



**CRYSTAL LAKE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2014
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 Esposito, Goss, Jouron, Skluzacek, and Hayden were present. Members Batastini, Gavle, and Greenman were absent.

James Richter II, Planning and Economic Development Manager, Latika Bhide, Planner, and Rick Paulson, Building Commissioner, were present from Staff.

Mr. Hayden asked those in attendance to rise to say the Pledge of Allegiance. He led those in attendance in the Pledge.

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

APPROVE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 4, 2013 SPECIAL PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

Mr. Jouron moved to approve the minutes from the December 4, 2013 Special Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as presented. Mr. Skluzacek seconded the motion. On roll call, members Esposito, Goss, Jouron, and Skluzacek voted aye. Mr. Hayden abstained. Motion passed.

2013-59 SMK CENTER – 835 Virginia St. – PUBLIC HEARING

Special Use Permit to allow a TV-VCR clinic as a special use in the “M” district at the specified location.

Mr. Hayden stated that due to a problem with notification, this petition will be continued to the February 5, 2014 PZC meeting.

Mr. Goss moved to continue 2013-59 SMK Center to the February 5, 2014 PZC meeting. Mr. Esposito seconded the motion. On voice vote, all members voted aye. Motion passed.

2013-61 MARTIN CHEVROLET – 5220 Northwest Hwy. – PUBLIC HEARING

Special Use Permit Amendment to allow expansion of an automobile dealership, a drive-through use (car wash), and an electronic message center sign; and Variations from: A. minimum required setback Exchange Drive; B. maximum allowable impervious surface coverage; C. maximum allowable building height; D. maximum allowable height for an accessory structure; E. allow accessory structures to be located in the front yard; F. Standards for parking including stall length, parking lot islands, island width and landscaping; G. standards for elevated displays; H. requirement that repair bays are not fronting adjacent major roadways to allow the bays to front along Northwest Highway and Exchange Drive; and I.

standards for drive-through uses.

Mr. Hayden stated that the sign had been posted. He said the surrounding property owners were notified and the Certificate of Publication was in the file. Mr. Hayden waived the reading of the legal notice without objection.

Ken Rawson, attorney, Dan Hoyland and Todd Martin, partners/owners, and Simon Yu, architect, were present to represent the petition. Mr. Rawson gave the history of the dealership and stated that under previous ownership in 2011 only 8 other dealerships around the country were worse than this one. The new ownership is slowly rebuilding their reputation. The previous owners agreed to improvements to the site that were to be completed by December, 2012 and GM gave the current owners an extension. Mr. Rawson described some of the changes that they are proposing for the site. He said they would like to bring in commercial trucks, which is why the bay doors were enlarged.

Mr. Rawson said there are several things that this dealership can't advertise because not all of the GM dealers provide it: such as free oil changes for as long as you own the car and free car wash. They will need to add a car wash which will be along side of the existing building and it will require a variation. He said they want to have three flag poles with American flags. They would be located at Route 14 and Exchange and would be up 24 hours a day. Mr. Rawson said he had provided a photo of a dealership in south Michigan who has the flags. They are also requesting an electronic message center sign the same as the one approved for Honda on Route 176 & Route 14.

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

Mr. Jouron welcomed the new owners to Crystal Lake. He asked if the lights in the parking lot would be lowered to City standards. Mr. Rawson said they would be back at a later time for the lighting. Mr. Jouron asked where the EMC sign would be located. Mr. Rawson said they were exactly sure. They would like it on Route 14 but it depends on the location of the flags. Mr. Jouron said temporary signs were used over the summer to identify the business.

Mr. Jouron asked what was meant by commercial vehicles. Mr. Martin said it would be medium-heavy duty trucks. Mr. Yu said there will be three separate bay doors. Mr. Jouron stated that he didn't mind the arch – it is an attention getter. Mr. Rawson said the arch matches the building.

Mr. Goss said he has a different take on this request. He is looking for specifics such as building plans, landscape plans, etc. Mr. Rawson said this is only a preliminary review. Mr. Goss said this is to be done in three phases. Mr. Rawson said that is true but if the funds are available they want to build them all at the same time. Mr. Yu said the plans were already submitted and received the department comments. They are ready to resubmit for the second review but are waiting on what happens with this request. Ms. Bhide said the building plans that were submitted were used for the PZC hearing. Mr. Rawson said they are under the gun.

