Village of Gurnee Planning and Zoning Board Minutes June 3, 2015

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

Planning & Zoning Board Members present: Chairman James Sula, Karen Thorstenson, Sharon Salmons, and David Nordentoft

Planning & Zoning Members Absent: Josh Pejsach, Edwin Paff, and Richard McFarlane

Other Officials present: David Ziegler, Community Development Director; Tracy Velkover, Planning Manager; Molly Booth, Associate Planner; Bryan Winter, Village Attorney

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Public Comment

Mr. Sula asked if anyone from the public had any questions or comments regarding anything not on the evening's agenda. As there were no responses, Mr. Sula then closed the floor to the public.

4. Approval of Planning and Zoning Board's May 20, 2015 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Sula asked if there were any questions or comments about the minutes; there were no responses.

Ms. Thorstenson motioned, seconded by Ms. Salmons, to approve the Minutes from May 20, 2015.

Voice vote: All "Ayes", no "Nays", none abstaining Motion carried: 4-0-0

5. Public Hearing: Stonebridge of Gurnee

Moon Development, Inc. and The Burton Foundation are requesting the following items:

1) Zoning Map Amendment to rezone approximate 6.6 acres from E-Estate District in unincorporated Lake County to R-1, Single Family Residential District in the Village of Gurnee; 2) Special Use Permit for a Preliminary Planned Unit Development application to develop the subject property with a 4-story Supportive Living Facility (SLF) for physically disabled adults, including certain departures from the Village's codes, ordinances, rules and regulations; 3) Special Use Permit to allow a Supportive Living Facility (SLF) for physically disabled adults, more formally defined within the Zoning Ordinance as a Geriatric Center/Institution for the Care of the Aged; 4) Special Use Permit to allow internal horizontal light levels to exceed 14.99 footcandles associated with an entrance canopy; and 5) Such other relief as may be necessary to accomplish the applicant's development plan.

The subject property is zoned E-Estate District in unincorporated Lake County and is located at 16256-16346 Washington Street, which is on the north side of Washington Street, approximately 700 feet from the Washington Street and Cemetery Road intersection.

Ms. Booth stated that the petitioners, Moon Development and the Burton Foundation, have an option to purchase 6.6 acres located at 16256-16346 Washington Street, which is on the north side of Washington Street, approximately 700 feet east of the Washington and Cemetery Road intersection. She noted that they are proposing to develop the property with a 4-story, approximately 85,000 sq. ft. 120-unit supportive living facility for physically disabled adults ages 22-64. To accomplish this goal they are requesting approval to: 1) rezone the property from E, Estate, in Unincorporated Lake County, to R-1, Single-Family Residence District in the Village of Gurnee; 2) secure a Special Use Permit for a Preliminary Planned Unit Development; 3) secure a Special Use Permit for the care of the aged in the Zoning Ordinance; and 4) secure a Special Use Permit to allow the internal foot-candle readings underneath a canopy to exceed the 14.99 level allowed by code.

Mr. Sula stressed that, while an Informal Review was held previously regarding this item on a different parcel, any comments made on the item at this meeting must be made based on what is being presented at this meeting. He stated that nothing "carries over," so to speak, from the Informal Review.

Mr. Winter swore in those wishing to speak on the item.

Mr. Sula turned the floor over to the Petitioners.

Thad Gleason, Architect with Gleason Architects, P.C., 765 Heartland Drive, Sugar Grove, IL, presented on behalf of the Petitioners. Mr. Gleason started out by showing a map of the proposed location, which is approximately 6.6 acres on the north side of Washington Street, east of Cemetery Road and west of Tri-State Parkway (16256-16346 Washington Street). He noted that there are existing residential homes in the area. The proposed facility is a 120-unit supportive living facility designed for adults, ages 22-64, with disabilities. The facility is intended to keep younger individuals who need some assistant with their daily living activities from having to be placed in a senior facility or nursing home. He then walked the PZB through the plans. The site has one entry point off of Washington Street and a cross access easement is

