

PLAN COMMISSION
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 22, 2018

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Mary Loch at 7:00 p.m. Plan Commissioners Angela Fanella, Phillip Hartweg, Tracy Heming-Littwin, Terra Costa Howard (left at 8:48 p.m.), Tim Loftus, Mohammed Saeed and Jamie Vondruska were present. Plan Commissioner David Rodemann was excused. Also present were Village Director of Planning and Development Staci Hulseberg, Village Attorney Greg Mathews, Village Planner John Sterrett, Associate Planner Kelly Purvis and Recording Secretary Barbara Utterback.

No general comments on non-agenda items were made by the public at this Plan Commission meeting.

Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Plan Commissioner Fanella, to approve the minutes of the January 11, 2018 Plan Commission meeting. The motion carried by voice vote with two abstentions.

On the agenda was a pre-application meeting for 491 and 495 Newton Avenue and a continued public hearing for Zoning Code Text Amendments.

PRE-APPLICATION MEETING TO DISCUSS THE RE-ZONING, RE-SUBDIVISION AND PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OF 491 AND 495 NEWTON AVENUE TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO DUPLEXES ON THE SITE

(Ray Whalen Builders, Inc.)

Staff Introduction

Associate Planner Kelly Purvis stated that the petitioner for the subject project is Ray Whalen Builders, Inc., owner of the property commonly known as 491 and 495 Newton Avenue. Ms. Purvis stated that Mr. Whalen has requested a pre-application meeting with the Plan Commission regarding the proposed resubdivision, rezoning and special use for a planned unit development of these two parcels to allow the construction of two duplexes on the site. Ms. Purvis stated that the subject properties are located on the east side of Newton Avenue between Anthony Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. She stated that the southernmost lot is zoned C5B Central Service Subdistrict and the northern lot is zoned R2 Residential Zoning District. She added that as part of the approval, the petitioner plans to request approval of R4 zoning for the entire property. She stated that the surrounding land uses are Multi-Family R4 Residential to the west, C5B Commercial to the east and south and R2 Residential to the north.

Ms. Purvis stated that the petitioner had appeared before the Plan Commission for pre-application meetings on three separate occasions. She stated that the first application was for a multi-use 3-story mixed use building on the 491 Newton Avenue site. She added that the

plans were later revised to also include the 495 Newton Avenue property that was for two similar style mixed use buildings that would be rezoned to C5B. Ms. Purvis stated that the second pre-application for this site was similar to what is being proposed tonight which is a rezoning of the property to R4 with two duplexes to be proposed on the site. She stated that in 2015, the Plan Commission was in favor of the rezoning of the property to R4 and felt it was a good transition between the single-family and commercial uses and generally a good use of the site.

Ms. Purvis stated that in order to proceed with the project, the petitioner would need to receive approval of a zoning map amendment for the rezoning, a minor resubdivision and a special use for a planned unit development which is required for attached single-family and two-family dwellings in the R4 Residential district. Ms. Purvis stated that the petitioner would like a combined review of the preliminary and final PUD.

Ms. Purvis stated that the total site is approximately 26,000 square feet and the petitioner is proposing to construct two 2-story duplexes, each consisting of approximately 2,350 square feet and each duplex would have a shared front porch and a detached two-car garage in the rear. She added that the shared driveway and landscaping on the site would be maintained by a homeowner's association. Ms. Purvis stated that the site would be resubdivided and the southern lot is C5B and the northern lot is R2. She added that the petitioner is proposing to rezone both properties to R4 Residential zoning district. She also stated there are multi-family residential uses located across the street from the subject site and staff believes this would be encouraged as a transition between the commercial and single-family zoning districts and would be an appropriate rezoning of the site. Ms. Purvis stated that the density of the project is in compliance with the density standards of the zoning code. The code requires a lot area of 4,950 square feet per unit for two-family developments in the R4 zoning district. In accordance with this requirement, five units would be permitted on the property. She added that the project has a floor area ratio of .37 and a .4 floor area ratio would be permitted. Ms. Purvis stated this site would be subdivided into four lots so that each property would have ownership of the patio and the detached garage behind it which creates smaller than normal zoning districts. She stated that the lot widths range in size from almost 35 feet in width to approximately 39 feet in width. She stated that adding Lots 1 and 2 together would result in almost 74 feet and Lots 3 and 4 would be almost 72 feet. Ms. Purvis stated that in order to complete the project as proposed, each lot would require a deviation from the interior side yard setback requirement where there is a shared lot line. A deviation would also need to be provided for the impervious surface setback as no impervious setback would be there and 2 percent is required per code. She also stated that deviations would be required to allow the garages to touch and that they take up more than 30 percent of the required rear yard. Ms. Purvis stated that the shared driveway aisle width is 18 feet on both sides and approximately 12 feet in the middle. Ms. Purvis added that the code requires that two-way drive aisles must be 19 feet wide so there is enough room for cars to pull over to the side if

necessary. She added it is anticipated that with up to eight (8) parking spaces in the rear there would not be much traffic going in and out but the drive aisle width should be considered.

