



Michael P. Collins
PRESIDENT

Michelle Gibas
VILLAGE CLERK

TRUSTEES
Margie Bonuchi
Paul Fay
Larry Kachel
Bill Lamb
Garrett M. Peck
James Racich

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

DATE: AUGUST 18, 2009
LOCATION: VILLAGE HALL,,,,,,

Chairman Sobkoviak called the meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Renzi, O'Rourke, Sanders, Kiefer, Seggebruch, ex-officio Commissioner Schrack;
Chairman Sobkoviak; and Plainfield Fire Protection District
Absent: Ex officio Commissioner Heiner, Plainfield Park District, Plainfield School District, Plainfield Library
District, and Plainfield Police Department

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The August 4, 2009 minutes were accepted as presented.

DEVELOPMENT REPORT:

Planner Proulx summarized the results of the August 3rd and August 18th Village Board meetings. He acknowledged the appointment of Commissioner Kachel to the vacant Trustee position on the Village Board.

OLD BUSINESS:

CASE: 1475-070209.RZ.SU.SPR.PP/FP **PLAINFIELD DENTAL ADDITION**
Request: Map Amendment (Re-Zoning) and
Special Use for Planned Development (*Public Hearing*)
Site Plan Review
Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision
Location: West of IL Rt. 59, north of Commercial Street
Applicant: Peter Muraglia, D.D.S.

TIME: 7:05 p.m.

Planner Proulx stated this is a continuation of the public hearing for the rezoning and the special use from the August 4th Plan Commission meeting. Staff sought direction and attempted to gather additional information to clarify and help focus the discussion as it was staff's understanding there were two primary areas of focus by the Commission at the last meeting. One was regarding the zoning and whether a Business Transition Zoning was appropriate by having two lots consolidated into one given previous Village Board policy regarding the location of Business Transition Zoning. The second main area of focus was on the proposed access configuration utilizing the alley for access to the development. Staff sought direction from the Board at the Committee of the Whole Meeting specifically regarding the zoning issue. Staff did not provide a site plan to the Board. It was staff's attempt to maintain the integrity of this process and preserve the Plan Commission's role in providing a recommendation on the project as a whole. Staff gave the Board partial information, but asked for their direction on the zoning. There was not 100% agreement, but there was a consensus among the Board that there was support for the Business Transition Zoning. It was suggested that the Plan Commission move forward on the assumption that the Village Board would not be an obstacle or an impediment on the zoning issue.

Planner Proulx further stated staff met with the applicant and tried to get more objective or quantifiable information about what type of traffic might be generated by the business, what hours, days of the week, etc. The petitioner estimated that the dental office averages from 25 to 30 patient visits per day. They also have anywhere from 8 to 14 employees. Staff made some assumptions about the number of trips in and out. The petitioner indicated that anywhere from one-quarter to one-third of his patients use the alley either coming, going, or both. That amounts to around 2 to 3 cars per hour that will use the alley as a result of coming to the dental office.

Staff obtained some traffic count information that the Village had already recorded, which indicates there are about, at least for the day sampled, 210 trips in a day. He believed the peak was 20 or 25 in an hour, around the 1:00 o'clock hour in the afternoon. It is staff's estimation that this information demonstrates that the dental office is really a small contributor to traffic in the alley. In addition, staff asked for some information from the petitioner on how the proposed office addition would factor in. The addition would approximately double the size of the original building, but the traffic would not necessarily double. Staff agrees that traffic in the alley is a concern and it remains staff's position that the traffic is likely to be increased or become a larger problem as a result of closing Commercial Street. Staff feels it is important to work on the strategy to address the potential for cut-through traffic regardless of whether this project moves forward or not. Staff proposes hosting some sort of public open house meeting to invite the people who would be affected by any changes to the alley. This could help to identify if there is a preferred traffic calming strategy or reconfiguration to make the alley completely one way in a certain area and two ways in another location. This meeting would take place before the case moves forward to the Village Board. That way when the Village Board considers the project, there would be a good solution and good strategy for addressing traffic concerns in the alley. Planner Proulx showed slides of other businesses utilizing alleys for access in a similar manner as what is being proposed for Plainfield Dental.

