CRYSTAL LAKE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 2010
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 welcomed the two new members of the Planning and Zoning Commission Darrel Gavle and Ann Lembke. He thanked them for agreeing to serve not only the PZC but also to serve the community.

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 AUGUST 4, 2010 PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

Mr. Esposito moved to approve the minutes from the August 4, 2010 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as presented. Mr. Goss seconded the motion. On roll call, members Esposito, Goss, Jouron, Skluzacek, and Greenman voted aye. Members Gavle and Lembke abstained. Motion passed.

Mr. Greenman asked to suspend the order of the agenda. He would like to hold the public meeting for Chase Bank first. There was no objection from the Commissioners.

2010-51 CHASE BANK (LUTTER CENTER) – 1186 Route 31 – PUBLIC MEETING
A motion is requested to set a public hearing date on September 15, 2010.
Preliminary & Final PUD for a financial institution.

Tim Meseck, architect for Chase Bank, and Mike Metzger with Chase Bank were present to represent the petition. Mr. Meseck said they are requesting Preliminary and Final PUD for a single story bank building with no basement. The building will be predominately a flat roof and the mechanicals will be dropped down so they will not be seen from the street. He added that there are 48 parking spaces shown on the plan. They feel that at the maximum peak time there will be 38 people in the bank – employees and customers – therefore they would need the parking shown. Mr. Meseck said they will landscape the property per ordinance and will try to match the surrounding area.

Mr. Meseck said they have been working with Engineering regarding sidewalks on the east and west side

of the property and they would also like to add a sidewalk to the north property line. He said they have tried to incorporate features from the surrounding buildings and they will match the color of the EIFS on the WalMart building. Mr. Meseck said they would like to have signs on all four sides of the building since this is a commercial area and to let people know they are there. This is consistent with what Chase has done recently in other buildings in the area. He added that they had originally submitted information for a pylon sign but is changing that to a monument sign that will be 5 feet tall and 13 feet wide with a masonry base. Mr. Metzger said this site fits their model and having WalMart there will be a help to their success.

Mr. Greenman said this is a public meeting but asked if there was anyone in attendance who wished to speak on this item because they would not be available to attend the next meeting. There was no one in attendance who wished to speak.

Mr. Goss said he is not in favor of granting any variations. He said there are many vacant buildings and this is not a tax generating business that is going on a retail property. Mr. Goss added that he would not want a sign on the north side of the building since people coming south on Route 31 would not be able to enter the bank off of Route 31. He suggested there be a parking agreement reached with WalMart to allow the bank's employees to park in the spaces near the bank.

Mr. Gavle said he is glad the petitioner is not requesting a pylon sign. He agrees with the comments that were previously made by Mr. Goss. Mr. Esposito, Mrs. Lembke, and Mr. Skluzacek agreed. Mr. Jouron added that it would have been a deal breaker if they were requesting a pylon sign. He is concerned that there is an ocean of asphalt there already and stated this is a nice building.

Mr. Esposito moved to set a public hearing date on September 15, 2010 for 2010-51 Chase Bank at 1186 Route 31. Mr. Jouron seconded the motion. On roll call, all members voted aye. Motion passed.

2010-49 MOBIL OIL – 250 N. Route 31 – PUBLIC HEARING
Special Use Permit and Variation for a gas station with convenience store, car wash.

Mr. Greenman stated that the fees have been paid, and 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.

Eric Carlson, architect, was present to represent the petition. Mr. Carlson said this is a basic project. They will be upgrading the existing abandoned gas station and reopening it. The pumps, canopy, and tanks were previously removed. He showed photos of the buildings as they exist today and showed the site plan they are proposing. Mr. Carlson said the canopy will be in the same location but a slightly different shape. The pumps and columns for the canopy will be in the same locations. Mr. Carlson said they will be removing and replacing some of the landscaping and repairing and painting the buildings. He said they would like to be open as soon as possible.

Mr. Carlson said they believe the car wash equipment will only need to be refurbished and not replaced. They will also be replacing the sign fronts only on the building since the sign boxes are still there. He added that their intent was to use the pole sign but since they would need to replace it in 5 years to comply with the City's ordinances, they have decided to remove the pylon sign and replace it with a monument sign. They are requesting electronic pricing on the sign. Mr. Carlson said they would also like the approval to have pump topper advertising. He concluded by saying they would request a deferral for the utility line burial until an area wide program or IDOT's improvements to that intersection.

Tom Zanck, 40 Brink Street, said he is excited that the petitioner is undertaking this project since the business has been closed for several years. He said it doesn't make sense to have a full access onto Route 176 because of the number of lanes that need to be crossed. It is a disaster waiting to happen. Mr. Zanck added that he owns the car wash to the west of this property and has no problem with this use. He did urge the Commissioners to consider alterations for the egress of this site on those busy roads.

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 if there will be a barrier on Route 176 when the IDOT improvements are done. Ms. Rentzsch said yes. Mr. Goss said he is certain that IDOT would not approve that full access again. He also asked if IDOT would be taking right of way from this property for the improvements. Ms. Rentzsch said the intersection will be moved north and this property should not be impacted with property taking. Mr. Goss asked staff to check into that. He feels that the utility lines should be buried now and not wait for the road improvements.