Ms. Purvis stated that with planned unit developments, there is a requirement that 20 percent of the site be dedicated to common open space and since this development is being divided into four individual lots, there would not be any common open space. She added that what is required is 5,215 square feet and approximately 47 percent of the site is open green space (12,200 square feet). She added that staff feels due to the nature and the size of the development that a deviation for common open space would be appropriate for this type of project.

Regarding landscaping, Ms. Purvis stated that staff would typically recommend some type of a border or fence to provide a buffer at the northern part of the site between the single-family residences to the north and a little more of an intensive use at the subject location with duplexes. Ms. Purvis stated that the petitioner has indicated that he has spoken to the property owner to the north and the property owner would prefer landscaping instead of a fence. Therefore, large shrubs are being proposed that are listed in the plant list of the Appearance Review Guidelines as a 4-foot tall deciduous shrub variety. She also stated that the landscaping plan shows the appropriate number, size and type of tree that is required in the Supplemental Regulations of the Zoning Code. She added that the residential PUD regulations require that a 10-foot wide landscape buffer be provided along the peripheral lot lines so staff suggests that adding some additional natural groupings in front of the property might have more impact than the 10-foot buffer around the outside especially since some of the commercial uses are a more intensive use as is the multi-family use across the street. Ms. Purvis stated that this is the area that needs to be screened and the petitioner is providing screening there.

Ms. Purvis stated that a deviation from the Supplemental Regulations Table would be required to allow bay windows to encroach into the interior side yards. She stated that bay windows are permitted in the rear and front yard but not in the interior side yards.

Ms. Purvis stated that the petitioner is seeking feedback from the Plan Commission on the proposed development concept, the rezoning of the property to R4, the subdivision of the site into four (4) lots, the request for a one-step approval process for the preliminary and final PUD and the proposed deviations to complete the project.

Questions to Staff from the Plan Commission

Plan Commissioner Loftus asked if verification was received that notification was sent to the neighbors for this project and Ms. Purvis replied no. Plan Commissioner Loftus also asked if the resident who owns the property to the north has agreed to the shrubs on the north side. Ms. Purvis stated that the petitioner has indicated that he had spoken to the neighbor to the north

who stated he would prefer landscaping at that location. She added that she did not speak to the neighbor to the north. Plan Commissioner Fanella asked how staff feels about the driveway width. Ms. Purvis stated that this issue was discussed at the Village Development Committee. She stated that the driveway will be private so there is less concern regarding it meeting what staff would typically want for a two-way drive aisle. Ms. Purvis responded to Plan Commissioner Fanella that a single-family driveway can be as small as nine (9) feet for a one-way drive aisle. Ms. Purvis responded to Plan Commissioner Loftus that the petitioner is requesting approval of a preliminary and final approval at the same time for this project at a future meeting. Ms. Purvis clarified for Chairperson Loch that all four (4) bay windows would require a deviation. She added that all four (4) of the bay windows on all sides would require a deviation. She added that the windows would be permitted if they were in the rear of the duplex or in the front of the duplex but are not permitted on the sides. She also stated that an encroachment can be up to three (3) feet in the required yard in the rear or the front of the duplex, however, it is not permitted on the sides. She added that the subject encroachments would be 2-1/2 feet into the side yard.

Petitioner's Presentation

The petitioner, Ray Whalen of Ray Whalen Builders, spoke on behalf of his proposed project at 491 and 495 Newton Avenue in Glen Ellyn, Illinois. Mr. Whalen stated that when he looked at the subject parcel originally, the use would have been more of an intense use with a commercial aspect and because of market conditions, he downsized the use to single-family which fits more as a transition and more in the character of the neighborhood. He stated he looked at the adjacent homes in the area and most of them have detached garages which is why he prefers the proposed concept and will be requesting several deviations. Mr. Whalen stated that the density could have been greater as they could have included another unit on the site. He added that four (4) units was a personal preference as he wanted to have windows and a lot of open space and daylight in the units so they did not feel confining to the residents, looked better and fit in better with the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Whalen stated there is quite a bit of open space on the site and he would like the residents to feel that their units are single-family homes. He added that this project is a transition from the R2 zoning district into the Commercial and R4 zoning district across the street.

