

VILLAGE OF GURNEE

PLAN COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING

held

SEPTEMBER 2, 1998

7:30 PM

GURNEE MUNICIPAL BUILDING

325 North O'Plaine Road

Gurnee, Illinois

1 PLAN COMMISSION:

2

3 DONALD RUDNY, Chairman

4 JIM SULA

5 BILL SMITH

6 LYLE FOSTER

7 KRISTINA KOVARIK

8 CARL CEPON

9

10 ALSO PRESENT:

11

12 JON WILDENBERG

13 TRACY VELKOVER

14 BARBARA SWANSON

15 BUTCH MAIDEN

16

17

18

19

20

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

22 CSR License No. 084-003104

23

24

2 Plan Commission meeting will now come to order.

3 Can we have roll call, please.

4 MS. VELKOVER: Winter. Absent.

5 Foster. Absent.

6 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.

7 MR. SMITH: Here.

8 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.

9 MR. CEPON: Here.

10 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.

11 MS. KOVARIK: Here.

12 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.

13 MR. SULA: Here.

14 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Here. Please all join  
16 me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

17 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: First we have the  
19 approval of the August 5th, 1998 Plan Commission  
20 minutes. I know they were pretty long, I don't  
21 know if everyone has had a chance to review them.

22 Are there any additions or  
23 corrections? If not, I'll entertain a motion to  
24 accept them as presented.

4

1 MR. SULA: So moved.

2 MR. SMITH: I'll second.

3                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I have a motion by --  
4           is it Mr. Cepon -- Mr. Sula, and second by Mr.  
5           Smith. Is that right?

6                   All those in favor of the motion  
7           signify by saying aye in the roll call; those  
8           opposed nay. Roll call, please.

9                   MS. VELKOVER: Smith.

10                  MR. SMITH: Aye.

11                  MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.

12                  MR. CEPON: Aye.

13                  MS. VELKOVER Kovarik.

14                  MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

15                  MS. VELKOVER: Sula.

16                  MR. SULA: Aye.

17                  MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.

18                  CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries  
19           and it is so ordered.

20                         Next is the continued public  
21           hearing, American Stores Properties, Inc. The  
22           subject property consists of approximately 75 acres  
23           located at the northwest corner of Route 120 and  
24           O'Plaine Road.

5

1                         The property is zoned S Suburban in  
2           unincorporated Lake County. The Petitioner is  
3           requesting annexation and rezoning to a planned

4 unit development PUD with underlying C/B-1  
5 neighborhood commercial and C/O-1 restricted office  
6 in the Village of Gurnee.

7 Tracy, do you have anything to add?

8 MS. VELKOVER: Just that at the last  
9 meeting the Plan Commission directed staff to  
10 determine the development possibilities for this  
11 parcel under the current County zoning  
12 classification which is Suburban.

13 The Village's Planning consultant,  
14 Butch Maiden, with the office of Rolf Campbell &  
15 Associates has taken a look at this matter and he  
16 will be giving his report on that this evening.

17 It's important to remember that the  
18 ability to develop this property in the County  
19 depends upon the availability to service the  
20 property with sewer and water.

21 We did -- staff did check into  
22 this. At this time the North Shore Sanitary  
23 District will not allow the tap in into the  
24 transmission main that runs along O'Plaine Road in

6

1 the right-of-way.

2 The City of Waukegan does have  
3 sewer and water lines on the south side of 120,  
4 Route 120. The developer could approach the City

5 of Waukegan about tapping into these lines.

6 Another option that the developer  
7 would have for servicing the property with sewer  
8 would be to run a line directly to the North Shore  
9 Sanitary District through the O'Plaine Road  
10 right-of-way.

11 The likelihood of any of these  
12 scenarios happening is difficult to determine of  
13 course. They relate to the cost of -- for the  
14 developer for running the improvements or putting  
15 in the improvements and also to the benefits to the  
16 City of Waukegan for allowing to tap into their  
17 sewer and water -- I'm sorry, sewer and water.

18 Having said that, I'll turn it over  
19 to our planning consultant Butch Maiden. He'll  
20 explain what could be built on the property under  
21 the current classification in the County which is  
22 Suburban zoning.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Hang on just a  
24 second. Okay. Butch, are you ready to proceed?

7

1 MR. MAIDEN: Yes, I've prepared a  
2 memorandum that went to Tracy dated August 27th.

3 It does discuss some of the  
4 concerns Tracy raised in regard to the ability for  
5 the site to obtain the necessary sewer and water

6 facilities that would be required to realize all of  
7 the range of uses that may be permitted in the  
8 Suburban District. They would have the option of  
9 doing a well and septic subdivision as an  
10 alternative.

11 I did go through the memorandum and  
12 did indicate the section from the County Zoning  
13 Ordinance on the Suburban District which does  
14 indicate that this district is designed to  
15 accommodate the growth for the next 20 years in the  
16 unincorporated areas.

17 It does list the public facilities  
18 that are necessary, sewer and water being two of  
19 those that are listed. It does note that if you  
20 could provide these facilities most uses are  
21 allowed by right so you do not need a special  
22 hearing to obtain those uses.

23 It does list general uses that can  
24 be permitted, it talks about that they must have a

8

1 suburban character and ranges from moderate density  
2 residential and compatible commercial,  
3 institutional or industrial uses.

4 We also went through the standards  
5 in regard to the range if it developed a hundred  
6 percent residential, if it developed a hundred

7 percent non-residential, or if there was the  
8 possibility of a mix of uses.

9 Our office has worked for  
10 applicants and processed plans through the County's  
11 Suburban system and we normally find that you do  
12 see a mix of uses; you normally don't see just one  
13 particular type of use.

14 To give you an example, though, on  
15 the residential classification the County does list  
16 12 different forms of residential uses that could  
17 occur and they range from conventional development  
18 single family to open space development single  
19 family, duplexes, townhome, multiple family  
20 buildings.

21 Depending on specific factors that  
22 you would have to meet you could have a range  
23 anywhere from perhaps 75 units if it was on well  
24 and septic just with single family homes to over

9

1 300 units if it was in some form of multiple family  
2 type development with substantial areas for open  
3 space.

4 In regard to the non-residential  
5 uses, we looked at the uses that are listed include  
6 retail sales and service uses including shopping  
7 centers, industrial uses including warehouses, and



8 other industrial uses having less than a half  
9 million square feet of total floor area.

10 There are factors in regard to  
11 floor area ratio and impervious surface ratio which  
12 help to limit the amount of development that may  
13 occur on the site.

14 The impervious surface ratio  
15 applies not only to the building but also whatever  
16 parking and access areas that may be required.  
17 From that standpoint there may be building area  
18 permitted but if you couldn't have enough parking  
19 you may not be permitted to have that use.

20 Generally this site would be  
21 permitted to have up to 625,000 square feet of  
22 building area provided you could make the parking  
23 and drive area work for that particular use. If  
24 we're looking at uses such as warehousing where the

10

1 parking demand isn't as high you probably could  
2 achieve that use or that intensity of use under the  
3 County zoning standards.

4 If you were looking at purely a  
5 retail use it would be rather questionable that you  
6 could get a 600,000 square foot retail center. It  
7 may be possible under the County's Ordinance to  
8 have anywhere from a 400 to 500 thousand square

9 foot center. Again, subject to making the parking  
10 work and subject to having the necessary utilities.

11 From a mixed use potential we did  
12 look at the range that may be possible in  
13 considering both residential and a non-residential  
14 use. One scenario that we looked at would be to  
15 have up to approximately 200 multiple family units  
16 and approximately 100,000 square foot retail  
17 center.

18 There would be substantial open  
19 space areas remaining on the site and this is only  
20 one example of a mixed use type project that could  
21 occur.

22 I do want to point out that there  
23 are potential changes in the County Zoning  
24 Ordinance that are currently under way. In fact,

11

1 tomorrow the County is having a meeting on their  
2 new unified development code. There is no Suburban  
3 classification in the draft of the new Ordinance  
4 but I'm not aware of what classification this  
5 property may be put into. But again, that's some  
6 time into the future. They haven't even held  
7 public hearings yet. But I did want to let the  
8 Plan Commission know it is subject to change.

9 Do you have any questions?

10                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any questions from the  
11 Commissioners?

12                                   (No response.)

13                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I think we can  
14 continue on then with the Petitioner's presentation  
15 tonight. And this is a public hearing so anyone  
16 with the Petitioner who is going to give testimony  
17 and also we will open the floor again to the public  
18 for comments and questions so anyone who plans on  
19 doing that for this hearing needs to stand now and  
20 be sworn in by the Village Attorney.

21                                   (Witnesses sworn.)

22                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Please proceed. If you  
23 can state your name and affiliation for the record  
24 we would appreciate that.

12

1                   MR. BROWN: Thank you, Chairman Rudny.  
2 My name is Robert Brown, Director of Real Estate  
3 for American Stores Properties, the division that  
4 handles real estate construction for Jewel-Osco in  
5 the Chicagoland area. This is our fourth hearing  
6 before the Plan Commission.

7                                   Many of the issues that have been  
8 raised through questions by the neighbors, the Plan  
9 Commissioners and also in the neighborhood meetings  
10 and other local input we have attempted to address

11 throughout this process.

12 We are now to the point where we  
13 are presenting what we believe to be the best plan  
14 that we conceivably can put together for this  
15 development given that Jewel and Osco do intend to  
16 develop a store, a retail store at this location if  
17 the Plan Commission and the Village Board so elects  
18 to approve the petition.

19 Obviously if our petition is not  
20 successful then the land owners would be free to  
21 pursue other alternatives and Mr. Maiden has  
22 pointed out some of those possibilities which are  
23 very, very numerous and very difficult to define.

24 I think the overall presentation

13

1 that we would like to leave with you this evening  
2 is that Jewel and Osco as a responsible developer  
3 and a leading food and drug retailer in the  
4 Chicagoland area intends to develop this property  
5 if permitted under Ordinance with a comprehensive  
6 cohesive plan that addresses as many of the  
7 operational, landscaping, architectural, land use,  
8 access, traffic and other issues that we possibly  
9 can to facilitate both this development and most  
10 important be a good neighbor in the community.

11 It goes without saying that our

12 existing store at Grand and Hunt Club is one of the  
13 most successful stores that we have in Lake County  
14 and indeed in the Chicagoland area. Everyone is  
15 familiar with our operation and we hope that we can  
16 be every bit as successful if in fact this  
17 development can proceed.

18                   The timetable we've discussed is  
19 not an imminent one. We need to proceed with  
20 closing on the property under our existing contract  
21 conditions and that process needs to go forward in  
22 the relatively near future; otherwise, the land  
23 owners are free to pursue any other development  
24 opportunity that they may wish and Jewel and Osco

14

1 will evaluate other alternatives.

2                   But at this point we are still  
3 committed to try to develop the best possible plan  
4 to attempt to address as many of those issues as I  
5 mentioned. And I think it can all be summarized  
6 and I will not belabor them because we all know  
7 what they are.

8                   The key issues that we have talked  
9 about before and our consultants have addressed the  
10 neighbors are concerned with are traffic.  
11 Obviously there's an existing condition on O'Plaine  
12 Road that does not meet existing ideal



14 as a very significant issue. We understand and  
15 appreciate the lifestyle and the architectural  
16 quality of Providence Oaks and Providence Village.  
17 We understand that the neighbors want any  
18 development here, be it Jewel-Osco or  
19 office/service or any other potential use, to be  
20 compatible.

21 We've heard that this location of  
22 this corner is the entrance to Gurnee from the  
23 south. We appreciate that. We've attempted to  
24 incorporate that desire and that requirement into

16

1 our development planning with some aesthetics and  
2 landscaping that our initial plans quite frankly  
3 did not acknowledge.

4 Also, the landscaping as I  
5 mentioned along the north end we continue to show a  
6 maximum buffer in my 25 years or so of real estate  
7 development with Jewel-Osco in Chicagoland there is  
8 no other project that I have been involved with  
9 where we have attempted to incorporate as great a  
10 landscaping buffer with residential neighbors than  
11 we have under the plan we're currently proposing  
12 before this Commission.

13 There's some operational issues  
14 that have been raised. Hours of delivery, noise,

15 lights, many issues that would be common and you  
16 would expect to be of concern to neighbors, be they  
17 residential or other commercial neighbors.

18 Jewel and Osco operate over 200  
19 stores in the Chicagoland and greater Midwest area.  
20 We deal with these operational issues every day.  
21 We're not perfect, our housekeeping standards are  
22 as high as they possibly can be; but we always  
23 endeavor to try to improve them and to address any  
24 of the specific issues that neighbors may be

17

1 concerned about.

2 Hours of delivery were raised at a  
3 previous meeting as one that may be of great  
4 concern since all delivery vehicles must access the  
5 site at Cornell Avenue which is reasonably close to  
6 the residential development to the north and across  
7 the street to the east of course.

8 We are willing to make some  
9 limitations to limit the hours of delivery if  
10 that's something that the Village and the community  
11 and the neighbors who are customers would expect,  
12 and reasonably so.

13 There are other issues. As I say,  
14 noise, lighting. We fully expect to and always  
15 have attempted to comply with all municipal and



16 state ordinances regarding noise, lighting, what  
17 have you. We will evidence to the Village and to  
18 any other municipal ordinance, any other municipal  
19 entities and the state that we are in compliance  
20 with all of those requirements.

21 So the bottom line is that we're  
22 not an unknown quantity. We are a food store. We  
23 attempt to serve the neighborhood. Our trading  
24 area that we've identified and projected for the

18

1 fiscal use study is a local trading area. It's  
2 within five to seven minutes' driving time for  
3 neighbors. We would not be embarking on this  
4 process or continuing before you if we didn't  
5 believe that this could be a successful commercial  
6 venture.

7 Comments have been made about the  
8 proximity to other stores. We fully believe that  
9 the location at this intersection is one that is  
10 compatible with our existing store network or other  
11 retail uses that may be traveling in this area.

12 The vast majority of our customers  
13 will come from the local area. They are already in  
14 many cases on the network of roadways that are  
15 presently in the vicinity on Route 120, O'Plaine  
16 Road, Washington. If they're not going to travel

17 to this location for any retail or commercial  
18 shopping use they will be traveling to some other  
19 area either within the community or outside.

20 So again we hope that we can  
21 persuade the Village and the neighbors that we will  
22 serve their needs and it will be a compatible use,  
23 not a use that would be in conflict with any other  
24 shopping needs.

19

1 Without belaboring it any further,  
2 I'd like to focus on the two issues that seem to be  
3 most paramount that we have been able to make  
4 changes on. We do have changes to the plan within  
5 the last four weeks or so since we last presented  
6 our proposal.

7 One is the land use issue. Which  
8 again Mr. Maiden has discussed and we would want to  
9 amplify with our consultant Les Pollach of Camiros.  
10 We also would like to present a new elevation from  
11 an architectural standpoint by Peter Theodore, the  
12 project architect of Ambrose & Theodore. And also  
13 some enhancement to the landscaping.

14 The basic plan has not changed from  
15 the last proposal. We're still attempting to  
16 insulate and isolate the retail development as far  
17 away as possible from the residential to the north

18 with the access wholly captive to O'Plaine Road.

19                               Mr. Rosenquist's property or the  
20 balance of the development which would be  
21 office/service would continue to be a lower density  
22 use of the type that would be consistent with Lake  
23 County zoning as well as we believe your  
24 comprehensive plan.

