

Approved

**Village of Gurnee  
Planning and Zoning Board Minutes  
December 2, 2020**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

Planning and Zoning Board Members Present: Chairman James Sula, Brian Baugh, Tim Garrity, David Nordentoft (remote), Edwin Paff, and Josh Pejsach (remote)

Planning and Zoning Members Absent: Laura Reilly

Other Officials Present: David Ziegler, Community Development Director; Tracy Velkover, Planning Manager; Clara Gable, Associate Planner; and Bryan Winter, Village Attorney

**2. Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Sula announced that, in accordance with the Governor's Executive Order in response to COVID-19 #2020-07, in-person attendance requirements under the Open Meeting Act have been suspended and relaxed. Therefore, tonight, certain members of the Planning & Zoning Board will be attending remotely which will be reflected in the minutes. He also announced that the meeting is being live streamed onto YouTube in view-only mode, so no live comments will be taken.

**3. Approval of the November 4, 2020 PZB Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Paff motioned, seconded by Mr. Garrity, to approve the meeting minutes from November 4, 2020.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Baugh, Garrity, Nordentoft, Paff, Pejsach, and Sula

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Motion Approved: 6-0-0

**4. Public Hearing: Petition of Anthony Buick GMC, Inc. for property located at Northridge Plaza:**

- a. Special Use Permits to allow the following: i) the establishment and operation of a vehicle dealership with outdoor storage and display; ii) exceptions from the Zoning Ordinance use standards for a car dealership, lighting standards, landscaping standards, and design/building material standards; and iii) an additional ground sign that is an off-premise sign with an electronic message board component, on property located in Northridge Plaza; and**
- b. Variance to allow exceptions to the lighting standards**

Mr. Sula announced that item 4b is being removed from the agenda as a separate notice for the lighting variance needs to occur.

Ms. Gable stated that Anthony Buick GMC, Inc., an Illinois corporation, is seeking Special Use Permits to allow the following at Northridge Plaza (5589 Northridge Drive): 1) Vehicle Dealership with outdoor storage and display; 2) One additional ground sign, a sign that is an off-premise sign, and a sign with an

Approved

electronic message board component; and 3) Exceptions from Article 5.4.1 (C-2 District Design Standards), Article 8.2.29 (Use Standards for Vehicle Dealerships), Article 10.1.3 (Exterior Lighting Standards) and Article 12 (Landscaping & Screening). The subject property is zoned C-2, Community Commercial District and is completely surrounded by C-2 zoning. There is R-2, residentially-zoned property, located on the other side of a 100-foot wide outlot immediately south of the subject property. In regards to the requested items, the Planning and Zoning Board will make a recommendation that will be forwarded to the Village Board for their determination. The applicant is in attendance in person tonight.

As this is a Public Hearing, Mr. Sula asked that all wishing to speak on this matter be sworn in. Mr. Winter conducted the swearing-in.

