VILLAGE OF GURNEE JOINT PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLAN COMMISSION AND **ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

PUBLIC HEARING held March 25, 1998 7:30 PM

GURNEE MUNICIPAL BUILDING 325 North O'Plaine Road Gurnee, Illinois

PLAN COMMISSION:

DONALD RUDNY, Chairman

JIM SULA

KRISTINA KOVARIK

CARL CEPON

LYLE FOSTER

BILL SMITH

BRYAN WINTER

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS:

TOM HOOD, Chairman

ROBERT McDOWELL

BILL FINN

STEVE AMUNDSEN

FRANK PAPP

ALSO PRESENT:

JON WILDENBERG **BARBARA SWANSON**

ABSENT:

TRACY VELKOVER

Reported by: SANDRA K. SMITH, CSR, RPR CSR License No. 084003104

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

2

1	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The Village of Gurnee
2	Plan Commission meeting will now come to order.
3	Tom, do you want to call the Zoning
4	Board of Appeals to order.
5	CHAIRMAN HOOD: 7:35, Zoning Board of
6	Appeals meeting called to order.
7	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Can we have roll call,
8	please.
9	MR. WILDENBERG: I'll start with the
10	Zoning Board of Appeals. McDowell.
11	MR. McDOWELL: Here.
12	MR. WILDENBERG: Finn.
13	MR. FINN: Here.
14	MR. WILDENBERG: Amundsen.
15	MR. AMUNDSEN: Here.
16	MR. WILDENBERG: Papp.
17	MR. PAPP: Here.

MR. WILDENBERG: Hood.

- 19 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Here.
 20 MR. WILDENBERG: Plan Commission. Sula.
 21 MR. SULA: Here.
 22 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.
 23 MS. KOVARIK: Here.
 24 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepon.
 - ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

3

1	MR. CEPON: Here.
2	MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.
3	MR. FOSTER: Here.
4	MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.
5	MR. BILL SMITH: Here.
6	MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.
7	MR. WINTER: Here.
8	MR. WILDENBERG: Rudny.
9	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Here. Okay. So we're
10	here tonight for a public hearing to consider
11	amendments to the terms of the Gurnee Zoning
12	Ordinance to add an Article 8.12 exterior lighting
13	to expand exterior lighting controls.
1/1	So this is a culmination of about

15 four or five meetings, workshop meetings that we've

16	had over the past couple of months. They were
17	public meetings but it's time now, we think we're
18	at a point where we'd like to present this to the
19	public and talk amongst ourselves and also open the
20	meeting at some point, open the floor to the public
21	so we can get public comment and questions.
22	I think probably the best thing to
23	do is our planning consultants Rolf Campbell I

think can maybe give us an overview presentation of

4

the Lighting Ordinance, where we stand at this 1 point. 2 I think there still may be a couple 3 of loose ends, too, that we the Commissioners need to address. So I'll turn it over to Butch. Are you going to start the presentation or, Jon, do you 6 want to? MR. MAIDEN: Sounds fine. 8 9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Go ahead. Okay. Since this is a public 10

hearing we do need to have anyone who is going to

12	give testimony sworn in. Anyone from the audience
13	who is going to make a comment or ask a question
14	also needs to stand now and be sworn in by the
15	Village Attorney.
16	(Witnesses sworn.)
17	MR. MAIDEN: My name is Al Maiden for
18	the record. I'm a director of planning for Rolf
19	Campbell and Associates.
20	Lee Smith from our office has also
21	been working with the Plan Commission and will do
22	part of the presentation tonight. Some of this for
23	the Zoning Board and Plan Commission will be a
24	summary.

5

1 For the audience, to let you know, 2 we have been working with the Village on review of lighting plans for numerous special uses, 3 annexations, planned developments. 4 5 What the Commission and the Village was concerned with is the existing Zoning Ordinance 6 7 had very little guidelines in regard to procedures, uniform standards. We found that many of the uses 8

9	when we would go back and try to compare some of
10	the annexations, some of the special uses we've
11	approved we would find a different standard for
12	definition of how you measure the height of a light
13	pole, the height of a structure.
14	We would find different
15	definitions well, actually we found no
16	definitions on how to do the formulas on
17	calculating foot candles. And as we went back and
18	looked we found different computer generated
19	calculations that used different methods and we
20	were concerned.
21	I think as a Village we were
22	comparing apples and oranges on many of these past

applications. So what the Village looked at in

working with the group for the past six months was

23

24

- 1 trying to standardize some of the procedures.
- What we did was actually consider
- 3 some of the past approvals that have been granted,
- 4 maybe some of the individuals here tonight

5	represent some of those past approvals. We did try
6	to take the best from those areas as we could.

We also did go to look to see if

- 8 there were other local communities that had set
- 9 standards as to light levels, heights, definitions
- 10 and how they may or may not apply to the Village of
- 11 Gurnee and to past approvals.
- We also did some search in regard
- 13 to national standards, communities throughout the
- 14 nation as well as research publications.
- 15 Also as part of the research staff
- 16 did go out and measure actual foot candle readings
- 17 at many of the uses in the Village. This was not
- 18 only from the standpoint of what we had from the
- 19 computer generated studies and records, we wanted
- 20 to see how they compared to actual standards that
- 21 we've found in the community.
- We also tried to make some
- 23 comparisons with actual foot candle readings we
- 24 found in other surrounding jurisdictions for

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

7

1 similar types of land uses in the area.

2	In that regard we also started
3	working on an outline of an ordinance as to how we
4	would begin to structure this ordinance for the
5	Village of Gurnee and how that structure may apply
6	to the various conditions that we will find in the
7	community.
8	We tried to combine all of these
9	aspects in the Exterior Lighting Ordinance. I do
10	want to make that a clear point by the way. This
11	is only for exterior lighting situations. And we
12	did try to get input from the various groups and
13	agencies and from staff.
14	We have not had the opportunity to
15	get input from the public as yet. I think as the
16	Chairman indicated, this is sort of the first step
17	in that process and I know we'll be very interested
18	in the comments and input we will get from the
19	public and the general community.
20	With that overview I'd like Lee to
21	go through and review the structure of the
22	ordinance and when he's through I'm going to go
23	through two of the main tables as to how they may
24	or may not apply to particular properties and give

- 1 some examples.
- 2 MR. LEE SMITH: Good evening. Hi, my
- 3 name is Lee Smith. I'm a senior planner with Rolf
- 4 Campbell & Associates.
- 5 I, too, worked with the Plan
- 6 Commission and the Zoning Board on developing the
- 7 draft that's in front of you this evening for the
- 8 public hearing.
- 9 And I'm basically just going to run
- 10 through the structure of the ordinance, highlight
- 11 some of the main points; but when it comes to
- 12 questions of some of the standards and how they may
- 13 be applied we're going to get into that in a little
- 14 bit.
- The first section of the ordinance
- 16 has to do with the purpose -- sets out the purpose
- 17 of these regulations. And what we're doing is
- 18 we're elaborating on the reasons for exterior
- 19 lighting, the benefits of good exterior lighting,
- 20 problems with light trespass and glare when
- 21 exterior lighting is done poorly and poorly
- 22 implemented or poorly designed and the benefits to
- 23 the general public, health, safety and welfare from
- 24 establishing these regulations in the ordinance in

1	ordinance form in the Zoning Ordinance and
2	elaborating on the issues of exterior lighting that
3	are the subject of this ordinance as opposed to
4	sort of the vague standards that are in that are
5	presently in the Zoning Ordinance.
6	Section 2 has to do with the
7	definitions where we define most of the terms that
8	are in the ordinance for clarification. There were
9	really very few definitions that were applicable in
10	the existing Zoning Ordinance under definitions so
11	we've elaborated on those and we think that we've
12	hit most of the important ones if not all of them.
13	The third section just establishes
14	the regulations and establishes that the
15	applicability of these exterior lighting
16	regulations to both public and private uses in the
17	village and all public and private uses except for
18	those that are exempted further on in the
19	ordinance.
20	The section following establishes
21	that a light plan is required and needs to be

22 submitted for a number of different categories. 23 Single family residential where 24 you're just building on a lot you do not have to ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220 10 1 submit a light plan nor do you have to submit one 2 for a single family subdivision. 3 All non-residential uses in a single family district have to submit a light plan. 4 5 All multiple family developments, all commercial, industrial, institutional, and public uses have to 6 7 submit a light plan to the Village for review. 8 The light plan includes a number 9 of items. I'll run through those quickly. A site 10 plan with pole locations, the location of building 11 mounted lights, et cetera. The specifications for 12 the luminares, the lamp types, that sort of thing. 13 Details on the base and the poles, 14 on the type of poles, the height of the poles, the 15 height of building mounted lights have to be set 16 forth in the lighting plan as well. 17 We've asked that the applicants

18	submit elevations of their property through their
19	property so that the Plan Commission so that
20	staff and the Plan Commission and the consultants
21	can review the relationship of the poles and the
22	heights of the poles to the buildings.
23	The elevations will allow for us to
24	examine what the cutoff angle is of the light poles

11

that are put up so that we can identify any 1 2 problematic structures that are being put up vis-a-vis glare extending onto abutting residential 3 properties or just abutting properties generally or 5 onto street right-of-ways. We're requiring that the proposal 6 put in the lamp wattages for all of the lights that 8 are going to be proposed in the exterior lighting 9 plan. A photometric plan needs to be 10

submitted. A photometric plan, for those of you

readings on the property and at the property line

so that we can make measurements and see whether

not familiar with it, indicates the foot candle

11

12

13

15	the proposed lighting plan will be consistent with
16	the standards that we've established in the
17	ordinance for foot candles at the property line and
18	internal to the site.
19	Then there's a catchall on other
20	information as needed which may be requested by
21	staff or consultants to ensure that to assure
22	that we get quality exterior lighting that's not
23	going to cause any problems.
24	The section after that establishes

12

measuring light levels, specifies the equipment,
how the equipment is to be set up, the type of
light meter that we're suggesting.
As well it specifies where
measurements will be taken on adjacent properties
and it sets forth that horizontal light readings at

a property line be taken three and a half feet off

9 And then for the vertical readings

the ground with a light meter.

10 of the foot candle at the property line we've

7

11	measured three and a half feet but then we can also
12	look at any height above the plain of the property
13	line so that so that staff can identify any
14	problems that may occur with lights shining into a
15	window of an adjacent property or casting light on
16	a residential property. That might be a
17	problematic situation.
18	The following section is the
18 19	The following section is the standards and requirements. There are two the
	Ç
19	standards and requirements. There are two the
19 20	standards and requirements. There are two the first section references Tables 1 and 2. Table 1
19 20 21	standards and requirements. There are two the first section references Tables 1 and 2. Table 1 sets forth based on the wattage of the lamps which

- to 250 watts, 251 to 400 watts and greater than 400
 watts.
 The second table establishes the
- 4 allowable acceptable foot candle readings in
- 5 residential districts where residences abut
- 6 residences. So we're looking at the type of light
- 7 readings at property lines that would be acceptable

0	in the vertical of the nortzontal position.
9	In residential areas where
10	non-residential property abuts residential property
11	and where non-residential property abuts other
12	non-residential properties, we'll get into some of
13	these details momentarily.
14	The next section sets forth
15	standards for luminares with cutoffs. And we
16	defined what a cutoff luminare is. A cutoff
17	luminare is a luminare that's shielded so that
18	it so that it cannot be observed by a person
19	standing on a property line at an angle of 75
20	degrees or less.
21	So there's various cutoffs that
22	could be considered but in terms of this ordinance
23	we consider a light to be cut off if the angle
24	where the lamp is visible is 75 degrees or less.

14

1 We establish what permitted
2 heights would be for cutoff luminares. Further we
3 establish that a cutoff luminare must be completely

4	shielded from the light source, must be completely
5	shielded from an observer who is at a level of 3
6	and a half feet on an adjacent property line.
7	Then we get into standards for
8	luminares that have no cutoff which is the lamp is
9	visible to the naked eye and we establish that a
10	lamp that's not cut off, has a cutoff angle of 75
11	degrees or more, the height is measured as
12	determined by a formula which we could get into if
13	you so choose later on.
14	Further we establish for
15	requirements for control of glare. What we're
16	attempting to do is make sure that people are not
17	blinded either in their properties or on roadways
18	and we establish for non-cutoff luminares that the

21 And the lumen is a matter of

10,000 lumens.

19

20

22 illumination. Most standard bulbs at 100 watts

23 being incandescent, fluorescent or sodium vapor or

lamp wattage at a maximum can be 100 watts or

24 a metal halide bulb would not be 10,000 lumens at a

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

2	The next section deals with
3	luminares under canopies such as you might find at
4	a gas station. We established standards for those
5	that luminares under canopies have to be recessed
6	with no part of the luminare extending below the
7	exterior edge of the canopy.
8	The following section deals with
9	exceptions from the standards of these ordinances
10	and there are four basic categories of exceptions.
11	Lights put up for public roadway illumination
12	purposes by any municipal, state, federal
13	authority. Situations for emergency lighting for
14	police or fire or other governmental entities.
15	For recreation facilities such as
16	fields at a school, fields in a park district that
17	there would be they would be exempt from foot
18	candle requirements internal so that the fields can
19	be lit. The foot candle requirements external at
20	the property lines would still have to be met. We
21	are also excepting them from certain of the height
22	requirements.
23	Finally, other exceptions are for
24	temporary uses they would be exempted or at the

1 hundred watts.

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

- 1 discretion of the Zoning Administrator based on
- 2 documentation that's provided to the Zoning
- 3 Administrator.
- 4 Following that there's a section on
- 5 prohibited lights. There are a number of types of
- 6 lighting which are prohibited in this ordinance.
- 7 Flickering or flashing lights, search lights and
- 8 laser lights and mercury vapor lamps.
- 9 The following section deals with
- 10 nonconforming situations. And, you know, this went
- around and around as all the Members of the Zoning
- 12 Board and Plan Commission can attest to.
- 13 And finally it was settled on to
- 14 define nonconforming. There are illumination
- 15 systems that have been developed under and had a
- 16 lighting plan that were developed -- that was
- 17 developed under either a planned unit development,
- 18 special use approval, an annexation agreement, a
- 19 variation, some type of municipal approval that has
- 20 reviewed the lighting plan of an entity.
- Where that -- where those lights
- 22 may conform to the agreement that they've
- 23 established under the planned unit development but

1	forth in this ordinance, those that illumination
2	system would be considered nonconforming and the
3	requirements are that it would be replaced or
4	modified that it would be that it would have
5	fifteen years to be brought into conformity with
6	the standards of this ordinance or if the system
7	were to be replaced or modified greater than 60
8	percent of its value it would have to be brought
9	into conformance with this ordinance. So it's
10	either 15 years or 60 percent of its value.
11	The next is for illumination
11	The next is for manimation
12	systems that are not conforming to the require
12	systems that are not conforming to the require
12 13	systems that are not conforming to the require that don't have a lighting plan established, that
12 13 14	systems that are not conforming to the require that don't have a lighting plan established, that are not conforming and to the requirements of this
12 13 14 15	systems that are not conforming to the require that don't have a lighting plan established, that are not conforming and to the requirements of this ordinance they are legal nonconforming uses.
12 13 14 15 16	systems that are not conforming to the require that don't have a lighting plan established, that are not conforming and to the requirements of this ordinance they are legal nonconforming uses. Well, given that they've been
12 13 14 15 16 17	systems that are not conforming to the require that don't have a lighting plan established, that are not conforming and to the requirements of this ordinance they are legal nonconforming uses. Well, given that they've been established prior to this and they would be

- 50 percent of its value. So 50 percent or ten
 years.
 The next situation deals with
 legal nonconforming luminares which exceed the foot
 - ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

- 1 candle requirements, which we'll get into in a
- 2 moment, or direct light and glare towards a street,
- 3 adjacent residence or other property. So these are
- 4 more or less individual lights that are causing a
- 5 dangerous situation or a noxious, an obnoxious
- 6 situation.
- 7 And we're -- and the suggestion is
- 8 that those lights have to be shielded, redirected,
- 9 or otherwise modified within 180 days to repair --
- 10 to remedy that situation or they need to get an
- 11 extension for the period of time where they comply
- 12 or they have to request a variation and come in
- 13 front of the Zoning Board for a variation to
- 14 relieve that situation.
- The last section of the ordinance
- 16 deals with special uses and variations. Where a

17	special use is requested if a lamp you'll see in
18	a moment that certain lamp wattages require special
19	uses when they're related to when they're set
20	back a certain distance or off of an 80 foot or
21	less right-of-way that they would come in and go
22	before the Plan Commission for a special use
23	approval and ultimately to the Village Board.
24	And then we set forth that

1	variations will be dealt with if a proposal is
2	in excess of the performance standards but by less
3	than or equal to ten percent they would have to get
4	a variation from the Zoning Board.
5	If it's a height variation only and
6	the foot candle requirements are fine and it meets
7	the other performance standards that also would be
8	a Zoning Board variation with no input, with no
9	hearing in front of the Plan Commission.
10	If a variation is in excess of 10
11	percent we're recommending that the approval be a
12	joint approval from the Plan Commission for a
13	special use permit as well as a variation to be

14	granted by the Zoning Board.
15	So that's the structure. Al is
16	going to take you through some of the details on
17	the charts and I'll help him where I can.
18	MR. MAIDEN: Thank you. The two tables
19	that Lee referenced are the tables in the exhibit
20	that we've tried to enlarge so that we can use it
21	as an illustration. And as I explain it I'll turn
22	it toward the audience as well.
23	What we tried to do with Table 1
24	was to address lighting in residential districts

20

and non-residential districts and that was the 2 major category we addressed in different 3 situations. 4 As Lee mentioned, we did select 5 wattage levels of zero to 250, 250 to 400 and 400 plus. The selection of those levels was basically 6 because of the lighting that we saw coming in and the various special uses and annexations we have 8 reviewed and that's why we selected that wattage

10	range.
11	We then went through in the
12	residential and broke it into the uses of single
13	family, multi-family, or non-residential uses.
14	Because in the residential districts we do have
15	uses such as churches or schools and that so we did
16	need to cover that category.
17	In the non-residential districts we
18	attempted to make provisions in regard to setbacks
19	of the lights in relationship to either the width
20	of the street that they were abutting or and it
21	is an or, not and whether it was abutting a
22	residential zoning classification.
23	We have had some discussions where
24	we do have non-residential uses in residential

21

2	We have gone back and reviewed some
3	refinements we may need to make. There are areas
4	where maybe there's detention ponds or
5	non-residential uses where you may want to consider

6 some exceptions to those provisions, but that's

1 zones.