Mr. Whalen stated that he wanted to present this information to the Plan Commission so that this request can be combined into a preliminary and final Planned Unit Development. He stated he feels there is a need for this type of housing in the community for people downsizing and thinks it will help the economics of the downtown area as people will possibly shop and visit the restaurants more in the downtown. He also stated that he does not know if all of the garage space will be used or sold, however, he wanted to provide enclosed garage spaces instead of having single and two-car garages which has created a need for some of the deviations.

Mr. Whalen stated that one change that he learned about earlier today is that the ownership of the property to the north changed last summer so Mr. Whalen will get something in writing regarding that change. He added that he will be sure to do whatever the new neighbor wants regarding this property.

Mr. Whalen stated he would like bay windows on the buildings as they will enhance the look of the building, avoid long flat sides and break up some of the mass of the building. Mr. Whalen stated that he looked at the drive aisle as a private drive for the four (4) units and that the pervious surface would be reduced and there would be more green space and openness. Mr. Whalen added that the price point would be approximately \$650,000-\$750,000. He also stated the buildings will be able to have elevators with three (3) stops at the basement, first floor and second floor.

Questions from the Plan Commission

Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked what the depth of the bay windows is as compared to the fireplaces. Mr. Whalen responded that the bay window is projected approximately 2-1/2 feet and the fireplace cannot exceed more than 2 feet (approximately six (6) inches greater). Mr. Whalen responded to Plan Commissioner Saeed that all of the units will have a full basement and three (3) bedrooms. Mr. Whalen responded to Plan Commissioner Loftus that they intend to have a wall separating units for privacy, security and fire issues. He also stated that all building code requirements will be met as well as the requirements for the interior of the units. Mr. Whalen stated that the studs are staggered which he would classify as two walls but they will have to comply with requirements from the Village Building Department.

Persons in Favor of or in Opposition to the Request

No persons spoke in favor of or in opposition to the subject request.

Comments from the Plan Commission

Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin liked the proposed development which she felt is in a good transitional area. She appreciated that the petitioner took into consideration some of the items the Plan Commissioners had talked about at previous meetings. She was supportive of the re-zoning, subdividing the property into four (4) lots, combining the preliminary and final Planned Unit Development, the deviation and the bay windows. Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin also stated that she likes that the drive aisle narrows between the two buildings because: 1. There will be room to place snow on the side. 2. It provides the effect that the drive is private because it narrows down instead of being a large drive going through. She also stated that she appreciated that the petitioner was not over-building on the subject lot and that he intends to address this project with the new resident next door. The other Plan

Commissioners were supportive of the proposed project and agreed with Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin's comments.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENTS

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING WITH DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE GLEN ELLYN ZONING CODE.

AMENDMENTS INCLUDE CHANGES TO CHAPTERS 2, 4, 5 AND 8 OF THE GLEN ELLYN ZONING CODE THAT WILL AFFECT THE REGULATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE VILLAGE. THE PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS ARE RELATED TO SUCH THINGS AS DEFINITIONS, SUPPLEMENTAL REGULATIONS, RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USES, ACCESSORY STRUCTURE SETBACK REQUIREMENTS AND PERMITTED OBSTRUCTIONS AND STRUCTURES IN REQUIRED YARDS, AMONG OTHER ITEMS.

(Village Planner John Sterrett)

Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Plan Commissioner Loftus, to open the public hearing. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Staff Introduction

Village Director of Planning and Development Staci Hulseberg, Village Attorney Greg Mathews and Village Planner John Sterrett were present to speak on behalf of the subject requests. Mr. Sterrett stated that seven (7) text amendments had been deferred from previous Plan Commission meetings and will be discussed at this meeting.

4. Amend the Definitions of "Family" and "Group Homes" and make "Group Homes" a permitted or special use in various residential districts.