20

1                               So we're looking for approval to  
2 proceed with this mixed use development. And at  
3 this point I would like to turn it over to Peter  
4 Theodore to discuss the architecture who in turn  
5 then will ask Ben Bussman our landscape architect  
6 to spend a minute or two to talk about some of the  
7 landscaping enhancements that we've made.

8                               At that point we'll ask Les Pollach  
9 from Camiros to amplify on the land use and then  
10 we're available for questions. We have our traffic  
11 engineers, our traffic consultants, our land use  
12 engineers and others available who can answer  
13 specific questions posed by the Board or by the  
14 neighbors and at that point we would open it up for  
15 comments or questions. Thank you.

16                               MR. THEODORE: Good evening. My name  
17 is Peter Theodore, principal architect at the firm  
18 of Ambrose & Theodore.

19 I think it was made pretty evident  
20 to me after my last presentation that the elevation  
21 that we were proposing was not compatible with the  
22 adjacent property owners or the flavor that the  
23 Plan Commission was seeking.

24 And following Mr. Sula's request as

21

1 well as the Plan Commissioners and the residents we  
2 essentially scrapped our design and really borrowed  
3 from a page out of Providence Village.

4 I won't use the word pallet because  
5 I realize that that word is no longer in flavor  
6 with this design, but I would say contexturally  
7 that these materials can be found through the  
8 Providence Village and that what I've tried to do  
9 is take those elements and apply certain elements  
10 found throughout the residences in a commercial  
11 vocabulary that would relate to the size and scale  
12 of this building but at the same time have the  
13 flavor of a Bannockburn Green and some of the other  
14 quality developments that I was requested to  
15 review.

16 There's a heavy use of timber,  
17 siding, wood shakes and other materials as well as  
18 a color scheme that is really in context with the  
19 residential neighborhood. We've tried to define

20 the massing of the building in similar ways to the  
21 way the original design was set up in the sense  
22 that the base is anchored to the ground with  
23 masonry.

24 The main facade itself has siding

22

1 that is trimmed out, not only on the top defining  
2 its capital but along the edges and that there is  
3 reference and hierarchy given to the entrances as  
4 well as the scaling where the sign is applied.

5 This is the first time that  
6 Jewel-Osco has ever really embarked on a design of  
7 this type and where the whole thing has been looked  
8 at texturally in relationship to the houses and to  
9 the vocabulary that we're trying to address as we  
10 create a marquis and a keystone for this area as  
11 you drive into the Village.

12 We feel that this elevation really  
13 speaks to the flavor that this Commission and the  
14 residents are seeking and regardless of what  
15 happens on this endeavor whether we're turned up or  
16 down, it's been an exercise that I've enjoyed and I  
17 hope that at least from a design standpoint I've  
18 come away with an awareness and a growing and I  
19 hope that the city as well as the residents view  
20 this favorably.

21 I will now turn this over to Ben  
22 Bussman and he will address some of the highlights  
23 that were added to the landscaping plan and some of  
24 the enhancements along the buffering edge and the

23

1 numerous trees that were added to the plans.

2 MR. BUSSMAN: Good evening. Since our  
3 last hearing we have made some extensive additions  
4 to the landscaping along the north berm.

5 The north berm will now have  
6 plantings. Within every 100 feet of the length of  
7 that berm there will be five trees, five evergreen  
8 trees, five understory trees, and five shrubs.

9 The whole site will have almost 460  
10 trees to be planted. This is an extensive  
11 landscape berm planting that I've done in all the  
12 ten Jewel-Oscos that I've worked on.

13 The screening from the homes in  
14 Providence Village will go through essentially  
15 three layers prior to views of the Jewel-Osco.  
16 There will be the -- this cross-section actually  
17 depicts it better.

18 There will be the existing tree  
19 buffer on the property line. There will be the  
20 berm which for the most part is ten feet high.  
21 There will be the landscaping on top of the berm.

22 There will be the parkway trees and then the  
23 building.

24 The distance from the property line

24

1 to the building is 580 feet which is two football  
2 fields or a Tiger Woods nine iron.

3 So the other enhancements we've  
4 also added to the plan, the buffer along Route 120  
5 is also wider. We've got a very extensive  
6 landscape plan. I think the parking lot is very  
7 well landscaped. It's going to be very decorative.

8 The whole site will be very full of  
9 seasonal color and I'm very proud of it. I'll now  
10 turn it over to Les Pollach.

11 MR. POLLACH: Good evening. I am Les  
12 Pollach from Camiros Limited. I have had a chance  
13 to also review Mr. Maiden's memo.

14 We set out to do a similar analysis  
15 and we concur in his findings of the development  
16 that could occur in the County is of a magnitude  
17 generally that he reviewed with the constraints  
18 that he also identified based upon the sewer and  
19 water constraints as well as certain buffering  
20 constraints that we got into a little bit as well.

21 I'd like to talk tonight about how  
22 this proposal comports with the comprehensive plan.

23 This was a question early on and it's come back up  
24 so I suppose I'm here to answer the question again.

25

1 In thinking about this I think you  
2 can think about four different scenarios that might  
3 happen on this site. I believe that three of the  
4 scenarios generally comport with the land use plan.

5 Those three scenarios would be  
6 development under the County of non-residential  
7 uses, development as to office/service uses for the  
8 entire site probably reflecting the intensities  
9 that are in your C/O-2 district at least for the  
10 non-commercial aspects, and I believe from a  
11 community point of view since this is within the  
12 context of that same district that what we propose  
13 here also has a strong relationship to the  
14 comprehensive plan.

15 The comprehensive plan, the site 75  
16 acres that are the subject of this hearing is an  
17 area that is located within that portion of the  
18 plan that is shown as a regional community  
19 corridor. It's also shown as an area to be  
20 developed for office/services and when developed to  
21 be well buffered from adjacent development and  
22 buffered from the roads.

23 The process that exists within



24 Gurnee as well as within other municipalities is to

26

1 take in a property that's annexed and it comports  
2 with the plan to provide proper zoning. There's no  
3 zoning that absolutely equates to or is absolutely  
4 equivalent to what's in the comprehensive plan.

5 I believe probably the one that  
6 comes closest is the C/O-2, it talks about the  
7 creation of industrial or office parks but it also  
8 accommodates certain degrees of commercial but not  
9 commercial to the fullest extent as we identify it  
10 here. This is not ancillary to the office park.  
11 We admit that.

12 If you were to review that district  
13 you'd see that the development intensity within  
14 that district allows an FAR of point five. It  
15 establishes buffers, if you look at the corner side  
16 yard requirements for the purposes of using a  
17 buffer of about 75 feet.

18 And it -- the development that  
19 would be contained within that would have to take  
20 access because of the constraints of the site from  
21 O'Plaine Road.

22 The proposal that we have also can  
23 be developed under the C/O-2 Ordinance. It  
24 provides a buffer as has been testified to in the

1 earlier parts of this continued hearing of a  
2 hundred feet along the northerly edge and required  
3 buffers along the -- both the easterly edge along  
4 O'Plaine and the southerly edge along 120.

5                   The difference is that it's  
6 community oriented versus regional oriented. Some  
7 of the differences could be looked at this way  
8 here, if something were to be regionally developed  
9 and this falls in regional corridors the kinds of  
10 uses that are destination uses. Major retail uses,  
11 Six Flags Great America is a regional use, it draws  
12 people as a destination. Gurnee Mills is a  
13 regional use.

14                   One can look outside for similar  
15 uses that could be considered to be regional uses  
16 and might fall within this particular area, a  
17 Conway Farms, a major destination and employment  
18 use. Abbott is a major destination and employment  
19 use. You can look at Libertyville, the Motorola  
20 facility is again a major destination and  
21 employment use.

22                   These uses have substantial impact.  
23 And if they were to come before you you would I  
24 presume have similar concerns about impacts on

1 adjacent developments, impacts to the street  
2 system, hours of operation and the like.

3 Our proposal is not for a regional  
4 sort of use, a use that's a major destination from  
5 the larger northern suburban region. It's for what  
6 we would term a community use. The Jewel grocery  
7 store is a store that is used by people that are  
8 largely in the immediate neighborhood but indeed  
9 it's a destination for a more focused area than  
10 some of the earlier examples I gave.

11 The development as proposed by Mr.  
12 Rosenquist for smaller office, office industrial  
13 concept facilities similar to Grand Tri-State while  
14 having some destination function again is nowhere  
15 nearly as intensive as some of the uses that might  
16 be proposed within the context of the plan.

17 So taking that into consideration  
18 we do I think reflect the office/service  
19 characteristic although we're more community in  
20 scale and we do have this difference of bringing  
21 forward for your consideration the integration of  
22 about 20 to 25 percent of the site for specific  
23 retail development.

24 And there is of course a third

1 scenario that might happen that would comport with  
2 the plan, and that could be development in the  
3 county for non-residential kinds of development.  
4 Residential use of this site would be in conflict  
5 with the plan since the plan calls for  
6 office/services.

7 I suppose there is a fourth  
8 scenario as well and that's change the plan. And  
9 so that the plan isn't oriented to non-residential  
10 development, it isn't oriented to regional or  
11 regional community uses but it's much more modest.

12 However, I recognize that you have  
13 just gone through the plan and respect the process  
14 that you went through and indeed if the community  
15 were to look at modifying the plan I would expect  
16 that interested parties and the property owner may  
17 be concerned about that because there are certain  
18 assumptions that the community has built into it.

19 There's nothing that has really  
20 changed in terms of adjacent development and in  
21 terms of development trends generally that would  
22 indicate that, the call for this area to be located  
23 within the regional corridor. It's right at the  
24 interchange of the Tollway.

1                   And to be non-residential, there  
2                   doesn't seem to be any reason to argue with that  
3                   that should no longer be the function and the  
4                   function should be some residential or extremely  
5                   low intensity function.

6                   So in sum, what we are proposing  
7                   here is a use that meets the plan in a number of  
8                   ways. It's less intensive than what might be  
9                   considered for this site since this site could be  
10                  developed as a regional use. It does accommodate  
11                  an FAR that's in the same range as the overall FAR  
12                  that would apply in the most applicable zoning I  
13                  could identify which is the C/O-2 zoning at point  
14                  five.

15                  It takes its access from O'Plaine  
16                  Road which is really a more community street than  
17                  it is a regional street. And we have a community  
18                  use.

19                  We have attempted to exceed the  
20                  size of the buffer that could be provided or  
21                  required either under the County, which is  
22                  somewhere between a 40 to 70 foot buffer. And  
23                  since the County uses buffer yard concepts based  
24                  upon the density of landscape I believe that that

1 buffer would be more to the direction of the  
2 smaller width than the wider width.

3 We are providing a hundred foot  
4 buffer and some very specific commitments as to the  
5 design and development of the site.

6 So taken in the context of what the  
7 plan seems to call for in one sense you might even  
8 consider this development to be a lesser intensity  
9 in terms of the potential impacts that could evolve  
10 from this development than might occur from a use  
11 that indeed fully meets the criteria established in  
12 the comprehensive plan for this use.

13 It's my opinion therefore that in  
14 general terms we reflect the character of the use  
15 that provides employment, it serves the community.  
16 It's a focused destination use. It gets access in  
17 the same manners that the site could be accessed by  
18 any other use and would fit within the context of  
19 the plan.

20 MR. BROWN: That concludes our formal  
21 presentation, Mr. Chairman.

22 As I say, we have various  
23 consultants and other individuals available to  
24 answer questions of the neighbors or the community

1 or the Plan Commission.



3 Route 120 intersection and has made a number of  
4 recommendations that the Petitioner has concurred  
5 with that they would implement into their plan if  
6 it were to be annexed into the Village.

7 And through the annexation  
8 agreement with this property we have the ability to  
9 enter into a contract for those improvements with  
10 the developer.

11 But our -- the basic opinion of our  
12 traffic consultant is that the scope of the  
13 development that they're proposing along with the  
14 recommended improvements should render the site  
15 functional and may even help the functioning of  
16 O'Plaine Road beyond what it is today.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You'll have an  
18 opportunity to speak. Are you prepared to -- for  
19 the traffic consultant, can you give us kind of an  
20 overview?

21 I don't think you need to go  
22 through the details, but maybe you can touch on  
23 some of these points that Jon was talking about as  
24 far as maybe some changes that were recommended by

34

1 our traffic consultant.

2 MR. LINDGREN: I'll use the plan with  
3 the pretty green stuff on it.



4 I'm Jerry Lindgren, traffic  
5 engineer for the Petitioner. And I -- very  
6 briefly, the improvements that we have discussed  
7 before is signalization at the intersection of  
8 Cornell at our access point, the addition of a turn  
9 lane on Route 120, the right turn for traffic from  
10 the east to go north.

11 Your consultant has pointed out  
12 that there are other improvements that are needed  
13 at Route 120, additional turn lanes and whatnot  
14 that are needed now, not as a result of this  
15 development but in fact could incorporate dual  
16 lefts.

17 And these are things that we have  
18 to discuss with the State and the County in terms  
19 of their intersection.

20 They generally concurred with our  
21 improvement recommendations on O'Plaine as we  
22 modified and with our amended report. And that in  
23 essence provides generally the five lane  
24 cross-section that the County is looking for on

35

1 O'Plaine through this section.

2 Further, we have a five lane  
3 cross-section at our throat on the access to the  
4 development accommodating separate left out, a

5 through lane separate right out, and dual lanes  
6 inbound.

7                                 There is some discussion that we  
8 may have to widen in order to accommodate dual  
9 lefts into the development. Now this is subject to  
10 the density of development relative to the offices  
11 that could occur in the remainder of the property  
12 after Jewel develops and again the intensity with  
13 which they might develop.

14                                 That's a thumbnail sketch of the  
15 things. There's one more item that your consultant  
16 has suggested that we pursue with the County, and  
17 that would be an additional access to O'Plaine Road  
18 for right turns in and out only.

19                                 Now this is for two reasons. One  
20 reason is that it does obviously help reduce the  
21 intensity of movements at Cornell and the signal.  
22 But perhaps just as importantly is it helps with  
23 respect to the cul-de-sac issue in terms of the  
24 length of roadway that goes all the way through

1 without additional access to the external system.

2                                 By providing an additional access  
3 at this point in a sense you have a looping system  
4 that can hook up to the remainder of the property  
5 that in fact reduces the cul-de-sac nature of the

6 development.

7                           It's one way to obviate the  
8 cul-de-sac issue is what it is. And I don't  
9 disagree with it. I think if the County would  
10 accept it it's a very nice means by which we can do  
11 that. And that basically would be in this area  
12 here.

13                           I think that pretty well covers it,  
14 the major issues. If there are specifics that I  
15 can address for you I would be happy to do so.  
16 Jon, does that -- thank you.

17                           CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We'll go to the  
18 Commissioners to see if they have any specific  
19 questions. Mr. Smith.

20                           MR. SMITH: I had a question on Butch  
21 Maiden's report here.

22                           You said the scenario if it was  
23 developed in the County under retail it could be  
24 525,000 square feet.

37

1                           That would be equal to like five  
2 Walmarts at Hunt Club?

3                           MR. MAIDEN: I think it's 625,000 if  
4 it's non-residential. But I think because of the  
5 parking requirements you would probably only get  
6 something between 400 and 500 thousand for retail.

