

**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Meeting
Minutes
April 13, 2017**

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

Roll Call

Present: J. Lemberg, J. Miaso, D. Negele, A. Hopkins, J. Allen, T. Ridenour,
M. Hopkins and J. Kallas

Absent: T. Connor

Also Present: J. Plonczynski, CD Director; R. Grill, Asst. CD Director & A. Zubko, Village Planner

A moment of silence was held in memory of Trustee, T.L. Arends, whom passed away last week.

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the March 9, 2017 meeting.

Motioned by: J. Miaso

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Roll call

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

Abstain: M. Hopkins and J. Kallas

Motion carried.

Case # 17-03 Bracht's Place - Site Plan Amendment and Special Use Permits

- a) To serve liquor into the newly acquired/leased 1,200 square foot unit;
- b) A game room/recreation and amusement establishment to extend into the newly acquired/leased 1,200 square foot unit; and
- c) Allow outdoor seating including serving food and liquor

PUBLIC HEARING

J. Lemberg proceeded to swear in the Petitioner: L. Humbracht.

The following Exhibits were presented:

- Exhibit A - Picture of Sign**
- Exhibit B - Notification of Publication**
- Exhibit C - Mail Affidavit**

A. Zubko stated the Devon Prospect Plaza was built around 1987. Bracht's Place was granted Special Use Permits in 1990 to allow an indoor sit-down restaurant serving liquor and a game room limited to no more than two machines.

In 1993 Bracht's Place amended their Special Use to allow a game room limited to no more than five (5) machines.

In 1993 they were granted Special Use Permits to allow for the operation of a Recreation and Amusement Establishment and to expand their existing site one tenant space to the north.

Currently the Petitioner is requesting a **Site Plan Amendment** to allow outdoor seating.

The Petitioner has acquired/leased the northern 1,200 square foot unit. Bracht's Place will be expanding from 2,700 square feet to 3,900 square feet and will expand to the northern end of the building.

The Petitioner is requesting to allow their **Special Use Permits** to also be permitted within the last unit (serving liquor, game room & recreation and amusement establishment) and to have outdoor seating including serving of liquor outside.

The Petitioner has been at this location since 1990. They currently lease three units and would now lease a fourth unit.

They would like to put in an outdoor beer garden in the rear of the building directly east of the newly acquired tenant, eliminating the last 3 parking stalls. There will be seating outdoors but there will be no music or speakers in the beer garden.

A 3' high fence around the outdoor seating area is required to serve liquor. The petitioner is proposing to install a 6' solid PVC fence around the outdoor area. There will be a gate on the south side that will be locked so patrons cannot enter or exit through the beer garden but it will be accessible for the fire department.

Bracht's Place is currently open seven days a week from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. Sunday thru Thursday and 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 a.m. Friday and Saturday and has a Class A extended liquor license. The hours for the Class A extended liquor license are Sun.-Thurs. 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. and Fri.-Sat. 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 a.m. There are two (2) establishments with this type of license: Bracht's Place and the Bartlett Volunteer Fire Association.

The fence on the east property line is in need of repair and is currently a code violation. The property owner has been notified that the fence must be repaired prior to the Special Uses being granted on this property.

Staff recommends approval with the Findings of Fact with the condition of having the fence fixed before the final approval.

J. Lemberg asked the petitioner if there was anything to add to the opening comments.

L. Humbracht stated no, everything was covered.

J. Lemberg asked the Commissioners if they had any questions.

A. Hopkins questioned if the 48 inch wide gate on the fence around the beer garden will be locked?

A. Zubko stated that is correct.

A. Hopkins asked if there would be some kind of emergency exit?

A. Zubko stated yes, it will be equipped with something like a push alarm, and a lock box if the fire department needs to get in.

A. Hopkins stated there isn't going to be music now, but what happens if down the road they would like to have music outside will they need to come back to the Plan Commission or the Village Board?

A. Zubko stated yes because it would be considered a Special Use. If you feel more comfortable Staff can put it as a condition that they cannot have outdoor music.

