

J. Lemberg called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

Roll Call

Present: J. Lemberg, J. Miaso, A. Hopkins, D, Negele, T. Ridenour, T. Connor, J. Allen

Absent: J. Kallas and M. Hopkins

Also Present: J. Plonczynski, CD Director, R. Grill, Assistant CD Director and A. Zubko, Village Planner

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the August 10, 2017 meeting.

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

Roll Call

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

Abstain: None



Case (# 17-05) Balance Chiropractic

Site Plan Review

A. Zubko stated the existing building was built around 1987, (sometimes referred to as the Bormann Building) and has had many uses over the years, including an animal hospital, advertising agency and tutoring center.

The Petitioner is requesting a **Site Plan Review** to demolish the existing two-story brick building located at 368 S. Main Street to construct a new 6,152 square foot building consisting of a chiropractic office on the first floor and two residential apartments (1,867 sq. feet) on both the first and second floors toward the back of the building.

The proposed building will have a prairie style look and be constructed of materials similar to neighboring residential properties. The height of the building would be 26'-2" at the corners of the building with a median height of 23'-5", meeting the Zoning Code.

The Petitioner requested 5 different Variations:

- a) a 30 foot reduction from the required 50 foot front yard building setback,
- b) an 18 foot reduction from the required 50 foot front yard parking setback,
- c) a 10 foot reduction from the required 20 foot side yard (southern property line) building and parking setback,
- d) a 10 foot reduction from the required 20 foot side yard (northern property line) parking setback, and
- e) a 25 foot reduction from the required 30 foot rear yard parking setback

The Variation requests were discussed by the Zoning Board of Appeals at their meeting on September 7, 2017 and all were recommended for approval.

Currently, the property has a curb cut in the middle of the site along Main Street and one shared access drive aisle along the north property. There is a recorded cross-access easement agreement shared between this property and the property to the north. The petitioner proposes to eliminate the curb cut in the middle of the site along Main Street and utilize the shared curb cut to the north for all traffic. Eliminating curb cuts along Main Street is also a recommendation from the Downtown Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Plan.

The Petitioner has shown a cross-access easement on the west side (rear) of the lot to connect the parking lot to the property to the south when/if it develops.

The Petitioner proposes to have 25 parking stalls including 1 handicapped parking stall. This exceeds the parking requirement of 24 parking stalls.

The Petitioner also proposed to install a bike rack which is a recommendation from the Downtown TOD Plan along the northeast corner of the building.

The Petitioner proposed to add a trash enclosure west of the building in the existing parking lot. The previous owners/tenants shared the trash enclosure with the northern properties, creating their own.



The Downtown TOD Plan included planning strategies for the revitalization of older properties in the Downtown that would enhance the visual appeal along the Main Street Corridor. This project accomplishes that objective not only with the updated architecture of the building but also by bringing the building closer to the street frontage, locating a majority of the parking to the rear of the building, adding a bike rack and eliminating a curb cut.

The Petitioner has been operating out of a tenant space at Westgate Commons since 2006. If approved, the Petitioner will be relocating to this new building.

The Staff recommends approval of the petitioner's request subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact. The petitioners are present if anyone has any questions.

Petitioners Julie Salyers 2000 W. Main Street, Unit H, St, Charles and Dr. Robin Ackerman 776 W. Bartlett Road were sworn in by J. Lemberg.

