



**VILLAGE OF PLAINFIELD
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
RECORD OF MINUTES**

DATE: December 4, 2007

LOCATION: Village Hall

Chairman Sobkoviak called the meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:13 p.m. after the close of the Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting.

ROLL CALL:

- Present:** Commissioners Kachel, McKay, Renzi; O'Rourke, Bonuchi, and Sanders; Ex Officio Commissioner Cox; Chairman Sobkoviak; and the Representative from the Plainfield Fire Protection District
- Absent:** Plainfield Park District, Plainfield School District, Library District, and Plainfield Police Department
- Also Present:** Michael Garrigan – Village Planner Village of Plainfield, Jonathan Proulx – Planner II Village of Plainfield, Mike Schwarz – Planner II Village of Plainfield, Sara Leach – Planner Village of Plainfield, Sara Javoronok – Planner Village of Plainfield, Carol Millan – Secretary Village of Plainfield, and Neal Eickholtz – Baxter and Woodman

MINUTES:

The minutes from the Plan Commission meeting of November 20, 2007 were accepted as amended. Page 12 of 13, third paragraph, second sentence, "He stated the findings are not the strongest points to say they are findings of fact", should be inserted in the previous paragraph after the sentence, "He stated they can agree to disagree on those points."

Chairman Sobkoviak made mention of the meeting dates for the ZBA and PC for 2008 and asked if there were any conflicts with the meeting dates. The Commissioners agreed with the dates.

DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Michael Garrigan gave the development report. The Village Board reviewed the Heron Point Project at their meeting on December 3, 2007. They approved the modification to the PUD by a vote of 4-2, the Plat of Consolidation by a vote of 4-2, Preliminary/Final Plat by a vote of 4-2, Site Plan Review for the retail center by a vote of 5-1, and the Economic Incentive Agreement was also approved by the Village Board. He ended his report.

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE: 1371-102907.FP **BINNY'S BEVERAGE DEPOT**
Request: Preliminary & Final Plat of Subdivision (Consolidation)
Location: 12307 S. Route 59
Applicant: Drew Development, LLC

TIME: 7:18 p.m.

Mike Schwarz summarized the staff report. In August of 2007, the Village Board approved a parking variance for the project. There was a stipulation that required the applicant to consolidate three properties into one. This is housekeeping to put into place a cross-access easement across the new consolidated Lot #1 and the property to the North. No access to Route 59 would be granted directly from this subject property.

Staff believes the plat generally meets Village requirements. It will need to be reviewed by the Village Engineer for any technical corrections before it gets recorded. Staff's recommendation is to approve a one lot subdivision known as Binny's Consolidation with two stipulations in the staff report.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Neal Eickholtz if he had any comments. Neal responded there have not been any engineering revisions to the site and they do not have any comments.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked if there was anyone in the audience that cared to ask a question or make a comment. There was no response from the audience.

Mike Schwarz stated it was his understanding that the applicant would not be present at tonight's meeting because of the straight forward nature of the request.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked about any cross-access to the property to the south. Mike Schwarz stated that is not subject to this process. The only stipulation was for this property. The property to the south was already subdivided in the County and then later annexed into the Village. That is another issue. The original developer to the south never provided cross access as part of the subdivision plat. It was never platted and there is no separate REA (reciprocal easement agreement) recorded. It would be another housekeeping matter. As any future Village approvals of the property to the south come in, staff will look to clean that up also, addressing cross access after the fact. Commissioner O'Rourke mentioned a property further to the south where there was no easement in place. Mike Schwarz clarified that there is an easement that was platted, it was unclear as to whether or not the access was providing legal cross access to the property further south.

Commissioner Renzi had a recollection there were discussions about posting a sign to let people know there was additional parking for Binny's. He felt there was some sort of agreement between Binny's and the people to the south. Mike Schwarz stated there is a separate agreement between Binny's and the property immediately south, Car Care Collision. That separate agreement does provide an ongoing easement to allow parking. He thought it was 10 or 11 parking spaces. Mike Schwarz went on to say there will be a statement provided on the face of the plat. It will be clear that it is an access easement.

At 7:25 p.m. Commissioner Sanders made a motion that the Commission approve the Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision (consolidation) for a one-lot subdivision known as Binny's Consolidation, subject to the following stipulations:

1. Subject to the requirements of the Village Engineer,
2. Subject to the requirements of the Plainfield Fire Protection District.

Commissioner Bonuchi seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

Aye: McKay, Renzi, O'Rourke, Bonuchi, Sanders, Kachel, Chairman Sobkoviak
Nay: 0

The motion is carried 7:0

CASE: 1374-110207.TA **TEXT AMENDMENT SIGN CODE**
Request: Text Amendment to the Village's Sign Code (Public Hearing)
Location: Village-wide
Applicant: Village of Plainfield

At 7:26 p.m. Commissioner McKay made a motion to continue Case 1374-110207.TA to January 15, 2008

Commissioner Kachel seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

Aye: Renzi, O'Rourke, Bonuchi, Sanders, Kachel, McKay, Chairman Sobkoviak
Nay: 0

The motion is carried 7:0

CASE: 1372-110107.SU **VANDYKE ROAD VENTURE**
Request: Major Change to a PUD (Public Hearing)
Special Use for an Assisted Living Facility
Site Plan Review for an Assisted Living Facility
Site Plan Review for a Daycare Facility
Location: Northwest Corner of Prairie Grove and Van Dyke Road
Applicant: Scott Hagge with Hagge Construction

At 7:27 p.m. Commissioner Bonuchi made a motion to continue Case 1372-110107.SU to December 18, 2007.