L. Humbracht stated he doesn't want music outside. Period. It's noisy enough inside we don't want it outside too. The outdoor area is just for smoking and to have a beer. In the fall we'll get a permit so we can have a grill and maybe have a bean bag game. Customers go outside to smoke now, this would mean just going out a different door.

J. Lemberg opened the meeting to the public.

J. Plonczynski announced the first resident to speak, **Stephen John Dastrup**.

S. Dastrup stated he resides at 615 Mallard Court, which is right behind Bracht's and does like the establishment and doesn't mind the idea, however; his main concern is the outside. Bracht's is open until 2AM on week days and 4AM on weekends. That late at night, there just isn't a good crowd, very loud, this would just give them another excuse to come outside and a fence will not keep the noise down. The smokers alone you can hear them all night long. During the summer I have to close my windows and doors. Bracht's is surrounded on three side by families. If they close it at a reasonable time **S. Dastrup** stated he wouldn't have a problem. Open till 4AM will cause people to call the Police to tell them to quite down. Also, the element of people that will be coming into the Village are ones that shouldn't be out on that road that late. If the outside could be shut down at a reasonable time **S. Dastrup** would not see a problem.

J. Plonczynski announced the second resident to speak, **Sandra Gilbert**.

S. Gilbert (Inaudible at first) stated she is also worried about the noise being that she lives across the street and she can still hear the fighting and swearing with the windows shut during the winter. If anyone comes at 4AM they're half in the bag already. She realizes that there will be a fence, but she is concerned that things will be thrown over the fence with kids walking in that area.

J. Plonczynski announced the third resident to speak **Larissa Doucette**.

L. Doucette stated she lives at 310 Broadmoor Lane and also owns a property at 623 Mallard Court that she now rents out but lived there previously for 14 years. She stated she is very familiar with the noise and the smoker's going outside. Her tenants have also heard people at 2AM. **L. Doucette** stated Bracht's is a great place but is very concerned about the noise and being able to keep tenants.

J. Plonczynski stated that was the last of the residents that wanted to speak.

J. Lemberg asked if there was anyone else. Would the petitioner like to respond to any of the comments that the public had?

L. Humbracht stated when Bracht's opened there was a corn field across the street so there was no concern about the noise back then. There was an incident a few years ago with noise after hours, when people didn't want to go home. We now put a person out there to keep the noise down, since smoking is not allowed indoors the customers must go outside. **L. Humbracht** stated he is not opposed to shutting down the beer garden at a particular time. This was just an idea, since other bars have this. He is not looking into causing any more problems with the neighbors. 75% of our own customers take care of most of the problems. The police are not called very often. **L. Humbracht** also stated the decision is up to Staff and was mainly interested with in getting the inside approved, since he has been paying rent and utilities on empty space he is not using at the moment.

J. Lemberg asked if anyone else had any other questions or comments from the audience. The Public Hearing was closed.

J. Lemberg asked if anyone else had any other questions or comments from the commission.

D. Negele inquired about the six picnic tables. How many patrons are anticipated to be using the outdoor area?

L. Humbracht stated originally the space would have to be covered, however; that required fire suppression, so the plans were changed not to cover the space. The six tables is just an artist rendition of the area. He stated they are not anticipating more people just more room, to sit outside to have a beer and smoke. At the moment they cannot go outside with a beer.

D. Negele stated her concern was with the voice level with more people at later hours of the night. She questioned if there will be a limit of people out in that area, not only sitting at the tables but just standing there as well.

L. Humbracht stated he was unsure since he has never done something like this before.

D. Negele stated she has seen when there have been events such as a Bears game, people will just stand and that alone will change the noise level tremendously and that is her main concern.

L. Humbracht stated there isn't a Bears game on at 4AM. Most of the celebrating is done inside, there will not be TV's or speakers outside.

D. Negele asked **L. Humbracht** if he had a number in mind as far as the amount of people that many be outside. **L. Humbracht** stated he did not.

M. Hopkins asked if vote could be in three parts since there are three parts to this request.

T. Ridenour stated it was a great idea to consider earlier hours for the beer garden, we would just need to decide what would be a reasonable time for the outdoor area. **T. Ridenour** suggested perhaps 10:00 PM on week nights and 12:00 midnight on weekends.

