

Approved

**Village of Gurnee
Planning and Zoning Board Minutes
March 16, 2022**

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, Josh Pejsach, R. Todd Campbell, David Nordentoft, and Edwin Paff

Planning and Zoning Members Absent: Brian Baugh

Other Officials Present: Tracy Velkover, Planning Manager; and David Ziegler, Director of Community Development

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of the PZB's Meeting Minutes from February 16, 2022

Mr. Sula asked if there was any discussion for the minutes. As there was not, Mr. Paff motioned, seconded by Mr. Campbell, to approve the minutes of the February 16, 2022 meeting.

Voice Vote:

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

Motion Carried: 5-0-0

4. Public Hearing: Petition of AR Building Company for Rezoning and Preliminary PUD Plan/Site Plan Review Approval for 11.44-acres generally located north of the I-94 Tollway and east of Rt. 21 (south of Woodlake Apartments)

Ms. Velkover introduced the item by stating that AR Building Company is seeking the rezoning of an 11.44 acre parcel generally located east of Rt. 21, north of I-94, and south of Woodlake Apartments, from O-1 PUD, Restricted Office as a Planned Unit Development, to R-6 PUD, Multi-family as a Planned Unit Development. She noted that Preliminary PUD and Site Plan Review approval is requested for a 153-unit apartment complex in three 4-story buildings for a density of 13.37 DU/acre. She stated that the proposed zoning is consistent with the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan and surrounding land uses, which include the Woodlake Apartment Complex to the north. She noted the following exceptions to the Zoning Ordinance requirements that are requested by the applicant:

1. Increasing the building height from 45 feet to 48 feet;
2. Reducing the number of required parking spaces from 266 to 253 (doesn't include 6 land banked spaces); and
3. Requesting the ability to use existing trees along both the Rt. 21 and Tollway frontages for the required buffer plantings.

Approved

Ms. Velkover stated that the petitioner is present to walk the PZB through their plans and answer any questions. The PZB has advisory authority in this matter and therefore, a recommendation on the proposal to the Village Board would be required.

As this was a Public Hearing, Mr. Sula asked that anyone wishing to speak on this matter be sworn in. He also reminded everyone that this project was the subject of an informal meeting several months ago, but that they cannot refer back to any of that testimony. He stated that the testimony has to be provided at this public hearing to get it into the record. Ms. Neddenriep, acting Village Attorney, conducted the swearing-in.

Mr. Hal Franke, attorney with the law firm of Meltzer, Purtil & Steele LLC, located at 1515 East Woodfield Road in Schaumburg, stated that he's representing the applicant, AR Building Company Inc. He said that he is joined by Emily Mitchell, a representative of AR Building, and a team of consultants. He noted that they will show why and how the applicant's request meet the standards for Zoning Map Amendment and PUD approval, including those elements requested for exceptions as outlined by Ms. Velkover. Mr. Franke stated that they have a power point presentation that they'd like to run through. He introduced the following members of the team that will be presenting this evening: Emily Mitchell, with AR Building, Jared Placek and Eric Isaacs, Project Managers with Manhard Consulting, Geoff Campbell, Project Architect, and Luay Aboona, Traffic Engineer with KLOA, Inc. He turned the floor over to Ms. Mitchell to provide information on AR Building Company.

Ms. Emily Mitchell introduced herself as the Director of Land Development at AR Building Company, located at 310 Seven Fields Boulevard, Seven Fields, PA. She stated that AR Building Company is a 53+ year old apartment development company based in Pittsburg. The company has a single owner who has no partners or investors. All projects are built with their own equity. Currently they have a portfolio of about 9,000 apartment units in 10 states. They are looking to break into several other states, including Illinois. They are currently meeting with the planning staff in Batavia about a potential project in that community. She stated that the company holds all their projects for their portfolio so they go into every project knowing that they will be the long term owner and manager. Therefore, they take that into consideration when they enter the design and construction phase of the development. They use sound design principals and quality construction materials and techniques because they know that they will be ultimately be responsible for the maintenance and management of the project. They want the buildings looking as good in year 20 as they do in year 1. They are a fully integrated company; so they buy, build, and manage their projects. They also hire all of their staff for their communities. This facility will have a full time management office and all staff will work directly for AR Building. She showed several slides of some of their other projects, keying in on their Reynolds Farm Community in North Kingstown, RI. It is a 51-unit 4-story building with an elevator and that the buildings are similar in form to those proposed in Gurnee. She noted that their architect is here this evening and that he will take the PZB through the architecture of the proposed buildings in greater detail. As for the interiors of the buildings, the typical living

