

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF BARTLETT
PLAN COMMISSION

IN RE THE MATTER OF:)
)
Bartlett Ridge - Public)
Hearing.)

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

June 11, 2015
7:00 P.M.

PROCEEDINGS had and testimony taken
before the Bartlett Plan Commission of the
above-entitled cause taken at the Village Hall,
228 South Main Street, Bartlett, Illinois, before
LYNN M. EVANS, C.S.R., License #084-003473, a
Notary Public qualified and commissioned for the
State of Illinois.

PRESENT:

- MR. JIM LEMBERG
- MR. MARK HOPKINS
- MR. TIM RIDENOUR
- MR. JOHN MIASO
- MR. JERRY KALLAS
- MS. DIANE NEGELE
- MR. AUSTIN HOPKINS
- MR. TOM CONNOR

ALSO PRESENT:

- MR. JIM PLONCZYNSKI, AICP
- MS. ROBERTA GRILL, AICP
- MS. ANGELA ZUBKO

RECEIVED
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
JUN 29 2015
VILLAGE OF
BARTLETT

1 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: I'd like to call to order
2 the meeting of the Bartlett Plan Commission at
3 7:02. Secretary call the roll.

4 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Jim Lemberg.

5 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Here.

6 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Mark Hopkins.

7 MR. M. HOPKINS: Here.

8 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Tim Ridenour.

9 MR. RIDENOUR: Here.

10 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: John Miaso.

11 MR. MIASO: Here.

12 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Jerry Kallas.

13 MR. KALLAS: Here.

14 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Diane Negele.

15 MS. NEGELE: Here.

16 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Shane Cook.

17 Austin Hopkins.

18 MR. A. HOPKINS: Here.

19 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Tom Connor.

20 MR. CONNOR: Here.

21 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: We have a quorum.

22 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Next item is the approval
23 of the April 9, 2015, meeting minutes.

24 Is there a motion to approve?

1 MS. NEGELE: Motion.

2 MR. CONNOR: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Motion approved.

4 Any discussion?

5 Have the roll, please.

6 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Diane Negele.

7 MS. NEGELE: Yes.

8 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Tom Connor.

9 MR. CONNOR: Yes.

10 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Mark Hopkins.

11 MR. M. HOPKINS: Yes.

12 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Tim Ridenour.

13 John Miaso.

14 MR. MIASO: Yes.

15 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Jerry Kallas.

16 MR. KALLAS: Yes.

17 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Austin Hopkins.

18 MR. A. HOPKINS: Yes.

19 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Motion approved.

20 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Okay. The next item on our

21 agenda is 14-29 Bartlett Ridge preliminary

22 subdivision plat, preliminary PUD plan, rezoning

23 from SR-5 PUD to SR-4, special use permit for the

24 SR-4 district, and a comprehensive plan amendment

1 to the future land use plan to allow the subject
2 property to change from commercial uses to
3 suburban residential.

4 It's also a public hearing; and if anyone
5 in the audience is going to speak or have comments
6 tonight, we ask that you fill out one of these
7 forms. They're back there where the clock is or
8 they might be by the podium up here.

9 Okay. Roberta, do you have the documents
10 for the mailings and posting?

11 MS. GRILL: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Okay.

13 MS. GRILL: I thought I would start off with a
14 little history of the site. This property was
15 zoned B-3, neighborhood shopping, and complied
16 with the comprehensive plan, which also identified
17 this site for commercial uses, until it was
18 rezoned to the SR-5 PUD multi-family district
19 back in 2006 where it was rezoned to the SR-5 PUD
20 district -- sorry -- for the Bravo Sound
21 subdivision. It was an 87-unit townhome
22 development and was approved as a preliminary
23 subdivision PUD plan. A final development plan
24 was never submitted for this property. Then in

1 2007, a new developer approached the Village to
2 finalize these preliminary plans, which included
3 larger townhomes and upgrades to the elevations.
4 This amended 87-unit preliminary final PUD plan
5 was approved in 2007 and was known as Bartlett
6 Ridge. This development was also never built.

7 The petitioners brought in a concept plan
8 before the committee of the whole back in July of
9 2014. The petitioner was seeking input and
10 direction from the committee prior to their full
11 submittal for a single-family subdivision. The
12 subdivision consisted of 43 lots with a planned
13 unit development overlay that allowed for
14 modifications in the required bulk regulations.

15 A resident from the Timberline subdivision
16 located south of this property expressed concerns
17 with the proximity of the proposed homes to their
18 townhome units and asked if the developer could
19 review the size of the rear yard setbacks adjacent
20 to their homes prior to their full application
21 submittal. Several trustees agreed and asked the
22 developer to review the rear yard setbacks along
23 their south property line prior to their
24 resubmittal.

1 And before you tonight is the actual
2 submittal for a preliminary subdivision,
3 preliminary PUD plan, and a special use for a PUD
4 for a proposed 43 single-family lot subdivision.
5 There is actually a total of 48 lots, which also
6 includes the common area -- common areas, open
7 space detention, and a park site. The
8 13-and-a-half-acre site is currently vacant and
9 located along the east side of Naperville Road,
10 approximately 1200 feet south of Lake Street.

11 The petitioner is also requesting to
12 rezone the property from the SR-5 PUD zoning
13 district to the SR-4 PUD district. The proposed
14 minimum lot size for this subdivision is 6,988
15 square feet, which most closely matches the SR-4
16 suburban residence district, which has a minimum
17 lot size requirement of 6,000 square feet. The
18 average lot size in this subdivision is 8,126
19 square feet.

20 The special use request for the planned
21 unit development overlay on the subject property
22 would allow for the following modifications from
23 the bulk regulations. Petitioners are asking for
24 a 20-foot front yard setback, whereas in the SR-4

1 straight zoning district the front yard is 25
2 feet. The side yard request is for 7 feet and
3 the side yard in the SR-4 district is 5 feet.
4 Rear yard request is for 25 feet and in some
5 instances, which I'll explain in a minute, is 35
6 feet and the SR-4 bulk regulations require 45
7 feet for the rear yard.

8 The petitioner has agreed upon -- as
9 agreed upon during the concept plan review to
10 increase the rear yard setback from 25 feet to 35
11 feet for those homes -- for those lots closest to
12 an existing townhome unit along the south
13 property line, so I know it's difficult to see,
14 but from here to about here. These proposed
15 homes would be the closest to the existing
16 townhome units in the Timberline subdivision.

17 The plat of subdivision identifies a
18 17-foot wide road dedication along the east side
19 on Naperville Road, and they have provided a
20 10-foot wide bike path.

21 Petitioner is requesting two modifications
22 from the subdivision ordinance, one to reduce the
23 right-of-way width from the required 66 feet to
24 60 feet for proposed streets A and B and to

1 exceed the maximum cul-de-sac length of 600 feet.
2 The cul-de-sac as shown in the plat measures
3 1,476 feet more or less.

4 They are also providing or proposing a
5 park site approximately half acre in size down in
6 this location, southeast corner of the site.
7 This new park would expand the existing Peregrine
8 Park located within the Eagle's Ridge subdivision,
9 which is southeast of this site.

