

**PLAN COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
Monday, March 1, 2021**

---

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by President Palmer

**1. Roll Call.**

Present: (In person) President Palmer, Mr. Michalski. (Virtual attendance) Mr. Kujawa, Mr. Jodie, Mr. Long, Mr. Cashin, Mr. Reineke

Absent: None.

Also: Thomas Harrigan - Zoning and Planning Administrator/Assistant to the Village Manager, David De Angelis - Village Manager, Hector de la Mora – Village Attorney and Applicants.

**2. Review and act on meeting minutes dated 12/7/20 and 2/1/21.**

Mr. Michalski motioned to approve the meeting minutes dated 12/7/20, Mr. Cashin seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Michalski motioned to approve the meeting minutes dated 2/1/21 as submitted, Mr. Kujawa seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

**3. Review and act on a request for a Temporary Plan of Operation pursuant to §335-85B for the Sunset Playhouse, located at 700 Wall Street, to host outdoor concerts.**

Nancy Visintainer-Armstrong, of Sunset Playhouse, was present before the Commission.

President Palmer asked if anything has changed in the application since submission.

Mrs. Visintainer-Armstrong indicated that nothing has changed. The outdoor programming was held in the same location as proposed last summer, and there were no issues with the performances.

Mr. Michalski asked if the Village received any complaints from local residents related to sound during the summer of 2020.

Mr. Harrigan indicated no complaints were received.

Mr. Kujawa motioned and Mr. Cashin seconded to approve as submitted. Motion carried 7-0.

**4. Review and act on a request for an amended plan of operation for Vantage Financial pursuant to §335-85 for a Brokerage (stock, mortgage and other financial services), pursuant to §335-22A(9) located in the B-1 Local Business District at 13230 Watertown Plank Road.**

Jesse Niederbaumer, of Vantage Financial, and Brad Kropp of PDI Architecture, were present before the Commission.

President Palmer indicated that if the proposed building addition is approved, the Village Building Board will review the proposed architecture of the building.

Mr. Kropp explained the rationale for the proposed building addition, which would be an extension of the original building addition that has previously been approved by the Commission on December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2020. The smaller addition of the rear of the building will allow for storage space for the building tenants.

Mr. Michalski motioned and Mr. Long seconded to approve the plans as submitted. Motion carried 7-0.

**Item 5. Review and act on a request for a demolition permit for a single family residential home located at 1145 Highland Drive pursuant to §106-11 to §106-16.**

Rob Miller, of Rob Miller homes was present before the commission.

Mr. Miller indicated the demolition and new home construction plans are still be modified per the Ruekert & Mielke Engineering review.

Mr. Cashin asked if Mr. Miller has considered raising the foundation of the home, based on comments found within the engineering review.

Mr. Miller stated that is being considered.

As there several demolition application items are found to be incomplete, Mr. Michalski motioned to table the item to a future meeting, Mr. Cashin seconded. Motion carried 7-0.

**Item 6. Review and discussion on the request for approval of a Certified Survey Map, Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Rezoning and Redevelopment Plan for the School Sister of Notre Dame Campus, pursuant to §305-7, §335-92.1 and §335-30.**

President Palmer stated this is the first formal review of the School Sister of Notre Dame (SSND) campus redevelopment by the Plan Commission.

Mr. De Angelis explained there are several items related to the redevelopment proposal which will be reviewed by other standing committees. These items include:

- The independent review of the Traffic Impact Analysis – Public Works Committee
- Proposed water main extension (when submitted) – Public Works Committee
- Traffic and pedestrian safety – Public Safety Committee

After these items have been reviewed, they will return to the Plan Commission for final recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Harrigan informed the Commission that at this time, the Commission is being charged with determining the appropriateness if the request for re-zoning, the Planned Development Overlay District usage and the new single-family home lots.

President Palmer indicated that residents were concerned about the original layout of the “pocket neighborhood” concept for single-family lots. The southern portion of the SSND campus has been reconfigured from the “pocket neighborhood” concept into eleven “traditional” single-family lots.

