



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

DATE: MARCH 3, 2009

LOCATION: Village Hall

Chairman Sobkoviak called the meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Kachel, Renzi, O'Rourke, Bonuchi, Sanders, and Peck, Chairman Sobkoviak; ex-officio Commissioner Fremarek and Kiefer; and Plainfield Fire Protection District

Absent: Plainfield School District, Library District, Park District, and Plainfield Police Department

Also Present: Mike Schwarz – Planner II Village of Plainfield, Sara Javoronok – Planner I Village of Plainfield, Carol Millan – Secretary Village of Plainfield, and Neal Eickholtz – Baxter and Woodman

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes from the February 3, 2009 meeting were accepted as amended. Commissioner Peck made a revision to Page 13, Paragraph 5. He wanted it stated that Michael Lambert interrupted the petitioner.

DEVELOPMENT REPORT:

Planner Schwarz summarized the outcome of the Village Board meeting on March 2, 2009.

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE: 1447-020209.FP.MC

GRACE POINTE CHURCH

Request: Major Change to a Planned Development (Public Hearing)
Final Plat of Subdivision

Location: Northwest Corner of 127th Street and 248th Avenue

Applicant: Naperville Bible Church d/b/a Grace Pointe, Inc.

TIME: 7:06 p.m.

Planner Schwarz summarized the staff report. He stated this is a public hearing. All notices were made in accordance with Village and State Statute, as well as a sign was posted on the property.

Commissioner Renzi arrived during Planner Schwarz report.

Planner Schwarz stated the applicant is requesting a major change of approximately 6.4 acres. Lot 2 of the Grace Pointe Church Subdivision will be re-subdivided. The applicant is also requesting approval of the preliminary/final plat of subdivision in conjunction with this major change. Two variances are being requested from Village Standards (a variance to allow the creation of a lot that does not abut a publicly dedicated street and does not comply with the minimum lot width requirement for the B-1 Zoning District, and a variance to waive strict compliance with the yard standards of the B-1 Zoning

District based on the new lot orientation). The applicant and the contract purchaser of the newly proposed Lot 1 have divided the different aspects of this development. The applicant in this case is only contractually obligated to re-subdivide the subject property. The purchaser of the new Lot 1 would then come back later to submit site plan review documents for review. This makes this case somewhat unique. In the past when there have been re-subdivisions, the Commission would be looking at the site plan at the same time as the major change.

Planner Schwarz stated the site is 6.4 acres and is the existing Lot 2 in the Grace Pointe Subdivision. Lot 1 was the large parcel to the west of the corner, which is going to be the site of Grace Pointe Church. Under the Annexation Agreement, the subject property was zoned B-1 (Neighborhood Commercial) and was intended for future retail purposes. The major change to the PUD is required for several reasons. Planner Schwarz went through the criteria for a major change to a Planned Development. This requires a new public hearing. The proposed re-subdivision alters the concept and character of the final development plan. Also, the proposed variances requested in conjunction with the re-subdivision alter the design standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance.

Planner Schwarz summarized the objectives of a Planned Development. He further stated when there is a major change it is helpful to look back at the original Planned Development and see what is being changed or modified. He summarized the criteria for evaluating a major change to a Planned Development. He stated 1 of 3 objectives is met (a), and two objectives are neutral (b, & c).

Planner Schwarz summarized the findings of fact for a Planned Development. Staff believes 6 of the 7 findings are met in this case. There is no impact to the original Planned Development. Staff has not identified any significant issues regarding the subdivision plat. This plat will create two new lots. One lot would be an "L-shaped" lot fronting 248th and 127th Street and would have no frontage on a public R.O.W., but would be orientated to face a private access easement serving the Church and the commercial development. A daycare facility is proposed for this lot. Currently, there are no improvements on the property, as far as roadways. There would be a stipulation that for this subdivision to be approved it would be subject to engineering. The Daycare Facility will not be able to be built until such time that the roadway improvements internal to the site are completed, as well as the public utilities.

