

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
VILLAGE OF NEW LENOX PLAN COMMISSION

Held in the New Lenox Village Hall, 1 Veterans Parkway

Tuesday, February 4, 2014 7:00 p.m.

#14-02-A

CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the Village of New Lenox Plan Commission was called to order at 7:02 p.m. by Chairman Mark Muehlnickel.

Chairman Muehlnickel led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Upon roll call, the following were present: Chairman Mark Muehlnickel, Commissioners Annette Boyd, Rob Moss, John Kuchler and Terry Schultz.

The following were absent: Commissioners Gary Berner and Joan Byerley.

Mr. Muehlnickel announced there was a quorum present for this meeting.

Also present were Senior Planner Jeff Smith and Secretary Pat Hansen.

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLAN COMMISSION MEETING OF JANUARY 21, 2014

A motion was made by Commissioner Kuchler and seconded by Commissioner Boyd to approve the January 21, 2014 minutes as presented. Voice vote was taken. Motion carried.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL USE FOR PRELIMINARY AND FINAL P.U.D. PLAT
(Public Hearing)

NEC Route 30 / Vancina

6.37-site located at the northeast corner of U.S. Route 30 and Vancina Lane
Edwin Gebauer/NewLenox IL (NEC Route 30 / Vancina) LLC - Petitioner

Chairman Muehlnickel stated that a public hearing will be held tonight for this request and explained the public hearing process to those in attendance. Mr. Muehlnickel asked Senior Planner Jeff Smith if proof of notice has been given for this hearing. Mr. Smith replied

affirmatively. At this time, the Plan Commission Secretary swore in those who potentially thought they may speak during the public hearing. Mr. Muehlnickel asked for a motion to open the public hearing.

A motion was made by Mr. Moss and seconded by Mr. Kuchler to open the public hearing. Voice vote was taken. Motion carried.

The public hearing was opened at 7:05 p.m.

Mr. Edwin J. Gebauer, with New Lenox IL (NEC Route 30 / Vancina) LLC, introduced himself to the assembly, and said he represents the property owner and petitioner for a proposed Special Use for a Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Plat for a proposed 6.37-acre commercial development at the northeast corner of Route 30 and Vancina Lane.

With the assistance of his PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Gebauer explained that the property is located on the far eastern side of New Lenox, located between two other retail developments, one in Frankfort, and the other being the Wal-Mart anchored center to the west. He said this development is located directly across the street from the Lowes and Target center. Mr. Gebauer stated that the Village's Land Use Plan calls for Community / Regional Scale Commercial uses for the subject property, and that it is zoned C-2. He said both of these are consistent with the petition that is going forward tonight for a P.U.D. for a commercial development.

Mr. Gebauer stated that the company he represents also holds the 10 acres to the west of this 6.37-acre site. He said the overall vision would be to develop the entire 16 acres with a consistent feel. Mr. Gebauer stated that the P.U.D. for the 6.37 acres is driven by a larger tenant at the eastern portion of the site. He said the site is bordered to the south by Route 30 with retail beyond; to the west by Vancina Lane; the additional vacant commercially-zoned land to the east with a mix of commercial and single-family residential development beyond; and to the north by single-family residential.

Mr. Gebauer explained that the proposed plan illustrates three lots, and that Lot 1 will contain a fitness center tenant, L.A. Fitness. He said there are two additional lots along the western portion of the site that are now being marketed for other commercial uses, and the goal to potentially have additional tenants on board resulting in concurrent construction.

Mr. Gebauer stated that the initial construction of Lot 1 would consist of the building and parking field with significant infrastructure improvements for Vancina Lane, which will be a public roadway. He said Vancina Lane will extend from the current traffic signal, essentially creating a new leg to the intersection. Mr. Gebauer explained that the shared access lane between Vancina Lane and Garfield Avenue will provide additional cross-access for all users of the development, plus the residents of Garfield Avenue and emergency vehicles, as needed. He noted that Garfield Avenue is a right-in/right out only intersection.

