# VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT - REGULAR MEETING AGENDA 

Monday, October 3, 2022
Village Administration Building
Village Board Room
7:00 P.M.
432 W. Nebraska Street, Frankfort, IL

1. Call to Order \& Roll Call
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Unanimous Consent Agenda

All items on the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine in nature and will be enacted in one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a board member so requests, in which event, the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and will be considered separately.

Mötion: Motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.
A. Approval of Minutes

1. Regular Meeting (September 19, 2022)
B. Approval of Bills/Payroll
C. Plan Commission Report Summary
2. Oltman Residence Multiple Zoning Variances: 240 Center Road - Ordinance (Waive $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Readings)
a. First Floor Building Materials Variance
b. Roof Materials Variance
c. Driveway Setback Variance
d. Driveway Turning Radius Variance
3. Pic \& Plā Special Use Permit for Indoor Recreation: 21800 S. LaGrange Road Ordinance (Waive $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Readings)
4. Oasis Senior Living, Inc. - 8531 W. Lincoln Highway
a. Special Use Permit for an Assisted Living Facility - Ordinance (Waive $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Readings)
b. Oasis Frankfort Subdivision - Final Plat Approval
5. Plan Commission Report Summary (Tabled from September I9, 2022)
A. Opa! Major PUD Change for Brookside Commons: 10235 W. Lincoln Highway Ordinance (Waive $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Readings)
6. Mayor's Report
7. Board Comments
8. Village Administrator's Report
9. Police Department Report
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9. Attorney's Report
10. Other Business

## 11. Public Comments

12. Adjournment

## MINUTES OF THE REGULAR FRANKFORT VILLAGE BOARD MEETING SEPTEMBER 19, 2022

## CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Keith Ogle called the regular meeting of the Frankfort Village Board to order on Monday, September 19, 2022, at 7:01 P.M., at the Village Administration Building, 432 W. Nebraska Street, Frankfort, Illinois.

## REQUEST FOR ELECTRONIC ATTENDANCE \& PARTICIPATION

Village Clerk Katie Schubert reported Trustee Jessica $P$ row mitted an Electronic Attendance Request to electronically attend the September 19, 202 rep at eting of the Village Board.

After being duly identified by image with audio capabilites a video .erence, Trustee Petrow stated the reason for not being physically present wecause employment purposes.

## ROLL CALL

Village Clerk Katie Schubert called the it The fo wins vere in attendance: In attendance were Mayor Keith Ogle, Clerk Katie Schubert, stees Ma. . et Farina, Michael Leddin, Daniel Rossi, and Gene Savaria. Also in $a^{+}$vane tey George Mahoney, Attorney Hannah Lamore, Police Chief Leanne Che' ${ }^{\prime}$ is, Admin. tor $k$ Piscia, and Asst. Administrator John Burica. In attendance by means c deo conferenc Trustee Jessica Petrow.

Clerk Schubert noted a quor of the p ic body was physically present.

## PARTICIPATION BY BOARL CMBER VIA ELECTRONIC CONFERENCING

Mayor Ogle entertained a motion from the floor to allow Trustee Petrow to participate and vote by means of electronic conferencing.

Trustee Savaria made a motion (\#1), seconded by Trustee Rossi, to approve participation and voting via electronic conferencing by Trustee Petrow.

Clerk Schubert called the roll. Ayes: Trustees Farina, Leddin, Rossi, and Savaria. Nays: None. The motion carried.

## ROLL CALL FOLLOWING APPROVAL FOR PARTICIPATION AND VOTING VIA ELECTRONIC CONFERENCING

Clerk Schubert called the roll．In attendance were Mayor Keith Ogle，Clerk Katie Schubert， Trustees Adam Borrelli，Margaret Farina，Michael Leddin，Jessica Petrow，Daniel Rossi，and Gene Savaria．

## APPROVAL OF SPECIAL ORDERS－UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGENDA

All items on the Omnibus Agenda are considered to be routine in nature and are enacted in one motion．There is no separate discussion of these items unless a board member makes a request，in which event，the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and will be considered separately．

Trustee Savaria requested item D（3）－Opa！Major PUD Change for Brookside Commons be removed from the Consent Agenda．

A．Approval of Minutes
1．Regular Meeting（September 6，2022）
B．Approval of Bills／Payroll－$\$ 1,431,592.35 / \$ 44^{\circ}$

C．Committee of the Whole Report
1．Disposal of Surplus Vehicles $-\mathrm{O}_{1}$ mance（laive ${ }^{\text {t }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Readings）
Accept the recommendation of Commi ne Whole，waive the First and Second Readings，and pass ANーロロNAㄱ（NO．3308）AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN SURP＇s PRG ？TY VNED BY THE VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT， WILL AND Cr $<$ COUNTIE．ILLIN IS．

2．St．Francis Road h rfacing $\operatorname{Pr}$ ect－Resolution
Accept the recomme．tion of ee Committee of the Whole and adopt A RESOLUTION （NO．22－26）AUTHOK．THE EXECUTION OF AN IDOT RESOLUTION FOR IMPROVEMENT UNDE ，THE ILLINOIS HIGHWAY CODE AND A LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCY ENGINEERING SERVICES AGREEMENT FOR AN APPROPRIATION OF $\$ 76,000.00$ IN MOTOR FUEL TAX FUNDS，for Phase I and Phase II Design Engineering Services，including pavement cores，for the resurfacing of St． Francis Road from U．S．Route 45 （LaGrange Road）to $88^{\text {th }}$ Avenue．

3． 2022 Sanitary Sewer Lining Project：Contract Award－Resolution
Accept the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole and adopt A RESOLUTION （NO．22－27）AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT WITH VISU－ SEWER OF ILLINOIS，LLC，RELATED TO THE 2022 SANITARY SEWER LINING PROJECT，for the rehabilitation of approximately 6,000 linear feet of sanitary sewer in the Prestwick Subdivision and Industrial area，in the amount of $\$ 369,310.00$ ．
4. Illinois Transportation Enhancement Program (ITEP) Grant: Sauk Trail Bike Path Project Approval - Resolution
Accept the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole and adopt A RESOLUTION (NO. 22-28) IN SUPPORT OF THE VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT'S APPLICATION TO THE ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR FUNDING UNDER THE ILLINOIS TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM GRANT FOR THE SAUK TRAIL BIKE PATH PROJECT AND AUTHORIZING THE APPROPRIATION OF VILLAGE CAPITAL FUNDS, in the estimated amount of $\$ 286,000.00$, for the local sponsor's share of the project costs.
D. Plan Commission Report Summary

1. Kerley Residence Multiple Variances and Final Plat Approval: 25 Carpenter Street Ordinance (Waive $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Readings)
Accept the Plan Commission recommendation, waive the First and Second Readings, and pass AN ORDINANCE (NO. 3369) GRANTIN~ MULTIPLE VARIANCES TO CERTAIN PROPERTY LOCATED WITHI' 'HE MITS OF THE VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT, WILL AND COOK COUNTI 1 LI 'S (KERLEY RESIDENCE 25 CARPENTER STREET), granting a front-1 setbac variance from the 30 -foot requirement to 10.2 feet; a side yard setback variance om the . sot requirement to 19.4 feet; a lot coverage variance from $20 \%$ to $2^{\rho^{\prime}}$. $n d$ a bu. 'ing materials variance to permit the use of non-masonry siding on the fi , floo conju ion with a proposed addition and remodel of the existing residential me al . rc rdance with the reviewed plans, public testimony, and Findings of $\Gamma \mathrm{zt}$.

Accept the Plan Commicsion re nmendation and approve the 25 Carpenter Street Subdivision Final P1 plepa. by M. 'ngerich Gereaux \& Associates, dated 08.18.2022, in accordance $w^{i}$ the reviewc lans 1 subject to any necessary technical revisions prior to recordi.
2. Facen4Ward Venues ecial U. Permit for Indoor Entertainment: 20871 S. LaGrange Road - Ordinance (Wa1, st $\quad\lrcorner 2^{\text {nd }}$ Readings)
Accept the Plan Commissi . recommendation, waive the First and Second Readings, and pass AN ORDINANCE (NO. 3370) GRANTING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR INDOOR ENTERTAINMENT (EVENT SPACE) TO CERTAIN PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT, WILL AND COOK COUNTIES, ILLINOIS (FACEN4WARD VENUES, LLC - 20871 S. LAGRANGE ROAD), within the Butera Center Plaza to permit the business operation of Facen4Ward Venues, in accordance with the reviewed plans, public testimony, and Findings of Fact, with the following conditions: soundproofing on the east and west walls shall be installed to the ceiling of the building; and loud music must end by 8:00 P.M. from Sunday through Thursday and by 10:00 P.M. on Friday and Saturday.
3. Opa! Major PUD Change for Brookside Commons: 10235 W. Lincoln Highway Ordinance (Waive $1^{\text {st }}$ and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Readings) - Removed from Consent Agenda

Trustee Farina made a motion (\#2), seconded by Trustee Savaria, to approve the Unanimous Consent Agenda.

Trustees Borrelli, Farina, Leddin, Rossi, and Savaria presented a brief overview of the consent agenda docket items under consideration for approval.

Mayor Ogle invited trustee comment on the consent agenda docket items prior to a vote being taken.

Trustee Borrelli commented on the good turnout for the Open House held earlier this evening for the Sauk Trail Bike Project, voicing his support of the project.

Clerk Schubert called the roll. Ayes: Trustees Borrelli, Farina, Leddin, Petrow, Rossi, and Savaria. Nays: None. The motion carried.

## OPA! MAJOR PUD CHANGE FOR BROOKSI ¿ Cr MONS: 10235 W. LINCOLN HIGHWAY - ORDINANCE

Trustee Savaria presented a brief overview of the Opa! M. - PUD wange for the Brookside Commons Planned Unit Development. He rep ... pplica. George Karuntzos proposes a building addition and relocation of the outdoo satio ${ }^{\dagger}$ 'he exisung Opa! restaurant, located at 10235 W. Lincoln Highway, within the Broo de omt development. The project would involve enclosing the existing 670 squa foot $p$ to ans constructing a new 324 square foot outdoor seating area adjacent to it. To ommod th proposed improvements, the applicant requests the granting of a Mair

At the September $8^{\text {th }} \mathrm{P}$ ac Hearing o he prect, the Commissioners reviewed the proposed Major PUD Change , the Brookside Commons development and forwarded a split (4-1) recommendation to the 'age Board $\delta$ approve the Major PUD Change, subject to final engineering approval and L . restav at not opening before 3:00 P.M. The applicant was amendable to not opening befo. ${ }^{3}$ JP.M., Monday through Friday. The dissenting vote was because of the proposed patio and c.aditional seating request.

Mayor Ogle noted the applicant was not present at the meeting and suggested for the item to be tabled.

Trustee Farina made a motion (\#3), seconded by Trustee Savaria, to table consideration of the Opa! Major PUD Change for the Brookside Commons Planned Unit Development to the next regular Village Board meeting on October 3, 2022.

Mayor Ogle invited board comment on the item prior to a vote being taken. Attorney Mahoney stated the motion to table the matter has precedence.

Mayor Ogle suggested for board members to forward any comments regarding the Major PUD Change to staff who will convey the information to the applicant.

Trustee Petrow felt it is best practice, whether the item is on the consent agenda or not, for staff to communicate to applicants that they should be present when their item goes before the Village Board.

Mayor Ogle called for a vote.
Clerk Schubert called the roll. Ayes: Trustees Borrelli, Farina, Leddin, Petrow, Rossi, and Savaria. Nays: None. The motion carried.

Mayor Ogle stated the matter is tabled until the next regular Village Board meeting on October 3, 2022, and staff will convey any comments received from the trustees to the applicant.

## MAYOR'S REPORT

- Mayor Ogle announced Cruisin' Frankfort will end its $20^{\circ} \mathrm{s}^{\circ}$ ason on Monday, September 26, from 5:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M. in downtown Frankfo
- Mayor Ogle reported the Frankfort Country Mark $\quad$ ntinues ery Sunday in downtown Frankfort, from 9:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. through October He enc.a.aged the community to join the Frankfort Police Department for "Cou" 'arket , ' a Cop" on Sunday, September 25, from 10:00 A.M. to 11:30 A.M.
- Mayor Ogle invited the public to regi .er for t : "Sca y on the Prairie 5K Costume Run \& Spooky Sprint" event in downtown $\quad$ kfort or + 」ay, October 22.
- Mayor Ogle congratul -d Chelse ${ }_{\text {a }}$ term te School 157-C for being recognized as a 2022 National Blue Ribl School for acá mic excellence. He noted Chelsea Intermediate School is one of only 17 sch. 's in Illinois to e identified as a National Blue Ribbon School.
- Mayor Ogle gave a shout c to f sy Pavlacka for sharing a beautiful photo he had taken of Arrowhead Bridge at sunset.
- Mayor Ogle wished Josie a Happy $90^{\text {th }}$ Birthday.


## BOARD COMMENTS

The Village Board extended congratulations to Chelsea Intermediate School for being named a National Blue Ribbon School.

Clerk Schubert reported three trustee seats for the Village of Frankfort will be elected at the April 4, 2023 Consolidated Election. She stated petition circulation for residents seeking election begins tomorrow, September 20, 2022, noting petition packets are available at the Village Hall during regular business hours. The 2023 Candidate's Guide provides information for candidates seeking office, which is available at www.elections.il.gov.

Trustee Leddin commented on the Illinois Municipal League's (IML) Annual Conference held September 15-17, voicing his appreciation for the opportunity to attend the conference.

Trustee Savaria announced his daughter and son-in-law are expecting their first child, voicing his excitement of being a first-time grandfather.

Trustee Farina gave a shoutout to the Forest Preserve District of Will County for hosting "Make Trail Moments on the Old Plank" event held on Saturday, September 17, in downtown Frankfort.

Trustee Petrow congratulated the Lincoln-Way East Griffins for their homecoming victory over Andrew High School. She commented on the IML Annual Conference, and the educational sessions provided. She requested consideration to discuss some of the lessons learned from the sessions at a future committee meeting.

Trustee Borrelli also commented on the IML Annual Confe $n \gg$ held over the weekend and the outstanding educational and networking opportunit; for nicipal officials. He expressed concerns regarding the Safety, Accountability, Fairnes. Equ. Today Act (SAFE-T) and the unique challenges of passing a trailer bill.

Trustee Rossi encouraged residents to attend the al pro tion of Theory of Relativity at Lincoln-Way East High School on Saturday, Sf iembe and C cober 1, at 7:00 P.M.

Mayor Ogle expanded on Trustee Borre! s comr ents rt ating to the SAFE-T Act, noting the Village has had concerns regarding po as of th an or the past two years, and the Village Board has been encouraged to our. islative representatives regarding those concerns. He also voiced his support of al Coun Stat ttorney James Glasgow and his efforts to address the issues with public sr con contained the St, E-T Act.

## VILLAGE ADMINISTA TOR REP T

Administrator Piscia advised co, ry members that the repaving of Old Plank Road Trail from Harlem Avenue to Schoolhouse Rcad, which was scheduled to begin this week, has been delayed. Administrator Piscia thanked residents who attended the Open House for the ITEP grant for the proposed Sauk Trail Bike Path project eârlier this evening and he encouraged anyone interested in submitting comments for the project to contact Director Mike Schwarz at the Village Hall.

## POLICE DEPARTMENT REPORT

Chief Chelepis invited residents to attend the "Country Market with a Cop" event on Sunday, September 25, from 10:00 A.M. to 11:30 A.M., noting it's a nice opportunity to meet the men and women of the Frankfort Police Department. She reminded residents to close overhead garage doors, lock their vehicles and doors, and never leave keys/key fobs inside of vehicles.

## VILLAGE ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Village Attorney Lamore had no report.

## OTHER BUSINESS

Trustee Borrelli asked if there was any additional information or follow-up from Jill Plesha regarding her purchase proposal for the 2 Smith Street property. Administrator Piscia reported no additional information has been provided. Mayor Ogle noted the matter will be placed on next month's Committee of the Whole agenda for further discussion.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments were addressed to the Village Board.

## ADJOURNMENT

Hearing no further business, Trustee Farina made a motion (4) reconded by Trustee Savaria, to adjourn the regular board meeting of Monday, Septem' ir $19 . \quad 12$.

Clerk Schubert called the roll. Ayes: Trustees Borrelli, F , Ledd. Detr w, Rossi, and Savaria. Nays: None. The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at , \& P.M.

Katie Schubert
Village Clerk


FRANKFORT FINANCIAL SYSTEM
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Schedule of Bills
VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT GL060S-V08. 17 RECAPPAGE GL540R

FUND RECAP:
FUND DESCRIPTION

GENERAL CORPORATE FUND MOTOR FUEL TAX FUND
$\begin{array}{ll}23 & \text { MOTOR FUEL TAX FUND } \\ 31 & \text { CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}31 & \text { CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND } \\ 62 & \text { SEWER \& WATER OPER. \& MAINT }\end{array}$
TOTAL ALL FUNDS

CTOBER 3, 2022
DISBURSEMENTS
253.904.70

4,089. 12
2,160,953.47
155,497.98
$2,574,445.27$

VENDOR NAME
DESCRIPTION
AMOUNT

MANAGED SERV-ENDPT-OCT MANAGED SERV-ENDPT-OCT MANAGED SERV-ENDPT-OCT MANAGED SERV-ENDPT-OCT MANAGED SERV-ENDPT-OCT MANAGED SERV-ENDPT-OCI MANAGED SERV-ENDPT-OCT MANAGED SERV-USER-OCT MANAGED SERV-USER-OCT MANAGED SERV-USER-OCT MANAGED SERV-USER-OCT MANAGED SERV-USER-OCT MANAGED SERV-USER-OCT MANAGED SERV-USER-OCT BACKUP SERVICE-OCT 2022 BACKUP SERVICE-OCT 2022 BACKUP SERVICE-OCT 2022 BACKUP SERVICE-OCT 2022 BACKUP SERVICE-OCT 2022 BACKUP SERVICE-OCT 2022 BACKUP SERVICE-OCT 2022 BACKUP SERVICE-OCT 2022 T\&M-ONSITE SUPPORT-AUG T\&M-ONSITE SUPPORT-AUG T\&M-ONSITE SUPPORT-AUG T\&M-ONSITE SUPPORT-AUG T\&M-ONSITE SUPPORT-AUG T\&M-ONSITE SUPPORT-AUG T\&M-ONSITE SUPPORT-AUG T\&M-ONSITE SUPPORT-AUG REMOTE SUPPORT-AUG REMOTE SUPPORT-AUG REMOTE SUPPORT-AUG REMOTE SUPPORT-AUG REMOTE SUPPORT-AUG REMOTE SUPPORT-AUG REMOTE SUPPORT-AUG

AKERMAN LLP
NEGOTIATIONS
NEGOTIATIONS

ALECK PLUMBING INC
WTR HEATER SERV-RGNL,
R\&M - TREATMENT PLANT
62.491 .4229
01.421 .4321
01.421 .4321

ATTORNEY FEES
ATTORNEY FEES
VENDOR TOTAL

R\&M - BLDG/SITE IMPROVEM 01.441.4211

AMBER MECHANICAL CONTRAC
HVAC SERV AGREEMENT-VH

GL540R-V08.17 PAGE

PO\#
F/P ID LINE

5490000
54900004
54900004
54900004
54900004
54900004
54900004
54900005
54900005
54900005
54900005
54900005
54900005
54900005
54900001
54900001
54900001
54900001
54900001
54900001
54900001
54900001
54900002
54900002
54900002
54900002
54900002
4900002
54900002
54900003
54900003
54900003
54900003
54900003
54900003

54900006
54900007

S134599
54900080

VILILAGE OF FRANKFORT

## VENDOR NAME

DESCRIPTION
AT\&T
432 W NEBRASKA-ALARM

I LAWN MAINTENANCE
MNCPL MOWING $8 / 22$
MNCPL MOWING $8 / 22$
MNCPL MOWING $8 / 29$
MNCPL MOWING $8 / 29$
MNCPL MOWING $8 / 29$
MNCPL MOWING $9 / 6$
MNCPL MOWING $9 / 6$
MNCPL MOWING $9 / 6$
MNCPL MOWING 9/12
$200^{\circ}$ RT30 FROM WNDY HILI
22971 DEVONSHIRE LN
20696 MICHIGAN ISL RD
20479/20465 MAGNOLIA
22994 MADDELIN LN

```
BLUME/DONALD
HARLEM ANNEXATION
HARLEM ANNEXATION
```

CAREFREE LAWN SPRINKLERS
SPRINKLER SYS RPR-PD
CARROLL CONSTRUCTION SUP
OUTLET/GRATE/SHOVEL-KANS
1GAL SPRAYER
LIFT SLINGS
NAILS-SIDEWALKS

CINTAS CORPORATION \#344
MATS-PD 8/8
252.26
$1,353.10$ 676.54 676.54

2,706.18
109.74
$8,475.00$
AMOUNT
ACCOUNT NAME

R\&M - BLDG/SITE IMPROVEM 01.441.4211

```
SOFTWARE SUPPORT SOFTWARE SUPPORT
*VENDOR TOTAL
```

01.413 .4753

SOFTWARE SUPPORT 62.491 .4753

R\&M - VEHICLES

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT
01.
477.51

22/9-23

172066
172066
172067
172067
172067
172068
172069
172070
172070
172072
186927
186944
186975
186978
187002

181301200002
181301200003

373507
54900062

FR103462
FR103515
FR103755
FR103948

4127649899
54900092

FRANKFORT FINANCIAL SYSTEM 09/30/2022 09:52:36

## VENDOR NAME

DESCRIPTION

CINTAS CORPORATION \#344 MATS-VH 9/16
MATS-PD 9/19

CLARKE ENVIRONMENTAL MOS
MOSQUITO CONTROL 9/15

PHONE SYSTEM MNTNC

CORE \& MATN LP
4 B-BOX ASSEMBLY
HYMAX COUPLINGS
COUPLINGS

D \& T VENTURES LLC
CREDIT CLERK SUPPORT
CREDIT CLERK SUPPORT
CREDIT CLERK SUPPORT
S INC
-

21841 S ELSNER-TOWER
194 GULSTREAM-LIFT ST
730 TANGLEWOOD-WELL 4
429 NEBRASKA ST-POND
20327 LAGRANGE-H/C PUMP 601 PRESTWICK-WELL 17

CREDIT CLERK SUPPORI

1,180.00
3.181.68

4,947.60
9.309.28
00.00
130.89
215.53
351.10
697.52

5, 115.41
147.39

2,221.43
$2,221.43$
163.64
163.64
11.365 .90

1,201.04
19.263.94

3,974.18
3,974.18
27.32
37.48
38.28

4,551.93 737.75

2,489.56
1,540. 35
33,911. 37
AMOUNT
185.42
117.52
414.87
$7,935.00$
400.00

STREET LIGHTING STREET LIGHTING ELECTRICITY ELECTRICITY ELECTRICIT *VENDOR TOT

R\&M - STi
SYS'

ELECTRICITY
ELECTRICITY
LECTRICITY
E TRICT
ELEC I Y
ELECTK_CITY
ELECTRICITY
ELECTRICITY
ELECTRICITY
*VENDOR TOTAI

SOFTWARE SUPPORT

SOFTWARE SUPPORT TELEPHONE
TELEPHONE
*VENDOR TOTAL
R\&M - BLDG/SITE IMPROVEM 01.441.4211
R\&M - BLDG/SITE IMPROVEM 01.441.4211 *VENDOR TOTAL

PEST CONTROL
01.441 .4672


4131660523
4131792033

1027089

913540

87712014900421
87712014900461 87712014903564

0210061037
0444146098
4359088050
359088050
9097745017
01.441 .4232
62.491 .4611
62.492 .4611
62.491 .4611
62.492 .4611
62.491 .4611 62.491.4611
62.492 .4611
01.441 .4611
62.491 .4611
62.492 .4611
62.492 .4261
62.492 .4261
62.492 .4261
01.442 .4753
62.491 .475
2.491.4753

R\&M - WATER LINES
R\&M - WATER LINES
R\&M - WATER LINES
*VENDOR TOTAL

SOFTWARE SUPPORT SOFTWARE SUPPORT SOFTWARE SUPPORT

## VENDOR NAME

DESCRIPTION
D \& T VENTURES LLC 5 ONLINE W/S BILL MNTNC . 5 ONLINE $W / S$ BILL MNTNC

DAILY SOUTHTOWN SUBSCRIPTION THRU $12 / 5$

E Z DUZ IT PRODUCTS INC WHITE VINEGAR/URN SCREEN HOT CUPS/PLATES-PD PPR TOWELS/VINEGAR

EJ USA INC STORM GRATES

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS CORPOR FLEX HRA-SEPT 2022 FLEX HRA-SEPT 2022

EUROFINS ENVIRONMENT TES
SAMPLE TESTING
SAMPLE TESTING

EXCEL ELECTRIC INC
RPR STLGHT-S BTRNUT CIR RPR STLGHT-VARIOUS LOC DEHUMIDIFIER SERV-RGNL RPR STLGHT-JENNIFER/MARY

FLEETPRIDE
SEALANT HOSE-ST25
HOSE-STOCK

FRANCZEK PC
PTAB MATTERS
FRANKFORT CHAMBER OF COM MGN SPONSORSHIP

FRANKFORT POST OFFICE
$.5 \mathrm{~W} / \mathrm{S}$ BILLS-OCT 2022
$.5 \mathrm{~W} / \mathrm{S}$ BILLS-OCT 2022

AMOUNT
200.00
200.00 200.00 700.00
69.50
94.00 111.00
171.00
171.00
376.00
418.88
378.25
66.75
445.00
235.50
100.00 335.50

333
635
2,635
635.84
330.00
356.41
3.655.85
98.60
61.96
160.56
160.56
175.00

[^0]ACCOUNT NAME

SOFTWARE SUPPORT
SOFTWARE SUPPORT *VENDOR TOTAL

SUBSCRIPTIONS

JANITORIAL SUPPLIES
JANITORIAL SUPPLIES
JANITORIAL SUPPLIES
*VENDOR TOTAL

R\&M - STREETS/SIGNS
01.4

4233
412.4136
112.4136
2.491 .4641
62.491 .4641
01.441 .4236
01.441 .4236
61.441.4236 62.491.4229
01.441 .4243
01.441 .4243
01.411 .4321
01.411 .4531
62.491 .4433
62.492 .4433

LLAIM
INVOICE
PO\#
F/P ID LINE

54900094 54900095

54900021

54900022
54900086
54900096

54900023

54900024 54900025

54900026 54900027

54900028
54900089
54900088
$\begin{array}{ll}549 & 00088 \\ 549 & 00087\end{array}$

54900097 54900098

54900029

54900030

PERMIT 130
54900099 54900100

FRANKFORT FINANCIAL SYSTEM 09/30/2022 09:52:36

## VENDOR NAME

DESCRIPTION
FRANKFORT SCHOOL DIST. 1 2 X-GUARDS-OCT 2022

GALLS LLC
BOOTS-319
UNIFORM PANTS-306/308

GASVODA \& ASSOCIATES, IN
METER SERVICE-RGNL

GOLDY LOCKS INC
KEYS-PD
16.20
530.00
136.67
$19,821.75$
795.00
706.11
270.00

$$
\begin{array}{r}
2,203.80 \\
3,123.65 \\
2,610.65 \\
470.00
\end{array}
$$

### 2.799.27 <br> 775.18 <br> 732.11

4,306.56
. 20

$$
706.11
$$

$$
8,408.10
$$

136.01
164.72

GOVERNMENT FINANCE OFCRS GFOA ACFR RVW FEES-FY22

GRAINGER
SOCKET SET
GREEN GARDEN ROAD DISTRI STUENKEL RD RESURFACE

GREEN GLEN NURSERY INC TREES
/CHERYL
FNL RFD- 21976 THYME LN
HAWKINS INC
CHIORINE/HSA-WELLS
CHLORINE/HSA-WELLS
CHLORINE-WELLS
SURCHARGES-WELLS

HERITAGE FS INC
DIESEL
DIESEL
DIESEI

HOME DEPOT \#6919
TORCH KIT/HOLE SAW
COUPLERS/CATCH BASIN
DISPOSABLE GLOVES

AMOUNT
270.00
126.23
285.52
411.75
460.50

OPERATING SUPPLIE
01.4. 4331
01.421 .4051
UNIFORMS 01.421.4781

UNIFORMS
VENDOR TOTAI
81
01.421 .478

R\&M - TREATMENT PLANT

OPERATING SUPRLIES

AUDITOR FEES
492.4701

FUND \& ACCOUNT CLAIM INVOICE

R\&M - STREET
31177.4233
01.441 .423

R\&M - TREA SNT P $P_{\perp}$
62.491 .4229

GUSTOMER AC UNTS RECEIV 62.000.1311

## CHEM

CHEMICALS
CHEMICALS
VENDOR TOTAL

GASOLINE/OIL
GASOLINE/OIL
GASOLINE/OIL
VENDOR TOTAL

R\&M - STREETS/SIGNS
R\&M - STORM SYSTEM
JANITORIAL SUPPLIES
62.492 .4711
62.492 .4711
62.492 .4711
62.492 .4711
01.441 .4731
62.492 .4731
62.491 .4731
01.441.4233
01.441 .4232
01.441 .4741

0973855
0973863
1973832

PO\# F/P ID LINE
22/10 XGUARDS 54900101
$22041612 \quad 54900031$ 54900032

54900102

54900034

54900126

54900033

54900129

54900103

54900035

54900104

54900108
54900107
54900106 54900105

54900109
54900109
54900109

54900116
54900117
5490003

AMOUNT
65.40
153.22
50.62
309.84
299.50
34.44 CR
21.94
47.12
178.45
49.97
203.20
67.14
42.94
1.773 .60

ACCOUNT NAME

| R\&M - BLDG/SITE IMPROVEM | 01.441 .4211 |
| :--- | :--- |
| R\&M - BLDG/SITE | IMPROVEM |
| 01.441 .4211 |  |
| R\&M - SIDEWALKS | 01.441 .4220 |
| JANITORIAL SUPPLIES | 01.441 .4741 |
| R\&M - STREETS/SIGNS | 01.441 .4233 |
| OPERATING SUPPLIES | 01.441 .4761 |
| SAFETY SUPPLIES | 01.441 .4762 |
| OPERATING SUPPLIES | 01.41 .4761 |
| OPERATING SUPPLIES | 01.4 .761 |
| OPERATING SUPPLIES | 62.4 .1761 |
| OPERATING SUPPLIES | 01.41 .41 |
| JANITORIAL SUPPLIES | 441.4 |
| R\&M - VEHICLES | 441.424 |
| *VENDOR TOTAL |  |

PO\#
F/P ID LINE

| 549 | 00110 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 549 | 00114 |
| 549 | 00112 |
| 549 | 00111 |
| 549 | 00113 |
| 549 | 00121 |
| 549 | 00120 |
| 549 | 00039 |
| 549 | 00038 |
| 549 | 00036 |
| 549 | 00119 |
| 549 | 00118 |
| 549 | 0011 |

54900040 54900041

54900124

54900122 54900123

54900042
54900125

54900043
5490004
54900045
54900046
54900047
54900048 54900049 54900050

54900051
54900130
54900052

VENDOR NAME
DESCRIPTION
LANDSCAPE SUPPLY INC CURB RESTOR-757 LINCOLN RESTOR-CTTNWD/MDW PATCH RESTOR-757 LINCOLN-PATCH RESTOR-COTTONWOOD/MEADOW RESTOR-757 LINCOLN LN RESTOR-249 FRANKLIN RESTOR-300 FRANKLIN RESTOR-306 FRANKLIN RESTOR-319 ELM

