

VILLAGE OF GURNEE

PLAN COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING

held

November 4, 1998

7:00 PM

GURNEE MUNICIPAL BUILDING

325 North O'Plaine Road

Gurnee, Illinois

2

1 PLAN COMMISSION:

2

3 DONALD RUDNY, Chairman

4 JIM SULA
5 BILL SMITH
6 LYLE FOSTER
7 BRYAN WINTER
8 KRISTINA KOVARIK
9 CARL CEPON

10

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12

13 JON WILDENBERG
14 TRACY VELKOVER
15 BARBARA SWANSON
16 AL MAIDEN

17

18

19

20

21

22 Reported by: SANDRA K. SMITH, CSR, RPR

23 CSR License No. 084-003104

24

3

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The Village of Gurnee
2 Plan Commission meeting will now come to order.
3 Can we have roll call, please.
4 MS. VELKOVER: Winter.

5 MR. WINTER: Here.
6 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.
7 MR. FOSTER: Here.
8 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.
9 MR. SMITH: Here.
10 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.
11 MR. SULA: Here.
12 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.
13 MS. KOVARIK: Here.
14 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.
15 MR. CEPON: Here.
16 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Here. Will you all
18 please join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

19 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. We have a
21 continued public hearing, Six Flags Theme Parks,
22 Inc. and Prism Development Company, L.L.C.

23 The subject property consists of
24 approximately 134 acres located at the northwest

4

1 corner of I-94 and Washington Street. The
2 Petitioners, Six Flags and Prism Development
3 Company, are requesting the following:

4 A, to rezone the property from I-2
5 General Industrial to a Planned Unit Development
6 PUD with underlying zoning of I-2 General

7 Industrial District and C/S-1 Outdoor Recreation

8 District.

9 And B, such other approvals as may
10 be necessary or desirable under applicable Village
11 Ordinances and Codes, all as may be necessary to
12 permit development on the property of theme park
13 uses, an entertainment village consisting of
14 entertainment compatible retail related uses,
15 employee housing facilities that are accessory to
16 new or existing theme park uses in the village,
17 general office and industrial uses and other
18 compatible uses.

19 First, this is a public hearing so
20 I ask anyone with the Petitioner that's going to be
21 giving testimony tonight and also anyone from the
22 public who wishes to make a comment or ask a
23 question, we'll open the floor to the public, you
24 all need to stand and be sworn in by the Village

5

1 Attorney.

2 (Witness sworn.)

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Tracy, do you have
4 something to add to this?

5 MS. VELKOVER: As you indicated, this is
6 a continued public hearing. At the previous
7 hearing there were some concerns still with the

8 development standards document and some concerns
9 and questions about the fiscal impact study.

10 So you have received from the
11 Petitioner a revised plan, also a revised
12 development standards document, a response to the
13 fiscal impact study concerning some questions.

14 You also have received a memo from
15 Ms. Kovarik outlining concerns and questions with
16 the development standards and also a letter from
17 Mr. Gary Silha.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I think Mr.
19 Silha's letter relates to concerns that he had
20 brought up in prior meetings and I think the
21 Petitioner and some of the Plan Commission members
22 will attempt to address that tonight.

23 I know his letter indicated he
24 wouldn't be able to make it here tonight but what

6

1 we'll do is address those concerns and I will
2 personally make an attempt to contact him later
3 this week to let him know what had transpired there
4 to give him an opportunity to respond again.

5 I think another thing is that we
6 will open the floor to the public and I know in the
7 past some of the meetings have gone quite late and
8 a lot of you may not have had an opportunity to
9 speak because you maybe had to work the next day so

10 you had to leave early or something like that.
11 So what we're going to do tonight
12 is the Petitioner will make his presentation which
13 I think is going to be relatively short. I don't
14 think we're going to be here until ten o'clock
15 making that presentation. I expect that it might
16 take an hour or so and after that we will open the
17 floor to the public before the Commissioners
18 respond. So I anticipate that the public will have
19 an opportunity to speak on this matter somewhere
20 around 8 o'clock.

21 So with that, Mr. Francke, please
22 proceed with your presentation.

23 MR. FRANCKE: Thank you. Mr. Chairman,
24 Members of the Commission, Ladies and Gentlemen,

7

1 again, my name is Hal Francke. I'm an attorney
2 with the law firm of Rudnick & Wolfe and I'm
3 appearing before you this evening on behalf of the
4 Petitioners.

5 What our agenda is for this evening
6 is as follows. First, we would like to have Alan
7 Krackauer briefly summarize the update to the
8 fiscal impact analysis that we provided to you last
9 week.

10 You will recall at the last

11 meeting, at the last session of the public hearing
12 Mr. Krackauer walked through his fiscal impact
13 analysis and there were some questions that had
14 been raised by Village staff and the Village
15 planning consultant. And we did subsequently meet
16 with those individuals and it resulted in the
17 update to Mr. Krackauer's analysis that you
18 received last week.

19 We would like to take a few minutes
20 to have Alan Krackauer walk through that for the
21 benefit of the public.

22 I then would like to run briefly
23 through the revised development standards that you
24 received. Again, I think this is the sixth --

8

1 fifth or sixth draft of that document.

2 And I do not intend to go through
3 it in any great detail, but there are a number of
4 substantial revisions that have been made that I
5 would like to highlight and discuss again for the
6 record and for the benefit of the public, for those
7 members of the public who have not seen that
8 document.

9 I do believe that a number of
10 issues have been raised over the last several
11 sessions that have been identified to us as
12 requiring further discussion and explanation so it

13 would then be our intention to walk through those
14 issues.

15 I would then hope to briefly
16 summarize where we are right now and where we've
17 come from and how the plan has evolved and how it's
18 changed over the course of really the last year and
19 most specifically over the last six months or five
20 months since the Plan Commission process began.

21 And then finally I would like to
22 work through what the Commission might be consider
23 -- if they're predisposed to considering a final
24 recommendation or a vote this evening I'd like to

9

1 walk with you through what might be some
2 development conditions that you want to pass on to
3 the Village Board.

4 So with that as a brief overview of
5 what our plan is for this evening I'd like to turn
6 the floor over, as I said, to Alan Krackauer.

7 Thank you.

8 MR. KRACKAUER: My name is Alan
9 Krackauer. Good evening.

10 Following the last Plan Commission
11 meeting I had the opportunity along with the
12 applicant to meet with the Village staff and Mr.
13 Maiden, your planning consultant, and they raised a

14 number of questions.
15 I responded to those questions in a
16 letter dated October 29th, 1998 which I assume you
17 have a copy of. What I'd like to do is just
18 summarize a few of the issues.

19 The most significant thing in this
20 letter was a response I think to a comment made by
21 Mr. Maiden. He asked if there would be another way
22 of looking at the actual value of this project.
23 Instead of simply coming up with the actual cost
24 estimates of the applicant or the developer would

10

1 it be possible to have a spread to go from the
2 current Prism estimates to a moderate type of
3 estimate and then look at a very low type of
4 estimate.

5 In other words, have a range of
6 cost estimates from a sort of high to low and then
7 have a range of the related tax revenues from high
8 to low so that depending on how this development
9 would take place in the years ahead we would have
10 a -- more of a realistic range rather than looking
11 at just the better quality type of development.

12 So what we did was I referred back
13 to a -- in order to get costs other than those that
14 are provided to me by the applicant I looked at a
15 document called Marshal Valuation Service. And it

16 really is something that begins to get beyond my
17 profession because I'm not a cost estimator but
18 it's pretty much a nationally recognized big thick
19 book that sets forth costs on almost every type of
20 building, it could be an office building or a
21 shopping center, and it's respected by people who
22 are in the appraisal business I believe and it's
23 respected by those that are assessors. And after
24 reviewing it I also was quite taken aback by it and

11

1 had the same level of respect.

2 But through that we were able to
3 take a look at a variety of scenarios from the
4 Prism to the moderate to the low. And in the
5 little packet I gave you is a very long sheet.
6 It's merely a summary sheet and it's not really
7 worth taking the time to go over every number, but
8 what is significant is to take a look at the
9 estimated market valuations. And I'll just go over
10 those real briefly with you.

11 The market valuations in the
12 original project as proposed by Prism and Six Flags
13 was somewhere in the range of about 377 million
14 dollars. In the moderate range it would be about
15 291 million dollars and then on the lower range
16 about 243 million dollars.

17 They vary only by construction
18 costs. In other words, the more expensive
19 scenario, the original one had the very highest
20 grade development. The moderate still had a very
21 highest grade development but not as high as the
22 original. And the lower one we came down to a
23 lower quality but never came down to the point of
24 tilt up slabs or metal clad buildings, it was all

12

1 masonry type construction. That is then translated
2 into assessed values.

3 And then if you look at table --
4 that was Table A. If you go to Table B, which is
5 an 8 and a half by 11 sheet, those are the
6 projections of the estimated property taxes also
7 done on a spread basis.

8 So we look at each taxing district.
9 And what has happened here is that we take all the
10 taxing districts, there's about 11 or 12, that
11 benefit from this development. The lowest
12 projection of estimated tax revenues is about five
13 and a half million dollars. The moderate was close
14 to 6.6 million dollars, and then the highest which
15 is the original of about 8.6 million dollars.

16 The other table in here -- and I'm
17 not sure it has a table number -- refers basically
18 to the school districts. And the school districts

19 are -- that would be on Page 7.

20 The school districts are the
21 beneficiary of the revenues that flow from this
22 development. Whether we take the current proposal
23 or a moderate proposal or lower proposal or even
24 something lower than low, whatever that's going to

13

1 be, it is the school districts in this community
2 that benefit because they, as I indicated to you a
3 couple weeks ago, receive approximately 60 to 70
4 percent of your tax dollars. So on your tax bill
5 60 percent of what you pay every year goes to the
6 school districts. That number generally in Lake
7 County gets a little bit higher each year as we go.

8 And we look at the school districts
9 and we add them all up. At the lowest end of the
10 spectrum -- and what I'm talking about, by the way,
11 I want to remind you if this development is
12 developed as Prism proposes it at maturity fully
13 occupied, so bear in mind that's what we're talking
14 about.

15 So if this development is done as
16 they project in the years ahead and fully occupied
17 and built the lowest projection would be in the
18 range of about 3.7 million dollars annually of
19 reoccurring revenue to the schools. The moderate

20 estimate would be about four and a half million
21 dollars and the original estimate was about 5.8
22 million dollars.

23 So no matter how we look at it,
24 even if we took those numbers and said we were 50

14

1 percent wrong or only half of this thing ever got
2 built the school districts still receive
3 substantial revenues without any cost to
4 government.

5 In other words, this development
6 produces no children into the school district so
7 this is nothing but a surplus of tax revenues,
8 something that most communities would look forward
9 to receiving.

10 Given all the revenues that are
11 produced from this development, as high as they
12 are, there generally is no indication that taxes
13 are not going to stop escalating because that seems
14 to be part of -- not just what we do in Lake County
15 but our American way of life.

16 When you do have a higher surplus
17 cash flow especially in the school district the
18 tendency is to hold down the assessment level and
19 thereby try to keep the tax structure in balance.

20 There was one other element that I
21 thought was important to make. Mr. Maiden had

22 asked a question about sales tax generation that
23 would come from the conference center and we were
24 able to turn to Prism and develop a comparable

15

1 scenario which was approximately about 155 dollars
2 a square foot.

3 And lastly, we looked at the
4 implications of these three scenarios as they would
5 relate strictly to the Village of Gurnee. And that
6 appears on the very last table, C.

7 And interestingly enough, even
8 though we've lowered in two of these scenarios the
9 actual market value and thereby the real estate tax
10 generation, the dollars that flow to the Village
11 remain very stable because most -- you have a very
12 low property tax in this community so whoever runs
13 local government does a pretty good job in context
14 of other communities in Lake County.

15 Most of the revenues that will flow
16 to the community are the amusement tax from the
17 water park and the hotel and room tax and then the
18 sales tax. So those items hold stable if this
19 development is built as proposed.

20 So even if we take the lowest case
21 scenario to the Village in terms of revenue it's
22 about 2.7 million dollars. And if we take the

23 highest case scenario it's about 2.9 million
24 dollars. Not a very big difference because the

16

1 taxes -- the real estate taxes are not significant.

2 And lastly, we held stable the
3 actual cost of this development to government. I
4 went back and looked at the employee anticipation
5 method that I had used. I'm still comfortable with
6 that way of estimating costs. And then I took a
7 look at something that I thought was easier to
8 understand, and that was Six Flags Great America
9 which we have across the street so to speak.

10 They have over 3 million visitors a
11 year. With whatever level of police protection and
12 fire protection and other public service protection
13 that's provided to them it's been estimated I think
14 by the Village and by Six Flags that the cost to
15 the community is somewhere in the range of about
16 \$300,000 give or take.

17 So if we have a development across
18 the street where we have experience with three
19 million people and we're looking at this
20 development that will have over a half a million
21 people -- I can't give you the exact number because
22 I don't know -- I think that's somewhat of a
23 comparable situation and a good way of comparing
24 the costs that I have generated in this study.

1 So generally that's the supplement
2 to the original study that I believe is dated
3 September of 1998. And if you have any questions
4 on that now or later I'll be happy to respond to
5 those.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think we'll reserve
7 all the questions for later once you make whatever
8 presentations you have and then we can open it up
9 for questions.

10 MR. FRANCKE: Thank you, Alan.

11 I would now like to briefly walk
12 through the revisions to the plan, the conceptual
13 preliminary planned unit development plat and the
14 development standards that have been made since the
15 last session of the public hearing.

16 You have all received reduced
17 copies, reduced size copies of the revised
18 conceptual preliminary PUD plat. I have here a
19 blown up larger size for the benefit of the
20 residents who may not have seen it and I would like
21 to highlight a few of the significant revisions
22 that have been made since the last session.

23 First of all, most significantly we
24 have now broken out as a separate parcel the area

1 where we anticipate the regional hotel and

2 conference center being constructed.

3 I think you'll note in the memo
4 that Commissioner Kovarik provided there was a
5 question about the ability to simultaneously grant
6 conceptual PUD approval and preliminary PUD
7 approval for the same parcel which we thought was a
8 very fair question.

9 So we thought the best thing to do
10 would be to break it out as a separate parcel. And
11 so that has now been identified on the plan.

12 Another issue that was raised by
13 that memo was the possibility of future confusion
14 to the extent that we use the term village center.
15 And therefore you'll note throughout the
16 documentation and on the plan now that we now refer
17 to the hotel and entertainment district.

18 Finally, somewhat more of a legal
19 technical matter, but you'll note now that instead
20 of Lots 1 through 12 we refer to Parcels A through
21 J I think or A through L. The reason that was made
22 was simply so that as time progresses and we go
23 down the road we don't run into confusion because
24 there will be a subdivision plat here and that

1 clearly will as required by the Recorder's Office

2 make reference to lots and have number
3 designations.
4 So we didn't want to have confusion
5 later down the road when people refer to Lot 4 did
6 they mean Lot 4 on the PUD plat or Lot 4 on the
7 subdivision. So the PUD plat now has reference to
8 parcels and letters so that later on that isn't an
9 issue.

10 I think those are the principal
11 changes that were made to the concept plan,
12 preliminary PUD plat. It is now dated October
13 30th, 1998. It still consists of two pages.

14 The other thing -- and I don't know
15 if that's on a separate board here -- the other
16 thing we've tried to clarify and now I'm going to
17 jump a little bit ahead to the development
18 standards, the revised development standards.

19 Again, those plans that I just made
20 reference to are in Section 5(b) of your
21 presentation booklet and now I'm jumping ahead to
22 5(c) which are the revised development standards.

23 One of the other questions of
24 concern was clarification on exactly what it is

20

1 that we're seeking preliminary PUD approval for and
2 conceptual PUD approval. Remember when we started
3 this whole process we were not even seeking

4 development approval as a planned unit development
5 and it was one of the concerns expressed by all of
6 you on the Commission as to maybe the fact that
7 maybe we should be doing that.

8 So we have after some time -- going
9 back some time now we've modified our application
10 to be requesting rezoning from the existing I-2 OIP
11 zoning to a planned unit development.

12 And what this plan now shows and
13 with the development standards have been very clear
14 now in terms of calling out is what it is we're
15 seeking preliminary PUD approval for and what it is
16 we're seeking conceptual planned unit development
17 approval for.

18 And the former, those uses for
19 which we're seeking preliminary planned unit
20 development approval at this time are limited to
21 the employee housing facilities, the theme park,
22 and the regional hotel and conference center.

23 Every other aspect of the plan
24 we're leaving at the conceptual stage which means

21

1 under your Zoning Ordinance that as those segments
2 of the development come forward before you for
3 preliminary approval there will be further public
4 hearings.

5 And of course as you all know that
6 one of the benefits of having this now modified
7 from a development with straight zoning to a
8 development with planned unit development approval
9 is that the owner of the property will consistently
10 be returning to you for plan approval and the
11 Village will have a significantly greater level of
12 control over the future development of this site
13 because of the fact that the owners will be
14 returning to you with applications for preliminary
15 and final plan development approval.

16 Again, looking at the revised
17 development standards, you'll note that we've added
18 a rather lengthy opening section to try to put into
19 words what has been expressed over the several
20 months that we've been appearing before you.

21 There was a concern expressed by a
22 number of the Members of the Commission about
23 having in words something that expresses the
24 concept and the vision that we've been sharing with

22

1 you over these past several months and
2 incorporating those into the development standards.

3 So there's a lengthy opening
4 section now entitled description of development
5 which was not originally there. And again, I'm not
6 going to go through all that at this point but it

7 does summarize what our intent is and what our
8 vision is for the project and what we've been
9 discussing with you for the last several months.

10 Again, jumping ahead, we've
11 narrowed down the parcel areas and the uses to
12 those for which we're seeking conceptual and
13 preliminary planned unit development approval.
14 Again, those being the employee housing facilities.

15 And we've clearly identified that's
16 on Parcel A. The theme park and parking facilities
17 which we've clearly identified as relating to
18 Parcels B, C and D. The hotel and entertainment
19 district which is clearly identified as meaning
20 simply Parcels E, F and G. And the Washington
21 Street outlots which as you know have now been
22 decreased in number from four down to two. And of
23 the two only one is identified as a potential site
24 for future commercial retail, et cetera type use.

23

1 And number five is the conservation
2 area and the open space lot that's located in the
3 southeast quadrant of the property; namely, Parcels
4 J, K and L.

5 And again, we've made it very clear
6 now those areas that are seeking -- for which we're
7 seeking preliminary approval and those for which

8 we're seeking conceptual approval.

9 One of the issues that is also
10 identified in the revised development standards is
11 language that's been added to make it clear that
12 the two additional hotels for which we are seeking
13 special use approval will be architecturally and
14 functionally compatible with the regional hotel and
15 conference center.

16 And so we've added language to
17 indicate that before the other two hotels can move
18 forward that final plan approval will have been
19 sought and issued for the regional hotel so that a
20 benchmark is established for comparison in terms of
21 functional and architectural compatibility.

22 We understand that that is a
23 concern for some Members of the Commission and so
24 we've tried to address that through the language.

24

1 Again, you'll recall when this
2 application was initially filed and as we stand
3 here, sit here this evening hotels are a permitted
4 use on this property.

5 And again, one of the revisions
6 that we've made to the plan in response to some of
7 the concerns of some Members of the Commission
8 because that special permit was adopted fifteen or
9 more years ago, what we have tried to do to address

10 your concerns and some of the things we've heard
11 about the existing hotel uses in the Village and
12 the desire for other types of hotel uses in the
13 Village we have now identified that on this
14 property hotels would be a special use.

15 However, we've asked that today the
16 special use authority be acknowledged or granted
17 for the three hotels that we've talked about so
18 that we can go to the marketplace and identify --
19 and identify the use approval remains in effect at
20 least for these hotels, these three hotels on this
21 property.

22 It is still very clear through the
23 documentation, however, though, that the regional
24 hotel and conference center still has to come back

25

1 before the Commission for final development
2 approval, for final landscaping, circulation, plan
3 approval, architectural, final architectural
4 approval.