The subdivision plat does reflect a cross-access easement that is new across the west lot line and along the south lot line of the new Lot 1. That would serve the proposed Daycare Facility on Lot 1. Previously recorded easements and R.O.W. dedications along 127th and 248th remain in effect. Staff would recommend approval of the re-subdivision plat subject to the Village Engineer's technical review. Staff also recommends approval of the major change to the Planned Development known as Grace Pointe Church subject to two stipulations. Staff also recommends approval of staff's findings of fact.

Planner Schwarz concluded his staff report.

Commissioner Sanders asked if the adjacent property to the west was part of this parcel. Planner Schwarz stated the adjacent property immediately to the west is the Grace Pointe Church site. The Church is not presently underway. Commissioner Sanders also asked if the major change to the Planned Development will put Lot 1 on the tax rolls or would it still be considered part of the Church property. Planner Schwarz stated he believed the new Lot 1 is under contract to a purchaser, a potential Daycare Facility.

Commissioner Kachel asked if the bicycle path would be put in now or would it be completed at the time the commercial property is developed. He clarified that a 10' wide bicycle and pedestrian path is planned for this area. Planner Schwarz stated since this is just a re-subdivision at this time, there would be no requirement to put the path in. The Open Space Plan does depict an anticipated trail along 127th and 248th, but they are basically planned to be within the public R.O.W. on the south side of 127th and on the west side of 248th. In this case, the west side of 248th would be reviewed at site plan review when those projects come in. Commissioner Kachel just wanted to make the developers aware of this.

Commissioner Renzi stated since the developer is putting in private roads, the road would have to go to the street also. At that juncture, they may have to address how the bike path is going to traverse that private road area. Planner Schwarz stated the bicycle path is just off to the north. It stops short of the subject property and is adjacent to the Canterbury Woods Subdivision. It is lined up to continue southward toward 127th Street. It is in the Open Space Plan to have that continue within the public R.O.W. that has already been dedicated. It would be the obligation of the future development that comes in to put that segment of bicycle path into the ground.

Chairman Sobkowiak asked Village Engineer Eickholtz if he had anything to add. Village Engineer Eickholtz responded the detention, sanitary, water, and the road access are provided as part of the original Grace Pointe Subdivision. This new re-

Village of Plainfield Plan Commission Minutes

March 3, 2009

Page 3 of 8

subdivision is dependent upon the Church completing those improvements. It is his understanding that these will be completed in the near future.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in the representative for the Church. Patti Bernhard spoke. She stated she represents Naperville Bible Church d/b/a as Grace Pointe, Inc. She stated they were at the Commission about 1-1/2 or 2 years ago to get the Grace Pointe Church property approved. The 6 acre parcel, zoned B-1 was first thought as having a pharmaceutical use or doctors offices with Edward Hospital across the street. They did have a number of contracts with a couple of medical facilities to construct large medical offices on that property, but those contracts did not move forward. As Edward Hospital was not approved, the contracts kind of disappeared. At this point in time, they are looking at trying to subdivide it into a number of smaller parcels. With 6 acres it is very difficult to try to get one commercial user to use that full parcel. They do have a contract purchaser, which is Creative World Daycare Center/ preschool/early learning center. They do have another facility in the Aurora Area. They are looking to franchise and move into this area.

Petitioner Bernhard believed the Daycare has been talking to Village Planner Garrigan about the project. The contract requires that the Church get this lot subdivided prior to selling the property to them. This process has to be completed before they will purchase the property. She represents the Church, so she cannot represent the Daycare. She has a contractual obligation to have the property subdivided by April 30th and have a separate PIN number for it. There will be a separate PIN or Tax ID number for that property, which will put it onto the tax rolls. Right now, it is owned by a Church so it is probably not on the tax rolls.

She stated the contract requires that the Church put in the roadway. When the Church puts in the roadway, they will make sure that there is the bicycle path that cuts across that roadway so it is done properly before anybody else comes in.

