



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

**DATE: APRIL 21, 2009**

**LOCATION: Village Hall**

Chairman Sobkoviak called the meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:05 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Commissioners Kachel, Renzi, O'Rourke, Bonuchi, Sanders, Peck; Chairman Sobkoviak; and ex-officio Commissioner Kiefer

**Absent:** Ex-officio Commissioner Fremarek, Plainfield School District, Library District, Park District, and Plainfield Police Department

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

**DEVELOPMENT REPORT:**

Village Planner Garrigan summarized the results of the Village Board meeting on Monday, 4/20/09.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The minutes from the April 7, 2009 meeting were accepted as presented.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**CASE: 1452-022709.RZ.SU.SPR**

**FURQAAN ACADEMY**

**Request:** Rezoning from R-1 and I-1 to all R-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 Attorney Carl Buck

**TIME:** 7:10 p.m.

Village Planner Garrigan summarized the staff report. He stated this is a public hearing being held pursuant to Village Ordinance and State Statute in accordance with proper posting and notice. The property is located on Eastern Avenue just north of Lockport Street and south of Main Street. Currently, the property is a vacant industrial building. A portion of the property is currently zoned R-1 with a portion zoned I-1. The zoning is bifurcated. Therefore, the applicant is requesting to down zone the property to all R-1. Currently, the Comprehensive Plan identifies this property as Village Residential. Eastern Avenue has been identified as a minor collector. He described the adjacent zonings. The applicant is also requesting the special use because a school would be a special use in the R-1 District.

Village Planner Garrigan stated the 5 findings of fact for rezoning and stated 5 of the 5 findings of fact are favorable to the applicant. The applicant is proposing the operation of the site from approximately 8:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. There will be approximately 60 students and 20 employees within this facility. He also stated the 2 findings of fact for the special use and stated 2 of the 2 findings are favorable to the applicant.

Village Planner Garrigan summarized the site plan review. He stated this is a vacant industrial building and believed it has been vacant for several years. It faces Eastern Avenue and is parallel to the adjacent CN/EJ&E Railroad tracks. The applicant is proposing no major additions or major changes other than some façade changes to the exterior. The applicant is proposing the adaptive re-use of this building to a school facility. The applicant is proposing to consolidate the two access points, which are currently located along Eastern Avenue into one access point into the proposed site. There will be the construction of a new parking lot which will require the removal of approximately 18 mature trees. There will be a total of 37 parking spaces, which complies with the Village Ordinance. Village Planner Garrigan deferred the stormwater management to the Village Engineer, but did state that perhaps this property would fall within the exemption of stormwater management. The applicant has not submitted a trash enclosure plan, so prior to this being submitted to the Village Board that plan would be submitted to staff. According to the Zoning Ordinance there shall be 100% screen provided around trash containers. At the time of the drafting of the staff report, staff did not have a complete submittal of the elevations. He reviewed the elevations at this time. There will be some limited façade modifications to the eastern elevation, western elevation, and to the northern elevation. The applicant is proposing to use the current metal exterior. There will be no additional new materials added to the building. The applicant is proposing to maintain the current metal, existing fabric of the majority of the building. Currently, there is a masonry portion of the building which faces Eastern Avenue. That portion of the building will be maintained, but the balance of the building is metal. The applicant is proposing to incorporate a series of windows to provide some architectural interest to the proposed northern elevation, western elevation, and eastern elevation. They are proposing a series of pointed, arched windows, which reflects the architectural character of the proposed religious school.

The applicant submitted a landscape plan on late Thursday or Friday, but staff did not have this information at the time of drafting the staff report. Village Planner Garrigan stated based on a preliminary review it appears there will have to be some additional landscaping, which will be required in accordance with Village Ordinance. Staff would like the opportunity to work with the applicant to add some additional landscaping. Staff has some concerns since there will be 18 mature trees removed. There is a required replacement ratio that has to be met by the applicant. Therefore, staff will work with the applicant to ensure that there is extensive landscaping along the southern property line of this proposed site to ensure that there is sufficient buffering to the residential homes to the south. Staff would also like to work with the applicant to ensure that there is extensive landscaping to buffer the properties to the west. It is critical, due to the number of mature trees that are proposed to be removed from this site, the applicant make extensive efforts to incorporate mature landscaping along the western and southern property line to provide the required buffering.

The applicant is not proposing any exterior lighting based on the hours of operation for the school facility. Therefore, no photometric plan has been submitted.

Village Planner Garrigan outlined the issues for consideration presented in the staff report:

Village Planner Garrigan stated staff submits that the proposed rezoning of the school site is appropriate. The required findings of fact have been complied with. Staff recommends approval of the special use for a school with 5 stipulations, and recommendation of the site plan review with 5 stipulations.

Village Planner Garrigan concluded the staff report.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Village Engineer Eickholtz if there were any engineering issues. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated that to date the engineering for this project has not been submitted. A deficiency letter was sent out March 19<sup>th</sup> requesting this information, but they have not received anything. He further stated if the applicant keeps the improvements less than 25,000 sq. ft. then they are able to avoid the detention requirements; but with the large impervious area, drainage could be an issue. Hopefully, the engineering plans will address this.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in Carl Buck, who is representing the petitioner. He stated the rezoning and special use requests are very straight forward. He introduced Mark Waxali from Crescent Engineering. There is no plan at this point to expand the building or otherwise increase the footprint of the building. The parking lot could potentially be reduced. There are 33 students enrolled in the school at the present time, with 60 being the maximum number of students. It is grades K-8. He complimented Village Planner Garrigan's use of the words "adaptive re-use" and "vacant industrial building" in the same sentence. He said he didn't think that adaptive re-use of a vacant industrial building has ever been considered before. Chairman Sobkoviak stated that is part of the Plan Commission's job to guide the orderly expansion and also the redevelopment of the Village. Petitioner Buck felt it was a good use for the site. He stated the petitioner has analyzed the train schedules and knows that they can adjust the school in terms of the routes to correspond with Indian Trail. This applicant wants to come to Plainfield.

It is a very good building for their intended use. The petitioner did not want to be controlled by the train. The train is going to be there so it should be worked around.