Approved

room will have vinyl flooring, floor to ceiling windows to bring natural light into the units, whereas the kitchens will have granite countertops and stainless steel appliances, and finally they try to provide either a balcony or patio for all of their units. She stated that there will be a clubhouse with a community room and provided photos of similar facilities in their other communities. The clubhouse will also have a fitness room, mail room, full time management office, and an outdoor pool. In summary, she stated that they look for land all over the United States for apartment development and that this property ticks off all the boxes for them including: great transit access, close to office, retail and other amenities, consistent with the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan and surrounding land uses, and provides diversity of housing within the development (1 and 2 bedroom units).

Mr. Franke stated that, as was laid out at the beginning of the hearing, the request is to rezone the property from its existing O-1 PUD, Restricted Office District as a Planned Unit Development, to R-6 PUD, Multi-family as a Planned Unit Development, to grant Preliminary PUD and Site Plan approval, and to grant exceptions for the following: 1) increased height from 45 feet to 48 feet; 2) reduction in parking from 266 to 253; and 3) to allow the use of some existing trees to count toward their required buffer plantings. Mr. Franke went through each standard for rezoning of a property (below) and indicated that their presentation will show how they meet these standards:

- 1) The compatibility with the existing use and zoning of nearby property.
- 2) The extent to which property values of the subject property are diminished by the existing zoning restrictions.
- 3) The extent to which the proposed amendment promotes the public health, safety, and welfare of the Village.
- 4) The relative gain to the public from the rezoning, as compared to the hardship imposed upon the applicant.
- 5) The suitability of the subject property for the purposes for which is it presently zoned.
- 6) The length of time that the subject property in question has been vacant, as presently zoned, considered in context of development in the area where the property is located. He noted that the property has been in its current condition since 1986 or 1988, since before the Woodlake development. The Village left this parcel and another smaller parcel to the north as office zoning so that an office development could occur. Over the past 30+ years no office development has occurred on these properties.
- 7) The consistency of the proposed amendment with the Comprehensive Plan and any adopted land use policies. Mr. Franke noted that the development is consistent with the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
- 8) That the proposed amendment will benefit the needs of the community.

Mr. Franke also noted that they have to prove out their case that the proposed PUD meets the standards for a PUD. These include:

- 1) The proposed PUD will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in

Approved

the vicinity for the purposes already permitted.

- 2) The proposed PUD will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in the zoning district.
- 3) There is provision for adequate utilities, drainage, off-street parking and loading, pedestrian access, and all other necessary facilities.
- 4) That adequate provision has been made for vehicular ingress and egress from the project site so as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.
- 5) That the arrangement of structures, parking areas, walks lighting and appurtenant facilities, are compatible with the surround neighborhood and adjacent land uses.
- 6) The area of the proposed PUD that is not to be used for structures, parking and loading areas, or access ways, is suitably landscaped.
- 7) The PUD preserved unusual topographic or natural features of the land.

Mr. Franke stated that the testimony will help the PZB make findings of fact that the above noted standards are met in regards to the petitioner's request for rezoning and Preliminary PUD approval. With that he stated that he was turning the microphone over to Eric Isaacs who will discuss the compatibility of the proposed both in terms of land use and zoning is compatible with the surrounding zoning and use of nearby properties.