5 And the other two hotels although
6 we are seeking special use permit authority up
7 front to establish entitlement to the use, those
8 actually have to even go through preliminary
9 planned unit development approval. So they will be
10 coming back before the Plan Commission and the

11 Village Board also for further public hearings. So
12 we've tried to clarify that also in the revised
13 development standards.

14 Another thing we've done is we've
15 clarified that alcohol -- the serving of alcohol in
16 restaurants is a permitted use in this area but
17 only if it is incidental to the serving of food.
18 And that to the extent that it is not so incidental
19 or to the extent that it's in connection with a
20 tavern or a club that it will -- that use has now
21 been moved from the permitted use list to the
22 special use list which I believe is more in keeping
23 with the existing commercial district provisions of
24 your Zoning Ordinance.

26

1 One of the issues that was raised
2 and not yet addressed in these development
3 standards and I think it was referenced in my
4 letter to you last week, again it's a comment or a
5 concern that was raised by Commissioner Kovarik was
6 the question of outdoor dining with restaurants.

7 We've identified from day one that
8 we anticipate a concept here, a retail pedestrian
9 oriented concept where it's highly likely that
10 there will be restaurants with outdoor dining as
11 many of us are familiar with in similar types of
12 developments in other locales.

13 So we clearly want to leave that as
14 a possibility -- as a possible permitted use in
15 conjunction with restaurants that are maintained as
16 a permitted use, but we're happy to work with you
17 on perhaps crafting, you know, on an up-front basis
18 so to speak standards that you would normally
19 incorporate into what might otherwise be a special
20 use permit for outdoor dining so that you know up
21 front that certain provisions are met if somebody
22 is going to have an outdoor eating area as an
23 adjunct to an existing or a new restaurant.

24 So on that issue we're really

27

1 looking for input from you and from your staff in
2 terms of the type of issues that you would
3 typically see when you have an application for
4 outdoor dining and the type of constraints or
5 limitations or protections that you would look for
6 to build into these development standards so that
7 those are identified on an up-front basis.

8 On -- I'm sorry, I forgot what
9 section this is exactly, but on Page 11 of the
10 revised development standards you'll note that as
11 requested we have identified the specific potential
12 square footage of the various development
13 components based upon the FAR that we're

14 establishing and limiting for this property.
15 Again, the FARs that we're
16 establishing for this project are significantly
17 less than the FARs that are permitted on the
18 existing zoning. We have identified and called out
19 those FAR limitations, floor area ratio
20 limitations, and we have now tied them, calculated
21 out the specific square footages of the
22 improvements that might go on the property.

23 Again, I'm looking at numerous
24 language revisions that you and your staff

28

1 requested. I'm not going to highlight those at
2 this time.

3 One of the other changes that we've
4 done -- again, it's in response to the concerns
5 that some of you have expressed about these
6 additional hotels that we want to see developed on
7 the property -- is we've added language to indicate
8 these have to be full-service hotels with the
9 amenities that you would typically see in a
10 full-service hotel which is, for example, on-site
11 dining and restaurant facilities, an indoor or
12 outdoor swimming pool, exercise room, perhaps some
13 level of meeting facilities, no access to the hotel
14 rooms from an exterior basis at least in terms of
15 the principal access. In other words, all access

16 to the rooms would be from an interior hallway.

17 So we have now built that into the
18 development standards. That did not exist
19 previously.

20 And finally, in terms of site
21 lighting, we had numerous provisions in there that
22 seemed to tailor the lighting requirements
23 specifically to this development.

24 And what we have done now is simply

29

1 referenced the new lighting standards that you all
2 considered recently this past year and the Village
3 Board just enacted in a new Ordinance. So now
4 we're just referencing the newly adopted Village
5 Ordinance on lighting standards so that there does
6 not have to be an independent analysis of the
7 standards that we propose in our development
8 standards.

9 So I think that pretty much
10 summarizes where the development standards have
11 gone. As I say, I believe that's the sixth
12 draft -- fifth or sixth draft that's been presented
13 to the Village.

14 They've gone through numerous
15 revisions as a result of input we've received from
16 the Commission, from the staff, from the Village

17 consultants and from the public and we feel pretty
18 good about the fact right now they will help
19 implement our collective vision for the Six Flags
20 entertainment village and that they're in pretty
21 good shape now to be passed on to the Village Board
22 and incorporated into a PUD agreement.

23 I'd like to focus on a few of the
24 what I perceive to be open issues or unanswered

30

1 questions that may impact any recommendations that
2 you might make to the Village Board or any
3 conditions that you might impose as a condition to
4 PUD or special use permit approval.

5 The first one that I'd like to
6 focus on is the one that I think that has received
7 the most attention and that is the area of
8 roadway -- off-site roadway improvements. And in
9 saying that I'm referring to everything that we've
10 talked about other than the potential new
11 interchange at the Tollway and Washington Street.

12 I thought I was clear at the last
13 session of the public hearing but in case I was not
14 let me reiterate that we understand that as part of
15 Phase I of the development the improvements that
16 are recommended in the traffic impact analysis that
17 was prepared by Metro Transportation Group, it was
18 discussed at more than one meeting by David Miller,

19 have to be constructed either prior to or in
20 conjunction with. If they haven't been previously
21 constructed by others, for example Lake County,
22 that they have to be constructed in conjunction
23 with the development of Phase I.

24 We also understand that the roadway

31

1 improvements have to be paid for by individuals who
2 are other than the existing residents of Gurnee.

3 And I think that -- I went back and
4 looked at some of the financing conditions if you
5 want to call them that or recommendations that the
6 blue ribbon task force put together in terms of
7 financing these improvements. And I think that
8 they actually pretty well summarized what we're in
9 agreement with in terms of their statement that the
10 residents of -- the existing residents of the
11 Village shouldn't have to be directly investing in
12 these improvements or funding them necessarily with
13 general obligation bonds or anything like that.

14 We understand that and we are in
15 agreement with that. And what I tried to say at
16 the last meeting is that at this point we're trying
17 to get past the stage of knowing exactly what the
18 development will look like in terms of the zoning
19 so that we're in a position to sit down with all

20 the governmental authorities -- the County, Lake
21 County, IDOT and even the Tollway -- and start
22 talking specifically about those improvements.

23 And we anticipate that once we get
24 past those hurdles, the uses, the improvements we

32

1 can start talking about costs and who is paying for
2 what costs. We anticipate that that will be a very
3 involved discussion that involves the other units
4 of local government, Lake County and obviously IDOT
5 and even the Tollway Authority.

6 And at this point we are not
7 looking -- as I stand before you today we're not
8 looking at any rebates or offsets but we're also
9 not saying that at a later date that won't
10 necessarily be part of the program that it might
11 not be a separate request once we understand the
12 full magnitude of the costs of the improvements and
13 what government may or may not be willing to
14 contribute for improvements that in all honesty are
15 needed today -- many of which are needed today even
16 without this development.

17 So we anticipate that the cost
18 issue will be a complicated discussion. And
19 although today it's not part of our request, we're
20 not asking for any kind of rebates or offsets
21 against impact fees, those discussions may come at

22 a later date.

23 And as all of you know, if there is
24 any kind of discussion about some kind of rebate of

33

1 sales taxes or amusement taxes or hotel tax or
2 whatever the Village revenue component might be,
3 those discussions would require a new public
4 hearing.

5 So nothing is going to happen
6 without, you know, further involvement of the
7 public and without further consideration by the
8 Village.

9 The other big issue I think that
10 came out in the last meeting or two or session of
11 the public hearing was the issue of the extension
12 of Tri-State Parkway. I'm not going to reiterate
13 everything that we had said at the last meeting
14 about what we had heard initially and why that was
15 not part of our original plan.

16 But our position remains the same
17 which is that we are more than willing to provide
18 in our plans to set aside a segment of right-of-way
19 that our traffic consultant and the Village's
20 traffic consultant deems necessary to adequately
21 preserve future options for the Village in that
22 regard.

23 We would suggest to you, however,
24 that rather than saying that -- that rather than

34

1 rushing to judgement on the issue and saying that
2 that parkway should be extended and connected today
3 we would suggest that that be made the subject
4 matter of additional study because we think that it
5 involves the input of a lot of people who may want
6 to get further information and further opportunity
7 to speak on the issue.

8 And I'm talking about not just the
9 neighbors in the area but the business community,
10 the Tri-State Industrial Park to the north has
11 addressed you in the past and I don't believe
12 really that we've really analyzed all the different
13 potential implications, looked at different changes
14 to the directional distributions or trip
15 generations or anything like that that we've talked
16 about at prior meetings. None of those have really
17 been looked at should Tri-State Parkway be
18 connected, extended.

19 We've shared with you some of the
20 concerns that we actually had expressed to us when
21 we first started out and contemplated that
22 connection in terms of its affect on Grand Avenue.

23 So it's our position again that
24 it's not that that shouldn't happen, it's a

1 question of how should it happen and when it should
2 happen. And as I say, in what form it should take
3 and what if any other improvements might be
4 necessitated or in fact obviated because of that.

5 So our suggestion on that would be
6 that you recommend that we set aside the
7 right-of-way but that the ultimate issue of when
8 and how and if it should be done be a subject
9 matter of further study.

10 I have already indicated to you,
11 you know, that we think we need to resolve the
12 issue of what standards or requirements or
13 limitations might be necessary if outdoor dining is
14 to be an accessory use to restaurant uses on the
15 property.

16 There was an issue raised about the
17 adequacy of the parking on the site and I think
18 that that's a very interesting question and it's a
19 good question and it's a question that I think is
20 going to be answered over time as uses come before
21 you.

22 As you know, we're only seeking
23 preliminary approval for three of the uses that
24 we've been discussing from day one--the employee

1 housing facility, the theme park and the regional
2 hotel.

3 The employee housing facilities I
4 feel -- you know, we feel on our team is sort of a
5 standalone facility that we can satisfy you and
6 will satisfy you as we go through the final
7 planning has adequate parking based upon our
8 experience and based upon the unique aspect of that
9 use.

10 So the real question for today is
11 the adequacy of the parking for the hotel and for
12 the theme park. I believe that if you do an
13 analysis of the theme park parking under your
14 Ordinances you'll find that the parking that we've
15 provided throughout our materials we've identified
16 that we're setting aside or we're creating in our
17 first phase in connection with the construction of
18 the theme park parking fields that will contain
19 2,750 parking spaces.

20 And I think that in consultation
21 with your staff we determined that that is a few
22 hundred spaces short of what on a technical basis
23 your Ordinance would require. Our position and our
24 belief is obviously that there's justification for

1 that because of the whole nature of what we've been

2 describing and sharing with you over these months;
3 namely, that a lot of the people that we anticipate
4 visiting the theme park will not be driving to
5 those parking lots because they will be on-site in
6 the area hotels or they will be coming from other
7 hotels through a shuttle system that we anticipate
8 putting in place in conjunction with the regional
9 hotel.

10 So we believe that there is
11 adequate parking for the theme park. Again, we're
12 not looking for any relief from the Village's
13 standards for the hotel parking.

14 So when we come in for final plat
15 approval we will either have to demonstrate
16 conformance to your parking requirements for the
17 hotel or we will have to demonstrate to you through
18 an analysis submitted to you at that time and if
19 it's found to be acceptable to your staff and
20 consultants that because of complementary uses,
21 perhaps offsetting peak hours or peak uses, that
22 there is in fact the basis for reducing the strict
23 requirements of parking based upon the concepts of
24 shared parking or joint parking which in fact are

38

1 concepts that are already recognized in your Zoning
2 Ordinance.

3 So we believe that this is going to

4 be an ongoing evolving process and we have no
5 problem basically agreeing to a development
6 condition or standard that says every time we come
7 in to you either for a preliminary plan approval
8 for those areas for which we have not yet sought
9 preliminary plan approval or even for final plan
10 approval for those areas in which we've already
11 sought preliminary plan approval we will always
12 have to demonstrate to you that parking on the site
13 is adequate.

14 If you will, by analogy for example
15 to a loan, a construction loan or others, what
16 we'll have to do is basically show you that our
17 parking is in balance. In other words, based upon
18 the uses that are on-site at any given time and the
19 parking spaces that have been provided that it all
20 balances out.

21 And fortunately we have enough land
22 here that we don't really have to land bank any
23 area to meet parking requirements because in effect
24 all of the areas that are undeveloped is one big

39

1 land bank of land for the Village to decide at a
2 later date you're going to have to provide
3 additional parking in that location because it
4 turns out that you're not so to speak in balance

5 and that we have found that based upon the use that
6 you've put in on Parcel G we're having a parking
7 problem and therefore you're going to have to deal
8 with it somehow in Parcel E.

9 So I think that we would suggest to
10 you that in any recommendation that you pass on to
11 the Board there be this requirement to on an
12 ongoing basis provide a methodology or a study that
13 assures you that the shared parking and joint
14 parking facility program can be implemented in a
15 manner that furthers, you know, the public health,
16 safety and welfare.

17 There was a question that one or
18 more of you raised about detail on a shuttle
19 system. And again this was an issue that had come
20 up -- it has come up for a year or more. Just to
21 give you an example, I brought copies that we can
22 -- I can pass out for the Members of the Commission
23 of the type of system that Six Flags has at its
24 facility in Texas, in Arlington, Texas.

40

1 And what we're saying is that we
2 anticipate that there would be a system like this
3 created at the entertainment village. And so in
4 the development standards you'll note that we've
5 added a provision that says that we have to provide
6 you with the details.

7 At this time we can't provide you
8 with the details, but we are acknowledging that
9 those details do have to be provided prior to final
10 plan approval for the regional hotel.

11 It's our anticipation that it's at
12 that time that the shuttle system would be put in
13 place. That is at the time that the regional hotel
14 and conference center was constructed.

15 Another issue that has been raised
16 or discussed in prior meetings was the overall
17 issue of the hotel demand and the question of the
18 special use approvals that we're seeking up front
19 for the two additional hotels.

20 I think everyone has always
21 acknowledged, it goes back to the days of the
22 Village's original RFP, the desire to see a
23 regional hotel and conference center be constructed
24 in the Village and specifically on this site.

41

1 And as I've stated in prior
2 meetings, I believe that the key issue on a special
3 use evaluation is the issue of community need. We
4 believe we have submitted to you information from
5 the Lake County Convention and Visitor's Bureau,
6 Lake County, Illinois Convention and Visitor's
7 Bureau of the existing need in the community for --

8 and in the region for more hotel space.
9 We've also had conversations with
10 one large corporate citizen in Lake County who has
11 indicated a substantial need and sees a substantial
12 need for additional hotel space in the area and I
13 can share with you a memo to that effect.

14 Also, if you turn back to the
15 submission that we made to you back in August which
16 is I think in Item 15 in your presentation book on
17 Page 2 of the discussion it talks about this issue,
18 there are some specific numbers that identify that.

19 There is clearly room for
20 additional hotel growth in this area and in
21 particular for the type of hotel that we are now
22 saying will be provided on this property in terms
23 of full service and in terms of the amenities that
24 we discussed above.

42

1 I believe that there is a clear --
2 there's clear evidence in the record that that type
3 of hotel is not necessarily predominating right now
4 in the community of hotels in the Village and so
5 we've tried to establish for you that there is that
6 need for hotels of that nature.

7 Again, that's to establish
8 entitlement to the use, it is not to diminish the
9 necessity for or to take away at all from the

10 responsibility of us to come back to you for a
11 preliminary and final plan approval for those other
12 hotels which means you will have ongoing control
13 over architecture, internal circulation,
14 landscaping, signage.

15 We're not looking for any
16 pre-approvals on those issues. So all of those
17 issues and then finally perhaps and foremost is the
18 issue that was raised most recently, assurances of
19 compatibility with the regional hotel.

20 All of those will be ongoing issues
21 of concern for the Plan Commission and the Village
22 Board. You are not relinquishing any control over
23 those issues at this time.

24 The last -- the last issue that I

43

1 wanted to identify that came up at I think the last
2 session of the public hearing was the question of
3 water usage. And unfortunately neither our
4 engineer nor the Village engineer is here but I can
5 tell you they've spoken to one another and that to
6 the extent that the water concern -- the use of
7 water is a concern because of irrigation we've
8 talked to the Village engineer about some
9 alternative strategies for irrigation to the extent
10 that that becomes any kind of major use on this

11 site, major use of water.
12 And I think that in terms of the
13 water park itself to the extent that that is a
14 concern, all I can tell you is that my
15 understanding is that neither our engineer nor the
16 Village engineer feels that that will be a
17 significant drain or strain on the Village's water
18 system and that these issues can easily be
19 addressed at the time of final engineering.

20 Again, even the water park is
21 subject to final plan, final platting and final
22 engineering review by the Village.

23 The last issue that I wanted to
24 address is the issue that has been raised about the

44

1 affect of this development on surrounding property
2 values and most notably the potential affect on
3 surrounding residential property values.

4 We found this to be a very
5 difficult question to provide specific evidence on.
6 And I think that part of the problem was there are
7 two sides to this coin and two issues that were
8 addressed.

9 One of the issues that was made
10 earlier -- one of the questions -- or I'm sorry,
11 one of the statements that was made earlier was the
12 fact that this would have a positive impact on

13 residential values and residents were questioning
14 where the evidence for that statement was.

15 I think the flip side of the coin
16 and the other corollary issue was not will it not
17 increase values but will it have a detrimental
18 affect on values.

19 One of the things that we did was
20 we looked at -- one of the things that we did do
21 was we went back and looked at basic U.S. Census
22 figures. And what we found was that from 1970 to
23 1990 the median value of owner occupied housing in
24 Gurnee increased 457 percent, i.e. while Six Flags

45

1 Great America was in business.

2 And I think it was identified at
3 prior meetings -- at a prior meeting that the
4 similar statistics have been found with respect to
5 housing values right around Gurnee Mills even after
6 the construction of Gurnee Mills.

7 We also went and searched some tax
8 records for properties immediately surrounding
9 Great America since it seems to be that that would
10 be a perfect place to look for comparison. Let me
11 just pass some of these out to you.

12 Again, what we have done is go
13 back to the tax records, the green sheets and just

14 do a sampling of some of the houses in the
15 immediate vicinity of Great America, the existing
16 theme park.

17 What we found was one property
18 located on Darlene Drive that was purchased in 1983
19 for \$47,500 that sold in 1997 for \$178,000.

20 Another property on Elsie Street that was purchased
21 in 1986 for \$25,000 that was sold in 1998 for
22 \$152,000.

23 A third house identified as a
24 property located on Darlene Drive purchased in 1991

46

1 for \$145,500 that sold this year for 159,000.
2 Another property located on South Road that was
3 purchased in 1995 for \$86,000 that was sold in 1997
4 for \$106,800. And finally, a house that is located
5 on Darlene that was purchased in 1981 for 52,000
6 and sold in 1993 for \$175,000.

7 Now, needless to say, we all know
8 that a lot of different variables go into a value
9 of a home, some specific to the house, some
10 specific to the locale and some more general in
11 nature.

12 But what we tried to show you is
13 that in and of itself being near a major regional
14 attraction is not necessarily an indication that
15 property values are going to decline.

16 And I think that the statement that
17 was made when we said this development in general
18 will be positive to local values I think what we
19 were trying to say and perhaps by summarizing our
20 feelings we didn't say it correctly, but what we
21 were trying to say was, you know, the obvious which
22 is that this development is going to be very
23 positive to the school district as was indicated in
24 Alan Krackauer's report.

47

1 And even if you decrease the
2 projections that were indicated in Alan's report
3 there's no doubt about the fact that the
4 development that's being proposed here is going to
5 be only positive to the local schools.

6 And to the extent that good schools
7 are probably the most important aspect or component
8 to house values, we believe that this development
9 will have a positive affect in that regard on
10 existing residential values.

11 At this point what I would like to
12 do, and I think we will be able to stay under the
13 one hour limit and I want that noted for the
14 record, I would like to summarize briefly now where
15 this plan has come from from its inception and how
16 the plan has changed and evolved substantially

17 through the input of all of you. And as I said,
18 the input of staff, the consultants and the public.