Commissioner Renzi asked if the school has any programs in the evening, parent/teacher conferences in the evening, people picking up at 4:30 to 5:30 at night during the evening hours, where exterior lighting would be beneficial. He felt that there would be a need for exterior lighting. Petitioner Buck stated there will be people coming and going at night, but according to Village Ordinance, the size of this site does not require lighting in the parking lot. The petitioner is trying to reduce any impact to any of the neighbors. Petitioner Buck further stated there is lighting over the doors of the building.

Commissioner Renzi asked where the sidewalk would be put. Village Planner Garrigan stated the sidewalk would be located along the western side of Eastern Avenue to continue the network of sidewalks along Eastern Avenue. There is a gap at the present time in the sidewalk. Commissioner Renzi asked if this would fill the gap. Village Planner Garrigan believed there still would be a gap. Petitioner Buck stated there would be a gap on the vacant lot to the south. Commissioner Renzi asked if staff would want the petitioner to put in the sidewalk now rather than a bond or some commitment to have it put in when the lot to the south is developed. Village Planner Garrigan stated it makes sense to put the sidewalk in now, and staff will work with the petitioner on that detail. Chairman Sobkoviak stated the Village has for some time wanted to put in a sidewalk there to aid students going to and from the Middle School.

Commissioner Kachel stated just about every daycare facility or school that has come before the Commission has supplied some green space area for kids to play, or go outside. He noted he did not see anything like that on this site plan. He asked for the reasoning behind that decision. Petitioner Buck stated with the curriculum that this school has and the size of this space, it is a balancing act of being able to find some place that they could open in August and make a viable school out of. This space just did not afford them the opportunity to have green space for a playground, so the children will be within the school for the time they are present. The Petitioner stated initially there may be agreements with another recreational facility in the area much like "home schoolers" use those facilities to supplement the academic work with the physical education part of the curriculum. There are currently plans to work with other recreational facilities offsite. Commissioner Kachel asked if that would be public or private. The Petitioner stated possibly both. He further stated that is something that is being resolved internally.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked the applicant if they had physically been inside the building when a train is passing. Commissioner O'Rourke had a concern this would not be conducive to children in a learning environment. Petitioner Buck stated the petitioner has had an opportunity to do a structural analysis of the building and go into it. They have considered that aspect of it. Commissioner O'Rourke asked the petitioner if he felt it would be positive for the children to be able to be in that environment and still learn. Petitioner Buck stated the petitioner does feel that way.

Commissioner Kachel had concerns about safety from possible train spills, noise from the trains, sound proofing of the building. He asked if the switching area for the trains was in use presently. Planner Schwarz stated he believed the track has been removed.

Commissioner Peck asked the petitioner if the plans for the sidewalk include a pedestrian crossing with a gate for the safety of the children that may be walking or riding their bicycles to the school. Petitioner Buck did not know who has the jurisdiction to put up gates. If the petitioner was allowed to put up the gates, it would be in their best interest to do so.

Commissioner Peck then asked the petitioner how many feet the railroad tracks are from the subject building. Petitioner Buck answered he did not know that off the top of his head. Commissioner Peck stated it says on the plan 90 feet. He stated as he was checking out the property, he got stopped by a "double stacked" train going past the facility. He had concerns, as the train was going 60 plus mph, about hazmat materials on these trains and a possible accident with it being so close to the subject facility. Petitioner Buck stated a hazardous spill in that area would be devastating for Central, Indian Trail, all of the residents in that area. Hopefully, the trains are not carrying hazmat. With respect to the sound proofing that Commissioner Kachel mentioned, right now there is no insulation in that building, either in the ceiling or walls. Their plan for insulation does include an aspect of sound proofing. Commissioner Kachel stated usually the insulation itself does not sound proof. You have to add separate walls. Petitioner Buck agreed and stated the petitioner has taken a look at that and does plan to include sound proofing.

Commissioner Sanders asked if there was a pedestrian crossing across the track or would that be part of the extension of the sidewalk. He asked if that would be CN's responsibility or the Village's responsibility. Village Planner Garrigan stated he didn't believe there is a pedestrian crossing. He believed that would have to be worked on with ICC for a sidewalk. That would be a whole separate process. Commissioner Sanders asked if the sidewalk would dead-end at the tracks. Planner Schwarz stated the sidewalk would dead-end at the petitioner's property.

Commissioner Kachel stated it states the building was vacant for 3 years, and he thought the owner (Valentino) had a "close out" sale last year in the fall. He thought that was when they closed their business.

Petitioner Mark Waxali spoke. He clarified the impervious surfaces. He stated the 53% indicated on the site development plan includes the existing building. The impervious surfaces to be prepared as a result of the improvement amounts to less than 25,000 sq. ft.

Chairman Sobkoviak opened the meeting up to public comment. He swore in each member of the public before they spoke.

Commissioner Renzi had googled the site on his phone. He got a more updated map showing that the spur line to the north is no longer present.

Francis Carlock spoke. He stated he has lived in this area for 30 years. His home is the brick home to the south of the site. He always planted as many trees as he could in there on his property. He has nurtured the trees that the petitioner wants to cut down. He felt there was room to park cars without taking down the trees. There is an existing sidewalk on the east side of Eastern Avenue already. To put a sidewalk on the west side, you would have to knock down a lot of nice trees growing there. He objected to the removal of the mature trees. He also had concerns with the impervious area. Petitioner Mark Waxali stated the impervious area is less than 25,000 sq. ft.; however, there are concrete slabs to the north and west of the building that will be removed, so the net is at about 18,000 sq. ft. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if that was not including the building. Petitioner Waxali stated that was correct. It was new surfaces to be installed. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if the total is what was stated in staff's report or 53%. Petitioner Waxali stated the total impervious surface with the building is 53% of the property. Mr. Carlock also stated the building has been used since last summer. It has not been closed down for 3 years. He also stated he would not want to see his kids going to school in that building and spending any time in that building. It has been used for many different uses, possibly asbestos and Fiberglas. He stated he would not be against the petitioner taking the building down and putting up a new building. Commissioner O'Rourke asked Mr. Carlock if he could hear the trains going by in his home. Mr. Carlock stated he could hear trains going by. He is not as close to the tracks as the subject property.

Dale Lewis spoke. He lives at 14904 Center, which is directly behind and to the west of this property. He did state that they do notice the trains, but you become numb to it after a while. The whistle blowing has been eliminated. He felt it is a fantastic re-use of the building. It is an eyesore to the community. He felt it would be a perfect adaptive re-use for the building. He supports it, as does many of his neighbors in the community.

