

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL PRE-ANNEXATION HEARING OF THE GURNEE VILLAGE BOARD IN REFERENCE TO THE LIGHTHOUSE COVE PUD GURNEE MUNICIPAL BUILDING

The hearing was called to order at 7:32 P.M. by Mayor Welton.

Roll call, present: May, Zelenko, Salata absent: Yost (arrived at 8:03 P.M.), Johnson, Smith (arrived at 7:34 P.M.)

Other Officials present: Robert R. Trigg, Village Administrator

Mayor Welton explained the purpose of this Special Hearing was to consider the proposed Lighthouse Cove PUD on Route 21.

Zelenko moved, seconded by May, to appoint Trustee May as the President-pro-temp of this Special Hearing. All ayes carried.

May took the chair.

Mr. Trigg read verbatim the Finding of Fact and Recommendation of the Plan Commission of the Village of Gurnee in reference to the said proposed PUD.

Introduced to the Village Board were the developer, Mr. Allan Schmidt; architect and landplanner, Mr. John Green; consultant architect, Mr. Daniel LeNoble; counsel, Mr. Leon Teischner; engineer, Mr. Joseph Zgonina; and representative of Cowhey and Associates, Mr. Robert Goodmanson.

Village Attorney Swanson swore in all persons who desired to participate in this hearing.

Mr. Teischner was introduced, who in turn reported that agreements for contributions of money have been made with the Woodland Grade School District, Warren Township High School District No. 121, and with the Gurnee Park District.

Mr. Daniel LeNoble was introduced, who in turn stated that the main issue of the pre-annexation agreement is the zoning and density of housing. He said the underlying zoning of this PUD was R-5 & R-6, as he understood the Village Zoning Ordinance. He then distributed to the Board a "density analysis sheet" and explained it. He said that the overall density was between that of Pembroke and that of HeatherRidge. Four variables of bedroom mix are being considered.

Trustee Yost arrived at 8:03 P.M.

Mr. LeNoble explained the Site Plan as to orientation of the condominium buildings, main entrance, main recreation building, berms, jogging trail, tennis court, and green areas. He then explained and displayed a longitudinal/transverse elevation diagram and a visual schematic. He then asked if a variation would be needed for a 15 foot setback for the underground parking under the berms along Route 21 because IDOT is requesting 10 feet additional for ROW. Village ordinance requires a 25 foot setback.

The townhouses will provide 9% of all units, being eight planned buildings of four units each. A total proposed number of 348 units will consist of 32 townhouse units and 316 condominium units.

He explained that 9.6 acres of land will be covered by buildings, streets and sidewalks. Twenty one.2 acres of the parcel will be lake. The remainder of the site is open space at a 81.9% ratio, or a 72.4% ratio for the land area only. Cutting the density of the units would increase the open space ratio little.

The provision for parking provides one space in the building and 1.2 spaces in the condo area for a total of 2.2 spaces per unit, or 10% more than required by Village Ordinance. The townhouses will provide two spaces in the townhouse, one space outside each unit and one space in tandem for a total of four spaces per townhouse unit.

The yards exceed required minimums.

The condominium buildings will have a planned height of 38' to 39', under the Village Ordinance maximum of 45'.

Amenities included in the condo buildings are one car parking space, hospitality room, terrace on each unit, private heating and laundry facilities for each unit, as well as public laundry facilities, video security, smoke alarms, sprinklers in public areas, fire zoning, and facilities to service the handicapped.

The townhouse amenities include private decks, sound control, two inside parking spaces and 1~ to 2~ baths.

Fire emergency lanes will be built around the entire project.

Year-around site maintenance is required and all parking will be off the roads.

Non-motorized boats will be allowed on the larger lake.

The recreation building will house a swimming pool, sauna, boat storage, hospitality rooms, bar, kitchen and meeting rooms.

The civil engineer, Mr. Goodmanson, explained that the sanitary sewer is in conjunction with the sanitary sewer for the Marriott Industrial Park and that both parties are in agreement.

The water main will have two connections with the 12' Village main on the west side of Route 21, all being augered under Route 21 and all being looped.

The storm sewer system will flow into the smaller lake which will have a restricted outlet at the lower end of said lake.

All roadways will be built according to the Village Ordinance with bridges or culverts to be built over all swails.

The flood plain elevation for the site is 662.1' with the lowest furnished first floor of any unit to be 665.1'. The use of sump pumps is yet to be determined.

Mr. Teischner explained the construction phasing as follows: Phase I Condo I and recreation building complex; Phase 2 - Condos 2 & 3; Phase 3 - Condo 4 and the townhouses.

Mr. Joseph Zgonina explained the means to be taken to handle the traffic. The main entrance to Lighthouse Cove will be at the intersection of Route 21 and Gages Lake Road. At that intersection, the throat of Rt. 21 will be widened, providing for a left turn lane going south and the addition of right turn deceleration lanes in both north and south directions. The north entrance will be only a right-in, right-out entrance, allowing no left turns in any direction. The turning radii of all streets and intersections exceed the requirements of the law. He then iterated the results of a traffic study made in April, 1981, for the intersection of Route 21 and Gages Lake Road. According to the provisions of the state law, the said intersection does not warrant the installation of traffic control devices.