19 As I said earlier, when we
20 initially applied our goal was to leave the
21 existing I-2 zoning with the Office and Industrial
22 District special permit in place to leave this in
23 effect as a parcel with straight zoning and to not
24 have the property rezoned planned unit development

48

1 which of necessity or by definition means the
2 ongoing review of plans that I talked about before.

3 Of course our proposal now
4 contemplates and requests approval as a planned
5 unit development so that the Village does have this
6 ongoing review, authority and control; something
7 that it doesn't have on this property right now.

8 Through the development of the
9 property as it's now proposed the Village has a
10 proposal in front of it that will lead to the
11 construction of substantial roadway improvements
12 that again under the existing zoning which has a
13 very significant authorized permitted FAR but no
14 requirement to construct any of these roads we
15 think that there's been substantial benefit by the
16 creation of a plan and through your input
17 identifying these improvements and indicating the
18 importance of having them constructed with the

19 initial phase of development.

20 We think that this plan now shows
21 substantially increased landscape setbacks,
22 perimeter setbacks which again far exceed what's on
23 the property right now. They're not for -- most
24 notably, for example, we now are providing for the

49

1 100 foot scenic corridor, if you will, setback on
2 Washington Street. And that's from the future
3 right-of-way of Washington Street, not the current
4 right-of-way. That is something that is not
5 required under today's zoning and development
6 guidelines.

7 We have reduced heights from what
8 could be built under the existing zoning. We
9 substantially reduced the permitted FAR, floor area
10 ratio, the intensity of development if you will
11 that could be developed on the property from what
12 exists under the current zoning.

13 We have -- as I indicated earlier,
14 we have changed hotels so that they are no longer
15 permitted uses on this property, which they are,
16 so that now they are special uses on the property.

17 We have reduced the total number of
18 outlots. You'll recall we initially proposed four
19 outlots on this property for future development on

20 Washington Street. A number of you expressed
21 concern about what type of precedent this might set
22 for Washington Street, your concern about
23 Washington Street not becoming another Grand
24 Avenue.

50

1 And so again what you will recall,
2 we've brought it down to one outlot that could be
3 developed with commercial uses.

4 We have provided for the extension
5 of the Village's bike and pedestrian trail system
6 along and through this property which again the
7 current zoning and development approvals for the
8 property don't contemplate.

9 And finally, going back to some of
10 our early discussions, I believe we have brought
11 before you a plan that really does further the
12 goals of your new recently adopted comprehensive
13 plan which is to capture regional opportunities and
14 to create uses that strengthen the vitality of the
15 important uses that are already existing in your
16 community.

17 So I think that although the
18 process has taken quite a bit of time I would say
19 it's a better plan than the first plan that walked
20 in the door to you.

21 And I'm sure that you still have

22 some thoughts or comments about what's been
23 presented to you, but we would respectfully ask
24 that at this time hopefully you have received

51

1 enough input that you are in a position to vote on
2 the requests that have been put before you.

3 And again, just to summarize, what
4 we are requesting is planned unit development
5 approval, rezoning -- the first request is for
6 rezoning to planned unit development with an
7 underlying zoning of a combined zoning of I-2 and
8 C/S-1 and preliminary plan approval for the three
9 uses I talked about before, conceptual plan
10 approval for the other uses, special use permit
11 authorization for the employee housing facilities.

12 The third is special use permit
13 authority for the three hotels that we've
14 discussed. And the fourth one that I really didn't
15 focus on tonight, but it is something that you need
16 to consider and vote upon, is our request for a
17 preliminary plat of subdivision approval which is
18 -- I think it's Item Number 11 in your presentation
19 book.

20 That is another matter that you
21 would need to make a recommendation on, although
22 that plat of subdivision would have to be revised

23 and updated to reflect the most recent changes to
24 the conceptual plat.

52

1 So with that and in less than one
2 hour, I'd like to thank you for your time and
3 patience and attention. Thank you very much.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.

5 As I promised, I'd like to now open
6 the floor to the public to get your input. And I
7 know in the past meetings we've limited it to the
8 topics that were discussed. Since generally it
9 seems that the whole plan was discussed we'll take
10 input regarding any aspect of this development from
11 the public at this time.

12 So now I know there were a number
13 of you that came in late so those of you who wish
14 to speak and have not been sworn in, I ask that you
15 now stand to be sworn in by the Village Attorney.

16 (Witnesses sworn.)

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I ask that you
18 state your name and address for the record. And if
19 you could address your comments to the Plan
20 Commission we'd appreciate that.

21 MR. FERRARO: Good evening. Anthony
22 Ferraro, I live on Washington Park.

23 A couple things strike me about the
24 proceedings. Most of the time when somebody

1 petitions a governmental body and makes assertions
2 such as the developers or petitioners are entitled
3 to do with able counsel I would think that there
4 would be somebody refuting the assertions that the
5 Petitioner is making asking for foundation, for
6 example, about the Marshal study or whatever
7 Mr. Krackauer referred to.

8 I would assume that there would be
9 people cross-examining the testimony to get to some
10 of the issues. There's sweeping statements being
11 made by the Petitioners, as they're entitled to do,
12 about revenues, about the benefit. This is a
13 speculative real estate deal that's being proposed
14 to the Plan Commission.

15 And there is no pre-leasing. There
16 is no pre-commitment. We don't have customer one
17 yet for the water park, the hotel, et cetera. So
18 it would seem to me for the Plan Commission to
19 approve a change in zoning on a speculative real
20 estate proposition would be irresponsible without
21 challenging some of the assertions that the
22 Petitioner is making. That's the way I see that.

23 On a best case basis if everything
24 they propose is correct and their projections are

1 accurate then what we're left with is all of the
2 concerns that the residents have about occupancy,
3 full occupancy, traffic, increased cost to the
4 Village. We're hearing about the shuttle service.
5 There's no indication as to who is going to fund
6 the shuttle service.

7 So I would just ask the Plan
8 Commission to reserve a vote on this until you're
9 prepared to really examine and take the
10 Petitioner's statements to task and challenge them.
11 Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

13 MS. THOMA: Barbara Thoma, 1883
14 Gatewood. I just had essentially one comment.

15 Under the -- basically the Six
16 Flags entertainment village development, the
17 architectural standards statement on Page 6, Item
18 Number 2, there's a couple items --

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Could you speak in the
20 mic, please?

21 MS. THOMA: I'm sorry. There's a couple
22 items there under recreation and entertainment,
23 social facilities that they want as a permitted
24 use.

1 Certain items I'd like to see as

2 basically a special use. One is permanent
3 carnival, kiddie parks, go-carts, miniature golf
4 and batting cages. If that would be possible to be
5 used as special use rather than a permitted use.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm sorry, is that --
7 you're saying that's in the development standards?

8 MS. THOMA: Yes, on Page 6, Section 5
9 under recreation and entertainment and social
10 facility uses.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm not sure, which
12 draft do you have?

13 MS. VELKOVER: It's Page 8 of the new
14 draft.

15 MS. THOMA: Sorry. This is the draft I
16 had, it's Page 6.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. You're saying
18 that that should be a special use, that's your
19 comment?

20 MS. THOMA: Carnivals, kiddie parks,
21 go-carts, miniature golf and batting cages.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. That's it?

23 MS. THOMA: Um-hum.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

56

1 MS. COURSHON: Mary Courshon, 55 Silo
2 Court, Gurnee. South Ridge.

3 You'll be pleased to know I didn't

4 bring any bags this evening. I have several
5 responses.

6 At our last meeting a response from
7 Mr. Cepon regarding the initial purchase by
8 Marriott of the property in question. I've been a
9 lifelong resident of Lake County and do remember
10 when Marriott did buy that property.

11 And yes, they did own the property
12 on the west side as well as I think a parcel on the
13 south side of Washington Street because they used
14 to house the exotic animals there. When they first
15 opened they had like a big tent circus kind of
16 show.

17 They maintained the ranch style
18 house that was on the west side of the property --
19 on the north side rather for quite some time. My
20 mother used to say she thought it was Tex Ritter's
21 home, but it was a beautiful sprawling ranch house
22 with a circular driveway and they maintained that
23 house until they sold the property. So I don't
24 know who demolished it or who did that.

57

1 In fact, I think that might have
2 even predated the original comprehensive plan of
3 the Village. So yes, I do know that Marriott
4 bought that parcel but they also kept it intact

5 looking fairly residential.

6 A response to Mr. Winter's concern,
7 he was -- he pointed out that Great America was
8 present prior to me purchasing my home in South
9 Ridge and since Great America was there first it
10 would be reasonable for us to suppose that Great
11 America would sprawl over to the west side of the
12 Tollway.

13 However, I would like to make an
14 observation that a 20 year presence on the east
15 side of the Tollway plus a comprehensive plan in
16 place by the Village that the Mayor in fact used
17 with pride when he was campaigning for reelection
18 to cite that very comprehensive plan would be
19 suggestive of Village stability and its adherence
20 to its own development standards.

21 In fact, South Ridge as a
22 residential community was almost fully built out
23 when the land on the west side of the Tollway was
24 purchased by the Petitioner. So which seems to

58

1 come first is kind of a moot argument when you want
2 to consider who came first, the chicken or the egg.

3 The comprehensive plan as it was
4 written and stood in place for many years might be
5 viewed as a covenant between the Village and its
6 residents to the planned development of Gurnee with

7 sensitivity of the homeowners in mind. The
8 revision of this covenant while this particular
9 development is being considered is suspicious I
10 feel and degrades the efforts of this Board.

11 The Petitioner's traffic consultant
12 cautioned in his past presentation not to jump to a
13 quick fix at any one intersection without looking
14 further down the road as to what was going to be
15 impacted. Once this development and its subsequent
16 road and traffic improvements -- I use the term
17 loosely -- on Washington Street take place it will
18 completely reverse the position this Board took
19 some four months ago to give an unfavorable
20 recommendation to McDonald's on the northeast
21 corner of Washington and Hunt Club as, and I quote
22 this Board, it was never intended for the traffic
23 at this intersection to be that intense.

24 In fact, Mr. Cepon did go on to say

59

1 that the Amoco station at that intersection was a
2 mistake and he wouldn't like to see it compounded.
3 I'd like to ask what would this development do
4 considering how many lanes it's going to increase
5 Washington Street to and is this another mistake in
6 the making.

7 Initial phase of this proposal, the

8 employee housing and water park will as presented
9 by the Petitioner be empty for two-thirds of the
10 year. They have testified here that the season is
11 expected to be approximately 100 days long.

12 With what is being proposed to make
13 this attraction a destination location what other
14 activities would attract people to this destination
15 location for the other two-thirds of the year?

16 Does this leave a potential opening for a casino
17 development?

18 The Petitioners have stated that
19 further development is going to again be brought
20 forward to this Board and to the public. And since
21 it appears that the Petitioner is still blind to
22 the fact that the public is not interested in this
23 development I'm not sure why these assurances are
24 being given as a positive for consideration of this

60

1 proposal.

2 I am unclear about the need for
3 parking in the employee housing area. As it has
4 been presented to this Board and the public the
5 need for the employee housing is to house out of
6 town and out of country employees that Great
7 America hires and is currently bussing to college
8 dorms. So if they don't have cars now because
9 Great America has got to bus them and incur the

10 expense why do they need parking for employee

11 housing once they build it here?

12 We have a quote for 1990 housing

13 values, how they had appreciated in Gurnee. I

14 certainly do recognize that that's the case.

15 However, in 1996 housing values as quoted by North

16 Shore Magazine went down in Gurnee. And the

17 suspected reason for that as printed in the

18 magazine was the explosion of development in the

19 area.

20 Do the houses that have been

21 mentioned on Darlene back up or border on the Grand

22 Avenue corridor as the houses in South Ridge back

23 up to Washington?

24 Thank you.

61

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

2 MR. PAPIERNAK: James Papiernak, 6072

3 Indian Trail.

4 I have a couple questions. Will

5 this development be hidden from the road

6 essentially and out of sight out of mind like the

7 main gate for Great America?

8 Noise. Will there be any mandated

9 limitations for -- or noise statute? I'm not

10 familiar with any of those.

11 I'd like some clarification. If we
12 approve this zoning change do we give them the
13 opportunity to place any type of restaurants they
14 want? If this went through I'd love to see a
15 restaurant in the Bob Chinn's classification but if
16 a broad approval in this range would that allow
17 them to put in just another chicken joint or a
18 McDonald's.

19 What is -- what is this approval --
20 is put in this approval to prevent them from
21 putting in another budget type hotel instead of a
22 Marriott type establishment?

23 I still feel the traffic question
24 hasn't been properly fulfilled. I still don't see

62

1 a need for another water park in the area.

2 The other concepts of this
3 development might be very beneficial to the
4 community, perhaps another Marriott Lincolnshire
5 which would be highly used by the surrounding
6 companies like Abbotts and Baxter. This would
7 fulfill the Lake County Visitor's Bureau request.

8 And I would like to see possibly a
9 Village sponsored real estate impact study. Thank
10 you.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Sir, you rattled off
12 those questions rather quickly, I don't know that

13 we got them down. Would you have them written down

14 that we can --

15 MR. PAPIERNAK: Not in any legible form,

16 but I can prepare them. I could rewrite them and

17 submit it.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. We've got it on

19 the transcript but we might want to address some of

20 those questions tonight.

21 MS. VELKOVER: If we miss one can you

22 let us know which one we missed and we can go

23 through them?

24 MR. PAPIERNAK: Sure.

63

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thanks.

2 MR. HAWKINS: Good evening. My name is

3 Jim Hawkins. I'm the president, CEO and owner of

4 Keller Manufacturing Company.

5 The mic is a little low for me, I'm

6 going to hold it in my hand. I'm not here so much

7 to comment on the park. We've gotten a

8 presentation from Prism Development already with

9 the business owners and it's a fine organization

10 and they're doing a nice job with their park

11 notwithstanding the residents' obvious concerns.

12 I'd just like to say one thing

13 before I get into the main thing I want to say, and

14 that is with regard to property values.
15 Personally I was an owner of a
16 property in Hunt Club Farms and I have to say that
17 my property values did decline after Gurnee Mills
18 went into operation. In fact, that whole
19 development was under some stress for some time
20 after Gurnee Mills went into operation. It's now
21 just recovering.

22 My main point here tonight is not
23 to talk about so much this development but I
24 understand that the Plan Commission is considering

64

1 the extension of Grand Tri-State Parkway through
2 the industrial park. I just wanted to express my
3 concerns which I think are representative of the
4 current concerns of the business owners in that
5 park.

6 When we moved into the park this
7 was a very nice park. It was presented as a very
8 nice park. I bought into it because it was very
9 similar to the Corporate Woods down in
10 Lincolnshire, it was a very similar type of a park
11 there.

12 The things that were of interest to
13 me were the privacy and security of the park. As a
14 corporate user of those facilities we often welcome
15 corporate visitors, but we have a great deal of

16 prestige established with our businesses and of
17 course we have a lot invested in the landscaping
18 also.

19 Any time you have public access to
20 any public -- or a private industrial park you have
21 a problem with security. That's another keen
22 issue. If right now if there are people
23 notwithstanding the residents, we welcome the
24 residents to come in, they use their skateboards,

65

1 they walk in the park, they jog, they run, we're
2 very happy to see them. We know who people are and
3 who the residents are.

4 But if you start getting traffic
5 through there and it's an open public access area
6 it's very difficult to understand who should be in
7 there and who shouldn't be in there. So you really
8 lose policing control over that area.

9 It's pretty obvious at least to
10 me -- and I'm not an industrial broker -- but I'm
11 sure if an industrial broker was here they would
12 tell you that the property values inside of a park
13 that has private limited access are going to be far
14 in excess of property values in parks that are on
15 main roads say along Milwaukee Avenue, Waukegan
16 Road, Rondout and 176.

17 For example, the property we're
18 looking at we paid at the time in 1988 \$2.70 a
19 square foot and there was property over on
20 Winchester Road in Libertyville out near 45 that
21 was going for a dollar a square foot. And there's
22 other factors involved there, but I would guess
23 that there's at least a 50 percent discount for
24 property that is not in a private exclusive

66

1 industrial park like Tri-State Industrial Parkway,
2 Tri-State Industrial Park.

3 I heard earlier the representative
4 from the developer saying that they wanted to put
5 this aside and I would encourage that. I think
6 there is a need for additional hearing.

7 I'd like to have the other business
8 owners speak as well. I think I represent their
9 opinions here and I think we're willing to stand
10 very united in saying that we're very much opposed
11 to the idea of an extension going through the
12 industrial park and we feel it would have a great
13 negative impact on the property values of any
14 further and future development and investment in
15 our community. Thanks so much.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do you realize that
17 that road was always planned to be extended through
18 to Washington? Did you think that that was just

19 going to be like a one entrance into the park?

20 MR. HAWKINS: Yeah, it was planned by
21 the developers at that time that that roadway was
22 to have come in on Cemetery Road and exited on
23 Washington Street.

24 But that park was never designed

67

1 for a public use. That whole south section there,
2 that parcel was original parcel by Tri-State Realty
3 Partners and that whole development was -- is
4 zoned I believe at the time or at least the plan
5 was for an additional business space. In other
6 words, there was just an extension of the business
7 park.

8 Only recently was that land
9 subdivided off and purchased for retail use. And I
10 suppose there's been some rezoning on it but that
11 land was never originally intended to be used as a
12 water park or a convention center or a hotel use.
13 It was originally conceived that that was going to
14 be an extension Phase II of the Tri-State
15 Industrial Park.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But it was always
17 anticipated to go through as a public thoroughfare,
18 it's a public road, it's not a private road.

19 MR. HAWKINS: That may well be the case.

20 I'm just explaining to you that
21 we're very much opposed and it will have an
22 extremely negative affect on the property values of
23 the industrial community there and I think we'll
24 all be pretty much standing up here in opposition

68

1 to that idea of making that a public access road
2 and allowing -- and inviting public access from
3 Grand Avenue over to Washington.

4 I'll give you an analogy. It's
5 like if you moved into a subdivision, you bought a
6 home in a subdivision and the developer said and
7 the Village basically said to you that this is
8 going to be a beautiful development and your home
9 is going to be in here and you're buying the
10 privacy and you're buying the special things.

11 You're paying the money for this,
12 too. I mean it's not like you're getting these
13 things for free because the developer spent money
14 to make this thing very attractive to you. And the
15 Village obviously wanted you to come in so they
16 could get tax revenues from it.

17 And then somewhere down the road
18 ten or fifteen years removed the Village comes back
19 and says you know what, we'd like to extend
20 Dilley's Road to go through this subdivision
21 because we want to build another one on the other

22 side. And to me that's just, you know, solving a
23 problem at someone else's expense.

24 And I really don't think that that

69

1 was the initial intent, that's not the reason why I
2 bought the property in there, that's not the reason
3 why I've invested so heavily in this community to
4 be quite frank with you.

5 And to bring public access into the
6 park, this was also considered not six months ago
7 with CarMax that we opposed it at that time and we
8 opposed it at this time.

9 You change the whole complexion of
10 an industrial park when you make it a public access
11 area. And that was not the covenant with our
12 developer or with the Village in my mind at that
13 time that that's the way that property was going to
14 be used.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.
16 Anyone else?

17 MS. BEN: My name is Lisa Ben. I live
18 at 171 Knob Hill.

19 My main concern is the security and
20 privacy of South Ridge and our neighborhood. The
21 other night I had an incident where a man came to
22 my door asking for money for gas for his car

23 because he ran out of gas supposedly. Now I see
24 that happening with more frequency if there is more

70

1 people traveling up and down Washington and Hunt
2 Club roads.

3 I don't live on a corner, I live in
4 the middle of a street in the middle of the
5 subdivision and I felt quite threatened by this and
6 it immediately brought to my mind what might happen
7 in the future with more traffic and more access to
8 the roads around our area and people cutting
9 through the subdivision.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. LOPEZ: My name is George Lopez, 73
12 Silo Court.

13 It seems like one of the major
14 concerns here is obviously traffic. One of the
15 topics that hasn't really been brought up but I
16 don't see why they can't make some type of ramps
17 coming off the Tollway into the park.

18 If you come from the entrance off
19 of Milwaukee on the Tollway all the way up to Grand
20 Avenue it's over a mile. It seems like there's
21 plenty of room there where they could put an
22 entrance ramp going into the park especially from
23 the south.