Approved

being provided to allow for future connection of the parcels to the east and west. A fire lane runs along the east and north sides of the building. The facility will have 71 parking stalls, a service entrance, patios along the north and east sides of the building, and sidewalks providing walking areas around portions of the building. He noted that the site slopes steeply from west to east and includes wetlands to the east. Stormwater detention will be provided along the eastern edge of the site. He went over the utility plan including stormwater detention and how water and sewer would be provided to the facility. He noted that the building is 3 stories from Washington and the west side, but due to the slope of the site, the building will appear 4 stories from the north and east. A gazebo is proposed along the north area, as a sitting area for residents. This area will also require a retaining wall with a wrought-iron fence on top for safety. A tree survey has been conducted on the property. Trees will be removed based on building/site improvement conflicts and poor health/species. A landscape plan has been provided which meets the Village's code requirements. One monument sign is proposed along the Washington Street frontage that will also comply with Village code. Planting around the base of the sign and the foundation of the building are also proposed. Plantings will be completed around the detention pond to make the area as natural as possible. In regards to lighting, the Village's decorative light fixtures will be used in front of the building. More standard, shoebox style fixtures, will be used in back. LED lights will be used for the sign, underneath the entrance canopy, and for the access/exit signs. The building will have an elevator, two-story grand entrance with fireplace, kitchen area that provides 3 full meals per day, dining room, laundry facilities (self/full service), activity rooms, barber shop, theater, library, fitness center, and rehab/therapy area, clinic. There will be 98 studio units and 22 1bedroom units. Each unit will have a full bathroom and kitchenette. The units on the upper level will have balconies. The facility will meet all ADA requirements, fully accommodates wheelchairs. The building will have sprinklers and will meet all state and local codes and ordinances. The building will be designed to present a residential look with red brick exterior, cement board siding, fiberglass shingles, gabled roofs, chimneys, and operable windows.

Mr. Sula asked if there were any questions from members of the Board.

Ms. Thorstenson asked if the Petitioners have constructed any similar properties.

Mr. Gleason answered that they have, and noted that Deer Path in Huntley, Illinois is a similar property of theirs.

Ms. Thorstenson explained that she asked, because—after seeing a photo of a gazebo in the presentation, she wondered if structures such as that would be wheelchair-accessible.

Mr. Gleason responded that all structures would be 100% wheelchair-accessible.

Ms. Salmons stated that she a concern with the height of the structure (41 feet), and questioned why the plans call for such a departure from the 35-foot height limit set by the Village's ordinance.

Mr. Gleason explained that the intent is to minimize the length of the building's wings, so as to create ease of movement to common areas on the building via centrally-located elevators.

Mr. Nordentoft also expressed concern over the building's height, and questioned at what point does the building measure 41.6" feet in height.

Mr. Gleason responded that it is measured at the grade of the building, in the front (Washington Street side), to mid-peak.

Mr. Nordentoft noted that height is actually 52.9 feet to the very top of the roof. Mr. Nordentoft asked if this facility would be for long-term care or transitional.

Mr. Gleason responded that it is to be for long-term care.

Mr. Nordentoft asked about the mobility of residents and if there will be transportation (bus or shuttle) available to transport residents off the property.

Joe Mugnaini, with Moon Development, Inc., explained that, while the residents will likely be pretty active, they will not likely have cars of their own on the premise. He stated that transportation, however, will be available to residents by the facility for those residents who wish to shop, go to doctor's appointments, etc.

Mr. Nordentoft also expressed concern that the lighting used to illuminate the monument sign may be a bit excessive for such a facility.

Mr. Sula asked for clarification, for the record, of what kind of lighting is being requested.

Ms. Booth answered that they are asking for a maximum of 29.1 foot-candles underneath the entrance canopy and the maximum currently allowed by code is 14.99. She also stated that staff noted the maximum for the ground sign at 46 foot-candles, even after an attempt by the Petitioners to reduce it. Suggestions included using a different fixture or putting visors on the fixture to direct the light to the face of the sign.

Mr. Nordentoft asked is this was normal to have foot-candle lighting issues with a ground sign.

Ms. Velkover noted that she has not encountered any issues in the past with sign lighting not meeting code. She also noted that it is not clear, at this time, whether the foot-candle levels being reported are on the face of the sign or on the ground surrounding the sign. She believes that the applicant should be able to make revisions to meet the lighting level for the sign.

She also pointed out that, while the Petitioners submitted their plans under the old zoning ordinance, the new zoning ordinance that went into effect 2 days ago would allow lighting

levels underneath a canopy to be 25 foot-candles, by right. So the proposed levels under the canopy are just slightly over 4 foot-candles above what is currently allowed by right.

Mr. Sula stated that lighting for the sign should stay within the ordinance, and that doing so should provide enough visibility for a facility such as this to identify itself. Mr. Sula also stated that the height of the building appear to be exaggerated by the terrain. He confirmed with staff that the Fire Department has reviewed the plans and was comfortable that it would be able to serve a building of this type.

Ms. Velkover noted that although the building height to the top of the building is slightly over 52 feet from grade at the front of the building, code measures building height to mid-peak. This is done consistently for all structures, including single-family homes. She stated that there are many residential structures along the golf course at Heather Ridge that, from the back-side, are 3 stories because of grade change.

Mr. Sula then opened the floor to the public on this item, stating that questions would be taken all at once from the public and then answered at the end by either staff or the petitioner.

