

PLAN COMMISSION

JANUARY 4, 1995

Members Present: Carl Cepon, Ken Hellstern, Bill Smith, Bill Gill, Steve Kaplan and Chairman Rudny

Members Absent: Dan Robison

Other Officials Present: Jon Wildenberg, Director of Building; Tracy Einspanjer, Village Planner; Bud Reed, Village Engineer; and E.M. "Butch" Maiden, Rolf C. Campbell & Assoc.

1. Call to order by Chairman Rudny at 7:30 P.M.
2. Mr. Kaplan moved, seconded by Mr. Hellstern, to approve the minutes of December 21, 1994, as presented.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Hellstern, Gill, Kaplan & Rudny
Nays: None
Abstain: Cepon & Smith
Motion Carried 4-0-2

3. Final Plat: Blackstone Re-Subdivision

The petitioners were in attendance.

Ms. Einspanjer explained that this re-subdivision is located north of Blackstone, between Magnolia and Pine Grove. It consists of 3 lots under an R-3 zoning district on approximately 0.93 acres.

There is an existing home with outbuildings located on Lot 2, which are a legal non-conforming structures. The legal non-conforming classification has not been caused by this subdivision.

The petitioner is requesting a waiver of curb, gutter, sidewalk and storm sewer.

Engineering finds this final plat to be in general conformance with the Subdivision Ordinance and is recommended for approval subject to the relief requested and final engineering.

Mr. Smith moved, seconded by Mr. Kaplan, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Village Board on the Final Plat of the Blackstone Re-Subdivision.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Cepon, Hellstern, Smith, Gill, Kaplan & Rudny
Nays: None
Motion Carried 6-0

4. Informal Discussion: Concord's Property in Arbor Valley

Mr. Bill Rotolo, Concord Homes, and Mr. Frank Salathe, Jen Land Design, were in attendance.

It was explained that the revision in question is to a portion of Concord's Arbor Valley property, north of the Commonwealth Edison right-of-way. Originally, this property was approved for 202 apartment units (12.18 du/ac) and 440 townhome/manorhome units (7.49 du/ac). In 1993, Concord amended this plan to include 311 single-family homes with two lot types: the Village lots average 7,555 square feet and the Cottage lots average 6,159 square feet. This amendment reduced the density to 3.5 du/ac.

Mr. Rotolo informed the Commission that the Cottage Lot homes have been very difficult to market, and on average, they are only selling one unit every two weeks. He said they cannot compete with other developers in this area for that price range. Thus, they are here to discuss the possibility of amending a portion of the Cottage lot area to townhomes. Specifically, they are proposing to eliminate 120 of the Cottage lots and construct 158 townhome units on 20.33 acres, for a density of 7.77 du/ac. He also stated that the Village and Legend units are selling well.

The townhome units would include:

- Two stories;
- Two car garages;
- Average unit size of 1,400 square feet;
- Price range of \$135-140,000; and
- The same architect as the single-family homes.

The townhome development would be bordered by: Concord's single-family model area to the north (22 lots); Stonebrook's multi-family subdivision to the east; the remaining Cottage lots to the west; and green space and the Commonwealth Edison right-of-way to the south.

Mr. Salathe stated that some of the roads have been installed in this area and that most will remain. There is one cul-de-sac that has been installed that will be eliminated. The plan provides for two parking spaces in the garages and two parking spaces in the driveway. In addition, 15 guest parking spaces have been provided in the bulb of the cul-de-sacs. Discussions with Ms. Einspanjer revealed that if parking is to be provided in the bulb of the cul-de-sacs, then these streets will have to be private. Mr. Wildenberg explained that the Village does not allow parking spaces to back directly onto publicly dedicated streets.

There was concern expressed about the level of guest parking provided. Other developments in the Village have provided .5 space to .33 guest parking spaces per unit.

Mr. Salathe commented that the overall density for the townhomes is reduced to approximately 5.0 du/ac by adding the acreage of the green space. He also stated that this is in line with the Village's Comprehensive Plan and Westfield's development to the east.

Mr. Rotolo stated that they have tried to situate the buildings so that the single family and townhome units do not directly face each other. The only area that they weren't able to do this was for the two buildings in the northwesterly corner of the property.

Chairman Rudny questioned why the townhome buildings are being proposed instead of additional Village lots, since they are selling.

Mr. Rotolo replied that the property was purchased based on the number of units that were to be built. Building more Village lots would not be economically feasible. He also stated that although the Village lots are selling, they are not performing to their expectations.

Mr. Kaplan expressed concern for traffic due to the number of curb cuts located on the east/west roads. He suggested that the road design be re configured to decrease the number of garages that face these roads (place the backs of units to these roads). He suggested that the two units in the area north of the northerly east-west road be eliminated and that single family lots be placed in this area. He also stated that he would like to see the number of guest parking spaces increased.

Mr. Hellstern suggested that the two buildings north of the northern east/west road be eliminated to add a distinct transition between the single family area (where the model homes are located) and the townhome area. He also expressed concern with the "canyon effect" of the buildings on the east/west roads.

Mr. Smith questioned how many units were occupied surrounding this proposed area. He was concerned with residents buying homes bordering this site with the understanding that this would be a single-family area.

Mr. Rotolo responded that no units have been sold directly to the west of this proposed amendment and no homes have been sold in the model home cul-de-sac area. He commented that Mr. Smith had a legitimate concern and that it would be Concord's concern also.

Mr. Wildenberg stated that the utilization of the guest parking spaces in the cul-de-sac bulbs might not be a bad idea.

Mr. Maiden stated concern with the converging of the driveways in the cul-de-sac areas. He further stated that the guest parking might need to be increased to be consistent with other Village subdivisions. Mr. Maiden stated that he does see this as a workable plan.

The overall consensus of the Commission was:

- That the two buildings north of the northern east/west road be replaced with single-family lots.
- That the road configuration be re-worked so that there is not a "canyon effect" or as many garages facing the main east-west streets; and
- The number of guest parking spaces be increased.

Mr. Cepen moved, seconded by Mr. Gill, to adjourn the meeting at 8:30 P.M.

Voice Vote: All Ayes

Respectfully submitted,

Connie S. Dinsmore, Secretary
Plan Commission