



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

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

Michelle Rentzsch, Director of Planning and Economic Development, and Latika Bhide, Planner, were present from Staff.

Mr. Hayden 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 MARCH 2, 2011 PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**

Mr. Skluzacek moved to approve the minutes from the March 2, 2011 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as presented. Mr. Goss seconded the motion. On roll call, all members present voted aye. Motion passed.

**2011-05 AHMED – 935 Hawthorn Drive** – PUBLIC HEARING

The petitioner is requesting to be continued to the April 6, 2011 PZC meeting

Mr. Batastini moved to continue 2011-05 Ahmed Variation to the April 6, 2011 PZC meeting. Mr. Greenman seconded the motion. On roll call, all members voted aye. Motion passed.

**2011-09 ADVANCE AUTO PARTS – 6130 Northwest Highway** – PUBLIC HEARING

This petition was sent back to the PZC from City Council on March 1, 2011.

Final PUD Amendment for a new monument sign.

Mr. Hayden stated that this petition was referred back to the PZC from the City Council to re-review the monument sign requested by the petitioner.

Charlie Sheeel was present to represent the petition. Mr. Sheeel said they had discussed the monument sign at the previous PZC meeting and he withdrew that portion of their request during that meeting. Since that time he has discovered that the monument sign is a lease contingency at this location for Advance Auto Parts. He added that at the previous meeting there was concern with the materials to be used for the monument sign. Mr. Sheeel said he has looked at the surrounding properties and compared their signage to what is being proposed for this location.

Mr. Sheelex handed out revised copies of the monument sign. Mr. Hayden asked what the difference is between this packet and the one they received. Mr. Sheelex said on page 4 the materials and color of the brick matches as closely to the center as possible and the next page shows the entire monument sign has full brick surrounding the entire cabinet and even the topper. He said the signs across the street are closer together and have entrances off Route 14 to each business while this has two entrances that are close to this building and the proposed monument sign is over 200 feet away from the existing free standing tenant sign. The monument sign is to let people know ahead of time where they are located so they can maneuver safely into the site. Mr. Sheelex said he was not aware of the real estate ramifications at the previous meeting.

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 said he still doesn't like it and doesn't want it. He added that if people can't see the wall signs they won't be able to see the small monument sign.

Mr. Batastini said he was not at the previous meeting. He said there is a large tree located near this proposed sign location. If the sign is approved he doesn't want someone coming back to the City to say the tree needs to be removed because people can't see their sign. Mr. Batastini said he doesn't want this center's landscape area littered with signs. He questions the need for the monument sign and added that auto parts are not an impulse purchase. Mr. Batastini asked who is demanding the monument sign as part of the lease. Mr. Sheelex said he was only told that the monument sign is what is driving this deal. He added that the monument sign is uniquely small. Mr. Batastini said he wants to support the business but he also looks at this as a consumer. He is not sure people will drive by and say they need to have their alternator changed.

Mr. Hayden asked if the total signage for this project (wall and monument) was over or under the allowable square footage. Ms. Bhide said it is under the allowable square footage.

Mr. Skluzacek said he likes the monument sign and asked if it would be internally illuminated. Mr. Sheelex said yes.

Mr. Greenman thanked the petitioner for making significant changes to the sign. He tried to make it clear at the previous meeting that he feels the monument sign is excessive. He does not feel that people will have a problem finding the business. Mr. Greenman added that from a planning standpoint, because of the size of the wall sign and the closeness to Route 14. He feels that if a monument sign were to be installed this sign is the wrong size because of the speed of traffic on that road. He does not feel the need for a monument sign.

Mr. Batastini said there will be landscaping that will be in the way of the sign. Ms. Bhide said the landscape plan was approved with the PUD and the materials need to be maintained and can't be removed. Mr. Batastini said he wants to be sure the landscaping is maintained.

Mr. Goss said the revised sign is attractive but Blockbuster Video was in this location for many years without a monument sign. He also feels the wall signs should be on the east and west elevation. Mr. Goss said he is not in favor of the sign.