7 something we'll	get at a	as soon	as we	take	ıne
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	------	-----

- 8 public comment, we'll have to make some amendments
- 9 to those areas.
- But just to give some example -- by
- 11 the way, we also intended that this would be the
- 12 most restrictive provision would apply. We had
- 13 some discussions, some individuals felt that there
- 14 was some conflicts with the regulations.
- We know there are overlapping areas
- 16 of regulation. We don't consider it a conflict.
- 17 What we anticipate is that the most restrictive
- 18 provision will apply. Let me give you an example
- 19 with this. We just tried to pick the four
- 20 different categories.
- A site, hypothetical site with an
- 22 80 foot right-of-way, with a less than 80 foot
- 23 right-of-way, with residential on one side,
- 24 residential on another side. What the table

- 1 suggests is that within the 80 foot right-of-way
- 2 setback you are allowed to have a 250 to 400 watt

- 3 bulb as part of a special use within -- well,
- 4 actually on the property line anywhere from the
- 5 property line back. And that's where we drew these
- 6 blue arrows to show you can start at the property
- 7 line and move interior to the site.
- 8 However, when you're abutting a
- 9 lesser right-of-way less than 80 foot or if you're
- 10 abutting a residential zoning district, in those
- 11 classifications the table indicates you need to be
- 12 at least 100 foot to have a 250 to 400 watt bulb
- 13 from an abutting residential zone or from an
- 14 abutting street right-of-way of less than 80 feet.
- So what happens is although you may
- 16 have areas that it appears you'd be allowed this
- 17 larger wattage when you have a more restrictive
- 18 classification along the street or along the
- 19 residential it means that you wouldn't start those
- 20 lights until you were 100 feet in from the property
- 21 line.
- So as I say, we don't consider
- 23 those conflicts. We consider those are overlapping
- 24 areas and whatever the most restrictive

1	classification is that is what applied.
2	We did try to provide an overall
3	illustration. If we have discussion this evening
4	there are some amendments that we may want to
5	consider in the discussions.
6	As you already know, we have made
7	changes to the draft as to whether we want to
8	consider possibly adding special uses for the 250
9	and 400 watt bulbs in certain conditions where we
10	may have, as we said, a right-of-way of less than
11	80 but the land use actually may be something
12	different, may be a detention pond or something of
13	that nature.
14	So I think we may want to get some
15	of the public comments before we get into possibly
16	considering changes in these areas.
17	We also have the Table 2 which
18	shows the maximum foot candles that are permitted
19	in either the residential to residential
20	situations, in the non-residential to residential

Again, the refinement we may need

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD.

situations, and we have specific provisions in the

residential districts, specific provisions in the

non-residential districts.

21

22

1	to look at in this area, we compared these areas to
2	the readings that staff found in their foot candle
3	levels. We also went back and looked at the
4	computer printouts we had on the special uses, the
5	annexations.
6	One area that we did start to find
7	possibly some need for relief is if by chance we
8	find a situation where we may have connecting
9	drives, private drives between either residential
10	areas or connections to areas with less than an 80
11	foot right-of-way where the drive is located we may
12	need to consider a refinement for the
13	non-residential areas to actually the foot candle
14	levels we're looking at for the permitted and
15	special uses in the non-residential area.
16	I think the standards we quoted in
17	these areas relate more to if we're finding parking
18	lots next to a residential area and then going into
19	lawn, these are the types of standards we found.
20	But not where we actually found a drive situation
21	between properties.

With those types of refinements my

- 23 suggestion is we get your additional questions or
- 24 comments and also get questions and comments from

1	the public.
2	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Let me start. I
3	just had a question, just a clarification actually.
4	On the nonconforming conditions,
5	the last paragraph there seems to be some confusion
6	as to whether that would include the uses that were
7	approved under some planned unit development or
8	special use or annexation agreement.
9	In other words, does that cover all
10	the legal nonconforming uses or just those that
11	never had a specific Village approval?
12	MR. LEE SMITH: The last one really
13	addresses not an illumination system. That's
14	addressed in the first one which the first one is
15	an illumination system where it's got PUD approval
16	or annexation agreement approval or
17	variation approval. That's where that comes in.
18	The last one really has to do with
19	individual or maybe a more limited number of

- 20 luminares that are creating a problem glare,
- 21 specifically glare or specifically light into an
- 22 adjacent property. And so it's more -- this one is
- 23 more while they might be legal under the existing
- 24 system they come in and they are exceeding the foot

- 1 candle requirements but not on a total system
- 2 basis. One light, two lights.
- 3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I guess my
- 4 confusion comes in is the second paragraph talks
- 5 about illumination systems that were not part of a
- 6 specific Village approval and then says are no
- 7 longer conforming, shall be considered as legally
- 8 nonconforming and shall be subject -- I guess that
- 9 should be to, there should be a to in there I
- 10 guess, subject to the following regulations and
- 11 then there's a colon.
- 12 And then you have this next
- 13 paragraph and then you have the last paragraph. I
- 14 don't know if that's part of the second paragraph.
- MR. LEE SMITH: Yes, it is.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Or if now we're talking 17 about all legal nonconforming luminares. 18 MR. LEE SMITH: The way I envisioned 19 this was we established that some things are not 20 part of a PUD agreement or a special use and these 21 are dealt with in the first section. 22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Right. 23 MR. LEE SMITH: The second paragraph and

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

the following one is dealing with possibly a

27

- 1 shopping center that predated having someone come
- 2 in with a photometric plan but it's a system that
- 3 is developed for a unified center but might not
- 4 have had the specific approval of, you know, a
- 5 planned unit development agreement.
- 6 And that's related to the paragraph
- 7 that starts with existing illumination systems
- 8 which do not conform to the requirements of the
- 9 section.

- 10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Right, that's what I
- 11 kind of figured it was.
- MR. LEE SMITH: Yeah.

13	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But I'm afraid that
14	somebody might I don't know if anybody else
15	feels the same way, but there might be some
16	confusion.
17	I guess if the last paragraph said
18	all legal conforming luminares that exceed the foot
19	candle standards it would clarify it for me better.
20	MR. MAIDEN: And that's what we do want
21	to clarify. If, let's say, on this example that we
22	do have a nonconforming situation where there's a
23	light level that is higher than permitted as long
24	as that one luminare can be shielded, modified,

- 1 whatever it takes to meet the foot candle levels it
- 2 is permitted to continue.
- We're not saying just because it's
- 4 one foot too high or whatever may be the
- 5 nonconforming situation, if it's just that one
- 6 luminare if it can be brought into conformance and
- 7 it's not causing a glare or other lighting problems
- 8 it would be allowed to remain.

9	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think if I recall why
10	we put that in there was just in case we do have
11	this kind of unusual fluke case of a problem that
12	we have some way of being able to rectify that
13	without having to wait fifteen years.
14	MR. MAIDEN: Yes.
15	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Anyone else have
16	questions? Bryan.
17	MR. WINTER: I made three of the four
18	meetings and I know we were talking about the
19	nonconforming conditions.
20	My concern with the fifteen years
21	is that I think the lights have a useful life
22	greater than fifteen years. Right? I mean and
23	I was just wondering whether if we took out the
24	fifteen years and just left it at 60 percent of its

- 1 value and tightened up the language on that.
- 2 I also think we might need to put
- 3 in a definition for illumination systems. There is
- 4 no definition for that term. I don't know quite
- 5 whether that's going to make much sense to anyone.

6	But it seems to me fifteen years
7	is you know, I don't know what happened at the
8	last meeting because I know there was some
9	discussion that maybe we didn't have to put years
10	in there and just say they could keep the lights
11	until they decided they were going to replace the
12	lights or they had to replace the lights.
13	It's not going to would it
14	weaken the ordinance if we took out the 15 years
15	and the 10 years and just left it at 60 percent and
16	50 percent?
17	MR. MAIDEN: Well, I think that was some
18	of the discussion that was held by the group and we
19	went everywhere from 5 years to 25 years.
20	I think we selected something in
21	the middle and I think hopefully we'll hear what
22	the public has to say if they think something, you
23	know, what is reasonable.
24	Whether you decide you don't need

30

1 any at all, we have found I think with oh,

2	provisions on things such as signs and things of
3	that nature we do see turnover.
4	So as long as we're addressing the
5	problem area of foot candles, things of that nature
6	perhaps you don't need a time limit. But I think
7	that's up to you as a board or commission to make
8	your determination of what you find acceptable for
9	your community.
10	MR. WINTER: Jon, in terms of
11	enforcement I mean I could see that if we pass the
12	ordinance we'll have something in place; but to go
13	back, don't you foresee that that's going to be a
14	problem or it's going to be a big task I would
15	think.
16	MR. WILDENBERG: You know, we would have
17	to obviously give notice to those projects that
18	fall into that category.
19	And then I'm sure we'd enter into
20	some pretty detailed discussions about how
21	compliance can either be achieved, whether it can
22	be done and what the options are for coming in to
23	compliance with the ordinance short of redoing the
24	whole system.

- 1 MR. WINTER: The final point I had was
- 2 is it correct to understand this to mean if someone
- 3 was going to build say two duplexes next to each
- 4 other they'd have to have a lighting plan? And
- 5 they might put one yard light out, they're going to
- 6 have to submit a --
- 7 MR. LEE SMITH: We exempt single family.
- 8 Multiple family developments are included. We may
- 9 want to consider a threshold of some type.
- MR. WILDENBERG: That's a good point.
- 11 MR. WINTER: I think to have someone
- 12 that may put in a couple duplexes it is not
- 13 practical to require them to be submitting a
- 14 topography map and everything. I think that --
- MR. LEE SMITH: It could be ten units or
- 16 eight units or something along those lines.
- MR. WINTER: I think there has to be a
- 18 threshold. I really think that it's too limited
- 19 the way it's written there.
- 20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anyone else?
- MR. BILL SMITH: I've had a problem with
- 22 the years, too. Especially on a special use permit
- 23 where you said hey, they've come before us and this
- 24 is the way it's going to be.

1	Now all of a sudden 15 years, like
2	I say, I have a problem with I think they're a
3	lot longer than that. To lower a pole, like I
4	said, 10 feet can cost a lot of money. I mean it
5	isn't just to go out and cut off the pole 10 feet
6	and drop it down, it's quite an expense.
7	And I don't know, I've always had a
8	problem with the years. When they come through,
9	especially like they say the plan, they come
10	through us and get a special use and we say these
11	are the rules. It's just like in the middle of a
12	game you say now we're going to change all the
13	rules and I've always had a problem with the years.
14	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, the only thing is
15	rules change. You know, speed limits change on the
16	road. And it doesn't mean you can say well, I used
17	to be able to go 65.
18	But I don't understand your comment
19	on the special use because I think if you're
20	permitted something under a special use and you
21	presently have a special use you would be legal

- 22 conforming.
- MR. BILL SMITH: But you'd have fifteen
- 24 years you would have to change it.

- 1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: No, you would be
- 2 conforming.
- 3 MR. BILL SMITH: So there's a
- 4 misunderstanding then because I understand and I
- 5 think Bryan understands it that way, too, is that
- 6 in fifteen years they have to change it.
- 7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: They have to change it
- 8 if they're legal nonconforming. They would have to
- 9 change it in fifteen years.
- MR. BILL SMITH: So if the pole is 30
- 11 foot tall now and we approved it a year ago,
- 12 fifteen years from enactment of this they'd have to
- 13 change it to 20 feet.
- 14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Not if it's allowed
- 15 under a special use and they have a special use for
- 16 the 30 foot they wouldn't have to change it
- 17 because that would be conforming.
- MS. KOVARIK: They would have to change

- 19 it.
- MR. LEE SMITH: They would have to
- 21 change it.
- MS. KOVARIK: Even if we approved it
- 23 under a special use or annexation or a planned unit
- 24 development, even if it was approved now once this

- 1 goes into effect anything that's not within these
- 2 guidelines is legal nonconforming and they have
- 3 fifteen years or when they replace a certain amount
- 4 of percentage of its value.
- 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Wait, if the --
- 6 MR. BILL SMITH: That's where I have a
- 7 problem.
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We can only talk one at
- 9 a time because we have a court reporter here.
- Let's take the height restriction.
- 11 Now the 30 foot --
- MS. KOVARIK: It would be 20 so 25 feet
- 13 is special use, requires a special use permit.
- 14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. It's going to be

- 15 a function of the distance from the property line. 16 MR. LEE SMITH: That's a function of 17 distance from the property line has to do with bulbs that are unshielded, un-cut off. 18 19 MS. KOVARIK: Height itself is on Page 20 6. CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think the other 21 22 height is, too. 23 I guess what I'm saying is if a
 - ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

certain -- whether it be height or whatever --

35

- 1 restriction is allowed as a special use in this
- 2 ordinance and somebody presently has a special use
- 3 for that, wouldn't that be conforming?
- 4 MR. MAIDEN: If they're allowed as a
- 5 special use, yes.

- 6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Right, if they're
- 7 allowed as a special use.
- 8 MS. KOVARIK: No, that's not the way
- 9 this is written, though.
- MR. MAIDEN: If they're allowed as a
- 11 special use in here they would conform. If it's a

- 12 35 foot high pole or something that's not allowed
- 13 then they're not in conformance.
- MS. KOVARIK: If we gave a special use
- 15 to a Burger King somewhere to have 35 foot poles
- 16 last week and now next week this goes into effect
- 17 that would be legal nonconforming because it's
- 18 supposed to be 20 to 25, right?
- MR. MAIDEN: But then they would have to
- 20 come back. In fifteen years they have to conform
- 21 because that's not allowed special use under this
- 22 structure.
- MS. KOVARIK: So the special use really
- 24 doesn't mean anything now with the new lighting

- 1 ordinance for fifteen years?
- 2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, you picked an
- 3 example of where it wouldn't be allowed in this
- 4 ordinance as a special use even.
- 5 But I'm saying if it is allowed as
- 6 a special use, and you have to look at each
- 7 specific circumstance, then in this ordinance it's

8 allowed as a special use and they presently have a 9 special use then they are conforming. 10 MS. KOVARIK: Yes. 11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Am I right, Butch? 12 MR. MAIDEN: Yes. Now we also may want 13 to point out what you've had occur with other uses 14 besides lighting that you have had individuals come 15 in and said okay, I'm nonconforming, I don't meet 16 your standards and I should be amortized. 17 They will come in and ask for a 18 variation for a set amortization schedule. So I 19 think based upon your past procedures what someone 20 could come in with and say is I'm only one or two 21 years out in my agreement now but instead of 22 fifteen years I want to come in and apply to this 23 Village for a variation to allow a 20 year time

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

37

1 And from what you have applied in 2 other situations I think that's within your 3 authority to at least consider. That's why we

threw out these years of should it be 5 or 25

24

4

period.

- 5 whatever. I think it was looked at as you still
- 6 had some options. No matter what you picked you
- 7 still had some options.
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: One thing I wanted to
- 9 point out is that -- and I know this is the -- one
- 10 of the findings that the Zoning Board of Appeals
- should consider, but it's the -- let's see, the
- 12 consistency of the proposed text amendment with
- 13 other provisions in this ordinance.
- 14 And this is something that we've
- 15 done, for example, the Sign Ordinance. We went
- 16 through this on the Sign Ordinance, too. And I
- 17 think in the past we have found that if our goal is
- 18 to get our Village to move in a certain direction
- 19 that we implement some kind of amortization
- 20 program.
- Now, you know, maybe the fifteen
- 22 years is too short. We had talked about that and I
- 23 think Lee had given us some indication that the
- 24 fifteen years was a reasonable period on lighting.

1 Maybe it's not. Maybe that's something we need to 2 discuss further. 3 But at some point you need to put 4 in some kind of goal or effort to try to get any 5 non-complying uses into compliance. And we should 6 try to be fair about it, I don't disagree with that, but just to leave it open ended I don't know that that's a good solution either. 8 9 Why don't we let the other people 10 talk. Bob. 11 MR. McDOWELL: The amortization and the 12 fifteen years, that's something that we discussed 13 at length. And we didn't come to that fifteen 14 years easily but I felt that that and I still feel 15 that that is a fair number to work with. 16 There are exceptions with the 17 special uses and a longer amortization if needed, 18 but I think you have to have a set standard that 19 you're going to deal with. 20 And we aren't changing rules in the 21 middle of the game, we're just establishing game 22 plans that we never had before. There is a 23 difference. 24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anyone else?

