

President Wallace called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 7:20 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairmen Camerer, Carbonaro, Deyne, Gabrenya, Hopkins, and Reinke

ABSENT: President Wallace

<u>ALSO PRESENT:</u> Village Administrator Paula Schumacher, Senior Management Analyst Sam Hughes, Management Analyst Joey Dienberg, Finance Director Todd Dowden, Planning and Development Services Director Roberta Grill, Public Works Director Dan Dinges, Public Works Engineer Bob Allen, Building Director Brian Goralski, Golf Professional Phil Lenz, Chief Patrick Ullrich, Village Attorney Bryan Mraz and Village Clerk Lorna Giless.

BUILDING AND ZONING, CHAIRMAN HOPKINS

Bannerman's Special Use Permit

Chairman Hopkins stated that the petitioner is requesting a special use permit to allow outdoor seating including the serving of food and liquor. The request is for Bannerman's located at 858 South Rt. 59 in the Bartlett Commons Shopping Center.

Planning and Development Services Director Roberta Grill stated that Bannerman's has occupied just over 12,000 sq ft. of the shopping center since 2007. The petitioner purchased Bannerman's from the previous owner in the fall of 2018. They would like to convert the existing fenced in area that was used by a previous tenant as an outdoor play area for the daycare center, into an outdoor beer garden in the rear of the building, directly south of the Bannerman's leased space. The beer garden would include ten tables with a total of 40 seats and the petitioner is proposing to have T.V.'s, some games, outdoor chess and occasional acoustic music with no amplification. The existing six foot tall fence would be repaired and new fencing would be installed parallel to the building to provide a separated four foot wide emergency exit aisle for the karate school. Bannerman's is currently open seven days a week from 11:00 a.m. until 11:00 p.m. Sunday through Tuesday, 11:00 a.m. until 12:00 a.m. Wednesdays, 11:00 a.m. until 12:30 a.m. Thursdays and 11:00 a.m. until 1:00 a.m. Friday and Saturday. The petitioner is requesting the outdoor beer garden to be open for the same hours as the indoor operations. Staff is recommending forwarding this request to the Plan Commission for further review and the public hearing.

Chairman Devne asked how close the nearest residence is to the beer garden.

Ms. Grill stated that the closest home is about 185 feet.



Chairman Deyne stated that he thought the neighbors would probably be against this because of the outdoor activities that would be happening in the beer garden.

Chairman Hopkins asked if this is passed, he wanted to include that an outdoor play area cannot be added next to this beer garden. He didn't think it would be appropriate for a playground to be that close to a beer garden.

Ms. Grill clarified that Chairman Hopkins meant within close proximity.

Village Attorney Bryan Mraz stated that it should be able to be done, but it affects the owner of the shopping center, so he would need to be made aware of it.

Chairman Gabreyna stated that she concurred with Ray and she thought being loud until 1:00 a.m. is unreasonable.

Chairman Deyne stated that there were concerns before on the Plan Commission with Bannerman's having outdoor concerts. The neighbors had feedback and they were able to work everything out, but he is interested to see what the comments are from the Plan Commission.

Mr. Mraz stated that just because the petitioner is requesting a 2:00 a.m. time allotment to match its liquor license, doesn't mean it has to be granted. With it being a special use, you can add separate conditions and have shorter hours if you were going to grant this license.

Chairman Hopkins asked if Bracht's beer garden is the same as their liquor license.

Mr. Mraz stated that Bracht's has a later liquor license and the beer garden is much shorter.

Ms. Grill stated that the beer garden is limited until 10:00 p.m. Sunday through Thursday and Midnight Friday and Saturday which is different from their operating hours.

Chairman Deyne asked how near the closest home was to Bracht's

Ms. Grill thought over 200'.

Chairman Reinke asked if we have had any complaints about Bracht's beer garden.

Ms. Grill did not think they have had a complaint.

The item was forwarded on to the Plan Commission for review and a public hearing.



Harbecke/FJH Concept Plan

Chairman Hopkins stated that the petitioner is requesting a concept plan, a conceptual review of the proposed development project and the petitioner requests input and direction from the Committee of the Whole prior of submittal of the application.