LAWSON PRODUCTS INC
CAP SCREWS
CAP SCREWS
CAP SCREWS

LOCAL PRINTING \& DESIGN 405 SHIRTS-SCRY PRAIRIE STICKERS-CHESS ON GREEN SIGNS-SCARY PRAIRIE 5 K

MACE IRON WORKS, INC.
STEEL BAR-ST7
STEEL BAR-CHIPPER

MASTER AUTOMOTTVE SUPPLY FILTERS-ST31/STOCK HYDRAULIC SPINON-CHIPPER . 5 BRAKE PADS/ROTORS-U1 . 5 BRAKE PADS/ROTORS-UI BRAKE PADS/ROTORS-SQ12
LENS-MARKER LIGHT
RELAY-TEREX LIFT

MATTHUIS TRUCKING INC
45.16TN CA7/46LDS DIRT 82.80TN CA7/6LD DIRT STREET SWEEPING DISPOSAL 20.99TN CM6 STONE DLVRY

AMOUNT
$1,900.00$
1,584.00
2.772 .00

1,152.00
171.00
441.00
144.00
875.00
324.00

17,800.00
20.03
20.03
20.03
60.09

2,848.95
32.00
60.00
$2,940.95$
25.00
107.00 132.00
38.80
32.82
239.60
239.60
427.81
2.26
992.88
9.477.63
2.539 .90 700.00 246.63

12,964.16
$1,000.00$ 500.00
1.500 .00

ACCOUNT NAME

R\&M - WATER LINES R\&M - WATER LINES R\&M - WATER LINES R\&M - WATER LINES R\&M - WATER LINES R\&M - WATER LINES R\&M - WATER LINES R\&M - WATER LINES R\&M - WATER LINES *VENDOR TOTAL

```
R&M - VEHICLES
R&M - VEHTCLES
R&M - VEHICLES
```

VENDOR TOTAL
EVENTS
R\&M - PUBLIC ROUNDS EVENTS
*VENDOR TOT

FUND \& ACCOUNT CLATM INVOICE
PO\# F/P ID LINE
62.492 .4261
62.492 .4261 62.492 .4261 62.492 .4261 62.492 .4261 62.492 .4261 62.492 .4261 62.472 .4261

2022-17
2022-176
2022-17
2022-179
2022-181 2022-186
2022-187
2022-188
2022-189

9309909665
9309909665
9309909665

1286
12889

80735
80762

15030-121982
15030-121983
15030-122175
15030-122175
15030-122347
15030-122513
15030-122515

2960
2968
2969
2969

B229322
B229322

54900131
54900132
54900133
54900134
54900135
54900136
54900137
54900138
54900139

54900140
54900141
54900142

54900145
54900143
54900144

54900147
54900146

54900148
54900149
54900153
54900154
54900152
54900150
54900151

54900156
54900155
54900157
54900158

54900159
54900160

22875 SARA SPRINGS DR
22875 SARA SPRINGS DR

LANDSCAPE DEPOSIT
VENDOR TOTAL
62.492 .4261
62.492 .4261

1. 441.4238
01.441 .423
01.000 .2321
01.000 .2323

## VENDOR NAME

DESCRIPTION

STRIPING-PINE RDG/CALLIS
NICOR GAS
22801 WOLF RD-WELL $11 / 12$
8847 W LINCOLN HWY-WIO
524 CENTER RD
524 CENTER RD
524 CENTER RD
20538 S LAGRANGE-RGNL
460 OHIO RD-WPS
2 WHITE ST
422 SPRUCE DR-NPS
11 N WHITE ST
601 PRESTWICK DR-WELL 7
23031 S 80TH AVE-W 13/14
2 SMITH ST

NU-WAY DISPOSAL SERVICE,
6737 CURB SERV-SEPT 2022
6737 RCYC SERV-SEPT 2022
TSF GARBAGE 23.54TNS

ORKIN PEST CONTROL
20602 LW LN 9/21
24 ELWOOD 9/13
P. T. FERRO CONSTRUCTION

2022 ROAD MNTNC \#1
2022 ROAD MNTNC \#2
245.231.26 1, 130, 109.68

PARK HARDWARE \#16759
SPRAYER/STOP GAP
FASTENERS/SPRAY PAINT
FASTENERS
WIRE STRIPPER/CONNECTORS
PLANT FOOD
RAINSUIT-JD
PAINT ROLLERS

AMOUNT
196.00
$3,730.79$
$2,059.00$
ACCOUNT NAME

R\&M - TRAFFIC LIGHTS

LEASE RENTAL

R\&M - STREETS/SIGNS

## HEAT

HEAT
HEAT
HEAT
HEAT
HEAT
HEAT
HEAT
HEAT
HEAT
HEAT
HEAT
HEAT
HEAT
HEAT
*VENDOR TOT

GARBAGE POSA
RECYCLING '
GARBAGE DI. JSAL
*VENDOR TOT
$\mathrm{CON}^{-} \mathrm{L}$
CO
ROL
*VENL OTAL

R\&M - STREETS
R\&M - STREETS
*VENDOR TOTAL
36.96
37.74
8.95
53.94
31.99
34.99
12.48

OPERATING SUPPLIES
R\&M - VEHICLES
R\&M - VEHICLES
OPERATING SUPPLIES
R\&M - PUBLIC GROUNDS
R\&M - UNIFORMS
OPERATING SUPPLIES

FUND \& ACCOUNT CLAIM INVOICE
01.441 .4234
01.441 .4661

01.447 .4625
01.447 .4621
01.441 .4672

232677375
234214681
22/9-30
22/9-30
8002304

47317
47346

| 7339 | 549 | 00190 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7454 | 549 | 00189 |
| 7463 | 549 | 00184 |
| 7482 | 549 | 00188 |
| 7488 | 549 | 00187 |
| 7502 | 549 | 00185 |
|  | 549 | 00182 |

54900177
54900178 54900179

54900175
54900176

54900180
54900181
01.441 .476
01.441 .4243 01.441 .4243 01.441 .4761
01.441 .4216
01.441 .4251
01.441 .4761

54900185 5490018

701982

6688817

54900161

54900162

54900163

54900165 54900168 54900166 54900166 54900166 54900167 54900171 54900174 54900164 54900172 54900170 54900169 54900173

PARK HARDWARE \#16759 SPONGES/LIME AWAY MOUNTING TAPE/RAKE
PEERLESS NETWORK INC
TELEPHONE CHGS
TELEPHONE CHGS
TELEPHONE CHGS
TELEPHONE CHGS
TELEPHONE CHGS
TELEPHONE CHGS
TELEPHONE CHGS
TELEPHONE CHGS-PD

PERMA-SEAL
RFD BLDG PERMIT FEE
RFD PLAN RVW-808 HGHLAND

PETTY CASH
PRIORITY MAIL-SUPERFLEET
POSTAGE DUE-WTR BILL
APPLE JUICE-WASP TRAP
WATER-FALL FEST
CERTIFIED MAIL
COFFEE
WHITE BOARD

PLAZA CLEANERS
UNIFORM MNTNC-AUGUST
POSTMASTER
.5 1ST CLASS PRESORT-WS
.5 1ST CLASS PRESORT-WS

RED WING BUSINESS ADVANT
WORK BOOTS-DV
WORK BOOTS-LT

ROBINSON ENGINEERING LTD PFEIFFER RD EXT PROJECT

AMOUNT
17.97
24.98 260.00
208.29
65.08
84.60
91.11
65.08
65.08
71.59
690.13
$1,340.96$

ACCOUNT NAME

JANITORIAL SUPPLIES OPERATING SUPPLIES
*VENDOR TOTAL
30.00
30.00
60.00
8.95
0.60
3.55
18.07
18.07
7.85
21. 49
66.97
421.38
137.50
137.50
275.00
175.00
175.00
350.00
4.089.12
TELEPHONE
TELEPHONE
TELEPHONE
TELEPHONE
TELEPHONE
TELEPHONE
TELEPHONE
TELEPHONE
*VENDOR TOTAL

PUBLIS

R\&M - UNIFORMS
UNIFORMS

FUND \& ACCOUNT CLAIM INVOICE PO\# F/P ID LINE

| 01.441.4741 | 7517 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 01.441 .4761 | 7529 |
| 01.412 .4441 | 554674 |
| 01.413 .4441 | 554674 |
| $01.4{ }^{4.4441}$ | 554674 |
| $\bigcirc 1.4$ | 554674 |
| $02.40 \quad 441$ | 554674 |
| 52. 2.11 | 554674 |
| +41.4. | 554674 |
| 121.444. | 554674 |

54900186
54900183

| 549 | 00191 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 549 | 00191 |
| 549 | 00191 |
| 549 | 00191 |
| 549 | 00191 |
| 549 | 00191 |
| 549 | 00191 |
| 549 | 00192 |

B228949 CNCLD B228949 CNCLD

| $22 / 10-2177$ | 549 | 00199 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $22 / 10-2177$ | 549 | 00200 |
| $22 / 10-2177$ | 549 | 00201 |
| $22 / 10-9435$ | 549 | 00195 |
| $22 / 10-9435$ | 549 | 00196 |
| $22 / 10-9435$ | 549 | 00197 |
| $22 / 10-9435$ | 549 | 00198 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| $1001167-08-01$ |  | 00202 |
|  | 549 | 00266 |
| PERMIT 130 | 549 | 00267 |
| PERMIT 130 |  |  |

PERMIT 130
54900267

711-1-103974
54900203
01.441 .4251

711-1-104046

22060265
54900205

RUSSO'S POWER EQUIPMENT
HEDGE TRIMMER

```
ENDOR NAME
```

    DESCRIPTION
    RUSSO'S POWER EQUIPMENT
AIR FILTER
CHAIN SAW BLADE
$\mathrm{S} \& \mathrm{~S}$ MECHANICAL SERV-AT
EXHAUST SERV-WELL 15/16
FALL FURNACE TUNE UP-PD
A/C UNI'T RPR-CHAMBER
HEATER SERV-RGNL
SASE COMPANY INC
CONCRETE GRINDER PARTS
SAUNORIS' NURSERY
4YD TOP SOIL
SCHUBBE/MICHAEL
WORK BOOTS-MS
SCHULTZ/STEVEN
MRKT ENTERTAINMENT-10/2
SOLENIS LLC
POL.YMER-RGNL
STANDARD EQUIPMENT COMPA
BALI VALVE
STAPLES ADVANTAGE
PENS/STENO/COFFEE/POSTIT
PAPER / TONER/PENS / PADS
SUPERFLEET
GASOLINE-WTR
GASOLINE-BLDG
GASOLINE-POLICE
SUPERIOR PUMPING SERVICE
MOTOR SERVICE-RGNL
FILTER MOTOR SERV-RGNL
SYNAGRO

SLUDGE REMOVAL-RGNL

Schedule of Bills
VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT GL540R-V08. 17 PAGE

AMOUNT
6.16
75.96
75.96
150.10

1,995.00 858.00 590.36 330.00 3.773.36
160.00
175.00
300.00
$13,941.34$
663.
128.29
225.24
353.53
147.91
295.48
144.34
587.73

2,203.00
$1,046.07$
3,249.07
$5,667.75$

ACCOUNT NAME

R\&M - VEHICLES
OPERATING SUPPLIES
*VENDOR TOTAL

R\&M - BLDG/SITE IMPROVEM 01.441.4211 R\&M - BLDG/SITE IMPROVEM 01.411.4211 R\&M - TREATMENT PLANT


13143
13145
13235

301427

701395

22/9-27 BOOTS
54900211
54900210
54900212 54900209

54900213

54900214

54900215

22/10-2
54900216

54900217

54900218

54900220
54900219

| FB426 | 549 | 00221 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FB426 | 549 | 00222 |
| FB426 | 549 | 00223 |

- FB426
01.421 .4731

FB4 26
54900223

54900224
54900225

54900226

AMOUNT
$2,129.00$
135.00
798.00
24.00
957.00
50.00
150.00

5,189.00
173.82
2.371.81
332.80
332.80
$5,383.35$
$8,420.76$

1,958.07
3,985.49
130.70
328.79
210.17
$6,613.22$
272.25

1,001.87
1, 274. 12
78.66
532.20
63.06
166.82
166.81

ACCOUNT NAME

R\&M - VEHICLES

UNIFORMS
UNI FORMS
UNIFORMS
*VENDOR TOTAL

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

INSPECTION FEES

R\&M - STREETS/SIGNS

OPERATING SUPPLII

R\&M - LAWN Y WING 0 441.4215
R\&M - BLDG, -E IMPRO
. 491.4211
MOW
VENDOR I

OPERATING
s PLIE
पQUIPMENT \& CCESSORIES
ERATING
PPLIE

R\&a
*VENL
*VENL

R\&M - WATER LINES
R\&M - WATER LINES
*VENDOR TOTAL

CELLPHONE CHGS-BLDG
IWIN CHARGES
CELLPHONE CHGS-PW
CELLPHONE CHGS-SWR CELLPHONE CHGS-WTR

TELEPHONE
SOFTWARE SUPPO
TELEPHONE
TELEPHONE
TELEPHONE
*VENDOR TOTAL
62.492 .4761
62.491 .4791
62.492 .4761
62.492 .4262
62.492 .4261
62.492 .426
01.442 .4441

1. 421.4753 01.441 .4441 62.491 .4441 62.492 .4441

CNA PRAIRIE LLC
22.50TN CM11 STONE
82.80TN CA7 STONE

UND \& ACCOUNT CLAIM INVOICE
01.441 .4243
01.421 .4781

1. 421.478
01.421.4781

PO\# F/P ID LINE

54900227

54900229
54900230
54900228

54900231

54900232

54900233

54900234

54900236
54900237
54900238
54900235

54900240
54900239
54900241
54900242
54900243

54900244
54900245

9915762596
9915762596
9915762596
9915762596
9915762596

54900246
54900247
54900248
54900249
54900250

RANKFORT FINANCIAL SYSTEM 09/30/2022 09:52:36

VENDOR NAME
DESCRIPTION
WATER SOLUTIONS UNLIMITE CHLORINE/PHOSPHATE CHLORINE

WEX BANK
GASOLINE-SWR
GASOLINE-WTR
GASOLINE-PW
GASOLINE-BLDG
GASOLINE-COM DEV
GASOLINE-POLICE

WINGREN LANDSCAPE INC
LIGHT RPR-KANSAS SDWLK
IST AYD CORPORATION
.5 TOWELS/TP
WASH/WAX/GLASS CLEANER WASH/WAX/GLASS CLEANER .5 WASH/WAX/GLASS CLNR
.5 WASH/WAX/GLASS CLNR

## Schedule of Bills

AMOUNT
ACCOUNT NAME

CHEMICALS CHEMICALS

$$
15,114.50
$$ *VENDOR TOTAL

$$
\begin{array}{r}
14,733.50 \\
381.00
\end{array}
$$

1. 230.28

2,129.25
1,378. 22
619.01
33.58

8,403.60
8.403 .60
13.793 .94

GASOLINE/OIL GASOLINE/OIL GASOLINE/OIL GASOLINE/OIL GASOLINE/OIL GASOLINE/OIL VENDOR TOTAL
$1,570.00$
97.90
97.91
97.91
309.99
309.99
309.99
154.99
155.00

1. 125.78

COMMUNITY ENHANCEMENTS OPERATING SUPPLI OREM - VEHICLF R\&M - VEHIC R\&M - VEHIC
R\&M - VEHT R\&M - VEH VFN- TOTAI

FUND \& ACCOUNT CLAIM INVOICE
$62.492 .4711 \quad 107080$
$62.492 .4711 \quad 107163$

| $\begin{array}{rr} 62.491 .4731 \\ 62.492 .4731 \\ 01.411 .4731 \\ 71.4 & 131 \\ 01.46 & 731 \\ 1 . & 1 . \\ & \\ & \\ 31.4 & 5268 \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 31.

VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT GL540R-V08. 17 PAGE
491.4701
$62 \rightarrow 7761$
014.4243
01421.4243 6491.4243
-.492 .4243

PO\# F/P ID LINE

54900252 549
549
0

54900253
54900254
54900255
54900256
54900257
54900258

54900259

PSI555465
PSI555465
PSI557862
PSI557862
PSI557862
PSI557862

54900264
54900265
54900260
$\begin{array}{ll}549 & 00260 \\ 549 & 00261\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}549 & 00261 \\ 549 & 00262\end{array}$
54900263

REPORT TOTALS:
AMOUNT ACCOUNT NAME
$2,574,445.27$

RECORDS PRINTED - 000316

## Payroll Expense Approval

9/30/2022 Payroll

|  | 2021 Gross <br> Wage Avg | Gross <br> Wages | Pension | 457 | Medicare | SS |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Fund | $56,300.72$ | $61,708.29$ | $4,983.61$ | 715.00 | 888.79 | $3,546.73$ |
| Police Fund | $153,178.88$ | $141,934.91$ | $41,646.38$ | $1,770.00$ | $2,039.76$ | $8,721.76$ |
| Utility Fund | $61,726.84$ | $63,734.60$ | $5,328.21$ | 850.0 | 1 | 12 |
| Streets | $50,964.56$ | $51,850.78$ | $4,326.70$ | 750 | $4,932.61$ |  |
| Total | $322,171.01$ | $319,228.58$ | $56,284.90$ | $4,085.6$ | $4,595$. | $19,394.53$ |
| Grand Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## C. PLAN COMMISSION REPORT SUMMARY

1. OLTMAN RESIDENCE MULTIPLE ZONING VARIANCES: 240 CENTER ROAD ORDINANCE

Applicant, Jarrett Lecas of Gander Builders, proposes to build a new single-family residence on the vacant property located at 240 Center Road for the Oltman Family. A house formerly existed on this site but has since been demolished and cleared. The proposed house requires four variances:

- First floor building materials variance to permit a mixture of three primary materials, including 4" Hardie Board lo sia (wood composite), ChamClad exterior siding (PVC with wood appearan 1, ar. \& 'ted white brick;
- Roof materials variance to permit a mix of .. al and. 'ngle roof materials;
- Driveway setback variance from the 4'pave,ne, etback rement to 1' to permit a driveway serving a side-loaded garago-
- Driveway turning radius variance fr $n$ the quirea '' to 25 ' to permit a driveway serving a side-loaded garage.

At the September 22, 2022 public he ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{q} \mathrm{g}$ on the ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{ojec}^{\prime}$ the Plan Commission forwarded three split (5-1) recommendations to the $V_{2}$ re Boara ..pprove the first-floor building materials variance, the roof materi ..... anc edriveway setback variance requests, and one split (4-2) recommendatio .or the drive y tur. $\quad$, radius variance request.

Motion: Accept the ${ }^{\text {an }}$ Commis on recommendation, waive the First and Second Readings, and pass an dinance anting the following zoning variances to permit the construction of a new sing. 'am' residence on the property located at 240 Center Road: a first floor building materials iance from the masonry requirement to permit the use of non-masonry materials; a roof materials variance to permit a mix of metal and shingle roof materials; a driveway setback variance from the 4' pavement setback requirement to 1 ' from the property line; and a driveway turning radius variance from the required 26' to 25', all in accordance with the reviewed plans, public testimony, and Findings of Fact.
2. PIC \& PLĀ SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR INDOOR RECREATION: 21800 S. LAGRANGE ROAD, UNIT B - ORDINANCE

Applicant Tony Villa proposes to renovate Unit B of the existing building located at 21800 S . LaGrange Road to operate Pic \& Plā, an indoor recreational facility containing four pickleball courts. To accommodate the facility within the I-2 General Industrial District, the applicant requests the granting of a Special Use Permit for Indoor Recreation.

At the September 22, 2022 Public Hearing on the project, the Plan Commission forwarded a unanimous (6-0) recommendation to the Village Board to approve the Special Use request subject to several conditions.

Motion: Accept the Plan Commission recommendation, waive the First and Second Readings, and pass an Ordinance granting a Special Use Permit for Indoor Recreation to the property located at 21800 S. LaGrange Road, Unit B, to permit the operation of Pic \& Plā, an indoor recreational facility containing four pickleball courts, in accordance with the reviewed plans, public testimony, and Findings of Fact, conditioned upon if any mechanical uses are added to the roof of the site, they shall be screened per the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance; the project shall obtain compliance with all applicable codes, including the Fire Code and International Building Code; there shall be no indoor bleachers installed and no tournaments held at this location; and no less than 25 parking spaces shall be allocated to the proposed use.
3. OASIS SENIOR LIVING SPECIAL USE PERMIT ${ }^{\wedge}$ OR」 ASSISTED LIVING FACILITY \& FINAL PLAT APPROVAL: 8531 W. LINCOL. HIr.. Y - ORDINANCE

Oasis Senior Living, Inc. proposes to construct an c 'unit as. . living facility at the southwest corner of Route 30 and Windy Hill $\Gamma \cdots$. Assis ${ }^{1}$ living facilities are permitted in the B-2 zoning district with the issuance of spe, 'Use 1 nit. The project also requires approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision to ct the a' $u$ accrd, as the property is subdivided.

This project was heard before the $\mathrm{P}^{\top}$ ₹. Comm ion = a workshop on March 10, 2022. On August 23, 2022, the applicant hosteu eighborı. . meeting at the Frankfort Public Library to explain the project, in $r^{\prime}$.... nges .'he plans since the workshop meeting and to answer any questions from th sublic.

The following is a su. ary of chang to the plans since the workshop and the neighborhood meeting.

- The building has been $\mathrm{s}_{2} \quad$ d north slightly, to allow for a wider landscape setback along the south property line. There were formerly two rows of parking along the front of the building facing Route 30 . The rows have now been split up, with one row of parking along Route 30 and one row of parking along the west side of the building.
- The landscape buffer along the south property line has been increased from $14^{\prime}$ to $33.45^{\prime}$ and more vegetation has been added in this area.
- The northern driveway was shifted further north when the building was moved further north.
- The apron on the northern driveway has been widened (flared out) at the request of Village staff to make it easier for southbound traffic on Windy Hill Drive to navigate around any vehicles turning into the assisted living facility.
- The unit count was increased from 78 to 82 . There are now more studio units and less 1-bedroom units.
- A retaining wall was added to the northwest corner of the site, measuring approximately $300^{\prime}$ long and 7 ' tall at the highest in the middle. The retaining wall
tapers to meet grade at either end of the wall.
- The trash enclosure has been moved from along the south property line to the west property line (still in the same vicinity, but further away from the existing townhomes). The setback from the trash enclosure to the south property line has been increased from 7' to $44.7^{\prime}$.
- Decorative fencing was added on both sides of both access drives along Windy Hill Drive to match the existing fencing at the northeast corner of the property. The proposed fencing would match the existing fencing in terms of materials, height, design, and color.

At the September 22, 2022 Public Hearing on the project, the Plan Commission heard from several residents who expressed their opposition to the assisted living facility. They cited traffic and drainage concerns and loss of green space as a few of their reasons for not supporting the project.

The Plan Commissioners were unanimous in the supp of the project, forwarding two unanimous (6-0) recommendations to the Village E $\quad \mathrm{rd}^{+}, \mathrm{a}_{1}$. $\quad$ ve the special use request and the final plat of subdivision.

Motion: Accept the Plan Commission recor-ondatic waive the First and Second Readings, and pass an Ordinance grantingr pecın ${ }^{\prime}$ 'se Per. ‘for an assisted living facility to the property located at 8531 W . Lincoln ighr $\downarrow$, , errit the operation of Oasis Senior Living, in accordance with the revie ?d plar, pubi c .estimony, and Findings of Fact, conditioned upon final engineerins ? proval; e rer acement of any damaged sections of public sidewalk; the base of anv futu. round so nall be consistent with the materials of the wainscot of the buil' o, 'the J. 'ity's bus shall be parked on the west side of the building.

Motion: Accept the , $\quad$ Commissi, recommendation and approve the Oasis Frankfort Subdivision final plat, $\uparrow$, ared by eotech Inc., revised 09.13.22, in accordance with the reviewed plans and subjec. ar cechnical revisions prior to recording and conditioned upon final engineering appro

## ordinance no. 33XX

## AN ORDINANCE GRANTING MULTIPLE ZONING VARIANCES TO CERTAIN PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT, WILL AND COOK COUNTIES, ILLINOIS (OLTMAN RESIDENCE - 240 CENTER ROAD)

WHEREAS, an application for certain variances for real property within the Village of Frankfort, legally described below, was filed by Jarrett Lecas of Gander Builders, Applicant; and Dustin Oltman, Owner; and

WHEREAS, the Subject Property, located at 240 Center Road, is currently zoned R-2, Single Family Residential District; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant requests the granting of multiple variances to accommodate the construction of a new single-family residence on the $\mathrm{Sv}^{1}$, ect, serty; and

WHEREAS, the variances include: a first floor $b_{\text {. ing ma. als variance to permit the use }}$ of non-masonry materials; a roof materials variance to $p_{c}$ it a mi. netal and shingle roof materials; a driveway setback variance from the ronired 4 vement setback to 1 ' from the property line; and a driveway turning radius vari ce 1 the re. red $26^{\prime}$ to $25^{\prime}$; and

WHEREAS, a timely Notice of a P lic fea ag bet me Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Frankfort w? ablishec the aily Southtown newspaper announcing a Public Hearing on the Owner's applica. for zon.. ariances for the Subject Property; and

WHEREAS, at a'ne and plac 'esign. tin such published notice, a Public Hearing was held before the Village Frankfort Plai Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals on the Owner's application for the zonin ${ }_{\varepsilon}$ riances for $t$ l Subject Property; and

WHEREAS, the Boaru ${ }^{〔} \mathrm{Tr}$ _es found, based upon evidence presented to it:

1. That the Subject Property cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in an $\mathrm{R}-2$ zoning district;
2. That the plight of the Owner is due to unique circumstances; and
3. That the variations will not alter the essential character of the locality, and that the requested zoning variances should be granted.

WHEREAS, the legal description of the Subject Property at the time of the filing of the variance application is as follows:

# NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT, WILL \& COOK COUNTIES, ILLINOIS, AS FOLLOWS: 

## SECTION 1. VARIANCES

That the requirements imposed under the R-2 zoning classification of the Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance are varied from Article 6, Section B, Part 2(g); Article 6, Section B, Part 4(i); Article 6, Section B, Part 2(i); and Article 5, Section D, Part 3(b) for the Subject Property as follows:

1. First-floor building materials variance from the required masonry requirement to permit the use of non-masonry materials, including 4" Hardie Board lap siding (wood composite), ChamClad siding (PVC with wr ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{a}_{1} \cdot$ ance), and painted white brick; and
2. Roof construction and materials variance to mit a $x$ of metal and shingle roof materials; and
3. Driveway setback variance from the remired 4 эvement setback to 1 ' from the property line to permit a driveway ser ng e de-loac garage; and
4. Driveway turning radius variance $f$ m the c ired $20^{\prime}$ to $25^{\prime}$ to permit a driveway serving a side-loaded garage.

All variances are granted to perm. e constr. of a new single-family residence on the Subject Property located at +er $k \quad 4$, in accordance with the reviewed plans, public testimony, and Findings act.

## SECTION 2. K 'EAL OF CO FLICTING PROVISIONS

All ordinances ano olutions, parts thereof, in conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance are, to the extent the uflict, expressly repealed on the effective date of this Ordinance.

## SECTION 3. SEVERABILITY

If any provision of this Ordinance or application thereof to any person or circumstances is ruled unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this Ordinance that can be given effect without the invalid application or provision, and each invalid provision or invalid application of this Ordinance is severable.

## SECTION 4. EFFECTIVE DATE

This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval and publication in pamphlet form as provided by law.

PASSED this __ day of __ , 2022; with _ members voting AYE; __ members voting NAY; and __ members absent; the Village President not voting; with __ members abstaining and said vote being:

| ADAM BORRELLI | - | MARGARET M. FARINA | - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MICHAEL LEDDIN | - | JESSICA PETROW | - |
| DANIEL ROSSI | - | EUGENE SAVARIA | - |

KATIE SCHUBERT VILLAGE CLERK

APPROVED this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2022.


ATTEST:

KATIE SCHUBERT VILLAGE CLERK

Chris Gruba presented the staff report.
Chair Rigoni invited the applicant to the podium.
The architect, Steve Lecas, approached the podium. He noted that at the workshop the Plan Commission asked the applicant to try and meet the setback requirements. The biggest challenge encountered while trying to meet all setback requirements was the "pinched" area of the property. One member of the Plan Commission had suggested moving the home further away from Center Road. Due to the geometry of the property, meeting both side yard setbacks by moving the home away from Center Road was unfeasible. However, the applicant was now able to comply with the side yard setback along the north property line. The side-loaded garage and driveway on the south side of the property were now closer to the south prope $y$ lin fany homes in the downtown area had driveways located within the required v- bay back, so Lecas believed this was not a large concern. He asked staff whether andsca $a_{1}$ Or nance was new or not.

Staff responded it was not.
The architect noted that it was the ist time e had ncountered the tree preservation requirements of the Landscape C . ance. H. experience with many homes in the Village and had nevf ...red a. difficulties with the Landscape Ordinance. Requiring 26, 2.5' aliper trees offse. e loss of four preservation trees seemed excessive. Ther ere many trees $n$ the subject property, many of which were either in poor condition or $4 \quad{ }^{4}$. They wor do their best to keep the evergreens during and after construction. The prop vowr had indicated to Lecas that he had no preference for keeping or removing the ang evergreens along the south property line, so the architect would defer to the preferences of the neighbor to the south. In regard to the new proposed ChamClad material, Lecas had brought a sample for the Commission. He handed the sample to the Commission to inspect as he spoke. The metal siding material that was proposed previously and discussed at the workshop was still available, however the color that they intended to use was only available for interior applications, not exterior applications. ChamClad, on the other hand, did provide materials in the desired color which were appropriate for exterior use. The material was made in part through a 3D printing technique, which helped to achieve the faux-wood look. Lecas stated he was happy to answer any questions for the Commission.

Chair Rigoni asked if there were any initial comments from the members of the Plan Commission.

There were none.

Chair Rigoni opened the public hearing, and asked if there were any members of the public willing to speak on the matter.

Josh Bohms, a resident who lives at 246 Center Road, stated that he had no issues with the proposed building. He also had no opinion on the evergreen trees which could be impacted by the proposed driveway.

Mary Tepper, another resident who lived near the subject property, expressed her concern for the design of the home. It did not look like any other home in the downtown area. It was very modern looking. Even though the property was not in the heart of downtown, it was still considered a part of the downtown residential area per the Comprehensive Plan. She noted that the design of the proposed home did $\mathrm{p} \downarrow \mathrm{t}$ follow the downtown residential design guidelines which the community worker oder v as a part of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan back in 2019. Mary had $w$ ' witı. 'e Village and the guidelines with her own home, in order to make sure that $\mathrm{tl}^{\text {a }}$ ign ma. $\quad$. he neighborhood context. The proposed home did not match that same 1 . aborhood context.

Chair Rigoni clarified that the downtow resid thesign guidelines were not enforceable, unlike the Zoning Ord ance, s ach w s-aforceable.

Ms. Tepper stated she understooa t the gun es were not enforceable, but that one would expect somen num into $L$. downtown area to make efforts to abide by the guidelines and ar is a good ne $i_{c}$, bor in ing so. She again stated that the proposed design of the ho. felt out of con xt from an architectural standpoint.

Beth Partyka, another ighbor proached the podium. She stated that she had the same concerns as the other peo, ao had made comments before her. She understood that the design guidelines were not enforceable like the Zoning Ordinance. It felt confusing that so much work went into creating the design guidelines for them to not be followed or adhered to, especially when other residents in the downtown area worked within the guidelines. She stated that the proposed design had many features that the guidelines were created to avoid.