Mr. Goss said they need to have things in final form so they know what they are approving. The plans don't show any in or out for the car wash. The petitioners are asking the City to approve the location but don't have any information on it. Mr. Rawson said the cars will enter from the rear and exit facing south. Mr. Goss said they will eliminate parking. Mr. Rawson said this site is big. They have 9 acres to work with. Mr. Goss said this is too close to Exchange Drive. He also asked how the delivery semis will get in and out of the site. He added that the sign on the building can be seen from Route 14.

Mr. Yu said the standard buildings for GM have been changed 3 times in the past 10 years. Mr. Goss asked why national car manufacturers come in and say this is what they want - take it or leave it. They need to respect any municipality's ordinances. He added that the City treats Routes 176 and 31 differently than Route 14, which is the main business area. If this were approved, everyone would be coming in and changing their signs. Mr. Rawson said they don't have a choice. Either they are in or out of Crystal Lake and they want to stay here. They need the variations, etc. because the building was designed wrong and has handicapped his clients. He said they are at a disadvantage because their building is set back so far while the new dealership across the street is very close to the road. People who drive past can see exactly what that dealership has to offer as far as cars and deals. Mr. Hayden stated that the property across Route 14 from this dealership has an extremely shallow lot. It is long and narrow which is why the building isn't set back more.

Mr. Goss said he has no problem with the front of the building. He said the flags are too big and may not be able to meet the illumination requirements. Mr. Rawson said they will have special lights that are built into the ground and shine upward. He thinks the large flags are great. Mr. Goss said the City has a cell tower on McHenry Avenue that had an extremely large flag. Now the larger flag is only put up on holidays because there were issues with the wind. On the other days it is a regular size flag. Mr. Rawson said this is a great asset to the community and it isn't interfering with anything. He said the larger pole alone will cost over \$30,000. Mr. Yu said there is a project in Wheaton that has the flag poles. It is a marker for them.

Mr. Skluzacek said he agrees with Mr. Goss that the flags are too high and about the entrance-way arch. He asked about the building height variation. Mr. Rawson said they will need 37 feet 11 inches and not 42 feet.

Mr. Esposito said the flags are too large. There is a bank on Main Street that has an oversized flag close to the road and it is too big. He can't see having three poles that tall. Mr. Esposito asked about the stacking for the car wash. He said there would be 7 to 8 cars waiting on a nice day. Mr. Yu said they could stack the cars going south on the property and divert the line to go east/west. Mr. Rawson said their staff needs to see what is going on at the car wash.

Mr. Esposito believes the petitioners would get more bang for their buck if they would eliminate the archway and concentrate on the EMC sign to include their logo and architectural features with landscaping around it. That would make a bigger impact than the arch. He has no problem with the

design of the building.

Mr. Hayden asked about the car wash and the flow of traffic. Mr. Rawson explained the traffic flow. Mr. Hayden asked if the car was unmanned. Mr. Rawson said the car wash will be opened and manned while the dealership is open. Mr. Martin said the cars will be hand dried. Mr. Hayden asked if there will be a vacuum station. Mr. Rawson said they vacuum cars that are brought in for service. Mr. Hayden said he could see a stacking problem if this car wash was open to the general public but since it is for their customers only it shouldn't be that much of a problem. Mr. Rawson said they do have 9 acres of land to use.

Mr. Goss said the EMC portion of the sign can't flash, have animation or change copy quickly. Ms. Bhide said the copy can change every 5 minutes.

Mr. Goss asked about the setback along Exchange Drive. Mr. Rawson said it is already paved there. He said they are not increasing the paved area. Mr. Goss said he would like to see a landscape plan. Mr. Hayden said he would prefer a different traffic flow for the car wash. He doesn't care for the cars going in front of the building. Mr. Goss said the car wash should be on the other side of the building. Mr. Rawson said all of the office staff is on the side of the building where the proposed car wash is located. They need to keep an eye on things. Mr. Goss asked if the customer will stay in the car during the car wash. Mr. Rawson said yes. Mr. Martin said he wasn't sure if there would be a vacuum station available.

Mr. Hayden said there are many things that still need to be worked out. Mr. Rawson said they can't do the plans until they know what variations will be approved. Mr. Goss said there are no dimensions at all to go by. He asked how far from the roadway would the arch be. Ms. Bhide said 30 feet from the property line. Mr. Rawson said it will have their name on it. Mr. Goss said that would be classified as a sign. He said the final plans need to be submitted and reviewed by the PZC and voted on. Mr. Rawson said they can't do final plans. Mr. Goss said they don't know what they are approving.

Mr. Jouron said he prefers a monument sign to a pole sign.