Chairman Sobkoviak summarized that the Village Board has said that the expansion of the business zoning in itself is not a stumbling block and the traffic entering and leaving through the alley in itself is not a stumbling block. The traffic will still have to be dealt with because of the closing of Commercial Street. Planner Proulx agreed that the first point is correct regarding the zoning. Staff really discouraged discussion on the alley because staff was trying to keep that aspect of the case with the Plan Commission so that could be part of the Plan Commission's recommendation to go forward to the Board.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Village Engineer Eickholtz if any engineering issues have been identified since the last meeting. Village Engineer Eickholtz stated nothing new has been identified.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked if there was anyone in the audience who wished to make a comment. The following residents responded:

Arnie Ozbolt spoke first. He lives on Commercial Street. He feels there is a problem with the alley. He did not see why there could not be an access off of Commercial Street. He stated there is a lot of traffic on the alley already. He also did not like the 1-5 year option for building the addition.

Mark Heffner lives at 15209 Illinois Street. He felt because of the traffic in the alley it is an accident waiting to happen. He had traffic concerns in the alley.

Tim Stetenfeld, 24007 Ottawa, spoke next. He is not in favor of one way traffic in the alley. He felt traffic calming measures, such as speed bumps, might work. He also felt heavy signage and enforcement might work. He asked for a higher quality of landscaping on the north end of the property with some stops so that cars in the parking lot do not nose into the landscaping and ruin it. He wants to work with the petitioner, but also wants to protect his investment in his house.

Petitioner Muraglia spoke. He was sworn in at a previous meeting. He also wants to protect his investment in the dental office. He stated the practice has been in this location since 1968. He bought the practice in 1996. He bought the back lot in 2003. IDOT has taken away parking in the front of his building. He stated they are done between 4:30 and 5:00 p.m. three days a week. They are there on Monday and Wednesday until 7:00 p.m. with only one doctor working. The most cars in the parking lot would be 3 to 4 between 6:00 and 7:00 p.m. They are there until Noon on Saturdays. He further stated they are trying to be a good neighbor and maintain the look. He is trying to work with the Historical Society as they believe the home he bought 7 years ago is Chester Ingersoll's home. He is donating it to the Historical Society, along with the strip of land so that they can move the home. His business is expanding. He has given the Historical Society one year to move the home. He will not be able to start his addition until the home is moved. The economy at that time will dictate if he can build his addition. He also stated they are willing to work with the Village to let them use the lot for Plainfield Fest or any fest to take

some of the traffic off of Commercial Street. They are willing to down zone their zoning so they do not put anything other than a low impact business. He stated this is the master plan. He wants to maintain the landscaping to keep it looking nice.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Planner Proulx about the 5 year extension. Planner Proulx stated that was staff's suggestion of something that could be included in the Planned Unit Development. It is identified as relief and is not listed as a stipulation of approval. It is something that would be included in the SIA for the Planned Development. Chairman Sobkoviak felt the 5 year extension period could become an issue.

Planner Proulx stated in regards to the timing of the project there are really two phases or two aspects the applicant is looking for. The expansion or reconfiguration of the parking lot is of utmost importance to them. They would like to do that as soon as possible, perhaps yet this fall. Resident Stetenfeld would like to get the parking constructed and not just be left in an interim condition for a period of years. Staff believes it would be appropriate to have that stipulation.

Commissioner Sanders asked if the main reason for having the flexibility of the extension period is the relationship to the historical significance of the building and the conveyance of that to the Historical Society. Planner Proulx stated it is fair to say that is a significant complicating factor to work through, but not the sole factor.

Commissioner Renzi found it hard to believe that the Historical Society would have the funds to move the house. Planner Proulx stated the principle agreement is between the petitioner and the adjacent property owner to the west. The Historical Society has been identified as a conduit for this donation to flow through. The parties have agreed in principle. Planner Javoronok stated there is a tentative agreement between Dr. Muraglia and the property owner to the west. The property owner to the west would have ownership of the property. Their plan is to move the house 10, 20, or 30 feet over. They are interested in landmarking the property, as well as renovating it and returning it back to its original appearance. Commissioner Renzi asked then if it is not going to be a showplace, but rather an income generating property. Planner Javoronok stated that was correct. Commissioner Renzi suggested possibly a 3 year period to get this done with an option of an extension for another 3 years.

