

# **Village of Homer Glen**

**14933 S. Founders Crossing  
Homer Glen, Illinois 60491**

**Phone (708) 301-0632 • Fax (708) 301-8407**

## **PLAN COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**

**Monday, November 3, 2008  
7:30 PM**

**Village Council Chamber  
14917 S. Founders Crossing  
Homer Glen, Illinois 60491**

**A. Call the Plan Commission to Order**

The meeting of the Homer Glen Plan Commission was called to order by Chairman Stevens at 7:30 P.M.

**B. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag****C. Roll Call; Establish Quorum**

Chairman Stevens begins the meeting by introducing Tom Bernicki as the new Plan Commissioner. Tom is replacing out going Tom Polke. He welcomes Tom to the Plan Commission.

Present were Chairman Stevens, Bill Karn, Kathy Hines, Kevin Hoffmeister, Ted Kagainas, and Tom Bernicki. Present on behalf of the Village of Homer Glen was Lindley Ehlert. The minutes were recorded and transcribed by Candace Rose.

**D. Approval of Minutes****October 6, 2008**

A motion to approve the Minutes from October 6, 2008 as written was made by Member Karn, seconded by Member Hoffmeister. Voice vote taken, all in favor, none opposed.  
*Motion Carried.*

Chairman Stevens swears in anyone wishing to speak at tonight's scheduled Public Hearings.

**E. Agenda Items****1. 15340 Gougar Road (1.5 Mile Review): Consideration of a Map Amendment from A-2 to R-2 to allow the permitted uses within the R-2 district located at 15340 Gougar Road.**

Lindley Ehlert explains the petitioner is before the Plan Commission and Village Board for recommendation based upon their 1.5 mile review authority. The parcel is not contiguous to the Village's current boundary lines, and is outside of the Village's boundary agreement with Lockport.

The Village Board passed a resolution in opposition to the proposed special use for the operation of a church in the A-2 zoning district and variation from 25% lot coverage to

20 % lot coverage and variance from the 300-ft frontage requirement to 165.7-ft frontage July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

The applicant also received opposition of those same requests by Homer Township and was ultimately denied at the County level.

The petitioner is proposing a map amendment from A-2 to R-2 on a 4.9 acre parcel in Will County. There is currently an existing residence, and two accessory buildings on the property. The petitioner is not proposing any special uses or variances at this time. A church is a permitted use in an R-2 district.

Ms. Ehlert states that the previous concerns that were noted by the Village Board members and residents of Homer Glen and Homer Township per Resolution No. 07-018 were the traffic concerns on Gougar Road, the presence of a nearby school (Oak Prairie), the site distance of the proposed entrance, and concerns about the function of the retention pond and septic tank.

Ms. Ehlert states that the petitioner is not present to answer questions.

Chairman Steven allows people from the audience to comment on this case.

Marvin Pickering from 15525 Gougar Road states that the main issue with this site is the location. Just the other day a school bus was almost hit by a SUV, there are no sidewalks and almost no shoulder to the road and children walking along there everyday. He also states that the Church that wants to build on this property is a seven day a week operation, not just Sundays. He explains that all the properties from 159<sup>th</sup> Street to 151<sup>st</sup> Street on that side of the road are zoned agricultural and to allow an R-2 property in the middle of them all would be inappropriate. Mr. Pickering restates that the most important issue is the safety of the school children.

Tom Logan from 15337 Gougar Road states that he lives directly across the street from this property and he agrees with everything that Marvin has stated.

Chairman Stevens states that since the petitioner is not present the Commissioners can not speculate as to what use they (the petitioners) are planning. They have only asked for a map amendment for the property. Maybe a vote should wait until the petitioner can be present.

Mr. Pickering states that this issue is going to the November 18<sup>th</sup> County Board meeting so if the Village wants any input into the decision they need to vote tonight.

