

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

VILLAGE OF GURNEE
PLAN COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING
held
April 7, 1999
7:30 p.m.

GURNEE MUNICIPAL BUILDING
325 North O'Plaine Road
Gurnee, Illinois

- PLAN COMMISSION:
DONALD RUDNY, Chairman
JIM SULA
KRISTINA KOVARIK
CARL CEPON
LYLE FOSTER
BILL SMITH
BRYAN WINTER

- ALSO PRESENT:
JON WILDENBERG
TRACY VELKOVER
BARBARA SWANSON

Reported by: VIRGINIA A. GAISER, CSR
CSR License No. 084-003887

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

2

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Village Plan Commission
2 will now come to order. Can we have a roll call,
3 please.

4 MS. VELKOVER: Winter.

5 MR. WINTER: Here.

6 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.

7 MR. FOSTER: Here.

8 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.

9 MR. SMITH: Here.

10 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.

11 MR. SULA: Here.

12 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.

13 MS. KOVARIK: Here.

14 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.

15 MR. CEPON: Here.

16 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Here. Will you all
18 please join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

19 (Pledge of Allegiance recited)

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: First we have the
21 approval of the February 24, 1999 Plan Commission

22 minutes.

23 Any additions or corrections?

24 (No response)

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

3

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: If not I'll entertain a

2 motion to accept them as presented.

3 MR. SULA: So moved.

4 MR. SMITH: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All those in favor of

6 the motion say aye.

7 MR. WINTER: Aye.

8 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

9 MR. SMITH: Aye.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye

11 MR. CEPON: Aye.

12 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

13 MR. SULA: Aye.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Opposed nay.

15 (No response)

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion carries.

17 Next there is approval of the

18 March 17, 1999 Plan Commission minutes. Again,

19 any additions or corrections?

20 (No response)

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'd entertain a motion
22 to accept them as presented.

23 MR. CEPON: I'll so move.

24 MR. FOSTER: Second.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

4

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All those in favor say
2 aye.

3 MR. WINTER: Aye.

4 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

5 MR. SMITH: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye

7 MR. CEPON: Aye.

8 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Opposed nay.

10 (No response)

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion carries.

12 MR. SULA: I'm abstaining on that because
13 I was wasn't at the meeting.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I should have
15 asked for exceptions. Sorry about that.

16 Next is approval of the March 17,

17 1999 Joint Planning Commission and Zoning Board of
18 Appeals minutes.

19 Any additions or corrections?

20 (No response)

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: If not, I'll entertain a
22 motion to accept them as presented.

23 MR. FOSTER: I would make that motion.

24 MR. CEPON: Second.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

5

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We have a motion and a
2 second. All those in favor say aye.

3 MR. WINTER: Aye.

4 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

5 MR. SMITH: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye.

7 MR. CEPON: Aye.

8 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Opposed nay.

10 (No response)

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Abstain?

12 MR. SULA: Abstain.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion carries.

14 Next matter is the Vacation of
15 Public Property: Alley located south of Grand
16 Avenue and east of Briar Avenue.

17 Mr. Smith has requested vacation of
18 an alley located between Lots 5, 6, 7 -- 5, 6, 7,
19 8 and 9 in F.H. Bartlett's North Shore Garden
20 Subdivision, Block 1.

21 The subject property is generally
22 located south of Grand Avenue and east of Briar
23 Avenue.

24 Tracy, can you fill us in on that,

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

6

1 please.

2 MS. VELKOVER: Just as you said the
3 property is located south of Grand Avenue to the
4 east of Briar Avenue. Mr. Smith does own the land
5 on both sides of this alley and is therefore
6 requesting the vacation of this alley.

7 Our procedure is to circulate it to
8 the various department heads to insure that they
9 do not have any concerns with the vacation. They
10 have all signed off on the vacation indicating no
11 concerns with it.

12 At this point we do need a
13 recommendation from the Plan Commission on the
14 vacation. Once we do have a recommendation, then
15 we will have an appraisal completed for the
16 property, and then an offer will be made to
17 purchase the property for a percentage of the
18 appraised value.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is Mr. Smith here?

20 MR. SMITH: Yes, I am.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Any questions of
22 Mr. Smith?

23 (No response)

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: If not, I'll entertain a

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

7

1 motion to forward a favorable recommendation to
2 the Village Board regarding this matter.

3 MR. SMITH: So moved.

4 MR. CEPON: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Moved by Mr. Smith;
6 Seconded by Mr. Cepon.

7 All those in favor of the motion
8 signify by saying aye in the roll call.

9 Tracy, will you take the roll call,
10 please.
11 MS. VELKOVER: Winter.
12 MR. WINTER: Aye.
13 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.
14 MR. FOSTER: Aye.
15 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.
16 MR. SMITH: Aye.
17 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.
18 MR. SULA: Aye.
19 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.
20 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.
21 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.
22 MR. CEPON: Aye.
23 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.
24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries and

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

8

1 is so ordered.
2 MR. SMITH: Thank you.
3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.
4 (Attorney Swanson enters proceedings)
5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Next matter is the Final
6 Plat of Subdivision: Fourth Re-subdivision of the

7 Gurnee Center for Commerce and Industry, Unit B.

8 Subject property consists of

9 approximately 1.7 acres located at the

10 intersection of Grove Avenue and Estes Avenue.

11 The property is zoned I-2 PUD and is part of the

12 Gurnee Center of Commerce and Industry Planned

13 Unit Development.

14 The owner is requesting to subdivide

15 the property into three lots.

16 Tracy, will you fill us in on that.

17 MS. VELKOVER: We have an overhead of the

18 plat of subdivision.

19 As you indicated this is part of the

20 Gurnee Center for Commerce and Industry, and this

21 piece of property is zoned I-2 as part of a

22 Planned Unit Development.

23 The PUD agreement for this property

24 requires a minimum of 15,000 square feet for an

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 I-2 piece of property and minimum lot width of 70

2 feet.

3 They are proposing to subdivide it

4 into three lots. Each lot conforms to the lot
5 size and lot width standard in this PUD. Full
6 public improvements are already installed in this
7 area.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is the petitioner
9 present?

10 MR. SCHROEDER: My name is Steve
11 Schroeder, and I'm here on behalf of the bank
12 property.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any questions from the
14 Plan Commissioners?

15 (No response)

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'll entertain at this
17 particular time a motion to forward a favorable
18 recommendation to the Village Board regarding this
19 matter.

20 MR. CEPON: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a
21 motion to approve the resubdivisions.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion by Mr. Cepon.

23 MR. FOSTER: I'll second.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All those in favor of

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 the motion signify by saying aye in the roll call.

2 Tracy, will you take the roll call,

3 please.

4 MS. VELKOVER: Winter.

5 MR. WINTER: Aye.

6 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.

7 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

8 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.

9 MR. SMITH: Aye.

10 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.

11 MR. SULA: Aye.

12 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.

13 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

14 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.

15 MR. CEPON: Aye.

16 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries and

18 is so ordered.

19 MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

21 Next matter is final plat of

22 subdivision for Norwen Resubdivision. The subject

23 property consists of approximately 1.5 acres

24 located at the northwest corner of Delaney Road

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 and Grove Avenue.

2 The property is zoned C/B-2 PUD and
3 is part of the Gurnee Center for Commerce and
4 Industry Planned Unit Development. The owner is
5 requesting to subdivide the property into two lots
6 and one outlot.

7 Tracy, can you fill us in on that?

8 MS. VELKOVER: As you indicated this is
9 part of the Gurnee Center for Commerce and
10 Industry was the last parcel. This parcel is
11 C/B-2 PUD. And in the PUD agreement it has a
12 minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet and a
13 minimum lot width of 75 feet. They are proposing
14 to subdivide it into two buildable lots that do
15 meet the lot width and lot size requirements.

16 They are also proposing to subdivide
17 part of each lot into an outlot to be dedicated to
18 the Village of Gurnee.

19 There's some floodplain in this area
20 that's also adjacent to a dry detention basin just
21 directly to the north of the Gurnee Center for
22 Commerce and Industry and as floodplain properties
23 and the ability to expand dry detention basin, the
24 ability to do that with the Village is something

1 that we would like to encourage, therefore we have
2 requested that they dedicate this property to us.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do we have any
4 questions?

5 (No response)

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is the petitioner here?

7 MR. GALT: Yes, sir. My name is Rick
8 Galt. I'm manager of real estate development for
9 Norwen Properties.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: No questions. I'll
11 entertain a motion for a favorable recommendation
12 to the Village Board regarding this matter.

13 MR. SULA: So moved.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Moved by Sula. Seconded
15 by Mr. Cepon.

16 All in favor of the motion signify by aye
17 in the roll call. Roll call, please.

18 MS. VELKOVER: Winter.

19 MR. WINTER: Aye.

20 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.

21 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

22 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.

23 MR. SMITH: Aye.

24 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

13

1 MR. SULA: Aye.

2 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.

3 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

4 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.

5 MR. CEPON: Aye.

6 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries and
8 is so ordered. Thank you. Okay.

9 The next matter is the continued
10 public hearing of the Daly Group. The subject
11 property consists of approximately 22 acres
12 located south of Grand Avenue and west of
13 Stonebrook Drive.

14 The petitioner is requesting to:

15 (i) rezone a 14-acre parcel from NC/SP
16 Neighborhood Conservation/Special Park and NC/HC,
17 Neighborhood Conservation/Highway Commercial, in
18 unincorporated Lake County to a Planned Unit
19 Development (PUD) with underlying C/B-2, Community
20 Business zoning in Gurnee; and (ii) obtain

21 preliminary PUD plat approval for a commercial
22 shopping center on the above-noted 14-acre parcel
23 as well as an 8-acre parcel that is zoned C/B-2
24 PUD and has Conceptual PUD plat approval for

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

14

1 commercial uses.

2 Tracy, do you have anything you'd like to
3 add?

4 MS. VELKOVER: Just that this is a
5 continuation from a previous public hearing and
6 since the last meeting the petitioner has made
7 some revisions to the plan and they're here to
8 present those revisions.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Since this is a
10 public hearing anyone who is with the petitioner
11 and also anyone from the public -- we will open
12 the floor to the public at a later time -- if you
13 can stand and be sworn in by our village attorney.

14 (Witnesses sworn)

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. So the petitioner
16 may proceed.

17 MR. HOAG: I'm Bill Hoag. I'm with the
18 Dalan Group.

19 We were here several weeks ago
20 initially presenting our plan for the 22-acre
21 parcel that is bounded by Grand on the north,
22 Stonebrook on the east, the Concord homes on the
23 west and several subdivisions on the south.