Mr. Gebauer said the P.U.D. plat of subdivision shows three lots plus an outlot for a shared storm water detention basin for the development. He stated that utility easements are shown on this plat, but in addition, there is a “Declaration of Easements and Covenants” (DEC) that provides for this cross-access, as well as cross-parking within the development. Mr. Gebauer stated that this DEC will provide for unrestricted reciprocal access for all three of the lots. He noted that Lot 1 consists of 3.7 acres; Lot 2 consists of 0.7 acre, Lot 3 consists of 1.3 acres, and the detention pond contains about 0.6 acres, for a total of 6.37 acres. Mr. Gebauer explained that the property is bordered on three of the four sides by public right-of-way totaling 1,500 feet of frontage.

Mr. Gebauer stated that the detailed site plan with dimensions also shows the signage they are proposing. He said this plan shows details to the proposed Vancina Lane improvements as well as Garfield Avenue improvements. Mr. Gebauer said they are working with IDOT on intersection improvements, and they have been approved to proceed with submitting the geometry for review. He advised that IDOT has reviewed a Traffic Impact Study incorporating all of the traffic that is expected from this development and the adjacent 10 acres. He continued by stating it was important to get the Garfield Avenue curb cut access as close to Route 30 as possible. Mr. Gebauer explained that the curb cut location is a compromise from what L.A. Fitness would traditionally want, but it was done in order to deter customers from traveling further north into the Garfield Avenue residential area.

Mr. Gebauer continued by stating that L. A. Fitness, to be located on Lot 1, is an acceptable use for the underlying zoning. He said there are a couple of special uses that are ancillary to the L.A. Fitness facility, which would include a health spa use, a childcare nursery use, and an internal vending machine use that would all be located within the fitness club and necessary for the operational success of the business. He said they expect that Lots 2 and 3 will be a mix of retail and restaurant, and they are including a few special use waiver requests in this P.U.D. petition to accommodate these lots. He said these special use waivers would include outdoor seating for a potential restaurant use, as well as a financial institution in the event that a bank would come in for the corner lot. Mr. Gebauer said the Village’s Sign Code would allow four signs for this development; two on Route 30, one on Vancina Lane, and one on Garfield. He said they are showing three signs along Route 30, which will be spaced evenly, because they would prefer these locations for better visibility for major traffic passing along Route 30. The multi-tenant signs at the Vancina Lane and Garfield Avenue intersection will be installed upfront, while a single tenant sign located at the eastern side of Lot 2 will not be constructed until there is a tenant proposed on this lot.

Mr. Gebauer stated that there are a few more items in which they are seeking relief through the P.U.D., and one of them is parking. He said that although total providing does exceed the Village’s parking requirements, they are asking for a slightly smaller 9-foot wide by 18-foot stall since there will be no shopping carts involved with any of these uses. He noted that parking on either side of L.A. Fitness is dead-end by design in order to discourage customers of the center from circulating behind the building.

Mr. Gebauer noted that in addition to being at the natural low point of the subdivision, the detention basin provides a buffer to the residential properties adjacent to this site.

Mr. Gebauer referred to the topographic survey that illustrates existing conditions and indicates that from south to north, there is a channelized ditch that runs through the property. He said that there was some previous grading done on this site by the previous owner, which resulted in some of the drainage going directly north. Mr. Gebauer advised that with the proposed design, they will be directing all of the drainage back towards the natural low point, which is the northern central point on the site. The runoff will all be handled by pipes within the parking lot and discharged into a naturalized detention basin that will be planted with a natural wetland type planting.

Mr. Gebauer explained that as a result of engineering this site, there will be significantly less runoff. Within the detention basin itself, there will be a small diameter pipe that limits the discharge to a controlled rate, essentially cutting the run-off rate by 85%. Mr. Gebauer continued by stating that another measure that the engineers have designed is a discharge method called a level spreader, and this allows the discharge to bubble up and out of a manhole, going downstream gently rather than shooting out of a culvert at a rapid rate. He said these measures should improve any drainage concerns in the area. Mr. Gebauer said the Vancina Lane improvements will also be routed through this pond.