Mr. Jason Christopoulos, Attorney for the Petitioner (Anthony Buick GMC), stated that with him is Bill Blum, President of Anthony Buick GMC, and Jerry Mortier, the project engineer with the Redmond Group. He said that Mr. Blum is currently operating his dealership in Gurnee on west Grand Avenue and is proposing to make a significant capital investment into Gurnee. The proposed location is near the corner of the Tollway and Grand Avenue (exiting the Tollway onto east Grand Avenue). The site sits down off the road behind some restaurants and hotels. He walked the PZB through some of the preliminary interior building plans, which reflect an approximate 8,000 sq. ft. sales and showroom toward the front (north) and a large service area to the rear (south) with quick service bays along the east side of the building. Vehicles would be displayed along the north side of the building, with service and customer parking to the rear. He noted that Northridge Drive dead ends near the southwest corner of their site. He pointed out that there is a 100-foot wide outlot south of the dealership site that contains a berm, landscaping, and a 6-foot tall fence at the top of the berm and that south of that 100-foot area is a residential area. He showed the PZB a landscaping and lighting plan, as well as exterior elevations that show the building materials (glass and aluminum composite panels on the front and east side in the showroom area and split-face block and mostly glass garage doors elsewhere). He noted that the number of overhead garage doors on the exterior elevations is probably more than what they will need/want, but that they wanted to show the concept of where the service area/doors would be and that the number will be finalized later. He presented a topographical plan that reflects the end of the dealership property, the berm with the 6-foot fence on top (which will be about the same height as the top of the dealership), the road elevation, and finally the residential to the south. He noted that the dealership is a significant distance from the residential. He then walked the PZB through the sign plans, which includes 2 monument signs at each of the dealership's entrances that meet all Village codes and an off-premise monument sign that is proposed along the Tollway frontage, for which there is an easement allowing its installation. This sign contains a top portion that is a stagnant Buick GMC identifier and the bottom portion is the LED electronic message board component. He touched on landscaping, including the significant amount of material in the south buffer yard. He discussed the lack of some landscape islands in the long rows of parking and indicated that, because this is a dealership where cars are stored/displayed, it is different from a customer parking area for a Target or other retail store. He noted that there is not a shortage of landscaping to make sure that this is not a sea of pavement and that it'll meet aesthetically with what the Village requires.

Mr. Sula provided the PZB members with an opportunity to ask the petitioner questions or make comments on the proposal.

Mr. Nordentoft stated that he believes this is an appropriate site for a car dealership. He noted that he does have some questions on landscaping. He stated that he respectfully disagrees with the shade tree coverage on the site. As he understands it, the site does not meet the requirement for shade trees interior to the site. The applicant's written response to this staff concern is that shade trees will block

Approved

the views of the cars. The canopy of shade trees will be above cars and he also noted that they won't have leaves on them for the better part of 5 months.

Mr. Christopoulos stated that a dealership displays their goods (vehicles) outside and the bigger the trees the harder it is to see around those trees and although the canopies are taller than the vehicles, they don't reach that height until 10 or 15 years. He also stated that, as pointed out, leaves drop from the trees and this creates a mess on their displayed product. They have to keep the cars and the area clean. This is different from a retail parking lot where people park their cars and go inside to view the product. He also noted that this is not a plan that they are completely married to. They are willing to work with the Village on this matter. They just want to make sure that the site is able to be used for a dealership and they are willing to work with the Village on these and other issues.

Mr. Nordentoft stated that he appreciates what Mr. Christopoulos is saying and that maybe there is some middle ground. While he understands that the dealership doesn't want to send someone out there to blow off the cars and paved areas, the community values its landscaped areas/trees regardless of the use. He asked if they are able to talk about lighting, now that item 4b is removed from the agenda.

Ms. Sula stated that lighting can still be discussed, as there are lighting items that still require a special use permit, but that they won't be able to take any action on the variance.

Mr. Nordentoft asked if the light fixture heads are the same as what exists at the Anthony dealership on the west side of town.

Mr. Mortier stated that the LED fixture is noted in the plan and is a very narrow profile fixture where the lens is flat. He said that it is not the same fixture.

Mr. Nordentoft indicated that one of his concerns is the visibility of the lens from the south, southeast, and east. He noted that the current dealership lights are quite exposed and there is a significant amount of spill to the residential area. He was hoping that the lights would be significantly improved over the current dealership lights, including house side shields to keep visibility of the lens minimized. The light poles, at 22 feet in height, are basically roof-top level and his hope is that there would be some compromise, such as lowering the pole height on the southern portion of the site.

Mr. Mortier stated that he believes that reducing the height of pole fixtures on the southern portion of the site is something that they could look at.

Mr. Christopoulos pointed out the separation between the dealership and the residential, including the berm, fence, and landscaping. He noted that the homes to the rear are around the same elevation, which means that they wouldn't be looking up into the fixtures. He understands that lighting is a sensitive subject and that they'll need to come back for additional review.

Mr. Nordentoft stated that he drove that area and the grade drops to the east, so while that statement is accurate for the homes directly south, the homes further east are at a lower grade than the dealership lot and therefore, there is a possibility that residents in this area might be looking up into the light fixtures.