Chair Rigoni asked if there were any other comments.
There were none.

Motion (\#2): Motion to close the public hearing.
Motion by: Jakubowski
Seconded by: Schaeffer
Approved: (6-0)
Chair Rigoni summarized the motions which were before the Plan Commission. There were two variances related to the proposed driveway and two variances for the proposed materials. She asked for comments from the Plan Commission in regard to the building materials.

Commissioner Knieriem stated that the ChamClad sample looked so similar to wood he could not tell the difference.

Commissioner Schaeffer agreed, saying she tho ht L . aterials were appropriate.
Commissioner James noted that one of the inten, behin. tesigning products like Hardie Board was to create a material which loonea 'e wooc imClad also achieved that effect.

Commissioners Jakubowski and Marku s ap ed.
Chair Rigoni asked staff what th uilding nart ent's opinion on the material was. Chris Gruba respon' ne Im noke. ith the Building Department director, who was unfamiliar with ${ }^{\prime}$ ChamClad p tuct. uba added that the Zoning Ordinance specifically proh. is vinyl siding at is silent regarding PVC siding. However, both vinyl and ChamCla. re PVC prr acts.

Chair Rigoni stated that s as hesitant to approve the material since the Plan Commission was first made aware of it at the meeting and given how similar it was to vinyl. Not getting a clear response on the quality of the material from the Building Department was another reason for her hesitancy. She asked the Plan Commission for their comments on the variances related to the proposed driveway.

Commissioner James stated that so long as the neighbor to the south was comfortable with it, he saw no issue.

Commissioner Markunas stated that because the proposed home was new construction, rather than an addition, and because the lot was larger than a standard lot in the R-2 Single Family Residential District, he struggled to find the hardship the property owner faced for the two variances for the driveway.

Chair Rigoni understood that there were other homes in the downtown area which had driveways close to their respective property lines. It was also important to consider that the subject property was 38,000 square feet, more than twice the size of the minimum requirement of 15,000 square feet. She asked the Plan Commission if they had any comments on any other considerations, such as the downtown design guidelines.

Commissioner Schaeffer noted that the Commission had an issue with the building setback on the north side during the workshop. One of the changes the applicant had made in response was to adjust the design to meet the building setback requirement on the north side of the property. Because of this, she felt comfortable with the proposal. In addition, the neighbor to the south gave their public support to the project, which led her to be comfortable with the two variances being requested for the driveway.

Commissioner Knieriem said he saw both sides of th. \&r 2 . He appreciated the applicant making an effort to get the home to meet code. nce eighbor to the south was comfortable with the project, he did not see any. es.

Commissioner Markunas thanked the applicant for try, to meet code.
Chair Rigoni moved the discussion to th Lan ${ }^{〔} \dot{a}_{1}$ Ordinance requirements for replacing preservation trees.

Commissioner Knieriem asked wi. he larges, eservation tree, a hackberry, needed to be removed, given i+ istan "om L. home.

The architect re nded that the l ge hackberry was located right on the edge of where the builders woula working, th 1 gh it was not over the house. The decision to remove the tree was a result $o_{1}$ a ten- $f$ cover-dig which would be required to allow for construction of the founa. The over-dig would get close to where the tree was, and the tree would become a satety hazard. In the architect's experience, when excavating close to the roots, and particularly when needing to cut some of the root system away, trees did not survive very long after the fact. He has contracted with services which would try to help the tree recover, but the interventions were commonly unsuccessful. From a safety perspective, it was smarter to cut down the tree than to work around it.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked if the strict requirements of the Landscape Ordinance could be relaxed regarding the number of replacement trees required.

Staff responded that the requirements could be waived by the code official, which was assumed to be Chris Gruba in this case, but he was seeking input from the Commission and whether they felt strongly one way or the other.

## DRAFT

Chair Rigoni stated she thought requiring 26 trees to replace one tree seemed unreasonable, but that she was hesitant to suggest waiving the requirement altogether. She asked if the large hackberry tree was the only one to be removed.

Staff clarified that five trees in total were going to be removed, four of which were classified as preservation trees. There was one large hackberry tree and three smaller hackberry trees.

Chair Rigoni asked if the members of the Plan Commission had any direction for staff.
Commissioner Knieriem asked if the applicant had submitted a tree plan.
Staff said they had not, that the removals were noted on the submitted site plan.
Commissioner Markunas suggested staff follow he r- ements of the Landscape Ordinance.

The architect clarified that the smaller hackberry tro would . in the way of any construction, since they were close to the $1 r^{\prime}$

Chair Rigoni responded that on the site an ty se swere marked for removal. The architect said he was unsure y they 1 'ber marked, and stated that the only hackberry to be remover ...nuld bo large onc.

Staff noted that ${ }^{1}$ adscape Ordi. ice re, ires a 1 "-for-1" replacement for any preservation tre ing removed.

Chair Rigoni said tha repla ment requirements may be met by the proposed landscape plan, which ha. yet been submitted to staff.

The architect stated that a landscape plan would be submitted to the Village for review and approval. He would also plant some trees on-site before beginning construction.

Chair Rigoni asked staff if they were clear on the direction the Plan Commission had provided.

Staff responded that they would make sure the proposed trees and the replacement of the large hackberry complied with the Landscape Ordinance, without waiving any requirements.

Motion (\#3): Recommend that the Village Board approve the variance request for firstfloor building materials to allow non-masonry siding on the property located at 240 Center Road, in accordance with the reviewed plans, public testimony, and Findings of Fact.

Motion by: Markunas
Seconded by: Jakubowski
Approved: (5-1, Chair Rigoni voted no)
Motion (\#4): Recommend that the Village Board approve a variance from Article 6, Section B, Part 4(i) to permit a metal roof on a residential structure on the property located at 240 Center Road, in accordance with the reviewed plans, public testimony, and Findings of Fact.

Motion by: Knieriem Seconded / : Ja.
Approved: (5-1, Commissioner James voted no)
Motion (\#5): Recommend that the Village ${ }^{\square}$-d appri a variance from Article 6, Section B, Part 2(i) to permit a driveway ervin ide-lon ed garage to be 1 ' from the side property line, whereas $4^{\prime}$ is require on epr located at 240 Center Road in accordance with the reviewed plan public stimo $y$, and Findings of Fact.

Motion by: Knieriem econded by: Schaeffer
Approved: (5-1 aair Rigoni vo 1 no)
Motion (\#6): Reco. end that th Village Board approve a variance from Article 5, Section D, Part 3(b) to. -mit _iveway serving a side-loaded garage to have a turning radius of $25^{\prime}$, whereas 26 equired, on the property located at 240 Center Road in accordance with the reviewed plans, public testimony, and Findings of Fact.

Motion by: Knieriem Seconded by: Schaeffer
Approved: (4-2, Commissioner Markunas and Chair Rigoni voted no)
Chair Rigoni announced that all motions had carried, and that this case would be heard by the Village Board at their October $3^{\text {rd }}$ meeting. She expressed that she voted against approving the building materials variance (Motion \#3) because the materials had changed between the workshop and the public hearing.

| Project: | Oltman Residence |
| :--- | :--- |
| Meeting Type: | Public Hearing |
| Request: | Four (4) Variances for proposed single-family home |
| Location: | 240 Center Road |
| Applicant: | Gander Builders |
| Prop. Owner: | Dustin Oltman |
| Representative: | Jarrett Lecas |

## Site Details

| Lot Size: | 38,350 sq. ft. (0.88 acres) |
| :--- | :--- |
| PIN: | $19-09-28-227-013-0000$ |
| Existing Zoning: | R-2 |
| Proposed Zoning: | N/A |
| Buildings / Lots: | 1 house w/ attached garage |
| Proposed house: | 3,493 square feet |
| Building Height: | $31^{\prime} 114^{\prime \prime}$ |



## Project Summary

The applicant, Jarrett Lecas, seeks to construct a 3,493 square-foot house on the vacant property at 240 Center Road for the Oltman family. A house formerly existed on this site but has since been demolished and cleared.

The proposed house would require four (4) variances:

1. To permit non-masonry siding that covers less than $100 \%$ of the $1^{\text {st }}$ floor. The applicant is proposing a mixture of three primary materials, including 4" Hardie Board lap siding (wood composite), ChamClad (PVC with wood appearance) siding and painted white brick.
2. Metal roofs are not permitted on single family homes except as accent features, such as roof areas above bay windows. The applicant is proposing a mix of metal and shingle roof material over the primary structure.
3. To permit a driveway serving a side-loaded garage to be located $1^{\prime}$ from the side property line, whereas $4^{\prime}$ is required.
4. To permit a driveway serving a side-loaded garage to have a turning radius of $25^{\prime}$, whereas $26^{\prime}$ is required.

## Attachments

1. Location Maps, prepared by staff (VOF GIS) scales $1: 2,500$ and $1: 1,000$
2. Plat of Survey of existing site, prepared by Studnicka and Associates, Ltd. dated 12/17/15
3. Color rendering of front building elevation with primary materials listed, received September 15, 2022
4. ChamClad informational brochure from Internet
5. Chamclad warranty brochure from Internet
6. Email from applicant (website for ChamClad), September 7, 2022
7. Variance findings of fact, submitted by applicant
8. PC-ZBA meeting minutes excerpt from August 25, 2022 (workshop meeting)
9. Photographs of property, taken by staff on August 17, 2022
10. Site Plan, received by staff on September 1, 2022
11. Elevation drawings, received by staff on September 15, 2022
12. Floorplans, received by staff on July 7,2022

## Analysis

## Background:

A workshop was held on this project on August $25^{\text {th }}, 2022$. At that time, three (3) variances were sought for a side yard setback, $1^{\text {st }}$ floor building materials and a metal roof on the nrimary structure. At the time, the Plan Commission had concerns regarding the side yard setback and 'ie $a_{\text {, }}$. rance and longevity of the proposed metal longboard siding. An excerpt of the meeting minutes $m$ th $w$ shop have been included with this report.

In response to the concerns raised during the workshop, the plans wer vised, mu...ig the house further back on the lot approximately $19^{\prime}$ to allow for the required $10^{\prime}$ sir . setback. ᄀwever, the driveway was shifted to the south, and is now 1' away from the south side pro rty line oreas 4 required for driveways that serve side-loaded garages, requiring a variance. The drivewa also is an ized turning radius. Driveways serving side-loaded garages must have a minimum tur ig radiu of at If st $26^{\prime}$, whereas $25^{\prime}$ is provided, requiring another variance.

The original variances for $1^{\text {st }}$ floor +erials troofing materials have remained. However, the workshop plans illustrated 6 " metal lonr ard siding, $w \quad h$ has , o been replaced by "ChamClad" siding with a faux wood finish, which is a high-grac' VC siding. The or rally requested Hardie Board siding remains unchanged. A copy of the manufacturer specifica s for the Char ad siding have been included with this report. Physical building samples will also be provided at $\quad$ ublichear of

Table of Dimensional Requirements:

|  | R-2 Single-Family Detached Residential District Requirement | Subject Property | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Lot Size | 15,000 SF | 38,350 SF | Conforming |
| Minimum Lot Width | 100' | $100{ }^{\prime}$ | Conforming |
| Minimum Lot Depth | 150' | 370.4' | Conforming |
| Minimum Required Yards (Setbacks) | - $30^{\prime}$ front <br> - Total $25^{\prime}$; min. $10^{\prime}$ on either side <br> - $30^{\prime}$ rear | - $59.6^{\prime}$ front <br> - $10.1^{\prime} \& 26^{\prime}$ sides <br> - $245^{\prime}(+/-)$ rear | Complies |
| Maximum Height | 35' | $31^{\prime} 1.25^{\prime \prime}$ | Complies |
| Maximum Lot Coverage | 20\% (for a two-story house) | 4.6\% (1,756 SF) | Complies |
| Maximum Impervious Coverage | 40\% | >40\% | Complies |
| Maximum Rear Yard | 30\% | 0\% | Complies |


| Coverage |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Gross Floor Area | 2,600 SF (for a two- <br> story) | 3,493 SF | Complies |
| Minimum Basement Size | $80 \%$ of the ground floor | $100 \%$ | Complies |

## General comments regarding revised plans:

Staff offers the following points for discussion:

1. The R-2 zone district requires a minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet, $100^{\prime}$ width and $150^{\prime}$ depth. The existing lot is 38,350 square feet in area, $100^{\prime}$ wide and approximately $370.4^{\prime}$ deep and is therefore conforming regarding lot size and width. The lot does narrow slightly toward the middle of the lot, to $98.3^{\prime}$ wide, before flaring out to $110^{\prime}$ wide along the rear property line. The house is located near the narrowest point of the lot.
2. The Zoning Ordinance requires that all houses in the R-2 zone district provide a $10^{\prime}$ minimum side yard setback (total of $25^{\prime}$ on both sides). The proposed house would be constructed $10.1^{\prime}$ from the north side property line and $25.5^{\prime}$ from the south side property line, meeting this requirement.
3. The Zoning Ordinance requires that all houses in the $R-\overline{2}$ or district have the $1^{\text {st }}$ floor entirely constructed of masonry (Article 6, Section B, Part $2(\mathrm{~g})^{\prime}$ ). ThF nosed house would be constructed of three primary materials: ChamClad siding (PVC with fa " d fin. $4^{\prime \prime}$ Hardie Board lap siding (wood composite) and painted brick, requiring a variance. The 'sed Cha. 'əd ding has a treated surface that closely resembles natural wood. To staff's knowledge, is materiu nas not been used on new construction in Frankfort.
4. The Zoning Ordinance prohibits metal roofs or ingle-f nis ames except for accent features above bay windows (Article 6, Section B, Part 4 (i)). 'e prope d hous '...uld have both a metal roof and shingled roof over the primary structure, requir $n$ a varianc The $r$ cal vs. shingle material is about an even split.
5. The Zoning Ordinance rear: that all 5 ges over 3 cars in size be side-loaded. The proposed 4-car garage is side-loaded $t$ ' Jmply $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{I}}$ ' is req. ment. The garage itself is 1,134 square feet in area.
6. The Zoning Ordir e permits a max im lot coverage of $20 \%$ for two-story homes in the R-2 zone district. The proposu ouse with attar d garage amounts to 1,756 square feet, which is approximately $4.6 \%$ of the lot, comply, vith this re' rement. There are two existing accessory structures (a shed and a barn) measuring 257 SF a. $196^{\circ}$ although these are proposed to be demolished. If these structures remained after the house was cructed, the lot coverage would be approximately $6.5 \%$.
7. There would be five (5) trees removed to construct the new house. Of these trees, four (4) are classified as "preservation trees" per the Landscape Ordinance, including three hackberry trees $\left(42^{\prime \prime}, 8\right.$ " 8 " diameters) and one oak tree ( $6^{\prime \prime}$ diameter). Preservation trees must be mitigated on-site at a $1^{\prime \prime}: 1^{\prime \prime}$ ratio of tree caliper (non-preservation trees can be removed without penalty). Preservation trees must be replaced with one of the "overstory tree" species as listed in Appendix A of the Landscape Ordinance. Replacement trees shall be at least $2.5^{\prime \prime}$ caliper size upon planting. In this instance, a total of $64^{\prime \prime}$ of tree diameter would be removed and need to be replaced on-site. If the applicant chooses to plant new trees that are $2.5^{\prime \prime}$ in diameter, a total of 26 trees would need to be planted on-site. If trees larger than $2.5^{\prime \prime}$ caliper were planted, the total number of replacement trees would be less. The site plans do not illustrate the location, type and size of any replacement trees.

Page 11 of the Landscape Ordinance states that "Village staff may vary the number of replacement trees required depending on the desirability of the existing tree". Staff has included site photos of the trees that would be removed. If the Plan Commission is of the opinion that any of the preservation trees do not
need to be replaced, in whole or in part, staff asks that this be noted during the public hearing. For example, the Plan Commission could recommend to staff that only $32^{\prime \prime}$ of tree diameter replacement is needed instead of $64^{\prime \prime}$ based upon the desirability of the existing trees. In absence of any recommendation from the Plan Commission, staff intends to require the total tree replacement as per the Landscape Ordinance and will request a tree planting plan from the applicant prior to the issuance of a building permit.

## Standards for Variations

For reference during the public hearing, Article 3, Section B, Part 3 of the Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance lists "findings" or "standards" that the Zoning Board of Appeals must use to evaluate every variation request.
a. The Zoning Board of Appeals shall not vary the provisions of this Ordinance as authorized in this Article 3, Section B, unless they have made findings based upon the evidence presented to it in the following cases:

1. That the property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used only under the conditions allowed by the regulations in that zone;
2. That the plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances;
3. That the variation, if granted, will not alter the essentia arr er e e locality.
b. For the purpose of supplementing the above standara, 2 . Toning $L$ Jf Appeals, in making this determination, whenever there are practical difficultios or hara $s$, shall also take into consideration the extent to which the following facts, favorable to + ap, ant, hav, en established by the evidence:
4. That the particular physical surroundings, sh a opog al conditions of the specific property involved will bring a particular hardship on the ner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations was ed out;
5. That the conditions upor netitic or variation is based would not be applicable, generally, to other property withir a same zon. lassifi. on;
6. That the purpose $c$ variation is no ased exclusively upon a desire to make more money out of the property;
7. That the alleged difficulty on 'de', has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property;
8. That the granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or unduly injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located;
9. That the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of any proposed structure will not be so at variance with either the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the structures already constructed, or in the course of construction in the immediate neighborhood or the character of the applicable district, as to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values within the neighborhood;
10. That the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of air to adjacent property, substantially increase the danger of fire, otherwise endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood,
11. Recommend the Village Board approve the variance request for first-floor building materials to allow non-masonry siding on the property located at 240 Center Road, in accordance with the reviewed plans, public testimony and Findings of Fact.
12. Recommend the Village Board approve a variance from Article 6, Section B, Part 4 (i) to permit a metal roof on a residential structure, in accordance with the reviewed plans, public testimony and Findings of Fact.
13. Recommend the Village Board approve a variance from Article 6, Section B, Part 2 (i) to permit a driveway serving a side-loaded garage to be $1^{\prime}$ from the side property line, whereas $4^{\prime}$ is required, in accordance with the reviewed plans, public testimony and Findings of Fact.
14. Recommend the Village Board approve a variance from Article 5, Section D, Part 3(b) to permit a driveway serving a side-loaded garage to have a turning radius of $25^{\prime}$, whereas $26^{\prime}$ is required, in accordance with the reviewed plans, public testimony and Findings of Fact.

240 Center Road - Proposed House (variances)






# EXTERIOR \& INTERIOR WALLS, SOFFIT, CEILING \& TRIM 

## CHAMCLAD.COM

for more information contact us at info@chamclad.com

## THE CHAMCLAD WAY

Chamclad exterior and interior walls, soffit and ceiling panels are transforming architectural design and building practices across North America.

Our Canadian made product is designed to be the ideal choice for applications requiring durability, low maintenance and easy installation - with no special tools required.

Our films have 35 years proven performance in the EXTERIOR industry and offer the most realistic woodgrains, metallic, and anodized finishes in the market. Additional benefits include superior UV protection and weathering resistance, colour stability, low heat buildup, and scratch and graffiti resistance.

ChamClace
by thitmalems Transforming Spaces

## CEILING \& INTERIC? WALLS



1 PANEL 2 LOOKS U-CHANNEL, V-GROOVE


6" INTERIOR V L AND CEILING P ELS 9', 12', $14^{\prime} \quad \prime^{\prime}, 30$ LEN AS


4" INTERIOR WALL \&
CEILING PANEL
$12^{\prime} \& 20^{\prime}$ LENGTHS


2 PC INTERIOR WALL \& CEILING FINISH TRIM PANEL $12^{\prime} \& 20^{\prime}$ LENGTHS


2" INTERIOR WALL \& CEILING PANELS SEAMLESS PROFILE $12^{\prime} \& 20^{\prime}$ LENGTHS


2PC 1.5" OUTSIDE CORNER TRIM (SMALL FACE) $12^{\prime} \& 20^{\prime}$ LENGTHS


UNIVERSAL J TRIM
PVC: 12' \& 20' LENGTHS

1.5" 2PC. H TRIM PVC: 12' LENGTHS


F TRIM $12^{\prime}$ LENGTHS

## EXTERIOR WALL \& SOFFIT CLADDING SYSTEM



1 PANEL, 2 LOOKS U-CHANNEL, V-GROOVE

$6^{\prime \prime}$ SOFFIT PANELSOLID 9', 12', 14', 20', 30' LENGTHS


6" EXTERIOR $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ WALL PANEL 12', 20', 30' LENGTHS


12" EXTERIOR 3/8" WALL \& SOFFIT PANEL SEAMLESS PROFILE $12^{\prime} \& 20^{\prime}$ LENGTHS

$4^{\prime \prime} \& 6^{\prime \prime}$ VENTED SOFFIT $6^{\prime \prime}$ AVAILABLE IN $12^{\prime}, 14^{\prime}, 20^{\prime}$ $4^{\prime \prime}$ AVAILABLE IN $12^{\prime}, 2^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$


4" SOFFIT PANEL
-SOLID 12' \& 20' LENGTHS


SOFFIT AND 12" SIDING 2PC FINISH TRIM

3/8" PANEL $12^{\prime} \& 20^{\prime}$ LENGTHS


6" SIDING 2PC FINISH TRIM $1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ PANEL
$12^{\prime} \& 20^{\prime}$ LENGTHS



UNIVERSAL J TRIM
$12^{\prime} \& 20^{\prime}$ LENGTHS

* 6" SIDIN ${ }^{\circ}$ NATION F' دH TRIs PANEL 12 20'LE'



2PC 3.5" EXTERIOR WALL FINISH TRIM 12' LENGTHS

INSIDE CORNER TRIM $12^{\prime}$ \& 20' LENGTHS


* STARTER STRIP $12^{\prime}$ \& $20^{\prime}$ LENGTHS

1.5" 2PC H-TRIM SOFFIT PVC 12' LENGTHS


2PC 2.5" OUTSIDE CORNER TRIM (LARGE FACE) USE WITH PANEL LENGTHS GREATER THAN 20'

- THESE TRIMS AVAILABLE IN ALUMINUM, PVC OR PVC/ALUM COMBINATION IN 12', 20' LENGTHS


## CUSTOM LENGTHS AVAILABLE

## STOCK COLOURS




## THE CHAMCLAD ADVANTAGE

## TESTING

$\checkmark$ ICCES ESR 4560
$\checkmark$ CCMC 14323-R
$\checkmark$ ASTM D696-16
$\checkmark$ ASTM D635-18
$\checkmark$ CAN/CGSB - 41.24.-95
$\checkmark$ CAN/ULC S102-2018
$\checkmark$ ASTM G154-16
$\checkmark$ ASTM D790
$\checkmark$ ASTM G155
$\checkmark$ ASTM E330/E330-14
PROCEDURE B $050<0.85$
$\checkmark$ RILEM TC -127-MS (ACID RAIN)
$\checkmark$ CAN/ULC S134
$\checkmark$ NFPA 285
$\checkmark$ NFPA 268

Chamclac
by
Transforming Spaces
1023518 St NW
For our USA distribution please
email us at info@chamclad.com



## COVERAGE UNDER THIS WARRANTY

Chameleon Wrapping and Lamination Ltd. ("Chameleon") is pleased to offer a 50 -Year Limited Warranty on its ChamClad® line of PVC siding, cladding and accessories (the "product"), on the terms and conditions set out herein (the "Warranty").

Chameleon warrants the product will be free from initial manufacturing defects in material or workmanship ("initial defects") for a period of 50 years from the date of purchase. Provided the product has been stored and installed according to ChamClad® installation instructions, the product is warranted for a period of 50 years (as prorated as set out below) against warping, blistering, and peeling ("technical failure"), subject to the limitations contained herein.

The product, like all materials, will experience some degree of discolouration due to age, sun exposure, and other environmental conditions. Provided the product has been stored and installed according to ChamClad ${ }^{2}$ installation instructions, $C^{\prime}$ 'am leon further warrants the product against unreasonable discolouration for a perir of 1i ars from the date of purchase (subject to the limitations contained herein). In the eve $\exists \Gamma^{\prime} \rightarrow m$ hrought under the Warranty for unreasonable discolouration, Chameleon, in its sole retion, determine whether the degree of discolouration or fading is unreasonable or exces $\quad \uparrow$, havih, 」ard to the factors set out below.

In the event of initial defects, technical failure o inrea л. 'e discolouration covered by the Warranty, Chameleon will, at its sole discretion, rep , resi . r replace the product in accordance with the claims provisions set ut belo Chan leon's responsibility is limited to the product only. Coverage for installation a 'abour ca be determined by Chameleon on a case-by-case basis, at Cham-' sole ' retion, and unless otherwise agreed by $^{\prime}$ Chameleon in writing, all' our ana. 'allath osts are the sole responsibility of the homeowner. The warr $y$ on the repai, repla ment product will be limited to the unexpired term of the Warranty it 'e product whil was repaired or replaced.

The Warranty extends to the iginal pl , naser(s) of the product. The Warranty shall terminate upon the sale of the property c . $r^{\prime}$ ath of the original purchaser(s)/homeowner(s), unless the Warranty is transferred to a new $c$, rer by applying to Chameleon in writing (as more particularly set out herein) within 60 days following the sale. Failure to transfer the Warranty to a new owner in strict compliance herewith shall result in the balance of the Warranty period being forfeited.

The right to transfer the Warranty is limited to individual homeowners only and under no circumstances shall any transfer be deemed to extend or renew the warranty period, which in all cases shall be a maximum of 50 years. In the case of corporations, governmental agencies, trusts, religious organizations, schools, condominiums, or cooperative housing, the Warranty is non-transferable, except by a builder to the home purchaser in the event of a new home build.

Should any of the product be determined by Chameleon to have any manufacturing defects or suffer technical failure, Chameleon, in its sole discretion, shall determine whether to replace, restore, or repair and return said product to the homeowner via the authorized ChamClad® ${ }^{(8)}$ retailer/distributor,

To start a claim, a Warranty Claim Form can be filled out and sent to Chameleon. If there are any questions, please contact Chameleon's customer service at $1(780) 4544430$ or at info@chamclad.com.

The product is not warranted for suitability of use in all situations. It is the sole responsibility of the purchaser to determine the suitability, effectiveness, and safety of any particular use or application of the product. As building code regulations and conditions vary from area to area, each purchaser should consult local building and safety codes for specific requirements, and qualified exterior contractors to determine the suitability.

## EXCLUSIONS AND LIMITATIONS UNDER THIS

 WARRANTYChameleon's obligations and liability under the Warranty are expressly conditional upon and subject to the following:

1. The installation, storage, and proper handling of L . roduct 'st have been completed in accordance with ChamClad® installation instruci. $\mathrm{rh}_{\mathrm{h}}$, lease, www.chamclad.com for storage, installation and care instructionel Nothin, this Warranty will construe a warranty of workmanship of any instal' nc 'mpose ly liability of unsatisfactory performance caused by faulty installati , inc ath but not limited to failing to ensure proper spacing for expansion and cc tracuon Jhen : L...ig the product prior to installation, it is important that it is not left unin: alled in ect s ilight. Leaving uninstalled product in direct sunlight will void the Warrar,
2. The Warranty mus ave been, stert s required herein, and any transferee must have completed and smitted the pro $r$ transier documentation to Chameleon. The claimant must provide $\mathrm{Ch}_{\mathrm{c}}$, Jeon with all ormation which it reasonably requires to evaluate the Warranty claim.
3. This Warranty does not c. estruction of or damage to the product, or to the product's failure to adhere to any sunace, where caused or contributed to by improper installation, improper cleaning (including the use of unapproved cleaning products or any abrasive materials), misuse, neglect, impact from foreign objects, ice, fire, wind (including tornados or other extreme wind events), earthquake, flooding (overland or otherwise), lightning or acts of God.
4. This Warranty does not cover abnormal surface weathering or distortion which may be caused or contributed to by air pollution, fumes, vandalism, misuse, harmful chemicals, or close proximity to heat sources such as fireplaces, barbecues, heaters and open flames. This Warranty does not cover damage to the product's finish resulting from foreign substances such as grease, oil, sand, and dirt.
5. This Warranty does not cover damage to the product caused or contributed to by the reflection, refraction, or intensification of sunlight from nearby highly-reflective surfaces. Care must be taken when determining whether the product is suitable for its proposed application by determining whether there are any reflections, refraction or intensification of sunlight which may arise from windows, doors, or other highly reflective surfaces, including those on adjacent properties.
6. This Warranty does not cover discolouration (whether unreasonable or otherwise) or other damage caused or contributed to by air pollution, harmful chemicals and harsh weather conditions. Normal weathering is to be expected as a result of exposure to ultraviolet radiation, atmosphere and weather that may cause staining, fading or other issues which may vary due to the geographic location of a property, sunlight, air quality, or other factors.
7. Coverage under this Warranty for discolouration will be limited to abnormal or unreasonable discolouration, judged against the weathering perfo narce provided by Chameleon's laminate supplier. The standard for unreasonable ascoli ation in ordinary conditions shall be a colour difference $\geq$ grey scale $2 / 3$ (ISO $105{ }^{7} 2$ "or $\epsilon$. sure in the US and Canada, and otherwise shall be in the sole discretion o' 'amele Ch-meleon may require independent lab testing to evaluate a claim for unreas ble disc. . ation.
8. In the event the product has been painte or se. tusing varnish or otherwise coated over the original factory finish, this Warra
9. The Warranty will be void if the " Juct is $r$ clee ad in accordance with the approved cleaning methods, as more particu, set out , ...w and at www.chamclad.com.
10. ChamClad® prodı, are not $W$. antea ainst movement distortion caused by structural movement or gr ad settlement. l $\quad$ of CnamClad® products beyond normal commercial and residential us. an applicatio not recommended by Chameleon or the local building codes will not be cov. $\quad \rightarrow$.
11. Chameleon's sole and e, ive liability under this Warranty is limited to the repair, restoration or replacement of the product. Chameleon shall not be liable for any other losses, damages, or expenses, whether direct or indirect, incidental, consequential, punitive, exemplary, or otherwise whatsoever, including without limitation, costs of removal or reinstallation of the product, labour, freight, taxes, loss of goodwill, lost profits and loss of use. Chameleon's total liability whether arising from or based on contract, warranty, negligence, tort, strict liability, or any other cause or basis whatsoever, is strictly limited to the purchase price of the products involved. Chameleon will not be responsible for any loss of any kind arising from a breach of this Warranty, for the sale of the product or from negligence or omissions on the part of Chameleon, its agents or employees. The warranty on any repaired or replacement products will be limited to the unexpired term of the warranty on the original product.
12. If a claim is made for a product that is no longer available, Chameleon reserves the right to supply a siding product that, in its sole discretion, is of equal quality and colour range for the purpose of fulfilling Chameleon's obligations under this Warranty.
13. Any person to whom product is supplied under the terms of the Warranty shall only be entitled to benefits of the unexpired term of the Warranty applicable to the product originally installed.
14. The Warranty coverage against technical failure is pro-rated as per the below pro-ration schedule (starts from the original date of purchase of the product):

- First 15 years ( $0-15$ years) $-100 \%$ of the cost of materials will be covered
- Next 5 years (16-20 years) $-75 \%$ of the cost of materials will be covered
- Next 10 years (21-30 years) -50\% of the cost of materials will be covered
- Next 10 years ( $31-40$ years) $-25 \%$ of the cost of materials will be covered
- Next 10 years ( $41-50$ years) - 10\% of the ost aterials will be covered

15. If any of the exclusions, disclaimers or limitation. a prol. "ed by law, such provisions may be severed from the Warranty without otherv, se fecting. ."dity of the balance of the provisions.
16. This warranty is exclusive and in lieu of $\varepsilon y$ and .her warranties, express, implied, and statutory.

