

M. Werden, Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call

Present: C. Deveaux, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, M. Werden Absent: B. Bucaro

Also Present: Kristy Stone, Interim Planning & Development Services Director, Devin Kamperschroer, Associate Planner

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the September 1, 2022 meeting minutes.

Motioned by: G. Koziol Seconded by: J. Miaso

Roll Call

Ayes: C. Deveaux, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, M. Werden Nays: None Abstain: None

The motion carried.

Public Forum

M. Werden opened the public forum. No one from the public came forward. **M. Werden** closed the public forum.



(#22-09) Townhomes at the Grasslands (Phase 2)

The petitioner, Dan Olsem on behalf of Bartlett 59 LLC, 1751A W Diehl Road, Naperville, came forward and was sworn in by Chairman M. Werden. D. Olsem stated, we have a preliminary plat approval for the Grasslands development. This is phase 2 of our subdivision which consists of 116 townhomes units, 27 lots, and 23 buildings on 70 acres. I would be happy to answer any questions. K. Stone I do want to state that this is in substantial compliance with the preliminary plat and preliminary PUD plan that was previously approved by the Village Board and is also in compliance with the development agreement. The only thing that is new are the building elevations since there was not a builder selected previously. M. Werden how do these elevations compare to typical elevations? K. Stone the initial submittal had all vinyl siding. We told the builder that we needed at least 50% brick on the front elevations and that we did not think that would get a positive recommendation without it from this commission. These elevations are what they came back with. They also increased the size of the balconies over the rear garages. Some of the builder's other balconies that they have in the suburbs are significantly smaller. M. Hopkins do the elevations go with this plat approval? K. Stone yes. M. Hopkins if we approve this, the petitioner is bound by the elevations and plans that are submitted. In general, we are not a design commission. We review the planning and zoning. We look for the nuances and quirks where a plan can fail or succeed. We have already done a preliminary plan review on this. If the plans come in without substantial changes and if they are in compliance with the first round, there is little for us to review. M. Werden in this case, it is an improvement over the last time because of the elevations. M. Hopkins we did not review elevations last time. K. Stone staff does recommend approval subject to the conditions and findings of fact in the staff report.

J. Miaso made a motion to pass along a positive recommendation to the Village Board to approve case (#22-09) Townhomes at the Grasslands (Phase 2) Final Subdivision/PUD Plat and Final PUD Plan subject to the findings of fact outlined in the staff report.

Motioned by: J. Miaso Seconded by: M. Sarwas

Roll Call

Ayes: C. Deveaux, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, M. Werden Nays: None

The motion carried.



(#22-13) 2250 Graham Street

PUBLIC HEARING

The following exhibits were presented: Exhibit A – Picture of Sign Exhibit B – Mail Affidavit Exhibit C – Notification of Publication

The petitioner, David Schaefer, DAS Architects, 2500 S. Highland Ave, Lombard, came forward and was sworn in by Chairman, M. Werden. D. Schaefer stated, I am the architect for this project. We are proposing to take an existing trailer storage facility and build 2 new buildings on the site. The total square footage is just shy of 50,000 square feet. Each building is about 25,000 square feet. The new owner is proposing to do truck repair inside the facility and the back of the lot would be for trailer storage. K. Stone I would like to give a little background. In 2003, the Village of Bartlett entered into an annexation agreement for this 186-acre property known as Bluff City Industrial Park. As part of that agreement there is a list of very specific uses that are permitted, special uses and prohibited uses. Over time, it has been questioned why some uses were listed as prohibited versus special uses and this petitioner came in requesting to do truck repair, which is listed as prohibited in the industrial park. Industrial zoning would have typically listed it as a special use. Because of that, the petitioner has to do amendments to the industrial park's PUD plan, the annexation agreement, and the special use for their planned unit development. It really opened up a lot of modifications that we had to make for this use, which would have normally been a special use permit application before you. Staff is recommending approval of this. **M. Werden** will this bring this into alignment with what is going on in 2022? K. Stone exactly. The annexation agreement for this development did have very generic design guidelines, which were, if you had a metal building, the front had to have some masonry on it, which is why the building does have masonry block on the front elevation. M. Hopkins did the report say "split-face CMUs"? K. Stone yes, which technically qualifies as masonry according to their annexation agreement. It is really the first building that we will have out there. This is not a business park like what you see in the Brewster Creek or Blue Heron business parks. M. Hopkins this is far from public view and staff made it clear that the building is surrounded by landscaping. K. Stone they do have more landscaping than what is required per the agreement. M. Hopkins this seems absolutely appropriate to me. M. Werden we like to see things that exceed what we are expecting.

M. Werden opened the public hearing portion of the meeting. No one from the public came forward.

J. Miaso made a motion to pass along a positive recommendation to the Village Board to approve case (#22-13) 2250 Graham Street Amendments to the Bluff City Industrial Park PUD Plan & General Site Plan, modification to the Special Use Permit for a Planned Unit Development, Final PUD Plan Review, Special Use Permit, Amendments to Ordinance #2003-103 subject to the conditions and findings of fact outlined in the staff report.



M. Werden closed the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Motioned by: J. Miaso Seconded by: G. Koziol

<u>Roll Call</u> Ayes: C. Deveaux, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, M. Werden Nays: None

The motion carried.



Old Business/ New Business

K. Stone I know there is 1 typo in the Rules of Procedure where it says "P&C", but we could get a motion to approve with that change and if there is anything else, let me know. **M. Hopkins** I just have one comment. I am not asking for any modifications, but I am very uncomfortable with Section 7 – Subpoena of Witnesses. If we adopt this, I would ask for a session with Bryan Mraz, Village Attorney so that he can explain the mechanics of that and what that would look like in operation. **K. Stone** I had a conversation with B. Mraz about that. We have to allow due process and that covers us for due process. If someone says there is someone that they think their testimony will add value to the discussion (it cannot be someone that they want to hire) its someone that they are trying to get to come to the meeting basically against their will to testify one way or the other. B. Mraz said that the odds of this ever happening are slim, but we need to have something in the procedure for that. **M. Hopkins** if that happened and in a public setting, during a hearing, would we then continue the meeting, but typically, we would know in advance. If there is something controversial, we would have Village Attorney in attendance.

M. Hopkins made a motion to approve the Planning & Zoning Commission Rules of Procedure.

Motioned by: M. Hopkins Seconded by: J. Miaso

Roll Call

Ayes: C. Deveaux, M. Hopkins, J. Kapadoukakis, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, M. Werden Nays: None

The motion carried.

K. Stone next month, we will have a minimum of 3 cases. One of them is a simple 2-lot resubdivision in Southwind Business Park, on one of those lots is a proposed self-storage facility that is requesting a floor area ratio variation. We will have a text amendment on our temporary sign regulations as they pertain to political signage.

M. Werden asked if there was a motion to adjourn.

Motioned by: M. Sarwas Seconded by: G. Koziol

Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:23 pm.