

**CITY OF MASCOUTAH
PLANNING COMMISSION
#3 WEST MAIN STREET
MASCOUTAH, IL 62258-2030**

January 17, 2024

The minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Mascoutah.

PUBLIC HEARING – 7:00 PM

PC 24-01 – DG Market – Site Plan and Architectural Review

Commission Chairman, Ken Zacharski, reported on the Planning Commission Hearing process.

The City Manager, Cody Hawkins, reviewed the staff report's requested action, background and staff comments, and variation requests on roof design and parking.

Hawkins continued, reporting that the variation request for parking spaces from 63 to 40. The applicant notes that the lot is too small to accommodate 63 parking spaces. The developer's 24 years of experience with Dollar General gave evidence to support the request in that the 40 spaces are well within range of their high-volume demands. The location is also surrounded by general commercial and with the emergence of online shopping, reduced parking is supported.

Commission member, Rich Thompson, asked if the evidence or study to support the parking variance came from Dollar General Corporate.

Hawkins stated that the supporting information was provided by the development firm that has designed and built most of the surrounding Dollar General structures in the Metro-east area. The study was not conducted by the city but from the experience of the development firm.

Commission member Karen Wobbe questioned the abutting partial listed on the zoning map image as RS-8.

Planning and Zoning Administrator, Tiffany Barrows confirmed that Brightly Senior Living Development is zoned RS-8.

Commission member Jim Connor stated that when the Brightly development began, stated that there is a state statute stating you cannot have that kind of facility on a general commercial lot, so it was rezoned to RS-8.

Commission member, Bill Millikin, stated that the truck space/required loading dock space takes up the parking.

Hawkins also stated that due to the orientation and placement of the building the development will also go before the Zoning Board of Appeals for the rear building setback of 15ft before the recommendation will go before the City Council. There was no other way to orientate the

building so that the front entrance will face Route 4. The building could be moved towards Route 4 by 5 ft. but that would negatively affect the driving aisle.

Wobbe asked if the current Dollar General would remain open.

David Elkan of Glenwood Equities stated that this project is a relocation plan. Expects the current store to close. The current, existing store is approximately 9,100 sf.

Thompson asked if the store will be managed locally.

Elkan stated that most Dollar Generals are managed locally.

Thompson continued and asked Elkan if the store would be authorized to contribute to local organizations and charities or would those decisions be dictated by the corporation elsewhere.

Elkan stated he believes that the district management or local management would be authorized to make such decisions.

Zacharski asked about the goods to be sold at this location.

Elkan responded, stating that it is a balance of what Dollar General carries, just more groceries such as fresh produce, milk, and freezer items.

Millikin asked if Glenwood Equities was the landowner and property manager.

Elkan confirmed that Glenwood Equities was the landowner, developer, store owner, and property manager. These projects are triple net developments.

Elkan expects that this development will begin approximately Fall 2024.

Thompson asked about staffing levels.

Bob Elkan of Glenwood Equities stated that the market stores have a larger staff due to the store size and traffic levels. He could not give the exact number of staff members. Normal staff level is approximately 3 people, 1-2 managers, and 2 other employees per shift.

David Elkan stated this would be similar to the Freeburg store.

Thompson asked why the design does not include a pitched roof.

Pat Boehler, of Westmore Group, explained the process of project design is based on the budget. The budget did not include a pitched roof. The cost to add the pitch roof could be provided but they would have to start over in the design process, including bid process.

Bob Elkan stated that the pitched roof would be designed if it is a requirement, but it could result in change of structure and all over design.

Hawkins continued with the staff report, reporting on lighting plan, access and traffic is compliant with code. He reported on the architectural review and design standards. He reviewed the code standards and that it is up to the planning commission to make a recommendation for the roof variance. He also reported that there are many one-story commercial buildings in town with a flat roof design. It is an architectural standard so must be reviewed and recommended by the planning commission.

Millikin pointed out the brick façade design and how it exceeds the code in that aspect. He believes that the design is much more attractive and includes a parapet so the roof would not appear to be completely flat in the front of the building. The parapet would hide the appearance of the flat roof.

Hawkins stated that he believes the reason for the architectural standard is to mirror the surrounding structures. He stated that there are surrounding commercial structures such as McDonalds, O'Reily's, they have flat roofs.

Wobbe asked if the standard should be changed.

Hawkins stated the code standard is circumstantial, case by case because once such a variance is granted can be hard to deny the same standard request in the same area. That is why a variance comes before the planning commission to have this hearing and base recommendation on individual project needs. He continued, stating that granting a variance does not mean changing the code.

Zacharski stated that the commission should be following the code.