10 Open space stormwater detention is
11 adjacent to the park site here and landscaping
12 and the proposed subdivision sign easement would
13 be located in the common area, lots 44 and 45,
14 along Naperville Road in the front to buffer
15 these two homes proposed closest to Naperville
16 Road. These 35-foot wide lots would have
17 landscaping and would be maintained by the
18 homeowner's association.

19 The petitioner is also installing an
20 8-foot high solid cedar fence along the rear
21 property line of lots 12 to 15, here, and along
22 lots 18 to 25, here, so along here and here.
23 This fence would help to buffer the future homes
24 from the existing RV sales property to the north

1 and east, as well as the adjacent restaurant/bar
2 with outdoor seating.

3 Previous development submittals and
4 requests by the staff had the existing Telluride
5 Court located in the Timberline subdivision here
6 extending through this property to not only
7 connect the street system, but to also provide a
8 second point of ingress and egress for both
9 subdivisions. The petitioner approached the
10 Timberline homeowner's association property
11 manager and president and were told that they
12 would not be interested in connecting these two
13 properties.

14 The annexation agreement stated that the
15 Village would need to request the road dedication
16 to take place within 24 months from the date of
17 the annexation agreement and the property needs
18 to be rezoned to residential. If the village did
19 not elect to exercise the dedication of the
20 right-of-way within said period, this dedication
21 would expire and be of no further force and
22 effect. The date of the annexation agreement was
23 February of 2001. Since no development proposals
24 were submitted to the Village for the subject

1 property within that two-year time frame, the
2 window for requiring the connection of the two
3 subdivisions has passed.

4 So as a result, the staff approached the
5 petitioner with providing an emergency access
6 easement at the end of the cul-de-sac. I know
7 it's difficult to see, but it's right -- here is
8 the end of the cul-de-sac and here is the
9 adjoining property which is Moretti's/Cadillac
10 Ranch. So they would provide a gate here and an
11 emergency access easement here. This would allow
12 a secondary point of access in the event that
13 Naperville Road was blocked.

14 The petitioner has contacted the owner of
15 the restaurant/bar located east of this property
16 and has had positive discussions regarding this
17 emergency access. The 20-foot wide access would
18 begin at the end of the cul-de-sac and continue
19 through the adjacent gravel and paved parking
20 areas and the fire department has found this
21 emergency access is acceptable.

22 The comprehensive plan currently identifies
23 this site for commercial uses. Therefore, the
24 petitioner is requesting that a comprehensive

1 plan amendment to the future land use plan be
2 made to change the plan to allow for suburban
3 residential uses to coincide with this
4 development. The proposed subdivision would have
5 a net density of 4.8 dwelling units per acre and
6 would be in compliance with the proposed
7 amendment to the plan.

8 The staff does recommend approval of the
9 petitioner's request subject to the conditions
10 and the findings of the fact, and I did leave a
11 copy of the findings of fact on the dais for you;
12 and if you have any questions, the petitioners
13 are here tonight and I believe people are here to
14 speak in the audience tonight. We would be happy
15 to answer any other questions.

16 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Okay. Thank you. Are
17 there any questions from the members of the
18 commission at this time?

19 MR. CONNOR: So there would be a gate that
20 would prohibit the use of that emergency access
21 by anybody?

22 MS. GRILL: Yes, it would have a lock per the
23 fire department.

24 MR. A. HOPKINS: What kind of gate? Will it

1 be like a chain-link fence?

2 MS. GRILL: I think usually it's the yellow
3 pipe bars. I don't know the exact terminology
4 for that, but that's what I've seen before. I
5 don't think that has been decided yet, but --

6 MR. A. HOPKINS: Okay. And then what about
7 how is it going to exit onto Lake Street?

8 MS. GRILL: Yes. This is the existing parking
9 lot. Let me show you. I don't know if I have
10 it. So this is already paved through here. Part
11 of this is gravel, so that already exists, so
12 here is the part would need the connection right
13 here.

14 MR. M. HOPKINS: Roberta, you said that there
15 was a tall stockade fence on the north side of
16 these lots. What about the east side?

17 MS. GRILL: It's proposed for that 8-foot high
18 cedar fence. We've had discussions about
19 continuing the fence along that east side. We're
20 also looking at landscaping. We're trying to
21 figure out which would be the best method to
22 buffer that. We don't know how much room there
23 is and final engineering hasn't been --

24 MR. M. HOPKINS: We'll see that during the

1 final?

2 MS. GRILL: Yes.

3 MR. KALLAS: So the emergency exit there or
4 entrance coming off of Lake Street, does that go
5 through the parking lot of the existing --

6 MS. GRILL: Yes.

7 MR. KALLAS: So it's not -- they're not going
8 to make it separate.

9 MS. GRILL: No, it is the parking lot.

10 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: What happens in the
11 wintertime? Is the restaurant going to plow a
12 path all the way back down to that restaurant.

13 MS. GRILL: Well, the restaurant is open in
14 the winter. If they want patrons to park in
15 their parking lot, I would assume they have a
16 contract to have that parking lot plowed, so I'm
17 imagining it would be plowed, yes.

18 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: But how would the
19 contractor that's plowing it know that that's an
20 entrance for an emergency and he doesn't just
21 take the snow and push it up in that direction?

22 MS. GRILL: I can't answer that. I would --

23 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Can they put sign -- post a
24 sign saying this is an entrance to an emergency.

1 MS. GRILL: There will be a sign and the fire
2 department has told me many times they will find
3 a way.

4 MR. A. HOPKINS: Is there anywhere else in the
5 village we have just an emergency access?

6 MS. GRILL: Yes, we do, just south of here.
7 We have -- the Timberline subdivision directly to
8 the south, when this access point did not go
9 through, we provided -- or the developer provided
10 at our request to provide an emergency access on
11 Naperville Road. It's a 24-four-foot wide grass.
12 Part of it's paved. Part of it serves as an
13 access easement to these townhomes right here and
14 then a small portion of it right here is
15 grasscrete and I just heard that they did use
16 that recently for the first time.

17 MR. A. HOPKINS: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Any further questions?

19 MR. KALLAS: How many variances are they
20 asking for here?

21 MS. GRILL: There is two modifications from
22 the subdivision ordinance and then there are the
23 bulk regulations that they're requesting, the
24 modifications, so no variances per se. It's a

1 planned unit development which allows for some
2 flexibility and you could ask the petitioners
3 that question as well.

4 MR. KALLAS: But the thing is if we have
5 certain regulations and they're asking for
6 something different, it's considered a variance,
7 is it not?

8 MS. GRILL: In this case it is not considered
9 a variance.

10 MR. KALLAS: Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Any other questions? Okay.
12 The petitioner is here this evening.

13 Can you stand and anyone else that's going
14 to give testimony and be sworn in, please.

15 (Witness sworn.)

16 MR. EIDEN: Good evening, everyone. My name
17 is Mark Eiden. That's M-a-r-k E-i-d-e-n. I'm an
18 attorney and my law offices are in Libertyville,
19 Illinois. I represent Ryan, the petitioner, in
20 this project. I just wanted to dispense first
21 with a formality, because it is a public hearing,
22 there are standards to be addressed. I've
23 addressed them all in writing in detail in the
24 application, and I'm assuming that you don't want

1 me to read them into the record. That could take
2 all night, but without doing that I would like to
3 incorporate them by reference into the record.

