



VILLAGE OF LAKE IN THE HILLS PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 19, 2008

Chairman Thomas Stock called the meeting of the Lake in the Hills Planning and Zoning Commission to order at 7:30 PM at the Village Hall.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Joe DeMay, Anna Siakel, Frank Covone, Chuck Rambo and Chairman Stock were present. Commissioners Brent Borkgren and Ira Stroud were absent.

Also in attendance were Director of Community Development Dan Olson, Development Coordinator Lynn Stevens and Recording Secretary Joyce Griggel.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Motion to approve the January 14, 2008 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting minutes was made by Commissioner Covone and a second by Commissioner Rambo. Motion unanimously approved by a sign of Aye.

Chairman Stock noted a change in the agenda. He stated that item "D" the Village Center Design Guidelines would be discussed before item "C" a Sketch Plan for Sunrise Senior Living.

NEW BUSINESS

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

A. Conditional Use for Planned Development, Rezoning, Plat of Resubdivision and Development Plan - Rakow Plaza (Wonder Industrial Lots 1, 2, 3)

Chairman Stock convened the public hearing at 7:32 PM. All Commissioners that answered the general roll call were present.

Chairman Stock swore in the petitioner, witnesses, objectors, and observers.

The proof of notification to the surrounding property owners was handed to the Recording Secretary. Mr. Olson added that the public hearing signs were updated with the proper hearing information.

Don Franz, Attorney for the property owner, commented on Lots 2 & 3. He explained that the landowner had a lease with Wonder Plastic Mold that expired December 15, 2007. There was a 90-day extension to March 15. The tenant refused to renew the lease unless there was an option to purchase within 7 years. The property owner agreed to the terms and therefore has limited control over Lots 2 & 3.

Mark Elmore, Architect with Mark Elmore Associates, noted that a couple of the minor variance requests had been eliminated. He mentioned that the decorative mason materials had been removed from the monument signs, and the signs now meet the ordinance. Parking in Lots 2 & 3 now meets the parking

requirement. They were still seeking a masonry waiver. He said that they were still asking for a variance for the parking setback. He commented that there was some miscommunication with the landscaping. There will be no berm.

Mr. Elmore recalled that the Commission wanted to see an overall design plan for Lots 1, 2 and 3. He noted AS2 & AS3 plans. He indicated that they tried several different schemes and each time came to the same solution (building orientation) on Lot 1. He indicated that AS3 was the end result. Chairman Stock was concerned with the development on Lots 2 & 3 looking at the rear of their building (on Lot 1). Commissioner Siakel had concerns with the building's orientation on Lot 1. She stated that it limits access to Lots 2 & 3. Mr. Elmore noted that per their annexation agreement there is a 10 foot setback along Rakow Road and then a 30 foot setback off of Jennings Drive. He commented that Lot 1 is not wide enough to turn the building (east/west) and provide parking in front of the building. Additionally, a building with deep retail spaces isn't useful. Chairman Stock had no issues with the proposed building orientation on Lot 1. He added that most traffic is stopped on Pyott Road, while the Rakow Road traffic is continually moving. Mr. Elmore noted that they placed windows on the north and south elevations. Commissioner Siakel questioned how the lots would be interconnected. Ms. Stevens noted that there was a sidewalk on the north end along Jennings Drive. Mr. Elmore added if necessary they could place a sidewalk along Rakow Road. Mr. Elmore added that a vehicle on Lot 1 would have to get back on Jennings Drive to access Lots 2 and 3. He stated that there was no need for another road parallel to Jennings because it just doesn't have a lot of traffic congestion. He commented that due to the size of the lot it doesn't allow for this. Commissioner DeMay suggested reducing the buildings size to 10,000 square feet to eliminate half of the required variance requests. Mr. Elmore replied that they could do that. He also suggested moving some of the parking spaces to the south end of the parking lot. Mr. Olson felt that would cause a problem because of the signage and County right of way.

Ms. Stevens remarked that at the last meeting she incorrectly stated that there would be a partial berm. She reiterated that there would be no berm due to the stormwater management, so a variance was required.

Mr. Elmore commented that he misspoke and that they did not have the authority to reduce the building's size.

Ms. Stevens noted that about 3% of the buildings façade was not masonry. She pointed out on the plan that the white areas were EIFS. The Commissioners felt that the buildings elevations looked nice.