Ms. Grill stated that in 2010, the sixty-plus acre parcel located immediately north and west of this parcel was the subject of a Concept Plan Review. The concept plan proposed a combination of single family detached residential homes on estate lots which are half acre lots and SR-2 and SR-3 lots on the remainder of the property. The Committee of the Whole, at that time, provided comments that were not favorable to the SR-3 lots. The petitioner revised the plans to eliminate the SR-3 lots and to decrease the overall density. The Committee of the Whole advised the petitioner to make a full preliminary subdivision submittal based on the revised plan; however, the petitioner did not pursue further approvals. The plans did not include the subject property being discussed tonight. The petitioner is proposing to develop the 14 acres at the northwest corner of Army Trail and Petersdorf Roads with twenty nine single family lots. They would be requesting to annex and rezone the property to the SR-3 suburban residential district and a preliminary final plat of subdivision. SR-3 requires 8,100 square foot lots, the concept plan is showing a minimum lot size of just over 10,000 sq. ft. with an average of 11,719. The plan includes two onsite storm water detention facilities, a ten foot wide multiuse path along the south side of the property, preservation of the wetland on the south side of the property, and a ten foot wide landscape buffer along the east side of the property to provide screening of Petersdorf Road and the Bartlett High School athletic fields. Two points of access are proposed onto Petersdorf Road. The northern access point is fully aligned with the Bartlett High School access drive and the petitioner is working with the property owner to the north for this off-site access point. The southern access point is approximately 350 feet north of Army Trail Road.

The Comprehensive Plan designation for this property is mixed use business park and estate residential. In the past, the Village Board and staff have questioned the viability of the proposed commercial uses along Army Trail Road as identified by the Comprehensive Plan. Staff believes that residential uses may be a more appropriate use for this property along Army Trail Road. The land use designation that is consistent with this Concept Plan is suburban residential, 2-5 dwelling units. The petitioner will be required to request an amendment to the Future Land Use Plan if they proceed with a formal application for residential uses. The trend of development in this area is estate residential and institutional uses. The residential subdivisions to the north, along Schick Road, and on the south side of Army Trail Road are rural subdivisions which were developed under DuPage County's jurisdiction. Taking this lot and the adjacent larger parcel into consideration together, a density distribution with larger estate lots adjacent to the existing



subdivision to the north and an increase in density moving south to Army Trail Road may establish the best land use pattern. This Concept Plan is consistent with that land use pattern.

The petitioner is here tonight, they are requesting the Committee of the Whole review the Concept Plan and provide input and direction prior to a formal application submittal.

Chairman Reinke asked what the plan for the adjacent 60 acre parcel is.

Ms. Grill stated that the Land Use Plan shows mixed use business park is along Army Trail road and north of it is estate residential.

Chairman Reinke stated that Bartlett has the challenge of infill in town and you create these strange parcels that are difficult to develop. His concern is about the balance of the property and how that's going to be developed. He doesn't want to see the Village get stuck.

Chairman Camerer asked about the size and type of houses built.

Vince Rosanova from Rosanova and Whitaker Ltd. stated that he is at the meeting on behalf of his client, the Pulte Group. Pulte Group is one of America's largest home building companies. They currently have 49 markets across 26 states. Last year they celebrated their 70th anniversary and they are very proud of their Chicagoland roots. They have been building homes in the Chicago area for 50 years. They are a perennial top three builder and they currently have 18 active communities in the Chicago area.

With regard to the Concept Plan, he just had a couple comments. They are proposing 29 single family detached home sites over 14 acres. Overall it creates a density of 2.07 homes per acre. Average lot sizes will approach 12,000 square feet and they provide for desirable lots and usable yards. There will be a 10 foot bike path along the south property line which will contribute to the bicycle connectivity. The preservation of the wetlands along the south property line look nice and are an additional buffer from the homes. Two access points will be located on Petersdorf. They have reached out to the owner to the north to get an access easement and align that access drive directly with the high school. In addition to the 35 foot rear yard setbacks on Petersdorf, they will also be enhancing that area with a 10 foot wide landscape area to further delineate the homes from road. With the lots being 11,719 sq. ft. they exceed the lot requirement by 1.5 times and the overall density of 2.07 is significantly less than what is otherwise allowed in SR-3 and borders along the estate residential Comprehensive Plan designation of 0-2 homes per acre.

For this community they are anticipating about four or five floor plans for homes and about four or five elevations. It will give a great deal of variety and avoid monotony. They



anticipate the square footages would fall somewhere in the range of 2,600 and 3,300 Sq. Ft. There will be three car garage options as well. The floor plans are open style and designed for entertaining. He thanked the Board.