A. Hopkins questioned if there was a plan for servers in the beer garden, serving food and beer.

L. Humbracht stated there are no waitresses, everything is all bar service, no table service. There are doormen to keep an eye on things and control the area.

- A. Hopkins** asked since this is expanding will there be another entrance. How many front door or accesses will there be?
- L. Humbracht** stated there will be another front entrance available but not to get in only to get out and the same for the back. People will not be able to walk in from the outside but there will be a panic bar to get out.
- T. Ridenour** stated maybe an amendment to the request to limit the hours of the beer garden.
- J. Lemberg** stated to limit the hours, restrict the hours. That can put in a motion if that's what you want.
- T. Ridenour** questioned as to what was the proper way to add restrictions on the hours for the outdoor area.
- A. Zubko** stated just add as a condition to the original request.
- J. Lemberg** stated there will be two votes, one for the **Site Plan** and the other for the **Special Use**.
- A. Zubko** stated the condition for no outside music will need to be added too.
- J. Lemberg** asked if there were any further questions or comments. Since there were no comments or questions there will be two votes, first for the Site Plan amendment petition for Conditions and Findings of Fact the Site Plan Amendment for Bracht's Place.
- A. Zubko** stated the Site Plan Amendment is to add the outdoor seating and eliminate three parking spaces. That's what is changing on the overall Site Plan. There are three separate special uses. Site Plan and Special uses can be separate or do four all separately, Site Plan Amendment and then the three Special Uses.
- J. Lemberg** stated the change in the times will go on the Special Use Permit.
- J. Allen** asked if there will be a problem with people stepping out the back door and smoking all night as they currently do.
- A. Hopkins** stated that is when the Police should be called.
- J. Allen** stated then the smokers would go out front and get noise complaints from the residents across the street.
- L. Humbracht** stated this will happen because there isn't anywhere else for them to smoke. He wants them to smoke in the back because the neighbors are furtherer away than in the front. The only difference is they will not be able to bring their drinks outside in the front if they go out to smoke. It's a pretty popular spot particularly in the summer, but they will go out to smoke when it's below zero. There isn't any way to control where they go to smoke but they cannot drink out in front.
- A. Zubko** stated she believes that even if there is a time limit there will still be smokers going outside. The smokers will still go out but without drinks and stop them from just hanging out to finish their drinks.
- J. Allen** stated it would be hard to determine what kind of sound suppression they would get from a six foot high fence.
- L. Humbracht** stated he didn't see where the fence would contain too much noise, it will just contain the people.
- J. Allen** stated without a roof there isn't a way to keep the sound down.
- L. Humbracht** stated that is the reason there will not be speakers or televisions outside.

J. Lemberg asked if there was a motion to approve the petitioner's request for the Site Plan Amendment and subject to the following Conditions and Findings of Fact.

Motioned by: J. Kallas
Seconded by: J. Miaso

Roll call

Ayes: T. Ridenour, J. Miaso, D. Negele, A. Hopkins J. Allen and J. Lemberg, J. Kallas

Nays: M. Hopkins

Abstain: None

J. Lemberg stated the next motion was for the Special Use Permits. Combine A, B & C and get the time change done?

T. Ridenour stated all together.

A. Hopkins stated the time and no music outside.

J. Plonczynski stated A& B are pertaining to the indoor expansion should be a motion itself. C is outdoor seating including serving food and liquor you may want to condition the timing in there but condition it as such that there is no liquor or food service after a certain time. People will still be allowed to go out and smoke, unless you want to put conditions to close everything outdoor after a certain time. It should be limited to liquor and food service.

J. Lemberg stated we will combine A & B. Is there a motion for a special use permit subject to the following Conditions and Findings of Fact, for A, to serve liquor at the newly acquired leased 1200 foot unit and B, game room amusement establishment to extend into the newly acquired/leased 1,200 square foot unit.

