

# PLAN COMMISSION

*September 17, 2018*

**7:00 PM**

## MINUTES

Approved: 

### I. ROLL CALL:

	<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
V. Armouti	E. Fultz, Staff	D. Hummel
M. Brandmeyer	C. Porter, Staff	
G. Coffey	L. Schneck, Staff	
D. Gerber	S. Harrell, Edw. Intelligencer	
J. McDole	D. Oates, Oates Associates	
J. Mullane	C. Schneider, Korte Design	
M. Pierceall	K. Shepard, Oates Associates	
M. Rabe	E. Eck, Anderson Hospital	
B. Schlueter	J. Stack, Alderman Ward 3	
E. Williams, Staff	K. Page, Anderson Hospital	

### II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes of the regular meeting for August 20, 2018 are hereby approved.

MOTION: Brandmeyer. SECONDED: Mullane.

### III. LAND USE CASES

A. Case 2018-29: Edwardsville Marketplace  
 Preliminary Plat  
 Developer: SM Properties  
 Engineer: Oates Associates

Emily Fultz gave a brief report of the proposed project. The property is located at the intersection of Governors Parkway and Troy Road. The developer is proposing to divide the site to create 2 additional lots (Lot C and Lot D) which are currently used for stormwater detention purpose. To create these two developable lots, they have adjusted lot lines to accommodate street frontage along Troy Road. A utility map was displayed of utilities within the area.

The property is currently zoned B-2 Commercial Business. The entire site is comprised of just over 18 acres. The Comprehensive Plan calls for this area to be a commercial use. The proposed development is within the Comprehensive Plan.

The developer is asking for a variance for required sidewalks. The subdivision code requires sidewalks be placed along the street frontage for both Lots C and D (the newly created lots).

The current lots were originally platted for stormwater detention. It will now be platted somewhere else within the development. That will require a stormwater plan approved and installed prior to Final Plat approval of the subdivision.

David Oates, Oates Associates, spoke on behalf of the proposed development. A drainage report has been submitted to the City which shows how underground detention can be used and will meet the needs for surface stormwater. Each lot is currently a drainage easement. With this plat, they will be vacating part of the existing easement which will not be used anymore because of the underground detention so the rest of the lot can be developed. There are no public improvements that will be built for this plat.

A sidewalk variance has been requested. The concern is if sidewalks are put in for these two lots, there would be two short unconnected pieces of sidewalk which would lead to nowhere. They would also have to be installed in IDOT right of way. IDOT will not allow sidewalk for only two lots without being connected and if installed, it would have to cross a signalized intersection.

Veronica Armouti asked for staff's recommendation before they went any further. Emily Fultz stated staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Plat with the variance for sidewalks as stated in the staff report. She also pointed out that any sidewalks installed now would be less of a burden on the taxpayers if it would be retrofitted at any time in the future.

Mark Rabe stated the ground water would be addressed elsewhere on the property. At the Land Use Committee meeting it was discussed that the underground capacity would not be less than what the current capacity is. Mr. Oates stated the study shows the flow from the underground detention would be the same as the flow out from the existing detention area.

John McDole asked if the underground detention would be under Lots C and D. Mr. Oates explained how the underground detention is installed to hold water.

Mark Rabe wanted clarification that the owners of Lots A, B, C, and D are not the same owners as Lots 1, 2, and 3. So if there was going to be a continuous sidewalk that would further complicate things since they are not the same property owners. Mr. Oates agreed.

Beth Schlueter asked if the City Engineer has looked at the drainage plans and is comfortable with what is proposed. Emily Fultz agreed and stated it will need to be completed prior to Final Plat approval.

Beth Schlueter asked what the reason was for the proposed lots. David Oates stated the value of land keeps going up and the installation of underground detention is very cost effective.

Beth Schlueter asked if the City had any future plans of sidewalks in this area.

Emily Fultz stated the Comprehensive Plan calls for sidewalks within commercial areas. With that being said, there are no plans for sidewalks within the next couple of years.

John McDole added the property across the street will have development someday. The City could wait and see what type of development goes there and the walkability and bike ability for that development. At that time, it would be determined what would be appropriate for that stretch of roadway.

Veronica Armouti stated this has unusual circumstances. The rest of the lots within the development have already been developed. She understands it is important to keep with the Comprehensive Plan but agrees with Mr. McDole.