Chairman Camerer asked how locked in they are to the two story concept. Many residents are saying Bartlett needs more ranch houses. Is there any thought in expanding for a ranch style house.

Mr. Rosanova stated that they do not want to do ranches for this community because they feel the high school will be a big draw and not so much for empty nesters and seniors.

Chairman Gabreyna stated that there was a gap between the existing subdivision and your subdivision on the map, why would you not incorporate that.

Mr. Rosanova stated that to the south is residential, to the west, the Comprehensive Plan lists a mixed use business park and residential and to the north is residential. The trend in development in this area he thinks will be residential, overall. He thinks that as you transition from Army Trail to the west and north, ultimately you can transition to lower density. The property to the south and north is all the same property and that will probably come in together with a consistent land use.

Mr. Mraz stated that this property was part of the old Harbecke farm. The Village thought that this corner could eventually be some big box type of store because there was an interest. The village turned down a residential development because the commercial business went under contract. There was litigation at the county level, partially because the village turned down the residential. After years, it was resolved and Mr. Harbecke held on to this piece because there has been some talk that it could be a stadium for the high school as well so it stayed out of the comprehensive plan. The village held out that a commercial business would want to go there some day. When you look at the test of time and the LaSalle factor, it seems to be that it should be a residential property. Harbecke sold the rest of the property, but held this 15 acres throughout the litigation. Somehow the financial terms were different on this piece that he held out. Now you are hearing of a plan with what seems to be a reasonable zoning change.

Chairman Reinke asked if the same party owns the other 60 acre property.

Ms. Grill stated that they do not.

Mr. Rosanova stated that the parcel to the north and west is owned by Baps Shri Swaminarayan Mandir.

Mr. Mraz stated that they ran utilities through there. He believed that they had hoped it would someday develop residentially based on where they granted easements for utilities.



Chairman Reinke stated that he is concerned that something later on might happen to the BAPS property where they can't get residential housing there and industrial building want to go there. The residents will not like it.

Mr. Mraz stated that the utilities line up with where the roads were located on the original residential map, so it is going to be something residential. Their intent was to develop it residential as well.

Mr. Rosanova stated that the water main is located along the north property line for their homes, which feeds into your history about how the line travels west.

Chairman Deyne asked what the homes typically retail for.

Mr. Rosanova stated that they are typically in the high 400's and low 500's.

Chairman Hopkins stated that he likes the subdivision, but he is concerned about the land use to the north and west. He asked if the village can put in a requirement that before anyone purchases a home, they are aware that the area next to them is zoned industrial.

Mr. Mraz stated that the village has done that in the past. BAPS would need to be the contact, and he wouldn't think they would objectify to a zoning change.

Ms. Grill stated that the 60 acres is zoned residential at the county.

Chairman Hopkins stated that we have it zoned differently.

Chairman Deyne stated that he appreciates the concern the other chairman are coming up with. He asked why we can't change the zoning.

Ms. Grill stated that none of these properties are in the Village.

Mr. Mraz said the Comprehensive Plan can be amended though.

Mr. Rosanova stated that they would not be opposed to adding a disclosure to potential home buyers. Additionally, it was his understanding that the village may be reviewing its 2004 Comprehensive Plan to see if it's still accurate.

Chairman Hopkins asked what the time frame was for them to come back.

Mr. Rosanova stated that this meeting was to just check and make sure they are on the right path and if they get that feeling they will regroup with the design team and staff and really start looking at the nuts and bolts in the next 60-90 days.



Chairman Hopkins asked if anyone objected to them moving forward.

Chairman Deyne stated that he liked the plan.

Chairman Hopkins stated that he liked the plan.

COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Project Oak

Chairman Gabreyna stated that the request is for a property located at the east side of Spitzer road, north of the ComEd right-of-way for a 399,666 Sq.Ft. warehouse building.