Commissioner Sanders seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

Aye: O'Rourke, Bonuchi, Sanders, Kachel, McKay, Renzi, Chairman Sobkoviak
Nay: 0

The motion is carried 7:0

CASE: 1348-071207.AA.RZ.SU.CP

RIVER Village of Plainfield

Request: Annexation (Public Hearing)
Rezoning (Public Hearing)
Special Use (Public Hearing)
Concept Plan

Location: West of IL. Rt. 59, south of Fraser Rd.

Applicant: Patti Bernhard

Michael Garrigan explained that this case has been requested for numerous continuances. He requested continuing the case to January 15, 2008. He wanted to give a brief update. There was a very positive meeting at the end of last week and many of the engineering issues at the conceptual level have been addressed. Staff is now in the position, based on discussions with the applicant and engineer, to schedule this case. This is a very large, complicated project down on Route 59.

Commissioner Renzi asked if staff would be present to address issues and concerns of the project. Neal Eickholtz commented that Steve Amann is working on this project.

At 7:31 p.m. Commissioner McKay made a motion to continue Case: 1348-071207.AA.RZ.SU.CP to January 15, 2008.

Commissioner Renzi seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

Aye: Bonuchi, Sanders, Kachel, McKay, Renzi, O'Rourke, Chairman Sobkoviak

Nay: 0

The motion is carried 7:0

CASE: 1335-061507.PP.SU

PLAINFIELD VILLAGE CENTER

Request: Special Use for a Planned Development (Public Hearing)
Preliminary Development Plan
Preliminary Plat of Subdivision

Location: Southwest corner of Lockport Street and Van Dyke Road

Applicant: Plainfield Commercial Partners

TIME: 7:32 p.m.

Michael Garrigan stated this is a continuation of a public hearing being held pursuant to public notice and in accordance with Village Ordinance and State Statutes. He stated Eric Gallt, the Village Traffic Engineer, will answer any questions the Commission may have in relation to traffic. After that, the meeting could be turned over to a public hearing, as there is extensive public comment. Then staff, if there is time, could proceed with their report.

Eric Gallt reviewed the traffic study and traffic impact analysis. He pointed out a few issues in the study that raised some concerns, not with the general conclusions of the traffic study, but some items within the traffic study. He stated it is critical to point out that the Stage 1 development is under the assumption that IL 126 is still under the jurisdiction of IDOT. His first comment was in regards to the proposed site access, specifically in Stage 1. He recommended a more controlled intersection of either Wallin Drive or Van Dyke, to the existing driveway access that was provided under the Wallin Drive construction adjacent to or across from the main entrance into the YMCA. Secondly, he believes some consideration should be made given that the traffic study assumed that the Village would continue its path for the reroute of 126. This assumption is an appropriate assumption, but he felt there should be some general understanding of a possibility of Rt. 126 not being rerouted and what the impact to this site would be if Rt. 126 was not rerouted. It would have a significant impact on the ability of this site to handle traffic and he felt there should be some sort of letter of understanding with regards to that fact.

Commissioner Renzi stated his recollection of the rerouting of 126 involves 3 issues. First, the initial rerouting is supposed to be completed by Grande Park South. He asked Eric if there was any indication, with the downturn of housing, that Grande Park South would not be completing that part of the reroute at this time. Eric briefly went through the entire Rt. 126 reroute. The actual Phase 1 would be the reroute of U.S. 30 to 143rd St. He stated that first phase of the reroute will be completed by the end of the month. Rerouting Route 30 as it comes down from Aurora onto 143rd St. will basically take some of the northbound truck traffic off of IL. Rt. 126 in front of the Hall between VanDyke and U.S.30. There are 2 other phases, called west phase and east phase. The east phase is a project that is currently under Phase II design by the Village, which is to extend 143rd St. from Rt.59 to IL. Rt. 126 over the DuPage River. The Phase II engineering is expected to be complete by December of 08. The concern of that project is it is approximately a \$12 Million construction project and the Village will have to find the funds to construct that. There may be some delays on that project if the funds are not readily available. To the west, there are agreements in place for most of the extension heading to the east, which includes the Grand Meadow site. They have stipulations within their agreement based on the Village extending 143rd to Plainfield Road. There is another developer involved with a portion of that and staff has been working with them. The market is a factor and he felt it was safe to assume that until the market takes some sort of upturn, the Village will not see the Rt. 126 extension completed to the east.

