



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
August 1, 2024

M. Werden, Chair called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

Roll Call

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

Also Present: Kristy Stone, Planning & Development Services Director, Andrew Barna, Associate Planner,
Brian Krause, Associate Planner

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the April 4, 2024 meeting minutes.

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

Roll Call

Ayes: B. Bucaro, C. Deveaux, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, J. Battermann, 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.



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
August 1, 2024

(#24-07) 231-251 E Lake St

Rezoning from the ER-1 Estate Residence Zoning District to the B-3 Neighborhood Shopping Zoning District

PUBLIC HEARING

The following exhibits were presented:

Exhibit A – Picture of Sign

Exhibit B – Mail Affidavit

Exhibit C – Notification of Publication

The attorney for the petitioner, **Frank Bongiovanni**, 108 Bokelman St, Roselle IL came forward on behalf of the property owner, Stephen French, SEM Vanderbilt LLC and was sworn in by **M. Werden**. **F. Bongiovanni** stated, we are requesting a rezoning from ER-1 to B-3 Zoning District. The property consists of 3 parcels on the south side of Lake Street. The property was recently annexed into the Village on May 21, 2024. The subject property will be included in the Lake Street Corridor TIF District. We believe that the property meets all seven of the findings of fact for rezoning into a B-3 district, which would be compatible with the existing uses of the other properties along Lake Street including the 7-11, Dairy Queen, auto repair business and restaurants. The proposed rezoning would be compatible with the zoning classifications of the properties in the general area. The properties immediately to the west are currently zoned B-3 and the properties to the east are zoned B-4. The proposed use of this property is compatible with uses permitted under the existing zoning classification. The anticipated proposed uses would be those that are permitted or will be special uses in the B-3 Zoning District. The trend and character of the development in the general area of the property in question would have a positive impact on the surrounding properties. I am sure that you are aware that the area east of the Dairy Queen to Park Boulevard is an eyesore. That area is underdeveloped and needs to be redeveloped. We believe that rezoning this to a B-3 district will help to spur development in the area. There will not be any negative environmental impacts on the property or the area. The rezoning is also consistent with the Future Land Use Plan and the proposed redevelopment plan of the Lake Street Corridor and is included in the strategic planning. **M. Werden** yes, that area has been an eyesore for years. Why is this property zoned ER-1? **K. Stone** all properties that are annexed into the Village are automatically zoned ER-1 upon annexation. That is our most restrictive zoning. Typically, properties come in for annexation and zoning at the same time; however, the only way to get this property incorporated into the TIF district was to have it annexed first before we complete the rezoning process. **J. Battermann** asked, why are you requested that this is rezoned to B-3 instead of a B-4 to match the east property? **F. Bongiovanni** the B-3 zoning has more uses to fit the area. **K. Stone** B-4 zoning districts have to be a minimum of 10 contiguous acres. **J. Batterman** would rezoning the triangle make those 2 zones come together or would they be separate. **K. Stone** it would be considered one B-3 zone district. **M. Werden** that is very practical. Did you receive any calls for this case? **K. Stone** no, we did not.

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



**Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
August 1, 2024**

B. Bucaro made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#24-07) 231-251 E Lake St** for rezoning from the ER-1 Estate Residence Zoning District to the B-3 Neighborhood Shopping Zoning District subject to the findings of fact and conditions outlined in the staff report.

Motioned by: B. Bucaro

Seconded by: J. Miaso

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

Roll Call

Ayes: B. Bucaro, C. Deveaux, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, J. Battermann, M. Werden

Nays: None

The motion carried.



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
August 1, 2024

(#24-09) BP AM/PM – 1100 W Stearns Rd

Special Use Permit – To Sell Package Liquor (beer, wine and liquor)

PUBLIC HEARING

The following exhibits were presented:

Exhibit A – Picture of Sign

Exhibit B – Mail Affidavit

Exhibit C – Notification of Publication

The attorney for the petitioner, **Claudette Miller**, Fox Rothschild, 321 N. Clark St, Chicago IL came forward on behalf of the Navi Singh who was present. **C. Miller** was sworn in by **M. Werden**. **C. Miller** stated that this is an existing BP convenient store and gas station. The current hours are 24/7. We are seeking a Special Use Permit to sell beer, wine and spirits during the hours allowed consistent with a class C extended liquor license. You can see in the staff report that we have met the findings of fact. **M. Werden** this is pretty straight forward. **K. Stone** anything with liquor typically requires a Special Use Permit. **M. Werden** I have no further questions. Are there any questions from the commission members? **C. Deveaux** I do not see the need for a third location to sell liquor on this corner. There is a liquor store across the street as well as a Walgreens. This just seems like saturation to sell that much alcohol in this small area.

