

PLAN AND ZONING

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF NORTHFIELD
PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION

COMMISSION

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of Northfield Plan and Zoning Commission held remotely due to the COVID-19 crisis, on the 1st of September, 2020, at the hour of 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BILL VASELOPULOS, Chairperson
DAN deLOYS
THOMAS BOLLING
STEVEN HIRSCH
KATHY ESTABROOKE
TRACEY MENDREK
WILLIAM KELLY

MEMBERS ABSENT:

TODD BERLINGHOF
CONNIE BERMAN

ALSO PRESENT:

STEVE GUTIERREZ, Community Development Director
MELISSA DeFEO, Director of Administrative Services

1 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Good evening,
2 everyone. I'd like to call to order the meeting of the
3 Plan and Zoning Commission. My name is Bill
4 Vaselopulos, and I'm the Chairman of the Commission.

5 At this time, I'd like to introduce all
6 the Commissioners that are in attendance tonight:
7 Steven Hirsch, Dan deLoys, Kathy Estabrooke, Tom
8 Bolling, and Tracey Mendrek. We may have one more, Bill
9 Kelly may join us later, and I'll announce him when he
10 does, if he does.

11 The purpose of tonight's meeting is to
12 conduct a public hearing and consider and discuss these
13 requests of approval of:

- 14 1. A Special Use Permit located at 2345 Clover Lane.
15 The Petitioner's name is Stephen Strickler and
16 Jessie Blank.
- 17 2. The approval of a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision
18 located at 587 Briar Lane. The Petitioner's name
19 is Jon and Jodie Hiveley.

20 The public hearing format will provide an
21 overview of these proposals and a forum for public
22 comment and input. This Commission is a recommending
23 body only and we will forward our recommendation to the
24 Village President and the Board of Trustees for final
25 determination on whether or not to grant these items
26 before us today. The Board will then consider these
27 items being discussed this evening at the next Board
28 meeting, which is scheduled for Tuesday, September 15th,
29 2020.

30 The Commission meeting requires that all
31 persons wishing to be heard and to enter testimony must
32 be sworn in. This includes all petitioners, individuals
33 with the petitioners, and any interested parties or
34 other property owners. Following the Petitioner's
35 presentation and after the Commission has had an
36 opportunity to ask questions and discuss amongst
37 ourselves, then all other interested parties will be
38 given an opportunity to speak.

39 With this format, Steve Gutierrez, the
40 Community Development Director, will ask each attendee
41 in attendance if they wish to speak and ask a question
42 or provide a comment. If they wish to say something,
43 they will first be sworn in and be asked to provide
44 their name, address, and interest in this matter for the
45 record.

46 Our first order of business tonight is to
47 pass the minutes from our last meeting from July 6th,
48 2020.

49 Is there a motion?

50 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: I'll make a motion that
51 we approve the minutes.

52 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Is there a second?

1 COMMISSIONER BOLLING: Second.
2 COMMISSIONER MENDREK: Second.
3 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: All those in favor?
4 (Chorus of ayes.)
5 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: All opposed?
6 (No response.)
7 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: The motion passes.
8 The first item before us will be 2345
9 Clover Lane. Before the Petitioner makes his
10 presentation, Steve, do you have any introductory
11 comment?

12 MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you, Chairman
13 Vaselopulos.

14 Again, as you indicated, we have a
15 petition from Stephen Strickler and Jessie Blank who are
16 seeking permission to construct a garage addition at
17 2345 Clover Lane. In an R-1 Countryside Residential
18 District in which their home is located, our Zoning Code
19 requires a special use in the event that somebody wants
20 to build more than 1,200 square feet of garage space.
21 So, that is the primary purpose of their request and for
22 this application.

23 The proposed garage addition will
24 encroach slightly into the required front yard and the
25 required side yard of the property. The side yard
26 setback requirement in the R-1 District is 15 feet.
27 They are proposing a 13-foot nine-inch setback, which
28 amounts to a one-foot three-inch encroachment into that
29 required side yard.

30 The minimum front yard in the R-1
31 District is 40 feet. They're proposing the garage to be
32 35 feet and three inches from the front property line,
33 for a four-foot nine-inch encroachment. The
34 encroachment into the side yard amounts to only about
35 1.6 square feet, and the encroachment into the front
36 yard amounts to 24 square feet. You'll see that in the
37 materials where the applicant actually shaded that land
38 area for you so you can have a graphic of the extent of
39 that encroachment.

40 The garage addition's building materials
41 are consistent with the existing home. The garage will
42 only be used for storage of the Petitioners' vehicles
43 and personal property. It will not be used for any kind
44 of commercial auto repair or anything like that.

45 So, with that, Staff recommends approval of
46 the requested special use and variations. The only
47 proviso we'd add is that adequate landscape screening
48 along the west and north property lines should be
49 maintained through construction and after construction.

50 Right now we think the existing landscaping is
51 adequate. What we're not sure of is during
52 construction, whether any of that could be damaged or

1 removed in order to accommodate the construction. With
2 that, if you have any questions of me, I'd be happy to
3 answer them. Otherwise, I will turn it over to the
4 Petitioners and their architect.

5 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Thanks, Steve. I
6 don't have any questions of Steve.
7 Does anyone else from the Commission have
8 questions?

9 MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

10 MR. STONEBERG: Well, Steve, thank you for
11 your time. You've been very helpful during this
12 process.

13 MR. GUTIERREZ: Steve and Jessie and Jack,
14 please raise your right hand.
15 (Witnesses sworn.)

16 MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you. Okay, proceed,
17 Jack.

18 MR. STONEBERG: Okay, thank you. I was just
19 thanking you, you've been very kind for the month that
20 we've been working on this. Thanks to the Commissioners
21 for letting us spend a few minutes with you tonight.
22 Steve (owner) and Jessie and I have been
23 working together for about three-and-a-half months on
24 this project. The initial program requirement, you
25 know, included expanding the family room over a single,
26 over the existing single-car garage, or the single-story
27 two-car garage. I don't know if you all have been able
28 to follow the plans and the narrative statement clearly
29 or if I need to present that material to you kind of in
30 summary right now, or can you follow the plans as we
31 discuss this?

32 MR. GUTIERREZ: Jack, because we have people
33 in the audience as attendees who may not be familiar, we
34 would like you to walk us through your plans.

35 MR. STONEBERG: Okay. All right, so I might,
36 I need to share my screen. Okay, thank you.
37 Is my screen sharing this drawing now?

38 MR. GUTIERREZ: Yes.

39 MR. STONEBERG: Okay, thank you so much.
40 So, if you can see my cursor here, this
41 is the existing outline of the existing 727 square-foot
42 garage which is to remain. This is the existing house.
43 The property lines are orthogonal, and the house is kind
44 of in a funny cockeyed angle to the property. The
45 property is at the end of a cul de sac and has a
46 turnaround driveway off of Clover Street. North is to
47 the right-hand side. So, west is up.
48 The area of the garage addition is in the
49 northwest quadrant of the property; it's this quadrant
50 right here. It's a 655 square-foot garage addition. In
51 the process of evaluating the program, you know, Steve
52 and Jessie inventoried, you know, a large list of items

1 that was to fit in the existing and proposed garage.
2 That includes four cars of their own, it includes lawn
3 maintenance equipment. In your community, you include
4 the garage, trash receptacles in the garage. They have
5 bicycles. Through this process, they determined that
6 the 655 square-foot was almost the minimum that Steve
7 wanted to add to his home.

8 This will be a single-story garage. I'll
9 scroll down here. This is the existing front facade of
10 the home and the existing single-story garage facing the
11 driveway. This is the side of the garage facing west.
12 The proposed elevations show the new family room
13 addition over the existing one-story garage. The family
14 room isn't really a part of this request. The request
15 is primarily for this part of the structure which is the
16 single-story two-car garage addition in that northwest
17 quadrant.

18 Since the property is, you know, kind of
19 at a quirky angle relative, and both arms of the house
20 are not orthogonal to each other, we've provided two
21 front elevations. Just a side note relative to the
22 garage, it's a colonial style home, we're trying to
23 embrace that. We're adding three dormers to the
24 original part of the house which was the original
25 volume, and we're redoing the siding. So, we're trying
26 to make a uniform, wonderful, new design for Steve and
27 Jessie.

28 I think the site plan up here shows the
29 dark triangle areas of the encroachment. Since the
30 house is not orthogonal or at a right angle to the
31 property perimeter, it became I guess a design decision
32 to not align the new garage facade with the existing
33 garage facade, but rather to step it back. That allows
34 the massing of the building to be a little bit more
35 intimate and less obtrusive so to speak and less
36 massive. It's sometimes difficult to resolve, you know,
37 two double-wide garage doors in a single house.
38 Sometimes you see them split up.

39 Steve and Jessie wanted the garage to be
40 contiguous to the existing garage. They wanted it to be
41 an attached garage. I think there's two trees that are
42 existing that will need to be removed during the
43 construction process and prior to the construction
44 process. Neither one of these trees are in the setbacks
45 and we've been working with Bono Engineering. I didn't
46 see Monica, it didn't seem like she was at this meeting
47 from Bernie's office.

