



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

J. Lemberg called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call

Present: J. Lemberg, Chair, A. Hopkins, M. Hopkins, D. Gunsteen, J. Miaso, D. Negele, and T. Ridenour

Absent: J. Kallas

Also Present: Planning & Development Services Director, Roberta Grill, Village Planner, Kristy Stone

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the June 11, 2020 meeting minutes.

Motioned by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: D. Gunsteen

Roll Call

Ayes: A. Hopkins, M. Hopkins, D. Gunsteen, J. Miaso, D. Negele, T. Ridenour, and J. Lemberg

The motion carried.



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

**(#18-21) Southwind Business Park Subdivision
Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision**

K. Stone the subject property was annexed to the Village and was zoned to the PD (Planned Development District) in 1988. A Conceptual Land Use Plan was approved, which showed this property as being commercial and industrial uses. In 1993, there was an amendment to the Annexation Agreement due to the State of Illinois condemning 866 acres of the total parcel for what is now known a James Pate Philip State Park. The Petitioner is requesting a Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision for the 20.54-acre Southwind Business Park to create five (5) lots. The Bluff City Office Building is located on Lot 1, Parkland Prep Academy is located on Lot 2, and True North has submitted a Site Plan that is before you today for Lot 4. There are two (2) curb cuts on Route 25, at Benchmark Lane and Southwind Blvd, and also one on at W. Bartlett Road on Southwind Blvd. A new curb cut is proposed between Lots 4 and 5 on W. Bartlett Road. These parcels are served by the existing stormwater drainage and detention system that is already constructed. The developer will install a bike path and berm along the south side of W. Bartlett Road in accordance with the West Bartlett Road Corridor Plan. Staff recommends approval of the Petitioner's request subject to the conditions outlined in your Staff report and also would like to add a following Condition G that the Petitioner works with the Villages of Bartlett and South Elgin, and IDOT to construct the bike path crossing at Route 25. The Petitioner is present. **M. Hopkins** asked what will be the role of the developer in coordinating the crossing on the bike path across Route 25? **K. Stone** typically, they are responsible for paying for the bike path up until the property line as part of the subdivision. The work in the right-of-way is going to involve significantly more cost than just that because it would involve pedestrian signals and a cross walk, and there are utility poles that have to be moved that are existing. It is not as simple as just putting in a bike path and striping it. **T. Ridenour** Condition G is not on the paperwork. **K. Stone** it is a new condition because we were not aware that IDOT had removed that item from their budget. **A. Hopkins** is the Petitioner paying for the bike path? **K. Stone** yes and they will be coordinating with IDOT.

J. Lemberg swore in the Petitioner **Dean Kelley** and asked if he had anything else to add. **D. Kelley** staff covered it. I am sure we will have a challenge with coordination between IDOT and some other things that need to be done, but we will see what we can do. **T. Ridenour** asked if there was a road between Lots 4 and 5. **K. Stone** it is going to be a cross access easement. It is not a publicly dedicated road. It is an access point. **T. Ridenour** is it 463' from that road to Route 25? **K. Stone** yes. **A. Hopkins** is there a reason that is not going to be a regular road? **R. Grill** it is a full road. It will be a private street and is going to be a cross access easement shared for maintenance purposes between Lots 4 and 5. **A. Hopkins** will people be able to use it? **R. Grill** yes, absolutely.

A. Hopkins made a motion to pass along a **positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#18-21) Southwind Business Park Subdivision** for a Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision subject to the conditions and the Findings of Fact outlined in the Staff report and the



**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020**

additional Condition G to coordinate with the Villages of Bartlett and South Elgin, and IDOT to construct the bike path crossing at Route 25.

Motioned by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: D. Negele

Roll Call

Ayes: A. Hopkins, M. Hopkins, D. Gunsteen, J. Miaso, D. Negele, T. Ridenour.

The motion carried.



**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020**

(#20-03) True North

Site Plan Review

Special Use Permits:

- A. Automobile service station
- B. Truck stop establishment
- C. Package liquor sales
- D. Outdoor sales

The following exhibits were presented:

Exhibit A – Picture of Sign

Exhibit B – Mail Affidavit

Exhibit C – Notification of Publication

Exhibit D – Letter from resident

Exhibit E – Letter from resident

The Petitioners present Ryan Howard, CFO of True North and David Ney, Environmental Expert for True North, and on behalf of the Petitioner, Michael Werthmann, Traffic Engineer, KLOA, Tim Shoemaker, Civil Engineer, RTM Engineering Consultants, Tod Stanton, and Landscape Architect, Design Perspectives were sworn in by the Chairman, Jim Lemberg.

K. Stone stated that the subject property was annexed to the Village in 1988 and was originally planned for commercial uses. There have been several amendments to the Annexation Agreement over the past few years. This site has always been designated for commercial uses. The Petitioner is requesting site plan review for a proposed True North truck stop establishment on 3.8 acres at the southeast corner of W. Bartlett Road and Route 25. This site is the proposed lot 4 in the Southwind Business Park subdivision that was just reviewed. The Petitioner is requesting Text Amendments to define a "Truck Stop Establishment" and to add "Truck Stop Establishments" to the Special Use list in the B-4 Community Shopping Zoning District. The Illinois Gaming Board permits truck stop establishments to obtain video gaming licenses. The Zoning Board of Appeals conducted the public hearing and recommended approval of the text amendments and variation request at their August 6, 2020 meeting. The Petitioner is also requesting Special Use Permits to allow an automotive service station, truck stop establishment, outdoor sales and to sell packaged liquor. This truck stop would include a 5,000 square foot convenience store with eight (8) pump islands for passenger vehicles and four (4) pump stations for diesel trucks. Passenger vehicles would utilize the pumps located north of the building. Diesel trucks would utilize the pumps east of the building. The truck stop is proposing to operate 24 hours, seven (7) days a week. The convenience store is oriented towards W. Bartlett Road. It would have a maximum height of 24 feet and be constructed with masonry and EIFS. Metal canopies are proposed over the windows and the front entrance of the building. Staff requested that the Petitioner use the same building materials for the canopy posts as the building and the Petitioner has agreed to do so. The Site Plan identifies a full access curb cut along the east property line onto the cross-access easement, which we were just talking about for the previous case. There are also two (2) access points



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

proposed onto Benchmark Lane to the south. The Staff would like to thank the Petitioner for agreeing to the change the western curb cut on Benchmark Lane into a right in/right out with a porkchop. There will be a barrier median. The Zoning Ordinance requires a total of 31 parking spaces, which includes 15 parking spaces for the convenience store and two (2) parking spaces for each pump island. The Petitioner is providing a total of 58 passenger vehicle parking spaces, which exceeds the Zoning Ordinance requirement. The Petitioner is also proposing two (2) truck parking spaces on the site, which is a requirement to be a truck stop establishment.

This site is located within the West Bartlett Road Corridor Plan and is identified as being in the "Picturesque Western Gateway". As a part of this plan, a 10-foot wide bike path and 18" berm are proposed along the north property line. The Petitioner requested a Variation to reduce the number of trees required in the interior parkway along Route 25 and W. Bartlett Road. Based on the concerns expressed by the Zoning Board of Appeals at their meeting on August 6, 2020, the Petitioner agreed to replace two (2) of the small deciduous trees along W. Bartlett Road with large deciduous shade trees. This parcel is served by the existing stormwater drainage and detention system. Staff is reviewing the Landscape and Photometric Plans.

Staff recommends approval of the Site Plan and Special Use Permits subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact outlined in your Staff report.

K. Stone stated that the Petitioner prepared a video to introduce themselves to the commission. The introduction video was played and viewed by all in attendance.

