

Approved

**Village of Gurnee  
Planning and Zoning Board Minutes  
October 12, 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, Dane Morgan, David Nordentoft, Edwin Paff, and Liliana Ware

Planning and Zoning Members Absent: R. Todd Campbell and Josh Pejsach

Other Officials Present: Tracy Velkover, Planning Manager; Clara Gable, Senior Planner; David Ziegler, Community Development Director; Jodi Luka, Community and Economic Development Management Analyst; and Gretchen Neddenriep, Acting Village Attorney

**2. Pledge of Allegiance**

**3. Approval of the September 7, 2022 Minutes for the Planning and Zoning Board Meeting**

Mr. Sula asked if there were any questions/comments regarding the minutes for the meeting of September 7<sup>th</sup>. As there were none, he asked for a motion to approve.

Mr. Paff motioned, seconded by Mr. Nordentoft, to approve the September 7, 2022 PZB Meeting Minutes.

Voice Vote:

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

Motion Carried: 5-0-0

**4. Public Hearing and Non-Public Hearing items: Zoning Map Amendment, Special Use Permits, Site Plan Review, and Minor Sign Exceptions for Patson, Inc. d/b/a TransChicago Truck Group**

Ms. Gable stated that Patson, Inc., d/b/a TransChicago Truck Group, is seeking the following for a 26-acre site located at 775 S. IL Route 21 (east side of IL Route 21 and south of Manchester Drive):

- Zoning Map Amendment to rezone the subject property from O-2 PUD, Office Campus District as a Planned Unit Development, to C-2, Community Commercial District
- Special Use Permit to allow the establishment and operation of a vehicle (truck) dealership with outdoor storage and display
- Special Use Permit to increase the size of directional signs by more than 25% (4 sq. ft. allowed by code while 9 sq. ft. is proposed)

Approved

- Special Use Permit for landscaping associated with the dealership including a departure from the parking lot landscaping island requirements and a departure from the requirement that 10% of area internal to the parking lot/display lot be landscaped (green)
- Site Plan Review of vehicle (truck) dealership with outdoor storage and display
- Minor Sign Exception to increase the height of the main ground sign by 50% (12 feet to 18 feet)
- Minor Sign Exception to allow a commercial message on directional signage
- Design Standard Modification for departures from the requirement that the west elevation, which is over 100 feet in length, have a 2-foot minimum vertical variation in roof height that is repeated, on-center, no more than every 50 linear feet
- Design Standard Modification for departures from the requirement that the west facade provides 50% transparency between 2 and 10 feet above grade (currently at 30.2%)

She noted that due to Zoning Ordinance text amendments recently approved by the Village Board, Special Use Permits are no longer required for the Design Standard Modification requests. The applicant's team is in attendance to present their requests. On the Zoning Map Amendment, Special Use Permit, and Site Plan Review requests, the Planning and Zoning Board will make a recommendation that will be forwarded to the Village Board for their determination. The Planning & Zoning Board has decision making authority on the Minor Sign Exception and Design Standard Modification requests.

Mr. Sula asked that, as some aspects of this matter are part of a public hearing, the petitioner and anyone from the public who wishes to speak regarding this petition should stand and be sworn-in by the acting Village Attorney. Ms. Neddenriep conducted the swearing in.

Mr. Doug Cayce, President and owner of TransChicago Group, stated that his team is proposing a new state-of-the art truck dealership on the subject property, which is at the southeast corner of Manchester and Rt. 21. His team consists of consultants from MPS Law, Cage Civil, Ketone Partners, KLOA (traffic), and Cornerstone Architects. He is confident that over time, they are going to become a very good partner for the community, its businesses, and its residents. He noted that he has some history in Gurnee as he lived in the Heather Ridge community for about 10 years and is acutely aware of how the residents care for their neighborhood and wants to be a part of it. He wants to address any concerns that Gurnee and the residents have with this project and in return, noted the benefits of this development including the generation of significant sales and property taxes that benefit the schools, park district, etc., as well as the creation of 50 jobs in year one with an increase to approximately 100 by year three. He then addressed why they chose Gurnee and why this site. As for why Gurnee, it is central to Lake County, which is beneficial to an underserved area of their industry, as there are not a lot of franchise dealerships in the area. They will also be able to support McHenry County, Kane County, the greater Chicagoland area, and southern Wisconsin. As for why this specific site, which they have under contract to purchase, it was selected for its convenience and access to the Interstate Highway (using Milwaukee and Rt. 120 access points), which will ensure that traffic is contained and not traveling through the center of

Approved

town or on other Gurnee arterial roads. These roads also provide for simple and easy access to the site.

Kyle Schuhmacher, with Ketone Partners, stated that he is a real estate development consultant working on behalf of TransChicago Group. He stated that this is a build-to-suit for TransChicago Group; unlike many speculative buildings that are constructed in Lake County today, the user is known. He clarified that this is not a truck stop, a cross-dock facility, a freight terminal building, or a distribution center – and that the traffic counts in the traffic study conducted by KLOA prove that out. The building itself is a combination of office, retail, parts warehousing, and maintenance/repair facility. The plans are to start with 50 new employees and grow to 100 by year 3, which includes a mix of office and retail staff, as well as union service technicians, and parts and service professionals. The property consists of 25.34-acres with a single point of access off of Manchester Road onto Rt. 21. The plan provides a 201 foot building setback to Rt. 21 and a 190 foot building setback to Manchester Road. Parking for approximately 112 automobiles and 233 commercial trucks is provided on the site. The parking lot is to be secured by fencing, lit, and paved. The landscaping plan provides 135 new trees, 313 new shrubs, and 234 new additional plants, and 45% of the site is pervious (unpaved). The building is 68,140 sq. ft. with an interior breakdown of space as follows: 13,220 sq. ft. office, 1,829 sq. ft. retail, 3,032 sq. ft. employee lounge, 22,253 sq. ft. parts warehouse, and 27,806 sq. ft. service. The building is modern style, constructed of precast concrete panels (some are clad with aluminum composite material and a fairly large amount of glass). There is a four color exterior wall paint palate and the exterior wall heights range from 24 feet to 33 feet.

