



**CRYSTAL LAKE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2011
HELD AT THE CRYSTAL LAKE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman Greenman at 7:30 p.m. On roll call, members Esposito, Gavle, Goss, Jouron, Lembke, Skluzacek, and Greenman were present. Members Batastini and Hayden were absent.

Michelle Rentzsch, Director of Planning and Economic Development, Latika Bhide and Elizabeth Maxwell, both Planners, were present from Staff.

Mr. Greenman stated that this meeting is being televised now as well as being recorded for future playback on the City's cable station.

APPROVE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 5, 2011 PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

Mr. Jouron moved to approve the minutes from the January 5, 2011 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as presented. Mr. Goss seconded the motion. On roll call, all members present voted aye. Motion passed.

2011-06 SENIOR RESIDENCES – 345-375 Station Drive – PUBLIC HEARING

Final PUD Amendment, Plat of Resubdivision, variation for senior apartments.

Mr. Greenman stated that the sign has been posted. He said the surrounding property owners have been notified and the Certificate of Publication is in the file. Mr. Greenman waived the reading of the legal notice without objection.

Kyle Peterson, Vice President of Development for Banner Apartments was present to represent the petition. Mr. Peterson said he is from McHenry County – Richmond – and has been searching for property in McHenry County for a senior residence development. He showed a Power Point presentation of the project. They are currently constructing two similar projects, one south of Gurnee and one next to the United Center. Mr. Peterson showed an aerial photo of the site and stated this is an excellent location because of the close proximity to the train station, medical assistance, and shopping. They have revised their plan which originally offered 3-bedroom apartments. They will be offering 63 – 1-bedroom apartments at 650 square feet with rent at \$700 per month and 16 – 2-bedroom apartments at 950 square feet with a rent of \$900 per month. This facility will have many amenities such as a community room, computer stations, fitness center, salon, screened porch with attached patio, walking paths, and a garden. Mr. Peterson said the services that will be offered at this facility will be determined by a resident council. They could include game nights and tax preparation assistance which would be coordinated by

the on-site staff. They will also be coordinating with the Park District, Senior Services, and Algonquin Township which have senior programs in place.

Mr. Peterson said they are requesting a PUD Amendment and Variation to allow the building height to be 38 feet which is comparable with the surrounding buildings. The proposed use is less intense, generating less traffic and impervious surface than the originally approved office buildings. Mr. Peterson said the density proposed, 18.84 units/acre, is similar to Sunrise at 19.3 units/acre and Bickford Cottage at 17.9 units/acre. Also this use meets several objectives listed in the Comprehensive Plan regarding mixed use being close to public transportation and encouraging a variety of housing in the community.

Mr. Peterson said staff had a few minor conditions regarding the site plan including widening the drive aisle and adding a grass paved path to the rear of the building for better access for emergency vehicles. He showed the revised site plan. They will also be providing a trash enclosure. Mr. Peterson said they brought samples of the materials and colors to be used in the building. Also stone caps have been added to the top and bottom of the windows. He added that Outlot 1 is not part of the resubdivision but it is the detention basin for the entire subdivision.

Eric Paulson, 567 Wium Rd., asked if there would be recycling available to the residents. Mr. Peterson said their other facilities do have recycling programs and he would check into it.

There was no one else in the public who wished to speak on this petition. The public portion of the hearing was closed at this time.

Mr. Goss asked about the two storm water outlots in the area. Ms. Maxwell said other lots will drain into this outlot. Mr. Goss asked if this project is age restricted. Mr. Peterson said yes. Mr. Goss said he would like a commitment to clear snow from the sidewalks so the residents can get to the medical buildings, shopping, and the train.

Mr. Gavle asked about the sidewalk installation since it is shown on the plan as future walkway. Ms. Maxwell said the petitioner is not requesting a deferral from sidewalk installation. Mr. Gavle said he has a family member who lives in a similar facility and feels that the elevators in this building are a distance from the entrance. He believes it would be better to have them closer to the entrance which is a more strategic location. Mr. Peterson said this is an independent living facility and most residents will be coming from the other entrance which is closer to the elevator. They want the residents to interact with each other. Also the elevators are closer to the laundry area.

Mr. Skluzacek asked if these were rental units or condos. Mr. Peterson said rental units. Mr. Jouron asked to see the material samples. Mr. Peterson described the materials and where they were to be used on the building.

Mr. Esposito said they recently considered a similar facility just on the other side of the Post Office. He said

this business development is getting more of an urban residential look and he has a problem with that. Mr. Esposito said he understands there is a need for this type of development but he is not sure there is the infrastructure for this. There are no sidewalks along Route 14 and there is limited bus service in McHenry County. He added that the rear of the building needs to be jazzed up. Mr. Esposito said he is not sure this is the right location for this use but does understand that it is needed.