## CLAIM PROCEDURE UNS CHAMCLAD®

 WARRANTYTo make a claim und $\quad$ Q Warranty, th riginal owner or registered transferee must notify Chameleon within thirty ( days of dis vering the defect. Such notice must be in written form using the attached docume. nd sha' e sent by certified or registered mail postage prepaid and addressed to: Chameleon, $\urcorner$ ' -184 Street, Edmonton, Alberta, T5S 2J4. The claim must include a description of the defec, date of discovery, the property address where the product was installed, and proof of purchase.

With reasonable notice, the owner shall allow our agents and/or distributor to enter the property and building to view the product only when deemed necessary and solely by ChamClad®. When asked, the owner or transferee will be responsible to provide all documentation and defective samples at the owner's expense.

## CHAMCLAD® WARRANTY REGISTRATION FORM

Please fill out this form completely and include a copy of your invoice (proof of purchase) and email to: info@chamclad.com

1. CUSTOMER NAME:
2. ADDRESS WHERE PRODUCT IS INSTALLED:
3. DATE PRODUCT WAS INSTALLED:
4. COPY OF INVOICE FRL DISTRIP IOR (PROOF OF PURCHASE):
5. INSTALLER INFORMATION (NAME AND CONTACT):

## CARE AND MAINTENANCE OF CHAMCLAD® PANELS

ChamClad ${ }^{8}$ products are designed to be low maintenance and our Laminate Films have exceptional properties that ensure ease of cleaning and surface longevity. They are highly ultra-violet, pollution and salt air resistant. The film's low surface tension makes it inherently dirt-repellent and therefore easy to clean. ChamClad® panel finish includes antigraffiti properties and in most cases is easily removed with a mild kitchen detergent and warm water. Should you experience removal difficulties, please contact us at info@chamclad.com

In normal or urban environments, where atmosphere is considered to have low-pollutants, we recommend cleaning every $12-18$ months. In areas subject to high-pollutants such as industrial or coastal environments, we recommend cleaning more frequently - every 8-12 months.

- Using a soft bristled nylon brush attached to a der, se, clean the surface with a mild PH neutral soap or non-abrasive kitchen terren varm water, DO NOT USE abrasive, erosive, or caustic solvents to clean C. IClad(k nels as they can damage the panel finish and could void the ra nty. Tc - ${ }^{-\prime}$ streaking start at the top of the wall - working your way to the bottom.
- Follow with a thorough rinsing of fresh ater to ure tha substances such as airborne salts, dirt and pollutants are removed.
- Always remove unintentional $p$ n splashe stuc spills, etc. immediately to prevent the possibility of dermar, staining.
- Do NOT pressur vash as th. suld nage the protective coating layers of Char , ad® Exterior ! pane,s and will void the Warranty.

Provided that Regular C. and Maint/ ance practices are followed, ChamClad $®$ Exterior wall panels will provide long ter, arforme, e and protect your investment.

| From: | Jarrett Lecas |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | $\underline{\text { Chris Gruba }}$ |
| Cc: | Steve Lecas |
| Subject: | Re: 240 Center |
| Date: | Tuesday, September 6, 2022 2:31:21 PM |

Chris, attached is the website tab for Chamclad's manufacturer specs where it details everything you need to know about the material. This includes the 50 yr warranty and all certifications ( including hurricane certifications for Florida). Let me know if this suffices thank u!
https://chamclad.com/resources/



Application for Plan Commission / Zoning Board of Appeals Review - Standards of Variation

Article 3, Section B, Part 3 of the Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance lists "findings" or "standards" that the Zoning Board of Appeals must use to evaluate every variation request. The Zoning Board of Appeals must answer the following three findings favorable to the applicant based upon the evidence provided. To assist the Zoning Board of Appeals in their review of the variation request(s), please provide responses to the following "Standards of Variation." Please attach additiona = s as necessary.

1. That the property in question cannot yield a reasonable + if $p$. ritted to be used onfy under the conditions allowed by the regulations in that zone;
This lot has been on the market for around 2 years thout much interest as there have been concerns over the traffic on cr ... The . ner is looking to make a large investment into the downtown are as th' se this ot has potential.
2. That the plight of the owner is due to 7, pue circu tance, and

The unique circumstance is that , nkfort whe prefer to have the garage doors not * visible on the front of , by ating a sideloading garage we are required to reach into the setr -k variana Ve pu 'ed the proposed house 5 ft to the north in order to save th ne of mature, corvitae trees on the south lot line.
3. That the variation, if gra d, will not ; sr the essential character of the locality. The material variance, ing re, ested would be consistent with many of the other homes in the downtown a is several homes are mainly consisted of lap siding material with newer homes veing that of Hardie material.

For the purpose of supplementing the above standards, the Zoning Board of Appeals also determines if the following seven facts, favorable to the applicant, have been established by the evidence. Please provide responses to the following additional "Standards of Variation."

1. That the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved will bring a particular hardship upon the owner, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations was carried out;
If a $10^{\prime}$ setback was enforced on the north side of the proposed home, this would push the drivewayfurther south. By doing so, the driveway would encroach onto the line of mature arborvitae trees planted along the south lot line. This would result in the arborvitae trees having to be removed and/or damaged.
2. That the conditions upon which the petition for variation is based would not be applicable, generally, to other property within the same zoning classification; The home to the North is much larger then proposed home.
3. That the purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make more money out of the property;
This home is 3500 square feet and from a FAR perspective could be much larger but owner choose to do a smaller home so it had a quaint Frankfort feel.
4. That the alleged difficulty or hardship has not been created b. anv person presently having an interest in the property;
N/A
5. That the granting of the variation will not be d riment the pubnc welfare or unduly injurious to other property or improvements in the neighb, hor in wl e property is located; N/A
6. That the exterior a. tectural appeal a functional pian of any proposed structure will not be so at variance with either $t_{\text {. }}$. xterior archite ural appeal and functional plan of the structures already constructed, or in the con of constr cion in the immediate neighborhood or the character of the applicable district, as to cau. sut antial depreciation in the property values within the neighborhood; or The functionality of the plan would be completely depreciated as a side load garage is necessary to make the proposed home more architectually appealing.
7. That the proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of air to adjacent property, substantially increase the danger of fire, otherwise endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.

None of this is applicable.
c) Subject to staff approval of the Photometric Plan prior to Village Board consideration.
d) Subject to staff approval of the Building Elevations prior to Village Board consideration.
e) Subject to staff approval of the Sign Package prior to Village Board consideration.

Motion by: Markunas Seconded by: Jakubowski

Approved: (5-1, Rigoni voted against)

Motion (\#7): Recommend that the Village Board approve a Special Use Permit for a Daycare Center/Preschool for the property located at 11031 W. Lincoln Highway (Pending Address Assignment), in accordance with the submitted plans, public testimony, and Findings of Fact, subject to the following condition:
a. Parking lot lights shall be connected to a sk aff twt hich automatically turns off the lights no later than 8:00 p.m. each night a. n no ea. $r$ than 5:30 am and only during days when the daycare/preschool is open . busines.

Motion by: Jakubowski
Se ,nded Schaefi.

Approved: (6-0)
Motion (\#8): Recorr the 'ige Board approve a Special Use Permit for extended hours $r$ peration ( $\mathrm{a}_{4}$ ving ${ }_{2}$. Daycare Center/Preschool to open for business at 6:30 a.m.) it he property loc. d at 11031 W. Lincoln Highway (Pending Address Assignment), in a rdance with e submitted plans, public testimony, and Findings of Fact.

Motion by: Schaeffer

Seconded by: Markunas

Approved: (6-0)

## D. Workshop: 240 Center Road-Oltman Residence

Chris Gruba gave the staff report.
Chair Rigoni asked if there were any initial questions from the Commission for the applicant or staff. There was no response.

Chair Rigoni invited the applicant or their representative to the podium.

Steve Lecas of Gander Builders approached the podium. He explained why he started using different exterior building materials on his projects in recent years. He stated that the modern farmhouse look is in right now. For this project he wanted to come up with a modern flair but still be different from all the other modern farmhouses that are being built. He stated that the type of metal siding that he is proposing for this project is very expensive but is far superior to fiber cement board. He added that it looks like real wood. It never fades, bugs can't eat it, and it cannot easily be dented. He stated that this house is going to be spectacular, unique, and tasteful. He is not sure why the Village is only allowing metal roofs as an accent material because they last for more than 100 years. They are very durable. He mentioned that Hackberry Trees are big junk trees and would like to remove these. He stated that he would like to save the existing barn but will use the reclaimed wood on the interior of the new house. He stated that he needs the side yard setback variation due to the side load garage which is required since the owner desires a four-car garage. He stated that he will work with the neighbor to the north on the plan for the landscaping on the north side of the new house. He then distributed a small sample of the proposed metal siding material fo bw by the Plan Commission / Zoning Board of Appeals members.

Chair Rigoni asked Mr. Lecas where this produc a ing use.
Mr. Lecas replied that he is currently buil ouse in w Buffalo Michigan which will have this product. He stated that it $i$ cour $t^{\circ}$, he price of Hardie Board $®$.

Mr. Lecas then distributed a broch e which ontair d photos of buildings that use the product and stated that it will no. k shiny.

Commissioner Jal owksi as. Mr. . 'as if he is using this due to the lifetime warranty.

Mr . Lecas replied L . the warrar is part of the reason but more for the look and durability.

Commissioner James stated that the intent of Hardie Board $®$ is to mimic the look of real wood siding, which this proposed Longboard $®$ product does just that.

Commissioner Jakubowski stated that she agrees and wishes that she had this on her house.

Commissioner Schaeffer stated that she is intrigued by this material. She wondered if a touch-up pen is necessary for scratches.

Steve Lecas replied that he has seen the material become scratched when it brushes up against brick, but it is very durable.

Commissioner Knieriem stated that he has no problem with the product but would like to see a color board.

Steve Lecas distributed a photograph of a house in Asheville, North Carolina that uses this product.

Chair Rigoni stated that everything in the brochure provided by Mr. Lecas is very modern. If he can find more homes that use this product it will be helpful.

Discussion ensued regarding the Village's Residential Design Guidelines which are included within the adopted Comprehensive Plan and how these were intended to allow for architectural variety.

Chair Rigoni stated that when Mr. Lecas mentioned saving the existing barn wood siding, he would use it on the exterior of the new house.

Steve Lecas replied "maintenance, maintenance maii re."
Discussion then ensued regarding the proposed. rool material.
Chris Gruba stated that metal roofing is approximate,,$\quad \eta$ percem of the overall roofing material on the new house. Past projects ${ }^{\downarrow}$ n. ${ }^{7}$ perm. $\gamma$ to use metal roofing as an accent material over porches, bay wind vs, etr

Commissioner Knieriem stated th. this loc mod n.
Steve Lecas respond *" this what he was going for in the design.
Discussion the nsued regardin the wh dows.
Commissioner Sc. ffer stated $t$ t the color rendering that was provided looks like an office building.

Steve Lecas responded that the rendering provided by the architect doesn't accurately reflect how the upper windows will have thinner mullions between the glass so as a grouping these will look like one large window.

Discussion then ensued regarding the proposed 5-foot side yard setback on the north side of the new house.

Commissioner Markunas stated that is it hard for him to allow this variation request since it is a vacant lot.

Commissioner Schaeffer stated that she is looking for a solution, She added that she does not like the fact that the new house is so close to the north property line.

Commissioner Knieriem stated that he echoes the other members' comment and that he is concerned with the proposed 5 -foot setback.

Commissioner James stated that the north wall of the house is also the tallest part of the house. He added that it is going to be tight.

Commissioner Jakubowksi stated that it is a big lot especially for the Downtown area.
Discussion then ensued about potentially shifting the proposed house further west on the lot, since the lot width becomes slightly wider. This may help the applicant achieve compliance with the required 10 -foot side yard setback from the north property line.

Discussion then ensued regarding the applicant asking for the blessing of the Building Department on the proposed Longboard $\circledR$ metal siding product.

Chair Rigoni invited an audience member to the podium. He identified himself as Charles Christensen.

Mr. Christensen stated that his biggest concern s.a pl sed 5-foot setback from the north property line, which would place the prope , ew hou alor to his property.

Commissioner Knieriem requested that $\mathrm{M} r$ \& place. kes at the corners of the proposed new house for the benefit of $b$ a the ${ }^{P}$ Comm. sion/Zoning Board of Appeals as well as for the neighbor

Mr. Lecas replied that he would
act prove th e stakes to show the location of the proposed new house r

## E. Public Comm

There were none.

## F. Village Board \& Coml 」pdates

Schwarz noted that the following matters that previously came before the PC/ZBA were approved by the Village Board at its meeting on August 15:

- Norman Residence side yard setback and basement area variations at 229 N . Locust Street - the ordinance was approved.
- Wildflower Hair Salon and Spa special use for personal services at 21195 S. la Grange Road - the ordinance was approved.

Schwarz also noted that the Illinois Chapter of the American Planning Association Annual Conference will be held at the Old Post Office in Chicago September 28-30. There is a nominal amount of funding in the budget for a few Plan Commission members to attend one day of the conference for a session which offers Plan Commissioner training. He stated that it is a good opportunity to learn best practices from other
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## NOTES


2. Proposed grades taken from apporved Neighbortood Drainage Foundation) elevation taken from elevations indicated on
3. Bulding footroint provided by others, and should be checked
4. Building location nhould be established by measuring from

5. Benchmark taken from previuus planiwork completed in
 indicated. such as spot checking top of cturt elevations
adjacent toundation elevation, eto. priot to construction
6. No topographic survey of current ground grades or existing responsibility of the Ownert to verity 1 coations prior to startiing
7. Any and all off-sitit disturbed areas
condtitions or better, if
8. Prior to Excavation call Jont Uuilites. Location Infomation tor
9. All proposed top of window wells shall be set at $T$ TF -0.30 ,
10. Side slopes shall be $5: 1$ or flate
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## ordinance no. 33XX

## AN ORDINANCE GRANTING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR INDOOR RECREATION TO CERTAIN PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT, WILL AND COOK COUNTIES, ILLINOIS <br> (PIC \& PLĀ INDOOR PICKLEBALL FACILITY <br> 21800 S. LAGRANGE ROAD, UNIT B)


#### Abstract

WHEREAS, an application for a Special Use Permit for certain property within the Village of Frankfort, legally described below, was filed by Anthony Villa, Applicant; and MTC Investment Properties, LLC - 21800 Series, 21800 S. LaGrange Road, Frankfort, Illinois 60423, Owner; and


WHEREAS, the Subject Property, commonly known as 21800 S. LaGrange Road, is currently zoned I-2 General Industrial District; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant proposes to renov $\quad \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{A}$, f the existing building on the Subject Property and requests the granting of a Special Perm. $r$ Indoor Recreation for the operation of Pic \& Plā, an indoor recreational facility conta. ${ }^{\text {g }}$ four . eball courts; and

WHEREAS, a timely Notice of Public H angs fore the an Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Frankfort was publi ed ir ne ilv Southtown newspaper announcing a Public Hearing on the Owner's applicatic for a St cial U e rermit for the Subject Property; and

WHEREAS, at a time and place a snated in ...n published notice, a Public Hearing was held before the Village of F ..rus ' n C nission/Zoning Board of Appeals on the Owner's application for a Special ee Permit fo, e ' Sut et Property; and

WHEREAS, the nkfort Plan 'mmission/Zoning Board of Appeals has made special written Findings-of-Fact as \& ured by ¿Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance 2001; and

WHEREAS, the Frankfor an Commission forwarded a unanimous (6-0) recommendation to the Board of Trustees of the Village of Frankfort that the Subject Property be granted a Special Use Permit for Indoor Recreation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT, WILL \& COOK COUNTIES, ILLINOIS, AS FOLLOWS:

## SECTION 1. SPECIAL USE PERMIT

That the following described real property to wit:
PIN: 19-09-28-102-002-0000
PARCEL 1

PART OF THE NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 28 , TOWNSHIP 35 NORTH, RANGE 12, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID NORTHWEST $1 / 4$, THENCE NORTHERLY ALONG THE WESTLINE OF SAID NORTHWEST $1 / 4,51843$ FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, THENCE CONTINUING NORTHERLY ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID NORTHWEST $1 / 4$ NORTH 00 DEGREES 00 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST 27970 FEET, THENCE NORTH 43 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 27 SECONDS EAST 6184 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF A PUBLIC ROADWAY ( 660 FEET WIDE), THENCE NORTH 89 DEGREES 56 MINUTES 56 SECONDS EAST ALONG THE LAST SAID SOUTH LINE 49194 FEET TO A POINT ON A CURVE ON THE WESTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF US ROUTE 45 ( 800 FEET WIDE), THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG A CUREVE TO THE LEFT, CONVEX TO THE NORTHWEST, HAVING A RADIUS OF 462375 FEET AND A CHORD BEARING OF SOUTH 34 DEGREES 24 MINUTES 38 SECONDS WEST AN ARC DISTRANCE OF 54457
FEET, THENCE NORTH 61 DEGREES 21 MINUTES 53 SECONDS WEST 25842 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, ALL IN WILL COUNTY, I ${ }^{〔} \mathrm{P}^{\top} O I S$

## PARCEL2

 OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, DES' $\square D$ AS LLOWS COMMENCING AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SAID NORTI LAST THENO NORTHERLY ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID NORTHEAST $1 / 451 i 43 / c E T$ THE POINT OF BEGINNING, THENCE NORTH 61 DEGREES 21 MIN, TES 5 sECO JDS WEST 20857 FEET, THENCE NORTH 29 DEGREES 43 MINUTES. 'ECONL पA' 「 19172 FEET, THENCE SOUTH 71 DEGREES 09 MINUTES 00 SERNDS E. T 6038 FEET, THENCE NORTH 43 DEGREES 15
 SAID SECTION 29, $T^{\top}$ ENCE SOU' 00 L GREES 00 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID EAST NE OF THE ORTHEAST $1 / 427970$ FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, ALL IN W COUNTY LLINOIS

Commonly known as 21800 S. $r$ ange Road, Frankfort, Will County, Illinois, which is the property subject to the previously a scribed application for a Special Use Permit, is hereby granted a Special Use Permit for Indoor Recreation for the Subject Property, Unit B, to accommodate the proposed operation of Pic \& Plā, an indoor recreational facility containing four pickleball courts, in accordance with the reviewed plans, public testimony, Findings of Fact, and conditioned upon if any mechanical uses are added to the roof of the site, they shall be screened per the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance; the project shall obtain compliance with all applicable codes, including the Fire Code and International Building Code; there shall be no indoor bleachers installed and no tournaments held at this location; and no less than 25 parking spaces shall be allocated to the proposed use.

## SECTION 2. REPEAL OF CONFLICTING PROVISIONS

All ordinances and resolutions, or parts thereof, in conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance are, to the extent of the conflict, expressly repealed on the effective date of this Ordinance

## SECTION 3. ZONING MAP AMENDMENT

That the Zoning Map of the Village of Frankfort is amended to reflect the Subject Property, currently zoned I-2 General Industrial District, is granted Special Use Permit for Indoor Recreation, as provided under this Ordinance and the Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance, as amended from time to time.

## SECTION 4. SEVERABILITY

If any provision of this Ordinance or application thereof to any person or circumstances is ruled unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of this Ordinance that can be given effect without the invalid application or provision, and each invalid provision or invalid application of this Ordinance is severable.

## SECTION 5. EFFECTIVE DATE

The Ordinance shall take effect after its passage, a. sval, a. vublication in pamphlet form, as provided by law.

PASSED this __ day of _ , 2022; wit NAY; and $\qquad$ members absent; the Village Pres lent $\mathbf{r}$ said vote being:


MARGARET M. FARINA
JESSICA PETROW

EUGENE SAVARIA

KATIE SCHUBERT
VILLAGE CLERK

APPROVED this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2022.

KEITH OGLE
VILLAGE PRESIDENT

ATTEST:

KATIE SCHUBERT
VILLAGE CLERK

## Public Hearing: 21800 S. La Grange Road - Proposed Pickleball (Ref \#105)

Chris Gruba presented the staff report.
The applicant, Tony Villa, approached the stand. He thanked staff for their work on the case. He explained that since he received approval to construct the new pickleball building at 9093 W . Fey Drive, the price of building materials increased dramatically.

Since then, the applicant had searched for another location in which the building was already constructed and decided on the property currently before the Plan Commission. Renting the tenant space would give the applicant a chance to try out the business concept without having to invest money in a brand-new facility. To his knowledge, the neighboring businesses had approximately four employees between them, which explained why the parking lot was typically as empty as it was. The estimated 60 -person occupancy limit was high in his opinion.

Chair Rigoni asked staff to clarify the numbers o de-requ d parking for the various uses on the site, 23 spaces were required for the othe. ouses, ach left 29 available for the proposed pickleball court.

Staff said she had the numbers correct.
Chair Rigoni asked if there were people, who wished to give comments on the proposal.

There were non
Motion (\#7): Motic a close the ublic hearing.
Motion by: Schaeffer
Seconded by: Knieriem
Approved: (6-0)
Chair Rigoni summarized the motions before the Plan Commission, there was a parking adjustment and a request for a Special Use Permit. She asked the other members of the Plan Commission if they had any comments on the Special Use Permit.

Commissioner Jakubowski said she had no issues with either the parking available on-site or the use.

Commissioner Markunas stated he had no issues with the use, either. He asked if the same conditions would be in place at the new location as the old location. Specifically, that there would be no food sales.

The applicant responded that Commissioner Markunas was correct, there would be no food sales, and the other conditions in place for the old site would be in place here as well.

Commissioner James agreed with other members of the Plan Commission that there was no problem with the use. Since there were two-hour blocks for reservations, he said he expected that turnover at each of the courts might be simultaneous or staggered. He saw no issue with parking.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked if the number of required bathroom facilities was an issue which would impact the granting of a Special Use Permit or a matter of Building Code compliance.

Staff responded that the number of bathroom facilitie was a matter of Building Code compliance and that it was added as a condition $i$ app al of the Special Use Permit.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if the covered rea rtion o. e bvilding would be closed in or left as-is.

The applicant responded that per his cor rsatic vith the rire District, a railing would need to be installed as well as an additic al s of si or evacuation.

Commissioner Knieriem asked L. applica any plans to build additional courts in the rear open area.

The applicant $\mathrm{s}^{\circ}$ he did not.
Chair Rigoni stated had no is e with the parking available on-site. She was unsure whether there was a ne, of lir parking, when instead the Plan Commission could limit the number of available co $\quad \stackrel{\text { instead. }}{ }$

Commissioner Schaeffer wondered if there was only enough space inside the building for four courts.

The applicant stated that there was only enough room for four courts.
Chair Rigoni said that was good information to help them understand the impact on parking. She asked if there were time buffers between reservations for the same court.

The applicant responded, saying reservations would typically have one hour and fortyfive minutes for games, which would leave fifteen minutes for turnover. The system was designed this way to make it easy to walk into the space and have a court available, since
one of the most common drawbacks to using public facilities was a lack of available spaces, which would deter patrons.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if games typically had four people playing or two.
The applicant said that most games are played as doubles, with four people per court, but singles was a possibility as well.

Chair Rigoni asked staff if the adjustment was needed because of a strict interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance.

Staff said they were looking for a specific number of parking spaces to be assigned to the pickleball use. Without a floorplan prepared by an architect, it was impossible for Village staff to determine the "maximum occupancy" of the tenant space. Gruba noted that he believed that once the architectural floor ' an 1. ained, as will be required prior to issuing a building permit, that it will demon. ate $\mu_{c} \quad r$ maximum occupancy which would then require a high number of parking spa ner the ning Ordinance, exceeding the number available currently. Since the existing $p_{a}$ ing lot 1 . always been observed at under-capacity (perhaps 3-6 cars total o.....iven $\alpha_{4}$ it would make practical sense to assign a certain number of parking sF ees to ickleball use. Gruba noted that a situation could arise in which the A - ant fur ture . rouse in Unit A moved out and that a banquet facility was then rosed. I defir dively assigning and calculating parking for the pickleball use, sta suld then urately perform a parking analysis for a potential future ban rracu, use.

Chair Rigoni as the applicant w many employees would be on-site at one time.
The applicant said the would + only one employee on-site at a time.
Chair Rigoni stated that 1 , arking spaces would be required if all four courts were in use by four people, all driving separately, and one for the employee.

Commissioner Knieriem then added another eight potentially required spaces to accommodate any patrons who arrived early for their reservation. This brought the total to 25 parking spaces.

Chair Rigoni asked if adding the parking requirement as a condition to the special use would be agreeable to the Plan Commission, in lieu of a separate motion for a parking adjustment.

Staff said they would prefer a separate motion, but would defer to the Plan Commission.

## DRAFT

Commissioner Schaeffer asked if there might be a potential issue where, after the proposed pickleball use leaves the space, any future use may be bound to the same 25 space parking limit.

Staff clarified that the 25 -parking space limit would be tied to the pickleball use specifically, and would not then limit a future non-pickleball use in that same space.

Commissioner Knieriem noted that there was plenty of space to park in the gravel lot behind the building as well, should it be needed.

The applicant explained that the gravel lot was used by one of the other tenants for trucks, as did the previous tenant. There were no parking spaces designated, but it could be something explored in the future.

Chair Rigoni requested that the reasoning which ed $t_{1}$ an Commission to settle on 25 parking spaces as the limit for the proposed us, erre. in the minutes of the meeting.

Staff explained that they were looking for? ific nu. or to use when calculating the parking requirements for the proposed $u$ and $t$ ite as a dhole, as well as for any future uses.

Commissioner James asked if th. was a po his y that the office space used by one of the other tenants may ruirin. nore parking in the future.

Staff noted that e tenant in que on primarily used their space as a distribution point, which may limit need for offir ; at that location.

Motion (\#8): Recomm that e Village Board approve a special use for an indoor recreation facility at 2180 La Grange Road, Unit B, in accordance with the reviewed plans, findings of fact, and public testimony, conditioned on the following:

1. If any mechanical uses are added to the roof of the site, they shall be screened per the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The project shall obtain compliance with all applicable codes, including the Fire Code and International Building Code.
3. There shall be no indoor bleachers installed and no tournaments held at this location.
4. No less than 25 required parking spaces shall be allocated to the proposed use.

Approved: (6-0)
Chair Rigoni said the item would be put before the Village Board on October $3^{\text {rd }}$.


## Attachments

1. Aerial images ( $1: 4,000$ scale and $1: 1,500$ scale) VOF GIS
2. Plat of Highways, illustrating vacated streets on subject property and current property line boundary, prepared by RT\&A, revised 7/11/06.
3. Interior space sketch, received by staff on 8.1.22
4. Floorplan sketch, based upon Frankfort Township Assessor, received by staff on 8.11.22
5. Special Use Permit Findings of Fact, applicant responses
6. Description of use, prepared by the applicant
7. Photographs of building interior and exterior, taken by staff on 8.10.22 and 8.11.22

## Analysis

## Description of use:

The applicant intends to occupy a 9,820 sq. ft. tenant space within the existing building at 21800 S . La Grange to use for indoor pickleball. The use would be located in Unit B, located between Unit A (Avanti furniture warehouse storage) and Unit C (Sunbelt Supply Company, manual and automatic valve experts). The applicant is proposing 4 pickleball courts, which was the same amount of courts as when the use was proposed and approved for the undeveloped property at 9093 W . Fey Drive. As before, the business would be open daily from $7 \mathrm{am}-9 \mathrm{pm}$; normal business hours within the Village are $7 \mathrm{am}-11 \mathrm{pm}$. Reservations to play would be made via a mobile app.

## Zoning

1. The subject property is currently zoned $\mathrm{I}-2$, General Industrial. Indoor recreation facilities require a special use permit in the $1-2$ district.

## Site Design

1. No exterior changes to the building are proposed, other than hat may be needed for compliance with the Fire Code, such as fire exits or new exterior stairs at ${ }^{+}$. back rance.
2. The applicant has informed staff that there will not be an conditio. for the building and therefore no exterior mechanical units will be needed. Should air-cona ning unit. ay other mechanical units be installed outside of the building in the future, * must be sened with landscaping or walls per Article 7, Section A, Part 3 (c) of the Zoning Ordir, Ice. I. has beer, luded as a condition of approval.

## Parking \& Loading

1. The existing site has a paved parkin tin the $t$ a containing 52 spaces, including two ADA accessible spaces. The sid $\quad$ วar yar re gravel and used for storing semi-trucks and trailers. Staff has created a parking alysis table 'ow ba. upon the existing uses.

2. The Building Department noted that maximum occupancy is calculated at a rate of 50 square feet per person for indoor recreation uses (pickleball). Unit B is 9,820 square feet, allowing for 196 people, requiring 49 parking spaces. However, the actual maximum occupancy is expected to be significantly lower once a scaled floorplan is provided by an architect or engineer, as the area dedicated for restrooms, storage areas, office areas and other rooms are not included in the calculation for maximum occupancy. For comparison, the formerly approved pickleball building at 9093 W . Fey Drive was 12,160 square feet and designed for a maximum occupancy of 50 people, requiring 15 parking spaces (including employee requirements). The proposed tenant space in Unit B is smaller than the formerly approved building by 2,340 square feet.
3. The applicant noted that if all four (4) indoor courts are being used at once, there may be up to 16 people playing at any one time. Other people may arrive early and wait to play.
4. The Zoning Ordinance notes that the Plan Commission can adjust the parking requirements for any use in a business or industrial district on a case-by-case basis. Should the Plan Commission recommend approval of the Special Use Permit, staff recommends that the number of required parking spaces be determined at this time to ensure that the proposed has adec te arking. In other words, the amount of parking required for this use would be enshrined in $\dagger^{\prime}$ appro of the special use permit and forever connected to the approved plans and public testimon As wte, the above parking analysis table, there is a remainder of 29 unused parking spaces per co tat coulu assigned in whole or in part to the proposed pickleball use. The advantage of determi. $n_{b}$, parkin ${ }_{b}$ ement now would be to avoid a potential deficiency of parking per code once the $h$. mum occupancy is determined after receiving a scaled floorplan from an architect. ... ture ar sctural floorplan reveals a parking deficiency, a parking adjustment will be require rom th $\quad$ ' Comm, ion.

Article 7, Section B, Part 5(b) of the Zoni Ordinan refers adjustments to required parking. It states in part:

Adjustments. In all busi, unnu. triala icts, the minimum number of required parking spaces may be adjusted by the P' Commission case-, use basis. The petitioner for such an adjustment shall show to the satis aon of the Plan Co. ission mat adequate parking will be provided for customers, clients, visitors, an. aployees. The fol ing provisions and factors shall be used as a basis to adjust parking requirements.

1. Evidence That Actual Parn De ads will be Less Than Ordinance Requirements. The petitioner shall submit written documentation data to the satisfaction of the Plan Commission that the operation will require less parking than the Ordinance requires.
2. Availability of Joint, Shared or Off-Site Parking. The petitioner shall submit written documentation to the satisfaction of the Plan Commission that joint, shared or offsite parking spaces are available to satisfy the parking demand.
a) Agreements shall be provided which demonstrate evidence that either parking lots are large enough to accommodate multiple users (joint parking) or that parking spaces will be shared at specific times of the day (shared parking, where one activity uses the spaces during daytime hours and another activity uses the spaces during evening hours.)
b) Off-site parking lots may account for not more than 50-percent of the required parking and shall be located not more than three hundred (300) feet from the principal use that it is intended to serve.