Mr. Eric Isaacs, with Manhard Consulting located at 700 Springer Drive in Lombard, referred the PZB to a slide that shows that subject property in relation to the surrounding properties. He referenced the zoning standard compatibility with surrounding zoning and land uses and indicated that the request would increase the compatibility on both accounts as the zoning directly north is R-5 PUD, Multi-family as a Planned Unit Development, which is a slightly less density than the petitioner's requested R-6 zoning, but R-6 is an appropriate transition from the Tollway to the R-5 PUD zoning. He noted that the rezoning is also compatible with the existing adjacent uses, as it's tucked into an area along the Tollway and Milwaukee Avenue, with an apartment development to the north. He then referred to a slide showing an excerpt from the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, which shows this property as a Focus Area with the subject property reflected as multi-family residential. He noted that it would leverage the existing adjacent multi-family through expansion creating, in essence, another phase of the development. He summarized that the proposed rezoning and PUD are completely consistent with the objectives and goals of the Comp Plan.

Mr. Jared Placek, Project Manager with Manhard Consultant located at 1 Overlook Point Suite 200 in Lincolnshire, stated that this site is located next to the Tollway and Rt. 21 and has some relatively decent grade change for Illinois (about 30 feet of fall across the property). The property features existing trees, which provide buffers to both the Tollway and Milwaukee Avenue. The goal of this development is to maximize these natural features as part of the

Approved

development. Site constraints include the required buffer yards, a very small (.1 acre) wetland in the middle of the site that will be filled as part of this development, and an existing storm water detention pond that is sized for this development. He noted that they are going to work with Village staff to consider 2 potential options for this detention area: 1) the expansion of the basin to meet the current storm water requirements; or 2) pursuing a fee-in-lieu. There is also an existing floodplain at the southern edge of the subject property which consists of the existing detention basin and one of the reasons that they may pursue alternatives to expanding the basin.

Mr. Geoff Campbell, Project Architect with the firm of Rothschild, Doyno Collaborative located at 2847 Penn Avenue in Pittsburg, PA., stated that his firm has been working with AR Building for about 22 years and that he personally has been working with AR for 18 years. His firm does most of their new projects and, because they maintain and own all their properties, they are able to get good feedback from residents about what it working and what might not be so they can make improvements with newer developments. He noted that the proposed project, as Emily stated, will be similar to the Reynolds Reynolds Farm Community in North Kingstown, RI. The Gurnee project is based on that with similar massing and building materials. When the site was laid out they wanted to ensure that they were providing frontage on both Woodlake Boulevard and Rt. 21; giving a presence for the community along Milwaukee but then keeping consistent with the rest of Woodlake Apartments and create a nice arc traveling along Woodlake Boulevard. They also wanted the clubhouse and swimming pool to take advantage of the beautiful views to the south. There are 3 identical buildings proposed, each having 51 units (27 one-bedroom and 24 two-bedrooms). He pointed to the slide which provided the parking counts (252 provided and 266 required). He also pointed out the orientation of the buildings to Woodlake and Milwaukee and how they try to provide long range views and not views into other buildings. He noted how the buildings are spaced out to meet this goal and provide more light into the units. He also stated that, when they get to the floor plans, the PZB will see how the units are loaded to one side so that every unit has a porch or balcony. He noted that the topography drops off toward the storm-water detention area and that the clubhouse and pool will be up on a plateau to take advantage of the views to the south. He showed a slide of the exteriors of the buildings and indicated that AR Building uses a lot of brick for durability and also to help ensure that the buildings will look as good into the future as they do when they are first constructed. They also use a lot of trim on the buildings and the overall massing uses the gables to give it a smaller sense. The balconies also provide variation in the façade by creating shadows that provide additional visual interest. He pointed out the building height, which is 48 feet and exceeds the allowable height of 45 feet. He noted that the building is actually 38 feet tall to the eave. They looked at doing a flat roofed building, but they felt it was important to the character of the area to provide a pitched roof building similar to

Approved

Woodlake Apartments. He noted the use of large windows (6 feet and sometimes floor to ceiling) to provide extra light into the units. He walked the PZB through the buildings' floor plans and noted that the 1 and 2 bedroom units are mixed throughout the building. The buildings have elevators, are accessible, and fully sprinkled. Finally, he walked the PZB through the clubhouse which has a fitness room, sales office, meeting room, package room and restrooms to accommodate the outdoor pool.