Mr. Larry Glascock, Landscape Architect with Cage Civil Engineering, stated that they approached this site like they do for other developments, by looking at code requirements as well as the neighboring properties. He noted that Gurnee is very specific about what they require as far as intensity of plantings across from any adjacent lesser use. He noted that there are portions of the site that are across Rt. 21 from multi-family residential, as well as retail, and the office/service development to the north. Across both of those areas, they tried to buffer the site heavily with a mix of plantings including evergreen, ornamental, canopy trees, and large shrubs arranged in a manner to block views and noise. As the site transitions to the corner, the landscaping is more of a traditional parkway tree plan with shrubs planted to buffer the parking areas. He pointed out the display area on the corner where they are proposing to display some vehicles; the area around this will be planted with perennials. To the southeast they are trying to bring back a tall grass prairie in the basin area for a more natural feel. He noted that there are two enclosed fenced areas: one on the lot west of the ring road (south of the building) and the other on the east lot (east of the ring road). The fencing on the west lot is all 8-foot tall decorative iron fencing. The fencing on the east lot is 8-foot tall decorative iron fencing along the front of the private drive and then 8-foot tall black vinyl clad chain-link fence for the remaining sides (north, east, and south).

Approved

Mr. Tom Petermann, Cage Civil Engineering, stated that they meet (actually exceed) all the storm water requirements. There is an existing basin that was constructed about 15 years ago and they've studied it to ensure that all the storage requirements are met. There is floodplain area on the site, as the site is proximate to the Des Plaines River. They are outside the limits for a majority of the project, but where they intersect the floodplain, they are providing compensatory storage.

Mr. Kyle Schuhmacher, with Ketone Partners, displayed color elevations of the building. He noted that it is a precast concrete building with a fairly large amount of glass on the façade along with aluminum composite panels. There are two loading docks on the building, both on the east side facing the private drive. Those have been screened with a precast screen wall. There is also a recycle and refuse area on the east side of the building that is screened on 2 sides with precast walls and on the south wall with a wrought iron fence.

Mr. Doug Cayce stated that they are in the commercial truck and truck-related product sales and service business. It is a 40 year family owned and operated business (currently on the 3<sup>rd</sup> generation in the business). They have over 450 employees in their organization and have 3 different local unions at their various operations that represent about 50% of their staff. They currently operate facilities in Elmhurst and Shorewood, Illinois, and Gary, Indiana. They also have a new 10,000 sq. ft. training facility that they will be launching in the next 30 days for training of their technicians to ensure that they are state-of-the art trained with the latest technology. The facility will carry a vast inventory of new Freightliner and Isuzu trucks and a host of all makes of used trucks. They also sell capacity yard spotters and Transcraft and Benson Aluminum Steel and combination trailers. The facility provides service for trucks, as well as an extensive inventory of parts for most makes of most model trucks. He reiterated that they are not a trucking company, a logistics company, a freight forwarder, a warehouse business, or a truck stop – those bring truck traffic that would be concerning. They are a truck dealership. This is their first design-to-build, as their other facilities have been acquired or renovated over the years; none were buildings that they built. The Gurnee facility is proposed to be their flagship design to take to other areas where they plan to grow. They hold themselves to a high standard, but they also have high standards established by their manufacturers/franchises. TransChicago is very connected to the community as they work well with a lot of trade schools, local high schools, and community colleges. They also support local youth sport programs and support charities by donating their older used vehicles along with \$5,000 for maintenance, insurance, and lettering of those vehicles to organizations that have a need for such a vehicle. He noted that each one of their existing facilities is adjacent to residential and that they have never had any complaints about noise, traffic, lighting, etc. In regards to their operation, their sales facility is open M-F from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm and on Saturdays by appointment. Truck service and parts hours are M-F from 6:00 am to midnight and Saturday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm. The entire facility is closed Sunday. Repairs are conducted inside their facility with the service doors down in compliance with Village code. He also noted that site lighting complies with Village code, including lighting after the close of business, which will be reduced to 29%. They use a triple-basin system that provides a separation of the fluids (oil, gas, and other volatile liquids); this is a key to their operation, installed as an interceptor between

Approved

their floor drains and the sanitary sewer. These systems are pumped and cleaned by a third party, which is tightly regulated. They do not store wrecked vehicles or vehicles in any state of disrepair or with open hoods. No long-term parking is allowed. He noted that the traffic study will show they are typically a business to business operation and not a business to consumer operation. Business is typically conducted where they are going to their clients. This is true of their parts business also. If someone needs a vehicle, they don't come in for a test drive. TransChicago goes to the client's site and conducts a sales presentation. Parts are typically ordered over the phone or via the internet and shipped. He noted that it is possible for a client to come to their facility, but that is not the norm. Their extended hours are primarily used to accommodate service demand. Right now they have a 3 week lead time on service work. Their traffic study shows that most of their traffic comes in during normal business hours (8:00 am to 6:00 pm). Because of the limited amount of traffic before 8:00 am and after 6:00 pm, noise will be very limited.

Mr. Javier Millan, Traffic Engineer with KLOA, stated that Milwaukee Avenue is a north-south arterial that provides 2 lanes in each direction and is classified as a Class 2 Truck Route. It carries an annual average daily traffic volume of 27,100 vehicles, of which 4-5% are trucks. The proposed type of business generally creates traffic in the form of tractors without trailers, box trucks (single-unit truck like a U-Haul truck), and vans. Very few tractors with trailers will be coming to the site and those that are will probably be making deliveries to the facility. To determine what type of traffic this facility would generate, they conducted a 72 hour survey of the existing facility in Elmhurst. This type of land use generates minimal during the peak hours: between 7:00 am and 9:00 am when most people are on their way to work and between 4:00 pm and 6:00 pm when most people are on their way home from work. The majority of the traffic generated by the facility, based on the survey of the Elmhurst facility, is passenger vehicles: 84% of the traffic is generated by van, pickup, or passenger vehicles, 13% by box trucks, and 3% by semi-tractors. Further review of this survey revealed that the facility generates most of their traffic in the off-peak hours (between 9:00 am and 3:00 pm), which means that the facility will have minimal impact on the peak hours. The survey also revealed that a total of 32 semi-trucks were generated on a daily basis with approximately 5-8 of those trucks generated between 6:00 pm and 11:00 pm. This volume of additional truck traffic will have minimal impact on Rt. 21. He also pointed out that the Village has conducted a traffic signal warrant study for the intersection of Manchester and Rt. 21 and that the study has determined that a signal will be warranted and the Village is pursuing approval from IDOT. For the purpose of this traffic study, they assumed the intersection will be signalized. Capacity analysis was also conducted, which is an analysis of the intersections to see how well they are currently operating and how well they will operate after the development is constructed, to determine if any improvements are needed. Based on the results of the capacity analysis for 2028, all of the studied intersections will operate at an acceptable level of service and the intersections will have sufficient reserved capacity to accommodate the future traffic volume, including the site development plus background traffic growth. Furthermore, the projection indicates that the proposed facility will increase the traffic traversing Rt. 21 by 1% or less. In summary, the proposed facility will generate a limited volume of traffic, inclusive of trucks, which

Approved

will be distributed throughout the day. The facility will result in a small percentage increase in average daily semi-truck traffic as the facility is projected to generate approximately 32 semi-truck trips on a weekday, which will be distributed throughout the day. The Manchester Drive and Rt. 21 intersection is projected to operate at a level of service of "A" with the installation of the traffic signal as proposed by the Village's traffic study.