Chaten Howard, 34675 N. Cemetery Road, stated that his house is located north of the Meyers' place, by the Village's pump station. He stated that his parents live at 34693 N. Cemetery Road and they share the pond with the Meyers. He has a few concerns with this building. He noted that he grew up at his parents' house, left for the military, and—upon his return four years later—had the opportunity to buy the house next-door to his parents' home (where he currently lives). He expressed concern with the height of the proposed structure. He stated from the backside they are going to see a 50-foot tall structure and the property already sits up high. He noted that this is a really nice residential area, that is a little more rural, and he and his neighbors enjoy their privacy. He also expressed concern about the lighting impact on the adjacent properties. He stated that they like being rural and being removed from the city area. Water runoff is another concern of his, as he feels drainage from the site will go right into his parents' pond. He also expressed concern over the impact that this project—along with Thomas Place and the memory care center—will have on Emergency Services. He stated that he pays for these services and want to know that, should he request such services for himself or a member of his family--the ambulance will not be held-up at one of these facilities.

Charlene Meyer, 34645 N. Cemetery Road, stated that she has a lot of adjoining property to this facility. She noted that only received her letter on this matter today, after she called the Village to find out about the hearing notice. She stated that the notice indicates that this is a hearing on a supportive living facility defined in the Gurnee Zoning Ordinance as a geriatric center. She noted that this is not a geriatric center, this is for persons 22-64 years of age. She noted that there are going to be a lot of people coming and going from this facility and that is it going to greatly impact stormwater water drainage. She stated that they already have a problem with the water treatment plant that is next to them that has no stormwater detention and has overflowed onto their property more than once. She stated that they still have no resolution even though the Village has known this to be a problem since 2006. She questioned whether

this facility would create the same kind of problem. She asked if vehicles would be allowed to turn left out of the facility, as this move would be very dangerous. She noted that the applicant indicated that this would all be physically handicapped individuals. She wanted to know whether there would be any residents with mental issues or drug or alcohol issues.

Tony Coletta, 36746 N. Kimberwick Lane, Wadsworth, asked where the sewer would come from to service this property.

Mr. Sula then closed the floor to the public. To begin answering questions, Mr. Sula first referred to staff.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the new stormwater detention basin will pick-up water from all the paved areas. There is a swale along the west and north sides and a swale on the south side along Washington Street. The outlet for the detention basin will go out through a level spreader into the wetland area that is owned by Centerpoint to the east. For sanitary sewer, they are evaluating 2 options. One is to come along Washington Street and hook into the doctors' office to the east. The second option, which is staff's preferred option, would be to get an easement from Centerpoint to extend sanitary from their park that is located to the east. As far as access onto Washington Street, Lake County Department of Transportation (LCDOT) has to give them access if they do not have any alternatives to access on a public street. The proposed access drive is at the best location, providing the greatest visibility given the grades on Washington Street and centrally located between the two existing traffic signals on Washington Street. The existing signals will provide gaps in traffic so that safe left turns can be made out of the site. The traffic study conducted by KLOA shows that for 2020 traffic volumes the left turn out of the site would function at a Level of Service (LOS) C with an average delay of 21 seconds during the AM peak hour and in the evening peak hour it would function at a LOS D with an average delay of 35 seconds.

Mr. Sula clarified that there will be one inbound lane and two outbound lanes (separate eastbound and westbound).

Mr. Ziegler stated that is correct. He also noted that the provision of cross-access on this site will allow for the elimination of additional driveway cuts onto Washington Street, if/when the adjacent properties redevelop.

Mr. Sula asked what the striping would be along Washington Street.

Mr. Michael Cavanaugh, Engineer for the applicant, stated that they met with LCDOT and they will be restriping the 60 foot wide center median to accommodate an eastbound left turn lane into the site.

In regards to the exterior lighting on the rear side of the property, Ms. Booth stated that plans call for zero-foot footcandles at the property line, which are below the levels required by

Approved

Village code. There are several parking lot poles and wall mounted light fixtures and each meets the Village's lighting ordinance.

Ms. Booth then explained that the project requires a Special Use Permit, and in application, is classified as a "Geriatric Center/Institution for the Care of the Aged" as such facility most closely resembles a Supportive Living Facility (SLF), for which the notice also referenced. The Zoning Code which this project applied under does not provide a specific classification for a SLF. She noted that the 2015 Zoning Code provides a classification for this specific type of facility and that it would also require a special use permit in the R-1 zoning district.

In addressing concerns over the projects impact on emergency services, Ms. Velkover stressed that is something the Village Board considers when deciding whether to annex a property. The Board also has the ability to determine whether any impact fees should be required with the annexation and development.

Mr. Ziegler added that the emergency services also monitor the amount of calls made for their services, and maintain staff, equipment, and other resources accordingly.

Mr. Sula asked the Petitioners to address occupancy.

