

Approved

**Village of Gurnee
Planning and Zoning Board Minutes
December 15, 2021**

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, R. Todd Campbell, Tim Garrity, David Nordentoft, and Edwin Paff,

Planning and Zoning Members Absent: Josh Pejsach

Other Officials Present: Tracy Velkover, Planning Manager; and Clara Gable, Associate Planner

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of the Planning & Zoning Board's November 17, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Sula asked if there was any discussion to be had over the minutes. He, himself, pointed out an error in the discussion to change the date of one of the PZB meetings scheduled for 2022. He explained that the date the meeting was switched with the date the meeting was moved from. This error was noted by Village staff to be corrected. Mr. Paff noted that there are two motions under the item regarding text amendment. Ms. Velkover responded that was actually correct, as there were two separate motions—one for residentially zoned lots, and one for non-residentially zoned lots.

Mr. Nordentoft motioned, seconded by Mr. Baugh, to approve the November 17, 2021 meeting minutes as amended.

Voice Vote:

All "Ayes," no "Nays," none abstaining

Motion Carried: 6-0-0

Before proceeding to the next items on the agenda, which are both Informal Reviews, Mr. Sula reminded that the purpose of such review is the chance for potential petitioners to discuss their concepts, and receive (nonbinding) feedback from the Board. He stressed that no motions would be made/voted on by the Board during such review.

4. Informal Review: AR Building Company (Vacant property south of Woodlake Apartments (south of the southeast corner of Rt. 21 and Washington Street))

AR Building Company is seeking feedback on a plan for 153 rental apartment units on approximately 11.44 acres located south of Woodlake Apartments (south of the southeast corner of Rt. 21 and Washington Street). The subject property is zoned O-1 PUD,

Approved

Office/Research as a Planned Unit Development. This property is part of the Washington/Milwaukee Subarea on the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The Subarea plan reflects multi-family residential for the property.

Ms. Gable introduced the item by stating that that AR Building Company is seeking feedback on a plan to develop vacant property east of Rt. 21, north of I-94, and south of Woodlake Apartments. The plan requires rezoning the subject property from O-1 PUD to R-6 PUD in order to accommodate 153 rental apartment units in three 4-story buildings (density of approximately 13.37 DU/acre). The applicant of the informal review is here to present their request.

Mr. Harold Francke, Attorney with the firm of Meltzer, Purtil & Stelle, LLC, and representing the petitioner, gave a brief history of the parcel, owned by Milwaukee I-94 Property Partnership since the 1980s. He noted that, when the present apartments were approved for development, a certain amount of the property was set aside for office buildings. As no such use has been developed—and, the Village has opened up the possibility for other uses in its Comprehensive Plan—the development of another apartment complex is being considered for the property by AR Building Company out of Pittsburgh.

Mr. Francke then introduced Jared Placek, Civil Engineer with Manhard Consulting, and Ms. Emily Mitchell, with AR Building Company, before turning the presentation over to Ms. Mitchell.

Ms. Mitchell, after giving a brief history of AR Building Company, offered a presentation outlining plans for the 153 apartments, which will be housed in three, four-story buildings:

1. Established in Pittsburgh in 1968, AR Building owns and manages over 9,000 luxury residential rental properties nationally. The company acts as a Developer, General Contractor, and Owner in maintaining apartments, townhomes, and single-family homes within over fifty separate properties, and employs all the onsite staff in every community.
2. AR Building's apartment buildings are defined by their high quality, durable materials and their focus on tenant amenities such as natural light, large porches, spacious interiors, elevator buildings, individual laundries and walk-in closets.
3. The apartment community will be in close proximity to I-94 and its Westbound Onramp, the Des Plaines River and the Des Plaines River Trail, Lake Carina Forest Preserve, Six Flags Great America, Great Wolf Lodge Water Park, Warren Township High School, etc.

Ms. Mitchell also outlined site constraints, as exhibited by Manhard Consulting, such as buffer yard, setbacks, and wetland delineation—explaining how zoning ordinance requirements would be met—and, how the project fits into the Village's Comprehensive Plan. Through visual presentation, Ms. Mitchell described the topography of the site, outlined the building elevations, and offered an aerial site of the proposed project. Wrapping up her presentation, she asked if there were any questions she could answer.

Approved

Mr. Garrity asked if there would be a parking garage.

Ms. Mitchell responded that all parking would be outdoors.

Mr. Nordentoft expressed support for the project and confirmed that the project would still be proposed as a Planned Unit Development. He asked if there were any studies done in regards to traffic.

Ms. Mitchell responded that no studies have been done yet, but will be, and that the experience with other properties of AR Building (that are also off a major highways) have not caused any real problems.

Mr. Garrity offered support for the project, noting that the current housing market suggests the availability of more rental properties are needed.

Mr. Baugh inquired in regards to the project's proximity to a major highway, and the potential noise.