4 Number two, we are here to give you any
5 information that you request. We have our
6 landscape architect with us, we have members of
7 Ryan, and we have our civil engineer here. Of
8 course, I'm here. I'm the attorney. I could
9 expound just a little bit on some of the off-site
10 issues that we've talked about.

11 The first is we are pleased to see that
12 the -- some of the members and the attorney for
13 the church to the north of us are here. We're
14 going to try to coordinate our efforts for
15 grading. They're going to put in a detention
16 pond close to our property line. We want to
17 match grades. We're trying to work out those
18 engineering details tonight, and you're free to
19 talk with them, if they are still here. Okay.
20 Yes.

21 We have worked out an arrangement with
22 Barrington Motors. We are going to supply them
23 with a sewer and water stub that they have
24 requested. They are going to allow us a grading

1 easement onto their property to match grades and
2 to install some landscaping. As you know, there
3 was a fence that was discussed. We intend to
4 install the fence, and we also intend once we get
5 a little further along in the engineering to
6 install some off-site landscaping in that area as
7 requested by Village staff.

8 The last item on the off-site issues is,
9 of course, the emergency access. We've had
10 positive discussions as recently as this week
11 about how we can work that easement out. We are
12 very hopeful that we'll get it. We've done
13 everything that we really can. We tried hard
14 with Timberline. They just, you know, decided
15 that was not something they wanted, so we moved
16 onto the Moretti's, the potential access and
17 we're proceeding in pace with that, and so we
18 have every expectation that we'll be able to work
19 that out.

20 Other than that, I don't think we have any
21 really highly charged issues in this. It is a
22 matter of whether you like the plan and the
23 changes that we've made. We've reduced the
24 density. We're down zoning, and we're going to

1 provide a park that, as Roberta said, can be
2 joined together with the adjacent park. We're
3 going to accept all the stormwater that we have
4 to accept under law, and we are going to try to
5 preserve certain trees that are on-site and work
6 around them, rather than remove them, again at
7 the request of staff.

8 So with that summary, I would be more than
9 happy to respond to any questions and, of course,
10 we have the people here that I referred to
11 earlier.

12 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Okay. Any members have any
13 questions? Not at this time.

14 MR. RIDENOUR: Can we go back to the fence for
15 just a second? Does that go to the full extent
16 of the parking lot of Moretti's at least?

17 MR. EIDEN: The full extent of the parking lot
18 of Moretti's?

19 MR. RIDENOUR: The fence on the east side.

20 MR. WYNSMA: Nate Wynsma with William Ryan
21 Homes. Address is 945 North Plum Grove Road,
22 Schaumburg.

23 Yeah, to answer your question, there will
24 be an 8-foot solid cedar fence and that will

1 start -- actually, if you can go back right -- I
2 believe that's lot 12 on your plans. That
3 property, the Cortina (phonetic) property, to the
4 north goes all the way up to 20. That's zoned
5 commercial. I think right now it's a
6 single-family home and some outbuildings, but
7 starting in the southwest corner of lot 12, so
8 adjacent to the church extending east across 13,
9 14, south along the west side of Barrington
10 Motors, east along the south end of Barrington
11 Motors to the corner of Moretti's, and then south
12 again along lot 24 along the Moretti's parking
13 lot up to the point where the emergency access
14 would come off the cul-de-sac. From that point
15 on, it's open space, trees, the detention area,
16 the park, so everything that backs to those
17 potentially more invasive commercial uses we're
18 going to do an 8-foot solid cedar fence and then
19 some areas of landscaping on -- in one case on
20 Barrington Motors side we're going to do the
21 landscaping on their side as a buffer. On
22 Moretti's side, we're going to do extra
23 landscaping on our side.

24 MR. RIDENOUR: I was just considering this

1 area where the park is. Wouldn't we want to
2 separate that from the parking lot also in that
3 corner?

4 MR. WYNSMA: The parking lot -- go to the
5 emergency access.

6 MR. RIDENOUR: Just south of the emergency
7 access and then heading east.

8 MR. WYNSMA: Where you see the emergency
9 access, the length of that as it leaves our
10 property, the reason why that the easement is as
11 long as it is there is that bold line that you
12 see that kind of arcs along the southwest corner,
13 that's actually roughly a scrub line of trees, so
14 we're taking the easement out that far all the
15 way to where the gravel starts for the parking.

16 MR. RIDENOUR: That arc there is filled with
17 scrub and --

18 MR. WYNSMA: All trees, yeah. So that 20-foot
19 easement will actually be cut through there. We
20 will grade it. We will build it with grasscrete
21 hard surface for emergency vehicles, but outside
22 of that, the rest of that tree line going north
23 towards the Cadillac Ranch along the east side of
24 lot 24 will remain intact as a buffer and then

1 everything to the south will remain intact. You
2 wouldn't really be able to see the detention or
3 park from there.

4 MR. RIDENOUR: All right. So that buffer is
5 actually on Moretti's's property?

6 MR. WYNSMA: Yeah, that's all existing and
7 continues onto our property and there will be
8 some opportunities for tree preservation on the
9 south side of that cul-de-sac bulb.

10 MR. RIDENOUR: All right.

11 MS. GRILL: You can see the trees.

12 MR. RIDENOUR: It's just hard to tell where
13 the property line is on that picture.

14 MS. GRILL: It's right here.

15 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Any other questions?

16 At this time I would like to open up the
17 public hearing.

18 Jim, you have their names?

19 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: William Parry.

20 MR. PARRY: Yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Would you state your name
22 and address, please?

23 MR. PARRY: William S. Parry, 1274 Tamarack
24 Drive. I'm a little concerned about the gate. I

1 don't live there, but if I have emergency
2 vehicles heading towards my house if it's on fire
3 or somebody was sick and I figured out they had
4 to open a gate to get through, I would be a
5 little concerned about that, but anyway, what I
6 really wanted to talk about is what's actually
7 going to be between my house, which is just south
8 of the property, and the new property? Either
9 one of you, I don't mind.

10 MR. WYNSMA: Well, anything on your side of
11 the property or along the fence row would remain.
12 Anything north of -- we have a 10-foot public
13 utility and drainage easement on the back of
14 essentially every lot for the village storm sewer,
15 for dry utilities; that along the property line
16 itself typically those utilities within that
17 10-foot easement may lie roughly in the center of
18 it, so any tree preservation opportunity within
19 the first, say, 5 feet of the property we would
20 intend to leave, any trees that we can along the
21 fence row.

22 MR. PARRY: Okay. So from my backyard, how
23 far away will be your house?

24 MR. WYNSMA: Assuming you're building --

1 you're one of the first four buildings there?

2 MR. PARRY: We're the seventh one.

3 MR. WYNSMA: Seventh unit or seventh building?

4 MR. PARRY: There you go.

5 MR. RYAN: So assuming your building is
6 roughly from our previous surveys about 40 feet
7 from the line, any landscaping you have within
8 that 40 feet and then any landscaping within the
9 first 35 feet of the single-family lot would be
10 minimum 75 feet.