24 One of the meetings they stated

1 that the majority of the traffic comes from the
2 south on the Tollway. There's plenty of room off
3 to the side where they could put a couple lanes for
4 the cars to sit there and wait until they get into
5 the park.

6 Saturday mornings is the worst time
7 on Grand Avenue because of all the traffic. This
8 would alleviate all that traffic, all that waiting
9 on Grand Avenue. If there wasn't enough room to
10 put an exit ramp from the park going back onto the
11 Tollway then people can get off at Grand and get
12 back on the Tollway. At ten o'clock at night on a
13 Saturday there's a lot less traffic than there is
14 at ten o'clock Saturday morning.

15 Another statement was brought up
16 about the Milwaukee Avenue entrance on the Tollway
17 being too close. Well, have you ever seen the exit
18 and entrance ramps on the Eisenhower Expressway?
19 They're a lot closer than that is.

20 So I think that could alleviate a
21 lot of problems and a lot of traffic concerns if
22 they could get some type of ramps going on the
23 Tollway into both parks or even an overpass from
24 one park to the other and have the ramps going back

1 and forth that way.

2 It seems like that really hasn't
3 been brought up much or been talked about that that
4 could be an answer sometime. I appreciate it.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

6 MR. CUMMINGS: My name is Edwin
7 Cummings. I live at 7254 Presidential.

8 Just as a general background, I
9 think that it's important that the Commission
10 understands that this is a huge issue for the
11 Village. I mean maybe I've overstated it, but I
12 don't think so.

13 I mean you've gone through a lot of
14 different things in the last couple years, some
15 significant hotly contested things with residents
16 who are concerned about it, but I think this is
17 probably one of the biggest issues the Village is
18 going to face in the last five or ten years easily.

19 And for that reason I think that
20 that warrants deep deep consideration on your part
21 and I bring this to your attention because it's
22 very easy to simply oh, just go along with the flow
23 and listen to representations, in fact statements
24 that are made and not really look real hard at it.

1 And there's a lot of apathy within the Village I

2 think by residents who simply just don't know.

3 I mean I myself just got really
4 involved in this in the last couple weeks. By
5 chance somebody mentioned it to me. I had no idea
6 the extent of this whole procedure.

7 So in the last couple weeks I've
8 tried to educate myself a little bit and based upon
9 that I think that there are some significant issues
10 here that need to be addressed before this panel
11 can make a decision about this.

12 The Zoning Ordinance in Gurnee, I
13 had the benefit of paging through that a little
14 bit, is going to control your decisions in this
15 case and you need to make certain findings of fact.

16 Since this is an amendment to the
17 current zoning provisions Article 3 is controlling
18 and there's about fourteen different issues that
19 you need to look at. I'm not going to bore you and
20 go through them because you probably know them
21 better than I do.

22 But the closing portion of that
23 particular Ordinance, the last paragraph in that
24 section says the Plan Commission shall not

74

1 recommend the adoption of a proposed amendment
2 unless it finds that the adoption of such an
3 amendment is in the public interest and is not

4 solely for the interest of the applicant.

5 Based upon the evidence that has
6 been presented in the material that we've heard I
7 don't think that we have enough information to make
8 that determination.

9 Specifically I would point to
10 several issues concerning, first of all, property
11 values, the economic impact and traffic.

12 Now the traffic has been gone into
13 I think quite extensively and there was actually an
14 independent study that was done.

15 And I pose the question with
16 respect to the economic issues especially since I
17 think there are some questions about Mr.
18 Krackauer's report given the numbers and the
19 realistic figures as far as what the actual revenue
20 generation is going to be might not it be prudent
21 to consider the use of some type of an independent
22 economist to address the specific issues of what
23 this project is going to generate both in tax
24 dollars for property taxes and the other revenues

75

1 for amusement tax and other taxes the Village
2 collects.

3 I think it's money well spent and
4 it does have to come through the Village coffers,

5 but since it's their development -- and I don't
6 know the practicality of this -- maybe they should
7 pay it.

8 Maybe we should designate it or
9 somebody on the Commission come up with a list of
10 three people and they come up with three people and
11 let's come up with somebody who can take a look at
12 this thing objectively because until we have that
13 information I don't think that we're in a position
14 to make a decision about this.

15 And this is a big decision. This
16 is something we're going to have to live with for a
17 long, long time. And for that reason I think we
18 need to really look at it and let's get it right.

19 Let's not shoot ourselves in the
20 foot or shoot in the dark because we don't have all
21 the facts and they don't have all their ducks in a
22 row.

23 You as appointed members of the
24 Plan Commission really sit in stead of the

76

1 residents and the citizens here and the Mayor and
2 the Village Trustees have had the wisdom to appoint
3 you to that position because they trust your
4 judgment.

5 So we as residents really rely upon
6 you to, you know, stand in our place and ask the

7 tough questions which you guys have done. I've
8 been to, you know, to these meetings and I've heard
9 some good questions.

10 But I think we need more
11 information and let's not just rush into this thing
12 without having everything we need before we make a
13 decision and we can't turn around on it. Thank
14 you.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

16 MR. SELTZER: I'm Joel Seltzer, 2464
17 Lawson.

18 Just following up on what this
19 gentleman just said, I think a marketing study is
20 needed. I really don't understand how they can
21 even speculate on this without even a proper
22 marketing study.

23 And having hotel experience myself
24 when you're proposing hotels with a higher rack

77

1 rate than any other hotel in the Village I would
2 want to see some justification for that especially
3 given the fact that the hotel with the highest rack
4 rate depends the least on Great America traffic of
5 all the hotels that are here right now.

6 I wouldn't necessarily trust
7 marketing studies funded solely by the Petitioner

8 because there could be some conflicts of interest
9 there.

10 A second point, however, needs to
11 also be brought up and that's employee housing.
12 The employee housing as I'm sure most of you recall
13 was recently rejected as a proposition that came up
14 a little while back for a different location at
15 Great America.

16 When we're talking about something
17 that only is for the benefit of the Petitioner and
18 not the public interest this really sticks out.
19 Those of you who were in the military service as I
20 was know what happens when you have a dormitory
21 situation populated by people with no roots to the
22 community.

23 And that's what we're proposing
24 here. Having resided in that in the U.S. Air Force

78

1 and having been part of the scourge of the
2 community that I was in at the time I don't think
3 it takes much imagination to see where that would
4 lead. And I see absolutely no reason why that is
5 of benefit to us.

6 Unfortunately, Great America
7 suffers from a fairly high crime rate among the
8 employees they have now who do have roots in the
9 community. Imagine the crime rate that we will

10 suffer if we import more people without those
11 roots.

12 When we talk about costs of the
13 community that will result we're looking at
14 increased police protection, increased insurance
15 rates for all of us because those are all tied to
16 the crime rate. And these are things that have to
17 be factored in.

18 Incidentally, in the military the
19 bases always provide military police to try to
20 temper some of the youthful exuberance of their
21 residents and don't rely solely upon the local
22 police. I haven't heard any comment on their part
23 of what they're going to do to control their
24 residents. So again, that should be some

79

1 additional food for thought.

2 I'm not necessarily against this
3 project in total but I hope that we're not being
4 seduced by the promise of a lot of dollars. We
5 were recently seduced by that promise with Auto
6 Nation which still sits empty today because with
7 all the great projections of income that they put
8 before us the fact of the matter was that it was an
9 experimental situation without a great track record
10 especially in this part of the country.

11 And the proof of the pudding in
12 that is that as a corporation they have slowed
13 their growth to the point where now the project
14 that you folks approved has been scaled back and
15 delayed because of the difficulties that their
16 corporation is suffering through.

17 The same optimism on their part
18 could turn out to be fewer dollars for us as well.
19 And understand that the projection of let's say 2.7
20 million dollars per year now only turns out to be
21 about \$100 per resident for the people in Gurnee.

22 I for one if this turns out to be
23 an inconvenience for me would rather pay the
24 additional few hundred dollars a year in taxes than

80

1 have to put up with what this will bring in order
2 to give me that supposed windfall. And I think
3 that the people that are here tonight would agree
4 with that assessment. Thank you.

5 MR. HOWARD: Barry Howard, Cemetery
6 Road.

7 I have the property that is
8 adjacent to Prism Development's proposal here. I
9 strongly encourage you to reject any rezoning
10 request by Prism Development.

11 There are too many unanswered
12 questions several people have touched on, traffic,

13 housing, special uses, and everything is a special
14 change so far.

15 What I would like to know is, and I
16 haven't heard this addressed yet, but the tax
17 advantages or difference it would be from their
18 development versus having an industrial park built
19 out, what would the advantage be tax dollar wise to
20 the Village if the industrial park was built out
21 versus a water park.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thanks.

23 MR. WILLIS: Morton Willis, 364
24 Churchill Lane in Winchester Estates.

81

1 I have the disadvantage of some of
2 you here, my house backs onto Washington so I have
3 all the traffic and the noise.

4 In addition to that, being in
5 Winchester Estates and away from the traffic light
6 getting out of there during most hours, not just
7 rush hour, is a real challenge. We have no light
8 and the exit onto Washington is extremely
9 difficult, dangerous, and one of these days there's
10 going to be a problem.

11 But we talk about property values
12 and we were given some comparisons. Again, like
13 many of the other comparisons given by the

14 Petitioners, it seems to be a partial bit of
15 information.

16 It talks about increase in property
17 values on Darlene and some of the other areas
18 there. I happen to know a family who lived on
19 Darlene and had a terrible, terrible time selling
20 their house.

21 What comparisons do we have to the
22 increase in property values in a new booming
23 community in other locales? Just because a number
24 has been given out doesn't mean a thing.

82

1 What is the number in other areas
2 in property increase over the time frame he's
3 talking about, 1970, 1975 to present, a very, very
4 long time, an awful lot of increase in property.

5 I think in order to really know
6 whether we're talking about property values wholly
7 we need much more in the way of numbers.

8 From our own standpoint in our
9 community there are 28 homes. About eight or nine
10 of them have been up for sale recently. They have
11 all taken a long time to sell, from six months to a
12 year and a half. I can't see where this is an
13 increase in property values. And this is before
14 this goes in.

15 Another question, water usage. We

16 have heard and the engineer from the Village and
17 the engineer from the Petitioner say that the
18 drainage and all this is fine.

19 All right, what about the usage of
20 water? This is a water park using a considerable
21 amount of water. Water evaporation has to be
22 replenished on a regular basis.

23 The Village of Gurnee has a water
24 allocation of gallons per minute. I have no idea

83

1 what it is. This Village is expanding rapidly with
2 new homes, all of it requiring more water.

3 It is difficult to the point of
4 impossible to get an increase in water allocation.
5 Water diverted from Lake Michigan is governed by
6 treaty between the United States and Canada, the
7 United States being represented by the states that
8 border the Great Lakes. None of them want to have
9 any increase in diversion.

10 Do we have enough water in the
11 Village to be able to take the amount of water and
12 water evaporation, water carryout by the people
13 who are getting in and out of this water park as
14 everybody gets out of the water carries water out
15 and it doesn't all go back in.

16 Do we have enough water allocated

17 to the Village to handle all of that demand plus
18 the demand that the increase in homes projected for
19 the Village of Gurnee is going to need?

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

21 MS. STEWART: My name is Karen Stewart
22 and I live in South Ridge subdivision at 274 Big
23 Terra Lane and there's a couple points I'd like to
24 make.

84

1 First of all, I've only been in the
2 Gurnee Village for a year and a half. I think I'm
3 somewhat non-typical in some ways because our
4 company relocated me to come and live in this area
5 and I chose Gurnee for three reasons. One is
6 schools, two is the housing value, and three is the
7 safety in the community.

8 And from looking at this in the
9 future of other people who will be relocating to
10 this area, Milwaukee is looking a lot more
11 attractive, surrounding communities, Grayslake and
12 other communities are looking really attractive
13 because the one thing that you have to really
14 consider is there's going to be too much
15 congestion.

16 In moving here a year and a half
17 ago I thought there was a lot of traffic already
18 and I wouldn't want to live in a place like

19 Naperville and I think that's what we're going to
20 end up with.

21 I think we're going to have
22 decreasing home values. In addition to that we're
23 going to have congestion, traffic. The traffic on
24 Grand Avenue is ridiculous, it's a dangerous

85

1 intersection. We have teenagers who are driving in
2 unsafe locations and that's going to be the exact
3 same thing that's going to happen to Washington.

4 Do you want your teenager driving
5 with all these other people who are going to have
6 no respect or appreciation for living in the
7 Village?

8 So the one thing I'd like to stress
9 is looking long term if people are looking to move
10 and relocate where are they going to choose to
11 live? Because if I had to make that decision now I
12 would probably move to another community outside of
13 Gurnee. Maybe not Milwaukee, but perhaps another
14 location. And that's something that you really
15 need to consider.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you. Anyone
17 else?

18 MS. JOHNSTON: Lori Johnston, 96
19 Foxborough Lane.

20 I know some of these points have
21 been brought up but I'd like to reiterate it. One
22 of my major concerns is traffic. If you drive
23 around Washington now it's extremely backed up. I
24 don't know -- you know what Great America is like

86

1 on Saturday. I don't know if you saw it on
2 Saturday October 24th for Fright Fest but the
3 Tollway was backed up all day and Grand Avenue was
4 backed up all day.

5 So far we've seen multiple changes
6 in what roads we're going to use to get there but
7 there have not been any feasible proposals put out
8 on how traffic is going to get to that new
9 entertainment village.

10 Also in reference to the conceptual
11 plan, it seems like every meeting the conceptual
12 plan is changing on what is going to be built there
13 and how many. It doesn't seem like there's a clear
14 vision that exists of what is going to be put
15 there.

16 In terms of economics, the jobs
17 that would be provided by this entertainment
18 village will be mostly minimum wage temporary
19 jobs. If we keep the property zoned as is we
20 provide industrial jobs and high paying
21 professional jobs to people in the area.

22 Also, we keep talking about all the
23 revenues coming in, that we won't have to pay much
24 as a village resident but it still affects Lake

87

1 County which are all our neighbors who live here
2 who have to pay for something that's going to be of
3 minimal use to us. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

5 MR. SCHROEDER: Tom Schroeder, 62 Silo
6 Court.

7 My concern is much like everyone's
8 concern around here, it's for the safety and
9 security of our community, the future of our
10 children.

11 I live along Washington Road,
12 Washington Avenue. Traffic is horrendous and it's
13 only going to get worse. I have a sneaky suspicion
14 that these guys over here really don't care about
15 our future. They don't care about our lives and
16 the affect that this is going to have on our lives
17 and our children's lives, okay.

18 They're going to make a lot of
19 money and it's going to come at our expense.
20 Enough is enough. Vote no.

21 MR. LEE: This I don't like. My name
22 is Arthur Lee, Orchard Valley. And we're adjacent

23 to Cemetery Road which is right now the brunt of a
24 lot of traffic from Washington.

88

1 It blocks off my wife from going to
2 work in the morning and coming home in the evening.
3 A five mile trip is taking a horrendous amount of
4 time. Your desire to embellish Gurnee with another
5 water world, Wallyworld is just ridiculous. I
6 don't understand what you've got against civil
7 living.

8 Mr. Francke just delivered a
9 determination that would be shaking the graves up
10 on Cemetery Road. I don't understand, I just get
11 so frustrated. I don't like to bellyache or
12 anything, but some of the things that were spoken
13 of are just inviting another Wisconsin Dells.

14 I can just see it now, Welcome to
15 Gurnee Dells, and then across it jump in our water,
16 jump in our sulfur water. The water being used in
17 the -- in that industrial park right off that
18 Tri-State Parkway now, they're using it to fill
19 ponds. Go smell the water.

20 They're sucking all the water up
21 from our reservoirs in Orchard Valley and now we're
22 getting sulfur water. The water stinks. You can't
23 get that out of your house.

24 I don't know what you fellows are

1 thinking about, you just don't give a whack-whack.
2 That's about what it is. It's a real dirge. I
3 didn't mean to say it so nasty.

4 MR. LAKE: Fred Lake, 6104 Indian
5 Trail.

6 I just had a couple of points.
7 Recently the Board voted down a petition by the
8 Postal Service to put in a post office on the
9 corner of Washington and Cemetery Road.

10 And as a matter of public record
11 one of the two reasons that it was voted down was
12 it would create too much traffic and it wasn't a
13 good location for a commercial operation like that.

14 If this creates too much traffic
15 for the post office obviously this other
16 development will create too much traffic.

17 Also, to echo what several people
18 have already said about house values, I live in
19 South Ridge also. I've lived there for eight
20 years. I don't have a prepared report for you this
21 evening but I can tell you that my value has gone
22 up about half a percent a year.

23 I think before the Board votes that
24 we should have a study commissioned on what the

1 affect is actually going to be on residential
2 values.

3 There's a good chance that the
4 value of all the homes in the surrounding area is
5 going to more than offset the possible economic
6 benefit we get from the park.

7 Also, I had a question about the
8 road improvement. The Petitioner stated that they
9 would prior to or in conjunction with the
10 development make any road improvements that were
11 necessary, but did they also say that that wouldn't
12 preclude them from coming back in the future and
13 asking for an offset or some division of cost in
14 some other way to provide for that which then means
15 that we're going to pay for it. I wasn't quite
16 clear about that.

17 And that's all I have. I just
18 really would like to encourage the Board to really
19 look at this affect on housing costs before they
20 actually take a vote. I think it justifies some
21 kind of a study other than the numbers from 1970 to
22 1990.

23 I think the Village has about
24 doubled in size since 1990 and the homes that are

1 affected are the ones that are west of 294 that

2 have been built since 1990, not the ones on the
3 other side that have those values that are drawn
4 prior to that time. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

6 Anyone else?

7 MR. LOWE: Just a real quick comment.

8 My name is Kevin Lowe. I live at 271 Big Terra in
9 South Ridge. I'd just like to make a comment.

10 I've grown up in this area since
11 1968. I went to Woodland, I graduated from Warren
12 right here up the street. I went to college in
13 Illinois and came back here so I'm kind of the
14 ultimate homey I guess, if you will, in Gurnee.

15 And I moved in here or stayed here
16 I should say with my family. I work at Abbott
17 based on the promise that -- or not the promise but
18 my investment here in the community, my home would
19 appreciate and the quality of life would maintain
20 if not increase.

21 And I just do not see the net
22 benefit of this development whatsoever to the
23 citizens of Gurnee and I feel that if this thing
24 goes through I think people are going to be bailing

92

1 out of Gurnee.

2 And I myself -- some of the
3 comments earlier, some of the surrounding

4 communities around here are looking more attractive
5 to live in as a homeowner. And I would just like
6 you guys to really think about that.

7 And people are going to take their
8 gains if any on their investments in their homes
9 now and there will be an exodus south of this
10 Village. So that's my position.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anyone else?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. The floor is
14 closed to the public.

15 I guess I just wanted to start out
16 by -- I know there were some of you that indicated
17 that, you know, we need to take a better look at
18 this.

19 And we haven't finished tonight, I
20 opened the floor to the public and put aside the
21 questioning by the Commission because I wanted to
22 give the citizens an opportunity to speak so we
23 didn't end up opening the floor at 10:30 at night.

24 And some of you had to leave and I

93

1 realize that not everyone can attend all of the
2 meetings. But we've had -- how many meetings have
3 we had so far on this? Seven?

4 MS. VELKOVER: I think it's six.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Six or seven meetings
6 on this. Quite extensive. Each of us has done a
7 lot of homework on this. I've been on the Plan
8 Commission for 16 years now and I've never spent as
9 much time on a petition as I have on this one.

10 So the Commissioners have spent a
11 lot of time on it. The Petitioners have been
12 cross-examined on a number of points. There has
13 been a number of testimonies given by our
14 consultants, our traffic consultant, our Village
15 staff has addressed a lot of the questions brought
16 forward by the Commissioners and also by the
17 public.

