

PLAN COMMISSION

SEPTEMBER 20, 1995

Members Present: Dan Robison, Carl Cepon, Ken Hellstern, Bill Smith, and Chairman Rudny

Members Absent: Bill Gill and Steve Kaplan

Other Officials Present: Tracy Einspanjer, Village Planner; Barbara Swanson, Village Attorney; and E.M. "Butch" Maiden, Rolf C. Campbell & Assoc.

1. Call to order at 7:30 P.M. by Chairman Rudny.
2. Mr. Smith moved, seconded by Mr. Hellstern, to approve the Minutes of August 20, 1995, as presented.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Robison, Cepon, Hellstern, Smith & Rudny
Nays: None
Motion Carried 5-0

3. Public Hearing: LaCASA

Ms. Sue Aldridge and Ms. Torrie Flink, representing LaCASA, and Mr. Michael Hoff, architect, were in attendance.

Ms. Einspanjer explained that LaCASA is requesting a special use permit for the operation of a counseling facility at 4275 Grand Avenue. This property is zoned C/S-3 and is currently vacant. Surrounding zoning classifications and land uses include:

North - C/B-2 (Henderson's two buildings and a commercial building)
South - Rt. 132
West - C/S-3, single family home
East - C/S-3, Ceckowski & Venturi Law Office

LaCASA has petitioned to vacate the adjacent Drexel Avenue right-of-way to the south; however, it has not been officially vacated. Their site plan reflects the use of this ROW and therefore, any favorable recommendation should be contingent upon their acquiring this property.

Ms. Flink stated that she is the Executive Director for LaCASA (Lake County Council Against Sexual Assault), which is a not-for-profit organization that started approximately 12 years ago.

Staff consists of 12 full-time personnel and approximately 100 volunteers. LaCASA provides services to over 9 area hospitals, in addition to prevention programs, support programs, and a 24-hour crises line. Ms. Flink informed the Commission that the 24-hour crises line will not be operated from this building.

Mr. Hoff stated that they have tried to create a plan for a residential looking building inside and out. This is done not only to fit in with the surrounding neighborhood, but to provide comfort and relaxation for the clients. The following depicts their proposal:

- A 12,000 square foot one-story ranch-style building, with brick and wood accents and a pitched asphalt shingled roof.
- A large fireplace in the waiting room.
- All counseling rooms have interior corridor doors, in addition to a door leading to either the exterior or the interior courtyard.
- Parking for the clients is in front of the building.
- Staff and training parking will be to the rear.
- The building can be portioned off for meetings.
- Interior courtyard to be utilized for counseling.
- Outdoor play area in the vacated right-of-way area.

Access will be provided off of Grand Avenue. There is an existing driveway off of Drexel, which will be removed and landscaped.

A hedgerow will be used to screen parking and headlights around the south parking lot. Additional trees and plant material will be installed, which more than meets the Village's tree replacement ordinance.

Mr. Smith was concerned with the lighting along the west wall. He indicated that the Village has experienced problems where the light source or lens is visible to the eye. He stated that he would like the petitioner to amend these fixtures to fixtures where the light source is recessed into the housing unit.

Mr. Hoff stated that these fixtures can be changed and commented that all lighting will be on a timer to shut off at 10 P.M.

Mr. Smith expressed concern with the play area being too close to Rt. 132 without being surrounded by a fence. He also stated that a solid wood fence should be installed along the west property line.

Mr. Hoff replied that there is a ditch along Rt. 132 that would deter children from going near Rt. 132, and added that the children will be supervised at all times. In regards to the fence along the west property line, there is an existing chain link fence and dense hedgerow along this line. He stated that some of the material may have to be removed to install another fence.

Mr. Hellstern questioned the design of the building and any Village Center Plan requirements for keeping with the appearance of the neighborhood. Mr. Maiden replied that there are not established standards; however, it would have to be viewed as to how it relates to buildings on both sides of the street.

The Commission commented that the single family home to the west has 7 feet of green space between the property line and the driveway. This site has 4 feet. The Commission stated that they would like to see the drive shifted to keep the same standard.

