

# Plan Commission

---

Minutes of the Meeting on  
August 3, 2023

Village of Homer Glen  
14240 W 151<sup>st</sup> Street, Homer Glen, IL 60491  
Community Room

**1. Call to Order**

The Meeting was called to Order at 7:02 PM

**2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was led by Commissioner Foley**

**3. Roll Call**

Members present: Commissioner Foley, Commissioner Stanly, Commissioner Fiskow, Vice-Chair McGary, and Chairman Hand. Also present were Planning and Zoning Director King, Assistant Planner Udarbe, and Plan Commission Secretary Pesavento.

Not present: Commissioner Bugos-Komperda and Commissioner Bradarich.

**4. Minutes.**

**a) July 6, 2023**

A motion was made to approve the minutes from July 6, 2023 by Commissioner Stanly, seconded by Vice-Chair McGary. All in favor, zero (0) opposed. The motion carried.

**5. Public Comment.**

None.

The Plan Commission Secretary swore in all wishing to speak. Chairman Hand provided a statement as to the order and operation of business for the Plan Commission process.

**6. New Business and Possible Action or a Recommendation.**

- a) Case No. HG-2312-SP, 16549 S. Parker Road, Special Use Permit (Public Hearing): Consideration of a request for approval of a Special Use Permit to allow a swimming pool to be located in a side yard for certain real property located in the A-2 Rural Residential District at 16549 S. Parker Rd, Homer Glen, Illinois [HG-2312-SP].**

Assistant Planner Udarbe presented the facts of this case. First, I just want to apologize because in the packet 6.A was actually Maple Avenue, but on the agenda, Parker Road is listed as 6.A so that is going to be first. I'm sorry about that.

This is a request for a Special Use Permit to allow a swimming pool to be located in a side yard for certain real property located in the A-2 Rural Residential District at 16549 S. Parker Road, Homer Glen, Illinois. The applicant and property owner, Mike Zambon is proposing to install an in-ground swimming pool in the side yard of the subject property at 16549 S. Parker Road. Per Village Code, private swimming pools are only permitted in rear yards except in cases of hardship where they cannot fit it in the required rear setback. Then they may apply for a special use permit to permit it in a side yard. The applicant is also proposing associated pool apron/pool patio, and a pool home in the side yard. Both of those structures are allowed in side yards and meet code so they will not require any variances for that. Only the pool requires a special use permit.

As far as zoning compliance, in the A-2 Rural Residential District, kind of oddly enough, all they say is that pools are permitted as long as they are set back from every property line at least ten (10) feet, exclusive of any and all easements and not located in a front yard. The permitted obstructions in yards does still apply to this, so they do need that special use permit for the side yard. They can apply for the special use permit if they are having difficulties fitting it in the rear

yard setback. This is just generally the bulk table (referring to presentation). It far exceeds all of the required ten (10) foot side and rear setbacks from property lines. The pool setback from structures is twenty-five (25) feet from the primary home, twenty (20) feet from the proposed pool home. That ten (10) foot setback from structures is a building code requirement. Then lot coverage, the pool itself does not change the lot coverage, but the pool home does count towards lot coverage. So, including that pool home, lot cover is going to be at around nine-point four (9.4%) percent. The pool counts at fifty (50%) percent impervious. The patio counted one hundred (100%) percent towards impervious and the pool home one hundred (100%) percent impervious. The site is at nine-point seven (9.7%) percent impervious with these proposed plans. Just for reference, here are some of the site photos. That first one is looking from the south side towards the pool side. That second one, you can kind of see the existing covered patio out there looking into the proposed pool site.

We have received quite a few public comments. Residents of an adjacent property came into the Village to discuss the plans for the project. They expressed concerns with the proximity of the pool to their property, specifically citing steep elevations in the subject property's side yard due to grade changes to the property. They had concerns with the runoff from these new grade changes, new drainage and standing water concerns since the construction of this property, and light pollution and noise levels invisibility. These neighbors also stated they are not opposed to the applicant having a pool. They just feel like this particular location is probably not the most appropriate, due to the proximity of their existing home. They said if this were to be approved, they would probably want to see some screening in-between. This is a picture actually from this neighbor's house. You can see there is a direct line of sight there. So, they would like some of that vegetation restored in between. As far as like drainage concerns, Brett and I had gone out to this resident's property. Part of the drainage concerns were with the work that ComEd had done to connect to the transformer that was on this neighbor's property. They had dug a trench. I think from what I understand, ComEd digs the trench, connects and then it is up to the homeowner and the contractors to finish, restore the ground, and then restore the silt fencing. That was one problem that was already addressed with Brett. The silt fencing had been restored in that area, but it did have some standing water when we had those really crazy storms a few months back. It has since been filled in. Otherwise, and I'll get into this with the site development and engineering, the rest of that is being addressed through Brett's permit stuff.

