



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

DATE: MARCH 17, 2009

LOCATION: Village Hall

Chairman Sobkoviak called the meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:27 p.m. immediately following the conclusion of the Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting.

ROLL CALL:

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

Absent: Commissioners Kachel and Peck, Library District, Park District, School District, and Plainfield Police Department

Also Present: Michael Garrigan – Village Planner Village of Plainfield, 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 March 3, 2009 meeting were accepted as amended.

Commissioner Renzi had a correction for Page 7. He wanted it changed from “. . . . wondered if it should be changed to “shall” to read: “. . . . wondered if should could be construed as shall”.

DEVELOPMENT REPORT:

Village Planner Garrigan summarized the results of cases before the Village Board on 3/16/09.

Chairman Sobkoviak polled the Commissioners to see who would be in attendance at the next meeting on April 7th since it is election evening. He stated Commissioner Peck has already indicated he will not be present. Commissioners Bonuchi and Fremarek stated they also will not be present at the meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE: 1452-022709.RZ.SU.SPR
Request: Rezoning from R-1 and I-1 to B-1 (*Public Hearing*)
Special Use for an Educational Facility (*Public Hearing*)
Site Plan Review
Location: 14912 S. Eastern Ave.
Applicant: Mohammad W. Sayeed, represented by Carl Buck

FURQAAN ACADEMY

TIME: 7:32 p.m.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated there is a request to continue this hearing until April 7th and wondered if that was a request from staff or the petitioner. Planner Schwarz stated it is a request by staff, but the petitioner acknowledges and understands the reason for the continuance request. Commissioner Renzi asked if it would be better to continue this to the meeting on the 21st because the 7th is Election Day and the Commission will be short some Commissioners. Planner Schwarz stated it was his understanding there is a time constraint based on contract.

At 7:34 p.m. Commissioner Renzi made a motion to continue the public hearing on Case: 1452-022709.RZ.SU.SPR until April 7, 2009.

Commissioner O'Rourke seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

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

The motion is carried 5:0

CASE:	KENDALL COUNTY CASE	KELLER FARM PROPERTY
Request:	Special Use Permit for a Winery and Bakery Special Use for a farm stand Conditional Use for a corn maze/pumpkin patch/ fall festival/farm tours Variance to allow the production of wine of crops grown offsite Variance to allow for an event to exceed six days in duration	
Location:	Southeast corner of Schlapp Road and Johnson Road	
Applicant:	Frank Keller, Jr., Property Owner, represented by Kathleen West	

TIME 7:35 p.m.

Chairman Sobkoviak reminded the Commissioners that their action on a county case is primarily limited to a letter of objection or letter of no objection to the County Board.

Planner Schwarz summarized the staff report. The site is within 1-1/2 miles of the Village's Planning Boundary. By Statute the Village is notified of the application and staff brings the matter through the Plan Commission and Village Board for review. The subject property is 360 acres overall. It is located in unincorporated Na-Au-Say Township in Kendall County. The property is currently being operated as a farm stand. The use is being expanded to several new uses. Staff has been advised by Kendall County staff that there would be a text amendment necessary at the County to allow the sale of alcoholic beverages because currently Na-Au-Say Township does not permit the sale of alcoholic beverages. Therefore, Kendall County staff has advised Village staff that the applicant may be directed to withdraw that particular request. The property is not presently contiguous to the Village, but is in within the Village's future planning area as depicted by the Oswego Boundary Agreement. Planner Schwarz stated the staff report indicates the proposed farm is within the footprint of the Grande Meadow Subdivision and should state that it is very near to the footprint of the future Grande Meadow Subdivision. He further stated the roadway improvements in the area are designated as a minor collector for Johnson Road and a major collector for Schlapp Road. The Open Space Plan for the Village depicts a greenway or a green belt along the southern boundary of the property. The Open Space Plan reflects a future trail, which would be a 10' asphalt bike path along both roadways at the time of future development. It is staff's opinion that the existing and proposed uses in the area are compatible with this farm use. Any future potential development of this property would require connection to the Village through annexation. Therefore, there would be a future opportunity for the Plan Commission and Village Board to re-examine these uses.

There are two main points of access, one on Johnson Road and one on Schlapp Road. A private gravel driveway serves these uses via these access points. The Village's internal Traffic Committee did review these proposed requests and there was a general consensus that the proposed uses, and specifically the fall festival and its related activities, should not have a detrimental impact on the existing roadways that are presently under the jurisdiction of Na-Au-Say Township. Traffic volumes in the area are very light. The applicant intends to use the existing gravel areas in the central portion of the property. The grass areas of the site would be used for overflow parking. There are a number of handicap spaces. Staff has not identified any significant issues. Staff recommends that the Plan Commission recommend to the Village Board to direct staff