24 Since we last met we tried to take

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

15

1 into account the comments that were forthcoming at
2 the last Plan Commission meeting and subsequently
3 meetings with several of the homeowners' groups,
4 meetings with Chairman Rudny and meetings with
5 staff.

6 These comments were taken in good
7 faith, and we've tried to respond to as many of
8 them as possible, tried accommodate as many as
9 possible and tried to at least comment on those we
10 couldn't accommodate.

11 Our site plan has been amended in
12 many different ways, and I will ask Tony Cassata,
13 our architect, to describe those changes. I will
14 also ask Steve Grabowski, our traffic engineer, to
15 describe the traffic comments and revisions that

16 we've made.
17 My comment initially is a general
18 one and that is based upon the comments that were
19 made and based upon the meetings that we had, I
20 think we have to start out by looking at Gurnee
21 itself.

22 Many would say Gurnee is blessed;
23 some would say it's cursed from the standpoint it
24 is a regional retail destination market. And

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

16

1 because of that this particular site we feel,
2 strongly feel, is therefore a regional retail
3 destination.

4 Because of that many of the users
5 who have expressed interest in the site and with
6 whom we've reached tentative agreements are
7 regional and national users who have come to the
8 marketplace because they believe as many others
9 have and have proven this is a market that works
10 for them.

11 At the same time we've tried to
12 accommodate within our site neighborhood uses as
13 well in addition to these regional users of, let's

14 say anywhere from 15,000 to 35,000 square feet.
15 There is certainly a need, we feel, and certainly
16 the wherewithal to provide for many neighborhood
17 and lesser regional uses.

18 We have to deal with the site here,
19 and this site is restrictive and constrictive. By
20 that I mean it is long and narrow.

21 It becomes longer and narrower
22 because of considerations by the Village for the
23 homeowners and for the frontage on Grand Avenue to
24 provide for setbacks and environmental protection

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

17

1 to make the usable area that much more restrictive
2 in terms of its narrowness.

3 It is also not a site that is
4 located on a major intersection. It is located on
5 Grand Avenue and, therefore, the marketability of
6 this site is based upon something very positive,
7 and that is its frontage on Grand Avenue.

8 Taking that all into account we
9 tried to accommodate both our major users and our
10 lesser users. When I say lesser, I don't mean in

11 stature. I mean in size. And as you can see from
12 our plan, the major users have been accommodated
13 for the most part on the eastern side of our plan
14 as far away from the residential connection so to
15 speak as possible.

16 If you can look at the overhead, the
17 uses of Linens and Things, Babies are Us, Cost
18 Plus and to a lesser extent Krause Furniture are
19 structured on the eastern side of the complex with
20 a parking field in front of them. One home
21 basically is contiguous to the Krause Furniture
22 building and somewhat to the Cost Plus building.

23 The other direct contiguities to the
24 site in terms of homes are on the western boundary

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

18

1 of the site, and there we've made some major
2 changes to provide more setback and more
3 protection for those homeowners. Tony will get
4 into that in a minute.

5 Once we took care of these major
6 users who want to be in this marketplace and feel
7 they have a place in this marketplace, that
8 comprised about 65 to 70 percent of the area of

9 the shopping center. It left obviously 30 to 35
10 percent of uses that we felt could be turned into
11 a town center type of complex. Those uses you can
12 see are from an in-line standpoint toward the
13 middle of the property with lesser depths and then
14 a separate -- three separate buildings. Two of
15 them front on Grand Avenue, and one is over in the
16 western section of the site.

17 What we've tried to do here is
18 something that is difficult yet doable, and I
19 think is in response to several of the centers
20 that were presented to us as examples.

21 What we've tried to do there is make
22 them as user-friendly as possible and to provide
23 physical connections and protection to the rest of
24 the center using this focal point as a way of

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

19

1 doing that.

2 When we were presented with several
3 other developments as examples, those developments
4 that we were presented with were first of all on a
5 major intersection; secondly, were neighborhood

6 centers where the users were 1,000 to 5,000 square
7 feet that does and doesn't apply to our situation;
8 and, thirdly, provided rationally to a certain
9 extent little or no protection to its neighbors,
10 their neighbors I should say.

11 For the most part they didn't have
12 to. They weren't contiguous to a residential use,
13 and we are as the Village particularly sensitive
14 to that use.

15 So what we've tried to do here is to
16 respond first of all from a site plan standpoint;
17 secondly, from a traffic standpoint as Steve will
18 address; and, thirdly, to address other issues
19 that were raised at the last meeting in a way that
20 I hope is specific.

21 And maybe I can point out before I
22 let Tony go on with the presentation -- point out
23 a couple of minor answers to questions -- I
24 shouldn't say minor -- answers to questions that

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

20

1 were raised.

2 One is truck traffic. It was raised
3 three or four times at the last meeting. We are

4 fortunate here. We are not our neighbor to the
5 east. We have a semitruck traffic volume of no
6 more than three per day for the center. I
7 verified this with all of our users.

8 We basically have about 20 semis per
9 week. Those deliveries are made during normal
10 business hours. The only non-normal business use
11 of a semitrailer is a drop-off periodically by
12 Linens and Things where they will drop of a
13 trailer during normal business hours, let it stand
14 there for the night. The truck is not there. The
15 truck has left. And the next morning it is
16 emptied, and the trailer is taken away.

17 Other than that, normal business
18 hours, no more than 20 semis per week. The rest
19 of the truck traffic in our center is basically
20 van-type of traffic. It is light because of our
21 use. None of these users are heavy semi users.
22 They don't have to be. They are not food users.
23 They are not a user of the type of Home Depot.
24 They are very light volume semi users.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 Secondly, garbage and trash and
2 construction, all of which sort of comes together.
3 First of all, I think the first step is to clarify
4 with everybody that none of our construction
5 traffic will enter this site anywhere but Grand
6 Avenue.

7 No trucks will enter during the
8 construction period. No vehicles will enter
9 during the construction period on any street but
10 Grand Avenue. And we can easily take care of that
11 by blocking off any potential on Stonebrook or
12 anyplace else.

13 Secondly, in terms of protection for
14 the site during construction, it is our desire, it
15 is our goal, to build the berm as quickly as
16 possible to eliminate -- I shouldn't say eliminate
17 -- but certainly minimize and give protection to
18 the entire site and more importantly to our
19 neighbors by providing a barrier.

20 Thirdly, during the construction
21 process we offer to both the homeowners and to the
22 Village the idea that we would like to set up, for
23 want of a better expression, a Steering Committee
24 whereby specifications and stringent requirements

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 are set up that we have to adhere to and meet with
2 representatives of the village and of the
3 homeowners' groups to make sure that we are not
4 straying from those requirements.

5 In terms of the development once
6 it's done, basically the same thing applies. We
7 have a reciprocal easement agreement that we are
8 signing with each of our tenants that requires
9 them to do certain things. It requires us to do
10 certain things.

11 We are happy to share the terms of
12 that agreement with the Village and with the
13 homeowners groups and provide them with language
14 and obviously with the enforcement that allows
15 them to be comfortable with what they may have
16 perceived to have happened in other centers -- I
17 shouldn't say perceived -- what they have see
18 happen in other centers.

19 You can never guarantee it's not
20 going to happen. You certainly can provide the
21 dialogue, and you can provide the wherewithal so
22 that it doesn't happen here.

23 In each case we will have a
24 representative available to you. There will be a

1 representative during the construction period, the
2 general contractor. There will be a
3 representative of our firm who runs our
4 construction during the period of time that the
5 project is in operation.

6 There will be a property management
7 firm who will be handling this property. That
8 representative will be made known, and periodic
9 meetings will take place as often as is required.

10 Several minor issues just to raise
11 at this point in time. I think most importantly
12 I'd like to turn it over to Tony Cassata to
13 discuss how we've tried to respond to the various
14 comments and issues that were raised over the past
15 three weeks to hopefully improve and make people
16 more comfortable with what we're trying to do
17 here.

18 Tony.

19 MR. CASSATA: Can you hear me if I speak
20 from here without the microphone?

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I think because
22 the people in the audience would like to hear you

23 if you could use the microphone.

24 MR. CASSATA: My name is Tony Cassata.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

24

1 I'm with PFDA Architects. Our office is at

2 20 North Wacker, Chicago.

3 What I'd like to do is discuss the

4 internal site plan and building changes that --

5 and I should say improvements -- that we've made

6 based on the last Plan Commission meeting as well

7 as subsequent meetings that we had with staff.

8 One of the major changes that we

9 brought, we made, was due to a point that was

10 brought up at the Plan Commission meeting which we

11 really we agreed with.

12 There was a problem of the driveway

13 circulation within the site plan that had the

14 driveway, most of the driveways throughout the

15 site, kind of unclear. And not only that, but

16 they, a lot of the driveways, had parking backing

17 into them.

18 In our revised site plan, I believe

19 that we've done an excellent job of taking care of

20 that problem. We have created virtually a ring

21 road around two parking areas that have no -- that
22 have no parking backing into them.

23 The main drive along the center is
24 30 feet wide. The drive coming down from Grand

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

25

1 Avenue is an isolated drive. There is no parking
2 backing into it, and there are islands on either
3 side of it.

4 The driveway at Brookside on this
5 plan, since we are no longer dedicating Brookside
6 we have been able to change that configuration and
7 also improve the circulation on that.

8 There was a concern as we have a
9 drive-up bank and the route. The bank again had
10 drive aisles that had parking on it. We have now
11 eliminated that. We have a drive aisle without
12 parking.

13 It's very clear where the stacking
14 lanes would be for the drivethrough. There is one
15 area, small area, here where it is a drive-in. It
16 has parking backed into it, but we've made that
17 drive 30 feet wide in order to accommodate that.

18 Access to the outlots has been
19 improved. Their access is directly off of the two
20 drives coming in with the exception of the bank.
21 But there was a direct drive without parking
22 coming off of the drive, off of the
23 right-in-right-out.
24 The other concern was the approach

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

26

1 into our center off of Stonebrook. There seemed
2 to be a great concern of vehicles, especially
3 trucks, that would come out of the center and make
4 a right-hand turn and go south on Stonebrook into
5 the residential areas.

6 In order to eliminate that problem
7 and still be able to serve the center in the
8 appropriate way that we needed for deliveries and
9 access for customers that may be coming in at the
10 light at Stonebrook, we have provided a right-in
11 and a left-out-only configuration at the entrance
12 drive. By doing that we are physically
13 prohibiting any vehicle from making a right-hand
14 turn and heading south on Stonebrook.

