



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

**DATE: September 18, 2007**

**LOCATION: Village Hall**

Chairman Sobkoviak called the meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:34 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Commissioners Kachel, Renzi, O'Rourke, Bonuchi, Chairman Sobkoviak, and ex-officio Commissioner Sanders and Cox, Park District, and Fire District.

**Absent:** Commissioners McKay and Murawski, School District, Library District, and Police Department

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

**MINUTES:**

The minutes from the Plan Commission meeting of September 4, 2007 were accepted as presented.

**DEVELOPMENT REPORT**

Mike Schwarz gave the development report. The following items went before the Village Board on Monday, September 17, 2007:

1. Approved an ordinance rezoning Coil Plus Drive, Lot 16 from I-2 to I-1,
2. Approved an ordinance for a special use for a preschool at Christ Community Church,
3. Approved the Final Plat of Resubdivision for Maude-Erb Resubdivision by a vote of 6-0,
4. Approved the Site Plan Review for Plainfield Fire Station #4 by a vote of 6-0,
5. Approved the Fire Protection Intergovernmental Agreement by a vote of 6-0 related to the transfer of the Village's municipal site at Grande Park for the construction of Fire Station #5,
6. Approved the opening of the Winding Creek Road by a vote of 6-0. This will come back later to see the traffic impact,
7. Approved the Annexation, Special Use, Preliminary Plat/Final Plat, and Site Plan Review for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints,
8. Approved the Rezoning of the Northwest Corner of IL Rt. 59 & 143<sup>rd</sup> St. by a vote of 5-1,
9. Directed the Village Attorney to draft the ordinance for approval of the special use for Pump it Up by a vote of 6-0,
10. Adopted an ordinance for annexation agreement for Rousonelos Property ,
11. Approved both the Major Change to the PUD and Site Plan Review for Plainfield Business Park, Lot I-6 by a vote of 5-0
12. Approved the major change to the PD by a vote of 5-0 and the Site Plan Review for Dayfield Commons by a vote of 6-0,
13. Directed the Village Attorney to prepare the ordinance for a major change to a PUD and approved a Preliminary/Final Plat of Resubdivision to the Crossroads Business Center,
14. Approved the Final Plat of Resubdivision for Spring Knoll by a vote of 6-0.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**CASE: 1348-071207.AA.RZ.SU.CP** **RIVER VILLAGE**  
Request: Annexation (Public Hearing)  
Rezoning (Public Hearing)  
Special Use (Public Hearing)  
Concept Plan Review  
Location: West of IL Rt. 59, south of Fraser Rd.  
Applicant: Patti Bernhard

At staff's request, Commissioner Renzi made a motion that the Plan Commission continue this case to the October 2, 2007 Plan Commission meeting.

Commissioner Bonuchi seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

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

**The motion is carried 5:0**

---

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**CASE: 1324-041307.CP** **LA BANCZ PROPERTY**  
Request: Concept Plan  
Location: North & south sides of Rte. 126  
East of County Line Rd. Extended  
Applicant: Lakewood Land, LLC  
Represented by Jim Truesdell

TIME: 7:43 p.m.

Mike Schwarz summarized the staff report. He stated this case has a long history. He stated this is a concept plan and is not a binding approval of the specific plan. It is basically to give the applicant feedback. This property presently is not contiguous to the Village. This is a request for the Village Board to enter into a pre-annexation agreement. The property is at the Northeast corner of IL. Rte. 126 and what would be the terminus of County Line Road. The property is specified in the Comprehensive Plan as medium density residential, which is 2.1 to 3.0 du/acre. The Comprehensive Plan called for two nodes of commercial on either side of IL. Rte. 126. The property is 121.49 acres, agricultural land in unincorporated Will County. It is ¾ of a mile west of the current Plainfield Municipal boundaries.

The concept plan was originally scheduled to be heard at the Plan Commission in June, 2007 and was removed from the agenda and tabled indefinitely at the request of the applicant. At that time, the concept plan reflected 258 single family lots for the residential portion of the development. The current concept plan reflects 352 total dwelling units broken down into 200 detached single-family lots and 152 attached single-family townhome units within a total of 26 townhome buildings, resulting in a gross density of 2.82 (recalculated to 2.98 at the 10/2 PC Mtg.) du/acre. The Comprehensive Plan identifies an overall base density, which is a gross density, of 2.1 du/acre, or what would equate to a maximum total of 262 dwelling units.

As part of the PUD, the applicant is requesting a number of items of relief under the Zoning Ordinance in return for the uniqueness of the project. The variances would include a reduction of the minimum lot size from 12,000 s.f. to 8,750 s.f. for the detached single-family lots, a reduction of the minimum lot width from 85 feet to 70 feet for the detached single-family lots, relief to allow building envelope lots for the townhome buildings which allows the lesser building-to-building setback, reduction in the minimum corner side yard setbacks from 30 feet to 20 feet for Bldgs. 15 and 16 along County Line Rd, and from 30 feet to 25 feet along the internal street for the same buildings. In terms of relief from the Subdivision Ordinance, the applicant would be seeking to reduce the public right-of-way for the local streets from 66 feet to 60 feet.

The subject property has varied topography, but it is generally flat. A creek is located along the portion of the west property line and the property does contain floodplain and wetland areas also along the west property line.

The applicant is proposing 352 total dwelling units, a gross density of 2.89 (recalculated to 2.98 at the 10/2 PC mtg.) du/acre or a net density of 3.09 du/acre. The gross density of 2.89 (recalculated to 2.98 at the 10/2 PC mtg.) falls within the density range established by the Comprehensive Plan, which designated the property as medium density residential. Based on the design aspects of the project, the applicant is proposing a 50% density bonus, which is the maximum potential density bonus permitted by the Village's Residential Design & Planning Guidelines for Planned Unit Developments and Annexations. Usually at this stage of the project, staff does not calculate the density bonus. To help the Plan Commission and the Village Board provide a measure of analysis regarding this proposed density bonus, staff has prepared a preliminary bonus calculation worksheet. Staff believes the proposed project may justify a 28% density bonus, which is 103 above the base density of 235 units. The project may qualify for 33 additional units due to on-site major transportation improvements (County Line Road extension) and for 4 additional units for corrected off-site issues (intersection and signalization improvements at Rte. 126 and County Line Road). This would bring the project up to a total of 338 units.