to prepare and submit a "letter of no objection" to Kendall County for the listed uses. Staff recommends a statement to be provided in the letter to Kendall County. Staff recommends that the property owner and/or the operator of the existing and proposed land uses should incorporate Best Management Practices for stormwater management if feasible. Planner Schwarz concluded his staff report.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in the petitioners. Kathy West, the lawyer for the petitioner, spoke. She gave a history of the Keller Family and stated they have been farmers for generations with farms in DuPage County, Will County, and Kendall County. She stated the younger generation of the Kellers, represented by Marty and Frank, are continuing the family tradition. They wish to expand the scope of their farming activities. The Keller farm is 360 acres. Frank and Marty, and their families, as well as their parents all live on the farm. The proposed activities are located on a very small portion of the farm itself. These buildings will be near the houses that the Kellers live in. The uses are very limited in scope. The greenhouse is only open April, May and June. The farm stand is open April through October. The fall festival just runs for two months, September and October. If and when the winery and bakery are constructed, those uses would be year-round. Except for the fall festival, these uses generate very little traffic or very few customers at any given time. They came before the County because they do run the fall festival and the corn maze in the fall; and under the County requirements, it can only be done for 6 days out of the year. They run it every week-end for September and October. The petitioner felt it was also important to let the County know what their other ideas are for the farm in the future. The purpose of these proposed uses is really to maintain and expand the farming tradition on the Keller Farm and help to keep farming of this property economically feasible.

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

Commissioner Sanders asked the petitioner if they could give an illustration of their vision. Petitioner West stated basically there is the farm stand now and at some point in the future, if business dictates, they would expand that. They do have a greenhouse right now and may add a second greenhouse. Both those uses are on the West side of the driveway. On the East side of the driveway they would build the winery and bakery. Between the existing farm stand building up to the road is where the pumpkin patch and corn maze would be located. Frank Keller, IV spoke. They do not look for the glitzy farm fall entertainment. They do hayrides, but that is about the extent of that. The main reason they are interested in doing this is because they found over the years, they are limited with just having a short vegetable and fall season. They are at the mercy of the weather. They tried to think of ways to get around the weather aspect. That is what leads them to the idea of the winery which would have traffic year-round. They just cannot bring in vegetables to sell year-round.

Commissioner Sanders asked if most of the demographics would be coming from the East. Frank Keller agreed. They would look to Yorkville, but about 90% of their customers are from Plainfield. Commissioner Sanders verified that the winery would be a year-round operation. Frank Keller responded they are located in "dry" Na-Au-Say Township so it will take a little while until they deal with that first. They did not think that would be a problem because they have talked to people in Na-Au-Say that are all for it. They are taking it step-by-step.

Commissioner Fremarek was generally supportive of the requests. He was familiar with their operation and stated they run a very good operation.

Commissioner Kiefer also voiced support and urged that staff's recommendation be accepted.

Commissioner Bonuchi agreed. She stated it sounds interesting and sounds like a great plan. She wished the petitioners good luck with the plan.

Commissioner Renzi also was in favor of staff's recommendation.

At 7:50 p.m. Commissioner Renzi made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend that the Village Board direct staff to prepare and submit a letter of no objection to Kendall County for the proposed Special Use Permit for a Winery and Bakery; Special Use Permit for a farm stand; Conditional use for a corn maze/pumpkin patch/fall festival/farm tours; Variance to allow the production of wine from crops grown off-site; and variance to allow for an event to exceed six days in duration.

Said letter shall outline Village of Plainfield recommendation including:

The property owner and/or operator of the existing and proposed land uses should incorporate Best Management Practices for stormwater management if feasible, consistent with the goals and objectives of the Aux Sable Creek Watershed Plan, given the proximity of these uses to the headwaters of the Little Slough Creek and East Aux Sable Creek.

Commissioner O'Rourke seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

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

Nay: 0

The motions is carried 5:0

CASE:	1449-022009.AA.RZ	GREEN PROPERTY
Request:	Annexation (<i>Public Hearing</i>) Map Amendment (rezoning) from the default R-1 District to the I-1 District (<i>Public Hearing</i>)	
Location:	East side of Rhea Drive, north of W. Industrial Drive South	
Applicant:	John Green, represented by Tom Green	
TIME:	7:51 p.m.	

Planner Schwarz summarized the staff report. The property is Lot I-27 in the Wolf Creek Industrial Phase III Sterling Estates Subdivision. The applicant wishes to develop a future office and/or light industrial building. A Site Plan Review application will be required prior to that future development. Planner Schwarz went through the zonings and land use for adjacent properties. The property is contiguous to the Village and is within the Village's Facility Planning Area. The applicant has submitted a draft annexation agreement that follows our standard language. Specific provisions in the Annexation Agreement, such as the building design and the exterior materials would be negotiated at the staff level before the agreement is presented to the Village Board in the future.

Planner Schwarz summarized the findings of fact for the map amendment and found that 5 of the 5 findings are favorable to the applicant. Staff recommends approval of the request for annexation and a map amendment.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in the petitioner. Tom Green spoke. He didn't add anything to Planner Schwarz's report.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked the audience if there was anyone who wished to ask a question or make a comment. There was no response.

Commissioner Renzi agreed with staff's findings of fact.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Village Engineer Eickholtz if there were any engineering concerns. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated they have not been involved with this case too much, but the access, the sanitary sewer and water are nearby. They do not anticipate any major concerns with this request.

Commissioner Fremarek also agreed with staff's assessment.