- **J. Lemberg** asked the petitioners if there is anything they would like to add. **J. Salyers** stated she believes there was a concern about the current drainage and how it relates to the property north of this project. Currently, there is a catch basin in the east parking lot that will be demolished. Also, there are two catch basins at the rear of the building. The catch basin in the back of the property will be kept, however, it will be dropped down. The grades in the back will be adjusted so in heavy rains the water will not flow to the adjacent properties. The downspouts will be tied directly into the storm lines in the back of the building.
- **A. Hopkins** asked if the fence at the back side of the property will be changed. **J. Salyers** stated that the fence is owned by the adjacent property owner. **Dr. Ackerman** stated the bushes in front of the fence will be replaced with new landscaping. **A. Hopkins** asked if light poles will be added to the rear parking lot. **J. Salyers** stated there will be a bollard type light added so the light will not reflect onto the neighboring properties. No light will pass this property's lot line.
- **T. Ridenour** asked what size the original building is and what if any kind of variations were done on the original building. **Dr. Ackerman** stated 6000 sq. feet, 3000 sq. feet for each floor. **A. Zubko** was unable to locate any previous variation requests for the existing site. They are not changing the current parking lot in the back.
- **J. Salyers** stated if you look at the roof area and the sidewalk and pavement area on the existing building it is calculated at 5,275 sq. feet. The new impervious area is 5,886 sq. feet, increasing the impervious area by about 600 sq. feet. **T. Ridenour** asked where the sidewalk was located and was informed just east of the property line.
- **J. Miaso** asked what the size of the apartments will be. **Dr. Ackerman** stated the apartments will be about 900 sq. feet each, loft style with a kitchenette and laundry.
- J. Lemberg asked if anyone else had any questions or comments. No one came forward.

A motion was made to recommend approval of the petitioner's requests subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact.



Motioned by: J. Miaso Seconded by: D. Negele

Roll Call

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

Nayes: None



Case (# 17-11) Rana Meal Solutions Plan 2

Preliminary/Final PUD Plan; Special Use Permit for a PUD **PUBLIC HEARING**

The following Exhibits were presented:

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

R. Grill stated the Petitioner is requesting a Preliminary/Final PUD Plan to construct a second building directly west of the current Rana facility along Brewster Creek Boulevard. The new building and associated parking area would be located on the west 11.7 acres of the 18.25 acre subject property and would be built to accommodate Rana's new lasagna line.

As outlined in the Zoning Ordinance, two principal buildings located on one zoning lot requires a PUD application and therefore the Petitioner is also requesting a Special Use Permit for the PUD overlay on the subject property.

No changes are proposed to the existing building, consisting of approximately 133,879 square feet and located on the east 6.5 acres of the site.

The new 326,000 square foot building would consist of three (3) stories and be approximately 44'10" tall. It would be constructed with precast concrete panels painted white with a grey accent band and aluminum frames placed around the windows to match the windows on the existing building. A future painted mural is also proposed along the south elevation as depicted on the attached color rendering.

Three (3) new curb cuts proposed along the western half of the property would provide access to the new facility and employee parking lot. Two curb cuts would be located along Hecht Drive (north and west property lines) and one along Brewster Creek Boulevard (south property line). An internal access drive north of the new facility would link both buildings for vehicular and emergency access.

Pedestrian linkages have also been provided on the subject property. Employees would be able to utilize a five (5) foot wide sidewalk beginning within the parking lot leading to the west, north and south sides of the new building; as well as providing access to the existing building. In addition, a missing segment of the eight (8) foot wide bike path will be installed along the north side of Brewster Creek Boulevard providing a walking path from Stearns Road to east of Spitzer Road as part of the overall Brewster Creek Business Park bike path network.

Six (6) new loading docks, as well as seven (7) drive-in doors would be located along the east elevation and will be covered with canopies to protect the food products being loaded onto the trucks. These loading areas would coordinate with the loading areas of the existing building which are oriented westward, creating one internal loading area on the subject property. Access to the loading areas would be via a direct route from either the north, Hecht Drive, or from the south, Brewster Creek Boulevard, with a security gate and/or guard house provided at each curb cut location.



The new building will primarily consist of the production lines on the ground floor with several office areas proposed. The 2nd and 3rd floors will also include some offices, but will primarily house mechanical equipment.

An eight (8) foot high, black chain-link fence is proposed around the perimeter of the west half of the 18 acre site, including the front and corner side yards which will require a Variation request. This fence is needed for security purposes and matches the fence currently located on the eastern half of the subject property for the existing building. Each of the curb cuts associated with the new parking lot will be gated and employees would need key cards to access this site. Visitors to the property would still enter at the existing guard house which will now be moved slightly southward from its present location to allow for improved maneuverability in the loading area and added security into the adjacent passenger vehicle parking lot. This item was recommended for approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals at their meeting on September 7, 2017.