Mr. Hal Franke, Attorney for the petitioner with the law firm of MPS, stated that they are here tonight for the following zoning relief.

- 1) Rezone the subject property from O-2 PUD, Office Campus as a Planned Unit Development, to C-2, Community Commercial;
- 2) Special Use Permit for a motor vehicle dealership, which is an authorized special use in the C-2 district;
- 3) Special Use Permit/Minor Sign Exception for onsite signs;
- 4) Special Use Permit for relief for interior parking lot island landscaping (green space); and
- 5) Site Plan approval

All of these requests come with different standards that have to be satisfied and it is their job to provide the PZB with facts that support these standards being met and that allow the Board to make findings of fact as such. He noted that they have provided a synopsis of the project along with detailed documents, plans, and studies that have been on-file with the Village for a while. He requested that these documents be entered into the public hearing record. He stated that they tried to accomplish this with their presentation and that they are available to answer any questions the Board may have. He referred back to one of the first slides in their presentation, which showed the subject property and the surrounding zoning districts. He noted that one of the standards that they are required to show is the appropriateness of the requested zoning; it must be compatible and consistent with existing surrounding zoning as well as land uses. He stated that the subject property is zoned O-2 PUD and the following zoning districts and land uses are adjacent: to the north is zoned O-2 and improved with medical office buildings; to the east of that is P, Public, zoning improved with the Village's Fire Station; across Rt. 21 to the west is the R-5 PUD zoned Cobble Creek multi-family development, south of that is the single-story commercial developments zoned C-2, and further south is the Spinney Run attached single-family development that are zoned R-5 PUD; and to the south of the subject property is partially zoned C-2 and the remaining portion is zoned O-2 PUD (which is currently the zoning of the subject property as well). The property to the south consists of about 12 acres that are improved with multiple older buildings dedicated to different types of uses including commercial, residential, office. Finally, to the east is a large area of open lands, floodplain/wetlands including the Des Plaines River. He stated that they believe the commercial zoning and commercial use being proposed is consistent with the existing zoning and land uses in the area, especially taking into account the large setbacks, significant landscaping, buffering, fencing, protections on lighting, etc. Another standard that the Board is asked to consider when making a recommendation on a rezoning petition is how long the property has been vacant as currently zoned. He noted that this

Approved

property has been zoned as office since 2008 and has remained vacant for almost 15 years. He noted that it was vacant for a number of years prior to this and stated that the office market, after the pandemic and many companies turning to remote working either full or part-time, has further retarded the office market. He also noted that one of the considerations is the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, which reflects office. He noted that the plan was completed right before the start of the pandemic and that the office market has substantially been diminished from this due to more businesses allowing remote work. The standards also include development in a manner that promotes public health, safety, and welfare, which they believe this does in that it provides for a traffic signal and substantial buffering/landscaping. He noted that he was before this body earlier in the year for a multi-family development to the north along Rt. 21 and indicated that it was similar in that it fronted Rt. 21 and was zoned for office for years and years (over 40) with no office interest. He noted that the Comp Plan was amended recently to reflect multi-family for that other parcel, which shows that the Village recognized the inappropriateness of office as a land use in the future on some parcels. He stated that the subject parcel is a candidate for consideration of a use other than office. He also noted that this parcel was zoned for commercial use in the past. As for the Special Use Permits, the key standard is the public need for that particular use in that location. He noted that this use at this location will satisfy a specific market need (Lake and McHenry Counties, southern Wisconsin). He noted that the traffic signal proposed to be installed at Manchester and Rt. 21 is only possible because of the warrants that this development provides. The state would not allow a signal at this location without meeting the required warrants. The traffic signal will provide safe entry and exiting for the Village's Fire Department, as well as residents to the west of Rt. 21 on Manchester. He concluded by saying that the project will produce a number of community benefits that further the public health, safety, and welfare, including but not limited to storm water management, traffic signal, environmental controls, lighting controls, significant landscaping, employment opportunities, community support, and financial benefits.

Mr. Nordentoft stated that there is a lot of information to take in, so at this time he really doesn't have any questions but wanted to make several observations. He noted that his first response to this is concern. He stated that when he's asked to review the petition against the standards that they are to consider, he might respectfully disagree with the petitioner's position on part of it. Commercial might be appropriate for Milwaukee, but he looks at the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (which he puts a lot of weight into), and the plan does not reflect commercial. He noted that the PZB uses this tool as a roadmap for how the Village develops over time. He noted that he takes the Comp Plan seriously and is not quick to make changes to it. This parcel might have commercial value to it, but he is not certain that the Village's vision was for 26-acres of commercial with this intensity of a use on it. He stated that they could debate what the future is of office or office-campus uses and maybe there is something in the middle at some point in time. Purely from a zoning standpoint, commercial zoning paints a very broad brush. The commercial across the street is a very low intensity commercial use, partially due to the size of the parcel and partially due to the uses (i.e., he compared the uses on the west side of Rt. 21 to the proposed truck

Approved

dealership with 18 hour operations). He noted that the service business hours, from 6:00 am to midnight, are outside of normal commercial business hours and do not respect the neighborhoods. He noted that even though they stated most of the traffic will come in after rush hour in the morning or before rush hour in the afternoon, they are still open until midnight which means the patrons can come at that time also. And the traffic is truck traffic, whether it is semis or box trucks, and they make road noise. Depending upon which way the wind is blowing, if it's coming out of the east, everyone to the west will be subject to whatever potential noise is coming from Rt. 21 and the site. He noted that he does not live in this area, but further west near Rt. 45 and that he can hear a lot of noise from this roadway. He also discussed the 10 service bays that face to the west and indicated that he didn't know what type of noise would come out of that area if the doors are open on a hot summer day (pneumatic tools, power drills, diesel trucks running, etc.). Finally, he noted that the applicant discussed the benefit to the public and identified the public as Lake and McHenry Count and southern Wisconsin, but that the public that he is to safeguard is that of the Village of Gurnee, so because of that he respectfully disagrees with some of the statements made by the applicant's team.