18 So I think to say that we at this
19 point haven't looked at things closely, whatever
20 our decision is we have looked at things very
21 deeply on this project. As the one gentleman said,
22 this is a big, big project. There's no question
23 about it, it's going to be major impact on our
24 community. Whether it be a positive impact,

94

1 there's going to be some negative impact. We have
2 to weigh that. It's a tough decision.

3 And many of you have brought up
4 some of the down sides of this project. But there
5 are positives. And what I'd like to do now instead
6 of -- you brought up a lot of good points, you

7 brought up a lot of questions so instead of trying
8 to go through each of those what I'd like to do is
9 open the floor to the Commissioners and ask the
10 Commissioners to not only have their points
11 addressed I think while they do that they're going
12 to probably be addressing a lot of concerns that
13 you brought up tonight and also in the past.

14 So with that I'd like to open the
15 floor to the Commissioners and ask that if you have
16 some questions or concerns if you could bring those
17 forward at this point.

18 I know I personally talked with
19 Ms. Kovarik. One of the points that you've made
20 tonight is the question of the affect on the
21 property values. And I know the Petitioner has
22 tried to address that and I realize it wasn't that
23 extensive but I know some us have some feelings on
24 that.

95

1 And I know, Ms. Kovarik, are you
2 prepared to make some statements on that because we
3 would like to address that. So you can start,
4 Ms. Kovarik, if you would.

5 MS. KOVARIK: I'm going to talk about
6 property values from my background. I've been a
7 residential mortgage lender since 1976. Of course

8 I started when I was ten.
9 Marshall's list is my Bible. You
10 know, we live and die by it. Because of the
11 government changes the criteria every couple years
12 for what it takes to be an appraiser I have as many
13 initials after my name as any real estate agent
14 here.

15 I think there's a lot of confusion
16 between what we as a lender view as property
17 values, your collateral for your loan and curb
18 appeal and supply and demand.

19 We have had a very cyclical supply
20 and demand in Gurnee and in some of the surrounding
21 communities which has impacted marketability but
22 not necessarily property values. What someone may
23 sell their home for versus what it's really worth,
24 you know, there's a lot of -- there's nothing

96

1 scientific with it, it's a lot of objectivity.

2 I could go through a uniform
3 residential loan appraisal with any one of you. I
4 happen to have a database of all the appraisals
5 done in Gurnee and in the whole United States over
6 the last ten years because of our work with the
7 major lenders. There is no line adjustments for
8 this type of commercial development. I feel very
9 strongly it would not have an impact on property

10 values.

11 I'm also going to talk to you
12 personally. My home backs up to Washington. I've
13 known about this project almost a year and a half
14 it's been talked about. My husband also happens to
15 be in residential mortgage lending and if either
16 one of us thought for a moment that we would lose
17 any equity in our home we would have taken the
18 steps that you all have talked about.

19 Both of us feel very confident that
20 it would not have a negative impact on our property
21 values. I think what you need to remember is the
22 most critical thing to property values for us in
23 this community is also helping to ensure the
24 competitiveness and ongoing economic viability of

97

1 Six Flags and Gurnee Mills.

2 That's very important. If either
3 of those become a white elephant, yes, there would
4 be a dramatic impact from an economic obsolescence
5 viewpoint on your property values.

6 So I am trying to balance that
7 against the fact that I do back up to Washington
8 personally with what I know as a residential lender
9 being certified to do an appraisal on anybody's
10 home. We deal with millions and billions of

11 dollars of mortgage backed securities. I do -- I
12 have to do the ratings, I have to assess the risk.
13 So I'm not talking to you as a Plan
14 Commissioner necessarily, just as someone who if
15 you want to talk about property values any one of
16 you can call me and we can walk through why there's
17 only been a half a percent increase in property
18 values in some years in South Ridge, why there was
19 a decline in 1996. I have all those statistics
20 available to me.

21 But I've shared my opinions about
22 property values with the other Commissioners and we
23 have looked at it and I have done my research and I
24 feel pretty confident that the development itself

98

1 is not going to drive property values down.
2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think just to add to
3 that, a lady had stated that one of the reasons
4 that she moved to Gurnee was the schools. And I
5 think clearly schools have an impact on property
6 values.

7 I think -- the Village doesn't
8 operate the schools but we can help to establish
9 the economic base that's going to provide money to
10 the schools so they can do their job. Now whether
11 they do their job or not is another issue, you have
12 to look to the school boards in that regard.

13 But, you know, this project clearly
14 will be a positive financial impact to the school
15 system. Now whether that results in higher
16 property values, that remains to be seen because
17 that depends on what the school system does with
18 the money and whether they're effective in making
19 the schools better with it. But it certainly makes
20 it easier for the school boards to provide for
21 better education when they have the resources.

22 Mr. Sula, did you have something?

23 MR. SULA: I just have a couple
24 comments, too.

99

1 I can fully empathize with some of
2 the concern in terms of the feeling that maybe
3 you're not seeing enough questions answered in this
4 meeting or maybe the last meeting, it depends how
5 many meetings you've been to.

6 But I had the opportunity to serve
7 on the blue ribbon committee as well as the Plan
8 Commission. And trust me when I say this, I don't
9 think the principal or the Petitioners would feel
10 anything less than fully peppered or interrogated
11 regarding the various issues from both the blue
12 ribbon committee and the Plan Commission.

13 A lot of the stuff does happen over

14 several meetings, it's not intuitively clear at
15 that one snapshot point in time. But we are very
16 well briefed by Village staff, Village experts both
17 internal to the staff and outside. And they do a
18 lot of work behind the scenes and give us that
19 input in the briefings that we receive prior to
20 every meeting.

21 As an example, somebody raised the
22 issue of safety. The police department petitioned
23 other Villages that have similar type things to
24 employee like housing. And you might find it

100

1 interesting that the City of Lake Forest found that
2 the Six Flags people caused no more problems than
3 the med school students that they had there during
4 the summertime.

5 So we do take that very seriously
6 and I can understand why you might not see it all
7 in one meeting but trust me, it is there.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you. Mr.
9 Smith.

10 MR. SMITH: I was concerned about the
11 road going down through the industrial park there,
12 too, until one morning I'm out there and sat. I
13 wished I would have kept a count but it's amazing
14 how many cars come up Cemetery Road apparently from
15 Washington Street and go into that industrial park.

16 And so that park is instead of
17 having the road go through Washington Street to now
18 they're using Cemetery Road to access that park.
19 There was a lot of cars came up Cemetery Road to go
20 into that park.

21 So I mean -- and that is a public
22 street that's there now. And the hotels could go
23 on the south end by right and the road would go
24 through. So I'm just saying I was amazed as to how

101

1 many people came up to get to that Parkway off of
2 Cemetery.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think we're probably
4 at some point there going to ask Mr. Grieve to
5 address the Cemetery Road -- not the Cemetery Road
6 but the extension of the Parkway issue because I
7 know that's something that if we move forward on
8 this we're going to have to recommend to the
9 Village Board as to what should be done in that
10 regard.

11 But I agree with you, Mr. Smith, I
12 think that there's a substantial impact to Cemetery
13 Road. A gentleman that lives on Cemetery Road, I
14 don't know if he's still here, there was another
15 gentleman, I think the older gentleman. I don't
16 know if he left.

17 But one of the potential benefits
18 that can come from this is if the extension of the
19 Parkway happens we can consider cul-de-sacing off
20 Cemetery Road so it will alleviate the impact to
21 the residential community on Cemetery Road which
22 the business park has had an affect on.

23 Unfortunately, you know, this whole
24 traffic thing is -- that occurs in our community is

102

1 something that we all are a part of. We're all
2 part of the if you want to call it the traffic
3 problem. And what we need to do is make sure that
4 we have the infrastructure in place to be able to
5 handle this traffic for all of us. So we all have
6 to kind of work together.

7 So, you know, when I hear the
8 business community say yeah, we're really
9 supporting this project but, you know, we don't
10 want the road to go through because then the
11 traffic is going to come through us, maybe that
12 will help alleviate the impact to some of the
13 residential areas as well.

14 So that's something, you know, I
15 think that's a positive factor in this and the fact
16 that the Petitioner with the creation of this
17 development will have to ensure that the
18 infrastructure is in and the road system to handle

19 and improve the traffic situation that we presently
20 have a problem with. And it would really cost a
21 lot of money for the taxpayers to improve it and it
22 probably isn't going to happen for a number of
23 years.

24 So together with the government

103

1 improvements that are planned and the input by the
2 developer I think that we can put a dent in this
3 traffic problem. That's one of the positives that
4 I see in this project. I'll let the other
5 Commissioners kind of address concerns.

6 Mr. Sula? Is there anyone else?

7 Did you have something to say, Mr. Winter? Did you
8 want to say something?

9 MR. WINTER: Well, with respect to the
10 Tri-State Industrial Parkway, in the recommendation
11 that was worked on earlier this week and you
12 received copies and I think most of us received
13 copies, there's a suggestion on one of the pages
14 that they would dedicate the roads but that this
15 would be -- there would be further workup in terms
16 of actually hooking it up.

17 So maybe just to streamline
18 tonight, I think I'm satisfied with the language
19 contained in the recommendation so that I think in

20 response to some of those questions we have heard a
21 lot of testimony regarding that issue but I think
22 the proposal right now at least in this
23 recommendation is that there would be a dedication
24 of the road and the right-of-way for those roads

104

1 but there would still be some further study.

2 It's Paragraph 5 on Page 2. The
3 way I'm reading it, it says our traffic consultant
4 and Petitioner's traffic consultant to provide for
5 the possibility of extending Tri-State Parkway
6 south. And I think it will be primarily the
7 Village's consultant that would decide that.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I think it also
9 goes with on Page 3 recommendation three that also
10 the Plan Commission conduct a public hearing and
11 make recommendations to the Village Board
12 concerning the possibility of extending Tri-State
13 Business Parkway from its existing terminus in the
14 Grand Tri-State Industrial Park to the subject
15 property at Washington so that Village staff,
16 Village consultants, Petitioners and other affected
17 property owners and members of the public are
18 afforded an opportunity to be heard on the issue.

19 MR. WINTER: And the reason I bring that
20 up is I think I indicated last time and I concur
21 with what's been said, we've all really spent a lot

22 of time considering this.

23 And I think it's appropriate that

24 we vote on this tonight in a sensible hour so that

105

1 the public can hear our voting on this. And then

2 not every issue will be decided tonight but at

3 least we've made it part of our processing this

4 request if we can take the formal vote tonight.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, let's see if

6 there are other comments by the Commissioners. Mr.

7 Foster.

8 MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, I'll just

9 briefly say I concur with what Mr. Winter is

10 saying.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Regarding the extension

12 of the parkway?

13 MR. FOSTER: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And the voting as well?

15 MR. FOSTER: I think we should get to

16 the point that we kind of state where we are.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay.

18 MR. WINTER: Don, I'm ready to make a

19 motion any time you want to accept one.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think we have some

21 other Commissioners that want to speak here. Mr.

22 Cepon.

23 MR. CEPON: After the meetings and
24 everything that we've gone through and after all

106

1 the revisions I thought it was done fairly well.
2 And we all know that this project
3 would not even start until all the road
4 improvements were in. But the one concern that I
5 did have was the same one as the owner of the
6 industrial park and Mr. Winter, I think we ought to
7 look at that extension of Tri-State Parkway all the
8 way to Washington Street, you know, very seriously
9 because I think that's something that could come in
10 the future if everyone decides that we should do
11 it.

12 But that was probably my biggest
13 concern on, you know, with everything that's
14 happened.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Mr. Sula?

16 MR. SULA: I do have one question
17 regarding the -- specifically the permitted uses.

18 I fully understand and accept the
19 Petitioner's request to maintain the existing
20 zoning for a period of time until the project is
21 somewhat under way.

22 But on Page 4 of the Tab Number 5 I
23 guess it is, if I'm reading this right, they want
24 to maintain the industrial use up until something

1 is constructed in the hotel and entertainment
2 district but not the regional conference center.

3 One of the concerns that I have in
4 terms of, you know, I want this project to be a
5 success if it indeed does go forward. One of the
6 needs of the community that's been articulated very
7 well over the course of time is a conference
8 center, you know, upscale hotels, that kind of
9 thing to better serve the business community.

10 I would be concerned the way this
11 is worded that we could end up with a water park
12 and then revert back to industrial zoning on the
13 rest of it. And I would recommend that as soon as
14 we get a building permit for any portion of this
15 thing, water park included, that that's when the
16 I-2 or the straight I-2 zoning goes away.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I think we had
18 discussed this earlier.

19 And, Mr. Francke, correct me if I'm
20 wrong, but I think the idea here is that -- I mean
21 you have a significant parcel here and I think at
22 this stage there's a good degree of certainty that
23 the water park and the employee housing would be
24 going in and that's why they have -- that's why

1 they've asked for the preliminary plat approval.

2 I think there's some assurance that
3 the hotel conference center could go in, but I
4 think the conceptual phase of this is in question
5 as to whether it will ever occur.

6 And if it didn't occur then I think
7 the Petitioner is asking for a reasonable use that
8 would revert back to the original concept and I
9 think they feel that that's compatible from the
10 standpoint that with the hotel conference center
11 you already have the industrial park to the north
12 and that could kind of tie in.

13 Now exactly how that would develop
14 around the water park, it probably would have to be
15 looked at because they would have to come for, you
16 know, approval there.

17 Mr. Francke, is that -- did I state
18 that accurately as far as what at least the
19 Petitioner's intention?

20 MR. FRANCKE: Yes.

21 MR. SULA: Maybe it's just in the
22 wording here but conceptually the way this is
23 worded you could get employee housing, the water
24 park and then the rest of it developed as Grand

1 Tri-State like.

2 MR. FRANCKE: That's correct.

3 MR. SULA: Because it's preliminary on
4 the main hotel.

5 MR. FRANCKE: That is correct. And I
6 think that the Chairman just indicated we didn't
7 think that was incompatible, that it was
8 necessarily incompatible or something that the
9 Village would want to preclude.

10 And I think the testimony early on
11 when this issue first came up from the Village's
12 consultant was that, you know, you wouldn't
13 necessarily from the standpoint of property values
14 and taxes, tax revenues to the school district want
15 to lose that zoning or have that zoning abandoned.

16 So our concept here -- and again,
17 you know, we're really only talking about this
18 limited area right here because the projection and
19 the testimony is that as we said, you know, as
20 early as next year the employee housing facilities
21 would be built, the theme park which is everything
22 up here would hopefully be ready to be opened by
23 the year 2000.

24 So all we're talking about really

110

1 is this area right here. And I think if -- you
2 know, if we didn't -- well, we were really just
3 focusing on this area here as the Chairman

4 indicated, we had figured that it was not an
5 inconsistent or incompatible use and that you
6 wouldn't want it to go away until these other uses
7 were established. That was the thinking anyway.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do any other
9 Commissioners have a problem with that portion of
10 it?

11 (No response.)

12 MR. SULA: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Ms. Kovarik, did you
14 have something?

15 MS. KOVARIK: Are you done?

16 MR. SULA: Yeah.

17 MS. KOVARIK: I just have a few
18 questions. My first question is for staff.

19 On the special use, the development
20 standards special use for the hotels, the
21 development standards really have a clear vision
22 that it's a full-service first class hotel.

23 And by granting the special use
24 we're agreeing that there's a need for it.

111

1 Hypothetically if a Super 8 did come forward and
2 they had the indoor access and they had an outdoor
3 pool and they were serving a continental breakfast
4 which I guess would be considered limited service,

5 can we say at preliminary that this doesn't meet
6 our vision of what we had for a first class hotel
7 and deny the petition, not the special use but deny
8 the petition on the preliminary?

9 MS. VELKOVER: I don't know where the
10 wording is on that, but I believe it does indicate
11 that it has to have a full dining facility.

12 MS. KOVARIK: Is says full or limited.

13 MR. SULA: It says full service.

14 MS. VELKOVER: I don't think that a
15 continental breakfast is a full dining facility.

16 MS. KOVARIK: It says full or limited
17 service restaurant so it --

18 MS. VELKOVER: What page is that?

19 MS. KOVARIK: Page 15, the bottom
20 paragraph. It would truly have -- so if it didn't
21 have a kitchen we could say no?

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, you know, there's
23 additional language in there that says that the
24 hotels have to be consistent with the --

112

1 architecturally consistent and functionally
2 consistent with the hotel conference center.

3 So I would think that you'd
4 probably -- and of course they'd have to be
5 discussed, but it seems to me that Super 8 is going
6 to not probably be architecturally and functionally

7 consistent with the hotel conference center.

8 MS. KOVARIK: Super 8 may be a bad
9 example. But is that what it's kind of leading to
10 with the special use and the preliminary being
11 separate that if it's not the vision we had for a
12 first class type hotel we can say no to
13 preliminary?

14 MS. VELKOVER: You still have to go
15 through from conceptual to preliminary so you do
16 have that ability.

17 And, you know, it does say full or
18 limited service restaurant and that's open to
19 interpretation and you can make that interpretation
20 at the preliminary PUD plat stage.

21 And if that's not, you know,
22 consistent with your interpretation of full or
23 limited service restaurant or the rest of the
24 definition in here for, you know, a full-service

113

1 hotel then you would have the grounds to deny it.

2 Butch, do you have anything to add
3 to that? I mean do you see that the same way?

4 MR. MAIDEN: I do. That's what I think
5 the provision was why they're only at conceptual
6 level.

7 MS. KOVARIK: I don't want to a year

8 from now be seen as an elitist or a snob or
9 something because we have this vision and it
10 doesn't come forward the way we want it. If we
11 want to say no I want to make sure we have the
12 right to say no, it's not our vision.

13 The second question, alcohol, my
14 hot button. We've discussed this. I feel it's
15 imperative that I act as responsibly as possible
16 when I am limiting -- you know, about limiting
17 access to alcohol when it goes to the outdoor
18 seating.

19 The development standards say see
20 below and there was nothing below on the what was
21 faxed us, the Exhibit A. And there wasn't any
22 Exhibit A so I'm still struggling with outdoor
23 seating and alcohol being permitted. And we've
24 always separated those for the -- through the

114

1 special use process.

2 I'm not sure what you're suggesting
3 as, you know, a possible way to get a blanket
4 approval for outdoor seating and alcohol all in the
5 same permitted.

6 MR. FRANCKE: What I'm suggesting is
7 that I understand you've dealt with this issue on
8 other uses, other restaurants already in the
9 Village.

10 And if you haven't I know other
11 Villages have dealt with the issue expressing
12 similar concerns. And what I'm saying is that I
13 believe that those types of conditions or
14 restrictions that you would want, not that there
15 wouldn't be alcohol served outdoors, in fact it's
16 part of the whole concept that was presented all
17 along and the types of the outdoor dining that
18 there would be there.

19 I saw a lot of glasses of
20 Chardonnay in the visions of what was being
21 produced. But I think those types of limiting
22 conditions are easily identifiable.

23 MS. KOVARIK: But those limited
24 conditions --

115

1 MR. FRANCKE: And they're not presented
2 yet because we're asking you to provide those.

3 MS. KOVARIK: So when you say Exhibit A,
4 Exhibit A is not here yet?

5 MR. FRANCKE: I'm saying you present us
6 with Exhibit A and hopefully we can work something
7 out.

8 MS. KOVARIK: We have outdoor seating
9 now with these limited conditions, it's all by
10 special use. What if we -- this is just a thought,

11 if we said if there's no alcohol outdoor seating
12 carte blanche permitted but if there is alcohol
13 then the outdoor seating has to come through some
14 process?

15 MR. FRANCKE: Well, again, we have a
16 problem with that because we know the outdoor
17 seating will involve alcohol.

18 And, you know, we're not -- we're
19 not envisioning like the back of a sports bar
20 that's behind an 8 foot high wood fence where
21 there's, you know, pitchers of beer on picnic
22 tables and people yelling and screaming.

23 What we're envisioning is that
24 they're outdoor cafes that I think a lot of us have

116

1 been to and seen where there's separation perhaps
2 between the public ways and the seating areas by
3 large planters or stone features and where there's
4 inabilities perhaps to access directly those
5 outdoor seating areas from the public way, that you
6 do have to come through the restaurant and outdoor
7 seating areas that are much smaller in size or
8 percentage in terms of seating inside the
9 restaurants.