Motioned by: A Hopkins
Seconded by: T. Ridenour

M. Hopkins stated if a new establishment were coming into town we would not give them a liquor license till 4AM, Bracht's is grandfathered in as is the Firebarn, and wondered why we would expand a bad thing. A new business would need to adhere to the kind of hours other businesses have to live with. **M. Hopkins** stated he is voting no because of the extended hours.

J. Lemberg asked if anyone else had any other comments.

Roll call

Ayes: T. Ridenour, J. Miaso, D. Negele, A. Hopkins J. Allen and J. Lemberg, J. Kallas

Nays: M. Hopkins

Abstain: None

J. Lemberg stated the next motion was to approve the Petitioners request subject to the following Conditions and Findings of Fact for a **Special Use Permit** allowing outdoor seating, including serving food and liquor.

T. Ridenour stated the first thing was closing the outdoor area.

J. Plonczynski stated the motion should be made first and then open it up for discussion.

T. Ridenour motioned to limit the outdoor seating and serving of liquor and food until 10PM on weekdays and 12 midnight on Saturday and Sundays.

R. Grill stated right now weekends are Friday and Saturday and Sunday through Thursday are weekdays.

T. Ridenour stated no outdoor music or entertainment, ever.

J. Lemberg stated that was a motion is there a second?

Motioned by: T. Ridenour

Seconded by: J. Kallas

Roll call

Ayes: T. Ridenour, J. Miaso, D. Negele, A. Hopkins J. Allen and J. Lemberg, J. Kallas

Nays: M. Hopkins

Abstain: None

J. Plonczynski stated all three requests have been approved and these recommendations will moved on to the Village Board Committee at their next meeting on May 2, 2017.

Case # 17-02 – New Bartlett Police Building and Parking Lot

Rezoning from the SR-4 (Suburban Residence) Zoning District to the P-1 (Public Lands) Zoning District and **Site Plan Review** for the New Parking Lot west of Oak Avenue (0.44 acres); a **Site Plan Amendment** for the New Police Building on the Municipal Complex Property; and the following **Variations**:

- (a) 10' reduction from the 25' front yard along Oak Avenue (east side) to allow for parking,
- (b) To allow a 6' high fence to be located in the front yard along Oak Avenue (east side),
- (c) 20' reduction from the 25' side yard along the south property line of the new parking lot along Oak Avenue (west side) to allow for parking,
- (d) 17' reduction from the 25' side yard along the north property line of the new parking lot along Oak Avenue (west side) to allow for parking,
- (e) 10.5' reduction from the 30' rear yard in the new parking lot along Oak Avenue (west side) to allow for parking,
- (f) 10' reduction from the 25' front yard in the new parking lot along Oak Avenue (west side) to allow for parking; and
- (g) Elimination of the required curbed planting islands at the end of a parking row within the new parking lot along Oak Avenue (west side).

The following Exhibits were presented:

- Exhibit A - Picture of Sign**
- Exhibit B - Mail Affidavit**
- Exhibit C - Notification of Publication**

J. Lemberg proceeded to swear in all of the Petitioners at once: A. Ouper, M. Bushhouse, S. Lange, E. Frisch and D. McCallum

R. Grill stated the existing Police Building was built in 1991 as part of the original Village Hall Addition/Expansion and Police Headquarters construction. The Police Building was approximately 21,677 sq. ft. in area and included both the 1st floor and basement area.

The **Site Plan** for the existing Municipal Complex was approved in 2004 and included the complete demolition of the Village Hall, the approval of a new two-story building with a revised parking layout for both the village employees and police personnel and the rezoning of all the Village owned parcels to the P-1 (Public Lands) Zoning District.

The Petitioners are requesting a **Rezoning** from the SR-4 (Suburban Residence) Zoning District to the P-1 (Public Lands) Zoning District and a **Site Plan Review** for the newly acquired 0.44 acre property along the west side of Oak Avenue. This property was purchased to provide additional parking for the Police Department and would become part of the overall Municipal Complex.

A **Site Plan Amendment** is also being requested for the Municipal Complex site to provide for the demolition of the existing Police Building, the construction of a new two-story Police Building, new parking areas and minor revisions to the parking area in front of the new Police Building and Village Hall.