Another neighbor called just asking what the request was for. We explained what the case was and they had no questions and they stated that they didn't have a problem with the pool. Another neighbor that backs up to the subject property off of 167th Street, I guess on their side, the subject property side yard, called the Village to see what the request was for. I explained and she stated the same thing. She had concerns with the noise problem, with the proximity to her property line. I explained that we are recommending conditions, hopefully some evergreen plantings would help to restore, both visual barrier and the sound barrier between the proposed pool site. I sent this resident the plans and then she didn't have any other concerns specifically about the site plan other than noise concerns. Another neighbor off of 167 Street called the Village to discuss the case. She stated concerns about noise levels in the large pool area and questioned what would happen with drainage. Brett actually called this resident back and explained to her the grading plan that is needed and his checklist of things. I don't believe she had any other comments for me.

So, getting to the recommended conditions. For screening we are recommending to add screening as a condition of the special use permit to ensure screening is restored and looking for feedback from you guys, probably later during discussion on the location and maybe types of plantings you would want to see. The applicant had already said that he intended to plant these.

He's been planting a lot of birch trees on the property and I think he also wanted to add more birch trees in this area. Staff is probably recommending adding evergreens, too. In this photo you can see his proposed open fencing. He's proposing aluminum style fencing. There are pool safety requirements in our building code. The fencing will need to meet those requirements, but as far as open fencing, there is not much screening with that.

As I was saying, with site development and engineering, the applicant had performed work in the front yard of the subject property in and around the pond without proper site development permits. He is working with Brett right now on a site development permit to remedy the issues that have happened up in the front. The engineering plans for the pool have not been approved yet. Brett's just focusing more on what happened in the front of the yard. We are recommending the condition that no other permits be issued to the property until the rest with Brett can get resolved with the site development permit. Not that it would anyways, but to make it very clear on the ordinance, if this goes through that that would not occur without the site development being resolved.

As far as findings, the proposed location of the pool in the side yard is tied directly to the orientation of the home. It has a "backyard" facing the side property line, which makes it all the side yard. It is kind of awkward because the orientation of the home and then the home in this specific location had been built to utilize the site of the previous home. This property is subject to the tree preservation ordinance. If they did build somewhere else, obviously there is a wetland in the front and then trees in the back. They wanted to utilize the existing site and existing driveway access point to where the old home used to be. That concludes my presentation. That concludes my presentation.

A motion was made to open the public hearing by Commissioner Foley seconded by Commissioner Fiskow all in favor, zero (0) opposed. Motion carried

The petitioner did not have anything to add.

The public spoke.

Good evening, everyone. My name is Doris Hehl. I live at 13462 W. 167th Street. I've been a resident of Homer Glen for the past twenty-one (21) years. I speak this evening for myself and for my neighbors to the east. Our properties are adjacent to this property that wants to install a pool. For three (3) years we have had limited use of our backyards because of the train of heavy-duty equipment of dump trucks, the noise pollution and the dust. We have not been able to open our windows in the summertime because of all the dust. Being good neighbors, we know that this is not a permanent environment. We know that this gentleman has to get his house built. That is fine. We're good with that. Now with this pool, myself and our neighbors to the east of us, have experience with that. Five (5) doors east of me there is a pool that was built with the home and they installed a loudspeaker and a karaoke environment when they have parties. They use this system to entertain themselves and it's cranked up so high that the neighbors four (4) doors west of that house had their windows rattling. The woman, the neighbor that lives in one of the houses, suffers from migraine headaches. Her husband went over to the people and had a chat with the owner. He was ridiculed and completely disregarded. The only avenue that we had was to call the police so that at 1:00 am in the morning the police would be called. They toned it down for five (5) minutes until the police left and then they would crank it back up again. Since we have experience with this, we have very major concerns about any kind of noise level. Now, I heard you say that there were going to be evergreen trees planted along to kind of prevent any noise pollution. I'm sorry, but that is not really going to be enough,

depending on how much noise is coming from that party. I'm not going to assume that the owner is going to put in a theatrical quality sound system that will keep residents, me and my neighbors, from enjoying our backyards. I also have a concern about light pollution. Homer Glen is the recipient of a dark sky community, which is an enviable label to have. I am very concerned about any kind of lighting that will reduce our dark sky. I'm hoping that this committee will keep all of our concerns in mind because we live in Homer Glen to keep the peace and we would like to maintain that. Thank you so much for listening to me this evening.

