

VILLAGE OF GURNEE  
PUBLIC HEARING  
OF THE  
PLAN COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING  
held  
July 1, 1998  
7:30 PM

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  
AL MAIDEN

Reported by: SUSAN R. PILAR, CSR, RPR  
CSR License No. 084-003432

2

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The village of Gurnee  
2 Plan Commission meeting will now come to order.  
3 Could we have roll call, please.  
4 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

5 MR. SULA: Here.

6 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.

7 MS. KOVARIK: Here.

8 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepen.

9 MR. CEPON: Here.

10 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.

11 MR. WINTER: Here.

12 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster. Absent.

13 Smith.

14 MR. SMITH: Here.

15 MR. WILDENBERG: Chairman Rudny.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Here.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: First if you will join

18 me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

19 (Whereupon, the Pledge of

20 Allegiance was said.)

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. First we have

22 the approval of the May 20th Plan Commission

23 minutes. Are there any additions or corrections?

24 If not, I would entertain a motion

3

1 to accept the minutes.

2 MR. CEPON: I make a motion.

3 MR. SMITH: Second.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Second.

5 All in favor signify by saying aye

6 in the roll call. Those opposed say nay.

7 Roll call, please.

8 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.  
9 MR. SULA: Abstain.  
10 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.  
11 MS. KOVARIK: Yes.  
12 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepen.  
13 MR. CEPON: Aye.  
14 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.  
15 MR. WINTER: Aye.  
16 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.  
17 MR. FOSTER: Aye.  
18 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.  
19 MR. SMITH: Aye.  
20 MR. WILDENBERG: Rudny.  
21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye.

22 Motion carried. So ordered.

23 Next we have a final PUD plat Auto  
24 Nation. The subject property consists of

4

1 approximately 14.5 acres located in the northwest  
2 corner of Route 132 and Dilleys Road. The property  
3 is zoned CB-2/PUD and has preliminary PUD plat  
4 approval for an Auto Nation car sales facility.

5 Auto Nation is requesting final PUD  
6 plat approval for a five to six hundred vehicle car  
7 sales facility on this site.

8 Jon, do you have anything to add to  
9 that?

10 MR. WILDENBERG: Not a whole lot. This  
11 is part of the overall plan in the zoning process.

12 This is the last stage before Auto Nation is  
13 eligible to receive building permits to construct  
14 the facility.

15 You'll note that they have revised  
16 the scale and the scope of the project and a  
17 representative is here tonight, Mike Palella, to go  
18 over their changes.

19 The village Board has previously  
20 reviewed the changes and made a determination that  
21 they are minor in nature as far as the minor or  
22 major amendment to the PUD so they can be processed  
23 and administrative review of the Plan Commission.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is the Petitioner here?

5

1 MR. PALELLA: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Please if you can kind  
3 of give us a rundown on what these changes are.

4 MR. PALELLA: Absolutely. If I could  
5 use one of these boards here.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Could you please use  
7 the microphone. Yeah. It comes off the stand.

8 MR. PALELLA: Okay. Good evening. Some  
9 of the changes. As you see we've created an  
10 out-parcel which will be for the future  
11 development --

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Could you -- maybe if  
13 you could bring it just a little closer, angle that  
14 towards the Plan Commissioners so they're able to

15 see that.

16 Is that okay for everybody?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's fine.

18 MR. PALELLA: The first noticeable  
19 change you will see is that we created an  
20 out-parcel which is still Auto Nation's property  
21 and it will be for future expansion of the  
22 facility. This portion -- the whole site on this  
23 portion of the site and we had to change  
24 configuration of the buildings to meet the zoning

6

1 line that was part of the PUD.

2 Let's see. The original proposed  
3 plan had roughly a thousand cars for display  
4 parking. This one here holds roughly around 500 as  
5 you've probably seen in your summaries that you  
6 have up there. All the facilities and the  
7 functions of the building remain the same.

8 They have the service building and  
9 the showroom building. They are now connected.  
10 Auto Nation felt that this made for better access  
11 for the public instead of sending someone oh, you  
12 got to go across the parking lot, it's all  
13 connected now.

14 They also feel that when someone  
15 drops off their car for service in the wintertime  
16 they can just walk inside the showroom and be in a  
17 nice area to observe and possibly buy a new car.

18 Let's see. Overall we reduced just

19 about everything, lighting, the actual pavement  
20 areas, and as you can see by those summaries we've  
21 met or exceeded the -- all the original items in  
22 the PUD by reducing lighting, pulling our setbacks  
23 back further away from the -- from the homes that  
24 are over here.