Ms. Ehlert explains that the Village was against the request for the Special Use Permit and variance but this request has been modified to only include the map amendment. At this time the petitioner does not have to define for the County what will be their intended future use for the property. County will allow the map amendment without knowing the

intended use. Ms. Ehlert also states that currently the property is identified on the Comprehensive Plan as R-2.

Motion to recommend to the Village Board non-support of the request for a map amendment from A-2 to R-2 for the subject parcel located at 15340 Gougar Road was made by Member Hines, seconded by Member Karn. All in favor, none opposed.  
*Motion Carried.*

**2. HG-0820-V Bell Side 7 (Public Hearing): Consideration of a variation from the regulation that the sign must exist on the premise where the activity, service or business takes place and a variation from the total gross surface area allowed from the maximum one square foot of signage for every three lineal feet of street frontage for the subject parcel located at 15829 Bell Road.**

Lindley Ehlert explains that the subject parcel is an existing land locked parcel with only a 30-ft access easement on Bell Road. Per ordinance, signs advertising an activity, service or business that does not take place on the premises where the sign is erected are *prohibited* (Section 10.6-3 (n) of the Zoning Ordinance). Bell Side 7 is one of Homer Glen's oldest businesses and has served the community as an automotive repair business for 46 years.

The applicant's previous sign would be considered a nonconforming sign by our current sign regulations due to the height and size. The previous metal Goodyear sign was approximately 85-sq.ft. and stood 40-ft in height. Ms. Ehlert explains that operating without a sign and due to the lack of frontage on Bell Road would cause the owners an economic hardship and that per Section 10.6; business/commercial district signs are allowed one ground mounted sign per each zoning lot.

The applicant is proposing a ground mounted masonry sign approximately, totaling 24-sq.ft. with stone pillars approximately 7-ft in height. By ordinance, the height of a ground mounted sign cannot exceed 10-ft. in size and must be setback 15-feet from all property lines.

Ms. Ehlert explains that the zoning ordinance states that the total gross surface area allowed cannot exceed one square foot of signage for every three lineal feet of street frontage. The subject parcel does not have street frontage, therefore a calculation for sign area is not possible. If the 30-ft easement were used to calculate area, the size would be significantly limited at 10-square feet. The applicant is requesting a 24-sq.ft. that is within the average of signs in the area. A 24-sq.ft. sign correlates to 72-ft in frontage. The minimum lot width per ordinance in the C-4 district is 80-ft', which demonstrates that the proposed square footage of signage is within a reasonable size for the district.

The applicant is proposing that the new sign will be approximately in the same location as the previous sign and set back at 20-ft from Bell Road-the requirement is 15-ft

minimum. The attached letter from the Will County Department of Highways dated August 25<sup>th</sup>, 2008 indicates that there is no additional right of way needed along Bell Road that would impact the proposed location of their signage.

The applicant has indicated they will be planting greenery along the base of their sign.

The applicant is proposing one or two spotlights (on each side) for their ground mounted masonry sign. These will be ground mounted also and at a 45 degree angle, per the lighting ordinance regulation.

Ms. Ehlert states that the applicant has provided a letter from the Shell gas station dated October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008 stating that Bell Side 7 is granted permission to place their proposed signage in the easement area previously granted by Shell.

Jodi Adelman is present tonight to answer any questions and address any comments. She states that essentially they would like to replace the over sized sign that they did have with a monument sign that will be within the Village requirements for size and lighting.

Brian Koch from 12738 W. 159<sup>th</sup> Street (Classic Car Wash) states that he has no problem with Bell Side getting their sign approved but he does have a problem with them not having any sewers or pavement on the driveway access to the site. He states that every time it rains he gets silt and gravel and other dirt washed up all over his site and in his sewer lines. It cost him on average \$5,000 a year to clean up the mess and he has no choice because it is not an optimal situation to have all the dirt, gravel and silt on his site when his customers are there to get their cars cleaned. He has been in before to talk with the Village about the issue and he thinks before they let them invest in a new sign they should be required to fix the other (more important) issues.