Mr. Luay Aboona, President of KLOA, Inc. located at 9575 West Higgins Road in Rosemont, IL stated that his firm prepared a traffic study that was submitted to the Village and, as part of the study, they looked along the Milwaukee Avenue corridor from Washington Street to the Tollway ramps to the south; encompassing the two intersections of Woodlake Boulevard with Milwaukee Avenue. They took traffic counts during the morning and evening rush hour to get an idea of the amount of how much traffic is currently on the roads in this area and how the intersections currently work. They then added in traffic generated by the proposed development (in accordance with the ITE manual) and accounted for the growth of background traffic over the next 6 years so that they could predict how the intersections would work in the future with the proposed development. The results of this analysis is that intersection to the north, at Washington Street, as well as that to the south, at the ramp onto the Tollway, will operate adequately and the signals at the intersections to the north and south will create gaps in traffic to allow traffic to enter and exit off of both Woodlake Boulevard intersections. He noted that both Woodlake Boulevard intersections are under stop sign control. Based on the subject property being located at the south end of the site, the majority of the traffic from this development will utilize the south Woodlake Boulevard intersection. There are left turn lanes into the site off of Milwaukee Avenue into both Woodlake Boulevard intersections and both Woodlake intersections have two exiting lanes. The traffic study shows that Woodlake Boulevard has capacity to service the proposed development. The study shows that all intersections (Woodlake Boulevard, Washington and the Tollway) will continue to operate at an acceptable level of service. From a parking standpoint, they looked at parking in 2 ways; first they looked at what the ITE Manual requires for parking of a facility of this type and size and setting (i.e., not near public transportation) and found that the parking ratio being proposed falls within the recommended range. Secondly, they looked at similar facilities that have been proposed and built in Chicago suburbs (Deerfield, Vernon Hills, Buffalo Grove, etc.) and found that the parking ratio proposed for this development is in the range found in existing developments in these suburbs.

Mr. Franke asked Mr. Aboona to confirm that the level of service (LOS) for the area intersections will continue to operate at an acceptable level of service after the proposed development is completed and that the project, as designed, will not cause undo congestion on

Approved

Milwaukee Avenue. Mr. Aboona confirmed this to be the case.

Mr. Placek discussed the topography of the site and indicated, as discussed earlier, that the site has substantial grade change and that they will be grading in a manner to step the site down while maintaining the buffers along the perimeter. In addition, they provide sufficient utilities to service the site (water, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer) and buildings. In regards to landscaping, their plan takes advantage of the preservation of existing material along the Milwaukee Avenue and Tollway frontages and as such, they are seeking relief to utilize the existing material as their buffer planting requirement. In addition, they are meeting all other landscaping code requirements internal to the site and long Woodlake Boulevard. Two trash enclosures are provided that will be sufficiently screened.

Mr. Franke asked Mr. Placek to confirm that all grading and engineering plans will conform to all Storm water Management Ordinances and that the developer is not seeking any relief. Mr. Placek confirmed this to be the case. Mr. Franke also asked Mr. Placek whether it was his understanding that the Village's sewer and water systems have the capacity to service this development. Mr. Placek confirmed this to be the case. Mr. Franke summarized that, as required, they have shown how this development will meet the standards of a Zoning Map Amendment and PUD Plat/Plan approval. He noted that they submitted an Economic Impact Analysis and since one of the standards is public benefit he wanted to point out the following: 1) the study shows that the development will generate almost \$600,000 a year in real estate taxes which is significantly more than the property currently generates and, of that amount, approximately \$275,000 annually will be payable to Gurnee School District 56 and \$136,000 annually will be payable to Warren High School District 121, and that even after the cost to educate children both school districts are projected to have a surplus because the type of units proposed will not generate many school children. Using the Village's/School District table for number of children generated by a development, they are anticipating 4 high school students (\$74,000 surplus) and 10 elementary students (\$133,000 surplus). AR Building Company's experience is that their projects generate even fewer children than the chart used by the Village/School Districts, so that the surplus for both school districts should be even greater. Finally, in regards to the Village, although the development does not provide a direct economic benefit in regards to taxes (as no taxes are levied), there are other benefits that the development will provide. The fact that the development results in a slight deficit for the Village is not surprising.

