VILLAGE OF GURNEE PLAN COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING

held

SEPTEMBER 16, 1998

7:30 PM

325 North O'Plaine Road

Gurnee, Illinois

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

I	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	

- 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.
- MS. VELKOVER: Sula.
- MR. SULA: Here.
- MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik, absent. Cepon.
- 13 MR. CEPON: Here.
- MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.
- 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Here. Will you all
- 16 please join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.
- 17 (Pledge of Allegiance.)
- 18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: First we have the
- 19 approval of the August 19th, 1998 Plan Commission
- 20 minutes if the rest of you have had a chance to
- 21 review those. Any additions or corrections? If
- 22 not, I'll entertain a motion to accept them as
- 23 presented.
- MR. CEPON: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a

1	motion to accept them as presented.
2	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion by Mr. Cepon.
3	Is there a second?
4	MR. SULA: Second.
5	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Sula, did you
6	second that?
7	MR. SULA: Yes, I did.
8	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All those in favor of
9	the motion signify by saying aye in the roll call;
10	those opposed nay. Roll call, please.
11	MS. VELKOVER: Winter.
12	MR. WINTER: Aye.
13	MS. VELKOVER: Foster.
14	MR. FOSTER: Aye.
15	MS. VELKOVER: Smith.
16	MR. SMITH: Aye.
17	MS. VELKOVER: Sula.

- 18 MR. SULA: Aye.
- MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.
- MR. CEPON: Aye.
- 21 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.
- 22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries
- 23 and it is so ordered.
- Next, the approval of the September

- 1 2nd, 1998 Plan Commission minutes. Do you have any
- 2 additions or corrections? If not, I'll entertain a
- 3 motion to accept those as presented.
- 4 MR. FOSTER: So moved.
- 5 MR. SMITH: I'll second.
- 6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion by Mr. Foster,
- 7 second by Mr. Smith. All those in favor of the
- 8 motion signify by saying aye in the roll call;
- 9 those opposed nay. Roll call, please.

- 10 MS. VELKOVER: Winter.
- 11 MR. WINTER: Abstain.
- MS. VELKOVER: Foster.
- 13 MR. FOSTER: Aye.
- MS. VELKOVER: Smith.
- MR. SMITH: Aye.
- MS. VELKOVER: Sula.
- MR. SULA: Aye.
- 18 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.
- 19 MR. CEPON: Aye.
- MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.
- 21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries
- and it is so ordered.
- Next we have a public hearing,
- 24 Westfield Homes, Inc. The subject property

- 2 northwest corner of Route 21 and Manchester Drive.
- 3 The Petitioner is requesting to
- 4 rezone the property from a Planned Unit Development
- 5 PUD with underlying C/B-1 Neighborhood Commercial
- 6 Zoning for a Planned Unit Development PUD with
- 7 underlying R-5 Limited Multi-Family Zoning.
- 8 Preliminary PUD plat approval for 45 townhome units
- 9 is proposed.
- Tracy, do you have anything to add
- 11 to that?
- MS. VELKOVER: Just that this property
- 13 was zoned commercially back in the early seventies
- with the annexation of the HeatherRidge property.
- 15 It was part of that property also.
- The comprehensive land use plan
- 17 reflects both commercial and office/service for the
- 18 site. The previous Comprehensive Plan back in 1990
- 19 reflected commercial for the entire site but with
- 20 the update that we recently went to there was some
- 21 office added to that site.
- 22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Also, this is a
- 23 public hearing which means that the public will
- 24 have an opportunity to speak, they can ask

1	questions or make comments.
2	So anyone, first of all, with the
3	Petitioner who is going to be giving testimony on
4	this matter and also anyone from the public who
5	wishes to make a comment or ask a question when the
6	floor is open to them, they need to stand now and
7	be sworn in by the Village Attorney. It's only for
8	this particular public hearing.
9	(Witnesses sworn.)
10	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. The Petitioner
11	may proceed. Will you please use the microphone.
12	Can everyone hear okay?
13	THE AUDIENCE: No.
14	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't think the sound
15	is working too well.
16	MR. HARRIS: I'm assuming this one is

- 17 not plugged in and this one is.
- 18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is that better now?
- MR. HARRIS: Good evening. For the
- 20 record, my name is Brian Harris and I am president
- 21 of Westfield Development. We are the Petitioner of
- 22 the subject property that you will see this
- 23 evening.
- We've been before the Plan

- 1 Commission on two other occasions with conceptual
- 2 plans for this property. What I'm going to show
- 3 you this evening incorporates some changes to the
- 4 conceptual plans, both a combination of things that
- 5 were based on your comments at those two previous
- 6 meetings and also several meetings that we had with
- 7 the HeatherRidge Association with respect to our
- 8 plans. And their comments were also taken into

9	consideration in our planning process.
10	We are the contract purchaser of
11	the subject property which includes approximately
12	7.68 acres that is located on the corner of
13	Milwaukee and Manchester Boulevard.
14	The seller of the property is HR
15	Land. They are the successor corporation to
16	HeatherRidge Realty who was the developer of
17	HeatherRidge and is currently the developer as
18	defined under the declaration.
19	This site presents some interesting
20	planning challenges with respect to its topography
21	its existing natural features, and a site that was
22	adjoined on all four sides by existing roadways.
23	The plans that we developed and you

24 will see tonight kept all of these factors in mind

- 1 as we went through our planning process. They were
- 2 all equally important to us in our presentation of
- 3 this property.
- 4 The landscape plan, the site plan
- 5 and the product development were all key to us in
- 6 order to present you a community that represented
- 7 our best foot forward and also respected the
- 8 surrounding property, all maintaining an internal
- 9 sense of livability.
- The zoning map is our first
- 11 exhibit. We are at the center of the zoning map.
- 12 As Tracy indicated, we are currently zoned
- 13 commercial. That zoning was in place back in the
- 14 mid 1970s with HeatherRidge. Our proposal before
- 15 you this evening is to rezone that property into an
- 16 R-5 PUD classification.
- 17 Predominantly surrounding us, as
- 18 you can see, are various residential zoning
- 19 classifications. HeatherRidge had a number of
- 20 zoning classifications from R-4 to R-3 PUD. There
- 21 is a small parcel of commercial zoning that occurs
- 22 at the Spinney Run Plaza which is opposite us on

- 23 Manchester Drive.
- Likewise, there are also to the

- 1 east, far north, and a portion in the center of
- 2 HeatherRidge that is currently in the County and
- 3 has Lake County Suburban zoning.
- 4 I wanted to vary a little bit from
- 5 my typical presentation because I think it's
- 6 important to understand the product of the
- 7 property.
- 8 We took a lot of time in looking
- 9 over different products for this location and
- 10 because of the issues that I had raised earlier
- 11 with respect to topography, the site layout, and
- 12 the surrounding neighbors it was important for us
- 13 to develop a product at this location that would
- 14 blend, aesthetically pleasing externally plus would

- 15 offer Gurnee a product that they currently do not
- 16 have.
- 17 This is a multi-family townhome
- 18 project product that consists of four and five unit
- 19 configurations. We have developed it and built it
- 20 in the past. We started with it in 1993 in Elgin,
- 21 modified it and refined it based on market demands.
- 22 We currently offer it in Lindenhurst as well. And
- 23 we believe it is a product that is in high demand
- 24 and offers a lot of variety both in its internal

- 1 and external design.
- What I'm showing you here is a
- 3 front elevation of a four unit building. I think
- 4 it's important in the townhome development product
- 5 that we really deal with a variety of different
- 6 front facades.

8	both from left to right we start out with different
9	types of roof pitches and detail on the front
10	garages. We also modified different slopes of the
11	roof and how it's tied in to the main part of the
12	house.
13	We varied the front porch detail
14	from a two-story entry with detail to a single
15	entry. All of the buildings whether they be a four
16	or five unit building will have a side entry, and I
17	will show you that in a minute.
18	They are basically two and three
19	bedroom units. All two car garage attached. A
20	number of different internal features. We
21	anticipate that approximately 90 percent of these
22	homes will be two bedroom, 10 percent being three
23	bedroom. We offer five interior floor plans with
24	options. And the square footage will range from

As you can see from this elevation

7

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

- 1 1,350 to 1,800 square feet.
- 2 Anticipated base price range is 145
- 3 to 165. In this particular market we've seen that
- 4 anywhere from 6,000 to \$40,000 in extras can be
- 5 spent on this product based on internal space,
- 6 whether it be a window or a walkout full basement.
- 7 So the end result can be a product and a purchase
- 8 price exceeding \$200,000.
- 9 Market demographics indicate that
- 10 we've seen a big change from the traditional
- 11 townhome buyer being a young professional. We've
- seen a big change, now we're seeing a lot of empty
- 13 nesters in this product because two of the units
- 14 are stacked flats meaning they are one floor living
- 15 over/under.
- The other three interior plans are
- 17 a traditional two-story townhome. So we do have a
- 18 wide variety of interior floor plans offering a
- 19 livability and desire to a wide variety of the
- 20 marketplace.
- These won't fit because they'll

- slide down, but I will show you the side
- 23 elevations. Again, as I indicated, it was
- 24 important to us to pick a product that respected

- 1 all four sides of the building.
- 2 This particular elevation is a left
- 3 side of the building. Again, you can see that it
- 4 typically looks like a two-story traditional single
- 5 family home with all full architectural detail.
- 6 Some brick wrap, again detail at the front porch,
- 7 window treatments. And we also inserted mutton
- 8 bars in the glass for that elevation.
- 9 Again, this is the right side.
- 10 It's a different type of unit, a different style of
- 11 unit. But again you can see the architectural
- 12 detail, four sided treatment. When we get to the
- 13 site plan you'll see that the views from the

- 14 surrounding properties and the streetscape respect
- 15 this elevation and that's the view that you will
- 16 get.
- 17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you show
- 18 those to the audience, sir?
- MR. HARRIS: Sure.
- 20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.
- MR. HARRIS: I'm not sure which one is
- 22 the right and which one is the left.
- This is the left elevation and this
- 24 is the right elevation of the end of the building

- 1 and they are side entry units.
- 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.
- 3 MR. HARRIS: Likewise with the back of
- 4 the unit because we do have some of our units that
- 5 do face adjoining streets we felt it was important

6	to develop architectural detail in the back of the
7	building, again respecting those properties that
8	were adjoining us.
9	As you can see, we've added detail
10	to that elevation. In some instances we vary with
11	our porch details, handrail architectural
12	handrail detail. We don't use all patio doors. We
13	have some divided light French doors accessing rear
14	patios. Some of the units do come with a patio
15	door. So it gives a variety of look in terms of
16	window detail and style.
17	We've added some shutter detail on
18	the variety of windows, breaking that up. Where
19	the shutters would not fit we put wood trim and
20	wood wrap around those windows. Again, putting
21	mutton bars on those windows and full architectural
22	detail on all four sides of the building. And
23	again, I can show the rear and the front.
24	(Enter Ms. Kovarik.)

- 1 MR. HARRIS: As I indicated, the
- 2 property is rather symmetrical in shape, it came
- 3 into our planning considerations.
- 4 We have approximately 1,200 feet of
- 5 frontage on Milwaukee, 900 feet on Manchester. And
- 6 this is Milwaukee, this is Manchester. There's
- 7 approximately 800 feet of frontage on Dunham. The
- 8 balance of the frontage is on Wilbur Court to the
- 9 north which is a private street within
- 10 HeatherRidge.
- The property slopes from southwest
- 12 to northeast from the intersection of Manchester
- 13 and Dunham to the existing pond at the northeast
- 14 corner. There's approximately 27 feet of fall
- 15 across the property.
- The existing pond was constructed
- 17 as part of the HeatherRidge development. It
- 18 provides not only detention for our property but it
- 19 also designed as a pass-through facility for the

- 20 upstream detention ponds that are part of
- 21 HeatherRidge.
- These ponds I'm showing
- 23 graphically, there's an existing pond on the west
- 24 side of Dunham. That existing pond is also linked

- 1 to a series of ponds upstream and further into the
- 2 HeatherRidge development.
- 3 So in terms of the water course the
- 4 water traveling through a series of detention ponds
- 5 comes underneath Dunham and then travels via an
- 6 existing ditch to an existing detention pond.
- 7 Our plan is to relocate the
- 8 existing ditch and move it somewhat north of its
- 9 current location. We are graphically showing that
- 10 in a blue line around the backs of Building 1 and
- 11 2. Again, allowing the current water flow to take

12	its natural	course	underneath	Dunham	and to	the

- 13 existing detention pond. I will get into a little
- 14 bit more detail on that relocation a little bit
- 15 later.
- There is also an existing storage
- 17 building that is on the site at the corner of
- 18 Manchester and Milwaukee that's currently being
- 19 used as a storage facility I understand from the
- 20 golf course for the golf carts in the winter time.
- 21 Various other paving and foundation remnants exist
- 22 on the site.
- There are a number of various
- 24 pockets of vegetation that occur predominantly on

- 1 the perimeter of the site along Milwaukee Avenue,
- 2 some scattered vegetation around the existing pole
- 3 barn storage facility and then an existing somewhat

- 4 degraded tree row that straddles either side of the
- 5 existing drainage ditch.
- 6 Our design plan, due to the small
- 7 nature of this property in its acreage and its
- 8 number of units being 54, was to keep the internal
- 9 portion of the property relatively simple. This is
- 10 a private community. We will establish an
- 11 independent private homeowners' association.
- We wanted to take a look at the
- 13 simplicity of the interior of the project. It is
- 14 12 individual buildings. As I indicated earlier,
- 15 they are four and five unit combinations. We have
- split the number evenly, 50 percent of the
- 17 buildings will be four unit and 50 percent of the
- 18 buildings will be five unit buildings.
- To keep the interior simple we did
- 20 this by creating an internal loop street accessed
- 21 off of Dunham. It services all of the internal
- 22 units. And we additionally provide an emergency
- 23 access at Manchester.
- 24 That cross-section is a 24 foot

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD.

- 1 back-to-back street, full curb and gutter, paving
- 2 cross-section per Village specification.
- There is one street, however, that
- 4 is a 20 foot wide street without curb and gutter
- 5 that is a private drive scenario that services just
- 6 Building 3 and 4. We also wanted to provide and
- 7 maximize the internal orientation of the buildings.
- 8 As you can see where we could in all instances we
- 9 have located all of our buildings facing
- 10 internally.
- 11 It's a little bit different from
- 12 the concept plan that you saw earlier. We did have
- 13 two buildings that accessed Dunham. We did make
- 14 that change pursuant to the Plan Commission's
- 15 recommendation.
- We wanted to make sure that we also
- 17 maintained an internal feel to the community by
- 18 orienting all of the buildings internally and

- 19 providing a simple loop street that wasn't
- 20 complicated. It was very simple and would provide
- 21 a nice view and livability internal to our project.
- It was also important to us to
- 23 respect the surrounding neighbors in the buffers
- 24 and the setbacks that we've provided to the

- 1 adjoining properties.
- 2 Milwaukee Avenue we have provided a
- 3 90 foot setback from the existing right-of-way.
- 4 That is in keeping with the Village's Comprehensive
- 5 Plan of a 90 foot scenic corridor both east and
- 6 west of Milwaukee. And it is also in keeping with
- 7 the property setbacks that occur both to the north
- 8 of us and to the south of us. So it was important
- 9 for us to maintain that setback of 90 feet along
- 10 Milwaukee Avenue.

11	Dunham Road is a public street from
12	Manchester to our north property line. That does
13	change to a private street after that point in
14	time, but we have full public street frontage on
15	Dunham. We have provided a 30 foot setback for
16	Building 11 and 12 at Dunham consistent with
17	Village Ordinance.
18	The north property line was very
18 19	The north property line was very important to us. We have moved those buildings
19	important to us. We have moved those buildings
19 20	important to us. We have moved those buildings somewhat away from that property line since the
19 20 21	important to us. We have moved those buildings somewhat away from that property line since the last time that you saw this plan. We have created

- 1 There is also some additional space
- 2 from our property line to the actual pavement edge

- 3 of Wilbur and a couple areas you can see where it
- 4 really works away from Wilbur and so there's some
- 5 additional distance from our common property line
- 6 to the paving cross-section as well. But to the
- 7 property line I'd say on an average you probably
- 8 have about 120, 125 feet.
- 9 Our internal -- I want to go back a
- 10 little bit to our internal separations and
- 11 spacings. We have a 64 foot setback front to
- 12 front. That only occurs in one instance in
- 13 Building 3 and 4. Because this is a 20 foot road
- 14 we have 64 feet. That allows us to create a paving
- 15 cross-section of 20 feet and driveways of 22 feet
- 16 from edge of pavement to the garage door.
- Our typical, however, is 68 feet
- 18 and it does occur predominantly throughout the
- 19 community on the loop street. So it's increased by
- 20 4 feet in that location primarily because the
- 21 street is 4 feet wider. Simple math.
- Our front to side setback of 60
- 23 feet, that occurs only in two locations. It occurs
- between Buildings 2 and 8 and 1 and 9 at the entry

1	of our subdivision. Our side to side is 30 feet
2	between buildings. Our side to rear is 40 feet.
3	And that only occurs in one instance which is
4	between Building 4 and 5. And our rear to rear is
5	45 feet which occurs just in the center four.
6	So we have a variety of setbacks.
7	They are large setbacks. They allowed us to open
8	up space in the middle of the property but they are
9	not repetitive setbacks. They only occur on
10	several locations throughout the property.
11	What they did in terms of providing
12	the setbacks, generous setbacks to the surrounding
13	properties plus general internal setbacks still
14	allowed us to achieve an overall goal of a good
15	plan and also provided over 62 percent of the
16	property in common open space which in this

- 17 particular application with street frontage on four
- 18 sides and generous setbacks I think really works
- 19 well for the location, for the plan and also fits
- well with the neighbors.
- 21 It provides both an internal and an
- 22 external amenity to both our homeowners and people
- 23 coming and leaving Gurnee because Milwaukee is a
- 24 major corridor to Gurnee. And we look at enhancing

- 1 that corridor through the 90 foot buffer and our
- 2 generous landscaping as you'll see later on the
- 3 other public streets that abut our property.
- 4 As I said earlier, each building is
- 5 set a minimum of 22 feet from the back of curb
- 6 allowing sufficient room for parking of any sized
- 7 vehicle on the driveway with the separation from
- 8 the vehicle to the back of the curb. Typical

9 vehicles today are anywhere from 14 to 16 feet so 10 we are allowing approximately 4 to 6 feet additional in that driveway spacing for parking 11 12 with additional room there. 13 All the homes again are designed 14 with two car garages. We have looked at some 15 opportunities to put in some side load garages. 16 They occur in a couple locations both on Building 8 17 and on Building 4. 18 When we get to the final design if 19 there's other opportunities on some of the other 20 corners we would certainly like to implement some 21 side load garages as well which again will offer an 22 opportunity of a variety of streetscape as you

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

We've also allowed and placed other

travel throughout the interior of the project.

23

- 1 guest parking. It is distributed evenly throughout
- 2 the community. You can see between buildings.
- 3 Also some off street parking at the ends of the
- 4 buildings. So we've distributed that guest parking
- 5 evenly throughout the community.
- 6 We are providing an overall ratio
- 7 of 4.3 vehicles per unit or approximately 234
- 8 parking spaces into our project. That's a
- 9 combination of four parking stalls per two car
- 10 garage; two in the garage, two on the driveway if
- 11 people have that many cars. And additional parking
- 12 off street which would bring us to a ratio of 4.3
- 13 vehicles per unit.
- 14 Sidewalks planned for the community
- 15 are external sidewalks. We have a 5 foot sidewalk
- 16 in the 90 foot corridor on Milwaukee traveling from
- 17 our north property line to the intersection of
- 18 Milwaukee and Manchester. We have graphically
- 19 depicted that sidewalk to meander through that
- 20 corridor.
- There's some grade changes that
- 22 occur as we leave the detention facility. It's
- 23 rather flat through here. The slope of the land

24

1	dramatically. We want to bring that sidewalk up to
2	the high ground and get it away from Milwaukee.
3	There's also an existing group of
4	vegetation in that location which we want to
5	preserve and bring that sidewalk above the existing
6	vegetation for a nice natural scenic corridor
7	through there allowing privacy not only to the
8	units that back up to Milwaukee but privacy and
9	screening from anyone that might be traveling on
10	that sidewalk to and from their destination
11	throughout Gurnee.
12	Along Manchester and Dunham it's an
13	extension of a 4 foot public sidewalk. That
14	sidewalk ends right now at the north intersection,

15 the north side of that intersection. We would

- 16 extend that sidewalk down to Milwaukee and
- 17 Manchester.
- We also are providing a 4 foot
- 19 sidewalk along Dunham. That sidewalk, however,
- 20 does stop at our entry because there is no other
- 21 sidewalk on the west side of Dunham, whether it be
- 22 through our public street cross-section or as you
- 23 leave Dunham and it changes to a private street in
- 24 HeatherRidge there is no sidewalk. So what we're

- 1 doing is we're terminating it at our street.
- 2 There is, however, a full public
- 3 sidewalk on the west side of Dunham. So all sides
- 4 of the property are accommodated with public
- 5 sidewalk in some variety, shape and form. We do
- 6 not have internal sidewalk, but we have created a
- 7 nice loop with respect to a sidewalk pattern. One

- 8 can take his evening walk around and loop back in
- 9 our project.
- We also would anticipate at the end
- 11 of this street possibly making a connection to that
- 12 sidewalk that we brought real close to the end of
- 13 that private street. So we create a nice loop both
- 14 internal and external to satisfy the public
- 15 sidewalk requirements of Gurnee and also offer some
- 16 opportunities for people moving throughout our
- 17 site.
- In summary, the site data, we again
- 19 have 7.69 acres, 54 units. It's a density of 7
- 20 dwelling units to the acre. We have building
- 21 coverage of 1.52 acres which represents 19.8
- 22 percent of the site.
- In pavement we have 1.37 acres or
- 24 17.8 percent of the site. And in open space we

- 1 have maintained 4.8 acres in open space which
- 2 represents 62.4 percent. So as you can see, a
- 3 substantially high percentage of this site is in
- 4 open space.
- 5 The landscape plan is probably one
- 6 of the things that I enjoy most in the planning
- 7 process. It's always interesting to go out to a
- 8 piece of property and identify the existing
- 9 vegetation, visualize the completed community and
- 10 how the buildings will orient both internally and
- 11 externally and also how well it can be successfully
- 12 integrated within the community itself and the
- 13 surrounding neighborhood.
- We also like to as you have seen us
- 15 do in the past in Gurnee identify our projects with
- 16 a major focal point. This particular project we
- 17 are naming Cobble Creek. It's important for us to
- 18 identify all of our projects with a major identity,
- 19 enhancing the landscaping and the image of a
- 20 community within Gurnee and also give identity to
- 21 the residents that live there.

- This particular entry signage will
- 23 occur at the intersection of Manchester and
- 24 Milwaukee. It is a combination of brick and stone.

- 1 Mature landscaping being installed around it. We
- 2 always try and oversize our landscaping at our
- 3 entries for initial impact so we always go a little
- 4 bit overboard I think in some of our entries but I
- 5 think the initial impact and visual aesthetics is
- 6 important from day one.
- 7 I actually started out by walking
- 8 the property and taking pictures throughout the
- 9 area. I have those pictures here if anybody has a
- 10 question and they want to take a look at it. But
- 11 it was important for me to understand what all the
- 12 views were from all of the public streets and the
- 13 surrounding area and use that idea as we developed

- 14 the landscape plan.
- The key was to create a quality
- 16 perimeter, buffer treatments and the Cobble Creek
- 17 identity. We do that by identifying existing
- 18 vegetation, potential tree transplants and
- 19 relocations on the site, implementations of buffers
- and street tree programs and then some internal
- 21 identity highlighting focal points where they may
- 22 occur in supplemental landscaping.
- Again starting with the 90 foot
- 24 buffer area there is some existing vegetation that

- 1 occurs to the north of that via plantings that
- 2 occurred with HeatherRidge. We looked at adding to
- 3 the plantings in that area to screen our property
- 4 and our views from people traveling south on
- 5 Milwaukee Avenue.

6	However, there is an existing berm
7	there so if you're actually on Milwaukee and you
8	try and look into the project it's relatively
9	difficult because of the quality of the vegetation
10	that exists there and the grade of the property.
11	I talked about the existing
12	vegetation that occurred in there. There's a large
13	group of Sumac. We want to bring that sidewalk
14	above that line of Sumac and above the grade. We
15	want to maintain that as it exists today. What it
16	does is it allows us to provide a buffer and
17	screening to the backs of Building 4 or the end of
18	Building 4 and the back of Building 5 in that
19	location.
20	Where the Sumac ends supplemental
21	landscaping with both evergreens and deciduous and
22	then the identity and the signage that I showed you
23	earlier occurs at the intersection of Milwaukee and
24	Manchester.

	a	•	• .	. 1	• .	1 .1
	So one	coming	1nto	the	nroiect	hoth.
1	DO One	commig	\mathbf{m}	uic	project	oour

- 2 either northbound or southbound will visually be
- 3 able to see that sign. The orientation will be
- 4 such that you will see that sign coming in from
- 5 either direction.
- 6 Manchester, as you remember
- 7 previously and I might get into it in a little bit
- 8 more detail, Manchester Drive as constructed is not
- 9 in the center line of the right-of-way. That's an
- 10 80 foot right-of-way on Manchester but for whatever
- 11 reason Manchester was constructed out of the center
- 12 line. And you can actually see it.
- I don't know, do you have the big
- 14 plans? Nobody has got their big plans. I actually
- 15 have small plans that you can pass out if you want.
- 16 It's easier to see sometimes.
- 17 The line that you see at this
- 18 location is actually the platted center line of
- 19 Manchester. Physical construction moved the street
- 20 approximately 10 feet to the south of its platted

- 21 center line. What that did was created a 10 foot
- 22 larger parkway on the north side of Manchester.
- 23 Typical cross-sections in that
- 24 location in an 80 foot right-of-way, that street is

- 1 a 36 foot back-to-back would give us a 22 foot
- 2 parkway from edge of pavement to the property line.
- 3 In this particular location we have 32 feet of
- 4 parkway from the edge of pavement to the property
- 5 line.
- 6 What that allowed me to do is
- 7 double up the typical landscaping and parkway tree.
- 8 We take advantage of that extra 10 feet in that
- 9 location. We've staggered and doubled our parkway
- 10 trees in that location to take advantage of the
- 11 extra 10 feet.
- Moving on to Dunham Road, we have

- 13 trimmed the corner again with a little feature
- 14 area. It's not signage but it's a feature area.
- 15 It will have landscaping in that location. It's a
- 16 combination of evergreens and deciduous,
- 17 ornamental, perennials and annuals.
- The backs of these buildings as
- 19 they faced a couple of units on the west side of
- 20 Dunham were very, very important to us to provide
- 21 screening. While the landscaping we do that with a
- variety of treatments, both deciduous parkway
- 23 trees, the backdrop of that is groupings of
- 24 evergreens and ornamentals as well.

- 1 We move on to the corner. Again
- 2 you can see that we've added some color at that
- 3 location which is an indication of a perennial bed
- 4 and some types of other treatments that would occur

5	there. Additionally at this location we propose to
6	do some berming where possible.
7	However, the Building 11 at the
8	corner is somewhat below will be built somewhat
9	below the elevation of Dunham. Because of the
10	grade of the property that particular building is
11	about 4 feet below Dunham.
12	To help you visualize that I
13	created an exhibit, although I think my land
14	planner went a little bit dark on me here. What
15	you're looking at is the back of Building 11 and 12
16	which are the two 4-unit buildings on Dunham.
17	This view would be from across the
18	street. This would be the location of the
19	intersection with Manchester and Dunham. And I am
20	standing to the north. Again, you can see that we
21	use a variety of treatments at that location, full
22	architectural detail on the rear of the buildings,

24 evergreen screenings, insert some ornamental which

23 parkway trees, backdrop that with additional

- 1 give variety.
- 2 You can see some berming that
- 3 occurs in key spots again to raise the grade,
- 4 create privacy both for us and for the surrounding
- 5 people.
- We also cross-sectioned that detail
- 7 as well. This is the west side of Dunham so I am
- 8 standing at the intersection of Milwaukee and
- 9 Dunham in this detail. And looking north you can
- 10 see the detail where we create some berming in that
- 11 location, a variety of landscape material and then
- 12 a building that sits somewhat level or below the
- 13 street grade.
- We're creating another major focal
- 15 point at Dunham and our entrance road. Again,
- 16 we're going to create a wet detention facility
- 17 there. Actually, it's a wet holding pond is what
- 18 it is. It will not have detention capabilities

- 19 because the detention for this site will be
- 20 provided in the existing pond.
- We are merely going to create a
- 22 situation at that intersection and that location
- 23 which will accept the water that comes from the
- 24 west pond underneath Dunham, will come into our

- 1 pond and then at the normal water rise of elevation
- 2 will merely enter this pond and then pass through
- 3 to the relocated ditch. I'll get into it in a
- 4 little bit more detail when we do engineering as
- 5 well.
- 6 But we looked at that as being a
- 7 project identity as well. I've done a graphic
- 8 illustration of what that view is. Again, this
- 9 would be the building that sits on the corner, I
- 10 believe that's Building 11. This is Building 1

- 11 that's in the background.
- This graphic presentation would be
- 13 if one was standing at this location traveling
- 14 north on Dunham what that entry would look like
- 15 looking at the corner of Building 12 and Building 1
- 16 in the background.
- 17 Again, you can see we placed
- 18 signage at this location, a water feature in terms
- 19 of a fountain as a backdrop to that signage,
- 20 picking up a detention facility or a water facility
- 21 in that location, a variety of different
- 22 landscaping making sure that visually we blend in,
- 23 we create an identity to our community and we use a
- 24 lot of different treatments at that location,

- 1 picking up annuals and perennials at the corners.
- 2 Moving on to the north property

- 3 line. Again, there was -- there's a number of
- 4 trees there. There are about three or four trees
- 5 that are existing. We want to relocate those
- 6 trees.
- We pulled our landscaping in this
- 8 location close to the property line. It's
- 9 important to have if you're creating a buffer that
- 10 you can get as close to a common property line as
- 11 possible so the views coming into our project both
- 12 provide adequate screening. And then because we
- 13 had a big setback from the back of our buildings we
- 14 felt it was important to create a sense of openness
- 15 for our residents viewing out of the back of their
- 16 units. We really think these are going to be
- 17 spectacular locations with respect to the distance
- 18 we have there, the open space, a lot of water
- 19 features.
- They will be a combination of
- 21 window and walkout basements at that location as
- 22 well. So we really had an opportunity on the north
- 23 property line to develop something that was special
- 24 both to our residents and the people surrounding

1 us.