In response to the Commission's concerns about the appearance of the structure, Mr. Hoff stated that prior to designing this building he looked at the area from Viking Park to the east Grand Avenue connection to Rt. 132. There are many different styles, built in different time periods. The dormers, wood trim, and fireplace were added to keep a residential feel. The building was restricted to one story in order to unobtrusive. The building will not be very visible from Grand Avenue since the site drops off significantly and the building is set back behind most of the garages.

A partial basement will be used for the mechanical and sprinkler equipment, in addition to storage.

Ms. Einspanjer read a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Don. Scheffler, 4295 Grand Avenue, who were unable to attend the public hearing. The letter indicated that Mr. and Mrs. Scheffler's first preference is that such a large commercial facility not be built in their neighborhood. However, in the event that the planned facility is built, they are requesting that LaCASA install a 6-8' high privacy fence at all residential property borders.

Mr. Dan Venturi, 4247 Grand Avenue, stated that his law office is immediately east of the proposed LaCASA site. He stated that he does not want a 6-8' high privacy fence installed along his property line. He said that although the architecture of the building does not reflect the architecture of the adjacent structures, its setback from Grand Avenue and its low profile will allow it to co-exist with the adjacent single family structures. He stated that it is difficult to make a 12,000 sq. ft. office building look like a single family home.

In response to Mr. Robison, Mr. Hoff stated that the air conditioner units will be viewed from Rt. 132 and screened with landscaping.

It was thereupon moved by Mr. Smith, seconded by Mr. Robison, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Village Board on the petition of LaCASA, for a Special Use Permit to allow the establishment and operation of their public counseling offices on property located at 4275 Grand Avenue, subject to:

1. Installing a 6-foot high solid wood fence along the west property line;
2. Amending the light fixtures proposed for the west side of the building so that the light source and lens is recessed into the housing unit;
3. Shifting the pavement (drive and parking area) along the west property line 3-4 feet to the east; and
4. LaCASA acquiring the Drexel Avenue right-of-way.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Smith, Cepon, Robison & Rudny

Nays: Hellstern

Motion Carried: 4-1

4. Public Hearing: Nordic Properties

Mr. Esper Petersen, property owner, was present.

Ms. Einspanjer explained that Mr. Petersen was granted a special use permit in 1994 for a heliport located at 3535 Washington Street, with the following conditions:

1. No more than 100 operations to occur per year;
2. The heliport be restricted to use by Mr. Petersen's Enstrom 280 FX and any regulatory helicopter;
3. The hours of operation are limited to 6 A.M. to 9 P.M.;
4. FAA and IDOT approval is necessary for a restricted landing area; and
5. Any change to the heliport requires a new public hearing.

Mr. Petersen explained that, at this time, he is looking to purchase one of the following helicopters: Bell 206 Jet Ranger, A-star 350 "A" or "B"; Enstrom 480, or an Agusta 109. All of these helicopters are jet powered and can carry up to 5 passengers. Mr. Petersen's existing helicopter has a reciprocating engine and can carry only 2-3 passengers. All of the helicopters that Mr. Petersen is looking at can fit into his existing hangar.

Mr. Petersen stated that he has operated his helicopter 12 times in the 9 months that he has been approved. Only once has he had to fly over Park City.

Noise information has been submitted to staff. Jet engines are typically louder than reciprocating engines. Of the 4 helicopters that Mr. Petersen is looking to purchase, the A-Star is the quietest and the Agusta 109 is the loudest.

In response to Mr. Cepon, Mr. Petersen stated that because jet helicopters are so powerful, they are not subject to wind direction when making approaches for landings. In addition, hot weather causes piston powered engines to lose power. The one time that he had to fly over Park City was because the day was very hot and the reduced power in his helicopter required him to make the approach based upon the wind direction. Jet powered helicopters can make 90° approaches and therefore, are not as reliant upon wind direction.

Mr. Petersen presented a letter from IDOT, Division of Aeronautics, which stated that his existing heliport is of sufficient size to accommodate a larger helicopter. In addition, it stated that jet powered helicopters have better safety records than piston powered helicopters. FAA approval will be obtained.

No public comments were received.