Mr. Sula started first by getting some things into the record. He asked if, in regards to the traffic and parking study that the petitioner conducted, is it safe to say that the Village's traffic consultant's review of this report indicated that traffic generated by this development could be

Approved

accommodated by the existing improvements and the parking reduction would not result in concerns.

Mr. Ziegler responded that Mr. Grieve's review of the petitioner's traffic and parking study concluded that to be the case.

Mr. Sula also asked if, in regards to the height of the building, does the Fire Department have any concerns.

Mr. Ziegler responded that the Fire Department does not have any concerns with the additional 4 feet in height as it would not change the rescue area.

Mr. Sula stated that, regarding the landscaping/buffer yards, he personally isn't concerned with who put the trees in the buffer yard, just that they are there. He asked if the trees that are there on the property or are they in the right-of-way (ROW).

Ms. Velkover stated that, per the tree survey conducted, those trees requested to count toward their buffer yard requirements are on private property and are not within the ROW.

Mr. Sula then invited members of the Board to start a discussion.

Mr. Pejsach stated that he is generally supportive of the proposal and has no issues with the height and parking exceptions. However, he is somewhat concerned with the buffer yard planting exception. He asked staff, if they were to plant the required buffers would they dig up the existing trees to plant those buffer yard plantings.

Ms. Velkover stated that she believes that they can probably place most, if not all of the required buffer trees in the buffers without removing existing material. She reminded the PZB that the Village has a Woodland Ordinance that requires replacement of any tree over 6" in DBH that is removed from the property. So the removal of those existing trees in order to plant the buffer trees will only result in additional plantings being required. She noted that they are already removing a number of trees that will require replacement just based on the building pads, parking areas, and engineering improvements.

Mr. Pejsach stated that he understands and is generally supportive of the exception request for the buffer yards. He noted that his last concern is with the sign width. He asked if the proposed sign is the same size as the existing sign.

Ms. Velkover stated that the concern isn't with the width or size of the sign face, but with the overall width of the structure that holds the sign face. She noted that the sign is consistent with code, and allowed by right. Because this is a PUD with Site Plan Review, the PZB has the ability to be more restrictive on the sign structure itself. She indicated that staff knows from past experience that the PZB has had concerns with the mass of sign structures when they are extremely wide. In the case of the applicant's proposed sign, the structure is 20 feet in width,

Approved

which is about the width that has created concerns with the mass of the structure in the past. As such, staff had the petitioner provide an alternative sign design for discussion purposes. That alternative sign structure is 12 feet in width. For comparison purposes, the existing Woodlake structures (located on either side of the north entrance into the site) are approximately 12 feet in width.

Mr. Pejsach asked where the alternate sign is in the plans.

Other members of the PZB indicated that it could be found at tab 28 in the binder materials.

Mr. Sula asked the petitioner to show on one of the slides, where the sign is proposed to be located.

A representative of the petitioner pointed on a site plan to the location of the sign structure; which is along Woodlake Boulevard.

Mr. Nordentoft stated that, overall he is very pleased with a lot of features on the plan/project. He noted that in regards to the relief for building height he is completely in favor of approving the additional height requested because he's all in favor of architectural quality. A flat roofed structure would diminish the residential character of the product and area. He asked them to touch on where the HVAC units will be located.

Mr. Campbell stated that, after years of putting the units at various locations on a site, they found that the best location is on the roof. So the units will be behind the pitched roof and fully screened. He noted that they do not have through-wall units that you typically see in a lot of apartment and hotel developments with vents all over the façades of the buildings. They use more the more traditional HVAC units, split-systems, with the units on the roofs.

Mr. Nordentoft stated that he thought that was where the units were located, but just wanted clarification. He noted this is another reason that he supports the additional building height. Regarding the parking exception he stated that he believes it is minor and very reasonable, especially given the fact that the Village's traffic consultant reviewed the request and does not have any concerns. In regards to the landscaping request, he's just trying to get a feel for what will remain on the site. As he drives by the site, it is considerably wooded, but knows that a significant amount of material back off of the setbacks will be removed. He noted that it's difficult to imagine what will remain and whether what remains will be appropriate as a buffer. He asked if there was something in their presentation that would more clearly delineate where this line is of where the trees will remain.