Regarding landscaping, Mr. Gebauer stated that all of the perimeter landscaping either meets or exceeds code. He said screening will be beefed up in the northeast corner in to make sure that any headlights from cars and lighting from the building and parking lot are sufficiently blocked. Mr. Gebauer is requesting a slight relief regarding landscape buffers between internal parking lots since each will be interconnected. He pointed out that there will be a privacy fence along the back of the building.

Mr. Gebauer mentioned that the average parking lot wattage will be reduced throughout the parking lot. He stated that the parking lot itself will have traditional pole mounted lighting with shields directing the light straight down. Additionally, Mr. Gebauer said that along the side of the building, there will be no lights mounted on poles; the lights will be mounted on the wall of the building. He said these lights act like down-lighting, but will give just enough light in the parking lot to maintain security. Mr. Gebauer said the back of the building will be completely dark with the exception of the mandatory code required lights on top of egress doors. Regarding wall signage, he said there will be a sign on the south wall facing Route 30 and the west wall facing future commercial uses and Vancina Lane. He said the building is designed as a pre-cast building; the color will be textured and colored in accordance with the architectural guidelines of New Lenox. Mr. Gebauer said there are additional architectural features on the front façade that includes the L. A. Fitness crown feature, which is uplift by some dim spotlights creating a warm glow. He said the crown feature will be designed so as to not have any spotlights or fog lights shooting up into the air.

Chairman Muehlnickel asked for Staff's comments.

Senior Planner Jeff Smith explained that the property is recommended for commercial use and is zoned C-2, which allows for the proposed fitness center, as well as future, anticipated retail and restaurant uses. He said Staff has no objection to the proposed use of the property as it meets the market demand for the commercial-zoned site along U. S. Route 30. Mr. Smith explained that the larger lot anchor will be located on the east side of the property, and the storm water facility will be located at the far northwest corner of the property. He said this facility will account for all of the runoff from not only Lot 1, but also future developments on Lot 2 and Lot 3 as well as the construction of Vancina Lane, a new public roadway. Mr. Smith advised that their project engineer has been working closely with the Village's Engineering Department to make sure they are meeting all of the Village's storm water requirements. He said that when the site was cleared years ago by a previous owner, this action created run-off issues in the area.

Mr. Smith continued by stating that as a part of this project, there are a number of deviations to the Village Code requested. He said he's not going to address each deviation, but that it is Staff's opinion that the request involves a cohesive and unified development that is mandated for a P.U.D., while in return for the requested deviations, it is Staff's opinion that the Village is getting an attractive development that is compatible for the area.

Mr. Smith said they are requesting to waive the special use requirement for a future restaurant outdoor patio, and that through the P.U.D. ordinance, as well as the future site plan review, any future restaurant must submit detailed plans for staff review, which ultimately must be approved by the Village Board. He said that through conditions in the P.U.D. and site plan review process, Village Staff can work with the developer to address items such as the location of the outside patio, the screening of the outside patio, as well as the hours of operation for the outside patio. He said Staff feels that the special use requirement could be waived with the exception of the restaurant requesting a liquor license for the outside patio. In that case, Mr. Smith said that in that case, the request would be required to go through the special use public hearing process.

Mr. Smith explained that an initial concern was that there was no foundation landscaping indicated on the L. A. Fitness plan. He said that although Staff had no issues with the back of the building, Staff has worked with the developer and they have agreed to add planter boxes along the front and side elevations of the building. Mr. Smith noted that amended plans addressing the planter boxes will soon be submitted.