Millikin stated that the developer is trying to stay within a budget, and they have already upgraded the exterior, changing the roof will most likely result in adjusting the exterior or the design, reduce quality somewhere else.

Thompson stated that fact is an assumption. He is not willing to make that assumption for them and the commission should ensure any development that comes to this community follows the code.

Hawkins stated that the commission can construct the recommendation to council however they would like it to be.

Zacharski pointed out that the recommendation to council does not mean the council will follow the recommendations of the planning commission.

Millikin stated that if the planning commission denies the variance request, it could result in a structure that is steel on three sides which is approvable. He asked if the commission denies the flat roof, can it be required to keep the proposed design with all around brick facade.

Thompson stated that Millikin makes a good argument, but the commission should follow the code or change it.

Tiffany Barrows stated that Brightly has not reached out to the city.

Hawkins stated that Kunkle, the developer of Brightly, knew that the abutting lots to Brightly, were commercial lots and would eventually be developed.

Barrows also stated that she has not received any comments from those within the buffer zone.

Residents stated that they received a public notice for the Dollar Tree but nothing for the DG Market.

Barrows stated that there were two separate public notices sent out at the same time for the two separate projects within two separate buffer zones. If the residents did not receive the DG Market notice, they must not have been within that buffer zone. There were only 8 parcel owners listed on the St. Clair County provided buffer report for DG Market project.

Barrows continued stated the Dollar Tree Site Plan was postponed.

Wobbe stated that during the Brightly development, a turning lane off of Route 4 was discussed and agreed that one would be put in.

Hawkins stated that a turn lane off Route 4 would be determined by IDOT.

Wobbe questioned how the turn lane does not get constructed when there is going to be more traffic. She asked where the disconnect was and stated there are a lot of accidents in that area already.

Hawkins responded, stating that it is based on traffic volume. The second commercial lot development may result in that expected traffic volume to change.

Connor stated that the turn lane was discussed a lot when the Brightly development was in the planning stage. He does not recall that it was determined that there was going to be a turn lane out in.

Hawkins stated that there is a lot happening on Route 4 where Mascoutah will see a lot of improvements to Route 4. There is a lot of commercial activity happening in the city, more activity than he has ever seen.

Zacharski stated that IDOT recently approved an entrance across from the subdivision without a turn lane.

More discussion on the turn lane and IDOT among the commission members.

Millikin asked if Onyx drive can accommodate the DG Market entrance and traffic.

Hawkins stated that Onyx drive will be expanded when the north lot develops.

Millikin asked if the street is wide since it is not a feeder street and consider a driveway for Brightly.

Resident, McKenzie Sirtak, stated that the street is a two-lane street, not half of a street.

Discussion of Onyx Drive among the commission members.

Sal Elkott, the city engineer, stated that the aerial view shows that Onyx Drive is as wide as the Onyx Drive on the east side of Route 4.

David Elkan and Pat Boehler confirmed the materials that will be used is masonry but is not full brick.

Commission discussed buffer along rear, side, and front.

Rear setback will be addressed at the January 24th Zoning Board of Appeals Hearing.

David Elkan also confirmed there will be a sprinkler system installed for the landscaping.

Thompson asked if there is any consideration to use vinyl instead of wood. He believes the wood will be a maintenance issue.

David Elkan stated that they planned to use the same fence materials as other projects. The material is good quality, pretreated, and held up for years. The proposed fence meets the city's requirements.

Pat Boehler stated that they can install vinyl fencing.

Barrows was asked to put the Freeburg location on the tv screens to show the commission.

Discussion of elevations and design among the commission members.

Discussion of updating the design code among the commission members.

Dan Kelly, resident of Prairieview Estates, stated that the residents of their subdivision were led to believe that the developer would put in a natural barrier around the subdivision to block it off from Route 4. The natural barrier was never put in. He continued, stating that when Brightly was developed, the residents were led to believe the same thing. That also did not happen. He stated that if this commercial property is developed the lights will shine inside of their properties like the Brightly development does. He asks that this development be required to put in a natural barrier on the subdivision berm to divide the commercial properties from the subdivision.

Pat Boehler stated that the DG Market lighting design will not bleed from its parcel. There is also a shield on the lights, and they can be dimmed if necessary. On the residential side of the project, there will be a privacy fence installed.

Dan Kelly stated that there is light that comes into his house now, through the back windows.

Sal Elkott commented, stating that photometrics are the most effective way to deter lighting and protecting the residents from light bleeding onto their properties. The city will review the photometrics and will have the development adjust the shielding. Photometric adjustments are more effective than berms.

Barrows referenced Sec. 34-9-18, to the commission which is the lighting requirements found in the code.

Dan Kelly stated that the natural barrier was not put in and now he has a clear view of Brightly from his backyard.