MOTION: Piercall. Make a motion to approve the plan as presented by staff including the sidewalk variance. SECONDED: Rabe.

Beth Schlueter asked that the variance be voted on separately.

Discussion among the board if they should be voted on separately.

Mike Pierceall withdrew his motion.

MOTION: Rabe. Move to approve the variance regarding the sidewalk as requested by developer and recommended by staff. SECONDED: McDole.

VOICE ROLL CALL:

7 Ayes: Armouti, Brandmeyer, Coffey, Gerber, McDole, Pierceall, Rabe

1 Nays: Schlueter

1 Abstains: Mullane

SECOND MOTION: Pierceall. Motion that the plat as presented be approved. SECONDED: Coffey.

VOICE ROLL CALL:

7 Ayes: Armouti, Brandmeyer, Coffey, Gerber, McDole, Pierceall, Rabe

1 Nays: Schlueter

1 Abstains: Mullane

#### IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Case 2018-31: Anderson Goshen Campus  
 PUD – Development Plan  
 Developer: The Korte Company  
 Engineer: Oates Associates

Emily Fultz gave a brief description of the proposed development. Utilities will be extended through the site as part of the development. The site consists of approximately 10 acres with three separate parcels. This area is identified as part of the I-55 plan area and designated as the Town Center district. The plans submitted meet most of the code requirements within this district. They are requesting a few variances which are highlighted in the staff's report. The variances will be discussed later in the meeting. The variances are necessary because this is a medical campus which requires different codes than what is outlined within the office guidelines when this plan was created.

Kevin Sheppard, Oates Associates, spoke on behalf of the development. Mr. Sheppard explained drainage currently runs across the site. Their intent is to bypass the detention basin and run it off where it currently runs off the site. That water ends up going into a larger drainage ditch and is picked up near the corner of Goshen Road and District Drive. That water does not have to be detained since it is runoff from the fields, not this site. In the future, whomever develops to the east of the site will have to provide proper detention.

This is a four phase development. The first phase will consist of the entrance at the south and across from the YMCA and the building on the southwest corner of the tract along with parking. They will extend the utilities through the middle of the site. Each phase of development will extend the utilities further. To the north of the site, there is a proposed road which will connect District Drive to Gusewelle Lane. Goshen Road is planned to be widened where they plan to connect to the south. There will be walkways around the detention pond and entire site. Also planned is bicycle parking near each building. Phase 2 will consist of the building on the southeast side of the tract with the necessary parking. Phase 3 will be the northeast corner with appropriate parking and the last phase will be the northwest corner.

Since this development is a medical facility, they have encouraged walkability throughout the development. These facilities will be for outpatient procedures so they don't anticipate any overnight patient stays.

Phase one will provide 87 parking spaces but are required to have 92 spaces. This would be a 6% reduction. Phase 1B, the future addition, would require approximately 13 more parking spaces. Phase two requires 200 parking spaces. They will be providing 179 spaces which is a

10% reduction. In phase three, they will be providing three more spaces than needed. After the completion of all four phases, they will be providing 441 parking spaces. The required spaces would be 490 spaces. The total square footage for the entire development will be 97,831. A parking analysis was done with surrounding communities on both sides of the river with similar types of facilities. While the ordinances vary, on average it is about four parking spaces per 1000 square feet is required. They fit within those requirements and are providing a little more than that. They are requesting right at a 10% parking variance.

Chris Schneider, with Korte Design, was present to speak on behalf of the petition. He wanted to point out that each phase is at or under the requested 10% parking space reduction.

Mr. Sheppard stated the exterior lighting plan will be submitted with the improvement plans. Each phase will contain a screened dumpster. He displayed a site plan showing the walkable areas around the development along with bicycle parking. Also presented were site plans with traffic circulation and utilities throughout the development. They are well above the ordinance requirements for greenspace.

Chris Schneider pointed out there is a large amount of unoccupied space within each building which is included in the square footage for the parking requirements. He feels this should be considered when deciding on the parking variance.

Mr. Sheppard displayed a diagram which points out areas where the easements will be located.

Mr. Schneider stated there were some comments from the City's staff which he would like to address. Staff asked about signage. A monument sign will be located at the entrance. Examples of the typical wall signs were displayed for each building. All signs will fall within the code requirements by the City. They also supplied a schematic of the landscape plan based on the points system. It too will meet code requirement.