Michael Lambert spoke. He lives at 14805 Eastern Avenue. He is not opposed to the down zoning or special use permit. He did not agree with staff about property values not being depreciated. He stated for the last two appraisals of his property, one of the big issues was the weird collection of uses in this particular area. His concern is not so much whether this use is appropriate, but he felt the whole area needs to be looked at by the Village as new uses come in because it is really a mixed up area. He also stated staff has stated Eastern Avenue is designated as a minor collector street. It is a minor collector without curbs or anything. It is kind of a mess and people drive where ever they want to. He would like to see that traffic is addressed on this street before much more development goes in. He stated when Indian Trail Middle School is in operation, the school buses park back to the railroad track. When there are evening events, they are parked all through the subdivisions. The area is pretty intensely used right now. He felt those things should be considered before additional uses are put into play. He could not think of another area where a metal building with minor modifications to it was allowed. He questioned whether or not this is an appropriate exterior rehabilitation of this structure. This is a very intensive use.

Since there was no further response from the audience, Chairman Sobkoviak closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bonuchi stated she is very familiar with this area. Eastern Avenue is a busy street. She did not agree with the minor collector classification. She was curious to know about the lot to the south that is, she believed, for sale. It is undeveloped. She wondered how the placement of this school and changes will affect that lot. She stated the metal building thing is amazing to her. From sitting on the Commission for 2 years and people arguing over the façade, the colors, etc., to

just leave this building there she did not feel that was appropriate. She questioned the 90 feet from the tracks. That was a safety concern for her. She would not want to be working in that building as a Secretary, much less be in that building for a long period of time. She did not believe this is a good fit for the area. She also mentioned that there was no engineering.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked staff about the surrounding zonings mentioned in the staff report. He stated it looks like there is an adjacent building that is an industrial use. Village Planner Garrigan stated the Village is currently working with the owner of that building. There are some uses which should not be permitted. There are presently some Code Enforcement issues. Commissioner O'Rourke asked the age of this building. Village Planner Garrigan stated it was built in the 60's, 70's. Someone stated it is older than that, probably going back to the 40's.

Commissioner Peck asked how the materials this building is made of compares to what the public school system would have in regards to safety for the children in case of a bad storm, etc. Petitioner Buck stated the petitioner cannot build to the standards of District 202 because they do not get to put anything on the tax levy. The building has survived every other tornado that has come through this town. It is structurally sound and is an existing building that is right for adaptive re-use. The petitioner feels it is an appropriate use. The petitioner might spend more money rehabbing the building than they would spend if they tore it down, but at this point their cost estimates do not tell them that. Petitioner Buck went on to say it is a structurally sound building that can meet their needs, both financially, and logistically. That is why they are pursuing this avenue.

Commissioner Peck made the applicant aware of the CN buy-out and the increased number of trains. He felt this does not go along with the Comprehensive Plan as it is currently written. He believed this property would come off of the tax rolls. He asked the applicant if that was correct. Petitioner Buck did not know if the petitioner would qualify as a non-profit, but they might. Commissioner Peck further stated if this was deemed to be a non-profit, this property would be taken off the tax rolls for the Village, Schools, Fire District, Park District, etc. He felt the safety of the children comes first and foremost. He believed it would be irresponsible to put a school so close to the tracks. Even though Central School is right there, adding another 60 children to the mix he believed is irresponsible. He asked the Commission and the Village Board to deny the rezoning and special use. He did not want Plainfield to repeat the disaster of August 28, 1990.

Commissioner Kachel stated he has been on the Commission for a long time and has not seen anything like this particular building, the architecture, the safety factor, etc. He has a tough time with this. He stated people cut through this area all the time, especially around the time school lets out. He felt this would be a safety issue for the children. He also felt it is not a good location for any type of school. It is an eyesore to the area, but right now there is a lighter use for the building. He recognized the fact that the petitioner intends to make improvements to the building and appreciated that.

Commissioner Sanders stated the Commission has looked at a lot of similar buildings that were metal and the Commission was concerned about the aesthetics of the building. Those buildings did not have a lot of the issues presented here. It is a major concern because the proposed use at this location does involve children and safety. He wanted to know what role would the Building Department, Fire Department, etc play. The use of this building as a school might not be the most appropriate re-use of that area. He did not think the present stipulations give the Commission enough information to move it forward.

Commissioner Renzi thought maybe the parking lot could be redesigned to increase the pervious areas and then leave some of the more mature trees. That could help get some of the drainage into the aqua filter rather than the sewer. He further stated he did not want any children walking across Eastern Avenue. He felt that could possibly be remedied by posting "no parking" signs during certain times of the day so parents cannot park there. They can then pick up in the designated area. He also had a concern with having children in a metal shelter during storms. He was not sure if the life safety requirements of the State of Illinois are going to sufficiently protect the children. He would like to see some sort of specific designation of a safe harbor or some place that is reinforced that could be a shelter in a severe storm. He referred to the Eichs project, which the Commission had them add some exterior elements to the metal building. He felt by adding more windows it would increase the sound of the trains. He also was not sold on the exterior lighting, but would trust staff to take a look at that. He felt it would be nice if the Commission had some engineering on the project, but felt if staff was comfortable taking it to the Village Board and getting the engineering, he would be comfortable with that. He would like to have this come back to the Commission with all of these items addressed, but if staff is comfortable he could vote on it and go forward.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Village Engineer Eickholtz at what point is engineering required on a parcel. Is this parcel too small to have stormwater engineering as a required element. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated the Ordinance states that detention is not required if you are doing 25,000 sq. ft. or less of new development. Chairman Sobkoviak asked if the parking lot improvements would be larger than 25,000 sq. ft.

Petitioner Buck stated they were not. Chairman Sobkoviak stated therefore, engineering is not a requirement in this case. Petitioner Buck stated this property is the lowest point along that street. He further stated the Illinois Life Safety Standards are not just for public schools. The petitioner also has to meet those standards. They have looked at the standards to see if they can get a license to open. With respect to storm safety, sound proofing, the safety of the building, the engineering, the structural engineering, they have already been through that. If the State does not approve, the petitioner cannot open the doors just like a public school.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated the petitioner's building will meet State Life Safety Standards. Engineering is not a requirement because it is too small. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated the petitioner will still have drainage to address. Even though there is no detention they have a lot of impervious areas that have to drain some place and have to be accounted for.

