

**Minutes of the Regular Meeting  
of the Planning and Zoning Commission  
August 19, 2020**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

The Regular Meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission was held on Wednesday, August 19, 2020 at the Public Services Facility, 1000 Bowes Road, South Elgin, IL. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Brian Carlson.

Chairman Carlson stated the role of the Planning and Zoning Commission and the procedures for the meeting.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners present were: Chairman Brian Carlson; Tom Kusswurm; Vice-Chairman Jennifer McClure; Leo Metz; Jason Micklevitz; and Rich Watson.

Members absent were: Cynthia Tarka.

Staff present at the meeting were: Director of Community Development Nancy Hill; Planner Lauren Blayney; and Recording Secretary Dione Stirmell.

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. Minutes of the July 15, 2020 Regular Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting.

A motion was made by Member Watson to approve the minutes of the July 15, 2020 Regular Meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission, which was seconded by Member Micklevitz. There was no further discussion of the motion. The vote was as follows:

Ayes:	Carlson, McClure, Metz, Micklevitz, Watson
Nays:	None
Abstain:	Kusswurm
Absent:	Tarka

The motion CARRIED (5-0-1-1).

**D. PUBLIC HEARING & DISCUSSION**

1. CD 2020-10: Request for an Aesthetic Design Review, Major Site Plan Review, and Variations for a proposed Self-Service Storage facility located at 250 Randall Road in the B-2 Community Business District – Bravo Development, Petitioner.

Chairman Carlson opened the public hearing at 7:03 p.m.

Chairman Carlson verified that proper notice of the public hearing had been given, and Planner Blayney confirmed this occurred.

Planner Blayney explained the Petitioner is requesting a recommendation of approval for an Aesthetic Design Review and Major Site Plan Review, and is requesting the recommendation of approval for three Variations for a new self-storage building to: 1) reduce the percentage of metal paneling allowed on the total façade area; 2) to reduce the number of parking stalls required for the proposed use; and 3) to increase the maximum lot coverage percentage on the property commonly known as 250 Randall Road, located in the B-2 Community Business District. She added that the Petitioner meets all other regulations of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO), with the exception of the requested variations.

Planner Blayney explained that the Petitioner is proposing a 102,287 square foot, 3-story self-service storage building, with two accessory self-service storage buildings located to the south and west of the main building. They are also proposing a future accessory self-service building along the west property line to be built at another time.

Representatives of the Petitioner were Jeff Jones, Ira Katz, and Bill Barbat of 9S151 Skylane Drive, Naperville, IL 60565.

Mr. Jones explained that the building façade of the main building will be constructed of split-face block, prefinished metal insulated paneling, prefinished metal insulation paneling with a rib pattern, and clear insulated glass. He added that Mr. Barbat lives within close proximity of the site and has special interest in this particular facility. Mr. Barbat stated he believes the aesthetics of the building fits in well into the surrounding area.

Chairman Carlson opened the hearing to comments and questions from the Commission.

Member Kusswurm inquired what type of material would be used for the fencing. Mr. Barbat replied ornamental fencing would be installed. Member Kusswurm asked if they would be allowing outdoor storage for recreational vehicles, such as boats or campers. Mr. Barbat said no there would be no outdoor storage.

Member Watson expressed concerns about the amount of parking proposed and the variation request to reduce the number of required parking stalls. Member Watson asked if the petitioner could work with staff to come up with a creative way to provide additional parking on the site. Mr. Jones explained that they have other facilities that have more storage units and less parking and they have never had an issue with parking. Furthermore, they have found that most people will park in front of their storage units.

Planner Blayney explained, as part of the variation request, that the Petitioner is proposing 13 parking stalls, including one accessible parking stall, in front of the building. The number of parking stalls proposed does not meet the minimum required by the UDO, hence the variation

request. However, staff believes that the proposed parking stalls displayed on the site plan would be sufficient for this type of use, especially since there is room to park behind the gates, in front of each accessory storage building overhead door.