Commissioner Sanders asked if this property was "in fill". Planner Schwarz stated the Village is contiguous to this property on the immediate west side of Rhea Drive. Chairman Sobkoviak stated when this area was first developed it was in the County. A few of the parcels were developed and the property owners wanted to get Village sewer and water. In order to do that they had to annex. So, the southern and western portions are all in the Village, but the northern portion and a couple of parcels in the east remain in the County. They are using well and septic. Planner Schwarz stated that was correct.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if the property was contiguous to the Village. Planner Schwarz showed the area on a slide to show how the property is contiguous. He felt over time more properties will come in that want to connect to Village sewer and water. He further stated this is an older County Subdivision. The Village annexed the property immediately fronting Rt. 59.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if the utilities were designed for the shopping center to be able to connect to these other parcels easily. Planner Schwarz stated there are utilities along Rhea Drive, but that would be something looked at in terms of Site Plan Review and engineering when the actual building is proposed. At this time, the petitioner is just seeking annexation to the Village and the rezoning.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked typically who pays for the extension of the utilities. Planner Schwarz stated typically the person annexing the property would be responsible for extending utilities across the frontage of their property. Chairman Sobkoviak stated they have to go all the way across the front of their property.

At 8:03 p.m. Commissioner O'Rourke made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the request for annexation of the subject territory located on the east side of Rhea Drive, north of W. Industrial Drive, South to the Village of Plainfield.

Commissioner Sanders seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

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

The motion is carried 5:0

At 8:04 p.m. Commissioner Bonuchi made a motion that the Plan Commission adopt staff's findings of fact and recommend approval of a map amendment (rezoning) from the default Village of Plainfield R-1 (Low Density Single-Family Residential District) to the Village of Plainfield I-1 (Office, Research and Light Industrial District) zoning classification upon annexation, for the subject property located on the east side of Rhea Drive, north of W. Industrial Drive South.

Commissioner Renzi seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

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

The motion is carried 5:0

Planner Schwarz stated another public notice would be required and published for the Annexation Agreement public hearing.

At 8:05 p.m. Chairman Sobkoviak called for the Plan Commission to take a break.

At 8:10 p.m. Chairman Sobkoviak reconvened the Plan Commission meeting.

CASE: 1450-022208.SU.SPR.FP VAN DYKE PLACE
Request: Special Use for Planned Development (*Public Hearing*)
Site Plan Review
Preliminary Final Plat
Location: Northeast Corner of Lockport Street and Van Dyke Road
Applicant: Van Dyke Road/Plainfield, LLC

TIME: 8:10 p.m.

Village Planner Garrigan summarized the staff report. He stated this is a public hearing and all notices have been published and posted per Village Ordinance and State Statute. This case came before the Plan Commission in January as a proposed concept plan.

This comes before the Commission as a Planned Development based on the fact that the applicant is requesting relief to allow a drive-thru and a daycare center. The daycare center and the proposed drive thru for the bank facility will be part of the Planned Development. There is also some minor relief with regard to a one corner buffer yard. This is a mixed use project, which will incorporate two restaurants, a bank, medical office space, and potentially some additional office space, or prospective retail space. Village Planner Garrigan went through the findings of fact for a special use and stated 2 of the 2 findings are favorable to the applicant. He also stated the findings of fact for the Planned Development and stated 2 of the 2 findings are also favorable to the applicant.

The applicant is also seeking Site Plan Review approval this evening so they can proceed with the development of this site some time in late spring to early summer of this year. Village Planner Garrigan highlighted the aspects of the Site Plan.

There are a total of 249 parking spaces, which is above Village ordinance requirements. The Traffic Committee did highlight an issue with regard to 5 parking spaces. Staff has suggested the potential of deleting 5 parking spaces. The applicant has articulated that there is a critical need for those parking spaces. Staff would like to work with the applicant to try to address that issue. The proposed site plan is consistent with Village Ordinance.

Village Planner Garrigan highlighted the architectural features. The buildings will all tie in together. A unified awning design in generally a unified earth tone color will be used by the applicant. Earth tone materials will be used with regard to brick and stone throughout this project. Staff believes the applicant has worked with staff and gone out of their way to incorporate a unified project which is consistent with the Village's vision for the downtown.

Village Planner Garrigan also highlighted the aspects of the landscaping plan and stated it exceeds the requirements of the Village. The proposed property does abut the Lincolnshire Apartments at the northwest corner of the site. The applicant is seeking some slight relief with regards to the landscape buffer, but extensive buffering has been incorporated all along the northwestern corner which will buffer the Lincolnshire Apartments from the medical office buildings.

The applicant has submitted a photometric plan which complies with the minimum requirements. They have also submitted spec sheets for not only decorative lighting along the exterior of the buildings, but also the proposed lighting standards in the parking lot.

Staff has reviewed the proposed drive-thru and has no issues with the drive-thru. Staff believes there is sufficient stacking area and proper traffic circulation to avoid any potential conflict between the bank drive-thru and other traffic going to any of the other end users within this site.

