can consider it for this project.

Commissioner Jaster said he believes that traffic speeds will be low enough that people will not have a problem with those curves, and there is precedent of other streets in town with that radius as well. He does not see a problem with it.

Commissioner Coleman inquired to the price point of the homes. The price points will be \$350,000 to \$475,000. They are marketing people who do not want to have the two-story homes and manage the stairs and also cannot afford to spend as much money as they did initially on their home.

Commissioner Coleman said he likes the look of the homes. Mr. Prohaska stated that the wall of the house is set 5 feet from the property line. She said they do have more room than the Springfield Place project in the front and rear setbacks. This project mimics closer to Rosedale Estates.

Vice Chairman King agrees with Commissioner Jaster.

Commissioner Shannon inquired if the petitioner would be open to losing a lot. She said they would prefer not to because it is a premium lot that backs to the water.

The Planning and Zoning Commission continued to discuss this.

Mr. Gascoigne said he heard the petitioner mentioned that they obtained a landscape architect, but there was no real discussion with the fence and how they were going to address it. He would like clarity on this issue.

She stated that it is their intent to take down all of the fencing that they proposed. They want to try to keep the fence by the parking lot access directly behind DuPage Medical Group. She said they will work with staff on this and the fence materials.

Moved by Commissioner Coleman, seconded by Commissioner Shannon to open up the floor to the public.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Chairman Brice

Motion Carried

No one came forward to address this hearing.

Moved by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Jaster to close the floor to the public.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Chairman Brice

Motion Carried

Moved by Commissioner Jaster, seconded by Commissioner Smith to recommend approval of the following requests and relief relative to the request for the development and construction of a new single-family residential subdivision containing up to 60 units with the property commonly referred to as parcels 2 and 4 at Stratford Commons and Springfield Pointe. For final subdivision approval, exceptions from the Zoning Ordinance related to the related setbacks, minimum required structure separations, minimum lot widths, minimum lot area, to provide no recreational area, minimum floor area for per dwelling unit, as well as deviations from the Engineering standards including right-of-way width, no parkway trees,

street termination without a cul-de-sac, sidewalk installation less than 1 foot from the right-of-way, standards for road curvatures and tangency, final site plan review and the comprehensive plan amended. The recommendation of approval made hereby shall be and is hereby made subject to the following conditions: all roadways are to remain entirely private or entirely dedicated, should Lot 5 not be dedicated, the remaining streets within the subdivision shall also remain entirely private. The petitioner shall revise the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions to specify that all fences constructed within the subdivision shall be constructed of aluminum, wrought iron appearance except along the entry road adjacent to DuPage Medical Group which shall be permitted to be solid provided the fence material is consistent. Such language shall be revised by the petitioner and subject to the review and approval of the Village staff and the Village Attorney. The petitioner shall comply with the requirements set forth in the memorandum of the Bloomingdale Fire Protection District, dated April 4, 2016. The petitioner shall comply with the requirements set forth in the memorandum provided by the Engineering Department, dated April 27, 2016 with the exception of the curve radius as discussed this evening.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Chairman Brice

Motion Carried

7. TEXT AMENDMENT – SIGNAGE – TEMPORARY – (FIRST HEARING) – 2016-106

The following exhibits were entered into the record.

Exhibit # 1 - Application for Hearing – Not Applicable

Exhibit # 2 - Notice of Public Hearing, dated March 15, 2016

Exhibit # 3 - Affidavit of Compliance – Not Applicable

Exhibit # 4 - Application Agreement – Not Applicable

Exhibit # 5 - Affidavit of Disclosure – Not Applicable

Exhibit # 6 - Notice to Surrounding Property Owners – Not Applicable

Exhibit # 2 is introduced into the record, which is the Notice of Public Hearing, dated March 15, 2016

Mr. Gascoigne said this is a clarification of the code. The code is very ambiguous when it comes to some of the temporary signs; specifically, these feather signs, which many municipalities use. Technically, they fit under the definition and description of a banner. The problem with that is that the banner language and the size allowances are far larger than what most people are putting up. Staff tried to come up with a period of time that was appropriate being no more than four times a year, seven days at a maximum, as well as how to manage some of the multi-tenant facilities and try to clean up that language. These are temporary signs.

Moved by Commissioner Jaster, seconded by Commissioner Shannon to open up the floor to the public.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Chairman Brice

Motion Carried

No one came forward to address this hearing.

Moved by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Coleman to close the floor to the public.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Chairman Brice

Motion Carried

Moved by Commissioner Smith, seconded by Commissioner Jaster to recommend approval of text amendments to the Zoning Regulations, Title 11, Chapter 14 of the Village Code as it relates to the allowance for temporary feather signs in Business

Districts as set forth in the staff report from the Community Development Coordinator, dated March 29, 2016 and subject to approval.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Chairman Brice

Motion Carried

8. OLD BUSINESS - None

9. NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner King would like to have a motion to elect a Vice Chair in the absence of Chairman Brice.

Moved by Vice Chairman King, seconded by Commissioner Smith to elect Commissioner Jaster as Vice Chairman.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Chairman Brice

Motion Declared Carried

10. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD - None

11. ADJOURNMENT

Moved by Commissioner Jaster, seconded by Commissioner Coleman to adjourn the May 3, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting at 8:58 p.m.

Ayes: All Commissioners Present

Nays: None

Absent: Chairman Brice

Motion Declared Carried

Respectfully Submitted,



Sandra Aronson, Recording Secretary
of the Planning and Zoning Commission