Conversely, the Plan Commission could table the special use permit request until staff receives a scaled floorplan prepared by an architect, which would allow staff to calculate the amount of required parking per code.
5. There are loading docks with roll up doors at the rear of the building. 1 door is currently used by Avanti Furniture, 2 doors are available for Unit B and 3 doors are currently used for Sunbelt Supply Company. The proposed pickleball use is not anticipated to require loading from semi-trucks, but if deliveries do occur, they could be accommodated by the existing rear loading dock and 2 roll up doors.

## International Building Code and International Fire Code:

1. A preliminary inspection of the tenant space was conducted by the Frankfort Fire District on August 11, 2022. At that time, the Fire District noted that several building upgrades would be required because the use would be changing from a warehouse use to an indoor recreation use. Staff has not been provided with a complete list of required Fire Code upgrades, but changes may include adding an exterior stairway to the rear loading dock.
2. The applicant has opted to not upgrade the building to meet the Fire Code requirements for a recreational use until after the Special Use Permit has been approved by the Village Board. A business license or occupancy permit would not be issued for the use until the necessary Fire Code improvements are made.
3. Unit B currently has two restrooms, with one toilet in en
.thoug t marked, one restroom could be assigned for men and one for women. Per the Building $c_{\text {, }}$ ment, th . sed use would require an additional toilet for the women's restroom and an additional ui. 'for the men's restroom. The applicant is aware of this requirement, which would invol ecc ruring an rexpanding the existing restrooms. This requirement has been added as a conditic of appr, ${ }^{1}$ (b)).

## Other

1. There will be no bleacher- ating $p$. ded within tne building.
2. There will be no ir or food concess sinsidt e building.
3. There are no locke ms illustrated $c$ he floorplan and no mention of any has been made to staff.
4. Unit A, now used for A. Fur are, was granted a Special Use Permit for Indoor Recreation for Frankfort Mixed Martial Arts ne 23, 2014 (Ord-2909). The use has since been discontinued.

## Special Use Request

The following findings of fact are used to judge the merit of a special use permit request. The applicant has provided responses to these findings of fact in a separate attachment.

## Findings of Fact:

No special use shall be recommended by the Plan Commission, unless such Commission shall find:
a. That the establishment, maintenance or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to, or endanger, the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare.
b. That the special use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.
c. That the establishment of the special use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.
d. That the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of any proposed structure will not be so at variance with either the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the structures already constructed, or in the course of construction in the immediate neighborhood or the character of the applicable district, as to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values within the neighborhood.
e. That the adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been or are being provided.
f. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
g. That the special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may, in each instance, be modified by the Village Board, pursuant to the recommendations of the Plan Commission.

## Affirmative Motions

1. Approve an adjustment to the total Zoning Ordinance quire king for the subject property based on the availability of both joint parking and shared pa, re the rosed indoor recreation use and the current building tenants.
2. Recommend to the Village Board to approve the Snarial Use $P_{C}$ it for an indoor recreation facility for the property located at 21800 S. La Grange Road .IIL , accord. with the reviewed plans, findings of fact, public testimony and conditioned upon e follor
a. If any mechanical units are adde .o the ro or site, hey shall be screened per the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.
b. The project shall obtain con, nce with . plicable codes, including the Fire Code and International B :
c. There shall' o indoor b, hers in. 'ed and no tournaments held at this location.

21800 S. La Grange, Unit B - Proposed Pickleball (Special Use Permit)


21800 S. La Grange, Unit B - Proposed Pickleball (Special Use Permit)




## RECEIVED 8.1.22

## Notes:

- Pickleball Court dimensions are $20 \times 44$
- 5' on end of each baseline so wall is not an issue and walkway for players
- 3.5' on each sideline between support poles

Support poles are at center court where nets would go and little likelihood of impairing play.



By Chnstopher Gruba at $9: 20 \mathrm{am}$. Aug 11. 2022

# VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT <br> $1 N C \cdot 1879$ <br> <br> Application for Plan Commission / Zoning Board of Appeals Review <br> <br> Application for Plan Commission / Zoning Board of Appeals Review Special Use Permit Findings of Fact 

 Special Use Permit Findings of Fact}

Article 3, Section E, Part 6 of the Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance lists "findings" or "standards" that the Plan Commission must use to evaluate every special use permit request. The Plan Commission must make the following seven findings based upon the evidence provided. To assist the Plan Commission in their review of the special use permit request(s), please provide responses to the following "Findings of Fact." Please attach additional pages as necessary.

1. That the establishment, maintenance or operation of $t$ spec will not be detrimental to, or endanger, the public health, safety, morals, comfort or s al wel,
The conversion to indoor pickleball use will not e trimen, to or endanger, the publich health, safety, moral, comfort or general wel.
2. That the special use will not be injurious ${ }^{+}$dhe use d enjo ment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes al $\quad$ y permitt nor abstantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhoon
The conversion to inr', 'piu. 'all $u$. will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property ir ae immedic vicin.
3. That the establishment of $t_{1}$. necia' e will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surround! perty for uses permitted in the district.
The conversion to indoor pickleball use will not impete the normal and orderly development of the property and its current uses.
4. That the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of any proposed structure will not be so at variance with either the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the structures already constructed, or in the course of construction in the immediate neighborhood or the character of the applicable district, as to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values within the neighborhood.
No changes to the exterior are required.
5. That the adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been or are being provided.
All are being provided and have been operational previously.
6. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
No change to ingress or egress required.
7. That the special use shall, in all other respects, confor to the licable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may, $i$ insta be modified by the Village Board, pursuant to the recommendations of the Plan Cr Understood and agreed.


Pic Indo.-Pickleball

Pic a cou. \& play!

CONFIOENIIAL DRAFT

## Pic \& Plā

## What is it?

- A for profit busines nat enables divicuals to reserve 1 to 4 indoor courts to play pickleball.
- Pickleball is a paddle spc that ombines elements of badminton, table tennis and tennis. Two or four players a paddle that's ~ $2 x$ the size of a ping pong paddle to hit a wiffle ball over a $36^{\prime \prime}$ net or a $20^{\prime} \times 44^{\prime}$ court.

The goal is to hit the ball over the net, within the boundaries of the court and in a manner that prevents your opponent from returning the ball back over the net. Games are generally played to 11 points.

## Pic \& Plā

## Why?

- $\sim 5 \mathrm{M}$ people in the UC .ow play 'ckle. II. It is the country's fastest growing sport.
- Frankfort has 3 dedica d outdoc pickleball courts at Commissioner's Park. Mokena, New Lenox, and Frankfo. Gqua have another ~20 outdoor courts. When the weather is nice (no rain, snow, cold . . ps or high wind $-\sim_{6}$ months out of the year), these courts are often filled with long wait times between games.
- There are $\mathbf{0}$ dedicated indoor pickleball courts within a 20-mile radius of Frankfort.



## Pic \& Plā

## How?

- There will be 4 indoo. vurts that an be reserved via an app.
- Reservations will be in two-, ar increments from 7am to 9pm.
- When all 4 courts are being utilized for dedicated pickleball play, $\sim 8-16$ people will be in the facility.



## Pic \& Plā

## Where?

- Lot 13 East Point Par.
- In the same complex as Roi. sports (indoor softball, soccer \& basketball)


## Pic \& Plā

## When?

- Goal is to break grou in May
- Estimated construction e of months
- Target opening in January 2, 5


## Pic \& Plā

## FAQs

- What are the hours operatio. M- तday, 7am -9 pm .
- Will this be memb hip based? o, pay per use.
- Will there be bleache pe seati ? No.
- What is the estimated to ca city at any one time? 25.
- Will there be a concessions siand onsite? No.
- How many employees will there be? 1. The owner plans to be onsite most days.
- Will there be anything stored outside the building? No.











# ordinance no. 33XX 

## AN ORDINANCE GRANTING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR AN ASSISTED LIVING <br> FACILITY TO CERTAIN PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT, WILL \& COOK COUNTIES, ILLINOIS (OASIS SENIOR LIVING, INC - 8531 W. LINCOLN HIGHWAY)

WHEREAS, an application for a Special Use Permit for certain property located within the Village of Frankfort, legally described below, was filed by Oasis Senior Living, Inc., Applicant; and MT Leasing, Inc., 6808 Wainwright Drive, Woodridge, Illinois 60517, Owner; and

WHEREAS, the Subject Property, located at 8531 W. Lincoln Highway, is currently zoned B-2 Community Business District; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant requests the granting of a Special Use Permit to construct an assisted living and memory care facility in the $\mathrm{B}-2 \mathrm{zo}+\mathrm{gd}$. ct for the proposed operation of Oasis Senior Living; and

WHEREAS, a timely Notice of a Public Hearing vet the Plai. amission/Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Frankfort was publisher' the Dalı, 'outhtown newspaper announcing a Public Hearing on the Owner's application for spech. 'se Pel. for the Subject Property; and

WHEREAS, at a time and place de znated such uurshed notice, a Public Hearing was held before the Village of Frankfort Pl , ommiss $\quad V \mathrm{Zo}$.ng Board of Appeals on the Owner's application for Special Use Permit for the $\quad$ bject $\operatorname{Pr}_{r}-\ldots y$; and

WHEREAS, the ankfort Pla ${ }^{\text {ramm }}$. ion/Zoning Board of Appeals has made special written Findings-of-Fa 's required by t. Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance 2001; and

WHEREAS, the Fra. 'ort Plan' mmission forwarded a unanimous (6-0) recommendation to the Board of Trustees of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{a}$ a , F Frankfort that the Subject Property be granted a Special Use Permit for an assisted livin ${ }_{\varepsilon}$, cility with conditions as enumerated in Section 1 of this Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT, WILL \& COOK COUNTIES, ILLINOIS AS FOLLOWS:

## SECTION 1. SPECIAL USE PERMIT

That the following described real property to wit:

THAT PART OF THE NORTHWEST FRACTIONAL QUARTER OF SECTION 23, AND THAT PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 23, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE INTERSECTION OF THE WEST LINE OF SECTION 23, TOWNSHIP 35 NORTH, RANGE 12, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, WITH THE CENTERLINE OF LINCOLN HIGHWAY, AND RUNNING THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE CENTERLINE OF SAID LINCOLN HIGHWAY, 991.07 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF PARCEL 1, CONVEYED IN DEED RECORDED AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R91-4623 AND RE-RECORDED AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R91-7702; THENCE SOUTH PARALLEL WITH THE WEST LINE OF SECTION 23 ALONG THE EAST LINE OF PARCEL 1 CONVEYED IN DEED RECORDED AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R91-4623 AND RERECORDED AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R91-7702. A DISTANCE OF 443.00 FEET; THENCE EASTERLY A DISTANCE OF 130.00 FEET PARALLEL WITH THE SOUTH LINE OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION 23 TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 05 MINUTES 44 SECONDS EA T, « ` 4 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF U.S. ROUTE 30 AS DEPICTED ON PLAT OF HI IWA A OCUMENT NO. R95-039615; THENCE EASTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A CUR) ONC. E TO THE NORTH (BEING THE SAID SOUTHERLY LINE OF U.S. ROUTE 30) ^A NG A 1 - $n$ JS OF 2355.66 FEET, HAVING A CHORD BEARING OF NORTH 79 DFRREES 4. MINUTES 44 SECONDS EAST, 271.6 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; TH NC 'ORTh DEGREES 31 MINUTES 29 SECONDS EAST CONTINUING ALONG S $/$ D SC $-{ }^{7}$ RI Y LINE OF U.S. ROUTE 30, A DISTANCE OF 166.13 FEET; THENCE ${ }^{\sim}$ OU 1 H 3 DE _ES 28 MINUTES 31 SECONDS EAST, 95.09 FEET; THENCE SOUTH ${ }^{1}$ C DEGRE $S 4^{\prime}$ INUTES 19 SECONDS EAST 64.33 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 13 DEGREES $\quad$ MINU'. 1 SECONDS EAST 22.64 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURF EE S THERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE CONCAVE TO THE W $\Gamma$, HAV A I DIUS OF 567.0 FEET, HAVING A CHORD BEARING SOUTH 02 GREES 32 M UTES 10 SECONDS EAST, 216.51 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THEI $\quad$ SOUTH 08 EGREES 24 MINUTES 10 SECONDS WEST, 124.75 FEET; THENCE NORTH ( DEGREE' 49 MINUTES 31 SECONDS WEST ALONG A LINE PARALLEL WITH THE SOU 'LIN OF THE SAID SOUTHWEST QUARTER, 469.97 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNIN $\sim$ WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PORTION CONVEYED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS BY ORDER VESTING TITLE DATED DECEMBER 7, 2010 IN CASE NO. 10ED66 FILED IN THE WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS CIRCUIT COURT AND MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: THAT PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF FRACTIONAL SECTION 23 AND PART OF THE NORTHWEST FRACTIONAL QUARTER OF SECTION 23, SOUTH OF THE INDIAN BOUNDARY LINE, IN TOWNSHIP 35 NORTH, RANGE 12 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS; DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE WEST QUARTER CORNER OF SAID FRACTIONAL SECTION 23; THENCE ON AN ASSUMED BEARING OF SOUTH 89 DEGREES 57 MINUTES 15 SECONDS EAST ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF FRACTIONAL SECTION 23, A DISTANCE OF 1121.01 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF A QUIT CLAIM DEED RECORDED

JANUARY 29, 1991 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R91-004623; THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 14 MINUTES 33 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID EAST LINE 3.90 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED BY A SPECIAL WARRANTY DEED RECORDED JUNE 1, 2007 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R2007-084184 AND TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, SAID POINT BEING ALSO ON THE EXISTING RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF US ROUTE 30 (LINCOLN HIGHWAY) PER DEDICATION RECORDED MARCH 25, 1922, IN BOOK 570, PAGE 186 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER 342998 AND ON A NONTANGENTIAL CURVE; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID PROPERTY DESCRIBED BY DOCUMENT NUMBER R2007-084184 AND SAID EXISTING RIGHT OF WAY LINE 254.93 FEET ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT, HAVING A RADIUS OF 2256.77 FEET, THE CHORD OF SAID CURVE BEARS NORTH 79 DEGREES 32 MINUTES 29 SECONDS EAST 254.79 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENT; THENCE NORTH 76 DEGREES 18 MINUTES 19 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID NORTH LINE OF THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED BY DOCUMENT NUMBER R2007-084184 AND SAID EXISTING RIGHT OF WAY LINE 182.84 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID PROPERTY DESCRIBED BY DOCUMENT NUMBER R2007-084194, $\quad$, POINT BEING ALSO IN THE WESTERLY RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF WINDY ] LL ז , E PER WINDY HILL FARM SUBDIVISION PHASE 1 P.U.D., RECORDED SE. MBE 5, 2000 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R2000-095341; THENCE SOUTH 13 DEGK $\angle \mathrm{L} 18$ MIN тг 54 SECONDS EAST ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE OF SAID PROPERTY VESCRIBED BY DOCUMENT NUMBER R2007-084184 AND SAID WEST ${ }^{\top}$ L. ${ }^{\text {IGHT }}$ ᄃ WAY LINE 57.26 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 79 DEGREES $50 \mathrm{MINUTE} 33 \mathrm{~S}^{r}$ a VDS WEST 292.39 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 88 DEGREES 00 MINUTES $07 \mathrm{~S}^{\circ} \mathrm{CC} \mathrm{ND}^{\prime}$ NES f. 07 FEET TO THE WEST LINE OF SAID PROPERTY DESCRIBED BY JOCUN NT N JMBER R2007-084184, SAID LINE BEING ALSO SAID EAST LINE O. THE PR - . CY DESCRIBED BY DOCUMENT NUMBER R91-004623; THF ${ }^{\prime}$ ' 2 RTr 1 DEGREES 14 MINUTES 33 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID WEST LI $\quad 23.00 \mathrm{FL}$ TO $\quad$ POINT OF BEGINNING OF SAID PARCEL, IN WILL COUNTY, I ${ }^{Y}$ NOIS. contaii g 4.68 acres, more or less.

Commonly known as 853 Lincoln ighway, Frankfort, Will County, Illinois, which is the property subject to the previou. desc ed application for a Special Use Permit, is hereby granted said Special Use Permit for an . .ed living facility in the B-2 Community Business Zoning District to permit the operation of Oasis Senior Living, in accordance with the reviewed plans, public testimony, and Findings of Fact, conditioned upon final engineering approval, the replacement of any damaged sections of public sidewalk, that the base of any future ground sign shall be consistent with the materials of the wainscot of the building, and that the facility's bus be parked on the west side of the building.

## SECTION 2. REPEALER

That all other ordinances or parts or provisions of ordinances of the Village of Frankfort, which are inconsistent with this Ordinance, are hereby expressly repealed.

## SECTION 3. ZONING MAP AMENDMENT

That the Zoning Map of the Village of Frankfort is amended to reflect the Subject Property is granted a Special Use Permit for an assisted living facility in the B-2 zoning district, as provided under this Ordinance and the Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance, as amended from time to time.

## SECTION 4. SEVERABILITY

In the event any word, phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph, provision, or section of this Ordinance or any portion thereof shall be held to be unconstitutional, unenforceable, or void, the same shall not affect the validity or enforceability of any remaining words, phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, provisions, or sections thereof.

## SECTION 5. EFFECTIVE DATE

This Ordinance shall take effect after its passage, af and and publication in pamphlet form, as regulated by law.

PASSED this __ day of __, 2022; with _ $m$. rs voth. A` $A^{\mathrm{V}}$; _ members voting NAY; and __ members absent; the Village President not vot. with __ members abstaining and said vote being:


APPROVED this __ day of __, 2022.

KEITH OGLE VILLAGE PRESIDENT

ATTEST:

KATIE SCHUBERT
VILLAGE CLERK

| A SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE NORTHWEST FRACTIONAL QUARTER OF SECTION 23 , AND THAT PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 23, TOWNSHIP 35 NORTH RANGE 12 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS. <br>  <br> Scale: $1^{\prime \prime}=50^{\prime}$ $\qquad$ <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  corong to the <br>  <br> 5. ALL quensions not cyer an feet ano decime parts theplof. <br>  $\qquad$ <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  $\qquad$ <br>  $\qquad$ <br>  <br>  <br>  $\qquad$ $\qquad$ <br> CEBTLCAE OE MOT APPROYA <br>  <br>  $\square$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Public Hearing: 8531 W. Lincoln Highway - Oasis Assisted Living (Ref \#106)

Chris Gruba presented the staff report.
Sam Martin, the architect and representative of the applicant, approached the podium. The proposed development was for an assisted living facility. The organization he represented had over fifty other locations in multiple other states, though this would be the first location in Illinois. A market analysis showed that the Frankfort area needed 200 additional beds to meet the expected demand for assisted living facilities. The architecture of the building was designed with the nearby neighborhood in mind, aiming to match what was already there. He had met with the local Homeowner's Association for Windy Hill Farm and felt they were able to address the residents' concerns and did their best to match their visions for the neighborhood. Turning to the prospective residents, the applicant was of the mind that the prospective residents of Oasis would have spoiled their children while raising them, $d$ the olicant was looking to do the same for the residents now at the proposed faci $\quad V^{\prime \prime}=\mathrm{e}_{\lambda}$, rined that everyone would require a similar service at some point in their liv and wa. 1 to nake sure that residents felt a part of a community rather than set as. by the $\quad$. elatives and by society. Those factors were considered when he $\mathrm{c}^{1} \cdots$. locatic ff the facility.

Chair Rigoni asked the members of the san omm had any initial questions for the residents.

There were none.
Chair Rigoni ar dif there were $y$ members of the public who wished to give comment.

Patrick Shea approache er sum. He had been a resident of Frankfort for 20 years, and recently retired to Win Hill. He had driven past Windy Hill along Lincoln Highway for many years and always appreciated how the area looked. In his opinion, a facility the size of the current proposal ought to have an entrance off of Route 30 rather than Windy Hill Drive. He understood that kind of adjustment to the proposed plans would require IDOT involvement, but felt that it was necessary. Having an entrance on Windy Hill Drive would negatively impact both the road and the neighborhood, Ultimately, he expected that there would be some need to ask for a traffic signal to be installed eventually, anyway. He said he appreciated the need for places like this, but felt that this was to ambitious a project for this location. He made clear he was not an engineer, but he was still skeptical that overland flow and drainage would work as was suggested by the Village's engineering consultants after reviewing the plans. He didn't feel like the Village should make exceptions for this project.

Ron Fries approached the stand. He said he had been a Frankfort resident for over 50 years. He moved to Windy Hill, and had a great view of an idyllic spot, one of the last in Frankfort. It would be a shame to lose that green space for this development. What originally drew him to the neighborhood was the aesthetic, as was mentioned by the previous speaker. The Plan Commission knew as well as the neighbors did how additional residences would impact Village services. There were already traffic issues on Windy Hill Drive, including a recent collision, which would only get worse with this development. He hated to see this space converted from green space to this proposed development. He felt bad for future residents of the development who would have to listen to semi-trucks braking to stop along Lincoln Highway. He said he would respect the Plan Commission's decision for the Village with 1890's charm.

Bunny Mashione approached the stand, a resident of Windy Hill Farm. She agreed with the other people who had spoken, that this was not ai ${ }^{\text {pr }}$ opriate spot for this development. She did not know why the applic it cor ot build across Lincoln Highway. The proposed development would ru. .ndy L. Farm. An additional stop light at that intersection would not be good for ti.es. shborh - dere would eventually be a death at that intersection. Traffic was bod already that intersection, and this was not the place for this building. She asked why th. lans ha changed from one building to four. In addition, she believed the prope dr r ani 1 was a bad idea. A cinder block retaining wall would take away frc the vis al app al of Windy Hill Drive. Someone would be killed turning off of W Hill D $\quad$ o Route 30. The other option for people leaving the ne $\quad$ d we be to exit onto Pfeiffer Road, which was also not a good option. Sh vas also co . rnea ar drainage on south side of the property. The proposal incluc covering a stre 1 , which she did not like. The neighborhood's residents moved to 'indy Hill fo ts visual appeal, and now it would be lost. She asked if there would be fou ildings the property.

Chair Rigoni clarified there would be only one.
Bunny Mashione asked if there would be a memory wing.
Chair Rigoni stated that there would be, as part of the same building.
Bunny Mashione continued saying she felt the Plan Commission had made up their minds already. She asked if the Plan Commission had.

Chair Rigoni thanked her for her comments.
Bunny Mashione asked if the Plan Commission would answer her question,

Chair Rigoni responded that the procedure for a Public Hearing was to take public comments before the Plan Commission deliberated and voted on its recommendation.

Bunny Mashione stated that she and her neighbors were all opposed to the development. She said she would like the Village to send out a survey to get more input from the Windy Hill residents. The proposed development would impact their lives. Her own property looked out over the site of the proposed development. The Village ought to send a survey to every home in Windy Hill to let them know what was going on at this property. She would like the survey to show the Windy Hill Drive entrances, which would be seen as an issue by the residents. This development was a big mistake. The applicant could develop on the north side of Lincoln Highway, since the land was for sale. This was wrong. She asked the Plan Commission to please consider sending a survey to Windy Hill residents for their input, she wanted them to know about the entrances which would be considered a big problem. or one would get killed.

Rita Starkey approached the stand, she was a re ${ }^{1}{ }^{\prime}$. of, dy Hill Farm. She explained that she had brought up her concerns at the work and ne. ho vood meeting. She had asked at the workshop for Oasis what the license. the deveropment was for. She was told it was for senior citizens, but in ally, was fo ssisted living. In her experience in other communities, there is an ac evelopment which was described as a senior project. Due to a lack of sf ors, thr issiste mving facility was expanded to help a greater range of people who ff ader ass. $\quad$ di; ing definition. Eventually, the residents became a probr as sto $\quad$ closed and the residents would knock on doors and windows in the nei oorhooa ${ }^{1}$ try nter other people's property. She could not imagine that in ${ }^{1}$. neighborhooc She was aware that other senior facilities around Frankfort are stru .ing to fill cap ity. If they couldn't fill up, this proposal would also struggle to fill all its ${ }^{1}$ s. Then would turn into same situation she had experienced in another community.

Terry Colins approached the stand. He said that he liked that the applicant was helping people, but didn't like that the buffer between the building and other properties was only 35 feet. He asked if there were only 35 feet between the building and the road.

Staff responded that it was 64 feet from road to building, 35 feet of which was a landscaped area starting from the south property line.

Terry Colins responded that he recalled a 250 ' notification being sent out. He asked why it was sent out.

Staff said it was village policy, a courtesy, to send out notification letters to properties within $250^{\prime}$ of the proposal.

Terry Colins asked how the 250 ' was calculated.
Staff responded that $250^{\prime}$ was measured from the property line of the proposed development.

John Burgess approached the stand, he lived near this proposed facility. He asked first what the barrier between the south property line and his back yard was,

Chair Rigoni explained there was 35 feet of green space, and asked staff to display the landscape plan.

Staff displayed the landscape plan on the screen.
John Burgess asked if there would be a line of trees, a road, and then the building when moving from the south property line of the proposed 'eve'opment to the north. Chair Rigoni confirmed he was correct.

Commissioner Knieriem added that there would be a gra 1 a between the line of trees and the road.

John Burgess then asked about lights. H and b ; ohbors had homes that overlooked the subject property. They lived on hil. If wan look at a facility out from his bedroom window, he would hav 1 . oved so swhe else. He said he did not understand


Bunny Mashione urned to th. and. was concerned about the stream which was proposed to be. $\quad$ in in. She said e loved the wildlife that came through the area. She asked if the trees 1 . e back be ry oved. She added that 35 ' was not a large area of landscaping. She said. felt it as a done deal, and she wished the board would just tell the public what they plan. $s$ do. She claimed the current notification process was insufficient.

Dan Anderson approached the podium. He said he lived across the street from the proposed facility. He said he would see a roof out over Lincoln Highway if this proposal was built. He had paid an extra $\$ 10,000$ for the view he currently had. He added that to put the entrance to the facility on Windy Hill Drive was ridiculous, and that there was no room for it. He asked why the applicant would build on the subject property when there were other places to build. He agreed with all others who had made comments. He noted that his view would be ruined, no more greenery or wildlife. It would also negatively impact his property values.

Motion (\#9): To close the public hearing.
Motion by: Schaeffer Seconded by: Knieriem
Approved: (6-0)
Chair Rigoni asked the members of the Plan Commission to be sure they addressed public comments regarding the engineering, lighting, and overall use. She asked staff if there were any variations requested or any other motions besides the Special Use Permit.

Staff responded the only request was for the Special Use Permit.
Chair Rigoni explained that engineering was not under the purview of the Plan Commission, but there were some concerns from the public regarding stormwater flow. She asked staff to clarify what the engineering docur nt showed.

Staff noted that there were existing storm pipes drain towards Hickory Creek to the southeast.

Chair Rigoni asked if stormwater detentio esubjc roperty was accounted for when Windy Hill was originally approv

The engineer, Tom Carroll, approa ned the and. F z said that yes, this parcel had been accounted for to a certain level ot pervious rage, which the current proposal was under. Stormwater p: instal. as well as a water main and sewer. This site was designed to be de roped when area s initially annexed into the Village of Frankfort. Ston. ater would dra to the south and east, while the properties abutting the subject property to south wou drain to the north and east, away from the existing townhomes.

Chair Rigoni asked the Plan Commission if they had any drainage questions.
Commissioner Knieriem asked if the applicant planned to fill the creek.
The engineer responded that they would. It was considered a drainage way, and some culverts were put in during the initial development, catch-basins as well. The creek would be filled in. They were working with the Army Corps of Engineers to get a permit to fill in the creek.

Chair Rigoni asked if there were any questions regarding traffic.
The architect stated that the traffic impact would be minimal. Residents did not typically drive, and even those residents with with cars would rarely move them. There would be three shifts of employees, from 7:00 to 3:00, 3:00 to 11:00, and 11:00 to 7:00. Employees
coming and going would be the main driver of new traffic. There would be some staggering in departure times and arrivals for different shifts. Staff could not leave the premises for meals. Deliveries would be made in the early morning, and the delivery vehicle would be the size of a large U-HAUL or a box truck, not a semi-truck. Deliveries would only take place once a week around 7:00 AM.

Commissioner Markunas asked if the applicant offered transportation for residents.
The architect responded that yes, there would be a bus for to take residents on trips. Most residents liked to have their doctors visit them on-site, and he would like to accommodate this if possible. The doctors would visit once or twice a month.

Commissioner Markunas asked what the applicant's experience was with applicants walking around.

The architect responded that building would bs ecur, d that anyone would need a code to get in or out. Independent residents coul me an as as please, but most tended to come home early and be in bed around $1 i \mathrm{i}$ in the e. g. Many residents would be forgetful and would not be able to very ${ }^{\text {r }}$. The applicant explained that the facility would do what they could to axim the resh, -nts' comfort. Residents did not usually wander, and facilities were ${ }_{1}$, vir' $a$ to 'ss residents' needs for exercise and movement. The building was s so desig ed tof ive courtyards which would provide a safe outdoor space for residents me resi nay have pets, such as small dogs or cats, which would be the ce tyard. Any resident outside the facility was usually accompar aby caregi,

Chair Rigoni aske hat kind of and out traffic could be expected.
The architect responc that it y ald be mostly employees, since few relatives come visit and are often out of statc el ves of residents who visit daily were uncommon.

Chair Rigoni thanked the applicant, and explained that she was trying to gauge how other permitted uses in the B-2 Community Business district would alternatively impact traffic.

The architect added that the proposed development would have a lower traffic impact than typical retail.

Chair Rigoni asked if there were any other traffic comments.
There were none.
Chair Rigoni noted that there had been some changes to the design since the workshop. She asked the other members of the Commission is there were any comments on the use.

Commissioner Knieriem said he had no issue with the use. There could be something more impactful on that site, like a business or a restaurant with a drive-thru. This was likely one of the least impactful developments possible for this site. He understood why people would not like the proposal, but the alternative could be worse.

Commissioner Schaeffer agreed. She added that this parcel would be developed anyway. In regard to the comments about views and roofs, this property was never intended to stay green. The applicant took great care to blend their proposed architecture with community.

Commissioner James agreed. He stated that he lived near Wolf Road, and commonly saw the other facilities. He noted that the number of vehicles going in and out of those facilities was minimal, and said he would expect the same level of traffic at this property. He asked the applicant to address the concern around licensing and age of residents.

The architect explained that residents must be 55 yeai 1 or older, and that the license was for a care facility. Most residents would $b\left(\right.$ osn $v_{1}$ 'ived on their own and needed help. The applicant did not receive a license to ho and/or re for people with mental disabilities. Even if he wanted to, his license would $L_{L}$ allow $h_{\text {. }}$

Commissioner James confirmed that the woul no ab, y to take in younger adults with special needs.

The architect agreed that this fac could $L_{L}$ tol them in.
Commissioner Mar alas agre that $L$. proposed use was the least impactful use for this site. He asked th the photometi plan b. displayed to help address residents' concerns about lighting.

The photometric plan plac on screen.
Staff noted that all but one of the lights to be installed on south side pointed down at the ground.

Commissioner Markunas noted that he was reading a measurement of 0 foot-candles on the south property line.

Staff agreed and added that those measurements met code. There was also one light pole on the south side of the property, and per the submitted specifications, they were shorter than typical light poles.

Commissioner Markunas noted that the discussion has not yet factored in the proposed vegetative screening along the south property line.

Commissioner Jakubowski stated she did not have much to add. She had visited other locations, and in those places the memory care wings were full. She added that there was a need for facilities like the one proposed. This property was always supposed to be developed, and this was the least impactful use.