M. Werden opened the public hearing. 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 **(#24-09) BP AM/PM 1100 W Stearns Rd** for a Special Use Permit to sell package liquor subject to the findings of fact and conditions outlined in the staff report.

Motioned by: J. Miaso

Seconded by: M. Sarwas

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

Roll Call

Ayes: B. Bucaro, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, J. Battermann, M. Werden

Nays: C. Deveaux

The motion carried.



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
August 1, 2024

(#24-10) BP – 5590 County Farm Rd

Special Use Permit – To Sell Package Liquor (beer, wine and liquor)

PUBLIC HEARING

The following exhibits were presented:

Exhibit A – Picture of Sign

Exhibit B – Mail Affidavit

Exhibit C – Notification of Publication

The petitioner's representative, **Claudette Miller** of Fox Rothschild 321 N. Clark St, Chicago IL came forward and was sworn in by **M. Werden**. **C. Miller** stated that this is also currently a 24/7 convenient gas station. We are requesting a Special Use Permit to sell packaged liquor at the hours that are consistent with a class C extended liquor license. Again, as indicated in the staff report, we have met the requirements in the findings of fact.

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

G. Koziol made a motion to pass along **a positive recommendation** to the Village Board to approve case **(#24-10) BP 5590 County Farm Rd** for a Special Use Permit to sell package liquor subject to the findings of fact and conditions outlined in the staff report.

Motioned by: G. Koziol

Seconded by: J. Miaso

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

Roll Call

Ayes: B. Bucaro, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, J. Battermann, M. Werden

Nays: C. Deveaux

The motion carried.



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
August 1, 2024

(#24-11) Recreational Vehicle Parking

Text Amendment

PUBLIC HEARING

The following exhibits were presented:

Exhibit A – Notification of Publication

K. Stone stated that Code Enforcement has been enforcing our current regulations for recreational vehicles, which restricts boats, recreational vehicles and campers from being in driveways May 1 through October 31. A resident was cited in March for having their boat on their property early. That resident sent a letter to several Village Board members and the Mayor requesting that the Board consider amending the dates for the allowing of boats and recreational vehicles on their driveway. Code Enforcement did a survey of other communities. There is not a uniform answer for this. It is all over the board. Some communities restrict recreational vehicles completely, some allow them, some follow our dates, some have different setbacks and some communities only allow them for 2 to 3 days at a time. The Village Board Committee had a discussion and thought about following the suggestion to change the date to March 1. There was also a suggestion to change the date to April 15. There was another option to leave the date the way it is. This ordinance has been in effect for years and the dates have not changed since 1983. This is something that we have had on the books for quite a long time. **M. Werden** asked, is the current start date May 1? **K. Stone** yes, May 1. **M. Werden** does Code Enforcement issue many citations for this each year? **K. Stone** most residents that have recreational vehicles know what the dates are. We do not typically get many violations for RVs being out too early. We do get violations on November 1 and phone calls from neighbors to tell us that their neighbor's boat is out on the property. This is something that we have enforced consistently since 1983 and this is the first time to my knowledge that anyone has suggested that we change the dates. **B. Bucaro** do you know when you get the most complaints about this? Is it mostly at the beginning of the season, during season or the end of the season? **K. Stone** we get a significant number of complaints in the summer and we have to tell them there is nothing we can do; they are allowed in November we do sweeps the first 2 weeks and issue 5 to 25 warnings to remove the vehicle. If they have received a prior notice, we give them less time because they are aware of what the rules are. We do not typically do sweeps at the beginning of the season looking for violations because they are not likely to be early. Those are based on complaints or done by the code officers if they see a violation while they are driving around. **K. Stone** we have not received many complaints about recreational vehicles being out early. Most people comply with the May 1 rule. **M. Werden** could there be a special provision for the one resident that brought this forward like how we allow overnight parking on the street? **K. Stone** we cannot enforce that in the zoning ordinance. These dates are in the zoning code. All of our rules have very strict deadlines. We do not have a permit to allow an exception. **M. Sarwas** a fishing boat is significantly smaller than an RV or a large speed boat on a trailer. Could we separate boats from RVs? I understand that fishing season starts earlier and by May, you have missed a couple of months and you are paying for storage fees. **K. Stone** if we separated fishing boats from RVs we would need to have very specific restrictions. Someone could have a large boat and say that they use it for fishing. How could we determine the difference? **M. Sarwas** we would have to separate boats from RVs and we would not differentiate based on size. Boats are boats whether they are speed boats or luxury boats. You cannot say, I use mine for fishing and I use mine for tubing. **K. Stone** if the separating boats