Chairman Hand asked, I'm looking at the overhead view on Google maps. Are you the house way to the rear of the lot or are you to the west of that? Vice-Chair McGary asked, is your house on the flag lot? Doris said no, it is right in the middle. See where the star is? We are about two (2) properties to the west of that. Chairman Hand said, okay just so we know.

A motion was made to close the public hearing by Vice-Chair McGary, seconded by Commissioner Stanly all in favor, zero (0) opposed. Motion carried.

Vice-Chair McGary said, we can't base our decision on what another neighbor does. I'm really sorry that is happening to you. I guess we don't have any alternatives. We can ask the owner how they intend or if they intend to do anything like this. If it is about noise that is about what we can do.

Commissioner Stanly asked the petitioner, when are you going to be done with the house you think? The petitioner replied, I'm guessing three (3) months. Commissioner Stanly said okay. I think that is it. We will wait for the permits. Chairman Hand asked, will the pool house and the pool go up together as one permit? Is that the plan? The petitioner replied, yes. We want to do the pool house and the pool at the same time. Chairman Hand said, right. That makes a lot of sense. When we talk about screening for the pool to the south there, the pool house will actually serve in that role too. The petitioner said, the pool house is exactly the same size as the pool. The pool is forty (40) foot and the pool house is right in line with the pool. Chairman Hand asked, then additional screening with trees? The petitioner replied, yes. All along that lot line there. I have a lot of trees already on the property that I brought in that we are going to move along the lot line. I want to put evergreens in front of that so that it is all year coverage rather than just summer. Chairman Hand asked, was the standing water related to the ComEd trench? The petitioner said, I'm guessing yes. ComEd came and they trenched it out. We were waiting for them to hook up power to the house. Chairman Hand asked, so that is the issue with the standing water? Taylor said, yes. That is what the resident showed us when I went out to the site. It was still trenched. I wasn't there when there was standing water in it, but it was pretty deep. There was a pretty big rain event a few weeks before so I would imagine that that probably would have pooled up with water. The petitioner said we refilled it back in. Now that ComEd is done, we filled it back in. We are going to put seed or grass back and put the trees in. Chairman Hand asked, and that has quite a slope to it? The petitioner said, yeah it is a decent grade.

Chairman Hand said, looking at the plan view here where the pool house and the pool are going to go, there is a slope there. Do you need to fill that in? The petitioner said, with what we have proposed there right now we are good with the grade. We are going to have to put a retaining wall right along where that grade is at, where there are steps coming down from the foundation there. There is going to be retaining walls and stairs coming there and coming off of maybe three (3) steps up from the bottom so the grade isn't as steep. Chairman Hand said, one of these site plans was showing, like the series of retaining walls. Are those there? The petitioner said, no, those will be landscape type retaining walls. They are not in yet. The picture that she

was just on before is what it looks like now, but we aren't going to put those in until after we get the pool in and the pool house. Then we can put the retaining walls up. Chairman Hand asked, your septic field is where? The petitioner said it is northeast of the house. I'm going to say that it is four hundred (400) feet away at least. Chairman Hand asked, so it runs out like northeast from the house? The petitioner said, yes. If you draw a straight line from the back corner of the house going straight east, it is about two hundred (200) feet or three hundred (300) feet east and then to the north.

Commissioner Fiskow said, the only thing that I have to add is this pool location. Even though it is technically the side yard, it is really his backyard. I mean, like Lynn said, we can't really judge this based off what another neighbor did. If he was to do the same thing, I don't think the pool location would make a difference because that is what we are voting on, is the location. If the pool was around the other corner, I don't really think that would affect the noise if he was to be a bad neighbor. I guess the screening along that south side would be important. I mean, especially for whoever lives or owns that flag lot because their house is, I'm guessing, the closest to it. That homeowner is not here, right? Taylor replied, no. They were the ones with the public comment. Commissioner Fiskow said, that is all I have to add on it.