15 In addition to that we have improved

16 the entrance off of Stonebrook by again putting a
17 dedicated drive without parking backing into it.
18 And at the traffic engineer's recommendation we
19 have taken out the S-curve that we had in here and
20 have straightened that curve.

21 At the same time we've taken care to
22 make sure that at this intersection we do not
23 block the sight lines for any cars approaching and
24 turning at that intersection.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

27

1 We have used the City's formula of
2 putting a 35-foot triangle at the intersection of
3 the two pavements and making sure that all
4 structures are set back behind that point.

5 One of the big concerns -- and this
6 was an item that was brought up by the chairman --
7 that the center that we were proposing appeared to
8 be just a very ordinary strip center.

9 At the Plan Commission meeting when
10 the question was asked two or three times we
11 really honestly didn't have an answer. We didn't
12 know how to respond at that time, and it was

13 obvious we didn't have an answer.
14 We wanted to get a better
15 understanding of what the feel was for what our
16 center should be like. We were given some
17 examples that we toured. We met with the
18 chairman, and we toured a few of the centers and
19 got an idea of what was felt would be improvements
20 to our center.

21 What we were able to do was to take
22 the area that is away from the three major anchor
23 stores that we have, the Linens and Things, Babies
24 R Us and Borders, and we took the area where the

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

28

1 smaller tenants were, and we pushed those
2 buildings back as far as we could.

3 By doing that we created a large
4 area in front of these buildings which we felt we
5 could work with in terms of creating a very
6 comfortable, attractive and safe pedestrian area
7 for people who are shopping at the small shops and
8 then traversing that area to go from one anchor to
9 the other.

10 By moving these buildings back, we

11 created a variety of different sizes of spaces
12 within the so-called sidewalk area. The spaces
13 range at the minimum in front of the anchor stores
14 at 12 feet, and the small retail stores in the
15 center have spaces anywhere from 20 to 25 feet
16 back.

17 We then determined that we wanted to
18 create an interesting path for people to walk as
19 they're walking from one anchor to the other and
20 walking along the storefronts.

21 I have a -- I don't know how well --
22 I apologize. We didn't have enough time to get a
23 color transparency, so we're putting up a
24 black-and-white transparency so that the room can

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

29

1 see.

2 What we've created in that area is a
3 series of planting areas and seeding areas for
4 people to use to make it as attractive as
5 possible. We've included ornamental lighting
6 which is over and above the overall lighting that
7 we have for the center. We have approximately --

8 proposing about 24 of these ornamental light
9 poles.

10 And throughout the area as you walk
11 through you encounter a variety of pavement,
12 different types of pavement. We accentuated the
13 areas at the entrances with pavers and then with
14 planting areas of various different sizes mixed in
15 with the seating areas, benches as you see.

16 In addition to that we've taken the
17 canopies of the buildings from between the extreme
18 anchors and have provided a covered walkway so
19 that pedestrians can walk under cover all the way
20 from one anchor store to the other in addition to
21 the walkways outside the covered area.

22 Those covered areas are provided by
23 the solid canopy areas as well as the softer
24 fabric awnings that are seen in these areas here.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

30

1 I have a sample board of materials that we're
2 proposing to use on the building.

3 These are for the most part the same
4 materials that we showed you before, however we've
5 made two major changes which we feel are

6 beneficial to the character that we're trying to
7 exhibit with this building. We've deleted the
8 standing seam metal roofing that we have on the
9 pitched roof, and we've replaced that with a
10 shingled roof.

11 And then on the -- all of the
12 colonnades that form the covered walkway, we've
13 replaced the block base that we have in columns
14 with the stone. This is -- it's a synthetic stone
15 but gives the appearance of real stone, and it's
16 very sturdy.

17 The canopies will be constructed of
18 the cement plaster material and in two colors.
19 Then the brick tiers will be of this color brick,
20 the base of the buildings that are beyond this
21 small area that we've talked about here.

22 But the stores, the major stores
23 beyond, would be of a rock face, rock face base,
24 on top of which is a stone band and then followed

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 again by the brick. So we have a variety of the
2 materials throughout the building.

3 The masonry materials that we're
4 using at the front of the building are going to be
5 wrapped around and used along the back of the
6 building.

7 So we feel that we've been able with
8 a limited amount of space that we have, we've been
9 able to provide quite an interesting pedestrian
10 area as opposed to our previous design which was
11 pretty much linear.

12 In addition to this, the landscaping
13 within the center area, we've widened the
14 sidewalks along the entire face of the building
15 and we've provided not only sidewalks but also
16 plantings against all of the buildings so all of
17 the foundations of all the buildings will be
18 planted with shrubbery and perennials.

19 Going back to the site plan we've
20 been able to provide -- actually increase the
21 amount of parking that even though we decreased
22 the amount of area of the buildings we've been
23 able to increase the amount of parking.

24 We are now at 818 parking spaces

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 which is five cars per thousand based on
2 88 percent of the gross building area. So, in
3 essence, we feel that we're providing
4 approximately 18 more cars than what we feel is
5 needed and also what was recommended by the city's
6 traffic engineer in terms of the amount of parking
7 required at peak use of the shopping center.

8 From our original plan we've reduced
9 the number of outlots. We had four outlots
10 before, and now we have three, the bank and these
11 two buildings here.

12 One of the other changes that we
13 made which was beneficial to the residents on this
14 side was we took part of the detention area that
15 was in here, and we distributed along the west
16 side of the property.

17 By doing that we've been able to
18 accomplish a few things. We've been able to
19 distance this building from the -- from the
20 residents here. And, well, I guess that's the
21 primary thing that we've been able to do.

22 As you can see from this section
23 here we've previously had the 60-foot landscape
24 buffer, and then we had the driveway which was

1 here and the building. By adding the detention
2 back here we've been able to push the building
3 another 55 feet back which -- we then have the
4 drive. Excuse me.

5 One of the -- on the previous
6 presentation that we made to you, we had indicated
7 that in doing our site lighting plan for the
8 center that we would do pole-mounted fixtures
9 mounted at 25 feet.

10 In further looking at the plan, we
11 realized that by using the 25-foot-high poles and
12 trying -- and meeting the requirements that we and
13 our tenants have in terms of the footcandle level,
14 a minimum footcandle level, throughout the parking
15 area that the 25-foot-high mounting height would
16 require light poles approximately 60 feet on
17 center. That we felt would create really a sea of
18 light posts, a forest of light posts throughout
19 the parking lot.

20 Understanding that we looked at the
21 site lines and saw that from the critical points
22 of the residences on the west as well as at a
23 section of the residences on the south -- but when
24 we took the view lines from what would be a

1 second-story window on the building to the -- just
2 to the west of the Retail A building, we found
3 that if we had a little higher pole in the parking
4 area along the main parking area that the
5 visibility because of the height of the building
6 and the distance from the property line that there
7 would be no -- you would never be able to see the
8 light fixtures as you can see if you were to take
9 projection of view, go over the parapet of the
10 building.

11 You'd be way above the light
12 fixture. You'd never be able to see that. There
13 is one area that we felt might -- there might be a
14 chance of visibility, and that would be if you
15 were looking out the window of this house here and
16 looking at an angle --

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you put that
18 up?

19 MR. CASSATA: This house here looking at
20 an angle, you would be able to see the poles in
21 this area here. For that reason we're -- we will
22 keep the low poles in this area here.

23 However, in this area of the parking
24 lot we're requesting a special use to go to a

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

35

1 30-foot pole. By doing that we would accomplish
2 the goals that we're trying to achieve in terms of
3 minimum footcandles and at the same time lowering
4 the maximum footcandle. We'd have by going up 5
5 more feet we're able to be spread the lighting
6 further. And by doing that we have overlapping
7 light from two different poles, and we're able to
8 provide the minimum requirement.

9 This is the other section showing
10 the line through the homes on Buchanan. And as
11 you can see this is the worst condition. This is
12 the house that's closest to the property line.
13 And again this is the Cost Plus building which is
14 one of the lower buildings.

15 So in any other location the
16 condition would be better yet. But as you see the
17 minimum building would obstruct the sight line to
18 the point that it would still be above the
19 30-foot-high pole by about 5 feet. So we feel

20 that by going with the higher pole there, we're
21 able to achieve pretty much a good quality of
22 light without creating any glare into any of the
23 residences.

24 We've also -- go back to the site

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

36

1 plan -- the requirement for landscape setback
2 along Grand Avenue is 50 feet, and we have
3 attempted to increase that area as much as
4 possible.

5 Along the whole area between the
6 west property line and Brookside we've increased
7 that 50-foot buffer by a minimum of 20 feet
8 100 percent of the way. In the area between
9 Brookside and the driveway to the east we've been
10 able to increase that 50-foot setback in
11 40 percent of the area.

12 And then from the east driveway to
13 the east property line, we've been able to
14 increase the 50-foot landscaping up to 75 feet for
15 75 percent of the area. By doing that we're able
16 to increase the amount of landscaping that we have
17 along Grand Avenue and also provide -- create a

18 situation so that the detention area is not one
19 long, straight line. And that could have a
20 variety of densities of plantings along the
21 street.

22 The signs that were proposed for the
23 entrance at Brookside and at this entrance here --
24 we've diminished the size of this sign. Since

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

37

1 this is a secondary entrance, officially these two
2 signs were the same height, and we were able to
3 reduce this sign to 18 feet. There was some
4 concern that the Dominick's Center here does not
5 have a sign, and we have proposed a sign at the
6 Stonebrook entrance, and we have also agreed to
7 delete that sign.

8 I believe I've covered most of the
9 changes. If there are any that you're aware of --
10 Thank you.

11 MR. HOAG: Thank you, Tony. Maybe I'm
12 repeating something that Tony went through, but
13 Building A on the western side -- maybe Tony
14 commented on that -- but the same canopy effect is

15 being created over there that we're creating in
16 the middle of the project.

17 MR. CASSATA: No, I didn't mention that.

18 The multi-tenant building, what is Retail A here,
19 we plan to treat that architecturally pretty much
20 the same way that we're treating the small store
21 area and this in here.

22 There might be a variety of these
23 same elements. They might not be an exact
24 reproduction, but we tend to use the same

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

38

1 materials, same type of covered canopy and have --
2 we plan to put a tower at this point, perhaps
3 similar to this, perhaps a little bit higher.
4 That creates an anchor as you're coming down into
5 the center.