Petitioner Bernhard went on to say that they are seeking approval of the Final Plat. Planner Schwarz had told her that they would need to get a major change to the Planned Development. When they first came in they did this as a Planned Development because there were two uses. They had a residential and business use on one parcel of property. In order to do that, they had to have a Planned Development. The Church property does have a large stormwater facility, which is going to be dry for the most part. They want to use it for recreational uses. That was part of their goal to have soccer or football fields, etc. on that property so that the Church could use it.

There is an access to the north and it will be the access road that the Church has to put in. It will have left-hand turn lanes so that it will be wide enough and large enough for vehicles to get in and out. This parcel will use that access. Eventually, there are two other access points that will come into the commercial property. There is a right-in/right-out that will be on 248th and a full access that is going to be on 127th. There will be two more access points that come in once the rest of this property is developed. There will be a number of ways in and out of the property. The access drive on the north and, once the Church is constructed, an access that gets out onto 127th from the Church will be constructed. When the Church came in they wanted to have an access point off of 248th so they did reserve an easement across that property so people can come in to the Church parcel from there as well. That north access drive will provide access for the Church, as well as this parcel. The Church will construct that access road. The Church is contractually bound to do that by a certain date. So before anything else gets going, they will have to get the road put in.

She further stated immediately to the north of this property is the stormwater detention facility for Canterbury Woods. When they put the commercial piece in, it was with the idea it would abut the stormwater facility on the north rather than the residential property. The residential property does have a berm. When Canterbury Woods came in they requested an easement from the Church in order to put their berm and landscaping on the Church property. Currently, the landscaping and berm that is there for Canterbury Woods is on the Church property. The Church gave them that permission. The Church then would not have to do any additional landscaping along that north property line. She stated the petitioner does feel that this project meets the standards for a Planned Development. For the special use there will be no impact on the use or enjoyment of the property in the immediate vicinity. It will not impede the normal development and, in fact, they believe it will be beneficial and hopefully spur some of the development there. They are trying to make this more of a pedestrian friendly area so people can walk from Canterbury Woods Subdivision to this facility. Petitioner Bernhard concluded her comments and was open to questions.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked if there was anyone in the audience who cared to ask a question or make a comment.

Carmel Krumser – a resident of the Canterbury Woods Subdivision was sworn in by Chairman Sobkoviak and spoke. She asked where the planned pathway and bicycle path would be. Planner Schwarz stated the bicycle path is adjacent to Canterbury Woods and will continue southward all the way to the intersection when the commercial development comes in.

Village of Plainfield Plan Commission Minutes

March 3, 2009

Page 4 of 8

It would be within the public R.O.W. Ms. Krumser then asked when it comes south and reaches the intersection does it continue anywhere else. Planner Schwarz stated it will eventually cross the crosswalk and then the plan is to have it continue in the R.O.W. along the south side of 127th Street. Ms. Krumser asked the location of the Church. Planner Schwarz pointed out the location of the Church. He stated the Church was approved in 2007, as far as the location, landscaping, and what it would look like. He had plans she could look at. Ms. Krumser asked what would be located adjacent to the homes in Canterbury Woods. Planner Schwarz stated he believed it was parking. Petitioner Bernhard stated there will be parking in that area. Ms. Krumser then asked the petitioner when she thought the construction of the Church would start and when it would be estimated to be completed. Petitioner Bernhard stated basically the Church is waiting for the funding to build out the Church. They are waiting for parcels to close so they can use that money. Petitioner Bernhard stated they are hopeful construction will start this summer. Ms. Krumser's only concern is that there was a huge puddle on the lot since it was cleared and then left open.

Commissioner Renzi agreed that there has been a lot of standing water there. The petitioner excavated and dug down. There is basically torn up land with a construction trailer that has been sitting there for 6 to 9 months. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated the petitioner has not completed the work out there and was not sure when that would be. Petitioner Bernhard stated they are scheduled to close on this the end of April. Once that closes, they will move forward with the construction out there. She stated she would mention to the petitioner the concern of standing water. Chairman Sobkoviak told Ms. Krumser to contact the Village anytime there is a problem with standing water.