11 We -- because of that increased setback
12 that we agreed to on those first lots backing to
13 the townhomes, we've restricted certain plans.
14 Our plans have varying depths to them. We've
15 restricted certain plans from being built on
16 those lots because they're too deep, so we have
17 plans that vary in depth as much as 8 to 12 feet,
18 so the minimum would be 75 feet. Maximum might
19 be as much as 85 feet depending on the plan.

20 MR. PARRY: Is there any plans for a fence? I
21 see you have one around the --

22 MR. WYNSMA: No. Along the residential to
23 residential we're not fencing. I guess the first
24 point I would make is we don't typically fence

1 residential to residential, at least not as the
2 developer. A resident can maybe choose to do
3 that, but because we do have a fence row of trees
4 there, if we were to determine there to be a
5 fence initially, we would have to clear that and
6 we want to leave the existing trees, if we can.

7 MR. PARRY: Let me make sure I have this
8 right. The 75 is to the garden or to the house?

9 MR. WYNSMA: It's the shortest distance
10 possible from the back of your home to one of our
11 homes.

12 MR. PARRY: The home or the garden?

13 MR. WYNSMA: Home.

14 MR. PARRY: The home. Okay. So after the
15 home, we've got how much space to the edge of the
16 property?

17 MR. WYNSMA: I think there is 40 feet on your
18 side and minimum 35 feet on our side.

19 MR. PARRY: Okay. That's all I have. Thank
20 you.

21 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Donna Campagna.

22 MS. CAMPAGNA: Hi. Donna Campagna,

23 524 Telluride Court. I think I've got this

24 straight, that there is going to be some kind

1 of -- on our north end there is going to be some
2 trees kept or some whatever that is kept,
3 correct? No, go back a little all through there.

4 MR. WYNSMA: To the extent we can along the
5 property line, the fence row, because there is
6 existing trees along that property line, but
7 there is storm sewer easements within there that
8 we have to put storm sewer. The site has a lot
9 of topography, so everything that's draining from
10 the church and from Barrington Motors, from those
11 properties to the north of us, everything that's
12 being captured in our storm sewer system, so our
13 site is taking all that water now. We'll have to
14 grade flat for the pads for the home, but at each
15 of the rear yards on the north side and south
16 side will be storm sewer to pick up any of that
17 drainage that could potentially come on your
18 property. So there will be some storm sewer
19 there, but to the extent that storm sewer is
20 within a 10-foot easement, anything within the
21 property line 5 feet in, we will try and save all
22 that.

23 MS. CAMPAGNA: Okay. But how far out is it
24 going to extend? My unit is the one that goes

1 this way by the cul-de-sac, that one, yes. So is
2 that going to extend across that because the
3 whole area there has --

4 MR. WYNSMA: Yeah, to the extent that entire
5 south property line -- you know, we've got storm
6 sewer that we know of and then I've got ComEd and
7 cable companies, their utilities in there, so we
8 try to keep them within that easement, but
9 frankly, it's out of my control at some point
10 because they go where they've got to go and they
11 won't let me dictate that, but as much as we can
12 along that entire south property line would be
13 the fence row.

14 MS. CAMPAGNA: Okay. Somebody said that, and
15 I don't know if this is just a rumor, that the
16 homeowner that's going to back to us would have
17 the option of keeping some of that -- I call them
18 trees. I don't know if they're trees -- or
19 having them taken down. Have I made that up?

20 MR. WYNSMA: I honestly don't know the
21 ordinance that much, but I would assume once we
22 sold a home there if somebody wanted to take down
23 trees on their lot, I think they can.

24 MS. CAMPAGNA: But, really, do you really

1 think -- when you're going to put the storm.
2 sewer, you're going to put the electric, it
3 sounds to me like it's really not going to stay.
4 What's your --

5 MR. WYNSMA: Along that property line, that's
6 why I say the hedge row or the fence row, outside
7 of a certain distance it won't. If there are
8 trees straddling the property line or within a
9 few feet of the property line that we don't have
10 to disturb, we will leave them. It just costs us
11 money to cut them down.

12 MS. CAMPAGNA: You sure it isn't easier just
13 to level the whole thing?

14 MR. WYNSMA: No, I don't think so. The site
15 has a lot of topography across it north to south.
16 We are going to have to do a lot of manipulation
17 of dirt when we do the development, but to the
18 extent that we can keep trees there, we will keep
19 trees there.

20 MS. CAMPAGNA: Okay. One more question.
21 Would you be responsible if -- I don't foresee a
22 problem, but let's say the drainage sewers or
23 whatever are not picking it up because of the
24 topography coming, and so now my cul-de-sac or

1 area is really getting bombarded. Is that
2 something that after the fact you would be taking
3 care of or is that let go?

4 MR. WYNSMA: That's something if there was any
5 shortcoming to our stormwater management
6 whatsoever and any of that was coming onto your
7 property, yeah, we would be responsible for it
8 during the maintenance period, so if we -- we
9 tend to build out of here within three years and,
10 typically, we have a one-year maintenance bond on
11 infrastructure that expires a year after it's
12 done, so within that time frame any issues are
13 going to be our responsibility. Beyond that time
14 frame it becomes dedicated to the village.

15 MS. CAMPAGNA: Okay. One more last. What are
16 the homes going to look like? Do you have a
17 scale model yet or anything?

18 MR. WYNSMA: We have an example. Is that your
19 last question?

20 MS. CAMPAGNA: It is.

21 MR. WYNSMA: I'll give a general overview
22 then. We have up to 13 plans we will offer here.
23 Ranch homes, up to three ranch plans that we have
24 right now that range from about 1800 square feet

1 up to 2400 square feet. Two story plans that
2 range from about 2500 square feet on up to -- I
3 think the Sheridan is about 2500 square feet
4 starting. The largest plan we're going to offer
5 goes up to about 3600, 3700 square feet. Each
6 plan has structural options. So buildable space
7 on the second floor for master bath bump outs,
8 family room bump outs, things like that that can
9 affect the square footage.

10 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Jim, next one.

11 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Karen Parry.

12 MS. PARRY: My name is Karen Parry. I live at
13 1274 Tamarack Drive. My townhome backs up to the
14 field. First off, I want to go on record as
15 saying that I can't understand why a builder such
16 as Ryan Homes would even want to consider
17 building on that crappy piece of land. I mean,
18 seriously there is nothing there. It has nothing
19 to offer, so I don't understand. Unless you
20 figure that -- and let's face it, there is a lot
21 of new developments going up. People are stupid.
22 They'll buy anything, but that being said, when
23 we had other builders that wanted to come in,
24 that whole tree line there -- first off, let me .

1 tell you those are not good trees. They're
2 falling down. A lot of them are dead. Not only
3 that, there is barbed wire behind those trees, so
4 who is going to take that down. We were told
5 many, many times that we could not touch those
6 trees because they were not our trees. Now
7 you're telling us they're our trees.

8 MR. WYNSMA: If they're on your side of the
9 property.

10 MS. PARRY: No. We were always told those
11 trees belong to the person who owned that land
12 and we could never touch them. Well, that's your
13 land, so what are you going to do with the trees?
14 You're not going to touch them, so you're going
15 to leave a bunch of half falling down, half dead
16 trees on that -- up against all these beautiful
17 homes that you're going to build.

