

**City of Rolling Meadows
Planning and Zoning Commission
City Council Chambers
7:30 PM
March 6, 2018**

APPROVED

Motion to Open the Meeting

Chairman Bisesi asked for a motion to open the March 6 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Mr. Whitney moved to open the meeting and Mr. Rataiczky seconded. Motion carried. Roll call:

Presiding: Chairman Bisesi

Present: Fink, Lynch, Patterson, Rataiczky, Rybarczyk, Whitney

Absent: O'Brien, Stefaniuk

Also Present: Fred Vogt, Public Works Director; Barry Krumstok, City Manager; Jim Macholl, City Attorney; and Elizabeth Payne, Secretary

Call to Order

Chairman Bisesi called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Bisesi asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the February 6, 2018 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Mr. Lynch moved to approve the minutes as written and Mr. Whitney seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Fink: Abstain

Mr. Lynch: Yes

Mr. Rataiczky: Yes

Mr. Rybarczyk: Abstain

Mr. Whitney: Yes

Chairman Bisesi: Yes

Motion carried. Minutes approved as written.

Upcoming Public Hearings: NONE

Pending Business: NONE

New Business:

- 1. Preliminary and final approval of a four-lot subdivision with variations for property located at 5160 Dupont Avenue, Palatine, IL, R-1 Residential, Petru Popa, Petitioner**

Chairman Bisesi asked if the file was in order.

Mr. Vogt stated that the file was in order and was made part of the record.

Petru Popa, 1372 N. Grove Ln., Palatine, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi.

Mr. Popa noted that he was the owner of the subject property, which he had purchased in 2016. The old house on the property had been demolished, and he began working with the City on engineering of the site for a subdivision. Over the course of the work, four lots was decided on. He planned to live in one of the proposed houses himself, and sell the other three lots.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting to commissioners' questions and comments.

Mr. Lynch asked if each owner would own the whole depth of the lot, even into the wetlands. Mr. Popa replied that would be the case. Mr. Lynch asked how much of the land from the back of the house would be usable. Mr. Popa stated that the houses would be approximately 50 feet deep. The two houses to the east would have approximately 20 feet between the back of the house and the proposed basin. He noted that the houses would not be as large as they were shown in the submitted documents. Mr. Lynch asked if the land behind the buildings would be usable. Mr. Popa replied that it should be when there was no precipitation – then there would be some water in the basin. Mr. Lynch asked what he would be required to provide his buyers regarding these conditions. Mr. Popa stated he would need to check with an attorney, but that it was his intention to tell the buyers everything about the parcel they were purchasing. Mr. Lynch asked Staff if they had any recollection of what developers were legally required to provide to buyers, based on previous subdivisions. Mr. Vogt noted that the more the seller disclosed to the buyer, the better. He went on to say the stormwater management easements would be recorded with the plat of subdivision, which would be available to the public. Mr. Lynch asked when such items should be disclosed to potential buyers. Mr. Macholl noted that there was no specific timeline for disclosure, but it was normal for to notify buyers in the contract to purchase. Mr. Popa noted that the easements would be noted on the plat of survey at the time of closing.

Sam Polena, 3922 W Main St, McHenry, IL (developer's Civil Engineer) was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi. Mr. Polena stated that there was no standing water on the property, unless there was a significant rain event. He stated that the proposed basin had been designed to handle 10 and 100 year floods, then overflow into the wetlands and then into the creek if needed. He noted that all this takes place within the referenced easement, and will be recorded appropriately. Mr. Rataiczuk noted that the information is public, and would likely be disclosed fairly early in the purchasing process. Mr. Polena added that the wetlands will have features that will mark them out as wetlands. Mr. Vogt noted that the plat of subdivision will indicate the easement as well. Mr. Macholl stated that a condition could be placed on the approval of the subdivision requiring disclosure to prospective

buyers early in the process. He noted that most buyers are not likely to do research on a home too far in advance. Mr. Polena stated that they intended to make the wetlands appealing as a nature feature to the properties.