Approved

Mr. Pejsach indicated that he shared Mr. Nordentoft's concerns regarding trees on the site and hopes that they can see a plan that meets Village Code. He said it sounded like he heard the petitioner say that they were receptive to some modifications.

Mr. Christopoulos stated that he didn't indicate that they'd come back with a new proposal that meets code. He said that they know there is further work to be done with respect to landscaping and that, as the previous gentleman said, there is probably a happy medium that will work for both parties.

Mr. Pejsach indicated that he would be receptive to a favorable recommendation with an updated plan that meets code. He indicated that he shares similar concerns on the lighting plan and its impact on the neighbors and hopes to see an updated lighting plan.

Mr. Sula asked staff to explain the deficiencies in the landscape plan.

Ms. Velkover noted that the landscaping along the south buffer meets code, as there is a significant amount of material in the area including evergreen trees. There is a requirement for trees and shrubs along the Northridge Drive frontage. There are trees and shrubs in this roadway setback along the southern portion, but at a certain point along the westerly roadway frontage, there are no more trees. There are shrubs in this area, but there is not enough information to determine whether the amount meets code or not. In regards to the trees in the east buffer yard, there is no requirement in code for buffering between commercial properties. Therefore, the trees in this area are above what code would require. Internally, code requires one tree for every 10 parking spaces. Based on the number of vehicle parking spaces, a total of 57 trees internal to the site are required. She noted that some of the trees in the east buffer yard could be counted for internal parking lot trees, but that other than those trees, there is one tree interior to the parking lot. There is a requirement in the new code for landscape islands at the ends of rows of parking spaces and then every 10 cars. She said that this is a requirement that is retail in nature and that car dealerships generally do not provide internal islands in strict conformance with this requirement (i.e., an island every 10 vehicles) because of the nature of the business, but end islands are not unusual. She noted that she asked PZB's to go drive some of the other car dealerships just so you could each see for yourself what exists on each site, because it is a mix.

Mr. Sula stated that he did drive the different dealerships and there's nothing in the back of Rohrman.

Mr. Paff stated that he's not seeing 57 trees in their parking lot either.

Ms. Velkover noted that every dealership is different in where their green area is located but most have some green area internal to the site, not at the level of a retail site, and they all have some internal parking lot trees.

Mr. Winter stated that the PZB has the ability to make a recommendation to allow the relief from the interior trees, while still requiring the Northridge Drive landscaping. Each area of landscaping can be looked at separately.

Mr. Sula asked is staff was objecting to the fact that there are no trees in the storage area.

Ms. Velkover stated that there is no designation on the plan between sales and storage areas. She pointed out that the concern is that the site, as a whole, has one interior shade tree.

Approved

Mr. Winter stated that staff does not make recommendations and is pointing out facts.

Ms. Velkover stated that she recommended members visit dealerships because it was impossible to describe each situation that exists in town for the various dealerships.

Mr. Pejsach stated that it appears that the petitioner is open to some middle ground on landscaping, but it's difficult without a plan that shows what that middle ground is.

Ms. Velkover acknowledged that car dealerships have some unique characteristics and for that reason, she doesn't believe that providing all the plant material required by code is appropriate. As the petitioner said, some middle ground between what is on the currently plan and what code requires may be appropriate.

Mr. Garrity asked how many trees are currently on the site.

Ms. Velkover stated that she doesn't have that information, but that the trees along the south property line are required for the south buffer, the trees along Northridge Drive are required for the street buffer, and the 10 trees along the east lot line are extras since there is no landscaping requirement for commercial property to commercial property, so that these can be counted toward the interior tree requirement.

Mr. Garrity asked about the sign along the Tollway that has the electronic message board component and what the hours of operation would be. He asked for more information about that sign, including the minimum message duration, which he believes is proposed to be 30 seconds.