Mr. Hayden reviewed the request. Mr. Rawson said they are not increasing the impervious surface. Ms. Bhide said the original approval didn't include a variation for the amount of impervious surface. She said staff tries to include variations when properties come forward with requests as it will grant them variations instead of nonconformities. This is strictly housekeeping. Mr. Hayden asked about the flag poles and maximum building height. He is concerned with the size of the flags. Mr. Goss said he wants a landscape plan. Mr. Yu said they have it but have not submitted it. Mr. Goss said the parking area needs to meet the code for the landscape islands every 10 spaces. Mr. Yu said they want to keep the parking area portion of the site the way it is currently. Mr. Goss said the landscape islands are required for customer parking not for the inventory. Mr. Yu said they can do that.

Mr. Hayden asked about the vehicle display areas. He said the City allows 2. Mr. Goss said they are

requesting 6 – 2 by Route 14 and the remaining 4 would be up by the building. Mr. Rawson said they will be elevated only 2 feet.

Mr. Hayden asked about Variation (i) standards for drive-through. Ms. Bhide said they didn't receive details about the drive-through so that is why the description is vague. She said there are standards in the UDO. Mr. Goss said there needs to be a bypass lane. He said he can't vote for the variation until he has more information. Mr. Hayden said he doesn't know what is needed. Mr. Rawson said there is no need for a bypass lane. Mr. Goss asked how someone would get out of line if there was an emergency call and they had to go. Mr. Hayden asked how far the car wash is from the end of the building. Mr. Yu said 30 feet. Mr. Hayden suggested moving the car wash north and then a bypass would not be needed. Mr. Goss said the UDO requires a bypass lane and it can't be deleted. Mr. Esposito said they will need to stripe the area.

Mr. Goss said the sign on the building will be changed and that will need to meet the UDO. He said there are two signs on Route 14 and asked if one will be removed to allow the EMC sign. Mr. Martin said they would like to keep both existing signs on Route 14 and would also like to have the EMC sign there too. Mr. Jouron said he always pushes for monument signs. Mr. Rawson said he doesn't have a problem with that. Mr. Goss said no dealership on Route 14 has three signs. Mr. Martin said they will put one on Exchange Drive. Mr. Rawson said they don't own the signs – they are leased. Mr. Martin said they would like to have one sign on each of the entrances and the other EMC sign on Exchange. Mr. Goss said it doesn't make sense to have the EMC on Exchange. Mr. Rawson said the EMC is very important to their business.

Mr. Hayden asked about the flags and the archway. Mr. Rawson said the archway would be setback from Route 14 by 30 feet. As for the flags, they would like 1-100 foot pole and then 2-80 foot poles later on the corner of Exchange and Route 14. Mr. Jouron asked about the height of the pole sign. Mr. Yu said they vary in height and they aren't exactly sure. Mr. Jouron said he is concerned with having 3 signs up front. There are no other dealerships along Route 14 that have three signs along the right of way. Mr. Hayden said he would prefer the message center be added to one of the existing signs like what M'Lady did with their sign. Mr. Yu said the signs are leased and an EMC is hard to incorporate into an existing sign.

Mr. Hayden said he is trying to move this forward and get a vote but there is a lot they are looking at without a lot of information. He added that they need to be fair across the board to all petitioners. Mr. Rawson said the building is not a sign. Mr. Hayden asked how can this building not be a sign and the others are. He said people know the dealership is there. It was very easy to see the temporary banner signs on the building from Route 14 when they first took over the business and he has been able to see all of the signs since. People are at the site on Sundays looking at the cars. Mr. Hayden added that they do understand branding and they do want to help the petitioners. He can't change what they bought and he is fairly certain that if the petitioner wanted to build a new building closer to Route 14 that they would agree to it. He said they need to be fair to all.

Mr. Goss asked again about the distance the archway would be from the pavement on Route 14. Ms. Bhide said the pavement is 7 or 8 feet from the property line which would make the arch setback about 37 to 38 feet from the edge of pavement.

Mr. Hayden asked when the plan will be finalized. Mr. Rawson said they have the department comments. Mr. Goss asked if the plans will be redrawn after Council approval. Mr. Rawson said they can't draw the final plans until the variations, etc. are approved. Mr. Hayden said that is giving the petitioner a blank check. Mr. Rawson said staff would be reviewing the plans. Mr. Paulson said this project is divided into three phases and sections could come back for approval at a later date. Mr. Goss said that would allow the petitioners time to determine the signage and locations as well as the archway and lighting. Mr. Esposito said the flags, flag poles and other items as well could be delayed in approval.

Ms. Bhide said the flag pole that was approved with a variation for American Bank on Main Street is a 50 foot flag pole. Mr. Hayden said that is huge. He added that it disturbs him when the American flag is used for advertising. He was in the military and didn't risk his life for the flag he defended to be used for advertising.