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
August 1, 2024

from RVs is something that the board wants to entertain, I could recommend a size restriction, but we would need to do further study on that because I do not want to pick an arbitrary number. **B. Bucaro** this seems like we would be opening up a can of worms. **M. Sarwas** could we split the difference and have the date be April 1? **M. Werden** why was the April 15 dated cited? **K. Stone** one of the trustees suggested that date to give everyone an extra 2 weeks. Typically, if we give a warning and it is the first notice, we give about 2 weeks to remedy the situation. If the date is April 15 and we have given a warning on April 1, by time the warning deadline arrives, they are in compliance. **G. Koziol** I do not have a problem with changing the start date or the end date, but I would hate to see a series of rules trying to make special changes based on the size of a boat or an RV. **B. Bucaro** the number of people that complain and the number of people with RVs are much less than people that do not have RVs. I would be inclined to just leave this alone considering the years that it has been in place. We try to make accommodations, but we need to look at the big picture. **K. Stone** we do have 1 household that calls us to tell us when a camper is there when it is not supposed to be. **B. Bucaro** in their own household? **K. Stone** yes, in their own household. **J. Battermann** if the date was changed to April 15 is there any overlap that would make it difficult for staff to enforce the ordinance because they will not be able to do the sweeps as effectively during the break between seasons? **K. Stone** there is not as much of a need for sweeps at the beginning of the season and I think our staff could handle that. **C. Deveaux** why was April 1 not a choice? **K. Stone** that date was not presented at the committee meeting. I would prefer that we choose from what was stated at the committee meeting and these are the options that were discussed. **M. Werden** March 1 seems like quite a stretch. **J. Battermann** option 1 seems way too early even for fishing season. I feel like 2 weeks is a good compromise. **B. Bucaro** in 41 years no one has brought this up. It is just this one resident saying they need March 1 because they fish. **M. Werden** there is no need for a text amendment and a "yes" vote would be to leave the dates as is.

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

C. Deveaux made a motion to recommend **Option 3 – Keep Current Regulations: 19-4A-3: C. Recreational Vehicles, Trailers, All-Terrain Vehicles, Watercraft and Snowmobiles.**

Motioned by: C. Deveaux

Seconded by: B. Bucaro

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

Roll Call

Ayes: B. Bucaro, G. Koziol, J. Miaso, M. Sarwas, J. Battermann, M. Werden

Nays: C. Deveaux

The motion carried.



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
August 1, 2024

Old Business/ New Business

K. Stone stated, Brian Krause is here, he is our new Associate Planner. **M. Werden** welcome aboard. **K. Stone** it does not look like we will have a meeting in September.

B. Bucaro the presentation **K. Stone** put together for the Future Land Use was excellent with a lot of information and a lot to think about. It really brought the whole development picture together **K. Stone** I can send copies of the Power Point presentation to any of you. It gives a good history of the out lots that we have and potential areas that may come into the Village so that we can start thinking about what types of uses we would like for those. **M. Werden** how soon will the demolition start on Lake Street? **K. Stone** the annexation agreement for the parcels that were before you today, the Village agreed to pay up to half of the cost for demolition of those structures to be removed within 6 months. Hopefully, the hotdog stand will be removed as well as the other buildings. **B. Bucaro** the one parcel that I would really like to see changed is across from the Spring Hills Mobile Park where there is truck parking now across from the fire station. I believe that corner has no Elgin utilities and it is an eyesore. That would be a nice parcel to add on to Brewster Creek. I do not know if we have something that we can trade with Elgin on Route 25. Maybe the land is not developable so I do not if it would be a good idea or not. I see it as an eyesore being contingent with Brewster Creek and if something could be done there that would be fantastic. **K. Stone** we have been in talks with the property owner about how that property looks. **B. Bucaro** that property is in Elgin. Could that be annex out of Elgin and into Bartlett? **K. Stone** there is a process where that is possible. In 2003, we did something similar. In Lakewood Mill, there was a 3.47-acre property along W. Bartlett Road on the south side that was in Elgin. Elgin needed a water emergency connection with the Village and part of that was a utility connection. Elgin agreed to disconnect that parcel and the Village was able to annex that so the Lakewood Development could be developed. It is not unprecedented. It is possible. **B. Bucaro** is that something that we might pursue? **K. Stone** it could be negotiated. **M. Werden** how big is that parcel? **K. Stone** it is approximately 42 acres. **M. Werden** has the owner owned that for a long time? **K. Stone** no.