7 MR. SMITH: I think Walmart is about  
8 500,000 square feet.

9 What's the procedure in the County,  
10 is there hearings?

11 MR. MAIDEN: There would be no  
12 requirement for a public hearing if you could  
13 obtain the sewer and water.

14 MR. SMITH: They would just build it?

15 MR. MAIDEN: They would show that they  
16 meet the standards to get a building permit.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Butch, so I get it  
18 clear now. These standards would probably include  
19 access to water and sewer? In other words, could  
20 they do something like that on a septic system with  
21 a well?

22 MR. MAIDEN: No, they would require  
23 sewer and water.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Mr. Sula.

38

1 MR. SULA: Just a couple comments.

2 First of all, I think you've done a  
3 fine job in terms of addressing some of the  
4 architectural issues with the Jewel per se; but I  
5 still think really I need some clarity on some of  
6 the other aspects of the development.

7 This is an entry into the Village

8 and I would go as far as to say it's the gateway to  
9 the Village given that it can't move any farther  
10 south than it is now given that there are boundary  
11 agreements and I think we need to pay some special  
12 attention to that.

13 A couple things that we talked  
14 about last time that I still don't have clarity on.  
15 One is the outlots. In the handouts that were  
16 distributed prior to the meeting they still talk of  
17 two outlots with the ability to have driveup  
18 facilities.

19 One of the things that is very  
20 clear to me in terms of talking to some of the  
21 people that live nearby is that there's great  
22 concern about the outlots. Nobody wants really to  
23 see a fast food type of an outlot to be developed  
24 on that property and it's a great concern in terms

39

1 of the image that portrays on that particular  
2 corner. And I'll get back to a follow-up on that  
3 in a second.

4 The other I think is a more  
5 important issue, I still don't feel that we have  
6 clarity in terms of what's being envisioned in the  
7 C/O-1 and the C/O-2 zoning.

8 One bit of feedback that I keep

9 hearing is office is okay, light industrial  
10 warehousing isn't viewed very positively by the  
11 surrounding community. As I go up and down the  
12 Tollway, I look at interchanges like Willow Road  
13 where there's a nice blend of office and  
14 residential, Route 60 at Conway Park there is  
15 mostly office but a little bit of residential.  
16 Route 22 and the Tri-State Tollway there's office  
17 and residential.

18 I have to go pretty far south,  
19 almost to Cicero Avenue I think to find industrial  
20 and residential. And I don't think we want that in  
21 that particular part of the community.

22 (Applause.)

23 MR. SULA: I wish you guys wouldn't do  
24 that. One of these days I'm going to say something

40

1 that's not popular and I don't know if my ego can  
2 take it.

3 As it relates to possible uses of  
4 the retail on the outlots I encourage you guys to  
5 take a drive by Old Half Day Road and Milwaukee  
6 Avenue. Lincolnshire has done a fine job on that  
7 particular corner in my opinion of putting some  
8 nice looking retail services in a somewhat visible  
9 area there without being offensive.

10                   And we still haven't talked about  
11 hours of operation. If I heard you right, you're  
12 pushing the Jewel as being a neighborhood store and  
13 not a magnet and I really firmly believe you need  
14 to address the issue of 24 hour operation.

15                   I don't think it's appropriate for  
16 a neighborhood store. It is appropriate for a  
17 magnet operation, but I think you guys have said  
18 it's not intended to be a magnet, it's intended to  
19 be a neighborhood store.

20                   One other small technical thing  
21 that needs to be clear is I don't understand how  
22 the berm heights relate on the north end of the  
23 property to the residential area. I think on the  
24 map or on the overlay there I was able to see how

41

1     it related to the retail and office development but  
2     I wasn't able to quite understand how it relates to  
3     the residential area.

4                   And that's all I have right now.

5                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Was there -- did  
6     that require some response, Jim?

7                   MR. SULA: Certainly I think we need  
8     clarity on the C/O-1 usage.

9                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Are you prepared  
10    to respond to that?

11 MR. DOSE: Sure.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Go ahead.

13 MR. DOSE: You mentioned a number of  
14 points. If I could pick up on a few.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You need to use the  
16 microphone. If you could state your name and  
17 affiliation for the record, please.

18 MR. DOSE: I'm Greg Dose and I'm the  
19 attorney for Jewel-Osco. And if I could just get  
20 to a few of your points, Mr. Sula.

21 In terms of the outlots, we are  
22 continuing to request the ability to put outlots  
23 along the O'Plaine frontage. In the revised design  
24 standards which we submitted to you last week we've

42

1 lowered the number from three to two, but we would  
2 like to have the ability to have two outlots along  
3 O'Plaine Road.

4 Now in terms of the character of  
5 the development of those outlots and the drive-thru  
6 facilities in the design guidelines, basically all  
7 that is in your hands. Under the design guidelines  
8 that we would apply here through the annexation  
9 agreement and ongoing Ordinance drive-thru  
10 facilities would be a special use, not a use as of  
11 right. So it would come before this Commission and



12 be allowed or disallowed by the Village Board so  
13 that's really in your hands.

14 And also the development of those  
15 outlots must receive site plan approval through the  
16 Commission and the Village Board. So again, the  
17 character of the architecture and design of those  
18 outlots would be in your hands.

19 MR. SULA: Just as a point of  
20 clarification from staff, please.

21 If this is a PUD we can designate  
22 whether or not there's a special use permitted  
23 under the PUD or not; can we not?

24 MR. WILDENBERG: You do have that

43

1 ability, yeah.

2 MR. SULA: I would say that we shouldn't  
3 even allow for a special use permit on drive-thru  
4 facilities.

5 MR. DOSE: We designed it as to allow  
6 drive-thru as a special use and again that would be  
7 in your hands.

8 In terms of the C/O-1 zoning, maybe  
9 I can work better with this plan. As we've  
10 envisioned it and described within the design  
11 guidelines, we've called for basically office north  
12 of Cornell, one level office. Single story office,

13 possible two story office again with a special use  
14 permit.

15                   The only thing of right would be a  
16 single story in character with the -- it would have  
17 to have the -- I don't know exactly how we said it,  
18 the roof lines have to be of a residential  
19 character, you can't have the flat roofs.

20                   But the area south of Cornell we've  
21 addressed that in terms of the C/O-1 zoning  
22 classification but with the opportunity to provide  
23 uses -- not warehouse uses, not truck transfer  
24 stations, but additional uses of research and light

44

1 assembly, all enclosed buildings similar to what is  
2 at the Grand Tri-State development further north of  
3 Mr. Rosenquist which I think has been the closest  
4 interchange in terms of comparison purposes to this  
5 location.

6                   And Mr. Rosenquist who owns the  
7 bulk of that territory is quite firm in wanting to  
8 preserve that opportunity for those types of uses  
9 that have been successfully implemented at the  
10 Grand Tri-State development.

11                   So I don't know if that completely  
12 addresses your --

13                   MR. SULA: I guess it's safe to say we

14 have a difference of opinion in terms of what's  
15 appropriate there.

16 MR. DOSE: I think we do.

17 In terms of hours of operation I  
18 think we have to ask Mr. Brown to comment on that.

19 MR. BROWN: The answer to that, hours of  
20 operation varies store by store. It's a function  
21 of convenience. If the customers are looking for a  
22 place to shop either pharmacy or convenience food  
23 then we want to be able to serve that need.

24 If the customers obviously don't

45

1 shop and for whatever reason don't support that  
2 kind of an operation then it's not going to happen.  
3 But we don't want to be hamstrung by the inability  
4 to be able to serve those customers if in fact  
5 there's a need there and other retailers in the  
6 area are serving that need. We believe that we  
7 should have that equal opportunity.

8 I have indicated that certainly the  
9 deliveries are something that we can address and  
10 are appropriate and that those could be restricted.  
11 In fact, we do that in many instances where we are  
12 a lot closer to residential than we are here with  
13 this particular building.

14 But we would not want to forego the

15 opportunity to have extended hours of operation for  
16 food and pharmacy. And in fact the drive-thru  
17 pharmacy is -- speaks to that with many needs for  
18 people, customers who will travel or need  
19 prescriptions late at night, inclement weather  
20 other times that are not necessarily the prime  
21 hours for shopping. And so for that reason we try  
22 to offer that flexibility.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Ms. Kovarik.  
24 I'm sorry, Jim, are you finished?

46

1 MR. SULA: No, the berm question wasn't  
2 addressed, how high the berms are compared to the  
3 back yards.

4 MR. BUSSMAN: I don't believe the  
5 topographic information extended to the foundations  
6 of the house, but what I can infer from the  
7 information I've got is the -- let's say the floors  
8 of the houses to the north of the site, the berm  
9 will still be about five feet higher than the  
10 floors of the houses so.

11 MR. DOSE: From the ground floor.

12 MR. BUSSMAN: From the ground floor of  
13 the house. Let's say where you're standing in your  
14 kitchen the berm would still be five feet higher  
15 than where you're standing.

16 MR. SULA: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Ms. Kovarik.

18 MS. KOVARIK: I have mostly questions.

19 The first one for staff.

20 Can you help me understand lot  
21 coverage. The C/B-1 says maximum lot coverage of  
22 30 percent and they have lot coverage at 75 percent  
23 and I'm sure I must be missing something.

24 MR. WILDENBERG: The lot coverage

47

1 that's referred to in the straight Ordinance refers  
2 to the footprint of the building. The  
3 impervious --

4 MS. KOVARIK: The foundation?

5 MR. WILDENBERG: Yes. The impervious  
6 surface ratio that's referred to in the development  
7 standards that you're looking at refers to a  
8 combination of the building footprint plus any  
9 paving.

10 MS. KOVARIK: So when they say lot  
11 coverage at 75 percent, that's --

12 MR. WILDENBERG: Building and paving  
13 together.

14 MS. KOVARIK: All right. And does  
15 C/B-1 have a limit, what is --

16 MS. VELKOVER: Under our straight

17 Ordinance we don't have an impervious surface ratio  
18 like that.

19 MS. KOVARIK: I'm trying to get a handle  
20 on the size in a neighborhood store. What is the  
21 sales floor area of Bannockburn, the square  
22 footage?

23 MR. BROWN: Bannockburn? You're  
24 referring to our competitor?

48

1 MS. KOVARIK: No, I'm --

2 MR. BROWN: Jewel-Osco doesn't have a  
3 facility in Bannockburn.

4 MS. KOVARIK: The Grand Hunt.

5 MR. BROWN: The store at Grand Hunt is  
6 75,000 square feet combined total area. We are not  
7 building stores of that size any more.

8 MR. KOVARIK: Is that the sales floor  
9 area?

10 MR. BROWN: No, that is the gross  
11 building area. Sales are typically about  
12 two-thirds of that, 70 percent perhaps.

13 MS. KOVARIK: So --

14 MR. BROWN: Roughly 50 to 52 thousand  
15 square feet of sales area which includes service,  
16 checkout.

17 The current stores that we're

18 building are now in the 57 to 67 thousand square  
19 foot range so the sales area would be  
20 proportionately less.

21 MS. KOVARIK: So this -- and I'm asking  
22 because there's been some news reports that this is  
23 the largest Jewel in the Lake County area.

24 MR. BROWN: Yeah, that's totally -- the

49

1 largest Jewel in Lake County is in Gurnee. That's  
2 the Grand Hunt. That is not what we're proposing  
3 as the maximum development size here.

4 Again, the plans that have been  
5 submitted are based on our best information today  
6 on what the maximum store size could be. Because  
7 it is a planned development, we acknowledge that we  
8 can only build within the building envelope that's  
9 presented on the plan.

10 We fully intend that we will  
11 building something no larger than that and probably  
12 smaller than that based on our current stores.

13 MS. KOVARIK: So the 52,000 you show on  
14 the plan is comparable to the sales floor area at  
15 Grand Hunt?

16 MR. BROWN: No, the building area  
17 that's shown on this particular submission is  
18 70,000 square feet.

19 MS. KOVARIK: And only 52,000 is sales?  
20 I'm just trying to picture in my mind sales at  
21 Grand Hunt.

22 MR. BROWN: Approximately.  
23 Approximately.

24 MS. KOVARIK: And you're saying that

50

1 Grand Hunt sales area is about 52,000?

2 MR. BROWN: That's correct.

3 MS. KOVARIK: So it's a comparable size.  
4 And then the area between the drive-thru and  
5 Cornell where you show the future expansion.

6 MR. BROWN: Um-hum.

7 MS. KOVARIK: If you don't have that  
8 future expansion, what is that area, just green  
9 space?

10 MR. BROWN: It will be used for pharmacy  
11 drive-thru and employee parking.

12 MS. KOVARIK: So there is parking up  
13 there, okay.

14 And if 53 does connect with the  
15 Tollway and they make this interchange here does  
16 that impact how you're going to lay out the traffic  
17 even?

18 MR. BROWN: It will, but it's so  
19 indefinite. We've tried to acknowledge the worst



20 case scenario of the taking for the highway  
21 right-of-way and I think all of our consultants  
22 both the Village's and ours are still very much  
23 uncertain as to how that will happen. And Lake  
24 County is probably uncertain because of the timing.

51

1 But we've tried to accept or  
2 acknowledge the maximum taking that would occur  
3 along Route 120 that would be obviously in place if  
4 that 342 is ever improved.

5 MS. KOVARIK: So your landscaping is  
6 behind what they could take?

7 MR. BROWN: Yes.

8 MS. KOVARIK: If they came and took it  
9 out it wouldn't destroy this nice buffer?

10 MR. BROWN: As an example, instead of a  
11 normal 35 foot buffer we now have an 85 foot buffer  
12 which acknowledges that there could be another 50  
13 feet taking for the IDOT proposal if in fact that  
14 occurs.

15 MS. KOVARIK: That's all my questions  
16 for now. Thank you. I have no other questions.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anyone else? Mr.  
18 Cepon, did you have any?

19 MR. CEPON: Basically I had the same  
20 questions that Mr. Sula had.

21                   And I think it's great that we can  
22           control the use of the outlots through the special  
23           use permit, but basically the other questions I had  
24           were the same as he had.

52

1                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Any other  
2           questions?

3   (No response.)

4                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. At this time I'd  
5           like to open the floor to the public if you have a  
6           comment or a question.

7   And I think many of you have been  
8           at the prior meetings so if you can limit your  
9           questions to some new things. If you have a  
10          spokesperson, that would be fine if you want to  
11          generally speak about the concerns here. But if  
12          you can specifically address the new things that  
13          have been brought up we would appreciate that to  
14          conserve some time.

15                                        So the floor is now open to the  
16          public. And if you could come up to the microphone  
17          and state your name and affiliation -- or your name  
18          and address, excuse me, for the record, please do  
19          so. Yes, sir.

20                                        MR. SANDERS: I'm Kurt Sanders from  
21          Providence Village. And after attending three of

22 these I feel like I'm --

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Could you state your  
24 address?

53

1 MR. SANDERS: 4812 Kings Way West.

2 Thank you.

3 Can we take a look at -- I didn't  
4 understand, this gives them the intention to build,  
5 can you help me understand what that means?

6 In other words, tonight the plan  
7 they put in effect, will that give them then the  
8 right to develop within two, three, five years?

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Maybe we can have --  
10 Tracy, can you address that?

11 MS. VELKOVER: What they're asking for  
12 on the commercial portion is preliminary PUD plat  
13 approval.

14 This property because it's not in  
15 the Village would be subject to an annexation  
16 agreement. They're proposing to put these  
17 development standards that they addressed here in  
18 these public hearings into the annexation  
19 agreement.