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

39

1	MS. KOVARIK: Also, lighting, you know,
2	we're trying to complement the character of the
3	Village.
4	So now we're saying this is the
5	look we want in the Village so we have changed the
6	rules basically only because of the way the
7	community has developed.
8	I mean five, ten years ago I mean
9	you had something every two miles. Now you have
10	something every eighth of a mile so now we have to
11	say we want to drive the character going forward,
12	at a certain point in time you want this consistent
13	look to the Village.
14	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yes, Bryan.
15	MR. WINTER: I would just have an
16	analogy, though. I know at the State level we as
17	local government object when state legislators
18	enact legislation that costs villages and other
19	institutions to conform to standards.
20	I think that's exactly what we're
21	doing here. When we say after they've gone through
22	the special use permit process I mean I really

think we have to have a better handle of what this

is going to cost the residents of our town and I

23

1	think it could potentially be a lot of money for
2	commercial businesses with the fifteen years.
3	I'm still unclear if they had
4	previously let's just take an example. Somebody
5	ten years ago got a special use permit. The way I
6	read this, in fifteen years or if they replace that
7	system before that I don't have any problem if
8	they're going to replace the system, I think they
9	should be in conformity.
10	But let's say they don't. In
11	fifteen years do they have to comply or come to the
12	Village to work out another lighting plan?
13	MR. MAIDEN: That's our interpretation.
14	MR. WINTER: I think that's
15	MR. MAIDEN: But that's from now, it's
16	not
17	MR. WINTER: They would have 25 years
18	use. But I still think we are passing on a
19	potentially significant financial burden and I see
20	no reason to replace lights that this Village has

21 approved at some prior date. 22 I think I have no problems with the 23 rest of the ordinance in saying that these are the 24 goals we want to achieve, but I don't think that we ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220 41 1 can pass this and then without any funding provision just say come in conformity with this. 2 3 I think if we just leave the 60 4 percent of its value it's going to cut down on the 5 paperwork our staff has to do. I think that lets everybody in the Village know that these are the 6 7 new rules, if you replace things follow them. 8 But I just think that we have to 9 rely on the useful life of these light bulbs and 10 fixtures and just say we're going to allow you to 11 use these workable functioning products until you 12 have to replace them. I feel real strongly we have 13 to do that. 14 MR. CEPON: Only you'd have to replace 15 them after 60 percent with no time limit? 16 MR. WINTER: Right. 17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Kristy.

18	MS. KOVARIK: I don't know how long the
19	light pole is good for, but if you're going to go
20	that direction and say, you know, there's no time
21	limit then it shouldn't be 60 percent.
22	It should be if you replace the
23	light pole the new light pole has to conform no
24	matter how much because otherwise you just replace
	ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220
	42
1	
	one light pole at a time over a twenty year period.
2	one light pole at a time over a twenty year period. Eventually you've replaced the whole system because
2	Eventually you've replaced the whole system because
2	Eventually you've replaced the whole system because you're doing it one at a time, you'd have to keep
2 3 4	Eventually you've replaced the whole system because you're doing it one at a time, you'd have to keep it in nonconformance.
2 3 4 5	Eventually you've replaced the whole system because you're doing it one at a time, you'd have to keep it in nonconformance. MR. WINTER: I agree that they shouldn't
2 3 4 5 6	Eventually you've replaced the whole system because you're doing it one at a time, you'd have to keep it in nonconformance. MR. WINTER: I agree that they shouldn't be able to circumvent that. I think we have to
2 3 4 5 6 7	Eventually you've replaced the whole system because you're doing it one at a time, you'd have to keep it in nonconformance. MR. WINTER: I agree that they shouldn't be able to circumvent that. I think we have to have a definition for an illumination system so

the years out then if you replace any light pole,

MR. BILL SMITH: I have a problem with

even one, then it should be in conformance.

11

12

14	that because all of a sudden you have light poles
15	of different heights all over the parking lot.
16	And in talking to someone that had
17	replaced lights recently, I think they're like 30
18	years old, and one of them happened to fall over.
19	Luckily, it didn't fall on the highway part. They
20	checked some of the other poles. Well, all of the
21	other poles were rotted, too.
22	So I think when one starts to go
23	they're going to be replacing the whole batch. I
24	think they all are going to go about at the same

43

time. If one starts rotting I don't see why the 1 rest of them wouldn't. So they're probably going to change 3 at least 60 percent anyhow, then they would bring 4 it all into conformity when they bring it in. 5 MS. KOVARIK: How long is a light pole 6 good for? 7 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Jim. 9 MR. SULA: Just a couple points.

One in terms of the amortization,

11	most people who are thinking in terms of buildings
12	or land improvements really think in terms of 25 to
13	40 years in terms of amortization schedules. I
14	don't know any accountant that would amortize a
15	building or building improvements over fifteen
16	years. That's a pretty short period of time.
17	One way to get around the 60
18	percent value thing without worrying about people
19	doing it piecemeal would be to say 60 percent or
20	some rolling time frame where if you replaced a
21	significant chunk in like 60 or 90 days so that it
22	wasn't somebody doing something once a week or once
23	a month, if you had some reasonable time frame to
24	capture.

1	The spirit of the thing is to not
2	let someone play around with the rules to come up
3	with an ongoing legal nonconformance by piecemeal
4	application.
5	Just a final question. Lighting is
6	one of the is visual but it's hard to visualize

7	when you're talking about it in black and white.
8	Jon, can you give us some idea in
9	terms of how many issues there might be in the
10	Village right now in terms of things that might be
11	nonconforming if we enact this?
12	MR. WILDENBERG: Well, for instance, on
13	the west side of town we've had most of the
14	commercial growth in the last few years here.
15	Generally you're going to find
16	light pole heights in the 25 to 33 possibly even 40
17	foot high range. And you'll commonly find light
18	fixtures on those poles of 400 watts. That's a
19	standard that's been applied to quite a bit of the
20	new commercial development in town.
21	Some of the older commercial
22	development, I have not really reviewed that in
23	detail but I think the majority of what you're
24	talking about is some of the newer developments

- 1 that we have.
- We have modeled our planned unit
- 3 development agreements and annexation agreements

- 4 per those standards. I think Gurnee Mills did a
- 5 lot in evaluating their site and also lending us
- 6 some standards to use as we considered not only
- 7 their development but future commercial
- 8 developments in the area.
- 9 And that's about how they run. So
- 10 you could potentially have some real significant
- 11 areas that would become nonconforming. And I think
- 12 you'll have to hear from those folks as to what the
- 13 cost ramifications or operational ramifications
- 14 are.
- But from an enforcement standpoint
- 16 it probably isn't going to be easy.
- MS. KOVARIK: And we have given them the
- 18 option to come for a special use and a variance so
- 19 that the 40 foot can stay, too. I believe it's
- 20 just considered one time again.
- 21 So there's compensable factors for
- 22 Gurnee Mills or wherever we can say if it's fits
- 23 with our community look, it makes sense from a
- 24 variation point and give them a permanent exemption.

1	MR. MAIDEN: And we did discuss the
2	nonconforming situation only to the performance
3	standards, not to the height issue. If you meet
4	the performance standards that might have a
5	different amortization period if perhaps none.
6	MR. CEPON: Can't we also review
7	situations as they come up?
8	In other words, this paragraph, 60
9	percent. Say we 60 percent of its value or
10	within 20 years. Say we kick it up five years and
11	if we have a problem with that situation deal with
12	it as necessary.
13	I mean if we can get everybody
14	within that, that would be fine. But if we can't
15	then you sort of take every situation as it comes
16	up.
17	I mean there may be some situations
18	where you can't meet the people can't meet that
19	criteria but is it really affecting anything, you
20	know. You have to look at that, too. You have to
21	look at that aspect.
22	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I don't know. I

think maybe there's some middle ground here, we

might be overreacting a bit.

23

1	I don't think anybody is saying
2	that absolutely anybody who is out of compliance
3	with this is going to have to make that change in
4	fifteen years. I think they have options. As
5	Kristy indicated, they can come for a variance or
6	maybe they need a new special use permit.
7	I think most of the lighting
8	systems that I'm familiar with out west are not
9	problematic. I personally don't think if they came
10	before the Plan Commission or Village Board that
11	they would have a problem getting a variation or
12	let's say change in the special use or whatever
13	would be necessary to accept it.
14	I think what we're trying to do
15	here is establish a standard so that we can't go
16	out and pick the ones and say well, we think this
17	one is a problem, we don't think that one is a
18	problem. We have to review each one and this gives
19	us an opportunity to do it if there is one that has
20	a problem.
21	And financially if it's very
22	burdensome then I think that there's flexibility in
23	being able to work out an amortization schedule

1	even an amortization schedule where we say okay, as
2	you replace groups of your poles or fixtures as
3	time goes on and eventually after 20 years or 25
4	years you have them all changed that might be fine.
5	I mean I don't think there's
6	anything Draconian about this or anything where
7	somebody is trying to force people to spend a lot
8	of extra money to replace their lighting system.
9	We're just trying to set some standards and be fair
10	to everyone in the Village.
11	I think it's important that the
12	existing uses try to comply with what our vision
13	for the community is as well. And we'll work with
14	them in doing that. But to just leave it open
15	ended they could be there fifty years and never
16	change it and it could be a problematic one and
17	they just say I'm just going to leave the system
18	I've got even though it's not complying.
19	MR. WINTER: But, Don, the problem with

- 20 that is we can't pass this and say just come on in
- 21 and we're going to grant or we're going to extend
- 22 the special use.
- I think that it's flawed if that's
- 24 our thinking. We should have it tied to the

- 1 usefulness of the light fixture as it is now and
- 2 say no, we really do mean it so when you switch 60
- 3 percent, it's got to be switched, we're not going
- 4 to make exceptions.
- 5 I don't think it serves anybody's
- 6 interest to have them come in and ask for us to
- 7 give them a special use and we're going to say
- 8 yeah, we're going to do that because we generally
- 9 don't think there are any problems out there.
- So I really think, you know, to say
- 11 well, you could get another special use, I think
- 12 the thought has to be you have to have very good
- 13 reasons. And I think that's another argument to
- say don't have fifteen years there, have the useful
- 15 life of the equipment be the dictating factor to
- 16 when the person converts over to the new ordinance.

17	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I didn't say that
18	we can say yes, come in and you're going to get an
19	approved variation or special use.
20	I would say if they think that
21	their lighting is not problematic they shouldn't
22	have a problem getting a variance if they have a
23	good reason to. For example, I could say some of
24	the lighting at Gurnee Mills, some of the further
	ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220
1	interior lighting away from the road, I'm sure I
2	don't care how high those poles are, it's not
3	obtrusive to the traffic on Grand Avenue.

So I don't see that if there is a

nonconforming situation there that they would have

a problem coming in and getting a variance. I'm

But I just think -- I don't see

somebody is going to say okay, I'm going to change

75 percent of my system. I think this happens like

Kristy is saying, I think the guy going to -- when

a fixture is deteriorating they'll change one

just pointing out an example.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- 13 fixture. He's not going to go out and change 60 14 percent of his system. 15 I think it's going to be a very 16 unusual case where somebody does that. They're 17 going to try to maintain the lighting that they 18 have over as many years as they can get out of it. 19 And you know, like I say, all we're 20 trying to do is set some goal. And if that goal is 21 unreasonable I think that the Village will be 22 reasonable in making different arrangements. 23 That's all.
 - ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

MR. BILL SMITH: I think they will

51

- 1 change a great percentage, they won't only change
- 2 at one time.

- 3 Like I said, the person that I
- 4 talked to that that pole had rotted and when he
- 5 started checking most of the other ones were
- 6 rotted, too. And the lighting pole company said
- 7 yeah, generally they last a certain length of time
- 8 and so he changed them all, you know.
- 9 And I think that's what would

10	happen here that when they get ready to change
11	they'll change them all.
12	A little bit of my problem, too, is
13	that we're having them come back fifteen years from
14	now, not probably any one of us will be sitting on
15	this board. They have no idea what really our true
16	intent was here or what our feelings are that we
17	that we had a good feeling that hey, there's a good
18	possibility we're going to give them an extension.
19	They might say hey, this meant
20	there was a cutoff in fifteen years. I'm just
21	saying we don't know what this other board is going
22	to be just like we have to handle something that
23	fifteen years ago they handed down to us, see.
24	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It could be probably

- 1 most of the owners that had property won't be here
- 2 fifteen years before us.
- 3 I didn't say that I'm trying to
- 4 give anybody an impression that it's okay for the
- 5 existing uses now. Each is going to have to stand

_	• ,	A 17	r ,1 * 1	· C 1	C 1 (1 (
6	On ite ouin	Δ nd I	l think	11 A2Ch	owner feels that
•	OH ILS OWH.	Allu	AIIIII I	II Cacii	OWING ICCIS MAI

- 7 he has got good reason for having the lighting that
- 8 he has he should be able to explain that to
- 9 whatever board is there and be able to convince
- 10 them to give him a different special use or a
- 11 variation.
- We may find that this lighting
- 13 standard becomes more restrictive. Ten years from
- 14 now this might be more restrictive and it might
- 15 require them to change in five years. I don't
- 16 know, I can't predict the future.
- But all I can do is sit here now
- and say let's establish at least some kind of goal
- 19 so that everybody knows where they stand and the
- 20 citizens know where they stand and the Village
- 21 knows where it stands. That's all.
- MR. WINTER: Don, one final point. I
- 23 think a lot of this growth has been within the last
- 24 ten years and these are -- and these properties

- 1 have come before to get either PUDs, annexations in
- 2 the last ten years.

3	I really don't think I think
4	they should be entitled to have the useful life,
5	whatever that is, and it's going to be maybe 40
6	years for somebody, 20 years for someone else.
7	And I just I don't think that
8	there's some long-standing problems out there. I
9	think most of these lights have already been
10	approved either by this Commission or well, the
11	Trustees. And I really don't see it as being a big
12	problem out there.
13	I think by putting this fifteen
14	years out there or another arbitrary year it's just
15	going to be a headache, it's going to be a lot of
16	paperwork, and I think it's going to be really
17	legislation that requires residents of the Village
18	and property owners who support the Village to have
19	to incur undue expenses.
20	MS. KOVARIK: Do you think it's a
21	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I've just got to
22	say I disagree with that. We've done this before
23	in the Sign Ordinance.

Because if you're saying that about

- 1 this, then we ought to go back into those other
- 2 ordinances and when the Sign Ordinance comes up
- 3 don't put any amortization on any of these things.
- 4 MS. KOVARIK: Bryan, do you think it's
- 5 fair to leave out the years and leave out the
- 6 value, say if you replace it you have to replace it
- 7 in conformance.
- 8 And I know what you said about the
- 9 different -- but if it's true that what that guy
- 10 said about them rotting, I mean once they have to
- 11 start replacing one they're going to have to
- 12 replace all of them.
- MR. BILL SMITH: What if lightning hits
- 14 one? They have to replace this one and now it's
- 15 20 foot.
- MS. KOVARIK: Write natural acts of God
- 17 in there or something.
- MR. WINTER: Jim had an idea where if
- 19 they had to replace so many in a given year or six
- 20 months, I think that's the solution.
- Because I do think we have to have
- 22 it so that there is fair enforcement and that
- 23 everyone complies and I think that is a proper
- approach that Jim suggested.

1	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I think that
2	leaving the fifteen years in is fair because
3	everybody knows where they stand and they know what
4	the schedule should be.
5	And then they can if they want a
6	different schedule they can work they can come
7	in and work that out with the Village and everybody
8	would have an opportunity to do that. They'd be
9	notified that they're legal nonconforming, that
10	they have X amount of time.
11	If in the meantime before that
12	period is up they changed more than 60 percent of
13	their system they'll have to conform at that point.
14	Otherwise they're going to have to work on some
15	kind of program to do it within a certain time
16	period or come before the Board, they can come
17	before the Board right on the first day and say we
18	think we really have a system here that is not a
19	problem and shouldn't be under this requirement and
20	they can get a variation at that point.
21	And then they know where they
22	stand. They know they've got a clear shot for the

- 23 next whatever, 40 years or however long they're
- 24 going to be here.

1	MR. WINTER: But, Don, I think you
2	underestimate the time that people have to fill out
3	for a special use and the fact is there's a lot of
4	33 and 40 foot poles that this Commission has
5	approved in the last ten years. In fact, probably
6	the vast majority.
7	And to say to them come back in
8	fifteen years, you know, and we'll be right
9	we'll give you an extension. But what, are we
10	going to require that they have a study to justify
11	all that? I still think there's a lot of cost
12	there that we're really not even considering just,
13	you know, to come to a meeting, to do the paperwork
14	to make these assessments.
15	And I don't know what goal is being
16	served by making them do that when this Commission
17	or the Village in some form that the Trustees have
18	approved their lights within a short time period of

- what we're talking about.

 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, then if that's acceptable then why are we coming up with new standards?

 MR. WINTER: I think the standard is appropriate and I think there are special aspects
 - ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

- 1 here, glare. And I think the experience of the
- 2 Village in the last ten years, I think we and the
- 3 Trustees have seen the need for having this.
- 4 And I think we have to start and I
- 5 think we start right now. But there has to be some
- 6 nonconforming leeway for what we've done in the
- 7 past.
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, there is. It's
- 9 the fifteen years. Now if you want to make it
- 10 twenty I don't have any problem discussing 20 or
- 11 25, but that's the leeway.
- 12 And the point is is if you feel
- 13 that these height restrictions are too restrictive
- 14 for existing uses then maybe we shouldn't have
- 15 those height restrictions in this standard.

16	MR. BILL SMITH: I don't think we're
17	saying that. We're saying that fifteen years is
18	too short a period of time.
19	Now I don't know, maybe somebody in
20	the audience knows. I mean maybe Dan Robison or
21	somebody who's an architect knows what the expected
22	length of these are. You know, how long is
23	what's the life expectancy of a pole, the average
24	light pole that's in most of these malls?