7

1 As you also see from the  
2 photometrics that were provided that they're -- we  
3 do meet the original PUD requirements.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: My understanding there  
5 were some fixture changes from 400 lot to thousand  
6 lot in one section. Can you point that out?

7 MR. PALELLA: Well, the original plan  
8 had the building situated like this and our display  
9 parking was along the tollway. In order to meet  
10 the zoning line we had to turn the buildings like  
11 this so we could have the service on the west side  
12 and the showroom on the other.

13 So what happened is our display  
14 parking tilted, also. So if you go by the original  
15 plan we would of had some fixtures in this area  
16 here that were lower wattage and that's why we did  
17 the photometrics so you can see that by making  
18 these the display fixtures which are higher wattage  
19 we still do not exceed the limits at the property  
20 lines and, of course, we have the berm over here  
21 and trees and the -- and the eight foot fence.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Any other  
23 questions? If there's no questions --

24 MR. SMITH: I would like to pass a

8

1 favorable recommendation to the village Board on  
2 the final plat for PUD for Auto Nation.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Motion for a  
4 favorable recommendation.

5 MR. SULA: I'll second.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion by Mr. Smith,  
7 second by Mr. Sula. All those in favor of the  
8 motion signify by saying aye.

9 Roll call, please.

10 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

11 MR. SULA: Aye.

12 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.

13 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

14 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepon.

15 MR. CEPON: Aye.

16 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.

17 MR. WINTER: Aye.

18 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.

19 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

20 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.

21 MR. SMITH: Aye.

22 MR. WILDENBERG: Rudny.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye.

24 Motion carried. It is so ordered.

1                   Okay. The next matter is a review  
2 of the signage proposal for out-parcel at Rosen  
3 Motors. The subject property is located at the  
4 northeast corner of Brookside Drive and Route 132.

5                   The Petitioner is requesting  
6 approval of signage for the outlot building on site  
7 and for a ground mounted sign on Grand Avenue in  
8 place of the sign approved for Brookside Drive.

9                   Jon, do you have anything to add to  
10 that?

11                   MR. WILDENBERG: The annexation  
12 agreement for this property required that at the  
13 time the outside parcel became developed and the  
14 signage program was put together for it that it  
15 come for review to the Plan Commission and village  
16 Board.

17                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I might add that  
18 we did -- the Petitioner also provided a letter to  
19 the Plan Commission before the meeting so if the  
20 Petitioner could -- actually, it's not a petition.  
21 It's just a review.

22                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's just a  
23 review.

24                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Show us what you have

1 there.

2                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it's  
3 easier for me to bring this toward you and show you



4           how this looks. The plan --

5                       MS. KOVARIK: That's Grand.

6                       UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's Grand and  
7           moving east to west.

8                       MR. WARNBROOK: We're also requesting --

9                       CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Could you use the  
10          microphone, please.

11                      MR. WARNBROOK: Yeah. Sure.

12                      My name is Steve Warnbrook and I'm  
13          representing Bridgestone Firestone in this respect  
14          and also the owner of the property which is Rosen  
15          Real Estate.

16                      The annexation agreement called for  
17          a -- a third sign which would be on Brookside Drive  
18          which would be right over here leading into the  
19          residential section of the property.

20                      What we're requesting is an  
21          amendment to that annexation agreement which would  
22          allow for the pylon sign to be located on Grand  
23          Avenue. This would be the third sign on Grand  
24          Avenue.

11

1                      There's a -- there's currently on  
2          this site a Rosen Honda sign and a Rosen  
3          Lincoln-Mercury sign. This would be -- the  
4          Bridgestone Firestone sign would be approximately  
5          the same size and height as the existing two signs  
6          on the site. With this amendment we would delete

7 the sign on Brookside and erect it on Grand Avenue.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Do we have any  
9 questions for these Petitioners?

10 Miss Kovarik.

11 MS. KOVARIK: Are you saying that the  
12 sign would be the same height as the Rosen Honda?

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Speak in to the  
14 microphone, please.

15 MR. WARNBROOK: Yes, that's correct.  
16 The sign is approximately ten by 15 and overall  
17 height of 20 feet.

18 MS. KOVARIK: This is for staff. On the  
19 other side of Grand do we have any ground signs  
20 that height? I thought they were all monument  
21 signs.

22 MR. WILDENBERG: Where your main project  
23 identification signs those signs go up to 25 feet  
24 in height and then there are smaller monument

12

1 signs.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And, again, we're  
3 going to be sharing with two other businesses.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: In fact, I just --  
5 before the meeting I drove down Grand Avenue  
6 because I was wondering the same thing and there  
7 are some -- some of the monument signs actually are  
8 on posts, too.