Mr. Christopoulos stated staff provided him with a copy of the last Special Use Permit ordinance that was granted by the Village for an electronic message board sign (Ordinance 2020-05 for 3747 Grand Avenue). He said they reviewed the conditions that the Village attached to that ordinance, including such things as a minimum message length of 30 seconds, the message not flashing or scrolling, and the sign being turned off between the hours of midnight and 6 a.m., and they provided to staff a commitment that those conditions would be met for the proposed sign. He stated that he knows that that is a baseline and that if they want something different or above this, that they'd need to request an additional SUP.

Mr. Sula wanted to clarify that it wasn't an ordinance but rather a specific SUP for a business.

Mr. Winter asked that the sign plan be shown as well as information on the dimensions of the sign.

Mr. Christopoulos indicated that the sign is 12 feet tall and 9 feet wide and that the base meets the 80% of the width of the sign face requirement to be classified as a monument sign. He noted that the sign is 88 sq. ft. with the top 51% being the static Buick/GMC sign and the bottom 49% being the electronic message board sign. He noted that, similar to landscaping, they wanted to know that they could put a car dealership on the property and put their sign up there and then comply with Village requirements.

Mr. Paff stated that he has some of the same concerns and didn't understand why there weren't any trees in the large green area in the front along Northridge Drive. He understands the concerns of landscaping in the storage areas, but all dealerships have landscaping along the frontage to the streets that include trees. The trees aren't going to block the view of the cars as the canopy will be taller than the cars and initially, when the trees are lower, they are also very small. As for lighting, he noted that in

Approved

the Dodge dealership and the Anthony dealership on the west side of town, the light fixture heights were dropped in the areas closer to residential. He understands that there is a berm with landscaping and a fence on top that helps provide some buffer, but he didn't realize the grade change between some of the residential area and this site and believes that the residents will be able to see the lights.

Mr. Christopoulos stated that he didn't mean to indicate that residents would not be able to see light fixtures. Merely, that the likelihood is reduced due to the substantial distance between the fixtures and the residential, the berm with landscaping and fencing that exists, and because the property is depressed. He understands there are lighting concerns and those are a work in process. At this time they've submitted what is before the PZB and they hear the concerns and will work on those issues.

Mr. Paff was surprised that the landscaping or lighting issues weren't addressed. He asked how close a business needs to be to the Tollway to get a Tollway sign (i.e., could Olive Garden get a sign).

Ms. Velkover stated that the owner of the property along the Tollway would need to grant an easement for the sign (i.e. allow a sign on their property), a Special Use Permit would be required for the off-premise nature of the sign, and that any off-premise sign would impact the property owner's ability to obtain ground sign(s) for their own business.

Mr. Winter stated that this is a very atypical situation. Staff is not aware of any other existing easements and again, a special use permit would need to be secured to allow for such a sign.

Mr. Sula asked if the easement was part of the original subdivision.

Mr. Ziegler stated that it was not part of the original subdivision and is a private easement granted between the owner of the former antique market property and the owner of the subject site. The Village is not a party to that easement.

Mr. Christopoulos stated that the questions being asked tonight (lighting and landscaping) were only brought to their attention about 10 days ago and they were asked to be able to discuss/talk about those issues and not that anything needed to be done with them. They felt that they addressed them.

Mr. Sula wanted clarification that the granting of the easement goes back many years.

Mr. Winter stated that this is not a recent grant of easement and predated the dealership.

Mr. Paff confirmed that the mall sign is on their own property. He then discussed his concern with plainness of the approximate 130 feet of wall frontage on the west side. He noted that there are some plantings between that wall and the street to help break up the wall, but was interested in seeing other possible options for addressing this issue.

Mr. Baugh stated that he concurs with everyone's comments on lighting and landscaping and believes that more details are needed. He also concurs with Mr. Paff's concern about the blank nature of the west wall. He noted that the plat of survey that was provided shows a common area between the car dealership site and the residential property to the south. He asked what that is and what it means. Mr. Baugh wanted confirmation that it was not dedicated to the public.

