

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
VILLAGE OF ADDISON  
FEBRUARY 9, 2022

The Planning & Zoning Commission meeting of the February 9, 2022 meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Fotopoulos.

Present: Ariano, Cargill, Fotopoulos, McComb (7:09), Schmitt and Turk (7:05)  
Absent: Kamide  
Also Present: Jennifer Henaghan, Village of Addison and Village Attorney Freeman

PUBLIC HEARING

**I. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL**

**II. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 12, 2022 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING**

Mr. Cargill made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 12, 2022 meeting, seconded by Mr. Schmitt. Chair Fotopoulos asked if there was any discussion. There was none. Roll call was taken.

Motion passed unanimously.

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. **File #PZ-22-02**, consideration of approval of an annexation agreement, annexation and a plat of resubdivision with variations. The property is located at 4N380 Maple Avenue, Addison, IL.

P.I.N.: 03-22-302-010, -011

Petitioner: Maxime Konan

This file was advertised in the December 27, 2021 issue of the Daily Herald Newspaper.

Mr. Cargill made a motion to open File #PZ-22-02, seconded by Mr. Schmitt. Roll call was taken.

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Schmitt made a motion to table File #PZ-22-02 until the March 9, 2022 Planning and Zoning Meeting, seconded by Mr. Ariano. Chair Fotopoulos asked if there was any discussion... There was none. Roll call was taken.

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Ariano made a motion to close File #PZ-22-02, seconded by Mr. Schmitt. Roll call was taken.

Motion passed unanimously.

2. **File #PZ-22-03**, consideration of approval of the following variations within the B2 Community Business District: a variation to increase the maximum driveway width to 40 feet; a variation to increase the maximum curb return to 40 feet; a variation to allow zero curb with bollards adjacent to the front and sides of the building; and a variation to reduce the required separation between above-ground detention and the property line to 0 feet. The property is located at 415 N. Swift Road, Addison, IL.

P.I.N.: 02-24-400-041

Petitioner: Quik Trip

This file was advertised in the December 27, 2021 issue of the Daily Herald Newspaper.

Mr. Cargill made a motion to open File #PZ-22-03, seconded by Mr. Schmitt. Roll call was taken.

Motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Jennifer Henaghan, Village of Addison stated the petitioner is requesting variations to allow for 40 foot wide driveways and curb returns and also to allow a zero curb with bollards around the convenient store building. If you looked at the packet from last month, there was a fourth variation for detention but they since have revised their plans so that a detention variation is no longer necessary. It is just the three that are in tonight's staff report. This is for the Quik Trip that was for the site plan which was approved back in 2021. With the driveways the Code allows a 35 foot wide driveway and they are looking to increase that to 40 feet wide as well as the curb return to 40 feet because this driveway will be accommodating both cars and trucks and they want to allow some additional width for safety purposes. The other variation for zero curb, that one is a variation to requirement for a 6-inch barrier curb surrounding parking lots. Quik Trip wishes to have a flat entrance from the parking spaces to the building for better accessibility and for safety they want to surround the building with bollards to prevent vehicles from driving into it. Staff does not support this variation request because the proposed bollards would create a visual barrier surrounding the store and they also won't channel run-off in the same way that a curb would. Staff is recommending approval of the driveway and curb return variations but not the variations for the curbing around the building.

Mr. Andrew Smith, Quik Trip, the petitioner was present and sworn in. Mr. Smith showed a power point presentation. Mr. Smith said we are foregoing the fourth variation for the detention. We figured on how to get everything underground. Mr. Smith said we are asking for driveway width and curb return have the same justification. It is just to allow adequate room for both cars and trucks to access the drive. This being the center drive is the reason for the request. We will sign it so that the trucks enter at the northern most drive on Swift but there will still be on occasions that they will come in and we want to make sure that we don't create an unsafe situation. The best way to do it is to allow for an additional 5 feet. If they do cut the corner a little tight they will drive through our landscaping a bit without the variation and we just want to make sure their landscaping looks like first class condition at all times. It just takes one or two trucks to create ruts and then we have to re-sod. We are happy to maintain our facilities in the best conditions as possible but in the meantime until it gets replaced it will look kind of bad. I don't really see where this one would have effect on any neighboring businesses or properties. It is very much specific to us and the use that is allowed at this location. It will be a benefit to public welfare since it will create a safer situation overall. Mr. Smith showed the exhibit on the overhead. Mr. Smith said the center drive is what they are asking for the variation. As far as the bollards go, this is a safety concern for us.