9 So you have -- that one over by the  
10 Grand Hunt has got something like that. So, you

11 know, I looked -- I went specifically to look at  
12 Rosen's I know because I thought the Rosen sign  
13 look pretty nice.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. We didn't  
15 want to create a mass with a -- with a full base so  
16 it looks better on the covered stem.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions?

18 (No verbal response.)

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I'll entertain a  
20 motion for a favorable recommendation.

21 MR. CEPON: I'll motion to have a  
22 favorable recommendation for the proposed signage  
23 change from Brookside Drive to Grand Avenue.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We have a motion.

13

1 MR. WINTER: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion seconded by Mr.  
3 Winter.

4 All those in favor of the motion  
5 signify by saying aye in the roll call. Those  
6 opposed say nay.

7 Roll call, please.

8 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

9 MR. SULA: Aye.

10 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.

11 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

12 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepen.

13 MR. CEPON: Aye.

14 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.

15 MR. WINTER: Aye.

16 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.

17 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

18 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.

19 MR. SMITH: Aye.

20 MR. WILDENBERG: Rudny.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye.

22 Motion carried and is so ordered.

23 Thank you.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you

14

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. The next matter  
2 is a public hearing, Ultimate Gymnastics. The  
3 subject property is located at 1018 Tri-State  
4 Parkway in the Grand Tri-state Business Park.

5 The property is zoned I-2 with a  
6 Special Use Permit for an office and industrial  
7 park. Gymnastic training facilities require a  
8 Special Use Permit in the business park.

9 Petitioner is proposing to utilize  
10 27,000 square feet of an existing 35,000 square  
11 foot building for gymnastics training.

12 Jon, do you have anything to add to  
13 that?

14 MR. WILDENBERG: You probably remember  
15 some years ago the Special Use Permit for Grand  
16 Tri-state Industrial Park was amended to allow for  
17 consideration of gymnastics facilities as a special

18 use and I think we've processed at least two  
19 applications for this type of use, one which never  
20 went forward; the other which I think was recently  
21 approved here in the last few months. This would  
22 be the -- the third type application on that.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I take it the  
24 Petitioner is here someplace?

15

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Please step forward and  
3 anyone with the Petitioner who is going to be  
4 giving testimony regarding this petition and also  
5 anyone from the public who wishes to make a comment  
6 or ask a question on this specific public  
7 hearing -- this is not referring to the other  
8 public hearings -- you need to stand and be sworn  
9 in by the village attorney.

10 MS. SWANSON: Only you're going to  
11 testify?

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We all intend to  
13 speak.

14 (Witnesses sworn.)

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Please proceed and  
16 state your name and affiliation for the record,  
17 please.

18 MS. NORTHRUP: Okay. My name is Nancy  
19 Northrup and I'm a partner in Ultimate Gymnastics  
20 of Gurnee. I have been in the gymnastics industry

21 for 30 years as a competitor, as a director, as a  
22 club owner.

23 I was director of Northbrook  
24 Gymnastics Training Center for eight years and

16

1 owner of Buffalo Grove Gymnastics Training Center.  
2 I live currently in Buffalo Grove with my husband  
3 and three children.

4 My husband Rob.

5 MR. NORTHRUP: And I'm the husband by  
6 the way. I'm Robert Northrup. I've been involved  
7 in gymnastics for a little over 20 years,  
8 competitively starting at Libertyville High School  
9 and Illinois State University where I received my  
10 degree in public relations.

11 You obviously know where I live now  
12 so I hand it over to Rebecca here.

13 MS. CASSIDY: My name is Rebecca Cassidy  
14 and I've actually been an owner of Ultimate  
15 Gymnastics for the last three and a half years.  
16 I've been coaching there, I've been managing the  
17 place with another partner.

18 I have been involved in gymnastics  
19 for 25 years not only as a competitor but also as  
20 coaches at two different universities, Illinois  
21 State University is one of them, and -- and I'm  
22 looking forward to expanding the business into a  
23 bigger building because I feel that we have  
24 outgrown our space and we're ready to do that.

1 Thanks.

2 MS. RUNYARD: Hello. My name is Vicky  
3 Runyard and I've been involved in the gymnastics  
4 industry for the past 25 years participating and  
5 coach and I've been with Ultimate Gymnastics since  
6 they opened over three years ago. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Go ahead. If  
8 you can tell us a little bit about your plans.