Approved

Mr. Ziegler stated that it is an outlot that is maintained by the business park association for the purposes of buffering (location of berm, landscaping, and fencing). It is not dedicated to the public and is maintained by the business park association in accordance with their covenants.

Mr. Baugh's last issue was with traffic circulation. He noted that he didn't see a traffic study and asked if they were going to get one. His first concern is with ingress related to Northridge Drive and Plaza Drive. Northridge Drive is circuitous and everyone likes to take the path of least resistance, which would be Plaza Drive. Plaza Drive, which is limited to one way, is not set up for a lot of vehicular traffic and really services McDonald's and Olive Garden. His bigger concern is egress from the site with most people coming to the dealership approaching from the Tollway. The left turn maneuver from Dilley's Road onto Grand to get back to the Tollway is handled by only one left turn lane and he expressed concern about how that stacking could impact businesses in that area.

Mr. Chirstopolous stated that although there are a lot of cars on a car dealership site, most of them are not moving. He noted that they sell 8-10 cars daily and maybe a few more on weekends, and that they maybe service another 20-30 a day. If you map that out over the hours that the dealership is open (7 a.m. for service and 9 p.m. for sales), the traffic is minimal. He also noted that the property is zoned C-2 and that a number of higher traffic generating uses could locate on the property by right (restaurant, hotels, general retail, movie theater, etc.). A traffic study was not required with this SUP application.

Mr. Mortier added that peak traffic time for car dealerships is between 7 a.m. and 9 a.m., which is opposite the peak hours of other businesses in that area.

Mr. Ziegler said that a traffic study was conducted when the original development was approved. The study contemplated commercial (restaurants, hotels, theater, retail, etc.) and that a car dealership has significantly less traffic generated than any of these uses. Therefore, a traffic study was not required for this petition. In regards to the signal operation at Dilley's and Grand, the Village is aware that the left turn lane is deficient and has been that way for a while. This intersection was outside the scope of the original development because the McDonald's on the east side was not part of the Northridge Plaza development and neither was the Speedway Station on the east side of Dilley's. Therefore, the Northridge Plaza development did not have the ability to widen that intersection and put in a second left turn lane. When Speedway redeveloped several years ago, the Village obtained additional right-of-way so that when the intersection is next improved, a second left turn lane can be installed.

Mr. Sula stated that he concurs with many of the concerns expressed tonight. He noted that one thing that might help with traffic is getting the Village's consultant to provide some information regarding the expected trips generated by this use compared to other uses.

Mr. Ziegler stated that he could provide the trip information from the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) manual for a dealership of the size proposed, as well as other types of development that could occur on the property under the existing zoning.

Mr. Sula opened the floor to the public on this matter. The following testimony was received from the public.

Ms. Pat Tennerman, 1020 Branch Road, stated that she is at the top of the last street. Her concerns are with traffic and stormwater. A traffic study needs to be conducted and information needs to be provided about how stormwater will be addressed. Stormwater has been an issue in that area for years, although

Approved

it doesn't impact her because she's at the top of the hill. She also expressed concern about people not adhering to the "Do Not Enter" sign on Dilley's Road where the road changes to a one-way direction and lack of enforcement. This becomes more of a problem with Six Flags is open. She asked about landscaping to the rear and if there will be a fence provided to the south of the dealership and north of the residential area to protect residents from people wandering from the commercial development into the neighborhood. If a fence is proposed, she wanted to know if it would be higher/more substantial. The existing fence has been dilapidated in the past and the current owner has been efficient in repairing it. She asked who would be repairing that fence in the future. She expressed concern about property values and the glow of lights created by a car dealership.

Ms. Mary Beck, 5609 Woodhill Drive, stated that she understands that traffic might not be an item specific to this dealership proposal. However, she wanted the board to know that she rarely leaves her neighborhood via the Dilley's/Grand intersection because it's so crowded and dangerous with all the restaurant and gas station traffic. She also wanted to know if all of the beautiful oaks and other trees on either side of the fence to the north of the residential area would remain. She expressed concern about lighting even though it's more of a concern for her neighbors than her because her property is higher and her home is a single-story. She would very much appreciate it if the lighting could be lowered.