Chairman Hand asked, where the staff recommends for the record that this property to be documented as having removed fourteen (14) inches of significant tree inches. Is that a recommendation to us? Director King said, I think we are doing this for a couple of reasons. I think tracking when trees get removed on properties that are larger and then accumulating those percentages, it gets documented in permits, but I think on this one it is also important to just talk about what happened here. What staff believes would be the justifiable percentage of removals, since it's kind of difficult to determine. We are looking at aerial imagery since we don't have survey of the conditions prior to removal and we would use the fourteen (14%) percent as kind of like a jumping off point. We are still working with them on their permitting on the pond. This may or may not also result in some more removal depending on what they have to do in order to restore the pond and potentially provide compensatory storage. You can kind of see a little bit of that on here, but that is not an approved plan yet so we don't really know what is going to come out. I think we would take any of the inches that potentially may come out of there, would also be factored in by our staff review. I think it is always nice to just document it. It doesn't need to be a condition, I don't think. Did I say that in here? I think that for the record, just making note that it's roughly about fourteen (14%) percent. If you have any questions about how I looked at it, now would be the time.

Vice-Chair McGary asked, what you have highlighted in blue is sufficient or it's not? You want more than that? Taylor said, that was the condition for visual and noise landscape screening that I am recommending. Director King said, I just wanted to make note publicly on the record that this is about where we see this because this happened after the single-family home permit was issued. We determined through this process, when they came in, our eyes became very aware of what had happened on the property. We realized if we also had a tree survey. In 2021 when they came in, they were not showing as much work around the house at that time on their plan, if that makes sense. I think after we look at all of the scope of the trees on the property that are still there today, and then looking at aerial imagery with old aerial imagery to determine, generally speaking, what I think would be like a very conservative view. It is like an estimate with high inches on every tree that I'm visually seeing. If that makes sense. Vice-Chair McGary asked, so do you want additional in the motion? Director King said, no. I just think that for record, making sure that we have looked at that and put eyes on it and there are not any new questions for staff as to how I looked at this. Chairman Hand asked, so you guys keep track of an accumulating tale in your department, correct? Director King said, correct. Chairman Hand

asked, so they've taken out fourteen (14%) percent and they are allowed forty-nine (49%) percent before they hit fifty (50%) percent? Director King said, the code says fifty (50%) percent on residential lots without having to start mitigating for that. We always want to promote the preservation of the trees. Chairman Hand said, okay I just wanted to clarify all of that.

Assistant Planner Udarbe said, I'm sorry can I clarify something really quick? I know we were discussing with the tree screening. Are we okay with just the screening along the property line? Is that what we were thinking? I wasn't sure if it was something around the site closer to the fencing or just along that property line where that visual gap is. Vice-Chair McGary said, actually for me realizing that the building was between the neighbor and the pool, not that I don't want the additional evergreen screening but the noise will be a general children noise factor. Nobody can block Marco Polo. Chairman Hand asked, you're planning on planting trees along the lot line or you did already? The petitioner said, I did in the back on the east side already and I'm going to next week. Chairman Hand said, and that is what we are referring to? The petitioner said yes, the birches and the evergreens. Chairman Hand asked, so it would be similar to what you have already done so your neighbors can see what you did and then you just roll along with that? The petitioner said, correct. Chairman Hand said, I mean if you are along the lot line, you're cutting down the line of sight. He says he is planning on doing it, so I'm okay with allowing that to roll along like he has been doing. Taylor asked, as in removing the condition or how it is written and approved by Village staff? We just make sure during our inspection process and permitting that he is planting the trees. Chairman Hand said, well it just refers to screen the pool site from view and he said what his plan is going to be and I think we are all fine with that.