48 The addition is going to include a minor,
49 I guess not minor, but it's going to include a new
50 driveway portion to circulate and get the vehicles in
51 there. So, we're going to be extending the driveway in
52 this crosshatched area. That driveway amounts to 623

1 square feet, and that's the paved area that is being
2 resolved with the civil engineering. Bono Engineering
3 is preparing a detention area in this area of the site,
4 and I think they've been in contact with the Village
5 engineer on that.

6 The west-facing, there's a planting bed
7 that we're proposing here on the west-facing. You can
8 see these new shrubs, the boxwoods. So, again, trying
9 to embrace as much landscaping on the perimeter of the
10 house that won't, you know, impede the vehicle access.

11 We're proud of the work that we did.
12 We're proud of the design. Sometimes these garage
13 projects are, you know, don't allow us to explore some
14 nice design content, and it's been a nice, pleasant
15 experience working with Steve and Jessie. They'll be a
16 great addition to your community.

17 I will make another note that they did
18 reach out to their neighbor to the immediate northwest,
19 which would be this neighbor, the most affected. I
20 believe that neighbor has provided a letter of approval
21 or non-objection, and I know that, I'll let Steve and
22 Jessie talk, but I know, I believe they have knocked on
23 other neighbors' doors as well.

24 I'm here to answer any questions.
25 Anything I missed? I don't think so.

26 Are there any questions?

27 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: What is the material in
28 front of the garage? It looks like, it looks almost
29 like brickwork, but it's not asphalt. I'm assuming it's
30 impervious?

31 MR. STONEBERG: Oh, in the driveway?

32 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: Yes.

33 MR. STONEBERG: The driveway, the current
34 driveway is, yes, it's going to be impervious. The
35 current driveway is asphalt with a brick border. I
36 think the intent would be to continue that, the brick
37 border, like we'll take these bricks out and mine them
38 and use those and extend the asphalt paving.

39 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: Okay, but that area of,
40 you know, that is not part of the asphalt that is kind
41 of not crosshatched, but the hatched area there where
42 the four-foot nine-inch measurement is in the middle of,
43 what is that area?

44 MR. STONEBERG: That triangle right there?

45 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: No, the entirety of that
46 sort of hash marked, hatch marked.

47 MR. STRICKLER: That's going to be new
48 asphalt.

49 MR. STONEBERG: That's the new driveway.

50 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: That is new asphalt, I
51 see.

52 MR. STONEBERG: That's the new driveway.

1 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: Okay, Staff, any
2 concerns for impervious area and drainage or anything
3 like that?

4 MR. GUTIERREZ: No, all of that will,
5 Commissioner Hirsch, will be reviewed as part of the
6 engineering plan. As the site plan is finalized, if the
7 special use is ultimately approved and then their site
8 plan will get finalized, and any other additional
9 improvements that would add impervious areas will be
10 taken into account to determine the final detention
11 requirement.

12 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: Right.

13 MR. GUTIERREZ: That's all done in the
14 building permitting process.

15 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: And obviously as this is
16 the end of a cul de sac, there is no uniform other
17 buildings that would point out the encroachment or any
18 of the setback issues, so I don't see any problems
19 there. That's it for me.

20 MR. STRICKLER: Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: The only questions I
22 had really you've answered during your presentation, the
23 location of the neighbor that attested to his approval.
24 I wanted to know where that person was located, you
25 answered that.

26 The neighbor to the west, describe that
27 property if you could.

28 MR. STONEBERG: Steve and Jessie, can you
29 describe your neighbor to the west home? Because I
30 haven't --

31 MR. STRICKLER: It's through a line of trees;
32 I can't really see them from our house. We did get out
33 to their house to try and talk to them; they did not
34 answer the door. So, we left a fairly extensive packet
35 explaining what we wanted to do with a bunch of I think
36 pictures of what the plans that Jack has made. I think
37 they also received a certified letter from us. Us going
38 to their house, I never heard, I don't think we ever
39 heard back from them.

40 MR. STONEBERG: It's pretty dense back there.
41 I mean, we --

42 MS. BLANK: Yes, you can't see the neighbors.

43 MR. STONEBERG: We had a tree survey completed
44 by Bono Engineering which I could share. I believe they
45 didn't survey the entirety of the property because we're
46 not, I think it was more focused on the immediate work
47 area. But it's a pretty densely treed rear yard, or
48 actually in this case side yard to the west.

49 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Okay, and the
50 detention pond you don't have listed here, but you had
51 it in your materials. Where would that spill out to, in
52 which direction?

1 MR. STONEBERG: I believe the engineer has it
2 moving in this direction. We could, if you want me to
3 pull that drawing up, I can do that. It's the
4 preliminary design that was generated by Bono
5 Engineering.

6 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Steve, while he's
7 pulling that up, the question I had may be more directed
8 towards you. You know, the proximity of the detention
9 to the new addition, is that an issue at all?

10 MR. GUTIERREZ: No, that's really a preference
11 of the homeowner, whether or not that would be an issue
12 for them.

13 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Well, it looks to me
14 like 10-15 feet max between.

15 MR. STONEBERG: So, this drawing has got
16 north oriented, different than my drawing. So, this is
17 the northwest quadrant of the home. Here is the garage
18 addition. Bono has a detention area of 432 cubic feet
19 provided with a note that says 362 cubic feet are
20 needed. It sits on a landscape berm.

21 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: The issue of the
22 drainage is not before us today, but because of its
23 proximity to the garage which is before us today is the
24 reason I'm asking. That's the only reason. We're not
25 here to pass judgment on the drainage and the flow and
26 how it's going to work. That's something for the
27 Village to do during the permit process. But that was
28 just in context with where it is vis-a-vis the garage, I
29 wanted Steve Gutierrez just to comment on that, which he
30 did.

31 MR. GUTIERREZ: I don't believe there's any
32 technical requirements for minimum distance beyond
33 maximum slope and insuring proper egress from the
34 garage. I don't see that there would be any issues
35 there.

36 Again, the final layout of the detention
37 will still be subject to staff review of all the
38 technical code requirements. At this point, we view
39 this as really a conceptual plan that needs to be
40 fleshed out in greater detail once they come in for
41 permits. The location of the detention area was what
42 prompted me to suggest this condition about the impact
43 that construction in general might have on the existing
44 trees and bushes that act as a protective visual buffer.

45 For instance if the excavation of the detention area
46 were to eliminate plantings that are necessary for the
47 screening, then we'd want that to be replaced and taken
48 into account.

49 But to answer your question, I don't see
50 any technical issues here.

51 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Yes, and
52 Petitioners, regarding Steve's comments about the

1 landscaping and screening and stuff, you're okay with
2 that, right?

3 MR. STONEBERG: Yes.

4 MR. STRICKLER: It's fine.

5 MS. BLANK: We'd like it as private as it is
6 right now, so yes.

7 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Okay, those are the
8 questions from me, thank you.

9 Any other Commissioners have any
10 questions or comments?

11 COMMISSIONER ESTABROOKE: No, sir.

12 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: All great here.

13 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Steve, did you say
14 something?

15 MR. GUTIERREZ: We want to be able to see if
16 there's anybody in the audience who wishes to give
17 public testimony regarding this application.

18 So, we have two items on the agenda. I know from
19 some of the names that some of you are here in the Zoom
20 meeting presumably for the other agenda item. I'm not
21 going to call on you for this item as I go through these
22 names, okay? But I will, what I'm going to do is go
23 through each name as they appear, I'm going to unmute
24 you and ask if you want to give any comments. If you do
25 wish to give comment, then I will need to swear you in
26 and then we'll allow you to speak, okay?

27 So, I'm going to start.

28 Diane, are you, do you have any comments related to
29 this item on the agenda? Diane?

30 (No response.)

31 MR. GUTIERREZ: Okay, we'll go on to Baker and
32 Sara Thompson.

33 MR. THOMPSON: No comments.

34 MR. GUTIERREZ: Joan Trueheart-Bacon? Ms.
35 Bacon?

36 (No response.)

37 MR. GUTIERREZ: Okay, Kent DeReus?

38 MR. DeREUS: I'm here for Briar.

39 MR. GUTIERREZ: Okay, Mr. Prosko? (No
40 response) Okay, last on my list is W. W?

41 (No response.)

42 MR. GUTIERREZ: Okay, so I have a phone
43 numbers here. 847-370-0668?

44 (No response.)

45 MR. GUTIERREZ: Okay, if anyone else I did not
46 call on and you do wish to speak on this, please raise
47 your hand; otherwise, that will do it for public
48 testimony.

49 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Okay, thank you,
50 Steve.

51 With that, any final questions or
52 comments from the Commission?

1 COMMISSIONER ESTABROOKE: No, sir.
2 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: No, okay.
3 Would someone like to make a motion
4 please?

