

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLAN COMMISSION HELD ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2021 AT THE WILLOWBROOK POLICE DEPARTMENT, TRAINING ROOM, 7760 QUINCY STREET, WILLOWBROOK, ILLINOIS

**DUE TO THE COVID19 PANDEMIC THE VILLAGE WILL BE UTILIZING A ZOOM CONFERENCE CALL FOR THIS MEETING**

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kopp called the meeting to order at the hour of 7:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Those physically present at VOW Police station were Chairman Kopp and Commissioner Soukup  
Present Via Zoom COVID -19 Pandemic were Commissioners Remkus, Kaczmarek, Kaucky, Walec,  
Vice Chairman Wagner and Building Official Roy Giuntoli

Also, present Via Zoom were Planning Consultant Anne Choi from the Village Hall

ABSENT: Recording Secretary Lisa Shemroske

3. OMNIBUS VOTE AGENDA

The items on the Omnibus Vote Agenda were as follows:

- A. Waive Reading of Minutes (APPROVE)
- B. Minutes – Regular Meeting January 13,2021

**MOTION:** Made by Commissioner Remkus seconded by Vice Chairman Wagner approve the Omnibus Vote Agenda as presented.

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

4. PLAN COMMISSION CONSIDERATION: Continuation of Zoning Hearing Case 21-01: Consideration of a petition requesting approval of a special use permit for a fast-food establishment and a special use permit for a drive-through in the B-2 Community Shopping District, including certain variations from Title 9 of the Village Code. The applicant seeks to demolish the existing gas/service station and construct a one-story building and drive-through with associated site improvements on the property. The Applicant is Hakim Yala of Panda Express, Inc, 1683 Walnut Grove Avenue, Rosemead CA 91770. The Property owner is the True North Energy, LLC 10346 Brecksville Road, Brecksville OH 44141.

A. PUBLIC HEARING

B. DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION

See Court Reporter Minutes for Discussion and Recommendation

**MOTION:** Based on the submitted petition and testimony presented, I move that the Plan Commission approve and adopt the Findings of Fact submitted in response to the Standards for Special Use Permits and Standards for Variations outlined in Attachments 3 and 4, respectively, of the staff report prepared for PC 21-01 for the February 3, 2021 Plan Commission meeting; and that the Plan Commission recommend to the Village Board approval of a special use for a fast food establishment with a drive-through, including the list of modified variations, as outlined in the staff report prepared for PC 21-01 for the February 3, 2021 Plan Commission meeting, and as deliberated by the Plan Commission, according to the plans listed in the Staff Report for PC 21-01 for the February 3, 2021 Plan Commission meeting, and subject to the fourteen (14) enumerated conditions listed in the staff report prepared for PC 21-01.

Made by Commissioner Kaucky and second by Commissioner Rimkus, all in favor.

Roll Call votes: AYES: Commissioners Remkus, Soukup, Kaczmarek, Kaucky, Walec, Vice Chairman Wanger, and Chairman Kopp NAYS: None

**MOTION DECLARED CARRIED**

5. **PLAN COMMISION CONSIDERATION:** Zoning Hearing Case 21-03: Consideration of a petition requesting approval of a special use permit for a planned unit development, including a financial institution with drive through, fast-food establishment with drive through, an automobile washing and cleaning facility, including certain relief, exceptions and variations from Title 9 and Title 10 of the Village Code; approval of a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision; and approval of a Preliminary Plat of PUD. The applicant for this petition is Alex Katz of G.W. Property Group LLC, 2211 N Elston Ave, suite 304, Chicago IL 60614. The property owner is Viren -Gill Ltd., LLC, 735 Plainfield Road, Willowbrook, IL 60527.

**A. PUBLIC HEARING**

**B. DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION**

See Court Reporter Minutes for Discussion and Recommendation.

**MOTION:** Based on the submitted petition, the testimony provided by the Applicant, and the staff report for PC 21-03 at the February 3, 2021 Plan Commission meeting, I move that the Plan Commission continue the public hearing to March 3, 2021 (or to another date to be determined) to allow Village Staff and the Applicant time to address the various issues raised by the Plan Commission and the Village Staff was made by Vice Chairman Wanger and second by Commissioner Kaczmarek, all in favor.

Roll call votes: AYES: Commissioners Remkus, Soukup, Kaczmarek, Kaucky, Walec, Vice Chairman Wanger and Chairman Kopp NAYS: None

6. VISTOR'S BUSINESS.

None

7. COMMUNICATIONS

Planner Choi informed Commissioners the two items that will be discussed at the Plan Commission Meeting scheduled for March 3,2021. One being for a Public Hearing for a Drive Thru Restaurant at Lake Hinsdale Commons and possibly the continuous of Zoning Case 21-03. Building Official Giuntoli informed Committee that permanent signals at Kingery and Plainfield are up and running and Dollar Tree should open next few days.

8. ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION:** Made by Commissioner Remkus seconded by Vice Chairman Wagner to adjourn the meeting of the Plan Commission at the hour of 9:01 p.m. all in favor

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED

PRESENTED, READ, AND APPROVED,

March 3 ,2021



A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Lisa J Shemroske". It is positioned above a horizontal line.

Chairman

Minutes transcribed by Building and Zoning Secretary Lisa J Shemroske

2/3/2021

**VILLAGE OF WILLOWBROOK PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE  
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

ROBIN HEJNAR

VILLAGE OF WILLOWBROOK  
PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE  
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
OF THE VILLAGE OF WILLOWBROOK

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2021

7:00 p.m.

RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS VIA ZOOM had at the meeting held before the Planning & Zoning Commission of Willowbrook, on Wednesday, the 3rd day of February 2021, commencing at 7:00 p.m., as reported by Robin Hejnar, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the County of DuPage and State of Illinois.

## APPEARANCES:

Daniel Kopp - Chairman

John Wagner - Vice-Chairman

Commissioner Soukup - Member

Maciej Walec - Member

Catherine Kaczmarek - Member

Leonard Kaucky - Member

William Remkus - Member

**Staff Also Present:**

Ann Choi - Planning Consultant

Roy Giuntoli - Building Official and interim acting  
Secretary

1 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I call to order the regular  
2 meeting of the Plan Commission of the Village of  
3 Willowbrook, and ask the temporary Plan Commission  
4 Secretary to call the roll.

5 MR. GIUNTOLI: Commissioner Remkus?

6 MR. REMKUS: Here.

7 MR. GIUNTOLI: Commissioner Soukup?

8 MR. SOUKUP: Here.

9 MR. GIUNTOLI: Commissioner Kaczmarek?

10 MS. KACZMAREK: Here.

11 MR. GIUNTOLI: Commissioner Kaucky?

12 MR. KAUCKY: Here.

13 MR. GIUNTOLI: Commissioner Walac?

14 MR. WALEC: Here.

15 MR. GIUNTOLI: Vice Chairman Wagner?

16 MR. WAGNER: Here.

17 MR. GIUNTOLI: Chairman Kopp?

18 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Here.

19 MR. GIUNTOLI: Planner Ann Choi?

20 MS. CHOI: Present via Zoom.

21 MR. GIUNTOLI: Building official Roy  
22 Giuntoli, I am here. The recording secretary is not  
23 present this evening.

24 Did I miss anybody else that needs to be

1 listed on this role call from staff of the Village of  
2 Willowbrook?

3 CHAIRMAN KOPP: All right.

4 MR. GIUNTOLI: No? Okay. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Next item on the agenda is  
6 the omnibus vote agenda. Do any of the commissioners  
7 want an item removed from the omnibus vote agenda?

8 If not, will someone make a motion to  
9 approve the omnibus vote agenda?

10 MR. REMKUS: Remkus, so moved.

11 MR. WAGNER: Wagner, second.

12 CHAIRMAN KOPP: All in favor say, Aye.

13 ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

14 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Opposed say neigh. That  
15 motion carries.

16 Next item on the agenda is continuation of  
17 Zoning Hearing Case 21-01, which is consideration of a  
18 petition requesting approval of a special use permit for  
19 a fast food establishment, and a special use permit for  
20 a drive-through in the B-2 Community Shopping District,  
21 including certain variations.

22 The applicant is Hakim Yala of Panda  
23 Express, from Rosemead, California. The property owner  
24 is True North Energy of Brecksville, Ohio.

1                   Ann, would you like to proceed?

2                   MS. CHOI: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Kopp.

3                   Before we start, though, we have a caller on  
4 the line named Matt. Can you give me your full name  
5 please?

6                   MR. WISZ: Sure. Last name is Wisz, W-i, S  
7 as in Sam, Z as in zebra.

8                   MS. CHOI: Okay. Sorry, this chat room is  
9 shifting. Where did they just go?

10                  And are you here for Panda Express, or are  
11 you here for the 735 Plainfield?

12                  MR. WISZ: The GYG Restaurant.

13                  MS. CHOI: Okay. And you said W-h-i-z?

14                  MR. WISZ: W-i-s-z.

15                  MS. CHOI: Okay. So I think this is  
16 probably the most participants I had at a public hearing  
17 at Willowbrook.

18                  We're just going to start with the Panda  
19 Express petition, Zoning Case PC 21-01.

20                  So the petitioner is requesting approval of  
21 the special use permit, including certain variations, to  
22 allow the petitioner to demolish the existing Shell Gas  
23 Station, and replace it with a construction of a  
24 one-story 2,300 square foot fast food establishment with

1 associated drive-through.

2                   The restaurant operator, as stated, is Panda  
3 Express. The proposed single-story building is situated  
4 towards the northwest portion of the subject property  
5 and will require several variations because the building  
6 will not meet required setbacks, required minimum lot  
7 area, and certain landscapes.

8                   So the property consists of a total of one  
9 acre. I am just going to note that, on the first page  
10 of the staff report, it is incorrectly stated as  
11 0.28 acres. The site is located at the southeast corner  
12 of Route 83 and 75th Street.

13                  The property is zoned B-2 Community  
14 Shopping, and is surrounded by the Willowbrook shopping  
15 center to the north, Potbelly's restaurant to the west,  
16 light manufacturing use to the east, and the Red Roof  
17 Inn to the south.

18                  So the subject property is currently  
19 accessed from both Route 83 and 75th Street via three  
20 driveways, two are located on 75th Street, and one on  
21 Route 83. I'm just going to share my screen and go to  
22 the site plan.

23                  Can everybody see the site plan on -- the  
24 plan commissioners?

1 MR. REMKUS: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Yes.

3 MS. CHOI: So, yes, there's two existing  
4 driveways, one is a right in --

5 THE REPORTER: Sorry, there's some feedback.

6 MS. CHOI: Can everybody who's not speaking,  
7 mute themselves?

8 So the Panda Express site layout proposes  
9 constructing new access driveways in the approximate  
10 location of the existing access driveways, with the  
11 exception of the right-in only site pattern. That will  
12 be closed off and curbed. The access on 75th Street  
13 will be a full movement for inbound traffic and limited  
14 to right-out only, right-in/right-out, and the access on  
15 Route 83 will remain as a right-in/right-out access  
16 only.