At staff's request, the applicant has provided boulevard entries at each of the two main entrances. The applicant has also agreed to provide a boulevard with several breaks along the length of the main entrance road coming off of Rte. 126. Two internal traffic circles (roundabouts) and various landscape islands are proposed within the internal street system as traffic calming measures. The Village's Residential Design & Planning Guidelines for Planned Unit Developments and Annexations provide that 35% of the homes are to include side and/or rear load garages and this can be met with most of the corner lots having homes with side-load garages.

An Architectural Pattern Book has been submitted and contains 8 examples of detached single-family homes to be built within the subdivision. The applicant would be required to select from the different styles of homes, with changes to colors, details, etc. There is an anti-monotony clause included in the Pattern Book. The Pattern Book does indicate specific guidelines for key lots, through lots, or key-through lots.

These are select locations where the lots will have to have additional landscaping, architectural detail, while still allowing the builder to use their standard product line on the remaining lots in the development. Staff is seeking additional key lots to be designated around the entire perimeter of the central park. Currently, every lot that backs to County Line and Rte. 126 has to be designated as a through lot. Staff would be willing to compromise and allow some flexibility in return for designating all of the lots framing the park as key lots.

As far as the townhomes are concerned, there are a number of architectural details, high end materials, and also gables and dormers. Most of the townhomes will be 6 units; some will be 5 unit townhome buildings. Staff has suggested on some of the conceptual elevations additional veneer, either stone or brick on the chimneys, and also stucco material underneath the gable. The applicant has indicated they will work with staff on this. Staff is generally pleased with the quality of architecture and the materials set forth by the developer. Some of the buildings that will front the park will actually have the end unit facing the park, which would almost give it the same appearance as a single-family home. The applicant has also stated they will be willing to provide that type of a unit on the other townhome buildings that would face Rte. 126.

There are two detention areas which will have native edge plantings, which are Best Management Practices. There is a greenway, which is non-buildable, which runs along County Line. It is floodplain area. A previous plan had County Line Road splitting the plan into two distinct sides. Staff is satisfied with the present position of County Line.

There is a 1.3 acre commercial parcel. The developer would be obligated to develop this consistent with the Village's design guidelines. If they would sell that to someone else the obligation goes with the property. There is no proposal at this time for any buildings on that project. There is a 10 foot bike path on the west side of County Line in the public R.O.W. As the path gets closer to the intersection with Rte. 126, staff has requested that the path have more of a meander in and out of the greenway.

The Village Engineer has reviewed the concept plan; generally the concept submittal does not require engineering, so the Village Engineer will not be able to comment on the engineering at this time until the next phase, which will be the preliminary plat stage. The Village Traffic Engineer supports the present concept plan and R.O.W. improvements shown on the concept plan. Staff did talk to the Park District and they have indicated that the proposed 6 acre park donation is acceptable. The estimated park land requirement is approximately 14.34 (recalculated to 11.51 at the 10/2 PC mtg.) acres. The balance of the park land requirement would be a cash-in-lieu contribution. There was a discussion explaining the Park District cash-in-lieu formulation. The adopted School Plan does not depict any proposed school facilities on the subject property.

Staff generally supports the proposed Concept Plan in terms of the mix of housing types, internal street layout, lot sizes, and land use. As part of ongoing discussions with the applicant, staff is looking for additional design features. Staff is willing to support a density bonus for the project in accordance with the Village's Density Bonus System to achieve the types of unique design features that will distinguish this development from a more conventional subdivision design. Staff is seeking some minor bike path and sidewalk adjustments, as well as a revision to show the proposed boulevard landscape median along the Rte. 126 entrance road.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked if Neal Eickholtz had anything to add. Neal stated the overland flood routing to and from the detention ponds is typically not allowed to cross over a large major thoroughfare. He felt it would be difficult to get the overland drainage into a pipe in large sections. The other item of concern was when the pond fills up, overland drainage is not allowed and they would need a large pipe that could be expensive.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Cameron Bettin from the Park District if he had anything to add. Cameron Bettin stated the Park District is okay with the concept. He stated in reference to the cash-in-lieu, the first priority would be developing the central park for the neighborhood. The Park District is working to use those revenues to build at least a Phase 1 of an initial Recreation Center.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in the group representing the petitioner. Bruce Goldsmith, the attorney representing Lakewood Homes, spoke first. He gave an overall review. He stated in the early stages there were questions about the location of County Line Road and, at one point, County Line Road bisected the property. At a previous meeting, the Commission had questions how someone would cross County Line Road to reach the central park and otherwise take advantage of the amenities of the site. The petitioner had to deal with some items to get to the fix. In particular, the creek is considered Waters of the United States and is under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers. There is the creek and the wetlands coming down the west side of the property coming almost to the corner at Rte. 126. There really are not development opportunities west of County Line Road. In addition, there is floodplain, which further complicates any development west of County Line. Basically, County Line, in some places, hugs the floodplain in the new concept plan. Also, the other problem the petitioner was trying to address was the problem at Rte. 126 and County Line Road with traffic control. One part of the improvements that the petitioner is doing is an off-site improvement. The Village has requested the petitioner make some improvements at Rte. 126 to allow a more viable intersection in the interim before it gets to the future configuration with an extension of County Line Road.

Jim Truesdell, Director of Planning and Zoning from Lakewood Homes, spoke next. He stated in the new concept plan they have integrated a townhome component. He stated the commercial site is about 1.3 acres. It is a triangular parcel. This parcel will likely not be built on its own independently. The petitioner would anticipate as the property to the south develops they would work with that owner so one consolidated commercial center could be built. He stated staff suggested making key lots around the central park, in exchange for reducing a few of the through lots in some of the locations, and they will work with staff to identify those lots. He stated they felt that also was a good idea and that will enhance the area around the central park. He stated this is a new single-family product line that Lakewood Homes has developed, more of a traditional neighborhood style. There are about 11 different floor plans, each with about 4 different elevations. There are front porches on almost all of the homes. The garages are all virtually set back from the front of the house from anywhere from 2 to 8 feet to create a product with a less dominant front garage. The square footage goes up to about 3,800 to 4,000 sq. ft. There will be some good size homes with a combination of 2 to 3 car garages. There will be additional landscaping on the key lots and the through lots. This would be incorporated into the Pattern Book.