6 One thing I did not mention was that
7 along with the improvement of the walk along the
8 storefronts we've also provided for a wider
9 sidewalk coming from Grand Avenue down to our to
10 -- to the site along Brookside as well as the
11 driveway to the east. And along that driveway
12 we'll be putting the planting areas as well as the

13 ornamental lighting that we have along the
14 building here.

15 Any questions?

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think we'll leave the
17 questions for later. I think we'll hear your
18 traffic guy.

19 MR. HOAG: Yes. Steve Grabowski will
20 make a traffic presentation on some of the traffic
21 issues and comments that were made about traffic.

22 MR. GRABOWSKI: Good evening. My name is
23 Steve Grabowski. I'm with Metro Transportation
24 Group. We prepared the original traffic study for

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

39

1 the shopping center.

2 I know that the Plan Commission,
3 residents, had some concerns and comments from the
4 last Plan Commission meeting. Since then we've
5 also received comments from the village traffic
6 engineer.

7 In response to those comments and
8 concerns, the site plan was revised. Tony, could
9 I borrow your overhead?

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Sometimes your voice
11 carries, but sometimes we lose you, so if you
12 would please use the microphone it would really
13 help.

14 MR. GRABOWSKI: Sure.

15 In response to those comments and
16 concerns the site plan was revised. I'd just like
17 to highlight a couple of the major revisions that
18 affect traffic circulation and access on the site.

19 The main thing was the increased
20 on-site circulation near the site, specifically to
21 the outlots, also the enhanced accessibility to
22 the right-in-right-out that's provided on Grand
23 Avenue.

24 The other major alteration to the

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

40

1 site plan was limiting the access at Stonebrook
2 Drive across from the Dominick's access. Based on
3 those site revisions, we have prepared revised
4 traffic assignments and analyses. I'd like to go
5 through those with you intersection by
6 intersection.

7 First, the intersection I'd like to

8 talk about is the Stonebrook at Grand
9 intersection. The existing geometrics at the
10 intersection consists of three westbound through
11 lanes and a single westbound to southbound right
12 turn. Eastbound -- in the eastbound direction we
13 have two through lanes and a separate right turn
14 lane to southbound Stonebrook. Northbound on
15 Stonebrook there are dual left turn lanes provided
16 and a single separate right turn lane.

17 Based on our revised traffic
18 assignments and analyses, we prepared capacity
19 analyses for that intersection based on those new
20 volumes. Those analyses indicated that the
21 intersection will operate at an acceptable level
22 of service.

23 In addition to that we also prepared
24 a queue analysis for the westbound left-turn

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

41

1 lane. That analysis indicated that the existing
2 storage length at that intersection will
3 accommodate the existing and the site traffic that
4 we have taken a look at.

5 There was also a comment at the last
6 meeting by one of the residents about difficulty
7 in making that left turn. I believe that's
8 because of the phasing at the signal at that
9 intersection, specifically for that left turn.
10 It's what we call in traffic engineering a
11 protected-only phase, whereby you can only take a
12 left-hand turn when a green arrow is out, and you
13 can't make a permissive left on a green ball.

14 So if you don't catch the signal
15 when that green arrow is up, you have to wait
16 through another entire signal cycle in order to
17 get a turn to go again.

18 I believe that's the reason why the
19 left turn may seem to be difficult out there. As
20 I stated before the intersection will operate at
21 an acceptable level of service with the added site
22 traffic.

23 The next intersection I'd like to
24 talk about is Brookside at Grand Avenue. This

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 presentation board shows the existing geometry and
2 also the proposed improvements that are needed to

3 accommodate the site traffic.

4 Just to run through the existing
5 conditions out there, currently it's a
6 T-intersection. There is no fourth light to the
7 south. There are two through lanes in both the
8 eastbound and westbound directions. There is an
9 eastbound separate left turn lane and a separate
10 westbound right turn lane to northbound
11 Brookside.

12 Existing Brookside -- the left lane
13 is currently a two-lane approach which are striped
14 as a separate left turn lane and a separate right
15 turn lane since there is no access drive to the
16 south.

17 We've also prepared passing analyses
18 to this intersection in terms of what improvements
19 we need to make at this intersection in order to
20 accommodate site traffic in and out of the new
21 fourth leg to the south.

22 Those improvements include an
23 eastbound right turn lane, a separate left turn
24 lane and a separate westbound left turn lane.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 From the access drive itself we've mirrored
2 existing Brookside, and we're going to provide a
3 separate northbound left turn lane in conjunction
4 with a combination through right turn lane.

5 We are going to also re-stripe
6 existing Brookside to mirror that same geometry on
7 the north side.

8 Again, the capacity analyses -- In
9 the capacity analyses that we prepared I indicate
10 that this intersection with these improvements
11 will operate at an acceptable level of service. I
12 would like to add, though, that any construction
13 on an IDOT route will require review and approval
14 by the Illinois Department of Transportation. So
15 this will be -- The specific geometry at this
16 intersection will be scrutinized by IDOT.

17 Again, at this intersection we
18 prepared a traffic signal north analysis. We
19 projected traffic volumes from the shopping center
20 throughout the day. Based on those daily traffic
21 projections a signal is warranted at the
22 intersection. The village traffic engineer has
23 concurred with that conclusion. I think that just
24 about covers the Brookside/132 intersection.

1 The next intersection I'd like to
2 talk about -- actually the intersection -- we've
3 prepared a drawing showing the existing geometrics
4 on Stonebrook Drive from Grand Avenue through
5 Camden Drive. I'd like to run through what
6 actually exists out there right now and then show
7 you what we're proposing to do at the Stonebrook
8 Drive intersection. I'll start from the north end
9 of Grand Avenue.

10 As I stated before northbound at
11 Grand Avenue we have dual left hand turn lanes and
12 a separate right turn lane. Southbound near the
13 intersection we have two southbound through
14 lanes. As we continue south we maintain the two
15 southbound through lanes and develop a separate
16 left-turn lane for the northern shopping center --
17 existing shopping center access.

18 Northbound at this access drive
19 there are two lanes in each direction, and the
20 right turns into the center are made from the
21 outside through lane. Continuing south to the
22 existing access which connects into the
23 circulation island in front of the stores, again
24 we have two southbound through lanes and two

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

45

1 northbound through lanes and also a separate
2 southbound left-turn lane.

3 At the second lighted intersection
4 one of the through lanes is dropped and is dropped
5 into a separate right turn lane at Camden Drive.
6 Northbound similarly an additional lane is added
7 to come up with the two through lanes north of the
8 access drive.

9 That one although it appears to be a
10 striped as a right turn lane it's not. It's is a
11 combination through right lane. It most likely
12 functions as a right turn lane due to the volume
13 coming out of there -- in there.

14 At Camden Drive itself as I
15 indicated before there is a southbound separate
16 right turn lane for southbound motorists that turn
17 right on Camden Drive. Northbound there is one
18 through lane in each direction, and a separate
19 northbound left turn lane is developed for traffic
20 wishing to turn left on Camden Drive. So those
21 are the existing geometrics along Stonebrook Drive

22 from Grand Avenue down through Camden.
23 As Tony stated before there were
24 some modifications to the Stonebrook Drive access

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

46

1 to limit that access to right-in through the north
2 and left-out to the north. We've done that
3 through better striping and also some very
4 effective signing.

5 What that does is eliminate four of
6 the movements at the intersection. Those are the
7 eastbound cross traffic, westbound cross traffic
8 between the centers, the northbound left into the
9 center and also the eastbound right back to the
10 south on Stonebrook Drive. Those four movements
11 have been eliminated. The elimination of those
12 movements limits the amount of traffic that will
13 use this intersection just because there are less
14 movements that can be made.

15 And it also eliminates some turning
16 conflicts with the elimination of the cross
17 traffic movements between the centers. Those
18 movements are actually still possible because of
19 the northern access drive to the Dominick's.

20 Anybody wishing to get to our center from the
21 existing center can come up the northern access
22 and come up the right turn lane.

23 Similarly, anybody wishing to cross
24 over to the existing Dominick's from our center

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

47

1 can take a left out of the Stonebrook access and
2 access the existing site at the northern access
3 drive.

4 What this does is minimize anybody
5 coming out of 132 and going through the signalized
6 intersections. The cross-movement is still
7 maintained but not specifically at the Stonebrook
8 or at the southern Dominick's intersection.

9 The right-in-left-out configuration
10 will allow a number of things. Patrons wishing to
11 enter and exit the site now will have two
12 signalized intersections to come in and out of,
13 one at Brookside a little bit further to the west
14 and at the Stonebrook 132 signal.

15 We believe that the flexibility
16 provided by patrons entering and exiting at two

17 signalized intersections is a benefit.
18 The limited access configuration
19 also provides for a good truck circulation
20 on-site. As you can see the loading docks, they
21 are oriented to the west, and there is also one
22 oriented to the east.

23 The access at Stonebrook provides a
24 way for trucks to circulate in either left or

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

48

1 right from Grand Avenue on Brookside, pull into
2 the loading area and back right in and then exit
3 out to Grand Avenue.

4 Similarly, from Brookside trucks can
5 come down Stonebrook, come in the right turn only
6 and pull into the truck dock, circulate around and
7 come back out Brookside to the signalized
8 intersection. So there is an advantage for truck
9 circulation to have the left-out-right-in
10 configuration.

11 What this limited configuration also
12 does is it forces all the site traffic including
13 the trucks to Grand Avenue and not south on
14 Brookside. There won't be any trucks or site

15 patrons that will go southbound on Brookside.
16 I guess there is one negative to
17 that, and that's that people that do live in the
18 area, specifically just south of the site, will
19 have to find an alternate route to get into the
20 center potentially up Huntington and then a right
21 on Grand and a right on Brookside or traveling
22 northbound on Stonebrook, take a left onto Grand
23 and a left at Brookside into the center.
24 We've also taken a look at the sight

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

49

1 distance from our access drive along Stonebrook.
2 At the present the sight lines that we have
3 measured in the field, calculated out the plan,
4 exceed minimum safe sight distance criteria for
5 both the northbound direction and also the
6 southbound direction. So that clears sight lines
7 for our access drive.
8 There were also a number of other
9 concerns that were raised by the Plan Commission
10 and some of the residents. One of those was do we
11 take into consideration traffic generated by other

12 development in the area, specifically the car
13 dealers.

14 Every shopping center will
15 experience what we call "pass-by" traffic, people
16 are already traveling on the -- say Grand Avenue
17 in this example -- on their way home from work
18 will stop in at the shopping center to do whatever
19 shopping they need to do.