J. Lemberg asked if there were any questions from the Committee.

T. Ridenour asked about the Landscape Variation. **K. Stone** stated that the Petitioner is required to have nine (9) trees along W. Bartlett Road. They are proposing to put in five (5) trees. **T. Ridenour** asked why the Petitioner was requesting that Variation. **R. Grill** stated that was discussed at the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting on August 6, 2020 and was recommended for approval. It is not under the purview of the Plan Commission to review variations. Staff and the Petitioner negotiated to substitute the two (2) ornamental trees for two (2) large shade trees. The Zoning Board of Appeals concurred. You may; however, ask the Petitioner why they requested the variation. **T. Ridenour** stated that he has seen various types of porkchops at different establishments, some of which can be easily overcome and are so small that you can turn left if you want to instead of right only. I would ask that if you had different plans to give us one that would be very difficult to overcome to make sure it is a right in/right out and one that can be overcome. I think we should try our best to make sure that it is right in/right out. **M. Hopkins** asked what the double lines were on the site plan. **K. Stone** answered that those are painted lines to designate the truck spaces. **M. Hopkins** asked what were the anticipated truck motions on the site. **R. Grill** stated that would be something that the Petitioner's traffic consultant could answer. **M. Hopkins** stated that looking at the building from Route 25, it looks like there is a service yard there. What will be seen on the west side of the building? **K. Stone** answered that those are walls to screen the dumpster enclosure. **M. Hopkins** asked if the rooftop equipment was fully screened. **K. Stone** answered yes, it is. **M. Hopkins** asked if the Petitioner will be playing music. **R. Grill** stated that the Petitioners are here and will



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

give a presentation. **D. Negele** asked to see what the view will be on the east side, as she is concerned what the residents will see. **K. Stone** stated that you can see part of the canopy. **D. Negele** asked what will the residents see out their backyard and what is the name of the street that has the homes? **K. Stone** it is Southwind Boulevard and there is another lot in between that can be developed. The closest house right now is 609 feet from the property line of this site. The plan in the future is for there to be a building in that location. **D. Negele** asked, how high is the fence? **K. Stone** there is landscaping not a fence. **A. Hopkins** asked if we are requiring bricking around the posts? **K. Stone** yes. **J. Lemberg** asked if there were any further questions for Staff. There were no further questions. **Tim Shoemaker, Civil Engineer**, RTM Engineering Consultants came forward for the Petitioner and stated that he suspects people are concerned that this is going to be a large destination truck stop and that is not the case. This is strictly to bring trucks that are already on Route 25 to the site. We have aimed for the minimum requirements to be defined as a truck stop by the State of Illinois. Regarding the tree question, the renderings do not quite show is right. We are limited by water main easements, buried utilities, overhead utilities, and the bike path, so what we have left is a very narrow space to put trees in. If we start picketing trees, you are not going to be able to see anything. If you are driving down the road, your eyes do not focus through something that dense and the Zoning Board of Appeals agreed with that. **J. Lemberg** asked the committee members if there were questions for the Petitioner. **A. Hopkins** asked why the Petitioner needed to call it a truck stop. **T. Shoemaker** stated that to get a video gaming license you have to be a truck stop establishment and there are criteria for how many fueling lanes, how many parking spaces and how many acres, and that is what we are meeting. **A. Hopkins** asked, what is the nearest location? **Ryan Howard, CFO, True North** answered, the nearest location is at Route 59 and North Avenue in West Chicago. **A. Hopkins** what is the size comparison of the facility in West Chicago to this one in Bartlett? **R. Howard** stated that the building is approximately the same square footage. There is no diesel there. There was not enough land there. It is essentially the same. **A. Hopkins** is that one considered a truck stop? **R. Howard**, no, it is not. **R. Grill** just to be clear, there are certain criteria for the definition of a truck stop. It has to have a minimum of 3 acres, the sale of 10,000 gallons of diesel fuel/biodiesel fuel per month, truck parking spaces (they are showing two (2) to meet this requirement), and a separate diesel pumping station. This is very similar to the station across the street in South Elgin. They also sell diesel. They are also a truck stop, they do have gaming at that facility and they have three pumps for the trucks. **D. Gunsteen** asked if the fueling area fuels three (3) trucks at a time total. **David Nye, Environmental Expert**, yes, it fuels three (3) at a time. Typically, a truck will have a master and a satellite. There are three (3) functional lanes. **R. Howard**, typically, what you might consider a truck stop location they are going to have 10 plus lanes for fueling, 50 to 200 parking spots for trucks, showers, a truck wash, and be on 30 to 40 acres. That is not what this is. This is more of a local truck pump and go. **D. Gunsteen** asked how are you keeping trucks from going around the front of the fuel canopy? Are the trucks forced to go on the access drive out onto W. Bartlett Road? **T. Shoemaker** the trucks will stay by the diesel canopies. **D. Gunsteen** asked if there was a truck turning route plan. **T. Shoemaker**, yes for every direction. **D. Gunsteen** asked the Petitioner if they would be using fiber glass underground tanks. **T. Shoemaker**, yes, double wall fiberglass. **D. Nye** stated that they are using double wall fiberglass tanks and that is a requirement. The



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

underground piping feeding the fuel facility and under the canopies is all double wall flexible plastic technology with spill buckets and tank monitoring leak protection. It is all updated to code. Everything under today's code is double wall. There is continuous leak protection, interstitial monitoring of the interspacing between the two walls and the tank and piping area, which would be the containment sumps as well as the tank itself. There is overfill prevention through a drop through flapper device. When it gets 90% full, the flapper starts to raise and when it is 95% it shuts the fuel off. We like to go with the drop tube device versus the audible alarms because a lot of times the driver cannot hear the audible alarm and the drop tube has an instant restriction of flow. **D. Gunsteen** what is the life expectancy of the tanks? **D. Nye** a general manufacturer's warranty of a fiberglass tank is 30 years; however, the life expectancy is much longer than that. There is no published documentation that says the actual life expectancy of a tank. As long a tank is installed and maintained properly in accordance to the manufacturer's procedures, the life expectancy is generally quite a long time. **D. Gunsteen** will there be signs in the parking area that no trucks are not to be running at any time while parked here?

R. Howard we have dispensing signs at every fueling point with instructions for no smoking, no cell phone uses, shut the vehicle off at the fueling point, attend the fueling point while dispensing fuel. Those signs are required by law and actually monitored by the State. **D. Gunsteen** at the two (2) parking stalls requested as truck parking, is it proposed that there will be a "No Truck Running" sign there? **R. Howard** we have not addressed that at this point, but I would be agreeable after a certain hour that there be no truck idling. I would ask for latitude during daytime hours. After 10:00 pm, I expect the truck traffic to be lower and think that is a reasonable request. **D. Gunsteen** asked, can Benchmark Lane have "No Truck Parking" signs so that we do not have truck staging on that road? **R. Grill** I do not anticipate any trucks parking on Benchmark Lane. That is something that we can monitor. **M. Hopkins** asked with the porkchop modified that way it is with the right in/right out with a non-mountable curb, do all of the truck motions still work for the overall Site Plan? **T. Shoemaker** we do not want trucks coming across the front. **M. Hopkins** what will be visible from the street for outdoor sales? **R. Howard** we try to keep a higher quality position in everything we do and while we could make money selling mulch and firewood, we do not engage in that activity. You will not see that at our other sites. The only thing we do outside is propane and ice machines and we wrap the ice machines nicely. They fit right in with the overall development. **M. Hopkins** is there music played at the pumps? **R. Howard** we typically have Sirius satellite radio playing inside the store as well as the dispensers. We are very respectful of the volume. During certain hours, we would be happy to restrict that between 10:00 pm and 6:00 am. That would not be an issue. **A. Hopkins** you had a traffic study done. **T. Shoemaker**, yes and we have a traffic engineer here tonight as well. **Michael Werthmann, Traffic Engineer** came forward to answer questions. **A. Hopkins** asked if there was an estimate of the number of trucks that would be traveling north on Route 25. **M. Werthmann** we do not have an exact percentage. Our directional distribution assumes 35% to and from the south on Route 25, about 30% to and from the north on Route 25. This is overall traffic, not truck percent.