*Chairman Hand asked for a motion. Vice-Chair McGary made a motion to adopt staff's findings as the findings of the Plan Commission and to recommend approval with conditions for Special Use Permit to allow a swimming pool to be located in a side yard for certain real property located in the A-2 Rural Residential District at 16549 S. Parker Rd, Homer Glen, Illinois, subject to the following condition(s):*

1. *No other permits shall be issued to the subject property until the Village can review and issue an approved site development permit.*
2. *The applicant shall plant trees, as approved by Village Staff, to screen the pool site from view.*

*[Case No. HG-2312-SP]?*

*The motion was seconded by Commissioner Foley. A roll call vote was taken with Commissioners Stanly, Foley, Fiskow, Vice-Chair McGary, and Chairman Hand voting in favor five (5) to zero (0). The motion passed unanimously and will go before the Village Board on August 23, 2023.*

- b) Case No. HG-2318-V, 13631 S. Maple Avenue, Variance (Public Hearing): Consideration of a request for approval of a Variance to reduce the required side yard setback for the proposed residential single family detached dwelling from twenty-five (25) feet to fifteen (15) feet, for certain real property located in the R-1 Single-Family Residential District at 13631 S Maple Ave, also known as Lot 87 in Robert Bartlett's Creekwood Subdivision, Homer Glen Illinois [HG-2318-V].**

Assistant Planner Udarbe presented the facts of this case. This is a request for approval for a variance to reduce the required side yard setback for the proposed residential single family detached dwelling from twenty-five (25) feet to fifteen (15) feet, for certain real property located

in the R-1 Single-Family Residential District at 13631 S. Maple Avenue, also known as Lot 87 in Robert Bartlett's Creekwood Subdivision in Homer Glen, Illinois. The applicant, Stephanie Maloney, owns the subject property located at 13631 S. Maple Avenue. The applicant is proposing to construct a single family detached residential home with a side setback of fifteen (15) feet on the north side of the property. In the R-1 district side yard setbacks are required to be twenty-five (25) feet from property lines. This property in 2021, the applicant had been granted a variance to reduce the required side setback from the required twenty-five (25) to fifteen (15) feet through Ordinance 21-027. Per code, a zoning variance is valid for a period no longer than one year from the date of the ordinance. Unless a building permit is obtained within such period and the erection or alteration of a building is started or the use is commenced within such period. So, because they haven't had their building permit yet and they have not started construction, that ordinance has expired. They have come back with a new engineering plan. We are having to take them through for that same approval again.

As far as public comment this time around, the subject property just to the south came into the Village to inquire what the notice was for. I explained the request and the history of the past approvals. I showed them the plans and they had no issues with the request. They also spoke with Brett, our engineer, to confirm that there wouldn't be any negative drainage impacts to this home location in the setbacks and then said that he had no other issues with it. In 2021, staff did receive several public comments with this case the first time around. That is part of the attachment in the minutes of that public hearing. There is a mix of most people calling to inquire about what it was for. I think two (2) or three (3) of the public comments were the similar potential drainage concerns.

As far as zoning compliance, like I said in the R-1 district, principal structures are required to be located a minimum of twenty-five (25) feet from side property lines. The applicant is proposing a side yard setback of only fifteen (15) feet from the north property line and is requesting a variance to reduce this setback. Per code, no accessory structures use shall be permitted in any front yard. As far as findings on the plans, there is a sizable wetland area three hundred (300) feet to the northeast of the subject property. It occasionally floods the adjacent two (2) properties to the north of the subject property and creates possible flows across 13631 Maple Avenue from the north line to the southwest. That limits where a home can be located on the subject property. The wetland overflows the floodplain in the front and the topography forced the owner of the subject property to build towards the rear of the property in close proximity to the neighbor at 13645 S. Maple Avenue. The neighboring home to the south is pretty close to their north property line. On the south property line of the subject property, the driveway goes pretty much right up to the property line. Then the new home at 13615 S. Maple, just north of the subject property, had built their home closer to Maple Avenue because of the topography of their lot. So, this side setback won't be getting them like too close to that other neighboring property because they are set back significantly further than that north neighbor.

Just for reference, this is one of the attachments from the last case. That first one is showing the exhibits of what a twenty-five (25) foot setback on each side would look like in relation to that neighboring home to the south. You can see how close they already are and where their driveway is. The other one on the right is showing what their variance request is for. The only other thing that has changed is the footprint of the home. It did get a little larger. If you look at this one and then look at this other site plan, you can see they added more home and got rid of some of that covered patio on the southeast side of the home. It did cover like generally the same footprint, but the home itself did get a little bigger. It is just over where it used to be an open porch. That concludes my presentation



A motion was made to open the public hearing by Commissioner Stanly seconded by Commissioner Fiskow all in favor, zero (0) opposed. Motion carried.