Construction of the new Police Building would occur in two phases. The first phase of development will take place along the north half of the site where the existing police parking area is located. This will enable the primary core responsibilities and day-to-day operations of the Police Department to continue to fully function within a majority of the existing building while construction begins for Phase 1. Once the north half of the building is completed, the Staff and operations will relocate to the new building so that demolition of the southern half of the existing building can take place and construction of Phase 2 would then commence.

The building would be approximately 48,982 square feet in area with a proposed 23,233 square foot 1st floor, which would primarily include the lobby, office space, interrogation rooms, the booking area and roll call. The 2nd floor, consisting of approximately 10,891 square feet, would contain administrative offices, a conference room, and training room and break room. The lower level or basement area would be approximately 14,858 square feet and would include police storage for files and evidence, the personnel lockers and changing areas, as well as the gun range and mechanical room.

The architect has designed the new Police Building to not only complement the existing Village Hall, but to also continue the overall architectural theme established by the Town Center. This new building will utilize similar building materials and colors, such as brick and stone accent features along the front façade, while also incorporating the use of natural stone as part of the archway over the new entrance to the Police Building. In addition, the patterned accent feature, shown on the tower, will also be duplicated above this new arch. The new two-story building with its pitched roof and building height of 39' 3" will match the existing Village Hall height, and with the inclusion of the arched entry feature, will provide a visual balance to the front elevation of the Municipal Complex.

Parking for police personnel would be located in three general locations – the new parking lot west of Oak Avenue, as well as a parking area north and south of the new building. Both the north and south parking areas have provided a space for turnarounds so that if these parking areas are full, vehicles would not have to back out of these parking lots.

The new parking lot west of Oak and the north parking lot would both be secured parking areas with each having an electronic arm that would prohibit vehicular access without proper security. As an added security measure, the north parking area would contain a six (6) foot high black aluminum fence, located west of the existing police storage garage to enclose this area. East of the garage, a six (6) foot high solid, PVC fence would be utilized to enclose and secure the remainder of the parking spaces.

Metal canopies are also proposed for this north parking area that would protect police vehicles from inclement weather. These structures would be approximately 9' tall, providing 7' of clearance along the north property line, while taller vehicles would be able to park under the canopies attached to the building, which would be approximately 14' tall, providing 12' of clearance.

The parking lot west of Oak Avenue would contain 29 parking spaces and vehicular movements would consist of a one-way pattern counter clockwise around the site. The existing dilapidated fence located on the site along the north property line and a portion of the west property line (southwest corner) was built by the former property owner and will be removed and replaced with dense landscaping to screen this property from adjacent residential properties.

Ingress/egress to the new Police Building would consist of three curb cuts which would replace two existing curb cuts located along the east side of Oak Avenue - the aforementioned north parking lot entrance, the relocated southern curb cut for the south parking area and the sally port curb cut which is an exit-only.

The new parking lots proposed for the Police Department would contain 63 parking spaces. An additional ten (10) existing spaces behind Village Hall would also be designated for police personnel; bringing the total number of parking spaces for the Police Department to 73. Minor changes to the parking area in front of Village Hall and the Police Building would also occur due to the location of the new security planter/seating wall, the expanded building footprint and outdoor public space, the required one (1) additional accessible parking stall and the relocation of two (2) accessible spaces. According to the Zoning Ordinance, the Village Hall would require 100 parking spaces based upon the office space and maximum capacity of the council chambers. The Police Department would only require six (6) spaces, based upon the 1,628 square feet of public access areas within the new building. This would result in an overall requirement of 106 parking spaces for the Municipal Complex. A total of 153 parking spaces have been provided, including the required five (5) accessible parking spaces, which exceeds the Zoning Ordinance requirement.

New LED lights on a motion sensor and timer are being proposed for the new parking lot west of Oak. These lights would turn on when any motion is detected and then dim after a certain period of time so as not to disturb the residential properties adjacent to this parking lot. In addition, the Village's decorative street lights will be installed within the right-of-way of the Municipal Complex properties along Oak Avenue to incorporate the lighting utilized at Village Hall and to continue the downtown lighting theme.