Introduction

Mr. Sterrett stated that the discussion on group homes had been tabled until this meeting in order to receive input from the Village attorney. Mr. Sterrett also stated that staff has provided information to the Plan Commission regarding how other communities similar to Glen Ellyn determine and regulate group homes. Mr. Sterrett stated that staff is proposing to change the proposed language for the definition of group home by taking the definition of family and specifically excluding a group home and a sheltered care facility stating that it is not subject to the definition of family because a group home would be in conflict to the way that a family is currently defined. Mr. Sterrett stated that the definition of group home has also been modified. He stated that staff previously said a group home was a residential building housing no more than eight (8) adults, however, that has since been changed to four (4) adults based on staff's findings from looking at other communities. He also stated staff has also tried to define what a group home is not, including a nursing home, a hospital, an adult day care center, child

day care center or a dwelling unit or living quarters to serve an alternative to incarceration. He stated that a reference is included about a group home having state certification. He also stated that staff is proposing to have a group home be a special use in the R2 and R2B District with four (4) or less residents instead of eight (8) or less residents as previously proposed. He added that in the R3 and R4 Districts, a permitted use would be four (4) or less residents and a Special Use in those two districts would be four (4) or more residents with the R5 District being the same.

Questions/Comments from the Plan Commission

Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin said that staff stated group homes are for adults, however, it states “for people” per staff which she feels could be any age. She felt that it would be more appropriate if “people” was changed to “adults.”

Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin also asked if people with criminal offenses who are transitioning back into society would be candidates to live in group homes and Mr. Sterrett responded no. Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin also asked for a definition of who would be covered under fair housing from a disability standpoint. Village Attorney Mathews stated that regarding the rehabilitation of criminally convicted individuals, neither the FHA nor the ADA would apply to allow those persons to be considered disabled for purposes of this type of housing. Attorney Mathews responded to Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin that the list of disabilities, including addiction, is wide-ranging and protected under the ADA and fair housing. He also stated that the people in group homes are not supposed to be specific to adults.

Plan Commissioner Loftus had concerns with wording in general. He stated that in his profession he must follow the Illinois Disability Code and that according to the definitions of the Illinois Accessibility Code, a group home is considered transient lodging and asked if transient lodging is allowed in residential areas. He then read the definition of a group home from the ADA handbook. Attorney Mathews then responded to Plan Commissioner Loftus and stated that transient lodging as viewed in the Village relates to bed and breakfasts and hotels/motels as opposed to extended stay lodging. Director Hulseberg stated that definition may include group homes. Attorney Mathews agreed with Plan Commissioner Loftus that meeting the accessibility codes would be required for transient housing in the Village. Plan Commissioner Vondruska expressed a concern regarding the populations that may end up in the group homes. Attorney Mathews stated staff is working to develop a process that does not currently exist whereby an owner of a group home could work with the Village to determine whether or not a use is appropriate for the residential district it is in. Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated that the R1 zoning is not included in the zoning districts that would allow group homes, and Director Hulseberg responded that is because R2 and R2B include the vast majority of residential districts in the Village. Plan Commissioner Fanella stated that all residential districts should also have the R1 residential district. Attorney Mathews stated that group homes should be considered for all residential districts. Director Hulseberg responded to Chairperson Loch

that there could not be more than four (4) disabled adults total in a group home. Attorney Mathews responded to Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin that the Village can require a group home to have a special use permit and other necessary documentation. Attorney Mathews stated that he will look into ADA requirements in response to Plan Commissioner Loftus. In response to Plan Commissioner Fanella, Attorney Mathews advised not discriminating among types of disabilities. He also stated that what cannot be said is that the residence does not fit within the character of the neighborhood because the residents are disabled. Chairperson Loch responded to Plan Commissioner Fanella that licensing is regulated by the state and building codes are regulated by the Village.

Persons in Favor of or in Opposition to the Request

Michael Spain, 367 Lorraine, Glen Ellyn, IL appreciated that the Village has started a process regarding group homes. He stated there are currently no requirements for group homes. He also stated the house at 373 Lorraine is not ADA compliant in any sense and was supposedly an all female establishment although there was a male living there at one time. He stated that calls have been made from the group home to the police department. Mr. Spain suggested that parking is atrocious and workers are allowed to park without a problem. He stated that cars cannot be parked where there are fire hydrants and he wondered why this has not been addressed. Mr. Spain also stated there appears to be potential abuse and the situation is devastating.

Paula Frederickson, 327 Phillips Avenue, Glen Ellyn, IL said that it has been stated that a process is not in place, however, she stated she remembered that special use permits were only allowed in R3 and R4 zoning districts and were not allowed in R2 and wondered why.

This item was tabled at this time and will come before the Plan Commission at the next meeting.

10. Original Text Amendment: Create a setback requirement for pervious paver driveways similar to impervious driveways.

Revised Text Amendment: Limit the previous surface setback requirement to five (5) feet from the property line on lots greater than 100 feet wide.