With regard to traffic, Mr. Smith advised that there will be improvements to Vancina Lane as well as improvements on the south side of the intersection where the Target/Lowes development is located in order that both intersections correspond with the traffic signal operations. He said the developer submitted plans to IDOT, and reviews are ongoing with this project. Mr. Smith said Garfield Avenue will be improved along a portion of the property. He said that public roadway improvements, along with the storm water area and the shared access drive that will provide a connection between Vancina Lane and Garfield Avenue, must be constructed with the initial public improvements for this project. As part of this project, Mr. Smith stated that sidewalks will be installed along the east side of Vancina Lane as well as along the west side of

Garfield Avenue, up to where there will be an internal connection to the main entrance of the fitness facility. Because of grade changes and the retaining wall requirements, a sidewalk could not be placed along the entire frontage of Garfield Avenue. He said the New Lenox Elementary School District #122 noted that there is a school bus stop at Garfield Avenue and U. S. Route 30, so Staff is recommending and the developer has recently agreed to install a school bus stop at the southeast corner of Lot 1 with a bench pad and a sidewalk connecting to the previously constructed trail along Route 30. In order to discourage commercial traffic from heading northbound to residential areas where there is no outlet; Mr. Smith stated that “No Outlet” signs will be installed on Vancina Lane and Garfield Avenue.

Mr. Smith said there have been some revisions to the proposed landscape plan as a result of Staff’s comments. He explained that the critical areas are located along the northern part of the property where there is residential property, as well residential properties on the east side of Garfield Avenue. He said Staff had concerns that the landscaping was sparse and perhaps not tall enough and dense enough. Mr. Smith said the plans have been revised with more enhanced perimeter landscaping along Garfield Avenue.

Regarding signage, Mr. Smith said they are asking for a few minor deviations. He said they are requesting a slightly larger wall sign on the west side of the building, which can be supported since Staff is also recommending that no wall sign be allowed on the east side of the building. The developer has agreed to the above.

A detailed lighting / photometric plan has been submitted, according to Mr. Smith, and with a recent revision, they have reduced the illumination by lowering the wall-mounted lights to 15 feet in addition to lessening the fixture illumination. Mr. Smith said the intended hours of operation will be likely be 5:00 a.m. through 12:00 midnight, with the potential of the fitness club being open 24 hours a day in the future. Even if the fitness facility was open for 24 hours, the recent modifications to the lighting plan and overall site design will ensure not only compliance with illumination standards but also compatibility with nearby residences.

Mr. Smith advised that one item that was not included in the report to the Plan Commission is the decorative tower lighting. He said lights will be shining up on the tower. Mr. Smith explained that it will be soft up-lighting that will be illuminating the south side of the tower that will be facing Route 30, the west side facing future commercial, and the east side that will be facing residential homes. He said there will not be any lighting on the north side of the tower. The developer has recently agreed to provide for dimmer up-lighting on the tower so as to avoid lighting concerns to adjacent uses.

Mr. Smith said that subject to the conditions in the Staff Report, Staff feels that this is a compatible, attractive development that will not cause negative impacts to the surrounding properties. Therefore, Staff recommends that the Plan Commission adopt the Findings of Fact that are outlined in the Staff Report. He said Staff recommends approval of the preliminary and final planned unit development plat subject to final engineering approval, final landscaping approval, lighting approval, elevation approval and the other items noted in the Staff Report.

Mr. Smith stated he is seeking Plan Commission comments and their recommendation to the Village Board.

Chairman Muehlnickel asked if the developer has agreed to lower the brightness of the lighting in the decorative tower. Mr. Gebauer replied affirmatively.

Linda Chalupa, 257 Garfield, stated that her property is directly north of the proposed fitness center, and said it appears that a lot of care was taken to be mindful of the neighbors. She wanted to know why the large plantings are predominately on the east side of Garfield, and nothing but shrubs to the north. Ms. Chalupa asked for the height of the wood fence. Mr. Gebauer answered that the fence will be 6 ft. high. Ms. Chalupa said she would like to see the fence height somewhat taller. She then asked to see the photo with the lighted crown. Ms. Chalupa said there appears to be some lighting in front of the building that is cut off on top, and some in the back. She asked if those are the lights that will be on the building with that proportion of height that is indicated in the picture.

Chairman Muehlnickel said he is also curious about what the back of the project will look like.