There were no further responses from the audience.

Commissioner Renzi asked which yard standards are being waived and what does the applicant want to do. Planner Schwarz stated essentially the new proposed lot does not abut a public R.O.W. and the property has a private access easement across the top of it on an east/west fashion. Staff wants to make it a little bit easier when the Daycare comes in to plot the building because there really is no front yard. They may choose to orient the building to the south, or they may rotate the building so the front wall of the building faces the new access easement. It is difficult based on the orientation of this new lot. Staff is basically saying to waive those requirements and deal with the site plan when it comes in. Commissioner Renzi then understood and stated basically the Commission will know when the site plan comes in how much of a variance the applicant will be given. This is not a normal lot and as long as the applicant comes up with an appropriately designed and orientated building, staff will help the applicant make it fit. A discussion followed. Planner Schwarz stated the Commission is only considering the subdivision that creates the two lots this evening.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked why the Commission would be giving up something that they are not sure what they are giving up. He further asked why the petitioner would not ask for the variances at the time of the site plan review. Planner Schwarz stated that could be done, but felt because this is a change to the Planned Development and it is a public hearing, it is easier from a processing standpoint to include those variances as part of the change to the Planned Development. Commissioner O'Rourke felt the Commission was leaving an open book on what the variance will be as they really do not know what the final variance will be. Planner Schwarz stated because the orientation of the lot does not front on a public R.O.W. it is going to need relief at some point for the front yard. What staff is saying is that rather than have strict compliance with the 20' front yard requirement, let the petitioner when they come through for site plan review decide. There is plenty of landscape buffer north of the drive aisle and there is also going to be some landscaping south of the drive aisle between the building and the proposed drive aisle. A discussion followed between Planner Schwarz and Commissioner O'Rourke in this regard. Planner Schwarz explained that the Zoning Ordinance defines the front yard setback as the setback off of the front lot line. There is no front lot line with this lot. By allowing the creation of this lot, it is essentially being said there is no front lot line as defined by the Zoning Ordinance. So, therefore, there cannot be a front setback.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated that typically in a situation like this the Commission would see the site plan that would be associated with this lot. Planner Schwarz stated this case is somewhat unique. He further stated the change to the PD is basically that an existing lot is being re-subdivided. Commissioner Kiefer asked if there would be a site plan at a future meeting. Petitioner Bernhard stated that was correct.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if there was a reason this is being done differently than what they normally do. Planner Schwarz stated it is because the case has two different parties to it. It is a challenge to sort of divide the case, but it is not out of the ordinary. A major change is required because you are splitting one lot. Those variances that are associated with the major change essentially acknowledge that there will not be a true front yard in the sense of the remainder of the property.

Village of Plainfield Plan Commission Minutes

March 3, 2009

Page 5 of 8

Commissioner Sanders asked Planner Schwarz if this facilitates the purchase of the property. Planner Schwarz stated that was correct. He further stated that the Commission has the right when the site plan review comes in to decide on what they would like. Commissioner O'Rourke wanted it understood by the contract purchaser that by the Commission approving this subdivision they are not giving the developer an open book to whatever design they want. Planner Schwarz stated that is also the developer's risk. This does not tie the hands of the Commission. Petitioner Bernhard stated the developer does understand that they have to come through the site plan process with the Village.