This is generally a one plat subdivision providing utility easements. At this point, the individual buildings within the development will be sold as condominiums so there would be no other subdivision requirement at this point. Staff is requesting approval from the Plan Commission.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Village Engineer Eickholtz if there were any engineering issues. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated they do not see any problems right now. They did receive the preliminary engineering and have supplied their review comments to the applicant. Once the final engineering incorporates their comments, which the design engineer has indicated they will do, the project should be in good shape.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in the petitioners. Harold Oliver spoke. He didn't have much to add to Village Planner Garrigan's report. He stated in today's market they are very fortunate because they are bringing not just the development, but users to this development right away. He stated they do have a bank that is signed up (Metropolitan Bank Group). They have a pancake house (Southern Belle). They have a restaurant that they cannot discuss at this time, but they have showed heavy interest. They have been in discussion for several months now. They really want to be in Plainfield, but it is financing and some other things. He further stated they end up with two corners with the restaurants. The Southern Belle Restaurant would be on Van Dyke. The uniqueness of this is the pancake house would open somewhere around 6 in the morning and close at 3 in the afternoon. With the other restaurant on Lockport, that restaurant would open somewhere around 3 to 4 p.m. and stay open until whatever the limited hours are. It is a sit-down restaurant. It is a very nice, high end, gathering place. He stated the parking is very, very important. In this project by having the restaurants with those hours, they are utilizing all of

the parking, so they are doubling up on the parking. Parking is always a concern with restaurants. So they are able to really do more parking than what the ordinance requires. He further stated in the back area on Van Dyke there is a building committed to a professional optometrist. They also have half of the building to the south committed with a dentist. They are sure they have someone in the north building. They are getting a lot of interest.

They also came in with a daycare. They had a daycare on this originally and due to the market, they changed strategies. They have decided to have a little flexibility there. He stated some of the developments come in and they are preparing for the "upturn". They have users for this development right now. He felt that was important to bring forward. He talked about the 4,200 sq. ft. building on Lockport Street and stated that building was in question with staff about the parking. There is some parking right next to the building and they are always hesitant to give up any kind of parking no matter how hard to get in and out of it may be. Being consistent with downtowns, there are always parking issues. They are trying to accomplish a downtown feel. They addressed the importance of these parking spaces with staff and suggested that these spots could continuously be used by the same users every day, be it staff, employees, etc. He also brought samples of the materials to be used on the buildings for the Commissioners to look at.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated the petitioner did address one comment from staff regarding the parking spaces. Staff would request that a uniform awning color and design be chosen for all the buildings within this development. He asked the petitioner if they were in agreement with that request. The Petitioner answered that they were in agreement.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated staff had requested the submittal of a proposed lighting standard specification for the proposed parking lot for review. Village Planner Garrigan stated that had been submitted.

Commissioner Sanders followed up on the uniform awning color. He stated the proposed stipulation used the word unified and in Village Planner Garrigan's presentation he used the term unified earth tone awning colors. Village Planner Garrigan stated there is a general consensus that the applicant has already agreed that there might be a slightly different variation of red, but it will be an earth tone red. Staff does not have a problem with slight variations. Commissioner Sanders asked if uniform meant all the same color. Village Planner Garrigan stated he felt there was agreement on the proposed awning colors. Petitioner Oliver stated they have the brick colors and awning colors with them if the Commissioners would like to see them.

Commissioner Bonuchi had a question on the parking spots. She asked if there was anything there that would block those spots if someone were to back up. She asked if there was enough room to put something there. Petitioner Oliver did not feel they have enough room to do that. He said they had actually made their buildings smaller to have that parking. If they removed the parking, in theory, they could put bigger buildings. They would rather have the parking though because of the users they already have in place.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked the petitioner if he was saying that parking would somehow be designated for employees. Petitioner Oliver felt that if these spots were reserved for the owner or employees, managers, etc. so that the same people are parking there every day, the problem would be eliminated.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked the petitioner if he believed that having those 5 parking spaces adjacent to one of the primary access points to the project is safe. Petitioner Oliver stated, yes. Chairman Sobkoviak stated that would be based on times of arrival and departure. Commissioner O'Rourke felt that could not necessarily be controlled. Commissioner O'Rourke felt it was dangerous. He asked if that was the concern of the Traffic Committee. Village Planner Garrigan stated the concern of the Traffic Committee and Police Department was a potential safety issue and a potential conflict.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked the petitioner if they were that adamant about keeping those spaces for their project or if they had considered widening the area. There could be a shared common driveway down the middle. Petitioner Oliver stated in the future if that was the request or recommendation of the Commission they would do that. He did not want to slow the process down just because of that.

Commissioner O'Rourke felt as people are heading south to try to get into those spaces, typically they would swing wide and go into the other lane as they turn north into the center, which could also create traffic problems. He felt it is a huge bottleneck there. Petitioner Oliver stated it was his understanding that Lockport Street would be diagonal parking. If there is diagonal parking on Lockport Street you would back out into the traffic on Lockport Street. That was his understanding for the future of Lockport Street. That is much more of a hazard.