Mr. Whitney asked if the forebay was designed for a 10 year or 100 year flood, as the third house is in the 10 year flood area. Mr. Polena noted it was designed for both, and any overflow would flow into the creek.

Mr. Whitney noted his concern about the lack of room behind the houses. He asked how deep the forebay would be. Mr. Polena stated that the design had been studied at length, though he did not have exact details to hand. He stated that the houses met the setback for stormwater design. Mr. Rybarczyk stated that, per the plan, it seemed that the difference in height between the houses and bottom of the borebay was six feet at a slope.

Mr. Patterson asked if the elevation near the houses was to be raised. Mr. Popa replied that it was not, except for the driveways. Mr. Polena added that two of the houses have foundations that will be raised with an equivalent compensation taken out elsewhere. He noted that they were taking out more than they were putting in.

Mr. Patterson asked if anything could be built in the wetlands or in the forebay. Mr. Popa replied that nothing could be built there. Mr. Patterson asked why a home buyer would purchase a lot, of which two-thirds could not be used. Mr. Popa replied that it would depend on the buyers. He himself would live in one of the homes, and would have no rear neighbors.

Mr. Rataiczky asked if the wetlands would be maintained. Mr. Popa noted that the developer would maintain the wetland area until it develops, at which point it would be self-generating.

Mr. Rybarczyk asked if the houses would be 50 feet deep. Mr. Popa replied that was the intention. Mr. Rybarczyk asked why the drawings indicated houses 80 feet deep. Mr. Popa replied that they would be 60 feet at the most – the houses would be designed to be 3,300 to 3,500 square feet in size.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting for comments from the public.

Thebraize Ahmed, 1284 S. Vermont St., Palatine, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi. Mr. Ahmed stated that he owned the property adjacent to the proposed subdivision. He had moved in 2006, and owned four acres for his single family home. He asked how much of the subject property was protected wetlands. He noted that his backyard became knee-deep in water when it rained. He asked how additional water runoff created by increasing the elevation on this property would be addressed. He asked how deep the forebay would be, and where the overflow would go. Mr. Polena stated that they had included wetland specialists in their plan. Their plan also included compensation for everything they were putting in, by taking out additional fill and providing higher quality wetland plantings. Mr. Vogt added that, per the submitted plans, overflow from the forebay would flow due north from the eastern two lots. Commissioners also noted that 60% of the lot is wetlands. Mr. Polena stated that the stormwater design was based on a 100 year flood. Mr. Rataiczky asked if those requirements were exceeded. Mr. Polena replied that they were. Mr. Vogt noted that the petitioner's

engineer has worked with the City's engineer and with MWRD, and their plans were close to final approval.

Mr. Ahmed asked if the overflow would head towards Euclid Avenue. Mr. Vogt replied that would be the case. Mr. Ahmed asked if the two acres to the rear had been purchased. Mr. Vogt replied that they had not. Mr. Ahmed noted that there was a great deal of standing water on this property and surrounding properties. Mr. Rataiczky stated that the petitioner was responsible for managing water from and on their own property, and that they were required to not increase flooding or water flow to adjacent properties. Mr. Vogt noted that no discussions had been held with Palatine regarding this proposal, but that the City would certainly reach out to them before approval. Mr. Ahmed asked for a water management solution that took care of standing water in the whole area. Mr. Vogt replied that could be investigated. Mr. Rataiczky noted that there was only so much that the developer could be compelled to do. Mr. Vogt noted that MWRD would be incorporated into the changes.