He stated their townhome product is currently being built in Carol Stream. It is on North Avenue, just west of Gary Avenue. It is a rear-loaded townhome. It is a good example of four-sided architecture. The side facing the street is really a raised-ranch front to the unit. It can be either front or side-loaded with the garages. You do not see the garages on the front of the building, because they are through the rear courtyards. They range in size from about 1,800 to about 2,300 sq. ft. They require consistent fencing throughout their project. It is a cedar board-on-board fence. They typically allow up to 6 feet if it is up

against a major road or some other land use, otherwise they restrict to a 4 foot cedar board-on-board fence on internal single-family fencing. All of the detention basins would be naturalized utilizing Best Management Practices. They would be planted with natural prairie grasses, wildflowers, etc. He stated he had reviewed the staff report and they are in concurrence with the report. They are agreeable to recommendations by staff. He stated staff had recommended eliminating two buildings. Jim Truesdell had suggested instead of just taking two buildings out, they might want to make the 6 unit buildings into 5 unit buildings along Rt. 126. They will work with staff on this.

Mike Schwarz stated the purpose of the meeting is to get the feedback from the Commission on the general layout of the plan. This is a concept and it could change again at the Village Board level. He stated as far as staff's recommendation about two buildings, staff was also considering the building-to-building dimension, 45 or 46 feet was the narrowest point. Removing two buildings would allow you to space the buildings out a little bit more to have a little bit more building-to-building separation, but staff is open to consideration of the petitioner's feedback on selecting units from each individual building.

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

Commissioner Kachel asked about the detention pond around Rt. 126 and the park area down by the townhomes. He asked if it was going to be treated as somewhat of a park area with lighting and seating. Jim Truesdell stated they are planning on extending a sidewalk, a walking path, all the way around this area. This would be privately owned and maintained, but it would be incorporated into the townhome development. Commissioner Kachel asked if it would also be lit. Jim Truesdell stated there really have not been any discussions and details of actually putting lights on the path. There would be street lights and lights on all of the buildings. Commissioner Kachel felt it would be a good idea for safety reasons to have it lit with some kind of low level lighting. Kurt Wandry, Vice President Lakewood Homes, stated it makes a lot of sense to give the lighting some consideration.

Commissioner Sanders asked Neal about the ultimate extension of County Line Road going north. He asked how far north it goes. Neal stated Eric Gallt would be the best person to address that. Commissioner Sanders asked if it would be a minor collector, major collector. Mike Schwarz stated it would extend north to 143<sup>rd</sup> Street ultimately. It would terminate at 143<sup>rd</sup> Street.

Commissioner Sanders asked about the townhome Buildings #15 and #16. Mike Schwarz stated right now, as proposed, only one side would have the raised-ranch product, but the applicant has indicated verbally a willingness to do both sides with the raised-ranch product. Jim Truesdell agreed.

Commissioner Sanders asked if there would be one HOA. Jim Truesdell stated there probably will be a HOA for the single-family homes because there still would be common areas that would need to be maintained. He also stated there probably will be an overall umbrella HOA that would cover and share the cost of the maintenance of all the detention basins, the entry features, etc; and then there would be another separate HOA to cover the townhomes because of the uniqueness of the townhomes and the common maintenance and the exterior maintenance of the building. Commissioner Sanders asked if the detention ponds would be considered an amenity to the community and be maintained by a HOA, and if they would be given some guidance on how to set up the infrastructure to maintain these. Jim Truesdell stated that was correct.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated a DSSA would be created prior to being platted.

Commissioner Kachel asked what was being considered for parking around the park area. Jim Truesdell stated that was something they would have to work with the Park District on. He stated there would be the ability for on-street parking. Besides the land donation, there would also be a cash donation to the Park District that they could possibly use to improve the park. Mike Schwarz stated the park would function as a neighborhood-type of park; it wouldn't necessarily be a drive-to destination. There was a discussion about

parking. Cameron Bettin stated they have not looked at the park site yet, as far as what will be built, but he stated since the cash-in-lieu amounts are a lot more now, it does give them more flexibility as far as the design goes. Commissioner Kachel stated a grid system could be put in where grass actually grows through it instead of asphalt, etc for parking.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked about the minimum requirement of determining land versus cash-in-lieu for the Park District. Cameron Bettin stated the minimum use was 3 acres, now it is 5 acres. He stated it depends on the development. A discussion ensued about determination of the distribution of park donation.

Commissioners Sanders asked if this neighborhood park was designed for more passive or active activities. Cameron Bettin stated typically the neighborhood parks will have a playground, picnic shelter area to be used by the neighborhood residents. He stated they would have to look at the needs in this area. He stated a tennis court might be a possibility since there are not many tennis courts out in the western portion of the Park District boundaries. A half-court basketball might be a possibility. They have been getting into berming and creating a little bit more buffering, a lot of landscaping. Jim Truesdell concurred that they have looked at this as a central active park for use by the entire neighborhood. He also stated there was another area that could be a park around a detention area.

Commissioner O'Rourke had questions about traffic calming. He asked about the parking for lots alongside these traffic calming features. He felt they would be restricted as far as parking along the street. Jim Truesdell stated that was correct. The residents in those areas would be restricted in parking along the street. Jim Truesdell stated this was something that came out of the Traffic Committee. Mike Schwarz stated the Village is one member of the Traffic Committee made up on other outside agencies, School District, Park District, Police Department, Fire Department, etc. There was a discussion about traffic calming measures for this project.

Commissioner Kachel asked if some of the townhomes are taken out is there any area where overflow parking for the townhomes could be created. In this way if someone wanted to make use of the waterway, they could drive and park. Jim Truesdell stated this is a private amenity so they are not really thinking that this will draw people from outside of this area. He further stated everyone can easily walk down to this area and they do not want to attract a lot of people driving from the outside. He also stated there will be room for guest parking at the ends of the courtyards and various off-street parking areas. He also felt there should be room for guest parking along the streets. Jim Truesdell pointed out that these are two car garage townhomes, so everyone will have two cars and a driveway sufficient to park cars in front of those garages also. There are 4 spaces per unit.