As part of the overall upgrades to the front façade of the Municipal Complex, the pavers at the existing entrances will be removed and replaced with stamped concrete. The pavers have become a "tripping hazard" and require continued maintenance and Staff believes the new stamped concrete will improve the overall safety and aesthetics of the outdoor public space. In addition, a new large planter and seating wall will be constructed in front of the new Police Building to not only soften the large area of hardscape, but to continue the landscaped seating area theme existing in front of the Village Hall. This planter area will also serve as a security feature to prohibit a vehicle from potentially damaging the new building. Additional security bollards along with two landscaped security planters will also be placed along the curb line in front of the remaining outdoor space adjacent to the building for security purposes.

As part of the development review for the Municipal Complex and New Police Parking Lot, several **variations** are being requested: (a) a 10' reduction from the 25' front yard setback along Oak Avenue (east side) to allow for parking, (b) to allow a 6' high fence to be located in the front yard along Oak Avenue (east side), (c) a 20' reduction from the 25' side yard along the south property line in the new parking lot along Oak Avenue (west side) to allow for parking, adjacent to residential usage requires a 25' setback, it's been reduced down to 5', (d) a 17' reduction from the 25' side yard along the north property line in the new parking lot along Oak Avenue (west side) to allow for parking, (e) an 10.5' reduction from the 30' rear yard in the new parking lot along Oak Avenue (west side) to allow for parking, (f) a 10' reduction from the 25' front yard setback in the new parking lot along Oak Avenue (west side) to allow for parking; and (g) elimination of the required curbed planting islands at the end of a parking row within the new parking lot along Oak Avenue (west side).

R. Grill stated all of the variation requests were discussed last Thursday by the Zoning Board and they did recommend approval.

The trash enclosure and loading area would be located along the west elevation of the new Police Building. They will be constructed with the same brick utilized in the construction of the building and would include the required gate. Landscaping would also be incorporated around the perimeter as required by Village Code.

Engineering and Landscape plans are currently being reviewed by the Staff. Staff does recommend approval subject to the following Conditions and Findings of Fact outlined in the Staff report.

J. Lemberg asked if the Petitioner had anything to add. No one came forward.

J. Lemberg reminded the Public that this is a Public Hearing and if anyone had any questions or comments to please complete a form.

J. Lemberg questioned that Site Plans he received didn't have a date on them, in the middle it shows Proposed Village Hall and wanted to know if there was something that needed to be shared with the Committee.

Response was inaudible.

R. Grill stated the Site Plan shows what the existing layout is today, verses what the new layout will be, just for reference purposes. She also pointed out that the dates were actually in the right hand side of the Site Plan, but were very small.

J. Lemberg had another question, regarding Phase 2, on the site plan, dated March 6, 2017. The existing monument is to remain, however isn't it to be moved about 75' east?

R. Grill asked the Police Chief to address that.

P. Ullrich questioned if **J. Lemberg** was referring to the Veterans Memorial out in front, the star shaped monument? **J. Lemberg** stated yes. **P. Ullrich** stated there is discussion to move it closer to the flagpole in front of the Village Hall and light it from the inside during evening hours, so yes you are correct. **J. Lemberg** then stated a revision to the site plan will need to be made. **R. Grill** stated yes that can be done.

J. Lemberg questioned if there are credible threats to the Police Department and Village Hall that the security bollards are necessary.

P. Ullrich stated they are to keep a vehicle from going through the front of the buildings.

J. Lemberg questioned the elevation drawings that didn't show what they would look like. Is there a picture?

R. Grill stated the planters and the bollards are conditioned as part of the landscape plan, and Police Department and Staff have not officially decided what they will look like. It has been narrowed down to three different possibilities.

J. Lemberg asked if anyone on the Commission had any questions.

T. Ridenour stated he believes the potential increase in population in Bartlett is limited to a couple thousand, correct, or is he off on his numbers.

J. Plonczynski stated the increase in population by the CMAP group is estimated to be at 48,000 by the year 2030. Currently Bartlett's population is just over 41,208.