Commissioner Renzi shared Commissioner O'Rourke's concern about pre-approval. He stated if the applicant knows they have to address this though, he would be okay with it. Planner Schwarz reminded the Commissioners that they have the right to attach their own stipulations in addition to the ones being presented by staff if the Commission feels there is some need to mitigate the variance, kind of balance the relief that is being requested.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated when it is stated to waive strict compliance there is a possibility that the site plan could come in and still meet all of the setbacks. It is being stated the Commission will work with the petitioner basically just because of the uniqueness of not having a R.O.W. abutting the property which defines the front yard. Planner Schwarz stated that was correct. Planner Schwarz stated it is important to note that the Annexation Agreement previously granted relief for this property when it was all one lot, and presumably it would continue for the new lot. It previously indicated only a 0 setback, where typically there would be 5' between the parking lot and detention area along the west property line. The Annexation Agreement allowed parking to be right up against that because there is this large open space with stormwater to the west. So, there was already some relief built into the Annexation Agreement for this parking lot that will be coming forward. He stated essentially if the lot is created, it is indicated that there will not be a front yard in the true sense of the word as defined by the Zoning Ordinance. It will still have to comply with other yard requirements, as far as parking. There will have to be a 5' perimeter setback from the parking lot abutting the south, but again there is already a 0 setback granted through the Annexation Agreement for the parking that would abut to the west.

Commissioner Kachel asked if the proposed Daycare didn't go through and the lot sat empty and someone bought the property at a later date would the variance give the Village a problem at a later date. Planner Schwarz stated the variances that are being requested as part of this case are associated with a change to a Planned Development and, as defined in the Zoning Ordinance, Planned Developments have a shelf life of 2 years. If no construction or permit is obtained or construction commences within that timeframe, then the Planned Development is always subject to being revoked. He has not seen that done in Plainfield, but he has seen it happen in other communities. He further stated a variance on its own only has 1 year.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked how it was worded in the Annexation Agreement as far as commercial or retail. He felt the original plan was retail. Planner Schwarz checked the Annexation Agreement. He stated the property was granted a special use for a Planned Development and B-1 Neighborhood Convenience District. He stated anything that is listed in the B-1 District is allowed. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if a potential daycare user would be allowed in the B-1. Planner Schwarz stated that was correct. There are interim uses allowed prior to development.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated in the staff report it stated B-1 with a special use for a Planned Development. He asked if that is the existing zoning or if that is what they are changing the new lot zoning to. He wanted to know where the special use need comes in. Planner Schwarz stated currently the subject property is everything that is Lot 2 of the original subdivision. There was Lot 1 for the Church. Lot 2, the subject property, is all zoned B-1 with a special use for a Planned Development. Planner Schwarz stated the entire Church property is the Planned Development. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if all PUD's are special use. Planner Schwarz stated they are. Petitioner Bernhard stated it is a requirement of the ordinance. Planner Schwarz stated it is a special use for a Planned Development on the subject property and a special use for a religious institution and Planned Development on Lot 1 to the west.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated the petitioner had indicated the maintenance and repair of pavement and curbing will be the responsibility of the owner of Lot 2. Petitioner Bernhard stated it would be the responsibility of the Church. She further stated the Church is going to be responsible for maintaining the access road and the stormwater management facility. They will be doing all of it. The contract requires that the Church, which is the original Lot 1, has to put in the access road and maintain it. They also have to put in the stormwater management. Commissioner O'Rourke stated it says it differently on the plat on the ingress/egress easement provision. Petitioner Bernhard stated she would make sure that it is changed. Originally it was set up that each lot was going to maintain what is on their lot, but they have a contractual obligation now to maintain both the stormwater area and the access road.

Planner Schwarz stated the original Annexation Agreement and approval of the Planned Development allowed just two points of full access for the entire commercial area. One point of full access would line up opposite Waterford Blvd. on 127th Street and there would be another point of full access along the 248th frontage coming into the project. When commercial development comes in, there may be requests for right-in/right-out driveways, which are always a negotiated item as they come through for site plan review. There are certain spacing requirements. The way it is being set up right now with this re-subdivision, the access coming off of the private drive on the north is actually coming through a parking lot and continuing through the parking lot to the south and to the east. Essentially, there will be a series of interconnected parking lots as opposed to a true dedicated drive aisle with no parking stalls fronting on it. Planner Schwarz stated does not foresee any issues because of the size of the property. He felt it was important to be noted. The site will be interconnected from one parking lot to the next. Commercial buildings will be wrapping presumably in the "L-shaped" parcel in the future and the backs of those buildings, the rear drive aisles and so forth, will then be able to connect to the parking lot that is being proposed as part of Creative World. It will not be a master plan with an internal street system with sidewalks and parkway trees and things. It will be a series of parking lot connections.