Commissioner O'Rourke felt it was great that the petitioner is trying to be creative and look for redevelopment of a building; unfortunately he felt the creativity on this one has gone a little too far. He did not see how it would be a good learning environment for children being located 90 feet away from a major train, whether it is noise or vibration. He felt the standards are being lowered as far as the metal building's façade for this specific use. He felt the 7 issues for consideration that staff outlined are more than the Commission would usually consider. He has some serious concerns about the project.

Petitioner Buck stated this is not new construction so it is not something where the slate is wiped clean. They have to deal with the current, existing site and make it as useful as possible. With the other schools in the area and the character of the neighborhood, he felt this is an excellent use for this site. Commissioner O'Rourke clarified that he was not saying that the issues cannot be resolved, but maybe they should have been resolved prior to coming to the Commission.

Petitioner Buck stated the issues raised by staff reflect things that they believe they can have overview of during the building process. The petitioner is asking for approval on the project because they have a time requirement they have to meet in order to open in August.

Commissioner Sanders stated the petitioner has State Statutes and guidelines that they have to comply with. He asked if this would be approved through some process at the State level. Petitioner Buck stated in order for the petitioner to get a license to operate as a school, they have to meet the Life Safety Standards. The State comes in and inspects and approves that site for a school.

Chairman Sobkoviak went through the Issues for Consideration identified in the staff report.

- Petitioner is aware that the train traffic will probably average 42 trains a day. There will be little or no foot traffic going to and from the school. Children will either be picked up by their parents or school vans.
- Reminded the applicant of the building code and Life Safety issues that need to be addressed. The petitioner stated they will be addressed.
- Metal addition may need to be removed. Petitioner Waxali stated the removal of the addition would require interaction with the adjacent property owner. Petitioner Buck stated he had talked to the owner of that building. He has no problem taking out the vestibule. The petitioner is prepared to remedy the situation. Commissioner Renzi felt maybe a green area for children to play could be put there. Petitioner Waxali stated that area coupled with the reconfiguration of the parking lot could possibly have adequate space for a small play area.
- Southeast corner of the existing building does not comply with the minimum 30 foot front setback due to the age of the building, which makes it a non-conforming building. The building may be enlarged as long as the addition follows the same building wall line and does not result in an additional encroachment.
- Staff has requested a tree survey.
- Zoning ordinance requires 100% visual screen around trash containers. Chairman Sobkoviak stated that the public schools have declined to add screening around the trash containers. They are claiming that this creates an area of concern. The Plan Commission and Village Board have conceded this point to the public school system. The petitioner should be treated the same way.
- R-1 District has a maximum impervious surface area of 35%. Chairman Sobkoviak felt this was something staff could work out with the applicant.

Commissioner Kiefer pointed out that the staff report is favorable on all counts. He believed the applicant is aware of all the challenges associated with this property. He would urge the Commission to forward this on to the Village Board.

**At 8:25 p.m. Commissioner O'Rourke made a motion that the Plan Commission adopt staff's findings of fact and recommend approval of the request for a Map Amendment (Rezoning) from R-1 (Low Density Single Family Residential District) and I-1 (Office, Research and Light Industrial District) to all R-1 (Low Density Single Family Residential District), for the property located at 14912 S. Eastern Avenue.**

Commissioner Sanders seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

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

The motion is carried 4:3

**At 8:30 p.m. Commissioner Sanders made a motion that the Plan Commission adopt staff's findings of fact and recommend approval of the request for a Special Use for a school for the subject property located at 14912 S. Eastern Avenue, subject to the following stipulations:**

- 1. subject to the requirements of the Village Engineer,**
- 2. subject to all Building Code requirements,**
- 4. subject to staff's technical review of the Site Plan Review documents prior to Village Board consideration,**
- 5. Subject to the stipulations agreed to by the petitioner during the Plan Commission discussion.**

Commissioner Renzi seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call

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

The motion failed

**At 8:32 p.m. Commissioner Renzi made a motion that the Plan Commission adopt staff's findings of fact and recommend approval of the Site Plan Review documents, for the subject property located at 14912 S. Eastern Avenue, subject to the following stipulations:**

- 1. subject to the requirements of the Village Engineer,**
- 2. subject to all Building Code requirements,**
- 4. subject to staff's technical review of the Site Plan Review documents prior to Village Board consideration,**
- 5. Subject to the stipulations agreed to by the petitioner during the Plan Commission discussion.**

Commissioner Sanders seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call

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

The motion failed.

---

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**CASE:** 1440-123108.AA.SU.SPR.FP **HARVEST CHURCH**  
**Request:** Special Use for Religious Assembly (*Public Hearing*)  
Site Plan Review  
**Location:** East side of Van Dyke Road, north of 135<sup>th</sup> Street  
**Applicant:** Harvest Church Plainfield, Inc., represented by  
Attorney Carl Buck

Chairman Sobkoviak stated that staff and the petitioner are requesting that this case be continued to May 5, 2009.

**At 8:35 p.m. Commissioner Kachel made a motion that the Plan Commission continue the public hearing for Case: 1440-123008.AA.SU.SPR.FP Harvest Church to May 5, 2009.**

**Commissioner Renzi seconded the motion.**

**Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.**

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

**The motion is carried 7:0**

---

**CASE:** 1457-032509.SU.SPR.FP **KING'S BRIDGE ESTATES DUPLEXES**  
**Request:** Special Use (*Public Hearing*)  
Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision  
**Location:** NWC of King's Bridge Estates Subdivision  
**Applicant:** Madonna Development

Chairman Sobkoviak stated that staff and the petitioner are requesting this case be continued to May 5, 2009.

**At 8:36 p.m. Commissioner Bonuchi made a motion that the Plan Commission continue the public hearing for Case: 1457-032509.SU.SPR.FP Kings's Bridge Estates Duplexes to May 5, 2009.**

**Commissioner Kachel seconded the motion.**

**Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.**

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

**The motion is carried 7:0**

---

At 8:40 p.m. Chairman Sobkoviak called for a break of the Plan Commission

Commissioners Peck and Bonuchi left the meeting.

At 8:50 p.m. Chairman Sobkoviak called the meeting of the Plan Commission back to order.