T. Ridenour stated the current building is 26 years old so what is the projection for the new building.

P. Ullrich stated the projection is 30 to 40 years, which was part of the space needs analysis that was done at the beginning of the project, how large of a building would be needed to suit Bartlett today and into the future.

T. Ridenour stated 25 years for a building is pathetic. 30 or 40 years for a municipal building seems a little light, considering how much money this will cost.

J. Plonczynski stated he believes the design plan is 30 to 40 years, but our architect will be able answer this question better than anyone.

M. Bushhouse from Williams Architects spoke and stated they have been doing the design and planning for this facility. Since the building was first built, the Village has had tremendous growth, and the current building was not sized to plan for that kind of growth. The building as it stands, will accommodate the current staff, but will not handle the additional staff needed to handle the projected growth of Bartlett.

T. Ridenour stated he understands but is concerned that this new building will only last 30 to 40 years.

M. Bushhouse stated a building will last as long as it is maintained, there is no time date on the structure itself. There is no way to guarantee that this building will meet the needs in 30 to 40 years.

T. Ridenour stated there are municipal buildings that were built 70 years ago are still going strong. Is there any reason we can't expect this building to last as long?

M. Bushhouse stated there is no reason this building couldn't last that long, you cannot predict the future.

D. Negele stated if this doesn't last that long, is there anything in this plan that additions can be added or is this building one that cannot be added on to.

M. Bushhouse stated this structure has not been designed to add more levels up, since we don't want to exceed the height of the Village Hall. This building can be expanded horizontally.

T. Ridenour stated the first floor is 23,000 Sq. Ft. and the basement is only 14,000 Sq. Ft. what is the reason the new building doesn't have a larger, more complete basement.

M. Bushhouse stated it comes back to tax payers spending as little as needed to and using that money for space that is needed in the foreseeable future. The Village Board was very concerned spending more money than absolutely necessary.

A. Hopkins asked if any other locations were considered, or is this something that needed to stay in this location. Maybe this could have been done somewhere else for less money.

P. Ullrich stated initially there were talks acquiring property and also took into consideration the cost of moving. It came down to the Village Board wanting to keep the Police Department downtown as well as next to Village Hall.

M. Hopkins stated looking at the Site Plan, it looks like there is too much project and not enough site. There are a bunch of things on this layout that we, the Village, would give a private developer a lot of grief over. Dead end parking, no planted islands and setbacks up against residential for the parking is a tough issue. This sets a bad precedent for us in the future. The property owners in the area will wonder what will this do to the value of their property. **M. Hopkins** believes there is too much stuff on the west side. The painting of the island shows they are scrambling for parking on the south property line, this would not be approved for another petitioner. Perhaps the Village could land bank those and buy another lot in the future. **M. Hopkins** commented it's the west parking lot that he has an issue with.

A. Hopkins asked if the west lot is just for Police and staff or will the public be able to park there on the weekends.

P. Ullrich stated no it's just for Police Staff with an armed gate at the entrance and exit.

A. Hopkins asked as to where will the Mobile Command unit be parked?

P. Ullrich stated it is parked off site and will remain off site.

J. Allen asked if there is a potential for purchasing a lot to the right of the parking lot.

P. Ullrich stated the Village has looked at everything that was available to maximize parking and to limit the effect to residents in the area.

T. Ridenour stated the Commissioners are just trying to give the Trustees things to think about for the future regarding the west side parking lot. Approving this will make it hard to say no to people in the future.

M. Hopkins stated the light fixtures need to be away from the houses and the light levels need to be kept to bare minimum for the property on the south property line.

R. Grill stated a 6' high fence is already there and we are also adding landscaping. The property to the north is believed to be a multifamily rental unit and landscaping will also be added along this property line.

J. Lemberg asked if there were any other questions. The meeting was opened to the public.

First to speak was **Mark Kosbab** who resides at 234 S Oak Avenue. **M. Kosbab** stated he has several concerns with this project. First being, his residence is across the street from the Police Department, although he enjoys their presence, he deals with noise and lighting issues. In the winter, the backup alarms on the snow plows wake his family up at 3AM as well as the officers on break talking loudly. He is unable to sleep with the windows open in the summer because of the noise and the lights shining in the windows. **M. Kosbab** believed this project will greatly affect his property values. The fence and landscaping will not stop noise and lighting issues. Second: What is the justification in the amount of spending, feasibility studies, making repairs or upgrades in general? How much parking is actually needed to suit the needs of the

Police Department? **M. Kosbab** questioned the idea of other locations for this project. Will this project close down the potential growth of the downtown area? **M. Kosbab** stated he would be disappointed in the elected officials if they recommend this expansion.