Commissioner O'Rourke pointed out the southeast quadrant of the development where there are single-family homes and an open space. He felt a natural flow would be to continue the townhomes over that area, not that there should be more density, but he felt it provides a good buffer between Rt. 126 and the single-family homes to the north. He stated he could support more density if space was opened up somewhere else where the rest of the community could have an advantage of utilizing it as well. He felt possibly by eliminating some single-family and opening up more park area that would offset the density. Jim Truesdell

stated that was something they could look at. They looked at this entry as a divider between the townhomes and the single-family homes.

Commissioner O'Rourke felt the petitioner was a little weak on the park area. Michael Schwarz talked about the population equivalent used to derive the Park and School acreage amounts. There was a discussion about the formulation. It is up to the Park District to determine whether they want the donation all in land or a combination of land and cash with the consent of the Village Board.

Commissioner O'Rourke talked about the bike path on the west side of County Line being extended. He wanted to know if there were any plans to tie that into the east edge of the property. Mike Schwarz stated it is proposed a crosswalk type of connection where the main entrance onto County Line Road is located. He further stated that typically the Village locates the 10 foot bike path on the west side or the south side of the arterial street. In this case, there would be a 10 foot asphalt path all the way down the extension of County Line Road and it would continue southward, and there would be a 10 foot asphalt path, when the future commercial comes in, east and west. On the east side of County Line Road, there would be the standard sidewalks. That could be negotiated. Staff might want an 8 foot sidewalk instead of the standard 5 foot sidewalk. Those details still need to be worked out. There will be a bike path on the west side of County Line Road and on the south side of Rt. 126.

There was a discussion about comparing previous plans for this project. There was a discussion about some areas that could become pocket parks.

Mike Schwarz stated staff is generally favorable of the overall land plan. Staff thinks that the removal of two townhome buildings would actually open it up a little bit more to allow the buildings to be separated a little bit better. Generally, staff feels the 28% density, which is very preliminary, along with the on-site and off-site transportation costs that have been provided to staff does constitute some measure of density bonus. The applicant is seeking the full 50% density bonus. The only other development that achieved close to that amount was the Grande Park South project and that case had extensive BMP's and so forth. That project received 47% density bonus. Ultimately, it will become a Board decision.

Chairman Sobkoviak called the Commission's attention to the computation by staff of the density bonus of 28% and asked if they agreed with staff's method of computation.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated he didn't have a problem with creating more density with the townhomes along Rt. 126 if the Village is getting more open space and maybe then the petitioner would get a higher score.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked staff if he heard correctly that they came up with 28% on the worksheet, but through other agreements with the petitioner, the density could be higher. Mike Schwarz stated yes. He also stated generally the density bonus is not provided. Staff thought this would be helpful to the Commission based on the fact that the commissioners are being asked to consider a concept plan. He stated it would be more important to focus on how the land plan appears and if the Commission is comfortable with how the buildings are arranged, what sort of building separation, as opposed to going through and debating each of the percentages.

Chairman Sobkoviak talked about the reliefs requested by the petitioner from the Zoning Ordinance. He asked staff what the Village is getting in return. Jim Truesdell stated they have worked hard and the Village is getting benefits from this. He stated there are front porches, substantial architectural details, especially in

the townhomes. The townhomes have a lot of high quality materials and they have worked hard to provide the 4-sided architecture so there is a good look around the entire building. They have worked hard to make sure that the land plan is laid out to enhance those elements of the building so that when people drive down the streets they see the fronts, and the raised ranch elevations on the sides. There are density bonuses for this type of architecture. If an applicant is not requesting any density bonus, they are not required to provide any architecture to the detail they are providing. He also stated the way they developed the land plan, in terms of the central park location, has created an excellent focus for the entire development. The BMP's, the naturalized detention, etc. are some of the things that go above and beyond what would necessarily be required. He stated a major factor is the regional improvements. One of the things that has been a big struggle in this community is County Line Road, the correct alignment. The Village ordinances provide for bonuses for regional infrastructure, such as County Line Road. Chairman Sobkoviak stated perhaps more emphasis needs to be placed on the infrastructure improvements. Jim Truesdell also mentioned the interim improvement to the intersection of County Line Road and Rt. 126 that they would provide funding for early on.

Commissioner Bonuchi asked why the petitioner did not stick to the Village Standards, as far as lot size. She felt there were too many homes for the area. She also mentioned a contradiction in the report that states the School District has requested 75 acres for a future school site and then a few pages later in the staff report it states the School District had no request. Mike Schwarz stated in the past the School District was inquiring about acquiring the 75 acres. At the current time, there has not been any comment from the School District. Jim Truesdell stated the first time they came through they received a letter that the School District appeared to be interested in the possible acquisition of this site for a high school. Subsequent to that, they met with the School District on more than one occasion and offered them the property. At this point in time, it was the petitioner's understanding that the School District is no longer interested in the property. Mike Schwarz stated the other issue is whoever was to ultimately develop the property, the obligation and the expectation of the Village to extend County Line Road is a significant expense, whether it be the School District or a private developer. To implement the vision of the thoroughfare plan of the Village, it is a significant out-of-pocket cost for the developer. Mike Schwarz replied to Commissioner Bonuchi that the lot sizes are smaller, but again the idea of the density bonus system is to allow the flexibility of a unique land plan. He further stated under a plan with 12,000 sq. ft. lots it is not impossible that there would be some of these features, but it would be a challenge for a residential builder.

Commissioner Renzi asked what are the foundation footprints. Jim Truesdell stated their houses will range from 1,800 sq. ft. on the small end up to 4,000 sq. ft. He stated the widest homes typically range from 44 ft. to 48 ft. wide. There is still the room for the standard 10 ft. side yards, plus some extra space depending on the particular house.