2	I also would pass out a little
3	graphic that we did this afternoon. We had walked
4	the site last week taking a look at the site again,
5	looked at our landscape plan and decided that we
6	would also add some additional plant material as an
7	additional buffer at that location.
8	Staff felt that we wanted to see a
9	little bit more variety because as I indicated
10	predominantly we had evergreen trees in that
11	location. The plan that I pass out tonight to you
12	you can pick up the trees that we've added in that
13	location based on a round circle with a square in
14	it I guess or a cross in it. Those are the
15	additional trees that we would be willing to
16	install at that location to again supplement and
17	enhance the screening and the berming in that

- 18 location.
- We have additionally placed berms
- 20 along that property line where appropriate. We are
- 21 picking up some existing drainage that comes from
- 22 Wilbur Court right now. There's two culverts that
- 23 come underneath Wilbur and they will be connected
- 24 to our relocated creek.

- 1 So in those areas we need to make
- 2 sure that we keep that open. We can't berm in
- 3 those areas. We need to keep them open for
- 4 drainage. Where we can berm along that property
- 5 line we've shown them in this location and we've
- 6 also added some additional landscaping to create a
- 7 variety of evergreen, deciduous and ornamental
- 8 trees similar to what we did on the other side of
- 9 the property.

10	Likewise when we get to the corner
11	of the pond staff felt that we wanted to add some
12	variety in that location so you'll see a couple of
13	added deciduous there as well.
14	We do have internally a couple of
15	locations that we can preserve existing. There's a
16	cluster of existing trees that occur around the
17	south side of the pond adjacent to Building 3. We
18	believe we have enough separation between pond edge
19	and the back of our building there, being
20	approximately 40 feet from water's edge, to
21	preserve that existing vegetation as well.
22	So the preservation of existing and
23	the installation of some additional screening in
24	that location I think covers all four sides of our

37

1 boundaries with a variety of treatments.

- 2 Moving internally, we have some
- 3 focal points internally. We always try and pick up
- 4 some areas that we can enhance and add supplemental
- 5 landscaping with respect to color. We have some
- 6 berming and some screening that occurs in the
- 7 center corridor in this location as well. We've
- 8 also added some additional plant material around
- 9 the end of the private drive where that sidewalk
- 10 was, again to provide some privacy in that
- 11 location.
- 12 Engineering. Now this is a
- 13 preliminary engineering plan that's been submitted
- 14 to staff. Again, it is relatively simple. We have
- 15 existing sewer and water in this location. I've
- shown the sewer in red, the water is in blue. We
- 17 have sewer along our north property line and also
- 18 along Milwaukee.
- There's water main that occurs
- 20 along Milwaukee, along Manchester, and along
- 21 Dunham. So we have adequate sewer and water, both
- 22 capacity and availability at this location.
- 23 Internally we make connections, run

1	Manchester and Milwaukee providing adequate fire
2	flow and pressure for a cross-section situation.
3	Sanitary sewer is relatively
4	simple. We service sanitary sewer where possible
5	along the front of the building, where not possible
6	we would enter the rear of the building but
7	predominantly we enter with sewer on the front of
8	the building.
9	This is a combination storm sewer
10	plan and I've also colored the buildings to show
11	you the different types of foundations that would
12	occur and where they are placed on the property.
13	In the lighter shade of brown
14	these would be the slab buildings. The darker
15	shade of brown is a walkout basement, and the

- 16 yellow I guess it is a window basement
- 17 condition.
- 18 It was important to us because of
- 19 the grade change to make sure that our orientation
- 20 of the backs of the buildings respected the grade
- 21 changes and we worked our way from the
- 22 intersection, the high ground, to Milwaukee.
- 23 Essentially the buildings that the backs face west
- 24 are slab conditions.

- 1 The buildings, the backs that face
- 2 east would be a variety of window basements at the
- 3 corner of Manchester and Milwaukee or full walkout
- 4 basements that occur at this location and again a
- 5 walkout basement in this location.
- 6 As you can see, the distribution is
- 7 evenly split between slab and a window or a walkout

- 8 basement. That's done for two reasons. Number one
- 9 is the grade of the property and the engineering
- 10 constraints and desires. And number two, we wanted
- 11 to offer a variety of product in this particular
- 12 location.
- Not everybody wants a basement so
- 14 we do have opportunities for those people who don't
- 15 want a basement. And then getting back to pricing,
- 16 some people are willing to buy that walkout
- 17 basement, pay for location and pay for premium. So
- 18 it does give us a variety of desires for the
- 19 marketplace and a variety and flexibility of price
- 20 range and interior livability.
- 21 The storm sewer plan, again we
- 22 create at this corner a new wet facility. That
- 23 water will not have a high water and a low water
- 24 bounce rate. It merely will pick up again the

- 1 water that comes via the culvert underneath Dunham,
- 2 will pass through our pond. We relocated and made
- 3 another connection between the two ponds.
- 4 We're showing small arrows where
- 5 the culverts come in from Wilbur. I look at that
- 6 as being an opportunity in that relocated waterway
- 7 to create some boulders in that location, maybe
- 8 create some waterfall situations. We will not have
- 9 water traveling through that ditch on a permanent
- 10 basis but when it does it will give us the
- 11 opportunity to create some small water features as
- 12 the water does move through it.
- We also have submitted as part of
- 14 our package a traffic report. I'm not going to go
- 15 into a lot of details of that. I hope that
- 16 everybody had an opportunity to take a look at
- 17 that.
- 18 The traffic report was prepared by
- 19 Strategy Planning -- I'm sorry, Transportation
- 20 Strategies of Glen Ellyn. Lisa Weisner is here
- 21 this evening with me to answer any questions you
- 22 might have.

- There's three things that we looked
- 24 at in the study. This study was taken on June 23rd

- 1 of this year. We looked at three components of the
- 2 traffic study.
- We looked at existing volumes. We
- 4 looked at projections of traffic generations coming
- 5 from our site both in the AM and the PM peak hours.
- 6 AM peak hour is defined from 6:30 to 8:30 AM. PM
- 7 peak hour is 4:30 to 6:30 PM.
- 8 We also like to take a look at the
- 9 level of service that occurs at a major
- 10 intersection. And in this particular instance the
- 11 level of service was studied at Milwaukee and
- 12 Manchester.
- The results of those three
- 14 components basically indicated that our site would

- 15 generate based on 54 units approximately 30 vehicle
- 16 trips in the AM peak hour and 35 vehicle trips in
- 17 the PM peak hour. Of that roughly 95 percent were
- 18 outbound and about 5 percent were inbound to our
- 19 site.
- In the PM peak hour 35 total trip
- 21 generations. 25 were inbound, those people coming
- 22 home from work, 10 were outbound, those people
- 23 going to soccer practice I guess, taking their kids
- 24 to soccer if that occurs.

- 1 The level of service -- actually
- 2 the directional distribution was also taken a look
- 3 at. This report indicated that approximately 80
- 4 percent of the people leaving our site would travel
- 5 southbound on Milwaukee, making a right-hand turn
- 6 at that location. 20 percent of the people leaving

7	the site would desire to make a left-hand turn on
8	Milwaukee and probably come into the Village.
9	Level of service was studied.
10	There's three movements that occur there, both
11	inbound and outbound, a right and left turn.
12	Existing level of service in two conditions are an
13	A classification. A third directional turn there
14	is currently in a D classification.
15	With our additional traffic at that
16	location the level of service does not change. All
17	of those A classifications remain the same and the
18	D turning movement remains a D turning movement.
19	And I believe that is a left bound or a northbound
20	left turn at that intersection. So there is no
21	impact with this development and the additional

Likewise, we did population

Milwaukee and Manchester.

- 1 generations for the property based on 54 units,
- 2 approximately 90 percent being two bedroom, 10
- 3 percent being three bedroom. Total population
- 4 being generated is approximately 108 people.
- 5 Of that distribution six are in
- 6 grades K through 5, four are in grades 6 through 8
- 7 and two are in grades 9 through 12. As we see,
- 8 typically all of our multi-family projects are low
- 9 generators of school aged children and this study
- 10 and report indicates likewise a total generation of
- school aged children of approximately 11 students.
- The balance of the number of 96
- would be adults 18 years or over for a total
- 14 population of 108 people.
- We also presented a fiscal impact
- 16 study that was prepared by Strategy Plannings of
- 17 Schaumburg. It was based on two factors. One was
- an average sale price of \$165,000 as I indicated
- 19 earlier and a two year buildout. We would propose
- 20 to start the project in 1999 and complete all

- 21 occupancies of the 54 units towards the end of the
- 22 year 2000.
- So taking a look at that base price
- 24 or average price and the absorption the fiscal

- 1 impact as we present for the Village of Gurnee
- 2 shows a small deficit at completion. There is an
- 3 initial deficit that occurs in years one and two.
- 4 That deficit somewhat shrinks but it's still a
- 5 negative of approximately \$5,500 to the Village of
- 6 Gurnee that's not -- that's typical with
- 7 residential types of applications.
- 8 It is a smaller deficit than you
- 9 would see with single family. And I believe your
- 10 other taxing revenues of the Village offset that
- 11 small deficit that occurs. That would be a
- 12 reoccurring deficit as it occurs through starting

- in the year 2001 and on to full occupancy.
- We also studied the fiscal impact
- 15 to Woodland School District 50, Woodland and Warren
- 16 High School and what the tax revenues would be
- 17 based on our valuation. There is a surplus, an
- 18 operating surplus that this project will generate
- 19 of approximately \$36,000 for School District 50 and
- 20 approximately \$28,000 to School District 121.
- 21 A couple other taxing bodies I
- 22 think that are important, too, is the Park District
- 23 based on a tax base rate of point 317 receives an
- 24 additional \$8,600 per year in tax revenue and the

- 1 library receives an additional \$7,000 per year in
- 2 tax revenue. The other taxing bodies are listed in
- 3 the report. You can take a look at that at your
- 4 pleasure.

5	We've also reached agreement with
6	Woodland, Warren, the Library District and the Park
7	District for developer donations. Woodland will
8	receive \$420 for a two bedroom, \$592 for a three
9	bedroom. Warren is 134 for a two bedroom and 248
10	for a three bedroom. The Library District receives
11	\$194 and the Park District on average receives
12	approximately \$1,100 per unit in the donation.
13	I would like to touch on one point
14	and then I will conclude. At the concept plan we
15	talked about the possibility of adding into the
16	HeatherRidge Homeowners' Association.
17	As I stated earlier this evening,
18	we do propose to remain an independent association
19	at this point in time. We had met several times
20	with HeatherRidge and the people that are here this
21	evening I'm sure will speak on behalf of that.
22	My desire at that point in time was
23	if it was a good situation both for the
24	Heather Ridge Umbrella Association and for us and

- our new residents and it made sense to add it in we
- 2 would certainly want to take that opportunity.
- 3 That opportunity does exist in the existing
- 4 umbrella document where HR Land could add this
- 5 property in if they so desired.
- 6 After several meetings with the
- 7 Umbrella Association it was really decided that it
- 8 was probably not a good financial situation that
- 9 they wanted to enter into taking on additional
- 10 long-term liability for our project.
- We decided that if they didn't want
- 12 it then we didn't want to force the issue and
- 13 decided to somewhat stand alone with respect to
- 14 this community.
- So I believe I have covered all of
- 16 the issues. I've maybe given you too much detail
- 17 at this point, but I will turn it over to you, Mr.
- 18 Chairman, and answer any questions you might have.
- 19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you. Well, I'll

- 20 open it to the Commissioners for any questions.
- 21 Mr. Winter.
- MR. WINTER: With respect to that
- 23 private drive I think in an informal session I
- 24 questioned whether there was any safety concerns

- 1 with police or fire that you have this 20 foot
- 2 drive.
- Where does it connect to the loop?
- 4 Did anybody look into that?
- 5 MR. HARRIS: I submitted this plan to
- 6 Captain Kolmers (phonetic). Also, Village Engineer
- 7 Mr. Reed has taken a look at this plan and there
- 8 was no concern with respect to our internal
- 9 circulation and the accessibility of those
- 10 buildings for fire protection.
- MR. WINTER: What's going to happen with

- 12 regard to snow removal for that private driveway?
- 13 The city is not going to -- because it looks like
- 14 you've got ten driveways off of that. When the
- 15 city comes in in the morning to move the snow
- 16 you're going to have to have a private removal for
- 17 that part?
- MR. HARRIS: These are privately owned
- 19 and maintained streets, the city will not be
- 20 responsible for any snow plowing on them.
- MR. WINTER: Even the loop is going to
- 22 be private?
- MR. HARRIS: It is all private street.
- MR. WINTER: With respect to that

- 1 Building 3 it looks like on some of the maps we
- 2 have that the setback from the pond into the
- 3 northeast corner is pretty close.

- 4 And I guess when you showed the
- 5 basements that is also going to be walkout
- 6 basement. Maybe this is a question for staff. Is
- 7 there any setback minimum that we would require
- 8 within the Village with regards to the retention?
- 9 I think you said that that might be wet.
- MR. HARRIS: This location?
- 11 MR. WINTER: Yes.
- MR. HARRIS: Yes, that's the existing
- 13 pond that will remain in its current configuration.
- MR. WINTER: It looks like on the maps
- 15 you only have a 30 foot setback from the back of
- 16 Building 3 or in that area.
- 17 I'm wondering whether the Village
- 18 has any setback requirements for that. 30 feet
- 19 doesn't sound like a whole lot or it doesn't look
- 20 like a lot.
- MS. VELKOVER: Bud will have to take a
- 22 look at that, but we do have other situations.
- For example, we have a let's say
- 24 park out at Grand Hunt area where we have detention

1	ponds that are actually on private lots and the
2	setback requirement I believe is anywhere from 20
3	to 30 feet.
4	MR. WINTER: Because this one they're
5	going to have doors leading out to that pond it
6	sounds like. It seems there's only three buildings
7	that would have that. Those were my concerns.
8	I think you had an excellent
9	traffic flow except for that one dead-end spot.
10	And that I think I suggested last time that if you
11	would maybe flip one of those buildings and omit
12	one of the other buildings you would have everybody
13	on the loop.
14	And my concern was that at least
15	for those ten driveways or anybody else using that
16	they have to turn around to get out of that private
17	that more narrow driveway or road.

- MR. HARRIS: We thought -- if I can answer just a couple of those comments.
- We thought it was important to
- 21 minimize the backs of the buildings that were on --
- 22 facing on Milwaukee where the orientation would be
- 23 on Milwaukee.
- 24 If we were to move Building 4

- 1 around so it was on the loop it would have added an
- 2 additional back of building to Milwaukee. As you
- 3 saw in our side elevations, there's a lot of detail
- 4 that occurs on the side so we really felt it was
- 5 probably a better situation from an aesthetic
- 6 standpoint to orient to the side.
- 7 A little bit of a tradeoff but we
- 8 felt from an overall scenic view along Milwaukee
- 9 that it would be better to orient Building 4 in its

- 10 end condition.
- We do additionally provide a little
- 12 extra paving at the end of that which would allow
- 13 people to back out of their driveway and go forward
- 14 at that location. Plus we also put a side load
- 15 condition onto Building 4 onto the loop street to
- 16 again minimize the driveways that occurred on that
- 17 20 foot section.
- So we did a number of things there,
- 19 I think addressing some of your comments earlier.
- MR. WINTER: How much does that driveway
- 21 go into the 90 foot setback?
- MR. HARRIS: Probably about 5 feet it
- 23 looks like to me.
- MR. WINTER: Thank you.

- 2 MR. SMITH: I didn't see anything in
- 3 here in the traffic report but maybe you know.
- 4 If that was developed as a
- 5 commercial as zoned how would that compare to what
- 6 the traffic -- I know it would be considerably
- 7 less, this would be, do you have any ideas of what
- 8 it would be compared to this?
- 9 MR. HARRIS: My traffic consultant is
- 10 shaking her head, but we did not study the
- 11 potential of what the traffic would be at that
- 12 location if it was commercial.
- I think we all know that the
- 14 generation would be substantially higher than what
- 15 we are generating. We are down zoning the
- 16 property. It is a less intense use than what could
- 17 occur there in its current condition so we did not
- 18 study the traffic that might occur there in
- 19 commercial.
- MR. SMITH: And it would be a lot less
- 21 than if it was commercial?
- MR. HARRIS: Yes.
- 23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Foster.
- MR. FOSTER: I wanted to see the

1	pictures that you mentioned you had.
2	MR. HARRIS: Oh, sure.
3	MR. FOSTER: Thank you.
4	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions?
5	Mr. Sula.
6	MR. SULA: Excuse me, I have several
7	questions.
8	Regarding the mix of two versus
9	three bedroom units, how is that mix going to
10	happen? Is it going to be strictly a demand of
11	market or are you going to be building some specs
12	to steer one way or the other?
13	MR. HARRIS: Predominantly it is demand
14	of market. A traditional layout would give us a
15	two bedroom configuration with some form of loft
16	and/or study. That loft and/or study could be

- 17 converted into a third bedroom whether it occurred
- 18 on the first floor or the second floor.
- We typically start a building after
- 20 50 percent of it has been sold. So if we have a
- 21 four unit and there's two buyers we'll start that
- 22 building and our own sales and marketing people
- 23 will determine what the other two configurations
- 24 should be in that building in terms of what the

- 1 previous sales were. So it's a combination of
- 2 pre-sale and spec judgment.
- 3 MR. SULA: Regarding -- I have two
- 4 separate questions, some related to landscaping.
- 5 In driving by the property at the
- 6 northernmost section of the property it seems to me
- 7 that -- and I'm not a trained tree specialist by
- 8 any means -- but it seems like there's a fair

- 9 number of mature tall trees and a great deal of
 10 dense more brush like shrub type that looked like
 11 they pretty much get removed or displaced by the
 12 locations of buildings I guess they're one, two and
 13 three.
 14 Could you comment in terms of the
 15 one-for-one replacements that are going to be
 16 implemented in that specific area?
- MR. HARRIS: Yeah. The trees and the vegetation that occur there, there are no hardwood trees, they're basically Cottonwoods and some
- 20 Boxelders that occur in that location. You are
- 21 correct that the placements of Buildings 1 and 2
- and a portion of Building 3 impact that tree line
- 23 as it exists today.
- However, as you can see, that

- 1 vegetation does work its way out of the back of the
- 2 corner of Building 2. We would like to be able to
- 3 preserve if possible in that location whatever was
- 4 there.
- 5 With respect to the additional
- 6 landscape plan that I gave tonight respecting the
- 7 concerns of what might occur there we added
- 8 landscaping at the back of there. We've also
- 9 submitted a tree survey to staff. There is
- 10 approximately -- oh, boy -- Tracy, are you going to
- 11 help me with this?
- MS. VELKOVER: Number of trees coming
- 13 down?
- MR. HARRIS: I think what -- I think I
- 15 have it here. We identified approximately 70 trees
- 16 on the site. Sixteen of those trees are to be
- 17 saved and/or relocated.
- MR. SULA: When you say on the site are
- 19 you talking the whole site or just this northern
- 20 boundary?
- 21 MR. HARRIS: The whole site.
- MR. SULA: I'm really more concerned

- 23 about that northern boundary right now.
- MR. HARRIS: I haven't compared numbers

- 1 but in terms of a replacement ratio I believe on
- 2 that northern location we would be well in excess
- 3 of a one-to-one replacement ratio based on a 6-inch
- 4 tree or larger. There's only about 5 or 6 trees in
- 5 that grouping that are 6 inches in diameter or
- 6 larger.
- What we're proposing in terms of
- 8 additional landscaping there would far exceed the
- 9 one-to-one replacement ratio.
- MR. SULA: Just a comment. In looking
- at it, especially this time of the year, it's
- 12 extremely dense and you can't even see the existing
- 13 maintenance barn from Wilbur Court.
- 14 And I can't tell from this

- 15 particular plan that it's going to be anywhere near
- 16 as dense after the development that it is right
- 17 now. It's pretty dense and I think we need to
- 18 consider, you know, some way to replicate that if
- 19 possible.
- The pond that's not a pond that's
- 21 at the corner down at the entrance into the
- 22 development, how deep is that going to be, water
- 23 level I'm speaking to, and how close to the
- 24 sidewalk is that?

- 1 MR. HARRIS: Again, there is no
- 2 sidewalk. It is the north part of our entryway and
- 3 there is no walk sidewalk on the north.
- 4 MR. SULA: So there's not going to be a
- 5 sidewalk from the entrance north on down?
- 6 MR. HARRIS: No, there is not. Because

- 7 there is no sidewalk anywhere to the north of that
- 8 intersection. All those streets are private with
- 9 no sidewalk so the sidewalk would essentially go
- 10 nowhere.
- The pond is going to be
- 12 approximately four feet deep, four to five feet
- 13 deep. We look at the front section of it because
- 14 we have a water feature there being probably a
- 15 little bit deeper to accommodate the water feature
- 16 and the aesthetics. That pond will get a little
- 17 bit shallower as it turns and connects to the
- 18 relocated drainage swale.
- MR. SULA: How close will it be to the
- 20 two streets?
- MR. HARRIS: I would say it's probably
- 22 -- well, here is the 30 foot setback line. It is
- 23 -- it could be designed at any location.
- Here it looks like it's

- 1 approximately 15 feet from back of curb, maybe a
- 2 little bit more, and at the northern location it's
- 3 at least 30 feet.
- 4 MR. SULA: Okay. My next question is
- 5 more for staff I think.
- 6 As it relates to school aged
- 7 children 10 out of 50 homes seems like a small
- 8 number to me. Do we have any experience in other
- 9 parts of either the Village itself or other
- 10 communities that are served by Woodland in terms of
- 11 what their experience is in terms of school aged
- 12 children?
- MR. WILDENBERG: The donation agreements
- 14 that are entered into with the developer follow the
- 15 School District's student population generation
- 16 formulas. And that's based on the Illinois School
- 17 Service Studies.
- So the generation of school
- 19 children is related to the number of bedrooms in
- 20 the unit. If they build the 9 to 10 ratio then the
- 21 school children generation will be as was stated

- 22 earlier. If the ratio changes then the numbers of
- 23 school children will also change as well.
- But the impact fees that they pay

- 1 are reconciled with what's actually built. So if
- 2 they build a three bedroom unit they have to pay so
- 3 many dollars. If it's a two bedroom it's something
- 4 less than that because you're generating less kids.
- 5 But the actual student population figures are based
- 6 on the State survey studies.
- 7 MR. SULA: Okay. More of a question or
- 8 a point of discussion for the Commission itself.
- 9 We have a prior meeting unrelated
- 10 to this topic we had a great deal of emotional gut
- 11 wrenching decision expressed by several Members for
- 12 a plan that was only 74 percent compliant with the
- 13 comp plan.

- 14 This one is zero percent compliant
- 15 from my view and I think we need to discuss that.
- 16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Do you want to
- 17 start the discussion?
- MR. SULA: No, I think it's zero percent
- 19 compliant. I think someone needs to address what
- 20 the compelling reason is to deviate from the comp
- 21 plan.
- 22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Maybe the Petitioner
- 23 can address the deviation from the Comprehensive
- 24 Plan.

- 1 MR. HARRIS: Well, I think that I had
- 2 given some testimony -- or not testimony but
- 3 conversation at the conceptual plan meetings that
- 4 we had.
- 5 The property is virtually useless

6 in its current zoning capacity as evidenced by t	he
--	----

- 7 fact that it's sat idle for twenty years.
- 8 Originally that parcel was -- the size and the
- 9 shape of it was made in anticipation of some type
- 10 of local grocery store types of facility.
- 11 Milwaukee Avenue is an SRA 2.
- 12 There is no access allowed on Milwaukee Avenue. So
- 13 you have virtually no ability to enter or leave
- 14 that site for commercial purposes via Milwaukee.
- 15 As I indicated before, it's got 27 feet of fall
- 16 across the property. It is not an easy site for
- 17 commercial to develop.
- 18 It has some very restrictive
- 19 natural features to it that a typical commercial
- 20 developer would not entertain taking on that type
- 21 of situation.
- 22 I'm not so sure that it's
- 23 compatible to the surrounding area. And you might
- 24 hear that from the people that are here this

- 1 evening and you might not. But all those factors
- 2 combined--20 years of sitting idle, the
- 3 restrictions that occur on the property, you have
- 4 what you have today.
- 5 Our proposal I think is more in
- 6 keeping with -- although it does vary from the
- 7 comprehensive plan, more in keeping with what's
- 8 needed in the marketplace today, the commercial
- 9 retail section of Gurnee has now moved away from
- 10 the Milwaukee corridor.
- You know where it's happening.
- 12 It's happening on Grand Avenue. That's where the
- 13 majority of the traffic occurs. That's where the
- 14 focus is at. That's where everyone wants
- 15 to be. They've bypassed this location.
- I also think it's a logical request
- 17 to put it into a residential classification because
- 18 it allows Milwaukee Avenue to be a dividing line
- 19 both east and west of residential which

- 20 predominantly occurs on the west side of Milwaukee
- 21 currently both all the way from the Tollway down to
- 22 120 and allow the Village to then work on the
- 23 vision of Milwaukee Avenue on the east side as the
- 24 corridor that you most recently looked at in your

- 1 own Comprehensive Plan.
- 2 So I think all of those factors
- 3 being that it's just an idle parcel that's sat
- 4 there, market demographics have moved commercial
- 5 and retail elsewhere in the Village, the restraints
- 6 that occur there and a logical dividing point
- 7 between residential and commercial in that corridor
- 8 make a lot of sense.
- 9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other comments
- 10 from the Commissioners regarding the Comprehensive
- 11 Plan? Mr. Cepon.

12	MR. CEPON: I think when that happened
13	back 25 years ago or whatever, like you said, the
14	market has changed in regards to commercial and
15	just, you know, everything in general.
16	And at that time this I think was
17	considered a fairly decent size site. But if you
18	look at what we went through with the Jewel on 120
19	and O'Plaine I think that site was roughly 13, 14
20	acres and this is 7.
21	I think, you know, just over a
22	period of time grocery stores have expanded and
23	commercial centers have expanded so theoretically

24 this is really not a big enough site to have

- 1 something that would be current.
- 2 And that's one reason we looked at
- and entertained this plan.

4	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other comments or
5	questions from the Commissioners?
6	(No response.)
7	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: At this time I'm going
8	to open the floor to the public. And maybe I
9	should explain the process that we're going through
10	here.
11	The Plan Commission is an advisory
12	board to the Village Board. In other words, we
13	don't make the final decisions here. We strictly
14	look at the details, look at the land use, look at
15	the design, the landscaping, and then we make
16	recommendations to the Village Board as to whether
17	we feel that this is an appropriate thing or
18	whether other changes should be considered or
19	should be considered and then the final decision is
20	made by the Village Board at another public
21	hearing.
22	And at that public hearing you will
23	also have an opportunity to speak and make your
24	comments and ask your questions of the Village

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD.

- 1 Board. So I just wanted to explain that process a
- 2 little bit.
- 3 But I'm going to open the floor to
- 4 the public now and if you'd like to ask a question
- 5 or make a comment we ask that you step up to the
- 6 microphone, state your name and address for the
- 7 record. And if you could address your comments and
- 8 questions to the Plan Commission and then we'll
- 9 take those under advisement.
- 10 And then after the floor is closed
- 11 we'll ask the Petitioner to respond to some of
- 12 those questions and also to some of the concerns
- 13 and comments.
- So if you'd like, please step up to
- 15 the mic and you're free to speak. One at a time,
- 16 though.
- MR. TILLMAN: Good evening. My name is
- 18 Douglas Tillman. I'm a resident of HeatherRidge at

- 19 641 Step Court.
- In short, I'm perfectly opposed to
- 21 any further construction in that particular
- section. It's mostly on the grounds of traffic
- 23 flow. I find the numbers that were presented
- 24 difficult to swallow. I commute every day turning

- 1 south off of Dunham -- off of Manchester onto 21.
- 2 It's a nightmare. It's a parking lot.
- 3 Making a right turn you can wait
- 4 five minutes. Any additional waiting time I
- 5 wouldn't look favorably upon. Making a left turn
- 6 isn't a whole lot of fun sometimes either. The
- 7 intersection from 21 -- or excuse me, from 120
- 8 making a turn north onto 21 in the evening is
- 9 taking your life into your hands, into your own
- 10 hands.

11	I mean it's just the traffic flows
12	are outrageous and I think anything that adds to
13	that should be resisted. I see nothing wrong with
14	leaving this little out of the way parcel
15	completely as it is and if we can go into the third
16	millenium that way that would be fine. Thanks.
17	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.
18	MR. LAJOIE: My name is Peter Lajoie. I
19	live at 5803 Regency Court in Gurnee and I am
20	president of the Cambridge and HeatherRidge
21	Homeowners' Association. I'm here this evening t
22	speak for that Board.
23	The Board opposes any entrance on

Dunham except possibly for one designed for

- 1 emergency vehicles only and restricted to that. If
- 2 you look at the traffic study, and I've read it and

- 3 I think it's significantly inadequate.
- 4 There are 54 homes going in there.
- 5 At least one of those people in those homes is
- 6 going to be employed full time. You're looking at
- 7 54 cars going out, not 30 to 35.
- 8 And they'll be very lucky with the
- 9 price of those homes there will be some homes with
- 10 two wage earners in those homes so you will have
- 11 more than that in terms of cars.
- 12 And trying to get out on Milwaukee
- 13 in the morning is a nightmare. Going right is
- 14 tough, going left is impossible. As residents of
- 15 that Cobble Creek begin to recognize those traffic
- 16 situations they're going to end up going up Dunham,
- 17 particularly the private section of Dunham that's
- 18 owned by HeatherRidge, up to Colby, down Gages Lake
- 19 to the light.
- Now going up through those narrow
- 21 roads, there are a lot of children in that
- 22 community, presents to me a very significant danger
- 23 that we should look out for. The school buses pick
- 24 up in the morning during those peak hours.

1	And the question I would have on
2	the traffic study is was anything looked at at
3	those four times during the day when the day school
4	down there at Manchester has people coming in or
5	out. That puts a lot of traffic on Manchester and
6	particularly on Dunham where they park on. And I
7	don't think in reading the report that that was
8	addressed at all. Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.
10	MR. HAHN: Good evening. My name is
11	Stephen Hahn. I'm the president of the
12	HeatherRidge Umbrella Association Board of
13	Directors. I live at 651 Mitchell Court in Gurnee.
14	I'm here on behalf of the Board
15	from HeatherRidge, the Umbrella Board.
16	We really have two significant

- 17 issues that we feel need to be resolved. And
- 18 provided those issues are resolved, in general we
- 19 are supportive of that development. However, these
- 20 two issues are significant and need to be resolved.
- The first is the planned unit
- 22 development itself allows for a declaration to be
- 23 declared for this parcel to be installed into the
- 24 Umbrella Association.