Rich Phillips, 1264 S. Smith St., Palatine, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi. Mr. Phillips stated that his property backed up to the proposed subdivision to the east. He asked what the proposed stormwater management easement meant, what a forebay was and how big it would be. He noted that he did not have a problem with the proposal as long as the forebay performed what he believed to be its job. He stated that, once new homeowners came in, their daily water usage from gutters, etc., would be dispersed towards the back, and asked what would happen to that water. Mr. Polena stated that the forebay is a detention pond that drains out, overflowing into the wetland area. The proposal has been looked over many times, including four revisions with substantial comments addressed. The City engineer wanted to be sure the stormwater plan worked. The US Army Corps had also signed off on the wetlands plan. He stated that all items with regard to stormwater management had been addressed, and the plan would work. The easement would be a restricted area for detention and wetlands. Mr. Rybarczyk suggested putting the restrictions on the deed so nothing could be done in that area. Mr. Vogt stated that the City responds to complaints and homeowner inquiries, so homeowners could call into the City to have their concerns investigated. Mr. Phillips asked what would happen five years into the future, once the buildings were in place, and if the future homeowners placed accessory structures without permits. Staff stated that building permits would be required for any accessory structures, and drainage would be addressed in the review. Mr. Rataiczky replied that any problems should be reported to the City, who would investigate and take appropriate action. Mr. Vogt stated that public drainage basins are looked at as often as possible, and the City responded to complaints at other times.

Glenn Davie, 2305 Lisa Ct., Palatine, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi. He stated that his property was a block and a half south of the subject lot. He asked what variations were being proposed. Staff replied that none were. (Note that Mr. Davie was referring to a misprint on the agenda.)

Chris Wagner, 1248 S. Smith St., Palatine, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi. He stated that his property backs to the wetlands on the subject property. He stated that the subject property had been vacant and had not been taken care of. The rear part of the parcel has dead and fallen trees on it. He asked who would maintain the property if it was sold. Mr. Vogt replied that, as proposed, it would be each individual homeowner caring for their section of the property. Mr. Rybarczyk added that it would be one homeowner for the entire line against which Mr. Wagner's property backed up. Mr. Wagner asked if there would be digging in the back. Mr. Rataiczky stated that the petitioner was

constrained by the restrictions of the wetlands. Mr. Lynch added that the new owner should be informed of any damage as soon as it was discovered, and they would then be responsible for correcting it. Failure to notify the owner of damage on another property would see liability for the damage transfer to the owner of the property where the damage had taken place. Mr. Vogt added that the City would respond to complaints and inquiries.

Mr. Ahmed asked if any digging would be done on the property. Mr. Polena stated that there would be some movement of fill and construction of the wetland, but there would be no change in elevation.

Stan Leonard, 2306 Lisa Ct., Palatine, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi. Mr. Leonard stated that his concern was with the street. The intersection of Vermont and Dupont was generally congested, and had a number of drivers who took the curve at high speeds. Parking was allowed there, and Mr. Leonard asked how a driver could go around the corner with no stop signs, parked cars, and oncoming traffic. Mr. Vogt stated that the Traffic Review Committee has looked at that intersection within the last year, knowing that this development was coming forward. He stated that the intent was to wait until the street and curb was improved, as the City was requesting that the developer improve the north side of Dupont. Once that was completed, the Committee would evaluate the need for a stop sign. Staff would also look at parking allowances in the area. All issues would be examined during final engineering approval.

Mr. Ahmed stated that he had requested a stop sign from Chief Nowacki previously. His hope was that two would be installed, one in either direction. He then stated that summer would bring another concern for area residents – mosquitoes would make their outdoor spaces all but unusable. Nothing seemed to work to abate the mosquitoes, and he hoped that some solution for that could be found as well.

Mr. Phillips asked that the houses be required to be constructed in a timely manner if the subdivision was approved, and not allow debris in the yards.

With there being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting to additional questions and comments from the commissioners.

Mr. Patterson asked how far back historically into Mr. Ahmed's rear yard the water problems went. Mr. Ahmed stated it was very far back. Mr. Ahmed provided photos of the standing water for the record.

Mr. Whitney noted that he wanted to ensure the Village of Palatine's involvement in future proceedings. He asked if the Commission should consider a postponement, or an additional condition. He also noted the problems parking caused to drivers going around the curve at Vermont and Dupont. Discussion ensued regarding postponement and potential conditions. It was suggested that the approval be contingent on Palatine's concurrence with final engineering.