Mr. Paff stated that he agrees with a lot of what Mr. Nordentoft said, but not so much on some things. He noted that the traffic hours, for this type of operation, are probably better than some uses, especially if it was an apartment or office development that would add traffic at peak hours. He noted that this property is going to be developed at some time and to expect the existing view across Rt. 21 to remain the same is not realistic. He stated he wasn't certain about 26-acres of trucks though. He did note the extremely large setback to Rt. 21 that is proposed (85 feet) and noted that one thing about a Special Use Permit is that the PZB can ask for concessions such as additional setbacks and buffering and assumes this is the reason for the proposed setback. He asked if there was any berm in that setback.

Mr. Petermann stated that there will be berming where they can accommodate it, but that there is a significant elevation drop from Rt. 21 to the site.

Mr. Paff stated that there is a berm there now along a portion of the site and asked if it was going to be that high (i.e., where dirt was dumped on the site).

Mr. Peterman stated that they don't have the elevations yet at this point, but that it would be at least that height. The site, at the north end, is about 10 feet below the grade of Rt. 21, but further south on the site (as it gets closer to the grade of Rt. 21) there will be a berm. The height is not determined at this time.

Mr. Paff stated that he understands that the site drops off from Rt. 21, but indicated that a concern is that the west side of Rt. 21 sits higher than the roadway, so residents will see down into the site and see a parking lot full of trucks and other vehicles. He noted that there is no screening interior to the lot and he understands why they don't want that. He likes the preservation of a lot of the existing trees along the private road through the site, because that will help block off the back parking lot somewhat as the trees are fairly well established. However, the lot up front, without



Approved

a berm will just be a view of large trucks from Rt. 21. Some of the residents up on the hill have their windows looking out to the east. He understands there is a display area at the north corner of the site, so a berm would not be possible there because it would block the display area. He asked about the timing of the traffic light at Manchester and Rt. 21 – specifically if it'll be installed before this development is constructed.

Mr. Ziegler stated that when the Fire Station was constructed, the Village anticipated a signal at the Rt. 21 and Manchester intersection. The State of Illinois issued a line-item grant in its budget for this signal, but IDOT would not allow its installation because the warrants for a signal were not met by the existing cross traffic (Manchester traffic). With this development, there should be enough traffic to warrant a signal and the grant is still active. IDOT needs an eminent development before they will issue a permit for a signal. If/when this project goes forward, the Village would issue the warrant study back to IDOT, the permit is anticipated to be secured, and the signal will be constructed next spring/summer prior to the opening of this business.

Mr. Paff noted that there was mention about a cross access easement to the south. He said that he doesn't see that roadway being extended down to Des Plaines court and asked to whom the cross access will benefit.

Mr. Hal Franke stated that the access easement has been known about, working with staff, it's just not shown on the plan. This project doesn't contemplate the development of the parcels to the south, but noted that they understand the plan to connect this roadway so that the properties to the south have the ability to get to the signalized intersection. He noted that the concept of a cross access easement is not an issue.

Mr. Paff stated that the connection worries him because trucks could make a left turn out of the site. If a left turn was not allowed out of that intersection, then he would not have any concern.

Mr. Tom Peterman stated that if they have the signalized intersection at Manchester and Rt. 21, IDOT would restrict the south access to a right-in/right-out.

Mr. Paff said that the applicant indicated a need for this facility. He asked where the closest facility like this is located.

Mr. Cayce asked for clarification as to whether Mr. Paff is talking about the same brands or different brands.

Mr. Paff stated he's asking about a similar dealership where they sell and service trucks like this.

Mr. Cayce stated that there are a lot of independent dealerships (not franchised) so that is difficult to say. The non-franchised operations may not have the same standards for operation that they do, but the closest franchised dealership is probably near the state line in Wadsworth.

Ms. Ware stated her appreciation for the presentation. She asked how busy the facility is between the hours of 5:00 pm and midnight, and why the need for such long hours into the night.

Approved

Mr. Cayce stated that the hours of operation are to accommodate the amount of work they have. They only have so much shop space for their technicians to work so they spread their work out over that time frame. The amount of traffic for drop offs after the hours of 5:00 or 6:00 pm at night is minimal. They don't write repair orders because they don't do work on demand. They don't have the capacity for someone to come into their facility and drop their vehicle off and have it worked on right away. So those hours, after 5:00/6:00 pm is really to accommodate the work they have and their shop space.

Ms. Ware asked if they are technically not open to the public during that time.

Mr. Cayce stated that their parts department is open to the public. Some passenger vans or vehicles might come in to purchase parts, but as the traffic study shows based on their existing facility, there really isn't a lot of traffic of any type that comes to the site after 6:00 pm.

Mr. Morgan stated that, per the traffic study, 97% of the vehicles are passenger vehicles or box trucks, and that there are 1,300 trips a day. He asked how many of those trips aren't employees.

Mr. Javier Millan, Traffic Engineer with KLOA, reminded that the 1,300 trips is a total (650 in and 650 out). In terms of how many of those are employees, he would need to look into their survey. He couldn't give that number right now, but indicated that the 650 trips is employees, deliveries, customers purchasing parts, etc.

Mr. Paff asked if he heard him correctly about the proposed development resulting in a 1% increase in traffic along Rt. 21.

Mr. Millan stated that the amount of traffic generated by the proposed development would result in a 1-2% increase in background traffic.

Mr. Cayce added that the traffic study was conducted at their Elmhurst facility which is their Corporate Office and their largest operation and heaviest traffic generator. It has 200 employees, so that would be about 400 trips. The facilities are about the same size, it's just the density of the area that they service as well as this one housing their corporate offices.

Mr. Morgan stated that they indicated the need for the additional ground sign size was due to trucks needing to see the sign to make the turn into the site.

Mr. Cayce clarified that the request is for additional height and not size. The reason for the taller sign is because it's important for those few trucks that they do have coming to their facility to see where they are going and to make the correct turn into the facility. If they miss the turn, it is somewhat challenging to get back to the facility.

Mr. Morgan stated he thought it would be difficult to miss a 60,000 sq. ft. facility.