- 1 As the developer mentioned, he was
- 2 in discussions with us on this issue and we listed
- 3 to him several pages of concerns. His ultimate
- 4 response to us was that he wanted to remain
- 5 independent.
- 6 That is perfectly fine with the
- 7 Umbrella Board. There's too much financial impact
- 8 long term to have them involved in the HeatherRidge

- 9 Umbrella Association.
- I do find it ironic, though, that
- 11 impact fees are paid to schools and libraries and
- 12 other entities but nothing was offered to
- 13 HeatherRidge. And to date we have incurred
- 14 expenses as a result of this.
- 15 Second, if this proceeds we would
- 16 request that the developer release that parcel from
- 17 any right to enter the HeatherRidge Umbrella
- 18 Association. It's absolutely required.
- The next issue, and it's probably
- 20 the most significant issue concerning many of the
- 21 residents here, is the traffic issue. I asked the
- 22 Commission to consider where they would propose
- 23 placing an entrance for a commercial development.
- 24 Currently this residential development when it was

- 1 first presented to us had two entrances, the first
- 2 on Manchester and the second on Dunham.
- Now there's only one entrance on
- 4 Dunham. If you're familiar with HeatherRidge,
- 5 Dunham -- the bulk of Dunham is a private road that
- 6 runs through the Stoneybrook single family home
- 7 section of HeatherRidge. It's highly dense. It
- 8 has a lot of traffic. There's a playground in the
- 9 middle of it. It's a narrow road.
- There are safety issues. And the
- 11 entrance on Dunham to this development impacts the
- 12 Stoneybrook area. I would request that the Village
- 13 go back and relook at an entrance on Manchester and
- 14 not on Dunham.
- 15 It is critical because I think that
- 16 there are just too many safety issues that the
- 17 Village is addressing for its own purposes but not
- 18 for HeatherRidge. I would also request that the
- 19 development have the landscaping and the Village
- 20 hold the developer to the landscaping that he is
- 21 proposing.
- HeatherRidge is very nicely
- 23 landscaped. We spent a lot of money on our

- 1 believe the developer has made great pains to draw
- 2 up plans which on paper look very nice and if they
- 3 are placed in the development as they look on paper
- 4 we'll be very pleased. But I would request that
- 5 there be some oversight on that issue.
- 6 Beyond that we have no other
- 7 issues. Thank you.
- 8 MS. THOMA: Barbara Thoma, 1883
- 9 Gatewood. I was just wondering how high is the
- 10 existing berm or actually are there any
- 11 restrictions on that road regarding construction
- 12 traffic?
- MS. O'CONNELL: My name is Carol
- 14 O'Connell. I live on Buckeridge Court --
- 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Excuse me, we didn't

- 16 hear that question. I was wondering if you could
- 17 repeat that.
- MS. THOMA: The last question?
- 19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The last question.
- MS. THOMA: Regarding construction
- 21 traffic.
- 22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The construction
- 23 traffic, okay.
- MS. THOMA: Are there any restrictions

- 1 on any of those roads.
- 2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Yes, ma'am.
- 3 MS. O'CONNELL: My name is Carol
- 4 O'Connell. I currently live on Buckeridge Court in
- 5 Stoneybrook and in two weeks I will be a resident
- 6 on Dunham Road.
- 7 I object strenuously to the

- 8 entrance, main entrance to this development being
- 9 off of Dunham. We have major traffic problems on
- 10 Dunham as it is. The preschool does not have
- 11 enough parking spaces for their employees so there
- 12 are 6 to 8 to 10 vans parked on Dunham every day
- 13 through the day.
- There is a playground, a recreation
- 15 center, and a pool on Dunham. And our
- 16 neighborhood's children use those facilities.
- 17 There are no sidewalks. I do not understand why
- 18 the major entrance to this development is not on
- 19 Manchester.
- A question possibly that I would
- 21 like to know is since Dunham is a private road can
- 22 we close it? How does the developer plan to keep
- 23 his traffic from turning right and going west on
- 24 Dunham to Colby? That's a question I would like to

- 1 hear.
- 2 I also notice he has no facilities
- 3 for recreational for his -- for the children who
- 4 live there. Can Dunham be declared a no parking
- 5 street on the dedicated part? With 96 adults
- 6 living in this community it does seem silly that
- 7 they figure there's only going to be 25 cars in and
- 8 out of there at rush hour. I think the traffic
- 9 issues are major for those of us who live in
- 10 HeatherRidge.
- 11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.
- MR. SUGRUE: My name is Dan Sugrue and I
- am the president of the Stoneybrook Residential
- 14 Association which is part of HeatherRidge.
- 15 And as Mr. Hahn has already
- 16 explained, Dunham Road is a private road that goes
- 17 right through the middle of Stoneybrook. What I
- 18 have right here is a petition. There are 126 homes
- 19 in Stoneybrook. This petition is signed by 126
- 20 homeowners.
- 21 And what it requests is, among

- 22 other things -- and some of these things have been
- 23 met, but the main concern that we the residents of
- 24 Stoneybrook have is as it's already been stated,

- 1 the traffic situation.
- 2 The lady before me explained that
- 3 there is a playground right on -- right next to
- 4 Dunham Road, the private road, which is
- 5 approximately maybe 100 feet or so away from where
- 6 this entrance is proposed.
- 7 With the increase in traffic going
- 8 up and down Dunham -- and I would imagine with 108
- 9 new residents there will be an increase in the
- 10 number of children there and there will certainly
- 11 be a significant increase in traffic. And I think
- 12 that that creates a dangerous situation.
- 13 Also you have to consider on

- 14 Dunham Road near where that entrance is is a bend
- 15 in the road which is not very -- it makes this a
- 16 little difficult to see cars coming from the --
- 17 coming from the west and going and turning south on
- 18 Dunham Road.
- 19 I think the increase in traffic is
- 20 going to make that situation even more dangerous.
- 21 If you couple that with the
- 22 children and with the children crossing Dunham Road
- 23 to this playground that Stoneybrook has it could
- 24 very easily create an even more traffic nuisance

- 1 problem for the playground area and it could --
- 2 it's just a dangerous situation especially when
- 3 you consider that there are a number of young
- 4 families in Stoneybrookk with small children.
- 5 If the Board desires, I could

- 6 submit these petitions with the signatures of the
- 7 126 homeowners. Thank you.
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you. Yeah, you
- 9 can bring that up.
- MR. TARNOW: My name is Mike Tarnow. I
- 11 have property that's contiguous to the development
- 12 parcel at 636 Wilbur Court.
- This is a map that was made up for
- 14 your viewing here and it demonstrates the 500 foot
- 15 notice area. Here is the subject parcel, this is
- 16 Milwaukee Avenue, this is Stoneybrook up here. And
- 17 there's the play area that was referred to by
- 18 President Hahn and President Lajoie and Sugrue.
- 19 This is Cambridge.
- 20 If you look at the subject parcel,
- 21 and you will see the traffic pattern, I don't think
- 22 there's anybody who lives in this area that does
- 23 not recognize that when you come out of here in the
- 24 morning the best way to get on Milwaukee Avenue or

74

1 go south is to get up here in Gages Lake and go

- 2 down this route.
- 3 Because turning right on Manchester
- 4 and Milwaukee is -- turning left is impossible,
- 5 turning right is a major safety concern. And
- 6 that's been addressed to you on several occasions
- 7 by other people here.
- 8 We were surprised when -- we were
- 9 encouraged when we heard that there was going to be
- 10 one entrance but we were very discouraged when we
- 11 heard that the entrance would be on Dunham and
- 12 moved from Manchester.
- We had recommended that an
- 14 emergency access be placed on Dunham. And by
- 15 interjecting all the traffic to this development on
- 16 the secondary residential street is -- we don't
- 17 understand that at all. We understand the site
- 18 line problems of the engineering telling you that
- 19 they don't want an entrance on Manchester.
- 20 But if this were developed as a

- 21 commercial site surely this Board, your Board, you
- 22 would not suggest an entrance on Dunham. Why then
- 23 would a residential development which we are
- 24 generally in support of except for this major issue

- 1 here.
- 2 And we ask you to consider very
- 3 seriously how a major entrance to this is going to
- 4 occur on a very minor residential street right
- 5 across the street from existing houses. These are
- 6 the existing houses right here.
- 7 And we think that this entrance
- 8 belongs on Manchester and would better serve the
- 9 community. And I don't think there's anybody here
- 10 from Stoneybrook that disagrees with that. Thank
- 11 you very much.
- 12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

- MR. CAMPBELL: Good evening. I'm Jim
- 14 Campbell. I'm an 18 year resident at HeatherRidge.
- 15 I thank the Board for listening to
- 16 the residents and I think the presentation that the
- 17 developer made was excellent as far as the
- 18 favorability to the developer. I can't see how
- 19 it's going to enhance HeatherRidge where I live at
- 20 all. At least I haven't seen anything.
- Now I would ask about the children.
- 22 They say there's going to be a lot of empty
- 23 nesters, they say that there will only be 12
- 24 children. And my question is where are these

- 1 children going to play? Are they going to migrate
- 2 to our playground, to our pools? We will have a
- 3 police problem on our hands policing the situation.
- 4 So I'd like to know what these

5	children are going to do and are we going to have
6	the problem or is the Village going to come out and
7	police it for us.
8	I would also address the fact that
9	it is a private street. We maintain those streets.
10	We the people, the residents of HeatherRidge
11	support and put into a fund every year to repair
12	those roads. And they are small roads, they're
13	narrow roads.
14	And I will tell you right now
15	anybody going north or west is not going to go out
16	on Milwaukee Avenue. They're going to try to
17	shortcut through our village, through our narrow
18	streets to get over to Colby to make their
19	directional change at that time.
20	I would ask you this, who is going

21 to police that? Who is going to apprehend these
22 drivers of these automobiles going through our
23 property?
24 I would also like to address the

- 1 fact that we put up private streets, no
- 2 drive-through. I think you owe us some answers.
- 3 And I'd say that they've got to be forthcoming and
- 4 some of it has got to be favorable to us or we're
- 5 going to do everything to make sure that this
- 6 doesn't go in.
- 7 Now you've answered the snow
- 8 removal. You've got one little private road that's
- 9 down to either blacktop or cement that's 20 feet,
- 10 there's no turn, there's no cul-de-sac. But that's
- an internal problem, I'm only concerned about
- what's going to happen to HeatherRidge.
- The daycare center is a shame. The
- 14 daycare center traffic, you can't get through the
- area. There's mothers, there's children, there's
- 16 door openings, there's traffic on both sides. You
- 17 are -- we are putting the children in traffic in
- 18 harm's way and we're in harm's way when we go down

- 19 through there when all these vehicles are twisting
- 20 and turning and getting children out. Go over and
- 21 look at it, ladies and gentlemen, you'll find what
- 22 I'm telling you is true.
- You've answered most of the
- 24 questions or most of the questions have been given

- 1 here tonight or concerns of our other residents.
- 2 And I thank you for listening to us, but I trust
- 3 that you will make these recommendations to
- 4 whomever you make them to to give the concern of
- 5 the residents that live there already.
- 6 I'd like to know how it's going to
- 7 enhance any part of our lives. Thank you.
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.
- 9 MR. HEPNER: My name is Russell Hepner.
- 10 I live at 640 Wilbur Court in HeatherRidge.

11	I have a little concern not a
12	little concern but a big concern about the
13	detention pond that's in back of my or over from my
14	place. They're cutting down trees and foliage,
15	getting rid of it and putting in cement blacktop,
16	whatever it is.
17	Well, they say they're going to
18	enhance it by other vegetation but the vegetation
19	that's there is not keeping that pond from
20	overflowing when we have a heavy storm. When we
21	have a heavy storm that pond goes over its banks
22	into my neighbor's yard, into our yard. And the
23	access for the water is being overflowed, it goes

24 down under Milwaukee Avenue but it can't take it.

79

1 And I'm wondering how much more

2 there's going to be when they build these buildings

- 3 in there. You were on the right track, Jim. I
- 4 hope you stay there. Thank you.
- 5 MR. SUGRUE: If I may indulge the Board
- 6 for just one more point that I forgot to mention in
- 7 my earlier comments.
- 8 Once again my name is Dan Sugrue,
- 9 I'm the president of the Stoneybrook Association.
- 10 I notice there are -- or a few of us noticed that
- 11 the traffic studies were done at the end of June
- which is, you know, of course after school is out.
- And my question is and my --
- 14 perhaps the Board could ask this to Mr. Harris,
- 15 were there any traffic studies done during the
- 16 school year when we have all the school buses going
- 17 down Dunham Road, when we have the increase in
- 18 traffic of parents taking their kids to school and
- 19 back. I think that would be an important question
- 20 to ask.
- 21 And just one other question in
- 22 terms of construction traffic. What do we do about
- 23 penalties or fines or what can be done about that
- 24 in terms of -- in terms of if there is construction

80

1	traffic that goes up and down Dunham. Thank you
2	very much.
3	MS. CRUNKILTON: My name is Ida
4	Crunkilton. I live in the building that's on the
5	corner in Cambridge and the building that's on the
6	corner of Manchester and Dunham.
7	I want to speak in a little bit
8	more detail about the nursery school. The traffic
9	study was not done when the nursery school is in
10	session. The nursery school has no parking. I
11	substitute at the nursery school.
12	The children are delivered and
13	picked up in individual mother's cars four times a
14	day. Eight vans park in front of my house on
15	Dunham every morning. I'm thinking of renting my
16	driveway to them

So that the whole traffic study is

- 18 meaningless. I live on the corner of Manchester
- 19 and Dunham. I do not work, I do not go out rush
- 20 hour. I never attempt to exit out Milwaukee. I
- 21 drive down Dunham to Gages Lake, to Colby to Gages
- 22 Lake over to where I can get a stop light out onto
- 23 Milwaukee.
- When I come home on the highway and

- 1 exit onto Milwaukee from 120 I had an accident the
- 2 first time I tried it edging out. Those two
- 3 locations without any traffic control are
- 4 absolutely useless. So the traffic studies say
- 5 that people are going to use that, that just isn't
- 6 so.
- 7 MR. EULASS: I'm Dave Eulass, 640 Dunham
- 8 Road in HeatherRidge. Just a side issue.
- 9 Simple mathematics, and I'm not

- 10 talking about higher math, shows that there's got
- 11 to be a 28 percent increase in traffic impact at
- 12 the exits to Dunham Road.
- Now if the exit is the west end at
- 14 Colby, they are driving over a street that is over
- 15 stressed at this minute. What will happen is it
- 16 will break up and disappear. What do we do about
- 17 it? Thank you.
- 18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.
- MR. DUNLAP: Good evening. My name is
- 20 Larry Dunlap. I'm a resident at 635 Wilbur Court.
- To start, I would tell you that the
- 22 plan has overbuilt the lot. This 52 units is just
- 23 too many. The 11 buildings are just too many.
- 24 This is -- this and especially the rear elevation

- When you build that type of
- 3 building in that particular area you have
- 4 devastated Cambridge, you have devastated us in
- 5 Stoneybrook. That's just too many units on that
- 6 piece of property. The streets are too small, the
- 7 parking is not adequate, and it generates too much
- 8 traffic.
- 9 I just heard the president of our
- 10 association say we have 126 homeowners in all of
- 11 Stoneybrook. They are proposing almost 50 percent
- of what we have on a little over 7 acres that most
- 13 of it's occupied by a wetland. It's just too many
- 14 units.
- 15 It should be duplexes. I would
- 16 think as the Village of Gurnee has matured that the
- 17 type of zoning should mature. Similar to what
- 18 happened at Cambridge, when those Cambridge units
- 19 went in they were duplexes. I happen to live in a
- 20 duplex. Most of the units at Stoneybrook are
- 21 single family homes. It's not an appropriate place
- 22 to put 52 units in 11 buildings. It's just too
- 23 many, too much density.

1	. 11.	1	C	• ,		
	told 10	annrovimatel	V) TAII 1	' linite	ner	acre
1	tolu is	approximatel	v ioui	umis	וטעו	acic.

- 2 Stoneybrook is approximately five. Now I'm not
- 3 sure of the figures but I think somebody has them
- 4 and you could check it out. Why would you turn
- 5 around and stick seven units there?
- 6 It takes -- zoning characteristics
- 7 are picked up by Cambridge and by Stoneybrook.
- 8 There's nothing across the road yet and of course
- 9 the business on the other side. You should not
- 10 allow him to have these many units. The density is
- 11 too much.
- You should go back and redraw this
- 13 plan. You are bringing down the value of our
- 14 properties by approving this.
- This is really an apartment

- 16 complex. This is simply what it is. There are
- 17 buildings, quote, on slabs. And I'm sure there are
- 18 some slab homes in Stoneybrook, but generally
- 19 speaking they're with basements generally in
- 20 Cambridge which is a wonderful development.
- 21 And when Cambridge went in I think
- 22 it caused the property values of the rest of
- 23 Stoneybrook to go up. Maybe it would have been
- 24 stagnant possibly.

- 1 Don't do this to people that have
- 2 lived there, to people that have relied on the
- 3 zoning whether it be commercial. The fact is it's
- 4 just too many units. There isn't room even to run
- 5 a snowplow in there and that is your concern.
- 6 You should eliminate these
- 7 buildings. It should be changed to duplexes and

- 8 you should put maybe five units per acre. That's
- 9 what the density should be.
- Go back and -- sure, it's a very
- 11 attractive plan and you've seen a lot of plans, but
- 12 you know enough about zoning to realize where you
- 13 pick up the density around. Is it fair for the
- 14 people immediately across the street who have four
- 15 units per acre or four and a half to suddenly have
- seven or seven and a half? That's not right.
- 17 That's absolutely not right.
- 18 And where else do you have
- 19 buildings with four and five units? You're going
- 20 to have a building of 1,300 square feet, 1,300
- 21 square feet. I don't think there's a unit around
- 22 within 13. I don't know what's in Cambridge but I
- 23 guarantee you they're anywhere from 1,800 to 2,400
- 24 square feet.

- 1 Why should he be allowed to have
- 2 something that would pull the rest of the
- 3 neighborhood down. That's not fair. That's not
- 4 right. It's not just. Thank you very much.
- 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other comments?
- 6 MS. BAKER: I'm Jackie Baker and I live
- 7 at 662 Dunham in HeatherRidge.
- 8 I don't have anything new to say.
- 9 The people before me have said it all. But I
- 10 didn't want you to think that I'm happy about this
- 11 development that exits on Dunham. I, too, think
- 12 there's going to be too much traffic through
- 13 HeatherRidge and through the public street of
- 14 Dunham.
- 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anything else?
- 16 (No response.)
- 17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. The floor is
- 18 closed to the public now. I think we should
- 19 probably start by addressing this traffic question,
- 20 that's seems to be the major concern.
- And maybe our staff can go through
- 22 the logic of the entrance on Dunham which is I

- 23 think really the original plan called for two
- 24 entrances, one on Dunham and one on Manchester.

- 1 And it was the staff, our Village engineer that
- 2 recommended that the Manchester entrance be
- 3 eliminated.
- 4 So I don't know, Tracy or Jon.
- 5 MR. WINTER: Don, could I ask one quick
- 6 question about is there any way that if they had
- 7 that entrance where they show it on Dunham could
- 8 you have like a no right turn at that
- 9 intersection?
- 10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Why don't we first of
- all have them explain their logic and why that
- 12 change was made and maybe they can address with the
- 13 Petitioner some of the concerns and maybe that can
- 14 be discussed.

15	Tracy, do you want to start?
16	MS. VELKOVER: The traffic, the
17	Petitioner did submit a traffic study and we did
18	have our traffic consultant, an outside firm take a
19	look at it to get his response to the traffic
20	generation numbers and also the curb cut situation
21	First of all, the Village engineer
22	did request that the Manchester Drive be
23	eliminated. And he did so for the following

24 reasons.

1	First of all, the limited number of
2	vehicle trips that are generated from this
3	development would require only one full access
4	point.
5	Second, that Manchester is a
6	collector road and that the Village whenever

/	possible we try to mint residential access from
8	collector roads.
9	The third reason is that as you're
10	probably all aware Manchester does have a pretty
11	steep grade change to it. The fourth reason was
12	because the proposed Manchester access into this
13	development would also have a very steep grade to
14	it intersecting to Manchester.
15	And the fourth reason is because
16	the Manchester access poses some limited sight
17	distance concerns from Milwaukee Avenue.
18	As I did mention, we did send the
19	Petitioner's traffic study to our traffic
20	consultant. He took a look at it. You each have a
21	copy of his comments. He did take a look at the
22	traffic generation numbers from this proposed
23	development.
24	There's a manual that the Institute

- 1 of Traffic Engineers puts out regarding various
- 2 traffic generation numbers from different types of
- 3 developments. He took a look at the total traffic
- 4 generations from this and concurred that those
- 5 numbers that are in their report he concurs with.
- 6 He also concurs with the
- 7 directional distribution. He goes on to state that
- 8 the minimal traffic generations can be readily
- 9 accommodated by only one access drive.
- The plan indicates that site drives
- 11 are planned on both Dunham and Manchester. At the
- 12 point that he got this plan there were two access
- 13 points. He recommended that -- we recommend that
- 14 the site access be located along Dunham.
- One inbound and one outbound lane
- 16 will be adequate to accommodate the limited site
- 17 traffic activity. Existing site traffic -- I'm
- 18 sorry, exiting site traffic should stop at Dunham
- 19 and he goes on to state that the drive on
- 20 Manchester Drive should be limited to emergency

- 21 access only.
- And then he goes on to make some
- 23 comments about the location and the number of off
- 24 street parking that are within the development.

- 1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Let me ask a question
- 2 about the report.
- 3 The one statement that we try to
- 4 limit access from residential onto collector roads,
- 5 isn't that primarily direct access from residential
- 6 units?
- 7 Are we actually saying that we want
- 8 to -- I mean obviously we have to have -- a
- 9 collector road collects from something and I would
- 10 think it would collect from residential
- 11 neighborhoods with I guess what would you call them
- 12 subcollectors that then would come out onto

- 13 Manchester.
- Isn't that what's really meant by
- 15 trying to limit the access to residential?
- MS. VELKOVER: I think it's a little bit
- 17 of both. It's not only to limit the driveway cuts
- 18 but also the cuts to and from development.
- One of the other concerns was the
- 20 limited sight distance between Route 21 and this
- 21 cut and the grade changes.
- 22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: When you say the
- 23 limited sight distance, that means vehicles that
- 24 would be turning from Milwaukee onto Manchester

- 1 would have difficulty seeing vehicles pulling out?
- 2 MS. VELKOVER: There's a required
- 3 distance of -- I believe their traffic consultant
- 4 is probably better addressed to discuss this -- of

- 5 I think 300 or 325 feet. And I don't believe that
- 6 they have that from Milwaukee Avenue.
- 7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Isn't it possible to
- 8 move that entrance --
- 9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear the
- 10 Chairman.
- 11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You can't hear me?
- 12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. It's like
- 13 you're talking to her but we can't hear.
- 14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I'm sorry. I
- 15 was wondering, can that --
- 16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Still can't hear
- 17 you.
- 18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't think the mic
- 19 is working. I asked that before and it didn't
- 20 sound like it.
- MR. WILDENBERG: It works when you talk
- 22 into it.
- 23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I guess I was wondering
- 24 why that entrance -- right now they show the

- 1 original entrance in the center of the loop.
- 2 Couldn't it be moved further west so that they can

- 3 increase that distance.
- 4 MS. VELKOVER: Then you have to keep
- 5 distances between the intersection and you encroach
- 6 then between the distance from Dunham to that cut.
- 7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All right. I guess I
- 8 do see the neighbors' point, though, that it does
- 9 seem that the entrance or the exit onto Dunham
- 10 would encourage people to go north on Dunham and
- 11 then use the Gages Lake entrance.
- 12 I think that they still may do that
- 13 even if you just have the Manchester exit because
- 14 they could still go up Dunham to Gages Lake but it
- 15 would discourage it to some degree.
- Jon, is there a chance or, Tracy,
- 17 can we have our traffic consultant maybe take a
- 18 second look at this considering now the input and
- 19 some of the concerns from the neighbors?

- I mean I have to agree I'm kind of
- 21 concerned about the fact because I -- in fact, I
- 22 just went to a party that was at the clubhouse off
- 23 of Dunham and, you know, it's a very kind of
- 24 secluded spot. And I would hate to see us increase

- 1 traffic in that area to any significant degree.
- 2 MS. VELKOVER: Well, in your
- 3 recommendation if you wanted, you know, staff and
- 4 the consultant to take a look at that or if you
- 5 wanted to recommend that we further evaluate that
- 6 and if at all possible keep that cut that is
- 7 something that you can do in your recommendation on
- 8 this.
- 9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do we have any -- Mr.
- 10 Foster.
- 11 MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, I concur with

12 w	hat you're	saying.	I think my	y concern	would be	I
------	------------	---------	------------	-----------	----------	---

- would not be in favor of sending a motion forward
- 14 just with the recommendation.
- I would want to know what the final
- 16 outcome would be on that potential cut on
- 17 Manchester or something different before a motion
- 18 was actually forwarded because I think the
- 19 neighbors have presented some very good reasons.
- I guess I'm also concerned about
- 21 the whole issue of the private streets and is there
- 22 a way to limit that or is that okay for people to
- 23 be going through streets that are maintained by a
- 24 homeowners' association since those are not public

- 1 streets.
- 2 Because I guess looking at one of
- 3 those layouts it seems like you can go down

- 4 Manchester to Colby. But if that's a concern in
- 5 terms of additional traffic on private streets I
- 6 would like some staff response in terms of that
- 7 issue. But I'm very concerned about the Dunham
- 8 Street, too.
- 9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Jon, any comment on
- 10 that?
- 11 MR. WILDENBERG: The Manchester Drive,
- 12 you mentioned that option for going to Colby,
- 13 Manchester is a public street.
- Dunham Road is a public street to
- 15 the northern boundary of this particular property.
- 16 But after you go north of that it is a private
- 17 street. As it's public street we can regulate --
- 18 the Village Board can regulate parking on it if
- 19 that becomes a problem.
- 20 But as far as limiting right-hand,
- 21 you know, trying to do something of a limitation
- 22 that would preclude right-hand turns if there was a
- 23 driveway cut or street cut onto Dunham, that might
- 24 be difficult to do.

1	You know, we've done that in other
2	instances where we have commercial traffic that
3	might take it upon itself to go into a residential
4	area. So we've tried to limit truck traffic and
5	commercial traffic from going into a residential
6	area. But where you have residential traffic
7	mixing with residential traffic it might be a
8	different story.
9	As to the interior streets, the
10	private streets interior to the proposed
11	development, was that a question as well?
12	MR. FOSTER: I think what I'm asking
13	more in terms of the homeowners' association
14	private streets. If there's a possibility I
15	know some will have a sign that say no through
16	traffic, for example.
17	Is there any ability to limit

- 18 essentially cut-through traffic if it's not people
- 19 who live in a private area, that's what I was
- 20 asking about. Or what is the right of the public
- 21 to go through private streets?
- MR. WILDENBERG: I don't know if we can
- answer that off the top of our heads. That's maybe
- 24 a more complicated issue because you've got travel

- 1 patterns established through there over the years.
- 2 Although, on the other hand, it is a privately
- 3 owned street. So that could be pretty complicated.
- 4 MR. FOSTER: I guess, Mr. Chairman, like
- 5 I said, I don't want to take on traffic consultants
- 6 tonight, but I'm always just amazed that the
- 7 handful of information that residents provide to me
- 8 is always so much more strikingly helpful than
- 9 sometimes what the traffic consultants say.

10	Because it seems like based on
11	what I'm hearing tonight that the traffic study at
12	the intersection is kind of meaningless because
13	most of the residents are not using that
14	intersection at all, they're really going somewhere
15	else.
16	So when we talk about what the
17	impact is of this development on that intersection
18	it may be because everybody uses these other
19	streets. And of course the June timeline is also a
20	concern. And I know that when school is in session
21	my wife, she's making three or four trips back and
22	forth to school taking my kids back and forth.
23	So I mean I'm just I don't think
24	that that traffic study is very helpful in terms of

96

1 what we really need to know about that

- 2 intersection. I guess it may not reflect what our
- 3 real traffic pattern would be in addition to the
- 4 number of car trips seems to be strikingly low
- 5 based on the number of adults that may potentially
- 6 be in that development.
- 7 I mean Gurnee is kind of a family
- 8 oriented town and no matter what age range I assume
- 9 if you've got a car you end up getting in it once
- 10 or twice, three times a day or more. So I guess I
- 11 have some concerns around that, too.
- 12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think -- is that
- 13 better?
- 14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.
- 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think somebody
- 16 sabotaged my mic.
- MR. FOSTER: Who could that be?
- 18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't know, quite a
- 19 few people.
- I think one of the things that's
- 21 unusual about this is this private street.
- 22 Typically private streets are created in areas that
- are not -- wouldn't allow for cut-through traffic.
- 24 Just like this subdivision here, it would --

1	basically private streets are just say a circle,
2	there's one entrance in so nobody is every really
3	going to cut through.
4	I think this is an unusual
5	situation that we have Dunham as a private street
6	that actually could be used as cut-through traffic
7	for actually other parts of HeatherRidge. But
8	certainly this development would thus create that
9	situation that you can get that cut-through traffic
10	that's going to go over to Gages Lake Road.
11	Certainly if somebody wanted to
12	travel west they clearly would just go up Dunham.
13	Now that still may happen even if there's an
14	entrance on Manchester only. So I don't know, I
15	think we need to have our staff, our traffic
16	consultant and the Petitioner's traffic consultant

- 17 take a second look at this and study it more to see
- 18 if there could be some solutions.
- 19 I think the residents brought up a
- 20 good point. Did we have some other -- Mr. Cepon.
- MR. CEPON: Real quick just maybe to
- 22 help the traffic a little bit, not to get into it.
- 23 But maybe just have a sign up there no entrance
- 24 from 7 to 9 in the morning or whatever, 6 to 10 or

- 1 something like that. No, but it's just, you
- 2 know --
- 3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Just like everybody
- 4 stops for a stop sign, right?
- 5 MR. CEPON: It works in some
- 6 communities.
- 7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Are there any other
- 8 questions or other comments on the traffic? Mr.

- 9 Sula, did you have something?
- MR. SULA: I don't have anything on
- 11 traffic, but I do have a comment but I want to make
- 12 sure that we covered all the questions that the
- 13 audience raised.
- 14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think we're going to
- 15 have Tracy bring them up.
- I think the other point that was
- 17 brought up that's something that I felt was a good
- 18 point was the question of the density and the
- 19 design providing some kind of amenity for the kids
- 20 in the area because clearly this is not going to be
- 21 part of the Umbrella Association so therefore they
- 22 really should be providing their own amenities.
- 23 Mr. Winter.
- MR. WINTER: Don, consistent with and I

- 1 think there is a connection with the traffic.
- 2 Just looking at that, I was just --
- 3 and just throwing this out, if you made sure that
- 4 each one of those buildings only had four units and
- 5 removed one of those units because I still don't
- 6 like the dead-end with the two on there -- and I've
- 7 been consistent in my criticism of that plan for
- 8 that reason -- then you'd have 11 buildings with
- 9 four units. You'd almost have an 18 to 20 percent
- 10 reduction.
- I don't -- you know, maybe that
- 12 could address some of the density there because
- 13 that has been my concern even in the preliminary
- 14 stages about the density. It does appear as if
- 15 this plan does have at seven units per acre a high
- 16 density in comparison to what's adjacent to it.
- 17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You know, your point
- 18 was well taken before that one unit number three
- 19 looks awful close to the detention pond.
- MR. WINTER: Especially when you look at
- 21 the pictures. The topography really slopes into
- 22 that. And now someone said that -- who lives there

- 23 for a long time says it floods. I think there's
- 24 even more reason to say why do you have that

- 1 building within 30 feet of that pond. It doesn't
- 2 seem to make any sense.
- 3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Any other
- 4 comments in that regard?
- 5 Tracy, I think there were some
- 6 other questions that were --
- 7 MS. VELKOVER: There was a question
- 8 about whether Dunham could be dedicated no parking.
- 9 The part of Dunham that is dedicated public
- 10 right-of-way, if the residents wanted to request
- 11 this they would request that to the Village Board.
- 12 The Plan Commission doesn't have any power to enact
- that, but the Village Board would.
- So I would encourage you to go

- 15 forward to the Village Board with that request and
- 16 they'll take a look at it.
- 17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It also sounds like
- 18 that's a problem really not related specifically to
- 19 this subdivision. It's a problem that's existing.
- So I think you should pursue that
- 21 and maybe something could be worked out to solve
- 22 the parking problem. Apparently some of that is
- 23 generated from the school.
- 24 Anything else, Tracy?