Mr. Estes reported on the population, school, and tax impact reports. The total projected population will be 604 persons. The tax base increase, due to the project, will be in an estimated amount of \$10,678,000 with an estimated Real Estate Tax Revenue to all government bodies in the amount of \$658,989. The effect on all schools will be the generation of more dollars in revenue than increased cost of education.

The following concerns were expressed by the Village Board.

Yost was reassured that the smaller lake does not flow into the larger lake. He also questioned if provision has been made for the parking of RV's in the enclosed spaces. The reply was that some provisions can 'be made.

Village Attorney Swanson stated that a list of all amenities will have to be addressed in the appropriate documents.

Zelenko questioned the correctness of the traffic studies, since the issue of traffic control and flow is a major concern of the citizens, in particular, left turns. The reply was that the State will not allow the installation of traffic control devices and that the developer will pay for all costs for the improvements to the intersection of Rt. 21 and Gages Lake Road.

May expressed concern that the density was high for the land area.

Mr. Trigg questioned the use of the north entrance. IDOT would issue a permit, subject to a right-in, right-out turn only and the filing of the engineering plans. The generated traffic of the project is expected to be 55% to the north, 43% to the south and 2% to the west.

Mr. Hayner questioned the construction of the main recreation building. The said recreation facilities will be constructed in Phase I, although the site of the tennis court is not precisely determined.

From the audience, Mr. Tom Wirtanen of 228 Hickory Haven Drive, asked about the ten items of the Plan Commission's "Findings of Facts".

Item 1: Proposed number of units is to be 312, not 348 as proposed. Item 2: Agreed. Item 3: Addressed by the Project Engineer, but not on the site plan. Item 4: Addressed not satisfactorily, but the State controls the installation of traffic control devices.

Item 5: Addressed

Item 6: Agreed

Item 7: Documents are available

Item 8: Agreed, since all units will be built out of the flood plain.

Item 9: No agreement

Item 10: Agreed. In particular, Items 1 & 9 will have to be addressed further.

Mr. Robert Amaden of 690 Chandler Road, questioned the density of the Project and the safety of the traffic at the intersection and suggested that the traffic issue be given more consideration.

Mr. Greg DeTogne of rural Gurnee, questioned as to why the Village could not prevent any further development. The reply was that development is difficult to stop since property owners have the right to use their property.

Mr. Ray Erdman of 346 Hickory Haven Drive, suggested that the Village allow the County to develop the project.

Mr. Dennis Hagge of 300 Hickory Haven Drive, questioned the saleability of the units due to the proximity of the NSSD Plant.

Mr. Greg DeTogne questioned if the property could be used for public use. However, the Forest Preserve District refused to purchase the site.

Mr. Chris Heisler of 650 Whitney Court, suggested R-6 zoning, allowing a maximum of 9 units per acre. He also complimented the developer for a fine presentation.

Mr. Tom Wirtanen requested the Village Board to try and hold down the density, to consider carefully the left turn situations, to require engineering plans, and to protect the rights of present residents and their quality of life.

Mr. Charles Suhling of 214 Hickory Haven Drive, questioned the ability of the berms to hide the project.

Mr. Erdman said that the developer should meet the Board's criteria. He also questioned if enough water pressure would be available, in particular, for fire emergencies. Village Engineer Klein answered that the pressure would be adequate under normal circumstances.

Mr. Wirtanen questioned why the Mayor was absent. For the record, he is purposely absent since a relative of his is handling the real estate transaction and that he will not participate in any proceedings on this project.

Trustee Smith suggested that 312 units is to be taken as the maximum number of units before any further discussion.

Trustee Salata suggested a maximum density of 270 units and questioned the impact on schools.

The following concerns must still be agreed upon:

1. Density must adhere to the 9 units per acre maximum.
2. An Association Agreement must be part of the Pre-Annexation Agreement.
3. The Net-usable land should be the determinant factor.
4. The traffic situation is a problem to be resolved between IDOT and the developers. The developer must meet with the Village Administration to resolve problems.
6. Charges for water and sewer tap fees need to be addressed.
7. Contributions to the Fire Department needs to be clarified.
8. Provision for Parking of RV's needs to be provided.

Mr. Butch Maiden, Village Plan Consultant, said that the developers are keeping the flexibility of the PUD ordinance. Some considerations will come before the Plan Commission in the future.

Yost moved, seconded by Smith, to adjourn and continue this meeting until June 22, 1981 at 7:00 P.M. All ayes. Motion carried.

The hearing was adjourned at 10:45 P.M. by Mayor-pro-temp May.

Norman C. Balliet
Village Clerk