Mr. Cayce noted that the building does sit down lower than Rt. 21 and there is a wooded area just north of the medical office area to the north that might block the view of the facility as vehicles approach from the north.

Approved

Mr. Morgan stated that he shares some of Mr. Nordentoft's concerns about the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. He stated that he was not part of the drafting of this plan, but could see that this may need to be revisited due to the change in the office market based on the impacts of the pandemic.

Mr. Sula expressed that he is not really troubled by a rezoning to C-2, noting that most of the surrounding area is zoned C-2, but he asked for a frame of reference regarding the height of a proposed sign suggesting a comparison to the newest fire station.

Mr. Ziegler responded that the sign in question was about the same height as the main garage of the station.

He then asked for a comparison of 68,000 square feet to existing buildings in the area. He clarified that the strip mall located at the same intersection as this proposed development would be only about a fifth the size (12,000 – 15,000 square feet).

Mr. Ziegler then cited the new Restaurant Depot, next to the Holiday Inn, is about 45,000 square feet.

Ms. Velkover also cited a new car dealership off of Northridge Plaza at about 55,000 – 60,000 square feet.

Mr. Sula clarified with Mr. Cayce that sold products would be delivered to the buyers, whether they be used or new; he elaborated that most business regarding sales would not be held on site.

Mr. Cayce also wished to clarify that the actual footprint of the building would be about 59,000 square feet, and that it represents about six percent of the total site.

Mr. Sula then asked where the sales tax would be reported for sales, and Mr. Cayce stated that they would be based on where the sale was made (Gurnee).

Mr. Sula also clarified with Mr. Ziegler that the proposed site could lead to connection with Des Plaines Court, as customers could mistakenly drive onto the road. Mr. Casey felt that signage would prevent that.

Morgan asked how many vehicles could be potentially brought in and fired up during the extended hours of business for repairs.

Mr. Cayce stressed that they would likely be few, as the type of repairs being performed take much longer than that typical of an auto repair shop.

Mr. Frank took this moment to stress the unlikeliness of this land being used for office space any time soon, by citing various areas in neighboring communities that have been re-zoning land that had been zoned for office use prior to the pandemic.

Approved

Ms. Velkover clarified that this property has dual designations on the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The front of the property is reflected as office, while the rear portion is reflected as Industrial/Mixed Use. The Industrial/Mixed Use classification includes a mix of uses including commercial uses.

Mr. Sula opened the floor to the public.

Mr. John Duncan, 763 and 769 Chelsey Court and 823 and 832 Kristin Court in Spinney Run, stated that the owner said he wants to attract truck traffic to Gurnee and that this is a question to consider regarding if this is what we want. He said that he looks at it in 5 areas: ESG (Environmental, Social and Governance), financial, environmental, traffic, and building. For ESG, he asked if the Village has an Environmental, Social and Governance document. He noted that the State of Illinois has one and asked if Gurnee has one. The purpose is to preserve the world (i.e., preserving open space, green building practices, smart growth). He stated that if he understands the traffic study, there would be 1,300 vehicles in and out of the facility every day. He asked if that is correct.

Mr. Sula clarified that it's 650 in and 650 out.

Mr. Duncan stated that is a high carbon footprint. He stated that there will also be light pollution from all the lights on the site. When he looks at the financial aspect, he asked if the Village has done a pro-forma on this development so they know what type of money is expected to be generated by this development. He noted that the Village's budget looks to be about \$94,000,000. He asked how much additional revenue would come in from this development and if that number is known and if so, what it is. He understands that this use will generate taxes, about \$300,000-\$500,000 per year (property), which is about the amount that collectively the Spinney Run residents pay. He asked how this would impact the medical office complex to the north and asked if people in Heather Ridge were noticed. He understands that a notice went to property owners within 500 feet of the property, but asked if others further away were contacted. He noted that based on this notice range, a large population of impacted residents were not informed. He noted a discrepancy in the number of parking spaces that have been reported for this project. He addressed noise from idling trucks and stated that he has a large Class A motor home and when he goes into a freightliner facility, he sees and hears trucks sitting and idling. He would encourage members to sit outside of a truck facility (a freightliner dealer to the north is about 30 minutes away, south of Milwaukee) for an hour and look at the traffic coming in and out. He asked if there is a paint spray booth or dynamometer at the facility. He expressed concern about run-off from the parking lot. There are 26 truck doors so there are going to be 26 vehicles being serviced at a time. As he drove here tonight, he noted nothing but darkness on that site and indicated this development would bring a whole lot of light pollution.

Kat York, 933 Chase Court in Heather Ridge, stated that she's lived in Heather Ridge for about 28 years. She also expressed concern about light pollution and noise. They walk their dogs 3 times a day and in a 30 minute walk, they will hear 3 ambulances go by because of Rt. 21 and Rt. 120 being a route to the hospital. She expressed concern that the proposed traffic will impede emergency

Approved

vehicles traveling to the hospital. As for the landscaping, she noted that the plans always look so nice but the trees installed are tiny and will not well maintained. She expressed concern with the rezoning of this property to commercial.

Susan Kwiatkowski, 837 Brian Court in Spinney Run, stated that she is one of the people directly affected by this development and she has a lot of concerns. She read a statement and wanted to ask questions. She asked if all of the signage would be illuminated. She noted that they've mentioned the public need and she doesn't understand what the public need is for this facility in Gurnee. She noted that their presentation indicated that business would be coming in from all of these different towns so they've already increased what they are saying to them. She thought she heard that the service bays would face west and if so, that's a noise concern as they will face directly into Spinney Run. She moved to Gurnee in 1979 and lived in Heather Ridge for a long time. They've been very fortunate to be able to buy a house in Spinney Run and call that their home. They bought it knowing that it's a residential community and not an industrial or a commercial community. There are some businesses along Rt. 21 but it's not commercial. Over the years, they've noticed a huge increase in noise level from the roadways (cars, ambulances, motorcycles, trucks, etc.). It's bad enough that sometimes it's difficult to have a conversation with people on her deck. This project is only going to increase this noise and make it more difficult for her to open her windows or use her deck. She asked why this developer and/or the Village isn't looking for industrial areas for this development to locate in. She hopes that the Board also consider additional crime that will come with this business and asked that they consider the residents who have lived so long in this community.