**CASE:** 1456-032009.MC **APPLELAND, LLC (APPLEBEES)**  
**Request:** Major Change to a Planned Development (*Public Hearing*)  
**Location:** 12624 S. Route 59  
**Applicant:** Appleland, LLC

TIME: 8:50 p.m.

Planner Schwarz 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. The applicant is requesting a major change to the original Planned Unit

Development known as Kensington Center North for Lot 3 in the Plainfield/Wal-Mart First Resubdivision. Planner Schwarz gave a background of the site. August 16, 2004 the Village Board authorized the execution of a Statement of Intent and Agreement (SIA) for the PUD. Staff has discovered that this was never fully executed, but according to the Village Board Minutes and other records and exhibits on file, the Village Board's approval was subject to a sit-down restaurant use restriction on this property. At that time, the Village Board did not desire fast food or bank uses, which were becoming prevalent along Route 59. The Future Land Use Plan and Comprehensive Plan designate that this property should be commercial. The applicant intends to use the front portion of the building for a dental office and the rear of the building for future retail.

Planner Schwarz mentioned the 7 standards that need to be met when granting a major change to a Planned Development as outlined in the staff report. The major change to the Planned Development is necessary because the proposed change in use alters the concept and character of the final development plan, which includes the sit-down restaurant use restriction. He also outlined in the staff report the purposes and objectives of a Planned Development. In 2004 the findings were met; and therefore, it was designated as a Planned Development. Staff believes the current Planned Development objectives and previous PUD objectives prior to the Zoning Ordinance amendments will continue to be met in this case. The proposed major change to lift the sit-down restaurant use restriction and the proposed use for a dental office and retail space, do not have a significant bearing on any of the PUD objectives since they are generally design related. Planner Schwarz went through the findings of fact for a PUD. He stated 5 of 7 findings are favorable and 2 of 7 findings are neutral.

Staff recommends the approval of a major change to the Planned Development to lift the sit-down restaurant use restriction and allow the proposed use for a dental office and retail space. Planner Schwarz concluded his staff report.

Chairman Sobkoviak wanted to reiterate that the restriction for a sit-down restaurant use was to eliminate the possibility of a bank or a fast food restaurant at this location. This is the Wal-Mart development, and it was an extremely contentious case. There was a good deal of discussion over traffic and safety in the parking lot to the point the Village convinced Wal-Mart to not add a fueling facility over in the corner of their parking lot as a further measure to reduce traffic and the intensity of usage there. The only real reason for the sit-down restaurant restriction was to eliminate the possibility of the traffic from a drive-thru bank, or drive-thru fast food facility.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Village Engineer Eickholtz if there is any change in the engineering. Village Engineer Eickholtz agreed there should not be any change.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in the petitioner. John Argoudelis spoke. The building is being sold and the intention of the purchaser is to use part of the building for medical offices, and the other part for retail. By simply lifting the one restriction, it goes back to the underlying B-3 District, which allows all of the uses being looked at.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked if there would be any changes to the façade, décor, trash enclosure, lighting, etc. Petitioner Argoudelis introduced the purchaser, Mike Patel. Chairman Sobkoviak swore in Mike Patel. Petitioner Patel stated the possible changes. They will make the building look nice.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked staff if there are any drawings as to how the building would be split up. Planner Schwarz stated the applicant did share with staff a preview of what they would submit to the Building Department in terms of partitioning the building. He believed the dental office would be on the front half of the building, facing Route 59; and the future retail uses would be at the back of the building. Commissioner O'Rourke was concerned that once this is approved and the restriction is lifted for the sit-down restaurant should the dental office not go in there, it can revert back to a bank or a fast food facility, which is what the concern of the neighbors was originally. He asked if that was correct. Planner Schwarz stated that was correct.

Commissioner Kachel stated this is the third time this has been changed. He further stated it is nice once we have a restaurant to keep a restaurant. There are so many vacant office facilities and brand new facilities around. He felt it seems a shame that a facility that could be a good restaurant, maybe not right now but in the near future, be changed to a commercial space. Commissioner O'Rourke agreed with Commission Kachel. Commissioner O'Rourke had a concern that 6 months from now, the Commission could have a request for a zoning for a bank or a fast food restaurant. Chairman Sobkoviak stated a bank would need a special use permit to have a drive-thru, which would require a public hearing.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked what the public notice was for a PUD. Planner Schwarz stated it is the same notice for any zoning change, special use, major change to a PD. The applicant is required to send a form notice to the adjacent surrounding properties, even across the street. The Village publishes in the local paper a legal notice, and there is a small public notice sign posted on the property as well.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked if there was anyone in the audience that wished to ask a question or make a comment. He proceeded to swear them in before they gave testimony.

Steve Caton – He is a commercial broker and the broker for this piece of property. He stated Applebees is baffled by this location. This is the worst performing Applebees in all of Chicagoland. He stated the access going north on Rt. 59 is very terrible. He felt if any other restaurant would come forward, they would have the same result.

Tracee Johnson spoke on behalf of the adjacent property owner. She is the property manager for Mars Kensington North. She is on a fact-finding mission. She wanted it on the record that she will take this back to the owners of Mars Kensington North to let them know what the intentions are. They are on Lots 5 and 6.

Petitioner Argoudelis stated Wal-Mart has restrictions on the uses of the outlots, and one of those is that there cannot be a bank because Wal-Mart contains its own bank or subsidiary bank inside.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if there was not an existing bank already in those outlots. Chairman Sobkoviak stated there was. Petitioner Argoudelis stated he did not know how that works, but perhaps they were allowed to have the one bank.

Village Planner Garrigan stated he worked on the original PUD for Wal-Mart. The Bank of America was approved contingent on the developer bringing in three restaurants.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated it sounded to him like there were a lot of items given up for certain things and compromises were made. Here, 5 years later, we are being asked to remove one of those major compromises off the table. Village planner Garrigan stated for the record, the bank was the compromise. The Village worked with Mid America Bank allowing them to have a bank in consideration of having three sit-down restaurants. Commissioner O'Rourke stated the sit-down restaurants were a positive attribute and now we are considering removing one of those attributes.

Commissioner Renzi stated Red Robin and Bob Evans are apparently doing fine. Applebees managed to be one of the three and then all of a sudden they have the worst performing restaurant. Commissioner Kachel reminded the commissioners that Applebee restaurants are closing across the country in different areas. Steve Caton stated the restriction of the bank is recorded on this lot. It was specific to this lot by Wal-Mart. It was not part of a restriction due to the PUD. The reason we are choosing to change this from a restaurant is because it failed.