5 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: I'll make a motion.
6 A motion to recommend to the Village Board the approval
7 of a Special Use, front and side yard setback
8 variations, for the construction of an attached garage
9 and use of 1,382 square feet of garage space at 2345
10 Clover Lane in accordance with the Petitioners'
11 Application and Supporting Materials, date stamped July
12 27, 2020, subject to the following conditions:
13 1. The garages shall only be used for the storage of
14 vehicles and property associated with the
15 residential use of the subject property. No
16 commercial operations or storage of commercial
17 vehicles shall be allowed in the garages, except
18 as may be permitted by the Village's home
19 occupation ordinance.
20 2. The Petitioner shall not perform repairs,
21 restoration or maintenance of autos or any other
22 machinery to the extent such activity creates a
23 nuisance.
24 3. Adequate landscape screening along the west and
25 north property lines shall be maintained upon the
26 construction of the proposed garage addition, as
27 may be required by Village Staff.
28 4. The presentations made in the application and
29 supporting documents are binding upon the
30 Petitioners. There shall be no additional uses
31 permitted beyond those specifically enumerated
32 herein or permitted by the Village of
33 Northfield's Zoning Ordinance.
34 5. The Village of Northfield Health, Fire, and
35 Building Officials shall be granted access to the
36 subject property at any reasonable time for
37 purposes of conducting inspections for compliance
38 with Village Codes and Ordinances.
39 6. An approval pursuant to any requested review by a
40 Village consultant, Village Staff member, Village
41 Commission or Village Board Committee shall be an
42 approval of only those items specified in any
43 motion, resolution, ordinance, or written report.
44 Such approval shall not be deemed to be an
45 approval of any matter which is within the
46 jurisdiction of any other Village consultant,
47 Village Staff member, Village Board Committee or
48 Village Commission that has not issued a report
49 or given its approval. Neither shall such
50 approval be deemed the approval of any County,
51 State or Federal Agency. Under no circumstances
52 shall the approval be deemed to be an approval of

- 1 any matter not included in this ordinance by
 2 virtue of the fact that such a matter appeared on
 3 a supporting document which is not attached as an
 4 exhibit to this ordinance or incorporated as an
 5 exhibit as part of this ordinance.
- 6 7. The Petitioner shall comply in all other respects
 7 with the ordinances of the Village of Northfield
 8 and nothing in this special use shall be
 9 construed as a waiver of any of those
 10 requirements.
- 11 8. Violation of any condition of this Special Use
 12 Ordinance shall be cause to revoke said permit by
 13 the Corporate Authorities upon 10 days proper
 14 notice to the Petitioner. Alternatively, the
 15 Village Manager shall have the right to assess
 16 fines, not to exceed \$750 per violation, for
 17 violation of this Special Use Ordinance. Such
 18 assessment of fines may be appealed to the
 19 Corporate Authorities by filing written notice of
 20 appeal within three days of the assessment.
- 21 9. Changes in the project may only be made as
 22 follows:
- 23 A. Minor Field Changes. Minor changes in
 24 locations or sizes shown on exhibits may be
 25 approved, in writing, by the Director of
 26 Community Development. Typically, a minor
 27 field change will not involve a percentage
 28 change greater than three percent. However,
 29 not all changes of less than three percent
 30 shall necessarily be deemed to be minor. The
 31 determination of the Director of Community
 32 Development as to whether a change is a minor
 33 field change shall be final.
- 34 B. Village Board Approved Changes. The Village
 35 Board may approve, without referral to the
 36 Plan and Zoning, such other changes as it
 37 believes are in the best interest of the
 38 Village and which do not involve changes in
 39 numbers found in the text of the Ordinance and
 40 which do not have a substantial, direct impact
 41 on adjacent properties. The determination of
 42 the Village Board as to whether a requested
 43 change should be referred to the Plan and
 44 Zoning Commission shall be final.
- 45 C. Changes Requiring a Public Hearing. Any
 46 change involving a size, quantity or other
 47 numerical value found in the text of the
 48 Ordinance or any change having substantial
 49 direct impact on adjacent properties shall not
 50 be made except after a public hearing before
 51 the Plan and Zoning Commission. Additionally,
 52 the Village Board or the Director of Community

1 Development may refer any requested change to
2 the Plan and Zoning Commission for public
3 hearing when either believes it would be in
4 the best interest of the Village to do so.
5 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Is there a second?
6 COMMISSIONER DELOYS: Second.
7 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Dan seconds.
8 All those in favor?
9 (Chorus of ayes.)
10 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: All opposed?
11 (No response.)
12 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: The motion passes.
13 Congratulations! Good luck to you.
14 MR. STONEBERG: Thank you so much from Steve
15 and Jessie.
16 MS. BLANK: Thank you.
17 MR. STRICKLER: Thank you, everyone.
18 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: So, the next item
19 before us is 587 Briar Lane, Petitioners Jon and Jodie
20 Hiveley.
21 Steve, whenever you're ready, if you have
22 introductory comments, go right ahead.
23 MR. GUTIERREZ: As Chairman Vaselopulos
24 indicated, the next item is a proposed subdivision at
25 587 Briar Lane. The Petitioners are Jon and Jodie
26 Hiveley, and they are the contract purchasers of the
27 property in question. The current owners are Mr. and
28 Mrs. Scorte. For the record, Staff does have a letter
29 from them, which I believe is in the application
30 materials, indicating their approval of this submission
31 and application.
32 The Petitioners are seeking approval of a
33 final plat of subdivision for 587 Briar. They wish to
34 split this property into two buildable lots. The
35 existing lot is a little bit just shy of two acres at
36 1.9 acres or 83,374 square feet. The property is zoned
37 R-1 Country Residential, and it is currently approved
38 with one single-family residence in the middle of that
39 property.
40 The proposed plat of subdivision does
41 meet all of our Subdivision Code's design requirements
42 and, thusly, no variations are being sought or are
43 necessary.
44 If an applicant has materials related to
45 the design of the home or homes that they intend to
46 build, we do suggest that they provide those to the Plan
47 and Zoning Commission with the subdivision application,
48 really just to give you an idea of what they might be
49 doing with the property. But those architectural and
50 site plans are not subject to the subdivision approval
51 process, but offered as context and really as a courtesy
52 to the Commission.

1 What you are reviewing tonight
2 specifically is the actual plat of subdivision, which
3 really is a two-dimensional plan outlining how this
4 property is being carved up. The associated preliminary
5 engineering concept is also something that is required
6 to be submitted as part of this process. But again, as
7 we have in the past and as you've seen in the past, what
8 we require at this stage is really the engineering
9 concept and not final engineering plans. The final
10 engineering plans are well vetted during building
11 permitting to ensure that the project meets our
12 Stormwater Ordinance requirements.

13 So, I just again, wanted to clarify that.
14 There's a lot of material that we've provided you. I
15 just wanted to narrow our review comments on the actual
16 plat of subdivision.

17 Going on then, the proposed subdivision
18 is consistent with our Comprehensive Plan which
19 encourages large lots. It really dovetails with our
20 Zoning Code which, in this district, requires a minimum
21 of 40,000 square feet, just a little less than one acre,
22 and that's really consistent with what the Comprehensive
23 Plan envisions. We feel that that is consistent with
24 the Comprehensive Plan in terms of its goals and
25 objectives for maintaining the quality of our
26 residential areas.

27 The proposed subdivision meets all the
28 standards and requirements of the Subdivision Code, the
29 Zoning Code, and the Comprehensive Plan. The Village
30 engineer believes that the existing infrastructure is
31 adequate to serve the proposed subdivision - we're
32 talking about adding only one more house at some point
33 in time. The Departments have no issues of concern.

34 The contract purchasers are planning on
35 building their home on Lot 1, that's the western lot at
36 the corner. They are intending at some point to sell
37 off Lot 2, but do not have plans right now for the
38 construction of a home on that lot.

39 Based on all of these facts, Staff is
40 recommending that the Plan and Zoning Commission
41 recommend approval to the Village Board of the proposed
42 plat of subdivision.

43 With that, if you have any questions for
44 me, I'll be happy to answer them; otherwise --

45 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Steve, let me
46 interject real quick.

47 MR. GUTIERREZ: Sure.

48 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Just a brief
49 announcement. When we first introduced all the
50 Commissioners, William Kelly wasn't able to join us at
51 that time. He has since joined our meeting and I'm just
52 introducing him at this time.

1 With that, any Commissioners have any
2 questions of Steve before we hear from the Petitioner?
3 Okay.

4 MR. GUTIERREZ: Okay, Nate, would you like to
5 begin your presentation?

6 (Witness sworn.)

7 MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you. Okay, go ahead,
8 Nate.

9 MR. LOCHNER: I am going to share my screen.
10 Okay, good evening, everyone. Nice to meet everyone and
11 thanks for everybody's time tonight to hear a request
12 for a two-lot subdivision at 587 Briar Lane.

13 My name is Nate Lochner and I work for A.
14 Perry Homes. I represent our clients who are the
15 contract purchasers as Steve mentioned, Jon and Jodie
16 Hiveley, who plan to move their family to Northfield
17 from Chicago. They plan to build on Lot 1 which is the
18 westerly lot and then potentially sell off Lot No. 2 in
19 the future.

20 So, I wanted to send out kind of a
21 special thanks to all of the Village Staff that has
22 worked with us on our request kind of over the past few
23 weeks and the past month as we kind of went down this
24 endeavor with them. Everybody has been great to work
25 with. Steve has been really great in responding,
26 answering any questions that we have to make sure that
27 we are going along the same path that follows the
28 Village guidelines.

29 We also worked pretty closely with the
30 Village Engineer, Russ Jensen, just in terms of making
31 sure that preliminarily we were outlining a plan that
32 really took into account everything from an engineering
33 standpoint, and that conceptually we were heading down
34 the right path with everything to kind of be finalized
35 upon permit submittal and review for each individual
36 property. Then also we worked with Linnea who is the
37 Village Forester, just to ensure that we were following
38 all the precautions there and any construction activity
39 in the future would be worked through and that all the
40 trees would be protected and things like that.