Mrs. Lembke asked about the materials to be used and the design of the rear of the building. She doesn't have a problem with the use at this location.

Mr. Greenman said the comments from the members are that this use is generally acceptable and this does compliment the area. He said there was a lot of discussion regarding the elevator location which could force a resident to leave the facility earlier than they might. It is something for the petitioner to think about. The other discussion is if this use is appropriate for this location but the area hasn't been developed for walking. He wants to be certain the residents can walk safely. Ms. Maxwell said the Engineering Division is working on a program to install the missing sections of sidewalks in this area. She added that both developments for senior housing in this area are going for the same grants/funding and only one will be built.

Mr. Jouron asked if there is something in the works for sidewalks along Route 14. Ms. Maxwell said staff has been checking on the space that is available for sidewalks.

Mr. Greenman said the roof line is very long and barrack-like and it will be noticeable. It seems very expansive. Mr. Peterson said there are gables where there are bump-outs. Mr. Gavle asked if the pitch could be changed. Mr. Peterson said he will check with their architects and engineers.

Mr. Jouron asked if this is approved could they change to regular apartments. Ms. Maxwell said no because they would be approved as age restricted unless they went through the amendment process.

Mr. Peterson said they can look into other programs for transportation for this development. They will find a way to make it work.

Mr. Greenman asked if they should add comments about the sidewalk situation. Ms. Maxwell said the Council will see the discussion the Commissioners had about the sidewalks and will know it is important. Mr. Greenman added that they should note that the site plan now shows 1- and 2-bedroom apartment eliminating the 3-bedroom and thought it would be a good idea to possibly add the comment about recycling.

Mr. Goss moved to approve the Final Planned Unit Development Amendment for a senior independent living development; Use Variation from Article 2, Land Use of the Unified Development Ordinance, to allow a continuing care retirement community without nursing facilities, in the "B-2" zoning district; and Plat of Resubdivision for Banner Apartments Senior Housing located on Station Drive (345-375 Station Drive) with the following conditions:

1. Approved plans, reflecting staff and advisory board recommendations, as approved by the City Council:
 - A. Application (Tom Suminski, received 1/27/2011).
 - B. Preliminary Plat of Resubdivision (iG Consulting, Inc, dated 01/19/11, received 1/27/11).
 - C. Site Plan (Worn Jerabek Architects, dated 1/26/11, received 1/27/11) **as revised showing 1- and 2-bedroom apartments. Staff shall review the revised plan prior to moving forward to City Council.**
 - D. Landscape Plan (Williams Design Group, dated 1/26/11, received 1/27/11).
 - E. Engineering Plans (iG consulting, Inc. dated 1/26/11, received 1/27/11)

2. Site Plan
 - A. Aerial apparatus access roads shall be 26 feet in width within a minimum of 15 feet and a maximum of 30 feet from the building. The south access and the west access will need to increase in width.
 - B. The fire apparatus access should not be greater than 250 feet to any portion of the building from an approved fire apparatus access. The fire access lane may need to be extended to meet this requirement.
 - C. Except for the designated parking areas, the access roads shall be posted “No-parking Fire Lane and Station Drive will need “No-Parking Fire Lane” on the side with the fire hydrants.
 - D. Provide an auto-turn exhibit indicating that a fire truck can access the entrance closest to Exchange Drive. Due to the proximity of the entrance to Exchange Drive, the entrance must remain one-way inbound.
 - E. The one-way entrance off Station Drive shall not be moved closer to Exchange Drive.
 - F. Illustrate the location for the trash enclosure, ensure it is readily accessible to a waste hauling truck.

3. Architecture
 - A. Provide actual material samples and colors for the elevation materials at the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council meetings.
 - B. To provide better definition in the elevations all windows shall have a stone top cap and bottom sill.

4. Plat of Resubdivision
 - A. Revise the plat so that Outlot 1 is not shown within Lot 1.
 - B. Create a separate outlot labeled Outlot 3 for the Roadway Access/ Landscape/ Private Utility Easement.
 - C. Provide a final copy of the revised CC&R’s

5. The following Variation is hereby granted as part of the PUD:
 - A. A variation from Article 3 Section 3 Density and Dimensional Standards to allow a building at 38 feet exceeding the maximum height of 28 feet, a variation of 10 feet.

6. The petitioner shall address all of the review comments and requirements of the Engineering and Building, Fire Rescue, Police, Public Works, and Planning and Economic Development Departments.

Mr. Gavle seconded the motion. On roll call, members Gavle, Goss, Jouron, Lembke, Skluzacek and Greenman voted aye. Mr. Esposito voted no. Motion passed.

Mr. Esposito said they are putting the cart before the horse. They don't have enough information.

2011-09 ADVANCE AUTO PARTS – 6130 Northwest Hwy – PUBLIC HEARING
Final PUD Amendment for an overhead door, new monument sign and wall signage.