Dr. Norbert Charles Bora, 747 Chelsey Court, stated that he lives in Spinney Run. He noted that when a house goes up for sale, it's sold in a day or two, which will no longer happen if this development is approved. He expressed concern with noise and stated that if shrubs were appropriate for sound control, then the tollways wouldn't have 20-foot tall walls. Also, the residents are not impressed with the applicant's donations to organizations. They know how that works: they buy a truck, depreciate it tax-wise until it's no longer depreciable, then donate it to some charity and get a double tax write-off. He is concerned with the traffic from Fire Station #3, as he spoke with Chief Kavanagh, and found that it is the most active of all of Gurnee's stations. It is not uncommon to see 14-15 emergency vehicles go out of there on a regular basis. He asked what would prevent vehicles from the proposed dealership from blocking emergency vehicles exiting from the site, stopping them from getting to an emergency on time. He stated that if the Board decides to allow this, he strongly suggests that the Board consider moving the station to a location where it can be used safely.

Ms. Regina Keller, 815 Kristin Court (Spinney Run), stated that one of the neighbors was unable to make the meeting and she wanted to read a letter from her. The letter is from Dianne Sickles (870 Kristin Court). In summary, Ms. Sickles is opposed to this development as she believes it belongs in an industrial area. She reasons include the following: additional traffic on Rt. 21 resulting in danger to homeowners in the area, reduction in property values, zoning was set for reason (lighting and noise), and negative impact on wildlife. She asked for the Board to consider the

Approved

residents and deny this request which belongs in an industrial area. Ms. Keller stated that she agreed with a lot of what Ms. Sickles stated in her letter.

Ms. Barbara Thompson, read a letter from Vicky Thedos (805 Brian Court in Spinney Run). She noted that her property is on the end and her deck would look straight out at the proposed development site. The letter indicated that she believes the request would be detrimental to the health and wellbeing of her family and her neighbors (exceed traffic congestion, noise, crime, and lighting). Ms. Thompson noted that she pulls out onto Rt. 21 every day from Spinney Run and this development will make her more nervous. She noted additional concern with the service area being open until midnight and the noise and smells that will be created by this activity.

Mr. Sula closed the floor to the public.

Mr. Sula reopened the floor to the public.

Ms. Gail Gudgeon, Heather Ridge, asked if this is approved when would construction begin on the project and how long would it take to complete.

Mr. Sula closed the floor to the public.

Mr. Ziegler stated that in regards to the ESG document that was referred to, the Village does not have such a document. He noted that the Village relies heavily on the Illinois EPA. However, he noted that the Mayor's office has implemented an environmental committee over the last couple of years that meets regularly but that to his knowledge they have not established a formal policy document. In regards to light pollution, the site meets all Village code requirements. No departures of any kind are requested to lighting. He noted that the Village's lighting ordinance establishes maximum levels allowed interior to the site, as well as at all property lines, and that the proposed development meets all of these requirements. In regards to financial generation review, that is not within the purview of this committee. This committee's purview is the review of zoning and special use permits based on land use and not financial or fiscal impacts. The review of fiscal/financial impacts is the purview of the Village Board. As for who was noticed, he indicated that State Statute requires notification of property owners within 250 feet and that the Village notifies out 500 feet. In addition, the Village places signs on the property and puts a legal notice into the newspaper. Unfortunately we can't notice everyone but information regarding upcoming meetings is placed on the Village's website. In regards to storm water detention, he noted that adequate storm water detention was installed when the site was developed in 2008. Based on the size of the parking lot, they will need to put in an oil and grit interceptor before storm water dispenses into the floodplain and detention basin (i.e., water quality requirements). In regards to the service bays, they face both east and west and he indicated that he is not certain whether they are drive through bays or single side access. In regards to the ability of fire trucks and ambulances being able to exit the site, the addition of a traffic signal at this location, due to warrants being met from this development, will improve emergency vehicle access. All emergency vehicles have an opticom system that enables them to turn lights green in order to clear traffic to ensure quick travel times. Currently, the emergency vehicles are only able to utilize

Approved

the opticom system to turn the flashing yellow warning light on, which doesn't allow for as safe, quick exiting. Chief Kavanagh has indicated that emergency vehicles currently approach the intersection and wait for all vehicles to stop and the drivers of the emergency vehicles will actually make eye contact with the cross traffic drivers to ensure that their exiting is safe. This all takes time, which will be addressed with the ability to turn the light on Rt. 21 red for safe exiting. By the time emergency vehicles get to the light, any trucks that may be on Manchester from the proposed development should have the ability to exit on the green, opening up the exiting lane for the emergency vehicles.

Ms. Velkover stated that in regards to signage, the ground sign is an illuminated screened box sign, meaning that the background is opaque and does not allow light to be transmitted through it, but the lettering and logos in the message are routed out and constructed of translucent material to allow light passage. Therefore, only text and logos will be illuminated on the ground sign. The wall signs are halo illuminated signs, meaning that the lettering is back-lit to cast a shadow on the building, and not directly illuminated. This is viewed as the highest quality of wall sign, per the sign ordinance. The directional signs are non-illuminated.

Mr. Sula stated that there were several questions related to operations, specifically whether the facility would have a spray booth or a dynamometer.

Mr. Doug Cayce stated that there would be no dynamometer or spray booth at this facility. In regards to concerns about idling engines, he understands the concern, but what has changed is the technology in the engines. Engine manufacturers prohibit idling for warranty purposes, as it is not good on the engines. Rather than taking his word, he encouraged people to research it and find that idling is prohibited by manufacturers.

Mr. Sula asked the applicant to address the discrepancy with the number of parking stalls on the site. He noted that he believes the confusion is between the number of passenger vehicle spaces, versus truck/semi-truck spaces.

Mr. Schuhmacher stated that 112 spaces are automobile spaces and 233 truck spaces. Of the 112 automobile spaces, 5 of those are ADA spaces (handicapped parking stalls).

Ms. Gable stated that there was a question about how long construction would take and when would it begin, if this project is approved.

Mr. Doug Cayce stated that, depending on approval, he would anticipate construction to begin at the earliest in January of 2023 and be completed by October of 2023 (again, at the earliest).

Mr. Ziegler asked if the applicant has any crime data on any of their other sites.

Mr. Cayce stated that he does not. He noted that they have fencing, cameras, and lighting and that it is in their best interest to deter crime.

Approved

Mr. Ziegler stated that one of the questions was why this area. He indicated that there are not a lot of 26 acre vacant sites in town. He noted that there are some developed parcels but a lot of them have some "hair on them" and are not easily redeveloped. He noted that this parcel is shovel ready, in that it has all necessary public improvements already completed (storm water, utilities to the site, etc.). He also noted their access to the Tollway off of Rt. 120 and Rt. 21.