Commissioner Renzi had a understanding that Grande Meadows will not have to build their portion if 143rd is not brought to them. Eric agreed. Commissioner Renzi stated the Village is not annexed all the way out there. Eric explained that the extension of the roadway is not dependent on annexation. The Village has been actively pursuing acquisition of the right-of-way for the extension. Commissioner Renzi asked if there is a design for the roadway. Eric stated staff has been completing the preliminary engineering work and the Village engineer has been contracted to do the design work for the portion of road from Steiner to what is called County Line extended. The Updike Farm developer is responsible for a portion of this road.

Commissioner Renzi asked if the Village is working on the easternmost portion and that is what the Village Engineer is looking at. Eric agreed. Commissioner Renzi asked if there was a timeframe for when they would be able to lay pavement. Eric stated he felt the earliest that they would be able to lay pavement would be in 2009. The design is one thing and the construction dollars is another thing. 2009 would be concurrent with the 143rd extension to the east. He doubted that the Village would be able to construct both east and west in the 2009 construction season.

Commissioner Renzi questioned whether the area that would go from County Line extension was developer funded. Eric stated from County Line to Plainfield Road is the responsibility of Updike Farm. Commissioner Renzi asked when they would start doing the design work. Eric stated they have done some preliminary work on the design work. At this point, staff has coordinated between their engineers and Grande Meadow's engineers. Commissioner Renzi asked if the developer of the Updike property would be in a position to lay pavement in 2009 also. Eric stated if the housing market does not turn, there is not an incentive for developers to push their projects forward. He did not believe there was a clause in the Updike project that forced them under a date certain to construct that portion of the roadway. It would behoove them to have that portion of the roadway constructed as it is a great access point from the east to their property. They have been active in the design and have expressed an interest in continuing that through, not only with the roadway but also with the utility connections, including a major sanitary sewer connection.

Commissioner Sanders stated what the Commission is looking at tonight is the relational situation of what may or may not occur with the rerouting of Rt. 126 and the impact to the development of the Village Center and how construction traffic would basically access the site. Eric stated that either way during the Phase I construction, IL 126 will be under the jurisdiction of State. He was concerned with the traffic volumes within that and that is why he recommended providing access for construction activities off of the main highway to a controlled intersection at either Van Dyke or Wallin Drive. He did not want to leave the impression that the Rt. 126 reroute will not happen. He wanted the Commission to understand that he cannot designate a particular time for the reroute. He believes the Village Board will move the 143rd Street projects forward. He felt there should be some kind of understanding of this project that Stage 1 may be 5 to 7 years, or it could be 3 years.

Commissioner Renzi asked Eric if there was any way it could be determined what traffic will look like keeping Rt. 126 as is with the developer looking to build their residential development so it can be determined how many more cars will be put out on the road. He stated maybe the Village should just start widening Rt. 126 and just get an extra lane across the bridge. Eric stated the type of improvements Commissioner Renzi is suggesting would be in the range of \$3 to \$5 Million based on the assumption that the Village is not rerouting Rt. 126.

Commissioner Sanders asked if construction traffic could be directed to 143rd to Rt. 30 and then come into the Wallin Drive entrance to the construction site. Eric stated the State will not reroute IL 126 at the existing U.S. 30 from Wallin Dr. extended up to 143rd. The State has made it clear that they will not reroute that in a temporary or permanent manner. The Village could designate some construction traffic route. U. S. 30 or Lockport St., the general business district, will be weight restricted. Rt. 126 will not be weight restricted because it will still be a state route under the Stage 1 construction.

Commissioner Kachel asked if the State had any plans to put a full interchange at Caton Farm. Eric stated no. Eric stated there are two concerns with the Caton Farm interchange. The first is the proximity to U.S. Route 30 and the second is there is some high quality wetlands in one of the corridors that would be significantly impacted.

Commissioner Cox asked Eric if the traffic study was prepared with the premise of the reroute of Rt. 126. Eric stated Stage 1 assumes that Rt. 126 remains in its current location. Stage 2, or ultimate buildout, does assume that Rt. 126 is rerouted to the 143rd St. corridor. Commissioner Cox asked if Eric was stating that without the reroute there will be significant traffic problems. Eric stated there are traffic problems right now; and that without the reroute, it will not be any better. Commissioner Cox stated that basically the

Village Center and the impact to the traffic along Lockport Street is really contingent upon the reroute. Eric agreed and stated that is an assumption made in the traffic study.

Eric stated the current agreement with the State, or letter of understanding, is contingent upon the full completion of both the east and west portion of Rt. 126. Commissioner O'Rourke asked when Stage 2 would begin. Eric stated the Stage 2 is the ultimate buildout.

Commissioner Kachel asked if the traffic study took into account some of the subdivisions that are not at full buildout. Eric stated the growth rates that the traffic study assumed are larger than the Chicagoland Area as a whole generally assumes on traffic studies. There was a discussion about traffic between the Commissioners and Eric Gallt.

Commissioner O'Rourke had a question about construction traffic on Wallin Drive. He asked if there should be any concern with the middle school located there. Eric stated a very large percentage of the traffic generated by this site does not impact Ottawa and Wallin Drive, or specifically the intersection of the main access to the middle school. There would be increased traffic on Wallin Drive north of the site, specifically Village Center Drive. The impact on Ottawa and Wallin will be relatively minimal.