Commissioner Renzi felt traffic flow would be best left to the experts.

Commissioner Kiefer asked if the neighbors would be open to having the open house to discuss traffic in the alley. Tim Stetenfeld felt it was a good idea, but he felt the Commission was hearing from the adjacent neighbors at this meeting. Commissioner Kiefer asked if there was a consensus of what the neighbors would like to see. Chairman Sobkoviak stated the traffic engineer and staff need to work out the particulars on what is done in the alley. That is not within the authority of the Plan Commission. Tim Stetenfeld mentioned as the people exit the dental parking lot, mirrors should be placed so someone can look both ways down the alley. He felt there should probably be a lot of signage, enough enforcement as possible, and maybe speed bumps. Dr. Muraglia stated they would also be willing to put up signs in their office telling their patients to slow down. He further stated he can only try to control his traffic.

Commissioner O'Rourke felt an obligation to work with existing businesses to try to help alleviate some of the negative impact they have felt from IDOT on Rt. 59. His concern was with the expansion part of the project and the additional traffic that it can generate. He felt the economics of today does not allow the petitioner to do the expansion today. Dr. Muraglia corrected Commissioner O'Rourke and stated the economics today does allow him to do the expansion. He does not know what the economics will be one year from now. He further stated if the house could be moved tomorrow, he could do the addition. Originally the petitioner had applied for a demolition permit for the property. The Historical Society looked at it and determined it was Chester Ingersoll's house. Commissioner O'Rourke suggested the petitioner wait on the addition part and come back in 18 months or 2 years for the addition. Dr. Muraglia stated his goal was to approve a master plan. Commissioner O'Rourke was concerned about supporting something for a long term scenario when typically it is a one year process.

Commissioner Seggebruch visited the site. He did not think the location for the parking lot is the best location. He felt there should be a curb cut onto Commercial Street. He thought possibly the best way to lessen the amount of traffic on the west half of the alley is to make it one way from beyond the entrance to the dental office. Possibly the dental entrance could be pulled back towards Rt. 59 with a one way entrance drive onto Commercial St. He also felt there was not proper back-out space at the east end of the lot next to Rt. 59. Commissioner Seggebruch felt the handicap parking needs to be moved as it needs to be as close as possible to the accessible entrance either to the new addition or the existing building. He felt the site plan needs to be re-worked no matter what happens with the alley.

One of the residents, Mark Heffner, stated there are a lot of children in the alley. Commercial Street is the front yard and the alley is their backyard.

Commissioner Seggebruch did not see how the Commission could move forward with this site plan. Chairman Sobkoviak stated the traffic engineer and staff will work together with the neighbors and come up with a workable solution.

Commissioner O'Rourke had a concern about the 22 feet between the aisles. The standard is 24 feet. Planner Proulx stated it is a condition that is present. It would be tight. He believes that condition would only occur adjacent to the existing building. It was staff's hope that as you get west of the existing building to the area in front of the proposed addition, the parking lot could be stretched a little bit to the south so there would be a wider drive aisle. He stated that would be something that could be addressed through the final engineering review. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if there would be a curb on the north end of the property. Planner Proulx stated that was correct. That would be a curbed, landscaped peninsula.

Commissioner O'Rourke stated it was his understanding there would be no site lighting. Planner Proulx stated the petitioner is not proposing any parking lot lighting. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if there should be lighting. Planner Proulx stated in other BTM situations there have been lighted bollards just to provide some security lighting, or some low level lighting. Given the proximity to the residential area, lighting is not something that staff really pushed for. Chairman Sobkoviak felt there would be enough lighting along Rt. 59 that would spill into the site. Mike Colombo, the architect, stated they are planning to use coach lights on the building. The petitioner was not opposed to bollards or that sort of thing.