Commissioner Renzi had concerns about getting the number of side loaded garages. He felt Lot 20 should be lost so there is enough area to make it a significant green space. He also felt Lot 32 is an oversized lot. He would like to see a reconfiguration of the detention area so there is significant open space there so there could be the allusion of two pocket parks in the subdivision. He agreed with Commissioner O'Rourke that there is not significant acreage for a park. He felt the residents are going to want to drive to the park. He felt this would lead to parking issues and capacity issues. He also agreed with Commissioner Bonuchi that it will be too crowded. He stated he sees a lot of streetscape dominated by buildings with little side yards and a lot of garages. He agreed with Commissioner Kachel about there not being enough parking for the townhomes. He also did not like the idea that commercial acreage was lost on a significant intersection and he does not like to see water at an intersection, but felt that might be something the Village has to live with based on the water flow. He felt there was cramped townhome design with a high number per unit. He

disagreed with Commissioner O'Rourke since he would not want to expand the townhomes, but that was one of his least objections. He felt other than getting the advantage of having County Line Road built, and possibly intersection improvements at Rt. 126 and County Line Rd., he does not see a whole lot of advantages with this plan because he felt it is going to be cramped. He basically felt there is not enough green space, too many townhomes, and too high of density.

Jim Truesdell responded to Commissioner Renzi's comments. He stated as far as the lot width and crampedness Commissioner Renzi was concerned about, while the lot sizes themselves are being reduced they are not asking for a reduction in yards. So, they are still maintaining a 10 ft. side yard. In terms of the commercial, he stated he understood Commissioner Renzi's concern. He stated unfortunately the way the intersection now lays out with floodplain; there is just not enough buildable land to do the commercial. Jim Truesdell went on to say in terms of the density of the townhomes, he stated they do concur with staff's recommendation to go back and loosen that up. They are not that far off – staff is saying 338 and they have 352. They will go back and see where they can take units out of there and get down to the density staff has requested. This will loosen those areas up. In addition, that will open up some areas for additional guest parking.

Commissioner Renzi asked if the bike path could be meandering. Since it is floodplain, maybe some creeks there could be enhanced or some natural waterways so it could be made more of a riding destination instead of simply putting a 10 ft. path, which kind of meanders up and down there. He also stated maybe some benches, etc. could be put there for people to do in-line skating, biking, strolling, etc. and maybe make it more of a recreational area rather than just a detention area.

Commissioner Kachel asked how the Park District would feel about the bike path going along the creek. Cameron Bettin stated the Park District does not have a problem with that. They have done that in other subdivisions. They have not talked about taking that area and he didn't know if the Park District would be interested in taking it. Commissioner Kachel asked if there were any plans north of this that could tie into this. Cameron Bettin stated nothing that he was aware of. Mike Schwarz stated the Open Space and Trails Plan generally calls again for a regional point-to-point type of trail that is along a road and it is to get you through the Village from one subdivision to the next. Mike Schwarz stated since this is floodplain area instead of the standard 10 ft. in the R.O.W. type of path, where most of it would be in the R.O.W., there could be some meandering of the path to bring the path into an easement through the greenway and meander in and out of the greenway, but generally hug the road R.O.W. He further stated Commissioner Renzi's idea was a good idea, but maybe have a spur of it, if possible, loop the pond. That will come with engineering. There was a discussion about the bike path.

Cameron Bettin wanted to make a comment about something talked about earlier. He mentioned there is the possibility of the northeast corner possibly being reconfigured to possibly allow the Park District to expand as future development comes into the north and east. He stated neighborhood parks need to have a service area of about ½ mile radius. If you look at that, the neighborhood park is serving that neighborhood. People will walk within that subdivision to that neighborhood park.

Commissioner Kachel stated there could be a small bridge put over the creek connecting this subdivision with a future subdivision to the west. Mike Schwarz stated the developer is willing to provide the R.O.W. on the road connection that would stub essentially at the creek. Through the pre-annexation agreement there would be an agreement on some monetary value of their proportionate share of the bridge to connect the bridge over the creek to a local road, basically just a subdivision connector. He stated that was the purpose of the R.O.W. on the north. He stated there might be a roundabout at County Line on the north property line.

Chairman Sobkoviak polled the commissioners as to what concerns they had with the project in order to give feedback to the petitioner.

Commissioner O'Rourke did not have a problem with increasing the townhomes, loosening them up and losing some of the single family to create some more space. Chairman Sobkoviak stated continuing the townhomes along Rt. 126 has merit, but at the same time the Commission is saying the density is a little high. Commissioner O'Rourke stressed to add the section of townhomes along Rt. 126, but maybe eliminate some single-family homes, space the lots further apart, and maybe add to the little pocket parks. He didn't mean to just increase the density to increase the density, but getting some other benefits by adding that density and maybe loosening some of the spaces between them also.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked how the commissioners felt about staff's compilation of the density bonus. Commissioner Renzi felt it was a good starting point. He stated he would go along with Commissioner O'Rourke, but in exchange have a couple of lots pulled out from the north street and south street to widen the lots out to 74 ft. from 70 ft. Mike Schwarz pointed out the setbacks are going to be the same. Chairman Sobkoviak reminded the commissioners that the petitioner is going to build within 10 ft. of the lot line, so it doesn't make any difference whether there is a 100 ft. lot or a 70 ft. lot, there still is going to be 20 ft. between the houses. Commissioner Renzi had concerns about the lot sizes on the straight roads. He suggested the petitioner move some of the buildings for the townhomes, take out a few lots, and increase the size of the pocket park, and have a little bit larger lot sizes on the straighter roads.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked the commissioners how they felt about the 5 stipulations in the staff report, plus the two added tonight. The commissioners were fine with the stipulations.

Commissioner O'Rourke wanted to reiterate his concern about the traffic calming measures, the tapering of the streets. He felt it would raise a concern with parking.

Commissioner Bonuchi reiterated her concern that the density for the project was too high.

Chairman Sobkoviak advised all of the commissioners about the concept plan review process. He stated the Commission did not know the actual density at this time. He stated the next step in the process will be for the petitioner to come back with a preliminary plat.

