
1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. on November 18, 2020.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

Present were Commissioners Berke, Creech, Johnson, Sprague, Thompson and Yedinak. Commissioner Blinova was absent with prior notice. Also present were Marcy Knysz, Village Planner, Mallory Milluzzi, Village Attorney and Ron Antor, Fire Inspector.

4. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA - None

5. CITIZEN CONCERNS AND COMMENTS - None

6. CONSENT ITEMS

- A)** Docket No. SCBA 20-27
Waggles
419 Harvester Court
Approval of a canopy sign
- B)** Docket No. SCBA 20-33
Global Trading Distributors
2110 Foster Avenue
Approval of a canopy sign

Commissioner Creech moved, seconded by Commissioner Yedinak to approve the following consent items.

Approve Docket No. SCBA 20-27 to permit the installation of an awning sign in accordance with the sign plans prepared by KM Brooks (dated 11/2/2020), for Waggles Dog Daycare located at 419 Harvester Court.

Approve Docket No. SCBA 20-33 to permit the installation of an awning sign in accordance with the sign plans prepared by TFA Signs (dated 9/10/2020, revised 9/16/2020), for Global Trading Distributors located at 2110 Foster Avenue.

On the roll call, the vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Berke, Creech, Johnson, Sprague, Thompson, Yedinak
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Blinova
PRESENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

There being six affirmative votes, the motion was approved.

7. ITEMS FOR REVIEW

- A)** Docket No. PC 20-20
209-211 Industrial Lane
Major Site Plan Approval for Construction of an Auxiliary Employee Parking Lot

This docket is for a major site plan review. Ms. Knysz explained major site plan reviews were required for projects with significant site alterations and require a concept review by the Village Board prior to the Plan Commission unless it is waived by the Village Administrator. This concept review was waived by the Village Administrator due to the scope of the proposed project of an employee parking lot. The Plan Commission's recommendation will be forwarded to the Village Board for a final decision.

Mr. Curtis Hanstine, Diversified Engineering was present.

Mr. Hanstine described the existing site with two entrances. The new parking lot has 103 total spaces with drainage to a catch basin and an underground retention system piped into the Village's storm water system.

Commissioner Creech questioned if curbs and gutters were being added on Industrial Lane. Mr. Hanstine thought they were previously installed. Ms. Knysz will confirm with the Engineering. Mr. Hanstine thought the storm sewer, curbing and gutter were already installed in front of their site but was unsure about the date.

Commissioner Creech noticed a security gate on the southeast corner but questioned if the fence went around the parking lot. Mr. Hanstine confirmed they were just securing entry to the Waste Management site.

Commissioner Creech asked if the petitioner was installing a sidewalk on the front end of the property. Mr. Hanstine confirmed they were not adding a sidewalk. Commissioner Creech thought the Village required sidewalks for all new projects as part of the sidewalk program. Ms. Knysz will confirm with Engineering. Commissioner Yedinak referred to the sidewalk that was required at the end of Industrial for the convenience store and Commissioner Sprague referred to a new sidewalk on the north side of the road.

Commissioner Thompson had no questions.

Commissioner Yedinak did not see detail on the connection to the other property. Mr. Hanstine confirmed there was a man gate to the back and a sidewalk connecting to the Waste Management property. Ms. Knysz confirmed there were no other proposed changes.

Commissioner Yedinak expressed concern for the employees going through the industrial drives with lots of truck traffic and no existing walkways. Mr. Hanstine confirmed the Fire Department did not express any concern. Commissioner Yedinak questioned if the Village had a concern about not having a designated walkway. Mr. Antor explained they looked at the proposed as the same as the existing which currently has employees walking between their trucks and other areas. Walkways are not included in the Fire Code.

In response to Commissioner Sprague's question, Mr. Hanstine confirmed the employees currently park throughout the site.

Commissioner Berke had no questions.

Ms. Knysz referred to the recommended condition regarding an irrigation plan.

Commissioner Sprague moved, seconded by Commissioner Creech to recommend approval of Docket No. 2020-20, granting major site plan approval, as required under Title 19, Zoning, of the Wheeling Municipal Code and Chapter 19-12, site plan and building appearance approval, in order to permit a new parking facility at the property located at 209-211 Industrial Lane, in accordance with the following condition:

1. An irrigation plan shall be submitted for staff review and approval as part of the engineering permit for site work.

On the roll call, the vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Berke, Creech, Johnson, Sprague, Thompson, Yedinak
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Blinova
PRESENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

There being six affirmative votes, the motion was approved.