20 And after they're approved for  
21 annexation, should they get approved for annexation  
22 and preliminary PUD plat approval they would still

23 have to come back to the Plan Commission for final  
24 PUD plat approval and then they could pull the

54

1 building permit for that.

2 MR. SANDERS: And then when would they  
3 have to commence building? Or are you saying  
4 that's an indefinite at that particular time and  
5 then at this point then could they come back and do  
6 another special use?

7 MS. VELKOVER: Per what they're  
8 proposing here in this PUD document they would have  
9 the right to build a Jewel-Osco within five years  
10 of annexation.

11 If they did not build a Jewel-Osco  
12 within five years of annexation then that  
13 commercial property would revert to C/O-1 property.  
14 All of the -- I'm sorry C/B -- is it C/O-1.

15 All of the office property, the  
16 C/O-1 and the C/O-2 would only be at conceptual PUD  
17 plat stage so for anything to happen on any of the  
18 office property would take another public hearing  
19 where we would notice property owners within 500  
20 feet and there would be another public hearing.

21 MR. SANDERS: My second question is have  
22 there been any alternate sites that have been  
23 evaluated other than this precious corner?

1 me to ask the planning board or can I direct that  
2 to someone at Jewel? They talk about alternate  
3 sites. I just thought it would be good if we could  
4 understand are there other commercial areas in  
5 proximity that we could consider a win-win.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, the way we work  
7 this is you address your questions to the Plan  
8 Commission and we take those questions under  
9 advisement.

10 If we think that's something that  
11 should be answered then we will ask the Petitioner  
12 that. And that's a good question, we'll ask them  
13 that question. So if you continue on, what we'll  
14 do is take all the questions and then close the  
15 floor to the public and then the Commissioners will  
16 address the Petitioner with questions and comments.

17 MR. SANDERS: Okay. I will agree with  
18 Jim Sula as well as I would like to see the  
19 elimination of the outlots.

20 And I mean that's not -- you know,  
21 that's the obvious as well. And I'm glad that you  
22 brought that up because as I look at the plan I  
23 notice that it is absent from there but without  
24 your probing I think we would have missed that so I

1 appreciate that.

2 I also wanted to address Kristine,  
3 did you get an answer as far as the size of this  
4 compared to the Grand Hunt. It sounded to me that  
5 after all of that analysis that it was in fact the  
6 same size as the one in Grand Hunt.

7 MS. KOVARIK: That was what I wrote  
8 down, the actual sales floor, maybe not storage but  
9 the sales floor area is the same. So that helps me  
10 make a picture in my mind.

11 MR. SANDERS: I mean I was nervous there  
12 for a minute because I thought I heard him say that  
13 it was nowhere near that size.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You know, I can only --  
15 the numbers you said that the size of the store was  
16 75,000 square feet on Hunt Club and the drawing  
17 that I have shows this proposed one as 70,640  
18 square feet. So, you know, it's some 4,400 square  
19 feet.

20 MR. SANDERS: Then it could in fact be  
21 one of the two largest Jewels that we have in our  
22 crown Gurnee city.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That I don't know. I  
24 can't answer that question.

1                   MR. SANDERS: Is Mr. Rosenquist here  
2                   tonight?

3                   MR. BROWN: No, he is not.

4                   MR. DOSE: No.

5                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: No, he is not.

6                   MR. SANDERS: Could I also -- I liked  
7                   the question about the 24 hours.

8                                 Could the Commission ask the  
9                   Petitioners does the Lakehurst Jewel have specific  
10                  hours of operation? In other words, I think they  
11                  close at ten o'clock.

12                                I would also like to have the  
13                  Commission readdress I think last time we talked  
14                  about Eastwood east entranceway and what was going  
15                  to happen there. And I don't believe, maybe I  
16                  missed it, I wasn't clear how that actually was  
17                  going to be closed or redirected so that traffic  
18                  may have to go through Providence Oaks.

19                                CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That's probably  
20                  something that the Village is going to have to  
21                  address. I think if I recall at the last meeting  
22                  Bud Reed indicated that that's probably something  
23                  that we need to address even now and I think  
24                  potentially that may be cul-de-saced so we'll bring

1 that up again.

2 MR. SANDERS: Okay. Did we also have  
3 the Planning Commission take a look at the  
4 remainder of the property just in your own  
5 conceptual minds to help me understand what would  
6 back up to the Jewel in your minds or would we have  
7 to go through the recommercialization of the rest  
8 of the property once this front gets  
9 commercialized.

10 I mean not to ramble, but I am  
11 thinking that the remainder of the property would  
12 be petitioned to be commercial once the front is  
13 commercialized or are you saying that with this  
14 approval or this approval tonight you could  
15 prohibit that from being further commercialized.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, the remainder of  
17 the property would be zoned a different  
18 designation. That would be a C/O-1 so only uses  
19 that would comply with a C/O-1 District would be  
20 appropriate for that.

21 If I understand your question  
22 right, you're saying the property that's actually  
23 the tan area on their drawing there?

24 MR. SANDERS: Yes, the west section. I



1 mean what is to prevent another vendor to come in  
2 or another supplier to come in and petition the  
3 courts for the remainder of the property, the tan  
4 section to say well, now that Jewel is there we  
5 petition the court and we go through this hearing  
6 process two or three times before the whole zone is  
7 red.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, because the zone  
9 is not going to be red. The zone is going to be  
10 commercial office.

11 And they would have to come -- they  
12 would have to come before the Village again to ask  
13 for rezoning.

14 MR. SANDERS: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: They would have to go  
16 through a whole public hearing process again and  
17 ask for rezoning.

18 And it's probably going to be much  
19 tougher to get rezoning at that point than now  
20 where it's not really -- I mean it's zoned in the  
21 County but they're coming in kind of fresh. So if  
22 they're going to annex to the Village and the  
23 Village has to decide what zoning are we going to  
24 give them. That's a little bit different standard

1 than when they come back later on and say you know  
2 what, we want -- I mean it's possible that they  
3 could come back and say, you know, we can't market  
4 this --

5 MR. SANDERS: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: -- as commercial  
7 office, we would really like to have the --

8 MR. SANDERS: Remainder.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: -- retail business  
10 expanded and then they would have to make -- they  
11 would have to go through another whole public  
12 hearing to get that rezoned.

13 MR. SANDERS: And I guess that's what  
14 I'm trying to dig at is I would like to have I  
15 guess in your minds, too, assurance that the plan  
16 that you have envisioned on that cornerstone not be  
17 let's make a deal on the corner.

18 I'm just afraid that the rest of it  
19 may be the tip of the iceberg, but I'm sure that  
20 you'll cull that through. Other than that I thank  
21 you for your time.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you. Yes, ma'am.

23 MS. BLAKESLEY: I'm Vicky Blakesley,  
24 5181 something road. I have two comments and one

61

1 question to address to the Commission.

2                   The first comment is is in keeping  
3     with the idea that the community would like to have  
4     this area as a community use area, whatever  
5     businesses happen to be there, I would make a plea  
6     that if you look around to the services we have in  
7     the neighborhood what we are missing are not large  
8     grocery stores. What we are missing is some of the  
9     smaller businesses. Doctors offices, lawyers  
10    offices, photo shops, smaller use rather than a  
11    large store.

12                   Secondly I agree with a lot of the  
13    comments that were made ahead that this is an  
14    important area to look at with regard to it is  
15    truly a gateway to Gurnee. And I am also concerned  
16    that once you start commercializing it it becomes  
17    much harder then to find someone to move to the  
18    rest of the property that would be in fitting with  
19    the picture that we have.

20                   The last thing I have is a  
21    question. I think I heard correctly that we're  
22    talking about two lanes in and two lanes out on  
23    Cornell.

24                   And my question to the Commission

1     and to their staff is what other examples can you  
2     give us where there's that type of a traffic flow

3 pattern this close to two housing developments on  
4 each side of the road, Providence Oaks and  
5 Providence Village.

6 I find it very hard to visualize  
7 somewhere in the area where you have that type of a  
8 traffic flow pattern. My impression left over from  
9 last time, it wasn't going to be two lanes in and  
10 two lanes out at Cornell.

11 And I'd like the Commissioners to  
12 take a look at that and give us some examples where  
13 you're satisfied in your minds that what we're  
14 setting up here with Cornell is really compatible  
15 with the overall plan within Gurnee.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

17 MR. HEIDENLINE: My name is Chris  
18 Heidenline, 451 Tanglewood.

19 And my concern is does Gurnee and  
20 Lake County really need another retail center with  
21 all that we have in the area. And I would really  
22 like the Board to take into consideration the  
23 cannibalization of other retail areas of our  
24 neighbors as well. Thank you.

63

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

2 MR. PINBOAT: Bill Pinboat, 439  
3 Crossroad in Providence Village.

4                   It looks to me that the traffic  
5 consultants for the benefit of the Jewel and  
6 whoever else is going in there potentially in and  
7 out is fine, you probably solved a lot of their  
8 problems.

9                   I ask you to take a drive at 7 AM  
10 or 9 AM just north of there. You can't come  
11 within, you know, from our entrance all the way to  
12 the far north entrance of Providence Village you  
13 can't get in the middle turn lane or, you know,  
14 straight lane. You have to actually break the law,  
15 come up the middle if you want to go left within  
16 ten minutes of coming out of our home, you know, a  
17 quarter mile away.

18                  So I have major concerns,  
19 criticisms perhaps of traffic flow. Coming south  
20 out of our own area I'd have to bypass, go up to,  
21 you know, Washington, come over to Greentree just  
22 to get to Allegiance where I work. I'm not willing  
23 to, you know, take that inconvenience lately. And  
24 I'm sure everyone here shares that.

64

1                   And it's just the morning rush hour  
2 we're talking. You're putting up maybe a light at  
3 that Cornell where everyone knows the timing of  
4 lights never work. That one is going to turn red,

5 120 is going to turn green, that whole span is  
6 going to be wasted for rush hour.

7 So it's just comments. But reality  
8 speaks, experience, whatever.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

10 MS. OSE: High I wasn't sworn in if you  
11 want to swear me in.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anyone else who is  
13 going to speak that wasn't sworn in, please stand  
14 and be sworn in now.

15 (Witnesses sworn.)

16 MS. OSE: My time is Kristy Ose. I  
17 live at 682 Williamsburg Avenue and that's in  
18 Providence Oaks.

19 I live probably just as close as  
20 you can get to where this site is going to be. And  
21 I'm opposed. And when I hear about the  
22 architecture and the landscaping and the traffic,  
23 even the traffic pattern of how they're going to  
24 get the traffic, reduce it or whatever, that means

65

1 nothing to me because right now where I live I hear  
2 noise at 5:30 in the morning on O'Plaine Road.

3 It doesn't matter which way you're  
4 going to reroute the traffic, there's going to be  
5 more traffic if there's a retail Jewel-Osco there.

6 That concerns me.

7 And also the fact that there's a  
8 liquor store that goes through my house. I'm a  
9 mother of a little girl and we plan on living there  
10 for awhile but with this coming in we've actually  
11 had to question whether we're going to live there  
12 or not.

13 Robb Sattan was here last meeting  
14 about the resale value of our houses and that  
15 concerns me greatly being that we've only lived  
16 there nine months. So all those issues in  
17 themselves concern me.

18 And like I said, none of this  
19 really matters when it comes down to it because  
20 it's not going to make the noise level any better  
21 or the traffic any better. Thank you.

22 MR. DEBOISE: My name is John DeBoise.  
23 I live at 4810 Providence Road.

24 I have a couple of comments but I

66

1 wonder if first all of us could get a decent look  
2 at the revised architectural sketch that Jewel has  
3 for this plan. Put it up in the front of the room  
4 where we can all see it.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I have a better  
6 idea. If the Petitioner doesn't mind, can we pass

7 it around so that people can get a close look at  
8 it. That way we can keep talking here and people  
9 can get a chance.

10 MR. DEBOISE: I'm unable to know what  
11 kind of signage is on it, whether we've still got  
12 the big orange billboard across the front, whether  
13 it conforms.

14 Well, there it is. Jewel-Osco.  
15 I've seen enough and I'll go ahead with my comments  
16 if that's all right with you.

17 A couple of points I'd like to  
18 make. The first is the economic impact of this  
19 proposal on the Village. The loss in surrounding  
20 property values will largely offset and could even  
21 outweigh the potential gain in sales and property  
22 taxes from this development.

23 If realtor Robb Sattan is right  
24 about the resulting destruction of property values

67

1 in the surrounding residential neighborhood and my  
2 figures are correct you could be looking at a one  
3 and a half to three million dollar annual tax loss  
4 to all of the taxing bodies in the Village.

5 The second is the environmental  
6 impact on the lives of hundreds of families who  
7 live nearby and the larger long-term quality of



8 life impact on Gurnee itself.

9 Lord knows this Commission has  
10 tried to reap concessions from Jewel-Osco to make  
11 their scheme as palatable as possible. Jewel  
12 points to the changes they have made, the design  
13 that they say reflects the fabric of the  
14 neighborhood and what was priced at \$250,000 of  
15 landscaping in our last meeting. That may be up a  
16 little.

17 Well, the design looks very much  
18 like a great big supermarket, a magnet store with a  
19 huge Jewel-Osco sign emblazened in orange letters  
20 across the billboard front.

21 No doubt the landscape architect's  
22 sketches reflect the best he could do with \$250,000  
23 or however much it amounts to now.

24 But that is a pittance alongside

68

1 the millions of dollars that the hundreds of  
2 surrounding homeowner families have put into  
3 landscaping their homes and making this an  
4 attractive neighborhood. Not to mention the care  
5 that these families put into the homes and their  
6 grounds over the years.

7 That contrasts very sharply with  
8 what I see in the institutional neglect that is

9 typical of Jewel's pallet parking lot landscaping.  
10 Jewel seems to think that all this would be a  
11 peachy setting for what it likes to call a  
12 neighborhood store.

13 But is Jewel willing to forego the  
14 outlots for the sake of the neighborhood? No, it  
15 doesn't seem so. It needs more traffic and revenue  
16 out of this site. It not only wants to move  
17 upscale from Lakehurst, but it wants to bring along  
18 such delights as maybe a Kentucky Fried Chicken or  
19 a Taco Bell or a Blockbuster Video or other who  
20 knows what tacky cookie cutter franchise  
21 architecture.

22 Somehow Jewel seems to have the  
23 notion that Gurnee is easy, that Gurnee can be had.  
24 They even took a bow in last month's meeting for

69

1 the great job they had done in their new Wilmette  
2 store. That store is in an existing commercial  
3 area but the description of it in yesterday's  
4 Tribune is worth noting here all the same.

5 "The building is polished enough to  
6 be taken for a fashionable department store. It  
7 respectfully lines up along Green Bay Road and is  
8 clad in quality limestone, sandstone and hand  
9 molded brick. The copper awnings have been treated

10 with acid to skip the aging process and achieve an  
11 instant blue green hue. Parking is confined to the  
12 side. Take out diners, loungette tables under a  
13 colonade."

14                                 Maybe Jewel instead of having a  
15 drive-in Taco Bell could put its own take out  
16 diners under a colonade at this location, but that  
17 doesn't seem to be in the cards or in their  
18 thinking.