Mike Schwarz stated the applicant would like comments on this plan to move forward to the Village Board or another option, at the Commission's discretion, would be to have modifications to this concept plan and move that plan to the Village Board. He stated staff is comfortable with the present plan with some minor modifications before it goes to the Village Board. If there are strong feelings on the road configuration, the spacing between the townhome buildings, the lot widths, those are key pieces of information that the applicant and Village Board would like to know.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated the Commission is very concerned with the lot widths. He asked the commissioners if they agreed. They agreed. Chairman Sobkoviak stated there also is a strong concern about the overall density and the number of dwelling units. The consensus is that townhouses could be continued across the southern perimeter of the parcel, but there should be a reduction of single-family dwellings. Commissioner O'Rourke stated he didn't know if that would reduce density, but it certainly would maybe open some pocket parks and loosen up the rest of the townhome project as well. Chairman Sobkoviak asked the petitioner if he needed to know anything else from the Commission.

Jim Truesdell stated it would appear the Commission is generally agreeable with staff's density figure, however, the Commission is concerned, in the single-family area in particular, that the lot widths need to be wider in general than what they are right now. The Commission would be willing to reduce some of the single-family homes for maybe some more townhomes spread out to achieve that density.

The Commission agreed.

Mike Schwarz wanted to add that where the Commission is going is actually just the opposite of where staff was going. Staff was talking about possibly single family on both sides of the road. He asked the petitioner why the land planner decided to keep the townhomes together as opposed to each side of the road.

Kurt Wandry stated it really became a marketing issue. They didn't want to see the entire frontage populated by townhouses and the single family neighborhood behind. The petitioner was hoping to show both product lines and bring it all the way out to Rt. 126. Chairman Sobkoviak stated the single-family homes will be facing inward and you will see the rear of the houses. Kurt Wandry stated a person will see a beautiful landscape buffer. He stated they hope to see the County Line Road extension go all the way to 143<sup>rd</sup> St and some people will be driving down it and see the single-family product.

Jim Truesdell stated they would like to hear the comments of the Commission and then incorporate them all. His understanding of the process is this is concept. The comments made by the Commission tonight would be sent on to the Village Board and then they would hear the Village Board comments. Then, they would have to come back to the Commission prior to the pre-annexation agreement to hold another hearing on the zoning. Bruce Goldsmith stated this would be done the same as the Rousonelos annexation, except that there would be a full plan rather than just the straight annexation. The Commission would get a chance to see the zoning with a site plan that would be updated to include the comments from this Commission and the Village Board. He stated the petitioner would prefer that the Commission add the stipulations and then they would go through the process. They would be back to the Commission with a different plan that would incorporate the Commission and Village Board's comments.

Commissioner O'Rourke wanted the petitioner to come back with the revisions before going to the Village Board. Mike Schwarz stated staff is comfortable sending the Commission's comments to the Village Board in the form of a written report with the minutes from tonight's meetings.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if the petitioner could come up with a new plan according to the Commission's comments before going to the Village Board. He wanted to make that a stipulation. The petitioner stated they would be happy to do that. The rest of the Commission agreed with Commissioner O'Rourke. The Commission added stipulation #7 stating, "Plans should be revised to reflect the Plan Commission recommendations prior to presentation to the Village Board."

Mike Schwarz stated the petitioner could make a presentation with side-by-side slides showing tonight's plan along with the revisions requested by the Plan Commission. The petitioner agreed.

At 10:14 p.m. Commissioner O'Rourke made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend to the Village Board approval of the concept plan for LaBancz Property PD, 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;
3. Subject to the minor bike path and sidewalk adjustments;
4. Subject to the inclusion of a boulevard landscape median along the Route 126 entrance road;
5. Subject to the removal of two townhome buildings based on staff's preliminary density bonus calculations and to provide for additional building separation in the townhome portion of the property;
6. Subject to additional key lots located on perimeter of park;
7. The concept plans should be revised to reflect the Plan Commission recommendations prior to presentation to the Village Board.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kachel

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

**Aye:** Bonuchi, Kachel, Renzi, O'Rourke, **Chairman Sobkoviak**

**Nay:** 0

**The motion is carried 5:0**

---

At 10:15 p.m. Chairman Sobkoviak called for a 10 minute break.

Commissioner Renzi left at 10:15 p.m.

At 10:25 p.m. the Commission reconvened.

**CASE:** 1353-080307.SPR **THE CLUBHOUSE AT PLAYA VISTA**  
**Request:** Site Plan Review  
**Location:** Playa Vista Boulevard, Lot 226  
South of 135<sup>th</sup> St., south of Grande Pk Blvd.  
**Applicant:** Hartz Construction  
Represented by Doug Blocker

**TIME:** 10:25 p.m.

Sara Javoronok summarized the staff report. She stated the site is located within Neighborhood 4, 5, and 6 of Grande Park. The preliminary and final plats for these neighborhoods were approved by the Village Board April 16, 2007. The applicant submitted architectural elevations for the Clubhouse and incorporated brick, stone, and fiber cement lap siding. As far as landscaping, the plan meets the requirements of the Village's landscape ordinance. At staff's request the applicant has added plantings for a landscape buffer. The trash enclosure is located to the southwest of the Clubhouse building and has 100% visual screening. The doors of the structure are also fiber cement horizontal lap siding and are hinged with steel pipe bollards.

Access to the clubhouse is from the southeast of the traffic circle at Playa Vista Boulevard, Grande Park Boulevard, and Carmel Boulevard. Pedestrian access is provided with several sidewalks and a bike trail. Sara went on to say the plans show 80 parking spaces, which is satisfactory for the Clubhouse and the additional facilities. Retention is to be stored on site. The photometric plan conforms to the Village's requirement. A monument sign is to be located along the median at the entry off of the traffic circle. Additional building or wall signage that may be desired on the Clubhouse or adjacent areas is also subject to the Sign Ordinance permitting requirements. Staff recommends approval.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Neal Eickholtz if there are any engineering issues. Neal replied that they had just received the plan, but do not anticipate any problems.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in the petitioner. Doug Blocker from Hartz Construction gave testimony. He stated this is a 55 year old and over community.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if there were no lights in the pool area in the evening. Doug Blocker responded there were not. He stated there was a 4 ft. fence around the pool. Commissioner O'Rourke then asked what would be built first the Clubhouse or the lots. Doug Blocker responded the Clubhouse would be built first and then the homes would be built as the lots are sold.