Commissioner Siakel questioned if the columns in the buildings front elevation protruded. Mr. Elmore stated that the piers holding up the high roofs came out about 4 inches and their color was different. Commissioner Rambo wanted to see the rear building elevation dressed up some more. Mr. Elmore remarked that there was brick soldier course and canopies on the rear elevation. They also intended to paint the split face block to match the color of the brick.

Ms. Stevens mentioned that the building's square footage reduction would be 840 square feet due to the required parking. She asked the Commissioners to consider if AS2 or AS3 meets their satisfaction. She pointed out that the parking space requirements were not met and the building sizes would need to be reduced. Mr. Olson added that if the Commission did not approved one of the plans (AS2 or AS3) they could not be held to it.

Chairman Stock reviewed the Findings of Fact for a conditional use.

There was no audience participation.

A motion was made based upon the staff report and findings of fact, to recommend approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Planned Development for Lots 1, 2 and 3 of the First Amendment to Wonder Industrial Complex Subdivision subject to the following conditions and documents:

- 1) The planned development is to be developed per the following standards:

Lot 1:

Per the B-4 Commercial Business District standards with the following exceptions:

Section 18.6-2, Parking Setbacks, Yards Adjoining Streets and Section 26.6-1, Parking Lot Landscaping, Pavement setbacks required to permit parking spaces within the front yards adjoining Pyott Road as shown on the Site Plan (C-2);

Section 26.3 -2, Perimeter Landscaping, Front, corner, side and rear yards abutting a street to eliminate the berm requirements on Pyott and Rakow Roads;

Section 26.6-1, Parking Lot Landscaping, Pavement setbacks required to reduce the pavement setback required from 30 feet to a range between 29 feet and 5 feet for the front yard along Pyott Road as shown on the Site Plan (C-2).

Lots 2 and 3:

Per the M-1 Limited Manufacturing District standards with the following exceptions:

Section 9.4, Manufacturing Districts Bulk Chart to reduce the minimum side yard requirement from 20 feet to 10 feet for the southernmost 100 feet of the east yard;

Section 18.6-2, Parking Setbacks, Yards Adjoining Streets and Section 26.6-1, Parking Lot Landscaping, Pavement setbacks required to permit a handicap parking access aisle within the front yard adjoining Jennings Drive;

Section 26.6-1, Parking Lot Landscaping, Pavement setbacks required to reduce the pavement setback required from 30 feet to 25 feet for a portion of the front yard along Jennings Drive as shown on the Site Plan (C-2).

- 2) A Development plan consisting of the following documents is approved: Site Plan (C-2) dated 1/24/08 with the reduction in building size to 9,960 square feet and the removal of northern most 4 parking spaces on Lot 1 with additional landscaping to be in their place, Elevations dated 2/12/08, trash enclosure and monument sign details as shown on Floor Plan (A-1) dated 2/12/08, Landscape Plan dated 1/21/08, lighting details as shown on Site Electrical plan (E-1) dated 8/29/07 and RUUD Lighting specification sheets, and Photometric Plan dated 10/30/07, subject to the condition that all comments are addressed to staff's satisfaction prior to Village Board approval.

- 3) No building permit shall be issued on any lot within the planned development until after review and approval by the staff, Planning and Zoning Commission and Village Board of Trustees of a Development Plan consisting of a site plan, landscape plan, photometric plan, and exterior elevation plan for the project.
- 4) Existing non-conformities on Lots 2 and 3 shall not be permitted in any future development.
- 5) All comments are addressed to staff's satisfaction prior to Village Board approval.

was made by Commissioner Rambo. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Covone. Discussion on the motion included:

Commissioner Siakel stated that the rear of their building was very visible and requested that it be dressed up. Mr. Elmore replied that they could paint it to match the brick. Ms. Stevens pointed out that it was not brick. Commissioner Siakel would like it to be brick. Commissioner Rambo suggested adding piers in the back that mimic the ones on the front side of the building.

Commissioner Rambo amended his original motion to include the piers on the back side of the building. The revision was agreed upon by Commissioner Covone. On a roll call vote Commissioners DeMay, Siakel, Covone, Rambo and Chairman Tom Stock voted Aye. There were no Nays. Commissioners Borkgren and Stroud were absent. Motion approved 5-0.

Chairman Stock closed the public hearing at 8:17 PM.