Jamie Lahey from 12720 W. 159<sup>th</sup> Street (Touch of Green Landscape) agrees with Brian. Every rain storm produces a huge amount of cleanup on his site as well.

Mike Adelman states that they know the driveway is a big issue and they do plan on paving it. But the sign needs to go in first because there will be underground wires and digging required with its installation that would ruin the driveway should it be installed first.

Mike Copresti from 15535 Gougar states that his son worked for Bell Side 5-yrs ago and the driveway was a hopeless mess then. He just wanted to confirm the issue for Mr. Koch and Mr. Lahey.

Brian Koch states that he thinks the Village should give them their sign but somehow require that in a defined amount of time they need to pave the driveway and hook into some (storm water) sewer system.

A motion to close the public hearing for Case No. HG0820-V was made by Member Karn, seconded by Member Hines. Voice vote taken, all in favor, none opposed. *Motion Carried.*

Chairman Stevens suggest that Village Staff should meet with Bell Side and lay out a time table to get things done. Member Hoffmeister asks Lindley Ehlert if all that has been discussed tonight is consistent with the conversations she has had with the applicant. Ms. Ehlert states that yes the applicant has discussed the flooding and driveway/parking lot improvements. Member Hoffmeister asks if Ms. Ehlert could keep the Plan Commission informed on the issue of a time line for improvements.

Member Hines suggests that a motion to approve includes conditions of the other improvements being made by a certain time.

Member Karn points out that the request for this sign has nothing to do with the flooding problems discussed tonight.

Member Kagainas agrees that the flooding has nothing to do with the request for a variance for the sign however; to get a variance the applicant should show their willingness to work with the Village on other issues.

Member Bernicki asks what recourse the Village will have if they approve this and no future improvements to the site are made by the applicant.

Member Hines asks how the Village Staff feels about the issues.

Ms. Ehlert states that they would like approval conditioned on a timeline established for the improvement between the Village and the applicant.

Chairman Stevens suggests first that Ms. Ehlert sets up a meeting between all parties and the Village Staff including the engineers. Then, second, they should establish a time line that is reasonable to complete the agreed upon improvements to the site.

A Motion to recommend to the Village Board approval of the request for a variance to erect a sign in Case No. HG0820-S given the following contingencies: a meeting between all parties is had to discuss a timeline for the need repairs to the parking lot, driveway, lighting, and flooding and a time line is determined was made by Member Hines, seconded by Member Karn. Roll call vote taken. In favor (5) Hoffmeister, Karn, Hines, Kagainas and Bernicki. Opposed (0) none. Absent (1) Maska. Abstained (0) none. The Chairman did not vote. *Motion Carried.*

**3. T-Mobile WCF Collocation (*workshop*): Consideration of a SUP to allow the construction of a wireless communication facility (WCF), consisting of the collocation of a 10-ft T-Mobile antennae at the top of an existing 105.5-ft electric**

**transmission tower and an ancillary building to house the supporting equipment, located at 12121 Derby Lane.**

Ms. Ehlert explains that the applicant requests a special use permit to co-locate a Wireless Communications Facility on the Commonwealth Edison Easement located at 12121 Derby Lane. The proposal includes a 10-ft T-Mobile antennae extension at the top of an existing 105.5-ft ComEd transmission tower and an 12.5-ft ancillary building to house the supporting equipment.

Ms. Ehlert states that T-Mobile has entered into an agreement with Commonwealth Edison to lease 240 square feet (12-ft x 20-ft) of their property, 90-ft southwest of Derby Lane. She explains that the proposed antennae will provide service for T-Mobile. The subject parcel was selected by T-Mobile based on R-frequency criteria, specifically, the proximity to the increased in-home subscriber use in the surrounding neighborhoods. T-Mobile has stated that there are substantial gaps in coverage in the immediate vicinity and no other existing communications towers are within the necessary proximity. The utilization of the existing ComEd infrastructure provides the opportunity for T-Mobile to utilize an existing structure and help to reduce the need to construct additional towers throughout the Village.