20 That person is already on the
21 roadway. He's not a new trip generated by a
22 shopping center. We do not discount our traffic
23 assignments and total traffic volumes based on any
24 pass-by traffic, so there is some built-in growth

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

50

1 by not taking a discount for traffic volumes.

2 Again, the village traffic engineer
3 had concurred with that conclusion also. At the
4 request of the village traffic engineer, they had
5 asked us to take a look at the potential for a
6 four-way stop and a potential also for the traffic
7 signal at the Stonebrook access drive.

8 We looked at the traffic volumes,
9 the total traffic volumes that we're projecting at

10 that intersection; and they -- neither warrants a
11 four-way stop or a traffic signal. But that
12 situation could be monitored in the future to
13 determine if traffic increases on Stonebrook for
14 any reason might warrant a four-way stop in the
15 future.

16 I know there was also concern about
17 getting in and out of Camden Drive. Maybe
18 something should be -- some studies should be
19 taken at Camden Drive to determine if a three-way
20 stop would be beneficial for residents at that
21 intersection.

22 That concludes my presentation. I'd
23 be happy to answer any questions.

24 MR. HOAG: I think we have covered

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

51

1 everything we have to cover, so we'll open it up.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Winter.

3 MR. WINTER: With regard to traffic on
4 Grand Avenue, the left turn lane going westbound,
5 what is the length of that turn lane?

6 MR. GRABOWSKI: I believe it's 350 feet.

7 MR. WINTER: The reason I ask is our
8 traffic engineer in his report that you had a
9 chance to see he talks about lengthening it to 350
10 to 400 feet. But you're saying it's already that
11 long?

12 MR. GRABOWSKI: Existing is 350? I
13 believe that's what Bill Grieves said in his
14 report also. That was based on the old traffic
15 assignments and the full access on Stonebrook. So
16 with the limited access, the traffic volumes
17 turning left from Grand Avenue onto Stonebrook
18 have been lessened slightly. So the need for the
19 extension of that turn lane isn't needed.

20 MR. WINTER: As far as doing that, is
21 that something you think you can get permission
22 from IDOT to do, an additional 50 feet?

23 MR. GRABOWSKI: That's something we'd
24 have to talk about, certainly in order to do

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

52

1 anything out there.

2 MR. WINTER: In your experience in the
3 field, is that something that is possible? Do you
4 think IDOT would agree to a 50-foot lengthening of

5 that?

6 MR. GRABOWSKI: I don't see why not.

7 We'd have to look at the existing geometry out

8 there and see what is physically possible.

9 But I can't imagine IDOT would be

10 averse to lengthening a turn lane. But I mean --

11 I don't know -- we need to discuss that with them.

12 MR. WINTER: I think you earlier

13 mentioned that it's a turn arrow only.

14 MR. GRABOWSKI: Correct.

15 MR. WINTER: That's not going to change,

16 though, right? That's going to continue to be the

17 way that intersection operates?

18 MR. GRABOWSKI: Yes.

19 MR. WINTER: That's all I have. Thank

20 you.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions?

22 Mr. Cepon.

23 MR. CEPON: If I understand you correctly

24 -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- on the corner

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 of Stonebrook Drive and Grand Avenue, are you

2 recommending a stoplight? Did I hear that right,
3 or is it a misinterpretation?

4 MR. GRABOWSKI: Stonebrook and Grand?

5 MR. CEPON: Right.

6 MR. GRABOWSKI: There is a signal there
7 already.

8 MR. CEPON: Okay. Okay. So you're --
9 all right.

10 MR. GRABOWSKI: We were asked to look at
11 the potential or potential warranting of a signal
12 at the Stonebrook access.

13 MR. CEPON: So you -- it's already
14 signalized, but would you have a restricted left
15 lane turn on that particular intersection?

16 MR. GRABOWSKI: That exists today.

17 MR. CEPON: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Kovarik.

19 MS. KOVARIK: You said the level of
20 service at Stonebrook and Grand was acceptable.

21 What is exactly the level of service? Is it the D
22 or the C?

23 MR. GRABOWSKI: The Illinois Department
24 of Transportation -- the Illinois Department of

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 Transportation sets the level of service D as an
2 acceptable level of service.

3 MS. KOVARIK: Is this an A or a B or a C
4 or a D? When you say acceptable does that mean
5 D?

6 MR. GRABOWSKI: Our capacity analyses
7 indicates that in the evening peak that
8 intersection would operate at a level of service
9 B.

10 MS. KOVARIK: B as in boy?

11 MR. GRABOWSKI: B as in boy.

12 MR. KOVARIK: Okay. That's very good.

13 MR. GRABOWSKI: A is the best. F is the
14 worst.

15 MS. KOVARIK: Yeah. You talked about
16 this signal or traffic stop sign at the access
17 road but then it doesn't warrant it.

18 Can the Village just put one up
19 because I think it will make it safer, or do you
20 have to have these warrants to get a stop sign put
21 up?

22 MR. GRABOWSKI: I believe the Village can
23 do whatever it wants. I've seen it happen in
24 other communities. But there are problems with

1 putting up unwarranted stop signs. If people
2 don't perceive the need for a stop sign they tend
3 not to stop at it.

4 MS. KOVARIK: Okay. The last traffic
5 question: When you made these changes with this
6 right-in and -- or no right and left only, has our
7 traffic consultant seen these, commented on these
8 latest changes?

9 MS. VELKOVER: They have not seen these
10 latest plans. No.

11 MS. KOVARIK: Thank you. I just want to
12 ask two architectural questions.

13 When you say the light poles at 25,
14 you'll have -- there's a lot of them; but that you
15 wouldn't at 30. How many -- what's the number
16 difference? I mean at 25 you have 100 poles, and
17 at 30 you'd have 50 poles?

18 MR. CASSATA: At 25 feet we have 34 poles
19 throughout the parking area. However, our
20 photometric analysis shows that we are not --
21 there are areas between lights that we are not
22 meeting our minimum footcandle level. We are
23 going down to below .5 footcandles in some areas.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

56

1 bright spots underneath the pole, and then it
2 diminishes down to very, very dark spots, and then
3 it gets bright again. So you get a spotty parking
4 lot.

5 By raising it that additional 5
6 feet, we have because we are restricted to the
7 angle that the lights are able to shoot the light
8 out, by raising it higher we then get the beams of
9 light to overlap and that goes areas that were
10 initially .5 or, you know, 1. Now, all of a
11 sudden their light levels double there, and it
12 brings it up to the point they should be.

13 MS. KOVARIK: So it's not that you're
14 eliminating bright poles by going higher; it's the
15 same number of light poles. By going higher, you
16 don't have to add more light poles --

17 MR. CASSATA: We would have to add light
18 poles if we stayed at 25 and tried to maintain our
19 minimum 2 footcandles.

20 MS. KOVARIK: I got it. My last
21 architectural question: On buildings A and B,

22 those two outlots, is there an architectural -- do
23 you know what the architectural will be of those?
24 Are they going to match Retail A anchors?

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

57

1 MR. CASSATA: If they are multiple-tenant
2 buildings, then they will match the rest of the
3 center. If they become a one-user we will, of
4 course, try to blend -- come up with an
5 architectural style that would fit in with the
6 rest of the center. But there might be some
7 changes to be made depending on what the user is.

8 But in all cases what the intention
9 on these buildings, these two freestanding
10 buildings here, is that regardless of who the user
11 is, if it's a single user or multiple user, the
12 treatment of all four of the facades has to be the
13 same. So all four of the facades have to be of
14 the same material, have the same architectural
15 style, so that they all look like the front of the
16 building. There is going to be no back of the
17 building area. There might be an area that might
18 have an enclosure for trash, but that enclosure

19 has to be designed in the same style as the
20 building.
21 MS. KOVARIK: I have to compliment you on
22 the design of the pedestrian -- looking at it I
23 almost felt back home in Florida with those
24 benches. And you've really made the changes that

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

58

1 at least I know I was looking for as far as
2 looking friendly.
3 I'm just kind of concerned about the
4 two outlots in front not only blocking the view to
5 this very nice shopping center but then, you know,
6 could be a, you know -- I don't want to mention
7 any restaurants but, you know, blocking the view
8 to the shopping center. If it's not compatible --

9 MR. CASSATA: You brought up the
10 restaurants which is one of the things that I
11 neglected to mention. We have no intention of
12 using either one of these two outlot buildings for
13 restaurants. That is one use that we are
14 excluding if I'm not mistaken.

15 MR. HOAG: No. That's a good point. I
16 might also make an additional comment and enforce

17 that.

18 It is very probable -- not possible,
19 but probable that both of those buildings will be
20 multiple-tenant buildings. There are contingent
21 leases out now on both of those buildings whereby
22 there will be at least two tenants in each of
23 those buildings. The probability is that the
24 architecture will be consistent with the rest of

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

59

1 the center.

2 MS. KOVARIK: I would object less to
3 outlots than -- I'm pretty consistent on my
4 dislike of outlots -- if I felt it was going to be
5 architecturally compatible with the rest of the
6 shopping center and it would all kind of blend
7 together, and you're not blocking the view with
8 this odd-looking building in the front.

9 MR. CASSATA: Right. Of course the ideal
10 situation would be the way that these three
11 buildings are kind of positioned if they were all
12 of the same architectural style they would. You'd
13 be creating almost some kind of a courtyard --

14 MS. KOVARIK: A synergy.
15 MR. CASSATA: And still have continuity.
16 MS. KOVARIK: I would be more in favor of
17 that many outlots if you had that synergy of the
18 buildings versus this beautiful shopping center
19 with -- I'm not going to name anybody out front.

20 That's all the comments and
21 questions I had.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDY: Mr. Sula.

23 MR. SULA: I'm not a real big fan of
24 outlots at all. Period. I find building B in

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

60

1 particular on this plan to be rather troublesome,
2 especially when you consider that building C is
3 going to -- it sounds like it's going to be a
4 drive through bank in all probability.

5 Given that the intersection doesn't
6 line up as a typical intersection, it looks to me
7 like it's going to be a dangerous situation for
8 people to try to get from building C all the way
9 over to the traffic light to get out of the
10 complex if they're trying to go westbound on Grand
11 Avenue.

12 I'd personally feel better about the
13 plan if there was a better alignment of the way
14 that intersection comes together there.

15 Secondly, I'd be curious to hear
16 what Bud and the Village's traffic consultant's
17 concerns are regarding this access on Stonebrook
18 Drive.