Commissioner Renzi felt there should be more lighting. He was not sure he was comfortable doing a site plan review, preliminary plat and final plat all at once where he didn't know how the parking and ingress and egress will flow. He wondered if there should possibly be an option A and option B for the site plan, where option A would go forward and option B would come back to the Commission.

Planner Proulx stated at this point staff is not recommending an access point from Commercial Street. Staff would plan to ask input from the residents on traffic calming alternatives, signage alternatives, enforcement alternatives, one-way/two-way, potentially vacating a portion of the alley to make it essentially a private drive instead of an alley. Staff does not support a connection to Commercial Street because staff believes this would introduce a significant amount of cut-through traffic through the parking lot.

Chairman Sobkoviak stated as far as the lighting, he felt this parking lot works now without lighting. Commissioner Renzi commented that presently the parking is on the front part of the lot where all the light is. The parking is being moved to the rear where it is darker. The petitioner stated they are not opposed to adding lighting.

Commissioner Renzi stated if he understood, staff is looking to route as designed in the site plan. The opening up of the access on Commercial is not an option. Planner Proulx stated he would characterize his meeting with the affected residents as a meeting to review traffic calming alternatives and potential changes to the alley irrespective of this proposed site plan.

Commissioner Seggebruch stated there is an existing curb cut on Commercial at this time and did not know the rationale for taking the curb cut away. He felt the Commission needs an Option A and Option B site plan. He did not agree with having the entry drive forced all the way to the west end of this lot. He thought it should be brought back to the east, more centralized so there is equal parking on each side. He thought that would lend itself to getting the handicap spot opposite the entrance and making sure there is proper back-up at each end of the lot. He did not think the parking lot works that well the way it is laid out right now. He reminded the Commission that it is a State Law that handicap parking has to be located as close as possible to the accessible entrance to the building.

Commissioner Renzi wondered if a cut-through was approved on Commercial would that be a substantial change that would require a return to the Commission as a revision to the final plat. Planner Proulx stated that was something staff would recommend. There are a handful of homes on Commercial Street that may have familiarized themselves with the plans and felt they were not concerned because there is no access on Commercial Street. If that was changed, the residents may be concerned and want to have a public venue to express that concern. It would be staff's recommendation that if that change were made, it would be revisited at the Plan Commission level. Commissioner Renzi wondered if that should be a third stipulation to the preliminary and final plat. Planner Proulx stated he would be comfortable with that.

Commissioner Renzi was okay with the map amendment and special use for Planned Development. He did not like the 5 year period. He liked Chairman Sobkoviak's idea for a shorter period or some type of extension or rollover, etc. He was okay with the site plan review. He was okay with the preliminary, final plat if a third stipulation was added that there is a requirement of

returning to the Plan Commission in the event of a reconfiguration of the parking lot. Commissioner Renzi further stated he would let staff work with the petitioner as far as lighting.

Chairman Sobkoviak polled the other Commissioners as to how they feel about adding a stipulation to the preliminary/final plat of subdivision requiring the petitioner to return to the Plan Commission if there is a substantial change to the parking lot, i.e. an entrance off of Commercial St. Commissioner Seggebruch stated that should include possibly relocating the access drive on the alley also. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if the stipulation should go under the site plan review. Planner Proulx clarified the site plan review is probably the place where it is most directly applicable. It could be included on both the site plan and preliminary/final plat of subdivision if the Commission desires. It was decided the stipulation should also be included on the site plan review.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked the Commission if anyone shared his concern about the timing of the building of the addition, and if it should be brought back at the time it is ready to be built. Chairman Sobkoviak had a concern about the time limit. He felt the time limit should be a different period and renewable. Petitioner Colombo suggested that if the historical house is not moved in a certain period of time, then Dr. Muraglia has the ability to demolish the house so he can move forward. Chairman Sobkoviak stated the Commission will not recommend that. A discussion followed in this regard. Commissioner Renzi suggested 18 months. Chairman Sobkoviak stated the SIA should contain the time limit of 18 months. If more time is needed, the petitioner will have to go to the Village Board for an extension.