Next to speak is **Cheryl Gillette** who resides at 226 S. Oak Avenue. **C. Gillette** stated she owns the property directly next to the parking lot. **C. Gillette** stated she was having issues with a stalker where she previously lived and was very grateful to be so close to the Police Department. However, the noise is very loud, snowplowing always wakes her up. She was looking at doing some upgrades to her home but now is concerned about her property values and fears she would be wasting her money.

J. Plonczynski stated that's all.

J. Lemberg asked if the petitioner had any comments or other comments from the public. Public portion of the meeting was closed.

J. Lemberg asked if anyone on the Commission had comments or questions.

A. Hopkins asked **R. Grill** to go over the parking one more time.

R. Grill went over the parking area and stated not all of the parking spaces in front of the Village Hall are shown on this plan.

A. Hopkins asked how the parking during the day is. Is there a problem finding a space to park?

R. Grill stated parking in the front lot is not a problem, parking for the Village Staff is not a problem since we have parking across the street in the gravel lot that can be used. The Police Department employees do park along Oak Avenue so additional parking for their personal vehicles is needed. The Police vehicles will be parked under a canopy.

A. Hopkins asked how many total Police vehicles are there? How many of the spaces will be occupied?

G. Preteklis answered there are approximately 43 Police vehicles.

J. Lemberg asked if there were any other questions or comments. No other questions or comments.

J. Lemberg stated there would be three motions: Zoning, Site Plan Review for the Parking Lot and Site Plan Amendment for the Police Building.

J. Lemberg stated the first motion was to approve the Petitioners request subject to the following Conditions and Findings of Fact for **Rezoning** from the SR-4 (Suburban Residence) District to the P-1 (Public Lands) for the New Parking Lot west of Oak Avenue.

Motioned by: M. Hopkins

Seconded by: T. Ridenour

J. Lemberg asked if anyone had any discussion.

Roll call

Ayes: T. Ridenour, J. Miaso, D. Negele, A. Hopkins J. Allen, J. Lemberg, J. Kallas, M. Hopkins

Nays: None

All in favor.

Motion Carried.

J. Lemberg stated the second motion was to approve the Petitioners request subject to the following Conditions and Findings of Fact for a **Site Plan Review** for the New Parking Lot west of Oak Avenue.

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

J. Lemberg asked if anyone had any further discussion.

A. Hopkins commented that he agrees with **M. Hopkins** that he hopes with all the variances for the parking lot it doesn't set a precedence for upcoming plans and the Trustees will take this into consideration. An added advantage is they will not be parking on the street during the day.

J. Lemberg asked if anyone had any further comments.

J. Allen asked if it would be in the Village's best interest to acquire the lot to the north and have continuous parking?

J. Plonczynski stated that property is not for sale at this time.

J. Lemberg asked if anyone had any other comments.

Roll call

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

All in favor.
Motion Carried.

J. Lemberg stated the third motion was to approve the Petitioners request subject to the following Conditions and Findings of Fact for a **Site Plan Amendment** for the New Police Building and Municipal Complex.

Motioned by: J. Kallas
Seconded by: J. Miaso

J. Lemberg asked if anyone had any further discussion.

Roll call

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

All in favor.
Motion Carried.

J. Plonczynski stated this will be moved to the Village Board Committee on May 2.

Old Business

J. Plonczynski stated there will most likely be meetings the next couple of months since there are several projects in the works.

New Business

J. Plonczynski asked that everyone turn in their Statement of Economic Interest if they have not done so already. It is due by May 1st.

J. Lemberg asked if there were any other comments.

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

Motioned by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: D. Negele

All in favor.

Motion Carried.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 P.M.