19 It seems to me that while we know
20 it's trying to accomplish no truck traffic to go
21 south on Stonebrook it's going to create a
22 frustrating situation for people that live south
23 of the development trying to get there. It's
24 almost like you can't get there from here off of

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

61

1 Stonebrook.

2 I don't know if we want to do that
3 to the residents of the village. I appreciate we
4 don't want truck traffic. I think we want to make
5 this somewhat easy for our residents too.

6 MR. HOAG: In terms of Stonebrook, I
7 think we have to bring something up here.

8 The Stonebrook access was part of

9 the annexation agreement. It's already in place.

10 It's already there.

11 What we've tried to do is to modify

12 it --

13 MR. SULA: I'm not suggesting it

14 shouldn't be there. I'm suggesting that not being

15 able to go northbound on Stonebrook and make a

16 turn into that center is kind of frustrating.

17 MR. HOAG: We agree that it may be

18 frustrating, but at the same time I think what

19 we're trying to do is accomplish something that

20 appeared to be more frustrating, and that was the

21 generation of traffic in those areas where traffic

22 from this center was not wished.

23 MR. SULA: Which I assume was the truck

24 traffic?

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

62

1 MR. HOAG: Not only truck traffic, but

2 vehicular traffic using the center that can filter

3 back into the residential area. I think we heard

4 that loudly and clearly, that that was not

5 something that was wished.

6 I'd also make comment on outlot B.

7 I -- again, I feel that where outlot B is is not
8 dangerous whatsoever. I think we provided for
9 some very efficient access, ingress and egress to
10 that outlot that doesn't affect the rest of the
11 center.

12 MR. SULA: You don't think someone going
13 from building C trying to get over to the going to
14 the exit on Brookside is going to have a
15 precarious situation to cut across there?

16 MR. HOAG: I really don't. No, I don't.
17 And I think it's --

18 MR. SULA: Have you ever gone through any
19 of our outlot situations on a Saturday afternoon?

20 MR. HOAG: Have I? Yes, I have.

21 MR. SULA: And you don't find them to be
22 awkward and dangerous?

23 MR. HOAG: No, I don't. No.

24 MR. SULA: We have a difference of

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 opinion.

2 MR. HOAG: No --

3 MR. KOVARIK: You've been to Wendy's.

4 MR. HOAG: And maybe I'll add to that.
5 I'm not a residents of Gurnee. I'm not up here
6 every Saturday. But when I have been here which
7 is two or three times on a Saturday, I haven't had
8 the problem.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is that all, Jim?

10 MR. SULA: Yes.

11 MR. WINTER: You're just looking for
12 questions?

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Pardon me?

14 MR. WINTER: Are you just looking for
15 questions or comments as well?

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, questions or
17 comments.

18 MR. WINTER: This is just a comment. I'd
19 say generally that this plan is a great
20 improvement over what we saw a couple weeks ago,
21 and I think that in my tenure on the board,
22 actually the petitioner has probably done one of
23 the better jobs of trying to respond to some of
24 the points that we raised, and I just wanted to

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 compliment the petitioner on doing that,

2 particularly the walkways in front of the
3 buildings. I think this would certainly enhance
4 the development of this project.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Smith.

6 MR. SMITH: My concern was getting into
7 this, too, from the south. We'd have to clear out
8 of Grand Avenue to get in the way I look at it.
9 Or am I wrong?

10 MR. HOAG: I'm sorry?

11 MR. SMITH: If you look to the south --
12 you're coming from the south, and you want to get
13 to that center on Stonebrook, you have to go clear
14 out from Grand Avenue and come back in.

15 MR. HOAG: At this point in time that's
16 correct with the idea, once again, that the
17 overriding problem, the larger problem, the larger
18 issue that we were faced with when we were here
19 and have discussed it with staff and discussed it
20 with the residents was that there was a tremendous
21 concern about the traffic that would be generated
22 from this center, rightfully or wrongfully, but a
23 tremendous concern about that traffic traveling
24 south into roads where that traffic was not

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 wanted, both vehicular and truck traffic.

2 In terms of what this center is, I
3 think we have to get back to what we're trying to
4 accomplish here. This is a hybrid so to speak.
5 There are regional users here, and the regional
6 users will be served by Grand Avenue in terms of
7 the main access to the center.

8 At the same time we need that
9 secondary access, that right-in from Stonebrook,
10 to provide some support access to the center.

11 At the same time what we tried to do
12 on behalf of the residents is basically provide
13 for a point where when a truck exits this, even
14 though there's a sign that says no right turn,
15 that truck can exit into areas that are
16 residentially oriented.

17 At the same time we have tried to do
18 the same thing with vehicular traffic that comes
19 into the center. We want to get that vehicular
20 traffic if at all possible back onto the Grand
21 Avenue feeder and get it somewhere else as quickly
22 as possible. That's what we're trying to
23 accomplish.

24 Now, the second problem that you've

1 raised. There is no doubt that the residents from
2 this south area, from the area south of this
3 center, will have to do one of several things
4 depending upon whether they use Stonebrook or one
5 of the roads to the south.

6 Somehow they're going to have to go
7 and come in off of Grand Avenue. There is no
8 doubt about that. But we feel that is a problem
9 that they are willing to solve on their own from
10 the standpoint that the larger problem will be
11 overcome.

12 MR. SMITH: I didn't know if there was a
13 way to make a left off Stonebrook. And going out
14 you'd have all right turns if you went out on
15 Brookside and came back around -- I don't know.
16 Maybe it can't be accomplished.

17 But I also want to compliment you.
18 I think you did a real good job as far as
19 looks-wise. I think you're going to find the
20 merchants are going to like it a lot better with
21 the covered walk area in inclement weather. That
22 way people can go from store to store.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions?

24 (No response)

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

67

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That's it.

2 Where's the traffic guy? I'll just
3 tell you what I'm going to do. I live to the
4 south. I'm going to take Dada to Stonebrook. And
5 then I'm going to turn in to the Jewel, then
6 Dominick's, probably the southern drive. I'm
7 going to drive up to the northern drive. I'm
8 going to turn left and then come south and make a
9 right-hand turn.

10 MR. HOAG: It is physically possible.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So is that really
12 something we want or --

13 MR. HOAG: Well --

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The other thing you're
15 going to get is people are probably going to make
16 a U-turn on Stonebrook.

17 MR. HOAG: Based on the existing traffic
18 counts from the Dominick's shopping center from
19 the northern and the southern access drive that
20 relates to about 10 percent of the total site

21 traffic.
22 So if we use that 10 percent to and
23 from the south going to our center, that relates
24 to approximately 15 vehicles entering and exiting

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

68

1 the site from the south. That's during the p.m.
2 peak hour.

3 Of those 15 they may not all live in
4 the immediate area. Some of them may live a
5 little bit further to the west, and it may be
6 easier to go north on Arlington and come out on
7 Grand into the shopping center just because of the
8 proximity out there.

9 So those 15 vehicles are further
10 reduced just by the area in which people live in.
11 So we're not talking about a lot of vehicles
12 trying to make U-turns into the Dominick's
13 shopping center or traveling on Grand Avenue.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You know, you're talking
15 like it's just the people in the neighborhood. I
16 live three miles away. And I can tell you I would
17 take Washington to Hunt Club, Hunt Club to Dada,
18 Dada to Stonebrook.

19 MR. HOAG: Correct.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You're going to have
21 everybody that lives, you know, in the southern
22 portion of Gurnee is probably going to figure out
23 to take that way, all the local traffic.

24 MR. GRABOWSKI: I may not disagree

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

69

1 totally with that, but, again, shopping centers do
2 attract a good percentage of pass-by traffic,
3 people already on the road going to or from work.

4 So the circuitous route that other
5 people may take from the south of the site may not
6 even be during the peak hour, typically the
7 highest combination of site and through traffic
8 which our recommendations are based on for our
9 off-site road improvements.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Foster, did you have
11 something?

12 MR. FOSTER: Just a couple comments. I
13 probably am not comfortable with what's proposed
14 on Stonebrook. I don't have any solution. But
15 it's probably not the best, what's being proposed,

16 and I share some of the concerns that are being
17 raised about some of the restrictions on
18 Stonebrook.

19 I do want to compliment the
20 developer on the building materials. I really
21 like the building materials. I like the
22 improvements that have been made and making it
23 more pedestrian-friendly. That's one of the
24 objectives that's certainly appreciated.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

70

1 The chairman went with the
2 petitioner to help look at some examples. It's a
3 marked improvement and will certainly make a very
4 attractive center.

5 I appreciate the canopy and your
6 desire to make the outlots as compatible as
7 possible with the main retail center. It's very
8 attractive.

9 I appreciate the ornamental
10 lighting. I'm a big fan of that. I think that's
11 going to add to the center.

12 I just have a concern about the
13 whole Stonebrook circulation. And I don't have

14 any answers. So I guess I'm kind of interested in
15 our own traffic consultant's response that he
16 hasn't had a chance to respond to yet.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Well, I agree
18 with Mr. Foster, and I would like to compliment
19 the architect on really making some really
20 wonderful changes here. It really looks good.
21 You've really captured, I think, some of the
22 things we were looking for.

23 I agree with Ms. Kovarik. I guess I
24 agree with Ms. Kovarik and Mr. Sula in

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

71

1 combination. I would probably prefer to not see
2 the outlots, especially A and B. I think you're
3 going to say you probably need that to make this
4 work financially, but I think it tends to distract
5 from the whole development.

6 But if they are necessary I think
7 that -- I think a requirement would be that the
8 architectural style be in line with the main
9 anchor building.

10 I would like our traffic consultant

11 to kind of address Mr. Sula's concern regarding
12 the traffic flow between Building C and the
13 access. I think that should be looked at closely
14 because I agree with his concerns that there may
15 be some safety problems there.

16 And as Mr. Foster said I think we
17 need to wait until we have a full report from our
18 consultant on the traffic. It seems like that's
19 probably the major concern.

20 So are there any other questions
21 from the commissioners?

22 (No response)

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: At this time then I'd
24 like to open the floor to the public. So if you

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

72

1 wish to make a comment or ask a question, please
2 step up to the mike. If you could state your name
3 and address. Please address your questions or
4 comments to the Plan Commission.

5 MR. WALLACE: Bob Wallace, 1446 Kingsbury
6 Court.

7 I'd like to see if we can -- the
8 Plan Commission could get a couple things

9 clarified. First of all, I'd just like to comment
10 on their claim they have a right to access off
11 Stonebrook Drive. They did under the conceptual
12 plan.