Mr. Placek to a plan and stated that along the Milwaukee and the Tollway corridor this is the 100-foot buffer zone and within that area the trees will be preserved, with the only "infringement" being the need to make a sanitary sewer connection through the area. He

Approved

noted that the club house is about 117 feet from the Milwaukee property line, so in essence trees in this entire area will be preserved. He stated that, as mentioned, trees in back of this area will need to be removed for the site improvements.

Mr. Nordentoft stated that one of the things that he noticed, when driving by the site later in the evening, was the Tollway and Milwaukee Avenue lighting, which is pretty high level lighting. He wants to make sure that what remains as a buffer provides future residents protection not only from lights but roadway noise. He asked if there was any other mitigation being taken to protect from the noise and light, or is it the trees and mother-nature that will provide the appropriate protections.

Mr. Placek responded by noting the distances between the structures and the actual roadways. In addition to the 120+ foot setback from the property lines, there is an additional 70 feet before the Tollway pavement starts, which is where the lights and traffic are located. He noted that this is about 2/3 of a football field away. In regards to Milwaukee Avenue the pavement is about 140-150 feet away, and Milwaukee has lower light poles and traffic than the Tollway.

Mr. Nordentoft pointed out that the balconies along the westerly building face out to Milwaukee.

Mr. Placek stated that is correct and was done to take advantage of the significant trees that are being preserved in this direction rather than facing the balconies internally toward the parking lot.

Mr. Nordentoft asked if he could address internal site circulation and connectivity to the adjacent residential development. Specifically, how friendly this site is for pedestrian and bike traffic and connectivity to the community as a whole.

Mr. Placek stated that the existing site has 2 curb cuts. They are proposing to maintain 2 curb cuts to the site, but moving the western most curb cut slightly to the east and work with the Village to remove a portion of the median that is in the way. The 2 access points provides great circulation into and out of the site for residents, garbage trucks, emergency vehicles, etc. Pulling the curb cut back also provides slightly more stacking for the exit onto Milwaukee. They are providing sidewalks internal to the site that tie into the existing sidewalks along Woodlake that tie into the path along Rt. 21.

Mr. Paff stated that most of his questions have been answered. He believes this development fits into the property well and glad to know that the trees in the buffer are on private property and not in the ROW. He stated that for him, he thinks that the alternative sign looks more appealing. He thinks the proposed sign looks like a wall with lettering on it.

Mr. Campbell stated that he also is in support of the project and his only concern is the buffers

Approved

and tree removal. He asked if there was a way to show on an aerial the area of trees that would remain.

Mr. Placek showed an aerial the western building and the clubhouse. He noted that there are significant trees in the area to be preserved, but Mr. Campbell is right, there is no way to preserve all trees. He stated that they are looking to maximize the ability to preserve trees along the main roadways and pull the buildings as far to the east as they possibly can recognizing that there is floodplain and floodway and substantial grade change that make it impossible to pull the buildings back any further.

Mr. Jason Kambitsis, President of AR Building Company, thanked the PZB for their time tonight. He stated that not all the trees on the site are equal. He noted that, when looking at the site, those trees internal to the site are generally smaller than those on the perimeter. He stated that they have preserved a lot of the most significant (large) trees on the site. He noted that they do create a significant buffer and that the preservation of as many trees as possible is paramount to them.

Ms. Velkover reminded the PZB members that the Village has a Woodlands Ordinance that requires replacement of trees over 6" in DBH, so that any trees removed will be subject to the replacement requirement of that Ordinance. The applicant has been made aware of this and will be required to address this at Final PUD submission. They may choose to go to the Village Board for direction on how to address the requirements of the Woodland Ordinance as they may not be able to physically fit all the required replacements on site. To clarify, some of those replacement trees might be used to supplement the buffer yards should it become necessary, or the Village Board might allow payment of a fee-in-lieu of some or all of the required replacements.