Chairman Rudny stated his opinion that this request is not needed due to the close proximity of municipal airports.

Mr. Robison moved, seconded by Mr. Cepon, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Village Board on the petition to amend the existing Special Use Permit for Nordic Properties to allow the heliport to be used by Mr. Petersen's helicopter and any regulatory helicopters which may need to use the facility.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Robison, Cepon & Smith

Nays: Hellstern & Rudny

Motion Carried 3-2

5. Public Hearing: Leakakos/Delgaard

Mr. Leakakos and Mr. Delgaard, petitioners, and Mr. Venturi, attorney, were present.

Ms. Einspanjer explained that Mr. Delgaard's property is located on the west side of Hunt Club Road, and Mr. Leakakos's property is located on the east side of Hunt Club Road.

Mr. Leakakos' site came before the Plan Commission in 1992. At that time, he was proposing R-2 zoning and to enter into a pre-annexation agreement that would allow 24 single family lots with a minimum lot size of 13,500 sq. ft. Because the property is not contiguous to the Village, a pre-annexation agreement was proposed to ensure that the property developed to the Village's standards so that when it became contiguous it could be annexed. The Plan Commission's recommendation in 1992 was that the property meet all R-2 standards, including the minimum lot size. The petition was not brought before the Village Board because an amendment was made to the State Statute which eliminated the ability of municipalities to enter into pre-annexation agreements.

Mr. Leakakos' current request is for R-2 zoning and the new site plan reflects 20 single family lots with a minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet and a density of 2.1 du/ac. The Village's Comprehensive Plan reflects residential at a density of 0-2 DU/acre for this site.

Detention is proposed to be incorporated on 4 of the private lots on this site.

Mr. Leakakos' property can become contiguous through the annexation of the Lakeland Evangelical Free Church property and Mr. Delgaard's property. Mr. Leakakos has an agreement with these property owners to annex into the Village. Because churches are

permitted uses in the R-1 district and property is assigned R-1 zoning at annexation, no rezoning petition is being submitted by the Church.

Mr. Leakakos' parcel had been rezoned in the County to S, Suburban.

Ms. Einspanjer informed the Commission that Mr. Delgaard is requesting R-2 zoning for development with 24 single family lots (14.14 acres). The lot sizes range from 13,200-21,500 square feet. The lots under 15,000 sq. ft. do not meet the minimum lot size requirement of the R-2 district and therefore, Mr. Delgaard is requesting to depart from the lot size standard.

There is sewer along the east side of the Leakakos' parcel and water could be extended from either the Orchard Valley Subdivision or the Amoco station. If it is extended from the Amoco station, the church and Mr. Delgaard would grant easements across their property.

Mr. Leakakos is proposing 8 different house plans, ranging from \$270-300,000. Three car garages could be an option. Average house size is 2700 square feet, and Mr. Leakakos is intending to develop this site himself.

Mr. Venturi stated that engineering has not been completed for the Delgaard site.

In speaking with Mr. Delgaard, he has agreed to conform to the R-2 standards without any departures and will have to redesign his plan. This parcel is long and narrow and 1/2 of the lots will back to Hunt Club Road. Anticipated price range for homes on these lots is \$175-200,000.

Concern was raised by the Commission as to the incorporation of detention areas into private lots. Mr. Venturi replied that they could make the detention areas outlots, but then a couple of lots may not meet the 15,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size requirement. He suggested deed restrictions.

Ms. Einspanjer stated that the Village has only approved stormwater detention on private lots once. This development is not built and therefore, the Village does not have any experience with whether this works or not. Chairman Rudny added that that particular subdivision was larger and had a homeowner's association.

Mr. Venturi stated that Mr. Leakakos' subdivision will have a homeowner's association. He questioned if a departure from the minimum lot size standard would be allowed if the detention areas were placed on outlots.

Chairman Rudny stated that he would like to see the detention areas as outlots and the R-2 standards met.

Mr. Hellstern was concerned with possible flooding problems in Orchard Valley and questioned the impact Mr. Leakakos' subdivision would have.

Mr. Smith and Chairman Rudny expressed concern with the incorporation of the detention areas onto private lots with deed restrictions, in that homeowners do not understand them or are not aware of them.

