

Maryville Planning Commission – August 22, 2005

Public Hearing Proposed Change to Subdivision Code / Siding on Foundations

The public hearing was opened at 7:00 p.m. R. Covarrubias requested comments from those present who had submitted a public hearing attendance card requesting the opportunity to comment at the hearing.

L. Gullede: Stated that the change was proposed by the Village Board and cited the Reindeer Forest development in Collinsville as an example of the unattractiveness of exposed concrete foundation in excess of 12 inches above the top of grade. He stated that the proposed ordinance would apply to all exposed sides of the building and the fines, as proposed, are consistent with other Village ordinances. The Village Board will hold its' public hearing on this matter September 7, 2005 at 6:10 p.m.

M. Halloran: Real Estate developer – stated he was for the proposed change to the ordinance. The siding is more attractive and is not a big hardship for the builder. The use of siding results in a more finished product in appearance.

R. Covarrubias: Questioned Mr. Halloran as to whether or not the ordinance was defined adequately with respect to the use of the phrase “all sides”. Mr. Halloran, Yes.

K. Flaughner: Stated that a warning notice is usually given prior to assessing daily fines.

R. Covarrubias: Questioned at what point the fine is assessed.

K. Flaughner: Fines would be assessed when the siding is installed.

L. Gullede: Stated that an occupancy permit would not be issued.

K. Flaughner: Stated that the ordinance would apply to new construction only from the effective date of the ordinance forward.

With no further comments from those present, C. Vincent motioned to close the public hearing. D. Drobisch seconded the motion. Motion carried all ayes. The public hearing was closed at 7:19 p.m.

Chairperson R. Covarrubias called the regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:20 p.m.

Members present: L. Andrews, L. Benesh, R. Covarrubias, D. Drobisch M. Floyd, S. Frey, and C. Vincent

Members absent:

Additional Attendees: J. Dutton, K. Flaughner, L. Gullede and R. Schmidt.

Chairperson Covarrubias called for a review of the minutes from the June 27, 2005 meeting. R. Covarrubias made a motion to accept the minutes as presented. Motion was seconded by M. Floyd. Roll Call: Andrews-aye, Benesh-aye, Covarrubias-aye; Drobisch-aye; Floyd-aye; Frey-aye; Vincent-aye. Motion carried – all ayes.

Chairperson Covarrubias called for a review of the minutes from the special meeting of the Planning Commission on July 11, 2005. L. Benesh made a motion to accept the minutes with 1 correction to a typographical error, the word “mad” should read “made” in the second to last paragraph of the minutes. Motion was seconded by M. Floyd. Roll Call: Andrews-aye, Benesh-aye, Covarrubias-aye; Drobisch-aye; Floyd-aye; Frey-aye; Vincent-aye. Motion carried – all ayes.

Recommendation – Proposed Change to Subdivision Code / Siding on Foundations

The Planning Commission questioned if the use of decorative concrete forms which would give the appearance of brick would be acceptable. They also questioned whether or not a painted foundation would be acceptable. In discussion, it was decided that a developer could request a variance from the ordinance.

C. Vincent motioned to recommend approval of the proposed change to the subdivision code / siding on foundations with the following changes: 1. Paragraph three (3) to be changed to specify that the ordinance applies to “new construction”. 2. Section four (4), strike “plus the costs or charges connected with replacing or reestablishing the concrete marker to its original location” after the work thereof. Motion was seconded by M. Floyd. Roll Call: Andrews-aye, Benesh-aye, Covarrubias-aye; Drobisch-aye; Floyd-aye; Frey-aye; Vincent-aye. Motion carried – all ayes.

Construction Plans – Tuscany Ridge

A review memo was received from Juneau Associates, Inc., P.C. dated August 22, 2005 for Job No. E-050716. The review of the construction plans by Ron Keepes, P.E. noted 6 items brought to the Planning Commissions attention. The developer agreed to correct items 1., 2., 3., and 6. In Item 3, the developer agreed to fill the area to street elevation to eliminate the potential for flooding.

Items 4 and 5 referenced the developers request for 2 variances from Village Ordinance. A separate letter from the developer dated August 22, 2005 was received requesting: 1) the use of HDPE storm sewer material in lieu of reinforced concrete pipe outside of public right-of-ways and 2) that the minimum spacing of storm sewer inlets to be 250 feet of storm water gutter flow be waived.

A second memo was received from Juneau Associates, Inc., P.C. stating no objection to the developer’s use of HDPE as long as strict adherence to the bedding and haunching requirements as set forth by the manufacturer were followed. Juneau and Associates did not recommend approval to exceed the maximum spacing requirements between curb inlets and catch basins.

R. Covarrubias made a motion to recommend approval of the developers request for variance to use HDPE storm sewer material in lieu of reinforced concrete pipe outside of the public ROW. Motion was seconded by S. Frey. Roll Call: Andrews-aye, Benesh-aye, Covarrubias-aye; Drobisch-aye; Floyd-aye; Frey-aye; Vincent-aye. Motion carried – all ayes.

R. Covarrubias made a motion to recommend approval of the developers request to exceed the maximum spacing requirements between curb inlets and catch basins provided the developer agrees to add 1 inlet at a location that is satisfactory to the Village Engineer. Motion was seconded by S. Frey. Roll Call: Andrews-aye, Benesh-aye, Covarrubias-aye; Drobisch-aye; Floyd-aye; Frey-aye; Vincent-aye. Motion carried – all ayes.

L. Benesh made a motion to recommend approval of the construction plans for Tuscany Ridge to the Village Board provided all changes were made per the memo dated August 22, 2005 from Juneau Associates, Inc., P.C. Motion was seconded by M. Floyd. Roll Call: Andrews-aye, Benesh-aye, Covarrubias-aye; Drobisch-aye; Floyd-aye; Frey-aye; Vincent-aye. Motion carried – all ayes.

Informational Presentation Proposed Development – Ed Moore

K. Flaughter stated that the property was located on State Rte #162, West of Nottingham Estates. The property is contiguous to the Village and the developer has agreed to annex into the Village.

Ed Moore, the developer was present with his engineer, R. Shaw of Koch Surveying and Engineering. Preliminary drawings and pictures of a similar development were shown to the

Planning Commission. R. Shaw led a discussion along with E. Moore concerning the proposed development.

The development would be a PUD-R restricted to those 50 + years of age or older. The average price of a unit would be \$250,000 + / -. Each unit would be 85% brick with a walk out lower level where possible. Initially, 14 buildings (8 Quads and 6 Duplexes) would be constructed containing 44 dwelling units.

The Planning Commission remarked favorably on the proposed development.

Other Business

L. Benesh questioned the fencing requirement that was recently added to the ordinance governing the parking of auxiliary vehicles on private property. He stated that the Planning Commission did not recommend the use of fencing. L. Gulledge stated that the change was voted upon and passed by the Village Board and that there were differences of opinion on this matter.

R. Covarrubias expressed the Planning Commissions appreciation for the written updates provided by R. Schmidt on actions taken by the Village Board.

K. Flaughter stated that a new proposal was being discussed on the Needler property located behind the car wash on Center. The developer is considering building storage units. Due to the narrow lot width, the developer would use the back of the buildings as required fencing around the perimeter of the property with ingress and egress at either end. A B-2 zoning would be required for this type of development which has been previously denied.

The Planning Commission remarked unfavorably on the proposed development.

With no further business to discuss, D. Drobish made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 p.m. Motion was seconded by C. Vincent. Motion carried, all ayes.