Mr. Sula stated that there are 2 distinct issues here; one is the issue with the buffer and one is with remediation. In the past, they've seen a combination of the two. He noted that it is not always in the best interest to try to meet the Woodland Ordinance by placing all replacements back onto the site; especially if there is not room for the trees to grow to maturity. The fee-in-lieu is a good option so that there is money for the Village to use for plantings needed in other areas of the community.

Mr. Campbell explained his concern for trees and understood the constraints of the site. He noted that, for signage, he prefers the smaller 12-foot wide sign structure.

Mr. Paff asked, if traffic doesn't work out as envisioned, can the intersection of the on-ramp to the Tollway and Rt. 21 be signalized.

Mr. Ziegler stated that it would not be too close to the Washington Street intersection, but the

Approved

south off-ramp from the Tollway is a signalized intersection. Typically IDOT wants about a ¼ of a mile separation between traffic signals and the signal at the off-ramp is about 1,100 feet away. He noted that it “may” be able to be signalized, but the fact that it is a 3-legged intersection (i.e., there is no traffic incoming from the on-ramp) means that obtaining the warrants for a signal would be questionable. Having said that, it might be possible.

As this is a Public Hearing, Mr. Sula stated that anyone wishing to make a comment or ask a question regarding the proposed development may do so and asked that they start by stating their name and address.

Sylvia Bren, who indicated that she currently works at Woodlake Apartments located at 101 Woodlake Boulevard, stated that she is there with several residents. She noted that they maintain the landscaping in the area and it makes her sad that they are removing all of those trees, which is one of the things that her residents love the most (wildlife/trees). She understands that this development will probably happen and asks that they try to keep it as beautiful and with saving as many trees as possible. She asked if there were any concerns with parking and whether the facility will be pet friendly/if there be a dog park associated with the development. She noted that the developments are so close that she feels that they’ll get residents parking on their site and therefore, asked how many parking spaces they are proposing to provide.

Mr. Steve Weiscover, stated that he currently lives at Woodlake Apartments and that he loves it there. He noted the same concerns as Sylvia and asked if there is any information at this time regarding the rental prices. He asked if the complex is going to be marketed as luxury/high end.

Mr. Dan Riedel, stated that he is a neighbor as he owns property across Rt. 21. He stated that he knows the zoning is currently office and that the best thing that could happen is for it to change to multi-family. This is a good product and he wanted to welcome them to Gurnee. He stated that he hopes to be a good neighbor across the street where he hopes to be building something soon. Finally, he indicated that the property has been there vacant for longer than Mr. Franke indicated; since the Tollway was developed around 1952.

Mr. Sula closed the floor to the public and asked Mr. Franke if he wanted to address the questions.

Ms. Mitchell stated that regarding the trees, it is in their best interest to protect as many as they can. There will be a significant number of large trees preserved on the site and they want this as this will be the first impression that people get of their complex. In regards to the rents for the units, this will be marketed as a luxury development and although the rents haven’t been determined they will probably be in the \$1,200-\$1,400 range. She noted that they have pet friendly complexes and that is a possibility for this project.

Approved

The applicant indicated that they are supportive of the alternate sign that is 12 feet wide.

Mr. Pejsach motioned, seconded by Mr. Nordentoft, to forward a favorable recommendation on the Petition of AR Building Company for a Zoning Map Amendment rezoning the subject property from O-1 PUD to R-6 PUD with Preliminary PUD and Site Plan Review approval for a 153-unit apartment complex in substantial conformance with the plans reviewed by the PZB on 3-16-2022, including the requested exceptions, and subject to approval of the 12-foot wide ground sign.

Mr. Sula asked if there was any discussion to be had on the motion. As there was not, a vote was taken.

Roll Call Vote:

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

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried: 5-0-0

6. Next Meeting Date: April 6, 2022

Ms. Velkover stated that there is a public hearing scheduled for this night.

7. Public Comment

Mr. Sula then opened the floor to comments regarding any issues not on this evening's agenda. As there was no one in the audience, he then closed the floor to the public.

8. Adjournment

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

Voice Vote:

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

Motion Carried: 5-0-0

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joann Metzger,
Recording Secretary, Planning and Zoning Board