9 MS. NORTHRUP: Okay. Our goal at  
10 Ultimate Gymnastics is to provide a full service  
11 gymnastics facility that will benefit the village  
12 of Gurnee in many ways. We assure a safe, clean,  
13 fun learning environment for children of all ages  
14 to foster self-confidence, social skills and gross  
15 motor skill development.

16 We believe that gymnastics training  
17 and physical fitness whether at the recreational or  
18 competitive levels is a valuable asset for all  
19 aspects of children's growth and development.

20 We intend to provide a variety of  
21 programming at Ultimate Gymnastics starting with a  
22 baby gym program for ages six months through two  
23 years, a dance program, recreational gymnastics  
24 classes for ages two years through 18 years,

1 cheerleading programs, birthday parties, summer day  
2 camps and the option to offer many community

3 service programs.

4 We believe that the property at  
5 1081 Tri-state Parkway suits our needs for many  
6 reasons. First of all, the physical structure of  
7 the building has adequate ceiling height and bay  
8 sizes for all our programming needs.

9 The building is a freestanding one  
10 tenant building with what we believe to be adequate  
11 parking for the needs of our business. Access to  
12 and from the building is eased by way of Cemetery  
13 Road or Grand Avenue into the business park.

14 Our hours of operation are safe we  
15 feel in regard to truck traffic through the park as  
16 we conduct the bulk of our business in the evenings  
17 and on weekends.

18 As you know and as Rebecca stated  
19 Ultimate Gymnastics has been an upstanding business  
20 in the village of Gurnee for three years. We  
21 currently occupy space at 122 Ambrogio Drive and  
22 with the ever growing needs for activities in the  
23 village we hope to grow along with you and we look  
24 forward to keeping our business here in Gurnee.

19

1 Rebecca is going to talk for a  
2 brief moment about the numbers of children and how  
3 we plan to cycle them through the facility.

4 MS. CASSIDY: Okay. The way that our  
5 classes run is the day classes with preschool



6 children and that's children five and under. The  
7 biggest they would be would be six to one  
8 teacher/student ratio.

9 The most people we would have in  
10 the gym at one time would be 50 participants and  
11 that would also include coaches within that -- that  
12 number of 50.

13 Obviously, our class size would  
14 have to get larger as the kids get bigger. So we  
15 wouldn't have as many classes going on at one time.  
16 Once they're six and older the teacher/student  
17 ratio would be eight to one.

18 So still again because the size of  
19 the classes will grow we will cut down the number  
20 of classes that can be allowed in -- in a gym at  
21 one time, which is actually necessary because the  
22 older they get the more training they're doing for  
23 gymnastics and they need more space to be able to  
24 do that.

20

1 So we want you to know that we're  
2 not going to have, you know, 500 kids in there at  
3 one time. Our goal is to get the gym up to 1,200  
4 students. We now have 700 students in the facility  
5 that we have right now and even in our facility  
6 that's only 7,200 square feet with 700 children we  
7 never go over the number of 50 and actually we  
8 haven't even come close to having 50 participants  
9 in the gym at one time.

10 MS. NORTHRUP: Do you have any specific  
11 questions for us regarding the space?

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Maybe we could do that,  
13 open it to the Commissioners and see if there are  
14 any questions.

15 Are you planning on closing the  
16 existing facility?

17 MS. NORTHRUP: Yeah. The existing  
18 facility will no longer be at Ambrogio Drive.  
19 Correct. We're intending to move the entire  
20 business to 1018 Tri-state Parkway.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. The  
22 Commissioners have any questions?

23 Mr. Smith.

24 MR. SMITH: Will you be having meets

21

1 there or anything?

2 I just wondered about parking, Jon.  
3 Would that be if they had a meet there of some  
4 kind?

5 MS. CASSIDY: Yes, we definitely would  
6 like to have meets there and usually you only have  
7 one or two a year. USAD really doesn't even have  
8 room to allow you to have more than that, but we  
9 would only have at the most 60 participants in a  
10 meet at one time.

11 If you have more than that the meet  
12 doesn't even run well. So you wouldn't even want

13 to have a larger meet than that, which we feel that  
14 the parking is very suitable for that many people  
15 coming to an event like that.

16 Also, meets are never done during  
17 busy times of traffic. The meets are done  
18 Saturdays or Sundays.

19 MR. SMITH: Well, I ask that because I  
20 have a nephew who's in gymnastics who is very  
21 successful. Very, very successful. He's from SIU,  
22 too. He was the state champ in 1968.