Eric stated he believes the traffic study underestimated the amount of trips that will be generated by the retail. He believes the trips generated could possibly be, especially in the evening, 2 to 3 times higher than what was proposed in the traffic study. The existing traffic, or the proposed background traffic on the major roadways, is going to be the major impact on the level of service for the intersection, not so much the added traffic from this site.

Eric stated the traffic study did mention pedestrian signals. There will be a permanent signal at Lockport Street. When sidewalks are connected, it will be a matter of just turning on the pedestrian signals because the infrastructure will be there and available.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked Eric if he felt this study is still valid or whether it should be redone. Eric stated portions of the traffic study should be redone and reevaluated as an addendum, but he said the major considerations should be some sort of agreement of how an access is handled. He also said it should be determined how stage 1 and going into stage 2 is impacted by the IL 126 reroute. There has to be some sort of understanding with the developer with regards to the impact before they move on.

Eric stated in stage 1 the developer had the installation of a two-way left turn lane from the access between Wallin Drive and Van Dyke, basically taking the existing left turn lane and turning that into a two-way left turn lane where you can have opposing traffic. Eric highly recommends that there not be a two-way left turn, but rather that they stripe out a minimal left turn lane and keep it an exclusive left between VanDyke and the entrance drive. Commissioner Renzi asked if it would be hard to get the conditional right-of-way, or is the road wide enough so that it could be narrowed down for that. Eric stated the road is wide enough at that point. It would require the removal of some median islands that exist, but it would be better to stripe it out as back-to-back left turn lanes rather than a continuous left turn lane.

Commissioner McKay asked would it be possible when the developer of Updike Farms comes forward with their PUD could the development of the roadway be something that could be used as a bargaining chip in the negotiations. Eric stated he believes there is an agreement already in place. Commissioner McKay asked why then is there no conclusive date as to when the roadway has to be completed. Eric stated in the agreement there was not a specific date for when that work has to be completed. Eric stated it is a major

access point for the Updike Farms development. When they break ground they most likely will complete that to provide access. He went on to say the Village can encourage the developer. He stated the developer does not have to complete this, but if Grande Meadow is moving forward the Village can step in and recapture those funds from that developer. The Village is limited and cannot do the entire Rt. 126 roadway from the east side of town all the way through without some sort of assistance from the developers.

Commissioner McKay stated if she was hearing correctly, she would determine that Eric would not be in favor of stage 2 of this plan without Rt. 126 being rerouted. Eric stated he would have significant concerns with this being ultimately built out without Rt. 126 being rerouted. He believes stage 1 is appropriate.

Stephen Bus from the petitioner spoke next. He wanted to clarify a couple of points. He stated they never intended to put a construction access off of Lockport Street as mentioned in the traffic report. He stated one at Wallin Drive would be the most appropriate and they have no problem with making that commitment. He stated looking at the long term plan it is critical that on-street parking be a component of any long term plan where you are trying to get street front shopping. You need to have convenient parking so people can access the store fronts. He agreed that will never occur while that road is under IDOT jurisdiction, so they broke the plan into stage 1 and stage 2. It is not their intent to even attempt to build these buildings without that parking being in place and without the ability to work with the Village and do the long term improvements to Lockport Street. The Stage 1 project would be south of Village Center Drive. The only component that they would potentially envision doing early on in the project commercially would be the corner of Wallin and Lockport because it would be something that would be viable commercially without the parking in and along Lockport Street.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked the number of parking spaces in the parking deck that would be built. It didn't look like the 20 parking spaces out in front of 50,000 sq. ft. of retail is going to have that much of an impact versus the parking garage itself. Stephen Bus stated there has to be the street front parking for the retail for people who want to get a "quick-in" and "quick-out" thing. Commissioner O'Rourke asked why the logic wouldn't hold true for the corner lot. Stephen Bus stated that corner would be marketed as a specialty niche grocery. That building would be proposed as a stand-alone building.

Commissioner Sanders asked if that building will be discussed architecturally later in the evening. The petitioner answered yes.

Commissioner Kachel asked why parking could not be put on Rt. 126. He thought there could be parking on Rt. 126. Eric stated the State will not allow on-street parking currently on any state highway that currently does not have on-street parking. He stated the reason there is on-street parking in the downtown is because it has always been there. Commissioner Kachel wanted Eric to check that out. There was a discussion about on-street parking on Rt. 126. Stephen Bus stated staff envisions this long term as a boulevard down the center, with two lanes and parking on the sides.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if there was a reason the commercial would not be phase 1 and the residential phase 2. Paul Mitchell explained the commercial will not want to do the development before residential is in place. Commissioner O'Rourke asked how many rooftops would be in the project. Paul Mitchell stated there would be 800. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if that would support 156,000 sq. ft. of retail. Stephen Bus stated the intent, as mentioned in the BDI Report, the commercial proposed on this project would require people to be drawn from offsite. That is pretty much how every suburban commercial development in Northern Illinois works. It is not the intent of the petitioner that all the residential in this project will support the commercial. They are making it a destination. The petitioner stated the three mixed

use buildings are tied to the whole IDOT jurisdictional issue. They have no control over this, but they do know that everything south of Village Center Drive will be ready to go when the market comes back in the next couple of years for that type of product. At that time, the commercial users will come. Commissioner O'Rourke had a concern that the residential would get built as stage 1, and then the commercial will come back for a PUD change for stage 2 and end up looking a lot different than originally proposed.