We do want to completely eliminate the risk of a vehicle, someone thinking that they are in reverse when really in drive and the tap the gas and go up on the curb. We want to completely eliminate that, additionally in winter markets where we do have snow, snow can get packed into the corner of the curb and create a bit of ramp and that is why we like to go with the bollards. They are only 4 feet tall but they also go 4 feet below the surface and they are filled with concrete and completely sturdy. They are painted the same color as the brick on the building. They are 5 feet apart so that a car can't get in between them, but they are wide enough that a wheelchair or stroller can make it in between. In the staff report were basically just the visual side of it an also the drainage. Our site is actually graded so that water drains away from the store, so there really isn't an opportunity for it to act as drainage channel because it would be flowing away, so there is no actual drainage benefit to having a raised curb. If there are concerns with the aesthetics a few things can be done to dress it up a bit.

Chair Fotopoulos asked if the Plan Commission had any questions. Mr. Cargill commented that he would like to make that opening bigger and that he likes the zero curb. Chair Fotopoulos asked Ms. Henaghan what the Fire Department feels about this. Ms. Henaghan said they had no concerns. Mr. Schmitt asked if Staff's only issue is the drainage. Ms. Henaghan said yes and there were also some concerns with appearance. Mr. Schmitt asked if there is any requirements for landscape around the building. Ms. Henaghan said the Village has no building foundation landscaping requirements. Mr. Smith said he believes there are some islands around the corners of the buildings. Mr. Schmitt said how does one person detect the direction going into traffic into vehicle areas. Mr. Smith said there is stamped concrete around that has a variation in it. Mr. Schmitt said he feels it would look better without the bollards.

Chair Fotopoulos asked for positive and negative testimony. There was none.

Chair Fotopoulos asked if the audience had any questions. There were none.

Mr. Schmitt made a motion to close File #PZ-22-03, seconded by Mr. Ariano. Roll call was taken.

Motion passed unanimously.

Consideration of File #PZ-22-03 as described above.

Mr. Schmitt made a motion for approval of File PZ-22-03 to approve Items 1 and 2 to increase the width of the curbs but I would recommend a negative for Item 3 for the zero curb around the building with the bollards. Mr. Cargill asked why would amend that to just Item 1 and 2 and then we will take about Item 3.

Mr. Schmitt made a motion for approval of File #PZ-22-03 to approve Items 1 and 2 with the increase in the maximum driveway width, seconded by Mr. Cargill. Chair Fotopoulos asked if there was any discussion. There was none. Roll call was taken.

Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Fotopoulos asked for a motion on Item 3, which is curb or no curb. Mr. Schmitt said he doesn't feel it is very attractive and don't like the separation of the curb. Mr. Ariano said can't we do a couple of bollards in the front. Mr. Smith said what if we broke it up and did a combination of bollards and like raised planter boxes. Mr. Cargill said his thoughts are only for the safety but why does the company want the bollards. Mr. Smith said they are safer and it eliminates the risk of somebody tripping. We have company wide roughly 60 to 80 incidents of someone tripping on their curbs and we only have it at about half of our stores and most of those are people leaving and stepping off the curb and

not seeing it versus the bollard it doesn't present that same risk. Mr. Turk what is the attraction to no curb. Mr. Smith said it's just safety because the curb does create a trip hazard for customers but either entering or existing the store versus the bollards would just be a flat surface with the bollards to stop cars.

Mr. Cargill made a motion for a variation for the zero curb and the bollards being lit adjacent to the front of the building and not the side, Chair Fotopoulos said Mr. Cargill's motion is to leave it as stands with the approval but make sure that they are lit, seconded by Mr. Schmitt. Chair Fotopoulos asked if there was any discussion. Mr. McComb said I he doesn't have a concern with the zero curb but Staff did recommend about the run-off, is that a concern. Ms. Henaghan said the run-off is what part of the general reasons for requiring curbs in the first place. The petitioner has stated though the site is sloped in such a way to direct run-off away from the building and it would not be an issue in this particular case. Roll call was taken. Mr. Schmitt and Mr. Turk voted no.

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Schmitt made a motion to close the file, seconded by Mr. McComb. Roll call was taken.

Motion passed unanimously.

#### IV. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

#### V. OTHER BUSINESS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN

None

#### VI. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Schmitt made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m., seconded by Mr. McComb.

Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Georgianne Jakubowski