B) Docket No. 2020-32
Prairie Park Concept Review
70 Prairie Park Drive

This docket is before the Plan Commission for a concept review. A concept review was held at the Village Board on October 19 and the Village Board unanimously was in favor of the concept review moving forward to the Plan Commission. After this concept review, the applicant will

proceed to the formal zoning entitlement process. Ms. Knysz noted there was one item that needed to be voted on after the discussion. This is an amendment to an existing PUD, so the Plan Commission will need to determine if it should be considered a minor or substantial change. A minor change is a modification that would not change the general character of the planned development or relocate any principle or accessory structures, reduce any parking, relocate traffic facilities, increase land coverage, increase floor area or reduce the amount of open space. A substantial change would make one of the modifications. A minor and substantial go through the same process except if it is determined to be a substantial change it would require a public hearing.

Mr. Jamie Smith, Smith Family Development was present. Mr. Steve Klump, AR-K-TEKS was present as well.

Mr. Smith explained the site was originally intended to be a 7-story condo building fitting in with the two existing 7-story buildings to the north of the development and the two 5-stories to the south and the single story clubhouse at the west end of the pond. They are proposing 18 single family townhomes on the site with a central drive running through the center so all the garages and driveways would not impact the views of the existing development. They are catering to the same demographics as the existing condo owners. There will be first floor masters, 2-bedrooms upstairs with an option for a more traditional 3-bedrooms on the upper floors with just the kitchen, living and dining on the first floor. There are eight additional parking spaces as well as the driveways and 2-car garages. If they need additional parking, they are land banking at both corners which does not exist today.

It is currently a vacant site. To the north, there is an empty parcel which they own and anticipate it to be a mostly residential project. They do not want any garages or driveways facing the interior of the project that could affect the views of the current residents. The townhomes will be 32' high across the board. The north elevation faces the diversion channel. The materials will be the same materials used on the existing condo buildings. The roof will be the same as the clubhouse which would continue the continuity. The west elevation faces the courtyard. The courtyard is a section between the triplex units and not the ends of the project. On the east end unit, they increased the height of the stone and brick to better accommodate the feel of the buildings on either end. The north elevation faces the new drive, Prairie Court with the garages and front entrances. The entrances for the end units will be around the sides. The east elevation includes a bookend with the higher stone. The west elevation faces one of the courtyards between two triplexes and the south elevation faces Prairie Court.

In response to Commissioner Berke's question, Mr. Smith confirmed the proposed colors and materials were identical to the existing buildings with the same roof materials as the clubhouse.

Commissioner Berke asked if there was a concern for water accumulation due to the difference in elevations. Mr. Smith confirmed their engineer and architect had no concern. The townhomes included basements that were slightly elevated to accommodate for the water table between the existing pond and Prairie Park and the diversion channel to the north.

Commissioner Sprague asked if it was possible to make the backs look like a front. Mr. Smith explained the back included doors and a walkway but no driveways or garages. He envisioned

people utilizing this entrance to go out for walks and enjoying the amenities within Prairie Park.

Commissioner Sprague referred to the north connector road. Mr. Smith explained it was no longer needed because the 7-story building was removed. They are willing to work with the Fire Department on the turning radius. Mr. Antor explained it modified the access to and from the rear of the two-existing mid/high-rise buildings, but it still has a longer route to access it. The petitioner needs to provide a turning radius to accommodate a ladder truck in and out of the site.

In response to Commissioner Sprague's question, Mr. Smith confirmed they would need to move some electric relating to the existing transformer.

Commissioner Yedinak abstained from the discussion since he could not provide an impartial opinion on the project.

Commissioner Thompson liked the addition of adding a different style to the development. Mr. Smith noted there was currently differential in the site with the two 7-stories, two 5-stories and a single-story.

Commissioner Creech asked if the 10' area between the townhouses was an issue. Mr. Antor explained the building had not been reviewed for permitting and there were Code requirements based on the construction and material used in the buildings. The type of construction and material would regulate the distance required in the Building Code.

Commissioner Creech asked about the mechanical locations (AC condensers, gas meters, waste receptacles). Mr. Smith confirmed they would be located in the basement including the HVAC system. Commissioner Creech asked about the location for the condenser and gas meters. He did not think they could be located on the sides or in the backs of the units because of the decks. Mr. Klump explained he planned for them to be by the stairs and next to the windows on the townhouses facing the diversionary channel. Commissioner Creech asked if it would impede the opening of the casement window. Mr. Smith promised they would follow the Code.

Commissioner Creech felt there was too much EIFS on all the buildings. Mr. Smith agreed to work with Staff to make sure they were within Code.

Commissioner Creech felt the proposed style was not considered a prairie style architecture. He would like the architect to change the design so it appears more of a prairie style architecture that would fit in better with the project. Mr. Smith agreed to work with Staff, but he felt the proposed style fit in and worked great with the existing buildings.

Commissioner Creech wants to see how the gutters and downspouts work and the location of the individual trash cans. He also wants to see the location of the mailbox center.