Ms. Chalupa said in looking at the plan, it does not appear to be much space between her driveway and the fitness facility. She said it appears that a lot of work has been done to protect the privacy of the residents to the east, and very little has been done to protect the privacy of the resident to the north. Ms. Chalupa said she wants to know about the height of the lights and what kind of lights will be placed on the side of the building. She said she also wants to know the height of the free-standing lights. Ms. Chalupa stated that she wants to know why everything is so close to her property line, and why the screening will consist of only shrubs. She said when she looks across the street at Target; there is a great deal of space between the end of the building, a berm, and a wall. Ms. Chalupa advised that the shrubs will be eaten in no time by the deer. She said she is also concerned about traffic noise and hours of operation. Ms. Chalupa said she wishes them well in this endeavor, but she does not want to listen to the noise or hear the noise from the fitness facility. She said there must be some kind of planning as to how to retain the vegetation as a visual screening. Ms. Chalupa desires more space between her driveway and the fitness facility.

Chairman Muehlnickel explained to Ms. Chalupa that Mr. Gebauer testified earlier in the evening that the entry way to the project from Garfield Avenue was placed as far south and as close to Route 30 as possible.

Anthony Avelis of 264 Garfield Avenue stated that his concern is more the height of the building as it pertains to the elevation of his house, which is really low. He explained that when he looks out the front window or is sitting on his front porch, he is looking uphill. Mr. Avelis requested that the landscaping could be more evergreen in nature, creating more of a wall so that he is not looking at a massive structure. Mr. Avelis would like assurances that vehicles would not be parking along Garfield Avenue. He said that when Burns Photography was being built, the street was quite congested and it was very difficult to get in and out of the subdivision at that time. He

said the residents got a lot of turn-arounds in their driveways as a result of people passing up Burns Photography, and this resulted in cars driving on their grass and infringing upon privacy.

Ms. Chalupa stated concerns about the noise that will emit from this project, and asked where the garbage dumpsters will be located. She said she lives in a quiet area and does not want to hear noise from garbage dumpsters or snow plows.

Bud Vancina of 426 N. Vancina Lane stated he has lived on Vancina Lane since 1970 and did not experience any drainage problems until 2010 when the property changed hands and the new owner clear cut it. Mr. Vancina explained that in 2011, there was a 5 to 6 inch rain event in a short period of time, and as a result, his home was inundated with water. As a result of the flooding, he spent a ton of money putting everything back together. Mr. Vancina said they built a berm on their property with a 12 inch sleeve to head off any further complications. In 2011, he said there was another heavy rain, and the same thing occurred. Mr. Vancina explained that at that time, the water went over the top of the berm and across his property. He said he now has a collection of items such as lumber, steel pieces, and hinges in his yard as a result of the demolition of the Corcoran property. Mr. Vancina advised that when the new owner began filling the property, there were no provisions made for detention at that time. He explained that another complication that occurred in 2011 was the blockage of a 4 ft. diameter culvert that ran under Garfield Avenue that resulted in the diversion of water to the front of his house. Mr. Vancina said the culvert was blocked with debris from the demolition of the Corcoran home. Mr. Vancina said at that time, there was again substantial damage done to his home. He said they will probably be selling their home in the next few years and noted that they will have to disclose that flood damage occurred. Mr. Vancina said he has met with Jeff Smith and Will Nash a few times to talk about the drainage issue. He said he just wants to be sure that any detention that is done will ensure that his property will not flood again. Mr. Vancina said that although he has no objection to the use, there needs to be a guarantee that his property is protected against additional flooding with proper storm detention.

Mr. Vancina said there are children living on Vancina Lane, with buses stopping on Route 30 to pick up and drop off the kids. He said he wants to be sure that this issue is also considered, because currently, there are occasions in which cars do not stop, even with a bus flashing lights.

Mrs. Kitty Vancina of 426 Vancina Lane said she is also concerned about the bus stop and the fact that no one seemed to be aware that there are children living on Vancina Lane. She said she is very curious to know what Vancina Lane is going to look like, as she envisions it being very wide at one end, narrowing substantially at the north end.

Regarding the children residing on Vancina Lane, Mr. Gebauer explained that there will be a sidewalk along Vancina Lane. He said there would be no hardship for them to add a bus pad on Vancina Lane that would intersect with the bike path along Route 30.