At 8:20 p.m. Commissioner Sanders made a motion that the Plan Commission adopt staff's findings of facts as the findings of fact of the Plan Commission and recommend approval of the requested map amendment (rezoning) of Lot 1 of the John D. Shreffler's Addition from B-1 to BT, and of Lot 2 of the John D. Shreffler's Addition from R-1 to BT.

Commissioner Renzi seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call

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

The motion is carried 6:0

Commissioner O'Rourke wanted a clarification of the special use. Planner Proulx stated this is a special use for a Planned Development. Limited relief would be granted. He stated he had identified some things, most of which were the result of existing nonconformities that would be entitled to remain.

Before Commissioner Renzi made the motion regarding the special use he wanted to make sure the 18 months time period would be included in stipulation #1 regarding the Statement of Intent and Agreement or did the Commission need to add that in the stipulation. Chairman Sobkoviak stated he had requested that staff add that to the SIA.

At 8:23 p.m. Commission Renzi made a motion that, subject to the discussions of and recommendations of the Plan Commission regarding the inclusion of certain phraseology regarding the Statement of Intent and Agreement, the Plan Commission adopt staff's findings of fact as the findings of fact of the Plan Commission and recommend approval of the requested Planned Development subject to the following two (2) stipulations set forth in the staff report:

- 1. Execution and recording of a Statement of Intent and Agreement illustrating the approved site plan, building elevations, landscape plan, and zoning relief associated with the Planned Development**
- 2. Execution and recording of a formal agreement with the property owner to the west regarding the property conveyance and building donation to facilitate relocation and preservation of the historic structure.**

Commissioner Kiefer seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call

Aye: Sanders, Kiefer, Renzi, Chairman Sobkoviak
Nay: O'Rourke, Seggebruch

The motion is carried 4:2

At 8:25 Commissioner Sanders made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the site plan subject to the 3 stipulations in the staff report and the 4th stipulation added by the Plan Commission:

1. Compliance with the requirements of the Village Engineer,
2. Compliance with the requirements of the Plainfield Fire Protection District,
3. Execution and recording of the formal agreement with the property owners to the west regarding the property conveyance and building donation to facilitate relocation and preservation of the historic structure,
4. Petitioner will return to the Plan Commission if there is a substantial reconfiguration of the parking lot, i.e. an ingress or egress off of Commercial St.

Commissioner Kiefer seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

Aye: Sanders, Kiefer, Renzi, Chairman Sobkoviak
Nay: Seggebruch, O'Rourke

The motion is carried 4:2

At 8:26 p.m. Commissioner Renzi made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the preliminary/final plat of subdivision subject to the two (2) stipulations set forth in the staff report and the 3rd stipulation added by the Plan Commission.

1. Compliance with the requirements of the Village Engineer,
2. Compliance with the requirements of the Plainfield Fire Protection District,
3. Petitioner will return to the Plan Commission if there is a substantial reconfiguration of the parking lot, i.e. an ingress or egress off of Commercial St.

Commissioner O'Rourke seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

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

The motion is carried 6:0

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a recess at 8:30 p.m.
Chairman Sobkoviak reconvened the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE: 1477-072809.CP WITTE COMMERCIAL PROPERTY
Request: Concept Plan Review
Location: West side of Illinois Route 59, approximately ¼ mile north of 127th Street
Applicant: Jeff Witte, represented by Bob Shemansky, RMD & Associates

TIME: 8:40 p.m.

