



westmont.illinois.gov

Community Development Department

31 West Quincy Street • Westmont, Illinois 60559
Tel: 630-981-6250 Fax: 630-968-8610

Village of Westmont Planning and Zoning Commission December 14, 2016 - Minutes

The Village of Westmont Planning and Zoning Commission held its regular meeting on Wednesday, December 14, 2016 at 7:00 p.m., at the Westmont Village Hall, 31 W. Quincy Street, Westmont, Illinois 60559.

Chair Ed Richard led in the following:

(1) Call to Order

(2) Roll Call

In attendance: Chair Ed Richard, Commissioners Gregg Pill, Craig Thomas, Thomas Sharp, Janis Bartel, Doug Carmichael, Secretary Wallace Van Buren, Planner Joe Hennerfeind, Community Development Director Jill Ziegler

Absent: none.

(3) Pledge of Allegiance.

(4) Swearing in of testifying attendees and reminder to sign in.

(5) Reminder to silence all electronic devices.

(6) Approval of Minutes of the November 9, 2016 meeting.

MOTION to approve the November 9, 2016 minutes.

Motion by: Pill

Second by: Bartel

VOTING A

Van Buren--Yes

Thomas--Yes

Sharp--Yes

Bartel--Yes

Pill--Yes

Carmichael--Yes

Richard--Yes

Motion passed.

(7) Open Hearing

New Business

PZ 16-027 Clark and Karen Neuharth regarding the property located at 310 South Hudson Street, Westmont, IL 60559 for the following:

- (A) Zoning Code Variance Request to allow for construction of a home addition within a required front yard setback in the R-3 Single Family Detached Residence District.

PRESENTATION: Clark and Karen Neuharth presented. They stated that they are looking to improve their property and home value. They would demolish their existing shed, patio, detached garage and asphalt driveway. It would enhance their yard and add area for landscaping and beautification. Their plan involves adding an attached garage with small covered porch and new entrance. They would need a four foot setback for porch and five foot for the garage. They address the three responses for finding of fact. Many homes have street facing entries with porches and attached garages, so they would like to make these improvements to match the neighborhood and improve the property. They stated that they had an architect draw a doorway and determined that it does not look as good without the additional porch. If they did not bring the front of the garage does not come to the front of the property they would not be able to access an existing entrance and would affect the flow of the house. It would also be cost prohibitive to reconstruct a new entrance. The architect has rendered drawings of the garage and the added porch.

STAFF COMMENT: Hennerfeind stated that the owners started working with staff over 3 months ago. He mentioned that there is no lot coverage variance being requested. Staff did a lot analysis of what was currently on the lot and what was being added. Initially, their plan would have been a lot coverage of 50%. The applicants reconfigured their plan, added permeable pavers to driveway and limited lot coverage to 32%. Hennerfeind mentioned that they responded well to hearing staff and revising accordingly. He stated that they had to reconfigure the front door and by adding a 4-5ft covering which did add additional coverage. It is the leading edge of the front porch that is driving this issue tonight.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

COMMISSIONER COMMENT:

Carmichael: wished them luck with the plan.

Van Buren: congratulated them.

Pill: thinks that it looks great based on neighborhood. He stated that it was great that they address the finding of facts. He mentioned the reduction of the lot coverage and how it will benefit the drainage for the whole area. He inquired about the garage and the drainage off the garage and re-routing the water. He asked about the structural support. **Reply:** there is a retaining wall that needs to be replaced. They have talked with neighbors around them and plan on addressing the drainage to make sure their yard is as flat as possible and there's no drainage that affects neighbors.

Thomas: appreciates that they have worked with staff and supports 100%.

Sharp: thinks the project will bring the property more into compliance and supports.

Bartel: supports the idea.

Richard: really likes the pavers. He inquired about the south fence and asked if it will remain. **Reply:** the fence will be removed. Richard asked about the downspout and direction it would drain, he suggested an impervious pipe to carry water off garage to front sidewalk.

FINDING OF FACTS A

(1) YES=7 NO=0

(2) YES=7 NO=0

(3) YES=7 NO=0

MOTION A

Motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees to approve to a Zoning Code Variance Request to allow for construction of a home addition within a required front yard setback in the R-3 Single Family Detached Residence District.