17 The single lane drive-through has a counter  
18 clockwise circulation around the site. It offers a  
19 second bypass lane after you pass the menu board, which  
20 is located a little bit north to the building. The  
21 proposed building can be accessed via the driveway on  
22 Route 83 for northbound travelers. Vehicles can enter  
23 here, side-pass parking, and then circulate around this  
24 way around the site.

1                   According to the traffic plan, which is on  
2 page 68 of your staff report, here, the proposed site  
3 layout is designed to provide a total storage length of  
4 seven cars for the drive-through window queue.

5 Placement of the menu order board is at the fifth car.  
6 Furthermore, two drive-through parking pick-up spaces  
7 are located here, and this would help reduce  
8 drive-through cueing as needed during peak business  
9 hours.

10                  The traffic study that was provided by the  
11 applicant has been reviewed by the Village's traffic  
12 consultant, who found the study to adequately address  
13 the first round of comments, questions and concerns, and  
14 no further response is needed.

15                  I'm going to go to page 20. Can everybody  
16 see this, the elevations here?

17                  MR. REMKUS: Yes.

18                  MS. CHOI: Okay. So the elevations are in  
19 black and white, but you can see that they provide  
20 variations in the choice of building materials. There's  
21 an additional number of brick in the facade, material  
22 changes, and variations of the roof line. Proposed  
23 building materials include a combination of brick,  
24 stone, EIFS and metal. Glass windows are also provided

1 on each elevation to allow natural light to filter into  
2 the building and provide street views for its patrons.

3 I'm just going to go to the colored  
4 elevation.

5 The proposed building elevations conform to  
6 the general conditions of the business district for  
7 building facade materials, and you can see these in the  
8 colored elevations here.

9 So I'm going to talk about the setback now.

10 The applicant is requesting three variations  
11 from the setback requirements of the zoning ordinance.  
12 Relief is requested from the 100-foot specific setback  
13 on Route 83, the 60-foot front yard setback also on  
14 Route 83, and the 60-foot exterior side yard setback on  
15 75th.

16 The subject property is further governed by  
17 ordinance No. 94-0-16, which provided significant zoning  
18 relief from this specific setback and in B-2 bulk  
19 regulations. This was applied to the gas station.  
20 Staff also considered the reduced setback of adjacent  
21 properties and the Village's history of allowing reduced  
22 setbacks in similar instances.

23 So I believe, right now, because we did  
24 receive some changes from the applicant today, they're

1 requesting a setback of 50 feet in the site plan that  
2 you reviewed, but that's being changed to 50.2. It's  
3 not a big deal.

17                   The drawings were black and white drawings,  
18                   so we have included a condition of approval that the  
19                   trash inclosure be constructed to look like masonry, and  
20                   shall appear similar to the color and style of the  
21                   building.

22 Site lighting was also evaluated. This is  
23 the photometric plan. I normally don't review these,  
24 but the engineer does, and he had indicated that the

1 site lighting is in general compliance with Village  
2 Code.

3                   Does anyone have any questions so far? No?

4 Okay. Then I will move on.

5                   We're going to talk about the landscaping  
6 plan next. This site, obviously -- this is the  
7 landscape plan -- is going to be providing additional  
8 foundation, interior parking lot and permit or  
9 landscaped areas. This is a huge improvement to what's  
10 existing.

11                  The landscape plan complies with the  
12 landscape ordinance, but they are requesting a variation  
13 from the width of the foundation landscaping located at  
14 the southern building facade. The site plan that you  
15 reviewed has it at 4.5. Our Code requires 7-feet wide.  
16 This has been further reduced to 3.8 feet as of today.

17                  I'm going to jump to the signage package.

18                  So one-freestanding sign is proposed at the  
19 northwest corner of the site, here. It's in the  
20 approximate location of the existing Shell Gas Station.  
21 A total of four wall signs are proposed, and the  
22 combined signage for the site is under the required  
23 total sign surface area. So they're not asking for any  
24 variations. They wouldn't be -- we wouldn't be able to

1 grant them anyway, because they're not part of the PUD.

2 The site also provides 46 parking spaces.

3 I'm just going to go back to the site plan.

4 The restaurant only requires 23 parking  
5 spaces, so they're very well-parked, and the fast food  
6 establishment is below the threshold of 5,001 square  
7 feet to trigger the requirement of a loading birth.

8 In terms of the contamination on the site  
9 from the gas station, I was told that the applicant has  
10 a purchase agreement in place with the current property  
11 owner, True North Energy. This agreement outlined the  
12 removal procedure for any contaminants from the existing  
13 gas station. It also states no further remediation or  
14 NFR letter from the Illinois Environmental Protection  
15 Agency, which is the responsibility of the current  
16 property owner and seller, therefore, the purchase of  
17 the property is contingent, that the current property  
18 owner obtain the NFR letter from IEPA. The Village is  
19 agreeable to this, and has added a condition of approval  
20 that the NFR letter will be required at the time of the  
21 building permit, if the seller and buyer have the NFR  
22 letters, condition of the sale at the closing.

23 So, lastly, I just wanted to note the  
24 modifications, because we did receive revised drawings

1       earlier today, as I stated. Let me open up those  
2       drawings.

3                   So the proposed building appears to have  
4       shifted to the east, just slightly, .2 feet, or the  
5       building envelope has expanded; and slightly to the  
6       south, just marginally.

7                   I'll defer to the applicant to explain why  
8       this is changed, but this change has impacted three  
9       other variations requested, two of the variations  
10      requested relief from the 100-foot specific setback on  
11      Route 83, and a 60-foot front yard setback.

12                  Instead of 50 feet, the variations would  
13      request reduction to 50.2 feet, marginally less than  
14      what was originally requested, and then to further  
15      reduce the foundation landscaping from 4.5 feet to  
16      3.8 feet, down in this area here.

17                  So staff does not have any objections to the  
18      proposed special use for fast food establishment with a  
19      drive-through. The building meets the users needs.  
20      Site improvements stated an approved situation than what  
21      exists today. The special use and requested variations  
22      as modified are supported by staff, and staff would also  
23      recommend acceptance of the written findings of fact in  
24      response to the standards of the special use permits and

1 variation in the zoning ordinance, which are included as  
2 Attachments 3 and 4 in the staff report.

3 So if the Plan Commission is supportive of  
4 the petition, a sample motion is found on pages 15 and  
5 16 of the staff report.

6 That concludes my presentation. I'm  
7 available for any questions. The applicant team is also  
8 here for any questions.

9 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Do any of the commissioners  
10 have any questions of Ann?

11 MR. REMKUS: No.

12 CHAIRMAN KOPP: That being the case, if the  
13 applicant would like to add to that, everyone who speaks  
14 will need to be sworn in by the court reporter.

15 MR. MAURIDES: My name is George Maurides,  
16 I'm the --

17 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. I'll swear you  
18 in.

19 (Wherein, George Maurides is duly  
20 sworn in.)

21 MR. MAURIDES: And I think I have a couple  
22 of our engineers that are on the call too, that you  
23 should probably swear them in also.

24 Brian, where are you?

1 MR. STYCK: Brian Styck with Atwell.

2 (Whereupon, Brian Styck is duly  
3 sworn.)

4 MR. MAURIDES: Thank you, everybody. I  
5 appreciate the presentation. It pretty well represents  
6 what we're trying to do here, and just a little bit of  
7 background before we get into this.

8 Panda Express is a family-opened business  
9 that's based in California, and was started by a father  
10 and son, and now it's run by that son and his wife, and  
11 they have now grown to over 2,300 restaurants, and  
12 they're in 11 countries and a thousand different cities.

13 It's a very well-run operation, and all the  
14 units are company run, they're family run businesses;  
15 and, as Ann said, we're seeking two things here this  
16 evening, a special use permit for the restaurant and a  
17 special use permit for the drive-through.

18 Today, around 3 o'clock, we got a letter  
19 from the IDOT; and maybe, Ann, if you could put the site  
20 plan up there, I can explain what the issue was raised  
21 by IDOT.

22 Can everybody see the driveway that's on 83?

23 So there's an existing driveway there right  
24 now, and we kind of designed our driveway to fit inside

1 the existing driveway, and when we got feedback from  
2 IDOT today -- I don't know if you can see it, but along  
3 the southern boundary of the property, there's a dotted  
4 line, and that's the property line. Can you see that?

5 MS. CHOI: Right here?

6 MR. MAURIDES: Yes, and if you extend that  
7 out into the street, you can see the bottom tip of our  
8 driveway, even though it's entirely in the right-of-way,  
9 it is actually south of that property line.

10 So IDOT came back to us and said, "Hey, you  
11 can't do that without getting a property line agreement  
12 with the neighbors to the south." Even though, right  
13 now, the driveway's there, and it actually goes even  
14 further south.

15 So we're going to have to reconfigure this  
16 driveway a little bit, and either move it a little bit  
17 to the north or get an agreement with the property  
18 owners to the south. We just found out about it today,  
19 at 4 o'clock. We don't know how much of a variation we  
20 might have to ask for, so we're looking for a little  
21 direction from the Plan Commission as to whether or not  
22 you're comfortable approving this property not knowing  
23 what this last variation might be, and either we have to  
24 work that out to staff's approval or come back to you;

1 and I don't know, Chairman Kopp, what your feeling is on  
2 that.

3 CHAIRMAN KOPP: To me it looks like it's not  
4 going to be a very significant change, so I would think  
5 that we would be willing to proceed with the assumption  
6 that it will just go up by -- I can't quite see, but a  
7 couple feet it looks like.

8 MR. MAURIDES: Yeah. Well, what it does is  
9 it pushes the edge of the driveway closer to the corner,  
10 and that's the variation we currently have, because the  
11 existing driveway is non-conforming. So if we scooch it  
12 up a little bit, it's going to increase -- it's one of  
13 our listed variations already, but we don't know, quite  
14 honestly, when engineers do their things, with the  
15 radiiuses and stuff, how it's going to end up looking,  
16 but we think we can accommodate it; and, actually, quite  
17 frankly, we might be able to go back to Tom Dellenbauch,  
18 at IDOT and say, "Well, we're making it actually  
19 smaller, less of an encroachment on the neighbor than  
20 exists right now, but can you live with that," but we  
21 just don't know the answer right now.

22 The way you published -- and it says for  
23 certain variations, but it doesn't list it specifically.  
24 So, apparently, you don't publish for specific

1 variations. If you're comfortable having staff review  
2 it and approve it in your engineering department, then I  
3 think we can proceed with the project today.

4 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I think we will be. We'll  
5 have to vote on that, but I'd be surprised if we're not.