Commissioner McKay shared Commissioner O'Rourke's concerns. Her concern was that the density gets put in and then possibly the developer sells off the retail part and the new owner comes back and requests a change to the PUD. She would like to look at the entire plan and put architectural reviews in place. She stated traffic matters to retail, but it is good traffic that matters. The retail will examine the property and count cars. They want to know where they are going, what they are doing, etc. Traffic is the number one concern.

Paul Mitchell stated they intend to complete the Rt. 126 bypass. Everybody agrees the only way that would not happen is if residential continues down. He further stated if that is the situation, the petitioner's project isn't going to move either. If they are not going to do Grande Park South, the petitioner will not be able to do their project either because they are selling to the same market.

Stephen Bus stated that is why they are looking at doing it in 2 pieces. Design guidelines, architectural design guidelines, landscaping guidelines, etc. will be applied to the mixed use buildings. This information is in the staff report.

Commissioner Renzi made mention that Paul Mitchell had mentioned this is the same market as the Grande Park South market. It was Commissioner Renzi's recollection that the lowest price house in Grande Park South was \$250,000 and there were some \$350,000 to \$500,000 homes. It was his understanding that a number of the units in this project were going to be in the \$150,000 to \$250,000 range for the condos, and the inner units. Stephen Bus stated the duplexes would be in the area of \$375,000 to \$400,000 range and that would compete somewhat with other products in town. The townhomes are envisioned to be in the \$325,000 to \$350,000 range. The mid-rise units would take some of the load off. The petitioner is trying to get as many different types of products into this project as possible. Commissioner Renzi referred to the BDI report which referenced the \$250,000 range. There was a discussion about the number of unoccupied homes already in Plainfield. Paul Mitchell stated nothing is selling right now in this market. If the market is like it is today, stage 1 is not going to be sold or it is going to be very slow. The petitioner probably would start construction, but it would be a very slow construction rate. Stephen Bus stated the owner of the property has had this piece of property for 12 years. They are going to prepare the property so they can begin when they choose to. The petitioner feels there is a good market for this product. He also referred to the BDI report referring to the sub-\$300,000 range there is only about a 4 to 5 month supply of product on the market. When you get to the \$300,000 to \$600,000 market, it is in the teens and when you get to the \$600,000 plus range it is up in the 20's. This lower priced market is closer to coming back in the near term than is higher priced units.

Commissioner Kachel stated he felt the plan was good if it could be built out right away. He stated it is predicted that the housing market will be flat for the next 5 years. His concern was that in 5 years will this product be viable or will there have to be a change to the PUD. There was a discussion about the previous TENG plan.

Commissioner McKay asked to see pictures of the villas (duplexes). Stephen Bus explained the layout of the units along Ottawa Street across from the existing single family homes.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in Chris Roberts for the petitioner. Chris Roberts spoke. He stated the developer has made an attempt to relate to the existing neighbors to the south of this development. He showed slides showing the architectural features. He stated there is four-sided architecture. The development transitions to the more urban Lockport Street.

At 8:55 p.m. Chairman Sobkoviak called for a ten minute break.

At 9:05 p.m. Chairman Sobkoviak reconvened the meeting.

The meeting was opened to the public hearing portion and the following residents were sworn in by Chairman Sobkoviak and gave testimony.

John Hawley – Wallin Woods resident. He stated it is not that they do not want to have anything developed on this property, but rather he feels this will make a big impact on the Wallin Woods residents. He had a big concern with traffic and did not think the projection of 82 students is practical based upon an 800 unit design. This is a major transition from the present residential community and they are concerned it will significantly impact their day-to-day lives and the value of their homes.

Virginia Hawley – 24605 Ottawa, Wallin Woods resident. She had concerns about the tall duplexes, traffic, and density. She also had concerns that the land would be cleared and graded and undeveloped for a while.

Bill Gerardy – Corner of Ingersoll and Ottawa, Wallin Woods resident. He had concerns with traffic, density of homes, and the values of their homes being affected.

Richard Smolen – He lives on Lincolnway and the back of his property abuts Ottawa. He is president of the Wallin Woods Homeowners Association. He has received a number of emails from residents of Wallin Woods. He stated one of the largest concerns is the traffic – and the extension of Van Dyke Road. He feels the traffic, whether it is along Ottawa, Rt. 126 and Van Dyke extending all of the way to Drauden, encompasses basically every corner of the neighborhood. The Wallin Woods neighborhood will have a major traffic thoroughfare going through it. He had concerns from residents as to how this will affect their property values. He mentioned the area between Dan Patch and Hamlin, in the center, where there are larger structures at a 45 degree angle. He would like to remove those and have duplexes along the entire length of Ottawa. He would like to have someone look at similar developments and how adjacent property values were affected. He found it hard to believe that the developer would be able to sell duplexes at \$375,000 to \$400,000 when homes in Wallin Woods have been sitting for, in some cases, more than a year. He would not like the developer to go in with the expectation of selling these homes at \$375,000 to \$400,000 and then the homes not sell and reduce the price to \$250,000 and detract from the single family homes across the street. He mentioned that previously it was stated this project could take 5 years. He did not want to be looking at the construction mess for 5 years. They would be willing to have the higher density if there is commercial, but are afraid the commercial will not develop. They would like to keep the project intact. He felt if it was the developer's intention to do just residential, then the density that is proposed does not need to be. They would like to be actively involved.