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

A. Hopkins a lot of the people's concerns tonight are that this is going to draw more truck traffic to that intersection. I think it is going to alleviate some of the problem. If trucks are coming from the south and need to stop for fuel, they are going across. I would imagine that this is going to help that traffic. Is there a way to confirm that? **M. Werthmann** anywhere from 60-70% of traffic generated from a fuel center is what we call pass-by-traffic. According to IDOT, Route 25 has 1,300 trucks per day traveling on it and W. Bartlett Road has 350-400 trucks per day. The area is surrounded by industrial/warehouse/construction type uses. We do not foresee bringing trucks in to the area. We are just trying to serve the demand that is already on the road. The truck traffic particularly will be more directional because it is hard for them to make the turns at the intersection to get over to the Mobile. I think this will be getting more of the northbound traffic and eastbound traffic where they can pull in and pull out and keep on moving. **A. Hopkins** I agree. I think this is going to help the flow of traffic and the convenience store, which is much needed in that area and will help the residents as well. **D. Gunsteen** I know you are still reviewing the Photometric Plan, but I am assuming we are using LED full cut off lighting will be used. **K. Stone**, yes. We typically require that they are recessed into the canopy so they do not cause glare for drivers. **D. Gunsteen** they will meet the code requirement. **K. Stone** yes. **D. Negele** to verify, this is 600 feet from the closest resident. **K. Stone** yes, from this site's the east property line to the closest resident's property line, it is 609 feet. **D. Negele** how many feet is it from W. Bartlett Road to the exit taking a right turn from Route 25. What is the distance from Benchmark Lane to W. Bartlett Road? If a truck was turning right onto Benchmark Lane or taking a right onto Route 25, how many feet would a truck travel to get to the traffic light on W. Bartlett Road? I am wondering about stacking causing a backup on Route 25. **K. Stone** it is 300 feet. **M. Werthmann** added that from an overall perspective given the pass-by-traffic it would be about a 2 to 2.5% increase in projected total traffic volume at the intersection of Route 25 and W. Bartlett Road. It is not a significant increase. Our study was very conservative. We increased traffic for ambient growth, which was 6% and we looked at a full build out of all of the parcels as well as the two (2) residential subdivision in South Elgin. We have looked at it all and we are at about a 2 to 2.5% increase in traffic.

J. Lemberg opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Chris Goluba on behalf of Ron Bolger of 1509 Trenton Lane. **C. Goluba** stated that he was there on behalf of **R. Bolger**, a 25-year Bartlett resident who has worked with truck stops before. When I first looked at the site, it reminded me of a Mattress Firm. Are we going to put a truck stop on every corner? Are we going to put a gas station on every corner? We saw what happened to Mattress Firm when they did that. They filed bankruptcy and closed stores. The other problem I see is that I think there is going to be an increase in truck traffic and that will impact the neighborhood. Trucks are loud and noisy, and they pollute the environment. This place is going to be bustling with activity. Route 25 is busy. I think the site plan is overdesigned. Where are the trucks going to park? There are two (2) parking spots for trucks. When truckers stop at these places they are there longer than 5 to 10 minutes to fill up. They want to stay there. There are IDOT requirements that they have to fill. They are going to be there for a long time. You might want to put the "No Parking" signs on the road there because there are going to be trucks parked there



**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020**

unless you have those. The Petitioner answered my next observation. Again, this is an overdesigned plan. It is a congested site. How are the tanker trucks going to pull in and fill up with gas and diesel? What about the delivery trucks? I think there is a huge circulation problem here. I think the Petitioner answered my question. They overdesigned this so they can have gambling here. They are telling the residents that this is not really a truck stop, but in order to gamble, it needs to be at truck stop, which one is it? You are going to sign an affidavit when you file your application with gaming board that you are a truck stop, but you are telling us under oath that this is not really a truck stop, we had to do that so we could have gambling. Also, with the plans, I think there is an issue with the fire marshal code that they need to be able to observe the diesel pumps as well as the gas pumps. From the designs that I saw, I do not think that is going to be met. With regard to the neighborhood, my observations, as I drove through there, there is a retention pond, there are children out playing, there are ball parks, there are going to be lights shining on this neighborhood, and there is going to be diesel fumes. Why are you selling alcohol at a truck stop? If you want to be a truck stop and have gambling, you are not required to sell alcohol. Why are you petitioning to sell alcohol? In conclusion, I know the site is going to bring in a lot of taxes. The site is overdesigned. There are circulation issues, safety issues, and traffic issues. This is negatively going to impact the neighborhood. My client has lived here since 1994. He is proud of his community. He is proud of his elected officials. He is confident that they are not going to overlook these major issues for some tax dollars. This place is full here tonight and if it was not for CO-VID, I bet we could not keep the doors open here. **Janet Susskind** of 1933 Sun Drop Court asked if any of the committee members lived in the area. **A. Hopkins** stated that he used to live in that area. **J. Susskind** you used to live in that area, but you do not now. I feel like we are the red-headed stepchild. Everything you do not want, except for monetarily, you throw onto W. Bartlett Road. We already have the train, which when I moved into Heron's Landing, there were four (4) trains a day and now there are 22 to 24 trains a day. The Village of Bartlett did not fight that very vigorously. There are two (2) main roads going east and we do not need even one (1) truck. Between the trains and the kids going back and forth from school, we do not need it on a two (2) lane road, one (1) in each direction. Everywhere around us, it is one (1) in each direction. Why are you punishing us? We pay our taxes. If you want to put something there, put in something we will use like fast food or a grocery store. What are you doing to us? Our property values have gone down. It is not all your fault, but a lot of it is your fault. Think of us. Do not think of the money. Think of the people. Think of the quality of our lives. Put in something we will use. Especially these days when we only get gas about twice a month. I go down there for gas maybe once a year. I go into Bartlett or South Elgin to shop because we have nothing down there. That is what you should be working on. **Lori Kronberg** of 113 Ruzich Drive stated, I moved into my house in 2005. There was a lot of traffic and I knew that. I was okay with that. There were four to five (4-5) trains a day. Now there are at least 20 trains. I am the last house on the corner. I count them on occasion. I lose track. We do not need a gas station on that corner. There is one right across the street. It is also a truck gas station. It has two (2) pumps. There are never trucks there. I do use the gas station because it is local and they actually have good pricing. We do not need another convenience store that is going to triple price everything. We need a grocery store and retail business on this side of Bartlett. The east side of Bartlett has everything. If you want this, put it on



**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020**

Army Trail Road. Keep it away from West Bartlett. We do not need any more stuff like this on W. Bartlett Road. **Vaughn Atkins** of 1927 Sun Drop Court stated, my main concern is for the children walking down to PS Fuels risking their lives with the trucks and there is a ball park right down the street. **Anna Bata** of 1968 Woodhaven Drive stated, my house backs up to W. Bartlett Road. I already have from dawn to dinnertime trucks barreling back and forth down that road. I do not need them 24 hours a day with a truck stop there. You do not do any upkeep on that road. All we ever get is our roads patched here and there. How would you like your house vibrating all through the day from the trucks going back and forth to the construction and now you want more trucks with a truck stop? Are you going to shut them down from W. Bartlett Road all the way to Route 59? That should be a no truck route. There is only one (1) lane and with all of the other subdivisions being built we are not only going to have dump trucks, we are also going to have semis up and down that road constantly. South Elgin does not let trucks go on that side of Route 25. What are the proposals for the truck routes? We do not need another truck stop there with overnight parking. **Dan & Lindsay Tintera** of 132 Hearthstone Driver stated, we are obviously in opposition of this. We agree with everyone here that this is being built in an area blooming with children. We moved to the area about six (6) years ago. We have two (2) children. How far away does gaming need to be from a school and does this meet those requirements? **R. Grill** it needs to be 100 feet from a school. That is the State statute. **L. Tintera** We do not need more gaming. We get that gaming is fun for everyone. It needs to be in the right place. It is not just about driving revenue dollars. **D. Gunsteen** what is the measurement to the little league fields right across the street. **K. Stone** it is 700 feet. **L. Tintera** it is 1-1/2 miles to the nearest elementary school that my children walk to with trucks driving up and down W. Bartlett Road. Convenience is not what we want and you heard that from the other residents. We need a grocery store. Something sustainable for families. I do not want my children going to a convenience store to buy Slurpys and Kit-Kats. I do not want my children going to a truck stop or whatever you want to call it that has video gaming, alcohol and additional traffic. Does that sound safe and good place for families to you? There are other revenue opportunities. Bartlett is doing okay with all of the different warehouses you are building. I understand what industrial warehouses do for tax revenue. Think outside the box and make sure that you are really meeting the needs of the residents of Bartlett, especially those west of the railroad tracks. **Joseph Fekete** of 193 Abbott Court stated that he lives kitty-corner from the proposal. He has been an electrician for 20 years in IEW, very familiar with construction jobs and everything. It is very minimalistic. Retail jobs. A couple of shifts here and there. You are not really looking for making jobs there. I have three (3) children. My boy is a Raider and plays at the Bartlett youth baseball field right there. We take our bicycles from our house right to that field. There is a school going there. There are all of these great things. We moved there three (3) years ago into a brand-new house. I lived in Hanover Park for 18 years at Irving Park Road and Barrington Road. There are not many places in Illinois that get busier than that corner. They have enlarged that corner so many times and it is still one of the most deadly corners in this area. We do not need a truck stop there. I do not care about the convenience of trucks passing by my house. That is more than irrelevant to me I can assure you. What I do care about is the road construction that is going to take place on top of the terrible traffic that is already on Route 25. You do not even need to add the truck stop. Just as is, that is a backup every day.