Ms. Grill stated the building would be their phase one. There would be a 75,000 Sq.Ft. addition as part of phase two on 26 acres. It is located on proposed lot #1 in the Brewster Creek Business Park in Cook County. A 17,383 square foot office space is identified at the northwest corner of the building with the remaining 382,316 square feet designated for warehouse space. The proposed building would be constructed with insulated, precast concrete panels with recessed pre-cast accent panels. The color palette proposed will consist primarily of varying shades of white/gray with blue and orange color accents. Pre-finished metal canopies will be located over the entranceways and over the patio area. The overall proposed height of the building would be 44 feet, but to allow for some flexibility within the interior of the building, the petitioners are requesting a Special Use Permit to increase the maximum height allowed for the building from 45 feet to 50 feet. The Site Plan identifies 62 exterior docks. The I-2 EDA Zoning District requires the docks on the north side of the building to be enclosed and recessed 15 feet from the front building elevation due to their location along a corner side yard. In this case it would be Jack Court. The petitioner is requesting a variation from this requirement along the north side of the building. Landscaping, including evergreen trees, will be incorporated along the north property line and the required parkway tree plantings along Jack Court will also provide screening of this loading area from the roadway.

Three curb cuts are proposed along Spitzer Road on the west property line and one along the future Jack Court on the north property line. Passenger vehicles would utilize the two northern curb cuts to access the employee parking area, with the southernmost curb cut to be utilized as an entrance/exit for trucks only. The curb cut on Jack Court is identified as an exit only for trucks. Each of the curb cuts for the truck entrance/exits would be gated, with trucks equipped with an electronic system that would enable them access to the loading areas. The petitioner is requesting a variation to allow for a reduction in the required number of parking spaces on the property. The site plan identifies 272 parking spaces, including eleven handicapped accessible spaces. The zoning ordinance requires 447 spaces for phase 1, and if phase 2 were built, a total of 522 parking spaces would be



required. The plan, however, identifies 253 future land banked parking spaces, which would increase the total parking provided on this site to 525 spaces, and if constructed, would satisfy the zoning ordinance requirement. The Site Plan also identifies 30 truck trailer stalls for additional parking along the south property line, adjacent to the parking area. Landscaping is proposed adjacent to this parking area along the south property line. A seven foot high black, vinyl clad fence is proposed within the corner side yard along future Jack Court to secure the loading dock areas. This fence would exceed the four foot high maximum permitted in a corner side yard and as a result, the petitioner is requesting a variation to allow for the proposed fence height. The photometric and landscape plans are currently being reviewed by the staff. The staff recommends forwarding the petition to the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Plan Commission for further review and to conduct the required public hearings.

Chairman Deyne is interested in what the Zoning Board of Appeals and the Plan Commission will say about this because it is in the Cook County portion of Brewster Creek and the village has been trying to get someone on that side. He asked if the petitioner is present this evening.

Ms. Grill stated that they were.

Chairman Gabreyna asked about the parking variation. She asked why the village would approve of reducing the required amount of parking.

Ms. Grill stated that in phase 1, they don't require as many parking spaces as our zoning ordinance requires. If need be, they have land banked 253 spaces and if the villages deams that there is a need for additional parking, we can request that they add it. Since they do not meet the current zoning requirement, they have to ask for a variation.

Chairman Gabreyna stated that there was at least one other business in the park that had an issue with their parking and they had to do a lot of shuffling. She wants to make sure that doesn't happen again and questioned if we have zoning for parking, why would we allow it.

Ms. Grill stated that the other two users that have land banking agreements with the village have not had a parking problem.

Mr. Reinke stated that he would assume the petitioner would have a pretty good understanding of its parking utilization. He likes that the village is using land banking just in case.

Chairman Hopkins confirmed that there are no parking allowed on the streets in Brewster Creek.



Ms. Grill stated that was correct.

The item was forwarded on to the Zoning Board of Appeals and Plan Commission.

Bartlett Tap Special Use Permit

The petitioner is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow live entertainment indoors utilizing a small amplification device. The petitioner plans to host live music, comedy nights, open mic events and trivia nights on a recurring basis. She did not have any concerns with the request.

Chairman Deyne stated that the owner had talked about possibly having a jazz group in there and did not have any intentions of having a rock band or anything like that in there. The owner told him that he wants to keep it a family destination.

The item was forwarded on to the Plan Commission for further review.

ROLL CALL VOTE TO ADJOURN

AYES: Trustee Camerer, Carbonaro, Deyne, Gabrenya, Hopkins, Reinke

NAYS: None

ABSENT: President Wallace

MOTION CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 7:59 p.m.

Sam Hughes Deputy Village Clerk