A second Variation is being requested for a reduction in the number of required parking spaces from 403 to 393. The Petitioner has stated that the new building will have approximately 90 employees on one shift, with a maximum of 180 employees at a shift change. Staff believes the parking spaces identified on the plan will meet the demand for this new facility. The existing building currently has approximately 120 employees and 114 parking spaces provided on site. The approved 108 temporary parking spaces will be eliminated with the construction of the new building for a total of 507 spaces. This item was recommended for approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals at their meeting on September 7, 2017.

Landscaping and Engineering plans are currently being reviewed by the Staff. A Site Development Permit has been issued by the Building Department for mass grading on the site to prepare the property for any future development.

Staff recommends approval of the Petitioner's requests subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact outlined in your staff report.

Petitioners, **Salvatore Trupiano**, 550 Spritzer Road, Bartlett, **Jennifer Oslager**, 1152 Spring Lake Drive, Itasca, **Joe Iovenelli**, 700 Springer Drive, Lombard, were sworn in by **J. Lemberg**.

- **J. Lemberg** asked the Petitioners if they had anything to add to the staff report. **S. Trupiano** stated no.
- **J. Lemberg** asked the members of the Commission if there were any questions or comments. No one came forward. He then opened up this portion of the meeting to the Public.

No one came forward. The Public Hearing portion of the hearing was closed.

- **J. Lemberg** asked if anyone had any questions or comments.
- **T. Ridenour** asked if the there was enough room for a truck to turn around in the loading dock area.
- **S. Trupiano** stated they did a study of truck traffic/truck movements and found it to be fine but they will schedule receiving and shipping so they happen at different times of the day.
- **J. Lemberg** asked if anyone had any questions or comments. No one came forward.



J. Lemberg then asked for a motion for the Petitioner's requests subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact.

Motioned by: T. Connor Seconded by: J. Miaso

Roll Call

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

Nayes: None



Case (# 17-16) Home Depot Outlot 2

Preliminary/Final Resubdivision of Lot 1 of the Home Depot Subdivision Second Site Plan Amendment for Lot 1 of the Home Depot Subdivision Site Plan for Lot 2 of the Home Depot Resubdivision Special Use Permits (Lot 2):

a) To allow a drive-thru establishment; and

b) To allow outdoor seating

Public Hearing

The following Exhibits were presented:

Exhibit A - Picture of Sign Exhibit B - Mail Affidavit

Exhibit C - Notification of Publication

Exhibit D - Forest Preserve Letter

A. Zubko stated the subject property was annexed to the Village in 1963. The Home Depot Subdivision was approved in 2000 and approved variances for a Front Yard Parking Setback, Side Yard Parking Setback and a parking variance for the Home Depot lot as a whole and are now seeking a further reduction.

In 2001, they amended the Site Plan for Lot 1 of the Home Depot Subdivision eliminating a right-in right-out on Route 59, which was never constructed, and added an additional 68 parking spaces. The Home Depot Subdivision was re-subdivided and built upon.

The Petitioner is requesting a Preliminary/Final Resubdivision of Lot 1 of the Home Depot Subdivision to create an outlot for a commercial retail building and a Second Site Plan Amendment for Lot 1 of the Home Depot Subdivision to create a new Lot 2. Home Depot proposes to add 11 parking spaces west of the building and 7 parking spaces in the northwest corner of the parking lot totaling 18 additional parking spaces. **A. Zubko** referred to the parking chart in the memo.

They were approved for a Variation in 2000 for 450 spaces but adding in this new lot will take the total down to 395 spaces. In the parking summary it shows that during the summer months it will go down to about 299.

The Variation request for Lot 1 was discussed by the Zoning Board of Appeals at their meeting on September 7, 2017 and they recommended approval of the parking reduction.

The Petitioner is requesting a Site Plan for Lot 2 of the Home Depot Resubdivision for a 39,747 square foot (0.91 acre) lot to be located along Route 59 directly south of the Mobil Gas Station. A proposed 8,200 square foot commercial building is proposed and would be constructed for four future tenants.

There will be a drive-thru lane located on the west and south sides of the building. The commercial retail outlot is physically separated from the Home Depot parking lot by two curbed medians along the west and south property lines. The western median creates a stacking lane and a bypass lane for the drive-thru located on the south side of the building.