Motion to recommend approval of the Final Plat for the First Amendment to Wonder Industrial Subdivision dated 1/24/08 subject to the condition that all comments are addressed to staff's satisfaction prior to Village Board approval was made by Commissioner Rambo and seconded by Commissioner Covone. On a roll call vote Commissioners DeMay, Siakel, Covone, Rambo and Chairman Tom Stock voted Aye. There were no Nays. Commissioners Borkgren and Stroud were absent. Motion approved 5-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

B. Text Amendments to the following Sections of the Lake in the Hills Zoning Ordinance: Section 7.5 Residential Bulk Chart, Sections 8, 9 and 10 – height and location of the outdoor storage of materials, equipment or vehicles; Section 11, Permitted and Conditional Use Chart; Section 13, Accessory Structures and Section 26, Landscape Standards

Chairman Stock convened the public hearing at 8:20 PM. All Commissioners that answered the general roll call were still present.

Chairman Stock swore in the petitioner, witnesses, objectors, and observers.

It was noted that the proof of certification for publication in a local newspaper was in the file.

Mr. Olson reviewed the proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance. He noted that in Section 7.5 the Residential Bulk Chart was being amended to clarify the height limit for Accessory Structures. A footnote is proposed to reference Section 13 "Accessory Structures".

Sections 8, 9 & 10 Outdoor Storage - adding provisions to restrict the storage of material or equipment within 10 feet of any interior lot line and not allowed within the front yard. He added that a height limit for outdoor storage is being recommended, so that it is not higher than the principal building. He stated that a 20 foot maximum height was being created, similar to maximum height for an accessory structure.

In Section 11, two new uses are proposed in the Permitted and Conditional Use Chart. A “Contractor’s Office and Storage Areas” that would be a permitted use in the B-4, M-1 and M-2 Districts and a conditional use in the AD2 District. “Juice Bars” would be permitted in the B-2, B-3, B-4, AD1 and AD2 Districts (same as Coffee Shops).

Section 13 Accessory Structures – clarifying Section 13.3-1 “Height Limitations” that it only applies to residential zoned properties.

Section 26 Landscape Standards – added an exemption for Village owned parks. The landscape standards are setup to screen items, which we don’t always want for parks. Mr. Olson noted that each park site goes through a review process and they are appropriately landscaped.

Commission Siakel thought that outdoor storage was not allowed. Mr. Olson stated that it was allowed and that there were a few restrictions on where it could be stored. Commission Siakel brought up stores like Home Depot, Sears or Lowe’s where there is outdoor storage. Mr. Olson commented that they could look at this in the future and suggested making it a conditional use. He added that temporary outdoor storage for a business like a gas station requires a permit. Chairman Stock questioned how this issue arose. Mr. Olson indicated that there were past issues with outdoor storage at different locations and no limitations currently exist.

Motion to recommend approval of the proposed text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance dated 1-08-08 was made by Commissioner Rambo and seconded by Commissioner Covone. On a roll call vote Commissioners DeMay, Siakel, Covone, Rambo and Chairman Tom Stock voted Aye. There were no Nays. Commissioners Borkgren and Stroud were absent. Motion approved 5-0.

Chairman Stock closed the public hearing.

D. Village Center Design Guidelines

Ms. Stevens conducted a power point presentation with the Commission.

The Commission felt that a pedestrian friendly development meant wide paths to walk upon, good lighting for safety, that architecture should be aesthetic pleasing, and there should be small outdoor gathering places. Ms. Stevens added that continuous store fronts without openings, visual interest & activities help create pedestrian traffic. She commented that a feeling of safety can be created with walks being separated from the street, easy of crossing and slower traffic speeds.

Row Vs. Clusters

Commission DeMay preferred cluster style developments and brought up the Downtown Disney area.

Commission Rambo indicated that he liked Woodstock Square. Commission Covone stated that he liked row type development. Commission Siakel commented that she favored cluster developments and noted Long Grove.

The Commission didn't want to get too specific. They wanted to leave details open for the developer. They all would like a central gathering area, with outdoor eating areas and a good mix to create interest.

The Commission felt that the different pictures of the "row" style developments were too tight, the buildings were too close to road, and that it gave too much of a historic/old town feel, which they did not envision for the Village. They would like unity with the architecture. Commissioners Siakel and Rambo felt that a maximum 2-story height limit should be put in place for the Village Center. Commissioner Siakel added that she prefers covered walkways. Commission Covone favored a central water feature and liked balconies.