Exterior rendering of the buildings were displayed. An explanation of the types of materials being used for the building were discussed. The following list are items that will not be met according to the I-55 Corridor Plan.

1. Glazing Requirement. Transparent windows must cover at least 40% of the wall area on the ground floor and at least 15% for each floor above the ground level. The percentage of glazing as required by the I-55 Corridor Code would be very difficult to meet with patient privacy. There is only a small percentage of space which needs natural light and glazing which would be the public spaces such as waiting rooms and hallways.
2. Screen Wall Height. One is for the 36-inch high screen wall parking. They would like to increase the height in certain areas for screening of dumpsters. They would prefer to have it at six feet. In phase one, there will be an exterior oxygen tank and emergency generator which will also need to be screened from view as well.
3. Ceiling and Structure Height. The building story height is required to be between 12-18 feet in height. Based on their needs, they will not need ceilings to be any higher than 9 feet.
4. Lot Width, Building Widths & Coverage by Building. There is also a requirement for the buildings to be between 80 feet and 100 feet in width. Their buildings will exceed that requirement. They will be seeking a variance from that requirement.
5. Frontage Requirements. A requirement for shading or a canopy over the main entrance of the building to extend to the sidewalk. This requirement cannot be met because of the patient privacy act and also because of the easement location. They will provide some type of shading by means of trees.
6. Building Heights. All buildings are also required to be two to four stories with a minimum height of twenty-four feet. Based on the developer's needs and the function of the building and MEP requirements, the buildings will remain one-story buildings in Phases 1, 2, and 4. Phase 3 will be a two-story building.

7. Building Footprint. A minimum of 10,000 square foot is required. Building 4 will be only 7,500 square foot. If they would add more square footage to the building, the more parking they would be required to provide. Unfortunately, this site is at its maximum capacity.

Matt Brandmeyer pointed out this area is a PUD and the items just discussed are not variances. It does not meet the standards for Town Center but with the PUD it can be requested for the flexibility.

John Mullane stated he was comfortable with the 10% parking reduction. He wanted to make sure that because of the use the buildings, the handicapped parking is adequate. Chris Schneider stated it met code requirements. Patients usually get dropped off by a family member. There is an area which they can get out of the vehicle safely.

John McDole asked if the sidewalk bordering Goshen Road is a shared use path. Kevin Sheppard agreed it will be a 8-foot wide walkway. It is a continuation of the walkway that is currently on Goshen Road.

Mike Pierceall asked for clarification if the retention basin will be sized to accommodate the entire site once constructed. Kevin Sheppard agreed. Pierceall asked if a traffic study was completed and if it warranted a traffic signal. Kevin Sheppard stated until District Drive is extended to the South, there is no need for a traffic signal there or into their development. It may be required in the future but not now.

Veronica Armouti asked how deep the retention pond will be. Kevin Sheppard stated it would be between 8 and 9 feet deep with rock (rip rap) around the edge of it and a walking path around it. She is concerned with kids because the elementary and middle schools are nearby. In the winter time it may freeze over with a thin layer of ice to attract the children.

Veronica Armouti asked if there would be medical waste put into the dumpsters onsite. If so, would they be locked? John Mullane stated removal would be handled by a specialized waste hauling for those items.

Veronica asked if the improvement to Goshen Road going to be done by the developer or the City. Kevin Sheppard stated the City will be doing improvements to Goshen Road. It is a separate project from this development but will be done at the same time.

Mark Rabe asked when the East / West road will be developed. Kevin Sheppard stated it will be up to the City and when they acquire the needed right-of-way. Greg Coffey asked if that would be done at the time as the improvement to Goshen Road. Kevin Sheppard replied the City is working on the coordination of these projects.

Emily Fultz stated staff recommends approval of the development as presented.

No one present in the audience to speak regarding this development.

MOTION: Pierceall. Motion to approve the development plan as presented and recommended by staff for the Anderson Goshen Campus PUD. SECONDED: Mullane.

VOICE ROLL CALL:

8 Ayes: Armouti, Brandmeyer, Gerber, McDole, Pierceall, Rabe, Schlueter

0 Nays:

1 Abstains: Coffey

## V. OLD BUSINESS

None.

## VI. NEW BUSINESS

None.

**VII. NEXT MEETING**

**Monday, October 19, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in City Council Chambers, 118 Hillsboro Ave.**

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**