There will be access to the site through two existing access points to the Home Depot's parking lot. An additional access point will be via a new cross access easement with the Mobil gas station to the north, which was recorded in 2010 but has not yet been constructed.



Three Variations are being requested on Lot 2:

- a) A reduction in side yard building setback along the southern property line,
- b) A reduction from the side yard parking setback along the southeastern property line, and
- c) A reduction in the rear yard building setback along the western property line.

The Variation requests were discussed by the Zoning Board of Appeals and all were recommended for approval.

The petitioner is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow outdoor seating with about 12 seats. The outdoor seating area will also have a bike rack and a 36" high fence to separate the outdoor seating from the parking lot and drive-thru.

The petitioner is also requesting a Special Use Permit to allow a drive-thru establishment. The drive through pick-up window will be located on the south side of the building. The menu/order board will be located on the west side of the building and provide stacking for about five (5) vehicles.

The Site Plan for Lot 2 identifies a total of 55 parking stalls, which exceeds the Zoning Ordinance requirement of 48 parking spaces.

The Traffic Impact Analysis estimates that the proposed outlot will still leave a surplus of parking for Home Depot. It also noted that there is a total of 10 stacking spaces provided from the pick-up window that will be located outside adjacent parking aisles. The report also notes that perhaps one or two additional stacked vehicles could be accommodated. The drive-thru area also has a desirable by-pass lane in advance of the menu/order board. The Traffic Impact Analysis states that the proposed retail outlot use will not adversely impact existing off-site access levels of service.

The Engineering Plans are currently under Staff Review.

Staff recommends approval of the petitioner's requests subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact:

A. Zubko gave each board member a copy of a letter from the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County who owns the property directly behind the Home Depot. The letter states they do not have any concerns with this petition. This was presented as Exhibit D. Home Depot also wrote a letter stating they would have no issues with eliminating the existing parking stalls.

Petitioners, Lawrence Freedman, 77. W Washington Street, Chicago, David Mangurten, 1121 Lake Cook Road, Deerfield and Lynn Means 625 Forest Edge Drive, Vernon Hills were sworn in by J. Lemberg.

- **L. Freedman** stated he is the attorney for the petitioner and can answer any questions the Committee may have.
- **J. Lemberg** questioned who was going to use the parking on the west and north sides. **L. Means** stated she prepared the traffic impact and parking study for the proposed development. Pertaining to the parking on the far west side, they anticipate the spaces to be designated for employees of Home Depot, if there wasn't sufficient parking within the other lot. The farthest spaces would be used by employees only. **J. Lemberg** asked why it isn't continued through so traffic can go north to get to the drive thru and not go all the way around the building. **A. Zubko** stated the plans have been



modified to add a median so there isn't a direct bypass through the parking lot. **L. Means** stated traffic that is entering should follow the path south or the path north in from of the Home Depot. This is to slow and defer traffic through that existing parking lot. The main north/south and the main east/west along the south and north access points are sufficient enough to provide adequate circulation within the site. This was also recommended by the review consultants as well. **L. Means** stated studies have shown 60% of the coffee shop customers are drive through traffic. **J. Lemberg** asked if this was a potential for an accident when cars are trying to back out of parking stalls when drive through traffic is going through the parking lot. **L. Means** stated one of the recommendations was that directly across from the drive thru be designated for employees so there would be minimal traffic opposite the drive through exit.

T. Ridenour asked **L. Means** to address the potential for diagonal vehicle crossing conflict between the retail outlet drive and the Mobil drive on Rt. 59. People coming southbound on Rt. 59 coming in the Mobil entrance may be conflicting with people exiting the Mobil. **L. Means** stated the queuing along the exit drive should not exceed two vehicles and is not expected to extend beyond that point. There is adequate access as to not create a diagonal cross. **T. Ridenour** questioned if the northern entrance to Mobil will be closed and if this will leave only one entrance and exit on Rt. 59. **L. Means** stated that is correct and this was taken into consideration when the study was done, as well as only one access remaining on Stearns Road. **A. Zubko** stated the access to Mobil will be right-in right-out with a median on Rt. 59. **T. Ridenour** stated since there will be a right-in right-out, people will be exiting the coffee shop, and with people coming in, will they need to cut across the Mobil lot? **L. Means** stated as part of the recommendation the traffic will stop before the cross access, that way there would be adequate site distance. There would be a stop sign at the property limits facing north. **T. Ridenour** asked if the single access point at Mobil will be increased in size since they will be losing the other entrance. **A. Zubko** stated yes.