19                                 "The exterior logo is modest and  
20 made of copper. Neighboring houses and a park are  
21 sheltered by brick walls and landscaping. Jewel's  
22 designer, Peter Theodore, calls it his best design  
23 and makes it clear that he took cues from community  
24 meetings and the Village's design review

70

1 commission. The architecture draws its vocabulary  
2 from the town he says."

3                                 We heard something much like that  
4 from Jewel in last month's meeting. I don't know  
5 what this says about the vocabulary of our town,  
6 but there are no such grace notes evident in what  
7 Jewel seeks to build in Gurnee's long planned  
8 office park on O'Plaine Road.

9                                 So at long last we come down to the  
10 comprehensive Village plan. More than anyone this

11 Commission knows how much hope and thought have  
12 gone into it over many years.

13 Of course it cannot be carved in  
14 stone for no one can foresee what the future will  
15 bring.

16 (Enter Mr. Foster.)

17 MR. DEBOISE: But it must not be carved  
18 in sand or putty or political manipulation that  
19 ignores the plan's great purpose long after all of  
20 us are gone.

21 In essence the plan, this plan is a  
22 promise to Gurnee's future, a promise to make  
23 Gurnee a better place for all of the people who  
24 have built, invested and live here and all who will

71

1 in years to come be secure in the knowledge that we  
2 have a plan and impressed with the good results of  
3 its community building purpose.

4 So once again the time has come for  
5 this Commission and the Village Board to keep that  
6 promise. We beg you to reject this inconsiderate  
7 Jewel-Osco scheme that would destroy far more  
8 overall than it brings to the Village in any way.  
9 Thank you.

10 MR. ROCKWELL: My name is Mark  
11 Rockwell. I live at 4485 Long Hill Drive. I'm

12 backed up to O'Plaine. I'm one of the few houses  
13 in Providence Oaks that's really backed up to the  
14 road there.

15 I have a couple concerns. I'm in  
16 the retail business and if I was building another  
17 business I would not want to build it immediately  
18 close to where I'm at right now.

19 I'm not going to gain any customers  
20 in the Gurnee community, I'm going to be drawing  
21 from one area to another. I'm not gaining.

22 So what I feel is, correct me if  
23 I'm wrong, is we're taking from outside our  
24 community. We're going to have more people from

72

1 Waukegan. They're not planning to draw from our  
2 community, it's from the outside community.

3 So it's not going to be a Gurnee  
4 shopping center because our Gurnee shopping center  
5 is five minutes from my house and it doesn't bother  
6 me to drive to Jewel-Osco there.

7 So in the retail business if I was  
8 five minutes -- I run a dealership. I wouldn't  
9 build another Honda dealership five minutes away  
10 from my other one unless I was doing something  
11 else, taking from another community or something.

12 I'm just confused. Is this

13 benefiting Gurnee or is it not benefiting Gurnee?

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I'm sure that's a  
15 question the Commissioners will be pondering.

16 MR. ROCKWELL: And then what happens to  
17 my property when they back up to my property as far  
18 as the two lanes?

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm sorry, what happens  
20 to your property?

21 MR. ROCKWELL: My fence line comes right  
22 up to the road almost. What happens if they widen  
23 that road?

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, look at the plan,

73

1 they say widen the road. I mean they have it laid  
2 out right now, I don't think anything is going to  
3 happen to your property.

4 There's going to be a buffer area  
5 between your property and this development that's I  
6 think a hundred foot.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Providence Oaks.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm sorry, you're  
9 Providence Oaks. You're saying that they -- I  
10 don't know, are they going to widen?

11 MR. ROCKWELL: If they don't do it now  
12 they're going to eventually have to do it because I  
13 drive it every morning, I can barely get through

14 there with one lane. But if they're going to put a  
15 shopping center there, even if they're going to put  
16 three lanes there eventually we're not going to be  
17 able to get in and out of there.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Are you north of  
19 Cornell?

20 MR. ROCKWELL: I am, yeah, north of  
21 Cornell. I'm two houses down from there.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't think -- is  
23 there any anticipation of any widening north of  
24 Cornell?

74

1 MS. VELKOVER: At some time in the  
2 future the County has plans to widen O'Plaine Road.

3 Maybe Mr. Lindgren can answer  
4 whether there's additional right-of-way already  
5 existing in O'Plaine Road to accommodate the  
6 widening or whether they would have to acquire some  
7 from either the east or west side.

8 MR. LINDGREN: I can't answer  
9 specifically on the right-of-way, but I do know  
10 that the County does intend to widen O'Plaine  
11 regardless. And that would relate to --

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You're going to have to  
13 use the microphone.

14 MR. LINDGREN: I'm sorry. I can't

15 respond specifically to the existing right-of-way.

16 I don't know exactly what that is to the north.

17 I do know that as it relates to the  
18 right-of-way along the frontage of the property  
19 whatever is necessary for the five lane widening is  
20 going to be provided.

21 Now, in terms of the future of  
22 O'Plaine Road, yes, the County is planning to widen  
23 it to five lanes at some point in time and it  
24 probably will come as a result of intersection

75

1 improvements at 120 and O'Plaine also.

2 But eventually that will happen.  
3 If there is a need for right-of-way then it might  
4 have to be condemned.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I live in Country  
6 Trails there and I was familiar with the entryway  
7 into Country Trails.

8 I believe that the County has the  
9 right-of-way already to widen O'Plaine if need be.  
10 It's not going to -- I mean obviously the road  
11 would be closer to your home, but it's not going to  
12 affect your property, they won't need to take any  
13 of your property.

14 MR. ROCKWELL: It would affect the value  
15 of the home, though.



16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: What's that?

17 MR. ROCKWELL: It will affect the value  
18 of the home.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I mean it's going to  
20 widen it and it will be closer to your home.

21 MR. ROCKWELL: Which will affect the  
22 value.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: As far as the value,  
24 you know, I couldn't comment on that.

76

1 All I know is that there probably  
2 were plans to widen O'Plaine a long time ago  
3 probably before your house was even built.

4 MR. ROCKWELL: I understand that. But  
5 there's also going to be a lot more traffic because  
6 of that.

7 I might even be able to live with  
8 the widened lanes, but there's enough traffic right  
9 now. If you build a Jewel-Osco there's going to be  
10 a lot more.

11 Devaluing my house because of the  
12 widening, I'll live with that. But you're going to  
13 devalue it on top of that with putting a Jewel.

14 And the traffic, I have two kids.  
15 I don't want them in the back yard if they're going  
16 to widen that road and put a Jewel there.

17                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY:  It's probably not a  
18                   good road to expose them to right now so it's --

19                   MR. ROCKWELL:  Well, I have a back fence  
20                   and everything else.  If you widen that road it's  
21                   going to be closer to my yard eventually, that road  
22                   is going to be.  Thank you.

23                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY:  Thank you.

24                   MS. RAFATEK:  I'm Roxanne Rafatek, 4909

77

1                   Kings Way West.  Several of us are still confused  
2                   whether it was to remain Lake County property if  
3                   they can build anyway why would they want to be  
4                   annexed to Gurnee?  Is it a sewer and water issue?

5                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY:  That was I think made  
6                   pretty clear that Mr. Maiden indicated that they  
7                   probably wouldn't meet -- they wouldn't meet the  
8                   performance standards if they couldn't get sewer  
9                   and water access.

10                                   In order to get sewer they would  
11                   have to run another sewer line to the sanitary  
12                   district and I think you know how far that is, or  
13                   they would have to access Waukegan.

14                                   There's still a question of water.  
15                   If they don't get the water from Waukegan where  
16                   else could they get water.  They would have to get  
17                   it from the Village.

18 MR. WILDENBERG: Either that or if they  
19 could get authorization to sink a private well.

20 MS. RAFATEK: So why do they want to be  
21 annexed to Gurnee?

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Because if they annex  
23 to Gurnee then they have access to the sewer and  
24 water.

78

1 MS. RAFATEK: Okay. So when you stated  
2 earlier that well and septic could be built on this  
3 property or could not?

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: No, the septic could  
5 not.

6 MS. RAFATEK: So they have to be  
7 annexed. This whole notion that they can build on  
8 this anyway --

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You don't need to use  
10 that language. They would have to run the sewer  
11 all the way to -- they could put their own sewer in  
12 or they could access sewer from Waukegan.

13 Waukegan is across the street on  
14 120 so they would have to run it under 120.

15 MS. VELKOVER: Water and sewer are on  
16 the south side of 120 in the City of Waukegan and  
17 they could approach the City of Waukegan and  
18 request to tap onto the sewer and water in the city

19 there.

20                               Whether Waukegan would allow that,  
21 I don't think any of us know that. So that is a  
22 possibility, though.

23                               CHAIRMAN RUDNY: There are other  
24 reasons. I mean it would be preferable to annex to

79

1 Gurnee, there's no question about it. Because not  
2 only because of the sewer and water but also  
3 because of the other services that they would have  
4 access to.

5                               For example, police. They would  
6 have access to our police whereas if they're in the  
7 County certainly the Gurnee Police would assist in  
8 emergencies but for any normal calls they would  
9 have to wait for the Lake County Sheriff's  
10 Department to show up. So there clearly are other  
11 benefits of coming into the village.

12                               MS. RAFATEK: I just want a  
13 clarification because at every one of these  
14 meetings they add that they could build on this or  
15 somebody mentions that they could go out and build  
16 on this anyway because it's Lake County property.

17                               CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, there's problems.  
18 When they say build anyway, there's a question as  
19 to whether they could build. That's a possibility



21 I'm sure that's going to be discussed when we get  
22 back to the Commissioners.

23 MS. RAFATEK: And then my last comment  
24 has to do with Jewel's perception that this is what

81

1 the customers wanted and it's a convenience for the  
2 customers and the customers need a 24 hour store.

3 And I think these are your  
4 customers in this room and we're telling you what  
5 we want. I haven't seen any surveys and I don't  
6 know if they've given any customer surveys in front  
7 of the Commission or not, but the customers here  
8 are telling them that that's not what we need.

9 I think Jewel -- this is from  
10 Jewel's standpoint this is not about customers from  
11 Jewel's standpoint, this is about money. That's  
12 what it's about. It's how much money they can  
13 make, and I can respect that; but as a customer and  
14 a citizen and a neighbor I don't want it.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

16 MR. COLWELL: My name is John Colwell.  
17 I live at 5060 Long Hill Road.

18 The gentleman from Jewel in the  
19 beginning summed up some of the key issues being  
20 land use, traffic, noise, architecture and  
21 landscape.

22                               What he didn't address is an issue  
23       that I think is important and that is the issue of  
24       crime.     The store in Lakehurst is a crime magnet

82

1       or an area that is a magnet to crime.   I have  
2       personally been in that store to witness a security  
3       person chasing a thief out the front door.

4                               And I happened to comment at the  
5       time to an employee how often does this happen and  
6       she said quite often.   Now -- and that environment  
7       over there if someone is chased out the door can  
8       run off and get lost in the parking lots and into  
9       the Lakehurst Mall.

10                              However, as I look at this setup  
11       over here, the likely place for people to run who  
12       are chased out the store or engaged in other  
13       criminal activity that that kind of a site draws  
14       are going to run into the back yards, my back yard  
15       where your children, our children play.   That  
16       concerns me a great deal.

17                              I see they're going to put a berm  
18       there, that's fine.   But as far as I'm concerned,  
19       we need a moat.   Thank you.

20                              MS. BOWYER:   My name is Donna Bowyer,  
21       14566 Eastwood.   I want to just make a comment.   My  
22       family has lived at the corner of O'Plaine and 120

23 for 120 years. We're the Lossmans. My grandmother  
24 made a decision when she was well into her eighties

83

1 to sell some farmland and Lossmans' woods which is  
2 now Providence Village. It was Phase I of  
3 Providence Village and I just thought you'd like to  
4 know that.

5 MR. MITCHELL: My name is Pete Mitchell,  
6 602 Plymouth Court.

7 I just had a question. I wanted to  
8 verify what is which piece of the building is  
9 facing Providence Village? Which piece of the  
10 building?

11 MS. VELKOVER: The second from the  
12 bottom I believe; is that correct?

13 MR. THEODORE: Yes.

14 MR. MITCHELL: This one here?

15 MS. VELKOVER: Yes.

16 MR. MITCHELL: Where the loading docks  
17 are? Okay. Thanks.

18 MR. BROWN: No, that's not correct.

19 MR. DOSE: That's not correct.

20 MR. MITCHELL: That's not correct?

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We'll give you a chance  
22 to clear that up.

23 MR. MITCHELL: Is it the bottom? Is it



24 the bottom of the building? Which one of these is

84

1 facing my house?

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We will -- you know,  
3 we'll let them address that. Why don't you leave  
4 the drawing and then we'll address it after the  
5 floor is closed to the public.

6 MR. MITCHELL: Thanks.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yes, sir, go ahead.

8 MR. TECHE: My name is Tom Teche. I  
9 live at 4411 Long Meadow Drive in Providence Oaks  
10 Subdivision.

11 There was some earlier comments  
12 about the traffic issue and I was here at the last  
13 meeting when there was a reasonably elegant  
14 presentation I must admit about traffic access and  
15 control and flow.

16 But the fact of the matter is if  
17 you look at the Grand Hunt store and certainly  
18 there are other businesses in that area that it's  
19 obvious from my shopping and my wife's shopping in  
20 that area that a lot of the traffic is in fact  
21 going to Jewel.

22 I count one, two, three, four,  
23 perhaps five different accesses to the Grand Hunt  
24 Jewel-Osco store. I count one to this opportunity.

1                   MR. SHARON: My name is John Sharon. I  
2 live at 652 Lexington Square West in Providence  
3 Village.

4                   One of my neighbors is out of town  
5 so he asked me to read a one paragraph note that  
6 he'd like to be read. Is that okay?

7                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yeah, that would be  
8 fine.

9                   MR. SHARON: This is from Jim Losser,  
10 4850 Kings Way West in Gurnee. My question to the  
11 Board is what is the purpose of the building Plan  
12 Commission? Is it to plan, is it to plan a  
13 developed community in which one can grow, invest  
14 and raise a family while maintaining a friendly  
15 welcoming environment or is it to increase the  
16 profitability of the community as a business  
17 through increased sales revenue?

18                   If it's the latter then I recommend  
19 we change the signs leading into the Village to  
20 read Gurnee, it's a great place to shop but I  
21 wouldn't want to live there.

22                   I didn't write the letter. As a  
23 resident and registered voter of Gurnee and  
24 taxpayer of Gurnee in Lake County I am against this

1 proposal. And it's signed Jim Losser.

2 That's Jim's letter. And he  
3 thought it was important enough that he was out of  
4 town but he wanted to make his opinion known. And  
5 I think there's a lot of people that I spoke to  
6 also that actually couldn't be here because they  
7 also are traveling but quite a few people have  
8 shown up.

9 One person did mention to me that I  
10 had spoken to in Providence Oaks, when discussing  
11 this he said well, you know, the government is for  
12 the people of the people and by the people. You  
13 know, these are -- we are who everything is  
14 supposed to be for, not the developers.

15 I have nothing against the  
16 Petitioners and there's certainly no animosity  
17 against them personally. I wish them the best of  
18 luck, but they wouldn't have this problem if they  
19 weren't trying to build some place that wasn't  
20 intended for this type of intensity. And it's  
21 clearly stated on the map if you just look at the  
22 color coding that you're not supposed to build  
23 something of this intensity in this particular  
24 piece of property.