Commissioner Renzi stated he would agree with keeping the 5 parking spaces if it was a right-in/right-out. He stated his preference would be if the parking spaces would remain to angle them to avoid the problem that Commissioner O'Rourke was talking about. He felt everyone coming from the west should turn onto Van Dyke Road and enter that way.

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

Chairman Sobkoviak asked the Commissioners to continue on to other aspects of this development and the Commission could come back to the parking aspect.

Commissioner Renzi inquired how the branding for the bank would be handled. He wondered if that would be taken care of at a later date through the sign permit process. Village Planner Garrigan stated the Commission is looking at the final elevations for the bank. The bank will have to come through for signage. If there are any variations from what the Commission is looking at tonight, the petitioner will have to come back with a new site plan review by the Commission. Chairman Sobkoviak stated if the petitioner is within the sign ordinance, the Commission would not even see the signage. The only way the Commission would see the signage is if the petitioner asks for a variance.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated when the Commission saw this at concept plan there was talk about having a pedestrian walkway from Van Dyke Road to the front of the bank. He believed the plans were still showing a knee wall. The sidewalk in front of the bank actually ends with plantings on the west side. Village Planner Garrigan stated that Commissioner O'Rourke was correct and the walkway was requested. He stated that was a reasonable request and it would not take much to put a small access point through the knee wall. The buffering would have to be addressed. Petitioner Oliver stated they want to be pedestrian friendly. They will work with staff on the walkway. They did not have a problem with that.

Commissioner O'Rourke questioned the extending of Soldier Drive. Village Planner Garrigan stated as it was discussed during the concept plan review that is not an option. If Soldier Drive is brought east, it basically would hit the garages of the Lincolnshire Apartments. There were discussions with the Post Office to basically bring Soldier Drive to the east, swing it to the north, and take it all the way out to Wood Farm Road. The Post Office made it quite clear to staff that was a "non-starter" and staff would have to work with the Federal Government to even discuss that. The Post Office has future plans for expansion. They had no interest in doing that. That cuts off any opportunity to swing Soldier Drive to the north; and therefore, staff does not believe at this point it makes any sense to extend Soldier Drive.

Commissioner O'Rourke suggested the Plat of Subdivision plan for extending Soldier Drive in the future in case something changes with the post office. Village Planner Garrigan stated they could work with the applicant to provide a cross access easement to the northwest corner. Nothing would change in regards to the current configuration.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated typically on most plats there are perimeter easements for the utility companies. On the plat, there are specific areas in the center almost. He asked if there is any reason why there should not be perimeter utility easements. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated he asked for perimeter easements around there as well. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if that would be adjusted. Petitioner Oliver stated they are working on that right now.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated the Commissioners could go back to the parking issue.

Commissioner Fremarek felt a lot of these are not high volume sites. They are office buildings. He felt there could be a potential in any parking lot of someone backing out of a parking space and hitting something. He was okay with the location of the 5 parking spots. He felt there is a potential for accidents in any parking lot.

Commissioner Sanders asked Commissioner Fremarek if he thought right-in was a possibility there and also if he was in favor of keeping the 5 parking spots. Commissioner Fremarek preferred a right-in/right-out versus a full access. Village Planner Garrigan stated in the long term when the Village has jurisdiction over Lockport that would be a full access. Right now IDOT has jurisdiction, so in all probability IDOT will only allow a right-in/right-out. The long term plan would be for a full access point there on Lockport Street.

Commissioner Sanders stated he would assume there would be a turn lane then. Commissioner Fremarek had issues with the parking spaces if it would be full access all the time. Village Planner Garrigan stated he did not think IDOT would allow a full access point on Rt. 126 at this time. Chairman Sobkoviak stated it is too close to the Van Dyke/Lockport St. intersection. There was a discussion between the Commissioners regarding the full access point on Lockport Street.

Commissioner Fremarek asked what the probability is that this would become a full access once the Village has jurisdiction of Lockport Street/Rt. 126. Petitioner Oliver stated they are planning on doing a right-in/right-out right now. They will not have a full access. They did not think the parking would be this big of an issue. They know it will be right-in/right-out. If the Commission does not want the 5 parking spaces, they are not here to argue. They want to show that they are working as a team. This is not a deal breaker. They think the 5 parking spaces make sense; but if the Commission disagrees, they will comply.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated the confusion is as proposed it is showing a full access. That is where the safety issue came up with the Traffic Committee and the Police Department. He thought if the petitioner is going to agree with a right-in/right-out maybe the Commission would be okay with creating the spaces on an angle going south. Petitioner Oliver stated that sounds like a great idea. They did not have a problem with that. Commissioner Fremarek agreed with Commissioner O'Rourke. Chairman Sobkoviak stated the Commissioners are looking for diagonal parking for a vehicle that would be essentially southbound. Commissioner O'Rourke stated whether IDOT agrees or not, the Commission then would be looking for a right-in/right-out. Petitioner Oliver stated they are pretty sure IDOT will not give them a full access. Commissioner O'Rourke wanted the approved plan to show a right-in/right-out. The petitioner did not have a problem doing that. Commissioner O'Rourke felt maybe it should go back to the Traffic Committee for their comments. Commissioner Sanders felt that could be handled under the existing stipulation stating compliance with the requirements of the Village Engineer.