18 MR. WYNSMA: Can I respond? Well, first of
19 all, there is really one primary reason we're
20 developing this property and because it's in
21 Bartlett and there -- we believe there is high
22 demand for single-family homes in Bartlett. We
23 believe there has been a lack of new construction
24 for such a long period of time now that there is

1 going to be a lot of demand for these, but we
2 understand the site has challenges and it's not
3 going to be, you know, three-quarter of a million
4 dollar homes, but we believe they're going to be
5 move-up buyers that want new construction in this
6 community.

7 As far as the trees, anything that --
8 remember that we have to sell a home that's going
9 to be 350-, \$400,000. Anything that is dead or
10 dying or in bad shape or a property line that has
11 an old metal fence to it or barbed wire, we'll be
12 removing that. To the extent that the trees are
13 in good shape and they offer us a marketing tool
14 to represent to people that they're going to have
15 some trees in their backyard, which I think is a
16 benefit, we will keep them. If they require
17 trimming or pruning, we'll do that in order to
18 make it look nice. You know, every single one of
19 these that has potential to have trees on the
20 rear of the lot, it's a marketing bonus for us,
21 so we will use it to our advantage as much as we
22 can.

23 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Okay. Thank you. Jim,
24 next one.

1 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Tom King.

2 MR. KING: Tom King from 1325 Tamarack. I
3 really don't have any questions. I have mostly
4 comments and objections, of course, but I think
5 it was an affront to this group that these people
6 came in to begin with in asking for originally a
7 25-foot setback. I'm sure they looked into
8 things and -- but you start slow and then you
9 hope the other people come down, so you can come
10 up to where they're at now.

11 I'm going to refer to my townhome, which
12 is the second one in from Naperville Road. The
13 developer there was restricted to a certain
14 setback. My particular unit has no small bay in
15 the kitchen area like the normal. It's a very
16 small bay, but it encroached on this setback, so
17 it wasn't allowed to be put in there. So we have
18 a very small breakfast area in the kitchen, but
19 now you want to take a whole development and
20 encroach ten feet or so into what the normal
21 setback should be. So that's one of my comments.

22 I hope this doesn't set a precedent for
23 more developers to do the same thing. What good
24 is an ordinance when just a small variance can't

1 be done, but you can take and put this whole
2 development in there. You know, I suggest that
3 these people shouldn't even come in to try and
4 develop something like this. There are other
5 options to develop that. I know we could use the
6 tax revenue, but for them to do this.

7 The other thing I worry about is increased
8 drainage because the buildings are closer to the
9 back of the lot lines. I also envision -- being
10 they're smaller yards, less space for them to
11 put, you know, sheds, things like that. We can't
12 do that in our town house, but these people
13 probably will be able to do that or swing sets.
14 I'm not against swing sets, but they should have
15 room and so that's basically my comments. Thank
16 you.

17 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Thank you.

18 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Andrew Peyton (sic).

19 MR. POYTON: Good evening. I'm Andrew Poyton.

20 I'm the attorney for the church, which is the
21 owner of the property that's labeled on the
22 screen right now as World Overcomers Church.
23 That's actually a prior owner of the property.
24 My client is Iglesia Bautista Betel church, but

1 at that location. My office is in Wheaton at 211
2 South Wheaton Avenue.

3 The church doesn't have an objection to
4 the development of this property as a
5 single-family planned unit development. Their
6 concern relates to a 50-foot grading easement
7 that is incorporated in the preliminarily PUD
8 plan that you see on the screen before you. That
9 is 50 feet onto the church's property. The
10 church has its own plans with respect to future
11 expansion of the church facility. There is a
12 proposed drainage area right there that's being
13 highlighted at the moment, which is a requirement
14 of that expansion.

15 We have just recently today had some
16 discussions with the developer, with Ryan Homes,
17 and their counsel and their engineer relative to
18 a possible solution. The church is open to the
19 idea of a solution, but at this point has an
20 objection to any approval of the plan that
21 reflects an easement to which there is not yet
22 any agreement. So we're hopeful that we'll be
23 able to reach a resolve, but until and unless we
24 do, that is the nature of the church's objection.

1 It is hoped that there could be a resolution that
2 would incorporate something that's beneficial to
3 the site, beneficial to the village, and also
4 beneficial to the church relative to the grading
5 on the southern portion of the church's property
6 and the drainage area that is back there.

7 So wanted to make those comments for the
8 record. We don't have any questions for the
9 developer at the moment, but we do plan on
10 working with them and wanted those objections
11 noted.

12 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Thank you.

13 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: George Lebron.

14 MR. LEBRON: Hi. My name is George Lebron,
15 506 Tamarack Drive, Bartlett, Illinois. My
16 concern is one being the variance being thought
17 by the Board to allow Ryland (sic) from 45 feet,
18 as so many other people said, to 25, now the
19 Bartlett board is considering 35 feet. I think
20 we should stay with the law or what the ordinance
21 that's 45 feet. I don't see why we're making
22 concessions.

23 The other second thought that I have is
24 the 10-foot easement where all the utilities are

1 going to be. All that grading and all that
2 construction and all those lines that are going
3 in are going to ultimately destroy the trees
4 along that property line and who is going to be
5 responsible for replacing them because most of
6 those trees -- we've had surveys done on that
7 property and there are trees on our property and
8 there are trees on the Ryland property and we're
9 concerned about, of course, our trees and who is
10 going to be responsible for that because, you
11 know, tearing up the easement, the roots are
12 going to get destroyed and those trees will die
13 over a few years.

14 Just another observation, I mean, Bartlett
15 is such a -- really up and coming middle class,
16 high middle class village and you're going to put
17 some 8-foot fence all along Lake Street and all
18 around a church. It's a cedar fence to rot in
19 five or six years and look like garbage. I don't
20 understand why you guys would allow such a thing
21 and hopefully you guys do the right thing for our
22 homeowners here because we have a beautiful niche
23 subdivision of nice class townhomes. We all pay
24 our taxes, and we hope you do the right thing and

1 protect our property and protect our homeowners.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Thank you.

4 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Beverly Higgins.

5 MS. HIGGINS: I'm Beverly Higgins. I live at
6 528 Telluride. I agree with everything and I
7 think the previous person said. My main -- that
8 I'm concerned about. Also, it just looks like a
9 lot of houses in a very small space. Just really
10 cramped in and I just don't see that as a quality
11 subdivision, and I think Bartlett is a newer --
12 not a newer, but a desirable village, and I think
13 our little town house -- our town houses are --
14 it's a nicer subdivision than a lot of the area
15 around us. I think these houses are going to
16 lower our property values. I just don't see them
17 as -- it's just so many houses. When I look at
18 that, it's more spacious -- our town houses have
19 more yard and land around them than all those
20 little houses. He showed nice pictures and
21 everything, but I just see that as a lot of
22 houses in a very small space and I think -- I
23 just don't see that as a quality subdivision
24 that's going to be coming in, along with all the

1 other problems we're going to have.

