

**Regular Meeting-Plan Commission/Zoning Board Of Appeals
Gregory J. Bielawski Municipal Center, Carol Stream, DuPage County, Illinois**

September 12, 2005

ALL MATTERS ON THE AGENDA MAY BE DISCUSSED, AMENDED AND ACTED UPON

Chairman John Bentz called the Regular Meeting of the Combined Plan Commission / Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 7:35 p.m. and directed Recording Secretary Wynne Progar to call the roll.

- Present: Commissioners Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen and Bentz
Commissioner Vora entered at 7:40 p.m.
- Absent: Commissioners Hundhausen and Sutenbach
- Also Present: Village Planner Don Bastian and Recording Secretary Progar

MINUTES:

Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Michaelsen made the second to approve the Minutes of the Meeting of August 8, 2005 as presented. The results of the roll call vote were:

- Ayes: 4 Commissioners Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen and Bentz
- Nays: 0
- Absent: 3 Commissioners Vora, Hundhausen and Sutenbach

PUBLIC HEARING:

**#05200: Central Park Square, LLC / Doug Salemi, 1270 Kuhn Road
Variation – Sign Code**

Doug Salemi, 200 W. Main Street, Unit G, St. Charles, IL was sworn in as a witness in this matter. He explained that he is requesting a sign that is taller than allowed in the code. He added that the businesses are located behind the buildings that are on Army Trail Road and this would be the only way anyone would know that they are there. He also stated that the design and features would mirror the other sign on the other side of the property.

There were no comments or questions from those in attendance at the call for public hearing.

Mr. Bastian stated In September 2004, the Village Board approved the Final PUD Plan for the 10,000 square foot commercial building currently under construction on the 2.17-acre property immediately to the south of National City Bank on Kuhn Road. In March 2005, the Village Board approved a Special Use for the Mapleberry Pancake House Restaurant to be operated in the building, and they also approved minor revisions to the approved Final PUD Plan, including a 400 square foot decrease in the size of the building, and an increase in the number of parking spaces. At this time, Doug Salemi of Central Park Square LLC is requesting a Sign Code variation that would allow a ground sign, proposed to be installed adjacent to Army Trail Road, to be approximately 11 feet in height as opposed to the maximum allowable height of six feet. As such, the

applicant has filed an application requesting a variation from Section 6-11-17(D)(2) of the Sign Code.

The Alta Survey (Exhibit B) for the property and the overall commercial subdivision shows the somewhat unique configuration of the applicant's property, which has a long, narrow strip of land extending north to the Army Trail Road right-of-way. Although this parcel configuration was not necessary for vehicular access, as cross-access easements exist across the private drive aisles within the overall commercial development, the long strip of land does allow this property to have a sign in close proximity to Army Trail Road. Visibility of the applicant's building by motorists on Army Trail Road could be limited due to the large setback from the road and also because other commercial buildings have been built along Army Trail Road. However, a sign located adjacent to Army Trail Road for this building should significantly improve motorists' awareness of the businesses in the building.

As you may recall, the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals approved a Sign Code Variation for the height of the ground sign that was built for the retail strip center at 566-578 Army Trail Road, just to the north of this property. In that case, although construction began on the sign without a permit and also in violation of the six-foot maximum height, the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals approved a variation to allow the sign to measure nine feet, six inches tall, citing the following unique factors:

The significant grade differential between the retail property and Army Trail Road – The retail center sat lower in elevation than Army Trail Road, which reduced the visibility of the shopping plaza from motorists. It was felt that a ten-foot tall ground sign would better inform passing motorists of the shops within the plaza than would a six foot tall sign as permitted by the Sign Code.

The speed of traffic on Army Trail Road – The posted speed limit on Army Trail Road is 45 miles per hour. As the speed of traffic increases, the amount of time that a motorist has to identify a business and make the necessary lane changes to enter a site decreases. It was felt that a taller ground sign would inform motorists of the specific stores in the plaza sooner than would a shorter ground sign.

The width of the Army Trail Road right-of-way - Given the relatively wide right-of-way, at over 100 feet, and the fact that the road has a six lane cross-section in this area, it is important for motorists to have as much advance notice of the location of a particular store they wish to visit to allow adequate time for safe vehicle maneuvering. A taller sign would give motorists more time to make driving decisions, and this was an important factor in the analysis of the request for a variation.