Mr. Gavle said he is glad to see that the petitioner will be using state-of-the-art leak detention and tanks for this project.

Mr. Esposito said he would also like to see the utility lines buried. He said the Commission has been consistent with recommending burial. Mr. Esposito said he likes the monument sign and the electronic numbers. It is neater and the numbers don't blow off. He said it is great to see this corner come alive again.

Mr. Jouron agreed with the burial of the utility lines. He doesn't have a problem with the sign. The building needs a lot of work done to it and having a right-in/right-out on Route 176 makes sense.

Ms. Lembke agreed with the statements that were made.

Mr. Skluzacek asked about the size of the monument sign. Mr. Carlson said it would be 9 feet tall and approximately 77 square feet. Mr. Goss said he had a problem with the pole sign and not the electronic. Mr. Carlson said they will meet the City's ordinance.

Mr. Greenman said he is excited about bringing business to that intersection. He asked if the petitioner had any concerns or comments regarding the conditions stated in the staff report. Mr. Carlson said there has been discussion regarding the sidewalk. He said the property does get affected by the IDOT improvements but in a positive way.

Mr. Greenman said this request meets the Findings of Fact listed in the report.

Mr. Goss moved to approve Special Use Permit for a gasoline station with a convenience store and a car wash and Variation from Section 4-1000, Signs of the UDO to allow electronic pricing signs and previously approved signage for Mobil Oil at 250 N. Route 31 with the following conditions:

1. Approved plans, reflecting staff and advisory board recommendations, as approved by the City Council:
   A. Application, received 8-6-10
   B. Plan Set, (including site plan, landscape plan, floor plan, elevations), Eric R Carlson, architect, dated 08-04-10, received 8-6-10
   C. Plat of Survey, VSEI, dated 11-30-06, received 8-6-10

2. A special use permit is hereby granted for the gasoline station.

3. Any missing landscaping on-site shall be replaced in accordance with the landscaping plan submitted.

4. Any new site lighting must comply with the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) including, but not limited to, minimum and maximum average light levels, maximum permissible light levels at property lines, etc. Submit lighting catalog cuts and photometric sheet.

5. All sidewalks that are out of the ROW should be in an easement. Submit an easement document for review.

6. Future cross access to south provision should be maintained as part of the SUP.

7. Any outside storage must meet the provisions of the UDO. Only 2 vending machines in total (including, but not limited to air compressors and vacuums) are permitted on-site. This number is in addition to one propane container that is permitted through the UDO.

8. A rumble strip shall be provided at the car wash exit.

9. The total wall signage (including all canopy signage, any signage on the pumps, convenience store, car wash) shall not exceed 150 SF in area and shall meet the provisions of the UDO.

10. ~~The existing free standing sign on the property can be utilized with the proposed face changes for 5 years. The sign shall be brought into compliance at the end of 5 years (in 2015).~~ **The petitioner has agreed to comply with the UDO requirements for free standing signs.**

11. A variation is hereby granted to allow the existing (and future) free standing sign to have electronic pricing. The total area of the electronic sign (for the current and any future sign) is limited to 20 SF.

12. 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.

13. A right-in/right-out on Route 176 is appropriate. When Route 176 is upgraded, there will be a median on Route 176 that will prohibit any left turns from this property.

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

Mr. Goss stated that the Commission prefers the overhead utility lines to be buried at this time and work in the area should be started soon and in the new right of way.

2010-50 McHENRY COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH – 620 Dakota – PUBLIC HEARING
Final PUD Amendment to allow an addition to the existing building.

Mr. Greenman stated that the fees have been paid, and 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.

Dave Hemple with Charles River Development, Dave Gillespie, architect, and Frank Gosser, attorney, were present to represent the petition. Mr. Hemple said the McHenry County Mental Health Board would like to consolidate under one roof. This is a two phase project and the building will have a partial basement. The brick will match as closely as possible to the existing building. He said the mechanicals will be depressed so they won't be seen from the street. Mr. Hemple said the existing monument sign was designed to be internally illuminated but they didn't do it. They would like to add the mechanism to the sign. He said they were told by staff there would be no problem and it would not require any special approval.

Mr. Greenman asked if there were any concerns with the conditions listed in the staff report. Mr. Hemple said they are requesting a variation for the parking at this time. He said there is enough room for parking in the northeast corner of the property but would like not to add that parking unless it is needed.

Mr. Gosser said they understand that the ordinance has changed regarding internally illuminated signs and there is no need for any special approval by the PZC or Council. He added that this facility is for the

McHenry County Mental Health Board and it is not a mental health building or the County health building. It will be used by the McHenry County Mental Health Board only.

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. Greenman asked if they needed additional approval for the internally illuminated sign. Ms. Maxwell said no special use permit is required in this area since it is not adjacent to residential property.