2 My house, my condo actually, faces -- is
3 going to face the back of all those houses, so --
4 because I have a side end unit, but I just think
5 the whole thing is not -- and also the fencing, I
6 don't know. All you have to do is go down
7 Naperville Road and see all the fencing that's
8 ill-maintained behind those houses that are just
9 south of us. It's not a good idea. It doesn't
10 look nice.

11 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Thank you.

12 MR. WYNSMA: I just want to point out that
13 that 8-foot fence is unusual for us to put onto
14 single-family lots. It's for the benefit of
15 future homeowners to buffer from the commercial
16 uses, but that would be under the jurisdiction of
17 our homeowner's association, so we will not be
18 leaving it up to each individual lot owner to
19 maintain that fence. It will be the HOA, so our
20 intent is to mandate that it be maintained in
21 perpetuity and be kept in good condition, and I
22 would point out that, I believe, the density of
23 this project is less than half of what the
24 Timberline density would be or is.

1 MR. A. HOPKINS: Just really quick, is there a
2 reason why cedar over a composite or --

3 MR. WYNSMA: Good question. I think that's
4 something we can research a little more in final
5 design because the -- you know, the concern, I
6 think, with an 8-foot fence, number one, just the
7 maintenance; number two, is the weight and it's
8 ability to withstand wind versus like a 4-foot or
9 6-foot fence, so I'm going to leave that up to
10 people that understand that stuff a lot more than
11 I do. It's our intent that it be of a quality
12 akin to a solid cedar. If it can be a
13 maintenance free composite, then that's what
14 we'll do, but it will have that appearance.
15 We're not looking to just do something of a
16 lesser quality.

17 MR. KALLAS: To answer your 8-foot fence,
18 looking at all the wooden fences that are up
19 around here, it seems like your wooden post will
20 always rot very quickly and your fence falls
21 down. My suggestion is that instead of using
22 wooden posts, use steel posts and you can attach
23 your fence to the steel post. Something happens
24 to your fence, easily take it down and put a new

1 one up.

2 MR. WYNSMA: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Jim, do you have anymore?

4 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: That's all I have.

5 MS. PARRY: I'm sorry. There is one other
6 thing I wanted to mention. Karen Parry, 1274
7 Tamarack Drive. There is one thing that nobody
8 else has mentioned and one of the other things
9 that we're concerned about is the traffic
10 patterns on Naperville Road. I don't know if
11 anybody here has noticed lately there has been a
12 lot of truck traffic on Naperville Road. There
13 was a sign up there that said this is not a truck
14 route, that they had to go to 59.

15 Well, my husband went to the police
16 station just the other day to discuss this with
17 them because we're seeing more and more dump
18 trucks coming down the road and then they're
19 tying up traffic getting onto Lake Street. Well,
20 we found out that it's a county road and it's --
21 it can be used as a truck route now, so you're
22 adding trucks, you're adding all the traffic from
23 the developments going down Naperville. Now
24 you're adding another subdivision on Naperville

1 Road and the only way we can get out, the only
2 way they can get out is onto Naperville Road, so
3 what are they going to do? Are they going to
4 widen Naperville Road? Where are they going to
5 widen it because there is developments on each
6 side of the road, so has anybody taken that into
7 consideration?

8 And also, like this lady over here, I am
9 also concerned about my property values. I mean,
10 seriously, if I wanted to sell my house and
11 someone goes into my loft and they look out my
12 window and they're looking into the window of
13 another home, why would they want to buy my
14 place? I wouldn't want to buy my place if that
15 was the case.

16 And I just have one other question and I
17 don't know if anybody can answer this. You know,
18 there is all of these developments that are
19 cropping up all over the place. You know, there
20 is a big one going on Schaumburg Road in Roselle.
21 There is big ones going up in Winfield. All of
22 these developers are charging 3-, \$400,000 for
23 the houses, okay, and they're getting it. People
24 are buying it. The rest of us who have

1 underwater mortgages can't get what we paid for
2 our houses. Can somebody explain that to me? I
3 don't understand it. Really. How is it that
4 these big developers can make all this money on
5 our houses and we can't sell our houses for what
6 we paid for them. I'm just putting that out
7 there.

8 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Thank you.

9 MR. KALLAS: I think the problem with your
10 trucks on Naperville Road, they're doing some
11 grading on Bartlett and 59, and I think the
12 trucks leave that area, go down through
13 Naperville Road to Lake Street, that's where your
14 trucks -- and, you know, that will end once they
15 get through doing that.

16 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: That's right, Jerry. They
17 have to go that way.

18 MR. KALLAS: Yeah, they have to go that way.

19 MS. PARRY: Yes, I understand that, but
20 eventually -- you're right, that's going to
21 happen, but, of course, you know once the
22 development starts here, they're going to have
23 trucks entering and leaving that site.

24 MR. KALLAS: True.

1 MS. PARRY: So then there is going to be a
2 problem for the rest of us trying to get out of
3 our development; and then once those houses are
4 filled and you have 48 homes times two for every
5 car of people coming in and getting out, so, you
6 know, you're going to have so much more increased
7 traffic on Naperville Road, you know. Where are
8 they going to go?

9 MS. GRILL: We have a court reporter here. If
10 you're going to speak, you really need to come to
11 the microphone. She's got to get you on the
12 audio. Okay.

13 MS. NEGELE: I want to say, keep in mind too
14 that this is being rezoned from a multi-family
15 zone to a single-family, so there would have been
16 even more housing. This is rezoning to single
17 family which is really going to be less than what
18 it was originally zoned for. So in your response
19 to the construction or the traffic on Naperville
20 Road, if there is any consolation perhaps this
21 would be less because eventually there could have
22 been multi-family homes on that lot.

23 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Could you state your name,
24 again, please?

1 MR. LEBRON: George Lebron, 506 Tamarack Drive.
2 I regretfully disagree with you, ma'am. I've
3 called the village several times. I've called
4 the county numerous times. I've been a resident
5 going on 12 years in that subdivision, and there
6 are trucks constantly going up and down
7 Naperville Road constantly.

8 Let's take Greco, the meat company that's
9 in Bartlett. I even called there once. Never
10 got a call back. Their trucks consistently are
11 up and down Naperville Road. There is a sign
12 that says this is not a truck route, and I've
13 called the police numerous times as well. Nobody
14 gives a damn. It's the county. No, it's the
15 village, but meanwhile I live right on Naperville
16 Road, and kind of similar situation what they're
17 going to be dealing with the homes, there is
18 traffic on there all the time with trucks. Why
19 isn't it anyone can monitor that situation? You
20 guys have signs up there and there will be more
21 traffic with the single-family homes because you
22 have all those homes, the family members, the two
23 cars, the three cars because they're
24 single-family homes and they have children that

1 will be driving and they have friends that will
2 be -- come visiting and there will be more
3 traffic flow in and out of Naperville Road.
4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Yes, sir. State your name,
6 please.

7 MR. KING: Tom King again, 1328 Tamarack.
8 Just couple more comments. First off, if you
9 drive down Naperville Road and you see these
10 fences, you see how they look after a couple
11 years, and I'm sure they're supposed to be
12 maintained by their associations, and this is
13 2015, we've got PVC. I think the gentleman
14 mentioned composite materials, so if this does go
15 through, at least have them do that, but the
16 other comment is -- well, two of them.