Hawkins stated that he would research the Brightly Development Agreement to see what the specifics were. He stated that it is possible that Brightly, being zoned residential, might not require a buffer zone but he is going to investigate it to see if something was missed. He is also going to investigate the landscape barrier for Route 4. He stated that if it is on the plans, it should be followed.

Dan Kelly stated that the residents have put in their own landscape buffer, but trees were cut down for the new electric line. He said that he would appreciate the city to do something about it.

Jessica Silvia, resident attending virtually, stated that Brightly has a special use permit to be zoned residential. That is why there was supposed to be a barrier put in. She also stated that a 6ft. privacy fence will not block lighting. She stated that the city and its boards do not follow or enforce the code and ordinances. She questions why the city would want another building developed that already exists across the street. She stated that the development is going to negatively affect the residential lots like the current Dollar General does. She also stated that there are a lot of wrecks there. She believes that Mascoutah needs to look at the benefit and the costs because we don't have the infrastructure to support these developments. She continued and stated there isn't a safe walking path or turn lane in that area. She stated she can see the current Dollar General lights can be seen by Jung Trucking and so she believes that the new Dollar General will shine in the subdivision lots as well as in the Brightly residents' windows.

Pat Boehler stated that the lighting for this Dollar General does have proper shields that can be adjusted, and it is in writing. She cannot speak on what is installed at the other Dollar General.

Dan Kelly requests that someone install natural barriers such as trees and shrubs.

Wobbe stated that when the BBQ place was approved it was required to have barrier.

Pat Boehler discussed Brightly lot and the orientation of their lot and the subdivision.

Dan Kelly asks that the city enforce the lighting requirements.

Thompson asked if they had enough room on their lots to plant their own trees.

Kelly stated they do but then it would be at their own expense which he believes they should not have to because the residents were led to believe that the developers were responsible for planting trees and bushes for the natural barrier. He said that the subdivision infrastructure was not built to code, so the barrier was cut from the developer's budget to fix all the infrastructure that had to be repaired or replaced. The builder was not held accountable before the project was signed off on and accepted. He reported that when Brightly was developed, it was promised again but there was no follow through before it was signed off on and accepted by the city.

Zacharski pointed out that this project has nothing to do with the commercial lot that is along the subdivision so there isn't anything the commission can do.

Kelly stated that there is going to be an additional line of sight.

Thompson stated that the city manager is going to look into this matter to enforce what was on the plans and agreements.

There was no further discussion.

PUBLIC HEARING – 8:18 PM

PUBLIC HEARING ADJOURNED at 8:18 PM

CALL TO ORDER at 8:19 PM

Chairman Ken Zacharski called the meeting to order.

PRESENT

Commission members Jack Klopmeier, Jim Connor, Bill Millikin, Rich Thompson, Karen Wobbe, and Chairman Ken Zacharski were present.

ABSENT – Bruce Jung.

ALSO PRESENT

City Manager Cody Hawkins, Planning and Zoning Administrator Tiffany Barrows, City Engineer Sal Elkott, David Elkan with Glenwood Equities. Present virtual is Bob Elkan with Glenwood Equities and Pat Boehler with Westmore Group.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A QUORUM

A quorum of Planning Commission members was present.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT

AMEND AGENDA – NONE

MINUTES FROM December 20, 2023

Wobbe moved, seconded by Connor to approve the minutes from the December 20, 2023, Planning Commission Meeting.

THE MOTION BY ROLL CALL

Jack Klopmeier aye, Jim Connor aye, Bill Millikin aye, Rich Thompson aye, Karen Wobbe aye, and Chairman Ken Zacharski aye.

6-ayes, 0-nays, 1-absent

PC 24-01 – DG Market – Site Plan and Architectural Review

Discussion was held during the Public Hearing process. Please see the Public Hearing section of these minutes for details.

MOTION:

Wobbe moved, seconded by Millikin, that the Planning Commission recommends approval to the City Council of the Site Plan and Architectural Elevations for a proposed Dollar General Market, located at 845 North Jefferson Street (also identified as parcel 10290303026), with approval of the (2) variances which will allow a flat roof with parapet on one-story building and reduced parking from 63 spaces to 40 spaces.

THE MOTION BY ROLL CALL

Jack Klopmeier aye, Jim Connor aye, Bill Millikin aye, Rich Thompson nay, Karen Wobbe aye, and Chairman Ken Zacharski aye.

5-ayes, 1-nays, 1-absent

MISCELLANEOUS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Wobbe moved, seconded by Millikin to adjourn at 8:22 p.m. All were in favor.

Tiffany M Barrows, Planning and Zoning Administrator