Mr. Cayce stressed that they are a business-to-business model. He heard a couple of comments about them bringing more traffic or drawing more truck traffic in. The traffic coming to the facility is the only additional traffic that will be generated and the traffic study reflects the low level of truck traffic and that the bulk of their traffic is during off-peak hours. In regards to them serving areas of McHenry County and southern Wisconsin, these are areas that they will go to with their vehicles or mobile parts vehicles. Mr. Cayce confirmed that while vehicles are being serviced, the overhead garage doors will be closed.

Ms. Velkover stated that the requirement for the overhead garage doors to be closed during the servicing of vehicles is a Village Code requirement.

Mr. Javier Millan, Traffic Engineer with KLOA, stated that he was answering the Chairman's earlier question about traffic generation from the previously approved office plan. He noted that the plan called for 461,000 sq. ft. of office space. He stated that the average trips for an office is 10-12 per 1,000 sq. ft. On the low end, this would be 4,610 trips daily. The peak hours would be much higher – almost 700 cars in both AM and PM peak hours – so this type of development would have a much bigger impact during peak hours than the proposed development.

Mr. Paff asked if the applicant actually drives trucks to a client's site for them to look at.

Mr. Cayce stated that does not happen very often. He stated that the sales people put proposals together and go out and meet with customers. The customer usually knows what the vehicle looks like and knows what he's buying because he has them already in his business. Therefore, they don't need to show the vehicles very often. Obviously, delivery of a vehicle would require the vehicle to be driven to the customer's location.

Mr. Morgan asked about the type of truck that is typically serviced.

Mr. Cayce stated that at this location it would most likely be heavy trucks and box trucks. He noted that it varies by location. He anticipates this location to be a mix of the two and he didn't know what that mix would look like at this time.

Mr. Sula asked if there is a difference in the amount of time that it takes to service a box truck versus a semi-cab.

Mr. Cayce stated that there is no real difference in the repair time between these vehicles. They all take around 4-5 hours to service as they are all diesel engines that have similar fail rates.



Approved

Mr. Sula stated that he is not certain there has been enough discussion about the sign request, including the request for additional height for the main ground sign.

Mr. Paff stated that he concurred. He asked what the grade change was between Rt. 21 and where the sign would be located. He asked for the applicant to identify on the site plan the location of the ground sign.

Ms. Velkover stated that the difference between the grade of Rt. 21 and the grade of where the sign is located is about 1 foot. She noted that the building sits about 10 feet below grade.

Mr. Sula asked if the site is flat from north to south.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the site also falls downhill from north to south, as well as from west to east.

Mr. Franke clarified that they are not requesting any departures or variations from what is required in regards to the number and/or size of plant material. He noted that as a Special Use the Board can create conditions regarding the maintenance of this material.

Mr. Sula reopened the floor to the public.

Regina Keller stated that the applicant said that their other locations were in areas near houses. She noted however, that it looks like they are in industrial areas. She stated that it is more appropriate to place this business in an industrial area rather than plopping it in the middle of a residential area.

Susan Kwiatkowski, stated that she believes the Village did a disservice to the residents of Heather Ridge. She noted that there are over 1,000 units in this neighborhood (2 entrances off of Rt. 21) and that there are a lot of Heather Ridge residents who aren't here tonight because they didn't know about this meeting. If this gets approved, she asked if the service time can be changed to no later than 9:00 or 10:00 p.m. so that the lights go down to a reasonable time to allow people to sleep.

Debbie Kowalczyk, Victorian Village, stated that she is over by Rt. 41 and that it is already really noisy in this area with the trucks that come off of Rt. 41. She stated that she just moved into the area in May (after living in Gurnee and moving out) and the overwhelming issues are noise and traffic. This use doesn't fit well.

Mr. Sula closed the floor to the public.

Mr. Cayce stated that they had a conference call with the Heather Ridge Homeowners Association Board and the Spinney Run Homeowners Association Board. They also met last Friday with the office complex managers (property to the north), as well as the owners of 2 of the businesses in that complex. He noted that they conducted 3 or 4 different Zoom call meetings after they contacted each of the Homeowners Associations (including Cobble Creek), which is really the best

Approved

way to make contact with the homeowners in the neighborhood because they do not have access to the addresses of each and every property owner in the subdivisions. He noted those Zoom calls were weeks ago. He can't speak to what type of notification was done from the HOAs to the residents. He noted that they would be happy to conduct additional meetings of this nature with the HOAs if this is something they want. In regards to the Gary location, there is residential directly across a small two lane road, medical facility directly to the west, and 45 acres of forest to the Their Elmhurst facility is directly across York Road (not nearly as wide as Rt. 21) from residential. He admitted that the side of the street that they are on is more industrial in nature, but directly across York Road is residential. He noted that the residential goes well east of that area. As for their Shorewood location, the back berm/fence corner is adjacent to one of Joliet's nicest residential communities. The rest of the area is admittedly industrial, but they do have this abutment to residential. In all of these areas they've never had a complaint about traffic or noise.

Mr. Nordentoft stated that some of his concerns still tie into the range of compatibility with the proposed use and the existing uses. If he looks at it in the broad sense of most zoning districts and uses, we typically try not to put high intensity uses next to lower intensity uses and instead use zoning districts to transition between these uses. From a compatibility standpoint, even though this is "commercial", it is a more intensive use across the street from less intensive uses. The Comprehensive Land Use Plan designation, as an office-campus, is less intensive than what is proposed. He pointed to noise, traffic, and hours of operation as elements that are more intensive. He stated that maybe there is middle ground such as restricted business hours (i.e., prior to midnight), or restricted use of the west overhead garage doors after a certain hour, reduced lighting, etc.

Mr. Paff stated that he understands what Mr. Nordentoft is saying. But he asked if not this use, what else could it be. He noted that a big box store like a Home Depot or a Lowe's would generate more traffic and noise. The office development, as indicated by the traffic consultant, would have a much greater impact on traffic, especially during peak hours. He stated that he understands residents' concerns, but something is going to develop on this property and this would have less impact than a number of uses. As for office, besides the additional traffic, there just isn't a demand for it as there are many examples of businesses closing large office developments. He noted that Pfizer has vacated 4 office buildings in their business park. He noted there is also C-2 directly across the street from this, so it is not a stretch for this property, which fronts a state highway, to carry commercial zoning. As for the specific type of business proposed, a truck dealership, he did research and looked at the applicant's traffic study, and it doesn't appear that the use will generate much additional traffic.