Commissioner Kachel stated he had a problem since this is the third time this piece of property has come before the Commission. There were commitments made to adjacent property owners at that time. Applebees are closing nationally. There are a lot of places closing at the present time. There is a lot of empty rental space just sitting open.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked Mr. Patel if he had an existing dental office. Mr. Patel replied in Plainfield. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if that was the one in front of Target. He stated basically Mr. Patel is going to move from Target further north to Wal-Mart. So, basically it is transferring one vacant spot for another.

Kalpesh Patel spoke next. He stated they have the Ivory Dental. He said for the convenience of their present patients they are moving very close by. They have been practicing for 4 years. They have invested a lot in the area.

Commissioner O'Rourke wanted to make the point that this is basically just a wash because the space in front of Target will now become vacant.

Commissioner Sobkoviak asked if there was anyone else in the audience who cared to ask a question or make a comment. There was no response so he closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Commissioner Kiefer's concern was that this building sit vacant for any extended period of time. It would be nice to get another restaurant in there, but he would rather see something go in there now than leave it vacant.

Commissioner Renzi stated 5 of the 6 restaurants here are doing fine from what he can tell. He suggested there might be issues with Applebees. He could not quibble with staff's findings. He had a concern about removing the restriction. Commissioner Kachel mentioned Bakers Square. They supposedly had a bad location, but there is another restaurant in there. It is all set up and approved for a restaurant. He had a hard time with this major change request.

Petitioner Argoudelis stated that the difference between where they are located now at Target and their desire to purchase this building is that the building will be purchased and owner occupied. He felt that when a building is owned, it certainly lends itself that the occupant be around a little longer.

Commissioner Renzi asked about the back of the Applebees parking lot and if there was a divider between that area and the Wal-Mart parking. Planner Schwarz stated there is a landscape median. Commissioner Renzi asked if there will be a problem with the retail there like with the Panera. Planner Schwarz stated this area is more contained. The Panera location has a drive-thru at the back of the building. The applebees never had a drive-thru so there is parking surrounding all four sides of the building. Planner Schwarz stated if the use restriction is lifted since it is zoned B-3, it would be up to the petitioner to put the retail on the front or the rear. He imagined though if the retail was on the back, the petitioner may be back before the Commission asking for signage. There was a discussion among the Commissioners regarding the configuration of the parking lot.

Commissioner Kachel asked if the property is being leased and the building would be owned by the petitioner. Petitioner Argoudelis stated it is owned by the Applebees Company. Commissioner Kachel asked if the petitioner will own the land and the building. Petitioner Patel stated he would own the land and building.

**At 9:25 p.m. Commissioner Sanders made a motion that the Plan Commission adopt staff's findings of fact and recommend approval of the request for a Major Change to the Planned Development known as Kensington Center North, for Lot 3 in the Plainfield/Wal-Mart First Resubdivision, and commonly known as 12624 S. Route 59, to lift the sit-down use restriction and allow the proposed use for a dental office and retail space, which are both permitted uses in the B-3 District.**

**Commissioner Renzi seconded the motion**

**Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.**

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

**The motion failed**

Commissioner Renzi felt such a significant major change would require a Board vote. That is why he voted no. Chairman Sobkoviak reminded the Commissioners that making a motion or making a second does not require you to vote in either a positive or negative manner. Just making the motion does not commit your vote.

---

**CASE: 1459-032709.AA.SU.SPR**  
Request: Annexation (*Public Hearing*)  
Special Use for an Education Use (*Public Hearing*)  
Site Plan Review  
Location: 26359 W. 135<sup>th</sup> Street  
Applicant: Amber Thompson  
  
TIME: 9:27 p.m.

**CORNERSTONE EARLY EARNING CNTR.**

Planner Javoronok summarized the staff report. She stated this is a public hearing and all notices have been posted and published per Village Ordinance and State Statute. The property currently is unincorporated and nearly surrounded by the Village of Plainfield. It is approximately 2 acres with an existing single family residence, shed, and pole barn. A special use permit is required for the pre-school and daycare uses. Staff believes this is a logical extension of the Village boundaries.

A special use permit is required for a child care facility located within the R-1 Zoning District. Staff submits that this use is appropriate for the location. A similar facility, 3 N One Daycare, is located a few miles away on 127<sup>th</sup> Street west of Ridge Road. Planner Javoronok went through the findings of fact for a special use. She stated 2 of the 2 findings are favorable to the petitioner.

The petitioner is proposing to use the existing single family residence that fronts 135<sup>th</sup> Street and pave the parking area. They are proposing to maintain the existing gravel area, pole barn, and shed on the property. They have agreed to remove or pave the gravel area once development occurs to the south or east, but not for a period of at least five years following annexation. An aluminum fence will also be installed to match the fence at Playa Vista. Fifty feet of right-of-way will be dedicated to the Village. The applicant will relocate some of the existing windows and doors on the single family residence.

Access to the site is from 135<sup>th</sup> Street with a single full access point. There will be 19 parking spaces and one handicapped space in the parking lot, which will be paved. Staff requests that the parking lot have a setback of 20' from the right-of-way, and that there be the addition of a 10' asphalt bike path along 135<sup>th</sup> Street. This path would be a continuation of the bike path from Playa Vista. Staff recommends the installation of the bike path when development occurs adjacent to the property, but not for a period of at least five years following annexation. Pedestrian access will be provided to the front and rear of the residence through access walks. The applicant has agreed to provide additional landscaping along the east, south and west of the property at the time of construction and occupancy of adjacent residential units within five years of annexation. The property is under the 25,000 sq. ft. threshold for detention. There is a single Lithonia light fixture, which is shielded and pointed downward. The trash enclosure will be located to the south of the proposed parking lot with a board-on-board enclosure. There is a proposed monument sign. Signage will be handled through a separate permitting process.