Commissioner O'Rourke had a concern with the public R.O.W. and the striping of the center lane for turns in both directions, deceleration lanes, etc. He stated in other locations PUD's have changed and the driveway setups have changed. The striping does not get done or it goes back to the Village at their cost. Planner Schwarz stated as indicated on the plat there were previous R.O.W. dedications on both streets, along with a corner cut dedication near the intersection so that all of those future improvements have room to take place. Commissioner O'Rourke felt it should be the responsibility of the petitioner for the striping of the roadway. Planner Schwarz stated the Commission has the authority to add on a condition to that effect as part of this case. He felt when the future commercial sites come in, they will have to get an access permit. That is when there is an actual plan for the driveway apron and so forth. Petitioner Bernhard believed that when they came through with the Annexation Agreement that one of the things that the Church had requested, since it is a Church and a not-for-profit organization, was that when the commercial parcels come in the commercial developers would be the ones that would be responsible and the Village agreed with the applicants because of the cost associated with that. Planner Schwarz stated in the Annexation Agreement it states that on the B-1 portion of the subject property the entrance drives, sidewalks, and landscaping improvements shown on the original preliminary plat shall be installed by the end users of the commercial parcels. In addition to the roadway improvements shown on an Exhibit in the Annexation Agreement, it states, "at such time as the portion of the subject property zoned B-1 is developed, the owners of the B-1 portion of the subject property shall be required to construct an additional northern lane along 127th Street frontage, a 5' sidewalk along 127th Street frontage, and a 10' bike path along the 248th Street frontage."

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if these improvements would be put in before the lots were sold. Planner Schwarz stated the access to the north would have to be put in for this proposed daycare facility to be constructed. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if that would trigger the other improvements. Planner Schwarz stated not necessarily.

At 8:05 p.m. Commissioner Sanders made a motion that the Plan Commission adopt staff's findings of fact and recommend approval of the request for a major change to the Planned Development known as Grace Pointe Church, located at the northwest corner of 127th Street and 248th Avenue, 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: Renzi, O'Rourke, Bonuchi, Sanders, Peck, Kachel, Chairman Sobkoviak

Nay: 0

The motion is carried 7:0

At 8:06 p.m. Commissioner Bonuchi made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the Preliminary and Final Plat of Re-subdivision for Grace Pointe Church's lot 2 Re-subdivision, located at the northwest corner of 127th Street and 248th Avenue, 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 Kachel seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

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

Nay: 0

The motion is carried 7:0.

RESIDENTIAL INFILL DESIGN GUIDELINES

Chairman Sobkoviak introduced this case and commended Planner Javoronok for the fantastic report. He stated it is really a fine comprehensive report. He stated this illustrates the goals to be worked toward.

Planner Javoronok outlined the contents of the guidelines. They are targeted towards the core of the Village. Essentially this would be southeast of the river, southwest of the railroad tracks, and north of Fort Beggs. In the past, staff has completed residential design and planning guidelines for Planned Unit Developments and also for annexations. These guidelines build on those documents and focuses on the core. Staff had looked at the guidelines from a number of other communities. These guidelines focus on site and form, roofs, materials, porches, windows, doors and entries, additions, garages. Multiple-family residences, and Business Transition Zoning. She stated staff is seeking review and comments from the Plan Commission. She concluded her report.

Commissioner Sanders asked if this prohibits taking two lots and building a "McMansion" of 10,000 sq. ft. Planner Javoronok stated the guidelines are not intended to prohibit anything. Commissioner Sanders asked if this could occur. Planner Javoronok stated that could occur. Commissioner Sanders stated it is an outstanding, complementary piece to all of the other guidelines. He suggested putting Village Core on the first page and highlighting that.

Commissioner Bonuchi agreed with Commissioner Sanders and stated it is very well done.