David Moore, 1059 Branch Road, suggested that if they can't lower the lighting maybe the fence could be raised on top of the berm. His other issue is storm water run-off from all the blacktop that is being added to the site.

Mr. Sula closed the floor to the public and asked Mr. Ziegler to address the questions regarding run off and stormwater detention.

Mr. Ziegler stated that, as with any development, the applicant would need to go through the Engineering Department's review for conformance with all the stormwater management regulations. The site was originally developed in the 1980s and the stormwater detention basins that were built were sized based on the codes in effect at that time. Codes have changed and an evaluation regarding stormwater would need to be made when they come in with their plans. The level of detail is not there at this point of zoning approvals. He noted that is not clear on the water issue that Ms. Tennerman is talking about around/under the fence.

Mr. Winter stated that it is important to know regulations would not allow the rate of water run-off from the site to increase.

Ms. Tennerman stated that she is talking about the pond to the north of the fence over by Dilley's Road. The first house on the cul-de-sac off of Woodhill's yard was flooded approximately a year ago and that the house on the east side of Dilley's Road also had a major water issue. The Village has done some work since and it appears "so far" to have helped.

Mr. Ziegler stated that they have cleaned out some of the right-of-ways. He didn't believe that it was a stormwater detention problem, but rather a conveyance problem (i.e., the movement of water to the detention pond).

Mr. Sula asked Mr. Zeigler to contact Ms. Tennerman to discuss this issue outside of this meeting since it isn't germane to the applicant's petition.



Approved

Mr. Sula stated that there were some questions about the berm, the existing fence and trees on the berm. His understanding is that the land that those improvements are on is not part of the petitioner's property, but rather an outlot of the business park.

Mr. Mortier stated that this is correct. He referenced the topographic plan that shows the end of the dealership site, and the 100-foot wide outlot that is to the south. He noted that it is within that outlot that the berm, fencing, and landscaping are provided. They will not be impacting that area.

Mr. Sula stated that if there is a concern with the disrepair of the fence that would need to be addressed with the business park property owner's association.

Ms. Tennerman asked who will be maintaining the fence into the future.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the business park association would still be responsible for maintenance so that whomever her contact is now would not change.

Mr. Christopoulos pointed out the south end of their property and that the fencing that Ms. Tennerman is referring to is on the top of the berm which is in the middle of the 100-foot wide out lot to the south. This is not part of their property. Placing a fence on the back side of their property would not provide any security as someone could just walk around this fence. He also noted that the concerns that she has with people wandering from the commercial sites into the residential area are related to the other uses: the hotels and restaurants, and not with car dealerships.

Mr. Sula stated that he heard a couple of issues that are code/law enforcement issues regarding the portion of Dilley's Road that transitions to one-way direction.

Mr. Ziegler stated that that is a codified part of the Municipal Code that is signed appropriately and if a police officer witnesses a violation, a ticket can be issued.

Mr. Winter added that if the Police Department receives a complaint, it would have to be witness-based.

Mr. Sula stated that he doesn't believe there are any concerns with a vehicle dealership on the site, but that some of the details are lacking. He stated that he is sensing the need for a continuance to fine-tune the lighting and landscaping plans.

Mr. Nordentoft stated that he is conceptually fine with a car dealership on this property but there are some outstanding issues.

Mr. Ziegler stated that there are some issues with the purchasing contract so that it may be beneficial to the petitioner to vote on the special use permit for the use and the sign special use permits and then leave the landscaping and lighting requests to a future date.

Mr. Sula stated that if Mr. Winter is comfortable dealing with the lighting and the landscaping separate from the dealership SUP, then he would be also.

Mr. Winter stated that this is an option. He would defer to the petitioner, because sometimes, time is of the essence. He asked what the next hearing date would be if the matter was continued.

Approved

Ms. Velkover stated that the next PZB meeting is December 16<sup>th</sup>, but that if the lighting issue that requires a variance is proposed to be addressed, then legal notification would be required and the earliest date would then be January 6, 2021.