1                   One thing I didn't know until just  
2                   recently is the landscape architect had mentioned  
3                   that the berm would be five feet tall. Please  
4                   don't -- I mean don't take this wrong, I don't mean  
5                   it in a mean way, but that's really a bad plan.  
6                   Five feet? You're telling me that I'm taller than  
7                   a berm? I mean that doesn't protect anybody. That  
8                   doesn't cut off anything. That doesn't shield  
9                   anything from anybody. That's horrible.

10                   I think getting back to the most  
11                   important part is what would the compelling reason  
12                   be for this Board to change the comprehensive plan.  
13                   It can't be tax revenue because we've got enough of  
14                   that. And it can't be just for convenience. I  
15                   mean if the convenience is supposed to be for the  
16                   citizens and we're the citizens that don't think  
17                   that the convenience is worth it.

18                   So what would the compelling reason  
19                   be to change something that's so important to the  
20                   City of Gurnee and the Village of Gurnee as the  
21                   comprehensive plan. Thank you.

22                   MS. COURSHON: Mary Courshon, 55 Silo  
23                   Court, South Ridge.

24                   Though I don't live directly

1 adjacent to the property in question the  
2 development of Gurnee has become a very sensitive  
3 issue with me.

4                                 And the sewer and water issue, the  
5 fact that they cannot access, annex or whatever  
6 directly into the lines without creating a line  
7 that's not been addressed by the Petitioner as a  
8 result of the information from this meeting whether  
9 or not they would intend to try to rip up, further  
10 screwing up the traffic at 120, to access onto the  
11 Waukegan sewer and water lines.

12                                 At this point because they do not  
13 have granting of access to sewer and water their  
14 petition becomes void unless they are willing of  
15 course to dig the trench along the O'Plaine Road.

16                                 The hours of operation, as we  
17 continue with the contention of this being a  
18 neighborhood store has been very clearly delineated  
19 by the customers/neighborhood that it is not  
20 interested in it being a 24 hour store. However,  
21 the profit margin has spoken inasmuch that he does  
22 not want to be hamstrung by this particular edict  
23 from the neighborhood.

24                                 I also want to address that the

1 neighborhood store concept of Jewel being -- having  
2 stores within three to five minutes at this point  
3 you can reach there at light speed from Providence  
4 Oaks and Providence Village areas.

5 Also, by moving the store into that  
6 area it begs the question as to whether or not they  
7 are interested in becoming a commuter store to  
8 catch the traffic coming from Waukegan going home  
9 west to do their little pickup grocery shopping  
10 which again has nothing to do with our  
11 neighborhoods. It has something to do with  
12 bringing an additional amount of traffic which is  
13 not exactly what they have pitched here in previous  
14 meetings.

15 They were talking about only doing  
16 neighborhood draw traffic, not really adding an  
17 additional burden to the already taxed area. And  
18 so I just thought I'd introduce that into -- for  
19 consideration.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.

21 MS. HELKIN: I'm Helen Helkin, 435  
22 South O'Plaine Road. Will this Jewel-Osco replace  
23 the one at Lakehurst or has consideration been  
24 given to enhancing that to serve the purposes that

90

1 you're talking about here tonight?

2 I think that would be something  
3 that we'd all like to know. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you. I'm  
5 sorry, go ahead.

6 MR. CHERVIN: Mr. Chairman, my name is  
7 Paul Chervin and I'm an attorney with offices in  
8 Waukegan.

9 I represent the property owner that  
10 owns 45 acres of property on the southwest corner  
11 of O'Plaine and 120. That property is in the City  
12 of Waukegan.

13 And I'd like to just address the  
14 issue that was -- one of the issues that Mr. Maiden  
15 brought up about the sewer capacity. That  
16 property, the property on the south side of 120,  
17 the sewer capacity has all been addressed as far as  
18 the North Shore Sanitary District is concerned on  
19 the 45 acres of property that my client owns which  
20 incidentally is zoned business or commercial and  
21 would be a prime site for a food store. I'll keep  
22 that in mind.

23 But the sewer capacity is spoken  
24 for. Between the Grand development, the United

91

1 development and what will be developed on the  
2 commercial property on the southwest corner the

3 sewer capacity is taken. So inner party or  
4 tri-party agreements, et cetera would not  
5 accomplish the purpose and I just would like to set  
6 the record straight.

7 I'm mainly here to monitor the  
8 Route 53 impact because Route 53 will directly  
9 impact the development of the 45 acres on the  
10 southwest corner of O'Plaine and 120.

11 So hopefully the Commission can  
12 take that into consideration in feeling that this  
13 property if it's going to be developed perhaps  
14 should be developed into Gurnee because of the fact  
15 that sewer and water is only available if  
16 annexation is brought in to the Village of Gurnee.  
17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.  
19 Anyone else have a comment or question?

20 MS. SANDERS: Nancy Sanders, 4012 Kings  
21 Way West.

22 The only thing I am a little  
23 confused about, up until tonight I was of the  
24 impression that Jewel was only contemplating and

92

1 wanted the ability in the next five years to commit  
2 to build a store there or not.

3 Tonight I sense a tone difference



4 or change in that they're saying we are going to  
5 build. And I guess I'd like that clarified because  
6 the thought occurred to me is is there something  
7 else going on here other than they want to build  
8 there.

9                   Because before they're saying well,  
10 maybe we will, maybe we won't, we just want the  
11 ability to tie it up for five years. And my  
12 thought is how do we know something better and more  
13 to our suiting could come along in five years but  
14 we would miss that opportunity because Jewel would  
15 have that tied up.

16                   So I guess I'd like to know is  
17 it -- is it a done deal if they get this will they  
18 build or are they still hemming and saying well,  
19 we'd like the ability but we don't want to be  
20 committed to build in the next five years.

21                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I think I can  
22 almost answer that I think no one can predict the  
23 future.

24                   My impression is that they intend

93

1 on building a store but it wouldn't be in a year or  
2 two, it would probably be more like in a three year  
3 period. So I think what they're saying is because  
4 of that there's some uncertainty there.

5                   If they were going to break ground  
6                   tomorrow you would say we know we're going to build  
7                   this, we're all ready to go. They're saying look,  
8                   we think we want to build here in three years.

9                   And so to kind of cover any further  
10                  uncertainty they say look, if we don't build this  
11                  store in five years then it will revert back to the  
12                  C/O-1 zoning just -- I think that's more as a  
13                  courtesy to the Village to let us know that we  
14                  don't always have to then worry about some other  
15                  type of business like that coming in.

16                  In other words, they're saying  
17                  look, we want to build a Jewel here, we're going to  
18                  probably do that in five years.

19                  MS. SANDERS: Is that standard procedure  
20                  then?

21                  CHAIRMAN RUDNY: No, that's somewhat  
22                  unusual. In most cases the intent is to usually do  
23                  it in a short term, that they want to purchase the  
24                  land and build. But there's nothing wrong with

94

1                  this. I don't see that there's any problem.

2                  MS. SANDERS: The only thing I see wrong  
3                  is they can tie it up for five years, come back and  
4                  say we don't want it. In the meanwhile there may  
5                  be some office buildings or some sort of complex

6 that would be more into our liking or desires.

7 But, you know, they're going to  
8 find another site because they want to build in  
9 less than five years. So I mean, you know, get off  
10 the fence. Either you want to build or you don't  
11 want to build. Don't make us tie this up for five  
12 years.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Tracy can address that.

14 MS. VELKOVER: Initially they came in  
15 and they wanted to zone this C/B-2 parcel C/B-2  
16 indefinitely forever.

17 And then based upon the concerns of  
18 some of the residents that came out that said that  
19 they would prefer that, you know, there be  
20 office/service Jewel put the timeline of five years  
21 on it. If they don't build within five years then  
22 it reverts back.

23 Typically we just zone property and  
24 it's zoned, you know, forever until somebody comes

95

1 in and petitions to amend or change the zoning.  
2 But in this case they voluntarily put the five year  
3 time frame on it so that it could revert to  
4 office/service and therefore be more consistent to  
5 the comprehensive land use plan.

6 MS. SANDERS: But in the meanwhile they

7 have a landlock on that, they tied that up; is that  
8 correct?

9 MS. VELKOVER: Correct.

10 MS. SANDERS: So somebody could come  
11 along and say I want to build a Greenleaf and you  
12 would have to say well, that property isn't  
13 available right now.

14 MS. VELKOVER: If they would be  
15 purchasing the property, right, they would have the  
16 right if they achieve the zoning, yes.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The Village doesn't own  
18 the property. There's a land owner that owns it  
19 and is selling it to American Stores.

20 American Stores is only going to  
21 buy that property if they know that they can get  
22 the zoning to build their store. If they get that  
23 zoning then they own the property.

24 Now if somebody comes along with an

96

1 office building if they can convince American  
2 Stores, if they can offer them enough money to buy  
3 the property and come along for rezoning and we  
4 probably would let them build their office  
5 building.

6 That's the way the system works.

7 That's a decision that the Plan Commission would

8 have to make. Once the Village of Gurnee approves  
9 this, if they approve this then there's not going  
10 to be any office building there, it's likely going  
11 to be a Jewel.

12 And that's a decision that we have  
13 to make, a recommendation that we have to make to  
14 the Village of Gurnee Board and that's a decision  
15 that the Village of Gurnee Board is going to have  
16 to make.

17 MS. SANDERS: So they're not saying I'm  
18 going to buy it in five years, they're saying I'm  
19 buying it right now but I will have up to five  
20 years to develop it.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And like Tracy said,  
22 actually it's a courtesy to the Village of Gurnee  
23 to say look, if we haven't built the store in five  
24 years it will revert to office.

97

1 They could be asking for the zoning  
2 forever. That's somewhat an advantage to the  
3 Village and to the people that look, we're not  
4 going to go past five years. If we haven't built  
5 in five years then it's going to revert back to  
6 office.

7 MR. WILDENBERG: Don.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yes, Jon.

9 MR. WILDENBERG: The other thing is if  
10 an office development came along, prospective users  
11 came along within that five year period we still  
12 have the rest of the site that could be developed  
13 as office within that five year period as well.

14 So the opportunity is not  
15 completely negated for office within that first  
16 five year period.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Right. Yes, sir.

18 MR. SIMMONS: My name is Ron Simmons.  
19 I live at 650 Plymouth Court.

20 Rather than refer to it as 120 or  
21 northwest I'm just going to call it my back yard  
22 because that's what it involves. I initially  
23 thought I wouldn't say anything tonight but I just  
24 can't help it.

98

1 I reflect and I think about my  
2 transition moving here three years ago and starting  
3 out what amounted to 61 houses going from Algonquin  
4 to Crystal Lake and ending up in Gurnee. And I  
5 think in retrospect what a good decision.

6 I haven't had the opportunity to  
7 attend every meeting, but I reflect, Mr. Chairman,  
8 as I kind of watch your demeanor in terms of how I  
9 observe you kind of move from a position of what I

10 thought initially was neutrality to almost an ally  
11 in this process and that disturbs me deeply.

12 One of the things that I want to  
13 suggest to all of you in this process that you have  
14 to consider is what if you're wrong about this,  
15 the irreparable harm that takes place in this  
16 process. It's not like we can digress, reverse the  
17 process and undo this.

18 You affect the institution of which  
19 you represent, the irreparable harm that's done to  
20 all these people in this room. Forget about the  
21 monetary value. You can look and see what my  
22 property value is. Sure, it's a lot of money.

23 I'm disturbed by that, but that's  
24 not the motivation and the context of this. The

99

1 implications of you and how you could consider even  
2 beginning to think about making a favorable  
3 recommendation given what's at risk here, it's not  
4 logical, it's not plausible, there's no basis for  
5 that under any circumstances.

6 And I ask you to consider the  
7 institution that you represent in this process.  
8 You establish a precedence here that you can't turn  
9 back and everyone that succeeds you will be stuck  
10 with this in the context of just how this thing

11 affects this community.

12                               And I wonder about that. I don't  
13 know if you think about that. You mentioned  
14 Country Trail. And I'm sure you've had the  
15 opportunity to be confronted with a number of  
16 difficult decisions, but for us this is our first  
17 difficult decision in the context of this thing.

18                               It does not make any sense,  
19 there's no basis for it. Economically it's been  
20 proven unsubstantiated that it has no value.  
21 Obviously when you start talking about berms and  
22 all the other esoteric things that go along with  
23 these, these people are just sitting here giving  
24 you a bunch of fluff in the context of that.

100

1                               You can't talk about berms at five  
2 feet. Come on, that makes no sense to anybody. I  
3 appeal to you to consider the institutions that you  
4 represent in the context of this thing. And if  
5 you're wrong the irreparable harm that you do to  
6 this community, you'll be labeled for the rest of  
7 your life in the context of this decision.

8                               CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'd like to address a  
9 little bit on that.

10                               I've been on the Plan Commission  
11 for sixteen years and I appreciate what you're



12 saying. I can assure you that I know I and I  
13 believe all the other Commissioners take this job  
14 very seriously.

15 And I agree with you the decisions  
16 we make we have to live with and our children and  
17 their children will have to live with for years and  
18 years. You know, fifty to a hundred years. So  
19 that's why we take the comprehensive plan so  
20 seriously and I'm sure that the Commissioners will  
21 be addressing those issues, you know, when we close  
22 the floor to the public.

23 It's an important decision. And  
24 believe me, we take it very seriously. So any

101

1 other questions or comments? Yes, ma'am.

2 MS. MAMIN: Actually, this is just an  
3 observation. My name is Mary Mamin, I live at 4580  
4 Providence Road.

5 After the second meeting when there  
6 was a lot of concern by residents about this  
7 actually coming to pass I took it upon myself to go  
8 and see what it would be like if we lived in a  
9 neighborhood that had a Jewel-Osco near us.

10 So I visited property immediately  
11 behind the current property behind Hunt Club Road.  
12 And the first and most noticeable thing was that

13 it's not residential single family dwellings. It  
14 was rental property.

15 This is a transitional area for  
16 people if they don't like it they have the ability  
17 to move in and out. And they also don't have a  
18 voice, a unified force or an investment pocketbook  
19 that is being made towards the thing.

20 Secondly, I made an informal  
21 request by just walking and knocking on doors and  
22 asking people what do you think of living behind an  
23 establishment like this. And time after time  
24 people I spoke to said they had to keep their

102

1 windows closed year round during the nighttime  
2 hours, anywhere from ten to six in the morning due  
3 to the result of having trucks and the noise and  
4 all of facilities moving in.

5 Now if that's something that you're  
6 dealing with in an area where people can't speak  
7 for themselves because they're not a unified force,  
8 here we are a bunch of invested owners here saying  
9 we don't want that. That is something that does  
10 devalue our homes.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anyone else? Question  
12 or comment?

13 (No response.)

14                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. IF not, the  
15 floor is closed to the public.

16                   And I think there were some  
17 questions that were asked that we probably need to  
18 address. I just had some notes here.

19                   Did you -- were there alternate  
20 sites that you considered before you looked at this  
21 one?

22                   MR. BROWN: Yes, there certainly were.  
23 And in fact we were questioned on that at I believe  
24 the initial Plan Commission hearing as to why

103

1 several other alternatives such as the intersection  
2 of Washington and O'Plaine could not be considered  
3 which we responded to by virtue of the size of the  
4 parcels and the proximity to our existing stores.