41 Unfortunately, tonight our clients, Jon
42 and Jodie Hiveley, are not able to attend the meeting
43 tonight. They had a previous family obligation that did
44 not allow them to join tonight. But they did want to,
45 and this was part of our submission to the Board as
46 well, they did send through kind of an introductory
47 letter, giving you guys a little bit more information
48 about themselves, why they chose Northfield and how
49 they're looking to move into the Village and raise their
50 growing family there.

51 So, they live in Chicago currently and
52 they have outgrown their space in the city. They went

1 on a long search of properties throughout Northfield,
2 they really identified that as the community that they
3 wanted to join, and they really fell in love with the
4 area here on Briar Lane and Oak Tree Lane and the
5 property and the character of the neighborhood. We were
6 able to help them find this piece of property and
7 they're really excited to be joining the community.

8 So, I guess I'll start kind of from the
9 beginning, kind of a big picture. When our clients
10 first perceived the property, one of the things when we
11 were looking at doing the subdivision that we wanted to
12 take a look at, it's just kind of the general context of
13 the neighborhood. We went through a large due diligence
14 period where we really read through and researched all
15 of the Village codes to ensure that we were going to be
16 identifying all the parameters that we needed to work
17 within as part of that.

18 So, just on my screen here, I've just
19 kind of got an overview of the neighborhood, for those
20 that aren't familiar with it. This was kind of included
21 in the packet as well. But the shaded blue area here is
22 the parcel that we are looking to subdivide into two
23 properties. You'll see kind of, just looking at the
24 surrounding properties, it's, you know, around twice the
25 size of some of the surrounding properties.

26 So, kind of after that, our next slide,
27 this just shows a little bit more. This is Northfield's
28 GIS map that shows the parcel as well with Briar Lane
29 and Oak Tree Lane and then the surrounding area.

30 So, one of the things when we,
31 conceptually at the beginning that we worked through was
32 trying to identify the best arrangement for subdividing
33 the property in terms of how we would divide each lot by
34 each other. So, knowing that we had to work within the
35 existing parameters that are identified by the Village,
36 we really kind of identified two potential
37 configurations that we could have potentially moved this
38 into.

39 So, the first configuration that we have
40 shown here is the same configuration that we have
41 submitted for our plat of subdivision tonight. In this
42 configuration, the red areas here represent the building
43 boxes for each parcel. In this configuration,
44 everything goes north-south on the property. We felt
45 that in order to meet the requirements for the lot area
46 and the lot width and things like that, that this was a
47 really good configuration.

48 We did preliminarily run this by Steve
49 and some other Village Staff just to kind of get their
50 initial thoughts on this configuration, as well as this
51 other configuration where we would orientate things
52 east-west versus north-south between the two parcels.

1 We felt like the previous configuration that I was
2 showing with Lot 1 and Lot 2, with it being north-south,
3 we felt like that fit more into the context of the
4 neighborhood, especially in terms of the buildable areas
5 that were there, how we were able to site the potential
6 houses on the properties as well. So, it was one of the
7 things that we wanted to explore and vet everything out.
8 We felt like the configuration that we had brought back
9 here was our best path forward for our subdivision.

10 So, this is the plat of subdivision that
11 we have submitted for approval. So, you'll see it's
12 very similar, a little bit more technical from a
13 surveying standpoint in terms of what we're submitting
14 for approval tonight.

15 So, we have Lot 1 which is located to the
16 west. That is the property that our clients, Jon and
17 Jodie, look to build their new single-family home on,
18 and then Lot 2 which would be located to the east would
19 be a parcel that they would look at selling to another
20 family similar to them looking to move into the
21 community and build a single-family home as well.
22 There's various easements that were existing for ingress
23 and easements kind of around the outside of the property
24 as well as a land restriction that was agreed to with
25 the neighbor to the east. So, that's, just in a gist,
26 the overall layout and configuration that we're
27 proposing for tonight for the plat of subdivision.

28 So, following that, we did spend some
29 time as part of this, once we identified the ways that
30 we wanted the parcels to be shown, we did engage with
31 several consultants to get them involved as well as the
32 Village to help build a team to make sure that we were
33 kind of going down the correct path in terms of
34 subdividing this property and going through and making
35 sure that we were kind of leaving no stone unturned.
36 So, we engaged with a consulting surveyor that did all
37 the surveying for the property, a consulting civil
38 engineer that developed the preliminary civil
39 engineering for the property, and also a consulting
40 arborist that went out and tagged all the trees on the
41 property, evaluated all the trees, as well as the health
42 of the trees and things like that.

43 So, as we, we'll go into a couple more
44 slides where we get more into the details of what we're
45 proposing to improve as part of the subdivision and as
46 part of the build. But I just kind of wanted to start
47 here by showing the existing parcel that's there now.
48 As Steve mentioned, there is an existing single-family
49 residence that is on the parcel that's highlighted here
50 and hatched in. There is a driveway that kind of sweeps
51 across along Briar Lane; it kind of enters in near Oak
52 Tree and Briar with the vast portion of asphalt kind of

1 behind the front walk. There is an existing detached
2 garage shed that's located at kind of the northwest
3 portion of the property.
4 So, this would, as part of the proposed
5 subdivision, all of that would be removed. I think
6 there is about just over 11,000 square feet of existing
7 impervious between the driveways and the walks and the
8 structures on the site that will be removed as part of
9 the subdivision to make way for the new residences that
10 we would be proposing.

11 So, just to kind of jump into the
12 engineering and how we looked at everything from the
13 site, so this gets a little bit more detailed. We
14 worked really closely with our consulting engineer and
15 Russ Jensen who's the Village Engineer to really kind of
16 develop and take a look at the existing drainage
17 patterns. How we were going to attack this
18 conceptually, to make sure that we had a good plan in
19 place to really identify some of the parameters that we
20 needed to work with. Then as we, we would develop a
21 very good preliminary plan and then really dig into the
22 details during permit review with the Village for each
23 individual parcel as we submit for a new single-family
24 home permit as part of that.

25 So, one of the things to note kind of
26 with the existing property is there, just kind of
27 through our, you know, collection and doing an updated
28 topographic survey to kind of identify all of the
29 existing parameters of the site, there was not any
30 detention areas or anything like that that's currently
31 present on the property. For the most part, everything
32 runs over grade as it drains currently. Just, you know,
33 looking at the standard engineering practices throughout
34 the Village as well as some of the things that are
35 identified in the Subdivision Code; we really wanted to
36 make sure that since we are increasing the density of
37 this property by another new single-family home, we
38 wanted to make sure that we were being very careful
39 about how we were going to manage the site and how we
40 were going to manage getting utilities to the site, how
41 we were going to manage dealing with all of the
42 stormwater that's on the site as well.

43 So, really the way that we're approaching
44 this, because like Steve mentioned, our client is
45 planning to build on the western property currently, and
46 we do not have another person that's looking to build
47 currently on the eastern property, but we really wanted
48 to look at it in terms of how does the site in total,
49 how do you deal with each parcel knowing that there is a
50 very good chance that they're not going to be built at
51 the same time. So, we worked with Russ and our engineer
52 to work through the grading preliminarily. One of the

1 things that we're planning to do is to make sure that
2 we're detaining a certain amount of stormwater on each
3 parcel.

4 So, if you guys see, there's kind of a
5 shaded area in each property that shows preliminarily a
6 detention area for each parcel. There's one located
7 kind of in the north part of the west parcel, and then
8 there's another one located in the upper north part of
9 the east parcel. These are detention areas that we're
10 proposing to help detain any stormwater that gathers on
11 that property. Then that stormwater would then be
12 released at a controlled rate in order to help mitigate
13 during storms and things like that, in order just to
14 make sure that we are approaching this and making sure
15 that we aren't negatively impacting any of the neighbors
16 or anything like that. So, these are just more
17 preliminary areas right now.

18 Our thought currently, knowing that we
19 need to meet a minimum lot area, and aboveground
20 detention areas do count against you in terms of the lot
21 area of the property, is that the property to the west,
22 because we are, like Steve mentioned, just over 43,000
23 square feet, this would be more of an at-grade detention
24 area that we would be using to help manage the
25 stormwater for this property. Then the property to the
26 east, that would be more of a below-grade detention area
27 that we would be doing piping underground to help detain
28 and keep some of that stormwater throughout any events
29 that were to come up with that and then it would be
30 released from there.

31 So, more details to come on that. Again,
32 this is kind of our preliminary concept. We've worked
33 closely with Russ. Russ felt that we've got a really
34 good plan that's in place here to be able to start to
35 address these things, and a lot more of the areas would
36 be kind of further detailed and gone through with permit
37 review for each individual parcel, because for instance,
38 the detention areas are going to be, the size of them
39 are going to be really dependent on the amount of
40 impervious that each parcel has.

41 So, the detention areas that we've shown
42 are there preliminarily just to give an idea to show
43 that we are planning to do that. But ultimately, it's
44 going to turn into how big of a home is going to be
45 constructed on each, how much impervious is located on
46 each, and how much we really need to mitigate for in
47 order to make sure that we're providing enough detention
48 to really help manage everything. Then, so that would
49 be the civil engineering.