Chair Rigoni asked the Plan Commission to give staff direction on the proposed trees. She noted that they went from a workshop where 15 feet of landscaping was provided as separation, to the currently proposed 30 feet for landscape screening. Architecture and other site considerations had been made to mitigate any adverse impact on neighborhood. This was a commercially zoned property and many other developments could be built on this site which would have a greater impact on the neighborhood. The Plan Commission had not yet made their decision. She asked the Plan Commission their opinion on the increased number of evergreen trees and the decreased number of deciduous trees.

The members of the Plan Commission all agree it wa good change.
Chair Rigoni asked how tall the trees would be a' time o . stall ${ }^{\text {ation. }}$
Staff responded that they would meet the r aments . he Landscape Ordinance, and believed they would be 6' tall.

Chair Rigoni asked what time gart e colle ion w uld take place.
The architect estimated :- puld be rly in the morning, around 7:00 AM for food deliveries. For gart se collec . he ld coordinate with the neighborhood to find a time that would the least disru ive.

Chair Rigoni stated wanted tr e elear what the applicant meant by "really early," and explained that the e ver mes were within the Village's allowed hours of operation.

The architect suggested that deliveries could be later in the morning too, between 8:00 and 10:00 AM.

Chair Rigoni asked staff if they wanted the Plan Commission to discuss any other topics.
Staff requested the Plan Commission discuss the proposed architecture and materials.
Chair Rigoni asked the members of the Plan Commission if they had any comments.
There were none.
A member of the public asked if she could comment.

Chair Rigoni responded that the public hearing had been closed.
Staff clarified that if it was the desire of the Plan Commission, they could re-open the public hearing.

Motion (\#10): To reopen the public hearing.
Motion by; James Seconded by: Knieriem
Approved: (4-2, Commissioner Knieriem and Commissioner Schaeffer voted no)

Bunny Mashione approached the podium. She said that the neighbors understood the subject property would be developed at some point. She had experience being on a board before, and knew that the Plan Commission had the power to decide what would and what would not be able to locate at the subject prope.

Chair Rigoni asked that Ms. Mashione ask her s on a. tay on topic.
Bunny Mashione continued, saying the neighbors knc somethw..g was coming, they just did not expect a development of the size $r$ pu The $\quad$ Commission has the ability to say what does or does not go on that e. Of a vould be nice there, but the Plan Commission had the ability to deci what $y$ nt the c.

Chair Rigoni thanked Ms. Mashic for her c. .ents.
Rita Starkey appr' -hed the po $\quad \mathrm{m} . \mathrm{S}_{1}$. explained that she was not against the development, $r$. r she was scar because the change from senior living to assisted living created a gi, rea. She asl $d$ the Plan Commission how the neighbors can be certain that the applic. only tr s in who they say they will at this meeting.

Chair Rigoni responded tha the applicant was on record saying what they will do, and they will be held to that.

Motion (\#11): To close the public hearing.
Motion by: Knieriem
Seconded by: Schaeffer
Approved: (6-0)
Chair Rigoni asked members of the Plan Commission if they had any other questions.
Commissioner Schaeffer asked staff whether their question for clarification on what would happen with the entrance sign along Lincoln Highway was directed to the Plan Commission or to the applicant.

Chair Rigoni stated that the submitted plans stated the sign would remain.
The architect and engineer affirmed their intention to keep the sign.
Commissioner Schaeffer asked staff if their question was answered sufficiently.
Staff said it was, and noted the existence of an easement by the sign.
Commissioner James asked if the Plan Commission could set a requirement for where bus would be parked.

Chair Rigoni said they could.
Commissioner James stated he would like the bus parked on the west side of the property.
Commissioner Schaeffer asked where the trash $F^{\circ}$ clos was moved to.
Chair Rigoni indicated where the trash enclosure smove 'o. She asked if the Plan
Commission wanted to add bus parking as condino.
Commissioner James and Commissioner rarku said L did.
Chair Rigoni asked the members of he llar comm soron if they were comfortable with the received public testimony.

All members respor a oy s. ig tha hey were.
Chair Rigoni as. ${ }^{1}$ staff if they n ded any direction in regard to landscaping.
Staff said that the mı. ss refler $d$ that the landscaping was acceptable. Staff then asked if any members of the $\mathrm{P}_{1}, \quad$ amission wanted to make comment on the proposed retaining wall.

Chair Rigoni stated they should match Chase Bank on La Grange Road, which the applicant had cited as an example.

Staff asked the Plan Commission if they had any preference for color.

Commissioner Markunas said it should match the building.
Chair Rigoni asked if there were any other questions or comments.
There were none.

Motion (\#12): Recommend to the Village Board to approve the Special Use Permit for an assisted living facility, in accordance with the reviewed plans, findings of fact, and public testimony, conditioned upon final engineering approval, the replacement of any damaged sections of public sidewalk, that the base of any future ground sign shall be consistent with the materials of the wainscot of the building, and that the facility's bus be parked on the west side of the building.

Motion by: Schaeffer Seconded by: Markunas
Approved: (6-0)
Motion (\#13): Recommend the Village Board approve the Final Plat of Subdivision for Oasis Senior Living, in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony, subject to any technical revisions prior to recording and conditioned upon final engineering approval.

Motion by: Schaeffer
Sec. ed by: nes
Approved: (6-0)
Chair Rigoni thanked the architect for $h$ ting a borhood meeting. The Plan Commission often asks applicants ${ }^{+}$hold th n, but truy don't always happen.

| Project: | Oasis Assisted Living |
| :--- | :--- |
| Meeting Type: | Public Hearing |
| Requests: | Special Use for Assisted Living Facility, Final Plat |
| Location: | 8531 W. Lincoln Highway |
| Applicant: | Oasis Senior Living, Inc. |
| Prop. Owner: | MT Leasing Inc. |
| Representative: | Tahir Khan |

Site Details
Lot Size:
203,861 sq. ft. (4.68 acres)
Figure 1. Location Map
PIN(s):
19-09-23-300-031-0000
Existing Zoning:
B-2
Proposed Zoning:
N/A
Future Land Use: General Commercial
Buildings:
Total Sq. Ft.:
1
75,074 sq. ft. (bldg.)


The applicant, Oasis Senior Living, I. is pro sing to construct an 82-unit assisted living facility at the southwest corner of Route 30 and Windy Hill Dr. ssisted living facilities are permitted in the B-2 zone district with the issuance of a Special Use Permit. The pro, ect will also require approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision to create a lot of record, as the property is unsubdivided. A Final Plat would also grant new easements (storm/detention, water, sanitary, etc.). As currently proposed, the project will not require any variances (setbacks, lot coverage, building height, etc.). The site is currently disused, with two abandoned structures that would be removed as part of the development. The site contains a moderate number of existing trees, some of which are preservation trees.

## Attachments

1. Aerial Photographs (VOF GIS)
2. Color renderings and materials, received September 1, 2022
3. Special Use Permit - Findings of Fact, applicant responses, received March 2, 2022
4. Stormwater Management Report, Geotech Inc., received April 14, 2022
5. Storm Sewer Analysis, Geotech Inc., received June 8, 2022
6. Stormwater atlas map of the site (Village of Frankfort)
7. NPDES Permit from IL EPA, received September 6, 2022
8. National Wetlands Inventory Map of subject property
9. Retaining wall photo example (Chase Bank), provided by applicant, received September 1, 2022
10. Retaining wall block detail, provided by applicant, received September 1, 2022
11. Photographs of site, taken by staff on May 13,2022
12. March 10, 2022, PC-ZBA meeting minutes excerpt (workshop)
13. Plat of Survey, received October 21, 2021
14. Site Plan, Geotech Inc., received August 17, 2022
15. Final Plat, Geotech Inc., received August 10, 2022
16. Improvement Plans, received September 14, 2022
17. Existing Tree Plan (tree survey), received February 16, 2022
18. Preliminary Landscape Plan, received August 17, 2022
19. Auto-Turn Plan (truck turning radius), received August 9, 2022
20. Building Elevation drawings, received August 15, 2022
21. Floorplan, received September 14, 2022
22. Photometric Plan, received June 8, 2022
23. Trash Enclosure Detail, received August 15, 2022

## History

## PC-ZBA Workshop, March $10^{\text {th }}$ :

This project was heard before the Plan Commission as a workshop on March 10, 2022. An excerpt of the meeting minutes from that date have been attached to this report. Below is a st $\quad m=y$ of the comments provided during the workshop. These comments were made by one or several cr missic sand may not reflect the opinion of every commissioner. Staff has provided updates to these commt ir alics

1. The proposed assisted living building should blend with the arcl ture of $\imath_{1}$. adjacent Windy Hill Farm Condos subdivision. No changes made to elevation The app, thad stated that the intent of the proposed masonry and cement board siding was provid 'sident/u appearance.
2. The landscape buffer along the south side of the ope $\quad$ sho . .ncreased from the proposed $14^{\prime}$ width to provide a better visual and acous.buffer $k$ ween $t$ e proposed assisted living facility and the existing townhomes to the south, espe "if deliver, vould be loading and unloading in the south drive aisle. If possible, this la bufte 'rould be at least $25^{\prime}$ wide. The landscape buffer was increased from $14^{\prime}$ to 3.', with an 'nal ln caping material added,
3. The tree removal wir esignificant, anc e applh at should try to preserve some of the existing mature trees. None of the e. ig trees on site be preserved, although most of the existing trees within the rights-of-way of Routes nd Windy Hill ive will be preserved.
4. The proposed trash enclosL. hould ${ }^{\text {r }}$. noved further away from the existing townhomes to the south. The trash enclosure was moven Along the south property line to the west property line (still within the southwest corner of the site). The distance from the south property line was increased from approximately $7^{\prime}$ to 44.7'.
5. The building elevation facing Route 30 should include more brick. The original building materials included cultured stone and cement board siding; no brick was ever proposed. The building elevations have not been changed since the workshop meeting, although the renderings were revised to reflect the actual proposed color of the building.
6. Color building elevations should be provided prior to the public hearing. Non-scaled revised color renderings have been provided to illustrate the four primary materials and true colors.
7. Decorative fencing should be provided similar to what is existing near the entrance of Windy Hill to create a more unified look. The Landscape Plan illustrates decorative fencing on either side of both access drives along Windy Hill Drive to match the existing fencing at the northeast corner of the property. The proposed fencing would match the existing fencing in terms of materials, height, design, and color.
8. The applicant should plant physical stakes along the south property line for the Commission to visualize the setback from the townhomes. Stakes were installed along the south property line on June $9^{\text {th }}, 2022$ and the Plan Commission was notified.

On August $23^{\text {rd }}$, the applicant hosted a neighborhood meeting at the Frankfort Public Library. The intent of the meeting was to explain the project, including changes to the plans since the workshop meeting and answer any questions from the public. The meeting was attended by approximately 30 people, mostly residents of the Windy Hills Farm Condos, located south of the subject property. The meeting lasted approximately 1 hour. Residents were encouraged to attend the future public hearing for the project.

During the meeting, residents had several concerns and questions. Summarized, they included:

1. The proposed assisted living facility is too close to other assisted living facilities in the area, saturating the market.
2. Delivery trucks would be noisy.
3. The assisted living facility should not be located on a major thoroughfare (Route 30), because it is extremely noisy and would be disruptive for residents.
4. The assisted living facility will be ugly to look at from the existing townhomes, especially the trash enclosure.
5. It seems that one dumpster is not enough to serve 82 units.
6. The assisted living facility would be better suited for the devel 'property on the east side of Windy Hill Drive (approximately 3.5 acres).
7. The intersection of Windy Hill Drive and Route 30 needs a light.
8. It was asked if the facility could still be profitable if there were s, ficantly leas than 82 units.

Some of the applicant's responses included:

1. The only regular trucks on-site would be f d trucks, naller' $x$ trucks and garbage trucks. Food deliveries take place at 7 am .
2. The dumpster would be ed" th an ' osure to screen it from view, as well as heavy landscaping along the south proper' .ne. Both $L$ 'rash $t$ ' ssure and the building would be partially screened from view by the propos r andscaping.
3. The assisted living fa is only 1 floor t ause most residents want to live on the $1^{\text {st }}$ floor.
4. The single dumpster wo 'e emptied ce a week, which they believe is adequate for their needs.
5. To qualify, a potential residu nnly $n$ as to be age 55 or older. They can move in while they are completely independent.
6. The units are not bought; they are leased. The leasing can be month-to-month. There is no down payment ( $\$ 30,000$ is sometimes typical). Oasis' units are typically slightly more affordable than other assisted living facilities in the area.
7. Oasis currently has facilities in five or six other US states, including Michigan.
8. The facility would be licensed by the State of Illinois.
9. Oasis does not take in residents that are "mentally challenged" but do accept people with dementia.
10. The facility is secured at every door and pass keys are required to enter and exit. The facility is not easy to enter illegally or trespass. Residents would be free to enter and exit as they wish, except for the memory care patients.
11. There would be no doctors or nurses employed at the building, but they will be allowed to come to the building for house calls.
12. Under the rare instances when residents become combative, the most likely reason is that they are on the wrong medication. Correcting the medication usually corrects behavior. Oasis has never had to remove a resident because of misbehavior at any of their locations.
13. Oasis would maintain the entire property, including the grounds.
14. Oasis expects to have the building $80 \%$ occupied within 6 months after opening.
15. The applicants chose Frankfort for their assisted living facility because of Frankfort's reputation as a desirable community.
16. The facility's location on a major thoroughfare is desirable because it allows easy access to the and from the building, such as when children might pick up their parents and take them out to dinner. They believe that the traffic noise from Route 30 would not be an issue due to building insulation.
17. Building signage location has not yet been determined, but they do intend to install a ground sign.
18. For residents who are able to drive, staff offers to clean off cars and warm them up in the wintertime for residents.
19. The undeveloped 3.5 -acre parcel to the east is too small for the proposed assisted living facility, which is why they pursued the 4.68 -acre subject property.
20. The applicant has purchased the property.
21. A traffic light at the intersection of Route 30 and Windy Hill Drive is not proposed. Route 30 is under the jurisdiction of IDOT, which determines when a traffic light is merited.
22. The facility would not reserve a certain number of units for people on Medicaid, because they are not required to, nor do they wish to do so.
23. The units would be leased for approximately $\$ 4,500$ per $m$ th.
24. Per the applicant's market research, the Frankfort area i eficie. ${ }^{9} 50$ assisted living units and therefore the demand exists.
25. Each unit has a kitchen setup, containing a microwave, toa. , urig ma. id sink. However, there is no stove because meals are prepared by staff. Meals and snacks be delivered door to door if the resident desires. The meals are 99\% homemade.
26. Each resident does not have a designated parkir space' $c_{L}$, most residents don't drive. Most residents live in the building because they $r$ ed assist ,ce.

## Summary of changes:

Staff has noted the following inges to the $p$ since workshop on March $10^{\text {th }}$ and the neighborhood meeting on August $23^{\text {rd }}$.

1. The building has been si. $\quad \mathrm{I}$ north slir. ly, to allow for a wider landscape setback along the south property line. There were in erly o rows of parking along the front of the building facing Route 30 . The rows have now been split $L$. vith one row of parking along Route 30 and one row of parking along the west side of the building.
2. The landscape buffer along the south property line has been increased from $14^{\prime}$ to $33.45^{\prime}$ and more vegetation has been added in this area.
3. The northern driveway was shifted further north when the building was moved further north.
4. The apron on the northern driveway has been widened (flared out) at the request of Village staff to make it easier for southbound traffic on Windy Hill Drive to navigate around any vehicles turning into the assisted living facility.
5. The unit count was increased from 78 to 82 . There are now more studio units and less 1-bedroom units.
6. A retaining wall was added to the northwest corner of the site, measuring approximately $300^{\prime}$ long and $7^{\prime}$ tall at the highest in the middle. The retaining wall tapers to meet grade at either end of the wall.
7. The trash enclosure has been moved from along the south property line to the west property line (still in the same vicinity, but further away from the existing townhomes). The setback from the trash enclosure to the south property line has been increased from $7^{\prime}$ to $44.7^{\prime}$.
8. Decorative fencing was added on both sides of both access drives along Windy Hill Drive to match the existing fencing at the northeast corner of the property. The proposed fencing would match the existing fencing in terms of materials, height, design, and color.

## Analysis

## 2019 Comprehensive Plan

The Village's 2019 Comprehensive Plan illustrates the subject property as "General Commercial". The "General Commercial" designation roughly translates to a zone district of B-1, B-2, B-3 or B-4. The subject property is currently zoned B-2 (Community Business). The Village's Comprehensive Plan is largely silent regarding senior housing or assisted living/memory care facilities, although the plan does encourage providing "a mix of housing options to meet community needs" as part of Goal 7.1.

## Zoning

The subject property is currently zoned B-2, Community Business, which allows for assisted living facilities contingent upon issuance of a Special Use Permit. Assisted living facil ${ }^{\prime} s>^{\prime}$-o require a Special Use Permit in the R-4 (Attached Single-Family Residential) and the H-1 (Historic), ne di ts. They are permitted by-right only within the B-3 zone district. Rezoning of the subject property is +re rift recommended. It should be noted that the project was designed without the need for any variances, was thı. ject designed as a PUD in which "exceptions" to the regulations in the Zoning Ordinance could be i equ ed.

## Dimensional Table

|  | Required | Pror sea | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Lot Size | 20,000 sq.f | 4. ${ }^{\text {acres }}$ | Existing parcel unchanged |
| Minimum Lot Width | 100 ft | 631 t 7ppr <.) | Measured along Route 30 |
| Front Setback (north) | 150 ft . | 150. | Measured to Centerline of Route 30 |
| Landscaped front yard (north) | 25 t | 30.76 ft . |  |
| Corner Side Setback (e. | 50 ft . | 80.54 ft . |  |
| Side Setback (west) | 50 ft . | 70.49 ft . | 15' required when not adjacent to res. |
| Rear Setback (south) | 50 ft | 64.15 ft . | $30^{\prime}$ required when not adjacent to res. |
| Building Height | 35 | $24 \mathrm{ft}$.4 in . | (35'4' to top of decorative cupola) |
| Lot Coverage | 1. Max | 36.80\% |  |
| Impervious Lot Coverage | 75\% | 58.30\% |  |

## Parking \& Loading

1. Assisted living facilities require 0.5 parking spaces for each dwelling unit, plus one for each employee during the largest working shift. There are 82 dwelling units, and the applicant has noted that there would be up to 12 employees at any one time, requiring a total of 53 parking spaces. The site plan illustrates 55 parking spaces, 3 of which are ADA accessible, meeting this code requirement.
2. For the plans presented at the workshop meeting, all parking was located in the front yard between the building and Route 30 . The parking field has now been split up, with one row of parking in the front yard and one row along the side yard to the west. The row of parking along the west side property line will be less visible from Route 30, being screened from view by the building and a row of evergreen landscaping along the west property line.
3. The Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum drive aisle width of $20^{\prime}$ when serving one row of parking. The drive aisles adjacent to parking stalls range from $20^{\prime}-24^{\prime}$ wide, meeting this requirement. A $20^{\prime}$ wide drive aisle is the minimum width required by the Fire District.
4. All parking spaces measure $9^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}$, meeting the minimum code requirement.
5. The Zoning Ordinance is silent regarding off-street loading requirements for assisted living facilities, although in general loading areas may not be located in a front yard. It is typical for assisted living facilities to receive deliveries by smaller "box trucks". The site plan illustrates four pedestrian entrances along the south building façade, with sidewalks leading to the southern access drive. At the workshop meeting on March 10, 2022, the applicant noted that deliveries would be made in the drive aisle along the south property line, completely screened from Route 30 and mostly screened from Windy Hill Drive.
6. Concrete curbs are required for all paved areas and have been provided.

## Access and Circulation

1. Per the Village's 2007 Master Transportation Plan, Rore 34 assified as a "Regional Arterial" and Windy Hill Drive is classified as a "Neighborhood Colle $\quad r^{\prime \prime}$. 50 is under the jurisdiction of IDOT, while Windy Hill Drive is operated and maintained by sllage. vo access points (driveways) are proposed along Windy Hill Drive, which have been revic rt voth $2 . \quad n$. ic Works Department and the Village's Engineering consultant. The existing driveway cess to Route 30 would be closed. Driveways were proposed along Windy Hill Dri ins. ${ }^{1}$ of Ro4 30 due to the slow permit review process for roads under IDOT jurisdiction an oecaur a. T was unlikely to grant a driveway permit within proximity to the existing intersectio
2. On all business lots with over 200 ' of ft 'ge, two p. fingress/egress may be permitted, measuring at least $20^{\prime}$ wide. The sit 'rates points of ingress/egress to Windy Hill Drive, measuring 24' wide and $20^{\prime}$ wide, $m$.ng this requ nent.
3. A traffic study may L equested by th illage but is not required. Typically, residents of assisted living facilities do not drive t. drom the uilding and the applicant noted the same during the workshop meeting. A traffic study wo. t rer sted during the PC-ZBA workshop meeting.
4. Sidewalks currently exist within the rights-of-way along both Route 30 and Windy Hill Drive and would remain. If the existing sidewalks are damaged during construction, those damaged portions must be replaced. This requirement has been added as a condition of approval.
5. A $G^{\prime}$ wide sidewalk has been provided connecting the front entrance of the building to the existing sidewalk along Windy Hill Drive, meeting code.
6. Although not required by code, the Village requested that the northern driveway apron be flared into a partial turn lane, or tapered turn. This flared driveway is intended to provide more space for vehicles to enter the site from Windy Hill Drive, being cognizant of the small, landscaped median within Windy Hill Drive closer to Route 30.

The current floorplan illustrates 82 residential units, whereas 78 units were originally proposed during the workshop meeting. The breakdown of unit types is as follows:

Current 82-unit floorplan:
a. Memory care units: 26
b. Studio units: 31
c. One-bedroom units: 21
d. Two-bedroom units: 4

Former 78-unit floorplan:
a. Memory care units: 26
b. Studio units: 20
c. One-bedroom units: 28
d. Two-bedroom units: 4

## Architectural Style and Building Materials

1. The Zoning Ordinance requires that new constr tion y nit $\stackrel{B}{ }-?$ zone district shall:
a) Have an original and unique desigr ie buildin xterir would be constructed of cultured stone and cement board siding. The roof wou, construc. of asphalt shingles, although metal roof accent panels would be user' -r wina
b) Shall be consister ith the archit ral dt. height, massing, and materials of adjacent properties. The building ai ecture and mater ; convey a more residential design to blend in with the adjacent townhomes. The , cent townhon to the south have a masonry (river rock) wainscot with board \& batten siding. Both L assisted li g facility and the existing townhomes would have pitched roofs with asphalt shingles.
c) EIFS should only be used for , ent features. No EIFS is proposed for the assisted living facility.
d) Brick or masonry materials shall be used on all sides of non-residential development. All sides of the proposed building contain some cultured stone veneer, either rising to the height of wainscot or sometimes extending to the eave of the roof.
e) Flat and mansard roofs are discouraged. A hipped roof is proposed for the assisted living facility, which is common for residential structures.
f) Colors schemes should consider the character of other structures in the area. Excessively bright colors should be used only as accent features. The proposed building will have mostly neutral colors (see attached colored renderings with proposed building materials).

Grading

1. There is a noticeable existing slope on the subject property. The site is highest at the northwest corner near Route 30 and lowest along the frontage of Windy Hill Drive. Cut and fill will be required to level out the property.
2. A single retaining wall is proposed at the northwest corner of the site. The proposed wall would vary in height, tapering at either end of the wall. The wall would be highest in the middle where it bends, measuring approximately $7^{\prime}$ tall max. A detail of this retaining wall is included on Sheet 3 and the applicant has also provided a copy of the manufacturer specifications (attached). The proposed retaining wall would be most visible from the proposed building, not Route 30 , since the grade drops down from Route 30. As such, the parking spaces near this retaining wall will appear recessed when viewed from Route 30 or the property to the west, visually screening those parking spaces. The Design Standards note that walls taller than $2.5^{\prime}$ or longer than $50^{\prime}$ require review and approval by the Plan Commission (the retaining wall meets both criteria). Approval of such walls by the Plan Commission is an acknowledgement, not a variance.

## Stormwater \& Drainage

An extensive amount of preliminary engineering work was conducted after the workshop meeting but before the public hearing. After thorough review by Robinson Engineering, it was determined that the site may utilize existing and proposed infrastructure and drain into the existing detention pond on the east side of Windy Hill Drive. This pond then empties into Hickory Creek further east. There ir 10 c estormwater detention required or provided.

## Floodplains and wetlands

There are no existing floodplains on the subject propert Ab. ge wetl report submitted to the Village on July $8^{\text {th }}$ concluded the presence of a small "potentia juris' a ' wetland area totaling 0.03 acres" and a "potentially jurisdictional stream measuring 373 lir sar teet" ne ter ._risdictional" refers to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) ased on iscuss; is with Robinson Engineering, it's staff's understanding that both the wetland and the st. would bc. .tted to be filled in due to their relatively small sizes, regardless of whether thev the J. tiction of USACE, although if they are, a permit would be required from either the USAr Illinois Depa ent 0 , tural Resources or the llinois Environmental Protection Agency.

## Tree Removal \& Landscaping

1. Tree Survey: A tree survey ' $s$ ' nitted illustrating 108 existing trees on subject property and within the adjacent rights-of-way. Of t. se trees, 96 are located on the subject property and all will be removed. The remaining 12 trees to be preserved are located within the right-of-way of either Route 30 or Windy Hill Drive.

Of the 96 trees that will be removed, 24 are classified as "preservation trees" per the Landscape Ordinance and must be mitigated on-site. The other 72 non-preservation trees may be removed without mitigation, although the Landscape Ordinance does require other forms of landscaping (street trees, buffers, parking lot landscaping) as part of the proposed new development. Of the 24 "preservation trees", 5 of these are evergreen trees and 19 are deciduous trees.
2. Preservation Trees: The 5 evergreen preservation trees must be mitigated on-site at a $1: 1$ ratio for tree height. The 19 deciduous preservation trees must be mitigated on-site at a $1: 1$ ratio for tree caliper (trunk diameter). A total of $144^{\prime}$ height of evergreen trees must be mitigated on-site, with $438^{\prime}$ provided, exceeding this requirement ( 3 times as much). A total of 283 deciduous tree caliper must be mitigated on-site, with 96 caliper inches being provided, falling short of this requirement ( 3 times as little). Page 11 of the Landscape Ordinance contains a provision that can allow relief specifically from the preservation
tree mitigation requirements: "Relief from any portion or all of the on-site tree replacement requirement may be granted by the code official". As such, staff seeks input from the Plan Commission as to whether an oversupply of evergreen trees would offset the undersupply of deciduous trees. In this instance, it may make more practical sense to provide more evergreen trees and less deciduous trees to provide a year-round visual screen between the subject property and adjacent properties. Conversely, the "code official" may require that all tree mitigation be met as specifically required by code.
3. Parkway Trees (Street Trees): The Landscape Ordinance requires one $2.5^{\prime \prime}$ caliper overstory tree for every 35 lineal feet where no overhead power lines exist. The applicant intends to meet this requirement using a combination of existing and proposed overstory trees.

|  | Required Street Trees | Proposed Street Trees |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Route 30 | 13 | 13 |
| Windy Hill Drive | 14 | 16 (10 of which in ROW) |

4. Buffer Landscaping: When a business use is adjacent to a residential zone, such use shall be screened from view (Article 6, Section C, Part 2, j). As such, landscaping is required along the south property line shared with the existing Windy Hill townhome development. This lan'scaring should offer year-round screening as much as possible, using mostly evergreen trees and abs. landscaping requirement is located in the Zoning Ordinance, not the Landscape Ordinance, si ' , it 's not specify a specific amount of landscaping required, only that landscaping shall exist tr vvide sci ing. Much of the preservation tree mitigation has been added along the west and south prof v linesto. vide a visual screening. The applicant is proposing more evergreens than is rea' 'ut less $L$ story (canopy) trees than is required.
5. Parking Lot Landscaping: Landscaping is rea ed scr tron parking spaces as well as provide landscaping within parking lot islands a fingers A mini um $10^{\prime}$ wide landscape screen is required along the parking lot perimeter, cons: of 150 pl unir cor every 100 lineal feet. At least $75 \%$ of this landscaping must be evergron- Fach $\mathrm{pa}_{\mathrm{a}} \quad \mathrm{g}$ lot islanu and finger must contain one overstory tree. The proposed landscaping $r$-s these uirem.
6. Mechanical unit su ning: All mechani units will be ground-mounted and located at various points on all sides of the buildir $L_{2}$ These units wil a screened with $30^{\prime \prime}$ yews.

Lighting

1. Lighting for the property will be provided in the form of light poles and building-mounted lights. The photometric plan illustrates 7 light poles and 7 building-mounted lights. The light poles would be distributed on the site with four (4) light poles adjacent to the front row of parking along Route 30 , two (2) light poles adjacent to the west row of parking along the west property line and one (1) light pole near the trash enclosure near the south property line. The building-mounted lights would be distributed on the site with four (4) being placed on the south side of the building and three (3) on the west side of the building.
2. The light poles measure $20^{\prime}$ tall and are fitted with non-cutoff fixtures. Light poles would be $20^{\prime}$ tall, whereas $20^{\prime}$ is the maximum height permitted, complying with the Ordinance. Building-mounted lights would be positioned 10 ' above grade and have cut-off fixtures. Details of the proposed light fixtures are illustrated on the Improvement Plans on Sheet 9.
3. Light levels shall not exceed 0.5 foot-candles along any property line. The photometric plan illustrates that this requirement has been met.
4. Certain zone districts, including the B-2 zone, require that new light poles be equipped with "decorative" bases. Sheet 9 of the improvement Plans illustrates a "bell-shaped", decorative metal base for the light poles.

## Other

1. The Fire District has reviewed the proposed site plan and does not have any additional comments at this time.
2. Basements are not required for this type of development per the Zoning Ordinance or the International Building Code.
3. Overhead powerlines exist within the road right-of-way of Route 30 . Since these lines exist within the right-of-way, they are not anticipated to affect the required street tree landscaping, which will be placed on private property.
4. The project does not contain any accessory structures, thas trash enclosure, located near the southwest corner of the property in the rear yard.
5. Dumpster enclosure visibility must be minimize sy ting the way from public rights-of-way and building entrances, using enclosure screening iterialr in $r$ to the main structure and through the use of landscaping. The proposed dumpster wou a be scaten. the southwest corner of the property, away from both public rights-of-way or is surro ted by rees and landscaping. The dumpster detail illustrates a cultured stone wainscot board an. n siding above it, matching the building. The dumpster enclosure wor ${ }^{\prime} \quad 6^{\prime}$ ta All aspects of the dumpster enclosure (setbacks, materials, height) comply with +' Loning Ora. ce.
6. Mechanical units w, ground-mount only and distributed on all sides of the building. The landscape plan illustrates that the, il all be scre, ed with evergreen shrubs.

## Special Use Request

The following findings of fact are used to judge the merit of a special use permit request.

## Findings of Fact:

No special use shall be recommended by the Plan Commission, unless such Commission shall find:
a. That the establishment, maintenance or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to, or endanger, the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare.
b. That the special use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.
c. That the establishment of the special use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.
d. That the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of any proposed structure will not be so at variance with either the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the structures already constructed, or in the course of construction in the immediate neighborhood or the character of the applicable district, as to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values within the neighborhood.
e. That the adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been or are being provided.
f. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
g. That the special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may, in each instance, be modified by the Village Board, pursuant to the recommendations of the Plan Commission.