6 MR. MAURIDES: Okay. I don't have a lot to  
7 add besides that; and, Ann, I think, covered everything  
8 very well, and I think this is a good project. I mean,  
9 definitely, when you look at what's on that corner right  
10 now, it's a huge upgrade, and we're hopeful that you'll  
11 see your way to approving our request this evening; and  
12 if there's any other questions from any of the plan  
13 commissioners, I'm happy to deal with them, or have my  
14 staff of people that are on the call try to answer those  
15 questions.

16 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Do any of the commissioners  
17 have any questions of the applicant?

18 MR. REMKUS: No.

19 MR. WALEC: Regarding the tanks that are in  
20 the ground currently, are those going to be removed?

21 MR. MAURIDES: I believe that's the reason  
22 they want the NFR letter.

23 MR. WALEC: All right. Perfect. That's the  
24 only question I had.

1 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Is there anyone in the  
2 audience, the Zoom audience that has questions of either  
3 the Village officials or the applicant about this  
4 matter, or wants to make a statement about this matter?

5 All right.

6 MR. MAURIDES: What we're going to do then,  
7 once we figure this out, we'll give an amended list of  
8 the variations to Ann, and you put those in the motion  
9 or how does that work?

10 CHAIRMAN KOPP: That's a very good question.

11 So, Ann, could we proceed with the motion or  
12 do we have to come back?

13 MS. CHOI: I mean, it's a little bit  
14 difficult, because we don't exactly know what the  
15 impacts are, but I think -- just let me share the site  
16 plan again -- if the applicant cannot get -- is it the  
17 lot line agreement with the southern property owner?  
18 Because I think that would probably be the easier route  
19 to go, is you don't change the site plan at all.

20 MR. MAURIDES: Yeah, I just can't honestly  
21 say that's possible, because it's a Red Roof Inn, a big  
22 company, and none of us have had any contact with them.  
23 I certainly -- it may be possible, but it may take six  
24 months, we don't know. We just don't have a clue.

1 MS. CHOI: So I'm going to read the comment  
2 from IDOT.

3 It says, "Either provide a lot line  
4 agreement for the driveway encroachment with the  
5 property to the south or shift your proposed driveway  
6 further north with a three-foot offset from the southern  
7 property line per the enclosed illustrations." I never  
8 received an illustration, but --

9 MR. MAURIDES: From IDOT?

10 MS. CHOI: -- I think it's more than a  
11 three-foot offset.

12 MR. MAURIDES: Brian Styck is on. Maybe he  
13 can answer that question, but I think it's doable.

14 Brian, do you have the little drawing that  
15 we had?

16 MR. STYCK: Yeah, the drawing that was  
17 referenced in the IDOT letter, or the drawing that I  
18 pulled up that shows the existing driveway, proposed  
19 driveway?

20 MR. MAURIDES: Existing proposal.

21 MR. STYCK: Am I able to share my screen,  
22 Ann?

23 MR. MAURIDES: Can he share his screen?

24 MS. CHOI: Yeah, I'm looking into that.

1 MR. MAURIDES: There you go.

2 MS. CHOI: Okay.

3 MR. STYCK: So we had put together just a  
4 little visual a few months back, actually, that helps  
5 illustrate where the existing driveway, which is in the  
6 blue, and, obviously, our proposed one, which is shaded  
7 in.

8 In general, we've kept the driveway in the  
9 same location. We have shifted it up a little bit; and  
10 then, as George indicated earlier, where we're -- what  
11 IDOT's concern is, basically, if you extend this  
12 existing property line, plus a three-foot offset --  
13 that's not to scale, but where this driveway flare  
14 crosses that line is basically what IDOT is saying they  
15 don't allow.

16 And I will point out, we're not creating  
17 this new condition. This is an existing condition; and  
18 I would also argue that we're improving it, but,  
19 basically, this portion of the driveway right now, as it  
20 is, is not compliant, and, so, the options, like we  
21 discussed, would be that -- the easiest way would be to  
22 get a signed agreement, or there would be some  
23 combination of shifting this driveway up to get that to  
24 work.

1                   MS. CHOI: So I just eyeballed it, and it  
2 looks like, if you shift that up so that flare is  
3 completely outside of that red line, it looks like it's  
4 going to be about 30 feet.

5                   MR. MAURIDES: I don't understand where you  
6 get 30 feet. 30 feet from where?

7                   MS. CHOI: If the flare is supposed to be  
8 completely outside of the red line that Brian just  
9 drew -- and I'm just going to pick up the flare and move  
10 it up. Am I not reading that correctly?

11                  MR. STYCK: I don't think it would be a full  
12 30 feet. Just for a comparison here, here's a 30-foot,  
13 and then here --

14                  MS. CHOI: 20 feet.

15                  MR. STYCK: Little over half. Yeah, I think  
16 20 feet is a fair approximation for this conversation.

17                  MR. MAURIDES: The other thing that we  
18 wanted to explore with the Village was, we wanted to use  
19 the existing driveway. They've been in use for  
20 40 years.

21                  MS. CHOI: Was there a reason why you chose  
22 not to use the existing driveway?

23                  MR. STYCK: As part of the typical process,  
24 they will make a new driveway connection as part of the

1 whole site development and site improvements; and, so,  
2 in taking a closer look at our grading, since receiving  
3 the letter from IDOT, we're not making significant  
4 changes to the grades.

5 So we could reuse the existing driveway, if  
6 required to, or unable to shift the driveway to the  
7 north, or unable to reach an agreement with the adjacent  
8 property owners. That was an alternative option that we  
9 had discussed.

10 MR. MAURIDES: So you would -- so the  
11 existing driveway starts -- where's the right-of-way  
12 line? Where the sidewalk is, or in between?

13 MR. STYCK: It's almost right at the back of  
14 the sidewalk.

15 MR. MAURIDES: So we would just leave  
16 everything in the right-of-way, the way it is, and then  
17 build to the east, from there.

18 Is that correct, Brian?

19 MR. STYCK: Yeah, that was one of the  
20 options discussed.

21 MR. MAURIDES: If the Village would agree to  
22 that --

MR. STYCK: Yeah.

1 route of shifting that driveway, like, say, 18 to  
2 20 feet to the north, that will impact -- I feel like --  
3 the stacking for the drive-through lane on the west side  
4 of the building. You know, I'm not sure if that will  
5 have to shift.

6 MR. STYCK: I think, with this curb in it,  
7 it would just straighten this out more. So I don't  
8 believe there would be any impact to the building or the  
9 drive-through south.

10 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I don't see any issue with  
11 using the existing driveway personally.

12 MR. MAURIDES: I'm with you. It's just  
13 whether -- if the Village engineers are okay with it,  
14 then we're fine with it.

15 CHAIRMAN KOPP: You were trying to make it  
16 better, but IDOT's not letting you do that.

17 MR. WAGNER: Mr. Chairman, Wagner. I'm not  
18 sure why, really, there's a discussion about this with  
19 IDOT. It's not on the property, it's within the public  
20 right-of-way. So if they have some rule about it, and  
21 they can't be accommodated, I would suggest they either  
22 use the existing or modify it in some minor manner.  
23 This is all within the public right-of-way, not within  
24 the property line.

1                   MR. MAURIDES: That's why IDOT comments on  
2 it, because Route 83 is an IDOT road, and if we had not  
3 proposed any changes, and --

4                   THE REPORTER: I'm sorry --

5                   MR. MAURIDES: But the fact that they're  
6 making less of a difference --

7                   THE REPORTER: There's some feedback.

8                   THE WITNESS: So that's where we stood.

9                   Is there other questions on the rest of the  
10 project?

11                  CHAIRMAN KOPP: It doesn't sound like it,  
12 and it doesn't sound like we had any people from the  
13 audience that wanted to speak on this matter.

14                  So, Ann, it does look like the motion that  
15 you prepared does not have specific -- the specific  
16 measurements of the variances. It just says substantial  
17 compliance with the plan. So I don't think that .2 feet  
18 variation change, or -- what was it? -- 10 inches of  
19 landscape, or the change of this curb cut is a  
20 substantial difference.

21                  MS. CHOI: Okay. So what I'm getting is,  
22 even in the worst case scenario, if the driveway has to  
23 shift 18 to 20 feet to the north, the Plan Commission  
24 would not have a problem with that?

1                   CHAIRMAN KOPP: Let's close the public  
2 hearing and have a discussion. That's an excellent  
3 point.

4                   So Mr. Maurides, we also give the applicant  
5 the last word. You probably said what you needed to  
6 say.

7                   MR. MAURIDES: Yeah, usually I thank  
8 everybody that worked so hard on this, which was Ann and  
9 her team there, and Gewalt Hamilton, and all you folks.  
10 So we hope you'll approve it.

11                  CHAIRMAN KOPP: So I close the public  
12 hearing for Zoning Hearing Case 21-01. So then we have  
13 our discussion.

14                  I am in favor of this project. I think it's  
15 a huge improvement to what's there. I think my kids  
16 would kill me if they heard that I somehow was an  
17 impediment to Panda Express moving into town.

18                  As Ann said, the only thing I'm concerned  
19 about is the curb cut. Do we care if it comes straight  
20 in as opposed to that loop, which is what the affect  
21 would be? I don't know if anybody has any thoughts on  
22 this, but I'm prepared to vote "yes" on this today.

23                  If other people think we should reserve  
24 judgment until we figure out the curb cut, that's

1       certainly a defensible position.

2                    MR. WAGNER: I think this looks like a great  
3        project, and I think this driveway issue is more or less  
4        generated by IDOT. Even if they had to move it several  
5        feet in one direction or another, I don't think it's  
6        going to affect the outcome of the project, and I look  
7        forward to voting on it tonight.

8                    MR. WALEC: Commissioner Walac. Same thing,  
9        I would like to vote on this today. I think this is a  
10       great project. It's going to change that corner  
11       significantly.

12                  CHAIRMAN KOPP: Commissioner Soukup said the  
13        same as well.

14                  All right. Will someone make a motion that,  
15        based on the submitted petition and testimony presented,  
16        I move that the Plan Commission approve and adopt the  
17        findings of fact submitted in response to the standards  
18        for special use permits and standards for variations  
19        outlined in Attachments 3 and 4, respectfully, of the  
20        staff report prepared for PC 21-01 for the February 3,  
21        2021, Plan Commission meeting, and that the Plan  
22        commission recommend to the Village Board approving of a  
23        special use for a fast food establishment with a  
24        drive-through, including the list of variations as

1 outlined in the staff report prepared for PC 20-21 for  
2 the February 3, 2021, Plan Commission meeting, and as  
3 deliberated by the Plan Commission, according to the  
4 plans listing in the staff report for PC 20-21 for the  
5 February 3, 2021, Plan Commission meeting; and subject  
6 to the 14 enumerated conditions, will someone make that  
7 motion?

8 MR. KAUCKY: So moved, Kaucky.

9 MR. REMKUS: Second, Remkus.

10 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I ask the Plan Commission  
11 Secretary to call the vote.