Mike Shuck – 15204 Lincolnway, Wallin Woods. His backyard looks at the development. He had concerns with traffic, and a concern about the value of his property. He stated possibly the units along Ottawa could be single-family units. He would like to Commission to keep in mind the concerns of the residents of Wallin Woods.

Michael Mays – 34641 Ottawa, Wallin Woods. He had density concerns. He felt the two mid-rise units seemed out of place in relation to access, uses, and scale. In order to preserve the character of Ottawa the duplexes should run along the entire frontage of Ottawa.

Jason Watt – 15162 Hamlin, Wallin Woods. He had density concerns. He would like to eliminate the three row house buildings that are directly on Ottawa Street. He will be looking at the side of a 3 story building. He likes the design of the row houses and is not opposed to the row houses, but thinks there should be some sort of a buffer zone, whether it is with the duplexes going all the way through, or at least with a row of single-family then the duplexes.

Commissioner Renzi mentioned an email that he received from a resident of Wallin Woods. She had concerns about traffic, density, and the height of the buildings along Lockport. He wanted to make sure it was part of the public record.

Chairman Sobkoviak closed the public hearing for the night. He asked Michael Garrigan if he wanted to wait for the next meeting to go over his staff report. Michael Garrigan responded that would be appropriate. He would give his staff report and go over the formal findings of fact for the PUD. He also stated staff will be meeting with the applicant. Chairman Sobkoviak stressed to the petitioner that the Commission places a lot of weight on the staff report. He stated the staff report will alleviate a lot of the concerns for the people who live along Ottawa Street.

Paul Mitchell stated they will meet with staff and go over a lot of concerns from this meeting. Chairman Sobkoviak asked which concerns will be met. Paul Mitchell asked if the Commission wanted that now, but Chairman Sobkoviak stated it can wait until the next meeting on the 18th. Stephen Bus pointed out that the owner of the property is the same developer that developed the Wallin Woods subdivision.

Commissioner Sanders commented on the process and stated from what he heard tonight from the residents, he believes it will be a collaborative effort from everyone.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated Chairman Sobkoviak asked the petitioner to take into account the comments made by residents tonight, but he also wanted the petitioner to take into account the comments made by the Village Traffic Engineer.

Michael Garrigan wanted a clarification as to whether the public hearing is to be continued to the next meeting. Chairman Sobkoviak polled the Commission. They wanted to continue the public hearing to the next meeting. Chairman Sobkoviak stated they would open the hearing to anyone who has not had an opportunity to address the Commission.

Commissioner Renzi asked if the changes to the staff report could be put in bold, a different font, etc. Michael Garrigan stated that could be done.

Commissioner Cox made a response to the public comment. He wanted everyone to know that he also is a resident of Wallin Woods. He shares many of the same concerns as the residents who spoke. In a perfect world, he would also like to see another row of single-family homes, but at a minimum a full continuation of the duplexes across all of Ottawa Street eliminating those three buildings.

Commissioner McKay stated she had received an email from a homeowner. Wallin Woods lost their sign completely. She wanted Commissioner McKay to ask if there was any potential, being that Wallin Woods is going to be surrounded by new development, if the developer would be willing to work together with the Homeowners Association towards something of that nature. Stephen Bus stated it might be appropriate to do something at the corner of Van Dyke.

At 9:45 p.m. Commissioner Sanders made a motion to continue the subject case, including a continuation of the public hearing, to the December 18, 2007, meeting of the Plan Commission.

Commissioner O'Rourke seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

Aye: Sanders, Kachel, McKay, Renzi, O'Rourke, Bonuchi, **Chairman Sobkoviak**
Nay: 0

The motion is carried 7:0

CASE: 1368-101807.SU.SPR **HOPE BUFFET/CHINA BUFFET**
Request: Special Use/Major Change to a PD (Public Hearing)
Site Plan Review
Location: 13610 S. Rte. 59 (west of IL Rte. 59, south of 135th St.)
Applicant: Joyce Lee (Brian Lane, representing the applicant)

TIME: 9:45 p.m.

Jonathan Proulx summarized the staff report. He stated this case had been continued from the November 6th meeting. This also is a continuation of the public hearing from the 6th and all of the appropriate notices have been posted and published.