Commissioner Kachel asked if the pool area would be open for parties. Doug Blocker stated no the pool cannot be used. It will be locked at night. Commissioner Kachel had concerns that visiting children might try to jump over or climb the 4 ft. fence. Matt Matthis, a representative for Hartz Construction, stated there would be lights under the water in the pool.

Commissioner Kachel had concerns about the materials used to construct the trash enclosure. He was concerned that these materials would not hold up. He would rather see it made of masonry.

Matt Matthis stated the petitioner could put the siding on the inside and just mirror what is being done on the outside. Commissioner Kachel had concerns about the structural integrity of the trash enclosure and felt it should be made of a more durable material.

Sara Jaronovok stated it matches the exterior of the building, which is required. Commissioner Kachel stated it might match the exterior, but he had concerns about how it would hold up over the years.

Mike Schwarz stated staff supports the aesthetic appearance of it, but maybe as a compromise the applicant might consider a masonry block construction or some other more durable construction method for the interior.

Matt Matthis wanted to clarify that there is not a lot of garbage coming out of this building. It will not necessitate the need for the type of dumpster that is loaded into a garbage truck like you would see in a bigger commercial application. The dumpsters will be wheeled out of that area and loaded into the truck.

Mike Schwarz stated the only code requirement is that the screening is accomplished by using the same materials used on the principle structure. So, in this case the exterior is consistent.

Commissioner Kachel asked if it were a block building or a frame building. Matt Matthis answered it was a frame building.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if the dumpster was built into the building. Matt Matthis stated no. He stated it is separate.

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

Commissioner O'Rourke asked the petitioner if they would consider additional landscape plantings to buffer the Bocce Area to the residents to the east. Sara showed where there is a retaining wall and that could be an area to be considered. Chairman Sobkoviak reminded the commissioners this is an age-restricted community. The petitioner stated they could take a look at that, but did not think there was a need for it because they are not all day activities. They go for an hour or two maximum.

At 10:45 p.m. Commissioner Bonuchi made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the Site Plan Review for the Clubhouse at Playa Vista 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 Kachel seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

**Aye:** Kachel, O'Rourke, Bonuchi, **Chairman Sobkoviak**

**Nay:** 0

**The motion is carried 4:0**

---

<b>CASE:</b>	<b>1362-090407.CP</b>	<b>FIFTH THIRD BANK</b>
Request:	Concept Plan	
Location:	Southeast corner of IL Rt. 59 & 135 St. Outlot F (3) – Meijer of Plfd. Development	
Applicant:	Fifth Third Bank Represented by Peter Theodore, Architect	
TIME:	10:45 p.m.	

Sara Leach summarized the staff report. She stated this is a concept plan review to obtain input on a conceptual bank with a drive-through to be constructed on Outlot F of the Meijer Planned Unit Development. The applicant is requesting input as to whether a second bank would be supported in the Meijer PUD. The previously approved bank, TCF Bank, will be selling their land to an unknown bank, but the previously approved special use permit will remain in place. The new bank will come through with a site plan review in the future. Fifth Third Bank is proposing a three lane drive-through. The applicant would need to apply for a special use permit to run concurrently with the site plan review. The applicant has included an attractive landscape plan that exceeds the Village's landscaping requirements in terms of plant units and plant species variety. Because this is a concept plan and it focuses more on the general idea of the site proposal, details about stormwater, trash enclosures, and lighting have not yet been received. Staff and the applicant are seeking input from the Plan Commission to determine if there is support for a

second bank with a drive through within the Meijer PUD development. Staff wishes to gather input from the Plan Commission to provide direction to the applicant.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Neal Eickholtz if there are any issues. Neal commented that they recommend that the alignment of the entrance line up with the aisle opening between the two landscape medians. Chairman Sobkoviak stated that would be to line up with one of the drive aisles as opposed to lining up on a landscape island.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in the petitioners. Richard Skrodzki – attorney for the petitioner, spoke first. He gave a brief history of Fifth Third Bank. They have been developing a presence in the Chicago Area for approximately the last 6 or 7 years. It was spearheaded by the acquisition of the Old Kent Bank.

Peter Theodore – the project architect and planner, spoke second. He talked about why another bank should be allowed in this PUD. He stated this use would create a low volume of traffic and does not overburden the site. Everything they have done, positioning of the building, positioning of the drive through, and the balance between open areas versus paved areas has been to really complement the use of the site. The hours of operation coincide nicely with the hours of operation of the center. The fact that they have limited the amount of curb cuts to just one does not overburden the main drive or any of the interior roads. He went on to say they are exceeding the landscape requirements as it relates to the number of species. The architecture basically is on all four sides with quality materials. The materials take a cue from the Meijers, but really take it one step further in the sense that they are using limestone, face brick, carrying it around all sides of the building. They made an extra effort to create layers of landscaping. Landscaping occurs along the setbacks on Rt. 59 within the property as you move into the second layer, and also along the façade of the building. There is foundation landscaping and essentially two other layers of landscaping. They intend on irrigating all of their landscaping. Fifth Third Bank has done market studies to show that there is a place for them in Plainfield. They put back into the community. They sponsor many activities and organizations. They hope to get a positive response from the Commission to move this to the next level.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated the main question is – is it appropriate to place another bank on this corner. He asked what the commissioners feelings were on the subject.

Commissioner O'Rourke felt the petitioner should be welcomed. He stated he knew there were some concerns about the number of banks and the lack of sales tax. He stated there are also positives as far as the generation of property taxes, which helps the School District. He stated he did have some issues with the site plan and the layout, but he did not have a problem with the use.

Commissioner Cox had no objection to another bank. He stated competition is always good no matter what the industry is.

Commissioner Bonuchi had no problem with another bank.

Commissioner Sanders asked what a possible use would be for bank if it decided to close. Peter Theodore stated they deviated from the prototypical design of Fifth Third not only because they wanted to blend with the center, but also adaptive use. He stated this building could easily be adapted to another use. The inside is extremely accessible with the exception of the vault and the vault can be removed. It could easily become a retail structure.