17 We know Naperville Road, Lake Street
18 eventually is going to be widened and bigger
19 intersection and all that because traffic is just
20 getting heavier; and the other thing about the
21 development, there is upscale developments, and I
22 don't know if I have the term right, but in
23 Wheaton and Naperville that are going in now,
24 like kind of row house things, but they're

1 upscale and they don't require the room that the
2 single families need. So that's it.

3 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Any other comments from any
4 other -- Jim, you don't have any more papers?

5 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: There is no more people who
6 have signed.

7 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Okay. Close the public
8 hearing at this time.

9 Commissioners have any questions,
10 comments?

11 MR. A. HOPKINS: Just a couple. It seems that
12 a majority of the issue has to do with that tree
13 line as far as on the south side of the property.
14 Is there other options? Is there anything else
15 that's been discussed? Will there be more trees
16 added in? Can there be more trees added in? Is
17 there a possibility of something that -- a better
18 barrier, something to help keep some of the
19 residents over there at ease?

20 MR. WYNSMA: Yeah. I wouldn't characterize it
21 as a barrier. I mean, to the extent we can keep
22 existing, that's our plan. If this were a
23 townhome or multi-family community, then we would
24 have maybe a different landscape plan approach to

1 all these rear yards because it would all be
2 association outlot where people aren't allowed to
3 do their own landscaping. In a single-family
4 situation, the market really demands that you be
5 provided a rear yard whether it's a garden,
6 whether it's landscaping, or anything else you
7 want to put in and the homeowner does that later.
8 I would fully expect that there is going to be,
9 especially since these are townhomes, homeowners
10 that want to come in and plant a dozen pine
11 trees, Norway spruces, or something at their rear
12 yard.

13 The part of the challenge here is that
14 utility easement, and essentially what's
15 happening is the rear of those townhomes along
16 their north property line there are storm sewers
17 that are picking up drainage. Because of the
18 standards of DuPage County and what Bartlett
19 follows, the storm sewers we're putting in our
20 rear yards are really a duplication, not
21 entirely, but we're double suspenders and belt
22 there with the storm sewer on our side capturing
23 and then they've get swales and things in their
24 rear yard.

1 Beyond just trying to maintain what the
2 standards are required for that storm and
3 utilities and whatever is worthy of being saved
4 and preserved on the rear yard fence line, there
5 really isn't anything else that we see as an
6 option. We don't want to clear it and put up a
7 fence. We want to preserve what we can, but we
8 also can't eliminate or cut back on storm sewer,
9 what we have to do on that end either. There is
10 limitations to what can be planted within that
11 10-foot public utility and drainage easement as
12 well.

13 MR. M. HOPKINS: Question for staff. In terms
14 of process now, this is preliminary, right, so
15 we're going to get a pass again and we're going
16 to see civil engineering, so we'll see the
17 grading solution, right?

18 MS. GRILL: Yes.

19 MR. M. HOPKINS: We'll see landscaping?

20 MS. GRILL: Yes.

21 MR. M. HOPKINS: We'll be able to see the
22 fence detail as we go on, as well as lighting and
23 all the final details of the development, so this
24 is just the first pass, and I think so we're kind

1 of teed up to be extra careful about the
2 perimeter of the property and how all that works
3 on all those bases, so we'll be watching that
4 real sensitive to it, but that being said, my
5 standpoint is that this is down zoning and we're
6 cutting the previously approved density down by
7 half and where the townhomes might have been
8 looking at more townhomes on a one-to-one basis,
9 they're looking at single-family homes that are
10 almost one-half the frequency of what would have
11 been there under previously approved plans, so I
12 would encourage moving forward on this project.

13 MR. KALLAS: Roberta, the cul-de-sac, the
14 length of the cul-de-sac, are we setting a
15 precedent if we pass this with the length of that
16 cul-de-sac?

17 MS. GRILL: I believe we have other cul-de-sacs
18 in the village that are this length?

19 MR. KALLAS: That length?

20 MS. GRILL: Yes.

21 MR. KALLAS: May I ask where? You should have
22 been prepared for that.

23 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: I think Regency Oaks is
24 pretty deep when you take it all into

1 consideration.

2 MS. GRILL: And we have other subdivisions
3 that only have one access point, such as Charter
4 Oaks, so we have -- I do have that.

5 MR. KALLAS: I figured you would.

6 MS. GRILL: So I have Charter Oaks, which has
7 97 homes on it with one access point off of 59.
8 I have Far Hills with 53 single-family homes. I
9 have Preserve Trail with 17, and then I also
10 noticed on the map today that the mobile home
11 park has one access point with 500 units in it.

12 MR. KALLAS: That was built way back when.
13 That's not how we live it now, but I was just
14 wondering, you know, because they're adding onto
15 our length by how much, what our standard is?

16 MS. GRILL: Our standard is 600, but we've had
17 modifications for cul-de-sac lengths before. I
18 just don't recall off the top of my head, but I
19 can find that out.

20 MR. KALLAS: Just checking. You know how I am.

21 MS. GRILL: To go back to Mark's comment, in
22 our staff report, you'll notice I have a
23 condition in there, E, 1E and I'll read it into
24 the record. It gives the staff a little bit of

1 flexibility here.

2 The preservation of existing trees around
3 the perimeter of the property, and especially
4 along the rear lot lines of 12 through 15, 18
5 through 24, and 44 through 46, shall be reviewed
6 and approved by the community development
7 department and the village arborist at the time
8 of final engineering at a building permit review.
9 Additional evergreen trees will also be required
10 to be planted for lots 12 through 15 and 18
11 through 24 subject to the review and approval of
12 the community development department.

13 So because we don't have final engineering,
14 don't have final grades, and we needed more
15 information, and I need to work with the
16 landscape architect that they've hired, and we do
17 have a tree preservation plan, but we can't make
18 that decision until we see the final engineering.

19 MR. M. HOPKINS: Can I ask you to say whether
20 by the time this comes back to us again, you
21 know, should this pass tonight, will the
22 engineering have been worked out with the church
23 grading before it gets back to us.

24 MR. WYNSMA: Yes. And if, in fact, for some

1 reason we can't come to an agreement, there would
2 be a portion of that north property line that
3 will have a retaining wall, but either way final
4 engineering will be worked out, and I would point
5 out although we'll have details of final, my
6 landscape architect is telling me that I'm wrong.
7 That it would likely be a PVC material and it
8 would likely be on steel posts for when grading.

9 MR. KALLAS: Okay. I found looking at the
10 fences that they put up with wooden posts, you
11 know, it doesn't take too long and they're laying
12 down and everything else, and the ones I see with
13 steel posts they're still standing there, and the
14 PVC the ones on Army Trail have been in there for
15 years and years and years and they're still
16 standing there.

17 MR. WYNSMA: Yeah. Thank you.

18 MS. GRILL: I think to help address the
19 church's issues, we can take off the labels of
20 any easements that are currently -- they
21 currently have labels stating those easements,
22 and I think the church would feel more
23 comfortable if we took those labels off and I can
24 condition that, and the next review I do of these

1 plans, I can assure you we can take those labels
2 off of there.