Commissioner Sanders asked the petitioner if there would be anything in the Declarations for the Condominiums about the parking spaces. Petitioner Oliver stated the designated parking would be part of the Association. Commissioner Sanders asked if there would be a mechanism to relate the safety aspect of those parking spaces to the users of those spaces. Petitioner Oliver stated that would be easy to address through the Association.

Commissioner Fremarek stated the petitioner is extending the look and feel of the downtown.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated it is a great plan. It speaks well of the developers that they already have users for the buildings.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Village Planner Garrigan if the Preliminary and Final Plat should be the first motion. Village Planner Garrigan stated that is correct.

At 9:00 p.m. Commissioner Sanders made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the Preliminary and Final Plat subject to the following stipulations:

- 1. Compliance with the requirements of the Village Engineer,**
- 2. Compliance with 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, Chairman Sobkoviak
Nay: 0

The motion is carried 5:0

At 9:01 p.m. Commissioner Renzi made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the proposed Special Use for a Planned Development subject to the following stipulations:

- 1. Compliance with the requirements of the Village Engineer,**
- 2. Compliance with the requirements of the Plainfield Fire Protection District.**

Commissioner Bonuchi seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

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

The motion is carried 5:0

At 9:02 p.m. Commissioner O'Rourke made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the Site plan Review subject to the following stipulations as revised by the Plan Commission:

1. Compliance with the requirements of the Village Engineer,
2. Compliance with the requirements of the Plainfield Fire Protection District,
3. Right-in/Right-out access at Lockport Street and change the subject five parking spaces at a diagonal for southbound traffic,
4. Incorporation of a unified awning color on all the buildings within this development,
5. Pedestrian walkway from the main bank entrance west to Van Dyke road.

Commissioner Sanders seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

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

The motion is carried 5:0

Petitioner Oliver stated that they appreciated the Commission working with them on the parking issue.

CASE: 1451-022709.SPR VAN DYKE PROFESSIONAL BLDG.
Request: Site Plan Review
Location: Lot 74 – Fairfield Ridge Subdivision
Applicant: Cary Bryant, Contract Development

TIME: 9:04 p.m.

Planner Javoronok summarized the staff report. The property is zoned B-5, Traditional Business District. It is located at the northwest corner of S. Van Dyke Road and W. Soldier Drive. It is designated as Multiple Family Residential, which primarily refers to the development located to the west of the subject property.

The applicant is proposing a 25,128 sq. ft. medical office building for Associated Orthodontics. The original PUD outlined approximately 24,000 sq. ft. of office/retail in four smaller buildings. The applicant is proposing a 2-story building. Brick is the material for much of the exterior of the building with the remainder being glass. The building is located on the edge of the expanded urban core and will be constructed on the eastern lot line of the property. The parking will be located to the side and rear of the building. The mechanicals will be located on the rooftop and will be screened. Planner Javoronok summarized the landscape plan and stated it is sufficient. The applicant has not addressed the Village's irrigation system requirement for the front and corner side yards.

The plans depict an 8' sidewalk along S. Van Dyke Road and around the perimeter of the building, with a 5' concrete walk along Soldier Drive. The Open Space Plan notes an existing trail along Van Dyke Road with an existing bike lane striped into this portion of S. Van Dyke Road. The building is on the edge of the Village's expanded urban core. Staff would prefer a continuance of the asphalt trail that is in place further to the north. Although staff would prefer the trail, staff would also support a 10' sidewalk. Planner Javoronok stated the plans depict a right-in/right-out from S. Van Dyke Road and a full access from Soldier Drive. The parking stalls meet the number required by the Off-Street Parking Schedule. Staff has requested the applicant include one loading space. Stormwater is handled by the detention for the Fairfield Ridge Subdivision. The photometric plan complies with the Village's Site Plan Review Ordinance. Trash enclosures will be located to the northwest of the building. Signage for the proposed facility will be handled through a separate sign application process.