Variation:

The Sign Code allows the ground sign for the subject property to measure a maximum of six feet in height. For your information, with respect to calculating the height of a sign, the Sign Code provides the following direction:

"Height of signs shall be measured to the highest point thereon, from the crown of the street directly opposite the sign, or from the natural grade level directly below the sign, whichever is higher."

The sign detail sheet, Exhibit A, provides some of the construction details and other specific information about the sign. Included on the sign detail sheet in the upper left-hand corner of the drawing is the elevation of the center (crown) of Army Trail Road, at 804.55 feet, and the elevation of the ground at the location where the sign will be installed, at 803.90 feet. At the location proposed for the installation of the sign, the ground is about eight inches lower in elevation than the crown of the road. This could have the effect of lowering the apparent height of the sign by about eight inches. However, by calculating the height of the sign as specified by the Sign Code, the height of the sign is allowed to increase in an amount equal to the amount below the grade of the crown of the road the property is at, without it counting against the height of the sign. In this way, the effective height of ground signage for sites that sit lower than the crown of the adjacent street is not reduced as a result of local topographic conditions.

In this specific case, Exhibit A proposes a sign having a peak height of 11.67 feet (11 feet, 8 inches) above the adjacent grade. Because the base of the sign will be located about 8 inches below the elevation of the crown of Army Trail Road, the proposed height of the sign as defined by the Sign Code is 11 feet. In the case from earlier this year, the sign had a peak height of 11.33 feet (11 feet, four inches) above the adjacent grade, and in that case, the base of the sign was located about 1.88 feet (one foot, eleven inches) below the elevation of the crown on the road, which resulted in a net sign height of 9.45 feet (nine feet, five and one-half inches). As such, although the applicant's sign will actually only be about four inches taller with respect to grade than the existing sign at 566-578 Army Trail Road, it will appear to be about one and one-half feet taller with respect to the road because of the grade differential between the signs and the crown of Army Trail Road at the two sign locations.

In evaluating the current request, staff finds that the three factors that were found to support the previous similar request, including the grade differential of the retail property and Army Trail Road, the speed of traffic on Army Trail Road, and the width of Army Trail Road, are also applicable in this case. There are two additional pieces of information that staff believes are relevant to this request. First, the applicant has designed the proposed sign to look virtually identical to the sign that was installed at the 566-578 Army Trail Road building. This will create an attractive, uniform appearance for the signage along the Army Trail frontage. Second, the applicant's building is set back about 300 feet from Army Trail Road, and there are two commercial buildings between the applicant's building and the roadway, so there will be minimal visibility of the building for motorists on Army Trail Road. Because of this, it will be even more important for the ground sign to capture the attention of passing motorists than in the previous case, since in the previous case, the building and individual tenant wall signage could also be seen from Army Trail Road.

In reviewing this request, we have identified several factors that could support a variation to allow the proposed ground sign to exceed the maximum allowable height of six feet. Initially, staff believed that the applicant should limit the height of the sign to the same height that was approved for the sign for the building at 566-578 Army Trail Road. If the Plan Commission so determines, the Sign Code variation for that sign could set the precedent for ground sign height along Army Trail Road. However, after further consideration, staff believes that visibility of the applicant's building will be significantly less than for the 566-578 Army Trail Road building. Because of this, and

because the sign will be designed to look virtually identical to the existing ground sign, staff does not object to the requested variation.

If the Plan Commission approves the requested variation, staff recommends that it do so subject to a condition that the applicant obtains the necessary building permit for the sign.

Commissioner Weiss said that he has no objection to allowing this variance. He asked if there would be a request for another sign at the Kuhn Road access to this property and Mr. Salemi responded that he will not be requesting a sign for that entrance, however, the tenant for Mapleberry Pancakes may request one.

Commissioner Michaelsen asked if the brick color and lettering would match the existing sign and was told that it will.

Commissioner Vora entered the meeting at this point.

Commissioner Bentz asked if there is sufficient distance between this sign and the other one so that one will not block the other and it was determined that one sign is on the eastern border and one on the western border.

Commissioner Weiss asked how many more lots are available for businesses that may want to put up signs and Mr. Bastian said that a submittal for the last available lot was received today so that would be the only other business requesting signage.

Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Michaelsen made the second to approve a variance to the sign code to allow a ground sign approximately 11 feet in height on Army Trail Road subject to the petitioner obtaining the necessary building permit for such sign. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Vora, Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen & Bentz
Nays:	0	
Absent:	2	Commissioners Hundhausen and Sutenbach

**#05151: Lakewood Homes, Inc., Fisher Farm Property, North Side of North Avenue West of Gary Avenue
Rezoning (Upon Annexation)
Special Use Permit – Planned Unit Development
Planned Unit Development Plan – Preliminary
Subdivision - Preliminary
(Continued from 8/8/05 meeting)**

The following previously sworn participants appeared before the Commission:

Jim Truesdell, Joe Maschek, Scott Farris and Dan O'Malley and Brent Coulter. Jim Truesdell and Joe Maschek provided a review of the preliminary development plan; Scott Farris provided a review of the changes in the landscape plan. Dan O'Malley provided a review of the architectural changes and Brent Coulter provided a review of the traffic pattern changes.

At the call for public hearing:

Ron Mason – 156 Carriage Drive: Traffic signage and current detention pond.

Irene Montana - 354 W. Shawnee Drive: Traffic signage, flooding on Shawnee, berms.

Barbara Kroll – 146 Surrey: detention area, berming for privacy, sidewalks

Pam Orlow – 216 Coachlite: storm drainage, single entrance gated community.

Arthur Panasewicz, 280 Shawnee Drive: parking area in front of his home, looking for protection and privacy.

In response to the questions regarding traffic control signs, Brent Coulter said that the actual signage for the new access into the project has not been determined. He noted that a traffic study will have to be done after the final engineering plans are approved and stated that it could be a yield sign, a stop sign or even a four way stop intersection.

In response to the questions regarding the existing ponds adjacent to the northeast and southeast corners, Engineering asked Lakewood to combine all water storage areas into the new pond since it is considered more efficient to confine stormwater management in one facility rather than in several small ones. The current detention areas will be filled in.

In response to the questions about a berm on the north side of the property, it was stated that there is a 30' wide sanitary sewer line that runs through that area and therefore a berm cannot cover any access to it. Landscaping of the area will include 8' to 10' tall evergreens and minimum 3" caliper deciduous trees. Richard Speckman of Cemcon engineering said that the flood zone around Klein Creek, which handles stormwater created by 100/year events, will not be touched. The created retention pond will be of benefit in controlling stormwater by having a 10 to 1 release factor. Ms. Montana asked who is responsible for the flooding that currently takes place by her home and it was determined that the Village Engineer should be made aware of the situation and that Lakewood will address the swale that is in the farm field adjacent to Shawnee Drive during the land movement phase of the development.

In response to the question about sidewalks it was stated that there will be sidewalks on both sides of the public streets. It was also noted that the proposed project has been reduced from the original presentation by four individual units not four buildings.

In regard to the questions about making this a contained development with a gated entrance, staff responded that every development that has been proposed in the Village has been done to connect to every other part of the Village as opposed to individual, unrelated communities.

In response to the questions about parking areas it was determined that the common parking areas have been removed from the perimeter and that all parking areas and private streets will be curbed and landscaped.

In regard to the question about how many school children will come from this development Mr. Truesdell stated that there should be 50 to 60 school age children and that Lakewood will make the required contributions to the appropriate school districts.

It was also noted that they have changed the architectural features of the rooflines so that there is a lower appearance to the buildings with a hip roof concept.

Mr. Bastian stated that Staff has conducted a preliminary review of the most recent set of revised plans from Lakewood Homes for their proposed development of the Fisher property. In presenting our analysis of the revised plans, this report contains two main sections. The first section will discuss the changes in the application and plans since they were last presented to the PC/ZBA at the July 11, 2005, meeting, and how the changes address the concerns enumerated by the PC/ZBA, residents, and staff. The second section includes a detailed list of the remaining concerns that staff has regarding the plans as of this time.

Notable Revisions

1. **Zoning upon annexation** – As indicated in the cover letter from Jim Truesdell,

Lakewood has amended their original application with respect to the zoning classification being requested for the commercial area, once the property is annexed to Carol Stream. Originally, Lakewood requested that the commercial area be zoned B-2 General Retail District, to which staff had no objection. However, after more fully exploring the potential users for the commercial area, Lakewood has learned that an automobile dealership may be interested in occupying the site. Since an automobile dealership is not a permitted use in the B-2 General Retail District, but it is a permitted use in the B-3 Service District, Lakewood has amended its request for the zoning of the commercial portion of the development from B-2 to B-3.