Mr. Whitney moved for preliminary approval of a four-lot subdivision for property located at 5160 Dupont Avenue, R-1 Residential

With the following conditions:

1. Site to be developed in substantial conformance with the proposed plat of subdivision.
2. Final plat of subdivision to be filed and recorded with Cook County within two years.
3. Public improvements as shown on the preliminary engineering plans (revised 1/31/2018) for roadway, curbs, sidewalk, and storm sewer are acceptable. Parkway trees will be required – number and locations to be determined with final engineering review.
4. Building permits will be required prior to any development of the site.
5. Public improvements are to extend through the curve at the intersection of Dupont Ave./Plum Tree Lane.
6. Appropriateness of establishment of a Homeowner's Association to maintain the wetlands to be decided.
7. Final engineering approval is to include design review and concurrence by the Village of Palatine.
8. Traffic Review Committee is to review traffic patterns in the area at final engineering.

Mr. Rataiczky seconded.

Discussion ensued regarding a condition limiting the time frame a building could take. It was decided that was addressed in the code already, and an additional condition would not be required. Property maintenance concerns were also discussed. Staff indicated inspectors would respond to complaints.

Roll call:

Mr. Fink: Yes – It is a good use of difficult property, and should not add to existing water problems.

Mr. Lynch: Yes – Monitoring would be required, but welcomes the property taxes.

Mr. Whitney: Yes – A lot of work had gone into the proposal, and concerns had been eased.

Mr. Patterson: No – Does not agree a final approval is warranted.

Mr. Rataiczky: Yes – A lot of time and effort had been put into the proposal and concerns had been raised, but no opposition had been voiced.

Mr. Rybarczyk: Yes – The engineering on the project was good.

Chairman Bisesi: Yes – Concurred with other Commissioners, and noted that more work needed to be done. The conditions imposed will ensure all concerns are addressed.

Yeas – (6) – Bisesi, Fink, Lynch, Rataiczky, Rybarczyk, Whitney

Nays – (1) – Patterson

Absent – (2) – O'Brien, Stefaniuk

Abstain – (0) – NONE

Motion approved as amended.

Chairman Bisesi stated that, with the vote 6-1-2, the item would go before the City Council with a positive recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission at a future meeting.

2. Sign Appeal to allow a digital off-premise sign at property located at 3975 Algonquin Road, Jim Perry, Lamar Advertising, Petitioner

Chairman Bisesi asked if the file was in order.

Mr. Vogt stated that the file was in order and was made part of the record.

Jim Perry, Lamar Advertising, 500 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi.

Mr. Perry stated that they were requesting an off-premise advertising sign at 3975 Algonquin Road. The sign as proposed would have two digital faces at 14 feet by 48 feet each, and be 76 feet above grade, or 60 feet above Route 53. He noted that each sign face would have six changes. No scrolling or flashing was proposed. It was essentially the same as the sign existing on Winnetka Avenue.

Mr. Perry stated that they were requesting a variance for the height of the sign and the hours of operation of the sign.

Mr. Perry stated that property was zoned C-2, and adjacent to R-3 property, the Preserves at Woodfield were 185 feet to the south of the proposed sign. To the north is T-1 district, and to the north is primarily right-of-way. He stated that the sign would be located in a landscaping island, so no parking spots were being eliminated, and no traffic modifications were being proposed. He noted that the height variance was being requested was due to sight impediments caused by the trees, highway signs, and utility poles.

Mr. Perry noted that lighting should not impact the neighboring apartment complex. He indicated where the signs would be facing, and where the light from the sign would shine.

Mr. Perry stated that the subject property had previously been vacant for a long time. The current owners had spent a good amount of money to update the property, and allowing the sign would allow them to offset some of that cost.

Mr. Perry referred again to the photometrics. Between the lights from the freeway and the lights from the apartment complex, the light from the signs should not impact the area a great deal. They did have measures to reduce light spillage, including the requested height, and the placement of the signs to face the highway, rather than the residences. Light spillage at the property line from the sign was expected to be minimal.