A. Hopkins had a concern with the entrance into the Home Depot parking lot near the Sonic. As you enter the parking lot during the spring with the seasonal items, there will only be one lane. There will be a major stacking problem on Saturdays and Sundays morning when people are trying to get coffee, shopping etc. What is the plan for spring and summer when that area is closed off? L. Means stated the traffic study was done when that area was closed off. All the traffic projections and volumes coming into and out of the intersections did accommodate peak traffic conditions in May which was the peak season for Home Depot. The volume count was for the worst case scenario. A. **Hopkins** asked with the construction on Stearns will there be a left hand turn lane heading west into the Home Depot/Sonic parking lot. J. Plonczynski stated this will be a dual left intersection, into Bartlett Commons and Home Depot. There will be a barrier median continuing west. D. Negele asked if left turns will be allowed on Stearns going west. There seems to be a lot of accidents. L. Means stated yes the same as they are today. The barrier median will start to the east of that access. The crash history was done as part of the analysis and they didn't find a significant volume of collisions at that location. Some of the congestion will be alleviated in the eastbound direction of Rt. 59 with the significant capacity improvements that will be implemented there. All four legs of the intersection will be dual left turn lanes as well as right turn lanes. The barrier median will prohibit some of the turns from the immediate access points from the Mobil and the adjacent BP. With the improvements in place that should clear up some of the backups. **D. Negele** stated she hopes the improvements will help with the accidents and near accidents because people are crossing over the yellow line trying to get into the Home Depot lot. There is only a short spurt from the light on Rt.59 and Stearns and that the turn entrance is very tight. **D. Negele** stated this is a big concern of hers.



- **J. Allen** thinks this will be an improvement with the center turn lanes and with Stearns wider at that point. **J. Plonczynski** stated the whole intersection will be a lot wider. With the improvements that IDOT and the County are doing are based on safety and traffic congestion relief. As **L. Means** stated with the dual left lanes you will not have long backups, more cars will be going through the intersections with the secured turn signals and also the ability to turn right. **J. Plonczynski** stated this is a safety improvement intersection because of the all of the accidents that occur on Rt. 59 and Stearns intersection. **J. Allen** stated it should be better but as **T. Ridenour** stated the concern was with the people coming at a high rate of speed off of Rt. 59, cutting into the Mobil lot. **J. Plonczynski** stated that is a movement that will still be available but many people may not take it.
- **T. Ridenour** asked if the green space on Rt. 59 will stay the same. **A. Zubko** stated yes that's correct.
- **L. Means** added with this development the coffee shop type use will be the highest traffic generator within the retail center. Studies confirm most of the site traffic will not be new traffic added to the roadways network. The majority of traffic, over 65-75% is already on the adjacent street network, referred to as by pass traffic. The majority of the traffic will be right-in right-out with the peak times before 10 AM.
- **J. Lemberg** asked the members of the Commission if there were any questions or comments. No one came forward. He then opened up this portion of the meeting to the Public.

No one came forward. The Public Hearing portion of the hearing was closed.

- **J. Allen** asked when doing the traffic study, is there an estimate of how many people would come out of the coffee shop and utilize the light on Rt. 59 going south as opposed to turning out of the Mobile station. **L. Means** stated the study shows over 25% of the traffic will utilize the right-in and out.
- **J. Lemberg** asked for the first of two motions.
 - 1) Preliminary/Final Resubdivision of Lot 1 of the Home Depot Subdivision
 - 2) Second Site Plan Amendment for Lot 1 of the Home Depot Subdivision and Site Plan for Lot 2 of the Home Depot Resubdivision
- **J. Lemberg** then asked for a motion for the Petitioner's requests subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact.