12 MR. GIUNTOLI: Commissioner Remkus?

13 MR. REMKUS: Yes.

14 MR. GIUNTOLI: Commissioner Soukup?

15 MR. SOUKUP: Yes.

16 MR. GIUNTOLI: Commissioner Kaczmarek?

17 MS. KACZMAREK: Yes.

18 MR. GIUNTOLI: I'm sorry, I did not hear  
19 that.

20 MS. KACZMAREK: Yes.

21 MR. GIUNTOLI: "Yes," okay. Thank you.  
22 Commissioner Kaucky?

23 MR. KAUCKY: Yes.

24 MR. GIUNTOLI: Commissioner Walac?

1                   MR. WALEC: Yes.

2                   MR. GIUNTOLI: Vice Chairman Wagner?

3                   MR. WAGNER: Yes.

4                   MR. GIUNTOLI: Chairman Kopp?

5                   CHAIRMAN KOPP: Yes.

6                   MR. GIUNTOLI: All "yes."

7                   MR. MAURIDES: Thank you, everybody.

8                   MR. GIUNTOLI: Thank you.

9                   CHAIRMAN KOPP: Next item on the agenda is

10                  Zoning Hearing Case 21-03, consideration of a petition

11                  requesting approval of a special use permit for a

12                  planned unit development, including the financial

13                  institution with drive-through, fast food establishment

14                  with drive-through, an automobile washing and cleaning

15                  facility, including certain relief, exceptions and

16                  variations from the Title 9 and Title 10 of the Village

17                  Code; approval of preliminary plat of subdivision and a

18                  preliminary plat of PUD.

19                  The applicant for this petition is Alex Katz

20                  of GW Property Group, Chicago, Illinois. Property owner

21                  is Viren-Gill Limited of Willowbrook, Illinois; and

22                  notice of this public hearing was published in -- I

23                  think it was the Pioneer Press.

24                  MS. CHOI: The Doings.

1 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Oh, in the Doings Newspaper.

2 Ann, would you like to present --

3 MS. CHOI: Yes, thank you.

4 So we have a caller -- sorry, I'm just going  
5 to do this -- with a phone No. (312) 860-9292. Can you  
6 please identify yourself?

7 MR. DWEDARI: Omar Dwedari, D-w-e-d-a-r-i.

8 MS. CHOI: So, as you may have received by  
9 now, a very thick agenda packet for this proposal -- we  
10 do have a lot of materials to cover, so please bear with  
11 me; and I think we have another -- someone else joining  
12 us too.

13 So the Plan Commission last saw a concept  
14 for this packet during the November 4th, 2020, meeting,  
15 the sketch plan review, so some of this is going to be a  
16 little repetitive.

17 The subject property is located on the south  
18 side of Plainfield Road between Route 83 to the west and  
19 Madison Street to the east. The site is about 2.79  
20 acres, and is currently approved with one building,  
21 currently vacant, but formerly occupied by the  
22 Willowbrook Bowling Alley.

23 The applicant, GW Properties, intends to  
24 redevelop the property into a three tenant mixed use

1 development that will include a car wash on the southern  
2 portion of the property on lot one, a fast food  
3 establishment with drive-through on the northeast  
4 portion of the property on lot two, and a bank on the  
5 northwest portion of the property on lot three. Cross  
6 access and cross parking will be established throughout  
7 the overall property.

8                   So the applicant intends to sell the  
9 southern portion of the property to Encore Car Wash, who  
10 will be developing the property and managing the  
11 1.2 acre lot. On the northeast corner, the applicant  
12 will be developing, approximately, 2,830 square foot  
13 freestanding building with one drive-through lane on the  
14 0.79-acre lot. The restaurant operator is Guzman Y  
15 Gomez. It's an Australian-based Mexican casual  
16 restaurant with 135 global locations, and one currently  
17 in Naperville, Illinois.

18                   And, finally, Chase Bank wishes to purchase  
19 lot three. It's also 0.79 acres, and intends to  
20 relocate from its current facility on the north side of  
21 Plainfield Road into a new 6,660 square foot facility  
22 with three drive-through lanes.

23                   So in terms of traffic circulation, the  
24 subject property is currently served by an existing

1 full-access right-in/left-in and right-out onto  
2 Plainfield Road. I'm just going to pull up the -- I'll  
3 share my screen in a moment.

4 Can everyone see my screen?

5 MR. REMKUS: Yes.

6 MS. CHOI: So the proposed development will  
7 construct a new access driveway in, approximately, the  
8 same location. Alex --

9 THE REPORTER: There's a lot of feedback  
10 coming in.

11 MS. CHOI: I believe this access has shifted  
12 20 feet to the east to better align with this fast food  
13 drive-through in and out. It also proposes a median  
14 separation between the right-in and right-out, here,  
15 with a driveway storage of, approximately, 38 feet.  
16 This will help deter vehicles from making a left turn  
17 into Plainfield Road.

18 So the subject property has an existing  
19 cross-access agreement in place with the Willowbrook  
20 Town Center, here, along the western portion of the lot,  
21 since there is a shared driveway between the subject  
22 property and the Town Center. The proposed  
23 redevelopment requires a relocation of the existing  
24 driveway between the two properties to be shifted

1 slightly to the south, approximately, 20 feet.

2 As you recall, during the sketch plan review  
3 back in November, Commissioner Wagner highlighted the  
4 bottleneck situation on Thomas Center Drive, here, and  
5 indicated that cars coming into the subject property  
6 from the traffic light would exacerbate the traffic  
7 congestion in this area.

8 So there was a suggestion given to include a  
9 dedicated left turn lane on the Town Center Drive, in  
10 the area right before vehicles were turning left into  
11 the subject property, and this suggestion was studied by  
12 the applicant's traffic consultants.

13 They ran a simulation, and the result of  
14 their simulation indicated that, when a southbound  
15 exclusive left turn lane is not provided at the access  
16 drive, vehicles queued back toward Plainfield Road,  
17 especially during the weekday evening and Saturday  
18 mid-day peak hours.

19 An exclusive southbound left turn lane was,  
20 therefore, recommended to keep the southbound  
21 through-lane clear and minimize a queuing back towards  
22 Plainfield Road. So a do not block intersection signage  
23 and striping are also proposed to prevent vehicles from  
24 blocking the access drive. This is reflected in the

1 site plan, and this was also reviewed by the Village's  
2 traffic consultant who agreed with the findings of the  
3 traffic impact study.

4 In terms of overall site circulation, a  
5 two-way internal driveway, here, serves as a main  
6 circulation path and runs between the proposed lot to  
7 provide separation and access to each of the three lots.

8 So we're going to jump to the car wash lot,  
9 down here. Does anyone have any questions so far? No?  
10 Okay.

11 So the single lane automatic car wash  
12 tunnel, it will -- it's exterior only, and it will have  
13 a clockwise location around lot one.

14 So patrons to the car wash entrance from the  
15 Town Center driveway will go down this internal  
16 driveway, and then they will head south. They have the  
17 option of making an immediate right or going west to get  
18 into the vacuum station. There's about 37 parking  
19 spaces here, and each have a vacuum station access.  
20 They can either make a right, or they can go straight  
21 and continue into the drive-up lane.

22 So there's, approximately, 30 vehicles  
23 before -- extending into the internal driveway. I think  
24 30 vehicles for stacking. Cars will go and pay -- there

1 is a dotted line here. I don't know if you can see that  
2 very clearly, but this indicates a pay canopy where  
3 patrons can look at a menu and pay before proceeding  
4 into the single lane -- into the car wash.

5 There will be signs and automated machines  
6 telling you when to go, and pulling your vehicle through  
7 this tunnel. Wave-by signage is proposed to drive  
8 vehicles to the circulation drive to minimize vehicle  
9 turning movement. In addition, a do-not-enter sign is  
10 posted at the end of the exit of the car wash tunnel to  
11 defer opposing traffic from entering the car wash tunnel  
12 or circulation drive from the one-way exit direction.

13 So when I spoke with the Village's traffic  
14 consultant, she had mentioned that car washes don't  
15 generally generate much traffic in the mornings, it's  
16 usually later in the afternoons and on the weekends.  
17 The peak hours for the car wash coincide with the  
18 shopping center's peak hours, and the busiest times are  
19 in the wintertime, after snowfall and summertime months.  
20 Typically, the highest business times are in January,  
21 volumes during the morning are less significant than  
22 compared to mid-day and weekends, and a little bit  
23 higher in the evening, but not in comparison to the  
24 mid-day timeframe.

1                   So I'm going to jump to lot two, which is  
2 the restaurant, here, for Guzman & Gomez. Vehicle  
3 circulation for the restaurant is much the same; in  
4 that, most cars will likely be arriving from the  
5 Plainfield Road access driveway, or from the Town  
6 Center, through this internal drive, and cars will  
7 rotate in a clockwise direction, so you will be ordering  
8 -- their order boards here, in this area. There's a  
9 little median, and then you'll pull up and pick up your  
10 order, and then drive out.

11                  The traffic impact study had indicated that  
12 there's, approximately, 11 vehicles accommodated within  
13 the drive-through lane without blocking the access  
14 drives or the internal circulation, and the study  
15 indicated that stacking would be sufficient to  
16 accommodate the peak demand of the proposed fast food  
17 restaurant. Wave-by signage is also provided, directing  
18 vehicles to enter through the drive-through; and,  
19 additionally, exiting movements from the drive-through  
20 are also under stop sign control.

21                  It's a little hard to see, but if you have  
22 your site plans in front of you, you could see these  
23 little numbers, and they indicate where the stop signs  
24 are located.

1                   So we're going to jump to the third lot, the  
2 bank lot; and the bank is located on lot three. Three  
3 drive-up lanes are proposed along the south wall of the  
4 bank building, here, including a bypass lane, here.  
5 Vehicles generally travel, again, in a clockwise  
6 direction when coming from Plainfield Road, or the  
7 shared access from the Town Center. Vehicles can access  
8 the drive-through lane at the Southwest corner of the  
9 building, here, and exit at the southeast corner of the  
10 building.

11                  The site plan indicates that, approximately,  
12 three to four vehicles will be accommodated within each  
13 of the drive-through lanes without blocking access  
14 drives or internal circulation. The traffic study  
15 indicates that it would be sufficient to accommodate  
16 peak demand for the proposed bank, and wave-by signage  
17 is provided.

18                  I think you had a 40-page signage package  
19 from Chase. They had a lot of private traffic direction  
20 signage included in their package; and, additionally,  
21 exiting movements from the drive-through should also be  
22 under stop sign control. I didn't see any stop signs,  
23 so we did include that as a condition of approval.

24                  Currently, the bank lot is also allowing

1 three parking spaces to be shared with the fast food  
2 restaurant so that the fast food restaurant can meet  
3 their minimum parking requirement, so as part of the  
4 approval of the preliminary PUD, a parking agreement  
5 will need to be executed to allow three of the parking  
6 spaces located on lot three to be shared with lot two,  
7 to satisfy the parking requirement, and this has also  
8 been included as a condition of approval.