50 Then also, we're just kind of showing a
51 little bit more of the context. We're showing kind of
52 the existing topography here of the area, the

1 topographic map just to kind of show. You'll see 635 is
2 kind of the high point over here, and then everything
3 kind of flows over through this way. 636 is also
4 farther to the south over here. But everything kind of
5 flows this way, kind of on a, you know, southwest to
6 northeast pattern. That's kind of the existing drainage
7 as well. Everything ultimately kind of works its way
8 down towards the river which is located to the east.

9 Then kind of lastly, we just wanted to,
10 like Steve mentioned, it's not something that is kind of
11 under review tonight, but we did want to share kind of a
12 front elevation rendering of what the proposed home that
13 the Hiveleys are looking to build, just to kind of share
14 with the Board and the neighbors what they're looking to
15 build. So, it's a new single-family home, Colonial
16 style. We feel like it's very fitting to the
17 architecture and some of the areas of the Village as
18 well. We're really excited to get started on that.

19 So, I guess with that, we're happy to
20 take any questions any of the Board members has in terms
21 of our submission, and we thank you for your time.

22 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Thank you very much
23 for the presentation and explanation. I have a couple
24 of questions. You indicated the alignment of the lots
25 are best suited for you to go north-south as opposed to
26 east-west. What you showed, it looks that you have a
27 larger building footprint if you run it north-south as
28 opposed to east-west overall.

29 The question I have is that the makeup of
30 Briar Lane is lots running east-west. If you could flip
31 to your other example when the lots are running east-
32 west? The two lots to the south of this property run
33 east-west. The three lots to the north of the property
34 run east-west. Then a couple of lots across the street
35 run east-west.

36 So, can you, it appears you're selecting
37 the other configuration because it gives you a little
38 better building area, especially on the one lot. Was
39 that the primary consideration? Or what other
40 considerations did you --

41 MR. LOCHNER: We did look at -- that's a great
42 question. We did look at Oak Tree as well because we
43 feel like there's a strong access on Oak Tree as well as
44 Briar. The lots on Oak Tree do kind of front off of Oak
45 Tree and run north-south.

46 The one concern that we had, especially
47 in this version, is just being able to, we felt like it
48 was, in terms of being able to make this parcel an area
49 that we're able to put a house on that would be
50 consistent with specifically the zoning district and
51 kind of the caliber of houses throughout the
52 neighborhood, it's actually kind of interesting just

1 with the subdivision regulations and the setbacks that
2 we're required here. We've got, this distance width-
3 wide, if you would imagine that Briar Lane would be the
4 front of the house, it's about 60 feet wide of what we
5 would be able to place a house on there with. We just
6 felt like it was really out of context with some of the
7 other houses and the scale of the neighborhood.

8 That's why we had kind of landed with the
9 north-south configuration as we were going through it.
10 But it was definitely something that we explored with
11 our client and explored with the Village as well.

12 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Okay, and then the
13 other question I had was regarding water detention.
14 That's not before us today, but I'm going to ask a
15 question anyway since it's a topic that will probably be
16 discussed and I just want to factually point something
17 out.

18 You control Lot 1, the lot to the west
19 and how that would be, and you're proposing that that
20 would be above-surface water retention. You're
21 suggesting that the Lot 2 would be underground storage,
22 but you can't control that necessarily because that lot
23 will be sold off to someone else. I just wanted to,
24 unless I'm wrong, I just wanted to point that out.

25 MR. LOCHNER: Steve, I don't know if you can
26 elaborate on that a little bit more potentially. But my
27 understanding is that it would not be able, unless we
28 were to do underground detention on that property, or
29 anybody were, that you would not be able to build on it
30 because it would not be considered a lot because it
31 would go underneath the allowable lot area. Am I
32 understanding that correctly?

33 MR. GUTIERREZ: That's correct. The
34 subdivision design standards for lot area state that you
35 can't count surface detention areas towards the lot area
36 requirement. So, Lot 2's lot area is just a little bit
37 above 40,000 square feet, so it would not allow for
38 adequate surface detention without making the lot
39 'substandard.' So, for all practical purposes, we
40 wouldn't allow surface detention on Lot 2.

41 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: If surface detention
42 is on Lot 1, you would not be allowing surface detention
43 on Lot 2, it would have to be underground is what you're
44 saying?

45 MR. GUTIERREZ: The surface detention on Lot 1
46 doesn't affect this particular provision. Lot 2 is just
47 38 square feet above 40,000 square foot lot area
48 requirement, and that certainly would not provide an
49 adequate surface detention facility. So, any detention
50 that's required for Lot 2 would have to go underground.

51 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Okay, thanks, Steve.
52 One final question I had on this topic,

1 the impervious land formula that exists right now, how
2 does that get spread over the two lots?

3 MR. LOCHNER: My understanding is the way that
4 we had done it originally is we were splitting it
5 between the two, and I think that was kind of the
6 direction that we received preliminarily from the
7 Village.

8 Steve, do you know by chance where the
9 dividing line of the two parcels is and that's how it's
10 determined, or if it's always one?

11 MR. GUTIERREZ: I am not sure frankly how we
12 came to the determination of splitting it evenly.
13 Splitting it evenly, however, would put a greater burden
14 on the Hiveleys and their development of Lot 1. Is
15 that, am I reading that correctly, Nate?

16 MR. LOCHNER: Correct.

17 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Okay, I don't want
18 to get too much into the weeds on that because that's
19 not before us today. I was just curious more than
20 anything else, and maybe others in the audience would
21 also have that curiosity. That's something that you're
22 going to figure out, Steve, in the permit process when
23 the time comes.

24 MR. GUTIERREZ: Correct.

25 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: So, okay, thank you.

26 Any other questions from any other
27 Commissioners?

28 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: Nate, and this is kind
29 of off the mark, too, but in Lot 2, the 20-foot land
30 restriction, has that been annexed already? Or is that
31 going to be a problem for the future landowner?

32 MR. LOCHNER: That was something that was
33 existing before and shown on the existing plat of
34 survey. There is that, it's shown on that, so that's
35 kind of an existing easement that's located there.

36 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: Is it utility? What is
37 it?

38 MR. LOCHNER: It's in a land restriction
39 easement, so I believe it's intended to help restrict
40 removing vegetation and things like that through there,
41 just to help preserve that area as kind of a buffer to
42 the property to the --

43 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: Okay.

44 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: So, yes, let me give
45 you a little background. The owner to the east owned
46 this lot to the west originally, I mean, the bigger lot.

47 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: Right.

48 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: I believe when that
49 got sold off, that was a provision they put in at the
50 time of that transaction to create a buffer. That's --

51 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: Okay.

52 MR. LOCHNER: Our understanding is that there

1 is not any trees or shrubs that are allowed to be
2 removed in there.

3 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: Okay.

4 MR. LOCHNER: We just have that understanding
5 and that's okay with us.

6 COMMISSIONER ESTABROOKE: I actually have a
7 question. I'm assuming that Lot 1 will have a Briar
8 address and Lot 2 will have an Oak Tree address? Or am
9 I, is that true? Does that mean anything? I don't
10 know.

11 MR. LOCHNER: That's a great, the Village
12 should be assigning the new addresses I would assume,
13 Steve?

14 MR. GUTIERREZ: Yes. The Lot 2 would
15 certainly have an Oak Tree Lane address. As far as the
16 Lot 1, we would consult with the Fire Department who
17 likes to have some uniformity in terms of the numbering
18 system. Frankly, I'd assume that they'd like to see
19 that be a Briar Street address, but again, we'd have to
20 talk to them about that.

21 COMMISSIONER ESTABROOKE: Okay.

22 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Any other
23 Commissioner questions or comments?

24 Okay, Steve, if you want to see if anyone
25 in the audience would like to have any questions or make
26 any comments?

27 MR. GUTIERREZ: Sure. We're going to Baker
28 and Sara Thompson. Are you there?

29 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, I'm here.

30 (Witness sworn.)

31 MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you. Proceed.

32 MR. THOMPSON: So, my question relates to when
33 the two lots gets subdivided in our particular
34 neighborhood, is it typical for the building block areas
35 to only be 30 feet apart? Is that, I mean, I'm learning
36 as we go here, but it seems to me like those two houses
37 relative to everything else in this neighborhood will be
38 particularly close together, relative to everything else
39 on the street. Is that, I mean, and maybe there's
40 nothing to do about it, it's within the code, but it
41 seems, I don't think there are any other houses that are
42 even close to 30 feet within the same, down this whole
43 block.

44 MR. GUTIERREZ: I think I can answer that
45 question, Chairman.

46 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Go ahead.

47 MR. GUTIERREZ: So, the setback requirements
48 are dictated by our Zoning Code, and those are 15 feet
49 from the side lot lines. In this case the newly created
50 north to south lot line is the side lot line. So, in
51 essence, you can build within 30 feet of the two homes.
52 So provided that a builder or homeowner honors that

1 setback as well as the 40-foot rear yard setback and the
2 40-foot front yard setback, they're allowed to build,
3 again, within that building envelope.

4 MR. THOMPSON: Understood.

5 MR. GUTIERREZ: Anything else?

6 MR. THOMPSON: That's it for me.

7 MR. GUTIERREZ: I'm going to call on 0629202,
8 are you there?

9 MR. McCARTER: I think that's us. I just, to
10 recover and --

11 (Witness sworn.)

