

**VILLAGE OF WOODRIDGE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
Regular Meeting of May 2, 2016**

A regular meeting of the Plan Commission for the Village of Woodridge was held at 7:30 p.m. on Monday, May 2, 2016 in the Board Room of the Village Hall, Five Plaza Drive Woodridge, Illinois.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Hendricks called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Upon roll call the following were:

Present: Balogh, Hendle-Kinnunen, Hulbert, Mast, Przepiorka, Hendricks

Absent: Gaspar

Director of Community Development Michael Mays, Planner Jason Zawila and Recording Secretary Peggy Halper were also present.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE APRIL 18, 2016 MEETING

Commissioner Przepiorka made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mast to approve the minutes from the April 18, 2016 meeting with no changes. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Przepiorka, Mast, Balogh, Hendle-Kinnunen, Hulbert, Hendricks

Nays: None

Motion Passed

IV. CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN PROPOSED ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 9 OF THE VILLAGE CODE, THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE VILLAGE OF WOODRIDGE

Chairman Hendricks called the public hearing to order. He then reviewed the application before the Plan Commission verifying that all required public notices had been given. A copy of the certificate of publication shall be made part of this public hearing record as exhibit "A". He then asked for staff to make a presentation.

A. Public Hearing

Michael Mays, Director of Community Development, was sworn in and stated he would like to make staff's report part of the public hearing record as exhibit "B". He stated that the purpose for tonight's public hearing was to modify the notification requirements that are contained in Title 9 of the Village code. Currently within the Village's code any type of rezoning, special use request, variances or major changes

of those types of considerations require that certain notifications be conducted. They include a letter being sent by certified mail 15 to 30 days prior to the hearing to all properties within 250 feet of the subject property excluding right-of-way. In addition, a sign is posted on the property 15 days prior to the Plan Commission public hearing. A notice is also published in a local newspaper between 15 and 30 days prior to the hearing. What the code currently does not require notification for is site plan consideration. This includes any project that is appropriately zoned, does not need a PUD or any type of relief, but is seeking site plan approval for a new project.

Mr. Mays said they had come before the Plan Commission on February 1st, as part of a larger discussion regarding office/warehouse development in the community. They had sought Plan Commission feedback on this notification question in response to resident's request. Based on the Plan Commission recommendation, staff prepared the text amendments for their consideration tonight.

Mr. Mays stated as it relates to the special use, variance, and rezoning requests all the prior requirements remain. The only change would be the distance for notification would expand from 250 feet to 350 feet, again excluding right-of-way. In addition to that modification the proposed amendments for their consideration this evening also include a notification process for consideration of new site plan approvals before the Plan Commission. The proposed amendment would require a letter being sent to all property owners within 350 feet of the subject property excluding right-of-way. It would also require notification via the sign on the property. It would not include notification in a local newspaper

Chairman Hendricks asked if anyone in the audience had questions regarding the public hearing.

A resident, Rosemary, asked if there was consideration given to placing door knob notifications on doors, that would be potentially cost effective, allowing the boundary to be expanded further.

Mr. Mays said one of the things that the Village has to follow, in relation to State statute requirements, is that a letter be mailed to everyone within 250 feet excluding right-of-way. He asked if having the door hanger component would be in addition to having the letters.

Rosemary stated yes.

Mr. Mays said some of the concerns that people raised on February 1st were that they don't read their mail. Part of the consideration here, with site plan approval, is instead of mailing a certified letter, the notice would be sent via regular mail. This way if the resident was not home they would not have to go to the post office to pick up the letter. The question would be who would deliver the door hangers, staff or the applicant. At least with the letters being sent copies can be provided to the Village, as proof of notification.

Rosemary asked if the concern was that there would not be proof that the door knob hangers would be hung or the cost.

Mr. Mays stated it is both. The Village wants to make sure that everyone is notified.

Rosemary asked if they knew what that cost would be.

Mr. Mays said typically with a certified letter, the cost is \$6.00 per notice. With a regular letter the cost includes the envelope, postage stamp and the letter itself. He does not know what the cost is for creating a door hanger.

Rosemary stated she does not speak for everyone here, but her personal preference is that the certified letter is not a big issue to her as long as they can show a lot of people are receiving the letters. The door knob hanger would allow them to expand the boundary and be more cost effective. She asked if anyone on the Commission has taken the time to measure out how far 350 feet would be from their particular lot line.

Commissioner Balogh said she knows with her lot line.