9                   Does anyone have any questions so far?  
10 Okay. I'll take that as a no.

11                   The proposed development will also require  
12 an additional cross-access agreement since the interior  
13 vehicular circulation is dependent upon shared access  
14 between all three lots. As part of the approval, the  
15 preliminary PUD, the applicant will be required to  
16 submit a cross-access agreement, and indicate the  
17 required easements on the preliminary plats. This is  
18 also included as a condition of approval; and this plan  
19 also, here, says that there will be a future potential  
20 drive with the lot east of the property. This needs to  
21 be further studied, because I know that's a significant  
22 increase change along there, and it's feasible; and if  
23 the preliminary PUD is approved, this can be  
24 incorporated into the final PUD documents. And this has

1 also been included as a condition of approval.

2 All right. So I'm just going to talk next  
3 about the various different plans.

4 In terms of the comprehensive plan, it  
5 designates this property as community-commercial. The  
6 plan includes several pages of development objectives  
7 and policies and guidelines. These have been  
8 incorporated into the proposed project, including  
9 attention to landscaping, the signage, pedestrian  
10 connection, facade materials. Community-commercial  
11 areas are intended to provide a full range of retail and  
12 service uses in the community, within an emphasis on  
13 community convenience-related goods and services.

14 So the proposed B-2 zoning complies with the  
15 comprehensive plan. The financial institution is a  
16 permitted use, the fast food establishment and  
17 automobile washing and cleaning facility are permitted  
18 as special uses in the B-2 Zoning District, and then the  
19 two drive-throughs proposed are also allowed as special  
20 uses for permitted uses in the B-2 Zoning District; and  
21 the site is also located within the Route 83 Plainfield  
22 Road Business District plan. Commercial properties  
23 located within the boundaries of this plan are subject  
24 to a one percent sales tax increase over the property

1 that are not located within the plan. It should be  
2 noted that the applicant has not requested any financial  
3 assistance to offset their development costs.

4 I'm sorry, I am just admitting another  
5 individual.

6 Okay. So I'm jumping back into the site  
7 plan, the proposed PUD will --

8 THE REPORTER: Mitch, if you could mute.

9 MS. CHOI: So the proposed PUD will require  
10 a number of waivers to provide relief in the front and  
11 interior yard setbacks, as well as from parking area  
12 setbacks.

13 In summary, if the requested relief has been  
14 provided on page 8 and 9 of your staff report.

15 I'm going to talk about the trash  
16 inclosures.

17 There's two trash inclosures proposed on the  
18 site plan. One is located on lot one at the northeast  
19 corner, and then the other is located on lot two, along  
20 the southern portion of the site. I'm a little  
21 uncertain how these trash inclosures would be shared,  
22 but, perhaps, the applicant can talk about that a little  
23 bit later.

24 The trash enclosure on lot two appears to

1 house a normal dumpster, here, while the trash inclosure  
2 on lot one accommodates three trash compacters and a  
3 dumpster. We did get comments back from Tri-State that  
4 had some concerns about their emergency vehicle not  
5 being able to turn around this. It could be  
6 problematic, and it might block access to the  
7 restaurant's drive-through, so this will need to be  
8 further studied to the Village's and Tri-State's  
9 satisfaction.

10 So I'm going to jump into the signage  
11 packages now. Does anyone have any questions for me?

12 So I believe we received a revised signage  
13 package, and I think we have a handle on some of the  
14 question marks that were in your staff report; namely,  
15 I'm going to start with lot one for the Encore Car Wash.

16 Overall, there is three freestanding ground  
17 signs proposed for the overall development, and each lot  
18 is required to accommodate its own freestanding sign,  
19 promoting only the business of that lot.

20 So the proposed freestanding sign on lot  
21 one, it incorporates digital technology. That's not  
22 currently allowed by the sign ordinance, but they would  
23 like to incorporate this as part of their PUD  
24 consideration, much like the one that's approved for, I

1 think, Pete's Fresh Market.

2 Similar to that sign, language will be  
3 incorporated into the ordinance that will restrict  
4 brightness, how messages are displayed, the length of  
5 the time required between changing messages,  
6 restrictions that will permit only static messages, no  
7 animation of any kind, and dwell time. That will be  
8 consistent with whatever provision is in place, at the  
9 time the recommendation is afforded to the Village  
10 Board.

11 In terms of wall signage and proposed sign  
12 surface area, the number of signs and sign surface area  
13 for each lot exceed what the Code allows. A summary of  
14 the requested waivers are provided on pages 13 and 14 of  
15 the staff report. I'll just jump there.

16 So when we're talking about lot one in the  
17 staff report, we actually didn't finalize what the total  
18 sign surface areas were; but I think I finally got a  
19 package today, and I can definitely provide the question  
20 marks here.

21 So lot one, which is E1 -- it's actually  
22 indicated in the elevation here. This is technically  
23 considered a wall sign, and the proposed sign surface  
24 area is 435.4 square feet. If you notice below, the

1 total sign surface area allowed is actually 335 square  
2 feet. So this one sign alone exceeds what's required.

3 E7 are painted signs. Let me see if you can  
4 see the elevation.

5 On the east and west facade, you'll see two  
6 signs painted in brick here. They're 12 square feet  
7 each, for a total of 24 square feet.

8 Sign E2, they are technically considered  
9 root signs on the detached canopies over the vacuum  
10 stations and pay canopy. That sign is 91.4 square feet.  
11 So the total sign surface area requested, I have  
12 calculated as 694.1 square feet, and then the excess  
13 wall signage would be 359.1 square feet.

14 So ongoing discussions about signage on this  
15 property have resulted in improvements. However, I  
16 think that additional modification should be required  
17 before final consideration before the Village Board.  
18 The latest proposed sign packages were submitted today,  
19 and will need to be more thoroughly reviewed by staff  
20 for consistency with the proposed plan. The requested  
21 waivers to allow their prohibited root signs, digital  
22 signs, painted signs, as well as a number of waivers  
23 from the total permitted sign surface area location and  
24 number of signs, should be carefully evaluated by the

1 Plan Commission.

2                   Does anyone have any questions for me right  
3 now?

4                   Okay. Let's see. I'm going to jump to  
5 landscaping. Sorry, one moment.

6                   So in terms of landscaping, a significant  
7 amount of landscaping is being provided site-wide, as  
8 the subject property was nearly 100 percent impervious,  
9 and the proposed redevelopment would provide a more  
10 pervious area. Storm water control was not anticipated.  
11 Additional interior parking lot, perimeter landscape  
12 areas will improve circulation and safety, and a waiver  
13 from the zoning ordinance for reduced foundation  
14 landscaping, border planting around each building is  
15 requested for each lot.

16                   So I did have comments on pages 17 to 20 of  
17 the staff report. So we request that the applicant  
18 address the following, and revise drawings to the  
19 Village's satisfaction prior to any consideration before  
20 the Village Board.

21                   So, first comment is, the applicant shall  
22 provide signage packages that are complete and include  
23 the list of waivers pertaining to the sign ordinance.

24                   The preliminary plat of subdivision did not

1 provide any utility easements. The Village engineer has  
2 indicated that there are two ways that easements are  
3 typically granted for this type of development. The  
4 first and recommended option is for a blanket utility  
5 and drainage easement which covers the whole site,  
6 except for the building envelopes, and areas for each  
7 sign can also be accepted. The other alternative would  
8 be to grant an easement over the path of each utility.  
9 So in either case, the location of certain signage  
10 locations may need to be adjusted, or the alignment of  
11 the storm sewer may need to be adjusted to provide a  
12 little bit more separation between any sign and sewer.

13 The proposed site plan and PUD plats should  
14 include a depiction of all existing and proposed  
15 easements acceptable to the Village engineer and prior  
16 to any consideration by the Village Board. This has  
17 been included as a condition of approval.

18 The requirements also for the Village Code  
19 for preliminary PUD approval includes submission of a  
20 market study and an impact study. So in lieu of an  
21 informal study, the Village was agreeable to abbreviated  
22 memos, highlighting sales, property taxes, fees,  
23 employees from a very high level.

24 By now I think the Plan Commission should

1 have received these, and I'll put them on my screen in a  
2 little bit so the applicant can go into this in more  
3 detail; and, finally, there were comments by Tri-State.  
4 I did include the consultants review letters, and the  
5 Village review letters at the end of the staff report,  
6 but there were comments by Tri-State that could have  
7 impacts on the layout of the proposed site. So their  
8 comments had to do with drive aisle width, location of  
9 trash inclosure, and impact to emergency access.

10           Although the proposed uses are allowed in  
11 the underlying zoning district as a combination of  
12 permitted and special uses, the proposed uses may not be  
13 the highest and best use of the site. Chase Bank will  
14 be relocated from its existing location across the  
15 street, and there will be a concentration of banks along  
16 the south side of Plainfield Road. This includes TCF,  
17 Chase Bank, and PNC; and although the proposed car wash  
18 offers a different type of service, there are several  
19 car washes associated with gas stations in town, include  
20 a car wash expansion that was approved early last year  
21 at the northwest intersection of Kingery and Plainfield  
22 Road.

23           The proposed development also presents some  
24 challenges as the site will need to accommodate, at a

1 minimum, two high-tensity uses, less than three acres,  
2 and the project does propose -- includes nearly 60  
3 waivers, which may be an indication that the site may  
4 not accommodate accommodation of these uses of this  
5 intensity.

6 However, as a site has sat vacant for  
7 sometime, the proposed development will bring increased  
8 foot traffic, some additional tax revenue to the  
9 Village, and additional traffic calming measures on Town  
10 Center Drive and Plainfield Road. So staff has provided  
11 three sample motions, and we'll defer to the Plan  
12 Commission for the recommendation.

13 I did email the Plan Commission some -- a  
14 new condition, and the modified waivers based on the new  
15 information that we received from the applicant, mostly  
16 having to do with signage. So let me know if you'd like  
17 me to go over those, or if you're clear on that, but  
18 that, really, just concludes my report. The applicant  
19 is here to answer any questions, and I can answer any  
20 questions as well.

21 CHAIRMAN KOPP: All right. Do any of the  
22 commissioners have any questions of Ann? If not, the  
23 applicant can speak, and if you were on the meeting  
24 before, you know you -- anyone who's going to speak for

1 the applicant is going to be sworn in.

2 MR. KATZ: I'm Alex Katz, the applicant.

3 Along with swearing me in, you might as well swear our  
4 engineer, Eric Tracy, in, because he's going to be able  
5 to answer a lot of these questions.

6 (Whereupon, Eric Tracy and Alex Katz  
7 are duly sworn.)

8 MR. KATZ: I also want to make everyone  
9 aware, that we have representatives from each of the  
10 tenants on this property, so if you have any specific  
11 questions for the tenants, we can make them available as  
12 well.