Planner Schwarz summarized the staff report. The property is currently zoned R-1. The applicant is requesting the concept plan review for a 2,100 sq. ft. commercial building. Following the concept plan review process, the applicant intends to rezone the property B-3, as well as a preliminary/final plat of subdivision that would create a single lot of record, and a site plan review for a proposed commercial building intended for small engine repair. Staff and the applicant are seeking feedback from the Plan Commission. The parcel is 88 ½' x 143' and is approximately 12,654 sq. ft. The Village's water pressure adjusting station is to the south, and the Heritage Meadows Homeowners Association buffer outlot is to the north and west. The future land use map designates the property as medium density residential. The building will have a residential style architecture. Several variances will be needed. The applicant is seeking two points of access on Rt. 59 (right

in/right out to the north and right out only to the south. Staff does not think IDOT will approve both access points. The project architect spoke recently with IDOT and they have indicated it is very unlikely that they will approve two points of access. The pending site plan will likely only include a small turnaround. If IDOT only allows a right-in/right-out, there would be a hammerhead type of turnaround within the parking lot for trucks and trailers to navigate. Staff had looked at possibly a cross access easement through the Village's water pressure adjusting station to the south. That would allow the subject property access to the Wal Mart northern access point. Staff anticipates a traffic signal for that intersection will be installed later this year. Unfortunately, the Public Works Department has indicated the existing Village site improvements at the pressure station site are very important for maintaining water pressure in the area and they do not support any resulting customer traffic that would pass in close proximity to the existing building. That leaves the only access for this property on Rt. 59.

The plan complies with the amount of parking required by code. The applicant is proposing a loading and unloading space on the east side of the building in the area of the proposed U-shaped driveway. The concept plan reflects a wide sidewalk along the rear building façade that provides access to one of the two proposed garage doors on the west façade of the building.

No landscaping plan has been submitted. Staff would require the north and west areas of the property to have 15' buffer yards. The proposed parking lot will encroach into both of the required yards. The applicant is proposing a wooden board-on-board fence. A 6' Village-owned, fence is existing along the south property line. The applicant would connect to that fence along the west and north property lines to allow a reduction of landscape plants required by code.

There is no on-site detention required under the Subdivision Ordinance based on the size of the property being less than one acre. The Village Engineer would review the engineering plans as part of the site plan review process. Also, a photometric plan has not been submitted at this time, but that would be required at the time of site plan review. The dumpster enclosure encroaches on the required west 15' buffer yard. That would require a variance. Signage would be submitted as part of a separate review process.

Previously, there was a single family home on the property at the time Heritage Meadows was annexed. Staff is not sure when that house was taken down. Staff believes the medium density classification was to incorporate this property into the subdivision, which it did not. It was an exception to the subdivision. Staff believes a commercial use is more appropriate and would support a rezoning to the B-3 classification.

Planner Schwarz summarized the feedback from other departments within the Village:

Village Engineer

- Reviewing the concept plan and will provide more detailed comments at the time of final plat and site plan review.

Public Works Department

- Seeks a minimum 25' wide public utility and drainage easement along the west side of Rt. 59 to provide a continuation of the existing 35' public utility and drainage easement that exists both north and south of the subject property.
- The applicant shall be required to construct a public sidewalk along the west side of Rt. 59 along the frontage of the property. If IDOT does not allow a sidewalk to be located within the public R.O.W. it may be possible to construct a sidewalk within a public access easement.

Planner Schwarz summarized the issues for consideration and discussion:

- Non-conformity with B-3 District minimum lot size,
- Proposed pavement encroachment into required minimum 20' front yard,
- Proposed parking lot and trash enclosure encroachment into required minimum 15' transitional buffer yard along north and west property lines,
- Proposed entry sidewalk along full length of north façade.

Planner Schwarz concluded his report.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Village Engineer Eickholtz if he has identified any engineering issues. Village Engineer Eickholtz echoed Planner Schwarz comment about the requested 25' easement across the frontage from Public Works.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in the petitioner. He swore in Robert Shemansky, architect, and Jeff Witte, owner of the property. Jeff Witte spoke. He stated he is proposing to put a lawnmower service shop for sales and service of small engines on the property.

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 O'Rourke asked Planner Schwarz about the 35' public utility and drainage easement. He wondered how that would be addressed because of the gap. Planner Schwarz stated there is an existing total of 35' of easement that skirts the property coming down from the north, running along the north property line, and then running within the Homeowners Association's outlot adjacent to the homes and then coming back into the existing water pressure adjusting station. The property was annexed into the Village staff believes as part of the Heritage Meadows project, but then when Eagle Pointe at Heritage Meadows was platted and recorded, the subject property was not included; and, therefore, no easements were shown running across the property. Some type of public utility and drainage easement would be needed along Rt. 59. At this time, Public Works is not seeking the full 35'. They believe that 25' would be sufficient for future needs because there is an existing 35' easement off-site to the north and west.