## Affirmative Motions

1. Recommend to the Village Board to approve the Special Use Permit for an assisted living facility, in accordance with the reviewed plans, findings of fact, and public testimony, conditioned on final engineering approval, the replacement of any damaged sections of public sidewalk, and the base of any future ground sign shall be consistent with the materials of the vainscot on the building.
2. Recommend the Village Board approve the Final Platc ubdiv, ir Oasis Senior Living, in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony, subject . y tech. 'revisions prior to recording and conditioned on final engineering approval.
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# VILLAGE OF <br> FRANKFORT 

## Application for Plan Commission / Zoning Board of Appeals Review Special Use Permit Findings of Fact

Article 3, Section E, Part 6 of the Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance lists "findings" or "standards" that the Plan Commission must use to evaluate every special use permit request. The Plan Commission must make the following seven findings based upon the evidence provided. To assist the Plan Commission in their review of the special use permit request(s), please provide responses to the following "Findings of Fact." Please attach additional pages as necessary.

1. That the establishment, maintenance or operation of sper will not be detrimental to, or endanger, the public health, safety, morals, comfort or 5 al wel.

The facility will provide a residential living expener, for ser, and will not adversely impact the surrounding areas or eral wu re.
2. That the special use will not be injurious the use id enjo ment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes $a$ : ' ly permit ' $n \mathrm{r}$, ubstantially diminish and impair property values within the neimhorhool

Senior living facilitir are ger, ly st ontained operations with very little outside activities that wo simpact adja nt prc, erties.
3. That the establishment of $t_{1}$ neci- se will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surroundi. sperty for uses permitted in the district.
The development of the parcel will not have a negative impact on future development of adjacent parcels.
4. That the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of any proposed structure will not be so at variance with either the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the structures already constructed, or in the course of construction in the immediate neighborhood or the character of the applicable district, as to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values within the neighborhood.
The building will be a single story structure consisting of cultured stone and board and batten style composite siding. The style is intended to be more of a residential feel and will not be in contrast with the existing residential subdivision to the south.
5. That the adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been or are being provided.
Village water main and sanitary sewer is adjacent to the as is a publicly dedicated roadway. Storm sewer has been provided to the parcel and will convey drainage to an existing detention basin in the Windy Hill Farm Subdivision.
6. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
Access to the site will be provided from Windy Hill Drive, a publicly dedicated street. The residents of the facility typically do not drive, so traffic volume will generally be limited to employees and visitors sporadically throughout the day. Traffic will be fairly light compared to other residential or commercial uses.
7. That the special use shall, in all other respects, conforr $o$ the 'icable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may, is $\quad \Upsilon^{\prime}$ nsta. be modified by the Village Board, pursuant to the recommendations of the Plan Cor sion.
The request does not include any variations from ap, able Vmage codes.

1207 Cedarwood Dr, Grest Hill, IL 60403 - 815-730-1010 - geotechconsultantsinc.com

## STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT



## Background

The proposed development will disturb approximately 4.68 acres and will consist of an approximately 75,000 square foot assisted living and memory care facility with paved parking areas. Storm water management will be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Will County Storm Water Management Ordinance and the appropriate local ordinances. All calculations utilize updated rainfall data from the Illinois State Water Survey Bulletin 75 (March 2020).

## Existing Conditions

Copies of the applicable floodplain map, wetland map, soils map, and County GIS map for the property are provided in Appendix 1. Based on the available data, the property does contain some wetlands at the very southwest corner of the property.

## Detention Analysis

Storm water detention has been provided off-site as $p^{-}$. of th etention basins constructed with the Windy Hill Farm Subdivision. The basin provil - $\mathrm{s}^{\text {t ag }} \mathrm{i}$ or the site up to an impervious level of 85 percent. The proposed imperviou. vel for . site, see below, is approximately $59 \%$; therefore, additional storm water de. $e_{1} n$ is no ed for the site,

Total Site Area:
Impervious Area:
Building
Paving/Walks
Total:
4.68 acres
1.72 res

1 ? acres
$2 . \%$ res (58.

## Storm Sewer

Storm sewer will be pr, 'ed to convey i runoff from the proposed improvements to the storm water detention facility fo, 10 -year rair il event. Calculations may be seen in Appendix 2.

## Overland Flood Routes

An overland flood route has been provided through the site to convey the 100-year flow to the proposed detention facilities. Calculations for weirs along the path are provided in Appendix 3 to demonstrate 1 foot of freeboard is provided for adjacent structures, Per the Will County Ordinance, the design flow at each weir will be 1 cfs per tributary acre.

## Off-Site Tributary Area

An analysis was performed to determine the off-site flow tributary to our site. There are approximately 3.86 acres west of our site that are tributary to the Oasis site. A GIS contour map showing the tributary area can be found in Appendix 4 and a calculation of the tributary flow is shown below.
$Q=C i A ; Q=0.3 \times 7.44$ (10 year) $\times 3.86 ; Q=8.61 \mathrm{cfs}$

## Conclusion

The proposed improvements will not adversely impact surface runoff on or adjacent to the site and proposed drainage facilities have been designed in accordance with the appropriate Ordinances.


## National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette



## Legend

SEE FIS REPORT FOR DETAILED LEGEND AND INDEX MAP FOR FIRM PANEL LAYOUT

SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREAS

Without Base Flood Elevation (BFE) With BFE or Depth Zone AE, AO, AH, VE, AR Regulatory Floodway

no screen Area of Minimal Flood Hazard Zone X

OTHER AREAS
GENERAL STRUCTURES
$\square$ Area of Undetermined Flood Hazard Zone D
-- - - Channel, Culvert, or Storm Sewer
AP PANELS

17.5 Water Surface Elevation

B - _ Coastal Transect

$\square$ Limit of Study

- Jurisciction Boundary

---- Coastal Transect
Profile Baseline
Hydrographic Feature

Digital Data Available | No Digital Data Available |
| :--- |
| Unmapped |

9
The pin displayed on the map is an approximate point selected by the user and does not represen an authoritative property location.

This map complies with FEMA's standards for the use of digital flood maps if it is not void as described below. digital flood maps if it is not void as described below. accuracy standards
The flood hazard information is derived directly from the uthoritative NFHL web services provided by FEMA. This map leflect or The ThFHL and effective information may chanse or become superseded by new data over time.

This map image is void if the one or more of the following map elements do not appear: basemap imagery, flood zone labels, legend, scale bar, map creation date, community identifiers, FIRM panel number, and FIRM effective date. Map images for unmapped and unmodernized areas cannot be used for regulatory purposes.



## Map Unit Legend

| Map Unit Symbol | Map Unit Name | Acres in AOI | Percent of AOI |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 149A | Brenton silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 0.2 | 5.0\% |
| 232A | Ashkum silty clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | 0.2 | 4.7\% |
| 241D3 | Chatsworth silty clay, 6 to 12 percent slopes, severely eroded | 0.1 | 2.7\% |
| 320C2 | Frankfort silty clay loam, 4 to 6 percent slopes, eroded | 3.8 | 87.7\% |
| Totals for Area of Interest |  | 4.3 | 100.0\% |



## Wetland Map



August 26, 2021

## Wetlands

Estuarine and Marine Deepwater
Estuarine and Marine Wetland


Freshwater Emergent Wetland
Lake
Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland
Freshwater Pond

This map is for general reference only. The US Fish and Wildlife Service is not responsible for the accuracy or currentness of the base data shown on this map. All wetlands related data should be used in accordance with the layer metadata found on the Wetlands Mapper web site.





Storm Sewer Tabulation




## $-1$

## Weir Capacity

Weir Capacity, $\mathrm{Q}\left(\mathrm{ft}^{3} / \mathrm{sec}\right): \quad 2.6^{*} \mathrm{~L} * \mathrm{H}^{1.5}$

| Weir Location | Trib. Area <br> (acre) | Design Flow <br> (1 cfs/acre) | Weir <br> Length (ft) | Weir <br> Elevation | Water <br> Height <br> Over Weir | Weir <br> Capacity <br> (cfs) | Lowest <br> Adjacent <br> Finished Floor | Freeboard <br> (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Weir 1 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 10 | 703.00 | 0.1 | 0.82 | 704.5 | 1.40 |
| Weir 2 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 10 | 703.00 | 0.1 | 0.82 | 704.5 | 1.40 |
| Weir 3 | 0.3 | 0.30 | 10 | 703.00 | 0.1 | 0.82 | 704.5 | 1.40 |
| Weir 4 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 10 | 702.60 | 0.1 | 0.82 | 704.5 | 1.80 |
| Weir 5 | 0.23 | 0.23 | 10 | 702.70 | 0.1 | 0.82 | 704.5 | 1.70 |
| Weir 6 | 0.32 | 0.32 | 10 | 702.70 | 0.1 | 0.82 | 704.5 | 1.70 |
| Weir 7 | 0.42 | 0.42 | 10 | 702.70 | 0.1 | 0.82 | 704.5 | 1.70 |
| Weir 8 | 0.41 | 0.41 | 10 | 702.70 | 0.1 | 0.82 | 704.5 | 1.70 |
| Weir 9 | 0.12 | 0.12 | 10 | 701.20 | 0.1 | 0.82 | 704.5 | 3.20 |
| Weir 10 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 10 | 609.90 | .1 | 0.82 | 704.5 | 4.50 |

## Memorandum

To: Christopher Gruba<br>From: Nicholas Whitmore<br>$\mathrm{Re}: \quad$ Oasis Senior Living Facility

Per Robinson's latest review letter for the Oasis Senior Living Facility, we performed an analysis of the existing storm sewer for the 100-year storm. The storm sewe infor, on was based on the as-built plans for the overall subdivision. The following documents are en sed , al tributary area map from original subdivision design, master utility plan for original sut on des and storm sewer calculations for existing storm sewer in the 100-year storm $\mathrm{C}, \quad \mathrm{n}$. In ad. $n$ summary of the percentage of the 100-year storm that each run has the capacity fo orovideu velow:


In summary, there are three (3) ou, eleven (11) existing storm sewer runs that have adequate capacity to handle the 100-year storr. Of the eight (8) runs that do not have adequate capacity, on average, they can handle $73.9 \%$ of the 100-year storm. Finally, this is all assuming full flow conditions and does not take any head pressure into account.




## 8531 W. Lincoln - National Wetland Inventc



April 27, 2022
WetlandsEstuarine and Marine Deepwater
Estuarine and Marine WetlandFreshwater Emergent Wetland
Lake Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland

Other
Freshwater Pond

This map is for general reference only. The US Fish and Wildlife Service is not responsible for the accuracy or currentness of the base data shown on this map. All wetlands related data should be used in accordance with the layer metadata found on the Wetlands Mapper web site.
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# Illinois Environmental Protection Agency 

1021 North Grand Avenue East, P.O. Box 19276, Springfield, ILlinois 62794-9276•(217) 782-3397
JB PRITZKER, GOVERNOR JOHN J, KIM, DIRECTOR

Project/Site: Oasis Senior Living - Frankfort, Frankfort, IL, Will County
NPDES Permit No: ILRIOZBVG

09/02/2022
We have reviewed your application requesting coverage for Oasis Senior Living - Frankfort located at 8531 West Lincoln Highway, Frankfort, IL 60423, and determined that storm water discharges associated with industrial activity from construction sites are appropriately covered by the General NPDES Permit issued by the Agency. Your discharge is covered by this permit effective as of the date of this letter. A copy of the NOI submission can be downloaded at this link: https://npdes-ercporting.epa.gov/net-cgp/api/public /v1/form/1542774/attachment/zip.

The Permit includes special conditions regarding the application, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and reporting requirements. Failure to meet any portion of the Permit could result in civil and/or criminal penalti. Th Agency is ready and willing to assist you in interpreting any of the conditions of the Permit as they relate specifically to $y$ disc.

As a Permit Holder, it is your responsibility to:

1. Submit a modified Notice of Intent of any substantial modification to thu pre such as a changes, new contractors, area coverage, or additional discharges to Waters of the United States within 30 day-
2. Submit a Notice of Termination once the site has completed fin,' Ttion anc storm water discharges from construction activities that are authorized by this Permit are eliminated.

Please reference your permit number ILRI0ZBVG in all futur corn apor nce. Si. jou have any questions concerning the Permit, please contact the Permit Section at (217) 782-0610.

Sincerely,



Darin E. LeCrone
Manager, Permit Section
Division of Water Pollution Control
Link to: General NPDES Permit No. ILRI?
cc:
$2125 \Sigma$ Ent Sictl. Cumpafn 1661620 (2172273.5S00
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## Pisa' ${ }^{\text {" }}$



|  | CORNER DOUBLE <br> SPLIT CLASSIC | XL TAPERED SPLT <br> CLASSIC | COPING <br> CLASSIC |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Bundle Type | DOUBLE | SINGLE | DOUBLE |
| Plant Produced | CHICAGO | CHICAGO | CHICAGO |
| Thickness $(\mathrm{mm})$ | $150 M M$ | 150 MM | $75 M M$ |


| FCFT PER | Bundle | 30.01 | 21.33 | 20.34 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Layer | 10.00 | 5.33 | 2.91 |
|  | Stone | 1.67 | 0.67 | 0.48 |

APPLICATIONS
1 .

## CROSS SECTIONS

Cross Sections are available on Unilock's
Contractor web site under Products:
contractor.unilock.com

| PER BUNDLE | Layers | 3.00 | 4.00 | 7.00 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Sections | 6.00 | - | 2.00 |

## APPEARANCE

Edge Detail-n/a
Surface Texture - Split \& Standard (coping)
Joint Spacing-n/a
Void-n/a

TECHNOLOGIES
CLASSIC"
Budget-friendly traditional product mix
TECHNICAL INFORMATION
Conforms to ASTM C 1372
Eligible for LEED v4.1 credits


GRANITE


NEVADA


SIERRA


COPING
$300 \times 75 \times 300 \mathrm{~mm}$
$11 \% \times 3 \times 117 / 0^{\prime \prime}$
42 units/Bundle
. 48 Fc.Ft./Stone

XLUNIT
$400 \times 150 \times 300 \mathrm{~mm}$
$153 / 4 \times 57 / 8 \times 117 / \mathrm{g}^{\prime \prime}$
32 units/Bundle
. 67 Fc . Ft./Stone





Jack Johnson asked if there will be a path in the middle of the townhomes to the school property.

Chair Rigoni stated she would not support that. There was consensus from the other members not to have such a connection.

There was some discussion about whether or not street signs could be added to state "local traffic only".

Chris Gruba responded this would be a question for the Department of Public Works.
Jack Johnson commented that this project seems to be needing numerous exceptions and that is not the intent of the PUD regulations.

Knieriem asked Mr. Johnson if he was interested in being on the PC/ZBA since he brought up some very valid points.

Rita Starkey, a nearby resident, approached the pc "um the location of the proposed dog park. She will h e mc agenda item.

Chair Rigoni summarized the issues to be considered:

- Landscape Plan
- Architecture
- Dog Park location

Commissioner Knieriem asked $N$ laherty $h \quad+h^{\circ}$ cimeframe is for the project. Mr. Flaherty respor $\leadsto$ that ${ }_{i t}$ ped reak ground yet this year.

Mike Schwarz. ed that when th natter is presented for the public hearing and staff provides suggeste otions, it wo l be appropriate for the first motion to be a recommendation fro, he PC/ZB to the Village Board to amend the Comprehensive Plan as there seems to $L$ nns ${ }^{\text {r }}$, as to do so, and this would be consistent with past practice for such deviation.

## Workshop: 8531 W. Lincoln Highway - Special Use Permit for an assisted living facility (Oasis Senior Living)

Chris Gruba presented the staff report.
Chair Rigoni asked the applicant to come forward.
Tom Carrol of Geotech Inc., on behalf of Oasis Senior Living, stated that he did not have anything to add to the staff report, as it was very thorough.

Commissioner Knieriem asked Mr. Carrol if the driveway around the building was required by the Fire Department.

Tom Carrol responded yes.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if there would be any fencing along Route 30 .
Tom Carrol responded no.
Commissioner Knieriem asked if fellow commissioners agreed.
Chair Rigoni asked if the applicant could explain who the residents are and to explain their needs.

Tanir Knan, the applicant, responded that the residents don't generally go outside nor do they drive. They would have two caregivers for every 15 residents, a chef, etc. He stated that the west wing is all memory care.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if there will be a turn lane off of Route 30.
Tom Carrol stated no. They would need to go to IDOT for zuch approval.
Commissioner Markunas stated that it would be roo a make the building and site appear to blend with the residential area of $\mathrm{W}_{1} \quad$ Hill.

Commissioner Markunas asked how many trees will be roved and have many do they need to provide.

Chair Rigoni restated that question.
Chris Gruba responded by statii, ${ }_{c}$ require
Commissioner Mar aras asn why t. 'uilding is set back so far from Route 30.
Tom Carroll h. onded that there a 130-foot setback requirement from Route 30.
Chair Rigoni stated + she feels, at there should be a 25 -foot setback for the delivery area from the residenti. ecar it is an incompatible use.

There was some discussion about the rear elevation of the proposed building and whether it would have windows facing south.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked if the storm sewer exists.
Chris Gruba showed the sewer atlas and confirmed that it does exist.
Commissioner Schaeffer asked where the deliveries would occur.
Tom Carrol responded that they would occur in the back at the south doors.
Commissioner Schaeffer asked what door the deliveries go to.
Tanir Knan responded into the middle door on the south side of the building.

Commissioner Hogan asked how many residents there would be (78) in order to compare to the deliveries of a typical restaurant.

Chair Rigioni stated that she would like a better understanding of the tree removal as it provides significant screening. She wishes that there could be a more creative site design to preserve more of the trees.

Commissioner Knieriem stated that he sees some trees along the property line that might be looked at to be saved.

Tom Carrol responded that they will take a closer look at these but site grading may require their removal.

Commissioner Hogan stated that the existing trees provide a benefit to both the existing residents and the new residents of the facility.

Commissioner Guevara echoes the comments about tree preservation and new landscaping to see how these offset each other.

Commissioner Guevara asked where the trash enc. is lo. 2 d .
Tom Carrol stated it is at the southwest corner of the bu. ing.
Chair Rigoni asked if there is a reason it $;$ here ? . ot on th. west side to be away from the residents.

Tom Carrol stated that they can ! at reloca $\sigma$ th rash enclosure further from the adjacent residences.

Chair Rigoni ask for commen. n the hitecture.
Commissioner G . Tra stated that e elevation facing Route 30 should be prominent with more brick.

Tom Carrol stated that the cant was going for a residential look.
Chair Rigoni asked staff to provide a color rendering of the building in the packet for the public hearing. She added that she would like to have more brick on the large wall expanse on Sheet 8.1. She stated that they should either differentiate from the architecture of Windy Hill or go closer to it, but not be somewhere in the middle.

Commissioner Hogan asked staff what the parking requirement is.
Chris Gruba responded.
Chair Rigoni asked the applicant how many visitor cars visit on average.
Tanir Knan responded that typically there are only about 10 visitor cars per day.
Rita Starkey, a nearby resident, approached the podium and stated that she conducted a
demographic study of the area and there are 27 assisted living facilities. She asked what will happen in the future when this facility is no longer needed. She stated that this will not be a quiet little place. She does not want brick. Everything should be stone like Windy Hill. He windows face this site and the lights will destroy her view. She doesn't want to see this vacant building in 15 years. She doesn't know if this is the right plan for the area. The loss of trees is a concern. Only a few buildings in Windy Hill face this property. She is not against assisted living, but do the demographics. She stated it should be aesthetically pleasing.

Terry Colins, President of the Windy Hill Homeowners Association, asked staff who owns the land.

Chris Gruba responded that he does not know but can find out.
Terry Colins stated that the same owner owns the other side of the street as well. Maybe they could buy that parcel. He stated that he is just making a suggestion. Leave the trees along the edge so people don't see the ruilding.

Chair Rigoni summarized the issues:

- It would be helpful to know more about th $W$ ty Hill a ${ }^{\text {. }}$. ${ }^{\text {cture. }}$
- Need for decorative fencing similar to rwhat exis. Windy Hill today.

Chris Gruba asked the Commission if thr woul' ${ }^{\prime}$ 'r anotner workshop.
There was consensus to have anoth workst
Chair Rigoni asked Tom $\sim$ moll it . could stake the property so that the Commission and rents cu visua. how close the property line is to the townhomes.

Tom Carrol respu dhat they c do this and then will let staff know when it has been staked.
E. Workshop: 22660 S. Harlem Avenue - Zoning Map Amendment (Rezoning) and Special Use Permit for a PUD (Gracepoint Ministries)

Mike Schwarz presented the staff report.
He noted that the applicants were seeking to use the existing 22.6 -acre property as a religious retreat center, which would require rezoning the property from E-R to R-2 and a special use permit for a PUD. He noted that the existing property is under one tax parcel, but has "split zoning", in which most of the property is zoned E-R with a smaller, southern portion zoned R-2 adjacent to Crystal Brook Subdivision. He noted that the Future Land Use Map within the Comprehensive Plan designates the property as "Single-Family Detached Residential", as well as the areas to the west and south of the subject property. The areas to the north and east of the subject property are Forest Preserve lands and are designated as "Environmental Conservation" on the Future Land Use Map. The driveway entrance to the property is gated. The applicant has
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| GENERAL NOTES \& DETAILS |
| :---: |
| project no.: job no:: L1721 9317 |
|  |
| $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { SHEET } \\ L-2 \end{array}$ |




$\underset{\sim}{c}$


RECEIVED
By Christopher Gruba at 9:02 am, Jun 08, 2022




| $\frac{D}{u T}$ |  | Troser |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | OASIS SEN | ACILITY |  |
|  |  | NEW SENIO | NTER |  |
|  |  | Lncoln highuar | Frankfort. |  |

## PLAN COMMISSION REPORT SUMMARY (Tabled from September 19, 2022)

## Opa! Maior PUD Change: 10235 W. Lincoln Highway - Ordinance

This item of business was removed from the unanimous consent agenda and tabled at the September $19^{\text {th }}$ Village Board meeting.

Mayor Ogle entertains a motion from the floor to take the matter from the table.
Motion: I move to take from the table the motion relating to Opa! Major PUD Change for
Brookside Commons Planned Unit Development.
Clerk Schubert calls the roll.
Staff contacted the applicant, George Karuntzos, and recommended that he attends the Village Board meeting to answer any questions that may come up as part of the Village Board's consideration of the Major PUD Change.

Staff received correspondence from the applicant req sting * ₹atter be postponed to May 2023.
Mayor Ogle entertains a motion from the floor to postr . the mal, ind finitely.
Motion: I move to postpone the motion relating $\quad$ ! Maje ${ }^{\circ} U D$ Change indefinitely.
Mayor Ogle invites trustee comment on the $n$ ter $r$.or $\imath$ vor e .
Clerk Schubert calls the roll.

## Excerpt from September , _un llage ard Meeting

Applicant George $Y$ intzos proposes building addition and relocation of the outdoor patio for the existing Opa! re rant, located t 10235 W. Lincoln Highway, within the Brookside Commons development. a project , uld involve enclosing the existing 670 square foot patio and constructing a new 324 are st outdoor seating area adjacent to it. To accommodate the proposed improvements, the at. ant requests the granting of a Major PUD Change.

At the September $8^{\text {th }}$ Public Hearing on the project, the Commissioners reviewed the proposed Major PUD Change to the Brookside Commons development and forwarded a split (4-1) recommendation to the Village Board to approve the Major PUD Change, subject to final engineering approval and the restaurant not opening before 3:00 P.M. The applicant was amendable to not opening before 3:00 P.M., Monday through Friday. The dissenting vote was because of the proposed patio and additional seating request.

Motion: Accept the Plan Commission recommendation, waive the First and Second Readings, and pass an Ordinance approving a Major PUD Change to the Brookside Commons Planned Unit Development to permit exterior renovations of the building and corresponding enclosure of the existing outdoor patio and construction of a new outdoor seating area to accommodate the business operation of Opa!, located at 10235 W. Lincoln Highway, in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony, conditioned upon final engineering approval and the restaurant shall not open before 3:00 P.M., Monday through Friday.

# ordinance no. 33XX <br> AN ORDINANCE APPROVING A MAJOR PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) CHANGE FOR THE BROOKSIDE COMMONS DEVELOPMENT <br> WILL AND COOK COUNTIES, ILLINOIS (OPA! RESTAURANT - 10235 W. LINCOLN HIGHWAY) 

WHEREAS, George Karuntzos, Applicant; an Karnta Investments, LLC, 3900 West $101^{\text {st }}$ Street, Chicago, Illinois 60655, Owner; filed an contion the Village of Frankfort for a Major PUD Change to the Brookside Commons P. ned Urı. evelopment, located at 10235 W. Lincoln Highway, Frankfort, Illinois $604^{\circ n}$ and

WHEREAS, the Subject Property is lo ted .ch. he corporate limits of the Village of Frankfort, Will and Cook Counties, Illino ${ }^{\circ}$ and is oned ] - Office District with a Special Use for a Planned Unit Development; and

WHEREAS, a tim of t tic Hearing on this application before the Plan Commission/Zoning Bo . of Appeal $f$ the lage of Frankfort was published in the Daily Southtown newspaper ouncing a Pub Hearing on the application for a Major Change to the Brookside Commons Plá. ${ }^{\text {d }}$ Unit Devt pment to accommodate a proposed building addition (enclosure of existing outdo veating a d) and a new outdoor seating area for the existing Opa! restaurant located at 10235 W . 'co' Aighway; and

WHEREAS, at a time and place designated in such published notice, a Public Hearing was held before the Village of Frankfort Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals on said application; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Frankfort Plan Commission forwarded a split (4-1) recommendation to the Board of Trustees of the Village of Frankfort, that the Subject Property be granted a Major PUD Change to the Brookside Commons Planned Unit Development, to permit a building addition and relocation of the outdoor patio for the Subject Property, with conditions as enumerated in Section 1 of this Ordinance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT, WILL \& COOK COUNTIES, ILLINOIS, AS FOLLOWS:

## SECTION 1. ZONING

PIN 19-09-21-304-044-0000, 19-09-21-304-043-0000
PARCEL 1: LOTS 21, 22 AND 23 (EXCEPT THE EAST 6.13 FEET THEREOF IN BROOKSIDE COMMONS P.U.D., BEING A SUBDIVISION OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 35 NORTH, RANGE 12 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED NOVEMBER 25, 1997 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R97-104659, IN WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

AND
PARCEL 2: THAT PART OF LOT 25 IN BROOKSIDE COMMONS P.U.D., BEING A SUBDIVISION OF THE WEST HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 35 NORTH, RANGE 12 EAST OF TYE $Y$ RD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RE TRD, NOVEMBER 25, 1997 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER R97-104659 IN WILL COL $r$, ILL 'OIS, BEING DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: COMMENCING AT THE NORTH L COR ${ }^{\circ}$ JF LOT 23 IN SAID BROOKSIDE COMMONS P.U.D., THENCE NORTH 89 . '43" EAST 6.00 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 23 TO TH ${ }^{\top}$ U $^{\top}$ OF b ${ }^{\circ}$ INNING; THENCE NORTH 00'04'17" WEST 3.00 FEET; THENCE NC TH ${ }^{\prime}$ ' 43 " EAST 37.00 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 00'04' 17 "' EAST 3.00 FEET TC THE N RTH $~$, E OF SAID LOT 23; THENCE SOUTH 89'55'43" WEST 37.00 FEET aLONG :AID JORTH LINE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, IN WILL COUNTY, ILL. OIS.

AND

PARCEL 3: THAT 1 गT OF SAI LOT 25 IN BROOKSIDE COMMONS P.U.D. DESCRIBED AS FOLLO, BEGINN JG AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LOT 21 IN SAID BROOKSIDE COMM ${ }^{\prime}$ 'S P .D.; THENCE SOUTH 89'55'43" WEST 6.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH $00^{\prime} 04^{\prime} 17^{\prime \prime}$, 51.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH 89'55'43" EAST 6.00 FEET TO THE WEST LINE OF LOT 23 IN SAID BROOKSIDE COMMONS P.U.D.; THENCE SOUTH 00'04' 17 ' EAST 51.00 FEET ALONG THE WEST LINE OF LOTS 23, 22 AND 21 IN SAID BROOKSIDE COMMONS P.U.D. TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, IN WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

AND
PARCEL 4: EASEMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF PARCEL 1, 2, AND 3, AS CREATED BY DECLARATION OF COVENANTS, CONDITIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND EASEMENTS FOR BROOKSIDE COMMONS FOR INGRESS AND EGRESS OVER COMMON AREA AS DEFINED IN THE DECLARATION RECORDED NOVEMBER 25, 1997 AS DOCUMENT R97-104658 AFORESAID.

Commonly known as 10235 W. Lincoln Highway, Frankfort, Will County, Illinois, is hereby granted a Major PUD Change to the Brookside Commons Planned Unit Development to permit exterior renovations of the building and corresponding enclosure of the existing outdoor patio and construction of a new outdoor seating area for the Subject Property, in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony, and conditioned upon final engineering approval and the restaurant shall not open before 3:00 P.M., Monday through Friday.

## SECTION 2. REPEAL OF CONFLICTING PROVISIONS

All ordinances and resolutions, or parts thereof, in conflict with the provisions of this Ordinance are, to the extent of the conflict, expressly repealed on the effective date of this Ordinance.

## SECTION 3. ZONING MAP AMENDMENT.

That the Zoning Map of the Village of Frankfort is amended to reflect the Subject Property, currently zoned B-4 Office District with a Special Use Permit for a Planned Unit Development, is hereby granted a Major PUD Change s pr, ed under this Ordinance and the Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance, as amended fi 7 tim ione.

## SECTION 4. SEVERABILITY

If any provision of this Ordinance or application there $\rightarrow$ any person or circumstances is ruled unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, sur inva 'ity sha. ot affect other provisions or applications of this Ordinance that can be ven ac without the invalid application or provision, and each invalid provision or in lid app cation on ais Ordinance is severable.

SECTION 5. EFFECTIVE $D_{A}$
This Ordinance shal ${ }^{1} \quad$ forc. $n d$ effect from and after its passage, approval and publication in pamphlet $f(\Omega$ as provic. by la

PASSED this $\qquad$
$\qquad$ , 21 2; with $\qquad$ members voting AYE; $\qquad$ members voting NAY; and __ members abs the Vill? $\dot{\text { President not voting; with __ members abstaining and }}$ said vote being:

ADAM BORRELLI
MICHAEL LEDDIN
DANIEL ROSSI

MARGARET M. FARINA
JESSICA PETROW

EUGENE SAVARIA

APPROVED this __ day of $\qquad$ , 2022.

KEITH OGLE VILLAGE PRESIDENT

## ATTEST:

KATIE SCHUBERT
VILLAGE CLERK

PREPARED BY AND RETURN TO: VILLAGE CLERK
VILLAGE OF FRANKFORT 432 W. 1 RASKA STREET F] (NK, T, IL 60423

## Public Hearing: 10235 W. Lincoln Highway - Opa! (Ref \#106)

Mike Schwarz presented the staff report.

Chair Rigoni invited the applicant to the podium to provide a summary of the request.
The architect, Steve Francis of Linden Group Architects, gave a summary. He explained that they submitted revised elevations per the comments they received at the workshop. He also clarified that anytime masonry is added on to an existing structure, the technical term is "veneer," hence the label on the submitted plans. The new brick, shingles, and other architectural details would match with the existing building. The applicant also proposed installing openable windows to allow open air in good weather. The previously proposed deck was changed to a patio to match design of existing patio which was to be enclosed. The light fixtures on the existing patio would be repurposed for the new patio. The applicant had already changed their hours oper a to address parking concerns on-site. Parking congestion was worst during $h h^{1}$ ut. $\quad$ the idea was that opening in the afternoon would improve parking conditions the oth earhy businesses.

Chair Rigoni asked if any of the commissir had an, itial questions for staff or the applicant.

Commissioner Markunas asked if $\Longleftarrow$ applic at wo d use full size brick for the enclosure.