- 1 MS. VELKOVER: In regard to traffic
- 2 there was a question about restrictions on
- 3 construction traffic and how it's controlled.
- 4 Again, this is going to be a PUD, a
- 5 planned unit development. You can write in or we
- 6 can write into the PUD agreement access for

- 7 construction off of certain roads.
- 8 As it is right now we have -- you
- 9 know, the plan only calls for access off Dunham.
- 10 But once that issue is resolved if you want to you
- 11 can recommend that construction traffic be routed
- in a certain manner and that could be written into
- 13 the PUD.
- 14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. There was a
- 15 question, I think it was by the Homeowners'
- 16 Association president regarding the rights to join
- 17 the association.
- 18 Is that something, Mr. Harris, can
- 19 you address that? My understanding was that you
- 20 would actually I would think refuse those rights or
- 21 eliminate those rights to join the HeatherRidge
- 22 Umbrella Association.
- 23 Is there something I don't
- 24 understand there?

- 1 MR. HARRIS: No. The declaration as it
- 2 exists today gives HR Lane who is the current owner
- and the seller of the property the right to add
- 4 this parcel into the Umbrella without any actions
- 5 required by the current Umbrella Board.
- 6 It's a legal description in the
- 7 declaration. He can merely record an amendment to
- 8 that declaration and this property then
- 9 automatically falls under the jurisdiction of the
- 10 Umbrella Board.
- 11 It was done with every add-on to
- 12 every portion of HeatherRidge as that property was
- 13 developed. There was like 26 different amendments
- 14 that were recorded adding particular parcels and
- 15 buildings to that Umbrella. That right exists and
- 16 exists with HR Land right now.
- 17 That right would then pass to me if
- in the event I close on the property. What Mr.
- 19 Hahn had requested that if that did occur and the
- 20 Village did pass a favorable recommendation that we
- 21 would waive that right to add this parcel of land

- 22 into the Association.
- 23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And you don't have any
- 24 problem with that?

- 1 MR. HARRIS: I do not have a problem
- 2 with that. I believe that our plan works with the
- 3 surrounding area and I can cover a couple of
- 4 issues.
- 5 In theory I do not have a problem
- 6 with that. I went into discussions with the
- 7 Umbrella Association looking for mutual benefits.
- 8 If there was not mutual benefits that we both could
- 9 visually and financially agree on then we just
- 10 didn't want to form a marriage and that's fine with
- 11 us.
- 12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do you have any
- 13 comments on the traffic discussion that we had and

- 14 also the density?
- MR. HARRIS: Sure. I could end up in a
- 16 little bit of a catch 22 when it comes to the
- 17 traffic discussion.
- You know, the numbers are based on
- 19 the manuals. As Tracy indicated, there's specific
- 20 guidelines that your traffic consultant reviews and
- 21 obviously our traffic consultant reviews. They're
- 22 working off of common denominators.
- Whether we believe in them or not,
- 24 it's a personal choice. But it is a common

- 1 denominator that we all live by. We rely on the
- 2 experts.
- 3 And then there's certain things
- 4 that are brought out that they look at in terms of
- 5 common denominators in that report. When they talk

6	about AM and PM peak hours and those hours are 6:30
7	to 7:30 in the morning and likewise 5:30 to 6:30 in

- 8 the evening, those typically are not hours that you
- 9 will see a lot of the school types of
- 10 transportation being on the streets.
- 11 You might see some high school,
- 12 you're not going to see --
- 13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Please give him a
- 14 chance to speak.
- MR. HARRIS: You might see some high
- 16 school traffic, you're probably not going to see
- 17 the elementary busses.
- 18 It's a common denominator to look
- 19 at peak hour. Traffic varies after peak hour and
- 20 drops dramatically because of commute traffic being
- 21 gone. So it's not typical that one would look at
- 22 traffic generations beyond the peak hour that would
- 23 take you into all of the things that the people had
- 24 talked about in terms of evaluating school traffic.

1	We certainly respect the public
2	comment and appreciate the public comment. There
3	is a situation that was created on Dunham Road, a
4	portion of it being public that fronts my property
5	and a portion of it being private that was
6	developed with all of HeatherRidge.
7	We have no objection to trying to
8	create a no right turn at our Dunham Road entrance
9	and into the private section of Stoneybrook. I
10	would be more than willing to say that that is an
11	appropriate type of application at that location.
12	If the property was developed in
13	its current use there probably would be another
14	commercial cut onto Manchester I would suspect.
15	There is a number of commercial cuts that occur on
16	the south side of Manchester.
17	They are both as primary entrances
18	to the Spinney Run Plaza and they are loading dock
19	entrances to the Spinney Run Plaza. And there is a

- 20 number of cuts that were occurred at the daycare
- 21 and the business center as well. And I think
- 22 there's a total of about six cuts along the
- 23 frontage on the south side of Manchester.
- There would be at least one

- 1 commercial cut, there might be two commercial cuts
- 2 on Manchester and there might even be a secondary
- 3 cut on Dunham to service the rear of a commercial
- 4 if it was developed in that application.
- 5 So traffic distribution in its
- 6 current zoning capacity would probably get worse on
- 7 Manchester in that location based on what's
- 8 occurred on the south side of Manchester today.
- 9 The parking that overflows onto
- 10 Dunham from the daycare is an issue that I can't
- 11 address, I can't deal with. That happened via

- 12 planning that occurred on another piece of
- 13 property.
- 14 I think it is appropriate for
- 15 HeatherRidge to petition the Village for your
- 16 consideration to eliminate any parking that occurs
- 17 on Dunham which I think would ease some of the
- 18 burden at that location. And I think that we would
- 19 support that if at all as to our opinion.
- 20 So I think those factors in
- 21 themselves--limiting right turn, no parking on
- 22 Dunham--are a major factor and we would support
- 23 those.
- Density. Density is a pure number.

- 1 And I really -- I think I've said it before this
- 2 Plan Commission before, I think it's somewhat
- 3 relative in the thinking process but irrelevant in

- 4 overall.
- 5 I say that with all due respect to
- 6 the Comprehensive Plan, with all due respect to the
- 7 residents. This is a down zoning. This is a
- 8 less -- much less intense use than its current
- 9 zoning. I would hope that the residents and the
- 10 Plan Commission understand that this proposal is a
- 11 much less intense use even at a number of seven
- 12 units to the acre than what could be built there.
- 13 It has an affect on traffic. It
- 14 has a lower affect on traffic based on seven units
- 15 to the acre than what is currently there.
- 16 HeatherRidge overall has seven units to the acre.
- Yes, Stoneybrook as our neighbor to
- 18 the north and Cambridge as our neighbor to the west
- 19 have somewhat less density than seven units to the
- 20 acre.
- However, Hidden Hills which is
- 22 directly to the west of Cambridge and actually in
- 23 much closer proximity than what I am is
- 24 approximately 13 units to the acre. They don't

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD.

108

1	have the separations and the setbacks that I am
2	providing with my development.
3	So to isolate this particular
4	development and say your densities are too high and
5	they aren't consistent with the area probably isn't
6	totally accurate because HeatherRidge is at seven
7	to the acre as an overall. There are areas at
8	HeatherRidge that are thirteen. I believe the
9	condos are at fifteen to the acre. And there are
10	some portions of it that are less than my seven
11	units to the acre.
12	However, if you look at my setbacks
13	building to building, front to front, my perimeter
14	setbacks, those setbacks even at seven units to the
15	acre are much greater than what occurs in
16	Stoneybrook.
17	Those buildings to my property

18 line, there's buildings that are 5 feet away from

- 19 my property line at the northern portion. There's
- 20 buildings that are 5 feet from separation building
- 21 to building at that location.
- So -- and I'm not trying to -- I'm
- 23 not trying to say that my setbacks are great and
- 24 theirs are bad. I'm only trying to point facts out

- 1 that I think the seven units to the acre is just a
- 2 number. If you feel comfortable with our proposal,
- 3 if we have tried to integrate our plan in terms of
- 4 its setback, its landscaping plan, it is consistent
- 5 and I think does address the concerns from a
- 6 perimeter standpoint and an internal.
- 7 It's a relative number. I think
- 8 even again and I'll close at seven units to the
- 9 acre we still provide a very quality type of
- 10 community in that location. Thank you.

11	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't think anybody
12	is questioning the seven units per acre.
13	I know one of the residents did,
14	but I think the Plan Commission was looking at it
15	more from a numbers standpoint we were looking at
16	it from the standpoint of amenities provided.
17	I realize it's a difficult site,
18	there's a lot of elevation change so you're
19	probably not going to be able to, you know, provide
20	the density that you normally would and yet be able
21	to have space for amenities and things like that.
22	I guess our concern mainly was
23	the Mr. Winter's concern and I agree with him,

24 that Building Number 3 looks awful close to the

- 1 detention area and you are not providing any
- 2 amenities for let's say the children like a tot lot

- 3 or something like that.
- 4 And we thought that that might be
- 5 appropriate given the fact that you won't be part
- 6 of the general Umbrella Homeowners' Association.
- 7 It seems like it would be unfair because you know
- 8 it's going to happen, you know that the children in
- 9 this development are going to probably come over to
- 10 that clubhouse area there, they've got tennis
- 11 courts and basketball courts. I think it was
- 12 tennis courts.
- MR. HARRIS: Not at that location.
- 14 There's basketball courts.
- 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: There's basketball
- 16 courts. And you know they're going to migrate to
- 17 things like that.
- 18 If you provided something like that
- 19 within the development that might help in that
- 20 site. I think that's what we're looking at, not
- 21 necessarily the number itself.
- So, Tracy, was there some other
- 23 questions?
- MS. VELKOVER: There was a question

111

1	about the height of the berm and I believe they
2	were referencing Route 21 and maybe Dunham.
3	MR. HARRIS: The berms that we would be
4	installing?
5	MS. VELKOVER: No, you said there was
6	an existing berm along Route 21 to the north.
7	MR. HARRIS: Yeah, there is an existing
8	berm. Actually, it's part of the overflow and
9	restriction of the detention pond. There is a
10	small grade change in berm in between Milwaukee
11	Avenue and the existing detention pond.
12	I think I have a picture of it,
13	too, that you can see. I think that's what I had
14	referenced at that location. There is no other
15	berms along Milwaukee Avenue because the grade

16 change is so much higher at that location.

- MS. VELKOVER: You had talked about some
- 18 berms along Dunham, some maybe impact or landscape
- 19 berms that were undulating.
- 20 Do you know the height of those?
- MR. HARRIS: They will be approximately
- 22 3 to 4 feet.
- 23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is that it?
- MS. VELKOVER: Again, questions from

- 1 the ---
- 2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, some of the other
- 3 Commissioners have questions and certainly can ask
- 4 them.
- 5 Any other questions or concerns?
- 6 MS. VELKOVER: Questions about when the
- 7 traffic study was completed, about whether it was
- 8 completed during times when the daycare center was

- 10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think Mr. Foster
 11 addressed that. I think that was part of the
- 12 re-review that needs to be looked at as to the

9 open and other schools were open.

- 13 timing of the traffic study.
- 14 You know, it seems to me I think
- 15 one of the things that came out of some of the
- 16 comments for the most part was that I don't think
- 17 anybody was really against what you're doing here
- 18 directly.
- There may have been one or two
- 20 comments, but I think for the most part they're
- 21 willing to accept it if these concerns are
- 22 addressed. In particular, the traffic concern and
- 23 also the concern about the children and providing
- 24 some kind of amenity within the development.

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

- 1 I don't think those are
- 2 unreasonable requests and I think if we put our
- 3 heads together and work on the traffic thing I
- 4 would think that there could be some resolution to
- 5 that problem, whether it be -- actually, I think I
- 6 would prefer to see something worked out where you
- 7 could access Manchester and try to keep as much
- 8 traffic off Dunham as you can.
- 9 But I think that's -- I'd like to
- 10 hear from our experts on that to see if they can
- 11 work something out. I don't know how the rest of
- 12 you feel, but I do agree with Mr. Foster, I don't
- 13 know that I would want to move forward on this
- 14 unless I had some more specific answers.
- 15 Mr. Winter.
- MR. WINTER: I would just add that I am
- 17 concerned about the density. I kind of suggested
- 18 an alternative that you have 44 units and I'd ask
- 19 that the Petitioner seriously consider that
- 20 personally for my support.
- 21 And I am also kind of in response
- 22 to a comment that he made, I think the concept is a
- 23 good one but in making this you made the argument

1 t	hat it's	not	practical	to	continue	its	designa	ation
-----	----------	-----	-----------	----	----------	-----	---------	-------

- 2 as commercial.
- 3 Once we do that I don't think you
- 4 can go back and then say but look what it would be
- 5 if it was commercial because you've kind of
- 6 abandoned that zoning and say look, this is
- 7 actually downsizing this.
- 8 And I think once you say that the
- 9 zoning is wrong I think it is the obligation of the
- 10 Commission to consider that, what would be the
- 11 right zoning, and take into consideration the
- 12 public welfare and safety concerns about too much
- 13 traffic and over building that.
- So maybe other people on the
- 15 Commission don't feel as strongly as I do, but I

- 16 think that the sheer volume or number of units is a
- 17 concern of mine and I think 54 is too much for this
- 18 site.
- 19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other comments?
- 20 Mr. Sula?
- MR. SULA: Are we done with the audience
- 22 questions?
- 23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm sorry, what was
- 24 that?

- 1 MR. SULA: Have we completed the
- 2 audience questions?
- 3 MS. VELKOVER: There was a question
- 4 about the stormwater detention.
- 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: About the capacity of
- 6 the detention area.
- 7 MS. VELKOVER: The overflow capacity of

the area. 8 9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: There was a question as 10 to whether that detention area is going to be able 11 to handle the additional surface runoff. 12 MR. HARRIS: We submitted to the Village a rather in-depth stormwater management 14 study. 15 We studied all of HeatherRidge upstream and we studied our property as well. The 16 17 conclusion of that report in laymen's terms are that there's about three or four detention 18 19 facilities that are interlinked west of Dunham Road 20 and they all kind of act together. 21 There's a restrictor at the west 22 pond and there's two 27-inch storm sewer pipes

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

going under Dunham. There's a restrictor in that

pipe and there's also a weir wall within that pipe.

- 1 So when the water rises a little
- 2 bit it goes through a 2-inch slot in that weir.
- 3 When the water rises a lot it jumps over that weir
- 4 and comes through this property a little bit
- 5 faster.
- 6 The detention pond as it exists
- 7 today was designed with capacity for this site to
- 8 develop. So when we did the study we looked at
- 9 what happened upstream and what was the affect on
- 10 that existing pond under this proposed development.
- The upstream was designed under the
- 12 old stormwater management regulations. The look
- 13 that we took on just our portion of the development
- 14 coming into this pond, we looked at the new
- 15 criteria that's required under the SMC guidelines
- 16 in the Village Ordinance.
- 17 Either one of the evaluations told
- 18 us that this pond as designed has capacity to serve
- 19 not only Cambridge, Stoneybrook and the balance of
- 20 HeatherRidge as it exists but will also handle this
- 21 development.

- Additionally, as it leaves this
- 23 pond there is another restrictor that occurs at
- 24 that location and the water then comes out of that

- 1 pond into the restrictor underneath Milwaukee and
- 2 then takes an eastern course. That water course,
- 3 those detention ponds will all remain the same in
- 4 the way that they function.
- 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Smith.
- 6 MR. SMITH: Mr. Harris, in your
- 7 conversations with the Park District, now I forgot
- 8 what you said you're giving to them, had they
- 9 thought about putting a small lot on here instead
- 10 of that money because they should be a partner in
- 11 this I would think, too, with all the money you're
- 12 giving to the Park District.
- I mean what was their

- 14 conversation?
- MR. HARRIS: Whenever we enter into
- 16 initial discussions with the Park Distinct we say
- 17 here is the proposal, here is the population
- 18 generation, are you interested in a land donation
- 19 or are you interested in a cash donation.
- Very small, as you can see from the
- 21 report, population generation in terms of school
- 22 aged children. They requested a cash donation in
- 23 lieu of any other amenity or land at that location.
- 24 Plus what we've seen in the past is

- 1 that if we put in a recreational facility, a tot
- 2 lot as an amenity and the demographics change in
- 3 that community -- and I've indicated that over 50
- 4 percent of what we've seen has been empty
- 5 nesters -- that they really don't want to maintain

6	in perpetuity a tot lot
7	So if there

- is an initial look at
- it and there is a very small number of children
- being generated there we don't propose a tot lot
- because, number one, it probably isn't going to be
- 11 used a lot initially. If it is, fine.
- 12 But number two, in the long run
- 13 demographics are going to change and they're not
- 14 going to want to use it and they'll take it out.
- 15 And that's been the experience in what we've seen.
- 16 MR. SMITH: I would think the Park
- 17 District should be a partner.
- 18 MR. HARRIS: They were interested in a
- 19 cash versus land donation.
- 20 MR. SMITH: That should be one of their
- 21 concerns you think, where these kids should play.
- 22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: If the Park District
- felt there was a problem I'm sure they would 23
- 24 recommend that they build it. Mr. Sula.

1	MR. SULA: I still have a couple of
2	comments.
3	First, I apologize for not bringing
4	these up during conceptual discussions and asking
5	you to chalk it up to an increasing awareness of
6	some of the subtleties that we deal with on the
7	Commission.
8	I'm still struggling with the
9	change in zoning. From my perspective we have a
10	comp plan that was 30 years old that was reaffirmed
11	within the last couple years and I really haven't
12	heard a compelling reason as to why that zoning has
13	changed.
14	And quite to the contrary, I'm
15	hearing compelling reasons why it shouldn't change.
16	And part of what I believe the Plan Commission is
17	charged with is appropriate land use as it relates
18	to a building of a cohesive community.
19	And as an aside to that, if I'm not
20	mistaken, my understanding of a PUD is to give

- 21 recognition to the special situations where in
- 22 certain areas you might want to go with higher
- 23 density but you create counterbalancing situations
- 24 elsewhere within the project to mitigate the

- 1 situation.
- 2 To the contrary, I haven't heard
- 3 anything that mitigates the situation on the site.
- 4 And in fact I've heard what will create a
- 5 polarizing situation between the future residents
- 6 of this development and the residents that already
- 7 exist in the community, concern over a
- 8 deterioration of roads that are maintained by the
- 9 existing residents, the use of the amenities that
- 10 the existing residents pay for and maintain
- 11 themselves. I don't see how that fosters a sense
- 12 of community.

13	And the density. HeatherRidge
14	might have 13 units per acre in some areas, but
15	there's also the mitigating situation. There's a
16	golf course nearby, there's tennis courts, there's
17	other things that go beyond that particular
18	density.
19	And I frankly haven't heard a
	And I frankly haven't heard a compelling reason to change it. And I know someone
	compelling reason to change it. And I know someone
20 21	compelling reason to change it. And I know someone
20 21	compelling reason to change it. And I know someone is going to say well commercial can be more intense. But just because someone has come up with

- 1 come in with an appropriate use that is less dense
- 2 that follows the existing zoning.
- 3 I mean yes, it's been vacant for 30
- 4 years but I can also say it's been vacant for 200

3	years. So why should we change it now because
6	something came up sooner.
7	And it is zero percent consistent
8	with the Comprehensive Plan.
9	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I don't agree
10	with I mean I agree with that, that it's zero
11	percent consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as
12	we have now.
13	And I'm not saying that I
14	necessarily agree that this is a plan that should
15	be put in, but I think we do have to look at the
16	ability to develop a commercial development here.
17	I don't know that you could
18	develop a commercial development here. You don't
19	have a cut on
20	MR. SULA: Well, what's the broad
21	definition of commercial, Don? It's just not a
22	retail store.
23	There could be boutique offices

there. There are very low intense definitions that

- 1 are available within our zoning. I'm not going to
- 2 jump to the highest density and say that's a valid
- 3 reason for rezoning. It doesn't make sense to me.
- 4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, it depends on how
- 5 you -- that's why I'm saying I don't necessarily
- 6 agree with the plan that we have. It could be less
- 7 dense.
- 8 But I'm saying that a commercial
- 9 development you don't have any cuts onto Milwaukee
- 10 Avenue, you're going to have to provide that. That
- 11 access is going to have to be put in on Manchester
- which as our traffic consultant said violates sight
- 13 distance requirements from Milwaukee to Dunham.
- 14 And that's on a commercial development now.
- So I don't -- I'm just saying I
- 16 don't know if a commercial development is even
- 17 feasible here.
- MR. SULA: Then why didn't we change it

- 19 two years ago?
- 20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't know, it was
- 21 never brought up.
- MR. SULA: So if someone brought it up
- 23 we should change it?
- 24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: If it was brought up we

- 1 might have changed it. That may be the compelling
- 2 reason. You know, I'm just bringing out a reason.
- 3 MR. SULA: Well, that's not a compelling
- 4 reason.
- 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But if we can't put a
- 6 commercial development in then we should just leave
- 7 it zoned commercial?
- 8 MR. HARRIS: The property owner knows
- 9 what it's zoned for right now. He's not
- 10 complaining about it.

- 11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: He's not complaining
- 12 about the zoning now?
- 13 MR. SULA: No.
- MR. HARRIS: The property owner has me
- 15 under contract --
- 16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I didn't get that
- 17 impression.
- MR. WINTER: Well, he's petitioning to
- 19 change it.
- MR. SULA: He's petitioning to change.
- MR. CEPON: He's petitioning.
- MR. SULA: The new owner is, not the
- 23 existing owner.
- MR. CEPON: The existing owner.

- 1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm just pointing out a
- 2 reason. You asked for a reason and I'm giving you

- 3 a reason is that if a commercial development is not
- 4 feasible there that that's a compelling reason.
- 5 MR. SULA: I'm not going to accept that
- 6 a commercial development is not feasible. I will
- 7 accept that no one has brought forth to this date a
- 8 commercial venture that fits current definition or
- 9 current understanding.
- But I don't know if I want to
- 11 preclude that someone might come up with something
- 12 that works ten years from now or twenty years from
- 13 now for the sake of something that's just a bird in
- 14 the hand today.
- 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, he was the one
- 16 that pointed it out he didn't feel it's feasible
- 17 now. You don't have to believe him.
- 18 I'm just pointing out that that's
- 19 his reason and that could be a compelling reason.
- 20 You said you didn't see any reason and I'm pointing
- 21 out that that could be a compelling reason.
- I'm not sure that I'm convinced.
- 23 I'm just pointing out that that is a compelling
- 24 reason. That if you can't put in a commercial

1	development there and he's right that that's not
2	feasible then that's a compelling reason to deviate
3	from the Comprehensive Plan.
4	Ms. Kovarik.
5	MS. KOVARIK: Part of what Mr. Sula was
6	saying is the discussion that we had when we heard
7	the project at Milwaukee and 21 even though we
8	wanted that to be office we deviated from the comp
9	plan and some of the facts of finding findings
10	of fact that we had were the extensive amenities
11	and the unique architecture and they cut down on
12	the density and things like that.
13	And we are not getting unusual
14	amenities here or even a portion of what we had
15	envisioned with this, you know, the blended office
16	with the multi-family.
17	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I agree with him on

- 18 that. I think that what he described as a PUD, I
- 19 agree. A PUD is a development that makes it better
- 20 than the underlying zoning would allow for.
- 21 And I agree with you. You can ask
- 22 the question about why is this better than the
- 23 underlying zoning and I'll point out to you some of
- 24 the setbacks and those kind of things and the

- 1 density is probably lower than underlying zoning
- 2 would allow.
- 3 And I'm not talking about the CB
- 4 underlying zoning, I'm talking about the R-5
- 5 underlying zoning.
- 6 But I also agree that I don't see
- 7 the amenities here to make this unique enough to
- 8 say that hey, I feel this is a lot better as a PUD.
- 9 But I think that's a different issue.

10	Mr. Sula is saying what about the
11	zoning change. And all I'm saying is if this can't
12	be developed as commercial, if it's not feasible
13	then it's not a reasonable development, then you've
14	got to allow for some kind of development of the
15	property.
16	MR. SULA: But let me just if it's
17	not a valid PUD per se how does that make it a
18	compelling reason to change the zoning?
19	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I didn't say it was. I
20	didn't say that a PUD did that. I said I don't
21	know that I agree with this plan.
22	But the zoning change forget the

plan, if somebody came to you and said could I

24 rezone this to R-5 you'd have to say why should we

127

1 deviate from the Comprehensive Plan.

- 2 And I'm pointing out that the
- 3 reason could be that the C/B-1 that's allowed in
- 4 there now is not feasible. That could be a
- 5 compelling reason.
- 6 MR. SULA: And what point are we --
- 7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And now you can go to
- 8 this plan and say all right, R-5 is feasible, is
- 9 this a good PUD. I think that's a separate
- 10 question.
- And I think we brought out some
- 12 good points here that the traffic flow and the
- 13 density and the amenities are questionable and I
- 14 think need to be improved in order for us to
- 15 consider this as a good PUD.
- MR. SULA: And I guess my question then
- 17 is what standard do we apply in terms of evaluating
- 18 the opinion or statement that commercial is not
- 19 feasible.
- I've heard one person say that. I
- 21 haven't heard a hundred people come in here and say
- 22 that. I haven't heard any other person except the
- 23 Petitioner say that. And is that the standard of

1	not feasible so	let's do	my devel	opment,	let's go

- 2 ahead and do it?
- 3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Let me just answer
- 4 this. There's no standard performance.
- 5 You take the testimony as it's
- 6 given. You don't have to believe it. You can vote
- 7 no on this. Or you can ask -- staff may have some
- 8 comments on it, the Commissioners may have some
- 9 comments on it.
- 10 I think that the -- if you look at
- 11 the traffic consideration, if we're concerned about
- 12 the traffic in this multi-family development
- 13 affecting the neighborhood, the commercial
- 14 development whether it's a lower intensity
- 15 commercial or a C/B-1 neighborhood strip mall or

- 16 something like that, I don't think that's going to
- 17 work out either. I think it's going to be worse.
- MR. SULA: So we should accept a lesser
- 19 evil for a lesser evil?
- 20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Pardon me?
- MR. SULA: You posed the question to me
- 22 before, so we should accept something that we don't
- 23 like to avoid a lesser evil?
- 24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, it's not

- 1 accepting it. It's a question of is there a
- 2 compelling reason to deviate from the Comprehensive
- 3 Plan.
- 4 MR. SULA: I'll relinquish the floor.
- 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Smith.
- 6 MR. SMITH: My comment, I've gone by
- 7 there a lot of times and gone out and seen this

8	property.
9	And it seems like Riverside, that
10	little mall right there, they're vacant more often
11	than they're filled. So that's a commercial strip
12	right there that's vacant half the time. It seems
13	that they can't keep anything in there. I think
14	right now it's probably over half vacant already.
15	Do you want another one across the
16	street that's going to be vacant, too? So I'm
17	saying I would think it would be a reason why
18	commercial wouldn't make it there, it can't make it
19	across the street.
20	MS. KOVARIK: I think traffic is
21	contributing to the problem with the stores. I

plaza and I will not go there except on Saturday

22 personally use that dry cleaners there in that

24 because I can't get out.

- 1 So I think that's hurting those
- 2 businesses there because there is a traffic problem
- 3 not because of the subdivision or Manchester but
- 4 just because of Milwaukee. You know, and I've said
- 5 it before up here, I read the newspaper every
- 6 morning from Gages Lake to Peterson Road because my
- 7 husband drives. I've taken to reading the sports
- 8 pages lately because it's that bad. It's that bad.
- 9 It's just stacked.
- And commercial isn't going to help
- 11 it either. This isn't going to -- it will make it
- somewhat worse, but that's what is hurting those
- 13 businesses is you can't get out of there during
- 14 normal weekday hours.
- MR. SMITH: So the argument is it's not
- 16 a viable commercial area because they can't make it
- 17 across the street. So I don't think they'd make it
- 18 over here either.
- MS. KOVARIK: If we nix Milwaukee
- 20 then --
- MS. VELKOVER: You also have to remember
- 22 that IDOT does have plans to take Milwaukee to four

- 23 lanes I believe in the year after the Merit Club
- 24 hosts the United States Women's Open in the year

- 1 2000. So I think they have plans to widen that
- 2 shortly after.
- 3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm not -- actually,
- 4 I'm not saying that I think that we should deviate
- 5 from the Comprehensive Plan.
- 6 I'm only trying to hop in and you
- 7 asked for reasons and that's what the Petitioner
- 8 gave. And I don't know if we're arguing this one
- 9 or if we're arguing the Jewel plan, but --
- MR. SULA: Well, I'm only discussing
- 11 what's on the table.
- 12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But I think the other
- 13 thing that we have to consider is a balance in the
- 14 community.

15	In other words, can we when we
16	look at our overall Comprehensive Plan will
17	changing a commercial area affect the balance that
18	we had planned. And that's another thing that you
19	do have to look at.
20	I mean it could have been discussed
21	at the Comprehensive Plan stage if someone had said
22	hey, I don't know that this is a good location for

23 the commercial area and then they could have

24

discussed whether we needed to change the

- 1 Comprehensive Plan at the time.
- 2 But I'm only pulling out the
- 3 reasons that the Petitioner has given for deviating
- 4 from the Comprehensive Plan. And the Commissioners
- 5 have to make the decision. Mr. Winter.
- 6 MR. WINTER: Don, I think the consensus

7	is that we're not going to vote on this tonight.
8	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, it sure seems
9	like that.
10	MR. WINTER: Well, just as my closing
11	remark on this and just to repeat, I think there
12	might in my mind there might be some compelling
13	reason to change the zoning in the fact that it has
14	been vacant, the traffic considerations there for
15	commercial.
16	And I think an appropriate change
17	in zoning would be to a residential type of zoning.
18	And but I do want to make it clear to the
19	Petitioner that I think this is too dense and, you
20	know, make it real clear that there are other ways
21	that he can look at this property. And in fact I
22	suggested some ways.

traffic just make it clear from my standpoint to

So maybe in addition to looking at

23

- 1 give a favorable recommendation would require a
- 2 change in the number of units. And I've said
- 3 previously I don't see how you can fit more than 44
- 4 units on this.
- 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I would add to that. I
- 6 think that not only does the density have to be
- 7 reduced but I think I'd like to see some additional
- 8 amenities put into the site. Mr. Foster.
- 9 MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, just from a
- 10 closing comment point of view, I think this is
- 11 actually a very good healthy discussion.
- 12 Unfortunately, we probably should have had more of
- 13 it maybe in the conceptual stages because it seems
- 14 like we could almost go into several different
- 15 directions at this point.
- I do want to go on record for the
- 17 sake of the minutes but also because I believe
- 18 that, you know, land being vacant I would not like
- 19 to think that's the Commissioners' rationale for
- 20 supporting changes to the Comprehensive Plan.