Mr. Sula stated that, although the PZB does not look at the economics of a proposal, the goal of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan is to provide a balanced community with opportunities for businesses so that the Village can support the provision of services for its residents. He stated that he is not bothered by the proposed commercial zoning request. He asked staff if the Village has received any comments from the medical office complex to the north.

Approved

Staff responded that they had not received any comments from the medical complex owners/tenants/managers.

Mr. Sula stated that is telling. He asked about the directional signage request. He stated that they are roughly twice the allowed size and contain a commercial message.

Ms. Velkover stated that the Village's sign ordinance allows direction signs up to 4 sq. ft. in size. The proposal is for signs that are 9 sq. ft. This requires a special use permit. She noted that most of the signs, if you look at their sign plans, only utilize a portion of the 9 sq. ft. In addition, code does not allow the signs to contain any commercial message. Basically, they are for signage such as "service (with an arrow)" or "customer parking (with an arrow)". In the applicant's case, they are installing the TransChicago name/logo on these signs, which requires a Minor Sign Exception for a commercial message.

Mr. Sula asked if anyone had any questions about the departures to the exterior elevations (west wall). He asked if this still required PZB action.

Ms. Gable stated that the departure to the roof variation, as well to the wall transparency percentage, requires a Design Standard Modification, which is reviewed by the PZB. She noted that the PZB has final decision making authority in this matter.

Mr. Paff stated that he doesn't think the elevation looks bad because of the depth changes and changes in color other architectural features.

Mr. Sula concurs that the wall does not look monotonous to him. In regards to the landscaping, he confirmed with staff that the number and size of trees and shrubs on site meets code, it's just that they are not in islands created interior to the site. This is not an unusual request for vehicle dealerships as it is difficult since the lots carry their inventory and not just parked cars during business hours.

Ms. Velkover clarified that not only does the applicant provide the number and size of trees and shrubs required by code, but they also provide the amount of green space required by code, it's just not internal to the parking lot as required. They did this by increasing the setbacks to Rt. 21 and Manchester.

Mr. Sula stated that, from his perspective, the requirement for the internal parking lot landscaping is an aesthetic issue for the consumer using the parking lot.

Ms. Velkover noted that this is not something unique to this dealership. Nearly every dealership in town has sought and received a departure from this requirement.

Mr. Paff stated that the ground sign height might be needed to see over the trucks that will be on the display pad.

Approved

The applicant pointed to the location of the display pad and the location of the ground sign on the site plan.

Mr. Paff asked is any of the signs along Grand Avenue are 18 feet in height.

Mr. Ziegler stated that the Rohrman sign, at Grand and Tri-State Parkway, is 18 feet tall.

Mr. Morgan motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Village Board on the petition of Patson Inc. d/b/a TransChicago Truck Group for a Zoning Map Amendment to rezone property located at 775 S. IL Route 21 from O-2 PUD, Office Campus District as a Planned Unit Development, to C-2, Community Commercial District.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Nordentoft, Paff, Ware, and Sula

Nays: Morgan

Abstain: None

Motion Carried: 4-1-0

Mr. Morgan motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Village Board on the petition of Patson Inc. d/b/a TransChicago Truck Group for Special Use Permit for property located at 775 S. Route 21, to allow the establishment and operation of a vehicle (truck) dealership with outdoor storage and display in substantial conformance with the attached plans, subject to the conditions that the fencing proposed to the south of the building (west of the internal drive) be 8-foot tall wrought-iron fencing and that the security lighting, if triggered by motion, brighten to full illumination for up to 5 minutes.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Paff, Ware, and Sula

Nays: Morgan and Nordentoft

Abstain: None

Motion Carried: 3-2-0

Mr. Morgan motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Village Board on the petition of Patson Inc. d/b/a TransChicago Truck Group for Special Use Permit for property located at 775 S. Route 21, to allow directional signage associated with the proposed dealership to each be 9 sq. ft. in size.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Paff

Nays: Morgan, Nordentoft, and Sula

Abstain: Ware

Motion Failed: 1-3-1

Approved

Mr. Morgan motioned, seconded by Ms. Ware, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Village Board on the petition of Patson Inc. d/b/a TransChicago Truck Group for Special Use Permit for property located at 775 S. Route 21, to allow departures from the parking lot landscaping island requirements and the requirement that 10% of area internal to the parking lot/display lot be landscaped (green).

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Paff, Ware, and Sula

Nays: Morgan and Nordentoft

Abstain: None

Motion Carried: 3-2-0

Mr. Morgan motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to forward a favorable recommendation to the Village Board on the petition of Patson Inc. d/b/a TransChicago Truck Group for Site Plan Review on property located at 775 S. Route 21, in substantial conformance with the submitted plans.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Paff, Ware, and Sula

Nays: Morgan and Nordentoft

Abstain: None

Motion Carried: 3-2-0

Mr. Morgan motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to approve the following Minor Sign Exceptions for Patson Inc. d/b/a TransChicago Truck Group on property located at 775 S. Route 21:

1. Minor Sign Exception to allow the height of the main ground sign to increase by 50% (from 12 feet to 18 feet).
2. Minor Sign Exception to allow a commercial message on directional signage.

Ayes: Paff

Nays: Morgan, Nordentoft, Ware, and Sula

Abstain: None

Motion Failed: 1-4-0

Mr. Morgan motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to approve the following Design Standard Modifications for Patson Inc. d/b/a TransChicago Truck Group on property located at 775 S. Route 21:

1. Departure from the building design requirement that the west elevation, which is over 100 feet in length, to have a minimum 2 feet vertical variation in roof height that is repeated, on-center, no more than every 50 linear feet.
2. Departure from the requirement that the west elevation provide at least 50% transparency between 2 and 10 feet above grade.

Approved

Ayes: Paff and Sula

Nays: Morgan and Nordentoft

Abstain: Ware

Motion Failed: 2-2-1

#### **5. Next Meeting Date: October 19, 2022**

Mr. Sula asked if there are items on the agenda for the next meeting. Ms. Gable stated that there would likely be a public hearing.

#### **6. Public Comment**

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

#### **7. Adjournment**

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

Voice Vote:

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

Motion Carried: 5-0-0

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joann Metzger,  
Recording Secretary, Planning and Zoning Board