Motioned by: T. Connor Seconded by: J. Miaso

Roll Call

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

Nayes: None



J. Lemberg then asked for a second motion for the Special Use permits a) To allow a drive-thru establishment and b) To allow outdoor seating subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact.

Motioned by: J. Miaso Seconded by: D. Miaso

Roll Call

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

Nayes: None



Case (# 17-17) 802 E. Devon

Third Site Plan Amendment, and Special Use Permit for disturbing a wetland **PUBLIC HEARING**

The following Exhibits were presented:

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

A. Zubko stated the subject property was annexed to the Village in 1963 and was zoned R-1 (Single Family Residence District). The Bartlett Industrial Park Subdivision was approved in February of 1969 creating 5 industrial lots zoned Mg (Manufacturing District). The current building was built in 1969 with additions added in 1986 and 1988 which were the first and second site plans which is why this is the Third Site Plan Amendment.

In 1987 a variation was granted for a 25 foot variation from the 50 foot required transitional side yard adjoining a residence, to the west. When the building was built in 1969 the side yard requirement was 10 feet. In 1978, through a text amendment, the property to the west was re-classified as SR-6 Multi-Family District, which it is still zoned today. The 1978 re-classification created a new side yard setback of 50 feet pursuant to the Village Code. Therefore, through no fault of the petitioner, the building was considered legal non-conforming and a variation was granted to allow a 25 foot variation from the 50 foot requirement. This building has been vacant since Main Steel vacated the building in 2011.

The Petitioner is requesting a Third Site Plan Amendment for the existing 52,182 square foot industrial building to add an additional 68,000 square feet on a 6.78 acre lot. This building would be constructed for four future tenants. The proposed building additions will be constructed of red masonry walls with darker red accents. The four proposed office areas will be located on the east side of the building. The building will meet the height requirements.

A building permit has been issued for a partial exterior remodel, roof repair and partial demolition. Work has already commenced and new brick has been added to the south and west elevations of the existing building and two portions of the warehouse have already been removed.

The petitioner is requesting a Special Use Permit to disturb the wetland located in the northeast corner of the site. An application to the Army Corps of Engineers has been submitted, and the report states: "this property contains waters of the United States. The Open Water Area and Swales have been determined to be under the jurisdiction of this office and therefore, subject to Federal regulation." A permit will be required from the Department of the Army before any work within 50' of the open water area and swale commence. The Petitioner must follow the three comments provided in the letter dated August 11, 2017 from Hampton, Lenzini and Renwick, Inc. (HLR) which are part of the conditions in the report.

The Site Plan shows 13 exterior docks on the east side of the building and 1 drive-in door on the north side of the building to be utilized for building maintenance, not day-to-day operations. All the docks are facing away from the residential zoning districts. The existing curb cut off E. Devon Avenue will be widened and utilized for all site traffic, passenger cars and trucks.



The petitioner is requesting a Variation to allow a reduction in the number of required parking spaces from 140 to 95 parking spaces. The Site Plan identifies 95 parking spaces. The Zoning Ordinance requires 112 spaces for the warehouse and 28 parking spaces for the office space totaling 140 parking spaces for this use. The plan however shows 51 future parking spaces, which would increase the total parking provided on the site to 146 spaces and if constructed would meet the Zoning Ordinance requirements. The future spaces are shown as parallel stalls on the east side directly across from the loading docks and about 38 stalls on the north side of the property if needed. Right now they actually show 6 parking stalls for trucks that would be painted first. The Variation request was discussed by the Zoning Board of Appeals at their meeting on September 7, 2017 and recommended for approval. A Landbank/Future Parking Agreement is currently being drafted which will include the following language to require the Petitioner to install the landbanked/future parking spaces. If Staff does an inspection of the site and it is clear that tenants and/or visitors are not parking in a designated parking space we can actually go in and perform the work if they will not do it. They will be posting a bond or letter of credit and the landbank parking agreement has to be recorded as well which is also another condition for approval.