Mr. Perry stated that there were monitoring protocols in place to ensure continued compliance with the code requirements.

Mr. Perry stated that there would be benefits to the City from this sign. These would include the placement of public safety alerts, and free advertising for City events. The City would also receive annual inspection fees of approximately \$2,500.00 per year.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting to commissioners' questions and comments.

Mr. Rybarczyk asked what the conditions were for prior approval by the Plan Commission in 2013. Staff indicated they did not recall what the conditions were, but could locate them if necessary. Chairman Bisesi stated that prior discussion had revolved around height, light spillage, and the park that had been proposed at that time.

Mr. Rataiczky asked about the requested variances. Mr. Perry noted that it was two variances. Mr. Rataiczky noted that he believed it was three. Staff commented that it was three – for the height of the sign, the size of each of the sign faces, and the 24-hour illumination. Mr. Rataiczky asked if the proximity to the apartment complex was also a variance. Staff noted that it was something to take into consideration, but was not a requested variance from the code. The information regarding the overlay district had been provided as background information, since the district had come up at the Committee of the Whole meeting the petitioner had appeared at in January, and to correct a previous staff report that had indicated this property was located in the overlay district.

Mr. Rataiczky asked what the petitioner meant by the statement that the sign was a permitted use in the district. Mr. Perry noted that these types of signs were permitted in the district, just not in the requested size. He viewed the size as a developmental issue, rather than a use issue.

Mr. Rataiczky noted the requested variance was quite large. He noted the variance seemed to be too large for comfort. He asked if there were any extenuating circumstances outside of what had been stated already. Mr. Perry noted that visibility was the most important piece of the sign, and obstructions in the area required the variances. Mr. Rataiczky asked if a smaller size would work on the requested height. Mr. Perry indicated that the requested sign was a standard unit. Smaller units would create visibility among all the traffic.

Chris Lupo, 500 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi.

Mr. Lupo noted that there were two standard sizes of signs for this type of highway: 20 feet by 60 feet, and the requested 14 feet by 48 feet. Mr. Rataiczky asked if the petitioner worked from code requirements, or from visibility. Mr. Perry stated they worked from visibility. The requested sign was fairly small for the location, but they had felt the larger sign was inappropriate for the location.

Mr. Patterson asked about a utility line that would restrict the foundation. Mr. Vogt replied that Mr. Patterson was likely referring to the MWRD intercepting sewer, situated nearly due north-south under the existing building. Previously, MWRD had provided a letter indicating the construction would not be a problem to this line. Staff would request a renewal of that letter if the project were to move forward to ensure MWRD would sign off.

Mr. Patterson asked if there were any sensor indicating proximity of traffic. Mr. Perry indicated there was not.

Mr. Whitney noted that he had no issue with the requested height. He asked if there would be any lively transitions between advertisements. Mr. Perry stated there would not – it would be

instantaneous transition, much like a slide show.

Mr. Lynch asked what an overlay district was. Staff replied that an overlay district is a section has the ability to exceed the code within certain parameters. It was similar to a different code section that applies only that area.

Mr. Fink asked how many advertisements there would be on the sign. Mr. Perry replied that it would be six per face. Mr. Fink asked how often they changed. Mr. Perry replied it was every ten seconds.

Mr. Fink asked how much of the sign fell over the building, and what safety measures were in place for the building. Mr. Perry replied the encroachment was 20 feet, and had been done to face illumination away from the apartments. They could potentially place a shroud and check engineering, but other signs of similar design had generated no complaints. In addition, inspectors would look at the sign monthly.

Mr. Krumstok added that the sign contractor would have liability to the building. Mr. Perry stated that damage that occurred to the building as a result of the sign would be paid for by the petitioner.

Mr. Vogt stated that the conditions requested by Mr. Rybarczyk had been located. As of March 25, 2014, the conditions had included the sign would not exceed 60 feet in height above Route 53, that the gross area of each sign face would not exceed 672 square feet, a fence should be placed around the sign, the sign would not advertise any sexually oriented business, and that the petitioner would demolish the existing building and develop the site in conformance with a submitted site plan.