Mr. Gebauer advised that Vancina Lane will be improved all at one time. He said it is much wider at Route 30, but will funnel down to a 24 ft. wide section at the north end of the property

where Vancina Lane meets the private driveway line, noting that this is the minimum cross-section allowed by the Village. He said if there needs to be some incidental repaving of the private drive, they will take care of it. As a result of conversations about snow plows, Mr. Gebauer said they will be adding a flare out so that the snow plow can turn-around and get back out without entering into the private drive. He stated that signs indicating that the street is not a through street will be positioned approximately where the northernmost driveway is located.

At this time, Mr. Gebauer addressed the drainage questions and explained that drainage should improve with this development. He said that what happened in 2010 rerouted a lot of the water away from the natural depression. Mr. Gebauer said that all water from the site will be collected in the drainage system and routed to the pond where it will be detained. He said he expects that the problems that are being experienced now will be alleviated.

With regard to the construction workers and where they will park, Mr. Gebauer advised that on a construction site like this, all of the construction workers would be expected to park on-site.

Commissioner Schultz asked if perhaps an agreement could be reached with Lowes whereas the construction workers could park in the lot across Route 30. Mr. Muehlnickel said it would probably be preferable for the construction workers to park on the construction site. Mr. Gebauer concurred, adding that they would like to keep the construction workers on the north side of Route 30 so they do not have to contend with dodging traffic when crossing the highway. Mr. Gebauer explained that when the site work is being done with heavy equipment, there would not be many workers onsite. He went on to say when the building construction begins, a lot of the manpower comes in, and by that time, there will be a parking lot onsite for the construction workers.

Mr. Muehlnickel asked Mr. Smith to address the height of the building, as well as the setback requirements.

Mr. Smith explained that the majority of the building will be 32 feet high, and he said that complies with the Village's requirement. He said the property is zoned C-2, and the height requirement in this zoning district allows up to 55 feet. Mr. Smith said the tallest portion will be along the front of the building in the area of the crown where there will be a wall extending up to about 36 feet in height. He said the tower along the front of the building will be the tallest portion of the building. Regarding the setback requirements, Mr. Smith said the C-2 District does not specify a setback requirement; however, they still must comply with the landscape buffer requirement. He also explained that since the property abuts a residential property, they must at least match the adjacent residential setback requirement. In this case, Mr. Smith noted that they are 34 feet from the north property line, which is more than double the side yard setback requirement of the adjacent residential home. He explained that this rear buffer yard allows for the emergency access drive, the retaining wall that is necessary due to the grade change, the 6 ft. fence as well as the landscaping shown on the plan. Mr. Smith said it is Staff's opinion that there is a substantial setback from the north side of the building to the north property line.

Mr. Kuchler wanted to know the distance between the property line and the retaining wall. Mr. Smith replied there is a about a 7-foot buffer. Mr. Kuchler asked what the height of the retaining wall is, and Mr. Gebauer replied that because of the grade, it's between 6 to 7 feet. Mr. Gebauer pointed out that the fence will be placed on the high side of the wall.

Chairman Muehlnickel remarked that the plans have been revised to indicate an increase in landscaping on the east side of the property. Mr. Smith said Staff had asked that the shrub height be increased to at least 3 feet in height, and there was also a request to add more evergreens in order to provide a fence-type screening. Mr. Smith said it appears that they have complied, but that additional review of the revised plans will be necessary.

Mr. Dan Uebelhor of Hitchcock Design Group, Landscape Architect for the project, stated that on the first revision of the site plan on the east side, additional evergreen trees were strategically placed between the two residences and the area in which the proposed lights on the building are located. On the north side in the area of the dumpster enclosure, Mr. Uebelhor said they will plant 6 ft. tall arborvitae that will eventually grow to 12 to 15 feet in height at maturity. He said there will also some dense yews planted at a 3 ft. height at installation, as well as some Junipers. Mr. Uebelhor said that shrubs will be compacted into a small space between the retaining wall and the solid board fence. He said the retaining wall will be about 6 ft. high, and on the high side of the wall, there will also be a 6 ft. high solid wood fence as well buffered by the shrubs and arborvitae to soften the hardscape line. Mr. Uebelhor continued by stating that when standing on the north side of the site on Linda's driveway, the fence will be about 12 feet above the driveway. He said that eventually, the shrubs will grow over the top of the fence. Mr. Gebauer addressed the deer issue by explaining that there is a narrow gap between the wall and fence, which will not be conducive for deer access.