13 Before I let Eric really get into the nooks  
14 and crannies of everything, I first want to thank  
15 everyone. This has been a very, very long process  
16 before we worked with the commissioner. I actually  
17 think the first meeting we were at was back in February  
18 of last year, February 3rd, and we've come quite a long  
19 way with the plan that we started there, to where we're  
20 at today. Obviously, with COVID, there were some  
21 changes, and the tenant makes up of air buds.

22 I think we've worked really well together in  
23 figuring a way to implement proper circulation, take  
24 your feedback and develop a plan on a property that's

1 really been sitting vacant for a significant amount of  
2 time; and what our goal was, aside from the bank  
3 relocating from across the street, was to bring two  
4 types of tenants we felt the Village didn't have, and  
5 they can compliment the Village, and prosper the  
6 Village, and we think we did that bringing in Guzman and  
7 Gomez, who, by the way, is not purchasing their  
8 property, they're actually leasing their property from  
9 us.

10 As Ann had mentioned, they're based out of  
11 Australia. They have 150-plus stores overseas. Their  
12 first location opened recently in Naperville, and  
13 they're looking at an aggressive role out in -- the  
14 second location they wanted was Willowbrook.

15 So I think we put together a really good  
16 comprehensive plan that allows us to have the  
17 circulation that is needed, and work well together in  
18 order to be able to create a nice development here on  
19 Plainfield Road.

20 CHAIRMAN KOPP: All right. Did you want to  
21 go into further detail with anything that Ann mentioned,  
22 or elaborate on anything?

23 MR. KATZ: There's one thing I'd like to  
24 mention, and then I'm going to let Eric go into some of

1 the other questions, with waivers and signs.

2                   In the site plan, there was a future  
3 proposed cross access with the property to the east.  
4 That hasn't been contemplated, other than we're open to  
5 that. We know we spoke with the Village about that in  
6 the past. We're open to it, but there's been no contact  
7 with the seller, or with the owner of the property to  
8 the east at that point.

9                   So it says -- I forget what it says on the  
10 site plan. I think it was possible future cross access.  
11 So I just wanted to make that clear.

12                   MR. GIUNTOLI: Future potential drive?

13                   MR. KATZ: Future potential drive, yes.

14                   Eric, do you want to elaborate on some of  
15 the things Ann had asked, some of the questions and  
16 comments that she had made based on the engineering that  
17 we had done? I think you're on mute, Eric.

18                   (Wherein, reporter troubleshoots with  
19 speaker volume.)

20                   MR. TRACY: Well, I'll try to speak up a  
21 little bit so you can hear me, and keep the mic close so  
22 if you have any questions, please cut me off.

23                   My name's Eric Tracy. I'm with Kimley-Horn  
24 & Associates, licensed professional engineer in the

1 State of Illinois.

2 One of the things that I'd like to highlight  
3 about this development is the improvement over what's  
4 there today. It really is a sea of asphalt; and the  
5 current condition, we're proposing a significant amount  
6 of landscaping on the site. We're not able to meet  
7 every code, but it's certainly well-above and beyond  
8 what's there today.

9 The infrastructure for the site from a  
10 utility and paving standpoint, it's going to be  
11 significantly upgraded, and right-in/right-out for the  
12 access to Plainfield Road is also a safety improvement  
13 up there as well.

14 So we've been working closely with Ann,  
15 really appreciate her efforts on this project. Dan  
16 Lynch with Christopher Burke, and Lynn Meads with Gay  
17 Walt [phonetic\_all], and we've been working with staff  
18 to address all their comments.

19 We've received some comments based on this  
20 most recent submission and attempt to address those  
21 before the Village Board; specifically, a couple that  
22 Ann mentioned. Signage, I think, we'll wait to hear  
23 feedback from the Plan Commission. We've worked with  
24 the different tenants to try to get packages that they

1 feel comfortable with, to promote their different uses.

2 Ann mentioned Tri-State's comments, and we  
3 did receive some specific dimensions for their truck,  
4 had modeled that on the site, and there will be a small  
5 change to the Encore lot, the car wash.

6 One or two vacuum stalls will be impacted.

7 We feel we can make it accommodate the movement with  
8 losing one vacuum space down there; and, Ann, I can  
9 provide you that exhibit for review, of course; and then  
10 many of the waivers are related to canopy setbacks,  
11 building setbacks. With this being a planned unit  
12 development, we're applying the underlying zoning  
13 setbacks to each individual lot.

14 So, for example, between the car wash lot  
15 and the bank, there's a common drive aisle in between,  
16 so pavement setbacks and that sort of thing can't be met  
17 there. So if you get the three uses on the site, plenty  
18 of the waivers really are related to it being a  
19 comprehensive development of three sites rather than  
20 one.

21 So I'm happy to answer any specific  
22 questions that anybody has about any of the plans or the  
23 submission.

24 MR. KAUCKY: Yes, this is Commissioner

1 Kaucky. I have a question regarding the restaurant.

2 Maybe I overlooked it, but I was looking for  
3 more information on the outdoor seating area that's  
4 shown in one of the prints. Can you talk to me more  
5 about that area? And maybe, if you have a photo of it,  
6 could you put that up?

7 MR. TRACY: Let's see what we have pulled  
8 down.

9 The intent is to have outdoor seating. I  
10 can share -- can I share my screen, Ann? Let me know if  
11 everyone can see that.

12 MR. KAUCKY: Yes, I can see something there,  
13 yes.

14 MR. TRACY: Excellent.

15 So this is actually a sign package, and you  
16 can see in the background, the floor plan and the  
17 outdoor seating area.

18 MR. KAUCKY: That's the restaurant inside  
19 that you're looking at? I mean, this is the restaurant  
20 plus the outdoor seating, that's what you're showing?

21 MR. TRACY: Correct. So I just rotated the  
22 page to orient it in the same way that the site plan has  
23 been, that you viewed. You can see Plainfield Road up  
24 here at the top of the page.

1                   MR. KAUCKY: Okay.

2                   MR. TRACY: So I will highlight the area  
3                   it's intended to be, the outdoor seating with a  
4                   connection to the restaurant, as a place for customers  
5                   to go on a nice day.

6                   MR. KAUCKY: That yellow highlighted area,  
7                   what type of protection is out there for the people that  
8                   are seated?

9                   MR. TRACY: They are proposing some type of  
10                  permanent fence at this time. The specific details of  
11                  that haven't been provided, but the intention is to have  
12                  that fenced off.

13                  MR. KAUCKY: And one more question. Maybe  
14                  I'm not seeing this, but to the right, to the top and to  
15                  the left, are there traffic -- is there traffic going by  
16                  in those three spots, those three sides?

17                  That area you just highlighted with the  
18                  yellow, to the right of that. Is there traffic to the  
19                  right of that?

20                  MR. TRACY: This right here?

21                  MR. KAUCKY: Yes.

22                  MR. TRACY: This is the drive-through lane.

23                  MR. KAUCKY: And I believe --

24                  MR. TRACY: From conversations with Guzman

1 and Gomez, this little pump out here is provided in case  
2 an order is not ready, a car can pull up and pull off to  
3 the side.

4 MR. KAUCKY: Is that a covered area by the  
5 way, that outdoor seating, or is that just open with  
6 tables and chairs?

7 MR. TRACY: I believe it's open.

8 MR. REMKUS: Okay. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Any other commissioners have  
10 any questions of the applicants?

11 MR. WAGNER: Commissioner Wagner.

12 Can you discuss in more detail the change to  
13 the entrance through the Harlem/Irving entrance that you  
14 are putting in the left turn bay to access this  
15 property? What kind of stacking is available there?

16 MR. TRACY: Yes, absolutely. There's not  
17 significant stacking here. We're really fighting to get  
18 this turn lane in as it is. Right now you're looking at  
19 one to two cars with part of that car being in this  
20 taper. Given the limitations of the access to  
21 Plainfield Road, this was the most we could fit in. At  
22 one point it was pursued to widen or -- see if we could  
23 widen the western edge of the drive, but that -- I'll  
24 show the aerial. There just wasn't adequate space to

1 accommodate that widening.

2 So that being said, I believe, as Ann  
3 mentioned, in the traffic study, it was modeled with  
4 this configuration and this storage. It did show an  
5 improvement in the condition.

6 MR. WAGNER: What is Harlem Irving's  
7 position on this?

8 MR. KATZ: Harlem Irving is in full  
9 agreement. We're working on amending that as we speak.  
10 They're totally fine with it. They think that it's --  
11 the benefit of having that left turn lane into our  
12 property, as well as that crosshatch area, the  
13 do-not-block area, which we'll also have signs that say,  
14 "Do Not Block Intersection," will allow traffic flow  
15 much better into their property, for their customers as  
16 well. They were actually very excited about it.

17 Because we're actually moving the access  
18 .20 feet to the south. Originally, the way it sits now,  
19 is actually closer to the corner at Plainfield Road,  
20 which allowed for even more congestion. So by moving it  
21 south, having that crosshatched area, with do-not-block,  
22 and the left turn lane, that will allow traffic to flow  
23 in and out of the property much cleaner, and allow  
24 traffic flow into their property. They were very

1 excited.

2 MR. WAGNER: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Anything else from the  
4 commissioners?

5 All right. Are there any members of the  
6 audience that have a question of the Village staff, or  
7 of the applicant, or want to make a statement about this  
8 project?

9 MR. ATASSI: Yes. My name is Hani Atassi.

10 THE REPORTER: I'll have to swear you in.

11 (Whereupon, Hani Atassi is duly  
12 sworn.)

13 MR. ATASSI: Good evening, everyone.

14 First of all, I'd like to express my serious  
15 concerns and my strong opposition to the proposed plan,  
16 particularly about adding another site for a financial  
17 institution.

18 As you-all know, we are going to end up with  
19 three financial institutions adjacent to each other.  
20 Chase, TCF on the east, and a TCF on the west.

21 So as the owner of 720 Plainfield, allowing  
22 this plan will be detrimental to the value of our  
23 property. As you-all know, Chase was looking to move  
24 into the proposed plan, and we will be looking to add a

1 full institution to replace Chase, which is going to be  
2 almost impossible due to the concentration.

3 So in addition, due to COVID, it's going to  
4 be -- it will take a significant time to find a full  
5 institution, and also would pose a risk to us, as owner  
6 of 720, of losing the special use permit that we've  
7 always been entitled on that property.

8 So I hope for the Village of Plan  
9 Commissioners to put that objection into their  
10 consideration, and consider how much improvement they  
11 are going to add to the area, if they're going to move a  
12 financial institution across the street and leave behind  
13 them an empty building.

14 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Anybody else in the Zoom  
15 meeting that would like to speak to this matter?

16 MR. KRISOFF: This is John Krisoff from  
17 Chase Bank. I'd like to speak as well.

18 THE REPORTER: I'll swear you in.

19 (Whereupon, Jonathan Krisoff is duly  
20 sworn.)