Staff recommends approval of the site plan review. Planner Javoronok concluded her staff report.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in the petitioner, Carl Bryant. His company is Contract Development. He had an issue with the continuation of the bike trail across the front of the building. One of the major tenants is an orthodontic practice and that means, children coming and going. He has a concern with bikes going across the front of the building on what would normally be the sidewalk or their entryway. He felt it can be a hazard. He had a concern about the liability issue if someone would be hurt. He would like to use concrete instead of asphalt because he feels it is a higher grade material and a better finish. He would like to keep the bikes on the street and off the sidewalk. He stated bikes cannot go down the sidewalks in the downtown, and he would like the same thing to happen by his building.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked if staff had a comment on that. Planner Javoronok stated from staff's perspective the bike path could serve as access to Settlers Park. Staff feels it would be more appropriate to have the bike traffic on a path as opposed to on the street. The property is on the edge of the expanded urban core and so it is a policy question. Chairman Sobkoviak asked what the present location of the bike path was. Planner Javoronok stated it is striped into Van Dyke. Chairman Sobkoviak asked if staff is attempting to move it on the other side of the curb. Planner Javoronok stated that was correct. She stated to the north in front of Cedarlake Village there is an existing bike path. It would be a continuation of that existing bike path. Chairman Sobkoviak asked if there is a plan for the bike path to be on the other side of the curb. Planner Javoronok stated it is drawn into the Open Space Plan that there is a bike path along Van Dyke, but it is not necessarily stated whether it will continue along the road or whether it will be a separate trail. The Open Space Plan does not go into the specifics of it.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if there is room on the road for it now. Planner Javoronok stated it continues to Lockport Street. Commissioner Sanders asked if it continued down Van Dyke into Wallin Woods or Settlers Park. Planner Javoronok stated there is no sidewalk currently on the west side of the street south of Lockport Street. Commissioner O'Rourke felt the petitioner made a good point and stated he did not know if having the bike path go across the front of this property would be pedestrian friendly. It is a conceptual or policy point. Chairman Sobkoviak stated the bike access needs to be maintained. The question is where it goes. There is a bike path on Van Dyke presently, which is part of the Village-wide bike path, and it needs to be maintained. Chairman Sobkoviak further stated the petitioner has stated that he would prefer to not have it on his side of the curb. He would prefer to leave it in the right-of-way. Commissioner O'Rourke stated it looks like it runs right next to the front door on the plan. Petitioner Bryant stated that was correct. Commissioner O'Rourke did not know if that was an appropriate place for the bike path given the design with the building basically holding the right-of-way all the way up to the front. Petitioner Bryant stated he complied with staff's request to have the building hold the right-of-way and then the bike path issue came up. Commissioner O'Rourke felt it was a valid concern by the petitioner.

Commissioner Fremarek also agreed with the petitioner in this regard. Chairman Sobkoviak stated at some point the bike path will have to run on Van Dyke to Lockport Street. Chairman Sobkoviak stated the Commission needs to answer the question where does the bike path start. Commissioner O'Rourke asked why the bike path could not be left on the street. Planner Javoronok stated the bike path could be left on the street. Chairman Sobkoviak stated for safety sake staff really wants to move it on the other side of the curb. It would be better if the bike path were on the other side of the curb. Commissioner Fremarek disagreed with that regarding this case. He asked if they were talking about the safety of the bike riders or the safety of the pedestrians coming into and out of the building. Chairman Sobkoviak stated generally the Village tries to put bike paths on the other side of the curb. He further stated when Van Dyke Road was first constructed the concept of a bike path was not entertained so the only place to put the bike path was to place it along the side of the curb. As some of these parcels are being developed the Village is trying to get the bike path on the other side of the curb. The bike path will not be able to run through the parking lot of Larry's Diner. It will have to go in the street. Commissioner O'Rourke suggested keeping it in the street by Larry's Diner and this parcel and then turn it into the path to the north. There was a discussion between the Commissioners in this regard.

Village Engineer Eickholtz stated they identified one concern with the setback of the building being near the right-of-way line. There is an existing deep sanitary sewer that is also against the right-of-way line. That is a concern for two reasons: 1) being able to maintain that sewer down the road would be very difficult with it being so close to the building and the foundation, and 2) the foundation would be placed on an over dig area where that trench was excavated, which is typically not recommended because of the settling concerns you could experience in a trenched area. Public Works concurs with that concern and is recommending that the building be 10 feet separated from the sanitary sewer so they have the opportunity to maintain the sanitary sewer down the road. Petitioner Bryant stated this concern was brought up to him earlier and as long as he is aware of it, he can deal with it. As far as the over dig goes, in any foundation if there is a fill or unsatisfactory soil they would fill it with engineered fill and would carefully deal with it. He has done that before and he is not overly concerned

about it. He did not think it would be an issue. At the time they excavate for the foundation and do their site work, they would have the city present and do the excavation jointly with one of the city engineers.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if there would be another concern on the part of Public Works if they have to go in and maintain that sanitary sewer. Petitioner Bryant stated just like any place else Public Works would have to do it carefully. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated the sewer is 20 feet deep and he doubted that the footing for the foundation is 20 feet. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if the site plan is going to have to be reviewed and changed. Village Planner Garrigan stated not necessarily. It is a policy issue. It may not be an optimum situation with regard to the utility line, but you have to balance that with regards to what is being created here with regards to an urban environment. You could push the building back an additional 10 or 20 feet to maximize the utility aspect, but again you are losing the downtown urban feel. Commissioner O'Rourke asked who will make that decision. Village Planner Garrigan stated the question is could you get access to the sewer line with the current position of the building. He further stated urban design, as it relates to downtown, would trump with regards to an optimum situation with regards to getting to a sewer line. Sewer lines are under sidewalks and streets in an urban environment every day versus a more suburban aspect where they are 20 or 30 feet away to maximize the ability to get to them.

Commissioner Fremarek would rather maintain the urban feel. He felt as long as the developer and the Village are aware of the situation, it can be dealt with at the time any maintenance needs to be performed.