12 MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you. Go ahead.

13 MR. McCARTER: Two questions. One is the
14 removal of tree cover which strikes me as extensive.
15 You're going from a lot that has maybe 11,000 square
16 feet of building and drive to one that looks like it's,
17 I'm not sure how big it is, but substantially larger.
18 Then the second question is the tree cover. This is a
19 heavily wooded lot presently. How many trees have to
20 come down? It's going to go from a heavily wooded lot
21 into pretty much open as I understand with the two
22 buildings.

23 MR. LOCHNER: Sure, I'm happy to help answer
24 that. I guess I'll start with the amount of impervious
25 that, that question that you had, sir. So, existing, I
26 believe it's about 11,300 square feet of impervious on
27 the single parcel currently. Just for reference, Lot 1
28 which is really the parcel that we know the most about
29 right now in terms of the plans for development, in
30 terms of the actual structure and the hardscapes, we're
31 proposing on that 7,600 square feet of impervious on
32 that parcel, which is under what the existing is.

33 Then just going over to Lot 2, just to
34 look at it in terms of what would be a potential
35 impervious for that property, obviously we don't know
36 until that's fully designed and reviewed by the Village
37 as part of their permit process, but just in terms of,
38 if we were to say a house of similar caliber that we're
39 planning to build on Lot 1 would be built on Lot 2, it
40 would look like we'd be, you know, about an increase of
41 around just over 3,000 square feet in terms of
42 impervious that would be adding to the entire parcel.

43 Then just in terms of the trees, we have,
44 as I mentioned earlier, we have worked with a consulting
45 arborist to evaluate the trees and, because it's a very
46 dense piece of the property currently. One of the
47 things that we noticed as we were doing the analysis of
48 all the trees is that there were several that were
49 actually in poor health or already dead. So, we
50 obviously want to, we would be removing those as part of
51 the build just to make sure that there isn't any
52 liability of storms coming through or something like

1 that and it becomes a maintenance issue on site. There
2 is a few trees that we do need to remove just as a
3 portion of making way for the new home that we're
4 proposing, but that's something that we have started and
5 we will continue to work with the Village arborist to
6 make sure that we're identifying those, we're following
7 all the standard Village protocols.

8 Also, the other important thing to think
9 about that we are thinking about as well is we want to
10 make sure that during construction activity, because a
11 lot of older mature trees do not take very well to
12 construction activity, especially in the root zones, so
13 we want to make sure that we're developing a good plan
14 with the Village when we get to that point to make sure
15 that we're carefully protecting root zones and things
16 like that to minimize any impact that we have on the
17 trees that are staying.

18 MR. McCARTER: Thank you.

19 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Steve, before we get
20 to the next audience member, I had a follow-up question
21 on that topic, trees.

22 MR. GUTIERREZ: Sure.

23 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: In addition to the
24 trees that you discussed, there's a tremendous amount of
25 brush that is throughout the property. What is the
26 intent there, to preserve as much as possible to
27 maintain privacy, or to remove that brush?

28 MR. LOCHNER: We haven't fully developed a
29 plan for what to do with that yet, just in terms of kind
30 of it will be almost up to each individual homeowner.
31 But one of the things that we particularly like and that
32 we have, as kind of some preliminary discussions with
33 the Hiveleys, is that it provides a really nice screen
34 and privacy, especially to some of the neighboring
35 properties. That is something that could be really
36 beneficial in keeping. But we haven't fully developed
37 and identified exactly which areas will stay and which
38 ones will be removed.

39 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Yes, and I ask
40 because it is in keeping with the rest of the
41 neighborhood. Secondarily, it does provide water
42 absorption that you would lose if you got rid of even
43 the smallest of, you know, low-lying brush trees.

44 MR. LOCHNER: Sure.

45 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Thank you.

46 Steve, if you want to continue back to
47 the audience?

48 MR. GUTIERREZ: Okay. All right, let's go to
49 Diane.

50 Are you there, Diane?

51 (No response.)

52 MR. GUTIERREZ: Okay, we'll go to Eileen

1 Isaacs. Eileen?
2 MS. ISAACS: I'm just listening to be informed
3 of what is going on. I don't have any contradictory or
4 contrary opinion.
5 MR. GUTIERREZ: Okay, thank you.
6 Joan Trueheart-Bacon?
7 MS. BACON: Thank you. No comment at this
8 time.
9 MS. DEFEO: Hey, Steve, D. Prosko has their
10 hand up.
11 MR. PROSKO: Yes, Steve, it's Duane Prosko.
12 Can you hear me?
13 MR. GUTIERREZ: We can. Can I swear you?
14 MR. PROSKO: Please do.
15 (Witness sworn.)
16 MR. PROSKO: So, I had I guess a couple of
17 comments and maybe one question. So, my property is
18 directly north of both Lot 1 and Lot 2, so it abuts up
19 directly to the lot. I'm not across the street on Briar
20 or Oak Tree.
21 I think for the most part, you know, most
22 folks would prefer to have one entire lot and not
23 subdivide this. But given that, I think this
24 configuration that Nate has presented with the north-
25 south subdivision is probably the best. I think Bill
26 was asking a question about why not an east-west lot.
27 The east-west kind of provision or split would not be
28 something that I think we would be interested in given
29 that, you know, my concern would be having a building
30 structure essentially, you know, right next to my front
31 yard on 611 Briar.
32 So, I think the way that Nate has showed
33 this is, and I know we're not approving building
34 structures tonight, but I think he has essentially the
35 building structures closer to Oak Tree and the
36 backyards, you know, closer to our property. So, that
37 would be, you know, one comment that I would have
38 relative to how we split these lots.
39 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Yes, and it provides
40 a 40-foot setback for the property to the lots to the
41 south that they configured this. That has been --
42 MR. PROSKO: Yes, that's right, that's right. So,
43 in this configuration, you know, essentially there's no,
44 at least for Lot No. 1, at least the plan that Nate is
45 showing, that there is no, you know, building structure,
46 a driveway or a garage that's close, you know, that's
47 right next to my driveway and right next to my front
48 door. It's essentially, you know, a yard, and realizing
49 again, we're not approving building structures for Lot 1
50 and we're certainly not approving building structures
51 for Lot 2 either.
52 So, that was just one comment I think

1 about the configuration of Lot 1 and Lot 2. The other
2 question I had was perhaps more of a technical question.
3 There is a reference in the submission to a company
4 called Lambo Company, LLC. Nate did not indicate who
5 that was or perhaps what the relationship is between the
6 current sellers and Lambo, or if there isn't ongoing
7 relationship say with the current sellers and this
8 Lambo, LLC and who they are.

9 MR. LOCHNER: Yes, that's a great question.
10 Fam Lambo Company, LLC is just, that's the family trust
11 for the Hiveleys and that's what they're going to be
12 purchasing the property through.

13 MR. PROSKO: So, Nate, I guess the current
14 owner would not have any relationship with Lambo, LLC
15 then, is that correct?

16 MR. LOCHNER: Correct.

17 MR. PROSKO: Okay, and I think my only other
18 question might be, you know, maybe Nate, if you could go
19 back to the water retention area slide? There was a
20 small diagram, there was an indicator there where it
21 says proposed detention outlet. I'm wondering what that
22 is because it looks like it's relatively close to again,
23 my house which you draw on the top part of that diagram,
24 and it's close to, you know, some outside air
25 conditioners that we have. So, I'm just wondering, you
26 know, what is that? Is that a PVC pipe? Is that, you
27 know, what is that?

28 MR. LOCHNER: Yes, that's a great question.
29 So, just to, we'll have more details on the specifics of
30 what that detention outlet would be when we review
31 everything for permit. We're more than happy to kind of
32 keep you apprised of that. But it essentially is, it
33 would most likely be a PVC pipe that would outlet, I'm
34 going to use some engineering lingo for you, to daylight
35 which would be kind of at, essentially would be at
36 grade.

37 So, currently, the way that the existing
38 grade that's represented by these lines that are a
39 little bit more faint here, it starts to flow this way
40 towards actually the rear of, it's kind of the area in
41 between your property and the rear of the property to
42 the east. This is 630 right here and it starts to flow
43 this way downhill. There's about a foot difference
44 between this point and that point.

45 So, that's really where the detention
46 outlet would be. That would be released at a controlled
47 rate as well to be able to help mitigate the amount
48 that's coming out of there. But that would, it would
49 essentially come back through here.

50 Just the other thing that I will point
51 out, too, just kind of for reference is it feels, when
52 you start to look at the survey and the engineering and

1 things like that, things feel a little bit closer than
2 they actually appear and what they'll actually be in
3 real life. So, just for reference, just that point
4 where it's shown there, I would say that's about 10 feet
5 away from the north property line of where that would be
6 discharged on this property. So, it's about 10 feet
7 south of that, just for kind of some referencing some
8 scale for you as well.

9 MR. PROSKO: Can you also, Nate, while you're
10 there, the proposed detention area, is that a structure
11 or is that just an area where, it's kind of two
12 questions. You know, if it's not a structure, or even
13 if it's a structure, do you cut any trees down in that
14 hatched area where you draw the proposed detention area?

15 MR. LOCHNER: The good thing about where we've
16 located it is there are a few trees that are located
17 over here, but for the most part, this is one of the
18 more open areas of the property in terms of vegetation.
19 There is one tree that probably will need to be removed
20 here which is a smaller tree where my cursor is. But
21 the good thing and part of the reason why it was located
22 there is it kind of helps to try to minimize that impact
23 to the existing trees.