This is a request for a major change to a PUD to allow for site plan modification and some changes to the proposed building. It was originally intended to be an office and due to conditions of the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Board that proposed medical office end user was not ready to move forward so the property owner is requesting to change the PUD to allow construction of a restaurant. The restaurant use is allowed in the B-3 Zoning District. The PUD amendment is to look at changing the parking lot layout, the building footprint, and setbacks. In addition before the Commission tonight is the Site Plan Review for the proposed restaurant.

At the last meeting the petitioner had not submitted some of the required plans, but has since submitted those plans. There were 3 or 4 topics of discussion at the last meeting that were unresolved. The petitioner has identified snow removal areas on the revised site plan and the snow piles would be contained within the curbed area of the parking lot. There is a landscape plan providing a 100% living screen, as well as a 7' berm along the west property line. Staff has identified an area along the south property line for supplemental plantings to make sure that any headlight glare from parking cars would be captured by the landscaping. The third issue is the nature of drainage and the drainage easement that would be allowed. Through a prior easement agreement, the property owner has obtained the right to drain into the Eagle Chase detention pond. There was some question whether that user agreement was restrictive to an office

use or whether the agreement would allow for additional uses, including a restaurant use. Staff reviewed the agreement and does not believe it is tied to an office use, but refers to the Village Engineer. There was a discussion about whether a sanitary sewer connection would be more appropriate regarding the cleaning of the trash enclosure and collect the runoff from the area of the trash enclosure and convey it to the Village's Sanitary Sewer Treatment System as opposed to simply being collected and conveyed to the storm sewer system. Staff has reviewed this issue with the developer's engineer and village staff. The sanitary sewer connection is inconsistent with Village policy. It is discouraged by the IEPA and the Village. Staff did an unscientific study around town about how other trash enclosures for facilities that do have food service operations are treated and staff found that there were no special basins, collection systems, etc. Staff feels the detention system can be designed to avoid any negative impacts. Staff is comfortable with the storm sewer nature the design has proposed. The petitioner has agreed to locate the trash enclosure to the NW area of the parking lot, which is consistent with the original plan approval.

Staff is seeking a favorable recommendation on both the major change to the PUD and the Site Plan Review.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Neal Eickholtz if there are any problems. Neal replied they have not had a chance to review the recently submitted engineering plans, but this site was engineered and approved previously and they do not anticipate any concerns with this plan.

Chairman Sobkoviak had previously sworn in Brian Lane. Brian Lane apologized for not presenting the plans for the previous meeting.

Chairman Sobkoviak opened the meeting to public comment.

John Weiffenbach had been sworn in at a previous meeting. He wanted the restrictions for snow removal and trash enclosure be part of the PUD so they are there for this development and any future developments. Chairman Sobkoviak stated he believed that could be accomplished. John Weiffenbach also would like to see the hours of operation and the hours of operation for delivery purposes in the PUD.

Joyce Lee stated they will be open 7 days a week. Sunday to Thursday from 11:00 a.m. to 9:30 p.m. and Friday and Saturday from 11:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Deliveries are from 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Chairman Sobkoviak asked the Commission if those hours were acceptable. John Weiffenbach stated he didn't have any problem with those hours, but just wanted to make sure they were part of the PUD.

John Weiffenbach asked about the proposed parking spaces. Jonathan explained the previous proposal had on the order of 50 spaces and this is 63 or 64. So, the parking actually increased with the restaurant proposal. There was a discussion about available parking spaces in developments.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked Mr. Weiffenbach if he has seen the location of the snow removal areas. Mr. Weiffenbach stated he has seen the plans. He added as long as it is all kept within the curbing area of the parking lot, which continues to be drained into the receptacles taking it into the pond, he is satisfied. The concern was that it not be pushed off onto the septic fields of the adjacent property. If that is included in the PUD and an ongoing requirement, he has no problem with it. Commissioner O'Rourke's concern was that the snow plow driver continue to push the snow past the curbing area and put it into the septic field. Mr. Weiffenbach said as he recalled it is in the southernmost parking spot on the west side and there is a cutout of the lot, so if the snow was pushed further it would be pushed toward the pond toward the lot immediately to the south.

Mr. Weiffenbach wanted to make it clear that he did not represent the homeowners to the west. They are not here tonight. They raised a lot of concerns about things going into the detention pond. Chairman Sobkoviak stated those items have been addressed. Mr. Weiffenbach stated he was not sure that they have been addressed.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked if there was anyone else in the audience that cared to ask a question or make a comment. There was no further response.

Commissioner Sanders asked the petitioner about the south elevation architecture. Brian Lane showed on a slide that previously there was just a door. They added two faux windows (murals) to the elevation.

Commissioner Kachel asked if there was a way to give it a faux window look like is done on a lot of the precast buildings. All of the elevations all the way around have windows, with an arch. Could there be the false look of a window on that elevation so that the building would look the same all the way around. Commissioner Sanders asked if Commissioner Kachel was asking for a precast relief rather than the mural. Commissioner Kachel said that was right. Joyce Lee stated she was okay with that. Commissioner O'Rourke agreed, but he would defer to staff.

Jonathan Proulx stated staff's primary objective was to incorporate something with some visual interest to the south elevation. The initial submittal was just a blank wall. He added that he felt the murals would certainly add visual interest. Staff's original recommendation is consistent with what Commissioner Kachel just suggested to have an actual window or a faux window enclosure.