The architect respe .ed that $l_{\text {. }}$ wou.

Commissioner $S$ effer asked st if parking requirements could be calculated based on the restaurant's avas le seating ther than using square footage.

Staff responded that the p. .g regulations were set by the Zoning Ordinance, and that the calculation for a restaurant is based on square footage and the number of employees. In recent cases, the Plan Commission was made aware of the option to either recommend approval of parking variations or grant parking adjustments based on the available shared or joint parking on-site.

Commissioner Knieriem asked staff if there was a shared parking agreement for the Brookside Commons PUD, which Opa! is a part of.

Staff responded that they are not aware of any formal or legal documents for shared parking, but the individual property owners may have documentation given that they all share and maintain the parking lot. Staff also stated that the applicant may know otherwise or be able to provide such documentation. The parking lot is already shared by the various property owners. The Zoning Ordinance provides that where multiple
businesses share parking, the Plan Commission may grant parking adjustments if sufficient evidence is presented to them.

Commissioner Knieriem asked whether the shared parking was an informal agreement.
Staff responded that they believe that it is unless documentation can be provided to demonstrate otherwise.

Commissioner Schaeffer asked whether the informal shared parking agreement was only for the spaces within the Brookside Commons PUD or for the three parking lots for the Brookside Commons PUD, the Brookside Commons West PUD, and the Brookside Office Condos PUD.

Staff responded that based on their research, as far as they can tell, there is no formal agreement for shared parking among the three sf`ara، ‘ ${ }^{\prime}$ pproved PUDs (Brookside Commons, Brookside Commons West, Brooks e Of condos). Staff believes that the different property owners within the Brookside (mons I D, via their owners'/tenants' association, understand that they co ctively . e their parking lot. However, staff was unaware of any forma ${ }^{1}$ ment $b$, een the three PUDs.

Chair Rigoni asked if there were any co mer fro ${ }^{1-}$ public.
Chime Airere, a local tenant, $\mathrm{ap}_{\mathrm{t}}$ ched the He expressed his thanks to Opa! for changing its hours of $\rightarrow \eta$. He ${ }^{\text {re }}$ red whether the change in hours was temporary or permanent. When applican oke at changing his hours, it sounded like a voluntary decis which could t eversed in the future.

Chair Rigoni respon ${ }^{7}$ that ther was a condition in the recommended motion which would be bound to the $H_{F}$ ner ${ }^{+}$That would prevent the applicant from changing his hours back without approv. Any future business would be bound to that condition as well unless the Plan Commission approved it.

Chime thanked the Plan Commission for the clarification and commented that he thought the change in hours was positive.

Motion (\#10): To close the public hearing.
Motion by: Schaeffer Seconded by: James
Approved: (5-0)
Chair Rigoni asked the commissioners if they had any comments.

Commissioner Markunas noted that the Plan Commission's main concern at the workshop was parking. He thanked the applicant for changing his hours of operation. Since most of the other businesses in the PUD are medical offices, tend to close around 4:00, and are not open over the weekend, it seems that the parking demands for the different uses would face less overlap.

Commissioner James agreed with Commissioner Markunas' comments regarding the changes in hours. He stated that he assumed the tables on the proposed patio area would only be seasonal. One of the concerns he had was with where snow would be stored in the winter. He believed that some parking spaces would be used for snow storage, which would result in a worse parking situation in the winter. If the patio seating was seasonal, his concerns over winter parking availability were addressed.

The architect noted that most snow was stored in or $r$ ar the detention pond in front of the building, so very few, if any, parking space woul filled with snow.

The applicant, George Karuntzos, echoed the ars ct's con ent and stated that snow is removed quickly so they should not lose any of thost ots.

Commissioner Schaeffer stated that she ked th. e propused brick would match the existing brick. She had no issue with pa...ing ad st al seating.

Commissioner Knieriem asked i. en the r, at opened at 3:00 p.m., whether the applicant expected re Gtron eht at opening or if the dinner rush would not begin until later ir ne evening.

The applicant res ${ }_{F}$ ded that staf rrived at 2:30 p.m., but that the restaurant didn't get busy until around 5: m ., or $s$ netimes earlier in the colder months. He noted that he lost a lot of business in. $n^{+}$eeks changing the opening hours to $3: 00 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. It would not be viable to open later t.an 3:00 p.m.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if the applicant had experienced any financial loss from opening later.

The applicant stated that changing his hours was a gamble, but it may balance out in the long run. Having the additional patio seating may help make up the difference.

Commissioner Knieriem asked if the applicant's restaurant was full on the weekends for dinner and what are the current wait times?

The applicant responded that they were full lately, with an average 40 -minute wait time on the weekends. It was about a 2 hour wait on the weekends over the past winter. The
proposed outdoor seating would help meet demand during the weekends during the nonwinter months.

Commissioner Knieriem noted that many downspouts on the restaurant were disconnected, which could cause water damage.

The applicant said he had never seen an issue and that he was unaware of the disconnections.

Commissioner Knieriem stated he was there a few days prior, and he believed water was able flow openly over the property because of the disconnections. There may be some long-term damage the applicant couldn't see.

The applicant noted that the previous owner took bad care, and that he had done a lot of work to clean it up. Returning to hours of operat n, i. plicant asked if he would be able to open the restaurant earlier for special o siove vents.

Chair Rigoni stated that based on the way the suzge d motic s written in the staff report, the condition for hours of operation for evt. tay of the week. She believed that the condition should be a discussion oint s there as room for flexibility on the weekends. She noted that she was puzzl $\quad$ by ae d of the PUD, and that it seemed like the properties in question wer cot initi ly ints ided to be used as a restaurant. She appreciated the later opening tim, it wishe ne outdoor seating and the major PUD change could be vote' naral 'otions. The Plan Commission had discussions with other applic $s$ in the pas ho $w$ adamantly told to make no additions to their spaces which $h{ }^{1} d$ make parkin vorse. She felt like the proposed outdoor patio seating was pushing the $h_{1}$. She underst , d where the applicant was coming from, but the Plan Commission needed $\iota$. cons int in its recommendations. The enclosure was a different mater, since the - g area already existed, but the inclusion of the additional outdoor seating on the patio was something that she struggled with. She asked the commissioners if they felt they could regulate the later opening hours to only include a limitation on weekdays and allow the applicant flexibility on the weekend.

Commissioner Knieriem noted that the applicant was not asking for it, but that he was willing to make that change.

There was some discussion on the wording of the condition.
Commissioner Knieriem asked whether there was any need to limit the hours on the weekend, or whether they should not mention the weekend in their condition at all.

Chair Rigoni responded that they would give that flexibility to the owner by not mentioning the weekend. She asked if there were any other comments.

There were none.
Chair Rigoni asked staff to verify that the proposed brick was full-sized, and not just a veneer in the sense of a thin layer on top of the main structure.

The project architect confirmed the brick veneer would be full-sized. They asked if the Plan Commission was comfortable with veneer note on plans, knowing that the architect said they intended to use full bricks.

Chair Rigoni stated she was comfortable with that. She asked the other commissioners their opinions.

There was general agreement among the other Commissioners
Chair Rigoni asked if there were any other comment
There were none.
Motion (\#11): Recommend to the Village Board to $\mathrm{a}_{\text {, }}$ rove the Major PUD Change to Brookside Commons, in accordance with $\approx 1$ ewed $p$. s and public testimony, conditioned on final engineering approv and d. e restaurant shall not open before 3:00 p.m., Monday through Friday

Motion by: Knieriem
Secondea oy: Schaeffer
Approved: (4-1, air Rigoni ve d no)
Chair Rigoni state at she only ted no because of the proposed patio and additional seating. If the patio $\mathrm{w}_{4}$. separ motion from the enclosure, she would have voted in favor of the applicant.


## Site Details

Gross Area:
PIN(s): Existing Zoning: Proposed Zoning: Future Land Use: Buildings: Units:

4,420 sq. ft. (0.1 acres)
19-09-21-304-044-0000
B-4
B-4
General Commercial
8 (within entire PUD)
21 (within entire PUD)

September 8, 2022

Adjacent Land Use Summary:


The applicant, George Karuntzos, proposi a building addition and relocation of the outdoor patio for the existing Opa restaurant, within the $B$. 's' commons PUD. The project would involve enclosing the existing 670 square foot patio and constructing a ne , 24 square foot outdoor seating area adjacent to it. The changes would only affect the parcel for the restaurant, which measures approximately 0.10 acres. There would be no changes to the common area within the PUD, including the existing parking, sidewalks and landscaping.

The proposal will require a Major PUD change to modify the approved plans for the Brookside Commons PUD, as well as a new Plat of Resubdivision to combine the 3 underlying lots beneath the 4,420 square foot parcel ( 0.10 acres). The Brookside Commons PUD is located between the Brookside Commons West PUD and the Brookside Office Condos PUD. Each PUD was approved separately. There is no formal shared parking agreement between the three separate PUDs.

## Attachments

1. PC-ZBA workshop meeting minutes from July 14,2022
2. Plat of Survey, received June 2, 2022
3. Aerial Photographs, Village of Frankfort GIS (large scale and small scale)
4. Aerial map of Brookside Commons PUD, Brookside Commons West PUD and Brookside Office Condos PUD
5. Tax Assessment Map, Will County
6. Pictures taken by staff, May 13,2022
7. Existing tenants map, prepared by staff
8. Brookside Commons PUD Site Geometrics Plan, received June 2, 2022
9. Preliminary Site Plan $1^{\prime \prime}: 20^{\prime}$ scale, received August 31, 2022
10. Building Elevation drawings, received August 31, 2022
11. Proposed enclosed patio plan (with new outdoor patio), received August 31, 2022

## Analysis

## Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals Workshop

A PC-ZBA workshop was held on this project on July $14^{\text {th }}, 2022$. At that time, most of the discussion pertained to the existing parking deficiency for the Brookside Commons PUD. The Plan Commission also recommended that the new north façade of the building facing Route 30 should be constructed of brick to match the rest of the building, instead of the proposed fiber cement panel siding. The meeting minutes excerpt has been included with this report.

To address the parking deficiency, the applicant has pushed back the daily opening time from 11:00 am to 3 pm . By having the restaurant closed for lunch, the restaurant would generate no traffic until 3 pm . According to a Google search, the existing businesses with the Brookside Commons PUD have a wide variety of daily closing times that vary from 12 pm to 9 pm , with the majority closing around 5 mm . ousinesses are closed on weekends. On approximately August $24^{\text {th }}$, staff noticed that the restaurant s nols. open for lunch and the daily opening time is now 3 pm . An opening time of 3 pm has been included as ition oproval of the Major PUD change.

To address the building materials request, the north building elevat. has bee. ,ed to eliminate the fiber cement panel siding on the gable of the façade facing Route $3 n$ and repla 'it with brick to match the rest of the building. The building elevation drawings state "new bri ver, to matcl. isting". However, it's believed that the existing building is constructed of full brick, not thi Jrick. $T^{-} \quad \mathrm{m}$ "brick veneer" usually implies thin brick, which may match the building style, but not necessarily ,ildir consi

## 2019 Comprehensive Plan

1. The Comprehensive rillusti the s. ct property as "General Commercial". The property is currently being use or a restauran $d$ the $\epsilon$. nsion and continuation of the use aligns with the Plan.

## Zoning

1. The subject property is $C$ ntly $2 C$ B-4, Office, with a PUD overlay which was approved as a special use (Ordinance No. 1594 ap. $\quad$ on October 21, 1996). The enclosure of the existing patio as well as constructing a new outdoor pa, would require a Major change to the existing PUD.

Site Plan

1. The Zoning Ordinance requires a $150^{\prime}$ minimum setback from the centerline of Route 30 . Route 30 is 5 lanes wide at this point, with two lanes in each direction and a left turn lane. There is also a landscaped median within Route 30. As such, there is no clearly defined "centerline" of the road. Per the site plan submitted by the applicant, the distance from the newly enclosed patio to the outside edge of the turn lane within Route 30 is $165.7^{\prime}$. The outside edge of the turn lane is not located in the middle of Route 30 , which has a ROW width of $150^{\prime}$. Staff, using Will County aerial imagery, measured the distance from the enclosed patio to the center of Route 30 and this distance is approximately 135'. Depending on how the "centerline" is defined, an exception to the PUD request may be required if the proposed patio enclosure is set back less than $150^{\prime}$.
2. The existing restaurant floorplan will not change with the proposed addition/enclosure. The restaurant is 2,675 square feet and seats 60 people.
3. The existing 670 square foot patio area, on the rear of the building but facing Route 30 , would be enclosed to allow year-round use. The enclosed patio would be equipped with foldable glazing panels which could open during the summer months. The patio, before and after the enclosure, seats 40 people.
4. A new, 324 square foot outdoor patio would be constructed on the east side of the building addition/enclosure, which would seat additional 16 people. The patio would only be accessible through the new enclosed patio area.
5. Both the building addition/enclosure and the proposed outdoor patio would be ADA compliant.
6. All changes to the site plan would occur on the 0.10 -acre parcel, with no changes to the common areas of the PUD.

## Building Elevations and Floorplans

1. The existing 670 square foot patio masonry knee walls would remain, with composite siding and windows added above and enclosed by a roof. The proposed shingle roof over the existing patio would match the existing roof regarding pitch and materials. The gable facing ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{ou}^{+} 30$ would be constructed of "brick veneer to match existing".
2. The outdoor lights along the perimeter of the existing $p^{-}$vould bt novef and repurposed for the proposed new 324 square foot outdoor patio.
3. The plans provided for the workshop meeting $n$ ed that new 32. uare foot outdoor patio would be constructed of a wood composite with a wooc iling ne. arave since been modified to illustrate a masonry foundation for the patio with rick wal o matc tne existing brick on the restaurant. The masonry on the patio walls is noted $t$ " $r$, atch exist. "alth gh it's not clear whether this is regular brick or thin brick.

## Parking \& Loading

1. The Zoning Ordin requires 1 park space for each empl during the
space for every 100 square feet of gross floor area, plus one sest working shift, regardless of whether the area is inside the building or outdoor sea The $\quad$ of the $1^{\text {st }}$ floor of the restaurant is 2,675 square feet and the existing patio is 670 square , a total of 3,345 square feet. The largest working shift is 8 employees. As such, the restaurant currenti, requires 42 parking spaces per Code. Outdoor seating area is calculated the same as indoor seating per the Zoning Ordinance; there is no differentiation.
2. The construction of the new 324 square foot patio would add an additional 3 parking spaces per code, for a total of 45 parking spaces for the restaurant.
3. Staff performed a parking analysis of Brookside Commons (attached to this report). The PUD contains 125 parking spaces, including 7 ADA accessible spaces. Currently, all the existing uses within the PUD require approximately 248 parking spaces, resulting in a parking deficiency of 123 spaces. The proposed building addition/enclosure with the proposed outdoor patio would add 3 more parking spaces, for a total of 251 spaces required. These figures do not account for the former Simply Smokin' restaurant, which is closed.
4. The former Simply Smokin' restaurant remains closed at this time. If reopened as a restaurant, it would require approximately 98 additional parking spaces. The parking analysis table currently reflects 0 spaces
required for this former restaurant because it is closed. It is possible that this structure may be reopened for something other than restaurant, which would require less additional parking.
5. Despite shared parking opportunities it is reasonable to assume that restaurant parking availability will be limited during the late afternoon and early evening hours on weekdays where restaurant and office hours overlap. Office users peak parking demands are primarily on weekdays, between approximately $8 \mathrm{am}-5$ pm , whereas restaurants peak parking demands are primarily on weekends in the evening.
6. Some existing tenants have indicated to staff that up to a dozen parking spaces are lost in the wintertime for snow storage.
7. There are no designated loading areas within the Brookside Commons PUD. Delivery trucks typically park in the drive aisle south of the restaurant. Some existing tenants have indicated to staff that deliveries are common during normal business hours and that it negatively affects traffic circulation within the PUD. There may be an opportunity for restaurant loading to be confined to the stubbed parking lot immediately west of the restaurant to reduce conflicts with motorists traveling to the other businesses within the PUD.

## Stormwater \& Drainage

1. Robinson Engineering has performed a cursory review di project. co the small amount of impervious surface added to the site ( 324 SF ), final enginet may be performed at the time of permitting.
2. According to the National Wetlands Invertory .aps nere a wetlands or floodplains on the subject property.

## Landscaping

1. The enclosure of patio will not a $t$ any , sting landscaping. The proposed 324 square foot new outdoor patio wis ult in the loss oi row of shrubs (see attached pictures). The representative has stated that no trees $~$ ' $v$ other lands ing would be removed as part of the project.
2. The site is heavily landscapt en the building and Route 30 , including around the existing detention pond on the north side of the $b$ ding.

Other

1. Although the project will require a Final Plat of Resubdivision to combine the underlying lots, a proposed plat has not been provided at this time. Should the Major PUD change be approved by the Village Board, the applicant would then submit a Plat of Resubdivision, which would require review by the Plan Commission and approval by the Village Board, prior to the issuance of any building permits.
2. The proposed plans were forwarded to the Utility and Building departments and the Frankfort Fire District. These departments have not indicated any concerns with the proposed plans.
3. The existing bathroom facilities are able to accommodate the proposed building addition/enclosure as well as the new outdoor patio.

For reference during the public hearing, Article 3, Section F of the Village of Frankfort Zoning Ordinance refers to Planned Unit Developments. Part 4 of said Section $F$ refers to the review standards the must be considered:

In granting or withholding approval of Preliminary Plans and Final Plans, the Plan Commission and the Village Board shall consider the extent to which the application fulfills the requirements of this Ordinance and the following standards:
a. The plan is designed to protect the public health, welfare, and safety.
b. The proposed development does not cause substantial injury to the value of other property in the immediate area.
c. The plan provides for protection of the aesthetic and function of the natural environment, which shall include, but not be limited to, flood plains, streams, creeks, lakes, ponds, wetlands, soil and geologic characteristics, air quality, vegetation, woodlands, and steep slopes.
d. The plan provides for and ensures the preservation of adequate recreational amenities and common open spaces.
e. Residential use areas may provide a variety of housing ty, achie balanced neighborhood.
f. The planned unit development provides land area to accommo cultura, ucational, recreational, and other public and quasi-public activities to servr seds of $L$. esidents thereof.
g. The proposed development provide for the orc ly and $e_{a}$ arrangement of all land uses with respect to each other and to the entire Village.

## Special Use Request (PUD)

The following findings of fact used to jun the mt of a special use permit request.

## Findings of Fact:

1. No special use shall be mmended the Plan Commission, unless such Commission shall find:
2. That the establishment, mair -e or operation of the special use will not be detrimental to, or endanger, the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare.
3. That the special use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.
4. That the establishment of the special use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.
5. That the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of any proposed structure will not be so at variance with either the exterior architectural appeal and functional plan of the structures already constructed, or in the course of construction in the immediate neighborhood or the character of the applicable district, as to cause a substantial depreciation in the property values within the neighborhood.
6. That the adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been or are being provided.
7. That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
8. That the special use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may, in each instance, be modified by the Village Board, pursuant to the recommendations of the Plan Commission.

## Affirmative Motion

1. Recommend to the Village Board to approve the Major PUD Change, in accordance with the reviewed plans and public testimony, conditioned on final engineering approval and that the restaurant shall not open before 3 pm , everyday.

Staff added that the Federalist style of architecture was characterized by red brick, dark shingles, and roof dormers. Staff then asked the Plan Commission if they were alright with moving away from that design somewhat.

Chair Rigoni responded that she was, depending on what the next set of submitted designs showed.

Commissioner Hogan said the ground-level elevations showed a long, empty roofline, and that he would like to see changes to it to make it less boring.

## D. Workshop: 10235 W. Lincoln Highway - Opa! Addition

Gruba summarized the case.
Chair Rigoni asked the applicant to approach the podium.
Steve Francis, the architect for the project, approached the podium. He stated that they were looking to enclose the patio so they could provide additional seating during the winter or other periods of inclement weather. The ade 'o would match with the existing materials. The existing wall sign would move f ward remain in relatively the same location: on the gable facing Lincoln Highway. er wo. also be some minor changes to the exterior brickwork to accommodate the lar hanges.

Chair Rigoni asked the members of the Plar mmissic f they had any questions or comments about the act of enclosing the atio st

Commissioner Hogan agreed that $\mathfrak{t}^{\text {² }}$ restaur it nee u...nore seating and asked if more seats would be added within the ex sting ou or pr of footprint.

The architect respond the rea for the addition was to keep existing space available despite y ther con 'ons, a that the overall amount of seating within the patio footprint uld not increa: beyon what it is today.

Commissioner Ja. agreed that e addition made sense. He saw no problem with the use.

Commissioner Hogan ask, if there would be any changes to square footage or if the existing exterior wall would be removed.

The architect responded there would be no change to square footage and the current exterior wall would remain.

Commissioner Jakubowski asked whether there would be four additional tables on the proposed outdoor deck area.

The architect said there would be four new tables.
Chair Rigoni asked if the proposed enclosure met the setback requirements from Route 30.

Staff responded they were unsure, but believed they did.

The architect said he would verify that the enclosure did.
Staff noted that the setback from Route 30 could be granted an exception as part of the Major PUD Change.

Chair Rigoni explained that Lincoln Highway had unique setbacks, and that the setback should be met. She also expressed concern over the issue of parking. She noted that the owner of the former Simply Smokin' restaurant space met with the Plan Commission recently to reopen the space as a restaurant with modifications and the Plan Commission insisted that there should be no increase in seating compared to what existed currently. The proposed enclosure and new patio area for Opa would make the parking problem at that location worse. Other uses have been turned down because of this issue in the past. Even though the proposed increase was small, it would be hard to approve the seating. Her only issue with the enclosure was with parking, since it would become a year-round challenge rather than a seasonal one.

Commissioner James asked if it was possible to consider the building enclosure and new outdoor patio separately.

Commissioner Hogan asked staff how many ac tion $\mathrm{c}_{1}$, es would be required for the new seating.

Staff responded that three additional spaces would be. uired, pu the Zoning Ordinance.
Chair Rigoni stated that the main proble was ty hangin ${ }_{\varepsilon}$ dvailability of parking spaces throughout the year.

The applicant stated that the res ${ }^{\wedge}$ ' ant was sies ${ }^{+}$, hen most of the other uses in the PUD were closed.

Chair Rigoni res ${ }^{r}$ ded that $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{L}}$ estau opened at 11:00 A.M., while the offices were also open.

The applicant agre but said th the majority of his business came when the restaurant was the only one usin, he lot

Chair Rigoni agreed, but n . ed that it was always possible for the restaurant to be busy while the offices were open and sharing the existing parking, and so wanted to anticipate that situation. She asked the Commission for comments regarding the architecture.

Commissioner Hogan noted that he had no issue with the proposed architecture, but that the main issue at this site was parking. The Plan Commission had heated discussions about parking concerns in this development in the past, most recently regarding the vacant building to the east.

The applicant asked if this discussion was taking place as a result of the additional tables.
Commissioner Hogan responded that the discussion was taking place because the development which included the restaurant currently did not meet the code requirements.


Chair Rigoni added that in the past, the Plan Commission had not considered parking when discussing outdoor seating spaces, but that the enclosure of the outdoor seating meant that parking became a consideration.

Commissioner Jakubowski noted that there were options to make outdoor seating viable during the winter months that did not involve enclosing spaces, and that they would also result in parking challenges.

Staff noted that regarding the front yard setback of the building, the proposed building addition would require an exception from the regulation as part of the request for a Major Change to the Planned Unit Development. The existing 150 -foot front yard setback regulation was adopted in 2002, which was after the building was built, and therefore made the existing structure legally nonconforming.

Chair Rigoni recalled that the setback regulation in question was put in place to allow for Lincoln Highway to be expanded in the future. She asked if the other members of the Plan Commission were willing to move forward.

Commissioner Hogan said that he was, but that rarkii r ded to be addressed.
Chair Rigoni asked the applicant if there was at. .ectu. reason for the change in materials under the front gable, particularly for $t^{1}$, posed ner paneling within the pediment.

The architect responded there was, but $t^{1}$, char $\quad$ o the $p_{1}$,osed design to match the existing brick facade was not a problem

Chair Rigoni stated her preferer e or brick ince t e proposed materials do not age well, as seen on other properties in the 'lage.

## E. Public Commen

There were no.

## F. Village Board \& Ce nittee $V$ dates

Schwarz noted that the fo, wing matters that previously came before the PC/ZBA were approved by the Village Board at its meeting on July 5:

- Chase Bank Service/Utility Areas Variance at 20810 S. La Grange Road - the ordinance was approved.

In addition, at the July 13 meeting of the Committee-of-the-Whole, staff was authorized to research and draft regulations for electric vehicle charging stations. Schwarz noted that some charging stations already existed in the Village, but there were no regulations for them. Certain designs for charging stations included advertisement components which do not comply with the Village's Sign Ordinance. Some preliminary research had been done, but the Plan Commission should expect draft regulations to be forthcoming.

Commissioner Hogan noted that electric vehicle charging was cheap, so it was important to be ahead of the curve.
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## Brookside Commons

Tenant Roster 6.29.22
PROPOSED PARKING

| Address | Name | Use Classification (Parking) | GFA (approx) | Employees | Exam Rooms | Parking required |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10171 | Frankfort Implant Detistry | Health Clinic: 3 spaces per exam room plus 1 space for each employee | 1,466 | 6 | 4 | 18 |
| 10175 | Brookside Dental | Health Clinic: 3 spaces per exam room plus 1 space for each employee | 1,466 |  |  | 18 |
| 10179 | Planet Color | Personal Service (Salon): 1 space per 200 SF GFA, plus 1 space for each employee | 1,466 | 6 |  | 14 |
| 10181 | Pain Management Institute | Professional office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 2,200 |  |  | 11 |
| 10189 | Midwest Anti-aging | Professional office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 2,200 |  |  | 11 |
| 10197 | CEI Marketing Communications | Business office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,400 |  |  | 7 |
| 10201 | Association Professional Counseling | Professional office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,400 |  |  | 7 |
| 10205 | Logiscial Claims Solutions | Business office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,400 |  |  |  |
| 10209 | ZPS Psychiatric Services | Professional office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | $1,{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | 7 |
| 10217 | Platt Counseling | Professional office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | $400$ | , |  | 7 |
| 10221 | Area Marketing \& Promotions | Business office: 1 space per $200^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$ GFA | 1,40 |  |  | 7 |
| 10225 | Family Medicine | Health Clinic: 3 spaces per room plus 1 space for each employee | $1,400$ | 4 | 3 | 15 |
| 10229 | Chiropractic |  | $1,400$ | 2 | 4 | 14 |
| 10237 | Ameriprise Financial | Busines. $\overline{\text { ice: } 1 \text { space per } 2}$ GFA | 2,250 |  |  | 12 |
| 10241 | Partners in Oral Surgery | Health Clinic: , ${ }^{\text {cespe } \mathrm{e}^{r}} \mathrm{dm}$ room plus 1 spac. employee | 2,250 | 7 | 4 | 19 |
| 10257 | Atlas Wealth Management | Business office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,450 |  |  | 8 |
| 10261 | Ameriprise Financial | Business office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,450 |  |  | 8 |
| 10265 | Synchronicity Event Marketing | Business office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,450 |  |  | 8 |
| 10269 | Lott Management, LLC | Business office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,450 |  |  | 8 |
| 10235 | OPA! | Full-Service restaurant: 1 space per 100 SF GFA plus 1 for each employee | 3,669 | 8 |  | 45 |
| 10211 | Former Simply <br> Smokin' (closed) | Full-Service restaurant: 1 space per 100 SF GFA plus 1 for each employee | 5,000 |  |  | 0 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 251 |

Available parking: 125 spaces, including 7 ADA spaces

EXISTING PARKING

| Address | Name | Use Classification (Parking) | GFA (approx) | Employees | Exam <br> Rooms | Parking required |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10171 | Frankfort Implant Detistry | Health Clinic: 3 spaces per exam room plus 1 space for each employee | 1,466 | 6 | 4 | 18 |
| 10175 | Brookside Dental | Health Clinic: 3 spaces per exam room plus 1 space for each employee | 1,466 |  |  | 18 |
| 10179 | Planet Color | Personal Service (Salon): 1 space per 200 SF GFA, plus 1 space for each employee | 1,466 | 6 |  | 14 |
| 10181 | Pain Management Institute | Professional office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 2,200 |  |  | 11 |
| 10189 | Midwest Anti-aging | Professional office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 2,200 |  |  | 11 |
| 10197 | CEI Marketing Communications | Business office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,400 |  |  | 7 |
| 10201 | Association <br> Professional Counseling | Professional office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,400 |  |  | 7 |
| 10205 | Logiscial Claims Solutions | Business office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,400 |  |  | 7 |
| 10209 | ZPS Psychiatric Services | Professional office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1, |  |  | 7 |
| 10217 | Platt Counseling | Professional office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | ,400 | , |  | 7 |
| 10221 | Area Marketing \& Promotions | Business office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,40 |  |  | 7 |
| 10225 | Family Medicine | Health Clinic: 3 spaces per room plus 1 space for each employee | $1,400$ | 4 | 3 | 15 |
| 10229 | Chiropractic | Health $\mathrm{C}^{-} \quad .3$ spaces $\_$vam room 1 space for each. em. эe | $1,400$ | 2 | 4 | 14 |
| 10237 | Ameriprise Financial | Busint fice: 1 space per ; SF GFA | 2,250 |  |  | 12 |
| 10241 | Partners in Oral Surgery | Health Clinic. `aces pe ${ }^{r} \mathrm{dm}$ room plus 1 spa. employee | 2,250 | 7 | 4 | 19 |
| 10257 | Atlas Wealth Management | Business office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,450 |  |  | 8 |
| 10261 | Ameriprise Financial | Business office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,450 |  |  | 8 |
| 10265 | Synchronicity Event Marketing | Business office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,450 |  |  | 8 |
| 10269 | Lott Management, LLC | Business office: 1 space per 200 SF GFA | 1,450 |  |  | 8 |
| 10235 | OPA! | Full-Service restaurant: 1 space per 100 SF GFA plus 1 for each employee | 3,345 | 8 |  | 42 |
| 10211 | Former Simply <br> Smokin' (closed) | Full-Service restaurant: 1 space per 100 SF GFA plus 1 for each employee | 5,000 |  |  | 0 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  | 248 |






## MAYOR'S REPORT <br> OCTOBER 3, 2022

1. Register Online for Scary at the Prairie 5K Costume Run \& Spooky Sprint

Run, walk, creep or crawl in your favorite Halloween Costume through Prairie Park for the "Scary at the Prairie 5K and Spooky Sprint" event in downtown Frankfort on Saturday, October 22. The 100 Yard Dash ( 5 \& under) starts at 10:30 A.M.; 1 Mile Fun Run (10 \& under) starts at 10:40 AM; and 5K Run/Walk (all ages) starts at 11:00 A.M. Participants are encouraged to stay after the race and enjoy refreshments and entertainment at Breidert Green. Details and on-line registration are available on the Village website, www.frankfortil.org.

## 2. Village Branch Collection to End in Mid-October

The last scheduled day for Village provided branch pick-up service is October 10. NuWay Disposal will continue yard waste and branch pick-p th , in November. Bundles and yard waste bags must have a yard waste sticker affixed ther nick-up by Nu-Way.

The Village will provide seven free curbside leaf ccat ons this Leaves will be picked up once a week from October 17 through Novemher 28.
3. Country Market Continues Through Oct oer 2

The Frankfort Country Market continvs ever sundi , downtown Frankfort, from 9:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M. through October 20
4. "Trick or Treat" Hours
"Trick or Treat" hour or the Vilic are 4 १ P.M. to 7:00 P.M. on Monday, October 31.
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