

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES
City of Geneva
109 James Street - City Council Chambers

January 26, 2017 – Meeting #1176

Chairman Stocking called the meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll call followed:

Present: Commissioners Case, Dziadus, Evans, Kosirog, Leidig (7:05 p.m.), Mead, Slifka, Stevenson, Chairman Stocking

Others Present: Development Dir. David DeGroot; Planet Depos Court Rptr. Gail Reed; Recording Secretary Celeste Weilandt

Public Present: Applicant Joe Stanton, Fargo Enterprises, 515 Hamilton, Geneva; John Green, Engineering Resource Associates, 3S701 West Ave., Warrenville; Applicant, Robert Untiedt, Graham's 318, 318 S. Third Street, Geneva; Tim Nelson, Architect, 421 James St., Geneva; Christopher Lannert, The Lannert Group, 215 Fulton Street, Geneva; Northwestern Medicine Dir. of Planning & Construction, Charles Cloutier; Christian Banks, Northwestern Medicine, Chris Hanson, and John Brown with V3 Companies, 7325 Janes Ave., Woodridge

Approval of Minutes of January 12, 2017

Minutes of the January 12, 2017 meeting were approved, on motion by Commissioner Mead. Seconded by Commissioner Stevenson. Motion carried by voice vote of 8-0.

Chairman Stocking read the opening statement explaining the protocol for the meeting and swore in those individuals that would be speaking on the following three agenda items:

Public Hearing

Contents of the file were read into the record by Community Development Dir. David DeGroot. (Leidig arrives.)

A. **Stanton Subdivision** - The applicant is requesting Preliminary/Final Plat of Subdivision Approval for a 3 lot single-family subdivision in the R1 Low Density Single-Family Residential District. **Location:** 1708 Kaneville Road; **Applicant:** Joe Stanton, Fargo Enterprises, LLC.

Petitioner, Mr. Joe Stanton, 515 Hamilton St., Geneva discussed that he sent out notices to the neighbors prior to starting the project in order to receive feedback. He stated he had a good response with some of the feedback asking about landscape buffers. He summarized that he did work with the city and believes he has met compliance from the city. However, Mr. Stanton noted that while he agreed with the conditions in the report set forth by city staff, he did not agree with the condition for the sidewalk installation. He believed it was up to the Planning Commission and the City Council to determine whether the sidewalks were required or not and also believed it would always be staff's opinion that sidewalks should be installed. He also believed the sidewalks should not be required since there were no sidewalks from Burgess to Randall Road on that (south) side of the street and, there were no sidewalks from Kaneville Road to South Street. Also, he added that there were no other properties that would go through the subdivision process and the sidewalks would lead to nowhere. Lastly, he did not believe it was a reasonable expectation to believe that the City would install sidewalks from his property to Randall Road. He asked that the condition be waived.

Mr. John Green, Engineering Resource Associates, 3S701 West Ave., Warrenville, Illinois, directed commissioners' attention to the tree preservation plan on the overhead, pointing out the grove of mature trees along the right-of-way area on the south side of Kaneville Road with approximately 7 to 8 existing trees with trunks between 12 and 30 inches in diameter. Regarding staff's comment of a right-away dedication to create more public land to construct the sidewalk, Mr. Green spoke about the topography of the site (drains from north to south) explaining the large trees were sensitive to filling or excavation work. He stated that sidewalks existed on the north side of Kaneville Road and he would rather preserve the row of trees on Kaneville Road and Burgess Road (with 11 trees) and comply with the city's tree preservation code. Furthermore, he pointed out that some utility impacts will take place on the property which will include reconfiguring a sanitary sewer, adding parkway trees, constructing a new storm sewer and installing a catch basin at each of the lot corners. Lastly, the applicant was contributing land cash contributions to the school and park district.

Mr. Green asked the commissioners to support the proposal except for the sidewalk installations.

Commissioner Leidig expressed concern that water already drained into Southampton Court and how would Mr. Green alleviate the residents' concerns about this, wherein Mr. Green mentioned a new catch basin would be installed, piped to the north and to the west lot line, thereby connecting to an existing storm system on Kaneville Road. Details followed on the new storm system. Mr. Green stated no negative impact would occur but "perhaps an improvement" to the Southampton area.

While she wanted to preserve the trees and also saw the value of sidewalks, Commissioner Evans asked staff if right-of-way funds could be held aside for future sidewalk connections from the corner parcel to Northampton and then to South Street; otherwise there was no point in removing the trees. Development Dir. DeGroot explained there was no such process in place currently and it was under the current ordinance. Per DeGroot, the challenge was that construction costs and material costs could change and the city did not know when an opportunity would arise to fill in the sidewalk gaps. Commissioner Evans thought it was a reasonable compromise.