Chairman Rudny was concerned with the depth of the lots in the Delgaard Subdivision, and stated that 120 feet is not very deep.

Mr. Maiden suggested using a curvilinear roadway and having larger side yards for accessory uses.

Mr. Albert Scales, 16978 Sibelius, stated he lives across from the Delgaard property and was concerned with drainage. He stated that there is nothing addressing run-off on these

plans. Mr. Scales was concerned with possible wetlands located on the Delgaard parcel. In addition, he informed the Commission that the County had dredged out a portion of this property and removed a field tile under Hunt Club Road. In turn, they installed a 2" drain, and now he gets the run-off faster. Mr. Scales stated that there are several 5, 10, 15, and 20 acre parcels from Rt. 132 to Washington Street/ Hunt Club Road to Cemetery Road. He was concerned with all of them developing in this manner and stated his opinion that all pieces of land are not conducive to development.

Mr. Ed Gutierrez, 34859 Hunt Club Road, questioned the road stub (on the Leakakos plan) to the south and why that didn't appear on the plans in the County. He stated that there is a seasonal creek on this parcel and a detention pond that is partially dug. He was concerned with run-off water. Mr. Gutierrez stated that he would like to see a privacy fence installed to screen his house and barn, due to his animals. He stated that he is willing to share the cost.

Mr. Todd Kemnitz, 16925 Sibelius, was concerned with drainage. He stated that these parcels will set a precedent for the future. Mr. Kemnitz was concerned with increased access onto Hunt Club Road, due to the amount of traffic currently on Hunt Club Road.

It was explained that the development will be required to complete a stormwater report for review and approval by the Village's engineering department. The development will have to meet the Village's stormwater detention ordinance. Presently, engineering has not reviewed or approved any plans; this will be required prior to any construction. Drainage and detention are two major items of concern to the Village.

The road stub to the south is to provide future access to the property to the south if it should ever develop. This is done to provide cross access points and to reduce the number of access points onto the major roadway.

The privacy fence issue is typically left up to the property owners.

Mr. Venturi indicated that Mr. Delgaard is withdrawing his petition for R-2 zoning. He will pursue annexation under R-1.

In response to Mr. Hellstern, it was explained that access from Orchard Valley can not be provided because this is a County subdivision and we cannot take access from a County subdivision.

Mr. Cepon stated that he would like to see the R-2 standards met.

Mr. Maiden suggested making the corner lots larger, make the street more curvilinear, and making the detention areas outlots.

Mr. Smith moved, seconded by Mr. Robison, to continue the public hearing of Mr. Leakakos and Mr. Delgaard, to the Plan Commission meeting of October 4, 1995.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Robison, Cepon, Hellstern, Smith & Rudny

Nays: None

Motion Carried 5-0

6. Continued Informal Discussion: Mayer Property

Mr. Elmer Hamning, E.H. Construction; Mr. Jon Nelson, Jen Land Design; Mr. Larry Mayer, property owner; Mr. Tim Frost, Bloodgood Sharp Architects; and various other support persons, were in attendance.

Ms. Einspanjer stated that this property is comprised of 40 acres located on the east side of Rt. 21, south of Saratoga Square. The Village's Comprehensive Plan designates this site

as office/service; however, this site is one of the sites considered for a possible land use designation change as part of the update of the Village's Comp Plan.

Mr. Nelson stated that there are several wooded areas on this site. There is also a Commonwealth Edition right-of-way to the east. Development of 420 rental units is proposed. The buildings contain 20 units each and have a 3-story core with 4 units on each floor, and a 2-story wing on each end that contains 2 units on each floor.

Preservation of the existing vegetation will be implemented, in addition to dealing with the natural characteristics of the site. A buffer zone will be added along Rt. 21 to add a "scenic corridor" feel. Proposed is a minimum setback of 175 feet from the centerline of Rt. 21.

IDOT access will be difficult on Rt. 21. Two emergency access points will be used and a spine system will be created for the parking lot network.

The developers have tried to create "mini neighborhoods" with this plan. There will be a 30% ratio of detached garages for rent and these are included in the parking count.