**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020**

I never come from Stearns Road up Route 25. I always shot up Munger Road and go down W. Bartlett Road because there is no way I will get home. I will sit from Stearns Road to my home, which is typically 30 seconds, I will sit there for 10 minutes not moving. That is before trucks are trying to pull out. The little porkchop there, a right in/right out. there is never going to be a right out. He is going to be hanging out two (2) lanes. You cannot turn there. It is never going to happen. Go there. The other thing is, my children are already in this main area. Southwind is the limit. They cannot go past there. There are going to be trucks coming in and out of there. There are going to be trucks coming from Route 25 trying to swing that and maybe they miss it and come back going the wrong. We sit all the time at Mobile. They do this silly thing where they make that move over the thing. You will stop that, but you will just create the other side having the same problem, I assure you. This is no good for the community. I will not particularly remain here. If this goes up, I will not live there. I was excited about the school, the parks, and the bike path. It seems family oriented. Let's keep that up. This is not a family-oriented decision and does nothing for the residents. It is not convenient to pay \$5.00 a gallon for milk. It is not convenient to pay \$2.00 for soda or \$3.00 for water. If you are just a gas station, why are you selling liquor and gambling. Be realistic. They were right. That is not what you have in mind. We all know what you have in mind. We all know the type of people it is going to bring to the area. It is not satisfying and again, there is one right across the street. You have to plan your route differently, get gas 5 miles that way or 5 miles that way. I moved there because it is quiet, it is dark, is it beautiful and peaceful and I want it to stay that way. **Donna Jankuc** of 1968 Woodhaven Drive stated, I want to ask the team, make up your mind, what do you want to do with that area of W. Bartlett Road? When I moved in over 13 years ago, it was idealist. It was the best cross between suburban and farm, and very quiet and beautiful. Now, over the past three (3) years or so, we have seen a huge increase in traffic. What are your plans? Do you want to keep it residential or are you trying to turn it into commercial? Right now, if you were to drive down that street, you would have no idea what this area is supposed to be because there are so many pockets of residential and commercial building. You guys need to make up your mind what you are going to do with that area. My suggestion of course, would be to keep it residential because that is the reason all of us moved there. What value does this bring? Everybody here has echoed the same sentiment. We already have a PS Fuels there. This new truck stop is not going to add any value to the residents or the commercial people that are currently working there and the businesses. I go to that gas station all the time and I never see cars waiting to get in there. I never see trucks waiting to get gas. They must be fulfilling the need with no problem. There would not be a need for another truck stop if they are fulfilling the need already. I also noticed that the petitioners really contradicted themselves in reference to serving the truckers and the increase in the number of truckers. One petitioner said, we are just going to be serving the trucks that are already there, but when they had their expert come up, the expert had already identified that there are going to be increase going north to south and east to west, which is it? The residents here can tell you that it is going to be the latter. It is going to be an increase. Also, as other people have mentioned here is the children and the residential community feel that we are trying to keep and not change. I back up to W. Bartlett Road. Right across the street from where I live, not even a block away, there is Nature Ridge Elementary. Every morning, I see families walking their children across the street. If we have more



**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020**

trucks coming by that is going to be a huge hazard for all of those families who are always going across the street to bring their children to school and take them to soccer practice. There is a huge field with soccer practice and baseball going on. There are family activities going on, not trucking activities going on. We need to make sure to keep things safe. As I mentioned, I back up to W. Bartlett Road. I cannot go in my back yard and talk to my spouse that is standing right there. I am not joking. That is a real experience that I have every single day. Now that I am working from home, I actually cannot open my back windows because the back of my house backs up to the road. I can only open my front windows because the trucks are so loud that on my conference calls, people can hear the trucks go by. That is ridiculous. I have noticed with the increase that we have already seen with trucks going by to support the development over the last three (3) years, my house now has cracks in the basement. I now see cracks in the ceilings because of all of the vibrations. I now have a crack in the asphalt in my driveway. I know all of those problems are coming from the trucks. I feel my house vibrating. I am just reiterating what everyone here is saying. We do not want another gas station or truck stop. We do not want it and we do not need it. **Kera Hebenstreit** of 400 Jones Drive stated I have lived in this area for 30 years. It has increasingly gotten worse. Given my experience with the truck traffic there and living there for 30 years and given that I have worked construction for the past 7-10 years and my experience with trucks in that area, what everybody is proposing is not what it is going to be. You are going to have trucks lined up on every main road surrounding that gas station. It is going to be a mess. It is going to be a nightmare. It already is as everybody has stated. The traffic is out of control. Half of that road is only a two (2) lane road. If you are going to make this work at all, you need to make those two (2) lanes four (4) and the four (4) lane part of W. Bartlett Road may as well become six (6) lanes and you need to add about five (5) traffic lights to the road if it is going to at all make sense. I have a 12-year-old daughter. I do not let her walk down W. Bartlett Road to the gas station, but she has plenty of friends who are 12 and 12-years-old who in a group by themselves with no adult supervision walk down W. Bartlett Road to the gas station on Route 25. It is dangerous already. Something a lot of people are not aware of, right across from Spring Lake Estates, on W. Bartlett Road, they are opening up five (5) square miles of rental space for trucks and construction or whoever wants to rent yard space. It is huge already. That right there is going to add to the traffic alone. Those are going to go to this new truck stop. A great point that everybody has already brought up, the gas station that is there now more than suffices. I have never seen it congested with trucks. I have never seen it congested with cars and again, I have lived there for 30 years. I do not think it is appropriate. I do not think it is necessary. I think it is going to bring a lot of danger to the community.

J. Lemberg asked if there was anyone else in the audience that had a comment or question. No one else came forward.

J. Lemberg closed the Public Hearing.

J. Lemberg asked if anyone from the Plan Commission had questions or comments for Staff or the Petitioner.



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

A. Hopkins asked Staff, with the possibility of increased truck traffic, is there any way to limit truck traffic, regardless of if this goes in or not, going east down W. Bartlett Road? **Lynn Means**, Village Traffic Consultant stated that W. Bartlett Road from Route 25 to just past the site limits is under Kane County jurisdiction and just to the east of that is under Cook County jurisdiction. It is a higher classification roadway, which is meant to serve higher volumes of traffic as well as to serve as a truck road. By nature, it is not a residential street. That would be something that you would have to petition. **A. Hopkins** Cook County is in charge of that road? **L. Means** yes. **A. Hopkins** the amount of truck traffic and potholes, that is Cook County. **L. Mean** yes, the majority of that is Cook County. **A. Hopkins** I believe there is a portion that is run by Elgin and by Spring Lake Estates. **L. Means** there is Kane County and the majority of it is Cook County on W. Bartlett Road. **A. Hopkins** there are some things that just cannot be changed at this meeting tonight. **L. Mean** correct. **A. Hopkins** I just wanted to get that clarified. Are there accident numbers at that intersection? **L. Mean** as part of the traffic study, they did look at crash history and I believe it was less than 15 crashes per year on average over a five (5) year period and for a signalized intersection, there was no significant history or anything to indicate that there was severe crash history or need of mitigation as a result of the crashes at that location. **M. Hopkins** the traffic engineer that the Petitioner brought from KLOA said that the traffic impact was going to be about a 2% increase. Do you agree with that? **L. Means** yes. They did do a very thorough analysis of traffic where they looked at existing traffic conditions. They followed the Institute of Transportation Engineers as well as IDOT standards where they project over five (5) year period using Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning what they expect for growth in the area as well as considered all of the undeveloped parcels that are currently planned or in the works with some of the residential and potential commercial in that area and generated traffic for that and assigned that traffic to it as well as, based on our experience with similar developments, we concur. The majority of the type of traffic for gasoline stations, convenience markets as well as truck fueling facilities, the majority of that traffic comes already from the adjacent traffic stream. **M. Hopkins** you are saying that the aggregate increase with all of the development including the gas station is 2 percent? **L. Means** just from this site. **D. Gunsteen** asked, will there be increased landscaping for the island where the trucks park? The landscaping plan seems pretty scarce there. **T. Stanton** correct, it meets the bare minimum requirement. The focus was the Bartlett Corridor and Route 25. There could be additional landscaping. There is ability to do a living screen to buffer that island and the fueling area.

