

**Maryville Planning Commission  
January 11, 2010**

**Regular Meeting**

The regular meeting of the Maryville Planning Commission was called to order by Chairperson Covarrubias at 7:00 p.m. on January 11, 2010 in the Village Hall.

**Roll Call**

Members Present: R. Covarrubias, D. Drobisch, M. Floyd, S. Frey, D. Keene,  
C. Vincent  
Members Absent: T. Nemsky  
Additional Attendees: K. Flaughner, R. Keepes, E. Kostyshock, C. Short

Chairperson Covarrubias requested a review of the minutes from the November 23, 2009 meeting. D. Keene made a motion to recommend the approval of the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by C. Vincent. Motion carried, all ayes.

There was no regular meeting of the Planning Commission in December, 2009.

**Recommendation of Final Plat (Minor Subdivision) – Heritage Business Park**

Ross Koch, Engineer for the development was present to answer any questions from the Planning Commission. The Business Park is comprised of 3 lots abutting Illinois Rte. 162 in front of the Villages of Amberleigh. Lot #1 is 1.5 acres; Lot #2 is 2.35 acres; Lot #3 is 2.86 acres.

R. Keepes of Juneau Associates, Inc., P.C. presented a review memo on the revised plat and plans dated January 5, 2010 for Job No. E-090712 from Juneau Associates, Inc., P.C. One item was noted in the memo as needing correction. That item had been corrected on the final plat presented to the Planning Commission. It was noted that the signature box on the plat needed to be changed to show the year as 2010.

A brief discussion ensued in which K. Flaughner presented a summary review of the Minor Subdivision. R. Koch answered questions regarding ingress, egress and access between the adjoining lots. There is currently access to each of the lots from Illinois Rte. 162.

C. Vincent made a motion to recommend approval to the Village Board of the Final Plat for the Heritage Business Park as presented. The motion was seconded by D. Drobisch. Roll Call: Covarrubias-Aye; Drobisch-Aye; Floyd-Aye; Frey-Aye; Keene-Aye; Vincent-Aye. Motion carried, all ayes.

**Informational Presentation – Proposed +55 Single Family Development**

K. Jones and several associates were present to give an overview of the proposed development and answer any questions from the Planning Commission. The proposed development is at West Main Street on the Cherry Family Farm property across from the Fox Mill Estates Subdivision. The development would be slightly less than 12 acres in size and be comprised of 37 single family units of approximately 1,500 to 1,900 sq. ft. with a price range of \$200k to \$250k. The homes would be single-story in the craftsman style with stone, shakes, and siding. Other amenities would include a community building and a water retention feature.

The plat would be presented to the Village as a PDR (planned development – residential). At this time, it is expected that the side yard would be less than 5 feet and there would not be a 25 foot green space buffer around the perimeter of the development. An average lot size would be 57 x 110. The development would have 80,000 sq. ft. in green space, which includes the water retention areas.

The developer has not decided at this time if the development would be FHA age restricted to 80% or greater of the ownership being +55, or simply marketed to those in an older age demographic.

K. Flaughter pointed out to the developer that the street would be a public street and have to meet all Village ordinances.

Members of the Planning Commission questioned: A) If a provision would be made for the use of public transportation, such as a drop off, pick-up area. B) If the covenants would allow on-street parking. C) If parking space would be provided at the community building. D) If a variance would be requested for the drainage design. E) Where the detention basins would flow to. F) If the retention ponds would be connected. The developer indicated that they were trying to make the water retention area a feature of the development with the possible addition of a walking trail, benches, etc.

Members of the Planning Commission commented that with the smaller lot size, increased density, reduced side yard set back, elimination or reduction of the 25 foot buffer around the perimeter of the property, etc. the developer should seriously consider age restricting the ownership of the units to 80% or greater to +55 or older. Also, adequate parking should be provided at the community building, and possibly other public areas within the development.

Members of the Planning Commission complemented the developer on the design of the homes, and the overall concept of the development.

The developer commented that it would be a phased development, and the community building would be completed as part of phase I.

### **Other Business**

There being no further business to discuss, C. Vincent made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:54 p.m. The motion was seconded by M. Floyd. The motion carried – all ayes.