President Palmer noted that as existing the property is zoned as I-1 Institutional zoning. The request for rezoning would designate the property into four zoning classifications:

- Rm-1 Multi-family
- Rs-3 Single-family
- Rs-4 Single-family
- I-1 Institutional

President Palmer called the Commissions attention to the proposed single-family lots and asked conceptually, what size would be acceptable for those properties?

Mr. Kujawa stated that he had no concern with the pocket neighborhood, or smaller lot sizes as the quality of the new home construction will dictate the value, not larger lot sizes. The SSND property is the only land in the Village that is suitable for single-family homes. However, there are other locations where multi-family may exist. Mr. Kujawa stated his concern is related to the total number of apartments. Maria Hall has little architectural

significance. Would it be possible to remove Maria Hall and create more multi-family massing on Watertown Plank Road in effort to allow for additional single family lots on the property?

President Palmer indicated this is a question for the petitioner.

Mr. Michalski noted that on the Pocket Neighborhood Concept Plan dated 2/26/2021, there appears to be a line of trees located within a 30' wide easement on the east side of the neighborhood. How is it guaranteed that these will remain?

Chris Miller, of Miller Marriott Construction, stated the proposed lots adjacent to the 30' easement would own that land and would not be able to build within the easement. Maintenance of the easement area would also be required, and recorded as a deed restriction against the lots.

President Palmer asked Mr. Miller if he can submitted a letter explaining specifically what is being proposed for this portion of the single-family neighborhood that would allow for people to better understand how the proposed easements would function.

Attorney de la Mora suggested the proposed easement language be submitted so that it can be reviewed up-front.

Mr. Miller agreed with Attorney de la Mora.

Mr. Cashin stated he believes the cul-de-sac layout blends in better with the existing neighborhood, compared to the previous concept proposal.

President Palmer suggested the Commission begin to consider what distance would be acceptable for side and rear yard setbacks for the single-family lots. As proposed on the new concept neighborhood layout, the 8' proposed side yard setbacks appear to be somewhat minimal.

Chris Miller indicated the proposed 8' side yard setback would allow for a side entry garage.

President Palmer indicated that Mr. Miller should come prepared to discuss the proposed lot sizes, proposed setbacks and easement areas at the subsequent Commission meetings. Specifically, why the proposed dimensions and setback allow for functionality of single-family home construction.

Attorney de la Mora noted the neighborhood concept plan proposed a maximum impervious surface allotment of 50% of the lot area. It was recommended this specific proposal be reviewed for appropriates of the request with the Village Engineer from Ruekert & Mielke.

Mr. Kujawa stated the proposed berm and landscape easement is OK. However, the 30' easement is going above and beyond what is required for all other single-family lots within the Village. Mr. Kujawa asked who maintains the stormwater management areas (dry ponds)?

Mr. De Angelis noted the out lots would be a portion of the overall development and maintained by the Home Owners Association.

President Palmer noted there should be separate documents associated with the overall site plan so that it is easier to review, and less busy. Regarding the proposed traffic pattern and ingress/egress to the site, President Palmer stated he has no objection.

Mr. Cashin stated the proposed sidewalks which run parallel with the interior roadway are positive additions to the site plan, so that pedestrians are not competing with vehicular traffic.

President Palmer requested for the applicants to submit site plans which demonstrate single-family homes with the proposed setbacks (side yard, rear yard, and street yard setbacks). There should also be a setback shown from the buildable envelope of the properties to the edge of roadway.

President Palmer also requested for a presentation to be created by the petitioner which addresses all the requirements which must be addressed to the satisfaction of the Plan Commission and Village Board, pursuant to §335-30H.

President Palmer stated it might be appropriate for the Commission to set several meeting dates approximately three weeks apart so that the review may continue to focus on sections of §335-30H.

**7. Other Business**

None.

**8. Adjournment**

Mr. Cashin motioned to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Kujawa, Motion carried 7-0.  
Meeting adjourned at 8:10 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas Harrigan  
Zoning and Planning Administrator/Assistant to the Village Manager