The petitioner Dave Riordan said, I thought I was here for an extension. To correct the record, the footprint question and the square footage, there was a room in the house that was not conditioned. They called it the barn and now it's getting conditioned. That is the difference in the square footage. The actual footprint of the house hasn't changed. This has all been approved by Brett and Joe. Like I said, I thought we were getting an extension on the previously approved variance. We are aware of the wetlands and all that stuff. I built the house next door. Chairman Hand said, a few of us we here when the first variance was passed. There was a lot of discussion about it. The petitioner said, I wasn't involved then. Chairman Hand said, but you are involved now. So, going for the permit is imminent? The petitioner said, correct. Chairman Hand asked, the variance and then go for permit? The petitioner said, that is right. It should be ready to go. Chairman Hand said, good to know.

A motion was made to close the public hearing by Commissioner Foley, seconded by Vice-Chair McGary all in favor, zero (0) opposed. Motion carried.

Commissioner Stanly said, it is just a beautiful house. Chairman Hand said, I have question for staff. The variance expired? Taylor said, yes, the zoning variance. Chairman Hand asked, when did it expire? Taylor said, the ordinance was 2021 so it expired July 14, 2022. Chairman Hand said, so it was one year? Taylor said, yes. It expired a year after. Chairman Hand asked, it expired one year ago, but it was good for one year? Taylor replied, yes. Director King said, the code says you have to have a permit issued and the construction commenced. Chairman Hand asked, so not just the permit? Director King said, I mean you could put a shovel in the ground and say that it started. I think that when Joe does this it is an issuance. I think that you literally could just do that and be like we started construction. It is a little gray. In our office the interpretation on that is per the issuance. Chairman Hand asked, what about the exterior construction standard variance? Director King said, those do not expire. Chairman Hand said, that is good to know. The petitioner said, we are not changing anything.

*Chairman Hand asked for a motion. Commissioner Stanly made a motion to adopt staff's findings as the findings of the Plan Commission and to recommend approval of a Variance to reduce the required side yard setback for the proposed residential single family detached dwelling from twenty-five (25) feet to fifteen (15) feet, for certain real property located in the R-1 Single-Family Residential District at 13631 S Maple Ave, also known as Lot 87 in Robert Bartlett's Creekwood Subdivision, Homer Glen Illinois [HG-2318-V]? The motion was seconded by Commissioner Foley. A roll call vote was taken with Commissioners Fiskow, Foley, Stanly, Vice-Chair McGary and Chairman Hand voting in favor five (5) to zero (0). The motion passed unanimously and will go before the Village Board on August 23, 2023.*

## **7) Old Business**

None.

## **8). Reports of Plan Commissioners and Staff**

Director King said, we have no cases for August 17th. Although, since everyone was available for that meeting, I have been talking with someone from our new attorney's office who reviews our ordinances, about potentially doing a Plan Commission training that night. It would be of legal realm. She is reviewing her PowerPoint that she has done before with training and she is going to send it to me. I have asked her to check her calendar to see if she is available for that

day. I don't know for sure right now, but I think within the next week I'll know if we're going to hold it still. Other than that, I don't think I have anything.

Chairman Hand asked, so, cases in the pipeline going into September? Director King said, we are still waiting to hear from Enterprise. I don't know what they are going to do. We did receive a resubmittal on the Menard's project. It just came in today. I know we have a trustee in the audience. We circulated that. It just came in this afternoon at like 5:00 pm. It will get circulated for the two (2) week review with engineering, which I have a feeling will go fast. You don't know this project, but it's Lot 5 and Lot 4 of the Menard's PUD (Planned Unit Development). If you are looking at Menard's from Bell Road it's the north lots. The stormwater on that is easy because it was overdesigned and compensated for within the pond already so they don't have to redo that. It's just on-site drainage. There were some site things that got changed the first time around when this project came through here, actually at Plan Commission. I don't anticipate the engineering review being crazy. There are some circulation conversations happening with regard to vehicles. That is probably the biggest thing and making sure that trucks and fire and all those things can get in and out of sites. Even as of last week, Brett and I still had questions for them. So, I don't know what is in the submittal because I haven't opened it. That potentially could come as early as September 7th to the Plan Commission. We will just see how that review comes back. Other than that, I'm trying to think what else is in the pipeline. Taylor said, I have still not heard from the Hickory Avenue guy about the ComEd stuff. I wish I had an update for that, but I do not.