1	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do we have any
2	questions?
3	MR. AMUNDSEN: I can't address that.
4	But it's crossing my mind as I'm sitting here and
5	through some of the other earlier meetings this is
6	simply the cost of any legislation that we're going
7	to do enforcement compliance ultimately and I think
8	the public is hearing this amongst all of us we're
9	trying to address every possible issue that may
10	arise and cover it.
11	And what does it do to the

- 12 integrity of this ordinance if it gets passed if we
- 13 just say the current geographic areas that have
- 14 been the most recent in growth all pretty much have
- 15 their own standard and we just grandfather them and
- 16 from now on we're going to enforce this new
- 17 standard?
- 18 It's -- it's a question. But
- 19 listening to all of us we're trying to cover
- 20 everything, every little contingency and there are
- 21 costs for even this Board. Don't take it the wrong
- 22 way, I don't want to be here right now. There's a
- 23 cost. There's a cost.
- MS. KOVARIK: But the cost shouldn't

- 1 drive the look of the community or what we're
- 2 trying to accomplish with light trespass and glare.
- 3 No one could see how the Village would end up
- 4 developing. We had a vision. Now we've seen how
- 5 it's developing.
- 6 There's a problem with glare,
- 7 there's a problem with light trespass in some areas
- 8 and if we grandfather everybody then we'll still

- 9 have that, you know.
- MR. PAPP: Where is the problem with
- 11 glare?
- MS. KOVARIK: I mean if we really think
- 13 that 35 or 40 feet or whatever, 33 feet is all
- 14 right, then maybe we should be looking at changing
- 15 the height requirements and not be messing around
- 16 with the grandfathering.
- 17 I mean if you really feel all these
- 18 new subdivisions or any special uses at 35 feet
- 19 were acceptable because we gave them a special use
- 20 permit then maybe that's where we should be drawing
- 21 the line instead of getting more restrictive.
- I like the 25 feet, but that may be
- 23 an easier way to go than trying to figure out
- 24 fifteen years or ten years or twenty five years.

- 1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think Jim Sula had
- 2 his hand up.
- 3 MR. SULA: I was just going to make a
- 4 comment about the length of time we should be

5	considering it.
6	I don't know if it should be 15 or
7	25, but I think the business community at large
8	would view this as an investment in a
9	non-productive asset at best and probably an asset
10	that doesn't give them any additional value add and
11	I think we need to be very, very sensitive to not
12	put a time frame in here that is vastly different
13	from what we would normally expect a lighting
14	fixture to last because I personally don't think
15	that's fair in terms of asking a business owner to
16	invest in something prematurely.
17	The height issue is tough. I mean
18	we tend to think of Gurnee as topographically
19	fairly flat but it's not. And in some cases 30
20	feet is okay and in some cases 20 feet is too high
21	because of the differences in the variations of the

land. And in that regard we have to view those on

a case-by-case basis to be sensitive to the

topographical changes.

61

1 But I think we have to pick some

22

23

2	middle ground. And whether it's that or whatever,
3	I think that's as good as any number. We just have
4	to be sensitive to the changes in the topography.
5	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So you're suggesting
6	that we put in a year but you think fifteen might
7	be too short?
8	MR. SULA: I suspect fifteen is too
9	short and I'd be curious to hear some other
10	perspective.
11	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: In fact, let's try
12	wrapping this up here and then get to the public.
13	MR. BILL SMITH: I have a comment for
14	Kristy there that I have no problem with these
15	regulations but I don't think this short of a time
16	period either.
17	And I think you would be jumping up
18	and down, too, if you were the land owner and had
19	to replace 40 or 50 of those poles in fifteen years
20	when just three years ago or that you got the okay
21	and said hey, this is what your standard is so now

very upset, too, if you were that land owner and

you put all these poles in at a large expense.

I think that you would be very,

22

23

- 1 now we said hey, we have to change these things at
- 2 a great expense to you when they're only half worn
- 3 out.
- 4 MS. KOVARIK: That's why I said I'd like
- 5 to know what the average life of a light pole is
- 6 irregardless of acts of God but just the normal
- 7 light pole.
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Cepon.
- 9 MR. CEPON: I just have one question
- 10 from Jon because he was involved with the Village
- 11 and that.
- Do we have a problem with lighting
- 13 at this particular time in all the developments
- 14 that we have here in the Village right now?
- MR. WILDENBERG: Not a widespread
- 16 concern, no. I mean the standards that have been
- 17 approved in these PUD agreements and annexation
- 18 agreements are good standards.
- 19 You know, the projects that you've
- all been a part of and the Board has approved when
- 21 you look at them are nicely done. I think most
- 22 people would say they're nicely done.
- We do have, you know, every town is
- 24 going to have that occasional hotspot in the

1	community where you have a topographic condition or
2	some unusual condition where a light is a
3	particular light is causing a particular problem.
4	But as far as applying standards
5	to, you know, large commercial developments and
6	industrial developments, you know, the standards
7	that have been implemented to date, you know, I
8	would suggest or at least my opinion would be that
9	they're pretty good, you know. You don't have a
10	rampant uncontrolled lighting flittering across
11	every property line in town.
12	MR. CEPON: Anything we have at this
13	particular time could probably be handled on an
14	individual basis and it doesn't seem what you're
15	saying is that we've really not had a real problem
16	with this in the past.
17	So maybe we're overreacting by this
18	by trying to implement something that we really
19	don't have a real problem or that we really have a
20	problem with. So maybe we should just sort of look
21	at what we should do in the future and everything

- 22 that's here right now seems pretty well to be taken
- 23 care of.
- MR. WILDENBERG: That's something the

- 1 boards need to come to grips with as you hear it
- 2 from -- as you discuss it amongst yourselves and
- 3 hear from the public.
- 4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We've been neglecting
- 5 this side of the table here.
- 6 MR. PAPP: If the lighting conditions
- 7 and designs in the west, the west expansion are
- 8 satisfactory and causes no problems or just very
- 9 isolated problems, why do we have such greater or
- 10 more restrictive ordinance?
- 11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That was my question.
- 12 I agree with you.
- MR. PAPP: Yeah. What's wrong with what
- 14 we already had? Just maybe tighten out the loose
- 15 ends. Why do we have a more restrictive if they're
- 16 25 to 30 feet west of us with 400 luminares, 400
- 17 watt luminares, why are we suddenly going to 250

- and 20 to 25 if it's not a problem?
 MR. WILDENBERG: Good question.
- 20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That's a good question.
- MS. KOVARIK: Well, it may be that it's
- 22 not a problem now.
- 23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Kristy, we've got to
- 24 let these guys talk down here.

- 1 MR. PAPP: I wanted to say, Kristy, you
- 2 had said that there were problems in glare and in
- 3 light encroachment. Where?
- 4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Trespass.
- 5 MR. PAPP: Where?
- 6 MS. KOVARIK: Do you want me to name --
- 7 I don't know that it's appropriate to name
- 8 examples.
- 9 MR. PAPP: Well, can't those be done on
- 10 an individual basis. If they're talking about
- 11 glare, that's one thing.
- 12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But you do have to have
- 13 some kind of standard to go to those individuals
- 14 places.

15	That was my point was I think for
16	the most part no one is going to object to most of
17	the developments that are on the west side that
18	would come in and say look, we think that even
19	though we don't technically comply with some of
20	these standards we feel that given our situation
21	that's acceptable and we can get a variation or
22	maybe a new special use or whatever.
23	We would need to take to kind of
24	pre-approve those particular areas but then the few

66

that don't comply -- and I can give you some, too,
that I feel need some work -- we can hold them to
it and say look, we want you to change.
And I think in some cases we can
give them the 180 day thing if it's a glare
situation. And if it's a situation where, you
know, maybe they have too many poles or too high of
poles we could then in fifteen years get them to
change that.

And that's all I'm saying is I

11 don't think that it's that unfair. 12 MR. PAPP: But there is a much more 13 restrictive requirement than what has been normally 14 passed here in the last five years. 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't think you can 16 make that a blanket statement. I think there are 17 some lighting plans that probably do comply with 18 this and then there are some that are probably a 19 little in violation of it and then there are 20 probably some that are quite a bit. Maybe, Jon, 21 you might be able to shed some light on that. 22 MR. WILDENBERG: Just, for instance, 23 we've had a half a foot candle as our light 24 trespass standards. That's what we've been

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

- 1 applying up till now. It's a pretty common
- 2 standard used in a number of communities and it's a
- 3 decent standard and it's still in certain cases
- 4 listed as the light trespass standard in this
- 5 proposed ordinance.
- 6 However, we have one annexation
- 7 agreement and one planned unit development

8	agreement that I can think of that allow or that
9	requires half of that or doesn't allow any more
10	than half, that it allows point 25 foot candle at a
11	property line in certain situations.
12	We got a couple auto dealer
13	installations where that's the case. So there is
14	somewhat of a mixing of standards, some are more,
15	some are less on various plans.
16	But the vast majority of the
17	
1 /	commercial developments that you see, the newer
18	commercial developments that you see, the newer ones have almost all been reviewed either through
18	•
	ones have almost all been reviewed either through
18 19	ones have almost all been reviewed either through an annexation agreement and public hearing or a
18 19 20	ones have almost all been reviewed either through an annexation agreement and public hearing or a special use of some kind so they've undergone the
18 19 20 21	ones have almost all been reviewed either through an annexation agreement and public hearing or a special use of some kind so they've undergone the kind of scrutiny and analysis. The lighting plans

and found to, you know, make some sense and not

- 1 cause problems.
- 2 So I think Don hit on it, with the
- 3 occasional hotspots the little problems we have

- 4 here and there or may find here and there that that
- 5 180 day section I believe was set up with the
- 6 intent to try to address those and take care of
- 7 those.
- 8 MR. PAPP: If you've got a pole that's
- 9 27 feet high or 28 feet high and it's 3 feet above
- 10 our maximum, there are ways to modify the lighting
- 11 so that you don't have to tear the pole down and
- 12 put a new one up.
- 13 MR. WILDENBERG: The thing I would be
- 14 worried about if I owned a property was the Village
- 15 coming in and saying okay, hey, look, your plan was
- 16 okay awhile ago but we're going to hold you to you
- 17 have to do a lower light and that would cause
- 18 people or could cause people to possibly even
- 19 double the amount of poles that they have to put in
- 20 their parking lot to meet the illumination
- 21 standards that they have to meet for their
- 22 operation for safety and visibility and whatever in
- 23 their parking lot.
- So, you know, I think we have to be

- 1 careful. I think we've got a really good start and
- 2 a really good base of conditions here and it
- 3 probably would do us well to do exactly what you're
- 4 doing and be very careful about what you recommend
- 5 on what you think is appropriate.
- 6 MR. McDOWELL: For the past three or
- 7 four years we've been going over there and we
- 8 based -- a lot of this was based specifically on
- 9 what we picked up from what the Village had been
- 10 doing and what was current in the Village.
- This is not that restrictive by
- 12 comparison to what's here already if I'm correct on
- 13 that matter, Jon, most of the stuff that we've got
- 14 in here?
- MR. WILDENBERG: In certain instances
- 16 yes, in other instances no.
- MR. McDOWELL: The majority of the
- 18 village falls within that category as it is.
- 19 MR. BILL SMITH: No. No.
- MR. WILDENBERG: Not exactly.
- MR. BILL SMITH: 80 percent doesn't.
- MR. McDOWELL: And which part falls out
- 23 of it, just the height of the poles?
- MR. WILDENBERG: Height and then the

- 1 luminare wattages that you permit. Right now we
- 2 permit any luminare, it doesn't matter if it's a
- 3 200 or a 400 or a thousand.
- 4 If you're a permitted use in a
- 5 permitted zone you can go ahead and put whatever
- 6 you want up as long as the property line you're
- 7 not spilling more than half a foot candle over.
- 8 You can put anything you want, any
- 9 height you want. Now we have more control in like
- 10 I say most of the recent annexation agreements and
- 11 PUD agreements that have specific standards tied to
- 12 it where there are height limitations and foot
- 13 candle limitations.
- Most of the commercial developments
- 15 you're going to see have 400 watt luminares pretty
- 16 much as a standard. That's what they use in their
- 17 parking lots.
- And you're going to see pole
- 19 heights more of the 25 to 33, 35 foot range as what
- 20 they need to light up their facilities in an
- 21 appropriate manner.
- So it's kind of hard to throw a
- 23 blanket statement over it because we do have a

71

1	MR. McDOWELL: I'm not trying to get a
2	blanket statement, you know, just to get an idea.
3	There's two or three things in question here. It's
4	not a standard, like I said, it's
5	MR. WILDENBERG: I would say the height
6	and the wattage where you're allowed to do certain
7	wattage luminare are probably the main ones where
8	you're going to have differences.
9	MR. McDOWELL: I don't think it's the
10	intent of anyone here including myself that we want
11	to go out and stick it to anybody in the
12	neighborhood, you know, simply because of something
13	that was done a few years ago. That's not what we
14	want to do.
15	What we're trying to do is
16	establish guidelines and set a game plan for the
17	future that we want to be in compliance. Now
18	what's done is there and we can't you know, we
19	just can't turn around and walk away from this.

We have to set some kind of

- 21 guideline that says this is where we want to be.
- 22 You can't make an open ended statement we want you
- 23 to do this sometime. So you need to set some
- 24 standards.

1	We said fifteen years as a standard
2	because and in a group conversation that's kind
3	of what we all we pretty much agreed on one
4	point, you know, or someone more, someone less, et
5	cetera.
6	You talk about people that have had
7	them up for five or ten years and going to have to
8	go back and do them. Well, in fifteen years that
9	pole is now 20, 25 years old so it's not just a
10	fifteen year.
11	And if you're dealing with
12	something that in fifteen years you have the
13	amortization I don't believe that if a company
14	comes in and says hey, two years ago before your
15	fifteen year rule set in place we had permission to
16	go in and put up 35 foot poles, these things are

17	only 17 years old, they can show where the
18	amortization of that should be 30 years, you know,
19	30 years as opposed to fifteen. I don't see
20	whether that this shouldn't even require a board
21	meeting.

- 22 If that's a proof of amortization
- 23 it can go -- that can be a straight staff. We're
- 24 not asking people to put themselves out for any

73

1	great amount to come in and do a board meeting and
2	stuff like that, you know, but you do have to set
3	some standards and you do have to set some
4	guidelines and you have to have a starting point.
5	Somewhere along the line you've got
6	to say well, this is what we want to do and this is
7	a time frame we want to accomplish it in and I
8	think we have to have a time frame in there.
9	Now does it have to be fifteen
10	years? If somebody can come up and show us here,

anybody from the -- anybody wants to jump in here

whether it should be twenty years for amortization

and get their feet wet, feel free to do so --

11

12

14 for that light, then fine, I'll go along with the 15 twenty years. 16 But right now fifteen years is what 17 we've come up with. And I mean if we've got some 18 better information than we do at this point, we're 19 willing to listen to it, please. 20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Maybe this is a good 21 time to open the floor to the public. Let Lyle 22 speak, okay, he hasn't spoken yet.

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

choice of words, but I think one of the concerns is

MR. FOSTER: I want to be careful in my

23

24

74

1 from my short time around Gurnee it seems that a 2 lot of our lighting standards are negotiated based 3 on what seems to be the most palatable in getting the development approved or compromising with the 4 5 residential area. 6 And I understood that one of the desires in coming up with lighting standards is so 7 8 we clearly set forth community standards for the

Village and what we find is acceptable to the

10	developers is clear, the residents are clear,
11	everyone is clear up front. These are the
12	standards, these are the guidelines.
13	I'm a little puzzled because some
14	of our discussion tonight seems to we are sort
15	of pulling back from even maybe revising the
16	lighting standards. I mean if everybody feels the
17	lighting standards are doing fine as they are I
18	think the exercise we've been through either was a
19	fruitful discussion or we have decided we're all
20	comfortable with how things are.
21	But if we're not comfortable I
22	think we should be clear and fair to the
23	development community and to our residents that
24	these are the guidelines and the standards.

1	Now one of the things that I would
2	maybe feel sometimes maybe for certain districts
3	and certain areas lighting standards could actually
4	be different and I have no problem with that.
5	Maybe along Grand Avenue there are
6	different lighting standards than in the quieter

7	residential areas and I think that's perfectly
8	acceptable.
9	But I'm concerned that one
10	development may have this set of lighting standards
11	and across the street you could end up with a
12	different situation or maybe it's based on use.
13	But I think if we had made the
14	decision that we're going to address the lighting
15	standards this is an opportunity to clearly state
16	these are standards that reflect Gurnee's intent
17	for how we want our community to be and use
18	Kristy's word, how we want to define the character
19	of our town.
20	As Gurnee has developed we're
21	beginning to see the impact of our development and
22	how it affects us from a light and a visual
23	standard. If we want to make an impact this is the

24 opportunity, this is a window I'd like to try to

- 1 respond to while this window is open. Otherwise,
- 2 we're going to close the window and we're going to

- 3 say I wish we could have, should have.
- 4 MR. McDOWELL: I have a feeling this
- 5 window is a few weeks away from being closed.
- 6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do you have any comment
- 7 on the amortization thing?
- 8 MR. FOSTER: I think it might be a few
- 9 years longer. I'm open to twenty years, but I
- 10 clearly feels there need to be some years put in
- 11 because it begins to say to people this is a time
- 12 frame.
- 13 I think it may be a tough, you
- 14 know, pill to swallow but I think it's a necessary
- 15 pill.
- My concern is more around property
- 17 changes hands, how does the new property owner find
- 18 out I have 12 years before my lights are not in
- 19 conformance. And from the enforcement aspect I
- 20 feel that should be a stated period of time.
- 21 I'm open to that being extended
- 22 from what's in that plan.
- 23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Carl.
- MR. CEPON: Just to elaborate on that a

- 1 little bit. If we're going to put in that that has
- 2 to be modified greater than 60 percent, that's the
- 3 replacement, we're using 60 percent as the
- 4 replacement value if they have to replace 60
- 5 percent of the lights why don't we just say that
- 6 within X amount of years the other 40 percent have
- 7 to be replaced. In other words, instead of --
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That's not what that
- 9 says.
- 10 MR. CEPON: Instead of --
- 11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It says if you do.
- MR. CEPON: The whole thing you have to
- 13 replace within fifteen years to leave it set as is.
- But if the system has to be
- 15 replaced, 60 percent of the system had to be
- 16 replaced then the other 40 percent has to be
- 17 continued and the whole system has to be replaced
- 18 but don't but eliminate the fifteen years.
- 19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: No, maybe you're
- 20 misunderstanding. What that says is if you do
- 21 replace 60 percent of the cost of your system you
- 22 must submit to compliance with the entire system.
- 23 MR. CEPON: Right.
- 24 MS. KOVARIK: If you only replace 10

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD.