Staff recommends approval of the Petitioner's requests subject to the Findings of Fact and conditions outlined in your report: Staff approval of the Engineering Plans and Landscape Plan; US Army Corps of Engineers permit approval; the three comments provided in the HLR letter that discusses needing a maintenance plan, and an Army Corp Permit, the Landbank Parking Agreement, recording that agreement, and signage and landscaping. The Petitioner is present if there are any questions.

One thing to mention is there is an existing fence on the west side of the property that is about ten feet tall. They will be keeping the existing fence to about the current building. Then the fence cuts in diagonally into the property so the petition will be removing that section all the way to the north and replacing it with a solid eight foot fence to meet requirements. There will still be a fence there, they just had to move it to accommodate the parking at the northwest corner of the lot.

Petitioners, **Dimitri Poulokefalos**, 27 Cutter Run, Barrington and **Charles Schwartz**, 1645 Ogden Ave., Chicago, **Bart Kalata**, 915 W. 58th, LaGrange were sworn in by **J. Lemberg**.

- **J. Lemberg** asked the Petitioners if they had anything to add to the staff report. **D. Poulokefalos** stated no.
- **J. Lemberg** asked the members of the Commission if there were any questions or comments.
- **T. Ridenour** asked what the potential users for this site are.
- **D. Poulokefalos** stated it is an industrial building, light manufacturing, could be one tenant, and could be up to four tenants. If there is one tenant there is plenty of parking, even if there are four tenants there will be enough parking.
- **A. Hopkins** stated that parking is his concern and reducing it by that much, can Staff please explain how the landbank parking agreement works?



A. Zubko stated the Village did this during the Exeter building out in Brewster Creek, the 400,000 square foot industrial building. They actually landbanked about half of their parking as they also were not sure of their tenants. So we drafted a landbank parking agreement between their attorney and ours and basically they post a bond to cover the cost of putting in that future parking if it is needed. We contact them first and tell them they need to put the parking in and if they don't we have money set aside in a bond to install it. This one is a lot different for the fact the future parking is already impervious/paved so they'd just be adding striping and two parking islands with landscaping, whereas the other building it currently is all grass area. That was a large landbank agreement where this will be minimal.

- **A. Hopkins** asked if there needs to be a number of complaints or does staff do a random inspection.
- **A. Zubko** stated that is correct, Staff can go do an inspection, typically those inspections start from a neighbor calling saying they're parking everywhere or on their property. Then we can start the process of agreement. She does not foresee this being an issue depending on the tenant but there is room on this property.
- **A. Hopkins** asked if there are going to be lights on the back of the building.
- **D. Poulokefalos** stated they will be around the building.
- **A. Hopkins** asked if there would be anything high enough reflecting to the residents.
- **D. Poulokefalos** stated they can work and make sure it will not affect the residents. There most likely won't be a height issue.
- **B. Kalata** stated they have done photometric studies, lights will be located a few feet below the parapet, there are different parapet heights but based on the study of the photometrics we will not cause any illumination problems on the neighboring properties.
- **A. Hopkins** asked what if one of the neighbors has an issue, is there something that can be done to adjust them?
- **B. Kalata** stated the light fixtures are adjustable so that could be modified.
- T. Ridenour asked if any of the Staff knew what Main Steel did in that building?
- **J. Plonczynski** stated they used to finish sheet metal. They do some of the decorative metal finished, not corrugated but buffed finished sheet metal. They did rolls and sheets of metal, used in bar finishes and a lot of different uses. They moved their operation down to Texas a couple years ago.
- **J. Lemberg** asked if anyone had any questions or comments. The Commission had no questions and he opened up this portion of the meeting to the Public.
- J. Plonczynski stated he had no witness forms.
- **J. Lemberg** asked if anyone had any questions or comments. The Public Hearing portion of the hearing was closed. He asked if anyone had any questions or comments.



A. Zubko stated to Mr. Hopkins that she wanted to let him know that there will be no lights on the west side of the building, there will be one parking lot light on the north but it's pretty far away from the property line.

A. Hopkins thanked staff.

J. Lemberg then asked for a motion for the Petitioner's requests subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact.