23 MR. WINTER: In your current location  
24 how many parking spaces do you have available?

22

1 MS. NORTHRUP: At the current  
2 location?

3 MR. WINTER: Yes.

4 MS. CASSIDY: I'm embarrassed to say  
5 about 15.

6 MR. WINTER: And is that inadequate for  
7 what you're experiencing right now or --

8 MS. CASSIDY: We have about ten percent  
9 of people who stay and watch. Most people drop off  
10 their kids and leave. So ten to 20 percent I would  
11 say stay.

12 MR. WINTER: And those spaces are all  
13 taken with the ten percent of people that stay  
14 or --

15 MS. CASSIDY: Of the 12 -- you know, not  
16 even quite because we actually have parking in the

17 back and nobody uses the parking in the back.

18 So ...

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions?

20 (No verbal response.)

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Just to follow up on  
22 parking, Jon. Is there a business plan? Do you  
23 feel the parking is adequate or we should --

24 MR. WILDENBERG: And we've also asked

23

1 our traffic consultant to take a look at the  
2 numbers and the scheduling and so forth and it's  
3 really kind of a tough use to nail down because the  
4 characteristics can be different from operation to  
5 operation.

6 I think the nuts and bolts of his  
7 recommendation is that since there is space or  
8 territory to expand parking if needed that there be  
9 some consideration for land bank conditional  
10 parking should it become necessary.

11 He has -- currently the site has 43  
12 spaces striped out. Our consultant felt that --  
13 that that may be workable but 50 to 55 would be a  
14 more comfortable number to start out with with the  
15 opportunity for more should it become evident that  
16 more parking may be needed.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Or we could also  
18 just -- we could -- if there are presently 43  
19 spaces --

20 MS. NORTHRUP: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: -- could we do  
22 something where with the special use that 25 spaces  
23 have to be land banked so that if there is a  
24 problem that they could then put in the additional

24

1 parking spaces?

2 MR. WILDENBERG: Yeah. Our consultant  
3 felt there could be the potential for the need as  
4 much as 68 spaces but that may only happen once or  
5 twice a year and may not happen at all.

6 It just again depends on the  
7 routine and characteristic of that operation, but  
8 the ability is there to land bank the spaces, and I  
9 think that's really what he's -- what he's driving  
10 at.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Kind of like when the  
12 village hall and the school have special events and  
13 we don't have any parking here it gets jammed.

14 MR. WILDENBERG: It only happens on the  
15 nights everybody wants to be here.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Right.

17 So you have no objection to the  
18 land banking of --

19 MS. NORTHRUP: If you could just explain  
20 land banking. Does that mean that we would have  
21 the option of coming back to you and requesting it  
22 in the future should we need it because the land is  
23 available or --

24

MR. WILDENBERG: It means that the

25

1 property would be encumbered under this Special Use  
2 Permit to provide those additional spaces should  
3 they become needed.

4 MS. NORTHRUP: Okay.

5 MR. WILDENBERG: If you on your own  
6 determine that yeah, we would really like to have  
7 spaces or you need them then you can just come on  
8 in and apply for a building permit for  
9 instructional space. You wouldn't necessarily have  
10 to come back through a special use proceeding.

11 MS. NORTHRUP: Okay. We have no  
12 objection to the land banking.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And the opposite would  
14 be true if, for example, there were some problems  
15 at least identified that, you know, would require  
16 you to put the spaces in then under the Special Use  
17 Permit you would be required to put those  
18 additional spaces in.

19 MS. NORTHRUP: Right.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Since it's a  
21 public hearing I have to open the floor to the  
22 public. Is there anyone from the public who wishes  
23 to make a comment or ask a question?

24 (No verbal response.)

26

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It doesn't appear so so

2 the floor is closed to the public and I'll  
3 entertain a motion for a favorable recommendation.

4 Mr. Smith.

5 MR. SMITH: Yeah. I would like to pass  
6 a favorable recommendation on to the village Board  
7 with the provision for 25 parking spots to be land  
8 banked.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Motion by Mr.  
10 Smith.

11 Is there a second?

12 MR. WINTER: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Second by Mr. Winter.  
14 All those in favor signify by saying aye in the  
15 roll call. Those opposed say nay.

16 Roll call, please.

17 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

18 MR. SULA: Aye.

19 MR. WILDENBERG: Ms. Kovarik.

20 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

21 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepon.

22 MR. CEPON: Aye.

23 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.

24 MR. WINTER: Aye.

27

1 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.

2 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

3 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.