K. Stone the public hearing for Lake Street TIF redevelopment plan is August 20, 2024 before the Village Board. The Joint Review Board is meeting August 16 to make their recommendations on the project. **B. Bucaro** how did the last meeting go? **K. Stone** most of the taxing districts had a few questions. The TIF study had to be updated to include the 2023 equalized assessed values. Those had not been out from Cook County when the report was originally drafted. We still meet all of the eligibility requirements that we did with the original numbers, it has just been updated. The districts wanted to take that information back to their boards to formally discuss it and vote on it. Last week, Hanover Township voted in favor of supporting the TIF district. There are meetings with the Library District and the Fire Protection District next week that the Village Administrator will be attending. **B. Bucaro** is it typically the school districts that do not like TIF districts? **K. Stone** typically, the school districts have some concerns. The school district property is included in this TIF district and there are capital costs that could be paid for through the increment. **M. Werden** I think most people would like to see improvement on Lake Street. **K. Stone** I do not think it is a hard argument to say that Lake Street looks blighted when you are driving down it in Bartlett. **M. Werden** I think there was reluctance to develop there with the Elgin-O'Hare project. We were told at one time that the out lots on the corner of Oak Avenue might be taken if that highway came through. **K. Stone** IDOT owns the southwest corner of Oak Avenue and Lake Street. There is a significant number of acres located southwest of Oak Avenue and Lake Street



Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
August 1, 2024

that is either IDOT right-of-way or individual parcels owned by IDOT that they acquired in the 1970s and in 1991 thinking that the Elgin-O'Hare was going to take that route. IDOT owns the lot on the corner of Oak Avenue and Lake Street, the L-shaped lot where Tom's Farm Stand and the lot south of that. That is all considered IDOT right-of-way currently. The plan was for the Elgin-O'Hare to go directly across Oakfield Plaza, down and continue over the wetlands. IDOT has dropped those plans. They have indicated that they would be willing to work with the Village and possibly sell back some of the property. The wetland area would have to remain wetland that they would just give to the Village or the Park District. IDOT is not willing to look into the specific details of that until the Oak Avenue realignment is constructed. **M. Werden** we were waiting on that reconstruction for the Elgin-O'Hare. **K. Stone** we were waiting for the State to decide what they were going to do with Lake Street. **B. Bucaro** the State does not move very fast. **K. Stone** correct, the last study they did on that intersection was in 2017. **B. Bucaro** the Lake Street rezoning that we voted on tonight is east of Oak Avenue and that is where this is going to have an immediate impact. **M. Werden** is there any talk of the State grabbing this land that we are trying to use for the TIF? **K. Stone** no. The State is aware that we are talking with IDOT and is aware of the plan. They are willing to draw up the plats once they have determined what the Oak Avenue extension is going to look like. The plan is significantly scaled back from what they were originally thinking. They have reduced the number of turn lanes that are required and the original traffic counts. We are not even close to what they had projected for 2020. They realized that what they were looking at was probably excessive at the time and they have scaled things back. Having this a 4-way intersection would be a huge spur for development along Lake Street. **B. Bucaro** did the Village Board approve the development on the south side of Lake Street and Park Boulevard? **K. Stone** that came in as a concept plan. The Village Board did not want Park Boulevard to connect with full access to Hale Avenue. It would be an emergency access only with a gate for the Fire District. The property owner still needs to work with IDOT and conduct an intersection design study to make sure that whatever IDOT approves matches the plan. That property is part of the TIF. **B. Bucaro** that would be more of an incentive? **K. Stone** the TIF is from Park Boulevard west to the 2 lots along Lake Street. There is the Marathon Gas Station and the 2 lots along N. Bartlett Road. A 7-Eleven was approved for that corner, but there are some taxes issues with that property and that deal fell through. **M. Werden** are there any plans for IDOT to widen Lake Street? **K. Stone** no, not through this section.

G. Koziol asked, are there any restrictions on flag signs and the super bright lights that are used around windows that light up an entire parking lot? **K. Stone** the LED lights, while they are bright, do not exceed our foot candle requirements. The foot candle measurements are at the property line. We did discuss flag signs at the Economic Development Commission meeting and the consensus was that they were fine. Staff suggested prohibiting the flag signs. There was not support for that. We also suggested a distance requirement or limiting the number and that was not supported at all. They are considered a temporary sign and do not require a permit. The only authority that we have is if they are in disrepair, we can have them removed. **G. Koziol** the number of signs allowed is unlimited. **K. Stone** yes.



**Village of Bartlett
Planning and Zoning Commission
August 1, 2024**

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

Motioned by: C. Deveaux

Seconded by: M. Sarwas

Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 pm.