Commission Rambo would like fewer streets and parking in back of buildings to create a more pedestrian friendly atmosphere. Commission Siakel and DeMay agreed.

Ms. Stevens noted that she would continue to work on the guidelines and present something in the near future.

PLAN REVIEW

C. Sketch Plan – Meadows Commercial Subdivision Lots 6 & 7 (Sunrise Senior Living)

Tim Hedges of TH Associates, remarked they are proposing an assisted living type of community with 80 suites in three buildings. The average suite size is 375 – 400 square feet. He remarked that the average resident is 85 years of age and they require some type of aid. They receive three meals a day, there are nurses on staff to assist with wellness plans. The buildings are designed inside to appear as a resident home. This type of development is considered to be a good transition from the commercial development on Algonquin Road to the Village Hall and school further north. He commented that the architecture of their buildings has varying roof lines and that outside there are landscaped walking paths and gathering places that visitors are encouraged to use. He mentioned that about 40% of the inside of the buildings would be common gathering areas. He stated that they build, design, own and operate their facilities. He informed the Commission that Sunrise Senior Living was founded 25 years ago and that they currently have 450 senior communities in the United States, Canada, Germany and UK. He mentioned that they don't generate a lot of traffic.

John Green with Groundwork added that they create a social environment. He commented the 15 foot grade difference led to a cluster style development. He noted that the site would have gathering places, gazebos, walking paths with small and large loops, varying architecture, no fences, and their small parking needs for staff and visitors. Their staff would be 25 to 30 people. He added that they are providing a commercial parcel on corner of Algonquin and Harvest Gate Roads. Chairman Stock questioned why they were providing the commercial parcel. Mr. Green indicated that it was requested by Staff. He also noted that 36,000 square foot wetland on the site.

Commissioner Rambo remarked that they had nicely designed buildings and that he was looking forward to it being constructed in the Village.

Commissioner Siakel didn't feel that this was the proper location for this type of development. She noted that there was a need in the Village, but not here. Commissioner DeMay agreed and questioned why they wanted to be located so close to commercial development. Mr. Green replied that they seek this type of location, near business, medical offices and government buildings. It helps create activities for the seniors.

Chairman Stock felt that this was the perfect setting for this development because of the school, Village Hall and some commercial. He questioned why a courtyard was not permitted. He added that he would like to see one. Ms. Stevens was not sure why the prohibition on courtyards exists and noted the code could be revised. Commissioner Rambo added that it was a good location and mix.

Commissioner DeMay remarked that once this parcel was developed it limits how the rest is pieced in and demises the size of the Village Center. He suggested removing this area from the Village Center. Mr. Olson remarked that he would prefer to leave it as part of the Village Center. Mr. Green indicated that they were willing to work with the Village to meet the goals of the Village Center area. Commissioner Siakel feels that this development will be perceived as private area that will be respected. Chairman Stock feels it would create a good residential and commercial mix. He pointed out the two areas would be separated by Harvest Gate road. Commissioner Covone added that it was a unique and great concept that could be made to blend.

Chairman Stock inquired on the different types of programs and level of care in each building. Mr. Green stated that each building is assisted living and that there was no critical care provided. He added that there were no doctors, just registered nurses on staff. He noted that each building had different activities.

It was noted that the closest facility was in Crystal Lake on Route 176.

Mr. Green noted that they had no concerns addressing staff comments in the email from Ms. Stevens. He also thought there were some interesting things they could do to make it feel more public.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Mr. Olson mentioned that a gateway project was being considered along Algonquin Road near Pyott Road. Staff and Trustee Mulcahy were in the beginning stages and are working with Planning Resources. He noted that a park site with a Veteran's Memorial was being considered.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None.

CALENDAR

Chairman Stock noted the March, 2008 meeting calendar.

TRUSTEE LIAISON REPORT

There was no Trustee Liaison Report.

Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Commissioner Rambo. It was seconded by Commissioner Siakel. Chairman Stock adjourned the meeting at 9:57 PM.

The next meeting of the Village of Lake in the Hills Planning and Zoning Commission will be Monday, March 17, 2008 at 7:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joyce Griggel

Recording Secretary