13 There was one building on the
14 Dalan's property in the rear section and one
15 restaurant in the front of the property that isn't
16 what's proposed anymore. We now have 14 more
17 acres of traffic going in here worth of stores at
18 least.

19 I got to commend you on at least
20 trying to do to something with the Stonebrook
21 access at that southern point on the roadway
22 there. I don't know what's a good answer there
23 myself. Last time when Dominick's was here I had
24 an answer for it.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

73

1 The other issue I wanted to bring up
2 was you have a bank up at the northeast corner
3 that you have some sort of contractual agreement
4 -- they have some sort of contractual agreement
5 with. Well, apparently because of the ATMs and

6 the state laws they can then supercede our
7 landscaping requirement.

8 Well, this is the entrance to a
9 whole bunch of homes off of Stonebrook Drive. It
10 would have made a lot more sense and with Jim
11 Sula's comments about the traffic flow wouldn't it
12 have been a better spot to put at Brookside and
13 Grand Avenue so that people can get in and out of
14 the drivethrough, and there you might lessen some
15 landscaping instead of the access to all the
16 residential areas off Stonebrook Drive.

17 Next, I don't know if any -- I
18 couldn't find it in any of the plans I went and
19 read at the library -- if there was any sort of
20 tree preservation plan on the property. There are
21 an awful lot of old growth trees there, and I'd
22 hate to see what just happened over at the auto
23 dealers where all the old growth trees were cut
24 down. There was one pine tree that had to be at

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

74

1 least 100 years old over there just chopped.

2 Berm heights. I haven't heard
3 anything about berm heights changing to match

4 either the Home Depot heights or Dominick's
5 heights of berming, and my concern would be the
6 Stonebrook Homeowners Association, the single
7 family across the pond there.

8 There is no mention of what the view
9 of those 30-foot lights would be from there. They
10 sit higher up than most of the townhomes. They're
11 going to have a direct view at those 30-foot
12 lights on the eastern edge of the property
13 especially if those berms aren't moved up in
14 height.

15 Lastly, the lighting -- and I'm a
16 stickler on that -- that there is a lot of
17 blockage supposedly going to happen shown on the
18 plan.

19 Is that at the 20-year growth of all
20 these trees, or will that happen right away, or
21 will people have to deal with this for 20 years of
22 seeing those lights until these trees grown in?

23 That all I have. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 MS. JACOBS: Clarissa Jacobs, 7107
2 Buchanan Drive. I'd like to see a few things
3 verified about the after hours lighting, whether
4 that would go down to the 50 percent of the light
5 in off hours.

6 Also, there's some issues regarding
7 the Stonebrook entrance. I don't know what the
8 best solution is there either. I would like to, I
9 guess, can we ask the Village to look at that
10 intersection on Camden.

11 That whole region, even though it's
12 two lanes or three lanes, doesn't function as
13 three lanes or at times four lanes because of the
14 way the curvature of the road is. There's also at
15 Camden that intersection for anyone who goes there
16 routinely throughout the year the grading isn't
17 proper for that road. So all the water stands in
18 the road there. So one full lane in the winter is
19 solid ice. And so it's basically down to one lane
20 of traffic in the wintertime. That's where people
21 drive 'cause they don't get any traction.

22 So I guess even if we're going to
23 expect more traffic on Stonebrook I'd like the
24 village engineers to look at that intersection

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 because it's going to be a nightmare with
2 increased traffic.

3 I'm also not sure how that's going
4 to happen with the Dominick's entrance across if
5 it isn't a right-in-left-out only. I can see even
6 worse things than people coming up Stonebrook and
7 making a U-turn in the Dominick's 'cause there's a
8 lot of traffic there, and it's also quite
9 deceiving if you're trying to make a left off of
10 Camden going north on Stonebrook.

11 If traffic is coming, especially
12 like at night, coming down Stonebrook south,
13 you're not going to be able to tell whether
14 they're going to make a right-hand turn or not.
15 It's going to be very difficult. It looks like
16 there is a large distance there -- I'm not sure
17 what the distance is, but it's not very large --
18 that's going to be there between those two
19 entrances.

20 I guess my only other comment is
21 since I've been here with the car dealership and
22 what plans were there -- I just want to commend
23 the presenters tonight for actually taking a lot
24 of the comments from last week or a couple weeks

1 ago and really actually trying to make some vast
2 improvements to their design. It's appreciated by
3 the community. Thank you.

4 MS. HANSEN: Jeannie Macken, 7175
5 Buchanan.

6 Like we all said, we don't really
7 have an answer for the Stonebrook entrance. I'm
8 just going to emphasize that I would prefer
9 traffic to be diverted to Grand rather than going
10 into any residential area.

11 I kind of find it amusing that a
12 Plan Commission member would say his way of going
13 around it would be going through Dominick's. So
14 you must know how we feel who live on Buchanan and
15 knowing that the car dealerships have access to
16 residential roads to go through them, that's the
17 problem. If we make it so that people can keep
18 going through residential areas, we're just
19 bringing in more traffic.

20 So I would -- my opinion would be to
21 divert any commercial traffic, be it for the
22 businesses or people who are going to shop there,

23 not to go near the residential area.

24 And if people who live on the south

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

78

1 of this development have to go through Dominick's
2 or have to go up to Grand, good, because I don't
3 want them on my street.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anyone else?

5 (No response)

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. We'll close the
7 floor to the public now. And I think there is
8 probably a couple things we can address here. One
9 of the things might be the last thing that was
10 brought up. The Dada Drive and Stonebrook, I
11 believe -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- but
12 they're collector roads.

13 So those two roads are actually
14 designed so that basically local traffic can
15 access things like commercial areas and things of
16 that nature. So in looking look at Stonebrook
17 Drive, we really don't have homes that actually
18 face Stonebrook. It's a collector.

19 Now, Camden is different. Because
20 that's more of a residential street. So those

21 collectors are designed so that citizens across
22 the whole area can access different developments.

23 Tracy, you had some other
24 questions?

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

79

1 MS. VELKOVER: There was a question about
2 security lighting. And at the original meeting
3 the petitioner was talking about meeting our
4 lighting ordinance, and our lighting ordinance
5 does have security level limits. Basically it
6 reduces the lighting that's allowed during
7 operating hours to half of that level.

8 And operating hours are defined in
9 our ordinance as one hour before start-up of
10 business and one hour after the close of
11 business.

12 However, now they're looking at, you
13 know, at least changing the height. I don't
14 assume that you're looking to change the security
15 lighting or make any amendment to that.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

17 MS. VELKOVER: The other suggestion is

18 this is a PUD, and we could, you know, if you
19 wanted to rely upon our lighting ordinance that
20 would be great.

21 If you wanted to get into the PUD
22 agreements some restrictions that we've done
23 similar to other developments, for example, some
24 of the car dealerships we restricted one light on

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

80

1 every other pole or every third pole throughout
2 the center. That could also be done. They both
3 probably achieve very similar results to the
4 dimming of the lights.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Was there
6 anything else we could address at this time?

7 MS. VELKOVER: If the petitioner could
8 address the tree survey and any plans to preserve
9 trees that are existing on the site.

10 MS. SCHULENBERG: My name is Wendy
11 Schulenberg -- I'm probably loud enough --
12 landscape architect with Dan Weinbach and
13 Partners, 53 West Jackson in Chicago.

14 The existing trees that are on the
15 site -- there are a number of -- there are some

16 large mature trees that when it comes to a site of
17 this size and grading that needs to take place, it
18 will be impossible to save the large trees and
19 cost -- it's not cost effective to try to relocate
20 them.

21 There are some smaller evergreens,
22 although they're scrubbier -- sort of the Junipers
23 and Cedars as opposed to Pines or some of the
24 evergreens we normally reuse. We will try to

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

81

1 relocate some of those small trees.

2 We're going to be -- along
3 Stonebrook when you come in right in here, there's
4 existing trees that come onto the site. And we
5 are going to be saving those.

6 We talked about saving the trees
7 along the south edge of the site. The trees that
8 are there -- obviously the locations do not work
9 with the new layouts on the site. But any tree
10 that is of a movable size that appears to be
11 healthy and of a species that is a quality species
12 -- anything that's a weak-wooded tree or

13 something that's not long-lived would not be worth
14 the attempt to move it.

15 We do not have a specific tree
16 survey for those trees on the site at this time.

17 MS. VELKOVER: There was a question about
18 the berm height and changing it to match the
19 Dominick's, and that's something that, you know,
20 the Plan Commission can discuss right now.

21 They're talking about a 60-foot
22 buffer with a minimum of a 10-foot high berm, and
23 I believe an 8-foot-high fence.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

82

1 MS. VELKOVER: Correct. Through the
2 evolution of the Grand Park Center we got over to
3 the Dominick's center. And again this property
4 was annexed -- a portion of this property was
5 annexed prior to the Dominick's and approved
6 conceptually with a 60-foot setback.

7 The Dominick's site, the Grand Hunt
8 Center evolved, got to 100-foot setback to the
9 buildings and, I believe, a 14- to 16-foot-high
10 berm with a 6-foot-high high fence on top.

11 You know, you can discuss the merits

12 of a 60-foot setback versus 100-foot setback.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anyone have any

14 comments?

15 MR. WINTER: Well, they showed us that

16 one -- we know they're not going to see the lights

17 except the lights in the back of that building.

18 As far as the building there is --

19 you had that one overhead that kind of shows the

20 berm -- how much of the building are these people

21 going to see?

22 It almost looked as if it was going

23 to go above the building.

24 MR. CASSATA: The lower line represents

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

83

1 the limit of view obstructed by the 8-foot-high

2 fence on top of the berm.

3 So in this situation here from the

4 second story of that closest building off of

5 Buchanan, you see approximately the top 2 feet of

6 the building.

7 The lights on the back of the

8 building are mounted at 16 feet, which is below
9 the lowest point of the building that you would
10 see. So you would not be able to see the lights
11 at that condition.

12 And then at the other condition
13 along -- on the -- from the west looking out, you
14 will see the, again, perhaps the top 2 feet of the
15 average parapet of the building. And then you
16 would see the pitched roofs of the -- that are
17 provided at the various locations on the
18 building.

19 And again, the light is mounted at
20 16 feet which is 2 feet below the view line that's
21 provided by the fence.

22 MR. WINTER: Well, I would just say my
23 comment -- my experience when talking about that
24 is you get them too steep in terms of maintaining

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

84

1 them and based on this information and the fact
2 that we're working with a 60-foot setback, it
3 seems to be an appropriate situation right now.
4 And in light of the fact that there is -- that one
5 house you're talking about is the one that's on

6 the north side of Buchanan, correct?