Chairman Carlson felt that the parking variation contradicted the intention of the recently adopted UDO. Vice Chairman McClure agreed with Chairman Carlson's concern and asked how many parking stalls would have been required under the previous Zoning Ordinance. She also asked how the current requirements were determined by the planning consultant, which prepared the UDO. Planner Blayney replied she did not know how Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) determined that number of required parking stalls, and emphasized that the UDO could be amended in the future if the Commission did not find this variation or the current standards acceptable. Member Watson recommended that the UDO parking be modified for storage units in the future. Planner Blayney added that staff would consider making a text amendment to the parking requirements for self-service storage uses.

Director Hill agreed that most people generally park in front of their storage units. She suggested that staff would work with the petitioner to display temporary parking stalls in front of the units on the site plan thus achieving some additional parking. Member Watson asked if they could add more parking on the north end of the building. Director Hill explained by adding more parking north of the building would increase the lot coverage on the site. Chairman Carlson felt that Director Hill's suggestion was a viable option and he did not want to add to the amount of pavement on the property. Mr. Jones said they could stripe in front of the outside storage units by the overhead doors to create more parking.

The Commission generally agreed that they could support the proposed project with the suggestions outlined by Director Hill to allow temporary parking stalls in front of the storage units.

Chairman Carlson suggested the Commission discuss the variation request to reduce the percentage of metal paneling allowed on the total façade area.

Member Watson commented that he was not comfortable with increasing the percentage of metal paneling allowed on the total façade area. Member Watson reiterated that the UDO was adopted to set design guidelines and standards for commercial building design. Member Watson stated granting this variation would set a precedent to future developments in the area, and he was not in favor of doing that.

Mr. Jones felt the site is unique having the railroad to the north, and an unincorporated area to the west. He felt the aesthetic design regulations create hardships and economic difficulties due to the unique attributes of the property. He continued to emphasize the building is not fronting on Randall Road, as it abuts the railroad tracks and fronts onto a private road. Mr. Jones reviewed the project budget, including costs of the building construction and the cost of the land, and felt this particular variation would be needed to allow them to construct this building. He added if it is not recommended for approval then the development may not come

to fruition. Member Metz understood the uniqueness of the site, and felt staff should consider changing the building façade requirements when a building faces railroad tracks. Chairman Carlson stated the financial burden created by the petitioner would not influence the decision of the Planning and Zoning Commission. He further stated that he did agree that the lot is unique. He suggested that meet south and east elevations of the main building (those most seen by the public) meet the requirements of the UDO - the metal siding and metals wall panels shall not exceed 20% of the total façade area - and the remaining building elevations will resemble the elevations presented. The Commission discussed this proposal, and the Petitioner stated they were willing to work with staff on that suggestion.

Member Kusswurm asked if the signage that the petitioner is proposing meets the Village Code requirements. Planner Blayney explained the proposed signage shown meets Village sign regulations; therefore, no sign variations are required at this time. A separate sign permit will be required prior to the signage installation. Member Kusswurm then asked if the petitioner is planning to install any freestanding signs on the property. Planner Blayney said no; however, there is an empty sign face on the existing freestanding sign at the northwest corner of Randall Road and Gyorr Road shared by this subdivision reserved for the subject property.

With no further discussion, Chairman Carlson entertained a motion to accept the Findings of Fact:

1. The proposed variation use will not endanger the health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the public.
2. The proposed variation is compatible with the character of adjacent properties and other property within the immediate vicinity of the proposed variation.
3. The proposed variation alleviates an undue hardship created by the literal enforcement of this Ordinance.
4. The proposed variation is necessary due to the unique physical attributes of the subject property, which were not deliberately created by the applicant.
5. The proposed variation represents the minimum deviation from the regulations of this Ordinance necessary to accomplish the desired improvement of the subject property.
6. The proposed variation is consistent with the intent of the elements of the Comprehensive Plan, this Ordinance, and the other land use policies of the Village.

A motion was made by Vice Chairman McClure that the Planning and Zoning Commission accept the Findings of Fact with conditions outline for building material coverage and parking, and was seconded by Member Kusswurm.

There was no further discussion of the motion. The vote was as follows:

Ayes:	Carlson, Kusswurm, Metz, McClure, Micklevitz, Watson
Nays:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Tarka

The motion CARRIED (6-0-0-1).

With no further testimony, Chairman Carlson entertained a motion to close the public hearing.