Section 8.32 of the Zoning Ordinance outlines the requirements for installation of a wireless communication facility within the Village and states installation of a wireless communications facility (WCF) requires a special use permit. The applicant requests to construct an antennae extension and a 12-ft x 20-ft (240 square feet) facility which will house associated equipment.

The total height of the ComEd tower, including the T-Mobile antennae extension and lighting rod will be 115-ft. The existing ComEd tower stands at a height of 105.5-ft. The T-Mobile single use antenna will be located at a height of 110-ft. Ordinance states all antennas within agricultural zoning districts shall not exceed 150-ft; therefore the applicant is in compliance with the zoning ordinance. No collocation of any WCF on an existing structure shall increase the height by more than 15-ft; the applicant is proposing an increase of only 10' in height.

The renderings for the WCF show a brick façade which complies with the Exterior Construction Standards Ordinance. The applicant has indicated that the proposed brick façade, shingles, and paint colors for the exterior doors will be identical to the materials T-Mobile had approved for the ancillary structure for case HG-0716-S on the Coachman Rd/ComEd easement collocation

The applicant has indicated the proposed WCF will require infrequent maintenance visits (approximately one or two times per month) which will occur during regular business hours. Access to the WCF is being proposed with a 12-ft wide paved access path to allow for vehicular and pedestrian access.

The current site plans note one motion sensor light mounted on the outside of the entrance to the facility. The equipment cabinets will be alarmed for security purposes.

Per ordinance, no portion of any WCF shall be located less than 30 feet from any lot line. The proposed ancillary building is setback 70-ft from the road, 56-ft from the property line to the east, and 141-ft from the western property line which meets the setback requirements of the ordinance.

The proposed landscape plan includes low mow turf, a variety of ornamental and native grasses, intermixed perennials, and ornamental, evergreen, and shade trees. These species are similar to what were approved per the landscape plan submittal for Case HG-0716-S T-Mobile Coachman WCF Collocation. Planning Resources had suggested these species for approval in case HG-0716-S and T-Mobile is proposing the same landscape plan in this collocation.

As with any special use, the Commission may consider placing conditions as part of the review.

Ms. Ehlert explains that the Storm Water Ordinance requires detention in developing this site and that the engineering is currently under review. She also points out that the Commission may require cash in lieu of detention as a condition of the approval.

Ms. Ehlert states that she did receive a letter from the fire department stating that they had no objection to the plan.

Mr. Mark Layne is present to answer any questions about the application. He shows on a map the expected increase in coverage that they expect to have with the additional antenna. He explains that this facility will be almost identical to the facility built on the Coachman Road site.

Member Hoffmeister asks if the facility on Coachman Road has a fence surrounding it. Ms. Ehlert states that no that site has all the equipment stored inside so there was no need to fence the facility.

Member Karn asks if the building at the Coachman Road site has been completed. Mr. Layne states that no, it is not finished. He adds that he heard that it will have its roofing done this week and the building should be done shortly.

Chairman Stevens asks if Plan Commissioner agree that this request looks reasonable. All Members agree that it is fine.

Chairman Stevens thanks Mr. Layne for his presentation. He then addresses the issue of up-coming Plan Commission meetings. He states that this meeting was the only meeting scheduled for November and thus the next meeting will be December 1<sup>st</sup>. However, the Christmas tree lighting ceremony is scheduled for December 1<sup>st</sup> at 6:00 followed by treats

here at the Village office. He asks if the Members would agree to change the time of the meeting from 7:30 to 8:00 for that night. Everyone agrees that an 8:00 start will be fine.

**F. Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn at 8:40 was made by Member Hoffmeister, seconded by Member Bernicki. Voice vote taken, all in favor, none opposed. *Motion Carried.*

Next Meeting  
December 1, 2008  
8:00 PM

Approved on \_\_\_\_\_

Chairmen Brian Stevens \_\_\_\_\_