- 21 Because I mean I think that sets a
- 22 precedent then we could just run all over with
- 23 because our Village is still being built out and
- 24 there may be some parcels that it will be a

- 1 considerable number of years in the future before
- 2 we find out what is going to be the best and
- 3 highest use for that parcel.
- 4 So I want to just take an issue
- 5 with that both from the part of the Petitioner and
- 6 my neighbor here in terms of land being vacant as a
- 7 compelling use.
- 8 MR. WINTER: As a factor. As one
- 9 factor.
- MR. FOSTER: I would only think of it as
- 11 a very, very, very small factor.
- 12 And finally, I do think Mr. Sula

- 13 has a good pint. I know you said, Mr. Chairman,
- 14 that it's a separate issue but I do think many
- 15 times as a Commission when we discuss PUDs it
- 16 really has been an overall concern that those PUDs
- 17 have something that we think is from the amenity
- 18 standpoint or is really bringing an additional
- 19 contribution to the particular area.
- 20 And I mean while I think it's a
- 21 good plan I cannot say there's anything necessarily
- 22 unique or outstanding besides it's a townhome plan.
- 23 So I do think that's something that needs to be
- 24 looked at more in terms of what are the outstanding

- 1 considerations of this as a PUD in terms of this
- 2 particular petition.
- 3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I only said it was a
- 4 separate issue from the Comprehensive Plan --

5	MR. FOSTER: Right, right.
6	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: deviation.
7	MR. FOSTER: Right, understood.
8	MR. SULA: Should we be considering a
9	motion to continue or a motion to send an
10	unfavorable recommendation?
11	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, let's ask the
12	Petitioner. Now that you've heard some of our
13	concerns would you be willing to consider some of
14	these changes?
15	Obviously the I think the
16	traffic thing would have to be looked at with the
17	traffic consultants and our staff traffic
18	consultant, but I guess the density and the
19	amenities, would you be willing to look at take
20	a second look at that?
21	MR. HARRIS: Yes, we certainly would
22	like the opportunity to take another look at that
23	and bring that back before you. It's a much better

24 alternative than an unfavorable recommendation.

1	W/A	think	We can	address	the
	VV C	HIIIIK	we can	additess	ше

- 2 concerns. You know, we would be more than happy to
- 3 work with Village staff, although the Village
- 4 traffic consultant submitted his report but.
- 5 We need to look at that and make
- 6 sure that everybody feels comfortable. I would
- 7 like to have that opportunity and evaluate the plan
- 8 as well.
- 9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: With that in mind I
- 10 would suggest that we give the Petitioner a chance
- and continue it. So what's your pleasure?
- MR. WINTER: I so move.
- 13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: October 7th I
- 14 understand that we have an opening. Would that be
- 15 sufficient time, Mr. Harris?
- MR. HARRIS: October 7th? Yeah, we
- 17 work fast. We work faster than government as a
- 18 matter of fact so it's up to you.
- We would have to -- if we're going

- 20 to modify the plan I don't know when the submittal
- 21 date would be. Tracy might be able to answer that.
- MS. VELKOVER: The Friday before that
- 23 Wednesday meeting so --
- 24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So that would give you

- 1 time also to meet with the traffic consultants?
- 2 MR. HARRIS: The burden is on us to meet
- 3 that date, I understand that.
- 4 MR. DUNLAP: Mr. Chairman, would that
- 5 October 7th date, is there some way that we can get
- 6 a copy of those plans before the meeting so we
- 7 don't have to maybe use up so much time next time?
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, the problem is
- 9 we probably will just barely get those plans in
- 10 time. I can't guarantee anything. I don't know,
- 11 is there some way, Tracy, what's the policy there?

- MS. VELKOVER: It sounds like Mr. Harris
- 13 is probably going to be getting the plans in the
- 14 Friday before the Wednesday meeting.
- So, you know, after that if you
- 16 want to come in Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, you
- 17 know, of that week of the meeting you can certainly
- 18 come in to take a look at the plans.
- 19 But like Mr. Rudny said, I don't
- 20 believe that we'll probably have the plans until
- 21 late the week before that meeting.
- MR. DUNLAP: Thank you very much.
- 23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where do you come
- 24 in to see them?

- 1 MR. WILDENBERG: Right here.
- 2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You come in the Village
- 3 hall in the Building department in the rear area

- 4 there. This gentleman up front here.
- 5 MR. HAHN: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest
- 6 that the developer Mr. Harris forward those plans
- 7 to the HeatherRidge Umbrella Association at the
- 8 same time that he's going to make them available to
- 9 the Village.
- 10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Could you speak up a
- 11 little bit?
- MR. HAHN: I would request that Mr.
- 13 Harris submit the plans to HeatherRidge Umbrella
- 14 Association at the same time that he's going to
- submit them to the Village so that we can have
- 16 adequate time to study them as well and all of our
- 17 residents here can access that information in our
- 18 office.
- 19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That would be up to
- 20 him. I can't order him to do that. We can just
- 21 request.
- MR. HARRIS: That's fine. You know,
- 23 we've supplied HeatherRidge with all of the plans
- 24 to date. I don't have a problem with giving them

1	an advance copy.
2	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yes, ma'am.
3	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: May I ask just a
4	clarification question on the traffic?
5	When your traffic study takes place
6	and his traffic study takes place do you count the
7	traffic on Milwaukee? As she said, the traffic
8	problem is the traffic on Milwaukee, not the
9	traffic running back and forth on
10	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: My understanding is
11	they look at the functioning of that intersection
12	caused by the traffic from the subdivision coming
13	out into that onto that road.
14	So I don't think that they count
15	the existing traffic other than the ability for the
16	traffic to merge and get out of that intersection.
17	MR. HARRIS: We did count traffic on

- 18 Milwaukee. Yes, we did.
- 19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Did you count the
- 20 Milwaukee Avenue traffic?
- MR. HARRIS: Yes, we did.
- 22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And one final
- 23 question. As a safety measure I would strongly
- 24 request that you come and observe how those nursery

- 1 mothers park on one side of Manchester and walk
- 2 their -- carry a baby in one arm and hold the hand
- 3 of a toddler with another hand and cross Manchester
- 4 four times a day. Dozens of dozens of kids.
- 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That sounds like an
- 6 existing problem.
- 7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But it will be
- 8 magnified immensely.
- 9 MS. VELKOVER: And again I would

- 10 encourage you if that's a problem, this Board can't
- 11 deal with it, it's an advisory board.
- But you can go to the Village Board
- 13 and ask that they take a look at restricting
- 14 on-street parking in that area and I would
- 15 encourage you to do so.
- 16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We have a motion on the
- 17 floor so I really -- we have another hearing that
- 18 we have to go through and we really want to
- 19 continue this.
- 20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There was one
- 21 question, sir, that was not answered. I'm sorry,
- 22 there was one question not answered.
- I asked the question in my
- 24 statement and in my questioning to the Commission

141

1 and to the developer where an entrance would be if

- 2 it was commercial and I did not hear an answer.
- 3 MS. VELKOVER: It would be off of
- 4 Manchester.
- 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think I said that. I
- 6 think if it's a commercial development it's going
- 7 to be on Manchester.
- 8 But that's one of the reasons I
- 9 don't think that a commercial development is
- 10 feasible here.
- All right. A motion on the floor.
- 12 All those in favor of the motion signify by saying
- 13 aye in the roll call; those opposed nay. Roll
- 14 call, please.
- MS. VELKOVER: Winter.
- 16 MR. WINTER: Aye.
- 17 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.
- 18 MR. FOSTER: Aye.
- MS. VELKOVER: Smith.
- MR. SMITH: Aye.
- 21 MS. VELKOVER: Sula?
- MR. SULA: Abstain.
- MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.
- MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

1	MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.
2	MR. CEPON: Aye.
3	MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.
4	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries
5	and it is so ordered.
6	MR. DUNLAP: Thank you for all your
7	time.
8	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We're going to take
9	about a five minute break here and we'll come back
10	for the next hearing.
11	(Recess taken.)
12	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The meeting will come
13	to order. This is a continued public hearing, Six
14	Flags Theme Parks, Inc. and Prism Development
15	Company, LLC.
16	The subject property consists of

- 17 approximately 134 acres located at the northwest
- 18 corner of I-94 and Washington Street. The
- 19 Petitioner Six Flags and Prism Development Company
- are requesting the following:
- A, to rezone the property from I-2
- 22 General Industrial to a Planned Unit Development
- 23 PUD with underlying zoning of I-2 General
- 24 Industrial District and C/S-1 Outdoor Recreation

- l District.
- 2 And B, such other approvals as may
- 3 be necessary or desirable under applicable Village
- 4 Ordinances and Codes, all as may be necessary to
- 5 permit development on the property of theme park
- 6 uses, an entertainment village consisting of
- 7 entertainment compatible retail and related uses,
- 8 employee housing facilities that are accessory to

- 9 new or existing theme park uses in the Village,
- 10 general office and industrial uses and other
- 11 compatible uses.
- Tracy, have you got anything to
- 13 add?
- MS. VELKOVER: Just that the Petitioners
- 15 have made some adjustments to the plan and would
- 16 like to briefly discuss those changes.
- 17 And at the previous meeting their
- 18 traffic consultant gave his report and we do have
- 19 the Village's consultant, Mr. Bill Grieve, in
- 20 attendance to review his comments on the
- 21 Petitioner's study.
- 22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. This is a public
- 23 hearing so anyone with the Petitioner and also
- 24 anyone from the public who wishes to make a comment

- 1 or ask a question needs to stand and be sworn in by
- 2 the Village Attorney.
- 3 (Witnesses sworn.)
- 4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Francke, you can
- 5 proceed. And I take it you're going to discuss
- 6 first of all the changes that you've made?
- 7 MR. FRANCKE: Yes. Thank you. Mr.
- 8 Chairman, Members of the Commission, ladies and
- 9 gentlemen, again my name is Hal Francke. I'm an
- 10 attorney with the law firm of Rudnick & Wolfe.
- And what we would like to do this
- 12 evening is, as Tracy indicated, first of all walk
- 13 through the revisions that we've made to our
- 14 proposal and the revisions we've made to
- 15 development standards that we have made reference
- 16 to in prior hearings, copies of which you have
- 17 received, you've reviewed, you've given us input,
- 18 you've given staff input and we've met with your
- 19 staff.
- And what we'd like to do is share
- 21 with you where the plan has now arrived after
- 22 listening to all of your comments and to the

- 23 comments and concerns of the residents.
- I think you'll note that I think

- 1 there have been some fairly significant changes
- 2 made since this -- the matter was first brought
- 3 before you.
- 4 First of all, I would like to
- 5 reiterate that we are now in our petition seeking
- 6 preliminary PUD approval only for the theme park,
- 7 the employee housing, and the regional conference
- 8 center hotel.
- 9 All of the other uses and in
- 10 particular the village component, the retail
- 11 component which we believe raised the most
- 12 significant questions, the one that was the hardest
- 13 one for a lot of people to get their arms around,
- 14 at this point we are looking only for conceptual

- 15 planned unit development approval meaning that we
- 16 will come back before the Plan Commission and
- 17 before the Board for both a preliminary approval
- 18 and final planned unit development approval when
- 19 greater detail is known about exactly what is
- 20 intended to be constructed within the village.
- 21 That is referenced in the revised development
- 22 standards that you have received.
- In addition, we have submitted a
- 24 rather restrictive use list of anticipated

- 1 permitted and special uses which we believe is
- 2 consistent with what we tried to present to you in
- 3 prior hearings. Meaning that the retail and
- 4 service uses that are referenced in these
- 5 development standards that you received a copy of
- 6 are now much more closely aligned with the proposed

entertainment and hotel principal uses that we've been discussing all along. 9 There is no broad C/B-2 type use 10 list, if you will, in this. Again, we're trying to respond to your specific concerns, a concern that 11 12 more than one of you expressed about not creating a 13 use that is necessarily competitive in an adverse way to other commercial areas within the Village of 15 Gurnee. 16 We have maintained throughout our 17 presentation that we don't believe that what we're 18 proposing is in any way inconsistent, incompatible, 19 or adverse to existing commercial uses within the 20 community. 21 What we've now done is shown you in writing with specific verbage what we anticipate 22

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

being developed on the site in terms of both

commercial and service uses.

23

- 1 In addition, I think one of the
- 2 three major areas of concern that was expressed at
- 3 prior meetings of the Commission was the issue of
- 4 Washington Street outlot. And in addition to the
- 5 Washington Street outlots perhaps as a subparagraph
- 6 on that I'd say also the issue of the frontage of
- 7 Washington Street, the setback and the issue of
- 8 appearance of Washington as people drive up and
- 9 down Washington.
- 10 Again, this was an issue that was
- 11 raised by a number of the residents when they
- 12 spoke. So what we have done, and again this is
- both as a result of our assembling of a number of
- 14 development and landscape standards, our submission
- 15 of those to you and to your staff.
- We've met on more than one occasion
- 17 with your staff and with the Village's planning
- 18 consultant and we've received input from all of
- 19 you. And I'd like to very briefly if I can walk
- 20 you through those because I think that they are, as
- 21 I said earlier, rather significant.

- John or Rick, if we could just put
- 23 that one plan up. We now have presented to you
- 24 plans that are identified as conceptual preliminary

- 1 planned unit development plats which up until now
- 2 we have not done. But I think that is consistent
- 3 with your Ordinance with prior practice.
- 4 Maybe let's -- if we can, why don't
- 5 we put Washington Street down this way. There we
- 6 go. Now again I believe that you have all received
- 7 reduced sized copies of these.
- 8 First of all, you'll note on
- 9 Washington Street where there was originally
- 10 proposed four outlots and there was an expression
- 11 of concern from some of you about the number of
- 12 outlots we now have reduced the number of outlots
- 13 basically to two.

14	And I basically because there's one
15	outlot that's shown at the far west side, west end
16	of the property and then another one just east of
17	the west entrance, proposed west entrance on
18	Washington Street.
19	But our proposal now is that only
	But our proposal now is that only the latter outlot, the one that's east of the west
20	1 1
20 21	the latter outlot, the one that's east of the west
202122	the latter outlot, the one that's east of the west entrance, is the only one that in effect would be

The other outlot we're designating

149

- 1 for, and you'll see that on your plan, as a public
- 2 use outlot meaning that it could be devoted to a
- 3 bus stop or a bus turnaround or a public
- 4 transportation area.

24

5 It could end up being some kind of

6	area f	or	access	to	the 28	acre	conserv	ation	area.
---	--------	----	--------	----	--------	------	---------	-------	-------

- 7 It could be an area that is devoted to stormwater
- 8 detention, retention.
- 9 And additionally, we're still
- 10 showing the 100 foot setback there. So we've
- 11 designated this what is now referred to as Lot 8
- 12 which is just under three acres as a public use
- 13 outlot, if you will.
- 14 The only outlot we are now
- proposing to see developed is the one that's right
- 16 in the middle on Washington Street. And as you can
- 17 see from the plans that we have now submitted to
- 18 you, we are also providing for a setback of 100
- 19 feet along Washington Street which again is
- 20 something that we've talked about in the past on
- 21 other projects related to Milwaukee Avenue where
- 22 your Comprehensive Plan talks about that type of
- 23 significant setback.
- And now what we're doing is we're

- 1 providing for that type of visual appearance and
- 2 precedent on Washington Street in this location.
- 3 And we are further providing in the development
- 4 standards for a significant berming and landscaping
- 5 of this area so that again you will have whatever
- 6 use is constructed on that one outlot very
- 7 substantially screened and buffered and set back
- 8 far from the right-of-way.
- 9 And that is -- and that
- 10 right-of-way we're providing it in the development
- 11 standards. You'll note that that right-of-way is
- 12 the right-of-way as it's ultimately going to exist.
- 13 It's not the right-of-way today and then if there's
- 14 a widening of the right-of-way, you know, the
- 15 hundred feet becomes 75 feet or 50 feet.
- 16 It's the right-of-way as of the
- 17 date of the recording of the plat which means after
- 18 the new right-of-way line is established.
- 19 So I think that all of you will

- 20 find and the residents will find that not only has
- 21 there been a substantial diminution in the amount
- 22 of development but it's going to be substantially
- 23 set back and buffered and screened from people
- 24 driving up and down on Washington Street, people

- 1 ultimately, you know, working or living on the
- 2 other side of Washington Street.
- 3 In the development standards you'll
- 4 also note that we've provided only one principal
- 5 structure will go on that outlot. We anticipate
- 6 again that it would be one significant use. We
- 7 have identified as potential uses a bank, perhaps a
- 8 sit down restaurant.
- 9 We specifically said no drive-thru.
- 10 No drive-thru facilities again in response to some
- 11 of the concerns of residents about impacts of what

- 12 could happen on these outlots in terms of traffic
- 13 impact on Washington.
- We've provided for the possibility
- 15 of one hotel whereas before we were talking about
- 16 the possibility of two hotels on Washington Street.
- 17 We've said that it is possible that this could be a
- 18 hotel but it would be limited in terms of size, in
- 19 terms of height, and again in terms of setback.
- So I think, you know, you can see
- 21 that we've made a substantial change to the plan in
- 22 terms of impact on Washington Street, setback,
- 23 number of outlots, et cetera.
- All of that is provided for in the

- 1 revised plat that you've received and it's also
- 2 provided for in the development standards, the
- 3 verbage that you've received in the development

- 4 standards.
- 5 We've also provided for a
- 6 substantial setback from the right-of-way of the
- 7 Tollway of a hundred feet, 40 foot landscape, and a
- 8 hundred foot building setback. Is that right? 75
- 9 foot building setback, I'm sorry. And then a
- 10 hundred foot building setback from the north
- 11 property line.
- 12 In addition, we've provided for a
- 13 50 foot building setback from the west property
- 14 line. And then throughout these areas we've
- 15 provided for a substantial landscaping with very
- 16 specific required quantities, heights of trees,
- 17 which I'm not going to go into the details tonight
- 18 but they're in those -- we are agreeing to very
- 19 specific heights and quantities of landscaping
- 20 materials again through our meetings with your
- 21 staff and with your consultants.
- 22 And also we've provided for --
- 23 well, I'll just identify one or two other things.
- 24 We've also provided for an overall floor area

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD.

- 1 ratio, an overall FAR for the entire development of
- 2 point four which is basically what I think we've
- 3 been advised by your staff is what the north half
- 4 of the industrial park has developed as.
- 5 But as you know, it's substantially
- 6 below the existing authorized FAR for this
- 7 property. Under the existing OIP special permit
- 8 for this property that was approved back in 1987
- 9 the authorized FAR is 1.0. So we're substantially
- 10 reducing the authorized FAR for the property.
- We're providing in terms of
- 12 building height for basically most parts of the
- 13 village 45 feet which is the same as under the
- 14 existing OIP.
- We are providing for greater
- 16 heights for the hotels that we're making reference
- 17 to. One hotel that we've made reference to in the
- 18 development standards for this area, Lot 5, and the

- 19 other being the regional hotel conference facility.
- We have provided for the height
- 21 there -- well, for the hotel for Lot 5 we have said
- 22 it would be four stories over two stories of
- 23 parking, six stories facing south I think it is; is
- 24 that correct?

- 1 Four stories over two stories of
- 2 parking, yes, facing north and six stories facing
- 3 south and not to exceed 80 feet. And these again
- 4 at that location will be several hundred feet back
- 5 from Washington Street.
- 6 And then for the regional hotel
- 7 we're providing for a maximum of six stories over
- 8 two stories of parking or a hundred feet.
- 9 And then for the theme park itself
- 10 nothing more than 125 feet. And for every foot of

- 11 height we've agreed that there has to be a foot of
- 12 distance from the Tollway right-of-way.
- All of these provisions are more
- 14 restrictive than the existing zoning. As I say,
- 15 the FAR, the height, these setbacks we're providing
- 16 for, none of these are required or provided for
- 17 under the existing special permit.
- So what we would like to do and I
- 19 think we -- as I say, we've made substantial
- 20 changes, we've met with your staff and your
- 21 consultants. We've received your input, their
- 22 input, the public's input.
- What we anticipate we'd like to get
- 24 this evening any final issues or concerns of a very

- 1 specific nature that you have on these development
- 2 standards that you received so that we can finalize

- 3 these and bring them before you for final action at
- 4 the next meeting.
- 5 That concludes my discussion this
- 6 evening of that aspect. It's my understanding that
- 7 after we complete our discussions of this issue of
- 8 the development standards that in accordance with
- 9 your request at the last meeting that the Village
- 10 traffic consultant is going to address some traffic
- 11 issues, address the traffic issues that were raised
- 12 at the last meeting and then our traffic consultant
- 13 is here also.
- I would ask the Chair whether it's
- 15 your pleasure to finalize our discussion or
- 16 continue our discussion of these development
- 17 standards at this time or to proceed with the
- 18 traffic?
- 19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think it would be a
- 20 good idea if we stick on the subject of the changes
- 21 and the development standards.
- I have to say I think you've gone a
- 23 long way on the outlot thing. That was definitely
- 24 going in the right direction.

1	We'll see what the other
2	Commissioners think, but I don't know if anyone has
3	looked at the development standards specifically
4	but restrictions on that for permitted uses my
5	understanding is
6	MR. FRANCKE: I believe this is on Page
7	7. Page 7.
8	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Page 7. Maybe you
9	could go through that.
10	MR. FRANCKE: What we've said and one of
11	the changes that we are going to make in the next
12	draft is to make it clear that these apply to the
13	permitted uses that are identified in Paragraph B1.
14	And you can see they're very
15	limited. It's offices, financial institutions like
16	banks and S&L, savings and loans without drive-thru

- 17 facilities or a restaurant again without drive-thru
- 18 facilities. It's rather narrow.
- 19 And we're going to clarify that
- 20 this is only for that Lot 7, not Lot 8. Not the
- 21 other outlot.
- And then we've identified as a
- 23 special use hotel and motels and conference centers
- 24 for -- let me just see. Hotel -- I'm sorry -- for

- 1 the Lot 7 hotels and motels and restaurants with
- 2 drive-thru facilities as special uses which of
- 3 course would require us to come back to the Plan
- 4 Commission and to the Village Board for the
- 5 restaurants with drive-thrus.
- 6 We are asking, you'll recall, for
- 7 the special uses for the hotels at this time.
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Are there any --

Mr. Sula, go ahead. 10 MR. SULA: I do have a question about the special use aspect of the drive-thru. 11 12 I mean philosophically I kind of 13 view that as not permitted but an invitation when 14 you put it as a special use and I'm wondering if it 15 should even be stricken as a special use. 16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm thinking the same 17 way. I guess our fear is, and the Commissioners can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think most of us 18 19 feel that the one thing we don't want to do in this 20 area is create Washington as another commercial 21 corridor. 22 Now you've gone a long way, this is

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

saying is when we see that special use for a

a great improvement. But I think what Mr. Sula is

23

- 1 restaurant with a drive-thru facility we can only
- 2 think of fast food restaurants. And I don't -- I
- 3 have to agree, I don't know that a fast -- I don't
- 4 know that you'd want a fast food restaurant there.
- 5 MR. SULA: I agree. I don't think
- 6 you'd want it in connection with your destination
- 7 hotel. It seems far apart.
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And I think all of us
- 9 have a fear that that's exactly what's going to go
- 10 in there.
- And so I guess that would be -- you
- 12 wanted something specific, I think that's pretty
- 13 specific.
- MR. FRANCKE: That's pretty specific.
- 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Does everyone agree
- 16 with that? Anyone disagree with it?
- 17 (No response.)
- 18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So are there any other
- 19 comments on these development standards?
- 20 One thing I would like to point
- 21 out, our staff, my understanding is, Tracy, we have
- 22 not had -- you have not had a chance to really
- 23 review that yet unfortunately.

- 1 you our best shot but I think we'd like to reserve
- 2 an opportunity to get input from our staff because
- 3 something as detailed as development standards like
- 4 that need to be gone over more than just a couple
- 5 of days.
- 6 Mr. Sula.
- 7 MR. SULA: I did have a couple other
- 8 questions after reading through the draft that we
- 9 got over the weekend.
- The first one, employee housing, it
- 11 looks like the layout has changed a little bit and
- 12 now there's this third structure that seems to have
- 13 more prominence than it had before. And I don't
- 14 know if it's just an issue of not to scale versus
- 15 scale but the way the buildings are situated on the

- 16 lots has changed and it appears that this third
- 17 building is bigger than we talked about before.
- MR. FRANCKE: The employee housing,
- 19 okay. Well, I'd let Rick deFlan talk about the
- 20 buildings themselves.
- The change in the site plan was
- 22 done specifically in response to a question or a
- 23 comment that was made by the Plan Commission in
- 24 terms of if you were flipping the buildings. That

- 1 was done specifically at your request.
- 2 In terms of the scale and the fact
- 3 that the third building looks bigger, Rick, do you
- 4 want to address that? We have a blowup of that I
- 5 believe, don't we?
- 6 MR. deFLAN: I think it's fairly simple.
- 7 Actually, the building in the center is a

- 8 recreation building. And that was in response to
- 9 some questions about places for the residents to
- 10 have a place to go and do things.
- So that building is actually the
- 12 size that we had talked about in the last meeting I
- 13 believe. And it's been enclosed in sort of the
- 14 courtyard that's formed by the other two buildings
- 15 to sort of buffer it, if you will, from the rest of
- 16 the development.
- 17 MR. SULA: Okay. Thank you. In the --
- 18 it's on Page 4, it's the retail business and
- 19 special uses, little two and then sub two.
- It lists a permanent use including
- 21 taverns and clubs, dancing, live, blah, blah, blah,
- 22 with alcohol. Conceptually don't we tend to think
- 23 of things with alcohol as special use as opposed to
- 24 permitted? No?

- 1 MR. WILDENBERG: The issuance of a
- 2 liquor license is a totally independent action from
- 3 zoning. That's something that is run through the
- 4 Liquor Commissioner and the Village Board.
- 5 MR. SULA: So this doesn't create an
- 6 inconsistency?
- 7 MR. WILDENBERG: A special use could
- 8 apply for a liquor license, a permitted use can
- 9 apply for a liquor license.
- MR. SULA: Okay. On Page 8, heliports
- 11 and helipads. Are we really considering one or --
- MR. FRANCKE: I think that was
- 13 inserted because of the retention of the industrial
- 14 office warehouse they're becoming, you know, more
- 15 common. But I mean it's not a big deal.
- Let me say this. One of the things
- 17 that you can't tell from these development
- 18 standards but one of the things that we've talked
- 19 about with staff and you can't tell from just
- 20 reading the development standards because these
- 21 development standards are going to be an exhibit to

- an agreement as you always have a PUD agreement.
- You don't have a PUD agreement but
- 24 it's in the PUD agreement that we have agreed that

- 1 the industrial uses that are identified on Page 3
- 2 would basically fall from the PUD once the other
- 3 uses were established. And that was something that
- 4 I believe you raised in a prior meeting.
- 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I was just going to
- 6 point out because I know the Peters petition for
- 7 the helipad, my understanding was he could put that
- 8 in by right. And I don't know that we have --
- 9 that we can restrict helipads if they get approval
- 10 from FAA. Is that correct?
- MR. WILDENBERG: I think in that
- 12 instance his property was zoned I-2 I believe and
- 13 under I-2 we have that use listed as a special use

- 14 permit so we --
- 15 MR. FRANCKE: Then I definitely want to
- 16 keep it.
- 17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So it is listed. Okay.
- MR. FRANCKE: Then I'm sure we want to
- 19 keep it there.
- MR. SULA: On Page 10, the building
- 21 setback standards section, we're talking about 75
- 22 feet right away along the Tollway but then there's
- 23 kind of like an except but for the auxiliary
- 24 parking.

- 1 I mean if it's a right-of-way in my
- 2 view it's a right-of-way and there shouldn't be
- 3 anything there.
- 4 MR. FRANCKE: Let me explain what that
- 5 exception is for. It's just because, you know,

6	we've always shown the main drive into the
7	development as running along here. And these we
8	wanted to make it clear that these parking
9	structures or gates or whatever you call them where
10	people, you know, are greeted and do what they do.
11	MR. SULA: The toll booth in other words.
12	MR. FRANCKE: That those aren't
13	considered a violation any more than other things
14	are allowed within the setback, parking, et cetera.
15	So that's the only carve out. It's
16	not that we're trying to create the setback and
17	then violate it with buildings. It's just that our
18	plans have always shown that since day one.
19	MR. SULA: I would suggest that we
20	consider more narrowly defining the need to match
21	what was just stated.
21 22	what was just stated. And I just had a general question

24 in the theme park, that seems like a pretty tall

- 1 water slide.
- 2 I guess I'd just like to hear some
- 3 other thoughts on that. That seems pretty tall.
- 4 That's the equivalent of a 12-story building.
- 5 MR. FOSTER: The answer is have you ever
- 6 been to Wet and Wild?
- 7 MR. SULA: I have not.
- 8 MR. FOSTER: Okay. You're kind of high
- 9 up sometimes, I'll just say that.
- 10 MR. SULA: Twelve stories?
- 11 MR. FOSTER: I was on one that was
- 12 pretty close to that.
- MR. SULA: You're braver than I am.
- MR. CEPON: Like a tower that they have
- or a ride like they have across the street.
- MR. FRANCKE: First of all, my
- 17 understanding is that that height is consistent
- 18 with the permitted height across the highway, Great
- 19 America.
- And again, the existing zoning or

- 21 what we're providing is that there would be a
- 22 setback. The fact that we're actually limiting it
- 23 at 125 feet is more restrictive than the existing
- 24 zoning which basically says as long as you step

- 1 back one foot for every foot that you go up you
- 2 could even go higher than that under today's
- 3 zoning.
- 4 MR. SULA: Today's zoning as you mean --
- 5 MR. FRANCKE: Under the OIP, under the
- 6 special permit.
- 7 MR. SULA: And that's the key word
- 8 because that was a specially negotiated thing for
- 9 that permit.
- MR. FRANCKE: Under that permit you can
- 11 go 200 feet high as long as you're 200 feet away
- 12 from the Tollway.

- 13 MR. SULA: All I'm asking for is a
- 14 discussion of whether 125 is appropriate.
- 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is that it? Jon, did
- 16 you want to say something?
- MR. WILDENBERG: Just a background point
- 18 that really doesn't show up in the documentation
- 19 here. But the existing theme park under the zoning
- 20 controls for that all structures are -- on that
- 21 piece of property are permitted up to 125 feet.
- 22 Anything proposed to exceed 125
- 23 feet in height has to go through a public hearing
- 24 process.

- 1 MR. SULA: And I guess the question is
- 2 do we want to have it be the same or more
- 3 restrictive on this particular project? And I'm
- 4 not hearing anybody say anything so.