A motion was made by Watson to close the public hearing, which was seconded by Member Micklevitz. There was no further discussion of the motion. The vote was as follows:

Ayes:	Carlson, Kusswurm, Metz, McClure, Micklevitz, Watson
Nays:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Tarka

The motion CARRIED (6-0-0-1). Chairman Carlson closed the public hearing at 7:45p.m.

Vice Chairman McClure made a motion that the Planning and Zoning Commission recommend approval to the Village Board of petition CD 20-10 for an aesthetic design review, major site plan review and variations for a new self-service storage facility located at 250 Randall Road in the B-2 Community Business District with the following conditions:

1. That the building elevations to be revised to show that on the south and east elevations of the main building the UDO be met, that the elevations of the accessory storage buildings facing the south and west property lines meet the UDO requirements. Otherwise, the other elevations, including the north and west elevations of the main building may remain as shown in the diagrams presented.
2. That the site plan be revised to show short-term temporary parking spaces in front of the accessory storage units.

The motion was seconded by Member Watson. There was no further discussion of the motion. The vote was as follows:

Ayes:	Carlson, Kusswurm, Metz, McClure, Micklevitz, Watson
Nays:	None
Abstain:	None
Absent:	Tarka

The motion CARRIED (6-0-0-1)

**E. DISCUSSION:**

1. CD 20-12: Concept Plan Consultation for a Major Subdivision request for the property commonly known as the Cavitt Farm – M/I Homes, applicant.

Planner Blayney explained that the applicant, M/I Homes, is requesting feedback on a Concept Plan for a Townhome and Single-Family Residential Subdivision for the property commonly known as the Cavitt Farm. Planner Blayney further explained the Cavitt Farm property consists of 120-acres. This proposal is to only annex approximately 90 of the 120-acres. This property is not currently annexed into the Village of South Elgin and, therefore, would require annexation into the Village. Among other entitlements, rezoning of the property and an annexation agreement will be necessary.

She explained that the applicant is proposing a residential subdivision containing townhomes and single-family dwelling units. The applicant is proposing approximately 110 townhome units, and approximately 218 single-family dwelling units. In staff's initial feedback to the applicant, staff indicated the Village's preference for there to be one large park, 10-11-acre in size, located north of North Lancaster Road, along the western property line, adjacent to the Spohr Family Farm property. This would allow for the park to potentially increase in size with any potential residential development that may occur on the Spohr Family Farm to the west in the future. Staff's envisions the park in this development to be an active park and to also serve the surrounding residential uses. Planner Blayney explained that the Village is aware that there is a fen south of this property, and the entire area has been designated by the Village as an aquifer sensitivity area. This means that special precautions need to be taken when developing this property. As outlined in this Plan and the Comprehensive Plan, bike paths should be installed along the north side of North Lancaster Road and meet with the future bike path along the west side of McLean Boulevard.

Planner Blayney explained there are other activities happening in the area of which the Planning and Zoning Commission should be aware that could affect the development, which include the McLean Boulevard improvements, the need for additional public infrastructure to serve this property and other surrounding areas, and stormwater management issues.

Representatives of the applicant present were Marc McLaughlin of M/I Homes, 400 E. Diehl Road, Naperville, IL 60563; Russ Whitaker of Rosanova & Whitaker Ltd, 127 Aurora Avenue, Naperville, IL 60540; and Marty Burke of Mackie Engineering 9575 W. Higgins Road, Suite 500, Rosemont, IL 60018.

Mr. McLaughlin explained that M/I Homes is the 13<sup>th</sup> largest homebuilder in the nation and operates in nine states, including Illinois. He explained that in the Chicagoland area M/I Homes

is the third largest homebuilder. He added they have 500 homes closings projected this year and they are currently planning projects in Des Plaines, Grayslake, North Aurora, and Palatine.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that the proposed project would be a subdivision conforming to the R2 and R3 zoning standards, with no variations being requested for density or setback standards. He explained that the will meet the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, Kane Country Stormwater Management Ordinance, the Bike Pedestrian Plan Goals and the Fen Groundwater Recharge Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. McLaughlin explained that the proposed development is split between the St. Charles Township and Elgin Township, and School District 303 and U-46 School District and he showed the dividing line between these areas. He explained there would be two different single-family home types. The "Single-Family A" part of the development will include 115 homes and is to be located in the Elgin Township and in the U-46 School District. The "Single-Family B" part of the development will include 103 homes, the lots will be larger in size, and is to be located in the St. Charles Township and in School District 303.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that the townhome models were a new product being rolled out for the South Elgin development. M/I Homes is calling the product it's Smart Series, which means buyers can choose from pre-designed plans and packages with limited options and upgrades, which takes the stress out of some of the decision making for buyers.