Staff has no objection to the requested B-3 Service District zoning classification for the commercial portion of the development. However, if the ultimate use of the commercial property is not an automobile dealership but rather ends up being a use that would have been permitted in the B-2 District, the Village may wish to amend the zoning of the commercial property in the future, so as to prevent some of the less desirable service uses permitted in the B-3 District from locating on the property. Whatever the future use of the commercial property is, the development will be required to be reviewed through the Village's Planned Unit Development and North Avenue Corridor review processes.

The PC/ZBA should indicate whether the requested B-3 Service District zoning classification for the commercial portion of the development is appropriate.

2. Street network connectivity – At the July 11 PC/ZBA meeting, there was some support for relocating the street connection from Lakewood's proposed development to Surrey Drive from the southern detention basin on Surrey Drive to the northern detention basin on Surrey Drive. One of the reasons for this was that it would bring the pedestrian connection closer to the existing neighborhood and community facilities such as school and parks. Another reason for moving the street connection to the north is that it would eliminate what would have become a through street with the more southerly connection, which some people in attendance at the meeting were concerned would have promoted high rates of speed for motorists. With the current configuration, a T-intersection will be created, which will result in slower traffic speeds.

In general, staff prefers and supports the street connection taking place through the northern detention basin as opposed to the southern detention basin, as previously shown. However, we do have some concerns with the current design of the connection, and these concerns will be presented in the next section of the report.

The PC/ZBA should indicate whether they support the northern street connection as opposed to the southern connection as was previously shown.

3. Increase setbacks and buffering from existing homes – The plans presented at the July 11 PC/ZBA meeting provided a 40-foot building setback for the new townhomes from the rear property lines of the existing single-family properties to the north and east of the proposed development. The current plans show townhome building setbacks from the existing residential property lines ranging from a minimum of 45 feet up to a maximum of 80 feet, with an average townhome setback of 61 feet. With respect to screening and buffering, the "Typical Property Screening Exhibit" in the bound packet of plans also shows a significant increase in the quantity of landscape

materials proposed to be installed between the existing and proposed residences. Staff recommends that all evergreen trees planted in the perimeter screening area be a minimum of eight feet in height at the time of installation, and that all deciduous shade trees be a minimum of three-inch caliper at the time of installation.

The PC/ZBA should indicate whether the increased setbacks and landscape screening are satisfactory as proposed.

4. Residential architecture – The PC/ZBA, residents and staff had several comments with respect to architecture. **(Please note that the revised residential elevations were received on Thursday, September 8, so staff has performed only a preliminary review of the revised elevations.)** The comments regarding architecture raised at the July 11 PC/ZBA meeting included a preference for more masonry and more color options on the units, a need for changes that would reduce the “barracks-like” appearance of the rear of the buildings, and direction to soften the appearance of the buildings as viewed from the existing residences.

With respect to the request that additional masonry be used on the elevations, it appears as though the amount of masonry has been increased on several units, although staff is not certain because the plans do not specifically identify the building materials. The petitioner should present elevations that clearly indicate the building areas that will consist of masonry, and be willing to commit to a certain minimum amount of masonry. Also, with respect to color, staff received black and white drawings, so it is not possible to determine the variety of colors that are proposed for siding, roofs, and masonry within the development. Again, the petitioner should have color renderings available for discussion at the PC/ZBA meeting. With respect to reducing the “barracks-like” appearance of the rear of the buildings, we note that intersecting hip roof elements are now shown for the rear elevations, which will improve the appearance of the rear of the buildings, and additional window shutters are also provided. In terms of softening the appearance of the ends of the buildings facing the existing residences, the petitioner has stated, and the plans indicate, that the ends of the buildings have been changed to a hip roof configuration, which reduces the building mass appearance and somewhat lowers the roofline.

Staff will have additional comments regarding the building architecture in the next section of the report. The PC/ZBA should indicate whether the revisions to building architecture satisfy the concerns presented at the July 11 meeting.

5. Guest parking – The primary concern with respect to guest parking as discussed at the July 11 meeting was not the number of guest spaces but rather the proximity of spaces in relation to the rear yards of existing residences. The Dimensioned Development Plan indicates that all guest parking spaces have been removed from the perimeter areas, and the plan now indicates that 44 guest parking spaces have been provided within the right-of-way, perpendicular to the public street. This is a similar configuration for guest parking as approved for the Fountains at Town Center development. An additional 30 guest parking spaces are provided throughout the development adjacent to the private motor court areas. The landscape plan indicates that the interior guest parking areas are screened with evergreen trees.