Introduction

Mr. Sterrett stated that staff was originally going to define what an impervious surface is so that it included some pervious surfaces such as Grasscrete. He stated that was to address a problem when new homes are built and driveways are constructed on predominantly large lots with large widths and that the path that is leading from the street to the garage—if it is a detached side load garage—will not be able to meet the impervious surface setback. He stated

that to be sure they meet the impervious surface setback and also have some space beyond that setback to drive a car on, they put Grasscrete down. He stated that strip of Grasscrete is unsightly and does not look good for the character of the neighborhood. He added that they had originally proposed to change the definition for impervious. Mr. Sterrett stated there were concerns regarding whether or not this would have negative impacts on other areas in the Village on smaller lots or where a small strip of Grasscrete would be installed where vehicles are driving to a detached garage in the back of a lot, and staff did not want to do anything that would impact them. He stated that instead of changing the definition to impervious surface, staff instead looked at what the problem is with larger lots which is that they have to meet this very large impervious surface setback compared to other lots and create an exemption that states that residential driveways on lots over 100 feet in width do not have to be further than five feet from the property line and this problem will be avoided. He stated staff is eliminating the definition of impervious surface.

Questions/Comments from the Plan Commission

Mr. Sterrett confirmed for Plan Commissioner Loftus that the above information regarding impervious surface setbacks only pertains to residential driveways.

11. Clarify that only emergency generators are allowed to project into the required yards, not all mechanical equipment such as HVAC units and pool equipment.

Introduction

Mr. Sterrett stated that research was done regarding how mechanical units get included in being able to be placed in a required corner side or side yard setback. He stated that up until the early part of 2014, mechanical units, including air conditioners, were never allowed in a required front or side yard setback. He stated they are still allowed on the side of a house but are not permitted in a required side yard setback, adding that took place by staff where the intention was to allow only emergency generators to be located in a corner side yard setback or required side yard setback. In December of 2013, the Plan Commission had no discussion at all regarding changing the allowances for mechanical units or air conditioners in required corner side or side yard setbacks—only emergency generators. Mr. Sterrett stated that what the Village Board ultimately approved included an allowance for mechanical units to be in a corner side yard or side yard setback. He added there had been no discussion regarding this topic to change it back to what it was four years ago and had been up until that point.

Questions/Comments from the Plan Commission

Plan Commissioner Loftus asked about noise levels in existence. Mr. Sterrett stated there are noise restrictions from commercial to residential, however, there are no noise restrictions from residential to residential.

13. Exempt primary shared driveways between two homes from the impervious surface setback requirement.

Introduction

Mr. Sterrett stated an exemption was brought forward for two residential units that share a driveway where the driveway is also going down the property line and allowing a driveway to be re-built in the same location and not have to meet the impervious surface setback. He stated that this is not being changed at this time because the Grasscrete issue could have an impact on this proposed change. He stated that with the changes to the residential driveways and not changing the definition of impervious surface, staff does not believe any issues will be created as a result of the previous text amendment.

15. Original Text Amendment: Require all accessory structures and detached garages to meet the minimum required corner side setback for principal structures.

Revised Text Amendment: Require all accessory structures and detached garages to meet the minimum required corner side yard setback for principal structures when located on a reversed corner lot. Require all accessory structures and detached garages to be at least twenty (20) feet from the corner side yard lot line when located on a corner lot.

Mr. Sterrett stated that currently per code a detached garage must be at least 18 feet from a corner side lot line. He stated that staff originally proposed that a detached garage on a corner lot would have to meet the same setbacks as a principal structure, therefore, it could not be located within that corner side yard setback. He stated that the Plan Commission recognized there are differences between detached garages that are on corner lots and detached garages that are on reverse corner lots which is where a corner side lot line is basically a continuation of the adjacent front lot line. He added that in those situations, a detached garage can be much further out than the adjacent principal structure. He stated that there is not the same concern on corner lots because the adjacent lot is not being impacted by the detached garage that might be closer. Mr. Sterrett stated staff provided a compromise that if one is on a reverse corner lot, one could not have a detached garage encroaching into the corner side yard setback, however, if one is on a regular corner lot, one could encroach into the corner side yard setback but it would have to be located at least 20 feet from the corner side lot line which is increased from 18 feet so that a car can be parked in a driveway and not overhang.