Commissioner O'Rourke wanted clarification about the driveway encroaching in the 20' setback. Planner Schwarz stated the Zoning Ordinance requires a 20' parking lot setback from the property line for green space. That is landscaped area and would not affect the easement. The building has a 30' setback from the property line. Currently, the u-shaped driveway, which probably IDOT will not approve, encroaches within the required 20' front yard.

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if the standard for the western half of IL Rt. 59 would be 60' of R.O.W. He mentioned the Plat of Survey shows only 53.51' in front of this parcel. Planner Schwarz stated when the subdivision plat comes in, staff will have to verify that the R.O.W. was previously granted. It appears it was granted based on the Plat of Survey that was shown. Petitioner Witte stated the reason the house was taken down was because it encroached on the right turn lane to Wal-Mart. IDOT acquired approximately 30' at that time.

Commissioner O'Rourke had a concern that this was close to residences. He stated the west elevation shows two garage doors. He figured they would be open at some point and emit noise. He remembered there was some contention with the adjacent homeowners when the Wal-Mart project went through. He guessed that the homeowners abutting this property are not even aware that this is a separate lot. They probably think it is a buffer area. He didn't know with a 12,000 sq. ft. lot if anything works well. He said the parking looks tight. There is no cut in the median on Rt. 59 so you could do nothing but a right-in/right-out. He felt there were a lot of issues putting a B-3 zoning in this location.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Commissioner O'Rourke what zoning he would consider in this location. Commissioner O'Rourke replied the current R-1 zoning.

Commissioner Renzi asked if there would be any issue with easements going under the structures. Planner Schwarz stated that was correct. Petitioner Witte stated there is actually about 20' in front that is easement also between the right turn lane and the lot. There is already some easement up there that is not considered in the lot dimensions.

Commissioner Kiefer asked Planner Schwarz how much of an issue is the buffer zone to the north. Planner Schwarz stated the Homeowners Association owns the 10 acre outlot that is adjacent to the north and west lot lines of the property. That will never be developed with homes. The ordinance bases the buffer yards on the zoning. In this case, there is residential zoning, which will most likely never be residential. It will always be an open space buffer privately owned by the HOA. Staff is a little less concerned with the encroachments into the required north and west buffer yards than if there was the potential for homes one day to be built there.

Commissioner Sanders asked the petitioner if marine engines were included in the small engine classification. Petitioner Witte said they were not included. Commissioner Sanders asked the petitioner how much noise is generated when you test small engines. Petitioner Witte said they are not super noisy. He also stated they will be putting a 6' fence on the buffer. Planner Schwarz stated that the zoning ordinance does require that all business activity take place completely within a building. Commissioner O'Rourke asked if that does not prevent the doors from being open during business hours. Planner Schwarz stated that was correct.

Commissioner Renzi asked if the Village had put in a sidewalk that connects to Wal-Mart. Planner Schwarz stated not along the frontage of the pump station. There is a sidewalk though along the entire Wal-Mart project. Commissioner Renzi asked

who would be putting in their sidewalk first. He asked if Mr. Witte was going to be required to put his sidewalk in and then the Village will have to come in and link it, or is it that Mr. Witte will be required to put the sidewalk in only when the Village puts in their sidewalk. He asked if a bond would be appropriate. Planner Schwarz stated that was done in the past. At the time of engineering review staff will get more into the details. It has been the Village's past practice that in lieu of actually putting the sidewalk in prior to the building permit or as a stipulation of the building permit, the Village has asked for a letter of credit, a bond, or cash-in-lieu. The Village would then use that as part of a road project improvement. Commissioner Renzi did not see the benefit of the sidewalk at this point. His thought was maybe a letter of credit would be the best option. Planner Schwarz disagreed and felt it would be better at this time to have the sidewalk put in.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked the Commission if there was anyone opposed to changing the zoning to B-3 for this parcel. Commissioner O'Rourke was opposed to the zoning change. The rest of the Commissioners were okay with the zoning change to B-3.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked the Commission if anyone had a problem with the proposed pavement encroachment into the required 20' front yard. Petitioner Witte stated the north curb cut is currently there.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked the Commission about the proposed parking lot trash enclosure encroachment into the required 15' transitional buffer yard and the reduction of the buffer yard to 15'. There was no response from the Commission.