10 You know, again, I personally
11 haven't been involved in this issue in this Village
12 but I have in other villages. And I'm not

13 minimizing the concerns that you're expressing.
14 All I'm saying is that no matter
15 how many times I've done it the limiting factors
16 are always the same. And so since we know what
17 those are, what I'm suggesting is we're agreeing to
18 put them in up front as part of the development
19 standards just like all the other limitations.

20 But why not do it that way and not
21 have to go through a special use every time it
22 becomes an issue because it will be an issue every
23 time there's outdoor dining.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Can I make a suggestion

117

1 because I think I have a solution to this.
2 We have a number of restaurants in
3 the Gurnee Mills area that now have outdoor seating
4 areas. Every one of those went through the special
5 use process.
6 I know you have this phobia about
7 special uses, but I think it's not -- we don't mind
8 looking at -- come every time one of the
9 restaurants that you develop in that entertainment
10 center wants to have an outdoor seating area, you
11 come before us, you present the design, we take a
12 look at it to see if there are any problems and we
13 say okay, this is good, we want you to do this or

14 we want you to do that.

15 The last one we approved was Pyzons
16 (phonetic). Because I can tell you if you want to
17 do what we did in all the other ones, all the other
18 ones have fences around them. The only one that
19 doesn't is Pyzons and the only reason it doesn't is
20 because everyone felt that the traffic flow in that
21 particular mall area was very low.

22 It wasn't like you would see in the
23 Gurnee Mills area. So that's why we allowed Pyzons
24 to put theirs in without the fence. So I think

118

1 you're going to have to meet the same standards. I
2 think it's only fair that the restaurants that
3 develop in the center there go through the same
4 things that everybody else in town does.

5 What's wrong with that?

6 MR. FRANCKE: Well, again, I understand
7 what you're -- you know, that that may be your
8 druthers.

9 But I'm saying my point is what is
10 the reason if we can identify your concerns up
11 front and build them in, if we don't comply with
12 those limitations or concerns it's a violation of
13 zoning.

14 You know, I don't know how many of
15 you have been, for example, to the outdoor seating

16 area at Maggiano's in Old Orchard. But I think it
17 would be very easy -- that's not a fenced in area
18 and yet it's obviously a very small part of the
19 restaurants.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Then you're asking us
21 to drop the fences. I mean we would have to make a
22 decision right here.

23 MR. FRANCKE: I'm saying drop -- it
24 depends what you mean by fences.

119

1 If you're saying fences that make
2 it impossible to see it defeats the purpose of the
3 outdoor dining so we would object to that.

4 But if you're saying a fence
5 because you want to have physical separation
6 between the public ways or the sidewalks of an area
7 and the residents that are drinking and eating,
8 that I understand.

9 But I mean the last few ones that
10 I've been involved with have involved the creation
11 of substantial concrete planters which create
12 physical separations from the public ways and the
13 dining area so that people can't necessarily come
14 and go, you know, and pass wine glasses back and
15 forth, that type of thing.

16 And we understand -- I understand

17 that concern, but I'm saying you could build these
18 into these standards the same way you do landscape
19 setbacks. And if you can do all these issues up
20 front now, why make each one a special use?

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That would be fine. I
22 thought you didn't want fences, though.

23 MR. FRANCKE: I'm not saying necessarily
24 fences. I mean you may decide that you want a low

120

1 lying wrought iron fence as the separation and I'm
2 not trying to take away that flexibility in future
3 design.

4 You're still going to have layout
5 design approval, architectural design approval,
6 landscaping. So I'm not saying that -- you may say
7 you want a wrought iron low lying fencing as the
8 separation.

9 What I am saying, though -- and I'm
10 not familiar with what you have done in other parts
11 of the Village on this issue -- but if what you're
12 saying is you've approved areas that have eight
13 foot high opaque wood board on board fences,
14 they're outdoor but they're totally cut off from
15 outdoor visibility, that we would have a problem
16 with because it flies in the face of our concept.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All the fences are
18 basically open fences but they do have a

19 requirement on the opening size so that you cannot
20 pass alcohol through the fence.

21 MS. VELKOVER: And generally --

22 MR. WINTER: Don, I was just going to
23 say if we can put it in the design specifications I
24 think we should because special -- you know, there

121

1 is a cost and there is a process for the special
2 permit.

3 And since we know they're going to
4 have these, you know, these are planned that I
5 would ask that they work with staff and work that
6 out as part of one of the recommendations if we
7 have, you know, if we make that part of a motion.

8 MS. VELKOVER: I think there is a
9 difference between what they're talking about with
10 separation and what you've typically done in the
11 past with separation.

12 They're talking about a physical
13 separation where you cannot get in and out, but in
14 the past when you've looked at special use permits
15 for outdoor seating you've wanted to physically
16 make it impossible to pass a drink not just a
17 person between the outdoor dining area and the
18 public area.

19 So, you know, a three foot wrought

20 iron fence isn't -- may be acceptable to him but
21 typically what we've done in the past what you've
22 done in special use permits, that would not be
23 acceptable because you would still be able to pass
24 drink. So that's just something for you to --

122

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That's why I say with
2 the special use we may even permit something like
3 we did at Pyzons where you don't even have to have
4 a fence if you show that the location of this is in
5 such a way that you don't really have pedestrian
6 access there.

7 You're not really going to -- maybe
8 there's landscaping or something like that it's
9 unlikely that somebody is going to work their way
10 through the stuff, we may say it's acceptable
11 without any kind of barrier.

12 That's why I think it's better to
13 just come to us with a special use permit.

14 MR. SMITH: Couldn't we put into there
15 where it would be impossible to pass a drink and it
16 has to be signed off by the police chief. I think
17 we had the police chief sign off on every one of
18 these, right?

19 MR. WILDENBERG: The police and fire
20 department and also building and zoning review each
21 one of these applications for an outdoor seating

22 area that includes the serving of alcohol and we
23 try to address all the concerns.

24 Also, the serving of alcohol in the

123

1 outdoor area is also tied to the liquor license for
2 each particular establishment. They're still bound
3 to follow the liquor dispensing rules under their
4 liquor license as well.

5 Another way to perhaps look at
6 this, it's so hard to conceive each and every
7 circumstances that we might come up with in this
8 entertainment village for outdoor seating in
9 restaurants. And there is a need for us to take a
10 look at those circumstances as they come up because
11 as you're saying in some instances a fence may make
12 no sense at all and in others a certain type of
13 fence may be very appropriate.

14 And it's very hard for us to sit
15 here right now today and draw up a list of criteria
16 that are going to fit each and every circumstance.

17 Another way to perhaps handle it
18 which would take it out of the public hearing
19 realm, take it out of the special use permit realm
20 but also afford a degree of oversight for you and
21 the Village Board in the issuance of a liquor
22 license is to have these applications for an

23 outdoor seating and alcohol serving area to come
24 through a review process with the Plan Commission

124

1 and then have a recommendation go up to the Village
2 Board hand in hand with the liquor license
3 application for that particular establishment.

4 That way you have a little bit of
5 an expedited process because you don't have to go
6 through official public hearing notice. And to be
7 realistic I think the property owners within 500
8 feet of these outdoor seating areas are all going
9 to be in the entertainment village for the most
10 part or in the theme park or in the wetland area so
11 your public notice -- so the public involvement is
12 really going to be from the people that are right
13 around there.

14 And it would still afford you folks
15 an opportunity to take a look at these
16 circumstances and we might get some good ideas for
17 some of the other outdoor areas that we've got
18 coming in the Village as well.

19 Plus it could be tied with a liquor
20 license application and taken up to the Board
21 simultaneously and kind of dealt with in that way.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And the liquor license
23 application, that's a public hearing before the
24 Village Board?

1 MR. WILDENBERG: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is that acceptable to
3 everybody?

4 MR. FRANCKE: Sounds okay to me.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Ms. Kovarik, does
6 that --

7 MS. KOVARIK: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It sounds like it's a
9 good idea to me, too. Do we have any other
10 additional questions? Ms. Kovarik, I'm sorry, I
11 thought you only had two questions but that's
12 three.

13 MS. KOVARIK: Other than outdoor
14 seating I'm in favor of all the permitted uses.

15 The only one that I would like to
16 see how the other Commissioners feel about because
17 it hasn't been brought out but there's a
18 performance arts theater here which sounds like a
19 wonderful addition to Gurnee but it also allows as
20 a permitted use -- I'm looking at cineplex,
21 performing arts theater, and a retail complex
22 anchored by a 20 multiplex theater is not -- it
23 doesn't fit the vision that I kind of see for how
24 the entertainment district is going to develop.

1 You know, the owner, Gurnee Cinema
2 doesn't seem to get the upscale destination hotel
3 and this type of retail uses.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Let me add something to
5 that because I agree.

6 I think that as in past
7 discussions, Mr. Francke, is special use we really
8 have to show a public need. And I think that the
9 movie theaters would be one use I would see in
10 there that I think the Petitioner should be --
11 should make the case that there is a need for that
12 because I didn't envision that this would have
13 movie theaters.

14 I envisioned a unique development
15 that would have maybe live theater or something of
16 that nature because we clearly have at this point
17 at least sufficient movie theaters in the
18 community.

19 So would you be willing to make
20 that a special use?

21 MR. FRANCKE: Well, let me say where I
22 agree and where I disagree with your statements or
23 your concerns.

24 I disagree that movie theaters are

1 inherently inconsistent with this type of a

2 proposal. I think any of the examples of this type
3 of use that we showed you during the public hearing
4 process almost every one had a movie theater.

5 So I disagree with you when you say
6 with all due respect that, you know, a movie
7 theater is inconsistent with this entertainment
8 district. I really strongly disagree with that
9 statement.

10 Where I agree with you is on the
11 concept of another, you know, 18 or 20 or 24 or 30
12 screen megaplex on the site.

13 That I agree with you. That I
14 think in a sense as we've planned the site would be
15 inconsistent with what they're proposing and it's
16 not our intent to create another use like that.

17 So to the extent, that, you know,
18 our documentation would allow us to do something of
19 that magnitude I agree with you it should be
20 revised to eliminate that possibility.

21 But I disagree that it should be
22 totally made a special use. In other words, I
23 think movie theater should remain, you know, up to
24 a certain --

128

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: How are we going to
2 define it, though?

3 MR. FRANCKE: I think in terms of the

4 number of screens. You know, the number of seats,
5 the number of screens.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't think that's
7 sufficient. I would want to see what the
8 particular use is.

9 In other words, if you had like a
10 small theater that was kind of maybe like an old
11 time theater where you're going to show old time
12 movies or something like that, I would say yeah,
13 that sounds very nice but I would like to see that.

14 We can't put that wording in to say
15 okay, we're going to allow that, we're not going to
16 allow this. Again, why not let the Plan
17 Commission look at the proposed cineplex and say
18 yeah, that's something that we'd like to see there
19 or no, that's just more of the same that we've got
20 in other parts of the Village.

21 What's wrong with that?

22 MR. FRANCKE: Again, we would prefer for
23 the same reasons, you know, having the right to do
24 some limited amount of theater whether it's an

129

1 eight screen or a ten screen theater as a matter of
2 right.

3 I understand you'd rather have them
4 all as special uses, Mr. Chairman. I understand

5 that a cineplex theater or a megaplex theater with
6 20 or 30 screens might be inappropriate. So I
7 understand that extreme.

8 But I also -- for all the reasons
9 we've said before we want each of these uses
10 whether it's restaurants with outdoor dining or
11 restaurants with alcohol or the hotels, you know.
12 We have narrowed -- remember, we started out with
13 an expansive list of commercial uses here that
14 members of the Commission objected to, many of
15 which are permitted uses on the property right now.

16 So we've pared it down and pared it
17 down and pared it down. And now I feel like almost
18 every use we're making a special use and we have to
19 bring in and justify every single use.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: This is just one more.

21 MR. FRANCKE: This is what?

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Just one more.

23 MS. KOVARIK: You've only got four uses
24 as special uses.

130

1 MR. FRANCKE: You only have four uses as
2 special uses but look how limited the permitted use
3 list is.

4 MS. KOVARIK: Yeah, but there's 10, 11.
5 Do you want me to count them?

6 MR. FRANCKE: It's really a very limited

7 use of retail -- list of permitted retail service

8 uses.

9 MS. KOVARIK: 13.

10 MR. SMITH: Was there a number like

11 eight, if it went over eight?

12 MR. FRANCKE: I'm suggesting eight or

13 ten screens and over that it becomes a special use.

14 MS. KOVARIK: Does anybody else think

15 that a cineplex is different than a performing arts

16 theater?

17 MR. SULA: I do.

18 MR. FRANCKE: Let me just say one

19 thing. The movie theater as a potential use has

20 been in the proposal from day one, in the traffic

21 report, in the fiscal impact report, it went to

22 you, to the blue ribbon. The possibility that

23 there would be movie theaters here has always been

24 there.

131

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But the thing is we're

2 not eliminating -- let me straighten something out.

3 We're not eliminating the

4 possibility that movie theaters could go in there.

5 We're saying we would like to see it before we say

6 yeah, that that fits in, that's all.

7 It's not like we're eliminating it

8 from the use list, it just goes from permitted to
9 special.

10 MR. FRANCKE: I understand.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay.

12 MR. FRANCKE: I understand what you're
13 saying.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Sula.

15 MR. SULA: I'm kind of on the bandwagon
16 that size does make a difference and I think eight
17 or ten is too big. I mean --

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think so, too.

19 MR. SULA: -- for what we're doing. But
20 frankly, I find it less offensive than bowling
21 alleys and indoor tennis courts. So I mean I don't
22 know where to cut it off.

23 MR. CEPON: Do you want to make it a
24 special --

132

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So you're saying leave
2 it permitted use? I'm not understanding.

3 MR. SULA: I'm almost leaning toward
4 making it toward a special use.

5 MS. KOVARIK: Maybe if I ask my question
6 differently. If we keep it permitted and it comes
7 preliminary and it wasn't our vision then we'd have
8 the leg to stand on, right, if it was permitted?

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: No, because don't

10 forget if that portion, the conceptual portion
11 comes to the preliminary plat and final plat you
12 probably aren't going to identify all of the uses
13 that are eventually going in there.

14 There would be some empty parcels
15 that could develop as a movie theater. They're not
16 going to come forward with a final plat just for
17 the movie theater. It probably will come back for
18 final plat for a use that's a permitted use.

19 So you really have to address that
20 now. I would -- I don't know how the other
21 Commissioners -- let me see how the other
22 Commissioners feel about it. If everybody says we
23 think it should be special use I can't really see
24 why that's that big a deal.

133

1 MR. FRANCKE: Let me say why I think the
2 eight to ten screen limitation is reasonable.

3 Again, our reports have always
4 identified the possibility of 1,600 seats in a
5 performance theater. And if you figure that in
6 today's multiplex theaters you have seating that I
7 would guess ranges from maybe in the real small
8 ones 125 or 140 seats all the way up to 185 seats.

9 That -- the 1,600 seats would
10 probably end up breaking down to eight to ten

11 screens if that theater instead of a performance
12 theater became a multi-screen movie theater.
13 So that's why again it's always --
14 it's not from a standpoint of traffic, we've
15 calculated the potential impact of that type of
16 usage into the traffic. We've analyzed the
17 economic impact, we've provided for further control
18 on your part for architecture, for landscaping and
19 all these things.

20 And if we said even eight or ten
21 screens was going to have to come back to you for
22 special use approval what are we trying to
23 determine at that point?

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do you want me to read

134

1 that --

2 MR. FRANCKE: What we're saying is
3 we've tried to establish every single use like this
4 that's been created anywhere around the region or
5 around the country has these types of uses in
6 there.

7 So when you say that's the whole
8 point if we're talking about a concept why do we
9 have to demonstrate at this point need when we're
10 saying it's needed for the concept?

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Not need for -- Tracy,
12 do you have the Zoning Ordinance? I hate to get

13 into this, but it's -- let me read the exact terms
14 in the special use section.
15 Okay. It says -- this is the
16 purpose of special uses. It says the Ordinance is
17 based upon the division of the Village into
18 districts within which districts the use of land
19 and the uses and bulk of buildings and structures
20 are substantially uniform.

21 It is recognized, however, that
22 there are special uses which because of their
23 unique characteristics can only be properly
24 classified in any particular district or districts

135

1 upon consideration in each case of the impact of
2 those uses upon neighboring land and of the public
3 need for the particular use at the particular
4 location.

5 So that's -- that would be the --

6 MR. FRANCKE: And I would suggest to you
7 that the first factor, its impact on surrounding
8 properties we've totally addressed because we've
9 located this in the core of the property and it's
10 going to be --

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It's the public need
12 part that's --

13 MR. FRANCKE: And we've tried to

14 establish in the same manner that we did with the
15 hotels that this is a typical component of this
16 type of use, the entertainment center type use, and
17 that there's a need for this type of entertainment
18 district in the community and in the region. And,
19 you know, that this is --

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, that's what the
21 hearing process would be about. That's what you
22 would -- in other words, if somebody wants --

23 MR. FRANCKE: But now we're
24 distinguishing between the need for the

136

1 entertainment district and the need for the
2 theaters.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It's not the need for
4 the entertainment district, it's the need, the
5 public need for the particular use at the
6 particular location.

7 In other words, if we felt that the
8 public would need it then we might think it's
9 important to put a -- you know, say yeah, we need
10 that in that part of town. But if it competes with
11 existing theaters in the area then I'd say, you
12 know, maybe we don't need it. Mr. Winter.

13 MR. WINTER: I just want to make the
14 comment that I agree this has been in here all the
15 time. I'd be satisfied with the restriction to

16 eight.

17 And I don't know whether -- and
18 again I mean this is not a surprise to me because
19 it's always been in the drafts.

20 MR. SMITH: I have a hard time, what's
21 the difference between 1,600 seats for performing
22 areatus or a ten cineplex theater, you know.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The difference is that
24 we already have theaters in town. And, you

137

1 know, one of the things we discussed at the very
2 start of this project and you guys testified this
3 isn't intended to compete with the more commercial
4 uses that we have in the community, all right.

5 MR. WINTER: Don, I thought if we
6 restrict it to eight I mean it will be dissimilar
7 to what we already have out at Gurnee Mills.

8 So it's going to be at the very
9 least half the size. I mean I don't -- so there is
10 going to be a distinction there.

11 Again, unless, you know, there's
12 some people that feel that strongly about it, you
13 know, I would remind everyone that this has been in
14 the proposals for -- from the inception of this
15 process.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But we're going -- the

17 thing is everyone has gone over it and there's some
18 changes and that was another question that was
19 raised.

20 Any other comments on this?

21 MS. KOVARIK: I just would say, you
22 know, we didn't want to just create just a shop,
23 the compelling reason to change the zoning was to
24 create something better in an upscale entertainment

138

1 distinct anchored by a performing arts theater,
2 1,600 seats on stage versus 1,600 seats in Gurnee
3 Mills. Unless they're going to have Backstreet
4 Boys there every weekend, it's going to be a
5 different flavor from a performing arts theater
6 which will set the stage for attracting people to
7 the hotel to spend the weekend and it just gets
8 into a whole different scenario than a movie
9 theater anchor.

10 MR. WINTER: Well, if that's the only
11 thing we're going to -- unless there's more maybe
12 we can bifurcate that and we can vote on -- I've
13 indicated before I'm prepared to make a motion and
14 I'd keep that separate so that we can vote on that
15 afterwards.

16 Again, I think it's very important
17 that at some point we vote on this.

18 MS. KOVARIK: What do you mean by

19 separate?

20 MR. WINTER: That we would vote on the
21 proposal with that particular item with a follow-up
22 motion as to whether that should be special use or
23 whether it should be limited to eight theaters and
24 then we could vote on that separately perhaps.

139

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I think it's a
2 simple thing.

3 You know, we can recommend to the
4 Village Board. If they want to overrule us I don't
5 think the Petitioner is going to say well, we're
6 not going to go forward with this petition because
7 you say we want it a special use. It's not whether
8 we want it or not, we're not authorized.

9 If we feel that it's important that
10 that be put in, then I think we should make that
11 recommendation to the Village Board. Mr.
12 Wildenberg.