Commissioner Creech addressed the setbacks and referred to the Code for a 30' setback between buildings. He referred to the south elevation facing Prairie Drive and felt the unit on the southwest corner was only 5' away from the sidewalk. He believed the setback for buildings to streets was also 30'. Mr. Smith stated the existing buildings were an average of 11 or 12' from the roadway and the proposed averaged 14'. The townhouses were setback further on average

than the existing four condo buildings.

Commissioner Creech referred to the site plan for the north elevation which states 1'6" from the property line against the diversionary channel which would require a big variance. He questioned if it would require any bank stabilization for the back up against a waterway. Mr. Smith confirmed it did not. Mr. Klump explained the slope was not radical right off the property. Commissioner Creech felt it could require bank stabilization in the back.

Commissioner Creech referred to the footprint of the townhouses in relation to the originally proposed condo building. He felt the footprint of the townhouses was much greater than the originally proposed condo building. He questioned if there would be re-engineering on the detention for additional water. Mr. Smith confirmed they had additional detention and comp storage.

Commissioner Creech referred to the proposed density which was higher than the Code. He also referred to the 18' depth on the majority of the proposed parking slabs which was smaller than the parking requirements. Mr. Smith addressed the density which he explained was a change to the PUD which encompasses the entire 17+ acre site. When the amount of open space (1/5 of the project) was included with the townhomes, it would fall below the 14 per unit density. Commissioner Creech questioned how it would be calculated. Ms. Milluzzi explained they had not looked at the issue at the concept level. As they prepare the amendment application it would be reviewed. She noted that PUDs often had variances built in. If needed, it would be addressed at application.

Mr. Klump mentioned the 70 building was set back 21'. Commissioner Creech mentioned that nine of the buildings were setback 18'. Mr. Klump referred to the A & C units on the north side that were 19.5' and the B unit was 18'. He explained they could pull the 60, 70 and 80 building another 6" toward Prairie Park Drive if necessary. Mr. Klump thought some variables were allowed in PUDs. Ms. Milluzzi confirmed variances would just need to be noted.

Chairman Johnson referred to outstanding engineering issues mentioned in the Staff Report. Ms. Knysz spoke with the Village Engineer who confirmed everything could be addressed. Mr. Smith agreed to work with Staff.

Chairman Johnson asked about the feedback they were receiving from the current owners. Mr. Smith confirmed he has received great feedback with some questions about the assessments. Most people specifically in the 100 and 40 buildings (24 units in each building) were much happier to face a 2-story townhome opposed to a 7-story building obstructing their views. They want to see a finished product.

Ms. Milluzzi stated the applicant would need to establish that the current governing docs allow the request to change from condos to the townhomes. It is either by showing Staff that the current condo governing declaration allows it or that the declarations have been allowed the request.

Ms. Milluzzi explained the Commission needed to determine if the proposed was a minor or substantial change. A substantial change changes the general character of the planned

development.

Chairman Johnson took a vote if the Commission felt it should be considered a minor or substantial change. A substantial change would require public notice.

Commissioner Berke: minor
Commissioner Sprague: substantial
Commissioner Yedinak: abstained
Commissioner Thompson: substantial
Commissioner Creech: substantial
Chairman Johnson: substantial

The vote was 4:1 in favor of considering it a substantial change.

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A)** Approval of Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 28, 2020 (including Findings of Fact for Docket Numbers 2020-29 and 2020-30) and November 4, 2020.

Commissioner Yedinak moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson to approve the minutes dated October 28, 2020 (including Findings of Fact for Docket Numbers 2020-29 and 2020-30) with the following change:

- Docket No. 2020-29 (Findings) – an ordinance and law coverage vs an actual cash value

On the roll call, the vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Berke, Creech, Johnson, Sprague, Thompson, Yedinak
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Blinova
PRESENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

There being six affirmative votes, the motion was approved.

Commissioner Creech moved, seconded by Commissioner Thompson to approve the minutes dated November 4, 2020 as presented.

On the roll call, the vote was as follows:

AYES: Commissioners Berke, Creech, Johnson, Sprague, Thompson, Yedinak
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Blinova
PRESENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

There being six affirmative votes, the motion was approved.

9. OTHER BUSINESS

A) 2021 Plan Commission Schedule

The 2021 regular meeting schedule was presented. The meetings are held on the second and fourth Wednesdays of each month except for November and December.

Ms. Knysz referred to the parking islands at Walmart. The rocks have been removed and replaced with mulch.

Ms. Knysz announced future Plan Commission meetings would be virtual until further notice.

Commissioner Creech asked for an update on the empty lot next to London Middle School. He has not seen much action. Ms. Knysz explained they were in the process of review.

Chairman Johnson has seen open houses advertised with a regular sign plus a feather sign.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Thompson moved, seconded by Commissioner Creech to adjourn the meeting at 7:54 p.m. The motion was approved by a voice vote.