5	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, the only thing I
6	can see that you might want to consider is that if
7	you look at the existing theme park you're probably
8	a lot closer to roads that you can see into the
9	park.
10	If you look at your setback here
11	from Washington, granted the Tollway is close but I
12	don't know that that would be a concern; but the
13	visual affect on Washington or other local roads is
14	going to be pretty minimal considering the setback
15	from the road.
16	MR. SULA: I hear that, but I'm just
17	going back to an earlier meeting comment where I
18	think a lot of the interior of the theme park was
19	designed to create a just a fantastic ambiance
20	but I'm concerned in terms of what the outside
21	ambiance is as you look in.
22	And I mean the equivalent of a
23	12-story building is pretty tall. And maybe I need
24	to better understand what the topography of the

- 1 land is to see if it looks different from various
- 2 points around the site. But 12 stories is very
- 3 tall.
- 4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I -- you know,
- 5 you're concerned about what it's going to look like
- 6 from when you're inside like at the hotel or
- 7 something?
- 8 MR. SULA: I'm concerned about the
- 9 impression that you have as you cruise up and down
- 10 the Tollway, the impression that you would have
- 11 from Washington Street, and to the extent that it's
- 12 visible from Cemetery Road, too. I mean curb
- 13 appeal is everything when it relates to real
- 14 estate.
- 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I don't know what
- 16 we could do to evaluate that other than -- you
- 17 know, to me it's not so much the height, it's the
- 18 kind of structure it is.

- 19 I think some of the structures that
- 20 you have in your existing park look pretty good and
- 21 some I don't think look good. But that's -- when
- you can see them and they don't look good, I don't
- 23 know if it matters how high they are.
- 24 Anybody else have any comments on

- 1 that?
- 2 MR. WINTER: One not on that, just on
- 3 something else.
- 4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Wait, are we finished
- 5 on the --
- 6 MR. SULA: Those were all the comments I
- 7 had from the --
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Winter, go ahead.
- 9 MR. WINTER: For the Petitioner I had a
- 10 question in terms of the conceptual approval for

- 11 the PUD for the village part.
- How is that going to -- I mean my
- 13 greatest concern is -- and I would start out by
- 14 saying I think great progress has been made with
- 15 the outlots on some of these other areas, but how
- 16 is it proposed that you're going to tie in the
- 17 conceptual PUD for the village and traffic?
- Because it seems to me that what
- 19 I'm hearing tonight is that you're not going to go
- 20 forward with the retail at this point but trying to
- 21 reconcile that down the road because I see the
- 22 retail in the traffic studies as being a big
- 23 element.
- 24 And so having that removed I think

- 1 will alleviate some of the traffic problems. But
- 2 when you ask for a conceptual approval how is the

- 3 Village going to tie that to perhaps whether or not
- 4 we get a new interchange?
- 5 MR. FRANCE: Well, we are not eliminating all
- 6 retail from the proposal. Retail component
- 7 is in the traffic report.
- 8 We've basically been told by staff
- 9 that the limitations of the traffic report will be
- liminations of the PUD. We have not eliminated all
- retail from the development.
- What we've said is for the retail
- that we're seeking approval for, it's conceptual
- only. And we're going to have to come back with
- preliminary plans at a preliminary PUD public
- hearing, preliminary PUD plat approval public
- hearing to show how it all works and how it all
- fits together.
- But the trips that are anticipated
- 20 to be generated from the retail component of the
- village which is only securing conceptual approval
- are taken into account in the traffic report.
- MR. WINTER: What I'm unclear about is
- 24 how far the approval can go if you receive

1	conceptual PUD for the retail village.
2	Can we say at a later date no, we
3	don't want half these stores because it's going to
4	be too much traffic, you don't have the new
5	interchange?
6	MR. FRANCKE: No.
7	MR. WINTER: See, I don't like that part.
8	MR. FRANCKE: No, we believe I mean I
9	don't want to
10	MR. WINTER: So you haven't removed it.
11	MR. FRANCKE: I think we have to the
12	concerns that we heard expressed before, and again
13	I don't want to jump into the next part of the
14	discussion which is traffic and it's not my area,
15	but the concerns that we were hearing was, first of
16	all, the fact that we were talking about some
17	numbers which went beyond what the traffic report

- 18 had utilized, number one.
- Number two, we heard a lot of talk
- 20 about, you know, theme and how it was going to be
- 21 fitting together and what -- how could we ensure
- 22 that there wasn't adverse competitive impact and
- 23 those types of issues. And those are the types of
- 24 issues we've tried to address.

- 1 We've never said that we're going
- 2 to totally eliminate the concept. The village
- 3 concept is still in the Six Flags entertainment
- 4 village planned unit development concept. It's in
- 5 the development standards that you received. It's
- 6 part of the plans that you've received.
- 7 But we've brought the anticipated
- 8 retail use down to the number that was utilized in
- 9 the traffic report. And again I'm going to defer

- 10 the ability of the roadway system to handle even
- 11 those numbers to your consultant and our consultant
- 12 when it comes to traffic.
- But we don't want to be in the
- 14 position where we're agreeing that we have to come
- 15 back to you for preliminary approval to show how it
- 16 all fits together, what it's going to look like,
- 17 what's the theme, how is it going to tie together,
- 18 what are the specifics on landscaping, what are the
- 19 specifics on location of curb cuts, parking, all
- 20 those types of issues; but we are looking for
- 21 conceptual plan approval for that component. We're
- 22 not totally eliminating it from the PUD.
- MR. WINTER: I guess I understand that.
- I thought that maybe the approach

172

1 that was being pursued was we have that, we have

- 2 that as a -- as the plan but we know that we're
- 3 going to have to convince you that the traffic or
- 4 the roads can be improved sufficiently for us to go
- 5 ahead with the retail aspect. And I guess I was
- 6 mistaken.
- 7 MR. FRANCKE: What we basically said is
- 8 I think where you're going, Commissioner Winter,
- 9 what we're saying is that if we go
- 10 beyond those numbers, if we go beyond the uses and
- 11 what we've done is we've specified retail uses that
- 12 are tied specifically to the theme park or to the
- 13 regional hotel.
- 14 And we've said, one, if we go
- 15 beyond the numbers we've presented to you here; or
- 16 two, if we go beyond the uses then we will come
- 17 back to you for the type of approval that you've
- 18 just referred to.
- But there is a threshold level up
- 20 to which we could proceed on a conceptual basis
- 21 without having to secure other approvals other than
- 22 plan approvals.
- 23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Any other --

1	MR. SULA: I hate to belabor the point,
2	but it will really help me later when we get down
3	to the nitty-gritty.
4	Can I just ask indulgence to just
5	clarify specifically what we're asking for
6	preliminary and conceptual. Lot 1, employee
7	housing, you're asking for preliminary?
8	MR. FRANCKE: Preliminary.
9	MR. SULA: Lot 2, parking.
10	MR. FRANCKE: Preliminary. It's part of
11	the theme park.
12	MR. SULA: Lot 3, preliminary, that's
13	the theme park.
14	MR. FRANCKE: Right.
15	MR. SULA: Lot 4, village.

- MR. FRANCKE: Only the regional hotel
- 17 conference, not the retail component of that.
- MR. SULA: The hotel only is
- 19 preliminary, the rest is conceptual?
- MR. FRANCKE: Correct.
- MR. SULA: Lot 5 which is another part
- 22 of the village across the road.
- MR. FRANCKE: Conceptual.
- MR. SULA: Lot 6, parking, must be

- 1 preliminary.
- 2 MR. FRANCKE: Yes.
- 3 MR. SULA: And Lot 7, the outlot.
- 4 MR. FRANCKE: Conceptual.
- 5 MR. SULA: That's conceptual?
- 6 MR. FRANCKE: Yes. Because we're not
- 7 showing you anything on Lot 7, not the use, not the

- 8 layout, not anything.
- 9 MR. SULA: Lot 8, the public area.
- 10 MR. FRANCKE: Nothing.
- MR. SULA: Neither -- okay. Where is
- 12 Lot 9? Oh, the roadway. I guess that has to be
- 13 preliminary, doesn't it?
- MR. FRANCKE: Yes, we would anticipate
- 15 that that gets approved as part of the preliminary
- 16 approval.
- MR. SULA: Lot 10, the conservation
- 18 area.
- 19 MR. FRANCKE: That will -- I guess
- 20 that's part of the preliminary. I mean that will
- 21 be going forward immediately.
- MR. SULA: And then Lot 11, the
- 23 conservation area along Washington.
- MR. FRANCKE: It's just preliminary. I

- 1 mean it's part -- in the initial stages, right.
- 2 MR. SULA: And then Lot 12, that's
- 3 another open space triangle?
- 4 MR. FRANCKE: Same.
- 5 MR. SULA: Preliminary.
- 6 MR. FRANCKE: Preliminary.
- 7 MR. SULA: So in terms of traffic
- 8 generation, it's the retail village and the outlots
- 9 that are a little fuzzy right now?
- MR. FRANCKE: Well, when you say traffic
- 11 generation, the uses that we're --
- MR. SULA: I'm just trying to help.
- MR. FRANCKE: The uses that we're
- 14 proposing now as part of the load of the entire
- 15 PUD, both conceptual and preliminary, are in fact
- 16 less than the overall quantity of uses that were
- 17 provided for in the original traffic report that
- 18 our consultant testified to and that your
- 19 consultant reviewed.
- I say they're less because of the
- 21 elimination of the outlots.
- MR. SULA: And all I'm trying to do is

- 23 clarify in terms of to address Mr. Winter's comment
- 24 in terms of trying to understand the magnitude of

- 1 the total program, what is more clearly defined at
- 2 this point in time versus what's a little
- 3 conceptual, if you will.
- 4 MR. FRANCKE: If I could, in terms of
- 5 traffic generation I believe what we're talking
- 6 about is 250 rooms of the employee housing which we
- 7 feel that it's basically not going to be generating
- 8 any traffic on the external roads.
- 9 The theme park, the 400 room hotel,
- 10 two 150 room or 200 room hotels. A total of 900
- 11 rooms in terms of hotels. The theme park, 900
- 12 rooms in terms of hotels, 250 employee housing
- units, and 300,000 square feet of retail use in the
- 14 village.

- Did I cover it? No? No. I've got
- 16 a shaking head. Right, the hotels are conceptual,
- 17 the other hotels; but they are included within the
- 18 traffic generations that are part of the traffic
- 19 report.
- 20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Except for the
- 21 destination hotel is not conceptual.
- MR. FRANCKE: Right. I'm trying to --
- 23 I'm distinguishing, there's two different issues.
- 24 There is the issue of what are we

- 1 seeking preliminary approval for. The only hotel
- 2 we're seeking preliminary PUD approval for is the
- 3 regional hotel.
- 4 But in response to Commissioner
- 5 Winter's question about what has the traffic report
- 6 addressed, it's addressed things that we've asked

7	for preliminary approval for and conceptual. The
8	traffic report has addressed all of it.
9	MR. SULA: And I guess the question
10	that still lingers, though, is given that there is
11	a fair chunk of space that's conceptual could it
12	potentially change enough for a different
13	conclusion to be arrived at when evaluating the
14	traffic requirements.
15	I think that's the fundamental
16	issue that we're trying to understand.
17	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: If it does, if it
18	changes later on, if they come back on that portion
19	of it and if they come back and it shows numbers
20	that they cannot say well, instead of the extra 500
21	rooms in hotels we want to do a thousand rooms of

hotels and it impacts the traffic study they're

24 point in order to get preliminary plat approval.

going to have to submit a new traffic study at that

22

1	But if they come back and they
2	conceptually if they want to move forward from what
3	they presented conceptually then it's going to be
4	hard to argue if we approved it conceptually that
5	now we're going to reject your traffic plan after
6	we accepted it in the conceptual stage.
7	MR. SULA: And I guess what I would like
8	just to be concerned about is let's say for the
9	sake of discussion that the traffic plan that's put
10	forth based on what's now defined as conceptual and
11	preliminary and an approved traffic plan gets put
12	into effect that has a Level of Service B for the
13	sake of discussion, I don't want to be sitting here
14	listening to changes to what's defined as
15	conceptual to take it all the way down to a D and
16	we say well, it's still okay because a D is a
17	passing grade.
18	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: They could make that
19	argument and then you could reject it.

I mean they could make that

- 21 argument. I don't know that that would happen. I
- 22 think what's going to be most important here is --
- 23 and maybe we should move on to that -- I'd like to
- 24 hear our traffic consultant and his review of the

- 1 traffic plan and I'd like to hear some information
- 2 on justification of the traffic plan and its
- 3 ability to handle the concept that we have in front
- 4 of us.
- 5 So does anybody else have anything
- 6 else on the development standards?
- 7 MS. KOVARIK: Yeah, I did. But I'd like
- 8 to hear the traffic study as that could change some
- 9 of my opinion.
- 10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And I think we're going
- 11 to have another shot at this because I think our
- 12 staff needs to review this and get back with us,

- 13 too, to give us some of their feedback.
- So I think, Tracy, Mr. Grieve is
- 15 going to make a presentation to us?
- MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, can I ask a
- 17 question?
- 18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Sure, go ahead.
- MR. FOSTER: Do we have anything in
- 20 writing?
- 21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Did we receive anytthing
- in writing? No. Is there any reason why we don't?
- 23 Is there a written report or are you going to
- 24 prepare one or --
- 1 MR. GRIEVE: We've throughout the
- 2 process the last several months --
- 3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Could you use the mic.
- 4 MR. GRIEVE: I'm sorry. For the record,
- 5 my name is Bill Grieve. I'm with Gewalt Hamilton
- 6 Associates.
- 7 Over the last several months that
- 8 we have been involved in the review of this project
- 9 we've prepared a couple of technical memorandums
- 10 that we've provided to staff as far as how we saw
- 11 the whole traffic analysis process going through,

- whether it be our challenges to the various
- 13 components of it, what we concurred with, what we
- 14 didn't concur with, other areas that we wanted them
- 15 to take a look at, that sort of thing.
- 16 If you'd like, after tonight I
- 17 could go through and put just one document together
- 18 that kind of summarizes the whole process.
- 19 MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I'd
- 20 like to go on record to say a project of this
- 21 magnitude and this substantive I consider
- 22 unacceptable that we don't have a written report at
- 23 this stage when our traffic consultant for the
- 24 Village is making a public report on this.

- 1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Go ahead. Give
- 2 us what you got.
- 3 MR. GRIEVE: With that I'd just like to

- 4 say that we have been involved in this process for
- 5 quite a long time. We have provided those couple
- 6 of very detailed technical memorandums that were
- 7 provided with staff.
- 8 We have been coordinating with
- 9 staff as well as the consultants and the developers
- 10 to make sure that they cover the issues that we
- 11 felt were the most important.
- With that out of the way, I guess
- 13 there's two primary questions that we're trying to
- 14 answer here. One, can the development traffic be
- 15 handled if there is an interchange at Washington
- 16 Street.
- 17 Absolutely. There is no doubt in
- 18 my mind that with the interchange at Washington
- 19 Street you're going to have a lot of relief on a
- 20 lot of the other area roadways, whether it be Hunt
- 21 Club, whether it be a bit of relief on Grand
- 22 Avenue, 120, O'Plaine Road, and all the rest.
- Because as mentioned at the last
- 24 hearing, you will have the opportunity to access

1	both into the existing Six Flags as well as to the
2	site.
3	Now that we've gotten that out of
4	the way, the much trickier question is let's say
5	that when the Illinois Toll Authority comes out
6	with their latest hit list I guess or their
7	priority list later on this year that this
8	interchange doesn't rank up high enough to be built
9	right away or maybe it's not built soon enough
10	before most of the site or all of the site
11	components want to be developed.
12	That becomes a much more detailed
13	analysis. And I know last time Dave Miller from
14	Metro Transportation gave a very detailed approach.
15	As I was here last time listening, the first
16	reaction that hit me was that we're really trying
17	to take

- MR. SULA: Excuse me, could you step
- 19 over to one side?
- MR. GRIEVE: I'm sorry.
- MR. SULA: Thank you.
- MR. GRIEVE: The first thing that struck
- 23 me as I was listening last time is that we're
- 24 taking a large chunk of regional trips along Route

- 1 94. About 60, 65 percent of the water park, the
- 2 hotel, the resort hotel.
- 3 And with the routing pattern that's
- 4 somewhat forced because of just the roadway
- 5 components that are available we're really starting
- 6 to use in my estimation a bit too much of what
- 7 would be considered the local street system,
- 8 especially as we get to the points of Hunt Club
- 9 Road and Washington Street.

10	The traffic analysis that Metro did
11	was very good. We worked very hard to make sure
12	that the numbers that they used I felt comfortable
13	with.
14	And when do I feel comfortable with
15	the traffic generations? Not at the low end, not
16	in the middle end, but I really made sure that from
17	my standpoint that they looked at the most
18	aggressive traffic generations for virtually all of
19	the components.
20	Traffic for these types of uses,
21	they're going to be generated at different times of
22	the day, days of the week, weeks of the month,
23	months of the year.
24	We took the highest we forced

184

1 them, we made them, we told them to take the

- 2 highest component from whether it be the Monday for
- 3 the water park, the Friday for the resort hotel and
- 4 the conference center and put them all together as
- 5 if they were occurring all at the same time.
- 6 So in that respect the numbers that
- 7 you see in their traffic study coming in and out of
- 8 the site are probably on the high side. How high?
- 9 It's hard to say because this is such a unique type
- 10 of a land use. But just by the fact we asked them
- 11 to take a look at the most aggressive trip
- 12 generation that we feel comfortable with those
- 13 numbers.
- 14 The next thing then would be to
- 15 look at the trip distribution. And as I mentioned
- 16 before, we got 65 percent -- 60, 65 percent of a
- 17 lot of that traffic that's oriented along the
- 18 Tollway.
- The problem associated with that,
- 20 you wind up with, as I said, a very detailed
- 21 routing pattern in and around. I guess my point
- 22 would be that as far as how we go through the
- 23 conceptual versus the preliminary, the Lake County
- 24 Division of Transportation is going to force

1	virtually all the road improvements that you see on
2	here done right away. That's their style, that's
3	the way they do things.
4	You have a shot at them once for
5	access and as part of the agreement we're going to
6	see such things as four lanes filling with four
7	lane stretch on Washington from the Great America
8	entrance a little bit west of 21 over to Hunt Club.
9	We're going to see the additional
10	turn lanes northbound and eastbound from Hunt Club
11	to Washington and westbound to northbound from
12	
	Washington to Hunt Club. We're talking about
13	Washington to Hunt Club. We're talking about traffic signals on the ramps from the Tollway over
13	traffic signals on the ramps from the Tollway over

- 17 really be nice if we got all this traffic on the
- 18 Tollway how do we really start to focus it. And
- 19 that's why I'd like to talk a little bit about
- 20 flexibility in the system.
- 21 As I'm coming up from the south the
- 22 routing pattern tended to be west on 120 over to
- 23 Hunt Club, up and back in and around the site.
- 24 That seems like a long way to me to try to get

- l people who are unfamiliar with the area to go
- 2 around.
- 3 One of the opportunities that I
- 4 think that the existing roadway system has to offer
- 5 is the ramp coming around, the cloverleaf ramp that
- 6 connects up with Route 21 at this point. Right now
- 7 it's just a stop sign, it's tough making a left
- 8 turn as you come around that corner.

9	But 21 is a regional route that's
10	under the jurisdiction of the Illinois Department
11	of Transportation. It's a very busy road. In
12	their five year plan they've already got
13	anticipated they're going to be spending 20 odd
14	million dollars on widening Route 21 in that
15	stretch and providing those two through lanes in
16	each direction plus turn lanes.
17	Providing the traffic signal at the
18	ramp terminus would offer that extra flexibility.
19	It's going to be it's going to have to be a
20	strong sign and a strong way finding program, a
21	strong education program to get people to
22	understand how to get to the site as it is.
23	So this once again provides a good
24	opportunity. They would then come up Milwaukee and

- 1 across Washington. We wouldn't be routing the
- 2 people at all throughout the residential
- 3 neighborhoods along Hunt Club, Washington to the
- 4 west, Gages Lake or even 120.
- 5 The next point I'd like to bring
- 6 up, and this is just a quick map of the existing
- 7 street system. It tends to show the regional
- 8 arterials as well as the local arterial routes that
- 9 serve the area.
- 10 And certainly you've got the
- 11 Tollway, you've got Grand Avenue, and you've got --
- 12 although the residents don't want to hear it, the
- 13 County considers Washington very much a major
- 14 arterial or a regional arterial and Milwaukee.
- 15 From a local standpoint you've got
- 16 Hunt Club Road, you've got Dilley's Road, and
- 17 you've got Tri-State Parkway.
- 18 How much more flexibility can or
- 19 how could we provide even more flexibility in and
- 20 out of this site. It's my opinion that Tri-State
- 21 Parkway should eventually be connected as a through
- 22 street down to Washington not only to serve this

- 23 development but on your comprehensive plan you've
- 24 got a very strong industrial office warehouse

- 1 component that's on the south side of Washington
- 2 Street.
- 3 Undoubtedly the area south of
- 4 Washington will wind up having a link that would
- 5 intersect with Washington. With providing this
- 6 extra bit of flexibility in the north/south
- 7 connection you start to help minimizing that impact
- 8 again along Washington west of the site along Hunt
- 9 Club because if you can see just on this map we've
- 10 got Dilley's Road kind of on the east side of the
- 11 Tollway. And then we've got this one little piece
- 12 of Tri-State Parkway.
- This north/south demand, localized
- 14 demand from businesses, from homes, from employers

- 15 is still going to be there. The question is how do
- 16 we get from one place to the other.
- Does this link want to go in right
- 18 now. Sure. It could. But does it absolutely have
- 19 to? I don't believe so. But I think in your
- 20 planning for this site you shouldn't preclude the
- 21 opportunity to eventually provide this connection.
- I think right now they're talking
- 23 about it being a connection for emergency vehicles
- 24 as well as perhaps shuttle buses. The road

- 1 alignment as proposed on their plan I think can
- 2 pretty much stay the same. What I would suggest,
- 3 though, is reserve some areas around there for
- 4 right-of-way, perhaps start minimizing how they get
- 5 in and out of the parking lots, that sort of thing.
- 6 The Metro study quite accurately

looked at those two heaviest peak hours, the 8 weekday evening and the Saturday midday. But the types of uses that are going on the site, to be 10 successful they're going to want to have customers 11 coming to the water park during hours outside of 12 that, not during the morning rush hour when 13 everybody is going to work, not during the weekday 14 evening when everybody is going home from work. 15 They want to get people there around noontime, they want to get people there to the water park during 16 17 the hottest part of the day. 18 And why not use the flexibility in 19 my estimation of the whole roadway system. That's 20 why I've come up with I guess those two extra 21 improvement recommendations as far as the traffic 22 signal on the ramps at Route 21 off of 120 as well 23 as then the extension of the Tri-State Parkway. 24 So I know it's late, briefly

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

- 1 concluding then, to answer to that second question
- 2 can this development as proposed be accommodated by
- 3 the roadway system. I believe it can.
- 4 As far as another safeguard goes,
- 5 you are looking at preliminary, you are looking at
- 6 conceptual. As the program evolves over five years
- 7 or ten years you've got an opportunity to monitor
- 8 traffic no different than what Great America does
- 9 now, no different than what Gurnee Mills does now.
- 10 You could establish threshold
- 11 numbers based on their own traffic study to start
- 12 looking at some of these things. You know what
- 13 guys, we now have the water park, the destination
- 14 hotel and one other hotel going, let's count the
- 15 cars, let's see where we're at. Maybe we're
- 16 higher, maybe we're lower, maybe we're still there.
- 17 So that way as time goes on, for
- 18 example, two of the hotels want to become something
- 19 completely different as you suggest it could be a
- 20 detriment to the traffic generation. You now have
- 21 the opportunity to either say figure out a way to

- 22 get to the original traffic numbers or figure out a
- 23 way to improve the road system to get you back up
- 24 to that Level of Service C. So not going from a B

- 1 to a D or a C to an E or what have you.
- 2 And I guess that would be my final
- 3 point in that with the road system recommendations
- 4 that they've come up with there is going to be
- 5 extra capacity available in that network.
- 6 By adding the through lanes on
- 7 Washington, by adding the separate lanes, turn
- 8 lanes for example at the intersection of Milwaukee
- 9 and Washington and Hunt Club and Washington that
- 10 you'll have capacity beyond what is needed by
- 11 existing traffic, by the site, as well as regional
- 12 growth that was taken into account in their traffic
- 13 study. Thank you.

- 14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Jim, go ahead.
- MR. SULA: I guess a very simple
- 16 question. Are you saying that you support Level of
- 17 Service C can be achieved with the existing
- 18 roadways without an interchange on the Tollway?
- MR. GRIEVE: Most of the intersections
- 20 right near the site overall would be operating at
- 21 Level of Service C with the improvements that
- 22 they're talking about.
- MR. SULA: You're saying that we can get
- 24 there without the Tollway interchange?

- 1 MR. GRIEVE: Yes.
- 2 MR. SULA: The road that you had the
- 3 dotted line on the other map, would that basically
- 4 connect what's on the preliminary document and
- 5 basically at the very northwest corner, you know,

6	right where the employee housing is? Is that where
7	you're suggesting?
8	MR. GRIEVE: Yeah. I'm told yes.
9	MR. SULA: And then I've got an
10	anecdotal to add to Mr. Foster's concern.
11	I had the opportunity today to
12	visit along Route 21 to view the item that was on
13	the prior agenda and can greatly empathize with the
14	difficulty in terms of making any sort of left-hand
15	turn. My car will do zero to sixty in less than
16	six seconds and I barely found an opportunity to
17	get through there.
18	So I am skeptical that 21 is going
19	to work.
20	MR. GRIEVE: And I concur with you. One
21	of the I got asked a few questions as I was
22	waiting for this as we were just chatting outside.

24 their data or do we get our own data. And we

And the question is did we just use

- 1 considered two very strong pieces of our own
- 2 information. Especially with regard to my
- 3 recommendations are up and above what their chart
- 4 showed.
- 5 The first thing we did was we
- 6 counted Route 21 just north of 120. And right now
- 7 you've got about 24,000 cars a day traveling in
- 8 that one lane in each direction stretch. That
- 9 easily meets the requirements for the two through
- 10 lanes in each direction that the State has on their
- 11 plans.
- The other thing to mention is that
- 13 as the State goes through and they do their
- 14 improvement or earlier if you wind up putting let's
- 15 say temporary signals at the ramps, as with any
- 16 other signals that get put on a system they will be
- 17 part of a system in that you'll be able to promote
- 18 through traffic but at the same time provide a few
- 19 more gaps, breaks in the action I guess you could

- 20 say for people to get out of the side streets
- 21 whether the side street has a traffic signal or
- 22 doesn't have a traffic signal.
- MR. SULA: And I echo Mr. Foster's
- 24 comment before. When can we expect a written

- 1 report that summarizes your findings?
- 2 MR. GRIEVE: I would assume within the
- 3 next -- your next meeting is in two weeks on this
- 4 thing?
- 5 MR. SULA: Okay. Thank you.
- 6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It's probably going to
- 7 be more like a month I think. But any other
- 8 questions? Mr. Winter.
- 9 MR. WINTER: Did you have an opportunity
- 10 to investigate the Tollway interchange, any sense
- 11 of the likelihood that we're going to be on the hit

- 12 list?
- MR. GRIEVE: They're pretty quiet about
- 14 that type of information.
- MR. WINTER: I mean it's been --
- MR. GRIEVE: On Washington --
- MR. WINTER: It seems to me this has to
- 18 be high on the list. But when will we know? Do
- 19 you have any sense?
- MR. GRIEVE: It's my understanding that
- 21 their first round of cuts I guess from their 200
- 22 locations that they're looking at will be coming
- 23 later on this year, perhaps November or December.
- The key thing that can happen

- 1 between now and then from the Village's standpoint,
- 2 I think with or without this project just as I say,
- 3 132 has problems during a few hours of the day,

- 4 several hours of the day.
- 5 You know, I think everybody wants
- 6 to work on trying to get this Washington Street
- 7 interchange together. So support from the Village
- 8 would certainly be helpful in that regard.
- 9 MR. WINTER: With regards to the
- 10 improvements on these other streets, Hunt Club,
- 11 what is the timetable for that work actually being
- 12 finished?
- You said I think at one point it
- 14 could be in the next five years, but I mean --
- MR. GRIEVE: The County has a plan
- 16 beginning next year to widen Hunt Club Road from
- 17 Washington south to Route 120. So that roadway I
- 18 think they're anticipating being completed within a
- 19 year.
- What I was referring to was when
- 21 any development comes into Lake County and they're
- 22 going to be asking for access on one of the County
- 23 roads it's the County policy that they make sure
- 24 that any type of road improvements that might be

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD.

1	outlined in the traffic study are all done right a
2	that time.

- 3 So they're not real interested in a
- 4 phasing program because once you've secured your
- 5 access they really don't have another chance to get
- 6 back at you unless there might be, for example, on
- 7 a monitoring program if they have to come back and
- 8 the uses have changed to the point that they're
- 9 changing the traffic numbers again.
- 10 So realistically from your
- 11 preliminary approval versus conceptual approval
- 12 you've got that little bit more of a comfort level
- 13 because the bulk of the road improvements as shown,
- 14 as called out by the Petitioner will have already
- 15 been made and you'll have that opportunity to see
- 16 how they're working as time goes on.
- MR. WINTER: My final question. You
- 18 suggested the north/south road through the

- 19 property.
- MR. GRIEVE: Right.
- 21 MR. WINTER: Currently it's proposed
- 22 that that's a private road right now just open for
- 23 emergency.
- MR. GRIEVE: Correct. And shuttle

- 1 busses.
- 2 MR. WINTER: And specifically what are
- 3 you thinking? It should be dedicated and be a
- 4 public road and what? Two lanes, one lane each
- 5 direction?
- 6 MR. GRIEVE: I think one lane in each
- 7 direction could probably handle the traffic loads.
- 8 That was the other piece of
- 9 information that we collected, the traffic volume
- 10 on Tri-State Parkway.

11	And right now during the weekday
12	there's about 6,000 trips per day occurring at it
13	south of Grand. On the weekend when the site
14	activity will be busiest it's down to 3,600.
15	So you've got a good opportunity to
16	use a road that isn't very busy. I said that
17	wrong. You get an opportunity to use a piece of
18	road that complements the uses very nicely in that
19	respect.
20	The other thing to point out is
21	Tri-State Parkway by our hourly breakdown obviously
22	is very busy first thing in the morning as people
23	are going to work and then northbound in the

24 evening. There's a big lull during most parts of

- 1 the day, the rest of the day when people would
- 2 perhaps use it to get to the water park.