D. Gunsteen whether you agree with this particular project or not, I believe competition in this market is good and I believe one of the positives of competition is that it forces the other businesses to keep their place in tip-top shape. I truly believe it is in the best interest of both of those gas station companies to keep their places at the highest level possible and as clean as possible. **A. Hopkins** asked the Petitioner if the packaged sales portion was not approved for alcohol, would



**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020**

you still proceed with the facility. **D. Nye** unfortunately, the economics would not work without it. The items are available within the area and in South Elgin already. This will be bringing in the same tax revenue that is already in the community across into Bartlett. **A. Hopkins** if the packaged liquor sales was granted, would you be willing to do away with the gambling. **D. Nye** the economics of the project do not work without the opportunity to sell all of those different items. This project has been worked on by others within our industry and they have not been able to make the project work to bring it through to the point that we have and I do not think that others within our competitive industry would be able to do that either.

M. Hopkins it is probably clear to everybody in the room what the Plan Commission is. The Plan Commission is an advisory body. We are appointed. We are not elected. We have a very limited purview that is specific, and that has to do tonight with site plan review. We are working from the basis of the published standards that are available to everybody all the time on the website. When everybody moves in and moves out, we can see what the use is designated for this property in our zoning ordinances. There is a zoning map and comprehensive plan available for all of the citizens to look at. The Plan Commission has to work within the constraints of those published standards and then evaluate the technical criteria of each site plan submittal. We do not work on the conceptual level of what should be on the piece of property or what we need or what we feel we do not need. I think you started to see that tonight when we were told we are not even to review the landscaping. I think we need to understand how our civic government works, what our charge is here, what we need to do, what the continuing process is, and how the public interacts with that. The next step would be the Village Board, for approval, which are our elected officials. I wanted to make clear to everybody what this particular meeting is all about. **A. Hopkins** well said Mark.

D. Gunsteen do we need to add another condition that says "No truck idling allowed between the hours of 10:00 pm and 6:00 am" that they will need to post and to add the maximum allowed landscape screening.

A. Hopkins added, it is a good-looking building and a good-looking facility. I did used to live in that area and while I was living there, there was nothing out there. I had to travel very far to get anything. A grocery store is absolutely needed out there because there are a lot of homes that are going to be developed out that way that will need to be serviced, but if you prefer nothing be out there and nothing get developed, that is something that could very well happen. We will see how the Commission decides to vote, but I will vote no. I am concerned about the truck traffic, but again that is something that the residents will have to talk to Cook County about.

D. Gunsteen made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#20-03) True North** for a Site Plan Review and Special Use Permits to allow an automobile service station, truck stop establishment, package liquor sales, and outdoor sales



**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020**

subject to the conditions and the Findings of Fact outlined in the Staff report and the two additional conditions: to increase the landscaping within the island east of the truck parking and to post signage stating "No truck idling allowed between the hours of 10:00 pm and 6:00 am".

Motioned by: D. Gunsteen

Seconded by: T. Ridenour

J. Lemberg closed the Public Hearing portion of the meeting.

Roll Call

Ayes: M. Hopkins, D. Gunsteen, J. Miaso, D. Negele, and T. Ridenour

Nays: A. Hopkins

The motion carried.



**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020**

(#20-04) Eastfield Subdivision

Rezoning (upon annexation) from the ER-1 (Estate Residence) Zoning District to the SR-3 (Suburban Residence) Zoning District

Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision

Special Use Permit – to allow a retention basin to discharge into a wetland

Comprehensive Plan Amendment to the Future Land Use Plan to allow the subject property to change from Mixed Use Business Park Uses to Suburban Residential Uses (2-5 dwelling units per acre)

The following exhibits were presented:

Exhibit A – Picture of Sign

Exhibit B – Mail Affidavit

Exhibit C – Notification of Publication

Exhibit D – Letter from Schiff Hardin, LLP

K. Stone stated that Pulte Homes submitted a concept plan for the subject property for 29 single family lots to be zoned SR-3 at the Village Board Committee's May 19, 2019 meeting. The Village Board Committee was receptive of the plan and indicated that the Petitioner should move forward with a full submittal. The Petitioner is requesting to annex, rezone (upon annexation), and subdivide 13.98 acres at the northwest corner of Petersdorf and Army Trail Roads for a 29-lot subdivision. The Petitioner is also requesting to annex just under one (1) acre north of the subdivision, which will be dedicated as right-of-way to provide a second access point for this subdivision. The development would include 27 single family lots with a minimum lot size of 10,010 square feet and an average lot size of 11,543 square feet. Lot 28 will be dedicated to the Park District, which is why the number of lots was reduced from the original concept plan and Lot 29 is for the detention area, including a wetland, wetland buffer area, and bike path easement. Upon annexation, the petitioner would be requesting to rezone the property from the ER-1 Estate Residence Zoning District to the SR-3 Suburban Residence Zoning District. The Petitioner is requesting an amendment to the Bartlett Future Land Use Plan, which currently designates the area as "Mixed Use Business Park" and "Estate Residential" to "Suburban Residential". A berm and six (6) foot tall fence would be installed along Petersdorf Road to screen the homes from the Bartlett High School athletic fields. A four (4) foot tall black aluminum fence would be installed along the east side of Lot 29 adjacent to Lots 15-23 to provide a safety barrier between these lots and the retention pond. The Petitioner will be installing a sidewalk along the west side Petersdorf Road and a will be installing bike path within the easement on Lot 29 rather than the Army Trail Road due to the location of the wetland on the site. The Petitioner is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow the retention area to discharge into the wetland buffer. The Landscape and Engineering Plans are currently under review by the Staff. Staff recommends approval of the Petitioner's requests subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact in your Staff report. The Petitioner is present.



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

The Petitioners **Patti Bernhard**, Attorney for Pulte Homes, **Greg Sagen**, Signature Group, Landscape Consultant, **Robert Getz**, VP of Land Acquisition for Pulte Homes, and **Anthony Falkowski**, CEMCON came forward and were sworn in by **J. Lemberg**. **J. Lemberg** asked if there were any questions from the Plan Commission to Staff. **D. Gunsteen** asked if there will be a fence along Petersdorf Road. **K. Stone** stated that there will be a fence from Lot 1 to Lot 10. It is a solid wood fence with metal posts. It will be maintained by the Home Owners Association. **A. Hopkins** asked if there was reason that the fence will be wood and not composite. **R. Grill** the Petitioner can answer that. **D. Gunsteen** asked, where is the shorter fence? **K. Stone** the four (4) foot fence is behind Lots 15-23 because there is a retention pond. That is a more decorative fence so that people can still enjoy the open space behind their yards. **D. Gunsteen** asked what is the general drainage pattern of the water? **R. Grill** the Petitioner can address that. **P. Bernhard**, the attorney for Pulte Homes stated that they are very excited to bring Eastfield Subdivision to the Village of Bartlett. We met with the Village Board a little over a year ago and they gave us good comments to come back to you with the project that we now have. We have 27 home sites. They are single family detached. They are designed for move-up buyers. This is not a first-time home. This is the perfect location right across from a high school where possibly some of those families will have students that will attend that high school. We have a very low overall density for the site of 1.93 dwelling units per acre for the overall density. We have very deep lots ranging in size from 155 to 190 feet deep. There are two (2) access points into the subdivision. One of them will be called Falcon Drive and it is directly across the street from Hawk Drive, which takes you into the high school property. The other access is called Eastfield Drive and will come out onto Petersdorf Road on the south side of the property. We are seeking annexation. Our property is contiguous to the Village, so annexation is proper. We are contiguous on the full east side along Petersdorf Road. We are also seeking approval of a preliminary and final plat. Again, it is a 29-lot subdivision with 27 single family homes, one (1) park site, which is 0.63 acres. The last lot is the detention, the wetland conservancy, and floodplain that is on the site. The park site is 0.63 acres and in addition, we will have cash in lieu of \$48,750, which will be the rest of the donation to the Park District. We will turn over the park site graded and seeded, as is required by the Subdivision Ordinance. With the park site, the floodplain, wetland area, and the detention pond, over 37% of this site is open space. Falcon Drive on the north lines up with the high school drive, which is one thing that the Village requested. It is an offsite roadway. We had to do two (2) plats of annexation because we are annexing the roadway separately from our parcel because we do not own that piece of property. The SR-3 District has a number of minimum standards. We considerably exceed those standards so there are no variances being requested. Our gross dwelling units per acre is 1.93 and net is approximately 2.18 acres. **G. Sagen** stated that the parkway trees are provided per Village ordinance along Eastfield Drive. The park site is going to be improved with turf grass and parkway trees along Falcon and Eastfield Drive for the Park District and also a row of evergreen trees that was included in the Village's last Staff review letter. There is going to be a staggered row of eight (8) foot evergreens approximately 15 feet on center to provide screening year-round from the park side from Petersdorf Road. Our lots 1-10 are longer and provide a landscape easement along the backside. The 30-foot easement is going to be slightly bermed and along that berm there will be shade trees, ornamental trees, and canopy trees scattered throughout. The six (6) foot wood fence is going to