Mr. Christopoulos stated that they do have a timing issue with the purchase of the property and were interested in getting a recommendation on the use and the signs. It was their intention to come back later to address lighting and landscaping.

Mr. Winter stated that a motion could be advanced on the dealership SUP and then the Board can make further suggestions relating to the lighting and landscaping concerns. He noted that, as it's been pointed out, the lighting would require a separate variance which would require a future hearing. He said that they could make motion on the use itself and exclude the additional exceptions requested.

Mr. Pejsach stated that he would be in favor of separating out the dealership from the lighting and landscaping and that although he didn't have any issue with the off-premise sign, he did have issues with the electronic message board component.

Mr. Winter stated that any motion on the electronic message board would have conditions attached, as testified to by the applicant. Those conditions would be spelled out and adopted as part of any motion.

Mr. Paff stated that he cannot think of any development this size that would generate less traffic than this one. As far as the sign, Great America has a digital sign and it has movement all the time. Since the applicant is agreeable to the same conditions that the Village placed on the Temps Now sign and given the sign's location along the Tollway, he doesn't have any issues with it.

Mr. Garrity stated that he is in agreement that the use is appropriate for the area and that it is a great and welcomed addition to the Village. He said when you compare the impacts of a car dealership to a hotel, the dealership is least impactful as it brings less people and less traffic. He noted that the property is already zoned commercially and this is not a rezoning or conversion of property to commercial. This is an excellent use of the land and his concerns center on lighting and landscaping. He stated that he would like to see them lower the fixture height closure to the residential and although he doesn't think that they need to provide all the landscaping required by code, he would like to see something between code and what is currently proposed. He is not against having a sign along the Tollway, but his concern is with the electronic message board. He knows that there is Great America's sign, but he cannot support the LED component, which is consistent with his vote on the last electronic message board sign request.

Mr. Baugh stated that, rather than splitting the use from the other issues (lighting, landscaping, architecture), he thinks they should keep everything together. He said that it's too hard to approve a SUP for a car dealership and have them come back for the other issues.

Mr. Nordetoft motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Village Board on the petition of Anthony Buick GMC for a Special Use Permit to allow the establishment and operation of a Vehicle Dealership with outdoor storage and display on property located at 5589 Northridge Drive.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Paff, Pejsach, Nordentoft, Garrity, and Sula

Approved

Nays: Baugh  
Abstain: None  
Motion Carried: 5-1-0

Mr. Garrity motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Village Board on the petition of Anthony Buick GMC for a Special Use Permit to allow an additional sign that is an off-premise sign along the Tollway for property located in Northridge Plaza.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Paff, Pejsach, Nordentoft, Garrity, and Sula  
Nays: Baugh  
Abstain: None  
Motion Carried: 5-1-0

Mr. Garrity motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Village Board on the petition of Anthony Buick GMC for a Special Use Permit to allow an electronic message board sign along the Tollway, consistent with the Ordinance 2020-05 and in substantial conformance with the attached plans, for property located in Northridge Plaza.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Paff and Sula  
Nays: Pejsach, Garrity, Nordentoft, Baugh  
Abstain: None  
Motion Failed: 2-4-0

Ms. Gable stated that because the legal notice has to be provided for the variance and there are legal notification requirements, the earliest date that a hearing on this matter could be set is January 6, 2021. She asked Ms. Velkover when plans would need to be in for that meeting date to be met.

Ms. Velkover stated that the hearing notice needs to be sent out on December 18<sup>th</sup>, so plans would be needed by a week in advance, December 11<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Winter pointed out that if the Village set the hearing for that night and the petitioner wasn't ready, a continuance could be granted.

Mr. Sula explained that the Board generally grants up to 2 continuances.