Motion by: Carmichael

Second by: Thomas

VOTING A

Van Buren--Yes

Bartel--Yes

Thomas--Yes

Sharp--Yes

Carmichael--Yes

Pill--Yes

Richard--Yes

Motion passed.

PZ 16-028 ALDI, Inc. regarding the property located at 6415 South Cass Avenue, Westmont, IL 60559 for the following:

- (A) Zoning Code Variance Request to allow for construction of a building addition within a required rear yard setback in the B-2 General Business District.
- (B) Zoning Code Variance request to increase the number of allowable signs.
- (C) Site and Landscaping Plan approval.

PRESENTATION: Chris Stair, real estate director of Aldi, presented that they are here as they would like to discuss remodeling the Westmont location. He mentioned that Aldi is looking at remodeling all of their stores. He stated that they are looking to expand their product line which requires the remodeling to allow additional sales floor and additional space to provide refrigeration for the products they would be adding. Other stores were making changes in two ways, blowing out either short wall or long wall and these options will not work at this location. It would affect shared access drive and impact parking. In order to get this store to meet expansion requirements for corporate, backroom expansion was the only option. If the space cannot meet the requirements to allow for more room then they would have to look at relocating the store. The area behind them is zoned residential but technically it is not really residential as it is a school and they do not see it affecting the school in any way. They have reached out to the school but have not received a reply either for or against the expansion. The requested variance still allows them to maintain a 20 ft setback.

Tom S. constructor manager discussed the exterior scope of work. It involves removing the existing stucco on front entrance, replacing two existing signs and adding the new food market signs. He stated that the new signs is relatively small in area in relation to what is allowed by sign ordinance and an impressive improvement. The interior will also be remodeled, new finishes, New graphics and new paint.

Nicky Kaemerer, civil engineer, stated that the expansion will only affect the back corner of the property. The expansion will be expanded into a grassy area which would require additional detention by code.

There was stormtrap underground detention already on property and it provides enough storage even with the expansion. They would be adding landscaping to buffer the north side of the building. There are some deficiencies on the property with replacing dead landscaping and with this remodel they will be replacing and improving the existing landscaping.

STAFF COMMENT: Hennerfeind stated that they are asking for two variances. The rear yard setback variance requirement in 2005-6 when this project went in was 60 feet and they received a variance for 40 feet. He explained that if this was a commercial property behind the lot it would only be a 20 foot setback but since it is residential it follows the residential requirements. Those residential area guidelines were put into place so that residences would not have a commercial structures too close to residences and to reduce the effects of noise and the business encroaching on the homeowners. This property is proposing a 20 foot setback but does not abut any residential homes. The applicant has worked diligently with staff. Staff had a lot of concerns about existing landscaping not being replaced and kept up and so they are proposing to bring site up to required standards. Staff and consultant have looked at stormwater and agree with a few minor changes that the existing detention can accommodate the needs for expansion. The additional building expansion also affects the number of spaces, increasing the requirement to 89. The applicant has provided 91 spaces by restriping the parking lot and converting 10 foot wide spaces to a 9 foot width. This allows for an increase in spaces without a parking lot expansion that would reduce open space and landscaping. A waiver for the 9 foot spaces will be made by the applicant to the board.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

COMMISSIONER COMMENT:

Bartel: great project, has noticed other Aldi location being remodeled as well. She inquired about plan for snow removal as she noticed it against the east fence. Reply: during construction they will be removing the snow and after construction they can address with maintenance team to come up with a plan. She asked about being open during remodeling. Reply: there will be a temporary barrier put up to block the construction debris and minimizing disturbances with customers.

Sharp: asked staff how they came up with landscaping requirements for the foundation plantings. Hennerfeind stated that if this was a new building they would look at total square footage and open space, open space requires 50% be landscaped and then there is another formula for number of trees and shrubs. Since this is an existing building with existing landscaping, they took the square footage of the addition and determined that they would require 28 shrubs. They did additional calculation for trees, but their plan already met the tree requirement for screening. Sharp commented that foundation plantings seemed very dense and could be moved possibly against street facing facade instead of being stuffed in the back of the building. Hennerfeind mentioned staff had discussed multiple placement options with the applicant that included adding the plantings in the front, but let the applicant determine final placement. Sharp asked about what additional products will be brought in. Reply: more refrigeration, a lot more fresh items, bakery section, fresh produce, organic and gluten free products.