4 MR. SMITH: Aye.

5 MR. WILDENBERG: Rudny.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye.

7 Motion carried and it is so  
8 ordered.

9 MS. NORTHRUP: Thank you very much.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Good luck.

11 Okay. The next matter is -- okay.  
12 We have actually two public hearings which we will  
13 hear simultaneously from Globe Corporation. One is  
14 an amendment to R-1 PUD and the other one is  
15 amended to C/O-1 PUD.

16 The subject property is located at  
17 the southwest corner of Route 120 and Route 21.  
18 The Petitioner is requesting an amendment to an  
19 existing Planned Unit Development to allow the  
20 redistribution of sewer capacity from the C/O-1  
21 office parcel to the R-1 residential parcel in  
22 order to allow for an additional 11 single family  
23 lots in the final phase, Phase IV, of the  
24 residential development.

28

1 The Petitioner is also requesting a  
2 reduction of the use list for the C/O-1 parcel and  
3 a reduction to the rear yard setback from 30 to 25  
4 feet and an increase to the front yard setback for  
5 five lots for the final phase of the residential  
6 development.

7 Jon, anything to add to that?

8 MR. WILDENBERG: No. Not really. The





12 any event, we started -- this piece of property,  
13 525 acres, have been in our family for 30 years and  
14 my parents -- my father who is still here still  
15 resides in this 100 acres on the -- what's really  
16 the southwest quadrant of Route 120 and 21.

17 But about nine years ago, eight  
18 years ago we came to the village and annexed this  
19 entire property in and developed on 325 acres The  
20 Merit Club Golf Club which you can see outlined in  
21 green.

22 Subsequent to developing The Merit  
23 Club we also put a conservation easement on the  
24 entire 325 acres. So this green section of the

30

1 property will in perpetuity be left an open space,  
2 and as many of you have been out or have seen it  
3 there's a lot of native wild grass and prairie  
4 grass, some wetlands that are untouched. It's a  
5 very beautiful piece of property.

6 Along with that we did come to the  
7 village with a hundred acres that we created an R-1  
8 PUD for to do up to a hundred homes on a hundred  
9 acres and the development is gone now with the  
10 absorption of sales that we're here to talk about,  
11 Phrase IV, and what we need to do to begin the  
12 planning of that.

13 So with that in mind what I would  
14 like to do is -- is discuss the petition and then  
15 I'm going to ask Lane Kendig to describe what we're

16 doing with the land plan and the landscape plan and  
17 then Jim Doherty and then open it up for any  
18 questions.

19 What we've done is on this 36 acres  
20 we created 36 cluster units of which we're nearing  
21 75 percent sales over here. They're beautiful  
22 homes, the architectural integrity is beautiful. I  
23 think many of you have been out and seen them.  
24 They're cedar shaked roofs and they're beautiful

31

1 masonry and they're 36 units on 36 acres. So it's  
2 a very low density development with a lot of wild  
3 grasses and ponds and whatnot.

4 Then we also have some estate lots  
5 here that are being built on one acre estate home  
6 and then over here we're talking about the 26 acres  
7 and what we're looking to do is -- is really  
8 complete the R-1 PUD by -- by building 49  
9 additional units here.

10 So instead of a hundred homes we're  
11 looking to do 111 homes. The homes that we're  
12 talking about doing here and the community are --  
13 are virtually parallel to what we've done on these  
14 two. The homes are going to be the same character  
15 and architecture and style that we've done.

16 It's just now that this phase nears  
17 completion we need to continue on and finish on  
18 here. So what we're looking to do is -- first is

19 revise and amend the original PUD allowing for 11  
20 units.

21 In addition to that we would like  
22 to amend it so that we could have 25-foot rear yard  
23 setbacks instead of 30-foot setbacks.

24 Now, Lane is going to describe the

32

1 landscaping components of that and the fact that we  
2 do have a 20-foot landscape buffer zone between the  
3 rear yard.

4 So even though we're asking for a  
5 little bit -- a rear setback reduction from 25 to  
6 30 feet we're actually adding a 20-foot strip of  
7 landscape buffers on the 20 lots, and the reason  
8 why we're requesting the reduction is so that the  
9 home -- the potential homebuyers will have more  
10 flexibility when it comes to adding screened  
11 porches and patios and things of that nature.

12 The -- the other Petitioner request  
13 we have here is also for -- for approval of a  
14 preliminary plat and preliminary engineering which  
15 Lane and Jim Doherty will get into as well.

16 And, lastly, what we've talked  
17 about doing -- or what we need to do is amend this  
18 C/O-1 PUD. There's some sewer requirements here  
19 that what we would like to do is reduce the density  
20 of the proposed uses.