3 MR. M. HOPKINS: Terrific.

4 MS. GRILL: I think that would help.

5 MR. M. HOPKINS: So hearing that, I don't
6 think we need a conditional approval then based
7 on the grading.

8 MS. GRILL: And I think the church was
9 concerned because those labels are on there and
10 there has been no approval, so if we take the
11 labels off until that has been negotiated and
12 settled, I think everyone would feel a little
13 more comfortable.

14 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Any other questions or
15 comments?

16 MR. KALLAS: I'm going to before there is a
17 motion made, I personally believe that when a
18 builder comes in here if they can't build within
19 our requirements, they shouldn't; and looking at
20 what is the bulk regulation for SR-4 and what's
21 proposed is a lot of changes. I'm told that's
22 not a variance. I believe it is. I mean, you're
23 going -- you know, your front yard, your
24 backyard -- the only thing that you increase a

1 little bit by two feet is the side yard, but you
2 cut down the size of your street.

3 You know, to me you're putting in
4 something that is putting in more than what
5 should be there; and, you know, I'm going to go
6 back when we did most of these when we did the
7 regulations for the village, I was one of the
8 persons that originally started it, and I always
9 believe that what we said what our directions are
10 that they're followed; and, actually, looking at
11 this, you're not -- you know, you're not
12 following what we have said; and, you know, your
13 houses look beautiful and, you know, I think you
14 just jammed in more than maybe you -- you could
15 have made this a little bit larger. Your lots a
16 little bit larger, your houses would have looked
17 better and everything else and that -- you know,
18 I totally understand that you have to make money
19 and with the piece of property you have it's hard
20 to work with. I grant you that, but I think this
21 could have been done a little bit better given,
22 you know, you have certain regulations, you
23 follow those certain regulations.

24 Now, the homes that back -- the townhomes

1 you're granting them 35 feet when the regulation
2 actually says 45 feet, so if you would have had
3 the 45 feet that would have been plus their 45
4 feet, you would have had a bigger yard. Now,
5 again, they cannot put any storage houses on or
6 anything else and yet you can. The people that
7 are buying your houses can, so these people what
8 are they looking at? They come out of their
9 backyard, they see a big storage house or like
10 they say the swing sets. I mean, you got kids
11 you have to have something. I'm not going to say
12 that, but the thing is that they're looking out
13 their backyard and what do they see? Now, unless
14 you put in, you know, your landscaping that's
15 going to block a lot of this, fine, but if you're
16 going to put landscaping in now, it will take 20
17 years before it's high enough so nobody can see
18 what's back there, so I mean, I understand what
19 problems you're having with this piece of
20 property, but on the other hand -- I have a hard
21 time in approving something like this, I really
22 do.

23 I mean, I moved into this village when we
24 had 3800 people, and I've been part of this plan

1 commission for over 24 years and a trustee for
2 two, and I mean -- I just, you know -- I don't
3 know. It's just something that I look at and say
4 why? Why can't it be better? Why can't it be
5 less homes and larger lots? Something that, you
6 know, would give you -- you know, can give you
7 better marketing.

8 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Any other comments,
9 questions? Then I guess we'll be looking for --

10 MR. KALLAS: The one thing they did say that
11 they're going to use steel posts or different
12 fencing, so if you want to put that part of your
13 motion, steel posts for the fence or --

14 MR. A. HOPKINS: Won't we see that when you
15 come back?

16 MR. KALLAS: The thing is you don't put it in
17 now, then we're going to have the same trouble we
18 had last time. You put it in now and it's there.
19 They come back and they say, no, they're not
20 going to do it. No, they agreed to it from the
21 beginning.

22 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: I would put it in with the
23 steel post and then subject, as Mark stated and
24 as Austin is saying, to their fence detail on the

1 plan.

2 MS. GRILL: We can amend the wood fence. D
3 calls for a wood fence. I can take out the word
4 wood and just an 8-foot high solid fence.

5 MR. KALLAS: Which is that, Roberta? I'm
6 sorry.

7 MS. GRILL: 1D. I could take out the word
8 wood in case there is an option for another type
9 of fence.

10 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: You're going to change that
11 wording then?

12 MS. GRILL: I can take out the word wood if
13 that's your motion. It's up to you.

14 MR. KALLAS: You don't want to put in at this
15 point --

16 MS. GRILL: There is a possibility they might
17 do a different type of fence, so I don't want to
18 hold them to wood if they choose to do something
19 different.

20 MR. KALLAS: All right. I understand.

21 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: So then we're looking for a
22 motion.

23 MR. KALLAS: You going to do each one
24 separate?

1 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: No. I'm going to do it as
2 one. Looking for a motion to approve the
3 petitioner's requests for, A, preliminary
4 subdivision plat; B, preliminary PUD plan; C,
5 rezoning from SR-5 PUD to SR-4 PUD; D, special
6 use permits for a PUD in the SR-4 district; and
7 E, a comprehensive plan amendment to the future
8 land use plan to allow the subject property to
9 change from commercial uses to suburban
10 residential uses, and conditions and findings of
11 fact.

12 MR. A. HOPKINS: So moved.

13 MR. MIASO: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Any further discussion?

15 Call the roll.

16 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Austin Hopkins.

17 MR. A. HOPKINS: Yes.

18 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: John Miaso.

19 MR. MIASO: Yes.

20 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Mark Hopkins.

21 MR. M. HOPKINS: Yes.

22 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Tim Ridenour.

23 MR. RIDENOUR: Yes.

24 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Jerry Kallas.

1 MR. KALLAS: No.

2 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Diane Negele.

3 MS. NEGELE: Yes.

4 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Tom Connor.

5 MR. CONNOR: Yes.

6 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: Motion carried.

7 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Thanks. Good luck.

8 MR. WYNSMA: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: The next item on the agenda
10 is old business, new business.

11 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: There will be a meeting in
12 July as we have a case that is up for -- it's an
13 industrial building and we have two special uses,
14 so we'll have three cases, so just mark your
15 calendar for July the 9th, I believe is the date,
16 and that's all the --

17 MS. GRILL: And if you haven't noticed, this
18 is Angela Zubko. She's our new Village planner.
19 Some of you have already met Angela, and the
20 final announcement is Julie has retired, so she
21 has officially retired. 25 years.

22 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Do you have anything else?

23 MR. PLONCZYNSKI: No.

24 CHAIRMAN LEMBERG: Okay. Is there a motion to

1 adjourn.

2 MR. RIDENOUR: So moved.

3 MR. CONNOR: Seconded.

4 (Which were all the proceedings
5 had at the hearing of the
6 above-entitled cause.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22


23

24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
2 COUNTY OF DU PAGE)

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

I, LYNN M. EVANS, CSR, No. 084-003473, a
Notary Public in and for the County of DuPage,
State of Illinois, do hereby certify that LYNN M.
EVANS, C.S.R., reported in shorthand the
proceedings had and the testimony taken at the
public hearing of the above-entitled cause, and
that foregoing transcript is a true, correct, and
complete report of the entire testimony so taken
at the time and place hereinabove set forth.


LYNN M. EVANS

My Commission Expires:
May 20, 2017