Staff supports the annexation, special use, and site plan review. Planner Javoronok concluded her staff report.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Village Engineer Eickholtz if there were any engineering issues. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated the property is currently serviced by a septic system and well. This is appropriate for a single family use, but the Village Engineer would feel more comfortable if they were tied into the Village's sanitary and water system. They recommend that this occurs.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in the petitioners. Mike Martin, attorney, spoke. He stated Amber Thompson and Jodie Fitzgerald are the owners of the property. Cornerstone is a daycare, pre-school, which is already in operation. He reminded the Commissioners that Cornerstone concept plan went before the Commission in December. They have addressed the site plan, engineering issues, lighting issues, landscaping issues, etc. He stated they have a meeting with staff next week to finalize items that will go into the annexation agreement. It was his understanding that the sewer is going to come from the McMicken Farm, which is to the south and east and is undeveloped at this time. He did not know the status of that project. He did not think the McMicken sewer would be put through very soon. There is no sewer available for them to tap into. It is his understanding that something might be worked out to get a sewer connection through Playa Vista. That should be addressed through the annexation agreement. He stated originally they were asking to stay on the septic just for a while. The petitioner has to pay an excess of \$25,000 just for roadway recapture fees for 135<sup>th</sup> Street. That kind of expense, together with everything else they have to do to make this building safe and useable is very burdensome for a small business. Chairman Sobkoviak stated the Commission could add a stipulation that the sanitary sewer issue be resolved before this goes to the Village Board. Petitioner Martin stated it will be in the annexation agreement. Chairman Sobkoviak asked if the Commission needed to add that stipulation. Planner Javoronok stated it will be in the annexation agreement.

Commissioner Kachel asked the Village Engineer Eickholtz if the septic system will take the number of children that will be in the facility or if something could be put in to handle it for the interim. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated normally they would be connected to sewer and water. Petitioner Martin stated there has been discussion whether or not they need another tank. He said they are not averse to doing what they need to do. He would not want to put in another tank and then in a year hook up to sewer. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated unfortunately this would require an EPA permit. There would have to be a holding tank and it would have to be pumped out regularly. It is not an easy permit to get. It could be a difficult process and could be costly. Commissioner Kachel asked what happens with the septic systems right now that are pumped. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated he did not think they were pumped regularly, but just cleaned. There was a discussion about the septic system between Commissioner Kachel and Village Engineer Eickholtz.

Commissioner Sanders asked when was the last time there was a percolation test performed. Rod Tonelli spoke. He did not know when the present facility was last tested. He stated the records will be pulled before they meet with staff. He stated there are two options; using the septic system or tying into the sanitary. With the information they obtained tonight, they are going to explore with staff if it is possible to tie into the sanitary system. He stated at a minimum there will be an interim use of the septic system. He further stated they will have to analyze if what they have today is sufficient for the operation.

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

Commissioner Renzi asked if in the event development goes in next year, the bike path will still not need to be constructed for 5 years on this property. Planner Javoronok stated that is what is currently proposed. Commissioner Renzi asked what happens if the adjacent property is not developed, does the petitioner still have to put in the bike path. Planner Javoronok explained that it is only when the adjacent property develops and no sooner than 5 years.

Commissioner Renzi also asked about the 5 year provision for the landscaping. He asked if there is no development is there no need to plant, or is it in year 6 they would be planting to get the trees and shrubbery to start to grow. Planner Javoronok stated it is proposed the same way as the bike path where in year 6 if there is no development, it can stay the way it is. Petitioner Martin stated it is a corn field right now. Petitioner Martin stated they will do the landscaping within the 5 years. He further stated some very large trees line the west side of the property. He also stated the bike path will be dedicated as that is part of the 50' dedication

Commissioner O'Rourke asked about the 135<sup>th</sup> Street striping for a left turn lane. Petitioner Martin stated there is room for the left turn lane and the petitioner will pay for the striping. Commissioner O'Rourke stated it was not mentioned in the staff report. Planner Javoronok stated she can incorporate it into the report.

Commissioner O'Rourke also asked Petitioner Martin if they had spoken to Playa Vista to the west. Petitioner Martin stated he has not had any contact with anybody from Playa Vista. He felt if Playa Vista decides to give the site a sewer line, they probably will have that discussion.

Chairman Sobkoviak polled the Commissioners to see if they wanted to add a stipulation that the sanitary sewer issue be resolved before it goes to the Village Board. Commissioner O'Rourke deferred to staff. Planner Javoronok stated she believed it was something that could be resolved before going to the Village Board.

**At 9:50 p.m. Commissioner Kachel made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the annexation of the subject property, 26359 W. 135<sup>th</sup> Street, as it is a logical extension of the Village's municipal boundaries.**

- 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.**

**Commissioner Sanders seconded the motion.**

**Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.**

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

**The motion is carried 5:0.**

**At 9:51 p.m. Commissioner Sanders made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of a special use permit for Cornerstone Early Learning Center, located at 26359 W. 135<sup>th</sup> Street.**

- 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 Code.**

**Commissioner Kachel seconded the motion.**

**Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.**

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

**The motion is carried 4:1.**

**At 9:52 p.m. Commissioner Renzi made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the site plan review for Cornerstone Early Learning Center, located at 26359 W. 135<sup>th</sup> Street, subject to the following three 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 Code.**

**Commissioner Sanders seconded the motion.**

**Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.**

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

**The motion is carried 4:1.**

Commissioner O'Rourke commented that he voted against the project not because of the use, but he did not agree with the location. He also stated his vote is consistent with the concept plan meeting.

---

**CASE:** 1460-032709.SPR  
**Request:** Site Plan Review  
**Location:** Northwest corner of 127<sup>th</sup> Street and 248<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
**Applicant:** Bright Futures of Plainfield, LLC

**CREATIVE WORLD DAYCARE**

**TIME:** 9:55 p.m.

Planner Schwarz summarized the staff report. The Plan Commission and Village Board recently approved the creation of the subject lot for the project as part of the Grace Pointe Church Resubdivision. Presently the property is zoned B-1 (Neighborhood Convenience District) with a special use for a Planned Development. The property is 2.23 acres. The property is presently vacant and Grace Pointe Church will eventually be located to the west and there will be a future commercial area on the L-shaped lot that surrounds the subject property.