7 MR. CASSATA: That's correct.

8 MR. WINTER: And all the other houses are

9 better off because there is a little bit more

10 distance.

11 MR. CASSATA: That's right. They are on

12 the other side of the street.

13 MR. WINTER: I guess my view would be

14 that as presented it appears to be appropriate for

15 the neighbors.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other comments?

17 Tracy?

18 MS. VELKOVER: There were a number of

19 comments suggesting that the bank be located at

20 the intersection of Brookside and Grand.

21 The other question or I guess

22 concern was with the access at Stonebrook Drive.

23 And again, our traffic consultant has not had a

24 chance to look at this. I see the date of this

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 plan is yesterday, so he definitely has not had a

2 chance to take a look at this.

3 And, you know, we want him to take a
4 look at that intersection because it is a concern.
5 So we'll have him take a look at that, plus that
6 intersection with building No. B also.

7 MR. WINTER: Tracy, on that point I know
8 it's been mentioned that Stonebrook's a collector
9 road, but it isn't a very straight road there. It
10 may be a little different than a lot of our
11 collector roads or how we like them to be.

12 And I notice that Grieve's report on
13 page 2, paragraph 7, he said metric -- concluded
14 that the sight distance study -- I think he's
15 referring to that area there -- met the AASHTO or
16 AASHTA standards and Grieves' says, However, my
17 several recent test rides along the strip of
18 Stonebrook leads me to conclude that traffic
19 operations could be confusing. And then he goes
20 on to enumerate some things.

21 Again, I think everybody said that
22 that seems to be the toughest intersection to
23 analyze. My two cents would be consider the fact
24 that it is a winding road and not a straight shot.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 I don't know whether that's -- Grieves enumerates
2 some reasons. But certainly I would defer to the
3 traffic people on that point.

4 MS. VELKOVER: Right. I think what he's
5 indicating here is that it meets the minimum
6 standards. But, again, because of the situations
7 here with the curving roads and access to, you
8 know, the different curb cuts into the shopping
9 centers and straight intersection that it does get
10 to be a confusing situation. And I hope he wants
11 to look at this further and throw a new plan on
12 top of it that restricts access into a right-in
13 and left-out.

14 We definitely want him to take a
15 look at that. We've had situations in other areas
16 of town where we've had restricted
17 right-in-right-outs. And our experience is that
18 people will try to do just about everything.
19 They'll try to turn left out of a right out. So
20 it really needs to be looked at.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I would suggest
22 that we continue this until we get that report.
23 And we ask the State to also take a closer look at
24 this internal operation with that building, Outlot

1 C to see how that functions.

2 MS. KOVARIK: B.

3 MR. SULA: Outlot B.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: -- safety problems that

5 might come up. I think we have a concern again.

6 They've shifted the road that comes in from off of

7 Stonebrook alongside anchor F. So then there is a

8 question again, that corner sight distance, if

9 that's a problem. So we need to take a look at

10 that again.

11 I think the overall reaction,

12 though, is pretty positive to the other changes,

13 and I think really what needs to be answered is

14 this traffic question.

15 I don't have anything more. Tracy,

16 did you want to say something?

17 MS. VELKOVER: Yes. At this meeting

18 tonight the petitioner talked about going to a

19 30-foot high lighting fixture. And under our

20 lighting ordinance, a 30-foot high fixture

21 requires a special use permit. And at this point

22 we have advertised for a rezoning and PUD but not

23 specifically for the lighting issue.

24 Now, we could make the argument that

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

88

1 you could encompass it into the PUD -- and, again,
2 I'd defer to Barb on this -- but it's an issue
3 that we need to discuss internally.

4 MS. SWANSON: My thought is because this
5 is a Planned Unit Development that in and of
6 itself could incorporate other special uses
7 including the light pole so as long as it's
8 discussed by the Plan Commission and various
9 standards are met, to issue a special use permit
10 that could be incorporated as part of this PUD.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And we would incorporate
12 that in the motion?

13 MS. SWANSON: Correct.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But it doesn't need to
15 be re-noticed.

16 MS. SWANSON: Correct.

17 MR. WINTER: Tracy, can you check on that
18 left turn -- I think there's been some testimony
19 and presentation that it's already 350 feet -- the
20 left turn going onto Stonebrook from Grand. When
21 I read Grieves' report he said he thought it
22 should be lengthened from 350 to 400. That at

23 least implies it is at that distance now. It may

24 be, but I'd like to have that confirmed.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

89

1 MS. VELKOVER: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: They said they weren't

3 going to make any changes.

4 The other thing since we're on

5 traffic, I think there was concern, a question,

6 from the one lady on the intersection at Camden

7 and Stonebrook, so maybe engineering can take a

8 look at her concerns there and address those as

9 well.

10 MS. VELKOVER: Okay.

11 MS. KOVARIK: Can we ask about a traffic

12 light for that Stonebrook access? I know it's not

13 warranted, but they work effectively inside Gurnee

14 Mills ring roads and that -- a traffic light would

15 certainly control it.

16 MR. SULA: Or a four-way stop.

17 MS. KOVARIK: You could start with a

18 four-way stop. I know it's not warranted but --

19 MS. VELKOVER: We can ask our consultant

20 to take a look at that.

21 MS. KOVARIK: Yeah.

22 MR. CEPON: I know we just got this
23 today. How long are you looking at for the
24 traffic consultant to be prepared for the next

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

90

1 meeting so we won't have to continue it?

2 MS. KOVARIK: I feel bad.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think the 21st is
4 pretty well booked.

5 First of all, Mr. Hoag, did you want
6 to say something?

7 MR. HOAG: We accept a continuance
8 obviously, but I think we need to meet with staff,
9 Tracey and John, on specific issues. And what
10 we'd like to do is to do that as quickly as
11 possible with you giving us an agenda of what
12 those specific issues are so when we do meet we
13 know what they are and we can come in with
14 educated responses to those specific issues.
15 I think that's extremely important.

16 In terms of trying to do something
17 on the 21st, we would dearly love to be on the

18 agenda for the 21st. We, very frankly, are
19 hopeful of beginning this project and obviously
20 after a day like today we would like to be in the
21 ground as of this morning.

22 So if there is any way we can be put
23 on the agenda for the 21st we would desire to do
24 so.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

91

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think that's going to
2 be extremely difficult.

3 Tracy, I think you've got -- is
4 there four?

5 MS. VELKOVER: We've got four public
6 hearings on that night, and we could -- we'll
7 probably have a couple of final plats and maybe
8 even a final PUD plat.

9 MR. HOAG: Maybe our issue can be very
10 limited then, our time can be very limited, but
11 we'd like to be on that agenda. I don't think we
12 hopefully will have that much to discuss at that
13 point in time. So, once again, we would request
14 that is if there is a way --

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, sometimes we have
16 meetings till 1:00 in the morning.

17 MR. WINTER: Well, I would say, John, --
18 and I should qualify this -- I'll be out of town
19 -- but I think the issues have been narrowed,
20 that maybe --

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I'll leave it up
22 to the commission.

23 MS. KOVARIK: Only have four?

24 MR. SULA: I won't be here either.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

92

1 MS. KOVARIK: I will be here. That's
2 three people.

3 MR. WINTER: I'm going to be out of
4 state.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'll leave it up to the
6 commissioners.

7 MR. SMITH: I don't like to have
8 something this important by four people.

9 MR. CEPON: I would concur.

10 MR. WINTER: Do you want to continue this
11 to next week?

12 MR. SULA: Everything would have to be

13 done.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Special meeting?

15 MR. CEPON: Well, basically we'd have to

16 have everything wrapped up tomorrow.

17 MR. SMITH: No. There's no way.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I've just been advised

19 by the village attorney there might not be much

20 after May 5th so --

21 MR. CEPON: Are you trying to say give

22 them whatever they want? I don't know. I don't

23 know.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I would say at this

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

93

1 point it sounds to me like the commissioners --

2 MR. SMITH: How about the 28th?

3 MS. KOVARIK: I think the four of us

4 understand how the other feels.

5 MR. SULA: My issues are pretty

6 straightforward.

7 MS. KOVARIK: Traffic and outlots.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So you're saying you're

9 willing to handle it on the 21st?

10 MS. KOVARIK: I'm not going to be the

11 chairman so --

12 MR. CEPON: I guess my concern with that
13 would be if we know we're only going to have four
14 members what happens if somebody gets sick?

15 MR. SMITH: What about the 28th?

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Are you guys are willing
17 to have a special meeting on the 28th?

18 MR. HOAG: That would be wonderful.

19 MR. WINTER: I can do that.

20 MR. SULA: I can do that.

21 MS. KOVARIK: I can do that.

22 MR. CEPON: You want a special meeting?

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Why don't we continue
24 this. That would be just -- would be just for

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

94

1 this hearing.

2 MR. SMITH: I'll make that motion.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'll entertain a motion
4 to finish this on May 28th. Moved by Mr. Smith.

5 MR. SULA: I'll second.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Seconded by Mr. Sula.

7 All those in favor of the motion

8 signify by saying aye in the roll call.

9 MS. VELKOVER: Winter.

10 MR. WINTER: Aye.

11 MS. VELKOVER: Foster.

12 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

13 MS. VELKOVER: Smith.

14 MR. SMITH: Aye.

15 MS. VELKOVER: Sula.

16 MR. SULA: Aye.

17 MS. VELKOVER: Kovarik.

18 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

19 MS. VELKOVER: Cepon.

20 MR. CEPON: Aye.

21 MS. VELKOVER: Rudny.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries.

23 MR. HOAG: Thank you very much.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

95

1 MR. CEPON: I'd make a motion to adjourn.

2 MR. SMITH: I second.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All those in favor say

4 aye.

5 MR. WINTER: Aye.
6 MR. FOSTER: Aye.
7 MR. SMITH: Aye.
8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye.
9 MR. CEPON: Aye.
10 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.
11 MR. SULA: Aye.
12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Opposed, nay.
13 (No response)
14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Meeting adjourned.
15 (Hearing concluded)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS:
2 COUNTY OF MCHENRY)

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

I, VIRGINIA A. GAISER, CSR, do hereby
certify that I am a court reporter doing business
in the County of McHenry and State of Illinois;
that I reported in shorthand the testimony given
in the foregoing Report of Proceedings; and that
the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of
my shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.

Virginia A. Gaiser, CSR
License No. 084-003887

PILAR COURT REPORTING SERVICE
(847) 336-5220