With regard to lighting, Mr. Smith said there will be lights shining onto the decorative tower, noting that this will not create any sky glow. Mr. Gebauer stated that lighting on the sides of the building will consist of softer down lighting. On the rear of the building, he said there will be no tower illumination, and on the rear building wall, he said the only lighting will be emergency egress door lighting that is about 7 ft. up, directly above the doors. He said this lighting is intended for security purposes only, and exists for building code compliance. Mr. Gebauer said the reason they are installing the grass paver emergency vehicle access in that location is so that it can be maintained as a green area for emergency vehicles only. He said the design of the rear of the building is intended to discourage any activity behind the building.

Chairman Muehlnickel stated it appears that height of the lights has been lowered from what was initially shown, and the lights have been dimmed as well. Mr. Smith said the specified changes were in response to Staff's concerns with the original photometric plan.

Chairman Muehlnickel asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

Mrs. Kitty Vancina of 426 N. Vancina Lane said that in the past two years, her property has flooded so badly that the house was taken down to the studs due to water damage. She said that more than once tonight, she heard the words, "this should take care of it". Mrs. Vancina said she is looking for a promise that this will take care of it. Mr. Gebauer stated that the engineering for the site will eliminate any issue that originated from this site. He said what he can do is promise that any of the contributing water from off-site will go away, as the engineering going into this site is very thorough and very conservative. Mr. Gebauer advised that the calculations indicate that runoff will be reduced by 85%. He said he does not know what proportion of the flooding the Vancinas have experienced is from this site specifically, but likely a significant amount. Mr. Gebauer explained that the public roadway drainage will flow into this detention as well, adding that the 10 acre site on the other side, when developed, will have its own detention basin.

Mr. Schultz asked if the system for Lot 1 will be able to handle the run-off from Lots 2 and 3 until such time these lots are developed with their own basin. Mr. Gebauer replied that the design is accounting for future hardscape on Lots 2 and 3, so the capacity of the pond is for the full development of the 6 acre site. In the interim Lot 2 and Lot 3 will be a grass area, and runoff will still be diverted into the pond. Mr. Gebauer added that the ultimate build-out condition is accounted for in the design of the pond.

A motion was made by Commissioner Boyd and seconded by Commissioner Moss to close the public hearing. Voice vote was taken. Motion carried. The public hearing was closed at 8:17 p.m.

Chairman Muehlnickel asked for a motion to adopt the required Findings of Fact for the proposed Preliminary and Final P.U.D. plat.

A motion was made by Commissioner Kuchler and seconded by Commissioner Moss to recommend to the Village approval to adopt the required Findings of Fact for the proposed Preliminary and Final P.U.D. plat. Voice vote was taken. Motion carried.

Chairman Muehlnickel asked for a motion to recommend to the Village Board approval of the Special Use for Preliminary and Final P.U.D. Plat

A motion was made by Commissioner Kuchler and seconded by Commissioner Boyd to recommend to the Village Board approval of a Special Use for Preliminary and Final P.U.D. Plat for a 6.37 acre site located at the northeast corner of U.S. Route 30 and Vancina Lane, subject to final engineering, approval of the Landscape Plan, Lighting Plan approval and resolution of all other Staff comments. Voice vote was taken. Motion carried.

Assuming that revised plans are submitted in the next week or so, Mr. Smith advised that the first read by the Village Board could occur at the February 24th meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

February 4, 2014
Plan Commission Minutes
#14-02-A
Page 12 of 12

None.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Smith advised that the next meeting will be held on February 18, 2014.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Muehlnickel asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was made by Commissioner Boyd and seconded by Kuchler to adjourn. Voice vote was taken. Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Patricia Hansen – Secretary