Dir. DeGroot clarified what trees were existing and what parkway trees were proposed along the right-of-way. He further explained that the challenge was providing the required trees and a sidewalk within a narrow parkway which was why staff thought it may make sense to consider a possible right-of-way dedication, thereby enlarging the parkway to provide for both. Per Commissioner Mead's comment, Dir. DeGroot agreed the lot sizes were slightly oversized and could meet the zoning requirements and still provide some dedicated right-of-way. After reviewing the actual number of trees that would be affected on Kaneville Road and on Burgess, commissioners discussed the pros and cons of having the sidewalks installed, whether a city sidewalk program existed to fill in the gaps, and a suggestion that the applicant come up with an acceptable tree plan and sidewalk plan that met city staff approval.

Asked if an estimate existed of how much land would be needed for the dedication, Mr. Green was not sure if an estimate existed but he surmised that most of the trees were scattered within the first 30 feet of the property and he could not consider dedicating more than five or 10 feet to still keep the lot sizes. He estimated most of the trees were in the property about five to 10 feet and believed that installing the sidewalk into the land impacted more critical root zones.

To that point, Commissioner Mead commented that sidewalks were constructed with 8 inches of gravel and a four-inch slab. The sidewalks would not affect the roots below the ground. Commissioner Evans recommended installing curved sidewalks and seeing a plan that reflects how sidewalks could work, with as many trees as possible, before a decision was made.

In response, Mr. Stanton explained that he submitted no plan because it was his request to not install sidewalks and the matter only came up because it was part of the subdivision process. Mr. Stanton

reiterated the issue was not about money, citing that he constructed sidewalks on State Street with pavers because there was the "reasonable expectation" that the sidewalks would "catch up." He also understood the River Lane in-fill sidewalk project. However, he stated this proposal was not an in-fill project because sidewalks did not exist from the property west to Randall Road, except for those sidewalks located on the north side of Kaneville. Mr. Stanton stated that installing the sidewalks would create issues for the residents using the sidewalks by having them walk to dead-ends. There were over 50 trees on the lots and many would have to be removed to install sidewalks. Lastly, the lots would be a significant size so the sidewalks could not be installed 20 feet in from the street. He asked the commissioners to look at the other homes in the area. Commissioner Evans and others reiterated they were not ready to make a decision and needed additional information. Commissioners requested that the applicant return with a plan displaying two options: 1) a plan with sidewalks reflecting existing setbacks; and 2) a plan with some form of minimal dedication to accommodate the sidewalks.

If a plan was created depicting what the sidewalks would look like, Commissioner Leidig asked if the applicant would have to stick with the strict setback rule, wherein Dir. DeGroot explained the setback requirement would remain the same from the property line but the property line would "shift in" and he did not know what that number would be to accommodate the parkway trees and sidewalk. Staff would have to determine what the dedication would be. Questions then followed regarding sidewalks planned for the new Havlicek subdivision on South Street, the new sidewalks installed on Rosenfelder, and whether sidewalks were planned for the new subdivision on Ray Street/Route 31.

Dir. DeGroot suggested that if the commissioners were requesting such plans from the applicant that they make a motion to continue the hearing in order for the applicant to prepare the documents and for the commissioners to review them.

In response, Mr. Stanton stated he would prefer the commission turn down his request to not comply with the sidewalks versus returning to the Plan Commission. Doing so would allow him to move forward with the project but force him to bring in new drawings for staff approval. Dir. DeGroot confirmed that the commission could recommend the proposal with staff's conditions and the applicant could then prepare the plans for consideration by the COW and City Council. However, Mr. Stanton pointed out that if the recommendation were to approve with the sidewalks, he would still have to go through the building permit process and send in the plans. Further dialog followed on the process. Dir. DeGroot stated that if the proposal were to move forward, his concern was that if there was a right-of-way dedication necessary to accommodate the sidewalks it should be recorded with the plat of subdivision.

As a compromise to both parties, Commissioner Evans suggested installing a sidewalk along Burgess Road but not on Kaneville Road in order to keep the row of trees. Again Mr. Stanton reiterated that the sidewalks would change the look of the neighborhood and the houses were set back. Again, he preferred the commissioners approve the plan but deny the sidewalk request. Commissioner Mead supported the compromise and Commissioner Leidig added that a sidewalk south down Burgess would be an advantage for those walking/biking to Sunset Pool. Mr. Stanton believed that the odds of the city performing in-fill sidewalks along Burgess were unrealistic.

Chairman Stocking opened up the public hearing to public comment. No comments received.

While Dir. DeGroot said he understood the no sidewalks argument, he asked everyone to keep in mind if the new residents of Lot 1 were to walk to Sunset pool, a sidewalk on Kaneville would provide them a safe route to the pool and could eventually connect to the existing vacant lot to the west. Further dialog followed that if the commission recommended the proposal with sidewalks, staff would work with the applicant over the next weeks before going to Committee of the Whole in order to have a clean set of plans so that amendments were not being made for right-of-way dedications.