Ms. Mitchell responded that other properties of AR Building near major highways have not resulted in any real complaints from tenants.

Mr. Sula also offered support for the project, adding that it fits nicely into the Village's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Sula then noted the positive feedback shown to the potential petitioners—wished them luck in further planning—and, stated that he hoped to see them again, soon. Ms. Mitchell thanked him.

5. Informal Review: Tory Eide (4236/4242 Old Grand Avenue)

Tory Eide is seeking feedback on a plan to demolish an existing single-family home located at 4236 Old Grand Avenue and consolidate the lot with a vacant lot to the west (4242 Old Grand) in order to build a 3,200 sq. ft. multi-tenant office building. The subject property currently contains two zoning districts, with 4236 Old Grand Avenue zoned C-4, Village Center District, and 4242 Old Grand zoned C-2, Community Commercial District.

Ms. Gable introduced this item by stating that Tory O. Eide, CPA, is seeking feedback on a plan to consolidate 4236 and 4242 Old Grand Avenue, demolish the existing house, and construct a multi-tenant office building. The plan also involves rezoning 4242 Old Grand Avenue from C-2 to C-4 (4236 Old Grand is already zoned C-4), which is consistent with the comprehensive land use plan as it reflects "Village Center" for this property. The applicant of the informal review is here to present their request.

Tory Eide introduced both architect Adam Lyons and builder Jonathan Rickert before offering a bit of his family's (and its business') history in Gurnee. He then turned the presentation over to

Approved

Mr. Lyons, outlined the potential project with a visual presentation detailing the plans in regards to:

- grading plan;
- building structure: safety glazing, HVAC, electrical, plumbing, carpentry, insulation, finishes, fire protection, etc.;
- concrete work: including walkways and a ramp for the handicapped;
- architectural details: intended to ensure the building fits nicely into the residential aspects of the neighborhood;
- landscaping: featuring ornamental/evergreen trees, deciduous/evergreen shrubs, and perennials/ornamental grasses; and
- parking.

Wrapping up the presentation, Mr. Eide and Mr. Lyons invited any questions in regards the plans.

Mr. Sula expressed support for the concept of the project, and suggested that they work with Village staff in deciding which zoning district makes the most sense. He agreed that a Special Use Permit is best avoid if possible. Mr. Sula also expressed support for the aesthetics and appearance of the proposed buildings.

Mr. Nordentoft stated that in the staff notes, he believed that there were some concerns listed with C-2 zoning and asked if staff could elaborate.

Ms. Velkover responded by stating that, in the notes, staff pointed out that C-2 zoning is not consistent with the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, which reflects Village Center for this property. The Comp Plan also doesn't reflect commercial for the commercially zoned property that is immediately west of the subject site, and instead reflects Village Center. The commercial zoning is a holdover from commercially developed properties that have been on the site since at least the 1940s. Finally, she noted that there are a number of uses in the C-2 district that may not be appropriate in such close proximity to single-family homes and that once the property is zoned C-2, any use allowed in that district could be placed on the property without any ability to review. Whereas, in the C-4 district, commercial uses would be subject to the Special Use Permit process, so that there would be some protections in place for the adjacent residential.

In light of this explanation, Mr. Nordentoft suggested that the potential petitioners examine the possibility of C-4 a little more closely. Mr. Nordentoft also expressed appreciation for the extra effort and attention paid to the architectural details of the proposed buildings, noting the

Approved

significance they play in assuring the buildings fit nicely into the residential feel of the neighborhood.

Mr. Garrity and Mr. Paff also expressed support for the proposed project and C-4 zoning.

Mr. Baugh, also expressing support for the project with C-4 zoning and asked if the building was to utilize a second floor.

Mr. Eide, with confirmation from Mr. Lyons, responded that it would be attic space.

Mr. Sula, noting the positive feedback towards the potentially-proposed project, wished the Eide family good luck.

6. Next Meeting Date: January 5, 2022

Ms. Gable stated that, while there are no public hearings scheduled for the evening, it is likely there will be a meeting.

7. Public Comment

Mr. Sula then opened the floor to comments regarding any issues not on this evening's agenda.

Mr. and Mrs. Otto Wimpffen, of the Hickory Haven subdivision, spoke, and—after Mrs. Wimpffen expressed support for the projects discussed, Mr. Wimpffen asked if the parking lot directly west of the Eide's proposed project would be used in that project.

Ms. Gable responded that this lot would not be associated with their development, as they are proposing their own lot with fencing between the two.

Mr. Wimpffen asked if the existing retention pond on the AR Building project site will be drained.

Mr. Sula explained that, as these were only informal discussions, such details would be further addressed should there be an actual petition filed.

As there were no more questions from the audience, Mr. Sula then closed the floor to the public.

8. Adjournment

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

Approved

Voice Vote:

All "Ayes," no "Nays," none abstaining

Motion Carried: 6-0-0

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joann Metzger,
Recording Secretary, Planning and Zoning Board