Mr. Rataiczky asked why the petitioner had not moved forward in 2014. Mr. Perry indicated the project had not had support from the Council at the time, likely due to the park to be dedicated to the City. Mr. Rataiczky asked if a fence would be part of this plan. Mr. Patterson stated that the fence had been required due to the inclusion of the park.

Mr. Vogt added that the original ordinance had included language about not damaging neighboring properties, or the general public welfare.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting for comments from the public. With there being no public comment, the public hearing was closed.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting to additional questions and comments from the commissioners.

Mr. Rybarczyk asked if notifications had been performed again. Mr. Perry stated they had. Mr. Rybarczyk asked if individual occupants of the apartments had been notified, or just the owner. Staff stated that the City requirements only required the owner or management company are notified. The management would then be required to notify their residents. In addition, the City Council had recently passed an ordinance requiring placement of signs for all requested public hearings, which had been required in this case. Public notice requirement had been met. Mr. Krumstok added that the signs did generate inquiries.

Mr. Lynch moved to approve a Sign Appeal for an illuminated billboard property located at 3975 Algonquin Road, C-2 Commercial District, Jim Perry, Lamar Advertising Co., Petitioner

With the following condition:

1. A photometric study will be provided to City Staff for review.

Mr. Whitney seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Rataiczky: Yes – A great deal of effort had been put into the project, despite the size of the variance.

Mr. Patterson: Yes – The additional height should not be detrimental, and visibility required the size.

Mr. Whitney: Yes – It will not harm adjacent properties and the variances are warranted.

Mr. Lynch: Yes – The state might use the properties to the north to sponsor signs, and he would rather see the sign in Rolling Meadows.

Mr. Fink: No – Has been against signs at interchanges due to vehicular safety – this is just a distraction.

Mr. Rybarczyk: No – This is too much distraction for drivers, and a detriment to public safety.

Chairman Bisesi: Yes – The petitioner has presented a project that will not adversely affect the area, and it will not be as much of a distraction as feared.

Yeas – (5) – Bisesi, Lynch, Rataiczky, Patterson, Whitney

Nays – (2) – Fink, Rybarczyk

Absent – (2) – O'Brien, Stefaniuk

Abstain – (0) – NONE

MOTION APPROVED

Mr. Rataiczky noted that the placement of the signs had not generated any public pushback.

Chairman Bisesi stated that, with the vote 5-2-2, the item would go before the City Council with a positive recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission, tentatively March 27, 2018 for first reading of the ordinance.

3. Text Amendment to modify the requirements for the side yard on a corner lot, City of Rolling Meadows, Petitioner

Chairman Bisesi asked if the file was in order.

Mr. Vogt stated that the file was in order and was made part of the record.

Mr. Vogt brought the Commission's attention to a sample plat of survey provided to the Commission in their packets. Current code regarding corner lots required a side yard setback equal to that of the front yard, which was 30 feet, as indicated on the sample. Staff proposed to modify the side yard setback on a corner lot to 20 feet, following a resident's inquiry about a permit.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting to commissioners' questions and comments.

Mr. Whitney noted that there was no problem, and most of the cases that appeared before the Zoning Board of Appeals were for such variances, which were generally granted.

Mr. Lynch asked how many petitions were brought forward on this issue. Mr. Whitney replied that it had waned over the years, but 15 to 20 years prior, there had been a great many. Mr. Lynch asked if there had been opposition to these petitions. Mr. Whitney noted there had not. He also noted most petitions had been for houses on busier roads.

Mr. Rataiczuk asked what a side yard was. Mr. Vogt replied that the front yard was typically where the lot was addressed, and the side yard faced the street on which it was not addressed. It was not transferable between frontages. Staff stated that the intent of the text amendment was to allow homeowners on these types of lots to use more of their yards. When a home is built, the yards are established at that time, and cannot be changed from there. The front yard setback would not change due to this text amendment.

