

**Special Meeting – Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals
Gregory J. Bielawski Municipal Center, DuPage County, Carol Stream, Illinois**

***All Matters on the Agenda may be Discussed, Amended and Acted Upon
November 23, 2020.***

Chairman Parisi called the Special Meeting of the Combined Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 6:00 p.m. and directed Patty Battaglia, Planning and Permitting Assistant, to call the roll.

The results of the roll call were:

Present: Commissioners Angelo Christopher, Michael Battisto, Charlie Tucek, Daniel Morris, Chairman Parisi.

Absent: Frank Petella, John Meneghini

Also Present: Tom Farace, Planning and Economic Development Manager, Patty Battaglia, Planning and Permitting Asst., Bill Cleveland, Village of Carol Stream Engineer, and Ms. Jackie Wells, Consultant from Houseal Lavigne Associates.

*All persons remotely called in at meeting unless noted otherwise.

MINUTES:

Minutes for the October 26, 2020, and November 23, 2020, meetings will be approved at the December 14, 2020, meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING:

There were no notices for Public Hearing.

PRESENTATION:

Ms. Jackie Wells, Project Manager for the Carol Stream UDO update, stated this a project overview of the last few articles of the draft UDO and the PUD standards, administration and enforcement, subdivision and the non-conformities. Then we'll have a brief discussion about our next steps.

Ms. Wells mentioned we have an eight step process towards completing the UDO with PUD's, administration and enforcement, subdivisions and non-conformities will be discussed. Article VII PUD standards is new text, with a rewrite to the existing PUD process with procedural updates, standards for review and modification standards for site development allowances, and PUD amendment options. Existing PUD ordinance doesn't have clear standards for review, but these provide more detail and ties the PUD back to the comprehensive plans (one area missing in your current PUD ordinance- alignment or tieback to the community in the comprehensive plan). Standards for review are going to be that tool that you use and the Village Board uses in the review of an entire PUD application. Modification standards are separate and ensure any site developmental allowances or deviations from underlying zoning requirements are met.

Ms Wells stated that there have been procedural updates and changes to the PUD approval process by requiring a pre-filing conference with the development team and a public meeting. This allows a developer to bring a concept plan or idea to the team before the application process. We're recommending that the PUD standards be updated to differentiate between minor and major changes. Chairman Parisi asked if there were any questions.

Commissioner Battisto, Morris, Christopher, and Tucek had no comments.

Chairman Parisi mentioned the new process of a requirement to actually hold a public meeting with the applicant prior to coming to the Plan Commission.

Chairman Parisi observed that it's more easily done when you work for a public agency like a library or municipality.

Ms Wells stated some communities who feel that same way don't want to require a pre-filing public meeting for all instances and may restrict a PUD of a certain size.

Chairman Parisi suggested to Mr. Farace to make this an administrative determination with the staff, and suggested staff determine requirements.

Commissioner Christopher added a lot of villages, even the City of Chicago, are opening up to these terms.

Chairman Parisi is in total agreement with Commissioner Christopher.

Commissioner Christopher added people are getting landlocked but it opens the door to other people coming in with different ideas that are going to be more acceptable.

Chairman Parisi asked if there are any other comments from the group before Ms. Well's proceeds to the next section and there were no further comments.

Ms. Wells is moving to draft Article VIII, the Administration and Enforcement Section. The standards included in the existing administration section have been reorganized to make the chapter more user friendly. We organized the article into administrative review for staff approval versus a petitioner or legislative review/al. We are introducing several new administrative processes which exist currently, but are not codified in the zoning or subdivision sign ordinances.

Ms. Wells started with Certificates of Zoning Compliance which would be applicable to new uses and moving into existing buildings. This introduces retrofit standards which are minimal improvements that new users would be required to make as their moving into existing buildings. The following would help to bring a building into conformity with the new standards of the UDO.

1. We're proposing the sign ordinance be updated to prohibit box signs to bring a business into conformity with that main requirement.
2. Installation of screening for trash and recycling receptacles, ground or roof mounted mechanical equipment are all new requirements to bring existing businesses into conformity through these retrofit standards
3. Village wide landscape including the placement of landscape planters as well as the planting of perimeter parking lot landscape for those properties that have a strip of grass or land between their parking lot and the public right of way. These improvements would require a performance bond.
4. The site plan review process is a new process that mirrors the current process for the Gary Avenue and North Avenue corridors. These would be approved administratively by staff.

Ms. Wells stated we updated and clarified the review criteria and findings of fact for variations, map, and text amendments was established.

Ms. Wells mentioned the current subdivision ordinance is separate from the zoning ordinance so we're consolidating all of these processes with the other petitioner and approval processes. The subdivision process is two different processes, the major subdivision and the minor subdivision process. The major subdivision process would be larger subdivisions that require dedication on the land for streets, for schools, for parks, etc. That would define what a major subdivision is and those would require a preliminary plat and final plat approval. There would be an option for concurrent

preliminary and final plat approval if the developer elects to participate. For minor subdivisions, the preliminary plat would be optional but the final plat would be required.

Ms. Wells mentioned Easement Encroachment and Annexations have new language and will have two new processes that don't exist within the zoning code.

Ms. Wells stated Enforcement Procedures are violations or ways people can violate the regulations of the UDO of the village. Chairman Parisi asked if there were any questions.

Commissioner Morris questioned the 35 million dollar letter of credit mentioned and asked where that arbitrary number come from and Mr. Farace replied the village attorney provided the number.

Commissioner Tucek, Morris, Battisto and Christopher had no questions.

Chairman Parisi mentioned the procedure being slightly different but liked the idea.

Commissioner Christopher added IDOT plays a key role as to what's acceptable and we need to be flexible.

Ms. Wells stated Article IX, Subdivisions, has been updated by village staff. Engineering and construction specifications will be included in a manual outside of the UDO which allows departments to update those standards and not require a text amendment for the whole UDO. Street standards includes a connectivity index which helps residents get through neighborhoods more efficiently and emergency response vehicles to respond more quickly. Easement standards have been updated. Blocks were updated to be a maximum length of 1,000 feet as opposed to the current length of 1,800 feet for pedestrian safety and walkway minimum requirement reduced to 600 feet.

No questions were asked for this article.

Article X covered nonconforming lots, buildings, structures and uses. The only difference is to separate nonconforming parking lots and buildings to help reinvest in other aspects of their property for development like interior islands inside parking lots.

No questions were asked but Commissioner Christopher commented that islands cause more problems than good because they are not maintained and a brief discussion was held pertaining to this interior parking lot landscape.

Commissioner Battisto mentioned bollards in front of buildings and a brief discussion was held pertaining to them, adding criteria for them is another section of the UDO.

Ms. Wells mentioned next steps is the final draft and ordinance stage and having a final workshop in January, having a public hearing in February, village board adoption in February or March, and then a public hearing in March as well for rezonings.

New business of Plan Commission meeting time was discussed and a common consensus was agreed to be changed to 6:00 p.m. effective 1/21 (Commissioners Petella and Meneghini were contacted by Mr. Farace and also agreed after the meeting).

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mr. Farace stated that the next Plan Commission meeting will be December 14.

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

ADJOURNMENT:

At 7:00pm Commissioner Tucek moved and Commissioner Christopher seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting.

The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Recorded and transcribed by,

Patty Battaglia
Patty Battaglia
Planning and Permitting Assistant

Minutes approved by Plan Commission on this 20 day of JANUARY, 2021.

[Signature]
Chairman