1	percent you don't.
2	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Right.
3	MR. CEPON: Okay.
4	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So I mean it's not like
5	you're saying it's okay to replace 60 percent of
6	your system. We're saying if you do that then
7	you're not only going to have the 60 percent in
8	compliance but the other 40 percent is going to
9	have to be brought in compliance as well.
10	Why don't we move things along here
11	and have I'm sure the public is interested in
12	giving some comments.
13	So the floor is open to the public.
14	And why don't you step up to the mic. And if you
15	could state your name and address for the record
16	and your business if you're related to a business
17	and address your comments to us.
18	MR. PETERSON: My name is Asper
19	(phonetic) Peterson. I've been building in the
20	Village of Gurnee here for 25 years.
21	It seems like what we're trying to
22	do tonight is a little bit like pornography, you

1	building here, living here, I've lived on and off
2	in the Village for a long time. And I'm definitely
3	against this Lighting Ordinance completely.
4	In Gurnee we have Zoning Ordinances
5	just to mention a few and all the amendments that
6	go with the Zoning Ordinance. You have grading
7	plans ordinances requiring that, storm water
8	management ordinances, ordinances for high school,
9	donations for grade school, library, fire, park
10	donations ordinances. We have ordinances for
11	everything.
12	We have a tree ordinance. Years
13	ago somebody out here at 21 cut a bunch of trees
14	down. What do we do? We get a knee jerk reaction
15	and now we have a tree ordinance. We have
16	landscape ordinance requirements.
17	My Gurnee Industrial Park that I
18	started in '76 out here, 1976 I got originally
19	annexed and zoned. There was no lighting

- 20 ordinance, there was no discussion about lighting.
- 21 So all this stuff that you guys are approving, I
- 22 used to come in here all the time and I don't come
- 23 in here any more at all, but there was no
- 24 discussion of lighting so every light I imagine in

- 1 my industrial park and Wedgewood Creek apartments
- 2 and Gurnee Industrial Park probably is illegal.
- 3 I want to read you a letter that I
- 4 got today from Gurnee. And I just found out about
- 5 this Lighting Ordinance and I'm a little bit
- 6 surprised.
- 7 But this is from the Building and
- 8 Zoning Department. This is in response to your
- 9 letter of March 12th and the fax from Steve
- 10 Schrader. Steve Schrader is my architect and Rich
- 11 Hobson is -- works for me in Nordic Properties. We
- 12 have a building over on Washington Street.
- This is from the Building and
- 14 Zoning. Please submit standard architectural
- 15 drawings of a photometric plan, horizontal and

16	vertical view plan for the entire site up to and
17	including the property lines.
18	The vertical photometrics should be
19	measured at 6 feet and 12 feet above grade. The
20	light loss factor must be point one, not point 76
21	to calculate the foot candle readings. A faxed
22	report is not acceptable.
23	Number two, provide a detailed
24	drawing of the exterior building light mount

81

1	brackets. They want to see the brackets. Not the
2	fixtures but the brackets. Please address all
3	comments to the above blah, blah, blah.
4	Now, we don't have a lighting
5	ordinance in Gurnee. It seems that what's going or
6	right now is already pretty in depth for
7	controlling what's going on with the lighting in
8	the Village here.
9	With all the ordinances we have in
10	this town it took me nine months to get my last
11	three building permits for factories in my

12 industrial park that was approved 20, 25 years ago.

13	The Gurnee Zoning Ordinance was rewritten in 1982,
14	which Butch was involved in that.
15	And a lot of the stuff that's in
16	that ordinance doesn't comply with any of the
17	property I'm building and it's an absolute
18	nightmare for the zoning, for Hayner, for the
19	engineering department because what they're trying
20	to get me to build just doesn't fit on what was
21	approved.
22	If I start changing things, you
23	know, I'm trying to build a building across from
24	the credit union, two and a half years I've been

82

waiting for the building permit on that.

If I have to go in and start

redoing my lighting -- first of all, the answer is

how long does a pole last? How long does an

aluminum pole sitting on a concrete base last? It

lasts longer than anybody in this room is going to

be around. It lasts indefinitely.

If you're going to start cutting

9	poles down and changing lighting, now let's start
10	talking about digging up parking lots, adding
11	poles, additional lighting.
12	You're cutting down on the amount
13	of lights that we have, yeah. I have a lot of 400
14	watt high pressured sodium lights. You're going to
15	have to start redistributing poles around take
16	one, take Wedgewood Creek. You go up to Wedgewood
17	Creek, all the poles there are over 30 feet. It's
18	a beautiful apartment complex.
19	If I've got to cut that down, now I
20	have to start adding additional lighting around the
21	parking lot. It's more than just cutting poles
22	down and changing the fixtures, it's adding all
23	over the place, basically rebuilding the entire
24	system.

83

1	I was just talking to Dan Robison.
2	He does some of my architecture, he used to be on
3	the Planning Commission. He estimates 80 percent
4	of the Village is built out.

Now is this a situation again where

- 6 we have somebody cut down a bunch of trees and now
- 7 we have a tree ordinance? Do we have one or two
- 8 problems in the Village? Because I drive through
- 9 town -- you know, I get around the country a lot.
- 10 Gurnee doesn't stick out as a town that has a
- 11 glaring illumination problem.
- I have some buildings that I have
- 13 problems with on St. Paul Avenue where there's a
- 14 glare problem. They brought it to my attention,
- 15 we're in the process of planting trees around that
- 16 to shield that.
- 17 I agree with, you know, with the
- 18 Village. They talked to me about it and we're in
- 19 the process of fixing it.
- It seems to me that whatever
- 21 happens government wants to come in and regulate it
- and control it. And you're not going to be able to
- 23 write a lighting ordinance that is -- that is not
- 24 going to be, A, challengeable all over the place;

84

1 B, impossible to enforce; and C, build another wing

- 2 onto the Village here to start to control what's 3 going on. 4 I can tell you that I'm involved in 5 that daily with my industrial park, my little 25 6 year old industrial park meets none of the requirements. I don't meet everything, everybody 7 8 is pulling their hair out because there are so many 9 ordinances in this Village right now that they 10 don't know how to enforce them. 11 And finally, this ordinance is part 12 of something that I don't believe is necessary in 13 the Village. I don't think -- if we have a couple 14 of bad problems, go to the businessmen. I think 15 it's all businessmen, you know, businesses mostly 16 we're talking about here. Go to those guys in the 17 Village, see if you can work it out if you have 18 ten, twenty bad problems. And I bet you 90 percent 19 of them are going to get fixed. 20 You're going to create a lot more 21 trouble by trying to pass an ordinance here 22 covering that. I think there's plenty in place now 23 to control it. Thank you.
 - ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thanks.

1	MR. JACOBSEN: Good evening. I'm Steve
2	Jacobsen, senior vice president of Mills
3	Corporation and I was involved with Gurnee Mills
4	from the inception which I believe was in '89.
5	As you already know, the entire
6	Gurnee Mills property is governed by a very
7	specific annexation agreement which does have a
8	defined term and a development agreement and a
9	special use permit with a PUD which does not have
10	a defined term. This was all approved by the
11	Village Board back in '89.
12	This agreement is a very well
13	thought out and detailed agreement that specifies
14	everything from landscaping, signage, trash
15	enclosures as well as lighting. We worked very
16	hard with the Planning Commission, Village stuff
17	staff as well as Butch when these guidelines were
18	established.
19	We were not cavalier in our
20	assumptions nor do we take lightly the impact this
21	project would have on this farming community. To
22	many of us including who live in the community it
23	was important that it worked and worked well.
24	When we came up with the lighting

1	issues in the annexation agreement our consultants
2	designed a very detailed photometric study. We
3	worked closely with the Village staff in order to
4	create a lighting package that was uniform,
5	non-obtrusive, safe and efficient.
6	Some of you may remember that we
7	actually erected mockups in the parking lot where
8	Members of the Village staff could go and I
9	believe you, Butch were out there at night with
10	all of us with light meters evaluating the lighting
11	options on the boom poles seeing what lights would
12	work and what lighting levels were acceptable.
13	And as a result of that a selection
14	was made for the actual pole heights and fixtures
15	that are now on the property.
16	To further minimize the impact to
17	the residential areas the poles in the north and
18	northwest areas of the property were reduced to 30
19	feet. We originally had requested 40. These light
20	poles also had concealed light sources.
21	The poles in the balance of the

- 22 parking lots are at 40 feet in height and also have
- 23 the same concealed light source. The light
- 24 poles themselves are 40 watt metal halide. The

- 1 only areas that bulk pack lighting was permitted
- 2 was the loading up areas which are totally
- 3 concealed from view.
- 4 To further reduce the lighting
- 5 impacts on the surrounding residential areas we
- 6 also agreed to construct a 30 foot high densely
- 7 landscaped berm along the north and west property
- 8 lines. If you look at the actual grade elevations
- 9 the top of these poles in some areas are actually
- 10 ten foot below the top of the berm.
- The light poles themselves are 200
- 12 feet from the property line on the north end and
- 13 are probably another 400 feet away from any
- 14 residents.
- We also did a few other items after
- 16 that were not required and were not part of the
- 17 original agreement. When Ruby Tuesdays opened its
- 18 doors there were some concerns from homeowners

19	about the late evening lighting. We agreed at our
20	cost to completely recircuit the lights at the
21	north end to minimize this impact. Again, we were
22	not obligated to do this.
23	Furthermore, we also agreed to shut

24

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

off the north mall entrance signage one hour after

88

- the mall closes which, by the way, conforms to the 1 balance of the parking lot lighting which also 2 shuts down one hour from mall closing except obviously for security lighting. The only 5 exception to this is the theater parking lot which 6 shuts down one hour after the last show ends. 7 The guidelines for this project are so complete and comprehensive that we actually 8 9 bring governmental officials from other properties 10 here to see what has been accomplished as a
- I can't tell you how many times
 I'll bring a mayor from Arizona or the mayor from
 the City of Ontario or other places to bring them

guideline for new projects.

15	and show them Gurnee Mills as far as the guideline
16	that have been established here.
17	Every time an official from another
18	city from across the country visits Gurnee Mills
19	they always marvel at the guidelines that have been
20	established. As a matter of fact, some of the
21	agreements actually say design it like Gurnee
22	Mills. What this tells me is that you in the
23	Village did a very good job back in '89.
24	For your information, the lighting

1	package that we have in Arizona which has probably
2	some of the toughest lighting requirements in the
3	country due to all the observatories in the area
4	actually has a less stringent lighting criteria
5	then we currently have at Gurnee Mills.
6	The lighting ordinance if approved
7	would result in tremendous negative operational,
8	financial, and safety impacts on our property. If
9	we were to conform 100 percent to this criteria and
10	at the same time maintain safe night time lighting
11	levels, the result would be an increase of almost

12	eight times the amount of light poles that
13	currently exist on the property.
14	Furthermore, the total wattage
15	would almost double from 194,000 watts to 321,000
16	watts. The mall parcel alone would increase from
17	158 poles to approximately 804 poles.
18	If increasing the number of poles
19	by a factor of eight and doubling the wattage on
20	the property is not an eyesore, then I don't know
21	what it is.
22	The fact that there would be more
23	obstructions in the parking lot would also result
24	in a tremendous increase in safety hazard for

90

motorists, not to mention the operational
nightmares for snow removal.
Financially this ordinance alone
would cost us over 4.5 million dollars not to
mention the tremendous annual cost increases for
maintenance. My question is who pays for this?

And finally, the fact that we have

8	a legal document that outlines what we are allowed
9	to do means that this ordinance if passed would not
10	apply to Gurnee Mills because the PUD would live on
11	forever.
12	We believe that together we have
13	created a lighting package that conforms to all of
14	the sensitive and non-sensitive issues that
15	typically go along with lighting.
16	We were cognizant of that fact when
17	we reviewed it with Jon and other members of the
18	staff and we understood what the issues were. We
19	did not come up with this criteria on our own. You
20	were part of the process.
21	We have proven to you over the
22	years that we are not only a tremendous tax revenue
23	generator, but more importantly we have always been

91

1	In closing, I think that over the
2	years every time there's been an issue with the
3	Village they have called us and every time we've
4	worked it out. In this particular instance we have

24 a good neighbor.

- 5 not had one phone call to discuss this lighting and
- 6 ask for our input on what the impacts would be.
- 7 As you hear the balance of the
- 8 testimony from others tonight I suggest that you
- 9 rethink and relook at the proposed ordinance from
- 10 the entire community perspective. Again I thank
- 11 you for the opportunity and I hope you might hear
- 12 my concerns.
- 13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.
- MR. HOBSON: My name is Rich Hobson,
- 15 also with Nordic properties. I'm just going to
- 16 expand on what Asper talked about.
- 17 First I'd like to start with the
- 18 purpose of the ordinance. It's my understanding
- 19 that the purpose of the ordinance is based on
- 20 improper lighting and adjacent properties.
- 21 If you look deeper into the
- 22 purpose, it also indicates such things as sense of
- 23 security, inefficient and well designed.
- We do not believe that the Village

1	or any other government entity should make the
2	effort to obligate its citizens or business owners
3	to meet such subjective criteria as those items.
4	Under procedure this ordinance
5	would require a schematic wire layout and power
6	source. Even under architectural plans we don't
7	have to submit those items.
8	It also further indicates the types
9	of fixtures which could be construed as
10	architectural review and those types of things.
11	Under the variance it also
12	indicates that anything above 10 percent out of
13	compliance will not be able to be varied. That
14	could be all of our buildings in the industrial
15	park. We've got yard lights in every lot that are
16	400 watts that are probably 15 feet off of the
17	property line. Under the new ordinance we wouldn't
18	be able to have those. So the security there is of
19	significant concern.
20	The height is another issue with
21	Wedgewood Creek apartments, with the shopping
22	center and some of the other buildings. We have
23	parking lot lighting that's protecting the
24	employees in the industrial park, protecting the

- 1 residents in the apartments. It's right on the
- 2 property line.
- We can have according to the new
- 4 ordinance a 3 foot pole. I don't know how you can
- 5 light a parking lot with a 3 foot pole. So the
- 6 security concerns are again significant.
- 7 Nonconforming uses. We say that,
- 8 you know, come on in and we'll talk about a
- 9 variance. Nobody here can tell anybody honestly
- 10 that they'll be able to get a variance.
- The economics of it, as Asper
- 12 mentioned, build another wing because you're going
- 13 to have to hire additional staff to monitor this.
- The cost to the businesses, I can't
- 15 even put a number on it because we haven't had
- 16 sufficient time to work on this. We got this late
- 17 last week. It's not enough time for anybody to put
- any significant time except for Gurnee Mills
- 19 because they've got the resources to come up with
- 20 numbers on that. But it is a significant impact.
- We talked about poles. Poles
- 22 basically last forever, it's the fixtures that you
- 23 need to replace. So you can have a pole that lasts
- 24 a hundred years, you can have a fixture that lasts

1	three months. So if you have fixtures that you
2	need to replace, now you're replacing the poles.
3	As Asper indicated and Gurnee Mills indicated, you
4	cut up parking lots, add more poles, on and on it
5	goes.
6	Where does it end? We start with
7	exterior lighting. Do we go to the interior
8	lighting? Do we go where do we go from here?
9	And those are concerns and I think they're
10	justifiable concerns on everybody's part.
11	But let's look at the citizens, the
11	But let's look at the citizens, the
12	residents and the security that lighting does
12	residents and the security that lighting does
12 13	residents and the security that lighting does create. I think it's underestimated in this new
12 13 14	residents and the security that lighting does create. I think it's underestimated in this new ordinance on the impact of security that lighting
12 13 14 15	residents and the security that lighting does create. I think it's underestimated in this new ordinance on the impact of security that lighting has.
12 13 14 15 16	residents and the security that lighting does create. I think it's underestimated in this new ordinance on the impact of security that lighting has. If you look at the Gurnee
12 13 14 15 16 17	residents and the security that lighting does create. I think it's underestimated in this new ordinance on the impact of security that lighting has. If you look at the Gurnee Industrial Park we've got very few problems in the

21	So based on that I would suggest
22	that it be declined in its entirety. Thank you.
23	MR. VARGO: My name is Jerry Vargo, I'm
24	president of Lake Partners and a developer in the
	ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220
	95
1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	community for over fifteen years.
2	My fundamental objection to
3	first I'd like to commend the public officials for
4	attempting to do something worthwhile maybe over,
5	you know, on new projects. I think it's always
6	commendable that you have the best interest of the
7	Village maybe in the context of trying to make it a
8	better community, a more uniform lighted community
9	to make the town look prettier and to make it more
10	functional in the feature.
11	But my objection fundamentally
12	centers around the issue of agreements that have
13	been formed up to now. I think that planned unit
14	development agreements with development standards,
15	we negotiate those in good faith. Many of those
16	have life expectancies much further than what this

ordinance suggests.

18	We also negotiate financial terms
19	with our lenders and we disclose to them what the
20	costs of that project is going to be and we make
21	commitments to make mortgage payments for a hell of
22	a lot longer than fifteen years. And along comes a
23	new ordinance that says you are arbitrarily going
24	to have to pay X number of dollars to change some

96

1	part of the project, okay.
2	I think there would be a tremendous
3	objection on the part of the lending institution
4	with this particular type of an ordinance. I also
5	think that I'd like to also know whether the
6	members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and Plan
7	Commission has had a legal brief on the ability to
8	violate PUD agreements and their terms as to
9	whether, you know, I entered into a PUD agreement
10	with the Village. It's got a 20 year life
11	expectancy, it's got development standards. I'm

living by the letter of the law and you decide to

change that, whether that's legal or not.