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

be located adjacent to the property line five (5) feet in off the sidewalk for bicycle safety and for snow removal. We chose wood because it is a more natural looking fence compared to a composite or vinyl product, which might last longer, but does not have the natural look that we want for this development. That is why the wood fence was chosen. Village standard includes metal posts, which give it good durability and it should last many years. Lots 11-14, which back up to Army Trail Road have additional landscape screening behind them to create further separation and buffering from Army Trail Road. The west property line is a storm water storage basin. The storm water storage basin is going to be a naturalized detention basin that is planted, seeded and plugged with prairie side slopes and wetland vegetation on the bottom. The wetland bottom will be a combination of vegetation and an open water channel to provide the benefits of a naturalized basin. Naturalized basins reduce runoff, slow down the velocity of the run off, increase infiltration in the soil, improve water quality and provide valuable wildlife habitat. The wetland detention basin will ensure that water coming through our storm water system and then leaving into the wetland will be pre-filtered in its treatment prior to entering the next system, which will be a continuation of the process. Along the west side, in the northwest corner, there is going to be an open grass area that will be seeded and along the north property line there will be a double pipe gate at the terminus of Falcone Drive to prevent access into the common area and the farms beyond until a later point in time when that might be utilized, but in the meantime, there would be a double gate to control that. There is a fence along the back of Lots 15-23 to provide security from those lots to the wetland area as well as providing limited encroachment that might happen into that natural area. **M. Hopkins** what is the concept behind the seeded area? **G. Sagen** the seeded area in the northwest corner is going to be low maintenance turf that can either be mowed for passive play or it can be left to grow as a low meadow. It is not native planting in the northwest corner. The balance of the basin, the southern two-thirds of the western border is native planting. **M. Hopkins** what is the construction of the channel? **G. Sagen** the open water basin within the wetland is to provide for different habitat. It is going to be a deeper pool of water within the wetland. The wetland itself will be a mud flat with zero grade and drop down to a three (3) to four (4) foot area that will have the open water channel. **A. Hopkins** is there a reason why the fence is going to be wood instead of composite or vinyl. **G. Sagen** again, we feel that wood is a more natural product in the environment and holds up well with the metal reinforced posts. We prefer that over the vinyl or composite. They look unrealistic. Our preference is a natural product. **M. Hopkins** asked, if Lot 29 is just open space. **R. Getz** stated that the space is essentially site-specific floodplain. We cannot build anything there. It is not going to be a maintained turf field. It is going to be open space and that open space is going to be there because it is site-specific floodplain that we need to leave as open space. We cannot build in it. There is going to be no use for it. It is going to be an open grassland area. It will be owned by the Home Owner's Association. The homes we are going to be offering for sale are from 2,600 to 3,800 square feet. All of the homes will be standard four (4) bedroom and could go to five (5) or six (6) bedrooms if you chose take a first-floor flex space and turn that into a sixth bedroom on the first floor, which is popular with buyers. The garages are standard two-car, but there are three-car options for all of the homes. Each home has five (5) elevations on each except for the Greenfield, as that is the smallest home and we do not get as many people choosing that one, but we do have four (4)



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

homes, basically five (5) elevations on each, which is 25 different elevations for 27 lots. The idea is to make sure that we have a lot of variability. Each home has a different architectural style to give a much different look to the homes throughout the subdivision. All five (5) of the Riverton models have a usable porch on the front. We look to use a variety of materials and styles of garages for a different look. **D. Negele** can you build any home on any size lot. **R. Getz** yes, because the lots are so large, any house would fit on any lot. There are no restrictions. **M. Hopkins** with the 25 potentially different homes, are you going to say to somebody, you cannot have that one? **R. Getz** we will have a monotony code in place. We will not make everyone take a different one, but will limit from an elevation standpoint and color palate selection. **D. Negele** how many homes down can they go before you can do another home. **R. Getz** two (2) houses down on either side one (1) across the street. **J. Lemberg** asked, what is the price range. **R. Getz** the base pricing will be in the mid-400s and with options selected we anticipate the closing price in the mid-500s. **D. Negele** do you know how much the Home Owner's Association fees will be? **R. Getz** it will be \$140 a month per resident. That is going to generate about \$45,000 a year. Of that \$45,000 a year, about \$15,000 will go towards the maintenance of the storm water retention areas, \$5,000 in reserves for the detention area, and the remainder go towards maintaining the other open common areas. Pulte is very careful with the HOAs budgets to make sure there is excess money rather than a short fall because we want to make sure our communities are in good shape not just in the short-term, but in the long term. **A. Hopkins** how did we come up with the street name of Falcon Drive? I do not know if that is a great idea since Glenbard East High School are the Falcons. **K. Stone** the names they originally proposed were ones that the high school already used for the private drives. **R. Grill** it is not approved yet, so it can still be changed. **A. Hopkins** maybe the Village Board can come up with some ideas. Will people be parking there when there are activities at the high school? **R. Grill** it will be a publicly dedicated street. I think that is going to have to be monitored. **D. Gunsteen** is there a proposed crosswalk at Falcon Drive? **R. Grill** there is not a crosswalk because that street does not exist yet. **D. Gunsteen** can we add it? Kids are going to be running back and forth. **R. Grill** that is something that we can talk to the developer about. **D. Gunsteen** I would like to see a painted crosswalk there. **R. Getz** if the entity that owns the road will allow us to do that, we would have no problem painting that crosswalk. **R. Grill** we will check with Public Works.