Mr. Goss asked if this meets the conditions of the Preliminary. Ms. Rentzsch said they had received approval of the Final PUD and the building was built. They are putting an addition on the building therefore only needs to amend the PUD. Mr. Goss asked about connecting to the parking lot to the west. Mr. Hemple said there is a cross access agreement in place.

Mr. Gavle said the site has many challenges due to the topography. Mr. Esposito said the building looks good.

Mr. Skluzacek asked about the possible parking in the northeast corner and if there will be retaining walls if the grade is lowered. Mr. Gillespie said there will be changes to the grade and there will be a few retaining walls.

Mr. Greenman thanked the petitioners for their efforts on this addition. He added that the findings of fact are supported with this petition.

Mr. Goss moved to approve the Final PUD Amendment to allow an addition to the existing McHenry County Mental Health Building at 620 Dakota Street with the following conditions:

1. Approved plans, reflecting staff and advisory board recommendations, as approved by the City Council:
   A. Application (McHenry County Mental Health Board, received 08/16/10).
   B. Site Plans (Gillespie Design Group, dated 08/16/10, received 08/16/10)

2. The following Variation is hereby granted as part of this PUD:
   A. The reduction in the required parking from 126 spaces to allow 114 spaces, with 98 of those spaces to be constructed with the building addition construction.

3. Should the City Building Division find insufficient parking onsite through routine inspection or complaint McHenry County Mental Health Board shall immediately construct the additional 16 parking spaces.

4. 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.

5. The existing monument sign may be changed to be internally illuminated.

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

2010-52 KNOWPLACE PETS – 825 Munshaw Ln. – PUBLIC HEARING
Use Variation to allow a pet care services facility.

Mr. Greenman stated that the fees have been paid, and 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.

Michelle Hutchinson, petitioner, Tyler Brewer, builder, and Tony Sarillo, architect, were present to represent the petition. Ms. Hutchinson said she is requesting approval for a dog day care, boarding and training facility. She said the City needs quality options for pet care. She said there are no homes near this property.

Mr. Brewer said it was a struggle to get this building going and the City has been great to them. He said there is plenty of parking for the uses in this building.

Mr. Greenman asked if there were any concerns with the conditions listed in the staff report. Ms. Hutchinson said no.

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 asked if this use was going in the middle unit. Ms. Hutchinson said yes. Mr. Goss said there have been other requests for this type of business in this zoning district. They will be looking into changing this in a few months when the UDO is reviewed. He feels it is good to keep this use away from residential.

Mr. Gavle asked for more information regarding the rear fenced area. There is asphalt back there which will be very hot for the dogs when they go outside. He asked if there will be a canopy. Ms. Hutchinson said there will be gravel there and the area will be used for the dogs to relieve themselves and not as a play area. She said the playing will be done indoors. They weren't planning on a canopy but they may consider it in the future. Mr. Gavle said this area is not for exercise. Mr. Hutchinson said yes.

Mr. Skluzacek doesn't feel that the gravel proposed is solid enough and is concerned about the liquid waste. Ms. Hutchinson said they will be putting down a biodegradable fluid nightly and hose down the area.

Mr. Greenman said he wants to see this business succeed. He said there are a lot of kids in the area because of the swim club and he wants to be certain that there is enough supervision for the dogs when they are outside not only to protect the kids but the owner as well.

Mr. Esposito moved to approve the Use Variation from Article 2, Land Use of the Unified Development Ordinance, to allow a Pet Care Services as a Permitted Use in the "M" Manufacturing zoning district for KnowPlace Pets at 825 Munshaw Lane with the following conditions:

1. Approved plans, reflecting staff and advisory board recommendations, as approved by the City Council:
   A. Application (Michelle Hutchinson, received 8/17/10)
   B. Plat of Survey (VSEI, received 8/17/10)
   C. Floor Plan (Michelle Hutchinson, received 8/17/10)

2. The Use Variation is granted to allow KnowPlace Pet Services, as described in the application information. The use shall not be significantly increased, i.e., the addition of kennels or conversion to a retail operation without amending this special use.

3. This petition must meet the Limited Use criteria for Pet Care Services.

4. The proposed fence must not extend into the parking lot drive aisle.

5. Storm water runoff from the "Outside Exercise Area" which may contain pet wastes, could enter the site storm system which is tributary to the subdivision's detention pond. Proper housekeeping and pet waste management will be needed to prevent storm water runoff water quality concerns. Work with staff to address waste management.

6. Signage is limited to 54 square feet of wall signage per the conditions of the variation previously granted.

7. The petitioner shall address any comments and requirements from the Engineering and Building, Fire Rescue, Police, Public Works, and Planning and Economic Development Departments.

8. The dogs are to be supervised when they are in the fenced outdoor area.

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

REPORT FROM PLANNING

- 2010-21 Topps – 8307 Ridgefield Rd. - Cont to 9-7-10
- 2010-47 Spirit Halloween – 5500 Northwest Highway - Use Variation
- 2010-48 Oaks Professional - Aptar - 475 W. Terra Cotta - PUD Amendment

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

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION

Mr. Esposito asked about the T-Mobil tower. Ms. Rentzsch said the lease is being finalized and it should go before the City Council soon.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.