21 MR. KRISOFF: So thanks very much. We've  
22 been -- I want to second everyone else's thoughts on  
23 this. We've been looking at a possible relocation for  
24 our branch here for a long time. Willowbrook's an

1 extremely important and strong branch for us, and it's a  
2 long-term keeper, and we've had a lot of existing  
3 facility issues, and existing issues at our current  
4 location, so I think this would help solve a lot of  
5 those; the access, the issues beyond two floors, with  
6 the facility issues, the maintenance of the current  
7 property. So that would help. This project would  
8 finally help us bring this branch, allow us to make an  
9 investment in the community, to refresh our branch, and,  
10 really, kind of solidify our presence within Willowbrook  
11 for the future.

12 This will also allow us to own versus lease,  
13 improve -- right now, as you're trying to get into the  
14 branch from the eastbound on Plainfield, you have to  
15 make a very dangerous, maybe illegal maneuver to get  
16 into the branch. Also, the stacking from the new light  
17 goes past the branch of getting in from the right turn  
18 lane is pretty difficult as well.

19 I don't think the landlord mentioned that us  
20 leaving will allow them -- you will have to get another  
21 financial institution to backfill our location. I don't  
22 think that's possible. He can backfill with any other  
23 use, other retail. I don't think -- we're not seeing  
24 banks expand. We're not expanding in this location,

1 we're just relocating because of our current issues. I  
2 don't think there are banks that are expanding, so I  
3 don't think you can find a bank to backfill. So I think  
4 you can help steer him towards another retail use,  
5 potentially a tax revenue for us.

6 We're excited for this. It's something  
7 we've been looking, you know, for a long time, at  
8 different sites. We've come along ways, and we're very  
9 excited about this possibility in allowing us to  
10 reinvest millions into the Willowbrook community, and  
11 solidifying our future there. Thanks very much.

12 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Anyone else in the audience?

13 MR. DWEDARI: Omar Dwedari, California  
14 Kitchen.

15 THE REPORTER: I'll swear you in.

16 (Wherein, Omar Dwedari is duly sworn  
17 in.)

18 MR. DWEDARI: As the owner of the property  
19 of 720 Plainfield, and my partner Mr. Hani Atassi --

20 THE REPORTER: It's hard to hear you. Just  
21 talk a little louder for me.

22 MR. DWEDARI: Okay. As the owner of 720  
23 Plainfield, my partner had mentioned -- most  
24 important -- regarding the institute -- of the fourth

1 facility basically.

2 We have tried before to, basically, do a  
3 business at that property, and we were turned down  
4 pretty much, and delayed from the Village, because of  
5 the tax revenue. Because, basically, the Village,  
6 namely, looking for a tax revenue, retail income.

7 I'm told the development of the restaurant,  
8 and also the development of the car wash, and improving  
9 the area. However, we're going to have four banks at  
10 that time. If Chase moves across the street, and if we  
11 were lucky to get another financial institute to replace  
12 Chase Bank as another bank, which is very difficult at  
13 this stage, especially with the COVID situation, but the  
14 area's going to be congested heavily, and the access is  
15 going to be heavily between all the locations.

16 On the point that he mentioned regarding the  
17 access for Chase Bank, this was something that the  
18 Village approve, and -- when they did the turn lane, the  
19 transition lane for the development of feet and high  
20 curbing development. They didn't appose anything. They  
21 did not talk about that, or mention about the  
22 difficulties of the entrance from going eastbound or  
23 westbound. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Anybody else in the

1 audience?

2 MR. TARSHIS: Yes. This is Matthew  
3 Tarshis from Frontline Real Estate Partners.

4 (Whereupon, Matthew Tarshis is duly  
5 sworn.)

6 MR. TARSHIS: Good evening, everyone.

7 Thanks for taking the time.

8 I represent ownership at 735 Plainfield  
9 Road, with Byron. I have been working on behalf of  
10 ownership for a little over two years, and it has been  
11 quite a process. I met with some of the members of the  
12 Village. I was at the last hearing last February, that  
13 we had in-person. I just want to share some lots on  
14 marketing of this site, and kind of the overall state of  
15 the retail Marketplace.

16 So we've been marketing this site for over  
17 two years, and we engaged with some very prolific  
18 developers throughout the Chicagoland area, many of them  
19 have done significant developments in all of the  
20 suburban markets surrounding Willowbrook, and including  
21 in Willowbrook. We ran a complete process. It was  
22 extremely thorough. We vetted a number of different  
23 developers. They all had different plans. We spent a  
24 significant amount of time trying to figure who was

1 going to be able to execute on the right plan in  
2 conjunction with working with the Village, and the  
3 community, and the neighbors, in getting a real  
4 comprehensive plan that can actually get executed upon.

5 We understand how long this site has  
6 remained underutilized, and I think that was a big part  
7 of our marketing efforts, and we went through the  
8 process. Ultimately, we determined to try and move  
9 forward with GW Properties. We spent a significant  
10 time, and effort, and money in order to move forward  
11 with them, and we have done our best to work with  
12 everyone involved to try and get the right plan in place  
13 with the right tenants, and to try and move forward.

14 I just want to kind of reiterate that we've  
15 done our best to work with everyone involved, and we're  
16 very excited about what this plan can ultimately bring  
17 to the Village and the community.

18 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Okay. Thank you. Would  
19 anyone else in the Zoom audience like to speak to this  
20 matter?

21 All right. As I mentioned with the prior  
22 meeting, we always give the applicant the right to have  
23 the last word before we stop the public comment part of  
24 the meeting.

1                   MR. KATZ: I appreciate that, Commissioner.

2                   I feel like I'm repeating a lot of what I've  
3                   said already and what others have said, but we've spent  
4                   a lot of time, and we've worked with you guys. We've  
5                   taken the comments, the thoughts, your concerns, and  
6                   we've implemented into a plan that, at first, we thought  
7                   was great, but based on your feedback and some of your  
8                   experience within your own community, we think we made  
9                   it even better.

10                  We're thrilled, really thrilled with the  
11                  tenants that we have in place to move this forward, and  
12                  similar to what Matt said, even though he hasn't been  
13                  our broker on this, we vetted a number of tenants; and  
14                  for whatever reasons, they couldn't fit into the  
15                  project, and we wanted to get tenants that weren't  
16                  already in the community, and that could service the  
17                  community and make it a better project than what it is.

18                  So we hope that we've accomplished that; and  
19                  as we've worked with you in the past, we'll continue to  
20                  work with you throughout this to make sure that the  
21                  Village is getting what they want.

22                  CHAIRMAN KOPP: All right. With that, I  
23                  will close the -- or wait. I'm not sure I want to close  
24                  the meeting, because we may be continuing it.

1                   I have -- I will not close the meeting yet.

2                   I have two concerns, personally. Well,  
3                   three, but one we can't do anything about.

4                   Every time we've looked at something for  
5                   this property, it's always like there's one too many  
6                   things on it, but I understand that this -- that you  
7                   have to get a return, the seller has to get a return,  
8                   the buyer has to get a return, so everything is always  
9                   crammed in on this property. That's fine. We gave you  
10                  positive feedback on the site plan before.

11                  So with the specifics of this plan, I'm very  
12                  concerned about the signage. Normally we're pretty  
13                  accommodating to signage, but what we did when we gave  
14                  the Town Center a bunch of signage rights, we went  
15                  through and -- with the theory that, okay, if we're  
16                  giving Town Center signage rights, those should be the  
17                  signage rights we give to all of our retailers -- not  
18                  just new ones, but existing and new retailers, and, so,  
19                  we did some work on our signage ordinance, to make it  
20                  more modern, and more flexible, and, again, more  
21                  accommodating.

22                  I'm alarmed that someone is asking for  
23                  signage that's literally double of what would be allowed  
24                  under our ordinance; and I realize it's a car wash, it's

1 in the back of the lot, and they want to be seen, but  
2 that's just an awful lot of signage. Again, it's double  
3 what we're giving to the other retailers, and I just,  
4 personally, don't think that's appropriate; and then the  
5 other thing I'm concerned about, of course, is making  
6 sure that Tri-State's requirements are accommodated,  
7 because we don't do anything here that Tri-State doesn't  
8 approve.

9 So those are my thoughts, and I'd like to  
10 hear the other commissioners' thoughts, and then we can  
11 discuss whether we continue this hearing or we vote on  
12 it tonight.

13 MR. WAGNER: Commissioner Wagner. I'd like  
14 to ask Ann concerning our traffic consultant and what  
15 the position has been on this.

16 I'm really pretty skeptical about the  
17 entrance crossing with a left turn, and the number of  
18 cars coming out of the Harlem Irving development, it  
19 just seems like a major bottleneck. I think the project  
20 is good. I'm just very skeptical. There's a lot of  
21 traffic there now.

22 I'd like to know what our traffic  
23 consultants say, and I would also like to know how you  
24 can accommodate this level of business with the number

1 of parking and drive-throughs associated with this. It  
2 just seems, to me, that a two to three cars maximum in  
3 this lane just is completely inadequate. That's just my  
4 opinion.

5 So if there's some clarity to that, I would  
6 like to see some of it in the future. I would continue  
7 this hearing to allow for that information to be put  
8 forward. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Any other commissioners have  
10 any thoughts? Because my inclination is to make the  
11 motion to continue this hearing, but, again, if the  
12 majority want to vote on this, we vote on it.

13 MR. REMKUS: This is Remkus. I'd like to  
14 hear a little bit more about -- like Commissioner Wagner  
15 said, the way they're bringing the vehicles in there.  
16 Because if these businesses are successful, and we want  
17 them to be successful, they're going to be busy, and  
18 they're going to be backing cars up down that road, and  
19 we need to be able to figure out a way that -- Are we  
20 going to be able to accommodate that or not? If we  
21 can't accommodate it, and people are going to be stuck  
22 out on Plainfield Road, it just isn't going to work; and  
23 I know they can accommodate the Tri-State thing, so I'm  
24 not too worried about that. They lose a vacuum or two,

1 and you can make that corner, but what worries me is the  
2 way the cars come in off Plainfield Road, and then  
3 making that left turn into the facility. I'd like to  
4 learn a little bit more about that.

5 MS. CHOI: So I actually -- I did include  
6 all of the consultants' comments at the end of the staff  
7 report.

8 So I actually included both reviews. This  
9 project went through at least two reviews. As you can  
10 see -- actually, am I sharing my screen. Hold on one  
11 second. This is page 239 of the staff report.

12 Lynn Meade, who's our traffic engineer, had  
13 requested more information, but she did write that the  
14 revisions that they made adequately addressed the  
15 comments made and her concerns raised.

16 She did ask for -- I thinking -- more data  
17 on the car washes that they studied. I think she  
18 pointed out that five of the car washes surveyed were  
19 gasoline facilities, so she wanted more information on  
20 that.

21 But towards the end of the letter she states  
22 that the comments that she made would not materially  
23 impact the findings or recommendations of the traffic  
24 impact study.