21 Now, bear in mind my parents still  
22 live here. There's no imminent development taking

23 place but per our annexation in 1990 we were  
24 required to come back to the village and have this

33

1 zoned, and that's why it's zoned as it is.

2 What we would like to do is reduce  
3 the density and essentially transfer over here so  
4 that we can accommodate 11 additional dwelling  
5 units.

6 So with that in mind I would like  
7 to introduce Lane Kendig and have him speak to the  
8 land plan and the landscape plan.

9 MR. KENDIG: Thank you very much, Burt.

10 It's a pleasure to be here before  
11 the Board again.

12 I think it is important to  
13 understand that this is completely a transfer. The  
14 density of this project is regulated by the amount  
15 of sewer capacity through an agreement with the  
16 development of the village and the county of Lake.  
17 So we can't ask -- we really cannot ask for more  
18 development.

19 What we're asking to be done is  
20 move the development from the commercial portion  
21 down to this portion and it will actually in all  
22 probability be a significant lower end of intensity  
23 because this is potentially commercial or office  
24 types of uses that have a much higher traffic

34

1 generation base than the residential will.

2 So at least in terms of -- for  
3 those of you who are unfortunate to have to drive  
4 on Milwaukee every day this is actually better for  
5 the overall project.

6 The site plan itself the road is --  
7 goes through the cul de sac in this direction,  
8 comes on and goes up this cul de sac in this  
9 direction. So this road is in through this area.  
10 The stand of oaks that you see if you've driven up  
11 that way are down here along the southern border of  
12 the property.

13 You have Libertyville Township open  
14 space with a stable on a part of that immediately  
15 to the south. To the southwest and west you have  
16 Marshall Field property and what we're doing --  
17 because these are one acre lots we go back to  
18 the -- this third phase here.

19 Those are one acre lots. So we  
20 have what is roughly half acre lots. In this  
21 location here is the transition. We have detention  
22 basins located in this area to handle all of the  
23 stormwater runoff.

24 We have a little bit of a -- a

35

1 public green type of landscape feature and actual  
2 parking in this location and then we -- we are  
3 coming fairly significantly uphill.

4                   This is the natural low point of  
5                   the site with drainage off to an existing drainage  
6                   channel at this location and we have basically  
7                   three cul de sacs.

8                   And as we pointed out earlier,  
9                   we've tried to create a landscape area in between  
10                  these so that there is a greater privacy on the  
11                  rear yards of all of these properties that have  
12                  some additional screening and we have parking in  
13                  both of the cul de sacs.

14                  We have kind of a loop here. It,  
15                  again, has a -- a landscape feature here and  
16                  another cul de sac up in this location. We have  
17                  buffer yards along with our southern/western  
18                  boundary, to the north we have views of the golf  
19                  course. So we're not doing anything to interfere  
20                  with the view out over the golf course.

21                  This is -- is generally the  
22                  landscape plan. Virtually all of the land down to  
23                  about this location is -- is just open farmland or  
24                  open space in Libertyville Township.

36

1                   There are some structures and  
2                   stables in this location here on Marshall Field  
3                   property and along the western border of Marshall  
4                   Field has a fence and to about this location here  
5                   there's a solid planting of evergreens on the  
6                   Marshall Field side. Those trees are -- are  
7                   roughly 30 to 40 feet high.

8                   From there north -- I don't know  
9                   whether there was a -- some sort of destruction or  
10                  not, but these -- the rest of that tree row are  
11                  only about 15 feet high. They will eventually fill  
12                  in, but what we've done is we've placed a heavy  
13                  evergreen screen on our side which will be raised  
14                  above the -- the property line so you'll have a  
15                  very effective border there.

16                         We have an out-parcel as I'm sure  
17                         you're all aware here in the center. It is not  
18                         controlled by us and is not in the village of  
19                         Gurnee and we have installed buffering yards along  
20                         all sides of that property as well.

21                                That property has a number of  
22                                mature trees on it and I think we've done a good  
23                                job of screening all of the various things with  
24                                regard to this.

37

1                                    I think we have a lot of very nice  
2                                    home sites, home sites that have views out over the  
3                                    golf course, a number of home sites that's going to  
4                                    look over the -- the detention basins which will be  
5                                    wet basins and on the interior ones we've -- we put  
6                                    our -- our own landscaping in.

7                                    Most of these homes on the down  
8                                    side of the cul de sac will be capable of  
9                                    supporting walkout types of units. Obviously, the  
10                                   ones on the uphill side will not support them.



11                   So I think that's a quick run  
12 through of the plan and I will pass it on.

13                   MR. GETTS: Yeah. Actually, I just have  
14 a couple of comments that Lane brought up. A  
15 couple of important things that I want to again  
16 reiterate.