5                   It's closer to both our Grand and  
6 Green Bay -- it's a mile closer to our Grand and  
7 Green Bay store and also to our Grand and Hunt Club  
8 store.

9                   Secondly, there are other --

10                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Please, let him speak.  
11 We let everyone else speak.

12                   MR. BROWN: I'm curious as to why people  
13 would question the geography of Washington and  
14 O'Plaine being not closer to our existing stores.

15 That confuses me.

16 THE AUDIENCE: It's not a mile.

17 MR. BROWN: To continue, there are other  
18 sites in incorporated Lake County also in Waukegan  
19 that have been evaluated.

20 The gentleman representing the  
21 Penguin Property, the Pritzker property in the  
22 southwest corner was a site that we had evaluated  
23 early on and so there are a number of alternatives.

24 But we identified this site as

104

1 being one that had development flexibility, the  
2 ability to buffer ourselves from residential which  
3 we knew would be a concern, always is, always will  
4 be. And I hope in the planning that we've  
5 attempted to illustrate tonight would just enhance  
6 that.

7 I would like to correct the record,  
8 though, if I might on a couple statements that we  
9 made that were not correct.

10 One, I indicated earlier that the  
11 potential right-of-way taking on Route 120  
12 Belvidere Road provided a setback of 85 feet from  
13 the south. I was informed by my engineer that the  
14 plan that we submitted to the Village of Gurnee  
15 shows a 60 foot buffer. So I had 25 feet extra in

16 there that it was not correct. So there is now a  
17 60 foot buffer. But again, that reflects our best  
18 estimate of what the IDOT taking will be.

19                   Secondly, the height of the berm  
20 Mr. Bussman clarified, he was referring to the  
21 lowest point from the floor elevation as best he  
22 could calculate it in the residences immediately  
23 north in Providence Village.

24                   The typical height of that berm

105

1 will gradiate from 8 to 10 feet depending on where  
2 it is in the property. Obviously it's not a  
3 completely flat piece of property.

4                   And that's the berm itself. Above  
5 that obviously is landscaping, significant  
6 landscaping and the fence as well. So I want to  
7 correct the record on that.

8                   And if there are any other  
9 questions I would be happy to try to address those  
10 as well.

11                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Tracy, was there some  
12 other things that needed to be addressed?

13                   MS. VELKOVER: There was a question  
14 about the Lakehurst Jewel and if they had any  
15 specific hours of operation.

16                   MR. BROWN: The hours of operation at

17 Lakehurst are limited. I don't know specifically  
18 what they are. The one gentleman indicated ten  
19 o'clock. That may be correct.

20                                 Again, if the customer demand is  
21 not there for extended hours then the store will  
22 not remain open. We don't make any profit during  
23 extended hours, it's strictly a convenience. If  
24 the customers don't support the store then

106

1 obviously there's no reason to keep it open.

2                                 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And then there was a  
3 question about, you know, I recall from the  
4 first -- I think you addressed that in the first  
5 meeting as to whether that Lakehurst store would  
6 remain open and I think you were uncertain.

7                                 MR. BROWN: We are still uncertain. If  
8 anyone here can tell us what the history or future  
9 of Lakehurst is I would be very anxious to hear  
10 that.

11                                 We understand that it's under  
12 contract to a developer, the entire shopping  
13 center. We're not certain what the specific plans  
14 are for that center. It's possible that it may be  
15 completely redeveloped. And if that occurs  
16 obviously we'll have to react at that point in  
17 time.

18                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is there a potential  
19                   that you would actually keep both stores open?

20                   MR. BROWN: Again, we don't know what  
21                   the future of Lakehurst is. I've stated before we  
22                   have no plans to close that store unless of course  
23                   those plans are forced upon us by the owner of the  
24                   property.

107

1                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Anything else,  
2                   Tracy?

3                   MS. VELKOVER: Eastwood east of  
4                   O'Plaine.

5                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: There was a question on  
6                   Eastwood. I thought I addressed that. I don't  
7                   know that Jewel is really in a position to address  
8                   that, but do you have any -- does the traffic  
9                   consultant --

10                  MR. BROWN: Our plan does not envision  
11                  any improvements on the east side of O'Plaine Road.

12                  MS. VELKOVER: The plans are for the 53  
13                  extension should that go through then 120, I'm sure  
14                  most of you have seen this, would go over O'Plaine  
15                  Road at that time.

16                                 And they are proposing because of  
17                                 the close proximity of Eastwood to that  
18                                 intersection that would have to be closed off in

19 some manner, probably a cul-de-sac.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So, in other words,  
21 it's -- what's envisioned by the Village at least  
22 is that that wouldn't be cul-de-saced until the 53  
23 would come in?

24 MR. WILDENBERG: It's not totally

108

1 dependent on the Route 53 situation. The Eastwood  
2 access is very tricky right now given its proximity  
3 to 120.

4 As the O'Plaine Road improvements  
5 proceed the closing of Eastwood or the  
6 cul-de-sacing of Eastwood might take place at that  
7 point in time.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That was my  
9 understanding is almost actually that it could be  
10 considered now because of the situation.

11 MR. WILDENBERG: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So is there anything  
13 else?

14 MS. VELKOVER: There was a question  
15 about it was directed at staff about whether there  
16 was another location in town where we had two ins,  
17 two out.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Similar traffic  
19 pattern, right.



20 MS. VELKOVER: And thinking about it all  
21 I could come up with was possibly the Dominicks and  
22 Piggly Wiggly, those were the two that came to  
23 mind.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Dominick's has two

109

1 access, has two accesses there.

2 So let's open it up to the  
3 Commissioners. Any additional questions or  
4 comments at this time?

5 (No response.)

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: One of those silent  
7 periods. You know, I'll start a little bit.

8 This is clearly a project that I  
9 really struggled with and I finally realized that  
10 the reason I'm struggling with it is because I  
11 don't -- I never envisioned something like this  
12 going in there. Clearly it is not consistent with  
13 the comprehensive plan, certainly with my vision  
14 for what would go in on that corner.

15 One of the things that concerns  
16 me -- and, you know, maybe the other Commissioners  
17 can help me on it -- I really feel that if, you  
18 know, our vision was to have a nice office park or  
19 business park go in there, I guess if the Jewel  
20 went in before the office property was developed it

21 seems to me that that's going to really detract for  
22 the development of the office park.

23 I mean if I wanted -- I don't  
24 really think we're going to see upscale office go

110

1 in on that site when you've got commercial at the  
2 entryway.

3 So I don't know if you guys have  
4 thought about that, but I certainly wouldn't want  
5 to put my corporate headquarters in there.

6 Any thoughts on that?

7 MS. KOVARIK: I don't think you'd get a  
8 Conway Farm or a Continental Executive Parkway like  
9 they have in Vernon Hills there with the Jewel.

10 You may get some Greenleaf which  
11 is small, nice. But you wouldn't get that large  
12 corporate headquarters.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm not even saying  
14 necessarily a corporate headquarters but even some  
15 of the business development that you see in the  
16 Grand Tri-State Business Park. I think you may  
17 tend not to get that here because of the commercial  
18 development out front.

19 I mean it's like the one gentleman  
20 asked, I would be concerned about that as well is  
21 that if they have trouble developing the property

22 just to the west of Jewel as office, you know, I  
23 mean are they going to be in here in five or six  
24 years saying geez, we can't market this as office,

111

1 you know, it's an ideal place for some more  
2 commercial to go in and we'd like to have that  
3 rezoned. I mean that's potentially a possibility.

4 But I still -- you know, it's -- as  
5 I said before, I've been on the Plan Commission a  
6 long time, I've looked at a lot of petitions.  
7 There's easy ones and there's hard ones. This is  
8 one of the hardest ones.

9 And they get harder because the  
10 Petitioner is trying to do something that you  
11 didn't envision and that's what makes it hard. The  
12 Saturn dealer came in here a few weeks ago and I  
13 know I think it was in the pretty late night  
14 session and it went through very smoothly because  
15 he developed it in an area that was designed to be  
16 developed in that way.

17 Everything was in place, it was a  
18 good design and the Commissioners didn't really  
19 have any trouble approving it.

20 And I sense that we're having  
21 problems with this one. Mr. Sula.

22 MR. SULA: I can't think of another

23 example that's identical to this one, but I can  
24 think of some that are similar in terms of a

112

1 mixture of retail and office.

2                   We talk about Bannockburn Green  
3 quite a bit. Immediately behind Bannockburn Green  
4 once you get past the tennis courts there's the  
5 Bannockburn office complex and it's a very well  
6 done office complex that's well shielded and they  
7 spent a heck of a lot of money on landscaping in  
8 that particular complex to shield it from the  
9 surrounding roads as well as the retail.

10                   Bannockburn Green in itself is  
11 bigger than that particular project so it's not an  
12 identical scenario. The other one I can think of  
13 is I guess it's Vernon Hills, Route 60 and at the  
14 very northern edge of where like the Walgreens and  
15 there's a little strip mall there, there's offices  
16 to the west of there. It seems to blend okay.

17                   But the notable difference is that  
18 behind there is really more multi-family housing as  
19 opposed to single family housing.

20                   The thing that I find real  
21 difficult when weighing the pros and cons on this  
22 particular one is one of land builder rights. And  
23 this isn't going to be very popular, but the land

24 holder of the property has rights, too. And the

113

1 underlying zoning does seem to indicate that there  
2 is some realm of possibility of similar if not more  
3 intense uses at that particular corner.

4 And while the other alternatives  
5 might be to go to other jurisdictions beyond Gurnee  
6 to get some of the services -- and I'm not going to  
7 debate whether they're going to get it or  
8 not, that's not my expertise -- what I do know is  
9 that to do that is going to cost the project more  
10 money and to recoup more money spent on  
11 infrastructure requires more density which bites  
12 against what we're trying to do here.

13 My gut instinct tells me that as  
14 much as we can work with this to make it as  
15 palatable as possible and exert as much control  
16 over it the better off we're going to be. But it's  
17 not easy. It's not easy at all.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So we should accept  
19 something we don't want to prevent something that  
20 we don't want?

21 MR. SULA: I think we should work on  
22 compromise to get something that is a win-win for  
23 all the parties involved is what I think.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Mr. Smith.

1                   MR. SMITH: I have a concern with what  
2 could possibly go in there, too.

3                   I think when they talked to this  
4 realtor he states that it being vacant so that's  
5 what our values are. But did he take it that there  
6 could be three times this density there what would  
7 your property value be.

8                   And I think that might hurt it more  
9 than what this would. That's my concern. He's  
10 taking this as being vacant.

11                  I'm sure he's not taking -- same  
12 thing with the traffic. I mean something is going  
13 to be built there and it's not going to be houses  
14 on two acre lots. It's going to be high density  
15 and so it's going to create traffic and O'Plaine  
16 Road is going to be widened and it's going to bring  
17 that traffic there no matter. It's going to be  
18 developed some time and it can be at a higher  
19 density in certain situations than that. That's my  
20 problem.

21                  CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Foster.

22                  MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, I saw you  
23 looking at me a few minutes ago. I think I'm close  
24 to where Mr. Sula is.

1                   I do feel that while it's obviously  
2     in this room an unpopular position I personally  
3     feel that the developer has made considerable  
4     modifications and concession to try to accommodate  
5     many of the different concerns they have employed.

6                   I believe that the landscape buffer  
7     is actually significant. I believe that the office  
8     service provides -- it might not be the most  
9     transitional, you know, phase but it does provide  
10    some transition next to the single family  
11    residential.

12                  I do think that this development  
13    has the wherewithal to put up the quality  
14    development. I believe they also have the  
15    wherewithal to work with the Village and with the  
16    neighborhood that if this store did go in, if this  
17    went forward that additional things could be done  
18    to accommodate some of the concerns that have been  
19    voiced.

20                  So at this point in terms of our  
21    discussion I am more leaning on the side of being  
22    in favor of this site.

23                  CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And have you come up  
24    with that compelling reason to deviate from the

1 comprehensive plan yet?

2 MR. FOSTER: Well, the compelling reason  
3 is a good issue, but I believe I would respond by  
4 saying I think that close to 75 percent of this  
5 parcel is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

6 And I believe that, you know, we  
7 have as a Commission contemplated neighborhood  
8 commercial, you know, development here. Obviously  
9 I understand this is not what -- you say this is  
10 not a neighborhood business center, there's a  
11 margin in that. But it's not 150,000 or 140,000  
12 square feet as it was originally proposed here.

13 So I do believe that if the office  
14 space is significant enough some portion of that  
15 property could be set aside as retail. Whether 25  
16 percent, 24 percent is the right formula, I'm not  
17 going to say it is. Maybe it's 15 percent. But I  
18 could live with 25 percent.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Ms. Kovarik, did you  
20 have something?

21 MS. KOVARIK: I, like you, have really  
22 struggled. This has been the hardest issue that  
23 I've looked at in a year and a half.

24 And as late as this afternoon I was



1 sitting with these plans across my desk trying to  
2 go one way or the other. I think what's helping me  
3 lean one way or the other is I spent some time with  
4 the Zoning Ordinance this afternoon and I looked at  
5 it tonight.

6                   And not the comprehensive plan,  
7 land plan, the zoning ordinance is very specific  
8 that Petitioners for commercial zoning are  
9 encouraged to apply for such zoning only in areas  
10 designated for commercial uses on the official  
11 land plan of Gurnee, Illinois kind of helps me a  
12 little bit.

13                   It also under on the description of  
14 C/B-1 which is what they're asking for here, the  
15 description of that C/B-1 zoning is day-to-day  
16 shopping needs for persons and adjacent  
17 neighborhood that will permit such uses as  
18 necessary to satisfy the basic shopping  
19 requirements should be encouraged to develop as a  
20 small neighborhood shopping center.

21                   A neighborhood shopping center in  
22 my mind is not the same size as the Grand Hunt park  
23 -- the Grand Hunt Jewel that's up there. That goes  
24 well beyond the basic needs. This is a very large

1 store.

2 That just goes beyond what I  
3 envision for a neighborhood, which I would like to  
4 see a neighborhood, I think a neighborhood center  
5 would probably be fitting there, 25 percent of the  
6 neighborhood and 75 percent office.

7 I did -- like the one gentleman  
8 said that we only get one opportunity to get it  
9 right. And I almost said something similar this  
10 afternoon myself, I've got to live with my  
11 decision. No matter how this goes tonight I have  
12 to live with what I vote the next 20, 30 years.  
13 And we only get one chance to get it right and I  
14 think only getting it 75 percent right is just not  
15 good enough for me.

16 I would not want to know that I got  
17 my prescription filled only 75 percent of the time  
18 right. So I -- as much as I struggled with this, I  
19 think after reading the Ordinance tonight and --  
20 yesterday and tonight again and in speaking I feel  
21 I know which way I'm going to lean or vote. I  
22 guess not lean, I have to do something tonight.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yeah, I think we're  
24 past the leaning stage. Mr. Sula.

119

1 MR. SULA: I just have one follow-up

2 comment and it relates to the 75 percent portion of  
3 the project.

4 I'm not really comfortable with how  
5 it's being defined. While I think that the Grand  
6 Tri-State project is a very nice project, I'm not  
7 sure that it's appropriate for that particular  
8 corner.

9 And I would like to see a little  
10 more strength in the commitment in terms of it  
11 being truly office as opposed to office slash  
12 office slash technical slash light assembly.