Motioned by: J. Miaso Seconded by: D. Negele

Roll Call

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

Nayes: None



Case (# 17-22) Get Fresh – Brewster Creek Business Park – Lot 9N1 Site Plan Review

R. Grill stated the petitioner is requesting a Site Plan Review for a proposed 151,000 square foot warehouse building on a 9.5 acre lot in the Brewster Creek Business Park, Unit 1. This building would be constructed as a second building for the existing Get Fresh facility located directly to the north of this property, across Schiferl Road. The subject property is currently being utilized as a temporary parking area for employees and trailers for Get Fresh.

The proposed building would be 44'10" in height and constructed with insulated pre-cast concrete wall panels painted light grey with dark grey accent panels. Light and dark green banding would provide additional accents on each of the elevations and coordinate with the glass and metal entry feature.

The 16,000 square foot office area would be located along the north and east portions of the building within the mezzanine area. An interior truck maintenance area would be located at the southeast corner of the facility along with the 29 exterior docks also located along the east side of the building.

Three curb cuts are proposed along Schiferl Road. The west curb cut would be utilized by passenger vehicles accessing the parking lot while the two eastern curb cuts would be utilized by trucks accessing the loading docks. The far eastern curb cut would serve as an "Entrance Only," while the curb cut located just to the west would serve as an "Exit Only." Appropriate signage would be posted at each location. There would be no direct access to Brewster Creek Boulevard.

The Petitioner has purchased approximately 15,000 sq. ft. of land at the northeast corner of Stearns Road and Brewster Creek Boulevard from Elmhurst Chicago Stone that was part of the detention easement, but was not actually utilized for detention purposes. This land (included in the 9.5 acre total depicted on the Site Plan) provides additional acreage for passenger vehicle parking on the site and eliminated the need for a variation request to reduce the number of required parking spaces on the site.

The Zoning Ordinance requires 136 parking stalls for the warehouse use and 59 stalls for the office space totaling 195. The Site Plan identifies 197 parking spaces, including six (6) accessible stalls, which exceeds the Zoning Ordinance requirement. There are also 25 straight truck spaces and 22 trailer storage stalls provided within close proximity to the eastern property line. The Petitioner estimates a total of 175 employees at a shift change for this use and believes the number of parking spaces provided on the plan will meet their needs.

The Landscape, Engineering and Photometric Plans are currently being reviewed.

The Staff recommends approval of the Petitioner's request subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact outlined in the report.

The Petitioners were present if anyone had questions.



- **J. Lemberg** asked if the Petitioner had anything to add. The Petitioner stated nothing at this time.
- J. Lemberg asked if any members of the Commission had any questions.
- **T. Ridenour** asked how many loading docks were in the building.

Petitioner Richard Schultz 1059 Hawthorne Drive, Itasca, stated there are 29 loading docks.

- **T. Ridenour** asked the Petitioner if they had one or two buildings across Schiferl Road. **R. Grill** stated there is one.
- **J. Lemberg** asked if anyone else had any questions or comments.
- **J. Lemberg** then asked for a motion for the Petitioner's request subject to the conditions and Findings of Fact.

Motioned by: T. Connor Seconded by: J. Miaso

Roll Call

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

Nayes: None



Old Business/ New Business

- **J. Plonczynski** stated he didn't have any old business. Other than these projects will be moved on to the Village Board as soon as possible for their final approval and hopefully start construction.
- J. Plonczynski stated at this time, we do not have anything for a meeting for next month. Rana has had some special dispensation to start grading already. A. Hopkins asked how many lots are left in the Brewster Creek Business Park. J. Plonczynski stated a handful, one on Munger, Humbracht Circle and Hardt Circle. T. Ridenour asked what is foreseen happening with the Cook County portion. J. Plonczynski stated they are doing the construction of Spitzer Road, which is part of the refinancing of the Industrial Park and once that is completed there will be better access to the Cook County side. Working with the property owners and generating more interest they may explore some of the Cook County tax incentives that we offered to companies such as Sebert and Main Steel to entice them for bigger warehouses or outside storage. 2022 is the end date of the TIF district.
- J. Lemberg asked if anyone else had any questions or comments. No one came forward.

Motion to adjourn.

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

Motion Carried

The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 P.M.