P. Bernard the Village received a letter from Janet Johnson at Schiff Hardin and James Murphy is here today from Schiff Hardin as well. Because of that, I would like to have **A. Falkowski**, my engineer do a presentation to talk about the storm water management on the site. **A. Falkowski** of CEMCON stated that the existing site drains in two (2) directions to the northwest corner and to the southwest through the wetlands to an existing drain tile that leaves the site and proceeds through to the adjacent property to the west. With the development, we have to follow DuPage County's ordinance and met their allowable release rate. DuPage County also has a requirement on their wetlands that we cannot do a direct impact. We have to have the wetlands act as if they were not even touched. We have two (2) discharge points. We have an RCP pipe with a restrictor that is going to discharge directly to the wetlands and then will discharge to the preexisting drain tile through the adjacent property. The primary discharge will be at the north. It



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

will be a 3" restrictor that will substantially be reducing the flow from the existing features of the site to the proposed conditions. This site is not mapped FEMA Floodplain, but with the DuPage County ordinance any site that has over 100-acre tributary to it you have to do a study and distinguish a base flood elevation for the site. We did that study and that is why that corner is undevelopable. **M. Hopkins** could you locate the detention basin within that corner? **A. Falkowski** no, we could not. The outfall is discharging directly in that corner. It was recommended by the Village of Bartlett not to directly connect into the drain tiles because drain tiles are designed for low flow. **M. Hopkins** the outflow is over grade. **A. Falkowski** yes. The flow is substantially reduced. In the existing condition is it approximately 19.5 CFS and with the 3" restrictor, we are only releasing 0.4 CFS per acre. **M. Hopkins** how high is the retaining wall behind the lots? **A. Falkowski** it is a 2-1/2 foot retaining wall. **M. Hopkins** what is the issue with the neighbor. **A. Falkowski** the neighbor recommended that we tie directly into the drain tiles with our outfall so that we did not have any over-land-flow. The issue with that is with the design. The Village of Bartlett does not want us discharging directly to a drain tile. We do not know the conditions of this drain tile. We do not know if it is back-pitched or the flow capacity, and in good engineering practice, you do not tie directly into a drain tile with flow. It is only designed for low flow. **M. Hopkins** the letter from Schiff Hardin says "you are going to do damage to our property and create wetlands that were not there before and make it undevelopable in the future." How do we respond to that? **A. Falkowski** one of the points they brought up was a volume issue with the all of the impervious area we are creating, but the way our storm water management is designed, we are only reducing the flow and that extra volume is being distributed and will draw down a lot slower when we are releasing out of that pond. **M. Hopkins** are we with confidence able to say that your engineering complies with DuPage County? **A. Falkowski** we are following the Village of Bartlett's requirement for design. We have our hands tied with DuPage County. They are following the DuPage County requirements on release rate and the wetland. **M. Hopkins** you are doing what you have to do. **A. Falkowski** yes, per Ordinance requirements. We are working with the property owners on alternative options of our outlet to possibly distribute the flow over a level spreader so they do not see that flow directly over land. We are in the process of working through that. **P. Bernhard** we did have a call today with Schiff Hardin with James Murphy and his consultants. We are committed to working with them to address any issues that they have. We are complying with DuPage County, the Village, and the State. We have ideas and will prepare plans for their engineers to review so that by the time we get to Committee of the Whole we hope to have a plan in place between all of us so that their concerns are alleviated and the site will still be operational as it is. We are in compliance with the Staff recommendations. We do know that they want approval of engineering. We are going to work with the neighbor next door and hopefully get that engineering approved. We are asking that the Plan Commission give us a positive recommendation to the Village Board and we are here to answer any questions. **D. Gunsteen** asked who would maintain the street lights. **K. Stone** the street lights are maintained by the Village.

J. Lemberg opened the Public Hearing portion of the meeting.

Keith Yaun of 2NW515 Orchard Road, came forward and stated I would have the unfortunate



**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020**

event of looking at a property with 27 homes, I believe. I can appreciate what Pulte is trying to do. It is a beautiful property. Right now, north, east, south and west of me is all rural. Residents in that area bought for a specific reason, for the rural look and feel not to look like what happened on W. Bartlett Road. It is inevitable that the property would be built on at some point. I am asking that you re-consider the SR-3. These properties should be an acre plus. This will stick out like a sore thumb and it is unfortunate. I am guessing this is phase a of probably 2 or 3. If you are looking to dump all of that traffic onto Petersdorf Road, which is already a cluster from the high school traffic, I do not know if you spent any time looking at the traffic flow at Petersdorf Road in the mornings and afternoons, but it is a mess. If you look to phase in this and other homes into the area and dump it all on Petersdorf Road, its bad. I avoid it going to work. I go the long way to work so I do not go through the high school traffic. People will be parking on that road all the time for ballpark parking. There is not a lot of parking there. It is only the high school. We have people parking on our streets every once in a while, for major events. Falcon Drive has a gate at the end, so I am going to guess that this is phase 1 of many and is my primary concern. I am on the north side of that property and a lot of my storm water since we do not have drains, goes down my property and into the easement of the field and I am dependent of that northeast corner to have all of the storm water taken away from my property. If it is blocked or there are elevated properties on that farmland, I am concerned that I am going to see back-up of storm water, which is a lot since I take on a lot of the neighborhood's water down my property, but I am dependent of it dumping into the field. One of my primary concerns is storm water retention and where that water is going to go. If you are going to build here ER-1 is the way to go. I am going to say no to the SR-3. I think it is a really bad idea for the look of the neighborhood. We do not want subdivisions. We want rural. That is why we all bought there. I have been there for 14 years and would like to stay there. I would say no to the annex. **James Murphy** of Schiff Hardin representing the property owners to the north and west of the proposed development. The letter from Janet Johnson outlines my clients concerns. To summarize the letter, my clients are concerned that the drainage and detention plan will actually increase the volume of water that is drained onto their property and would possibly cause exacerbation of exiting wetlands and create new ones. There could also be other negative affects that would impact the property as outlined in the letter. On the call today with **P. Bernhard** and the engineers to address my client's concerns, they indicated that they are willing to work with us to try to address their concerns prior to the final engineering plans. We appreciate that. They proposed one alternative today that we are willing to explore once we can get my client's engineers involved to look at the plans and understand what is going on give us their opinion on what is going to happen to the property. My client has an additional concern that whatever drainage and detention systems are constructed they must have someone responsible for maintaining, repairing, and replacing them. It sounds like there will be a Home Owner's Association created as part of this. We would like a declaration in the HOA document to say that the HOA and the property owners are responsible for maintaining, repairing, and replacing these systems so they do not fall into disrepair. On the Plat, it states that the Village can step in and do it for the HOA and property owners. That is a great idea and we support that. **Jacqui Edler** stated, my main concern is the safety of our children. The traffic on Petersdorf Road is crazy in the morning. Going into the high school from Falcon Road would be horrendous. The



**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020**

teenagers are going to be flying across trying to get in. People are going to get hurt. I do not have a problem with a subdivision going, but it is zoned for two (2) acres. How do you shove 27 homes into that little lot? It is impossible. All of our lots are at least two (2) to 10 acres. For your children's safety, would you want to buy a house there? I am for the homes. Keep it at ER-1. Even if it is one (1) acre homes it would be better than these slop houses they are going to throw in there and who can afford a \$500,000 house with associations fees? INAUDIBLE I do not know why they are not coming out onto Army Trail Road instead. There is no stop light at Petersdorf Road. Please consider everything before you let this go through. INAUDIBLE **Sandra Dyer** of 29W600 Schick Road stated she would like to know what is the precedent being used for the less than quarter-acre lots. As you can see from the map there is nothing even close to that size. This does not conform to anything in the area. Where are the closest 10,000 square foot lots in the area? **R. Grill** the nearest 10,000 square foot lots are west of Route 59 in Woodland Hills, to the east on Schick Road in Fairfax, and the north side of Schick. Some are smaller than 10,000 square feet. **Sandra Dyer** What is the traffic impact study and how many houses can be crammed onto the 60 acres, which is the total area? This is not conducive to the rest of the area and that is a concern. I do feel it will devalue the existing properties because those are large properties and that is why people have moved there. Do we really need to break up some of the last existing land in unincorporated Bartlett by putting in these types of homes? The traffic on Petersdorf Road and Schick Road is terrible already, particularly in the mornings and this is going to add a lot more traffic to Petersdorf Road and Schick Road.

J. Lemberg closed the Public Hearing portion of the meeting.

P. Bernhard to hit on a few of the points, the rural look of the land, the homes are obviously in unincorporated DuPage County. We are looking to come into the Village of Bartlett, specifically for water and sewer. We want to have city utilities for the residents of our subdivision. We did not do a traffic study because it is a such a small subdivision with only 27 lots. We will work on doing a cross walk at Petersdorf Road at the end of Falcon Drive. Pulte puts up houses all over Illinois and other states and they do put up very nice houses, \$400,00 to \$500,000 homes that people buy and at that amount they are going to take care of it and the HOA is also going to make sure they take care of those houses. In terms of setting and precedents for the BAPS property, we do not own any of the rest of the property and we do not know what is going to happen with the rest of the property. We are just looking at getting our property zoned, approved, and build houses in the Village of Bartlett.

M. Hopkins with regard to storm water and the discharge on the site right now to the north, once this detention basin storm water management system is installed, what will be the delta between the discharge to the north today and when the project is finished? **A. Falkowski** it will be less than the exiting condition.