Mr. Nordentoft motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to continue the hearing on the remaining special use permit requests (lighting, landscaping, and architecture) to the Board's January 6, 2021 meeting.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Paff, Pejsach, Nordentoft, Garrity, and Sula  
Nays: Baugh  
Abstain: None  
Motion Carried: 5-1-0

Approved

**4. Easement Vacation: Anthony Buick GMC, Inc. request to vacate an emergency access easement on property located at Northridge Plaza**

Ms. Gable stated that Anthony Buick GMC, Inc., an Illinois corporation, is seeking the vacation of the 30-foot Easement for Emergency Vehicle Access that is recorded on the Final Plat of Subdivision. This 30-foot wide easement, which is dedicated strictly to the Village of Gurnee, cuts through the site in an east-west direction. It was provided when Northridge Plaza was originally annexed, zoned, and subdivided because the length of the Northridge Drive cul-de-sac exceeds the Subdivision Ordinance's allowed 500-foot length. The removal of this emergency access easement has been reviewed by the Village's Fire, Police, and Public Work's Department. No concerns were expressed by any department. The elimination of this emergency access easement is required to develop the site plan in accordance with their plans. The process for the removal of this emergency access easement is review by the PZB at a public meeting with a recommendation that is forwarded up to the Village Board. The Village Board has the final decision making authority in this matter.

Mr. Christopoulos showed the location of the emergency access easement on the subdivision plat. He noted that it is 30 feet wide and divides the site making it difficult, if not impossible, to develop.

Mr. Garrity motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to forward a favorable recommendation on the petition of Anthony Buick GMC for the vacation of the Emergency Access Easement on property located at 5589 Northridge Drive.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Paff, Pejsach, Nordentoft, Baugh, Garrity, and Sula

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried: 6-0-0

**6. Next Meeting Date: December 16, 2020**

Ms. Gable stated that there are no public hearings scheduled for this night, but that there could be a non-public hearing item.

**7. Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

**8. Adjournment**

Mr. Garrity motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to adjourn the meeting.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Baugh, Garrity, Nordentoft, Paff, Pejsach, Reilly, and Sula

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried: 6-0-0

Approved

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joann Metzger,  
Recording Secretary, Planning and Zoning Board

**From:** Matt Pastori <mpastori4@yahoo.com>  
**To:** "cgable@village.gurnee.il.us" <cgable@village.gurnee.il.us>  
**Date:** 12/2/2020 7:48 AM  
**Subject:** Car Dealership Zoning Meeting

To whom it may concern,

I wanted to write to express my families concerns about the proposed car dealership in the empty lot at Northridge Plaza. I am located in the small neighborhood behind the Northridge Plaza area. Our main concern is lighting at the lot since it is close to our cul-de-sac. Not just light pollution in the area but also being able to see the lights directly through our windows. I have seen many dealerships that have lights on throughout the day and night. Also, while I don't think a dealership has any crowds or crime associated with it, a fence that is sturdy enough to make it though a light breeze would to deter people from seeing and entering our neighborhood. We already get people that hop the fence from the hotels located in the area in order to access Great America.

I understand that this email may not be included since I just noticed it stated 1 PM but I thought I would be able to make the meeting.

Thank you,  
Matt Pastori

1023 Limb Ct  
Gurnee, IL

**From:** Tracy Velkover  
**To:** Gable, Clara  
**Date:** 12/2/2020 4:00 PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Re: Northridge Plaza Developemenst for Chrysler

>>> Peter Bjurstrom <[peter.g.bjurstrom@gmail.com](mailto:peter.g.bjurstrom@gmail.com)> 12/2/2020 3:56 PM >>>

We live on Bough Ct directly behind this area. We strongly object to a car dealership being placed in that location. We feel this will definitely devalue

housing prices in our area, through the disruption to the natural environment,

the increase in the traffic as well as the light pollution 24 hours a day 7 days a week even after the light reduction is complied with for zone ordinance! One only has to go further along Grand Avenue in the evening to see how bright it is at the other dealerships. This will affect our rights to peaceful ownership of our homes in this area and put an end to this area being a desirable place to live.

Sincerely

Peter and Elizabeth Bjurstrom