Rosemary stated it is like a distance of four houses. She hopes that everyone on the Commission takes the time to find out especially when it involves a developer building 56 loading docks within 350 feet from their property before they decide if 350 feet is sufficient.

Chairman Hendricks asked if she had a recommendation as to how far she felt it should be.

Rosemary said she heard people talk about 500 feet, but feels it would depend on the size of the development. With this particular situation with the loading docks it would have such a substantial impact to negatively affect the quality of life there. She would expect at a minimum, half the subdivision would know about it. The easiest way would be to include the whole subdivision because it is not that large.

A resident, John Seelander, asked if there was any consideration of using social media the way that the Village utilizes for other notifications.

Mr. Mays stated absolutely and part of their commitment is to explore those requirements. To codify that in the Village code would be difficult with changing technology. Village staff is committed however to explore different ways to get the word out beyond the efforts that are already being taken.

Mr. Seelander said he thinks they should somehow codify the language in the code.

Chairman Hendricks asked if there were any further questions or comments regarding this public hearing. None responded. He then called for a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Balogh made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Hendle-Kinnunen to close the public hearing. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Balogh, Hendle-Kinnunen, Hendricks, Hulbert, Mast, Przepiorka

Nays: None

Motion passed

B. Plan Commission Discussion

Commissioner Mast asked if they knew what percentage of residents currently prescribe to the Village's social media.

Mr. Mays said he would have to verify, but as it relates to general information, there are about 3,000 people that subscribe to E-News. In terms of the number of people that subscribe to email notification of Plan Commission meetings he would have to go back and confirm. He stated it is under 100 and they are continuing to try and promote this as a great way to let people know what is on the agenda.

Chairman Hendricks asked if there were any further questions or comments from the Plan Commission. None responded. He then asked for staff's recommendation

C. Staff Recommendation

Mr. Mays stated that staff recommends to the Plan Commission that they make a recommendation to the Mayor and Board of Trustees regarding the proposed text amendments to Title 9 which is outlined in Attachment A.

Chairman Hendricks called for a recommendation.

D. Plan Commission Recommendation

Commissioner Przepiorka said he would like to add to staff's report dated May 2, 2016, the amendment language does not actually have "Attachment A" on it. He would like to make sure this is noted in the minutes.

Commissioner Przepiorka made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mast to recommend to the Mayor and Board of Trustees approval of the proposed text amendments to Title 9 of the Municipal Code, as outlined in Attachment A. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Przepiorka, Mast, Balogh, Hendle-Kinnunen, Hulbert, Hendricks

Nays: None

Motion passed

V. CONSIDERATION OF FINAL PLAN AND PLAT FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT – PARK 355 BUSINESS PARK – PHASE 3 – HSA COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE, LLC

A. Staff Presentation

Jason Zawila, Planner, stated the Park 355 business park is approximately 37 acres and is located south of International Parkway and west of Interstate 355. Phase Three refers to the northeastern most 9.68 acres of the site. The approved annexation agreement permits the development of the site as a business park with up to three warehouse buildings totaling up to 700,000 square feet. The applicant, HSA Commercial Real Estate, is requesting approval for final plan and plat for a PUD for Phase Three, which is the final phase of the Park 355 development.

Proposed Phase Three of the development includes construction of one 152,000 square foot office/warehouse building and associated site improvements to Lot 3 of the development. With the final buildout of Phase Three the total square footage for the business park would total 587,000 square feet and that is under the 700,000 square foot requirement that is specified by the annexation agreement. The proposed office/warehouse use for Lot 3 is consistent with the preliminary plan and plat of PUD. Access to and from the property will be exclusive to Internationale Parkway which currently has three access points that serve the development.

Mr. Zawila said per the preliminary approvals, the developer was required to replace approximately 25% of the trees on the site at completion of the entire Park 355 development. The proposed plans have accounted for the remainder of tree replacement and meets all the landscape requirements for the ORI zoning district. The applicant is also planning to make modifications to the detention pond to address recent amendments to the DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance, to accommodate additional best management practice elements that will adhere to the amended Stormwater Ordinance. He stated this would conclude staff's presentation and the applicant is present to make a presentation and answer any questions.

B. Applicant Presentation

Mark TeGrootenhuis, HSA Commercial Real Estate, stated he does not have a presentation but is present tonight to answer any questions that the Plan Commission might have. Also present is Brett Duffy from SPACECO, the civil engineer on the project.

Chairman Hendricks asked if any of the Commissioners had any questions.