Proposed is a central recreation facility with a pool and leasing office.

A possible internal bike path network would meander through the site linking to a proposed trail to the north and connect to the forest preserve.

A day care facility is intended on 1.6 acres adjacent to the dentist office to the north. This will be a separately run facility and will have its own access on Rt. 21 with an internal access road.

Mr. Cepon commented that there have been no changes from the previous presentation.

Mr. Rudny stated that the developer did not complete his presentation at the last meeting and that this is a continuation of his informal review.

Mr. Robison stated that there is quite a grade change on the property. He expressed concern with tucking the apartments in areas with trees, in that they would be cutting the edges of the trees roots. He stated that to tuck the buildings, one end would be on grade and the other would have 7-8 feet of fill. He was concerned with the possible loss of trees.

Mr. Nelson explained that the core and wings are separate structures and they can be stepped up or down with grade changes. This type of building is more conducive to elevation changes.

Mr. Robison stated his opinion that the 4 buildings that parallel Rt. 21 are too rigid and isn't a very interesting or imaginative plan. He suggested flipping the orientation of a couple of the buildings to make it more creative.

Mr. Nelson stated that although this is true, the tree line at the north end of the property hides 2 to 3 of these buildings, so that you will only see 1 to 2 buildings parallel to the road.

Mr. Smith stated that the Comp. Plan envisions this area as office/service. He suggested building 220-240 apartment units to the rear of the site and using the front half for office. He also suggested the possibility of building the north portion with apartments and leaving the south portion, which has visibility from I-94, for office use.

Mr. Nelson stated that it is hard to split the site into 2 uses (front and back) because the site is so narrow. Its difficult to split the site into 2 uses (north and south) because of limited access opportunities.

In response to Mr. Hellstern, it was stated that rental units have been chosen because there is no market for this amount of office/service. This site has been on the market for years as office/service and has had three brokers; however, there had been no offers. It is hard to fill 41.5 acres of property as office. In addition, there is no access off of I-94. If you split the property as office/service and apartment, the office will take away from the luxury apartments.

Concern was raised by the Commission as to high density and traffic. The Commission stated that a traffic study would have to be completed for the site. The study should address the location of the site's main access; to ensure that the location makes sense for the development of the property on the west side of Rt. 21.

Ms. Einspanjer stated that the Village's Police and Fire Departments have stated concern with the street system for this development. They would like to see a dedicated public street and turn around part of the way into the site.

In response to Mr. Hellstern, Mr. Maiden stated that if this site should develop as office/service, approximately 1,000 employment opportunities would be created.

Mr. Mayer stated that the property is almost inaccessible and in his opinion, an office/service user can not be found. He stated that this is their best shot and if density is reduced they could not build luxury apartments. They would prefer to develop in the County.

Parking for this site is provided at approximately 2 spaces per unit. The Village will require more spaces for guest parking.

Mr. Frost gave the following presentation on the type of units to be developed:

- maximum square footage 1140;
- units to include: kitchen appliances, large storage areas, deck or patio, stackable washer and dryer unit.
- Separate dining and living areas;
- 9' ceilings, taller windows, and 8' patio doors;
- private entrances for the two-story wing units;
- fireplaces in all top floor units (except smallest unit);
- 10% 2 bedroom/den

The entry vestibule will contain the mail boxes. Elevations will have brick facades, double doors, shutters, and wood wraps. Rents would range from \$750/month for a one-bedroom unit to \$1250/month for a 2-bedroom/den unit. Garage rent will be \$115/month.

Chairman Rudny stated that this parcel will set a precedent for other properties along Rt. 21. He stated that he likes the product, but questions the land use. Community balance is a concern of the Village. He stated that he also likes the scenic corridor concept.

The Commission informed the developer that they would be discussing this project and the treatment of the Rt. 21 properties at their next Comprehensive Land Use Workshop Session.

Mr. Cepon moved, seconded by Mr. Robison, to adjourn the meeting at 11:05 P.M.
Voice Vote: All Ayes

Respectfully submitted,

Connie S. Dinsmore, Secretary
Plan Commission