Given the fact that all units have two car garages with room for two cars to be parked in each driveway, staff believes that the 74 guest parking spaces will be adequate to serve the development. With respect to the 44 guest parking stall shown perpendicular to the street, within the public right-of-way, the Village will require that the guest parking spaces be maintained by the homeowners association, as the Village will not maintain these spaces.

The PC/ZBA should indicate whether the location, screening and quantity of guest parking spaces are acceptable.

6. Traffic signal at North Avenue – The PC/ZBA was in full support of a traffic signal at the North Avenue intersection. Lakewood has revised their traffic study and is continuing their efforts to obtain IDOT approval for a full signal at this location. Staff fully expects that a signal will be approved by IDOT.

7. Density – Some PC/ZBA members indicated that the density of the development appeared to be too high. The previous plan contained 284 townhome units with a net density of 8.3 units per acre, while the current plan contains 280 townhome units with a net density of 8.0 units per acre. The density of the project is within the parameters of the R-4 General Residence District. Staff will discuss the density issue further in the next section of the report.

Since the proposed density is within the acceptable range for the R-4 District, staff believes that the issue of whether the density is acceptable to the Village essentially amounts to whether the PC/ZBA and Village Board believe that building spacing, open space areas, recreational opportunities and the overall character of the development meet with expectations. Staff encourages the PC/ZBA to provide input regarding the issue of density.

8. Project amenities and details – One of the main concerns expressed at the PC/ZBA meeting in regard to project amenities and details involved the close proximity of the small proposed public park site to both the retention pond and the front of a townhome building. From a staff perspective, we have consistently stressed to Lakewood representatives the need for this development to have an identity and for a sense of place to be created. This is often accomplished through the fine details of a project.

In meetings with Lakewood officials since the last PC/ZBA meeting, the idea of creating an amenity focused around Klein Creek and the storm water management facility at the northwest area of the development was explored. Recall that the developer is proposing to name the development "Lakewood at Klein Creek" – as such, staff felt that it made sense to incorporate the creek as an amenity feature that would add to the identity of the development. The current plan has been revised to eliminate the small public park site, and the Park District has given a preliminary indication that they would be agreeable to accepting an all-cash contribution for this development. This arrangement would make available some additional land for the retention pond feature, which will be a recreational amenity. This mitigates the effect of eliminating the small public park site, since a recreational amenity will be created in its place. The "Detention Pond and Trail Connection" plan shows that an asphalt bike path will be

constructed from the public sidewalk at the northwest corner of the residential development, part way around the retention pond, along Klein Creek, to the bridge that crosses Klein Creek at the former entrance to the Village's Water Reclamation Center. The plan indicates that some landscape materials will be added to enhance the area along the bike path, along with a gazebo that will serve as a pond overlook feature and several stone outcropping areas around the pond. The retention pond is also shown to include a fountain and an aerator.

In the area of project amenities and details, it is staff's position that the plans show significant improvement, although some work remains to be done. For example, we recommend that decorative stone elements found in the vicinity of the retention pond and entrance monument feature also be incorporated at other locations within the development, so as to create an attractive, unified design theme for the entire development, even in those areas that are not within sight of the pond or entrance feature. We also suggested to the developer that the retention pond be reconfigured to allow for a bridge feature to be included, which would enhance the attractiveness of the bike path and retention pond amenity feature; the developer did not implement this design suggestion. Staff also recommended the fountain in the pond be lighted; the plans do not indicate whether this will be done.

Staff has some other comments regarding the retention pond amenity feature that will be discussed in the next section of this report. The PC/ZBA should indicate whether the improvements in the area of project details and amenities are satisfactory, or whether additional enhancements are necessary.

9. Commercial area – The size of the commercial area has been a focus of staff throughout the entire review period for this project. The developer initially proposed a 12.3-acre commercial site; the plan presented at the July 11 PC/ZBA meeting reduced the commercial site to 11.1 acres. Since then, revised versions of the plans further reduced the commercial area to 9.6 acres, while the current plan shows that the commercial area to be 10.2 acres.