He explained that they will be offering nine different single-family home models that range between 1,457 and 2,782 square feet. He added they would include 2-5 bedrooms, 2-3 bathrooms and 2-3 garages. He showed color renderings of the various model homes. He explained that M/I Homes is excited to introduce a new M/I Homes townhome model with rear-loading garages.

Chairman Carlson opened the hearing to comments and questions from the Commission.

Chairman Carlson asked if North Lancaster Road would be extended to the industrial subdivision. Mr. McLaughlin said yes, they will connect North Lancaster Road McLean Boulevard to the existing industrial subdivision on the west.

Member Kusswurm asked if they would have a traffic signal at the southern entrance of the development. Mr. McLaughlin said no.

Member Watson suggested that turn lanes be added to the entrances. Mr. McLaughlin replied they would work with IDOT and the Village to determine if turn lanes are warranted. Member Watson asked if the widening of McLean Boulevard would be completed by the time M/I Homes started their project. Mr. McLaughlin said they will coordinate the timing with the Village. Member Watson stated he liked the project and felt it was a good location for the type of development.

Member Metz asked about the price points of the units. Mr. McLaughlin replied he was not sure of the price ranges at this time.

Member Watson asked if they would have any covenants. Mr. McLaughlin said yes. Member Watson asked if they will have sufficient snow removal. Mr. McLaughlin replied yes. Member Watson confirmed that they would have appropriate detention and would asked how it would be maintained. Mr. McLaughlin replied that the Home Owners Association (HOA) would maintain it. Director Hill added that the Village will require a dormant Special Service Area be put into place to maintain the stormwater ponds should the HOA fail to do so in the future.

Member Micklevitz asked if M/I Homes would be requesting any variations from the UDO. Mr. McLaughlin replied no. Member Micklevitz stated he would not support variations pertaining to building setbacks.

Vice Chairman McClure asked if they would have sufficient parking. To which Mr. McLaughlin said they would meet all the parking requirements. He added that all the townhomes would have two car garages as well as a driveway to allow two full parking spaces in front of each unit. Vice Chairman McClure asked if they would connect to the bike path being constructed along McLean Boulevard. Mr. McLaughlin said yes. Vice Chairman McClure asked if they were using the detention pond for a buffer from McLean Boulevard. Mr. McLaughlin said the locations of the detention ponds are located at the lowest points of the property. Chairman Carlson asked if the detention would be wet- or dry-bottom ponds. Mr. Burke replied that it would be dictated by the Kane County Stormwater Ordinance requirements and would be determined once preliminary engineering begins.

Member Kusswurm asked if they would have sidewalks on the both of sides of the street. Mr. McLaughlin replied yes.

Chairman Carlson asked if they would have landscape buffers or sound walls installed when McLean Boulevard is widened to reduce traffic noise. Mr. McLaughlin replied they would work with IDOT and the Village to provide some kid of buffer. Chairman Carlson reminded Mr. McLaughlin that they would likely have to participate in the cost of the traffic signal at McLean Boulevard. Mr. McLaughlin said the developer understood this requirement and it would be negotiated as part of the annexation agreement.

Mr. McLaughlin thanked the Planning and Zoning Commission for their input and concluded his presentation.

**F. NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business to report.

**G. PUBLIC COMMENT**



No members of the public came forward to address the Commission.

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

Having no further business, a motion was made by Vice Chairman McClure to adjourn the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission, which was seconded by Member Watson.

With a voice vote of all ayes and no nays, the motion CARRIED (6-0-0-1). Chairman Carlson adjourned the meeting at 8:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Dione Stirmell  
Recording Secretary