Commissioner Renzi was impressed and only had a few questions. He referred to Page 12 where it states, "The materials used on the front should be used on all sides." He had concerns with the use of the word "should" and wondered if "should" could be construed as "shall." He suggested stating something like, although there is a preference for 360 degree architecture, it is more important to be compatible with the design. He referred to Page 14 where it states, "The placement of windows should not violate the privacy of adjacent properties." He suggested adding the words make every reasonable attempt. Commissioner Kachel stated he goes along with the privacy aspect. He stated especially in the BTD if they decide to put all windows and the property is adjacent to a bedroom window of a residence next door, it does make a difference. Planner Javoronok stated the intent was more towards the situation that Commissioner Kachel discussed.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated they are guidelines and not a requirement.

Commissioner Peck seconded Commissioner Renzi's thought. When it says, we would like you to do it this way, most people would take it that they have to do it a certain way.

Commissioner Sanders referred to Page 12. He stated because of the various sizes of lots in the core area, he thought it was suitably stated in there for the flexibility for 360 degree architecture because there are a lot of site lines from existing buildings. Under these guidelines, he sees an allowance for significant improvements to some of the site lines. He felt they were good guidelines and didn't feel anything needed to be changed.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated this is not a recipe book. This is a book of suggestions and illustrations that illustrate what is being talked about. Illustrations needed to be included in the last overhaul of the Zoning Ordinance because words alone often times cannot convey the meaning or concept of what is trying to be achieved. Planner Javoronok has given the Commission some pictures to illustrate goals and direction.

Commissioner Kachel also complemented Planner Javoronok on the guidelines.

Commissioner Kiefer echoed that and commended Planner Javoronok on her efforts. He also felt the word "should" is used appropriately throughout.

Village of Plainfield Plan Commission Minutes

March 3, 2009

Page 8 of 8

Commissioner O'Rourke thought the guidelines looked great. He felt the summary sheet spells it out, "the intent of the guidelines is not to recreate traditional architectural styles that do not allow for contemporary architectural designs or materials, but to provide a framework within which good design can flourish in context and enhance the existing Village character." He felt that summarizes it very well.

Commissioner Peck stated Planner Javoronok has done a great job with this.

Commissioner Renzi referred to Page 16 and asked why additions should be compatible, but distinguishable. Chairman Sobkoviak explained it is an architectural thing. He referred to a building addition in the downtown and stated to maintain the architectural integrity of the building and to maintain its historical status, they wanted the addition to look in the same period and be complementary to the original structure; however, to maintain this integrity it was important architecturally that you be able to distinguish the addition as an addition. Planner Javoronok stated basically it is just to show some differentiation between what the original structure was and what the new part of the structure is. Chairman Sobkoviak stated the more architecturally significant the building is the more important that sort of thing is. Commissioner Renzi thanked both the Chairman and Planner Javoronok for their input.

Commissioner Kachel stated sometimes when you try to match an existing building if you try to bring it just straight across and you don't distinguish the addition, it will not look right. Chairman Sobkoviak stated it would look like you tried to match it and you failed.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Planner Javoronok if she would be presenting this to the Village Board to be included in the Pattern Book and Design Guidelines. Planner Javoronok stated this will be taken to the Village Board. It is sort of a "stand-alone" document.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Planner Javoronok if there was anything else the Commission could help her with. Planner Javoronok stated she did not believe so. She thanked the Commissioners for their comments.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Kachel asked if the Village would be fixing Indian Boundary Road or will it be closed. He said it is getting very bad to drive on with many "potholes". This is south of Renwick Road. It is getting to be a dangerous road. Planner Schwarz stated he would convey that to Public Works and report back to the Commission. Commissioner Kachel stated that also was part of a PUD and he wondered since it is past 2 years who takes care of it. Will it be the responsibility of the Village now or the developers.

Since there was no further business before the Commission, Chairman Sobkoviak adjourned the meeting at 8:33 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Carol Millan
Planning Secretary Village of Plainfield