13 I'm all for research. I think the  
14 growth of the overall economy in the country is  
15 dependent upon research and I'm not opposed to  
16 research. But I don't think light assembly is  
17 appropriate for that particular gateway into the  
18 community.

19 And I'd like to see a stronger  
20 commitment toward office and office technical  
21 within the area.

22 And just to echo a comment I made  
23 before, the outlots, I don't think that drive-thru  
24 facilities should even be listed as an option under

120

1 the special use permits. I don't think it would  
2 convey a neighborhood feel for that particular

3 corner of the Village of Gurnee.

4 And that's all right now.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Mr. Cepon, did  
6 you have something?

7 MR. CEPON: Not really. I think  
8 everybody has said basically what we're all feeling  
9 and there isn't really much more I can add.

10 We all have mixed emotions on this  
11 and some of it is good and some of it is bad so I  
12 guess we just wait -- and are you ready for calling  
13 this or do you want to continue?

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't know, unless  
15 the Commissioners seem to have some reason to  
16 continue, I know Mr. Sula had some concerns there  
17 that might be addressed by the Petitioner.

18 Now one of the things that you're  
19 aware of that the office portion is just conceptual  
20 so that they would have to return, am I correct,  
21 Tracy, they would have to return to go to  
22 preliminary plat, they would have to come for more  
23 public hearings?

24 MR. SULA: I understand that, Don. And

121

1 one thing that bugs me in personal and private life  
2 is incremental disclosure. And I'd like to get all  
3 those things nailed down up front so I know what

4 I'm voting on in total and not a piecemeal basis.

5 I don't think it's fair to look at  
6 one block at a time. I need to look at the whole  
7 house.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Any other? Mr.  
9 Smith.

10 MR. SMITH: Are they willing to go  
11 without drive-thru facilities on the outlots,  
12 restriction on when you get deliveries no later  
13 than ten o'clock let's say or 9 o'clock or  
14 something no earlier than 7 in the morning?

15 MR. BROWN: As to the latter, we are  
16 definitely willing to restrict the hours of  
17 delivery vehicles to the Jewel-Osco and to the  
18 retail component.

19 And that's an issue one of the  
20 residents brought up. We face that in other areas  
21 and we appreciate that and that can be  
22 accomplished.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What are the  
24 hours?

122

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: What about the  
2 drive-thru?

3 MR. BROWN: As to the drive-thru  
4 facilities, as someone mentioned, it is a special

5 use, it will require special approval.

6 We envision a primary use for an  
7 outlot being a financial institution. Almost  
8 universally financial institutions will require a  
9 drive-thru of some sort.

10 So with the protection that the  
11 Commission and the Board would have to approve any  
12 such use because it is a special use we would  
13 request that we retain that opportunity to do  
14 something.

15 MR. CEPON: Would you envision two  
16 banks?

17 MR. BROWN: No.

18 MR. CEPON: I didn't think so.

19 MR. BROWN: One financial institution.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm told you can only  
21 have one financial institution according to the  
22 agreement.

23 MR. SULA: I think the point was  
24 throughout that the paperwork is asking for two

123

1 drive-thru operations and you can certainly  
2 understand the merits of a financial institution,  
3 but I think the more offensive thing is a fast food  
4 type drive-thru.

5 We've got enough chains in this

6 Village to last us a lifetime and we could use  
7 something that's more destination or community  
8 driven as opposed to national chain driven.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anyone else? Mr.  
10 Foster, did you have anything else?

11 MR. FOSTER: No, I was only going to say  
12 I support what Mr. Sula was saying in terms of at  
13 least I think in your discussion it could come up  
14 very strongly that from a conceptual standpoint we  
15 would not like to see light assembly. I support  
16 that, too.

17 I would really want true office for  
18 the rest of the site and I think that's a good  
19 point.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Well, the only  
21 comment I have is I would have to say I think Ms.  
22 Kovarik couldn't have put it better for me.

23 I agree with the one gentleman that  
24 these decisions are very important, they impact a

124

1 lot of people's lives. And that is the purpose of  
2 the comprehensive plan. And, you know, we tell  
3 people that come in here that complain about  
4 petitions well, you should have looked at the  
5 comprehensive plan, that we planned this a long  
6 time ago.

7                   And it's hard to look everybody in  
8                   the face now and say well, we're going to change  
9                   the zoning there and you can use the same on us and  
10                  say well, wait a minute, the comprehensive plan  
11                  shows this as being all office.

12                  And I -- the other thing -- the  
13                  other point is that the Petitioner has indicated  
14                  that if they don't build a Jewel in five years that  
15                  the entire site would revert back to a C/O-1.

16                  That tells me that the C/O-1 zoning  
17                  is a feasible zoning if they're willing to revert  
18                  back to that. So it's not like we have established  
19                  some unreasonable land use for this parcel.

20                  Even the Petitioner admits that  
21                  this parcel could be developed entirely as C/O-1.  
22                  So I'm off leaning, I'm clearly against this  
23                  proposal.

24                  So with that in mind, I certainly

125

1                  would entertain a motion for an unfavorable  
2                  recommendation if somebody is willing to give one.

3                  MR. CEPON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to  
4                  make a motion for an unfavorable recommendation to  
5                  rezone the property from Suburban to Planned Unit  
6                  Development C/B-1 plus the neighborhood commercial  
7                  and C/O-1 restricted office in the Village of



8 Gurnee.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do we have a second?

10 MS. KOVARIK: I'll second.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We have a motion and  
12 second. Do we have some discussion?

13 MR. FOSTER: Could I hear the motion  
14 again?

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm sorry?

16 MR. FOSTER: I'd like to just hear  
17 specifically the motion again.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You said you would like  
19 to discuss it?

20 MR. FOSTER: I would like to hear how  
21 the motion is worded specifically again.

22 MR. CEPON: Unfavorable recommendation  
23 to annex the property and change the zoning from  
24 Suburban in unincorporated Lake County to the

126

1 requested annexation and rezoning to a planned unit  
2 development with underlying C/B-1 neighborhood  
3 commercial and C/O-1 restricted office in the  
4 Village of Gurnee.

5 MS. SWANSON: If I could just clarify,  
6 the annexation itself is not an issue that the Plan  
7 Commission decides so it's strictly the rezoning  
8 issue.

9 MR. CEPON: Okay. Then you can strike  
10 that from the record.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other discussion?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. If not, all  
14 those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye  
15 in the roll call; those opposed nay. Roll call,  
16 please.

17 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.

18 MR. FOSTER: Nay.

19 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.

20 MR. SMITH: Nay.

21 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.

22 MR. CEPON: Nay.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Nay?

24 MR. CEPON: I'm sorry. I was repeating

127

1 myself.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I would say just to  
3 clarify again certainly so everybody understands  
4 this, it's an unfavorable recommendation.

5 MR. CEPON: Aye.

6 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.

7 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

8 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.

9 MR. SULA: Nay.

10 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. There's a 3-3 tie  
12 so there would be at this point no recommendation  
13 to the Village of Gurnee Board.

14 MR. SULA: Could we try --

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't think that it  
16 would make sense to, you know, move for a favorable  
17 recommendation. It would probably be a 3-3 tie.

18 But if someone wants to do that we  
19 can do that. If not then I would entertain a  
20 motion for adjournment.

21 MR. SULA: I'm just wondering if  
22 we're --

23 MR. FOSTER: I would like to say  
24 something after Mr. Sula.

128

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Sula, go ahead.

2 MR. SULA: I'm just wondering if we  
3 backed ourselves into a black and white corner the  
4 way that the motion was made.

5 And I would propose that we  
6 consider a motion recommending to the Village Board  
7 that we look favorably on a proposal that would  
8 limit the 75 percent to purely office, limit the  
9 outlots to no more than one -- please, I listened  
10 to you, I need to listen to myself here and speak



12                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So we have a motion and  
13 second. And I don't think I need to repeat it.

14                   Does everyone understand the  
15 motion? Any discussion?

16                   MR. FOSTER: Well --

17                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Foster.

18                   MR. FOSTER: Yes. I do think it's  
19 important even if perhaps the Commission is tied  
20 that our recommendation to the Village Board  
21 carries with it some language that it has the  
22 ability to express some concerns particularly since  
23 this agreement will involve annexation.

24                   I think there's been previous

130

1 experience in annexations that lets us know that a  
2 lot of things can go in annexation agreements and  
3 we want to be very careful in how an annexation  
4 agreement might go forward.

5                   At least the language attached to a  
6 potential motion could give the Village Board I  
7 think insight, additional insight into our concerns  
8 and perhaps additional constraints that could be  
9 attached to the development that would make this a  
10 more workable project.

11                   So I think having a motion going  
12 forward such as this may be helpful.

13                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't think you need  
14 the motion. What staff will do is that -- they're  
15 not just going to go to the Village Board and say  
16 it's a 3-3 tie.

17                   They will give them some insight as  
18 to what some of the concerns were. I think we had  
19 a -- just recently we had a petition that was a 3-3  
20 tie. And I think, Tracy correct me if I'm wrong,  
21 but I think we gave a description of both the pros  
22 and cons and the logic of both sides of the vote.

23                   MS. VELKOVER: The Board typically with  
24 the recommendation would get a findings of fact.

131

1 But in this case it's just a report of the Plan  
2 Commission proceedings and in that report would be  
3 a list of the concerns, you know, that each one of  
4 you, the positives that you have commented on and  
5 then the negatives with the proposal would be  
6 forwarded on to the Village Board. Plus the  
7 transcripts from all of the public hearings would  
8 be forwarded on.

9                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: What I suggest is when  
10 Tracy prepares that report that the Commissioners  
11 that are concerned could review that report and add  
12 some of their own comments at that time.

13                   MR. SULA: Point of order, though, I

14 believe we had a motion and a second.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We're in discussion.

16 MR. SMITH: I'm saying we have to vote  
17 on this motion.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, we'll vote on it.  
19 We're discussing this.

20 MR. SMITH: You were talking and --

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: There's no point of  
22 order. We're not out of order here.

23 I'm sorry, Mr. Sula, were you  
24 saying something?

132

1 MR. SULA: I thought we did have a point  
2 of order because I thought we had a motion and a  
3 second.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I didn't suggest we  
5 shouldn't vote on the motion. We should vote on  
6 the motion.

7 I'm saying that the motion is not  
8 necessary for the purpose that Mr. Foster -- that  
9 the Village Board will still get that information.  
10 So any other discussion on the motion?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All those in favor of  
13 the motion signify by saying aye in the roll call;  
14 those opposed nay. Roll call, please.

15 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.  
16 MR. FOSTER: Aye.  
17 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.  
18 MR. SMITH: Aye.  
19 MS. VELKOVER: Cepen.  
20 MR. CEPON: Nay.  
21 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.  
22 MS. KOVARIK: Nay.  
23 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.  
24 MR. SULA: Aye.

133

1 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.  
2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Nay.  
3 There's a surprise. So again there  
4 is no formal recommendation and really no informal  
5 recommendation to the Village Board.  
6 But there will be a report given to  
7 the Board as to the proceedings and some of the  
8 concerns of the Commissioners, both the ones that  
9 voted no and the ones that voted for it.  
10 Tracy, do you have anything to add?  
11 MS. VELKOVER: We should probably  
12 explain what the procedure is next. You're  
13 probably all wondering.  
14 Because the Commission voted 3-3,  
15 like Mr. Rudny said, it's a non-recommendation.





17 what our Village web site address is. It's -- and  
18 I hope I get this right -- it's www.Gurnee.il.us.  
19 And under the Village Board you can find the  
20 agendas listed for the upcoming meetings.

21 And again, they're posted the  
22 Wednesday before the Monday meetings. So it's  
23 going to be a while before it gets onto an agenda  
24 with the Village Board because they do have to

135

1 submit an annexation agreement which we don't have  
2 and we do have to publish in the newspaper a  
3 minimum of fifteen days in advance.

4 So you should keep your eye out for  
5 the agendas of the upcoming Village Board meeting.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Tracy, you know, that  
7 new Ordinance has been enacted that they have to  
8 post signs on the property.

9 Is that -- is that in effect here?

10 MS. VELKOVER: Yeah. I have the  
11 Ordinance here. I believe it was adopted in  
12 August, late July.

13 The next day after the Village  
14 Board adopted that Ordinance we contracted with a  
15 sign company. They made the signs. We just got  
16 them delivered about a week and a half ago.

17 We made arrangements for the

18 installation of the signs because they just came  
19 without the post and everything. We actually  
20 installed them yesterday.

21 MR. WILDENBERG: Monday.

22 MS. VELKOVER: They were installed at  
23 the various sites in town. Now the Ordinance is  
24 written so that they have to be installed a minimum

136

1 of fifteen days in advance of public hearings  
2 before the Plan Commission and Zoning Board of  
3 Appeals.

4 So we have one public hearing  
5 coming up in late or early -- late September, early  
6 October.

7 MR. WILDENBERG: September 16th.

8 MS. VELKOVER: September 16th that we  
9 did put a sign out for with a date on.

10 However, we have a number of  
11 matters that have already been through the Plan  
12 Commission process and are in the Village Board  
13 process or are in the middle of the Plan Commission  
14 process. For example, this one which has continued  
15 meetings.

16 We did post signs on all of those  
17 properties, too. We did not put a date on it  
18 because it's the original date had already passed.

19 So we did put the signs up there and it does have a  
20 phone number to contact about the public hearings.

21 We did an inspection of the signs.  
22 Like I said, we posted the signs on Monday. We  
23 went out today and took a look just to see exactly  
24 how they were holding up and the one that has been

137

1 stolen was the one for this piece of property.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I guess my question  
3 would be would there be a different sign put up  
4 then for the Village Board public hearing?

5 MS. VELKOVER: No, they would continue  
6 to stay up through the entire public hearing  
7 process.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Does the date change,  
9 though?

10 MS. VELKOVER: The date does not change.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So that doesn't help  
12 us.

13 MS. VELKOVER: No.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: There's a -- we can  
15 answer some questions here.

16 THE AUDIENCE: If it had gone positive,  
17 if it had gone positive or negative vote would they  
18 still have to go through the annexation?

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yes. Actually, the

20 Plan Commission doesn't address the annexation  
21 agreement. We're only addressing the zoning  
22 question. So in this case it's just a  
23 recommendation so it would have to go through the  
24 Village Board process. Yes, sir.

138

1 THE AUDIENCE: Very quickly about the  
2 neighbors distributed in the Gurnee area, which  
3 publication do you use and since we do have our own  
4 like local government, an association, can you at  
5 least contact the association committee and they  
6 can contact the rest of us?

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do you have an answer  
8 to that?

9 MS. VELKOVER: We can contact the  
10 president of the homeowners association or the  
11 vice-president if you want, Mr. Sanders.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The president should  
13 know because he's a village trustee.

14 MS. VELKOVER: And what was the other  
15 question?

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Which newspaper.

17 MS. VELKOVER: Gurnee Review. Pioneer  
18 Press.

19 MR. SANDERS: And will it be a public  
20 forum like this?

21 MS. VELKOVER: Yes, it is. You have the  
22 ability to make comments and ask questions.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'll entertain a motion  
24 to adjourn.

139

1 MR. CEPON: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a  
2 motion to adjourn.

3 MR. SMITH: I'll second it.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All those in favor say  
5 aye.

6 ("Aye" responses.)

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Nay?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Meeting adjourned.

10 (The hearing concluded at 10:05 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