24 It will be something to, again, this is a
25 preliminary plan to where it's shown diagrammatically to
26 show the concept of how we're planning to deal with the
27 stormwater and detain the stormwater for this parcel in
28 particular. So, it will be, I would assume as we
29 further develop those details as part of the permit
30 process and the engineering review, that this would take
31 on more of probably an organic shape that would fit more
32 in with the landscape back there, rather than just kind
33 of representing it as a square so to say to where it
34 really starts to fit more in with the character of the
35 property.

36 MR. PROSKO: Then lastly, but related to the
37 question that Mr. McCormick had, if there is not a tree,
38 if there's a tree that is on this property on Lot 1 or
39 Lot 2 that you haven't drawn, does that mean you're not
40 cutting it down? So, your tree surveyor, you know, did
41 not draw the tree and mark the tree on it, and if it's a
42 large tree, can we assume that that tree is perhaps on
43 the border, you know, of my property and Lot No. 1 or
44 Lot No. 2 and, therefore, you know, he didn't survey it
45 let's say?

46 MR. LOCHNER: We would have to double check
47 with our surveyor. I believe he did identify all of the
48 trees as they're located currently. Just this plan
49 might be a little bit easier to kind of depict on which
50 trees are being proposed currently to stay and which
51 ones are going to be removed. So, you'll see there's
52 tags kind of throughout identifying the trees that

1 correspond over here to the tree inventory.

2 The majority of the trees that we're
3 proposing to remove are more in this building area for
4 Lot No. 1 where the Hiveleys home would be placed. So,
5 you'll see they're kind of represented with some red X's
6 that are there. This line graphically here, that has
7 nothing to do with the tree removal, that's just more
8 fencing to help stabilize the site for any construction
9 activities that would happen.

10 MR. PROSKO: But again, just to confirm again,
11 Nate, the X's do not apply to Lot No. 2 because you have
12 a building box there, but you don't have a plan to build
13 so you haven't determined which trees should go, which
14 trees should be removed from Lot No. 2, is that correct?

15 MR. LOCHNER: At this point, yes.

16 MR. PROSKO: Other than the 20-foot easement
17 between Lot 2 and the existing home?

18 MR. LOCHNER: Correct.

19 MR. PROSKO: Steve, those are all the
20 questions and comments I had for now.

21 MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you. Let's see. Rob
22 Gamrath? Mr. Gamrath, are you there?

23 MR. GAMRATH: I am, thank you.

24 (Witness sworn.)

25 MR. GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

26 MR. GAMRATH: Thank you. My name is Rob
27 Gamrath. I am a real estate and land use attorney with
28 the law firm Burke, Warren, Mackay & Serritella, and I
29 represent Mr. Gordon Raymond who is the property owner
30 directly to the east of the proposed subdivision. His
31 address is 570 Oak Tree Lane.

32 Mr. Chairman, maybe if I could ask a
33 brief question for clarification? I had heard at some
34 point a statement that the engineering was not before
35 the Plan and Zoning this evening, but in the
36 introductory comments, my understanding is that the
37 engineering was a required submittal and then we've
38 spent a lot of time on it. The reason I ask for the
39 clarification is while Mr. Gordon is not opposed and has
40 not engaged me or his civil engineer to try to prevent
41 development, he does have very serious stormwater
42 management concerns and how they would burden his
43 property.

44 So, I just wanted to make sure that I had
45 a clear understanding before I shared my comments.

46 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Yes, what's before
47 us in the subdivision itself, not what's going to be
48 developed. The Village does ask for contextual reasons,
49 if you have some preliminary plans, if the Petitioners
50 have some preliminary plans they want to submit, it
51 helps us determine how the lot is going to be used, what
52 the best context, you know, whether we go north-south or

1 east-west in regards to that, and the Petitioner has
2 submitted some preliminary plans.

3 In terms of the detention areas, that's
4 really not part of our conversation at all. That's not
5 part of any Commission's purview. That is under the
6 review of the Village and Steve Gutierrez's Community
7 Development Department at the permit process.

8 So, Steve, I'll let you jump in here and
9 provide any more details there of how and when the
10 neighborhood including Mr. Raymond can be involved when
11 some of these decisions are made regarding detention.

12 MR. GUTIERREZ: To clarify, we do require in
13 the Subdivision Code requirements for the submittal of a
14 plat of subdivision preliminary engineering, and we
15 traditionally have required and accepted a preliminary
16 stormwater management plan but again, in concept form.

17 Our goal in this part of the process with
18 the civil engineering is to confirm that meeting the
19 code requirements in concept is doable based on the
20 configuration of the lot particularly. So, we don't
21 require and haven't required final engineering or a
22 great amount of detail in the engineering in that a lot
23 of that is driven by the actual development of a parcel,
24 how much of the parcel is going to be covered, where a
25 home might be placed, how the property might be re-
26 graded to accommodate the exact placement of the home,
27 the patios and sheds and whatnot.

28 While the Petitioner has a preliminary
29 site plan for the property, that can change. Because of
30 the preliminary nature of the development plans at the
31 point of this subdivision request, we don't require
32 detailed engineering plans.

33 We have a Stormwater Management Ordinance
34 that has very specific detention requirements, outflow
35 requirements, and design standards that we will
36 eventually vet during the building permitting stage.
37 Eventually, we'll also do onsite inspections to make
38 sure facilities are going in as designed and approved.
39 Even after construction, we require what we call as-
40 built plans which are elevations that are taken by a
41 surveyor to indicate that the grading was done according
42 to plan, that the tops of foundations are done according
43 to the plan, the elevations of the cross sections of the
44 detention facilities are done per plan.

45 So, there's different layers of control
46 and vetting and inspection that will be done to make
47 sure that the plans are in compliance with our
48 ordinances.

49 MR. GAMRATH: Thank you. Am I correct though
50 that this is the only layer that affords public and
51 community participation, that after tonight's vote and
52 then the Village Board's vote on the detention and the

1 subdivision and concept engineering, that that is then
2 left to discussion just between Staff and their
3 consultants and the Petitioner?

4 MR. GUTIERREZ: That's correct. Those things
5 are not subject to a zoning entitlement process or
6 subdivision entitlement process as they really are
7 technical requirements, unless somebody, well, actually
8 we don't really give variations to the stormwater
9 ordinance. So, they're very technical, cut-and-dried
10 requirements. You either meet them or you don't, so,
11 no, they are not subject to public hearing.

12 Now, anybody can come in and look at the
13 plans as they're submitted. If Mr. Raymond's engineer
14 wishes to take a look at them as plans are finalized, we
15 certainly will make those available to him or whoever
16 would like to look at them. They're all public
17 documents. If there are specific design concerns, we're
18 happy to consider those in our review of the plans, and
19 even to convey those to the design engineer if we feel
20 that's appropriate.

21 MR. GAMRATH: Thank you, and I would like to
22 invite both the Village and the Village engineer and Mr.
23 Lochner and his engineer to sit down and discuss the
24 stormwater management plan as at least conceptually
25 designed. I think that there's probably a better
26 solution that can be devised in terms of working with
27 the neighboring property owner and an inclusive process
28 from that standpoint. Unfortunately, Mr. Raymond only
29 recently became aware of this particular project, and to
30 my knowledge was never contacted by anybody involved
31 with the proposed development, which is unfortunate
32 because it may have avoided any type of concerns
33 regarding how things are going to process unlike the, or
34 in distinction with what was proposed and done in the
35 prior matter on the agenda tonight which they did reach
36 out to the neighbors.

37 We have submitted a letter, I believe you
38 have it, Mr. Gutierrez, and I think Dan Creaney, who's
39 the consulting engineer that was involved with Mr.
40 Raymond's development, prepared that and submitted it to
41 the Village engineer. So, we'd ask that those items be
42 taken into consideration. There is a change of grade,
43 as was pointed out. The existing drainage contour lines
44 are at least proposed to be adjusted. There is that 20-
45 foot east border that is protected and it's to be
46 protected from any destruction of the vegetation which
47 could be certainly through different construction means,
48 but also could be through unintended consequences with
49 the way the stormwater detention is directed toward that
50 area.

51 The proposed detention ponds now will be
52 point discharge which alters the way the flow will go

1 towards Mr. Raymond's detention pond which was sized and
2 specifically designed to accommodate the existing
3 situation and improvements on the 587 Briar Lane
4 property. As I'm sure Staff and the Village is aware,
5 he was required to install an ejector pump. There's a
6 question on whether the volume now and the rate as it
7 reaches his pond can be accommodated by the existing
8 ejector pump, whether there will be overtopping of his
9 pond which would create flooding in his backyard, and
10 you know, since we're only at a preliminary design
11 phase, whether or not the detention ponds, as proposed
12 at least and being so close to the floodway, will
13 overtop on what's proposed on 587 Briar Lane.

14 So, a lot of issues that maybe can all be
15 worked through, but unfortunately, the way the timing of
16 this unfolded, we're left trying to raise them at the
17 11th hour rather than be able to work through them in
18 advance. So, you know, I don't know if the Commission
19 is of the mind to defer the recommendation on this
20 particular subdivision matter until its next meeting to
21 give us time to discuss these with the Petitioner and
22 the Village's engineer and Petitioner's engineer. But
23 if that is not the pleasure of the Commission, then we
24 would certainly ask for the Village's and the
25 Petitioner's expressed cooperation before things move
26 forward beyond this phase.