Commissioner Kachel would be willing to go along with the bank on the site also.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated one of the big arguments was that banks take prime corners. This proposed bank is not taking a prime corner. He also stated even though a bank generates very little in sales tax revenue, it does generate real estate tax revenue. That assists the schools. The presence of a bank is a sign of prosperity.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated this was a concept plan and that a site plan review would have to come back before the Commission. Sara stated that was correct and the petitioner would welcome the Commission's comments. Chairman Sobkoviak stated a comment had been made about shifting the entrance to the parking lot. The petitioner indicated that can be done. He asked the commissioners for their opinions on the concept plan.

Commissioner O'Rourke had concerns about the way the plan is laid out. Commissioner O'Rourke felt if you move the entrance to the south it moves it too close to the intersection, the driveway intersection. If you move the entrance to the north, he felt additional problems would be created with the drive through. He felt the building should be facing Rt. 59 with the drive through on the north side. Sara stated the Village Zoning Ordinance requires that the drive through be in the rear of the building. Commissioner O'Rourke stated he felt the Ordinance stated the drive through cannot go in the front. Chairman Sobkoviak stated it cannot be on the street side. Commissioner O'Rourke stated the north side of this really would not be the street because it is not on the corner. Sara reiterated that she believed the Ordinance requires the drive through to be on the rear, but regardless the PUD requires drive throughs to be on the rear of the building also.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated Commissioner Kachel had a suggestion to take out one of the islands that is in the way. Sara Leach stated she believed those are already in place. She believed the parking stalls for the Meijer Parking lot would run parallel to those islands. Peter Theodore stated he would like to go back and meet with his traffic engineer and staff. Chairman Sobkoviak stated the Commission can ask the petitioner to work on it and come back with a workable solution.

Commissioner O'Rourke wanted to see if the building can be turned and the drive through be put on the north side. Sara Leach stated she can double check the requirements of the PUD and talk with the applicant about possibly amending that. She stated if the PUD is consistent with the Ordinance, staff goes with the one that has stricter regulations, which in this case would be the PUD.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated that would necessitate a public hearing to make a major change to a PUD.

Richard Skrodzki, attorney for the petitioner, stated one of the things they had to do before even filing a concept plan application was to get approval from Meijer for the site plan because they have outlet requirements as part of the PUD. That was a lengthy process. He stated the issue of the drive through being created interior is part of Meijer's requirement as well.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Commissioner O'Rourke why he wanted to see the drive through moved onto the other side. Commissioner O'Rourke stated he did not feel the site flows properly. Sara Leach stated TCF Bank as approved, along with the new bank coming in, the drive through is oriented the same way as this one. Commissioner O'Rourke asked how it stacked. Sara stated she would have to look again at the new bank's proposal, but it was consistent with this concept plan.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Neal if he saw any problems with the circulation of the parking lot. Neal did not see any circulation problems. He would prefer to keep the entrance where it is as opposed to moving it further south though. A discussion ensued about the drive through circulation and stacking.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated his suggestion would be to let the petitioner go back and work on this and come back as part of the formal site plan review.

Commissioner Sanders needed some clarification. He wanted to know if the three lane drive through would accommodate 12 vehicles and stacking of 4 vehicles. Sara stated that was correct.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked the petitioner if they had any problems using the same color brick as on the Meijer store and then incorporating more brick on the drive through. The petitioner said no.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked the petitioner if they needed anything else from the Commission. The petitioner stated they would consider what the Commission has cited tonight and will work with staff. The petitioner stated he would go back with his traffic engineer and look at traffic history for Fifth Third to see if their calculations were correct to make sure they have enough stacking, etc.

There was discussion about the phrasing of the motion. It was decided to have two separate motions. One motion would be the approval of the second bank to the PUD and the other could be the approval of the concept plan. Sara stated the applicant would like to come back with the site plan review knowing that the idea of a second bank in the PUD is already accepted. A discussion followed about the motions.

Richard J. Skrodzki reminded the commissioners that they would need to not only come back for the site plan review, but also a public hearing for the special use permit.

Commissioner Sanders asked if he was correct in assuming the traffic engineer and others felt this was the best place to have the entrance. Mike Schwarz stated it is significant for the site to function properly, but in terms of what is before the Commission tonight, this is an overall concept of a bank at this location. It all depends on how the Commission wants to phrase their motion. The feedback will get to the Village Board either way. There are minutes and the staff report that will be conveyed.

At 11:30 p.m. Commissioner Kachel made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the Fifth Third Bank as the second bank in the Meijer PUD.

Commissioner Bonuchi seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

**Aye:** O'Rourke, Bonuchi, Kachel, **Chairman Sobkoviak**

**Nay:** 0

**The motion is carried 4:0**

At 11:31 p.m. Commission Kachel made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the Concept Plan for the Fifth Third Bank subject to the following stipulation.

1. Subject to the requirements of the Village Engineer.

Commissioner Bonuchi seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

**Aye:** Kachel, Bonuchi, **Chairman Sobkoviak**

**Nay:** O'Rourke

**The motion is carried 3:1**

---

### **DISCUSSION:**

Chairman Sobkoviak made mention that comments were made at the Village Board meeting complementing the Plan Commission and staff on the thoroughness of their work, which makes it easier for the Village Board to approve.

Commissioner O'Rourke had a concern. He stated the Commission talks a lot about notification and wants to hear what the residents have to say at public hearings. He also stated the Commission talked about if there was going to be large attendance, those cases would be put on early so residents would not have to wait until the end of the meeting. This was done exactly the opposite at the last meeting. He did not feel the notifications were done properly and then the residents had to wait until the later hour before the case was finally called.

Mike Schwarz stated the Chairman of the Commission always has the authority, at the request of staff or the applicant, to rearrange or reorder the agenda. The agendas are basically in numeric order and there are some exceptions obviously. He stated this evening the first case was the longest and, in hindsight, they probably could have been reordered.

Commissioner Sanders stated his recollection of the notification problem was that constructive notice was given and when someone appears that validates the constructive notice. Commissioner O'Rourke stated as long as there is a policy regarding notification, it should be followed.

Since there was no further business before the Plan Commission, Chairman Sobkoviak adjourned the meeting at 11:40 p.m.

---

Respectfully Submitted

*Carol Millan*

Planning Secretary – Village of Plainfield