Staff has observed and made the comment to the developer that each time a project constraint arises which requires more land area for some use, for example, an increase in the size of the storm water retention facility, the commercial area has been reduced in size while the size of the residential area and the number of units has remained the same. Staff has informed the developer that this is not acceptable. In the current submittal, while four townhome units have been eliminated (a 1.4% reduction); we note that the residential land area was not reduced at all, and the commercial area is 17% smaller than originally proposed. While the reduction in units and a reduction in the size of the great lawn open space area do allow for plan improvements, particularly with respect to increased building setbacks from the existing residences, the developer has yet to modify the plan in a way that will allow the commercial area to return to the originally proposed size.

The PC/ZBA should indicate whether they find the size of the commercial area to be acceptable. The PC/ZBA may wish to consider recommending a condition that sets a minimum required size for the commercial property.

Remaining Staff Concerns

Staff has been working closely with the developer regarding this project, and as a result of the input provided at the July 11 PC/ZBA meeting, in addition to multiple staff commentary letters and meetings between the developer and staff, the current plans show meaningful improvement over those presented at the July 11 PC/ZBA meeting. However, there are still several aspects of the proposed development that staff cannot yet fully support, and because of this, we are not in a position in which we can recommend full approval of the development requests. As a reminder, in accordance with the Zoning Code standards related to the processing of a PUD Plan, if the Village approves a Preliminary PUD Plan for this development, the Village would then be obligated to also approve the subsequent Final PUD Plan if it is found to be in substantial conformance with the approved Preliminary PUD Plan. Because of this, staff believes that it is critical that the Preliminary PUD Plan contain or commit to as many of the fine details and components that are important to the Village, to ensure that they will be carried through to the actual development.

The following list comprises those aspects of the current plans, which, in staff's view, require additional discussion and further modifications to the plans.

1. Engineering issues – There are several aspects of the project that require detailed engineering plans and review by the Engineering Services Department, including storm water management, wetlands and riparian area management, floodplain considerations, traffic circulation and safety, grading, and utility layout. The Engineering Services Department staffs, and the Village's consultants, have reviewed and provided comment on several versions of the engineering plans, storm water report and traffic study. While some issues have either been resolved or a solution is readily apparent, other issues have not yet been resolved to the satisfaction of the Village Engineer. Since some of the unresolved issues could have a significant impact on the overall land plan, the Engineering Services Department cannot confirm that the land plan, as proposed, is feasible. The applicant is encouraged to continue working with the Village Engineer and the Village's review consultants so as to eliminate the concerns of the Village Engineer regarding the feasibility of the overall design.

2. Commercial area size – We have discussed the dwindling size of the commercial area earlier in this report, as well as how the size of the commercial area has been sacrificed each time a plan constraint arises that requires additional land. In a recent meeting with the developer, the Village established the benchmark size of the commercial area moving forward at 11.1 acres, and that any reduction in size would need to be matched by a reduction in the size of the residential area. The commercial area has been reduced to 10.2 acres, with no apparent reduction in the size of the residential area, even though the developer was able to gain the use of three-quarters of an acre of land, formerly allocated toward the public park site, for use in the storm water retention and pond amenity feature area. Staff believes that it is possible to increase the size of the commercial area by making some modifications with respect to the land plan and the design of the storm water management area.

3. Surrey Drive connection – Staff has recommended that the public street connection to Surrey Drive be moved approximately 75 feet to the south of the location at which it is currently shown. There are several reasons for this recommendation.

First, moving the street connection to the south would avoid causing the property at 224 Shawnee Drive, located at the corner of Shawnee Drive and Surrey Drive, from being bordered by three public streets, which is undesirable. Second, moving the roadway connection to the south as recommended would locate the connection out of the curve area of Surrey Drive, which is desirable since it will improve roadway geometry. Third, moving the connection south will increase sight distances in the general area of the existing and proposed new intersections. Finally, the Village Engineer notes that moving the road connection to the south as recommended would reduce the required storm water storage volume. Based upon these factors, staff still recommends that the road connection be moved to the south approximately 75 feet. Doing so would allow for a proper corner side yard to be provided for the existing property at 198 Surrey Drive, a standard 66-foot right-of-way for the street connection, and a 115-foot wide new lot that could be developed for a new single-family residence.