Chairman Sobkoviak agreed with Planner Schwarz and felt the sidewalk needs to be there even in the form of a bond or something because at some later point this building could be something else and people might want to walk over to a restaurant, etc. He felt the Village needs to be pedestrian friendly.

Commissioner Sanders felt the concept plan for this piece of property is one of the better fits that you could put on such a limited size area next to a large commercial area. The variances make sense in this case. He felt the concept is sound and would support the concept plan as proposed.

Commissioner Seggebruch felt the building is presenting a nice front to Rt. 59 and the entrances on the north. He could see the concern about the garage doors. He was thinking there would be a sidewalk that would continue down to the other garage door; otherwise he would question why there would be two garage doors. He asked the petitioner why he needed two garage doors. Petitioner Witte felt the one closer to the front would be to get things in and the one towards the back would be used to move things around.

Chairman Sobkoviak felt the petitioner is going to need to address noise issues to the west. He suspected that the next time the petitioner comes in there will be a number of neighbors to the west present who will be interested in the noise and sound impact. He also felt they would be interested in the lighting impact.

Planner Schwarz stated the parking is over by one space. Staff would look closer at the possibility of having some type of hammerhead, a little bit of a turnaround, on the north end at the time of site plan. It would be a little tight getting out from one of the parallel spaces, especially the one on the corner. Chairman Sobkoviak did not think parking should be a tremendous issue here. This is not a place where you come in and spend the day. A discussion followed.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked the petitioner if he had any questions for the Commission that he needed answered before he continues. Chairman Sobkoviak did not ask for a vote on the concept plan because there are going to be a number of changes to this.

Petitioner Witte stated he just wanted to get some positive feedback. His major hurdle was all the IDOT permits, which he is working on currently.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked Planner Schwarz if he needed anything from the Commission. Planner Schwarz stated there will be variances needed to move this concept forward. The limiting factor is there is limited access to the property. Chairman Sobkoviak told the petitioner he is welcome to bring another concept plan before the Commission.

Commissioner Seggebruch suggested bringing the trash enclosure over to the northwest corner of the parking lot. Chairman Sobkoviak stated it has to be located in a spot where the big garbage trucks can get to it. There was a discussion about the location of the trash enclosure.

Village of Plainfield Plan Commission Minutes

August 18, 2009

Page 10 of 10

Planner Schwarz stated the B-3 Zoning District does have an 80% maximum impervious. That will be reviewed in more detail at site plan review.

Chairman Sobkoviak reminded the Commissioners that there will be a number of variances requested to make this happen. If the Commissioners have a problem with granting those variances they should say so now.

Discussion on this concept plan ended at 9:30 p.m.

DISCUSSION

Commissioner O'Rourke asked if in the future the public could be invited to the concept plan meeting to get their input early on instead of later after the money has started to be spent. Planner Schwarz was not aware of any community doing public notice at the concept stage. He said it was something staff could look at. He did not know if it would make people angry because they do not have all of the facts when they come to the meeting. Commissioner O'Rourke felt the ideas of the public are important. He said he understands other communities may not do it, but maybe Plainfield could be the pioneer.

Commissioner O'Rourke also congratulated Trustee Kachel on his appointment to the Village Board. He also thanked him for all of his years of service.

Commissioner Renzi echoed Commissioner O'Rourke's congratulations to Trustee Kachel.

Chairman Sobkoviak thought Plainfield was one of the first villages to have a concept plan.

Since there was no further business before the Commission, Chairman Sobkoviak adjourned the meeting at 9:36 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Carol Millan

Recording Secretary