Mr. Greenman said he was told prior to the meeting that the petitioner has removed the request for the overhead door. Ms. Bhide said that is correct.

Mr. Greenman stated that the sign has been posted. He said the surrounding property owners have been notified and the Certificate of Publication is in the file. Mr. Greenman waived the reading of the legal notice without objection.

Michael DeMeulenaere and Charlie Sheelel were present to represent the petition. Mr. DeMeulenaere handed out copies of additional information. He said the integrity of the center will remain. Mr. DeMeulenaere said they are requesting a slight increase in the allowable square footage for wall signs from 75 square feet to 81 square feet. They are also requesting a monument sign as well because there is no room on the existing multi-tenant sign along Route 14. Mr. DeMeulenaere said the center has enough land to allow for an additional monument sign and feels this request is not out of the norm for this site. He said he has read the report and feels they meet all of the criteria listed.

There was no one in the public who wished to speak on this petition. The public portion of the hearing was closed at this time.

Mr. Jouron asked if this business has a larger percentage of its business from auto repair shops or walk in customers. Mr. Sheelel said about 70% of the business is walk-ins. Mr. Jouron asked if there will be a vehicle parked in the lot. Mr. DeMeulenaere said no. Mr. Jouron said he has always pushed for monument signs but this seems to be overkill. He doesn't know how anyone could miss the wall signs. Mr. Sheelel said the existing monument sign at the intersection of Northwest Highway and Teckler blocks the view of the wall sign when driving east on Route 14. Mr. Jouron said people will know where you are. He is sure that people aren't driving by the business, see it's a parts store and suddenly need to go there to get a part for their car. Mr. DeMeulenaere said there are always new people coming to an area and this business is new to this area and it needs identity. Mr. Jouron asked how tall the monument sign is. Mr. DeMeulenaere said 7 feet. Mr. Jouron asked how tall the wall signs are. Mr. DeMeulenaere said it's about 8-9 feet.

Mrs. Lembke said she would prefer the letters be shrunk to meet the City's requirements. Mr. DeMeulenaere

said the wall signs aren't box signs and the sign is proportional to the in-line tenants farther back in the center.

Mr. Esposito agreed with Mr. Jouron that this is a destination place. He said the petitioners are not doing much to the building so the signs should be visible. Once people know their location the additional signage would not be needed.

Mr. Skluzacek said he is glad they removed the request for the overhead door.

Mr. Gavle said he doesn't see a problem with the request and knows it is important to get known in an area.

Mr. Goss said people can get into the site from the entrance off of Route 14 just to the east of this building. Mr. DeMeulenaere said they want people to use a signalized entrance for safety. Mr. Goss said the colors that are to be used on this sign will stand out enough. He would prefer the petitioner match the criteria for the PUD. Mr. Sheelex said the red in the sign is not illuminated but painted on. It will be subdued. They would like to keep the requested square footage since the business name is so long. Only the first letter in each word is capitalized. He added that the sign criteria is put together by sign companies. Mr. Goss said the sign criteria for developments within the City are put together by Staff and the developer – not a sign company.

Mr. Greenman said he agrees with Mr. Goss regarding the size of the wall signs. He said regarding the monument sign it seems that the sign is placed on top of the block. The other monument sign has brick on the sides. Mr. Greenman stated that the rendering presented is unacceptable as presented. There have been many people in the past who have come before this Commission and gave them the same argument about the size of the signs. He thinks the amount of signage requested is overkill. Mr. Greenman added that the petitioner can come back if they find they need the monument sign but feels if they market the business that they are in front of Jewel and Toys R Us people will have no problem finding them.

Mr. Jouron said he doesn't care for the monument sign. Mr. Esposito agreed and feels the sign is not necessary. Mr. Greenman asked the petitioners how they would like to proceed. Mr. Sheelex asked for a straw poll of the Commissioners regarding the monument sign. One member was in favor of the sign. Mr. Skluzacek said they can come back later if they still feel they need a monument sign. Mr. Sheelex said they would like to withdraw the request for the monument sign at this time.

Mr. Greenman said the Commission will vote on the wall signage only. Mr. Goss said they meet the Findings of Fact.

Mr. Goss moved to approve the Final PUD Amendment for: ~~A. Architectural changes to add an 8' x 8' overhead door to the west facade;~~ and B.-Addition of a monument sign and wall signage for Advance Auto Parts at 6130 Northwest Highway with the following conditions:

1. Approved plans, reflecting staff and advisory board recommendations, as approved by the City Council:

- A. Development Application, received 2-1-11
- B. Sign Plans, received 2-1-11
- C. Elevation, Shive, Dated 1-18-11

~~2. The base of the monument sign shall be increased to 8 feet to meet the requirement that a sign base width be 80 percent of the sign width.~~

~~3. The monument sign must be set back at least 10 feet from the property line.~~

~~4. Landscaping must be planted around the base of the monument sign equaling 1 square foot of landscape area per 1 one square foot of sign area. The landscaping shall be located in an area radiating from the base of the sign. Submit a landscape plan for staff approval.~~

~~5. Any landscaping to be removed to install the monument sign must be replaced on-site.~~

6. The petitioner shall address all of the review comments and requirements of the Engineering & Building, Fire Rescue, Police, Public Works, and Planning & Economic Development Departments.