- 3 How many people would use it based
- 4 on the projections, maybe 10, maybe 20 percent at
- 5 the maximum on a Saturday of the water park
- 6 activity might find their way to Tri-State Parkway.
- 7 That represents maybe a couple hundred trips.
- 8 For example, if this property
- 9 stayed as zoned, a considerable amount of light
- 10 industrial office space and a reasonable FAR of
- 11 like about point four which is pretty similar to
- what's been happening to the north will generate
- 13 that many trips, again a very comparable number of
- 14 trips as the water park and other uses.
- 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Foster.
- MR. FOSTER: Did you indicate how people
- 17 would return home from their visit?
- MR. GRIEVE: Pardon me? I'm sorry.
- MR. FOSTER: Did you indicate how people
- 20 would be returning home from their visit?
- MR. GRIEVE: Certainly coming home will
- 22 also provide the opportunity to -- I know that the
- 23 routing pattern had them back out and down and
- 24 around and back down using Hunt Club again.

1	But with the extra lanes coming in
2	and out of the access driveways I think you'll see
3	a lot of people will have the opportunity, for
4	example, if I'm going to the south on the
5	Tri-State, you'll make a left out of the site and
6	then it's just a right turn down Milwaukee and then
7	a left turn to get on the ramp over on 120.
8	I think that provides a much
9	more that provides a lot of flexibility and
10	could help people make sure that they stay more on
11	the regional routes.
12	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anybody else have any
13	questions? Okay. Mr. Sula.
14	MR. SULA: I just had one follow-up
15	question to the status of Washington Street.
16	Can you help us understand or

- 17 someone help us understand the difference from the
- 18 County's plan to widen versus an approved project
- 19 versus a funded project, give us some sense of
- 20 the certainty because I understand it's been
- 21 planned for a long time.
- MR. GRIEVE: Right. It's got a really
- 23 nice big thick magic marker on their map that says
- 24 we need to widen this thing but they don't have any

- 1 money earmarked for this yet.
- 2 So without the commitment from this
- 3 project to widen Washington it's still going to be
- 4 several years before that piece of Washington would
- 5 be filled in for the four lanes.
- 6 MR. SULA: Thank you.
- 7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Now that's something I
- 8 don't understand.

9	Now wouldn't you with the
10	building of this project or to be developed
11	wouldn't that be required? I thought you said the
12	County would require the improvements to be in.
13	MR. GRIEVE: But I think your question
14	was more along the lines of does the County have
15	money themselves to widen Washington and they
16	don't.
17	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I understand you said
18	they don't. But then I thought you said even if
19	the development came in it would be several years
20	before it would fill in or did you say if the
21	development did come in?
22	MR. GRIEVE: If the development didn't
23	come in it could be several years.

24

MR. WINTER: The developer is going to

- 1 pay for it then?
- 2 MR. GRIEVE: You know, I can't talk for
- 3 the developer. All I know is that from the Lake
- 4 County Division of Transportation that everything
- 5 that's been discussed so far that, you know, the
- 6 access on Washington obviously is very critical for
- 7 this project.
- 8 And as part of that access granting
- 9 process that there's going to be a series of road
- 10 improvements that are needed at least, you know, at
- 11 the minimum the four laning of Washington.
- MR. WINTER: Well, I didn't get the
- 13 impression at any time that the developer was
- 14 committing to that in the presentation. I was just
- 15 wondering, what is your understanding? I mean how
- 16 is Washington going to get widened by the time they
- 17 build the hotel if they're successful in getting
- 18 that rezoning?
- 19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Francke said he's
- 20 paying for it.
- 21 MR. FRANCKE: I left my checkbook at
- 22 home, but --
- MR. SULA: After these meetings, the

24 length of these meetings he can afford it.

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

1	MR. FRANCKE: What we've been trying to
2	do is establish the improvements that are needed.
3	And really until we can get over
4	that hurdle of defining the necessary improvements
5	we can't even begin to address the issue of how
6	everything is going to be financed.
7	I mean that's a whole separate
8	discussion that we anticipate ultimately having to
9	resolve, needless to say, by the time we finish at
10	the Village Board level. At this point we're not
11	even completed with our discussion of the necessary
12	improvements.
13	MR. WINTER: You know, I do have one
14	final question.
15	In the traffic study they gave us

- 16 some numbers for those two peak periods for the
- 17 village center which assumes a certain square
- 18 footage. They had 1,500 trips. That's Page 19 of
- 19 the traffic study.
- MR. GRIEVE: Okay.
- MR. WINTER: Would it be fair to make
- 22 the assumption that if it was decided that
- 23 conceptually we only wanted to approve say a
- 24 hundred square feet or a hundred GLA essentially or

- 1 half of what was indicated there that you would
- 2 make the assumption that half the trips would then
- 3 be taken or is that not how traffic people look at
- 4 those things?
- 5 MR. GRIEVE: As Mr. Francke was going
- 6 through the list of what they're actually asking
- 7 for approval of, if I'm reading it correctly we're

- 8 about a couple of hundred trips down on the
- 9 Washington outlots and maybe another 400 trips down
- 10 for a theme restaurant.
- 11 I think you're asking for a
- 12 preliminary, correct?
- MR. WINTER: Yeah. Just look at that
- 14 retail item. They've got 225,000 GLA.
- MR. GRIEVE: Right.
- MR. WINTER: And they have the number
- 17 there for the weekday PM at 1,075 trips total.
- 18 If that number, let's say the
- 19 retail is half of that, would you then expect that
- 20 total to be half?
- MR. GRIEVE: Approximately. If you look
- 22 at historically for different sized developments
- 23 the number of trips generated per square foot on a
- 24 per square foot or a thousand square foot basis is

- 1 bigger for a much smaller development because that
- 2 tends to be on the lowest level, your -- the
- 3 tiniest level, your 7-11's, your Amoco mini-marts
- 4 where people are running in and running out,
- 5 running in and running out.
- 6 The much bigger projects that you
- 7 get such as Gurnee Mills, I mean that's still going
- 8 to generate a heck of a lot of traffic. But on a
- 9 per square foot basis that ratio comes down.
- That's the long way of saying that
- 11 if I cut this in half, yeah, the traffic would be
- 12 about half.
- 13 MR. WINTER: Okay.
- 14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Ms. Kovarik.
- MS. KOVARIK: When you say that the
- 16 County will want a four lane to be put on
- 17 Washington, will that extend all the way east to
- 18 21?
- MR. GRIEVE: Yes. They will be picking
- 20 it up from where the existing Six Flags Drive is is
- 21 my understanding and going west and fitting in with

- the piece of Hunt Club.
- In addition, there was also talk
- 24 about improvements at the Hunt Club Washington

- 1 intersection. Now one of the points that I jotted
- 2 down from the last meeting was accidents.
- 3 It's a high accident location. And
- 4 part of it has to do with just the fact that it is
- 5 kind of at an angle intersection. There's some
- 6 things that you can do now as far as designing
- 7 today that would make it safer than when they
- 8 designed and built it yesterday.
- 9 So the couple of improvements that
- 10 they're suggesting left turn lanes and adding a
- 11 couple of right turn lanes would go a long way to
- 12 help that.
- MS. KOVARIK: My question on the four

- 14 lane is is it really possible to four lane
- underneath the bridge that holds up the Tollway?
- 16 Do you have to cut across the --
- MR. GRIEVE: You can get four lanes
- 18 under there and you can also get the bike path
- 19 under there.
- MS. KOVARIK: And if the County can
- 21 demand that the improvements be put in, why isn't
- 22 it possible to just put the Tollway exchange in if
- 23 somebody is going to pay for it other than the
- 24 County? I mean can somebody else just step up and

- 1 would the State allow that?
- 2 MR. GRIEVE: Well, the State would love
- 3 it because if you put the ramps in at Washington
- 4 you're going to get rid of the ramps on Milwaukee.
- 5 Washington is a County road. So, as I said, the

6	State would really enjoy it.
7	As far as the Tollway Authority
8	just granting interchanges, they're a money driven
9	machine and they need to have you keep popping in
10	those 40 cents, those 50 cents. I guess up further
11	north when they get done with taking out the
12	Deerfield Toll Plaza I think it's going to be 75
13	cents up there.
14	So they need to go very strongly by
15	their own projections, cash flow projections. And
16	you really don't have the opportunity to get a new
17	interchange unless they can prove to themselves
18	that they're going to get our 40 cents along the
19	way to make up the slack.
20	That's why you've seen some of the
21	projects in recent history completing the Route 60
22	interchange, completing the Route 137 interchange
23	that took a fair amount of time for the Toll

24 Authority to convince themselves that they could

- 1 make enough money to put those ramps in.
- 2 MS. KOVARIK: But if somebody else paid
- 3 for the ramps and they went up to 40 cents or 30
- 4 cents or whatever, would they just say here, go
- 5 build it, it's yours?
- 6 MR. GRIEVE: No, because they'd still
- 7 want to be looking at the demand not only that
- 8 would be using the ramps but then might not -- the
- 9 people who might elect to get off the Tollway
- 10 system at that point and not continue farther on so
- 11 you could get hit for another 40 cents down the
- 12 road.
- 13 It's a pretty delicate balancing
- 14 act that they make. As far as if somebody else
- 15 threw enough money to build the interchange,
- 16 they're all for that. I mean they'd love that.
- 17 But that's --
- MS. KOVARIK: But they want to make sure
- 19 they can collect their 40 cents. So if they don't
- 20 think they can collect their 40 cents why would

- 21 they even put this -- do anything there and why are
- 22 we even talking about the possibility of Washington
- 23 if they're worried about -- an interchange if
- 24 they're worried about the 40 cents?

- 1 MR. GRIEVE: Because they're studying
- 2 it. That's all part of this study that they're
- 3 looking at 200 locations throughout that Tollway
- 4 system.
- 5 MS. KOVARIK: I thought their study was
- 6 not Washington specific, it was Grand Avenue
- 7 specific.
- 8 MR. GRIEVE: As part of the Grand Avenue
- 9 -- looking at Grand Avenue you tend to look at the
- 10 whole corridor through here.
- Washington could be considered
- within the influence area of not only the 132

- 13 interchange but when you get down even to 120.
- MS. KOVARIK: Can you tell me then
- where else on the Tollway system -- the Tollway
- 16 system they had interchanges that close together?
- I mean those are less than like two
- 18 miles. Maybe not even that.
- MR. GRIEVE: As you get, for example,
- 20 out in Hoffman Estates you have -- you've got
- 21 Barrington Road, you've got 59, you've got Beverly
- 22 Drive, Route 25, Route 31 are right there.
- They tend to -- they'll allow a
- 24 little bit tighter spacing of interchanges when

- 1 they perceive that they're going to have the
- 2 opportunity to get their lots of forty cents.
- 3 MR. SULA: Route 60 and 22 can't be more
- 4 than 200 feet.

5	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions?
6	MS. KOVARIK: No, not on traffic.
7	MR. SMITH: It's tough with the State
8	because Almond Road and Grand, that was paid for,
9	what, two years before. The money was there.
10	In order to get them to IDOT to
11	agree to put it in. I think with the County it's a
12	lot easier, they go ahead and let you do it. With
13	the State it gets caught in the bureaucracy and you
14	don't get it done. That money there was waiting
15	for it, the developers paid for it.
16	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, something is
17	telling me if Kristy can get somebody to pay for
18	this other than the Toll.
19	MS. KOVARIK: Maybe they'll listen to
20	that. I'm a great negotiator.
21	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Why don't we open the
22	floor to the public and see if we can get out of

here before midnight. I'm going to open the floor

24 to the public.

210

I	If you could direct your questions
2	directly to the Commission and your concerns, we'd
3	appreciate that. And if you can, it's obvious that
4	we're on the topic of the traffic. I guess if we
5	could kind of stay on the subject of the things we
6	discussed tonight which would be the traffic and
7	also the changes in the plan and the development
8	standards.
9	So if you'd like a make a comment
10	or ask a question, you may do so at this time.
11	Anybody? I knew there would be somebody.
12	MS. COURSHON: Mary Courshon, 55 Silo
13	Court, South Ridge. This will not be my only
14	appearance in my film this evening.
15	I do want to caution the Commission
16	on based on all this slight of hand and now you
17	see it, now you don't, now we're proposing it, now

18 we aren't, please do not buy a pig in a poke.

- The room numbers on the hotels seem
- 20 to be fluctuating wildly. First we've got 200 --
- 21 first we've got 500 rooms, then we've got 750
- 22 rooms, then we got a destination hotel for 900
- 23 rooms, then we have two hotels for 900 rooms.
- 24 Sold, you know, highest bidder.

- 1 The Petitioner constantly reflects
- 2 what we've heard and how he's addressed the
- 3 different things. What we've heard and we've done
- 4 about this and what we've heard we've done about
- 5 that. I fail to understand how he didn't hear
- 6 about the part about no outlots.
- 7 He again alluded to the fact that
- 8 well, we can pretty much do it anyway with the
- 9 zoning we got. Well, you know, with the stuff we
- 10 got now we could do this and with the stuff we got

- 11 now we could do that.
- 12 I'm very impressed with hearing
- 13 about the Tri-State Parkway connection. I think
- 14 that could be a plausible possibility to again
- 15 redirect that traffic to the commercial corridor at
- 16 Grand Avenue. That way if the Tollway wants to add
- 17 yet another lane at that intersection to get their
- 18 40 cents, God bless them.
- 19 I think, though, I would caution us
- 20 not to hang our hats on the Tollway because if they
- 21 decided today to build that exchange I don't know
- 22 if anybody here is commuting to the city every day
- 23 like I am, but how long is it already taking them
- 24 to screw around with the Deerfield toll and isn't

- 1 it fun.
- 2 In addition, our traffic consultant

- 3 also alluded to that if we get that interchange at
- 4 the Tollway at Washington it's not just going to
- 5 benefit our 12-story water slide there, it's also
- 6 going to impact how people access and egress that
- 7 Tollway.
- 8 So that now people who, for
- 9 instance, live west let's say in Round Lake are
- 10 exiting on Grand Avenue. But if they don't want to
- 11 hit all those lights by the shopping center
- 12 they're going to exit Washington Street.
- Now we're already talking about how
- 14 to bust our chops at South Ridge expanding
- 15 Washington to four lanes with these endless turn
- lanes, two left, three right, stand up, sit down.
- Well, if we're going to have an
- 18 interchange so that everybody going west now is
- 19 going to exit Washington to avoid all the lights at
- 20 Gurnee Mills, four lanes isn't going to be enough
- 21 on Washington. You're just going to have to take,
- 22 you know, like at least where my house sits in
- 23 South Ridge just to accommodate the traffic getting
- 24 off the Tollway for the further west development

1	that's happening here in Lake County.
2	We're talking about all the berming
3	happening along Washington. The bike path is also
4	happening along Washington and I'd like to know how
5	that berming and all these trees is managing to
6	hide that six story hotel that is part of the
7	outlot. There is a six story hotel there and then
8	there's the other six story facing south. That
9	would be like Washington is south, correct?
10	And then so therefore we only see
11	six stories of the water slide because of course
12	the two six story hotels are blocking the first six
13	stories of the water slide.
14	And thank you for including the
15	heliport and the helipad bulletin. That was very
16	special. I'll reserve more comments until later.
17	MS. MILLER: My name is Theresa Miller.

- 18 I live at 6177 Brittany Court.
- My -- I have no interest in going
- 20 to the water park, I have no interest in going to
- 21 Six Flags Great America either. I think it's quite
- 22 an ugly facility actually. And I think that all
- 23 the people that go to these places are coming from
- 24 outside, most of the people are coming from outside

- 1 of Gurnee.
- 2 So if there are going to be any
- 3 travel improvements to accommodate the people who
- 4 are coming from outside of our city to use these
- 5 facilities, I don't think that the residents of
- 6 Gurnee should have to pay increased taxes to
- 7 support these road improvements.
- 8 Secondly, I really don't think that
- 9 it is necessary to have ramps on and off the I-94

- 10 off of Washington. Yes, maybe it's necessary to
- 11 widen Washington for the current traffic problems,
- 12 but I think that having access onto I-94 at Grand
- 13 Avenue, Washington, and also at Route 120 is a bit
- 14 excessive for the size of community of Gurnee and
- 15 Waukegan on the other side of the Interstate.
- I'm not sure that I really
- 17 understand actually that there are traffic problems
- 18 getting onto and off of the Interstate. My
- 19 experience going onto I-94 from Grand Avenue has
- 20 been I've been able to get on perfectly fine. It's
- 21 just that traffic backs up because of all the
- 22 entrances on I-94. That's my opinion what backs up
- 23 traffic.
- So if you put in more of these on

215

1 ramps you're just going to further impact the

- 2 backing up of traffic on I-94. I think that's
- 3 probably it for now.
- 4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.
- 5 MS. ALBRECHT: Good evening. I'll try
- 6 to make this as short as I can. Vicky Albrecht,
- 7 4210 Cobblestone Court in Gurnee.
- 8 I'm also vice president of
- 9 Tri-State Realty. I'd like to give everybody here
- 10 an overview of the Grand Tri-State Business Park
- 11 which has been discussed tonight, particularly the
- 12 Tri-State Parkway in light of the report presented
- 13 by Mr. Grieve.
- My company, Tri-State Realty, has
- 15 marketed the Grand Tri-State Business Park located
- 16 at the southwest quadrant of Grand and I-94 since
- 17 its planning in the late 1980s. Since that time
- 18 the Grand Tri-State Business Park has become one of
- 19 the most successful corporate parks in Lake County
- 20 for a company seeking office, industrial, and land
- 21 parcels.
- Today over a million square feet of
- 23 office, industrial space has been constructed.

24 There are only 23 acres remaining left for sale,

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

1	most of which are premium lots with Tollway
2	frontage.
3	Some of the remaining factory and
4	distribution facilities located in the park include
5	multi-national companies such as Domino Amjet,
5	Nypro Chicago; successful second and third
7	generation family business such as Tablecraft,
8	Esquire Parcel as well as Arrow Instruments and
9	high tech companies such as Sterogenics and Vision
10	Tech

- 11 All of these companies have
- 12 invested millions of dollars building facilities in
- 13 the park and providing hundreds of professional and
- 14 technical jobs for Lake County residents. The
- 15 property taxes these companies pay have also

- 16 greatly helped our burgeoning school districts.
- 17 I know directly from having many
- 18 discussions with Dr. Conti how grateful he is to
- 19 have these corporate neighbors in our area.
- And this is our only corporate
- 21 corridor. Along Tri-State Parkway, all four phases
- 22 of the Grand Tri-State business park or corporate
- 23 center, I'm sorry, are fully leased.
- 24 Recently W.W. Grainger has taken up

- 1 residence in 40,000 square feet and they're a
- 2 significant interest for large blocks of space in
- 3 the three new buildings under construction.
- 4 We continue to attract quality
- 5 companies to the Grand Tri-State Business Park
- 6 because of the ease of access to I-94 Tollway via
- 7 Tri-State Parkway and the high quality business

8	park image that we have worked very hard to retain.
9	The traffic study presented by the
10	Village traffic consultant allows non-business
11	traffic to flow through a thoughtfully planned
12	corporate environment.
13	We need to take another look at
14	this band-aid approach of using the Tri-State
15	Parkway as a thoroughfare to the entertainment
16	village and continue working with Prism and the
17	extensive study that they have undertaken which
18	addresses traffic in a more logical fashion.
19	I hope the Plan Commission and the
20	Village staff seriously considers these issues as
21	they move forward and that the Village of Gurnee
22	staff consults with all the owners and tenants of
23	the Grand Tri-State Business Park before proceeding

24 with this plan any further. Thank you.

- 1 MS. MILLER: Sorry, Theresa Miller
- 2 again, 6177 Brittany Court.
- 3 I forgot a couple of things. First
- 4 of all, if the purpose of putting the ramps onto
- 5 I-94 is to facilitate traffic flow to and from the
- 6 entertainment center, then I don't see why Six
- 7 Flags doesn't use their existing very nicely
- 8 landscaped main entrance off of Grand and build
- 9 their own internal road underneath I-94 to move the
- 10 traffic from one part of the entertainment center
- 11 to the -- entertainment area to the other part to
- 12 the water park. And that's it.
- MS. SVENDSEN: Hello. Since tourism is
- 14 the good news industry I though I'd present a few
- 15 prepared remarks. My name is Gail Svendsen and I'm
- 16 the president and CEO of the Lake County, Illinois
- 17 Convention and Visitors Bureau.
- I was involved in the incorporation
- 19 in 1984. Since then I've been able to secure over
- 20 6 million dollars in State tourism grants to
- 21 promote Lake County as an overnight destination.
- Lake County continues to be the

- 23 third largest generator of tourism revenues for the
- 24 State of Illinois ranking behind Cook County

- 1 because of the Chicago product and behind DuPage
- 2 County because of their hotels, their convention
- 3 and meeting hotels.
- 4 The U.S. Travel Data Center reports
- 5 that in 1997 tourism expenditures in Lake County
- 6 were 559 million dollars with a payroll of 129
- 7 million dollars with State tax receipts of 24
- 8 million dollars and a local tax receipt of 11
- 9 million dollars.
- 10 I'm thirsty. Our attractions and
- 11 lodging facilities have provided us with a
- 12 tremendous return. I would like to see us move to
- 13 the next level which includes a destination hotel
- 14 to an already existing highly visible tourism

- 15 product here. What a dynamic combination.
- I would like to share my thoughts
- 17 with you regarding this project which I support as
- 18 well as our Board of Directors for the Convention
- 19 and Visitors Bureau, especially when it comes to
- 20 the Six Flags entertainment village, the concept of
- 21 the destination resort and conference center.
- Such a facility strengthens Lake
- 23 County's position as a destination area for
- 24 tourists. One of the advantages of transforming a

- 1 day trip to a destination market is the destination
- 2 market encourages extended stays by tourists
- 3 already visiting the area resulting in increased
- 4 room occupancy. In other words, it puts heads in
- 5 beds.
- 6 Several other significant benefits

7	are an increase in multiple use visits promotes
8	existing businesses in Lake County. The more
9	business or existing retail stores and
10	entertainment options means more jobs for the local
11	community.
12	Extended stays also provide
13	increased tax revenue for the local community
14	without necessarily increasing the number of
15	visitors. Rather, those already traveling to Lake
16	County will simply stay longer and spend more
17	money.
18	We believe that an upscale resort
19	and conference center also meets the growing
20	business and convention needs of the Lake County
21	companies. Currently there is one such facility in
22	Lake County and it is located at the southern end.
23	But it's away from established
24	attractions such as Gurnee Mills and Six Flags.

- 1 Keeping in mind that planners like to know that
- 2 when they're putting together a meeting convention
- 3 they want to do so in an area that's rich in
- 4 off-site entertainment amenities.
- 5 I know such a need exists because
- 6 the Convention and Visitors Bureau continually does
- 7 receive inquiries for convention facilities for
- 8 sizes that we can't possibly provide to the people.
- 9 We do know that we do need those facilities.
- We also receive hundreds of
- 11 conference leads each year, too, and we send those
- 12 on to other communities such as Rosemont and
- 13 Schaumburg. We would like to keep these meetings
- 14 here in Lake County where they belong and it
- 15 appears that the Six Flags entertainment village
- 16 will help us do just that.
- 17 Plus for the past fourteen years
- 18 our staff has been receiving calls saying what do
- 19 you mean Six Flags doesn't have a resort hotel. As
- 20 a member of the Village of Gurnee's Blue Ribbon

- 21 Committee and panel to review the Six Flags
- 22 entertainment village I had a wonderful opportunity
- 23 to look at the development very closely.
- One of the reasons the blue ribbon

- 1 committee gave a favorable recommendation is
- 2 because Prism Development Company addressed the
- 3 concerns of the local community.
- 4 Issues such as traffic flows,
- 5 quality of life, the impact on infrastructure and
- 6 financial benefits of this project were all dealt
- 7 with openly, fairly and professionally.
- 8 This is why I support the Six Flags
- 9 entertainment village. Thank you.
- 10 MR. PAPIERNAK: I'm Eugene Papiernak,
- 11 6073 Indian Trail Road.
- 12 Unlike some others, I like Great

- 13 America, I think it's tastefully done. However, I
- 14 think expansion is unnecessary.
- We haven't heard anything else
- 16 about the year-round park with the ice skating
- 17 rink. How is that going to affect any kind of
- 18 traffic proposals? We just heard about summertime
- 19 things.
- We -- there was talk that we
- 21 couldn't have a Tri-State expansion because of the
- 22 access on 132 was already crammed. Wouldn't it be
- 23 less expensive and easier just to expand the 132
- 24 ramp, widen that.

- 1 There was mention that the
- 2 Barrington Road and 59 exits are close together.
- 3 However, they're not nearly as close together. I
- 4 used to live out that way. So this would be a

5	unique intersection in my opinion.		
6	I forget the woman's name, but she		
7	talked about the world class businesses we have		
8	with the industrial park right now. Although I do		
9	like that Tri-State expansion, I would worry about		
10	deleting some of that international business. And		
11	I think that the quality of business and the		
12	expansion we've experienced over the past couple of		
13	years would be a significant reason to leave this		
14	park remaining industrial and hopefully to foster		
15	that growth.		
16	And for the helipad, you know, why		
17	not just put an airport in, wouldn't that be		
18	easier? Also I want us to remember that we are a		
19	community of families now. Thank you.		
20	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.		
21	MR. SILHA: Gary Silha, 6180 Indian		
22	Trail Road. I'll make it short and sweet.		
23	The last meeting last month it was		

also a very late evening. There were a number of

- 1 residential questions or concerns raised which were
- 2 not addressed because of the lateness of the
- 3 evening. I just want to make sure the questions
- 4 from last meeting will eventually get addressed at
- 5 the next meeting.
- 6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The questions tonight
- 7 weren't addressed you're saying?
- 8 MR. SILHA: No, the questions from a
- 9 month ago which were raised at the end of the
- 10 meeting but then not addressed at the last meeting
- 11 because it was also midnight by the time we were
- 12 wrapping up. So we never got answers to those
- 13 questions.
- 14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Well, actually
- 15 the way this works is that the questions are taken
- 16 under advisement by the Commissioners and the
- 17 Commissioners if they feel are legitimate questions
- 18 should ask those questions.
- But we'll review with our Village

- 20 staff to see if they have a record of what some of
- 21 those questions were and maybe the Commissioners
- 22 will be asking more questions when we close the
- 23 floor. Unfortunately, it gets pretty late.
- 24 MR. SILHA: I agree. Of particular

- 1 interest to me was the impact on real estate values
- 2 which has yet to be addressed.
- 3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Impact on what kind of
- 4 values?
- 5 MR. SILHA: Real estate values.
- 6 Residential real estate.
- 7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That's financial
- 8 impact, though. You know, see, that's the thing is
- 9 we like to keep some questions current with the
- 10 topic that we're discussing.
- 11 I think maybe you missed some of

- 12 the first meetings but we're trying to address
- 13 specific topics at each meeting and then address
- 14 questions regarding those topics.
- So traffic seems to be the big
- 16 thing today. Also, some of the changes that have
- 17 been made in the outlots and the development
- 18 standards. So I think that's a fiscal impact.
- MR. SILHA: I understand at the last
- 20 meeting, however, Mr. Francke listed an increase in
- 21 real estate values as one of the benefits to a
- 22 resident of Gurnee which I ask that he elaborate on
- 23 how exactly he determined that there would be an
- 24 increase in values and not a decrease.

- 1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I still --
- 2 that's a better question to be answered in the
- 3 fiscal impact presentation which I think they're

- 4 going to be making probably at the next meeting.
- 5 MR. SILHA: Thank you.
- 6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.
- 7 MR. LAKE: Fred Lake, 6104 Indian Trail.
- 8 I will limit my comments to Mr. Grieve's traffic
- 9 that you requested.
- Just a couple of comments. It
- 11 seems like everyone whether they're for or against
- 12 the development agree that if it did happen the
- 13 only way that really makes a lot of sense is an
- 14 interchange on Washington.
- The one thing that I don't think
- 16 was addressed was because of the nature of the
- 17 interchange not being a cloverleaf, getting on and
- 18 off of 94 entails traveling at least for a short
- 19 distance up and down Washington.
- 20 I'm wondering if that traffic
- 21 impact is taken into consideration in their study.
- 22 And will the four lanes handle that traffic back
- and forth getting on and off type of thing.
- 24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Just so I get a

1	clarification, you're talking about if the ramps
2	went in?
3	MR. LAKE: If a new, yes, interchange
4	off of Washington. Do you understand what I'm
5	saying?
6	In other words, that Grand Avenue
7	traffic flows quite well because it's a full
8	cloverleaf, you zip on and zip off. With the
9	interchange that they have you must go up and down
10	Washington to get back and forth to the ramp so to
11	speak.
12	And we're only talking about, you
13	know, on a smaller road than Grand Avenue
14	basically.
15	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think they discussed
16	that. I think they did consider that. I think
17	they said if the ramps went in there's certain

- 18 obviously, you know, it's going to create more
- 19 intersections. And we can cover that, but I think
- 20 they did analyze that.
- MR. LAKE: Another area was that I have
- 22 a question on -- is this Tri-State Parkway?
- 23 Although not discussed in detail at one point
- 24 evidently there was a discussion of having the road

- 1 go all the way through.
- 2 Mr. Grieve even proposed that that
- 3 would be a good idea. It is my understanding that
- 4 that was talked about at some time and the
- 5 businesses in the Tri-State Business Parkway said
- 6 we don't want a road going through here and that's
- 7 why they changed their proposal to say it would be,
- 8 you know, access only gated type of thing.
- 9 Certainly if the business people

10	don't want it there then the residents ought to be
11	able to say we don't want the entrance off of

- 12 Washington either. We don't need the traffic. And
- 13 the Plan Commission ought to take that into
- 14 consideration.
- 15 Another thing I've noticed that
- 16 both Mr. Grieve and the traffic consultant for
- 17 Prism have given us considerable information here
- 18 about traffic flows and A, B, C grades of traffic
- 19 and if we do this and we do that we'll have plenty
- 20 of road for the traffic.
- 21 I would submit to the Commission
- 22 that probably every road in Lake County had an
- 23 expert traffic person give some input when they did
- 24 something on it and I don't think there's anybody

229

1 in this room that drives around the country that

- 2 can't find in about 30 seconds a road that you
- 3 can't get through even though at one point in time
- 4 that traffic guy said it was going to work great.
- 5 I think we need those roads
- 6 improved and everybody knows that. But we need
- 7 them improved for what we have. And if we're going
- 8 to do this, let's make sure that they're going to
- 9 handle not only the traffic today and next year but
- 10 twenty years from now.
- One of my concerns because I live
- 12 in one of the neighborhoods there, you're not going
- 13 to be able to get out onto the major road. We
- 14 already have several intersections like Orchard
- 15 Valley Drive that comes out onto Hunt Club Road.
- 16 It's almost impossible to make a left-hand turn out
- 17 onto Hunt Club. There's not enough setback,
- 18 there's not visibility. You've got five lanes wide
- 19 of traffic that you have to turn.
- There's ten subdivisions up and
- 21 down Hunt Club Road. Are we going to have a
- 22 traffic light at every one of those subdivisions so
- 23 people can get in and out?
- 24 They're already proposing at least

I	two and possibly three more lights on Washington.
2	It's the only way people can get in and out of
3	their houses.
4	I wonder if the Commission is
5	considering this or if the County or the State or
6	Prism is possibly proposing to put all these lights
7	in so people can actually get in and out. I would
8	just like the Commission to think about that and
9	consider it. Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you. Yes, sir.
11	MR. DENZ: My name is Ron Denz and I'm
12	also from Indian Trail Road with a lot of people I
13	guess.
14	I have a question on the four lane
15	interchange. Apparently we're going to have all
16	northbound traffic you'll be able to access, exit

- 17 off that interchange to get to the water park; is
- 18 that correct?
- 19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, it's -- that
- 20 certainly seems like something everybody would like
- 21 to see. But the question is will the Tollway put
- 22 it in or not.
- MR. DENZ: If they put it in as part of
- 24 it, will that in effect -- will they be able to get

- 1 off and go into Great America at the same time?
- 2 And if that is the case then why
- 3 will we even have an exit at Grand Avenue
- 4 northbound. We will have all northbound traffic to
- 5 Great America getting off at Washington and that
- 6 makes it a major intersection.
- 7 Is that not right?
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, they're going to

- 9 have to put the improvements in like the gentleman
- 10 asked.
- MR. DENZ: Well, as it is right now,
- 12 Grand Avenue on a busy day, how far is the Tollway
- 13 blocked up when they're trying to get in? And they
- 14 have how many blocks to get in to Great America?
- 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: They'll have two exits
- 16 now. They can exit -- if they're going to Great
- 17 America they can exit at Washington or Grand.
- MR. DENZ: The point is you've got the
- 19 earliest exit is a problem. It's going to be a
- 20 problem. People will want to get off at the first
- 21 exit that they want to get off at.
- Are we going to have a note that
- 23 says you really don't want to get off this way, you
- 24 want to go off north because it's going to be a

- 1 little easier?
- 2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: There could be a sign
- 3 that would say that there's a second exit.
- 4 What's your question?
- 5 MR. DENZ: My question is does this make
- 6 sense to have an exit there for both Great America
- 7 unless they're going to make that a major entrance
- 8 on Washington for Great America also.
- 9 Are they going to change the
- 10 entrance for Great America on Washington?
- 11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think we can ask the
- 12 Petitioner that. I think that was addressed at the
- 13 last meeting, but we'll ask the Petitioner to
- 14 address that. Thank you.
- 15 Anyone else?
- 16 (No response.)
- 17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. The floor is
- 18 closed to the public. Why don't we start with that
- 19 question.
- I think there was some discussion
- 21 about making basically -- I don't know that it
- 22 would be the main entrance but it would be

- 23 certainly a larger entrance if the ramps went in.
- MR. DENZ: Do we have an answer?