12

14	Those are fundamentally some of the
15	comments that I have. I think you also when you
16	talk about amortization you're talking about life
17	expectancy of a fixture. To me amortization is how
18	long do I have to pay the mortgage. And what
19	you're doing is imposing a financial burden on
20	something that you really shouldn't have a right to
21	do so.
22	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thanks.
23	MR. FOERSTER: Good evening, I'm Mike
24	Foerster. I'm senior vice-president with Six Flags

97

1 Great America.

- 2 I have to say that our company has
- 3 performed a preliminary review of your proposed
- 4 ordinance. In all candor, we just received it
- 5 recently and when I see the thin turnout I'm not
- 6 sure how much awareness in the community there
- 7 really is of this going on because I don't know, I
- 8 didn't get it through you, I got it through another
- 9 channel.
- But in any case, we haven't had the

11	lead time to really perform a detailed analysis to
12	identify some of those points of nonconformity that
13	you're addressing there.
14	I appreciate Steve Jacobsen's
15	efforts because in many ways his parking areas are
16	very similar to mine and our fixture numbers are
17	very close.
18	And we ran into the same type of
18 19	And we ran into the same type of issues that Steve addressed basically of having to
19	issues that Steve addressed basically of having to
19 20	issues that Steve addressed basically of having to conform to the new standards would require
19 20 21	issues that Steve addressed basically of having to conform to the new standards would require effectively destroying our parking lot and having to run new electrical leads, new power, new poles.

- 1 within the ballpark.
- 2 I have a very unique issue I guess
- 3 with us as a company and that is within the
- 4 ordinance you have within your Section 8.12.7
- 5 businesses that are covered as commercial
- 6 recreation is exempted.

You talk about public and private
recreation facilities. I currently operate under a
special use under a commercial recreation zoning so
I'm I guess interested as to whether or not we may
be covered under that exemption.
I think when I read some of the
definitions in there that talk about seasonal
lighting, outdoor arenas and so on that we probably
do. If that's the case from a very parochial
self-interest I would request that we may be listed
in those uses when you're listing baseball fields
and so on.
On the other hand, if a
determination is made that we're not covered under
that particular section I have some of the issues
again that Steve and some of the other people have
brought up in that we do operate under a specific
special use permit and an ordinance that was passed

- 1 in 1980.
- 2 And as I read this new ordinance I
- 3 find a number of points of conflict that I think

4	agaın	Barbara	or	someone	1S	going	to	have	to	talk

- 5 to or resolve as you go forward because we likewise
- 6 have some long-term provisions in there that
- 7 protect us from future changes that can have a
- 8 dramatic financial impact on our company.
- 9 Going on to broad terms, I guess I
- 10 share a lot of the viewpoints that we have maybe
- 11 heard tonight. As I went through the ordinance, I
- 12 really didn't find a clear mechanism for addressing
- 13 some of these conflicts for the older residents
- 14 shall we say that are in there.
- We talk about the legal
- 16 nonconforming, we talk about those that put in
- 17 lighting plans. I agree with the gentleman back
- 18 here, I mean we never had to do a quote lighting
- 19 plan. We did huge site plans, we spent years
- 20 negotiating how it would look.
- But twenty years ago we didn't deal
- 22 with some of this reality so I presume I would
- 23 fall -- if I'm not covered by this other point I
- 24 would full under this ten year window and not a

1	inteen year window to try to bring conformity in.
2	I think that it's unfair to ask
3	people to have to go and submit themselves to
4	another appeal process merely to continue to
5	operate their business in the way that they've been
6	operating it for years.
7	We also think that the and I've
8	heard some of you guys address it as well that
9	this arbitrary selection of a time interval to us
10	is troubling and we would agree that, you know,
11	light fixtures ours are 22 years old. And we
12	don't particularly have changes in them.
13	Occasionally we do get hit by lightning or someone
14	will run into one perhaps or our snow plow will hit
15	one and we'll have to change a pole out. But
16	basically they're aluminum, they last forever. You
17	change the bulbs in them occasionally, but other
18	than that we don't have a lot of problems.
19	I think smaller businesses it would
20	have a very dramatic impact to try to conform to
21	some of these things.
22	I guess basically again the point
23	that people these are significant financial

24 impositions that are going to be placed on

- 1 companies. We may be viewed upon as having, you
- 2 know, deep pockets but I can assure you that we
- 3 don't make economic decisions on this type of a
- 4 basis.
- 5 When we have to conform to a new
- 6 regulation such as underground storage tanks or
- 7 something, you know, typically these are not things
- 8 that you start putting money aside in past years to
- 9 be able to replace these in year, you know, Z. We
- 10 have to take that out of current capital funding.
- And as someone else pointed out,
- 12 it's real cash, it's not just accounting. You have
- 13 to go and find the money to do these things.
- We also don't think that those
- 15 things should be imposed on people without a
- 16 compelling life safety reason. And I haven't
- 17 really heard any life safety issue addressed here
- 18 tonight. I've heard about some inconvenience.
- We're concerned, as Steve pointed
- 20 out, about life safety because the more -- if we
- 21 had to conform to this we're going to have to add a
- 22 whole different array of lighting fixtures within
- 23 our parking lot to create this use for the guests

1	maneuvering their cars, snow plows in order to
2	maintain the same light levels that we have now.
3	Over the past twenty-two years
4	we've worked cooperatively with the Village to
5	address concerns raised by citizens. As you know,
6	we typically get various complaints on various and
7	sundry things. As recently as a few weeks ago at
8	the Zoning Board of Appeals we heard about animals
9	that are being killed crossing Washington Street to
10	get into our park to eat.
11	So I've heard pretty much
12	everything. But the one thing I never heard a
13	complaint about, quite candidly, is lighting. We
14	have 40 foot light fixtures. We have thousand watt
15	high pressure sodium vapor lamps in there.
16	We likewise have heavy berming as
17	Steve identified. And I know of no real light
18	leakage on our properties to go over there.
19	I understand we can understand

- 20 the desire to publish standards for new businesses.
- 21 As some of the gentlemen pointed out earlier, I
- 22 really think there should be a grandfather
- 23 provision for existing businesses that have been
- 24 permitted and gone through the process and went

- 1 through the public hearing process and had comments
- 2 from neighbors.
- 3 Because as I understand it in my
- 4 participation in these is that when you talk about
- 5 the uniqueness of some of the developments it's to
- 6 address neighbor concerns and the surrounding
- 7 property owners and that's why you have some of the
- 8 diversity that you have is to address specific
- 9 needs in specific situations.
- I also agree, though, that
- 11 realistically if someone is going to come in and do
- 12 a change, a wholesale change or a large scale
- 13 change to these systems that, you know, I
- 14 personally and our company doesn't think that
- 15 that's a problem. If you're going to make that
- 16 investment, you've made that decision now that

17	you're going to change those fixtures and you
18	should look at a design perhaps that more closely
19	complies with what the Village is trying to achieve
20	by this ordinance or whatever ordinance may
21	ultimately serve.
22	But allow us some planning and lead
23	time and it becomes part of the economic process.
24	We just don't think that these unilateral time

104

1	limits work.
2	It's too difficult to manage and it
3	really doesn't solve the problem. In fact, as I
4	think about it in the way, you know, business works
5	I think somebody else alluded to it without perhaps
6	specifically addressing it, when you have this
7	little clock that's ticking out there six, seven,
8	eight years, nobody is going to deal with it today.
9	They're going to deal with it six years, seven
10	years, eight years.
11	If you're a ten year person or if

12 you're a fifteen year person there's going to be

13	some decisions made as to what's the economic
14	viability of continuing to do what I do today
15	versus making this capital investment.
16	And I've been through a lot of
17	communities that have strip malls and things that
18	have closed and shuttered because it became
19	economically unviable.
20	I think it's foolish for us to
21	think that that can't happen to Gurnee fifteen to
22	twenty years from now if we have some of these
23	major financial burdens being placed on people. Or
24	the guy who gets sold or buys an area or other
	ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

105

piece of commercial properties and doesn't realize
that that's hanging over their head. So I think
that's another issue.
Just finally listening to some of
your comments I've made some notes about -- I would
agree with Mr. Winter about you really have to
define what illumination systems are.

And as I read some of this we talk

about illumination systems being changed, not light

MARCH 25 1998 PC MINUTES.TXT[3/2/2017 3:35:13 PM]

8

10	poles. I mean I hear everybody else talking about
11	light poles, but the ordinance says illumination
12	systems which implies to me that I'm going out
13	there and saying this is obsolete, I can't replace
14	this stuff, I need to look at a new way and more
15	energy efficient way to put new fixtures into my
16	lot and I'm going to change what's going on.
17	So I really think if you're going
18	to proceed on this I think you should more clearly
19	define what those are.
20	I guess that's about it. Again, I
21	applaud you for trying to do something. I
22	understand what you're trying to accomplish. My
23	concern is just that you really are going to create
24	some additional burdens on people that perhaps is

- 1 not fully anticipated or hasn't been thought
- 2 through fully because it will be a dramatic change.
- 3 It's not just changing a pole.
- 4 It's changing the whole infrastructure that
- 5 supports that pole and literally tearing up 80

6	acres, 90 acres of parking lots in our case. I
7	don't know, Steve, how many you've got. But we've
8	got about 186 poles out there right now.
9	Thank you very much. I appreciate
10	it.
11	MR. FRANCKE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
12	Members of the Board and the Commission. My name
13	is Hal Francke and I'm here from the law firm of
14	Rudnick & Wolfe on behalf of the Mills Corporation
15	this evening.
16	And I would just like to follow up
17	on some of the comments that Steve Jacobsen made.
18	He, as you heard, on very short notice prepared I
19	think a very excellent detailed presentation of the
20	potential burden and impact to him.
21	I would as an attorney just like to
22	address a couple of the legal issues and concerns
23	that I have based on my review of the ordinance.

First I'd like to start out by

107

- 1 saying, echoing what some of the other individuals
- 2 have stated this evening. I join in their

3	statements in terms of commending your efforts and
4	applauding the legitimacy and virtue of your goals
5	which is to establish some standards and to have a
6	uniform set of guidelines and to do something that
7	furthers and protects the public health, safety and
8	welfare. I don't think any of us here this evening
9	are questioning that.
10	I think the biggest concern that I
11	have from a legal standpoint, and I know that the
12	number of the people in the audience have it and in
13	particular our client the Mills Corporation, is the
14	whole question of businesses in the community that
15	basically already have a negotiated set of
16	entitlements, projects and lighting plans that have

- entitlements, projects and lighting plans that have
- 17 received specific review and approval by you. And
- 18 I don't mean you individually but by the Plan
- 19 Commission and by the Board and by the Village
- 20 Board of Trustees.
- 21 And I do think that legally there
- 22 is a different set of rules that have to be, and
- 23 not only have to be but just should be out of, you
- 24 know, what Mike Foerster just said a sense of

- 1 fairness given the significant burden that could be
- 2 involved.
- 3 And I think that the real essence
- 4 of the problem stems from the provision that all of
- 5 you have spent the majority of your time speaking
- 6 about this evening which I think is the section on
- 7 nonconformity and bringing systems into conformity
- 8 with the standards that are being newly created.
- 9 There's no doubt in my mind
- 10 personally that if there were an annexation
- 11 agreement today whether it was approved today that
- 12 approved the lighting plan and it had a twenty year
- 13 term or a thirty year term which arguably you could
- 14 do it as a home rule community that you -- that you
- 15 could pass an ordinance that required conformance
- 16 within fifteen years notwithstanding that
- 17 annexation agreement. And in my opinion there's no
- 18 way that would be enforceable.
- 19 And while it's maybe not as clearly
- 20 clear under the statutes with respect to PUD
- 21 agreements and special use permits, I would argue
- 22 that there's really no difference in the way they
- would be treated legally or that they should be
- 24 treated legally.

1	When we come in with a client and
2	apply to you for a special use permit or PUD
3	approval, planned unit developments is in the
4	nature of a special use. We file an application,
5	we pay fees, we go through a process. The board
6	comes up, the boards and the commissions come up
7	with a set of entitlements but you also establish
8	limitations and conditions and required performance
9	with obligations.
10	In my view those documents when
11	they're done, planned unit developments, a special
12	use permit, those are no less agreements and
13	contracts than the annexation agreements. And so I
14	think that you do need a different set of rules for
15	those types of developments that have gone through
16	that type of scrutiny and that for all intents and
17	purposes are subject to contracts.
18	And so I think in that sense, Mr.
19	Chairman, they're different than your scenario
20	about, you know, we don't have entitlement the
21	speed limit isn't going to change or that the rules
22	aren't going to change.

1 the Village maybe that never went through any

2	specific approval and they had lighting programs
3	put in place under regulations that didn't exist or
4	that allowed them to exist I think you might
5	require a different set of rules than developments
6	that have gone through in particular a special use
7	process.
8	Because I don't think if the
9	rule is that you can change the rules
10	notwithstanding a special use permit,
11	notwithstanding this contract that I would suggest
12	exists, then I don't understand how you are helped
13	by going through the new special use permit process
14	which is being proposed in the ordinance that Butch
15	talked about because what after you go through
16	that and you create your new special use what
17	protection do you have that's it not going to
18	change again on you.

19	If you take the approach that the
20	special use and the agreements you reach in the
21	special use can be changed then what's the point of
22	having the special use and having the use of
23	conditions.
24	If the petitioner, if the property
	ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220
	111
1	owner wanted to change or avoid or expand on a
2	condition of the special use permit we couldn't do
3	it unilaterlly. You know we'd have to come back to
4	you and go through the process. So I'm not sure
5	
5	that it would work the other way.
6	that it would work the other way. My limited research, you know, on
	·
6	My limited research, you know, on
6 7	My limited research, you know, on the issue of amortization so far is just that as in
6 7 8	My limited research, you know, on the issue of amortization so far is just that as in many situations the law is going to make the
6 7 8 9	My limited research, you know, on the issue of amortization so far is just that as in many situations the law is going to make the amortization provision be reasonable. In simple
6 7 8 9 10	My limited research, you know, on the issue of amortization so far is just that as in many situations the law is going to make the amortization provision be reasonable. In simple parlance, it has to be reasonable.
6 7 8 9 10	My limited research, you know, on the issue of amortization so far is just that as in many situations the law is going to make the amortization provision be reasonable. In simple parlance, it has to be reasonable. And in analyzing the reasonableness

15

conform to the amortization provision.

16	And I just question how successful
17	the Village is going to be it being able to
18	successfully argue that the public benefit
19	outweighs the substantial costs that you're hearing
20	and burden are going to be borne by the development
21	community when in fact you're dealing in many
22	situations with programs that have been
23	specifically reviewed and approved by the Village
24	and in a situation where everybody is saying it's

1	working, it's not a problem.
2	And in fact we've been able to deal
3	with the fact that different properties are located
4	differently and will and do require different sets
5	of rules.
6	So in conclusion I would just like
7	to say that again I'd like to go back and say
8	nobody and I certainly don't question the virtue
9	or the legitimacy of your goals and objectives.
10	And it sounds like although I've only recently
11	with Steve come to review this and learn about what

12	you're doing, it sounds like you've been working on
13	it for quite some time and you've had a number of
14	meetings and you obviously are putting in a lot of
15	effort.
16	So nobody is questioning the goals
17	or the objectives, I would just strongly like to
18	encourage you to, as you are tonight by having this
19	public hearing and continuing the process, include
20	the development community in those negotiations
21	because there's no doubt in my mind you can create
22	an ordinance and you obviously won't be the first
23	village that has detailed standards and guidelines
24	for lighting, there's nothing wrong with that.