Mr. Gavle said the monument sign is more attractive and appreciates the total amount of the signage is less than allowed.

Mrs. Lembke asked if one of the wall signs could be removed. Mr. Sheeiel said no.

Mr. Batastini said the other problem is that a good portion of the center is currently vacant and the spaces are further back from Route 14. He can see others coming in asking for additional monument signs on Route 14.

Mr. Hayden said Blockbuster was there for many years and the signs didn't drive them out of business – it was the internet. He does like this sign as compared to the others presented but feels it is a duplication of what will be there on the elevations. Mr. Sheeiel said it is more for traffic safety. This building blends into the center. Other tenants have smaller spaces than this. If they could have a panel on the existing sign that would be different. Mr. Sheeiel said if there is no monument sign for this building it says this building is just like the others in this center. Mr. Hayden asked what they could tell the other tenants in the center that are further back from Route 14 when they request an additional monument sign. Mr. Sheeiel said this space is significantly larger than other tenants. This is also a nationally known tenant but believes the other businesses would have an argument.

Mr. Batastini moved to deny the Final PUD Amendment for the addition of a monument sign for Advance Auto Parts located at 6130 Northwest Highway. Mr. Goss seconded the motion. On roll call, members Batastini, Goss, Greenman, Jouron, Lembke, and Hayden voted aye. Members Gavle and Skluzacek voted no. Motion to deny passed.

**2011-08 SHELL – CIRCLE K – 280 N. Route 31 – PUBLIC HEARING**

This petition was continued from the March 2, 2011 PZC meeting.

Special Use Permit Amendment to allow changes in signage from Shell to Circle K and electronic pricing signage.

Mr. Hayden stated that this petition was continued from the previous PZC meeting and the petitioner is still sworn in.

Auna Foote with Corporate Identification Solutions was present to represent the petition. Ms. Foote described the changes to the request. They have reduced the amount of signage and the landscaping will be upgraded around the monument sign. She just received plans for the proposed roadway improvements to Routes 176 and 31 and can see how there won't be room for a monument sign after the roadway project is complete.

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. Goss said he had requested the roadway improvement plan for Routes 176 and 31 from staff so the petitioner knows what will happen with that intersection in the future. Ms. Foote said they don't know when the improvements will start to take place. Mr. Goss said the sign would need to be moved as well as part of the one canopy. He added the petitioner did a great job on revising the plans.

Mr. Batastini said on the revised plans the building looks white-washed out. He appreciates the changes that have been made and likes the landscaping plan.

Mr. Skluzacek said he likes the changes that were made and has no problem with the request.

Mr. Greenman thanked the petitioner for the changes and likes what was presented.

Mr. Hayden said he would like this to be like a shopping center – all tied in together. This plan doesn't seem to tie all of the uses in.

Mr. Goss stated that this petition meets the findings of fact listed in the staff report.

Mr. Hayden said condition #3 allows for the sign to remain until either the road improvements have commenced or 10 years whichever comes first. He also would like to see the landscaping maintained. Ms. Rentzsch said the general maintenance of landscaping is part of the PUD. Mr. Batastini said the parking lot is used like a roadway and it is in need of repair. Ms. Rentzsch said that also needs to be maintained.

Mr. Goss moved to approve the Special Use Permit Amendment to allow changes in signage from Shell to Circle K and the addition of an electronic message center sign for Shell – Circle K located at 280 N. Route 31 with the following conditions:

1. Approved plan, to reflect staff and advisory board comments, as approved by the City Council:
  - A. Application (Corporate ID Solutions, received 02/23/11).
  - B. Plat of Survey (First American Professional Land Services, dated 11/16/2009, received 2/23/11)
  - C. Monument sign elevation (Corporate ID Solutions, dated 03/07/11, received 03/09/11).
  - D. Wall Signage exhibit (Corporate ID Solutions, dated 03/7/11, received 03/09/11).
  - E. Car Wash Wall signage exhibit (Corporate ID Solutions, dated 03/7/11, received 03/09/11).
2. Future changes to the signage, which meet all requirements of the Unified Development Ordinance, shall not be required to amend the Special Use Permit.