4. Amenity features – As mentioned, staff has consistently stressed the importance that this development has a sense of place and a discernable character. Stated another way, the Village is not looking for this development to be a nondescript assemblage of row upon row of similar looking townhome units. Recent plan revisions have shown improvement in this regard, however staff feels that more work is still necessary. For example, staff believes that additional enhancements to the retention pond amenity feature are necessary to truly make this an amenity that meets with the Village's expectations for this development. For example, we believe that the aerator and fountain in the storm water pond should both be lighted. We also think that there is an opportunity to expand the retention pond onto some Village owned property to the north while also incorporating a bridge feature into the proposed bike path. Not only would this have the benefit of adding storm water storage volume, which could allow the commercial area to expand in size, but it would also enhance the value of the amenity feature. Finally, to tie the amenity features together and promote a unified theme for the development, we suggest that the decorative rock outcroppings, shown for use around the retention pond, also be introduced in other areas of the development, including at the entrance pergola, seating pockets, the ornamental tree grove and other common garden or lawn areas. Further, it is strongly recommended that the decorative stone areas be Lannon Stone, as this type of stone has been used in several public and private projects in the Village.

5. Private roadway curbing – The plan includes both public streets, which will be maintained by the Village, and private roadways, for example, the driveways and motor court areas leading to the garages, which will be maintained by the homeowners association. The private driveways and motor court areas are currently not proposed to have any sort of curb. This arrangement will result in the landscaped areas adjacent to the private roadways being vulnerable to damage by snow plowing operations. The areas will also become rutted by motor vehicles, and this arrangement will also encourage vehicles to park just off of the edge of the pavement, which is not desirable or permissible. As a result, staff strongly recommends that the developer modify the plans to include some degree of curbing for the driveways and landscape islands.

6. Residential architecture – As stated, staff has only performed a cursory review of the revised architectural plans due to the lateness of their submittal. Our quick review notes some improvements in terms of additional masonry and visual interest

created by more varied rooflines. However, there still only appear to be two different Unit C elevations that would face the public street, which will not result in an acceptably varied streetscape. A more significantly varied Unit C elevation needs to be provided, and staff also requests information regarding the masonry and color options that could enhance the streetscape variety.

7. Additional street connection – As noted earlier, the proposed street connection to the existing residential neighborhood is proposed to be at the northeast corner of the development. Staff is working with the developer to analyze the impacts (adverse and beneficial) that would accrue from such a connection. In addition, there have been discussions regarding a possible second connection towards the northwest corner of the site to Shawnee Drive. Initially, staff had felt that a second connection would be useful, and asked that the developer leave open the possibility of such a connection in the land plan. However, the preliminary findings of the traffic report, as well as the need to provide additional land area for the storm water management facilities, have caused staff to reconsider the value of a second street connection. If the open space reserved for a second street connection were used to allow expansion of the storm water management facilities, this would reduce the impact of such expansion on the commercial space.

8. Commercial property connectivity – As reflected in the attached letter from attorney Robert McNeese, there is a need to consider the connectivity of the Lakewood commercial parcel with the four properties between the Fisher Farm and Kuhn Road. The Village has consistently told developers and property owners that development of these properties would best be done under a well thought-out land plan that provided the best access and connectivity for the future commercial developments. At this time, there is no commercial developer identified for any of the five properties, including Lakewood's. Staff continues to work with Lakewood and the other property owners in an effort to achieve a unity of purpose and a cooperative development plan.

Summary:

Staff has acknowledged the changes and improvements to the plans since the July 11 PC/ZBA meeting. While we believe that the plans are headed in the proper direction, in terms of the recent improvements that have been provided, we are not yet at a point in which we can recommend approval of the Preliminary PUD Plan or the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the rezoning to R-4 General Residence District and B-3 Service District. Staff recommends that the Special Use for Planned Unit Development, the Preliminary PUD Plan, and the Preliminary Plat be continued to the October 10, 2005, PC/ZBA meeting, to allow the developer to incorporate the feedback of the PC/ZBA and residents provided at the September 12, 2005, meeting, as well as the staff recommendations included in this report.

Commissioner Michaelsen commented that he does not have a problem zoning the commercial part of the development to B-3; he is in favor of a street tie in to Surrey Drive; the side distances between units are acceptable. In regard to the Density and

Architecture, Commissioner Michaelsen commented that there are still too many units and while the roof line changes are an improvement, they still look like barracks. In response to the question about the distance between the units it was stated that each unit has a 20' long driveway as well as a 24' street which equates to building separation of 64' back to back in the courtyards. There is separation between the driveways in the back courtyards, providing more landscaping area. Face to face separation is a minimum of 65 feet and side to side configuration is a minimum of 30 feet. Commissioner Michaelsen asked where the guest parking is located and was told that the interior areas have courtyard parking and there are a few parking stalls around the great lawn area. They will be identified with signs and will be maintained by the homeowners association. In response to the questions, it was noted that the developer will be providing curbing on all street and parking areas and it was stated that the developer has received from IDOT acknowledging that the intersection on North Avenue meets the spacing requirements for a traffic signal, but it would still have to meet traffic warrants to actually receive approval for the signal.