1	And I think having an ordinance is
2	achievable and it's an admirable goal, but I think
3	it should be done more with the input of those that
4	will be affected. Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you. Anyone
6	else?
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. At this time I

9	close the floor to the public and I appreciate the
10	comments.
11	I would have to say, you know, I
12	sense a little bit of an overreaction here. I
13	don't think it was the intent of these committees
14	to try to revise the lighting systems of 80 percent
15	of our community.
16	I think our goal was primarily to
17	establish standards and actually help developers in
18	understanding what we would like to see from the
19	lighting standpoint. I would hate to see us kind
20	of drop this whole thing because of that one
21	amortization section.
22	You know, if that's what it means
23	to get this lighting standard through, I'm

24 certainly open to considering that. I don't think,

- 1 you know, when I read for example the -- I think
- 2 the height is the biggest concern of everyone.
- 3 And I think what we're saying here
- 4 is that we'd like to see as a standard 20 feet as

5	permitted use. A luminare in excess of 20 feet but
6	less than 25 feet shall require special use permit
7	approval. A luminare in excess of 25 feet shall
8	require a special use permit and variation
9	approval.
10	I certainly feel that Great America
11	and Gurnee Mills, I think I stated before I don't
12	see any problem with your lighting systems. I'm
13	sure that if you were building that development
14	today and came before us we would give you approval
15	even under this standard for what you have out
16	there. I feel that.
17	But I understand the concern
18	because we don't it's difficult for us to say
19	okay, we need to have this amortization clause but
20	we're going to exclude Gurnee Mills and Great
21	America I don't think we can do that

that. I think -- and from a legal standpoint I

I think Mr. Francke's comments on

establishing the agreements with someone, I respect

115

1 don't know if we're even, you know, capable of

22

23

2	putting something like that in this ordinance.
3	I think that's something our legal
4	staff needs to look at. We were advised that if we
5	were reasonable in the amortization that we could
6	include some amortization which I personally would
7	like to see only because I think there are some
8	isolated cases out there where it would be nice to
9	bring them into compliance in this fifteen year
10	period.
11	I think most of the developments
12	out there wouldn't even fall under that. I think
13	if they came before us and made the arguments that
14	you just made, we'd say you don't have to rip up
15	your parking lots, we don't want you to do that
16	because your lighting system is fine.
17	But I certainly and I don't know
18	how the other Members feel to me the most
19	important thing in this effort is to try to
20	establish some standards for the future uses. And,
21	you know, if it means dropping that portion of it,
22	you know, I'm certainly open to doing that.
23	If I had my druthers I'd like to
24	see us have some kind of amortization in there

- 1 But, you know, I understand the concerns. So I'll
- 2 open the floor to others.
- 3 MR. McDOWELL: Just a couple of quick
- 4 things.
- 5 First I would applaud you gentlemen
- 6 for coming in tonight. You may not believe it but
- 7 your input is extremely valuable to us. It really
- 8 is. I mean we can sit around here four or five
- 9 nights a week and talk about stuff, but you have
- 10 input that we don't have and we appreciate it.
- But one thing I did kind of pick
- 12 up, for the most part nobody seems to have any
- 13 strong objections to us having a lighting code,
- 14 it's simply the matter of the endorsement and the
- 15 time frame put in it.
- I mean just real quickly, am I
- 17 picking that up correctly? It's really the fact
- 18 that we're going after the time period or time. I
- 19 know Mr. Asper, I know you don't want a code at
- all, but I said with the exception.
- 21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And Mr. Peterson didn't
- 22 want it.
- MR. McDOWELL: But we don't have a
- 24 written code now, that's what we're trying to

1	establish. I get the impression there's no real
2	strong objection to us having a code in effect for
3	that which would make it easier.
4	MR. VARGO: I think that the people here
5	this evening have one major concern and that is
6	that you are trying to arbitrarily impose a
7	financial burden on property by placing a time
8	frame under which you then say we must do something
9	and we must spend money.
10	We have no objection or at least I
11	don't have any objection to a uniform lighting
12	standard which everybody can live by. In fact, the
13	development community always likes to know what
14	they're faced with up front. You know, the worst
15	possible circumstances is to go someplace where you
16	don't know what the rules are. We love to know
17	what the rules are. We thought we lived by the
18	rules the first time around.
19	What we perceive and you keep
20	saying that you don't think that's what it meant,
21	Don. We read it and we thought that it meant that

- 22 every light in this town is going to get changed in
- 23 fifteen years if it's more than 20 feet high.
- 24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I --

118

1 MR. VARGO: And your expert says -indicated that that's what they intended to write. 2 3 Butch said that that's what it meant, fifteen years you change the light. 4 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: No, that's -- I don't think that's right. 6 7 MR. VARGO: Wasn't that what you said? 8 MR. MAIDEN: No. 9 MR. VARGO: What did you say? 10 MR. MAIDEN: Or you would have to go 11 through the system of some type of approval 12 process. 13 MR. VARGO: I mean what if they say no. 14 MR. McDOWELL: That whole thing could be 15 a moot point.

MR. VARGO: But basically that's the

problem, that how we interpreted what you gave us

16

- 18 is that it was fifteen years and you're out or ten
- 19 years and you're out.
- MR. McDOWELL: What we put out was this
- 21 was open for discussion for exactly the type of
- 22 feedback we're getting. This is what we are
- 23 looking for.
- MR. VARGO: We never were even asked by

- 1 the Planning Commission.
- 2 MR. McDOWELL: That's why I'm glad
- 3 everybody showed up. But again like I said, I'm
- 4 certainly glad for that information myself.
- 5 But really the code is what we're
- 6 after and I think Mr. Rudny is correct in that if
- 7 it's a matter of the time frame and that seems to
- 8 be the major sticking point I've been a strong
- 9 advocate of the fifteen years but I also understand
- 10 what you're saying and I would have to agree with
- 11 him if that's the sticking point, and which it
- 12 could be, I'm definitely ready to back up on that
- 13 if that's what it takes to get something that's
- 14 going to benefit the Village as a whole for the

- 15 future which is what we want.
- 16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I agree. And I think,
- 17 you know, certainly I think the arguments that you
- 18 guys made out there were more convincing than some
- 19 of the members on the committee here.
- And I think Bob is right. We are
- 21 here to get public input. We want to see how you
- 22 guys feel about this. But there clearly was no
- 23 intention to try to get everybody to try to change
- 24 their lighting system. That was not the intent.

- 1 That was just a question of what
- 2 are we going to do with those developments that are
- 3 not complying with the standards. And you know, do
- 4 you just say well, you don't worry about them or
- 5 can there -- I feel there's some middle ground.
- 6 I feel that there are some that I
- 7 would like to do something about. I think there
- 8 are very few. I also agree with Mr. Francke that,
- 9 you know, I don't know that we have to really make
- 10 a big effort. I don't know how much it's going to

11	help the public. I don't know if it's worth the
12	expense to if there's enough public benefit to
13	work to make the expense worth it.
14	But again, you know, I think our
15	primary purpose was really to set some kind of
16	standard and not really force people to rip up
17	their parking lots. So I don't
18	MR. PAPP: I'm a little mystified by
19	this particular ordinance. I'm kind of a new kid
20	on the block so I'm not exactly sure what we're
21	trying to accomplish here.
22	But if as Mr. Jacobsen says, if
23	Gurnee Mills if they have to comply with this

ordinance they have to quadruple their amount of

121

- lighting fixtures, I don't think that's really our
 intent here. As you said, it's fine.
 I really -- I don't know where
- 4 these requirements came from, how we established 20
- 5 to 25 feet, 400 feet luminares. But I don't know
- 6 whether this was done from an engineering point of
- 7 view or from a lighting point of view with a

- 8 lighting consultant, however that was established. 9 But if we have to take a place like 10 Gurnee Mills and quadruple the amount of lighting 11 fixtures to achieve the kind of lighting that they 12 need then I think the ordinance needs a little 13 looking at. 14 MR. McDOWELL: That's what the special 15 use is for. 16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think there's one 17 thing that's being missed here is that Gurnee Mills 18 has the opportunity if they were to come in and say 19 they were going to -- it wasn't here and they were 20 going to build it they have the opportunity to put 21 in higher poles but they have to do it through 22 special use and variations. 23 And if they come in and make the
 - ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220

arguments and say look, if we don't put in the

122

- 1 higher poles we're going to have three times as
- 2 many poles or four times as many poles.
- 3 MR. PAPP: Wouldn't that apply to

- 4 anybody?
- 5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That will apply to
- 6 anybody. But the reason that we can allow them to
- 7 have higher poles is because of the size of their
- 8 property. They are inboard in their property,
- 9 they're not obtrusive and that will then allow that
- 10 particular development to make their case for a
- 11 special use or for a variation. Special use
- 12 process gives you that flexibility.
- MR. VARGO: Didn't I just go through
- 14 that with the car dealer, though, a special use
- 15 permit? Aren't you doing exactly what you just
- 16 described right now in the context of the PUD
- 17 special use permit?
- 18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We do that now, that's
- 19 correct. But everything is hit and miss because
- 20 there are no standards set. You don't have a
- 21 starting point.
- This gives us a starting point and
- 23 then you can make a variation on that through the
- 24 special use process. You can go to a higher pole,

it gives you the flexibility to do that. 1 2 You need some kind of starting point. Right now the starting point is we basically have what is the light falloff at the 4 5 edge of the property. 6 MR. VARGO: But whether --7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And then they come and 8 they present something to us and they say this is 9 what we need and then another development comes in 10 and says this is what we need and they're both 11 completely different. 12 MR. VARGO: But in the end whether your 13 starting point is zero or two or ten, in the end 14 the result is the same. 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Not necessarily, no. 16 MR. VARGO: Well, you know, in the end 17 you guys get what you want. Because you either 18 approve the project or you don't. 19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Jerry, what if we're 20 not here two years from now? 21 MR. VARGO: I understand it. But you're 22 saying, you know, and I -- I'm in agreement that

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

you should have some uniformity in your lighting

standards so everybody knows where they're starting

23

1	from.								
2	But when you talk about what the								
3	results will be starting doesn't mean where you								
4	finish. Right now you start from anywhere. But								
5	I'm assuming that if everyone here has the same								
6	view of what lights should look like at the end								
7	that regardless of where you start you're going to								
8	end up where you'd like it.								
9	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Number one is we all								
10	don't have the same view as to what it should look								
11	like when it's finished and this gives us that								
12	vision, this								
13	MR. VARGO: You're saying that it's a								
14	starting for you, not the ending views.								
15	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But you're going to								
16	have to justify. If you want to deviate from this								
17	standard through a special use process, you're								
18	going to have to justify the deviation.								
19	And I think a unique development								
20	like Gurnee Mills or Great America can do that.								
21	And that's why you can go maybe there's a								
22	development that will come in that can say hey,								

23 look, you know, all I need is a 100 foot pole in

1	be very effective and it's going to look better
2	than if I have fifty poles on the property.
3	And I think that this standard
4	allows a development to come in and convince us to
5	do that. We're not restricting them from doing
6	that.
7	MR. VARGO: I guess my argument is that
8	that
9	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think there's a
10	gentleman in the back that hadn't said anything
11	yet.
12	MR. PIKE: My name is Donald Pike. I'm
13	a manufacturer of light fixtures.
14	As a matter of fact, we made the
15	lights for Gurnee Mills. I think, number one, the
16	lighting ordinance is a good thing to have for a
17	city.
18	But I think what you should really
19	be concentrating on is not like the height of the
20	pole but really should be more on the cutoff at the

- 21 property line because if you -- cutting down to 20
- 22 feet is not going to solve the answer.
- 23 Because as Steve Jacobsen had
- 24 mentioned, you're going to increase the lights,

- 1 you're going to double the amount of lights that
- 2 you're going to have in this city, number one.
- 3 Number two, like you said, the
- 4 eight times the number of poles. But the answer
- 5 really should be the ordinance should be
- 6 concentrated on what should the foot candle reading
- 7 be at the border between the residential property.
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We have that.
- 9 MR. PIKE: That's really the most
- 10 important thing, not cut all poles to 20 feet. I
- mean you can have a pole at 40 foot high and still
- 12 have a very sharp cutoff and still have a very low
- 13 point 25 -- I think you mentioned point 25 foot
- 14 candle at the border, you know, such as Gurnee
- 15 Mills has today.
- You know, so that's really the most

17	• , ,	1			1		1.		1
1 /	important.	nluc	VAL	can	have	าก	Ordinance	α n	alara
1/	mportant	prus	you	Can	mavc	an	ordinance	OH	grarc.

- 18 a roadway glare. You know, ordinances are set that
- 19 way in other communities. On glare, cutoff at
- 20 property line, others -- other ordinances are set
- 21 on the maximum or deals with hotspots, the maximum
- 22 foot candle reading on a property versus the lowest
- 23 foot candle reading on the property.
- Example, if a property has a 12 to

- 1 1 maximum, 12 foot candles in one area, 1 foot
- 2 candle on the other, that's a hotspot that adds
- 3 glare. If a property has a 4 to 1, it's a very,
- 4 very low and it's very even lighting distribution,
- 5 you know. That's really what you should be
- 6 concentrating on with the amount of even lighting
- 7 distribution, less glare, the foot candle reading
- 8 at the residential property.
- 9 And I think Mr. Foster was very
- 10 much interested in like you mentioned about the
- 11 residents. And I think you will have happy
- 12 residents if they know that there's a very, very
- 13 minimum spillage going onto the property with like

14 berms like Gurnee Mills made along the northern 15 property line. 16 So that's just -- I just wanted to 17 attend the meeting on this and give you some of my 18 input. I mean nothing would I like better than to 19 sell a lot more fixture. But I really came here to 20 give an honest opinion on the science of lighting 21 and what is really the most important part of 22 lighting that you should be concentrating on.

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

addressed that. I don't think we're focusing on

23

24

128

CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I think I just

1 the height in the standards. That's one of the things that we're looking at. 2 3 In fact, that's the 20 foot is a permitted use. You can go to 25 with a special 4 5 use, you can go higher than 25 foot. 6 We would really like to see the 7 Petitioner give us the plan he feels is going to work best for him and still basically meet the 8

standard. If that means higher poles I think we're

10	going to approve that.
11	And the light trespass or falloff
12	at the edge of the property is definitely a
13	consideration that we have in there. So am I
14	correct on that, Butch? Do you have any other
15	comment on that?
16	MR. MAIDEN: I think one of the issues
17	that you may want to look at is the standard
18	relating to the existing conditions on the
19	variations and the hardship issue of destroying
20	existing design in parking lots, having to
21	reengineer the entire electrical system.
22	What we've had problems with is new
23	individuals coming in and saying you gave 40 foot
24	lights to somebody else, why can't I have it.

- 1 Well, if it's a vacant farm field and they're
- 2 starting from scratch then it's one thing to design
- 3 a 20, 25 foot pole.
- 4 But if it's existing conditions I
- 5 think there's a new standard that perhaps we want
- 6 to explore a little bit on the variation question.

7	So that even if, you know, if
8	there's no time limit or whatever and they come
9	back that's pre-considered so that you don't have
10	to start from scratch with an existing property and
11	redesign everything just to accommodate the height
12	issue.
13	So I think there's some things we
14	can address. We're getting some really valuable
15	information tonight.
16	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Bill.
17	MR. BILL SMITH: I firmly believe we
18	should have standards for new people coming in and
19	we say hey, these are the standards.
20	I've always had a problem with the
21	years. And after hearing Steve Jacobsen and them
22	and Mike Foerster I have a problem with the 60
23	percent, too, because if they all of a sudden
24	wind storm come through or something and knock 60

- 1 percent down, now they're tearing up their whole
- 2 parking lots and putting all these poles to that

- 3 height to meet the standard or come before us.
- 4 I don't like the 60 percent in
- 5 there now that I pointed out Paul has to go through
- 6 to bring it to this 20 foot standard if that's what
- 7 we try to impose to change that all around.
- 8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But, Bill, nobody is
- 9 trying to bring them to 20 foot standard. That's
- 10 not what the intent of this is.
- 11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's what it
- 12 says.
- MR. BILL SMITH: But we don't know what
- 14 the next board might do five years from now because
- 15 it's totally changed. They might think this is the
- 16 intent that we intended and say yes, you have to
- 17 bring them all to 20 foot. See, that's my part.
- MR. VARGO: That's what we think this
- 19 says.
- 20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Francke.
- MR. FRANCKE: I just wanted to reiterate
- because I think it's exactly what the last few
- 23 comments you made, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Smith, and
- 24 Butch.

1	Again, I think most of us here
2	don't have a problem with having an ordinance that
3	establishes standards. As Jerry said, I think most
4	of our clients like when there are rules laid out
5	and the standards are set.
6	So I don't think any I shouldn't
7	say anyone most of us here are not disagreeing
8	with the concept of having standards. I personally
9	don't have a problem with the new people coming in
10	who don't meet the standards having to go through a
11	special use hearing or a variation hearing because
12	again, as Jerry said, that's happening today
13	anyway.
14	Most of the projects are going
15	through a special use, you know, projects of
16	magnitude are going through a special use hearing
17	anyway where as Jerry said you have that control
18	available, you have that control now.
19	I think the core of the problem is
20	the paragraph that says people like us with Gurnee
21	Mills who already have gone through the process in
22	fifteen years have to go through it again.
23	And the unfortunate from my
24	standpoint perhaps, the fortunate from your

ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD.

1 standpoint and the reality of life is whenever you

2	have to have hearings sometimes you say yes and
3	sometimes you say no.
4	And why should someone who has
5	already gone through the process have to go through
6	it again and be subject to that uncertainty.
7	So I reiterate again, I think that
8	one provision as you said earlier is the core of
9	the problem for tonight.
10	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Why don't we
11	let's get some of the Commissioners here. We're
12	getting kind of late. I kind of think we're going
13	to continue this.
14	MR. VARGO: Could I make one quick
15	comment?
16	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Sure, go ahead.
17	MR. VARGO: It might be very helpful.
18	On your 60 percent of cost, you know, it seems that
19	the members up here seem to focus on like that
20	would kind of like 60 percent of cost translates to
21	like changing 60 percent of the fixtures is what I

kind of gathered the people said.

1	of the cost with the fixtures. You know, the real
2	cost of the fixtures, the lighting is not probably
3	even what you see. It's, you know, under the
4	ground and in the controls.
5	So, you know, you could lose 60
6	percent of your lights in the parking lot but not
7	60 percent of your costs.
8	MR. McDOWELL: Good point.
9	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: What you're saying is
10	somebody could change all the fixtures in their
11	parking lot and that may not be 60 percent of the
12	cost.
13	MR. VARGO: That's probably very true.
14	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So maybe what we should
15	do is have Butch take another look at that section
16	and see if there's any way we can come up with
17	some, you know, more sensible approach on that.
18	The one thing I would like to say
19	is is there any objection it's kind of open to

- 20 the floor here -- with the one section on -- where
- 21 the one paragraph on Page 9 where we say legal
- 22 nonconforming luminaries that exceed the foot
- 23 candle standards set forth in Table 2 and/or direct
- 24 light or glare towards the street, parking lots,

- 1 residences or property lines should be either
- 2 shielded, redirected or otherwise modified to meet
- 3 the requirements of this section within 180 days of
- 4 notification or apply for an extension of time
- 5 period for compliance or apply for a variation with
- 6 the specific time period for amortization, did
- 7 anybody have any problem with that one?
- 8 Because that one helps us address
- 9 the situation that Mr. Peterson was talking about
- 10 where you may have isolated cases of some bad
- 11 lighting that the Village staff could then address
- 12 on a case-by-case basis.
- 13 MR. VARGO: It's kind of like a noise,
- 14 light and pollution ordinance, you know.
- 15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Bryan.