Mr. Stanton, however, reminded him there were many trees of which he wanted to remove as little as possible but he had every expectation for the two remaining lots to be sold. Lastly, he said if the City Council agreed with the commission to install sidewalks then he would have to have them incorporated into the building plans.

Dir. DeGroot pointed out to commissioners that the subdivision itself was a “by right” subdivision and the only deviation being requested was the sidewalks. Chairman Stocking stated he was in favor of leaving the trees on Kaneville Road but installing the sidewalks on Burgess, even if they were winding sidewalks.

Motion by Commissioner Mead, seconded by Commissioner Leidig to close the public hearing. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote of 9-0.

Motion by Commissioner Mead, seconded by Commissioner Leidig to waive the bifurcated process and vote on the request. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote of 9-0.

Motion by Commissioner Mead, seconded by Commissioner Leidig, to approve a Preliminary/ Final Plat of Subdivision, subject to the following staff conditions:

1. Any Class A or Class B trees listed as being preserved on the approved Tree Preservation Plan that are subsequently harmed or removed shall be replaced as indicated in Section 11-10A- 10 of the Zoning Ordinance;
2. The applicant shall install a four-foot wide sidewalk along the west side of Burgess Road in accordance with the Subdivision Standards;
3. Final engineering shall be approved prior to building permit issuance by the City;
4. The applicant shall make a cash contribution to the Geneva School District in the amount of \$7,976.83; and
5. The applicant shall make a cash contribution to the Geneva Park District in the amount of \$11,051.90.

Aye: Case, Dziadus, Evans, Kosirog, Leidig, Mead, Slifka, Stevenson, Stocking

Nay: None

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 9-0

(This item will be on the February 13, 2017 Committee of the Whole agenda.)

Site Plan Reviews

A. Graham’s 318 Building Expansion – Applicant is requesting Site Plan Approval for a 3,515 sq. foot, two-story addition. Location: 318 S. Third Street; Applicant: Chris Lannert. The Lannert Group representing Robert Untiedt. On behalf of the petitioner, Mr. Chris Lannert, 215 Fulton Street, introduced Mr. Tim Nelson, architect for the project, and owner Mr. Robert Untiedt. Mr. Lannert reviewed plans for the impervious open space on the site, shared details of the proposed landscaping, and explained the easement St. Mark’s Church was willing to grant in order to access the two dumpsters located on the west side of the rear parking lot. Mr. Lannert stated that an existing delivery truck for catering would be parked in the front 30 feet of the driveway off of Third Street with the balance of the driveway to be sodded. Two trees would be planted along the north property line. A 17-inch tree would be removed but two trees would be planted in its place and \$20,000 would be paid into the parking fund for two parking spaces lost to the building addition, but in a phased program when the funds were due.

Mr. Tim Nelson, 421 James Street, Geneva, reviewed an architectural plan stating a majority of the addition would be to the rear of the structure to accommodate the business’s expansion. A review of

the interior's production area, serving area and seating area followed. Handicap accessible washrooms would be added. The second floor would include some rooftop seating and an office area. And the basement would be used for the production of gelato and ice cream products.

Materials for the proposed addition would include shingle siding in Craftsman-style and differ from the original building. A handicap ramp would be added. Mr. Nelson reported that a variance for lot coverage had been approved up to 75% and currently was at 72%. The Historic Preservation Commission also approved the conceptual design but it would have to return to them for final approval. Lastly, Mr. Nelson reported a six-foot rear setback variance was received from the city. As to how that compared to the Irish Sisters and Paper Merchant's setbacks, Mr. Lannert explained it would be midpoint between the two properties. As to the easement, Mr. Lannert also stated that the applicant would have to write an easement for the parking lot to place on the deed and be recorded.

Responding to Commissioner Kosirog's question about the addition being different from the main building, Mr. Nelson explained the Historic Preservation Commission looks for differentiation between the existing historical structure from any additions in the future and it is done, many times, through the use of different material. Chairman Stocking commended the HPC and appreciated them moving the addition back from the original location -- making it less of an impact.

Per Commissioner Stevenson's question, Mr. Nelson pointed out where deliveries would be made.

Motion by Commissioner Mead, seconded by Commissioner Leidig for Site Plan approval for a proposed 3,515 sq. foot, two-story addition of Grahams 318, and associated site improvements, subject to the five following conditions:

1. **The applicant shall contribute \$20,000 in lieu of parking spaces to the City of Geneva for two parking spaces lost to the building addition;**
2. **The applicant shall contribute \$1,218.80 to the City tree bank fund in lieu of providing 11 caliper inches of replacement trees, in accordance with Section 11-10A-10 of the Zoning Ordinance;**
3. **The applicant will provide an easement along the south and west property lines for utility services;**
4. **The applicant will secure and record an access easement from St. Mark's and the City of Geneva to utilize the parking lot access to the west for delivery and service vehicles; and**
5. **Final engineering shall be approved prior to building permit issuance by the City.**

Aye: Case, Dziadus, Evans, Kosirog, Leidig, Mead, Slifka, Stevenson, Stocking

Nay: None

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 9-0

(This item will be on 2/13/2017 COW agenda; Leidig steps away 8:08 p.m.)