1 CHAIRMAN KOPP: And did she specifically  
2 address the concerns that Commissioners Wagner and  
3 Remkus mentioned about the turn?

4 MS. CHOI: So I did have a phone  
5 conversation with her; and we were talking about that  
6 left turn lane, and she -- before I think they ran their  
7 simulation, she did think that it would be an  
8 improvement to the existing condition.

9 I relayed that to the applicant, and I  
10 believe that's when they ran their simulation, and then  
11 presented that finding in their traffic impact study.

12 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Well, yeah, but the existing  
13 condition is an empty bowling alley.

14 MS. CHOI: No, I meant the existing  
15 condition on the Town Center Drive.

16 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Oh, okay.

17 MR. WAGNER: Commissioner Wagner. There  
18 are -- again, in reviewing on page 18 of 35, where the  
19 police department has looked at this; and, specifically,  
20 in paragraph three, they're talking about leaving the  
21 property in the other driveway, at the northeast corner  
22 of the property, turning out right, and the police  
23 department thinks that there's a possibility that they  
24 can also turn left there.

1                   I would be concerned that this triangular  
2 island that helps prevent a left turn may need to be  
3 extended to the east a bit more, to force them to turn  
4 right, because I can just see people going out there and  
5 driving around that island and turning left myself.

6                   The other concern is the striped area on the  
7 -- Harlem Irving Drive, for people not to block the  
8 entrance to this development. I'm just very skeptical  
9 that this is going to work, because I happen to live on  
10 68th Street, near Madison, and just trying to get out of  
11 my street onto Madison just north of Plainfield Road,  
12 people block these intersections constantly.

13                  So I would hope that there would be some  
14 type of additional signage, flashing signage. People  
15 just don't seem to follow traffic rules much anymore.

16                  So I would hope that these things can be  
17 addressed. I hope the development is successful, but --

18                  THE REPORTER: You muted yourself on  
19 accident.

20                  MR. KATZ: Can I answer --

21                  MR. WAGNER: Thank you.

22                  MR. KATZ: Can I answer quickly?

23                  So, Commissioner Wagner, a couple things.  
24 One we will have signs that say do-not-block

1 intersection. If you want them lighted, we'll light  
2 them up. That's -- we'll work with you guys.

3 We understand that there is that concern  
4 there, and we will do whatever you need us to do, that  
5 we're capable of, to do that. So we have anticipated  
6 there were going to be signs that say do-not-block  
7 intersection, along with the crosshatch, similar to what  
8 you see in front of fire stations and things of that  
9 nature. If you want flashing signs, we're in. So we'll  
10 work with you there.

11 As far as the right-in/right-out on  
12 Plainfield Road, however it needs to be to magnify it as  
13 a right-in/right-out, we'll do that. That's what its  
14 intention is, so that's what we'll do.

15 Typically, T-bones -- or they're called pork  
16 chops, I'm sorry, are used in developing to push the  
17 right-in/right-out, but if there's concern that you  
18 still can turn left, without blocking the intersection  
19 or the right-in/right-out, we'll make it where it's  
20 almost impossible.

21 MR. TRACY: I can jump in and add to that as  
22 well.

23 We will -- that's going to be a concern of  
24 DuPage D.O.T as well, making sure that those cars and

1        vehicles turn right out of that access.  We'll meet all  
2        their standards, and we'll have to get that access  
3        permitted through them, but certainly, we'll do what we  
4        can to deter the left turn movement.

5                    MR. WAGNER:  Thank you.

6                    CHAIRMAN KOPP:  All right.  I'm going to  
7        close the public hearing for Zoning Hearing Case 21-03.  
8        I'm going to suggest that we continue this public  
9        hearing.

10                  Will someone make a motion that, based on  
11        the submitted petition, the testimony provided by the  
12        applicant, and the staff report for PC 21-03, at the  
13        February 3, 2021, Plan Commission meeting, I move that  
14        the Plan Commission continue the public hearing to  
15        March 3, 2021, or to another date to be determined, to  
16        allow Village staff and the applicant time to address  
17        the various issues raised by the Plan Commission and  
18        Village staff.

19                  Will someone make that motion?

20                  MR. WAGNER:  Wagner, so moved.

21                  MS. KACZMAREK:  Kaczmarek, I'll second.

22                  CHAIRMAN KOPP:  I ask the Plan Commission  
23        Secretary to call the vote.

24                  MR. GIUNTOLI:  Commissioner Remkus?

1 MR. REMKUS: Yes.

2 MR. GIUNTOLI: Commissioner Soukup?

3 THE REPORTER: I didn't hear that.

4 MR. GIUNTOLI: That a yes?

5 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Yes.

6 MR. GIUNTOLI: Commissioner Kaczmarek?

7 MS. KACZMAREK: Yes.

8 MR. GIUNTOLI: Commissioner Kaucky?

9 MR. KAUCKY: Yes.

10 MR. GIUNTOLI: Commissioner Walac?

11 MR. WALEC: Yes.

12 MR. GIUNTOLI: Vice Chairman Wagner?

13 MR. WAGNER: Yes.

14 MR. GIUNTOLI: Chairman Kopp?

15 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Yes.

16 Again, to the applicants, I think you can  
17 see that we're in favor of this project. It's just,  
18 we're not ready to recommend it yet.

19 All right.

20 MS. CHOI: Can I ask you a question,  
21 Chairman Kopp?

22 So is there any more specific direction  
23 you'd like to give to the applicant regarding signage?

24 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Yes. I think they need to

1 try to scale the signage for the project down to what's  
2 consistent with our signage ordinance, and to be  
3 consistent with Town Center and all the other  
4 developers. That's my view.

5 MR. KATZ: Can I ask if there's anything  
6 else on top of that? I just want to make sure.

7 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Not for me, and I assume,  
8 with Commissioner Wagner and Remkus's, both were  
9 concerned about the traffic issue.

10 Any of the other commissioners, please, the  
11 courtesy to let the applicant know if there's something  
12 that you think they should be addressing.

13 MR. WAGNER: Wagner. Chairman Kopp, I would  
14 agree with you on the signage. I think that we did  
15 extensive changes to the signage ordinance to allow  
16 greater signage than we had in the past. There may be  
17 some accommodation that we made for Harlem Irving; and  
18 there may be some accommodation made, but, as you said,  
19 it's almost double the size that it's recommended to be,  
20 so I would follow-up on that -- and this is not an issue  
21 that the applicant can address, but I think it would be  
22 shortsighted for the Plan Commission to look at this  
23 project in its approval stage, and also not look at the  
24 consequence of redevelopment of the property across the

1 street, which has very large traffic issues, and what  
2 will we end up doing at that point? Thank you.

3 MS. CHOI: I'm sorry, I'm going to focus  
4 more on the signage.

5 So how does the Plan Commission feel about  
6 the digital sign, or the painted sign, or the projecting  
7 signs, the root signs? These are all exhibited by code.

8 CHAIRMAN KOPP: Again, I'm not opposed to  
9 any of them by themselves; and the painted signs are  
10 actually very subtle, so those don't bother me at all.

11 The digital sign, and we've allowed it in at  
12 least two other locations so I don't see why we wouldn't  
13 allow it here. So the concern is the volume.

14 MS. CHOI: The sign surface area?

15 CHAIRMAN KOPP: I take it the problem is the  
16 surface area is those letters are standalone, but you  
17 treat it as if it's in a box?

18 MS. CHOI: Right. Okay.

19 MR. KATZ: Was it just the signage that  
20 you're talking about for the car wash or for the overall  
21 project?

22 CHAIRMAN KOPP: The car wash is what Ann  
23 focused on. I don't know -- I read this a couple days  
24 ago.

1                   Ann, did you do -- for the other two signage  
2 submissions, did you do something to compare it?

3                   MS. CHOI: Yes. If you go to page 14 of  
4 your staff report, you see what's proposed on lots two  
5 and three. I'm just going to share my screen.

6                   CHAIRMAN KOPP: Yeah, I see that.

7                   Yeah, it looks like those two, for the  
8 restaurant -- well, I guess the bank just has a pretty  
9 modest access. The restaurant is --what? -- 40 percent  
10 larger? I don't know that anyone cares about the height  
11 issue.

12                  MS. CHOI: I think the restaurant has excess  
13 wall signage of 48.4 versus -- the bank is 146.1.

14                  CHAIRMAN KOPP: Right, I got these mixed up.  
15 I flipped them around. Right.

16                  So, yeah, the bank -- that's quite a  
17 variation -- well, I shouldn't say variation. That's  
18 quite an amount of excess sign for the bank too. Again,  
19 we're trying to be fair to all the retailers in the  
20 community, and if we -- so if we set this standard, then  
21 that's going to be the standard for everyone else.

22                  I'm not saying there can't be some excess,  
23 but the bank and the car wash are pretty severe, to my  
24 opinion. I'm just one vote here.

1                   MR. KATZ: Mr. Chairman Kopp, we'll take  
2 that into consideration. We'll talk to our tenants who  
3 are on. I know most of them didn't speak, but they're  
4 on this Zoom meeting. So we'll go back. We'll sharpen  
5 our pencils. We'll figure it out.

6                   CHAIRMAN KOPP: All right. Thank you.

7                   MS. CHOI: I'm sorry, just so we're clear,  
8 I'm clear, and the applicant is clear.

9                   So the issues are: The signage needs to be  
10 reduced. All the comments from Tri-State needs to be  
11 incorporated in the site plan; there are traffic issues  
12 that need a second look, the left turn lane from the  
13 Town Center Drive, and possibly shifting the Plainfield  
14 Road access more to the east, or proposing another way  
15 to prevent left turners onto Plainfield. Is that pretty  
16 much it?

17                   CHAIRMAN KOPP: That's it. Although, I  
18 don't think Vice Chairman Wagner was talking about  
19 moving the exit, just trying to figure out a way --

20                   MS. CHOI: -- prevent the left turn?

21                   CHAIRMAN KOPP: Yeah.

22                   MS. CHOI: Okay.

23                   CHAIRMAN KOPP: All right. So that's it for  
24 that item on the agenda. We're going to continue with

1 our meeting. You-all are welcome.

2 (WHICH WERE ALL THE PROCEEDINGS HAD.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
2 ) SS:  
COUNTY OF DUPAGE )

3  
4 I, ROBIN HEJNAR, a certified shorthand reporter  
5 and registered professional reporter do hereby certify:

6 That prior to being examined, the speakers in  
7 the foregoing proceeding were, by me, duly sworn to  
8 testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but  
9 the truth;

10 That said proceedings were taken remotely  
11 before me at the time and places therein set forth and  
12 were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter  
13 transcribed into typewriting under my direction and  
14 supervision;

15 I further certify that I am neither counsel  
16 for, nor related to, any party to said proceedings, not  
17 in anywise interested in the outcome thereof.

18 In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed  
19 my name.

20 Dated: February 15, 2021

21  
22  
23   
ROBIN HEJNAR, RPR  
CSR No. 084-004689