13 MR. WILDENBERG: Just a quick reference
14 point, the cineplex in Gurnee Mills started out
15 with 12 screens initially and then they expanded up
16 to 20 over the last few years.

17 MR. FOSTER: I guess I'd like to make a
18 comment. I think the thing that's always a point
19 of contention with this project is really the

20 concept because, you know, personally I'm not
21 looking to see ten or four screens with a parking
22 lot around it.

23 But at the same time at Old Orchard
24 there's a multi-screen theater that really is very

140

1 unobtrusive because it has a pedestrian scale to it
2 and it fits in with the general context of the
3 development.

4 So a lot of this I think really
5 depends of course on how it's done. And
6 unfortunately we don't know at this stage how it's
7 done. Because if there was a main street motif and
8 and as part of that main street motif there was
9 either a performing arts theater or a movie theater
10 but it doesn't have this, you know, 20,000 square
11 foot monstrosity in front of you with asphalt,
12 that's a lot different.

13 So if behind that old fashioned
14 motif you've got six to eight screens that's a lot
15 different than how we might picture a cineplex with
16 a parking lot. So that's where I'm, you know,
17 depending on how it is I could live with eight
18 screens. But I'm not looking for eight screens
19 with the asphalt, you know, like we might picture
20 in a traditional mall setting. So that is how I
21 feel about it.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So it sounds like
23 you're going along with the feeling that it should
24 be special use.

141

1 MR. FOSTER: Well, I guess I would like
2 to have some ability to have some control. You
3 know, if it's over eight screens I guess I would
4 love to see a special use. If it's under maybe
5 that's one of the ways we can define it.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Is that
7 acceptable?

8 MS. KOVARIK: I would say that -- is
9 that fair? A certain amount of screens permitted
10 and more screens --

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Limit it to eight
12 screens and maybe you can work with staff to come
13 up with some wording to make sure that the concept
14 is unique and it fits in with the function and
15 character of the concept of the entertainment
16 village.

17 I think also that's in the
18 conceptual stage so again when you come forward for
19 preliminary plat it's something that could be
20 looked at as well.

21 Mr. Sula.

22 MR. SULA: I'm not sure if it's

23 conceptual or preliminary, though, for that parcel,
24 Don, Parcel C and E.

142

1 MR. FRANCKE: It's conceptual.

2 MR. SULA: But it says Parcel C as well.

3 MS. KOVARIK: That's inside the theme
4 park.

5 MR. FRANCKE: That's if there are
6 theaters in the theme park.

7 MS. KOVARIK: Movie theaters?

8 MR. FRANCKE: Just like right now there
9 is at Great America.

10 MS. KOVARIK: The Imax?

11 MR. FRANCKE: Right.

12 MS. KOVARIK: That's only one screen so
13 that would be all right, right?

14 MR. SULA: Page 8 says it applies to
15 Parcels C and E.

16 MR. FRANCKE: That's the theme park.

17 MR. SULA: I understand. But E is not.

18 MR. FRANCKE: Right, E, F and G are the
19 entertainment district.

20 MR. SULA: So F is still, okay, the word
21 conceptual. Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is that clear? Did you
23 want to ask something else? Go ahead.

24 MS. KOVARIK: Two more.

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Two more. Okay.

2 MS. KOVARIK: Some of this is for the
3 audience.

4 The distance from the west lot
5 line to the ring road which encompasses most of the
6 conservation area, about how wide is that? No.
7 Deep. Like deep.

8 MR. ROGERS: Right now -- I'm John
9 Rogers. Right now it measures out around 375 feet.

10 MS. KOVARIK: Okay. So for the
11 citizens, almost 375 feet separates the west
12 property line of the Cemetery Road residents?

13 MR. SMITH: No, not Cemetery Road.

14 MS. KOVARIK: I mean your back lot line.

15 MR. ROGERS: Right.

16 MS. KOVARIK: Your back lot line to the
17 ring road is almost a buffer of 375 feet of
18 conservation area.

19 And from the last meeting, and Don
20 and I both questioned, the conservation areas, you
21 cannot build in those because of the Army Corps of
22 Engineers? They're not buildable?

23 MR. FRANCKE: They're not buildable and
24 whatever is done in there is subject to Army Corps

1 control.

2 MS. KOVARIK: And that's J and K, right?

3 MR. FRANCKE: Right, Parcels J and K.

4 MS. KOVARIK: Last thing.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Wait a minute. You're

6 saying that that -- but I mean you're holding those

7 out, you're not going to build on those.

8 MR. FRANCKE: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But I mean were they --

10 if you wanted to -- I mean if somebody wanted to

11 build in there you can't? In other words, no

12 matter how this property developed those would have

13 to stay?

14 MR. FRANCKE: Right.

15 MR. ROGERS: It's a conservation area,

16 no permitted structures are allowed.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think you guys are

18 misunderstanding. Let's say you don't call them

19 conservation areas.

20 MR. ROGERS: They call it that.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Pardon me?

22 MR. ROGERS: They call it a conservation

23 area.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Oh, they do, that's

1 designated by the Army Corps of Engineers.

2 MR. FRANCKE: It's going to have an
3 easement.

4 MS. KOVARIK: I like the way you
5 outlined all the infrastructure improvements. You
6 worked with not only Bill Grieve and Dave Miller
7 and some of the things that I was concerned about.

8 One of the things I don't see is --
9 and this may not be possible and maybe staff can
10 answer it -- that the directional signs on the
11 Tollway would direct traffic to use Milwaukee
12 Avenue as the primary route for regional traffic
13 knowing that local residents would still be using
14 Hunt Club and Washington.

15 MR. FRANCKE: Yes.

16 MS. KOVARIK: That's agreeable or it's
17 possible?

18 MR. FRANCKE: Yes.

19 MS. KOVARIK: And I appreciate the
20 citizens that talked about the Tri-State Parkway.
21 We probably do need more public hearings on that.

22 Is it possible with the
23 right-of-way dedication that the ring road itself
24 be built to Village standards?

146

1 Not knowing whether it's going to
2 be a dedicated public roadway I'm thinking of what
3 happened over in the one that we just did with

4 Westlake Homes where we would have liked to make
5 that a public road but we couldn't because it was
6 too narrow because it had been built as a private
7 road.

8 I don't want this to be built as a
9 private road and then five years from now we want
10 it to be public.

11 MR. FRANCKE: This -- the way that it's
12 proposed right now, you know, definitely will be
13 built to public standards whether it's a public or
14 private road.

15 There's no doubt that it would be a
16 public road if it was opened, you know, if it was
17 connected all the way through.

18 MS. KOVARIK: Right, okay. So --

19 MR. FRANCKE: But I think there are real
20 questions and that's why we agree and think there
21 should be further studies as to how wide it should
22 be and how much traffic does the Village really
23 want.

24 If the Village determines that they

147

1 want it to go through after a further study,
2 there's still a lot of questions about how much
3 traffic do they want to encourage to go through,
4 what type of traffic, what routing and all that

5 kind of stuff. All that kind of, you know, issues,
6 those kinds of issues. And so I think those remain
7 to be discussed.

8 And one thing I wanted to identify
9 on that list because your last question,
10 Commissioner Kovarik, about the signage, I'm not
11 sure --

12 MS. KOVARIK: Directional signage.

13 MR. FRANCKE: Right, whether we answered
14 the same question you were asking.

15 And it relates specifically to the
16 question about the improvements off the ramp. Were
17 you asking about the -- were you asking about
18 signage that directs people to Milwaukee because of
19 the proposal or the recommendation by Bill Grieve
20 about the temporary signals off the ramp?

21 MS. KOVARIK: Yes. Yes, I would like
22 somebody coming from out of town would be directed
23 that their primary route should be to get on
24 Milwaukee to access the entertainment village

148

1 versus directing them all the way up to Hunt Club
2 and then back east down Washington.

3 Knowing that local people and the
4 people in this County would know to use those roads
5 but the out of towners would at least be directed
6 away from the arterial roads.

7 MR. FRANCKE: And that's what I wanted
8 to clarify because obviously that's not consistent
9 with what we have proposed in our analysis.

10 We have proposed the 120 to Hunt
11 Club to Washington direction. So we're happy to
12 work with the Village and with Bill Grieve with his
13 recommendation but we believe that it goes beyond
14 just the temporary signals.

15 I mean I today coming here got off
16 at that ramp and it's clear to me that you're
17 talking about more than putting up a temporary
18 signal if you're going to start directing the
19 traffic there, all the traffic.

20 So I think that whole line item, if
21 you will, that issue, that signal I think is
22 something that we really didn't focus a lot on
23 during the course of the hearing and it came up
24 late with Bill's memo.

149

1 And I think that, too, is something
2 that needs to be looked at a little bit more before
3 we start saying we're going to direct all the
4 traffic to that little one lane ramp.

5 And I think at the last meeting
6 Commissioner Winter expressed some concern with
7 that.

8 MR. WINTER: And we haven't talked about
9 that. I think the best we could do is look into
10 it. I mean that's exactly opposite of what Miller
11 talked about at least twice at two different
12 sessions so I couldn't support that.

13 I mean it makes no sense based on
14 two hearings we had on traffic on that. I have no
15 objection to look into that and if we can work some
16 signs out, but I don't think we can add that based
17 on the testimony we've heard at two different
18 sessions.

19 MR. FRANCKE: And one thing we do,
20 though, intend to do is make sure -- and this is
21 what we've talked to the Tollway Authority about
22 already -- is creating signage that keeps people --
23 even if you extend Tri-State all the way up to 132
24 that keeps those people off 132. That we do intend

150

1 to do and can commit to.

2 MS. KOVARIK: The traffic study
3 presented by Metro was on behalf of the Petitioners
4 and has a lot of very good stuff in it, but I think
5 some of Bill Grieve's suggestion diverts the
6 traffic, the regional out of towners off the local
7 arterial roads that the residents use onto the
8 roads that were designed for regional visitors.

9 So I think both are needed, not

10 just one or the other.

11 MR. WINTER: I'm just talking about the
12 signage and Grieve did not talk about signing it
13 that that's the primary way. I mean that's right,
14 Bill? I mean you never said that?

15 MR. GRIEVE: The key is to offer as much
16 flexibility as you can for route selection.

17 If you put the temporary signal up
18 now without Milwaukee itself, Route 21 being
19 widened, and you direct everybody there there will
20 be long backups.

21 If you get the temporary signal up
22 there now and then when IDOT comes through in the
23 next few years and widens Route 21 then the
24 variable signing system that's going to go on and

151

1 take place that the Petitioners talk about putting
2 together, you can then start getting into the
3 system of people coming off the Tollway. You run
4 them as much as you can up 21 and then, as you
5 would suggest, if that starts becoming a bit of a
6 problem then you shift it over to the
7 Washington/Hunt Club route.

8 MS. KOVARIK: That's better. And I
9 think maybe with the phasing thing already built in
10 that traffic studies are going to come in right

11 along that, you know, that certainly would be taken
12 care of.

13 The last thing is the parking
14 booths. And I'm not going to ask you not to have
15 parking booths. But if you had a performing arts
16 theater or a movie theater or just a restaurant and
17 I wanted to drive over and use it, is it still
18 going to be that I would pay to park in these two
19 lots and then go use the theater or whatever?

20 MR. FRANCKE: I would ask you to ask me
21 that question when we come in with preliminary plan
22 approval for the performance theater.

23 MS. KOVARIK: That's fair.

24 MR. FRANCKE: I mean it's too far away I

152

1 think at this point.

2 MS. KOVARIK: But those two parking
3 areas are the main parking area for the
4 entertainment motel district other than people
5 staying at the hotel parking in the hotel?

6 MR. FRANCKE: Right. Also, you know,
7 Dave Miller was just whispering in my ear on this
8 issue and I thought maybe he should share with you
9 what he was saying which in many respects is
10 similar to what Bill was saying but slightly
11 different with this issue on Milwaukee Avenue
12 access.

13 MR. MILLER: My name is Dave Miller.

14 I think the concept of using
15 Milwaukee at 120 I think is valid. But the real
16 key is I think it should be tied to exactly when
17 Milwaukee, that section of Milwaukee is going to be
18 upgraded.

19 In the five year plan that the
20 State has talked about that section, the money
21 that's being allocated I believe was for
22 engineering and some other things but was not
23 specifically allocated for the construction.

24 So if the road is not upgraded,

153

1 putting the temporary signals I think it's going to
2 create more problems. And so I think the issue is
3 really if the timing of that road can be
4 accelerated so that it is upgraded at a shorter
5 time period then I think it makes sense.

6 One of the reasons that we
7 specifically talked about using the Hunt Club to
8 Washington is unless there's a change in that the
9 County has committed that is going to happen within
10 the time frame that we've talked about.

11 Milwaukee, that section of
12 Milwaukee from north from 120 is not committed in
13 terms of the construction portion of it. So unless

14 that time frame can be accelerated I think that's
15 to be the concern. If you all of a sudden start
16 adding more traffic to that section which is a
17 two-lane section then that's when I think you need
18 to be careful.

19 Otherwise, I concur in terms of the
20 timing of it if it can be tied with the widening of
21 Milwaukee.

22 MR. GRIEVE: I'll get copies of this to
23 you. In the 1999 five year plan, there's a star
24 that says it's a fiscal year 1999 project that

154

1 talks about Washington Street to Illinois 120 for
2 engineering costs of \$800,000.

3 The line item right below it is
4 \$22,750,000 all within this next five years for the
5 widening, additional lanes, bridge widening,
6 reconstruction, utility adjustment on that same
7 stretch of 21 from Washington to 120.

8 MS. KOVARIK: Does what you just said
9 mean they're doing it?

10 MR. GRIEVE: Yeah.

11 MS. KOVARIK: So they're doing
12 Milwaukee?

13 MR. GRIEVE: Yeah.

14 MS. KOVARIK: So then we could have the
15 light there and the directional.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Is that it?

17 Anyone else?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Winter, do you have

20 a motion?

21 MR. WINTER: Yes, I do.

22 I'd make a motion to forward a

23 favorable recommendation to the Village Board of

24 Trustees concerning the Petitioner request for

155

1 rezoning of the subject property from I-2 General

2 Industrial District to the Planned Unit Development

3 with underlying zoning of I-2, C/S-1 with

4 preliminary planned unit development plat approval

5 for the proposed theme park, employee housing

6 facilities, regional hotel and conference center.

7 And for conceptual planned unit development and

8 plat approval for all other portions of the planned

9 unit development.

10 However, I'd make it conditioned

11 upon certain recommendations which I'll incorporate

12 by reference. And I hope -- I think all of us have

13 read these and they relate to many of the topics

14 that we talked about and I will just refer to that

15 by reference.

16 As a point of order, I know there's

17 three other motions that had to be -- that have to
18 be made or could be made tonight.

19 Should I just start with that then
20 or how do you want to handle it? Do you want it in
21 a big -- one big motion or do you want it separate?

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: For the first I think
23 we want three -- actually four votes. The first
24 one would be just what you stated.

156

1 And we can reference the conditions
2 as Part A, you know, 1 through 4. And then also
3 with certain recommendations. Is that --

4 Okay. You know, I know it's
5 laborious but you really should read it in, then it
6 will be on the record. Because the public does not
7 have copies of this. We did not prepare copies.
8 If we did it would be easy, but I'm afraid you've
9 already read the first paragraph. I'd say just go
10 ahead and read that in.

11 The first motion would incorporate
12 probably those conditions and recommendations. The
13 second would be to address the special use permit
14 for the employee housing. And the third would be a
15 motion addressing the special use permits for the
16 -- the special use approval for the three hotels.

17 And then the fourth would be a vote
18 for approval of the -- help me out on this one,

19 Tracy, is it the --

20 MR. WINTER: Preliminary.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Preliminary plat that

22 we -- a plat of subdivision that we have to

23 approve or forward a favorable recommendation on.

24 So I'm sorry, Bryan, but I think

157

1 you're going to have to read that in.

2 MR. WINTER: You're saying the entire

3 document?

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Right, the conditions.

5 Let's start with your first motion that you've

6 already read in, the basic motion and then you said

7 subject to the following conditions.

8 I think you're going to have to

9 read those conditions and recommendations.

10 MR. WINTER: Well, if anyone has served

11 on jury duty these are longer than jury

12 instructions you normally get. This is three pages

13 and it's pretty small print.

14 Condition A-1, that the subject

15 property be developed in substantial conformity

16 with conceptual preliminary plat of planned unit

17 development prepared by Devine, deFlan & Yeager and

18 bearing the most recent revision date of October

19 30th, 1998.

20 Two, that development of the
21 planned unit development shall proceed in
22 accordance with and be subject to the development,
23 landscape, and architectural standards statement
24 previously submitted by the Petitioners and bearing

158

1 a most recent revision date of October 30th, 1998
2 with the understanding that the standards will be
3 revised to provide that any outdoor dining
4 established in the hotel and entertainment district
5 will conform to the standards set forth on Exhibit
6 A to be recommendations and as the same may be
7 further revised pursuant to the mutual agreement of
8 the Petitioner and the Village.

9 Three, that an extension of the
10 Village's pedestrian bike path system be
11 constructed across the Washington Street frontage
12 of the subject property concurrently with the
13 construction of the theme park on the subject
14 property and that an extension of the pedestrian
15 bike path with an impervious surface subject to
16 Army Corps permits and authorization to be
17 constructed through the conservation area, the
18 location to be jointly established by Petitioner,
19 the Army Corps, and the Village staff concurrently
20 with the construction of the regional hotel and
21 conference center on the subject property.

22 Four, that prior to the opening for
23 business of either the theme park or the regional
24 hotel and conference center, whichever shall first

159

1 occur, the following roadway improvements shall
2 have been substantially completed or Petitioner
3 shall have substantially completed or caused the
4 substantial completion of the following roadway
5 improvements:

6 A, the following improvements
7 described in the traffic impact analysis prepared
8 by Metro Transportation Group dated June 8th, 1998.

9 Sub I, improvements to Hunt Club
10 Road/Washington Street intersection described on
11 Page -- and I'll make this amendment -- 43 to 46.

12 Sub two, the improvements to the
13 Hunt Club Road/Illinois 120 intersection described
14 on Pages 43 to 46.

15 Sub three, the improvements to the
16 Milwaukee Avenue/I-94 interchange described on Page
17 44.

18 Sub four, the improvements to the
19 Milwaukee Avenue and Washington Street intersection
20 described on Page 45.

21 Sub five, the improvements to
22 Washington Street described on Page 45.

23 And sub six, the Washington Street
24 western access intersection and the Washington

160

1 Street eastern access intersection improvements
2 described on Page 45 and 46 provided that the
3 western access intersection improvements need not
4 be constructed until the regional hotel and
5 conference center is to be constructed and open for
6 business.

7 And sub B, the temporary signal
8 improvements at the Milwaukee Avenue/Illinois 120
9 interchange ramp described in the memorandum of
10 Bill Grieve of Gewalt Hamilton Associates, Inc.
11 dated September 30th, 1998.

12 Sub five, that the final plat of
13 subdivision for the subject property shall reserve
14 and dedicate right-of-way to the extent deemed
15 necessary by the Village traffic consultant and
16 Petitioner's traffic consultant to provide for the
17 possibility of extending Tri-State Parkway south
18 from its existing terminus in the Grand Tri-State
19 Industrial Park through the subject property to
20 Washington Street.

21 Sub six, that prior to the
22 preliminary planned unit development plat approval
23 for any development that is to be constructed on
24 Parcels E or G and prior to final planned unit

1 development plat approval for Parcels A, C and F
2 Petitioner shall establish that each of the uses
3 then being established on such parcels satisfy the
4 requirements for off-street parking established by
5 the Village's Zoning Ordinances or that departures
6 from such requirements are warranted or justified
7 based on generally accepted principles and/or
8 methodologies of shared parking or joint parking.

9 Sub seven, that in connection with
10 the consideration of final planned unit development
11 plat approval for the theme park Six Flags shall
12 establish a location for parking fee booths and a
13 plan for collection of parking fees that ensure the
14 smoothest possible flow of traffic into the parking
15 lots for the theme park so that backups of theme
16 park traffic on area roadways during peak periods
17 of visitation are minimized.