B. Delnor Family Residency Continuity Clinic – Applicant is requesting Site Plan Approval for a 22,640 sq. foot Family Residency Continuity Clinic. Location: 298 S. Randall Road; Applicant: Christian Banks, Northwestern Medicine. (Stocking recuses himself; leaves meeting at 8:09 p.m.; Commissioner Mead steps in as Vice Chair.) Petitioner, Charles Cloutier, with Northwestern Medicine introduced his team: Chris Banks, Chris Hanson, and John Brown with V3 Companies. Mr. Cloutier summarized the intense training program that Northwestern has for its physicians, one of which is family medicine. The proposed clinic will be used to train resident physicians for the area and after completion of the 3-year program, to have those same physicians live and practice in the area (Leidig returns 8:11 p.m.) The program will add 8 residents every year for a total of 24 residents after 3 years. The subject building will also look like a typical outpatient

facility with examination rooms, lab space, and a procedure room but will also include components associated with the academic part of the program. The proposed building will be located between the Cancer Center and the Fitness Center along Randall Road in the under-utilized parking lot. Material for the two-story structure will include metal panels with stone and glass. Approximately 15,000 sq. feet of space will make up the first floor while 7,500 sq. feet of space will make up the second floor. Fifty-nine parking spaces are proposed, even though 58 are required. No variances were being requested.

Mr. Cloutier stated two alternative plans were also being considered for the project: 1) a pedestrian foot bridge that would connect the Cancer Center parking lot to the new parking lot; and 2) a green roof on the one-story portion of the building. Mr. Cloutier explained how the proposed building's material will blend with the other campus buildings as well as include a canopy similar to other buildings on campus. A new brownish-rust color was being introduced for this building. Mechanicals would be screened from view. A description of the building's interior space followed. Mr. Cloutier hoped to break ground this March/April with an official opening in June 2018.

Per commissioner questions, Mr. Cloutier explained the clinic will be used by the public for primary care services or individuals will be referred to the facility from Delnor's emergency department. Commissioner Case commented that the very pronounced canopy on the main hospital building does not protect very well from the weather, wherein Mr. Hanson explained that the canopy on the clinic's entrance would be about 25% lower than most of the buildings on campus. There will be no drop-off area in front of the building.

Mr. Cloutier reviewed the parking study in greater depth for the commissioners. Per Dir. DeGroot's question about changes to an 8-ft. screening wall, Mr. Chris Hanson stated that all changes had been made to the drawings that were out for bid and the screen wall was in alignment with the east facade of the building and to be within the setback requirements, as requested. The applicant also agreed to install a door directly into the water service room. Per another question, no subsidized housing would be provided for the physicians in training.

Motion by Commissioner Case, seconded by Commissioner Evans to approve the site plan and update to the Delnor Community Hospital Planned Unit Development to allow the construction of a two-story, 22,471 sq. foot Family Residency Continuity Clinic, subject to the following conditions:

1. **The screen wall located near the northeast portion of the building shall be reduced to a maximum height of 8 feet from 8 feet 4 inches;**
2. **The screen wall and east wall of the building shall be relocated outside of the 75 foot east setback; and**
3. **Final engineering shall be approved prior to building permit issuance by the City.**

Aye: Case, Dziadus, Evans, Kosirog, Leidig, Mead, Slifka, Stevenson

Nay: None

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 8-0

(This item will be on February 13, 2017 COW agenda.)

Public Comment – None.

Other Business

Dir. DeGroot briefly mentioned that Planner Evans had a family emergency tonight but that he did want some input as to whether the commissioners preferred paper packets or electronic packets.

Commissioners Case, Leidig, Stevenson, and Mead asked to have paper copies. However, Dir. DeGroot would provide some options and email them to the commissioners to choose.

Staff provided updates on the following: Geneva Commons, the Mill Race site, the Marquette/Cetron site; and Meadowbrook Manor. Staff also mentioned a recent resurfacing project that was planned for Route 25 (similar to the center turn lane installed on Route 31) but did not occur due to timing. Dir. DeGroot said he did not expect a meeting for the second week in February but instead, probably the fourth week. In closing, he said he did appreciate the commissioners' discussion on the Stanton project and the compromise recommended.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m. on motion by Commissioner Evans, seconded by Commissioner Leidig. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote of 8-0.