The applicant is proposing a 17,607 sq. ft. daycare facility. Access will be provided by an existing, full access point on 248<sup>th</sup> Street once those improvements are made via the cross access easement through Lot 2 in the resubdivision, which is just to the east of the property. A future, full access point would be located on Lot 2 of the resubdivision on 127<sup>th</sup> Street opposite Waterford Blvd. That future access point would indirectly serve the daycare facility via cross access across Lot 2 of the resubdivision. Internal circulation is provided via the two way drive aisle within the parking lot, which will provide the future connection to the development to the east and Lot 2 to the south. The Village's Traffic Committee did discuss the site plan. They did identify the need for a sidewalk connection to the future commercial areas to the east. They also identified that they would like a sidewalk connection along the north side of the main east/west access road coming off of 248<sup>th</sup> Street. Staff is requesting that the sidewalk connection be provided. The applicant has indicated they will provide an extension of the west sidewalk that runs along the building, through the landscape area, across their delivery area, and through another landscape area which would then be a crosswalk to the sidewalk that would be located on the north side of that future drive aisle. That would be in lieu of the sidewalk on the south side. The petitioner indicated the willingness to extend the sidewalk that is in front of the building on the south to the lot line so that when the future commercial area comes in; there will be a second direct connection.

They are providing the required off street loading. Access and circulation is provided within the parking lot. Stormwater management is provided in the adjacent property to the west. One trash enclosure is provided with all elevations provided as well. The building is a very attractive, residentially styled building. The materials are going to match the Grace Pointe Church and include a stone veneer on the trash enclosure. There is a varied roof line. Staff has not identified any revisions to the building elevations.

Planner Schwarz reviewed the revisions to the landscape plan.

- Staff has requested that the landscape architect label the required yard areas and foundation areas
- Staff has requested that the equivalent number of plant units that are required for the foundation plantings be provided in an alternative area on the site, potentially on the north side of the main drive aisle.
- Staff has requested that the required parking lot screening be provided in the south yard, screening the southern row of parking.

As far as the photometric plan is concerned, staff has requested several minor revisions. There are several readings along the north line that are slightly above the maximum of 0.5 foot candles. Staff thinks those can be adjusted or poles relocated to make the readings work.

Staff recommends approval of the site plan review. He revised stipulation #4 in the staff report. Planner Schwarz concluded his report.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Village Engineer Eickholtz if there are any engineering issues. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated they do not have any significant issues with the project.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in the petitioners.

Tory Hannan, architect, is representing the petitioner. Chairman Sobkoviak asked him if the petitioner is in substantial agreement with the comments made by staff regarding the photometrics and the landscaping. Petitioner Hannan stated they are in agreement as they are minor adjustments that can be easily taken of.

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 O'Rourke asked about the trees along the south and wondered if more were needed. Planner Schwarz stated the ordinance requires shrubs, screening, like a hedge row along the parking stalls in addition to the trees. It is just a minor review item.

Planner Schwarz added that the parking lot does comply with the minimum number of parking spaces. There will be a loss of 3 spaces in the future when they connect the parking lot to the south, basically at the southwest corner of the parking lot.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated it looks like there is a gap in the easement of about 5 feet on the plat. Planner Schwarz stated the subdivision plat that was previously approved for this resubdivision that created this lot has an easement that runs to the lot line and through the parking lot itself.

Commissioner O'Rourke felt this was one big, dead-end parking lot. Petitioner Hannan stated by design they located the parking to the west and the access to the daycare further west on that access road simply to eliminate easy cut-throughs, fast traffic through the parking lot, etc. The dead-end is an inconvenience, but the idea is you have slow traffic moving because there are young kids and parents dropping those young kids off. It was kind of a safety issue that was consciously thought through. When the commercial develops there will be a cut-through, but they hope because that access is to the west retail traffic is not going to use this for a cut-through. You want slow moving traffic through that lot. A discussion ensued in this regard. After the discussion it was decided to possibly have a temporary turn-around, hammerhead, where there are left and right areas to turn and make a maneuver to head back the other way. Joe LaPaglia for the petitioner added if the striping was eliminated on the last parking spaces, it would in effect create that hammerhead within the existing configuration of the existing lot. The petitioner will work with staff on this.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked who would be responsible for the maintenance for the driveway coming in off of 248<sup>th</sup> Street. Planner Schwarz stated those improvements need to happen in order for this property to develop. Petitioner LaPaglia stated it was part of the purchase agreement of this property. Commissioner O'Rourke asked who will be doing that work. The petitioner answered that it was the seller of the property. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if there was an easement and maintenance agreement along with that road. Planner Schwarz stated that is one of the things on the plat review that is being reviewed before it gets recorded. The reciprocal easement agreement language talks about that. The church will maintain the main drive aisle heading toward the church. The applicant will handle the internal easements that are on this particular lot.

Commissioner Sanders asked if there was dedicated parking for staff members. Petitioner LaPaglia x did not know and stated that is more of an operational issue.

At 10:15 p.m. Commissioner Renzi made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the Site Plan Review documents for Creative World School, located on Lot 1 in the Grace Pointe Church Lot 2 Resubdivision, 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 all Building Code requirements,
4. Subject to the Site Plan being revised to incorporate a sidewalk connection along the west side of the building crossing the drive aisle and linking to the sidewalk located on the north side of the church's planned sidewalk, which will be located along the north side of the main east/west access road coming off of 248<sup>th</sup> Street,
5. Subject to the Site Plan being revised to extend the sidewalk along the south side of the building to the east lot line to allow for a future connection to the future commercial area to the east.
6. Subject to staff's technical review of the Site Plan Review documents prior to Village Board consideration.

Commissioner O'Rourke seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

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

The motion is carried 4:0

Commissioner O'Rourke gave the rationale for his vote.

---

**DISCUSSION:**

Chairman Sobkoviak congratulated Commissioners Bonuchi and Peck for their election to the Village Board, Mayor Elect Collins, and Commissioner Fremarek for election to the Township Board.

Commissioner Sanders asked for time on the next Plan Commission agenda to discuss what the Historic Preservation Commission is working on. Planner Javoronok replied there is a public hearing, April 23<sup>rd</sup>, on the Downtown Historic District. They are also working to continue efforts on the Main Street Corridor Plan and to bring that to the Plan Commission and HPC's attention in the near future. Commissioner Sanders wanted a staff report on the results of the April 23<sup>rd</sup> HPC meeting. Planner Javoronok said she could give a report.

Commissioner Kachel asked what is happening with the gas station on Route 59 and the two houses behind it. Planner Javoronok replied there are no new developments.

Since there was no further business before the Commission, Chairman Sobkoviak adjourned the meeting at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

---

Carol Millan  
Planning Secretary Village of Plainfield