Commissioner Spink asked if the extra street is required by the Fire Protection District and Mr. Bastian explained that he is not aware that the extra street is required by the Fire Protection District but the Village staff feels strongly that there should be a street connection so that this development can be interconnected with the adjacent part of the Village to access parks and schools.

Commissioner Spink said that she believes that it is very important that this development is key to the development of all of the parcels along North Avenue to Kuhn Road and therefore the secondary road from this should be at Kuhn Road and not at Surrey Drive. A street through to Surrey could be developed at a later date if necessary. She also commented that she is disappointed that there will be a cash payment in lieu of a park. Mr. Truesdell noted that there are many small private park areas throughout the project and in answer to the question, said that the association would be responsible for maintenance of the gazebo. Commissioner Spink said that she would like to see that limits are put on the amount of specific types of units that will be allowed in each building, and that the density should be lowered to 7 units per acre instead of 8 and that there should be more commercial property instead. She also noted that she would support a change of zoning from B-2 to B-3 only for an auto dealership and that change could be made if it is necessary.

Commissioner Weiss commented that he would support a change to B-3 if there was a guaranteed buyer and since this is a high profile property only a sales tax generating business should be approved. He said that the developer should look into developing the Kuhn Road access since it will promote growth and development in the area. Commissioner Weiss commented that he would like to see more masonry added to the facades as well as added seating in and around the gazebo. In response to the questions it was determined that the association would be responsible for maintenance (as in snow plowing) of the guest parking areas and that they would also maintain the seasonal landscaping throughout the development. In regard to access through the Water Reclamation facility Mr. Farris said that they have investigated the property and determined that the developer can extend the path on the Treatment site to the existing driveway and it would be the developer's responsibility to relocate the existing fence so that the pathway would be along the creek but outside of the fence. There would be some additional landscaping, some tree removal and then new materials planted to make up for tree loss plus additional enhancements. The developer would build the path up to the existing driveway which would then allow users' access to Kuhn Road

and the schools and parks in the area.

Chairman Bentz said that the improvements made are good, but there is a lot more to do. He stated that he would be willing to change the zoning to B-3 only if it was required. The connectivity with the Village is important and he would go along with moving the street 75 feet to the south since it makes more sense. Chairman Bentz said that a tremendous job has been done with the north and east perimeters, the increased set back and the landscaping and buffering, and the improved elevations on the buildings. He stated that the developer now has to work on meeting the engineering concerns and it appears that this is going to take more than two weeks and he agrees with staff to continue this matter for at least four weeks. Chairman Bentz said that he would like to see the commercial area expanded; even an acre more would be acceptable.

Commissioner Michaelsen asked if there will be street lighting and was told that there will be street lighting as required by the Village along the public streets. There will also be lighting behind the buildings and the parking courts.

Commissioner Spink asked if there will be sidewalks into Shawnee and Surrey and it was stated that the only sidewalks proposed is along the connection to Surrey on both sides of the street and a pedestrian connection to the west. In the staff report, engineering has asked for an easement area for a bicycle path along North Avenue and the developer has indicated that they would provide.

Ms. Montana asked again why there cannot be some type of privacy berm for the homes on Shawnee. Mr. Truesdell said that the restriction is the sanitary sewer easement and that the developer will work with engineering and public works to determine if there is something that can be done.

Commissioner Weiss moved and Commissioner Michaelsen made the second to continue this matter to the meeting of October 10, 2005. It was noted that it would not be a problem if more time is required and the matter would be continued from the 10/10 meeting. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Vora, Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen & Bentz
Nays:	0	
Absent:	2	Commissioners Hundhausen and Sutenbach

Commissioner Michaelsen moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to close the public hearing. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Vora, Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen & Bentz
Nays:	0	
Absent:	2	Commissioners Hundhausen and Sutenbach

At 10:20 p.m. Commissioner Weiss moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to adjourn. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

FOR THE COMBINED BOARD