27 COMMISSIONER MENDREK: I would just like Steve
28 to explain how we post signs for public meetings and how
29 neighbors are notified, because I'm just a little
30 unclear why this came up basically the night before our
31 meeting when, I mean, I was there in the neighborhood
32 three days ago and there was a sign posted. So, I'm
33 just, I'm trying to make sure I understand what the
34 gentleman is suggesting the Village did or didn't do to
35 notify the neighbors.

36 MR. GUTIERREZ: Notification of this hearing
37 was made in a number of ways. One, there's a sign
38 posted at the corner of 587 Briar, at the intersection
39 there of Oak Tree Lane and Briar Lane at least 15 days
40 prior to this hearing. There was a newspaper
41 publication made in the notice section. The Petitioners
42 mailed via certified mail a notice to all the property
43 owners within 250 feet of the property.

44 COMMISSIONER BOLLING: In the packet that you
45 provided, Steve, 570 Oak Tree Lane was on that list of
46 letters that were sent out. Is there any way that
47 perhaps that wasn't actually executed?

48 MR. GUTIERREZ: Our code relies on the
49 Applicants to provide that notification, and they have
50 provided us with an affidavit indicating that they did
51 do that mailing. They attached that list of people that
52 they sent the notice to as part of that affidavit, and

1 we rely on that.

2 MR. LOCHNER: We also have, since we sent
3 everything certified mail, we do have the receipts that
4 show each individual property that they were mailed out
5 to.

6 COMMISSIONER MENDREK: But do you have, they
7 weren't return receipt requested so we can't really
8 identify whether the neighbor received said notification
9 or not.

10 MR. LOCHNER: They were not return receipt
11 requested, it was just certified mail.

12 MR. GAMRATH: Mr. Raymond indicated that he
13 first became aware of the project as a result of the
14 posted sign. I don't know if that was five days ago --

15 MR. GUTIERREZ: It was 15 days ago.

16 MR. GAMRATH: No, I understand that the sign
17 was posted, but I don't know when he first became aware
18 of the sign. I don't have any evidence of whether or
19 not he received the letter. I'm just sharing what I
20 know from Mr. Raymond's account.

21 MR. LOCHNER: I wanted to comment as well. We
22 are more than happy to sit down with you and Mr. Raymond
23 and Dan Creaney with our engineer, the Village engineer,
24 and as things develop in terms of a more refined plan
25 for the engineering on the site and really sit down and
26 talk through any concerns that you have with everything
27 and work through anything that could potentially come
28 up. We are more than open to that and we would love to
29 do that.

30 MR. GAMRATH: Thank you.

31 COMMISSIONER MENDREK: Mr. Chairman, we can
32 talk about this amongst ourselves as Commissioners, but
33 I'm not particularly inclined to table this for another
34 month for this one concern that was expressed here.

35 COMMISSIONER DELOYS: Agreed.

36 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Any other
37 Commissioners have any thoughts about that before I
38 comment?

39 COMMISSIONER BOLLING: I'm in agreement with
40 Tracey.

41 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: I would be, too.

42 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: My thoughts are
43 since that is not germane to what's before us today.

44 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: Exactly.

45 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: In terms of
46 determining whether this should be subdivided or not, I
47 think we should be able, if someone asked, I would
48 submit that we should proceed, although I do, I'm
49 encouraged by the Petitioner's offer to Mr. Raymond to
50 engage in continued conversation as this goes down the
51 construction path, the planning path I should say, and
52 the permit path because I think Mr. Raymond is raising,

1 you know, concerns about how his retention pond would be
2 impacted by the development to the west of his property.
3 So, I encourage both parties to engage in conversation
4 with the Village.

5 COMMISSIONER MENDREK: Well, I mean, Bill, the
6 unfortunate part about that is that there will still be
7 the vacant lot between the two properties, and until
8 that's sold and some plan is put in place there, Lot A
9 to the west will have already been completed likely
10 before the other lot, there's any, you know, inkling of
11 what might go there. So, as a neighbor, I can
12 understand the frustration with not really having any
13 idea what might end up there.

14 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Right.
15 Okay, Steve?

16 MR. GUTIERREZ: The last attendee I have here
17 that we haven't called on, at least in this portion of
18 the meeting, is W. I'm going to unmute you. Are you
19 there? (no response)

20 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Okay, thank you.
21 Commissioners, any final comments or
22 thoughts?

23 With that, would someone like to make a
24 motion?

25 COMMISSIONER DELOYS: So, we make a
26 recommendation to the Village Board.

27 **A motion to recommend to the Village Board approval of**
28 **the final Plat of Hiveley Subdivision, in accordance**
29 **with the Petitioner's Application and Supporting**
30 **Materials, date stamped August 21, 2020, subject to the**
31 **following conditions:**

- 32 1. The representations made in the application and
33 supporting documents are binding upon the
34 Petitioners. There shall be no additional uses
35 permitted beyond those specifically enumerated
36 herein or permitted by the Village of
37 Northfield's Zoning Ordinance.
- 38 2. The Village of Northfield Health, Fire, and
39 Building Officials shall be granted access to the
40 subject property at any reasonable time for
41 purposes of conducting inspections for compliance
42 with Village Codes and Ordinances.
- 43 3. An approval pursuant to any requested review by a
44 Village consultant, Village Staff member, Village
45 Commission or Village Board Committee shall be an
46 approval of only those items specified in any
47 motion, resolution, ordinance, or written report.
48 Such approval shall not be deemed to be an
49 approval of any matter which is within the
50 jurisdiction of any other Village consultant,
51 Village Staff member, Village Board Committee or
52 Village Commission that has not issued a report

- 1 or given its approval. Neither shall such
 2 approval be deemed the approval of any County,
 3 State or Federal Agency. Under no circumstances
 4 shall the approval be deemed to be an approval of
 5 any matter not included in this ordinance by
 6 virtue of the fact that such a matter appeared on
 7 a supporting document which is not attached as an
 8 exhibit to this ordinance or incorporated as an
 9 exhibit as part of this ordinance.
- 10 4. The Petitioner shall comply in all other respects
 11 with the ordinances of the Village of Northfield
 12 and nothing in this approval shall be construed
 13 as a waiver of any of those requirements.
- 14 5. Violation of any condition of this approval shall
 15 be cause to revoke said approval by the Corporate
 16 Authorities upon 10 days proper notice to the
 17 Petitioner. Alternatively, the Village Manager
 18 shall have the right to assess fines, not to
 19 exceed \$750 per violation, for such violation.
 20 Such assessment of fines may be appealed to the
 21 Corporate Authorities by filing written notice of
 22 appeal within three days of the assessment.
- 23 6. Changes in the project may only be made as
 24 follows:
- 25 A. Minor Field Changes. Minor changes in
 26 locations or sizes shown on exhibits may be
 27 approved, in writing, by the Director of
 28 Community Development. Typically, a minor
 29 field change will not involve a percentage
 30 change greater than three percent. However,
 31 not all changes of less than three percent
 32 shall necessarily be deemed to be minor. The
 33 determination of the Director of Community
 34 Development as to whether a change is a minor
 35 field change shall be final.
- 36 B. Village Board Approved Changes. The Village
 37 Board may approve, without referral to the
 38 Plan and Zoning, such other changes as it
 39 believes are in the best interest of the
 40 Village and which do not involve changes in
 41 numbers found in the text of the Ordinance and
 42 which do not have a substantial, direct impact
 43 on adjacent properties. The determination of
 44 the Village Board as to whether a requested
 45 change should be referred to the Plan and
 46 Zoning Commission shall be final.
- 47 C. Changes Requiring a Public Hearing. Any
 48 change involving a size, quantity or other
 49 numerical value found in the text of the
 50 Ordinance or any change having substantial
 51 direct impact on adjacent properties shall not
 52 be made except after a public hearing before

1 the Plan and Zoning Commission. Additionally,
2 the Village Board or the Director of Community
3 Development may refer any requested change to
4 the Plan and Zoning Commission for public
5 hearing when either believes it would be in
6 the best interest of the Village to do so.
7 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Is there a second?
8 COMMISSIONER BOLLING: Second.
9 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Tom will second.
10 All those in favor?
11 (Chorus of ayes.)
12 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: All opposed?
13 (No response.)
14 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: The motion carries.
15 Congratulations! Good luck on the rest of the process,
16 Petitioners, and good luck on your construction project
17 down the road.
18 Any other comments or thoughts before we
19 entertain a motion to adjourn?
20 MR. LOCHNER: Thank you for everybody's time
21 tonight.
22 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: Thank you, Nate.
23 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Can someone make a
24 motion to adjourn?
25 COMMISSIONER BOLLING: Move to adjourn.
26 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: I'll make that motion.
27 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: Tom moves to
28 adjourn, and a second from?
29 COMMISSIONER HIRSCH: I'll second.
30 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: All those in favor?
31 (Chorus of ayes.)
32 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: All opposed?
33 (No response.)
34 CHAIRPERSON VASELOPULOS: The motion carries.
35 Thank you, everyone.
36 (Whereupon, at 8:53 p.m., the above
37 meeting was concluded.)
38
39
40 APPROVED 11/2/20
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48