Mr. Esposito seconded the motion. On roll call, all members voted aye. Motion passed.

2010-06 COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN REVIEW – PUBLIC MEETING

Section 7: Unique Areas; Section 8: Parks & Recreation; and Greenway Infrastructure

Ms. Maxwell said they have completed the next draft sections of the Comprehensive Plan. They have found there are 4 unique areas which are identified in Section 7. They are the downtown area, Virginia Street Corridor, Ridgefield Corridor, and Three Oaks Recreation Area. Mr. Greenman said the downtown area is something to be proud of but there is the struggle with parking and he is not sure how they can get passed that. He would like that addressed in the plan. Ms. Bhide handed out to the members a summary of the parking improvements recently completed in the downtown area.

Mr. Greenman said he agrees with having public art in the Virginia Street Corridor but also throughout the City. Ms. Maxwell said public art is important in this corridor and will be included in a later phase. Mr. Greenman suggested they contact the high schools. They have extremely talented students.

Ms. Maxwell said the Ridgefield Corridor is mostly out of the City limits. Mr. Greenman said when Metra came before the Commission they started to think more of the Ridgefield area. He said they need to be ahead of this and not plan what we would like to see for that area during a petition. Mr. Goss agreed but he has difficulty planning an area that is not within the City limits.

Ms. Maxwell said there are goals for the Three Oaks Recreation Area TIF. Mr. Jouron said that is a beautiful area but you can't walk there. We can't keep that isolated.

Mr. Goss said 7.3 a and b are mutually exclusive and need to find a better way to express this.

Mr. Greenman said in the past there was a significant development proposed for the Northwest Subarea that was counter to the Comprehensive Plan. He asked if the Commission would hold true to the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Goss said they didn't have the UDO then. He feels they need to see the plan before deciding if the Comprehensive Plan should be adhered to. He added that a large development is planned to be further north that will still have a major impact on our roads without having any control. Ms. Maxwell said after the draft text is finished then they will look at the map for re-evaluation.

Ms. Maxwell said Section 8 is Parks and Recreation. She said the primary goal is to provide recreation amenities and programs as well as open space.

Ms. Maxwell said Section 11 is Green Infrastructure. More communities are going towards this. This includes rain gardens, bio-swales, native plantings, green roofs, porous pavement, etc. Mr. Jouron asked if the City has a handout on how build a bio-swale. Ms. Maxwell said she doesn't believe there is a handout, but the Engineering Division has a lot of information on bio-swales so the City could assist anyone interested in constructing one. Mr. Greenman said there is significant information in the watershed study that was recently done by Hay and Associates. Mr. Gavle asked if drywells will still be used or is the City moving away from it. Ms. Maxwell said they can be added. Mr. Greenman said this section is very exciting. He suggested that instead of having a section for this topic that it might be better if it is incorporated into the other sections. Mr. Goss agreed. Mr. Greenman said he doesn't want this to be a choice to do. That want this adhered to. Ms. Maxwell said many of these standards are already incorporated in the UDO and they have started working on pamphlets to help educate people. Mr. Greenman said it would behoove them to educate the developers as to what we want. He added that they need to be consistent.

Ms. Maxwell said the Green Infrastructure Vision is a stand-alone document that incorporates many principals of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Mr. Gavle asked if the City's idea on how to handle sensitive areas similar to the County's. Ms. Maxwell said the City is more stringent than the County. She said this is a starting point now that the areas shown in the maps are identified.

Mr. Goss asked that they check the acreage noted in Section 11 on page 4.

Mr. Esposito asked about the bike master plan. Ms. Maxwell said the Engineering Division is working on that and have held at least one public meeting.

There were no other comments from the Commissioners.

REPORT FROM PLANNING

- 2010-65 Walgreens – 151 W. Northwest Hwy. – Special Use Permit Amendment

- 2010-74 Exclusively Napa – 35 N. Williams - Special Use Permit, Variations
- 2010-73 Nemcek - Bertram House – 50 N. Carline St. - Landmark Designation
- 2010-59 UDO final 1-year review including presentation of final changes

Ms. Bhide gave a brief presentation on the final adopted changes to the UDO.

Ms. Bhide reviewed the items that are scheduled for the next PZC meeting.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION

There were no comments from the Commissioners.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.