Commissioner Mast asked with the construction of Phase Three would there be any temporary demand on water management or the sewer system that might need any special consideration.

Mr. TeGrootenhuis said there would not be any temporary demand.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked if they could talk about the adjustments being made to the detention pond.

Brett Duffy, SPACECO, stated he is the civil engineer for the project. When the site was first developed back in the mid 2000's they had followed the current ordinance at that time. In 2013 the county had changed their stormwater ordinance to require additional post construction best management practices on the property. When they originally designed the detention facility it was a wetland, native planting detention basin which provides water quality treatment for the area. That is part of the post construction best management practices that are now in place and they were ahead of their time when they originally designed it. Also with the new ordinance requirements there is a volume control component where you need to store an inch and a quarter of rainfall from all the impervious coverage from the site. The pond has been modified to store that stormwater. He said they are not changing the shape of the pond or the plantings but rather store more water.

Commissioner Przepiorka asked how they were going to do this.

Mr. Duffy said they are raising the outlet pipe about three inches to store more water in the bottom basin.

Chairman Hendricks asked if there were any additional questions. None responded.

C. Public Comments

Chairman Hendricks asked there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak or ask questions. None responded.

D. Staff Recommendation

Mr. Zawila stated staff recommends that the Plan Commission recommend to the Mayor and Village Board approval of a final plan and plat for a planned unit development with conditions that are listed on pages three and four of staff's report.

E. Plan Commission Recommendation

Chairman Hendricks called for a motion of recommendation.

Commissioner Hendle-Kinnunen made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Hulbert to recommend to the Mayor and Village Board approval of a final plan and plat for a Planned Unit Development subject to the following conditions as listed on page three and four of staff's report dated May 2, 2016. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Hendle-Kinnunen, Hulbert, Balogh, Hendricks, Mast, Przepiorka

Nays: None

Motion passed

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT (ITEMS NOT RELATED TO THE AGENDA)

None

VII. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Mr. Zawila stated at the last Plan Commission meeting there was some discussion regarding electronic message board signs (EMB) and the potential for them to list specific uses in non-residential districts that would be allowed to take advantage of EMB signs. In 2013 they had expanded the allowance for EMB signs, as they previously were allowed as a special use in residential areas with non-residential uses and in shopping centers. With the amended ordinance, EMBs are now allowed for standalone commercial properties and golf courses; along with requiring a special use for those non-residential uses in residential districts.

Mr. Zawila said with non-residential uses in residential districts it is still a special use with a public hearing in front of the Plan Commission. He noted that with consideration of the amended EMB ordinance, staff reviewed all the areas that EMB's would be permitted and installed currently. This map was provided to each of the Commissioners, with an update on where signs have been installed or proposed since the 2013 amendment. The uses that are non-residential in residential districts include governmental entities like the Village and the Park District, educational facilities and schools, and lastly religious institutions. The concern with listing specific uses is the potential for violation of religious land use and institutionalize personal interest laws that would potentially restrict those signs that would be allowed for religious institutions different than all other non-residential districts do. Staff felt it would not be recommended to list those specific uses because there is really no other type of use that would be allowed in those districts.

Commissioner Mast asked if special consideration is required for approval of a special use how would criteria be applied.

Mr. Zawila stated there are the findings for special uses that are outlined in the code. There are also distance requirements, message timing, restriction on flashing, and area requirements. At a minimum the sign would have to adhere to that and then there are the standards that are applied to every special use.

Commissioner Mast asked if every single one would require approval.

Mr. Zawila said yes.

VIII. UPDATE OF PREVIOUS PLAN COMMISSION CASES

Mr. Mays stated in regards to Uptown at Seven Bridges, a study session will take place with the Village Board this Thursday. It will not be for the consideration of the development itself, instead it is for a study session to discuss the terms of the development agreement. When the original development was approved in 2007 it was tied to a development agreement that obligated the developer to certain improvements within Seven Bridges. The Village Board is going to be discussing those development terms and provide feedback to Pulte before they proceed with approval process. If they move forward they will be coming back before the Plan Commission for final RPUD approval. They have resubmitted plans with a pocket park in-line with the recommendation from the Plan Commission.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Hendricks called for a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner Przepiorka made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Balogh to adjourn the meeting. A roll call vote was taken:

Ayes: Przepiorka, Balogh, Hendle-Kinnunen, Hulbert, Hendricks, Mast

Nays: None

Motion passed

Chairman Hendricks

Peggy Halper, Secretary