18 B, recommendations. One, that a
19 committee be formed as recommended by Village
20 Engineer Bud Reed in his memorandum to Jon
21 Wildenberg dated October 9th, 1998 to ensure that
22 the plans to reconstruct the Washington Street/I-94
23 interchange proceed as early as possible.

24 Two, that the Village further study

1 the need for the possibility of installing traffic
2 signals and other roadway improvements. For
3 example, turning lanes at the employee entrance to
4 the existing Six Flags Great America theme park on
5 Milwaukee Avenue.

6 And three, that the Plan Commission
7 conduct a public hearing and make recommendations
8 to the Village Board concerning the possibility of
9 extending Tri-State Parkway south from its existing
10 terminus in the Grand Tri-State Industrial Park
11 through the subject property of Washington Street
12 so that Village staff, Village consultants,
13 Petitioners and other affected property owners and
14 members of the public are afforded an opportunity
15 to be heard and provide input on the issue.

16 That's all for the current motion.

17 If there is a second to this, Mr. Chairman, I'd
18 like briefly to identify five reasons for me making
19 this motion.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay.

21 MR. SMITH: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So we have a motion and
23 a second now. Do we have discussion? Mr. Winter,
24 do you have something?

1 MR. WINTER: Basically there are really

2 five -- that have not already been identified --
3 some of the reasons or factors that I considered in
4 making the motion that I did tonight.

5 The first is I considered the
6 existing uses and zoning of the property in
7 question and that of the nearby property. Very
8 simply if this property had been zoned residential
9 in my opinion there would be no way that I would
10 think that this property would qualify for a change
11 if it was residential and the general area where it
12 is located with residential.

13 That is not the case. As everyone
14 knows, this is an I-2 industrial existing zoning
15 for this property and it is also in very close
16 proximity to Great America. And for that reason I
17 believe that is a factor, a reasonable reason to
18 make this recommendation to the Board.

19 Secondly, I considered the
20 suitability of the property for the proposed
21 change. Again, I would identify this property as
22 being a unique parcel. It is one of the largest
23 parcels that we have vacant in the Village right
24 now comprised of approximately 134 acres intact.

164

1 And again, because it is next to,
2 essentially contiguous to a theme park existing I
3 think that's an important factor.

4 Three, whether the -- I considered
5 whether the change would adversely affect the
6 general health, safety and welfare of the public.
7 There's been a lot of comment about that.

8 I think the analysis of that,
9 though, is that a lot of us want to compare this
10 property to what it is right now -- vacant -- and
11 say well, this is going to adversely affect us
12 because it's vacant property and whatever we build
13 on there will make things worse for us.

14 But I really think that the
15 analysis is you have to look at this property at
16 its current zoning which is I-2. And that's the
17 comparison you must make, what could this be built
18 at I-2 versus the PUD.

19 And again, I think this is where
20 the recommendations that we've just read into the
21 record, a lot of time has been devoted to working
22 on these things and sometimes almost to the point
23 of where we're frustrated up here to say how can we
24 go over this ground again.

165

1 But I think that by making these
2 recommendations these roads are going to be better
3 than they would be under the existing zoning. I'm
4 convinced that we have taken every safeguard

5 through this hearing process to make sure that that
6 will in fact occur, that we're going to have four
7 lanes on Washington Street, something that's
8 overdue, that the traffic can get better.

9 Fourth, I considered whether this
10 change would be consistent with the development of
11 our comprehensive plan, our other goals and plans
12 that we've identified in the comprehensive plan. I
13 believe this change will be consistent with our
14 comprehensive plan.

15 Many of the areas that still exist
16 in the Village have the zoning classification of
17 office -- office and service. I think the
18 impediment to developing that property is that we
19 don't have some of the amenities that other
20 communities farther south than Gurnee have and that
21 if we have this destination hotel I think that
22 there's been sufficient evidence at this hearing
23 process to suggest that we can preserve and
24 actually complement the comprehensive plan that the

166

1 Village has worked a long time on.

2 The final remark is -- the final
3 consideration that I would submit is the fiscal
4 impact. And I think the fiscal impact, my analysis
5 of that is whether it's positive versus negative.
6 I want to make it very clear at least for me

7 personally, I don't think the Village should ever
8 abandon zoning just because someone comes in and
9 says well, we can make more money on this property.
10 I don't think that's right.

11 But I think that in this case -- so
12 I don't know that I -- the figures, you know,
13 whether it's 8 and a half million dollars, whether
14 it's two and a half million dollars, I don't think
15 that that's necessarily what's important. And
16 really I've listed it as the fifth factor because I
17 don't think it is near important as some of these
18 other areas.

19 But I think it is significant in
20 the sense that we know that it isn't going to cost
21 taxpayers and for that reason I think that it is a
22 factor that has been brought up and should be
23 considered.

24 There's other good reasons that

167

1 have been stated, I'm sure there will be some other
2 discussions. But those were the five after a long
3 time of consideration of this that has led me to
4 make this motion. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other discussion?

6 Ms. Kovarik? Mr. Foster.

7 MR. FOSTER: Okay. Mr. Chairman and

8 Members of the Commission, I certainly sense a real
9 deep concern amongst the neighbors who have come to
10 many hearings over the last several months and I
11 know that so many times it always feels sitting
12 here that the public often thinks that this is a
13 done deal and we're just kind of going through the
14 motions.

15 And I really feel that there's not
16 too much I can say tonight that can perhaps allay
17 that, but I would like to emphasize as many of my
18 fellow Commissioners have stated tonight that this
19 project has caused a lot of deep thought and deep
20 study on the part of all of us because we really
21 believe this is a very, very significant project to
22 the future of Gurnee.

23 When we visited the comprehensive
24 plan and spent many many meetings updating it and

168

1 revising it last year and the year before that, we
2 did talk at length about a regional entertainment
3 corridor being located within our Village and
4 building upon some of the regional entertainment
5 that's already in place.

6 And I guess I'm kind of one of
7 these rare commodities because prior to living in
8 Gurnee my family lived in Evanston and we found
9 that we were always coming up here to Six Flags and

10 Gurnee Mills, if you can believe that, and we
11 finally said because we're up here most of the time
12 we might as well move here.

13 So I guess I'm going to say that
14 not everybody is frightened by the entertainment
15 attractions that are here. In fact, my family,
16 that was one of the things that helped to draw us
17 here believe it or not.

18 And I do believe that Six Flags has
19 been a responsible neighbor and member of the
20 Village for many years.

21 You don't know what we'll be saying
22 ten years from now but it is my hope tonight that
23 this project will become an asset for the Village
24 and will be something that we all point to as a

169

1 good neighbor and as something that's continued to
2 make the Village of Gurnee the outstanding
3 community that it is.

4 I did not approach this project
5 thinking that it was a slam dunk; but, you know,
6 I've always tried to have an open mind with the
7 Petitioner.

8 I believe that a destination hotel
9 conference center is a real desirable asset to our
10 community. And one of the things about this

11 project that's very appealing to me is that in fact
12 it does give us that opportunity and it will come
13 to fruition.

14 Six Flags has for several years
15 tried to secure employee housing. And the previous
16 vote a few years ago, there was a negative vote I
17 think had a lot to do with the location and the
18 proximity to the neighbors.

19 I think the location as proposed in
20 this particular parcel is in fact a location that I
21 think has sufficient setbacks and distance from any
22 neighboring properties and I also think that as the
23 Petitioner has presented their project to us time
24 and time again there seems to be sufficient I guess

170

1 I would call it protection and as well as I think
2 the building itself is a good one.

3 And as I've listened to some of the
4 projects throughout the nation it does seem that
5 many projects do in fact incorporate some kind of
6 employee housing. And I know that Six Flags has
7 been at a disadvantage because of not being able to
8 do that. Locally I think there needs to be some
9 recognition of that.

10 So I am in support of this project
11 and I hope that it's going to be a good project. I
12 do hope that the concerns of the neighbors through

13 the recommendations and through Village staff and
14 the Petitioner can be addressed and hopefully can
15 be alleviated and this can be a win-win for all of
16 us.

17 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Smith.

19 MR. SMITH: I firmly believe we have to
20 have the conference center and destination hotel.

21 In talking to some corporate people
22 they said there's this mythical line at Vernon
23 Hills because there's nowhere for them to go. And
24 we've worked on I don't know how many parcels where

171

1 we're looking at office parks or office buildings
2 but we're not going to get them developed if we
3 don't have a conference center and a destination
4 hotel.

5 And so I think we need that on this
6 end of the County and I think this will also open
7 up a lot of our other parcels eventually to get
8 office parks, those parks if we want office.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Let's go to this
10 side of the table. Ms. Kovarik, do you want to
11 make any comments?

12 MS. KOVARIK: No.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: No. Okay. I guess I

14 would just add that I also support this project.

15 I think Mr. Winter said it very
16 well and I agree with all the things that he had
17 said. I think what's important here and Ms.
18 Kovarik had stated that earlier is that the
19 viability of Six Flags is extremely important to
20 this community.

21 And our comprehensive plan
22 reflected that in this corridor to allow for the
23 expansion of Six Flags development. It's an ideal
24 location for it.

172

1 It also considered the development
2 of a hotel conference center. I also might add
3 that our Village Board through a number of
4 hearings, public hearings issued an RFP for a
5 developer to develop a hotel conference center and
6 it was felt by the Board through -- from input by
7 the citizens and Board Members to try to get
8 something like that accomplished.

9 I think if you look at our
10 community this is probably the only location that a
11 development like that makes sense. I think that
12 that hotel conference center will add something not
13 just to the community of Gurnee but to the County
14 of Lake.

15 And I think it's something that's

16 badly needed and it's going to open up a lot of
17 business opportunities and I think will pave the
18 way for potential upscale office development in our
19 community which is going to provide upscale jobs.

20 And this was all covered in the
21 comprehensive plan through a number of public
22 meetings, input from citizens, they participated.

23 I'd also like to add that I
24 appreciate all the citizens coming all these weeks

173

1 and staying here at these long meetings. I think a
2 lot of the changes that we see in this proposal are
3 the result of not just the hard work of the
4 Commissioners but also the input from the citizens.

5 It might seem like we're not paying
6 attention and I suppose you want us to just defeat
7 this, but I think that your input helped us
8 convince the Petitioner to make some changes
9 because they certainly want to develop this in a
10 community that's going to accept them.

11 So with that, is there any other
12 discussion?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Tracy, did you want to
15 say something?

16 MS. VELKOVER: Well, I just wanted to I

17 guess point out maybe a possible additional
18 condition and then maybe one additional
19 recommendation and the Commission can discuss this.

20 But one of the conditions you might
21 want to look at is the timing for the installation
22 of perimeter landscaping. That is something that
23 we have done in the past with PUDs. So you may
24 want to take a look at that.

174

1 And then one of the recommendations
2 that you may want to also include is that a traffic
3 monitoring and parking program be established and
4 that these programs be used to evaluate future
5 phases of the development as they talked about.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Didn't we -- wasn't
7 that one of the conditions?

8 MS. VELKOVER: I did not hear that one.
9 We had talked about earlier a traffic monitoring
10 program where each time they came back for future
11 phases that they would evaluate where they stood on
12 traffic and then do a re-evaluation of what's
13 anticipated when they come in for preliminary.

14 So I don't know that that is
15 addressed in there. Maybe it is. So that's just
16 something that I thought I --

17 MR. WINTER: Could we request that --
18 because much of this is just the conceptual, could

19 we request that before we went any further? Do you
20 think that needs to be spelled out?

21 MS. VELKOVER: I was just going to
22 suggest that this be a recommendation and not a
23 condition, that it be a recommendation.

24 MR. WINTER: All right. Mr. Chairman,

175

1 if I could, I'd make the recommendation to Sub B
2 and add that sub four paragraph, B-4.

3 And I would adopt the language that
4 has already been read into the record regarding a
5 traffic study. And B sub five that would -- to
6 adopt the preliminary screening or landscaping.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Perimeter landscaping.

8 MR. WINTER: Yeah, preliminary
9 landscaping.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, that would be a
11 condition. I think you'd want to make that a
12 condition.

13 MR. WINTER: I'd ask that that be made
14 as a condition eight and that that be part of the
15 motion.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. So we have an
17 amendment to the motion.

18 Unfortunately, the one who seconded
19 it is not here so we'll have to wait for him to get

20 back.

21 MR. CEPON: I'll second it.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Well, let's just
23 make sure, is there any other discussion? Any
24 other comments?

176

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Then I'm afraid we're
3 going to have to wait for Bill to get back.

4 Bill, we have an amendment to the
5 motion that there was an additional condition and
6 an additional recommendation.

7 Basically simply put the condition
8 is that all perimeter landscaping be installed at
9 the first phase of the development and the
10 recommendation that a monitoring of the traffic be
11 conducted as phases are put in.

12 MR. SMITH: I have no problem with that.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So we have a motion and
14 a second as stated on the record. All those in
15 favor of the motion signify by saying aye in the
16 roll call; those opposed nay. Roll call, please.

17 MS. VELKOVER: Winter.

18 MR. WINTER: Aye.

19 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.

20 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

21 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.

22 MR. SMITH: Aye.

23 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.

24 MR. SULA: Aye.

177

1 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.

2 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

3 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.

4 MR. CEPON: Aye.

5 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries
7 and it is so ordered.

8 MR. WINTER: Mr. Chairman, if it's
9 appropriate I'd make a second motion.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That would be fine. Go
11 ahead.

12 MR. WINTER: I'd move at this time to
13 forward a favorable recommendation to the Village
14 Board of Trustees concerning Petitioner Six Flags
15 Theme Park's request for issuance of a special use
16 permit to construct, operate, and maintain employee
17 housing facilities on the subject property be
18 granted subject to the following conditions:

19 One, that the employee housing
20 facilities be constructed on Parcel A in
21 substantial conformity with the conceptual
22 preliminary planned unit development plat and

23 development landscaping and architectural standards
24 statement in the preliminary site plan prepared by

178

1 Devine, deFlan & Yeager, bearing a most recent
2 revision date of September 11, 1998.

3 And two, that rules and regulations
4 be established for the employees residing at the
5 employee housing facilities that are consistent
6 with the rules and regulations currently being
7 enforced by Six Flags Great America for existing
8 employees.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That's it.

10 MR. SMITH: I'll second that.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Any discussion
12 on the motion? Okay. The motion on the floor, all
13 those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye
14 in the roll call and those opposed nay. Roll call,
15 please.

16 MS. VELKOVER: Winter.

17 MR. WINTER: Aye.

18 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.

19 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

20 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.

21 MR. SMITH: Aye.

22 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.

23 MR. SULA: Aye.

24 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.

1 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

2 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.

3 MR. CEPON: Aye.

4 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries

6 and it is so ordered.

7 MR. WINTER: Mr. Chairman, I'd make a

8 third motion if it's appropriate.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yes. Please go ahead.

10 MR. WINTER: I make a motion to forward
11 a favorable recommendation from the Plan Commission
12 to the Village Board of Trustees concerning
13 Petitioner's request for the issuance of a special
14 use permit to construct, operate and maintain a
15 regional hotel and conference center and two other
16 hotels on the subject property be granted subject
17 to the following conditions:

18 One, that the regional hotel and
19 conference center be constructed on Parcel F in
20 substantial conformity with the conceptual and
21 preliminary planned unit development plat, the
22 development, landscape and architectural standards
23 statement and the preliminary site plan prepared by
24 Devine, deFlan & Yeager bearing the most recent

1 revision date of September 11, 1998.

2 Two, that in connection with the
3 consideration of final plat planned unit
4 development approval for the regional hotel and
5 conference center Petitioner shall provide a
6 detailed bus shuttle system that makes it possible
7 for visitors to the hotel and conference center to
8 travel by bus to the theme park, Great America,
9 Gurnee Mills, other area attractions and businesses
10 and vice versa so that use of area roadways by
11 visitors to these attractions and businesses can be
12 minimized.

13 And three, prior to or concurrently
14 with the consideration of final planned unit
15 development plat approval for the two additional
16 hotels to be constructed on the subject property
17 final planned unit development approval for the
18 regional hotel and conference center shall have
19 been granted so as to ensure that there's
20 functional and architectural compatibility between
21 the two hotels and the regional hotel and
22 conference center.

23 MR. SMITH: I'll second that.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion and second. Any

1 discussion to that motion?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All those in favor of
4 the motion signify by saying aye in the roll call;
5 those opposed nay. Roll call, please.

6 MS. VELKOVER: Winter.

7 MR. WINTER: Aye.

8 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.

9 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

10 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.

11 MR. SMITH: Aye.

12 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.

13 MR. SULA: Aye.

14 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.

15 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

16 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.

17 MR. CEPON: Aye.

18 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries
20 and it is so ordered.

21 MR. WINTER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to
22 make a final motion regarding this matter.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Please go ahead.

24 MR. WINTER: At this time I'd move that

182

1 the Plan Commission forward a favorable
2 recommendation for a preliminary plat of
3 subdivision to be provided by Mr. Francke's -- the

4 revised version, do we have the current one?

5 MR. FRANCKE: No, it needs to be revised
6 to reflect the October 30th plat of planned unit
7 development. It's a July -- it's a July plat of
8 subdivision. It needs to be revised to reflect the
9 October 30th PUD plat.

10 And also I would like to ask staff,
11 my understanding is that on the plat, preliminary
12 plat actually the Plan Commission makes a final
13 decision and it's not a recommendation or at least
14 that's what I was told earlier this year by the
15 Village Engineer.

16 MS. VELKOVER: Preliminary does not get
17 forwarded on to the Village Board.

18 MR. WINTER: Okay. Then I make a motion
19 that -- well, let me ask what would be the
20 problem -- do we have the document? Is the
21 document available?

22 MR. FRANCKE: No.

23 MR. WINTER: It needs to be revised?

24 MR. FRANCKE: It needs to be revised to

183

1 conform to the plan.

2 MR. WINTER: Can it be revised and put
3 on the agenda for the next meeting?

4 MR. FRANCKE: Sure.

5 MR. WINTER: Why don't we do that
6 because --

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay.

8 MR. WINTER: Just for clarification
9 purposes, I think we all want to see it.

10 I do know of one instance where the
11 Board had or the Commission had a problem with
12 granting final approval of a plat so I think it's
13 prudent to wait to see that document.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The other option is
15 that we could make it subject to staff approval if
16 you're comfortable with that. I'm suggesting that.

17 MR. WINTER: That's fine with me.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do you want to see the
19 plat?

20 MS. KOVARIK: Yeah, I do. I'm thinking
21 the same thing as Bryan is. I'd rather see it.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I thought you
23 said that you felt okay with staff approval.

24 MR. WINTER: Well, I mean just I think

184

1 if we have a consensus that everybody would like to
2 maybe we should wait and see it.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. We'll table it
4 then to the next Plan Commission meeting. In fact,
5 if we could get copies of that before the meeting
6 so we could review that and then we would be

7 prepared to address that at the meeting.

8 MR. SMITH: What would be the date?

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm sorry, what's the
10 date?

11 MR. WILDENBERG: November 18th.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: November 18th is the
13 next meeting date.

14 MR. SMITH: I'll second that motion.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't think -- we
16 don't require a continuance on that, do we?

17 MS. VELKOVER: No, that's not a public
18 hearing.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So there is no
20 continuance. There's no motion required on that,
21 that would be continued for that next meeting.

22 Okay. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

23 MR. SULA: So moved.

24 MR. CEPON: Second.

185

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion to adjourn. All
2 those in favor say aye.

3 ("Aye" responses.)

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Opposed, nay.

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Meeting adjourned.

7 MR. FRANCKE: Thank you very much.

8 (The hearing concluded at 10:37 p.m.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

186

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS:
COUNTY OF LAKE)

I, SANDRA K. SMITH, do hereby
certify that I am a court reporter doing business
in the County of Lake and State of Illinois; that I

reported by means of machine shorthand the
testimony given at the foregoing Report of
Proceedings, and that the foregoing is a true and
correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken
as aforesaid.

SANDRA K. SMITH, CSR, RPR
CSR License No. 084-003104