Thomas: his wife loves your store and understands where the expansion will take place, commented that it is lucky there is a school behind them but does feel that plantings are wasted in the back of the store.

Pill: does not have any problem with the expansion. He does notice that current landscape has been let go for the last ten years and is not confident that improved landscaping will be maintained and doesn't want to police. He is hoping that staff takes notes of this and makes sure that they may maintain. Attorney mentioned they would put in the ordinance and can review if plantings could even be accommodated in the front due to salting of the sidewalks, etc.

Van Buren: asked about non food items and if those would continue to grow. Reply: he mentioned they have added a new baby line, a lot of non food items are there limited special items, they will focusing more on the fresh products. Van Buren mentioned parking and not liking the smaller spaces since it is only expanding storage he doesn't feel it will affect needing additional parking.

Carmichael: agrees with Van Buren comments on 10 foot spaces being better. Supports the project.

Richard: shopped at the store and very familiar with it. He mentioned that last week was the only time he has seen the parking lot full and agrees that he does not he a need to increase the number of stalls instead of reducing the size of the spaces. Staff commented that they would need a variance if they did not meet the number of spaces. Richard commented they could add two spaces on the south side of building, they could also fit an additional two spaces near the north side of plantings, he favors the 10 x 20 to help reduce car damage. He commented that he thinks it is a complete waste to put the plantings at the back and would rather see them remove the 6 foot sidewalk since anyone that walks that sidewalk would hit the carts anyway . Attorney mentioned that they need the sidewalk for ADA requirements. Ziegler confirmed that yes the sidewalk is a federal ADA requirement. Sharp commented that if they have to go to parking lot to get around carts than that is an ADA issue. Richard commented that the handicap parking stalls are in middle of lot with no sidewalk around them. Attorney mentioned that accessible spaces would need to have an adjacent sidewalk. Ziegler mentioned that yes if they were restriping they would ask them to put spaces nearest the entrance. Richard commented that it seems ridiculous that they need a sidewalk if they can cross the parking lot and remove the sidewalk. He would like to see three big trees moved south, and line of shrubs should be moved to streetscape. Ms. Kaemerer replied that her understanding of the ADA of the requirements is that they have to deal with the proximity to the front door and maintain a 2% slope and a striped crosswalk to the front door. She agreed that they can look into the position of the handicapped stalls and they will look into the streetscape landscaping.

Sharp asked if they need to require the revision. Attorney replied that it is in minutes and if they can trust that the revisions will be made they can move ahead.

FINDING OF FACTS A

- (1) YES=7 NO=0
- (2) YES=7 NO=0
- (3) YES=7 NO=0

Richard asked what the line of expansion indicated on page 1. Reply: they think it has been mislabeled.

MOTION A

Motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees to approve to a Zoning Code Variance Request to allow for construction of a building addition within a required rear yard setback in the B-2 General Business District.

Motion by: Thomas

Second by: Bartel

VOTING A

Van Buren--Yes

Bartel--Yes

Thomas--Yes

Sharp--Yes

Carmichael--Yes

Pill--Yes
Richard--Yes
Motion passed.

MOTION B

Motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees to approve to a Zoning Code Variance request to increase the number of allowable signs.

Motion by: Van Buren
Second by: Carmichael

VOTING B

Van Buren--Yes
Bartel--Yes
Thomas--Yes
Sharp--Yes
Carmichael--Yes
Pill--Yes
Richard--Yes
Motion passed.

MOTION C

Motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees to approve to a Site and Landscaping Plan approval.

Motion by: Pill
Second by: Sharp

VOTING C

Van Buren--Yes
Bartel--Yes
Thomas--Yes
Sharp--Yes
Carmichael--Yes
Pill--Yes
Richard--Yes
Motion passed.

Ziegler congratulated Craig Thomas on his 15 year anniversary with the Planning and Zoning Commission and welcomed Mike Todorovic, Civil Engineer to his first meeting.

(8) Motion to adjourn.

Motion by: Bartel
Second by: Sharp

Meeting adjourned 8:00 p.m.