Commissioner Stanly asked, how about Dunkin Donuts? Director King said, we had to take everything back to the Village Board because their PUD was about to expire and then they never got the plat to the Recorder of Deeds in time. We did both of those the same night, extended the PUD and reapproved the plat. Then they did record it so literally within, I don't know, three (3) or four (4) days after that they did record the plat. All the signatures were on it except for ours. That is not true. They were already on there because they took it in and then Will County held the plat. They needed five (5) days to review it and so they went past their timeline. They still had the plat, but they took it back and had it recorded. I believe that the only thing outstanding is that we are waiting to hear back from the owner. There is a guarantee required on this project because there is public infrastructure related to some of the utility crossings and the sidewalks that are in the public way that are required to be posted as a public improvement guarantee. We haven't heard how they are going to post that. We can't release the permit until then, but I think they are really close to the finish line. I feel like it has taken forever. Like three (3) years. It has been a while. Director King said, the other one that has been sitting on my desk is McDonald's, which has just a few minor things that are kind of still hanging out there. We are trying to get that permit issued too. I'm trying to think of anything else.

The Village staff attended the Hadley/Parker Road, Will County project public Information meeting last week. It was really just like an open forum. They had boards. I don't know if anybody here attended the meeting. Did anybody attend that? It was just like boards around a room. They had consultants there. There was a few kind of milling around. I know there were Will County DOT people there. Their consultants had name tags and they were running the meeting and then they had comment forms for the residents to fill out. They also had aerials laid out and you could draw on the aerials if you had graphic things you wanted to write about. We have updated the website with what happened to that meeting. Their new project website is up and running and then there is a deadline for comments from the public. It is August 9<sup>th</sup> in order for it to be in the official public comment period record. Vice-Chair McGary asked, is that a done deal? Director King said, as of what we know, there is no plans drawn. Will County has been looking at this road network in this area for a long time. It has been on their long-range plan

because the pavement is failing and they feel like they have to do something to the road. I don't think we know right now what that is. Vice-Chair McGary said, I didn't go to the meeting. I'm only seeing the comments that are out there. It sounded to me like the plan was still a one way each way, but that middle thing, but I still don't think it was well received. Director King said, what they are showing, and even before they started diving into all the real detail review, the traffic numbers don't warrant an actual lane addition except at some of the intersections. It is requiring maybe a turn lane. Some of that is related to traffic accident, not just traffic numbers. They are looking at either turn lane or roundabout options. I think were the two (2) that I saw on the board. One of the things that would be a big change, is that right now there are two (2) lanes of ten (10) foot. The two (2) lanes are ten (10) foot lanes. There is like two (2) foot shoulder. That is how it was designed in 1980, but much of that shoulder has eroded. In some cases, you have just pavement that is really high stacked and then it just goes off into dirt. The swales weren't designed. You can see it out there. It is just kind of open. So, what they are proposing, even a rural cross section would be meeting federal standards and Will County standards. These standards are twelve (12) foot lanes, eight (8) foot shoulder, and one to four (4) slope, whatever ditches to handle all the drainage. It is a big change. Even if you're not widening it with a lane, it is still widening the profile. They had options, like a rural cross section versus a closed drainage, which is curving gutter. Commissioner Stanly said, there are a lot of trees. Director King said, everything is really close up on the road. Commissioner Stanly said, so many front yards will be gone because of that. New Lenox started clearing the property yesterday and today. My daughter works at Silver Cross Hospital, so all day we are all watching it. Director King said, being a planner and doing public stuff like this, I think it's just always important for us to keep making our comments and residents keep making your comments. Even if some people, I think, feel like it might be a done deal. I think that if you are worried about one through ten (10) and maybe at the end of the day, you win one through five (5). I just think you don't ever give up, right? If you have your passion and feel strongly about things, you just keep saying the things that you're convicted about.

Vice-Chair McGary said, I don't know if you have kept up, but Heritage Woods was turned down. Chairman Hand said, yes it was. Director King said, any questions about that? Chairman Hand said, that could be a long discussion. Director King said, we don't have to talk about it.

**9) Adjournment**

A motion was made to adjourn by Commissioner Foley, seconded by Commissioner Stanly. All in favor, zero (0) opposed and the meeting was adjourned at 7:58 PM.

Minutes transcribed and respectfully submitted by Sarah Pesavento.

Sarah Pesavento (Plan Commission Secretary): Sarah Pesavento

Approved Date: 9/7/2023