Commissioner Renzi asked if the sewer in the new downtown is under the sidewalks and street. Everyone agreed it was. He asked if the building would be going adjacent to the sewer line. The Petitioner answered it would. Commissioner Renzi made a comparison to the downtown. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated this sewer on Van Dyke is a pretty deep sewer which requires a lot of slide sloping. Commissioner Renzi asked the life of a sewer. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated it should be 100 + years. Commissioner Renzi stated if engineering ensures that the developer puts in the footings and does the backfill, he felt theoretically it should be okay. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated it was correct that the developer has to be conscious of this. Petitioner Bryant stated he has had that experience before and has dealt with it before. He stated it would be engineered fill and there would be an engineer test, by an outside firm, on it for compaction. He would do it in conjunction with the Village so everyone was comfortable. Commissioner Renzi asked what needed to be done so that the developer does the adequate backfill as suggested. Village Planner Garrigan stated that would be covered by the stipulation – compliance with the Village Engineer.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated that was just part of the equation. The other part is what if Public Works has to go down and do maintenance. Commissioner Renzi stated he understood, but hoped the sewer line was put in correctly and the life is supposed to be 100+ years. Chairman Sobkoviak stated the Village Engineer and Public Works people will be supervising that. Commissioner Fremarek felt the stipulation, compliance with the Village Engineer, would cover this.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked Village Engineer Eickholtz about Public Works' position. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated there were a couple of things, the sidewalk was right up against the building and it seemed tight. Chairman Sobkoviak asked if it should be removed. Village Engineer Eickholtz did not feel it needed to be removed, just that it was tight.

Commissioner Sanders asked Planner Javoronok about the stipulation – removal of the sidewalk directly to S. Van Dyke Road. He asked if that was the proposed sidewalk directly adjacent to the proposed building. Planner Javoronok stated it is the 8' sidewalk that extends all the way along Van Dyke. It is a very small portion that is extending off of that sidewalk directly onto Van Dyke. Commissioner Sanders asked how wide that sidewalk was. Planner Javoronok stated that is an 8' sidewalk. Chairman Sobkoviak stated staff wants that removed so people are not dropped off there.

Village Engineer Eickholtz stated he is referring to the sidewalk parallel to the building. The drawing implies that it is touching the building or coming very close to it. There is a sanitary sewer that is very close. It is not like downtown Chicago where you don't have the ability to move 2 inches one way or 3 inches another way. There appears to be a little bit of space.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Petitioner Bryant if he would comply with the irrigation system mentioned in the staff report. Petitioner Bryant stated he would comply with that.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if the driveway that stubs to the north would be a cross access easement. Petitioner Bryant stated he believed that was part of the original PUD. Commissioner O'Rourke mentioned that the right-in/right-put on the north side looks like the parking space to the east doesn't line up with the curb on the other side further south. Planner Javoronok stated that was not raised by the Traffic Committee. She would leave it up to the applicant. Petitioner Bryant

stated they are comfortable with it. A discussion followed in this regard between the Commissioners. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if staff wanted to look at eliminating that one parking space in order to line up the curbs. Planner Javoronok stated staff can look at that.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if it was okay to have a two story building in this location. Planner Javoronok stated staff is comfortable with a two story building in this area. Commissioner O'Rourke also asked if staff is okay with the elevations. Planner Javoronok stated staff is okay with the elevations.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if a resolution was reached on the sewer as far as keeping the building where it is located. It was the consensus of the Commission to keep the building as is and follow the stipulation, compliance with the Village Engineer..

Commissioner Renzi stated even though he likes the idea of the aesthetics, he noted that if one parking space is lost, as mentioned by Commissioner O'Rourke, then the plan is one parking place short. According to staff's report the applicant has the exact number of required parking spaces. He would rather have the parking space, but whatever staff works out with the applicant would be fine with him. Chairman Sobkoviak felt the parking should be left alone.

At 9:35 p.m. Commissioner Sanders made a recommendation that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the site plan for Van Dyke Professional Building, subject to the following stipulations:

- 1. Compliance with the requirements of the Village Engineer,**
- 2. Compliance with the requirements of the Plainfield Fire Protection District,**
- 3. Compliance with the Village of Plainfield Building Codes,**
- 4. The addition of one off-street loading space,**
- 5. Removal of the sidewalk directly adjacent to S. Van Dyke Road.**

Commissioner Bonuchi seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

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

The motion is carried 5:0

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner O'Rourke wondered if possibly bonuses could be given to developers of Green Buildings. Village Planner Garrigan stated staff is looking forward to having a developer do a Green Building. He stated Green architecture can be very expensive. There is a philosophical debate whether incorporating some Best Management practices are appropriate in an urban setting, such as bioswales, etc.. There has been some debate internally whether that is appropriate in the downtown environment. Staff is promoting Best Management Practices Village-wide, especially along the commercial corridors where there is more area.

Commissioner Renzi asked if benches or places to park bikes could be incorporated in the Van Dyke Place Project.

Chairman Sobkoviak encouraged everyone to vote on April 7th. Commissioner Fremarek stated that there is early voting at the Village Hall Monday thru Friday and Saturday until Noon for Village residents. The Township Office also has early voting.

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

Respectfully Submitted

Carol Millan, Recording Secretary