Mr. Mugnaini stated that there will be 120 units of which 98 will be studio apartments and 22 will be one-bedroom apartments. While it's possible that a married couple may share a one-bedroom apartment, most units will likely have one single resident. There will certainly be no families in any of these units.

Ms. Velkover asked the Petitioners to address the specific type of clientele for this project.

Mr. Mugnaini explained that their charter is for physically disabled adults and that it is defined by the Social Security Administration. There are a number of disabilities that could fall under their charter. There would be no mental or emotional issues. He noted that this is not a medical facility. It is a social facility for persons that are physically disabled that need assistance with 1 or more activities of daily living. In regards to drugs, this is a drug free facility and it would not be tolerated.

Mr. Sula re-opened the floor to the public after indication that there were other present who then wished to speak.

Laura Coletta, 36746 N. Kimberwick Lane, Wadsworth, stated that they own the property immediately west of the proposed project. She stated that their property is 1.2 acres. She noted that they have water service, but in regards to sewer, she's concerned that they will be forced into a non-residential use on the property. She asked for details on where sewer would be run to service the development. She said that she is trying to determine whether they will be responsible for extending the sewer to the corner of their property. Her concern is the cost, given that their parcel is only an acre in size.

Mr. Zeigler responded that they are trying to get the sewer closer to the Coletta's property. The preliminary plans show the public sanitary sewer being brought about halfway into the proposed site. As part of this development, the Village will request an easement to get the sewer to the Coletta's site. He noted that he is not certain it is physically possible to get it all the way to the Coletta's site as there are depth and slope issues that are required. He said he doesn't know whether this site would be better served from this site (east) or from the funeral home site to the west. He noted that he would check into this and let the Coletta's know.

Ms. Coletta asked that the Village keep in communication with them as to what the final decision will be.

Mr. Ziegler stated that he would keep her informed on this matter.

Mr. Bob Meyer, 64645 N. Cemetery Road, expressed concern over the security of his adjoining property, and protecting it from those residing in the establishment who may be mentally impaired. He asked whether or not there would be some sort of security fencing that would keep residents off his property.

Ms. Tracey Manning, with the Burton Foundation, 81 S. McLean, South Elgin, stated once again that this facility will not be serving either the mentally disabled or developmentally disabled populations. The residents of this facility will have physical disabilities.

Mr. Sula then asked if there were any other questions or comment from members of the Board.

Mr. Nordentoft motioned, seconded by Ms. Thorstenson, to forward a favorable recommendation to approve a Zoning Map Amendment to rezone approximate 6.6 acres from E-Estate District in unincorporated Lake County to R-1, Single Family Residential District in the Village of Gurnee

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Thorstenson, Salmons, Nordentoft, and Sula Nays: None Abstain: None Motion Carried: 4-0-0

After consultation with Mr. Winter, Ms. Velkover, and Ms. Booth, Mr. Sula suggested that remaining requests within this item be considered under three separate motions.

Mr. Nordentoft motioned, seconded by Ms. Salmons, moved to forward a favorable recommendation to approve a Special Use Permit for a Preliminary Planned Unit Development application to develop the subject property with a four-story Supportive Living Facility (SLF) for

physically disabled adults, including certain departures from the Village's codes, ordinances, rules and regulations (including the request height departure of 41 feet).

Mr. Nordentoft also asked that concerns expressed by those directly impacted by the height departure be duly noted for consideration by the Village Board.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Thorstenson, Salmons, Nordentoft, and Sula Nays: None Abstain: None Motion Carried: 4-0-0

Ms. Thorstenson motioned, seconded by Ms. Salmons, to forward a favorable recommendation to approve a Special Use Permit to allow a Supportive Living Facility (SLF) for physically disabled adults, more formally defined within the Zoning Ordinance as a Geriatric Center/Institution for the Care of the Aged.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Thorstenson, Salmons, Nordentoft, and Sula Nays: None Abstain: None Motion Carried: 4-0-0

Mr. Nordentoft motioned, seconded by Ms. Salmons, to forward a favorable recommendation to approve a Special Use Permit to allow internal horizontal light levels to exceed 14.99 foot-candles, up to a maximum of 30 foot-candles, associated with an entrance canopy with the stipulation that any other lighting (including the proposed monument sign) must fall within current existing sign lighting codes.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Thorstenson, Salmons, Nordentoft, and Sula Nays: None Abstain: None Motion Carried: 4-0-0

6. Future Meeting Date: June 17, 2015

Mr. Sula confirmed with Ms. Booth that there is an item on the agenda for the upcoming meeting on June 17th.

Approved

7. Adjournment

Ms. Salmons motioned, seconded by Mr. Nordentoft, to adjourn the meeting.

Voice vote: All "Ayes", no "Nays", none abstaining Motion carried: 4-0-0

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Joann Metzger Planning and Zoning Board Secretary