16	MR. WINTER: With that in light of what
17	was said I think someone provided testimony that in
18	one of the industrial parks because of security
19	reasons maybe your light I wonder whether and
20	let me just say this:
21	I think that in defense of Butch
22	and the committee we do know that many residents -
23	and we didn't just create these. For the most part
24	these are standards in other villages right now.

1	I think glare came from Maine and
2	other places. So this was a first attempt I think
3	after much discussion. I certainly voiced my
4	objection to the nonconforming provision.
5	But I think that in light of what
6	the Chair has said that we're going to continue
7	this I think people indicated they needed
8	additional time. Staff is working very hard on
9	this, but you can see that there's still a lot to
10	discuss and they're not always looking at it from
11	the perspective of I own ten buildings in the
12	village and I know I've got security lighting that

13	would have to require shielding for this and I know
14	how much that's going to cost me.
15	So I'm just looking at that one
16	provision there and the way it's written, glare
17	towards streets, parking lots, residences or
18	property lines, that may be even a little expansive
19	when you consider the industrial park where the
20	light is truly there for security purposes and it's
21	adjacent to another factory say for instance.
22	So again I think following up on
23	the comments of the Chair that if we're going to
24	reconvene at some point I think we should certainly

136

ask for those that are here tonight if they have
specific other changes that they should bring that
to our attention because I think everyone agrees
that our current ordinance is I think less than a
page or a page. It is inadequate.
There's a lot of definitions in
here, but I think that what we should focus on is

the chart. And I think we need to have some more

9	special uses there and I think anyway, I hope
10	that we all agree that the nonconforming conditions
11	have to be changed.
10	MD M DOWELL W

- MR. McDOWELL: We're going to have to
- 13 take a second look at them, there's no doubt about
- 14 it. Absolutely.
- MR. WINTER: Even that I think, Don,
- 16 that one section you pointed to I think that might
- 17 need to have some amendment to it.
- 18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I'm open for
- 19 amendment. I think that that was probably to me
- 20 the most important part of that section because it
- 21 will allow us or allow staff to address specific
- 22 problems within the community.
- 23 And you know, if it needs to be
- 24 reworded to be more specific I'm all for that.

- 1 Because I agree with you that that may be a little
- 2 bit vague when we say direct light or glare towards
- 3 streets, parking lots.
- 4 And then don't forget the other
- 5 thing, too, is if there are special situations

- 6 where for security or because of its location it's
- 7 not really a problem they could apply for a
- 8 variation.
- 9 MR. AMUNDSEN: But we're essentially
- 10 looking at hundreds of evenings of special use or
- 11 variation hearings. And in my hearing us talk
- we're looking at three, four, maybe five sites that
- 13 are potentially, you know, a problem.
- 14 And there's going to be hundreds of
- 15 people applying, fine, we'll push it off into the
- 16 board in the future. I still think that's a
- 17 serious flaw in what we're doing.
- So we can massage some of the
- 19 requirements here, heights and all these other
- 20 things. But we're basically saying, you know,
- 21 sometime out in the future there's going to be --
- again, Jon can't even say, but there's a lot of
- 23 them that are going to have to come in and ask for
- 24 a special use.

138

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: No, you must have

2	misunderstood me. I'm talking about the variations
3	for someone who has a in this last paragraph
4	where we have the 180 day notification, there may
5	be specific cases where somebody says look, I've
6	got the light, I have this need because it's
7	secure, you really can't see it from any residences
8	or something like that. They could come in for a
9	variation on this specific case.
10	I'm not talking about any
11	MR. AMUNDSEN: I was talking more
12	broadly even than just that.
13	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think we're going to
14	a consensus there that we need either that to be
15	rewritten drastically or maybe even dropped.
16	MR. BILL SMITH: Maybe the members that
17	are out here in the audience can look at that, work
18	with staff and give their opinions. And why don't
19	we reconvene in two weeks or something and see what
20	their opinions are, how we can put all the input
21	together and maybe as Asper or as
22	MR. PETERSON: Can I ask one question.

But isn't the law if you do it for one you have to

And I'm questioning fine, you come in for variance.

23

1	do it for everybody?
2	You can't just sit and pick and
3	choose that I'm going to give it to this guy and
4	not give it to that guy.
5	Aren't you going to create if
6	what you just said, I need it for security, isn't
7	every single guy going to need that light for
8	security or I need it for this purpose? Once you
9	grant it for one don't you have to grant it for
10	everybody?
11	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: If your situation is
12	exactly the same as his, yeah.
13	MR. PETERSON: Well, we're close.
14	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, then close I
15	don't know.
16	MR. PETERSON: You know what I'm saying.
17	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Like a special use
18	permit, what we do is we look at the particular
19	situation. And I do agree with you, we have to be
20	careful with setting precedence.
21	MR. PETERSON: I think you're opening a
22	can of worms and creating a lot of nights here for
23	you guys hearing I can tell you about 80

factories in the Gurnee Industrial Park that are

1	going to be in for permits or petitions because
2	none of them will conform.
3	You give it to one it just seems to
4	me like if you do it for one I know that's a
5	standard in the law, what you do for one you have
6	to do for everybody. If you don't enforce an
7	ordinance eventually it doesn't become an
8	ordinance. You have to enforce it equally. If you
9	give it to one I would think it would have to be
10	given everywhere.
11	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You're overreacting,
12	Asper. First of all, I think this section where we
13	talk about glare, it happens even in residences.
14	People for security will take two spotlights and
15	they'll put them out on their driveway to shine
16	up to light up their driveway and when I drive
17	by you can't the police can't read the house
18	numbering because they can't look down the driveway
19	because it's glaring right out into the street.
20	Those are the kind of cases we're
21	talking about. Now, if a business has something

- 22 like that and there are some cases in town and
- 23 there's very few I think would be notified by the
- 24 staff that would work with them to either shield

4	.1 11 1 .	11 1	1 . 1 .	1 1 1	•
1	the lights.	redirect them,	which is	probably	going
-	tile ingiles,	i can cot their,	***************************************	procuory	50115

- 2 to solve 90 percent of the cases.
- 3 And if some guy has a light that
- 4 says look, I absolutely need this light, there's no
- 5 solution to this, it's really not bothering
- 6 anybody, then he could come before us for a
- 7 variation.
- Frankly I don't think we're going
- 9 to see anybody because I think most people are
- 10 going to recognize what they have and they're going
- 11 to solve the problem. And it's going to be very
- 12 few cases in town. And that's the only reason that
- 13 we put that in there. It's not to try to get
- 14 everybody to change their lighting. I think most
- 15 people don't need to.
- MR. PETERSON: The only thing I say is I
- 17 agree with the lighting fixture guy here, if you
- 18 control the border, are you affecting your neighbor

19	rather than trying to control what fixture, what	
20	how we keep talking about height of poles. We are	
21	also talking about high pressure sodium 400 watt,	
22	thousand watt bulbs more than just a pole.	
23	I would think if like he says, if	
24	you control how are you affecting the neighbors and	
	ASK FOR PILAR & SMITH, LTD. (847) 336-5220	
1	how are you affecting the public driving on the	
2	street. I have some of those lights on St. Paul	
3	Avenue and we are in the process of shielding them	
4	by planting them out hopefully with landscaping.	
5	But I don't see what the control	
6	thing is how high the fixture. Like you say, if	

you had a hundred foot high pole and it worked how

CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We're not -- the height

are you affecting your neighbors and how are you

affecting the street traffic to me would be

of the pole is more a visual thing during the

And I agree that the light -- that

daytime actually more than it is at night.

MARCH 25 1998 PC MINUTES.TXT[3/2/2017 3:35:13 PM]

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

important.

to other properties is
to other properties is

- 16 important. But the other thing that's important is
- 17 glare. If you have a very bright fixture and you
- 18 can see the light source, that's a problem and we
- 19 have some of those in town.
- 20 And in fact we have some with
- 21 inside lighting. If you drive by the library
- 22 sometime it's pretty annoying. But that's
- 23 something that this section would address would be
- 24 got to light the library in there.

- 1 MR. WINTER: But really I think if
- 2 anybody has any suggestions because I don't think
- 3 anyone is overreacting or can overreact to this
- 4 because I really think it has some long -- there
- 5 really are a lot of possibilities where this could
- 6 disrupt how businesses are operating and their
- 7 costs.
- 8 And so I just encourage people to
- 9 just -- don't think we're going to resolve this.
- 10 You really have to be specific with some of your
- 11 suggestions to us because again everything that we

12	have here may have existed somewhere else and so
13	there is a basis for us coming up with this
14	initially.
15	If, you know, they had everyone's
16	help to refine this so it really is a workable
17	ordinance that makes sense and applies fairly to
18	everyone.
19	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I didn't mean
20	that people are overreacting. I'm just saying that
21	we're here to work with the citizens with the
22	businesses to try to come up with something that's
23	good for the community.

And like Bryan said, we would

144

appreciate your input and we do appreciate you
 coming tonight, too. And I don't know how you were
 notified and I know someone said they got this last
 minute or they got it through some other source or
 something.
 If you could -- I don't know how we

can spread the word more to even get more people

7

- 8 involved and even some citizens involved because I
- 9 doubt that there are many citizens that know this
- 10 is going on right now as.
- 11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why don't you
- mail it to every business there's this lighting
- 13 ordinance. You have their addresses.
- MR. WILDENBERG: We'll mail to every
- 15 business license that we have issued in town, what
- 16 if they weren't issued?
- 17 MR. PETERSON: Any industrial park you
- 18 have to get occupancy permits so mail it to them.
- 19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The notification
- 20 process is difficult. Sometimes the citizens come
- 21 in here and they say why don't you notify every
- 22 citizen?
- We try to do that through
- 24 newspapers and things like that and that's

- 1 obviously not that effective of a method. But, you
- 2 know, if we can get more people involved we would
- 3 appreciate that and if you can help us do that, go
- 4 ahead.

5	MR. VARGO: I mean I think it would only
6	be fair that if you're going to affect a business
7	financially that you notify them in advance in some
8	other than public notice in the Gurnee Review that
9	you're going to impact their financial well-being
10	in a stipulated period of time.
11	Public notices about a housing
12	project or whatever become pretty common knowledge
13	and word travels rather rapidly in that sector.
14	But some trust that opens a building in a business
15	park should be notified that you're going to affect
16	their financial well-being and you should give them
17	an opportunity to comment.
18	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, citizens argue
19	the same thing, if there's going to be a discussion
20	on an increase in the tax or something let me
21	finish.

MR. VARGO: But you're talking about

23 their properties.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We can't talk at the

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

1 same time, Jerry. If they're going to be -- if 2 their financial well-being is going to be affected 3 they feel they should be notified, too. 4 All I'm saying is it's somewhat impractical. Jon, what are the procedures on 5 notifying people? I mean I'd like to see more 6 7 people notified, too, if we could. 8 MR. WILDENBERG: For a text amendment in 9 the ordinance it's published in the newspaper. 10 There is no other vehicle that will get a certain 11 notification to everybody else in town. 12 There isn't anything and it's not 13 required under statute to do anything other than 14 publish a notice in the paper. All the newspapers 15 are then aware of it, they can cover it, they can 16 choose to give publicity, not give publicity, 17 whatever they want. 18 But the Village has met its legal 19 obligation for notice. 20 MR. VARGO: But if it's a public hearing 21 required under special use permit you have to go 22 within 500 feet of that property.

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

subject property that is a specific topic of the

MR. WILDENBERG: But then you have a

23

- 1 hearing. This is something where you're amending
- 2 the Zoning Ordinance for the whole community. It's
- 3 a little difficult to notify every property owner
- 4 in this town that it's happening.
- 5 And we're going to have more
- 6 issues, you're going to have some that are strictly
- 7 related to residential zones and residential lots
- 8 and how do you get the word out to every resident
- 9 in that town that you're going to have a particular
- 10 hearing.
- I mean we can put stuff on the web,
- 12 we can do the thing in the newspaper, we can -- you
- 13 know, we have the newsletter that goes out every
- 14 other month here. But there's not one vehicle that
- 15 assures you a hundred percent penetration.
- 16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That's what I thought.
- 17 Mr. Forester, did you have something?
- MR. FORESTER: I just wanted to respond
- 19 quickly on your question. People such as ourselves
- 20 about the one paragraph, you know, we haven't done
- 21 any measurements. I can't tell you if the numbers
- 22 in there are high, low, or sideways.
- So your suggestion that we come
- 24 back two weeks, three weeks, whatever you

1 established I think is valid because I need to do

2	some homework to have some engineering work done.
3	We haven't had time to do anything before I could
4	even begin to comment as to whether this was
5	realistic for us or unrealistic to know what kind
6	of impact it had.
7	Secondly, Jon, for notification we
8	have the twice monthly Gurnee business luncheon
9	notices in the mail. I assume we would have a
10	little list that would certainly give a broader
11	awareness to businesses in the community. Maybe
12	they can use that mailing list because there will
13	be enough word of mouth. You only have one
14	reporter here tonight. I'm sure there'll be some
15	more talk about it. But maybe that's a source that
16	you can send a notice out that this is being
17	discussed.
18	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That would be a good
19	idea, business luncheon or some kind of word of
20	mouth. You know, I think we're going to try to

- 21 maybe -- because we're definitely not going to vote
- 22 on this thing tonight.
- I don't believe we've got a lot
- 24 more work and maybe the Commissioners have some

- 1 other comment. Kristy, did you have a comment?
- 2 MS. KOVARIK: I want to say, and being a
- 3 global opponent of the grandfather, the thing that
- 4 made the most sense tonight that Mr. Francke said
- 5 is we gave them a special use and now we're saying
- 6 come back for another special use.
- 7 But then if there's another new
- 8 addition in the ordinance, they keep going through
- 9 the special use process and that's not the intent
- 10 of the special use process to keep one going
- 11 through again. Kind of when you sell a mortgage
- 12 you can't change the terms of it.
- I kind of agree with that. That
- makes the sense out of everything to say there
- 15 should be some grandfathering for a special use for
- 16 annexation. And I don't know, do they have an
- 17 expiration term? Did you say up until the

- 18 expiration terms of special use.
- 19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Some special uses have
- 20 expiration terms but some don't. Right, Jon?
- MR. WILDENBERG: Most of them don't.
- MS. KOVARIK: Most don't.
- 23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: An annexation agreement
- 24 is only good for twenty years. Special use permits

- 1 are indefinite.
- 2 MS. KOVARIK: Shouldn't they be
- 3 permitted -- once you've given them a special use,
- 4 to keep making somebody come back for a special use
- 5 every time we change the rules.
- 6 We do agree with that. I think
- 7 that's good reason to say we've got to grandfather
- 8 somebody.
- 9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think, you know, the
- 10 consensus seems to be to modify that section in
- 11 some way. And I think we can all maybe take some
- 12 time and think about other changes we might want to
- 13 incorporate. And also, you know, you're welcome to

- 14 come back at the next meeting and give -- take a
- 15 chance to take a look and see how it may affect you
- 16 in other ways and I think that's important
- 17 feedback.
- MR. WILDENBERG: I would say to all
- 19 Members of the Commission and any other interested
- 20 property owners and so forth in town if you do have
- 21 thoughts or suggestions you can please feel free to
- 22 call myself here at the office or Tracy any time
- 23 and let us know what you think. If you come up
- 24 with further ideas that will help us prepare the

- 1 next draft.
- 2 MR. CEPON: I make a motion that we
- 3 adjourn.
- 4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm being told that it
- 5 looks like we have two dates, April 22 or April
- 6 29th. The April 22nd date is regular ZBA. Do you
- 7 know if you guys have anything?
- 8 MR. WILDENBERG: No, we don't have any
- 9 variation petitions pending.
- 10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do you want to make it

- for the 22nd?
 MR. McDOWELL: 22nd of April.
 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Could we have a motion
 here.
 MS. KOVARIK: I do.
 MR. BILL SMITH: Second.
 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We have a motion and
- 18 second to continue to meeting to April 22nd. All
- 19 those favor of the motion signify by saying aye in
- 20 the roll call. Roll call, please.
- 21 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.
- MR. SULA: Aye.
- 23 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.
- MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

- 1 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepon.
- 2 MR. CEPON: Aye.
- 3 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.
- 4 MR. FOSTER: Aye.
- 5 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.
- 6 MR. BILL SMITH: Aye.

- 7 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.
- 8 MR. WINTER: I won't be here the 22nd.
- 9 Aye.
- 10 MR. WILDENBERG: Rudny.
- 11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye.
- MR. WILDENBERG: Hood.
- 13 CHAIRMAN HOOD: Aye.
- MR. WILDENBERG: Papp.
- MR. PAPP: Aye.
- MR. WILDENBERG: Amundsen.
- 17 MR. AMUNDSEN: I'm tired, yes.
- 18 MR. WILDENBERG: Finn.
- MR. FINN: Aye.
- MR. WILDENBERG: McDowell.
- MR. McDOWELL: Aye.
- 22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion carries and it
- 23 is so ordered. 7:30 here at the Village Hall.
- MR. McDOWELL: And we hope to see a lot

- 1 of you gentlemen back here for that date, too.
- 2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion to adjourn.
- 3 MR. BILL SMITH: Motion to adjourn.

4	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All those in favor
5	signify by saying aye.
6	(Aye responses.)
7	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Opposed?
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Meeting adjourned
10	(Whereupon, the hearing
11	adjourned at 10:13 p.m. to be
12	reconvened on April 22nd,
13	1998 at 7:30 p.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

STATE OF ILLINOIS)

) SS:

COUNTY OF LAKE)

I, SANDRA K. SMITH, do hereby certify that I am a court reporter doing business in the County of Lake and State of Illinois; that I reported by means of machine shorthand the testimony given at the foregoing Report of Proceedings, and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.

SANDRA K. SMITH, CSR, RPR

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

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