Questions/Comments from the Plan Commission

Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin felt that this recommendation is too restrictive. Director Hulseberg stated that it is the shape of the lot and not the address that determines the location of the garage and added that three nearby communities have this in their code. Chairperson Loch was in favor of bringing garages back to the building line where the houses are because a

brand new garage in front of someone's home is intrusive. Director Hulseberg responded to Plan Commissioner Fanella that a garage is being recommended to be 20 feet from the lot line on a 50-foot lot.

16. Corner Side Yard. Add Corner Side Lot Line to the list of definitions of Lot Line. Modify the text and illustration that defines a required Corner Side Yard. Modify term used to define Reversed Corner Lot.

Introduction

Mr. Sterrett stated there is no definition for corner side lot line, however, there are definitions for front, rear and side. Staff is proposing to modify the definition for front lot line which would be that the front lot line is the front street line and the corner side lot line shall be the street line that is not the front line. Mr. Sterrett stated that staff is proposing to change the definition of a required corner side yard which is currently defined as going from the front of the house to the back of the house and in the front of the house will be the front yard setback, however, there is an area behind the house in the rear yard where there is no setback. He stated staff is proposing to extend the corner side yard from the front line of the building to the rear property line.

Director Hulseberg stated that staff is proposing to make a portion of the rear yard the required corner side yard. She added that one is allowed to cover only 30 percent of the required rear yard. She also stated that on a 50-foot wide lot, one can currently have a 600-square foot detached garage. She also stated that on smaller width lots, an accommodation will need to be made to cover more of the rear yard.

Questions/Comments from the Plan Commission

Mr. Sterrett responded to Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin that the front yard is the shortest dimension of a lot.

18. Create a definition and regulations for turrets as a special architectural feature placing limitations on the area, height and setbacks. Current height regulations in the Code effectively prohibit turrets.

Introduction

Mr. Sterrett stated that what is currently being proposed regarding turrets is no different than what was proposed last time, however, staff could review what surrounding communities currently do if the Plan Commission wishes them to do so.

Questions/Comments from the Plan Commission

Plan Commissioner Fanella asked if a Victorian home in Glen Ellyn could currently be replicated with a turret per the existing code. She added that she would like to continue preserving the character of the Village. Chairperson Loch responded to Plan Commissioner Fanella that currently a home could not be re-built with a turret that does not meet code. Director Hulseberg stated staff feels it is a good idea to allow turrets. Director Hulseberg responded to ZBA Member Heming-Littwin that one could request a variation for a large turret at the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Persons in Favor of or in Opposition to this Request

No persons spoke in favor of or in opposition to this request.

This item was tabled at this time and will come before the Plan Commission at the next meeting.

Motion 1

Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Plan Commissioner Loftus, to recommend approval of the presented text amendments as is for Text Amendment 10 regarding impervious surface setbacks, 11 regarding a/c units, 13 regarding shared driveways and 16 for the corner side yard definition.

The motion carried unanimously with seven (7) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Plan Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Loftus, Fanella, Hartweg, Saeed, Vondruska and Chairperson Loch voted yes.

Motion 2

Plan Commissioner Hartweg moved, seconded by Plan Commissioner Saeed, to recommend requiring all accessory structures and detached garages to meet the minimum required setback when located on a reverse corner lot and require all accessory structures and detached garages to be at least 20 feet from the corner side lot line when located on a corner lot.

The motion carried with four (4) yes votes and three (3) no votes as follows: Plan Commissioners Hartweg, Saeed, Loftus and Chairperson Loch voted yes; Plan Commissioners Fanella, Heming-Littwin and Vondruska voted no.

Motion 3

Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Plan Commissioner Fanella, to continue the public hearing regarding turret and group home text amendments.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Trustee Report

Trustee Liaison Bill Enright stated that the Village Board has recently been working on several items, including the Taylor Street underpass, the streets and sidewalks in the Central Business District, parking garages in the downtown, wayfinder signs, parking and funding. He stated that part of the reason for the budget shortfall is because the Village did not get an income tax rebate from the state. Trustee Liaison Enright also asked for feedback regarding having a parking garage behind the Civic Center which would be approximately \$60,000-\$70,000 per parking space or a parking garage near the Main Street parking lot which would be much cheaper at approximately \$30,000 per parking space.

Chairperson Report

No Chairperson Report was given.

Staff Report

Mr. Sterrett stated that the 2018 zoning map update will be on the next Plan Commission agenda.

Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Plan Commissioner Fanella, to adjourn the meeting at 9:20 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Prepared by:

Barbara Utterback

Recording Secretary

Reviewed by:

John Sterrett

Village Planner