Mr. Lynch asked if the lines in the provided sample were the setbacks per the existing codes. Mr. Vogt replied that would be the case. He stated that the setback on the side would move 10 feet closer to the street. The front yard setback would not change. Mr. Lynch asked if a fence could run across the front of the house to the covered porch. Mr. Rataiczuk stated existing code had provisions for prohibiting structures in front of the house. Staff stated that the provided sample showed current setback allowances, and homeowners typically do not bring fences into front yards to the porch.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting for comments from the public. With there being no public comment, the public hearing was closed.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting to additional questions and comments from the commissioners.

Mr. Patterson moved to approve a Text Amendment to modify City of Rolling Meadows Zoning Code Section 122-122(d)(2) to read:

(2) For a corner lot, the side yard setback abutting the roadway shall be not less than twenty (20) feet.

Mr. Whitney seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Rybarczyk: Yes

Mr. Rataiczky: Yes

Mr. Patterson: Yes

Mr. Whitney: Yes

Mr. Lynch: Yes

Mr. Fink: Yes

Chairman Bisesi: Yes.

Yeas – (7) – Bisesi, Fink, Lynch, Rataiczky, Rybarczyk, Patterson, Whitney

Nays – (0) – NONE

Absent – (2) – O’Brien, Stefaniuk

Abstain – (0) – NONE

MOTION APPROVED

Chairman Bisesi stated that, with the vote 6-0-3, the item would go before the City Council with a positive recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission, tentatively March 27, 2018 for first reading of the ordinance.

Miscellaneous Business: NONE

Matters Not on the Agenda:

Mr. Vogt stated that staff has additional text amendments to bring forward, as agendas allow in the future.

Reports:

Mr. Vogt noted that the next meeting was scheduled for April 3, 2018. Fuller's Car Wash was applying for a sign appeal for an electronic message board. The agenda for May 1, 2018 may include final approval petition for the subdivision and PUD for Ryan Homes.

Mr. Vogt encouraged the Commission to consider election of officers in April.

Mr. Lynch asked why the City was bringing forward text amendments in light of the upcoming update of the Comprehensive Plan. Staff stated that the Comprehensive Plan addressed the City's vision for the guidance of land use for the next 10+ years. Staff was bringing forward the amendments to clean up the existing zoning code and make it easier to use. The Comprehensive Plan update would not include an update to the zoning code, but could include a recommendation to update the zoning code. That update would be a separate project at another time. These text amendments would be items that staff had heard about most frequently in an effort to make the zoning code easier to use and help residents get better use from their properties.

Mr. Rataiczuk asked if any petitions to allow chickens had been brought forward. Mr. Krumstok replied that the Council had held those discussions in the past, and an alderman was interested in pursuing those discussions again at a future Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Krumstok reported that the Mug on Golf Road had closed, and was in process of becoming a Jersey Mike's. School Health had demolished the old building at 5600 Apollo Drive. The old sign had a temporary banner posted over it to lease portion of their new building that they would not use initially, and they were hoping to grow into in the future. Squibb Drive was done, except for the lights, which would hopefully be done in the near future. He added that the Jewel shopping center may be gaining a new restaurant in the near future. They were in the design phase, and still needed to go for permits. If everything goes well, the owner plans to open Memorial Day weekend. He stated that Comet's on Kirchoff Road was planning to reopen for the season on March 20, 2018. He added that the recently approved Dunkin Donuts has a construction fence in place, but needs MWRD approval before the project can move forward. He concluded that Northwest Community Hospital was working on moving into Arlington Office Park. The demolition was completed, but the general contractor had changed and they cannot move forward until that paperwork was completed.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Whitney and seconded by Mr. Rybarczyk. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote. The regular meeting of the March 6, 2018 Planning and Zoning Commission was adjourned at 9:52 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,



Elizabeth Payne
Secretary
Community Development Division

Distribution:

Mayor
City Manager
Planning and Zoning Commissioners
Community Development Department
Clerk's Office

Minutes approved at the April 3, 2018 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as written.