Commissioner Renzi did not mind the looks. He suggested maybe putting an arch over the service door. There could possibly be some oriental trees that would grow to the side of the building to each side of the door, and they could landscape it. There would be visual interest in that way.

Chairman Sobkoviak felt it looks great as presented.

Commissioner O'Rourke agreed with Commissioner Kachel.

Commissioner McKay suggested possibly putting a similar awning.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated they should leave this up to staff. The commissioners agreed.

Commissioner McKay addressed the hours of operation. She had concerns saying the hours had to be 11:00 to 6:00, etc. and writing it into the PUD. She stated just in case the petitioner leaves the building and the new owner needs different hours. With it written in the PUD – Chairman Sobkoviak stated they would have to come in with a major change to a PUD. Commissioner McKay stated the Commission needs to look at that. Chairman Sobkoviak stated it would force a public hearing to change the hours. Commissioner Renzi stated the petitioner might want to change their hours and open earlier. He stated the real concern is that the petitioner is not getting 2:00 or 3:00 a.m. deliveries. Brian Lane asked if there could be a restriction stating 9:00 a.m. and no hours of operation later than 1:00 a.m. Commissioner Renzi stated he did not want to see a major change to a PUD for possibly only an hour change in opening times. There was a discussion among the commissioners regarding the hours of operation. They decided on 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. for hours of operation every day of the week. Mr. Weiffenbach had no problem with those hours, and he also did not have a problem with the elevation on the south side of the building. He did not want any windows on the elevation.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if the hours of operation are going to be the same hours for deliveries. He was asking about the deliveries for restaurant supplies. It is staff's intention to have servicing of the building, deliveries, trash picked up, and so forth. Commissioner O'Rourke asked what hours. Jonathan Proulx stated that would be 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Commissioner Renzi had concerns about staff's findings. He stated for paragraph "b", it needs to be noted that there was some contradictory testimony about facilitating development. He stated he believed a gentleman who gave testimony at a previous meeting stated there was no intention to make commercial to the south. He also had a question on "g" regarding meeting standards of PUD regulations and it incorporates many aspects. His question was "when does many become enough" to make that finding.

Jonathan Proulx stated that with any review of final plat versus a preliminary plat there is substantial conformance and multiple findings can be made. There can actually be conflicting findings. Commissioner Renzi had concerns that the discussion might become subjective.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked Jonathan if the photometric is acceptable. Jonathan stated the actual photometric readings are acceptable. The fixtures are at a 45 degree angle and our code requires them to go straight down. Jonathan stated a revised photometric plan and product specification to be reviewed and approved by the Village Planner is one of the stipulations.

Commissioner O'Rourke did not notice that the cross easement to the south was on any of the plans. Jonathan stated the final plat was actually before the Commission with the office building and that doesn't require any revisions. The cross access easement is on the final plat, which has been approved by the Village Board.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated stipulation #2 on the major change to the Planned Development should be revised to remove snow removal and trash removal. Jonathan Proulx stated staff doesn't object to this change. There was a discussion among the commissioners regarding the snow removal and trash removal. Chairman Sobkoviak polled the commissioners to see if they had a problem with lining out snow removal and trash removal from stipulation #2. The commissioners agreed. The items were removed.

At 10:34 p.m. Commissioner Sanders made a motion that the Plan Commission adopt the findings of fact presented in the staff report as the findings of fact of the Plan Commission and recommend approval of the requested major change to the planned development to permit the proposed restaurant use with setback and parking relief at the property commonly known as 13610 S. Route 59, subject to the following two (2) stipulations:

1. The hours of operation for the restaurant use shall be 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. as recommended by the Plan Commission and/or as approved by the Board of Trustees; and
2. Servicing of the building, including delivery of equipment and supplies, shall be limited to 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. as recommended by the Plan Commission and/or as approved by the Board of Trustees.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kachel

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

Aye: Kachel, McKay, Renzi, O'Rourke, Bonuchi, Sanders, **Chairman Sobkoviak**
Nay: 0

The motion is carried 7:0

At 10:35 p.m. Commissioner Renzi made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the site plan review for the proposed 7,000 sq. ft. restaurant at the property commonly known as 13610 S. Route 59, subject to the following four (4) stipulations:

1. Compliance with the requirements of the Village Engineer;
2. Compliance with the requirements of the Plainfield Fire Protection District;
3. Submittal of a revised landscape plan subject to the review and approval of the Village planner;
and
4. Submittal of a revised photometric plan and product specifications subject to the review and approval of the Village Planner

Commissioner McKay seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

Aye: McKay, Renzi, O'Rourke, Bonuchi, Sanders, Kachel, **Chairman Sobkoviak**
Nay: 0

The motion is carried 7:0.

Chairman Sobkoviak reminded the commissioners to bring their Village Center packet with them to the December 18th meeting.

Since there was no further business before the Plan Commission, Chairman Sobkoviak adjourned the meeting at 10:37 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted
Carol Millan
Planning Secretary – Village of Plainfield