D. Gunsteen made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#20-04)** Eastfield Subdivision for rezoning (upon annexation) from the ER-1 (Estate



**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020**

Residence) Zoning District to the SR-3 (Suburban Residence) Zoning District Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision, Special Use Permit to allow a retention basin to discharge into a wetland, and Comprehensive Plan Amendment to the Future Land Use Plan to allow the subject property to change from Mixed Use Business Park Uses to Suburban Residential Uses (2-5 dwelling units per acre) subject to the conditions and the Findings of Fact outlined in the Staff report.

Motioned by: D. Gunsteen

Seconded by: T. Ridenour

Roll Call

Ayes: M. Hopkins, D. Gunsteen, J. Miaso, D. Negele, A. Hopkins, and T. Ridenour

Nays: None

The motion carried.



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

(#20-06) Lot 12B Brewster Creek Business Park

Site Plan Review

Special Use Permit - Outdoor truck trailer parking/storage

The following exhibits were presented:

Exhibit A – Picture of Sign

Exhibit B – Mail Affidavit

Exhibit C – Notification of Publication

K. Stone stated that the Petitioner is requesting a Site Plan Review for a proposed 25,000 square foot warehouse building with a 4,000 sq. ft. office area on 5.8 acres on the east side of Humbracht Circle. The proposed building will be painted gray with red accents and constructed with pre-cast concrete wall panels. The Site Plan depicts passenger vehicles parking along the north and west sides of the building. There are two (2) drive-in doors and nine (9) exterior loading docks on the south side of the building. Two (2) curb cuts are proposed along Humbracht Circle. Trucks will enter the site through southern curb cut and exit the from the northern curb cut after utilizing the on-site scale. Passenger vehicles will only be utilizing the northern curb cut. The Site Plan identifies 44 parking spaces, which exceeds the Zoning Ordinance requirement. The Petitioner is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow the outdoor storage of trailers on the site. There are 51 trailer parking stalls on the southern portion of the property. The Village Board will be reviewing the Petitioner's request to eliminate the requirement of installing a berm within the 50-foot wide Landscape Buffer Easement. The Petitioner has provided a cross-section exhibit, which depicts the exiting grade change from the site to the Litchfield Woods Subdivision. The proposed site is approximately 28 feet lower than the residential subdivision. A berm within the easement would not be visible to the homes to the east. The Staff recommends approval of the Petitioner's requests subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact outlined in your Staff report. The Petitioner is present to answer any questions.

J. Lemberg swore in the Petitioner **Russel Scurto**, Triumph Construction Services and **Patrick Clancy**, Rock Fusco & Connelly, LLC. **R. Scurto** stated I have been working with Staff and they do a better job at presenting than I do, but if there are any questions, I am here to answer them. **D. Gunsteen** asked why the scale is out front? **R. Scurto** it is the easiest access to get in and out. **P. Clancy** stated that the scale is out front because that is the easiest access and per Department of Transportation standards the trucks have to be weighed to show their goods when they leave and when they arrive at their final destination. **D. Gunsteen** where is the request for the landscape buffer? **K. Stone** they are requesting an amendment. The Village Board approves that. It is an amendment to Ordinance #2000-54. At the time the Brewster Creek Business Park Subdivision Unit 2 was approved, the grading for this portion of this site had not been completed so we were not aware what the grade changes were between this property and the subdivision to the east. The Village Board thought that an 11-foot berm would help buffer the properties without realizing that the site is already significantly below where the subdivision is currently. Once we received the new



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

information, we realized that the berm is unnecessary. **M. Hopkins** the section details look like they were drawn to make the case that you cannot see the RTU on the roof if you were standing on the property line. What is the precedent in that business park with regard to rooftop screening? **K. Stone** they are required to be screened per the building code. **M. Hopkins** are we skipping that commitment here or is there a request for a variation. **K. Stone** no. **M. Hopkins** I am looking at the south elevation exhibit. It is not showing any screening. It is showing a rooftop unit. It is showing it above the parapet and just under the dash line of the sight line. **K. Stone** sometimes they use other materials to screen mechanicals. It is not required to be a parapet wall. **M. Hopkins** I understand that, but it is not shown here. I think it is a reasonable inference from the diagram that they are making the case that RTU cannot be seen by a sight line. **R. Scurto** that sight line is showing the profile view because we are showing the view from the road, but it will be screened on all sides. **M. Hopkins** thank you that is all I needed to know. **D. Gunsteen** asked what will be the activity and noise level on the site? **R. Scurto** they do not leave trucks running. Trucks will come in and unload their goods, take a break while they are there, get back in the truck once the truck is reloaded with the goods that are going to a different location and they off on their way. It will be about 20 trucks a day. **D. Gunsteen** what time of day will there be that activity? **R. Scurto** during normal business hours between 7:00 am and 5:00 pm. We have built almost every building in that park so we know exactly what is going in and out. This is situated pretty far tucked back in the corner and down below. It is pretty well hidden. The trucks will be in and out during normal business hours.

J. Lemberg opened the Public Hearing portion of the meeting.

Jason Zaley came forward and stated, I am the homeowner directly behind this on Lot 31 in Litchfield Woods. The distance map is taken from my house. The building is directly visible from my house. The elevation that they used, they said was 28 feet below the grade of my foundation, but I do not stand on my foundation, I stand six (6) feet above my foundation. My second floor is 16 feet. I am eyelevel above that foundation. I will be able to see this building. Right now, the back of my property is very lush because we have had a lot of rain, but during the winter, I can see across Brewster Creek Business Park past Munger Road. I can see all of the lights in the winter and lot of those lights do not point down, they point out because those are the original buildings. The new buildings of course do not do that. This building is going to be visible from my house. Also, pollution with truck fumes and noise. They say, normal business hours, but normal business hours could be 6:00 am to midnight. On this side of Munger Road we have low parapet wall buildings. The only high one was the storage and they have been excellent neighbors. They are like mice with no movement. You cannot hear them. I can see that building. This is not a compatible use for this site, absolutely not. All of the heavy stuff is on the west side of the park and all of the light stuff is on the east side. This is not something that is compatible. As for the berm and not allowing it, it is 28 feet high. That is also probably 10 to 12 feet higher than most of the buildings on the east side especially along the east side of Humbracht Circle. Most of those are 16 to 18 feet parapet walls. This is 28 feet. It is not compatible at all. There are other places in this park that they could put it on. I am not saying you should not allow it. I am saying this is not the parcel to put it on. I am not the only homeowner that is going to be affected by this. There are a couple of berms, but



Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020

there is a gap and the reason there is a gap is because my property is the detention area that drains the northern part of the subdivision. With the past heavy rain, it almost overflowed. When you look at the map, next to the building, the southeast corner where it is orange, and the white area are gullies that is drainage from my lot, that is what the detention area does. I have been back there after a heavy rain and there is a waterfall coming off the cliff of that area. I think you need to talk to Public Works because Public Works comes out when it clogs up and drains it and it takes a while to drain. You can see on the aerial the drainage area and now you are going to block it.

J. Lemberg closed the Public Hearing portion of the meeting. **J. Lemberg** asked if there were any questions or comments from the commission. **D. Gunsteen** asked what was the reason for this particular site selection versus any of the others? **R. Scurto** this is actually the only site that fits their needs and their budget. **D. Gunsteen** has water run off been a problem that you have seen when building at this site? **R. Scurto** we have had no problems in this park with runoff. As soon as we build something you get a full storm water detention system.

T. Ridenour made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#20-06) Lot 12B Brewster Creek Business Park** for Site Plan Review and Special Use Permit for outdoor truck trailer parking/storage subject to the conditions and the Findings of Fact outlined in the Staff report.

Motioned by: T. Ridenour
Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Roll Call

Ayes: M. Hopkins, D. Gunsteen, J. Miaso, D. Negele, A. Hopkins, and T. Ridenour
Nays: None

The motion carried.



**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Minutes
August 13, 2020**

Old Business/ New Business: K. Stone we will have a meeting next month.

J. Lemberg asked if there was a motion to adjourn.

Motioned by: A. Hopkins
Seconded by: T. Ridenour

Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:24 pm.