Mr. Goss moved to approve the Special Use Permit Amendment to allow expansion of an automobile dealership, and a drive-through use (car wash), ~~and an electronic message center sign~~; and Variations from: A. The minimum required setback of 30 feet along Exchange Drive to allow the addition to be as close as 25 feet from the property line and a future car wash to be as close as 8 feet from the property line; B. The maximum allowable impervious surface coverage of 65% to allow the site as presented; C. The maximum allowable building height for the principal structure of 28 feet to allow ~~42~~ 38 feet; ~~D. The maximum allowable height for an accessory structure of 25 feet to allow an entrance monument and 3 flag poles that are up to 110 feet tall; SE. E. The Ordinance requirements to allow accessory structures to be located in the front yard;~~ F. The various standards for parking spaces including stall length, parking lot islands, island width and landscaping; G. The standards for elevated displays to allow 6 instead of the permitted 2 display areas – 2 along Route 14 and 4 by the building; H. The requirement that repair bays are not fronting adjacent major roadways to allow the bays to front along Northwest Highway and Exchange Drive; and I. The standards for drive-through uses, specifically regarding the by-pass lane, are waived for Martin Chevrolet at 5220 Northwest Highway with the following conditions:

1. Approved plans, reflecting staff and advisory board recommendations, as approved by the City Council:
 - A. Application, Martin Chevrolet, received 1-9-14
 - B. Engineering Plan Set, Manhard, dated 11-22-13
 - C. Site Dimensional and Paving Plan Sheet, received 12-13-13
 - D. Architectural Plan Set, Simon, dated 11-20-13
2. Variations

- A. Building Height: A variation to allow portion of the sales building to be 42 38 feet is granted through this request.
- B. Building Setbacks: Variations from the minimum required setback of 30 feet along Exchange Drive to allow the addition to be as close as 25 feet from the property line and a future car wash to be as close as 8 feet from the property line are granted.
- ~~C. Parking Standards: Variations from the various standards for parking spaces including stall length, parking lot islands, island width and landscaping are granted in accordance with the submitted plans.~~
- ~~D. Entry Monument: Details for the entry monument must be provided. No signage or logos are permitted on the entry monument. Variations to allow a height of greater than 25 feet for the entry monument must be approved as part of this request.~~
- E. Elevated Display Pads: A variation to allow six display pads, elevated no taller than 2-foot is granted in accordance with the submitted plans. **The display areas shall be located 2 along Route 14 and 4 close to the building.**
- F. Repair Bays: A variation to allow repair bays fronting Route 14 along the west side of the building is granted in accordance with the submitted plans.

3. Site Plan

- A. Car Wash: Details for the car wash are not provided at this time. Detailed plans must be submitted. The proposed car wash must be architecturally compatible with the building. Review of the details by the Engineering Division may generate additional requirements.
- B. Photometric Plan: A photometric plan must be submitted to determine light levels of all proposed exterior lighting including building exterior lighting and parking lot lighting. The light levels must be in accordance with the UDO.
- ~~C. Lighting: The plans indicate that the flag poles will remain lit at all times. The UDO encourages the lowering of flags at sunset to avoid the need for lighting. If proposed to be lit, the luminaires shall be setback no more than 30% of the pole height nor closer than 15% of the object height unless it can be demonstrated that a closer mounting will result in less sky illumination. No single luminaire shall not exceed 1100 lumens up to 45° maximum inclination or 800 lumens up to 60° maximum inclination and collectively not exceed 12,000 lumens.~~
- D. Roof Top Units: It appears that new rooftop units are being proposed. RTU's must be screened per the provisions of the Ordinance. Provide information on how the units will be screened.

4. Signage

- A. Details of all proposed signage will be provided. If the area of the wall signage exceeds the previously approved signage for this dealership, then a sign variation will be necessary.
- ~~B. If the EMC is approved, it is recommended that the EMC should be lowered into a 9-foot tall sign that and replace one freestanding sign on the property. The EMC must incorporate and architectural feature from the principal building.~~

5. 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.

6. Discussion of the identification signs along Route 14 (electronic message center, archway, flags and pole heights, and site lighting) will be held when there is more complete information provided to staff.

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

REPORT FROM PLANNING

- Mathews Corp – 500 Industrial Dr. - Annexation
- Curran Materials Virginia Yard – SW Virginia & Rakow – Special Use Permit

Ms. Bhide reviewed the items that are scheduled to be heard at the next PZC meeting on February 5, 2014.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION

There were no comments from the Commissioners.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.