1	CHAIRMAN RUL	ONY: Mr.	Foerster,	did you

- 2 have a --
- 3 MR. FOERSTER: I was waiting to see if
- 4 one of these gentleman was going to answer it
- 5 first. I can give you a very simple answer,
- 6 though, if he can't.
- 7 MR. MILLER: For the record, my name is
- 8 Dave Miller from Metro Transportation Group.
- 9 It's my understanding that that
- 10 would not be the major entrance off of Washington,
- 11 that Grand Avenue is still going to be the major
- 12 entrance.
- 13 It will provide the flexibility to
- have a second drive from the south to be able to go

- 15 into the Great America from the south. And then
- 16 returning they would come over and then be able to
- 17 use the ramps to the south. Maybe if I could very
- 18 quickly, I know the hour is late but I'd like to
- 19 clarify a few of the questions that were brought
- 20 up.
- One -- in no particular order, but
- 22 one of the last questions was regarding if the
- 23 interchange goes in will Washington be four lanes.
- 24 And I believe that I had mentioned the last time if

- 1 in fact the interchange goes in, in the immediate
- 2 vicinity of the interchange basically from the east
- 3 of the highway where this signal is over to the
- 4 other ramps west of the highway we have anticipated
- 5 that would need to be a six lane section to handle
- 6 the additional traffic primarily in the interchange

7	area.
8	It would then go to a four lane
9	west of that point and go back to a four lane
10	facility east of that point. But within that
11	immediate interchange area it would need to be six
12	lanes.
13	I'd like to just quickly clarify
14	again some of these issues that were brought up
15	relative to timing and some of these roadway
16	improvements.
17	Again, just clarifying because I
18	think there was a question about Hunt Club. I
19	believe last time I said Hunt Club from Washington
20	south to 120 is programmed to start next year with
21	the Lake County, the design has all been done and
22	they are supposed to be starting that improvement
23	of going to a full five lane section from

24 Washington south to 120.

- 1 On Milwaukee Avenue, which Mr.
- 2 Grieve talked about it, it is -- from the section
- 3 of Washington to just north of 120 it is programmed
- 4 in the next five years within the fiscal year 1998
- 5 to the year 2001.
- 6 They have allocated ten million
- 7 dollars to do what they call Phase II engineering
- 8 and utility adjustments. It's not actually the
- 9 construction but it's getting everything in
- 10 preparation for that. It's about 1.6 miles and
- 11 would include additional lanes, pavement
- 12 reconstruction, and bridge widening on Washington.
- 13 And on Washington itself I think
- 14 it's important to note the County has no plans for
- 15 that widening of that road. If this project was
- 16 not going in there is nothing in any kind of a
- 17 timetable that is -- that would be addressing the
- 18 widening of that road even though it needs to go to
- 19 four lanes right now.
- And it's also my understanding that
- 21 as part of the original PUD for the entire business

- 22 park that the section that we're talking about, if
- 23 that were built out as it was originally planned
- 24 out that there was not included any widening of

- 1 Washington. It was really just some intersection
- 2 improvements right immediately at their drive.
- 3 So I think that's important to note
- 4 that even though the traffic that we're generating
- 5 is comparable to what it would have been if it got
- 6 built out even at today's FAR and uses, much less
- 7 than what it could be built if it was built out at
- 8 the max is that what we're proposing is an
- 9 upgrading of Washington whereas before as a part of
- 10 that original improvement it did not include any
- 11 upgrading of Washington.
- Regarding the Tollway and the
- 13 interchange. I've had again some recent

- 14 discussions this week with the Tollway. And the
- 15 status is in October or November they're analyzing
- 16 I believe it's either 26 or 27 interchanges
- 17 throughout the whole metropolitan area of which
- 18 Washington is one of those.
- They have all the information that
- 20 we've provided. They do not need any more
- 21 technical information at this stage. They are
- 22 evaluating that along with the other interchanges
- and they've told me that in December of this year
- 24 they do plan to then make their recommendations

- 1 for the five year plan, their five year plan.
- 2 And in that they will identify
- 3 which interchanges and roadway segments of the
- 4 Tollway would be upgraded. So sometime in
- 5 December of this year we should know where we stand

6	with that interchange.
7	One positive regarding the
8	potential for the interchange is originally when
9	they've taken this concept that we developed, they
10	said they've enhanced it, they're working on I
11	have not seen what that enhancement is, but it's
12	still basically this concept that we've shown here.
13	But originally they were thinking
14	that with this interchange design they would also
15	have to add what they call collector distributor
16	roads. Essentially additional lanes on the Tollway
17	between Washington and Grand Avenue for some of the
18	additional weave maneuvers of traffic that would be
19	utilizing this interchange between Washington and
20	Grand Avenue. Originally they were thinking that
21	that would all have to happen at the same time.
22	The cost of that then would actually
23	be a detriment in trying to get this interchange.

24 My discussions with them as late as a few days ago

- 1 is they were -- the Tollway is now looking at
- 2 separating that, that they could conceivably build
- 3 this interchange at Washington and do the collector
- 4 distributor roads between Washington and Grand as a
- 5 second phase.
- 6 If in fact they do break those out
- 7 that way I think that enhances the potential for
- 8 that interchange because the cost then as a total
- 9 package would be much less.
- 10 I think it's been mentioned before,
- 11 one of the reasons the Tollway is very interested
- 12 in Washington is as a reliever of Grand Avenue.
- 13 Grand Avenue is seriously overloaded right now.
- 14 Some of the original estimates that the Tollway has
- 15 looked, it would be a major interchange improvement
- 16 of the cost of that would be substantially greater
- 17 than what could happen at Washington.
- So I believe they're looking at
- 19 Washington as a possibility of buying them some

- 20 more time before they would have to do some
- 21 additional improvements at Grand Avenue.
- Some of the other points I think
- 23 that it's important to note. In terms of traffic
- 24 generation for the site, while we have and I think

- 1 Bill mentioned that, we've taken really what I
- 2 consider a worst case, a very conservative
- 3 approach in terms of the traffic generations.
- 4 As an example, we've assumed the
- 5 traffic from the water park all year long.
- 6 Somebody mentioned about what if it's an ice
- 7 skating rink or something during the winter.
- 8 Effectively we've analyzed this as
- 9 an all year facility. In reality the water park
- 10 itself will probably only be open 90 to 100 days.
- And so we think that we have built

- 12 in a lot of that -- those points. In terms of the
- 13 capacities of these intersections. Other than the
- 14 intersection of Hunt Club and Grand Avenue, which
- 15 is a problem right now, all of the other
- 16 intersections with the improvements that we've
- 17 identified would be operating in the Level C or
- 18 better.
- 19 So that gives you some growth room.
- 20 And this is looking at the year 2002 which is four
- 21 or five years down the road. We've also with Bill
- 22 Grieve's input looked even beyond that to the year
- 23 2010. So we have already taken into account some
- 24 of our analyses not just to this development but

- 1 other growth that could occur over a period of
- 2 time.
- 3 I'd like to address quickly two

- 4 other issues that Bill brought up. One was
- 5 regarding the potential use of Milwaukee between
- 6 120 and Washington to come into the site as
- 7 additional flexibility.
- 8 If the State does in fact widen
- 9 that road and so there is that additional capacity
- 10 and some of these other improvements are done I
- 11 think having that as another route to get to the
- 12 site is useful.
- 13 It would be our concern that we
- 14 would not want to overload Milwaukee and then
- 15 Milwaukee Washington intersection. But if there is
- 16 multiple ways to come to and from the site we think
- 17 that that would be a positive. Even though they've
- 18 programmed that, in their five year plan the actual
- 19 construction of Milwaukee in that area has not
- 20 been defined. They've identified the engineering
- and some of the other things.
- I guess the biggest issue I'd like
- 23 to address which has been covered was this
- 24 potential extension of the Tri-State Parkway

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD.

1	hetween	Grand	Avenue	and	Washington
1	between	Grand	Avenue	anu	w asimplion

- We have some very serious
- 3 concerns about that. When we first got involved in
- 4 this project I believe over two years ago we had a
- 5 meeting with Village staff, Bud Reed. And at that
- 6 time we were looking at taking this traffic from
- 7 the site and bringing it all to Grand Avenue both
- 8 from the north and from the south.
- 9 And it was expressed to us, and I
- 10 think rightly so, that they had very serious
- 11 concerns about this weave maneuver if you're
- 12 coming from the north getting off of the Tri-State
- 13 heading west on Grand Avenue and in a very short
- 14 distance trying to cross three lanes of traffic,
- 15 the speed limit is 45 miles an hour, trying to get
- 16 into that left turn lane to go south on Tri-State
- 17 Parkway.
- He expressed that concern. We took

- 19 that concern to heart. In fact, that was one of
- 20 the reasons that led us to start looking at a more
- 21 regional approach, how can we minimize that
- 22 maneuver and effectively still handle the traffic.
- So we've got a concern from a
- 24 safety standpoint that if we open that road up that

- 1 that could be a problem, a safety problem not only
- 2 for traffic that would be generated for this site
- 3 but if in fact the development south of Washington
- 4 generates even more traffic it could be compounding
- 5 that problem even more so.
- 6 Tri-State Parkway was designed as
- 7 an industrial parkway. It wasn't designed as an
- 8 arterial road to be carrying a substantial amount
- 9 of traffic to and from that. Having said that,
- 10 though, we are open to the possibility of reserving

- 11 that right-of-way.
- 12 If the Village at some point deems
- 13 it necessary that that has to be a through street
- 14 we would reserve that right-of-way.
- But we wanted to express our
- 16 serious concerns with the safety, especially as it
- 17 relates to that weave maneuver and the substantial
- 18 amount of traffic not only from the site but also
- 19 for this development south of Washington that might
- 20 be on that roadway.
- I think that's all the points I
- 22 wanted to cover. Hal, did you have anything? Is
- 23 there any questions regarding that?
- MR. FRANCKE: Are there any questions

- 1 for Dave before --
- 2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Are there any other

- 3 questions?
- 4 MS. KOVARIK: Yeah, I'm sorry.
- 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yes. Ms. Kovarik.
- 6 MS. KOVARIK: Does the Tollway own the
- 7 land for that interchange or will they have to go
- 8 through the process?
- 9 MR. MILLER: They do not own that land.
- 10 There's one issue, though, and I think that I
- 11 mentioned this last time, that the Tollway would be
- 12 open that if it worked out with this interchange as
- 13 is shown here they would eliminate the two ramps at
- 14 Milwaukee and they've always talked about
- 15 eliminating those ramps.
- The Tollway does own this
- 17 right-of-way within those existing ramps. And
- 18 they've explored whether that's feasible or not of
- 19 doing possibly some land swapping.
- 20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, thank you.
- MR. MILLER: And so that if in fact that
- became feasible or made it more feasible to be able
- 23 to cover some of this right-of-way they would be
- 24 open to that. But they do not own the land

244

1	specifically in the vicinity of this interchange.
2	MS. KOVARIK: And just roughly how long
3	does a taking process usually take?
4	MR. MILLER: Obviously if the land can
5	be dealt with without having to go through
6	condemnation or legal maneuvers it can be done very
7	quickly.
8	If's it got to go through a legal
9	process, condemnation, quick take and things such
10	as that, it could be several years or more
11	depending on the legal process
12	MR. FRANCKE: But the Tollway Authority
13	has quick take authority so they can take the land

and fight over the value at a later date. So the

MS. KOVARIK: Okay. All right. That's

14

15

16

answer is quickly.

- 17 kind of what I didn't know that. Thank you.
- 18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do you have any
- 19 questions? Mr. Sula --
- 20 MR. SULA: I don't know if it's a
- 21 question or a comment.
- 22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Cepon.
- MR. CEPON: When you had the Blue
- 24 Ribbon Committee, this is for Mr. Francke, I'm

- 1 sorry, when you had the Blue Ribbon Committee or
- 2 they got through all that, Jim I think was on it;
- 3 weren't you?
- 4 MR. SULA: Yes, I was.
- 5 MR. CEPON: And wasn't one of the
- 6 recommendations or one of the things that was said
- 7 that nothing ever -- nobody agreed with this unless
- 8 all these changes were in place?

- 9 MR. FRANCKE: Which changes are you
- 10 referring to?
- MR. CEPON: Like the interchange on the
- 12 Tollway.
- 13 MR. FRANCKE: No.
- MR. CEPON: The Hunt Club Road.
- MR. FRANCKE: I don't believe so. Go
- 16 ahead.
- MR. SULA: Let me try to clarify
- 18 something here. When the Blue Ribbon Committee was
- 19 meeting there was another aspect of the project
- 20 that has seemingly disappeared and that is the
- 21 convention center/events center, the thing that was
- supposed to hold 12,000 plus people.
- That was the one that was really
- 24 bringing in the incredibly excessive amounts of

- 1 traffic at peak times. But the recommendation from
- 2 the Blue Ribbon Committee was with that in the
- 3 background, we thought and universal opinion was
- 4 that we would like the Washington Avenue or
- 5 Washington Street I should say interchange built at
- 6 Phase I in anticipation of Phase II.
- 7 If you put the new dynamics in
- 8 front of the Blue Ribbon Committee I'm not sure
- 9 that's what they would say today.
- MR. CEPON: You've cleared it up.
- 11 MR. FRANCKE: I think the driving force
- 12 behind the interchange that everybody said would
- 13 necessitate for sure the interchange was the events
- 14 center which as you know has been eliminated from
- 15 the proposal.
- And I don't think I want to clarify
- 17 that. I think we're all in agreement. We would
- 18 like to see the interchange in right away, too. I
- 19 think a number of the Members of the Commission
- 20 have expressed an interest in seeing it go in right
- 21 away.
- In terms of the Tri-State extension
- 23 we don't think it's necessarily the safest thing to

1	Avenue.	But we	are on th	e same	page as the	Village

- 2 in wanting to get our future visitors into the
- village as quickly and easily and conveniently as
- possibly.
- 5 We're not on a different page than
- everybody in that regard. But we think again just
- in terms of the Tri-State connection we know that
- the business owners of the Tri-State Park as was
- indicated are not in favor of it. We're not in
- 10 favor or it and we don't think that it's going to
- 11 be the safest thing as Dave indicated.
- 12 We were told two years ago that and
- 13 I think if you go back to some of the original
- 14 public hearing testimony when initially, you know,
- four months ago when John Rogers first appeared 15

- 16 before you he talked about the requests for
- 17 proposals, the RFP and the whole thrust of
- 18 addressing the problems on Grand Avenue and trying
- 19 to alleviate existing deficiencies and problems
- with Grand Avenue.
- We believe that what was discussed
- 22 this evening with respect to the continuation of
- 23 Tri-State would be contrary to that. We think it
- 24 would fly in the face of trying to make things

- 1 better for Grand Avenue.
- 2 But as Dave said, having said that
- 3 we have no problem reserving in our plan the
- 4 right-of-way that's necessary and leaving that
- 5 decision for the Village to make at a later date.
- 6 We don't have any problem with that.
- 7 I want to -- again, I know it's

- 8 late also. I also know I think that we still have
- 9 a little bit to go before we become the Mark
- 10 McGwires and Sammy Sosas as of late night Plan
- 11 Commission meetings. I think it's a little bit.
- 12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It's about -- if you
- want to press that.
- MR. SULA: Before we get too far away
- 15 from it.
- MR. FRANCKE: I'm not looking for the
- 17 record, but I want to clarify a couple -- in
- 18 response to a couple of the comments that were made
- 19 by the residents.
- MR. SULA: Can I interrupt for a second
- 21 before we get too far away from Mr. Miller's
- 22 presentation. I do have one follow-up question.
- In your assumption that the
- 24 interchange at Washington would be less expensive

- 1 than doing improvements at Grand my understanding
- 2 is that the existing bridge decking will handle
- 3 four lanes of traffic and a bike path or six lanes
- 4 of traffic but not a bike path?
- 5 MR. MILLER: No.
- 6 MR. SULA: How does that scenario fit in?
- 7 MR. MILLER: The existing bridge on
- 8 Washington can handle four lanes plus a narrow bike
- 9 path if it goes to the six lanes.
- We talked about in this area you
- 11 blow out the whole bridge. You have to. Not only
- 12 would you be having to widen the bridge from the
- 13 Tri-State but there just isn't enough width so the
- 14 Toll bridge here would have to be totally redone.
- 15 There's no way that you can get six lanes in there.
- MR. SULA: Okay. Thank you.
- 17 MR. FRANCKE: Again, in terms of
- 18 concluding for this evening and again we would be
- 19 happy to answer in writing any additional questions
- 20 that the Commission feels or the residents feel
- 21 haven't been answered.

- We feel we've answered all of them,
- 23 but I want to go back again to some of the earlier
- 24 testimony because you heard again this evening

- 1 about the regional need and the regional
- 2 opportunity for what we're proposing not from us
- 3 but from somebody else appeared before you from the
- 4 Lake County Convention and Visitors Bureau.
- 5 We indicated in prior meetings that
- 6 one of the components, one of the objectives of the
- 7 Comprehensive Plan is to achieve the opportunities
- 8 that are of a regional nature, to take advantage of
- 9 them when they are presented.
- We have provided you with
- 11 information that indicates those opportunities are
- 12 available today to the Village of Gurnee and to the
- 13 region in general and that others are looking at

- 14 grabbing those opportunities.
- So again we want to encourage you
- 16 to look at that aspect of the Comprehensive Plan.
- 17 We believe that what we are proposing especially
- 18 our proposal as we've modified it as of today
- 19 furthers that goal.
- Again, looking back at the original
- 21 public hearings we have tried to present a proposal
- 22 that achieves one of the Village Board's original
- 23 directions which was to accomplish relief to the
- 24 existing conditions on Grand Avenue.

- 1 We have repeatedly said and we've
- 2 tried to emphasize that it's a positive. And I'm a
- 3 little concerned that this is perceived as a
- 4 negative, but we've tried to emphasize time and
- 5 time again that we are making improvements on what

6	the existing zoning is, not in the context of what
7	you heard in the prior public hearing.
8	But in the true sense of the word
9	that we are providing right now setbacks,
10	limitations on floor area limitations, limitations
11	on height, improvements to the Washington Avenue
12	that these aren't it's not the same as the last
13	hearing where you heard a piece of property was
14	zoned for 20 years and so what.
15	This is a parcel that just a little
16	over ten years ago had these bulk regulations
17	established and before I was, you know, making some
18	light of the fact that the heliport was in our list
19	of special uses. But again, it's important to note
20	that is on the existing zoning.
21	All of those uses that the
22	representative of Tri-State Realty made reference
23	to earlier, any one of these uses could walk into
24	the Village today and apply for a special use for a

252

1 heliport for their facility. It is in the existing

- 2 zoning.
- 3 I can tell you honestly without
- 4 even talking to the representative of Six Flags or
- 5 Prism as I indicated to you before, it's not a big
- 6 issue for us. We would like to keep that in there
- 7 for as long as the industrial uses that are on
- 8 Phase I of the industrial park are part of our
- 9 permitted uses.
- We've already indicated to staff
- 11 that once the alternate uses that we're providing
- 12 for are sustained we have no problem providing that
- 13 all those uses are eliminated -- become eliminated
- 14 from the PUD as permitted uses.
- In other words, once the nature and
- 16 the character of the planned unit development are
- 17 established as we contemplate we have no problem
- 18 eliminating the industrial uses that at this point
- 19 we're reserving and the special uses that we're
- 20 reserving. But again, that is in the existing

- 21 zoning today.
- We weren't trying to sneak anything
- 23 in the way it was implied. We're not trying to
- 24 play let's make a deal and apologize. If I wasn't

- 1 clear on the number of hotel rooms, we have
- 2 provided very clearly in our development standards
- 3 for a maximum of 900 motel rooms.
- 4 We have made reference to a
- 5 regional conference hotel with 400 rooms. We've
- 6 made reference to two other hotels of 150 rooms
- 7 here and we've referred to -- we've made reference
- 8 to the probability of a fourth hotel on the outlot.
- 9 We did not talk about a six story
- 10 hotel on the outlot. We talked about a height that
- 11 would not exceed 45 feet on that one outlot. And
- 12 that again is in excess of, you know, a hundred

- 13 feet back from the right-of-way.
- 14 I think that we are eager again to
- 15 deal with the fiscal impact issues as the Chairman
- 16 made reference to at the next meeting. If there
- 17 are any civil engineering issues we would be happy
- 18 to address those at the next meeting.
- But again, we feel we have answered
- 20 all your questions. We feel this project provides
- 21 a very unique opportunity for the Village and we
- are eager to move forward at this time with your
- 23 thoughts, your final thoughts as I say on the
- 24 development standards which we hope we can conclude

- 1 at the next meeting and move forward at that point.
- 2 Thank you very much.
- 3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think we definitely
- 4 would like to hear the fiscal impact on this

- 5 project and also I think we need to give our staff
- 6 a chance to go over the development standards.
- 7 I think we've had some input
- 8 tonight that we might take a look at. I think by
- 9 the next meeting we should have worked with our
- 10 staff and addressing any other concerns and I think
- 11 there would be an opportunity for the Commissioners
- 12 to review those standards more closely.
- Maybe if there's a revised draft in
- 14 the meantime we'll get that to the Commissioners as
- soon as possible so that it could be reviewed and
- 16 discussed at the next meeting.
- 17 So with that in mind I'll entertain
- 18 a motion to continue this to what date? What's
- 19 the next date that -- now is the 7th -- so the next
- 20 would be the 14th then, correct?
- MS. VELKOVER: No, 21st.
- 22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Oh, it's two weeks.
- 23 That's right, the 21st. So is the 21st okay?
- MR. FRANCKE: Well, I can tell you again

255

1 without even consulting with my client that that's

- 2 not what we expected to hear.
- First of all, you know, we were
- 4 surprised, we thought we were the only item on the
- 5 agenda this evening which obviously we weren't. We
- 6 had talked about the possibility of perhaps having
- 7 a special meeting with you on the 30th so that we
- 8 could wrap this up.
- 9 We were told recently that that
- 10 can't happen because I guess you're having another
- 11 meeting, a special meeting already for a different
- 12 purpose. So we were hoping that we could appear
- 13 before you then on October 7th. I think, you know,
- 14 personally that the, you know, project we've been
- 15 appearing before you since June and I think that
- 16 we're close now to wrapping up everything.
- 17 And, you know, I would like to
- 18 think that we could meet sooner than another month

- 19 from now.
- 20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'll leave it up to the
- 21 Commissioners, but I know our schedule has been
- 22 pretty heavy.
- MR. FRANCKE: I can tell you we will
- 24 have the revised development standards to you by

- 1 the end of this week.
- 2 MR. WINTER: What do we have on the 7th?
- 3 I mean do we just have the thing we just continued
- 4 to the 7th?
- 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yeah, right.
- 6 MS. VELKOVER: We'll probably have
- 7 another double final PUD.
- 8 MR. WINTER: But those don't take very
- 9 long, right? We just approve them, right?
- MR. SULA: The 7th isn't going to work

- 11 out for me very well.
- 12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So we have the
- 13 continued hearing that we had earlier tonight so
- 14 that could be another long night if we made it the
- 15 7th.
- But I'll leave it up to you guys.
- 17 If you want to make it the --
- MR. SULA: The 7th doesn't work with me
- 19 at all.
- MR. WINTER: What about the 30th again?
- MS. VELKOVER: We have a joint meeting
- 22 of the Zoning Board of Appeals to discuss the
- 23 update of our Zoning Ordinance. That's the meeting
- 24 that we set.

- 1 MR. WINTER: How long do you think
- 2 that's going to be? An hour?

- 3 MS. VELKOVER: That's going to last a
- 4 good portion of the evening easily.
- 5 MR. FRANCKE: I mean --
- 6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I mean in all honesty
- 7 what about the 14th? It's just an extra week.
- 8 MR. SULA: What about a week from
- 9 tonight?
- 10 MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned
- about the notion that we'll be wrapping it up
- 12 because I just feel like there's so many unknowns
- 13 concerning the traffic.
- I'm concerned that I don't want to
- 15 give the impression that our consent to any meeting
- 16 date means that this will be wrapped up.
- 17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't think that
- 18 entertains that.
- MR. FOSTER: Well, with us trying to
- 20 schedule a date it seems like we're going in that
- 21 direction.
- So I just want to convey to whoever
- 23 that, you know, I'm not looking at any wrapup and I
- 24 have not gotten a traffic study from the Village.

	1	And I	think	that a	week	or two	is	still	too	many	1
--	---	-------	-------	--------	------	--------	----	-------	-----	------	---

- 2 unknowns at this point.
- 3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I don't think
- 4 that that's an indication just because we would
- 5 have a special meeting the point would be is that
- 6 we may need another meeting and then we could make
- 7 that the 21st.
- 8 MR. FOSTER: My point is that we were
- 9 asking for our traffic consultant to get a study to
- 10 us. So I'm saying by whenever we meet again I
- 11 would like to have that study in my hand.
- So if that's going to be in two
- 13 weeks I would also like to have that study in two
- 14 weeks.
- 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'd also like to have
- 16 that, too.
- MS. VELKOVER: The October 7th meeting

- 18 is three weeks away. If you're looking at after
- 19 there it's clearly more than two weeks so.
- MR. WINTER: How about the 14th and have
- 21 this as the only item on the special meeting for
- 22 the 14th.
- 23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is that acceptable?
- MR. SULA: That works for me.

- 1 MS. KOVARIK: The 14th added meeting.
- 2 MR. FOSTER: What dates do we have
- 3 meetings then so I'll note my calendar.
- 4 MS. VELKOVER: The 7th and the 30th.
- 5 MR. FOSTER: Somebody said something
- 6 about the 30th, the 7th, and the 14th.
- 7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And then we still have
- 8 a meeting on the 21st, too.
- 9 MR. WILDENBERG: We also have a public

- 10 hearing on the 28th for the overlay district.
- MR. FOSTER: That's what I'm trying to
- 12 find out before we schedule the meeting.
- 13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Look, if you don't want
- 14 to have the meeting, if you want it -- there's no
- obligation to have the meeting on that date.
- 16 If you don't feel inclined to do it
- 17 then let's have that on the regular scheduled
- 18 meeting.
- MR. WINTER: I really think that it
- 20 would be beneficial to have this as the only item
- 21 on the meeting -- on a meeting night.
- I think it's helpful for the public
- 23 that they know that they can come, they can tell
- 24 their neighbors. And I would also say this, I've

- 2 I'm not saying that we would vote
- 3 on the 14th but I certainly could articulate the
- 4 problems that I have with it at that point and say,
- 5 you know, can you come back or do you want us to
- 6 vote on it now or something.
- 7 But I think if we designate it a
- 8 day that this is the only thing we're going to talk
- 9 about, the public knows that something might happen
- 10 that day that they're going to get, you know, not
- 11 10:30 before they can say something.
- 12 I think that's really important.
- 13 And so I would encourage having the special meeting
- 14 that this is the only item on the agenda and maybe
- 15 we start at 7:00 even and we make sure that we open
- 16 it up to the public earlier than what we have been
- 17 lately.
- 18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't have a problem
- 19 with it. Why don't you make a motion.
- MR. WINTER: I'll make a motion that we
- 21 have a special meeting on the 14th. This is the
- 22 only item.
- 23 MR. SULA: Second.

1	o'clock?
2	MR. WINTER: Yeah, 7 o'clock. Why don't
3	we do it at 7 because
4	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, that's first
5	of all, do we have a second?
6	MR. SULA: I seconded.
7	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Let's discuss it as to
8	7 o'clock. Is the motion, is that acceptable to
9	everyone?
10	MR. SMITH: They're normally 7:30.
11	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Are you the only one
12	objecting? I mean it's a special heating so you
13	can call it at 7:00. What's the difference?
14	I guess I agree with Bryan, I think
15	we need to not have people, you know, here at

- 16 get up here at 11 o'clock at night to speak. It's
- 17 unfair to the public. So let's vote on the motion.
- We have a motion and second to
- 19 continue this to October 14th here at the Village
- 20 Hall at 7:00. All those in favor of the motion
- 21 signify by saying aye in the roll call; those
- 22 opposed nay. Roll call, please.
- MS. VELKOVER: Winter.
- MR. WINTER: Aye.

- 1 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.
- 2 MR. FOSTER: Aye.
- 3 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.
- 4 MR. SMITH: Aye.
- 5 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.
- 6 MR. SULA: Aye.
- 7 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.

8	MS. KOVARIK: Aye.
9	MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.
10	MR. CEPON: Aye.
11	MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.
12	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries
13	and it is so ordered.
14	Motion to adjourn.
15	MR. SULA: So moved.
16	MR. CEPON: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All those in favor say
18	aye.
19	("Aye" responses.)
20	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Opposed, nay.
21	(No response.)
22	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Meeting adjourned.
23	(The meeting adjourned at 12:40 a.m.)
24	

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 Notary Public, Lake County, IL CSR License No. 084-003104