3. If the free-standing sign is required to be removed or relocated due to roadway improvements or within 10 years whichever occurs first, it shall meet all requirements of the UDO including the maximum height of 9 feet, maximum square footage of 80 square feet and utilize materials or architectural elements from the building.
4. Any dead or missing landscape shall be replaced per the approved landscape plan dated 09/09/01 by Warren Johnson Architects.
5. The petitioner shall comply with all of the requirements of the Planning and Economic Development, Engineering and Building, Public Works, Fire Rescue and Police Departments.

**6. The parking lot and drive aisles on the north side of the site are deteriorating and need repair.**

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

**2011-12 buy buy BABY – 5540 Northwest Highway – PUBLIC HEARING**  
Final PUD Amendment to allow graphic panels.

Mr. Hayden 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. Hayden waived the reading of the legal notice without objection.

Samuel Lehman was present to represent the petition. Mr. Lehman said the original design showed the graphics that were to be added to the “window” areas. After the signs and graphics were installed, they were notified about the problem with the graphics.

Anna Maria Kowalik with Inland Properties, landlord of the shopping center, said she is present to support the tenant’s request. This is part of branding and the graphics show the services provided since this business is new to the area. Ms. Kowalik said graphics are a very popular tool on the east and west coast.

Mr. Hayden asked what happens to the tax dollars for items purchased on the internet. Mr. Lehman said they now collect tax for the state of Illinois but he is not sure if it stays only with the state or gets split up.

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. Skluzacek said he feels the graphics are signage since they are advertising. Ms. Bhide said that if considered signage, that would be an additional 300 square feet. She added that the graphics do not have the business name on it.

Mr. Batastini said the graphics are not objectionable and asked if they would change. Mr. Lehman said no. Mr. Batastini said the rest of the center looks very good. The graphics are not objectionable but he feels it is

signage. He asked what was there prior to the graphics. Ms. Bhide said there were faux windows.

Mr. Greenman said he read the minutes from the previous request for the additional wall signage. He said that was granted because of the distance from the roadway. He also believes the graphics are signs and doesn't have an issue with how it looks. If this were allowed it would be incredibly inconsistent with that they have done in the past. Mr. Greenman added that findings of fact #3 regarding complying general with the ordinances is not met.

Mr. Jouron said the graphics in the faux windows do look nice but he would prefer them not to be there. He said they went through a lot with Dominick's changing their exterior and feels that it doesn't fit in.

Mr. Gavle said he struggles with the amount of signage and feels that others will ask for the graphics in the faux windows as well.

Mr. Goss said this is advertising and can't support it.

Mr. Jouron asked what would happen if this is not approved. Mr. Lehman said it would be removed and returned to its original state.

Mrs. Lembke said she considers this signage as well.

Mr. Hayden said he was looking for the definition of signage in the UDO. Ms. Bhide said it is in Article 10 of the UDO. Mr. Hayden said other faux windows in Crystal Lake are architectural features and don't advertise services or articles that are available at that business. He said this is advertising. Mr. Lehman said the graphics are to show what is available and what services they provide. It doesn't include their name. It's just graphics.

Mr. Goss moved to deny the Final PUD Amendment to allow elevation changes to cover the faux windows with graphic panels for Buy Buy Baby located at 5540 Northwest Highway. Mr. Jouron seconded the motion. On roll call, all members voted aye. Motion to deny passed.

### **REPORT FROM PLANNING**

- Metra Ridgefield Station – Ridgefield Road - Preliminary PUD
- Senior Residences – 345-375 Station Drive – Final PUD Amend, Plat of Resub

Ms. Rentzsch 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 8:55 p.m.