17                   The style, the character, the  
18 integrity of the development of this phase is  
19 parallel to what we've done and for those that have  
20 been out to the resort at The Merit Club know that,  
21 you know, the open space and the rolling terrain  
22 and the integrity of the development and we have  
23 every -- you know, your goal is to make this every  
24 bit as part of that and with the same spirit and

38

1 character as what we've done.

2                   Lastly, as Lane did point out  
3 Marshall Field does have a farm adjacent to us to  
4 the west. Marshall and our family go back for a  
5 number of years.

6                   My father being close friends with  
7 him has talked to Marshall about this and showed  
8 him this plan and Marshall has no objections at  
9 all. He's actually very supportive of it because  
10 of the buffer zone here and the potential for our  
11 landscaping to provide the privacy and protection.

12                   So with that I would like to ask  
13 Jim Doherty, the engineer, to share with you some  
14 remarks and then we can have questions and answers

15 at that time.

16 MR. DOHERTY: My name is Jim  
17 Doherty and I essentially got the boring part of  
18 the presentation here. I'm a registered  
19 professional engineer in Illinois and was the  
20 original design engineer for The Merit Club and  
21 the -- or The Reserve at The Merit Club and The  
22 Merit Clubhouse.

23 I have here in front of you a  
24 version of the preliminary engineering that was

39

1 submitted to the staff for review. This area was  
2 originally planned for 38 cluster units and in so  
3 being we had extended utilities into this area for  
4 those 38 units.

5 On this plan showing sanitary sewer  
6 in red, storm sewer in green and water main in blue  
7 although it would be difficult to see from that  
8 distance.

9 The existing roadway for the Merit  
10 Club starts at this location. Originally it was  
11 planned to come through here. We've rerouted it so  
12 instead of a T-intersection we go down in this  
13 direction and it'll simply deadend 90 degrees in  
14 the other direction.

15 We've proposed roadways using the  
16 same criterias as those used for the east side  
17 clusters. We have a main road, parking on one side

18 only with limited access, no driveways along  
19 this -- this area in here. We only have three lots  
20 on this side that'll have driveways that'll come  
21 out onto that road.

22 Cul de sac roads are narrower as  
23 approved for the original cluster concept. We  
24 included four parking spaces in the cul de sacs for

40

1 guest parking.

2 In terms of sanitary sewer service  
3 we will be serviced tributary to a pumping station  
4 located immediately southeast as the guard house on  
5 The Reserve property. That pumping station has  
6 more than adequate reserve capacity for the 40 line  
7 lots that we've proposed here.

8 Water main was also stopped at this  
9 road terminates here. There is also a water main  
10 stub which actually falls off of our land but runs  
11 north of this out-parcel will be looping water main  
12 through and tying in to that existing stub in this  
13 location.

14 From a stormwater drainage  
15 standpoint the eastern portion of what we're  
16 referring to as Phase IV is within the drainage  
17 area for The Merit Club Golf Course and the  
18 original residential area.

19 This stormwater detention for this  
20 area is provided in the Merit Club Golf Course and  
21 other adjacent retention basins for that area.

22 This portion of the project which is approximately  
23 23 acres is part of a different minor drainage area  
24 which drains to the south.

41

1 So to provide the required  
2 stormwater detention we've provided two stormwater  
3 detention basins. There's two basins because there  
4 is a rather significant amount of topography here.

5 So this one is, I believe, about  
6 seven feet higher than this one vertically. It  
7 provides all the required detention volume in  
8 accordance with the Lake County Stormwater  
9 Management ordinance which you also adopted as part  
10 of yours.

11 At this point that provides you  
12 with a brief overview of the functional aspects of  
13 the Merit Club and we'll open it up to any  
14 questions you may have.

15 MR. GETTS: Why don't I just make a few  
16 closing remarks and then we can have questions.

17 Again, what we're really  
18 petitioning the village for in summary is, again,  
19 to revise or amend our original R-1 PUD to allow  
20 for 111 dwelling units and also for a rear setback  
21 reduction from 30 feet to 25 feet.

22 We'd also hoped to petition the  
23 village for a preliminary plat and engineering  
24 approval for that Phase IV.

1                   And the third really component is  
2                   also amending the C/O-1 PUD, which is if you recall  
3                   the hundred acres where my parents live which is  
4                   the commercial piece. Although we do not have any  
5                   intention of developing this at this time.

6                   What we're really talking about  
7                   doing is shifting, you know, essentially 11 -- the  
8                   sewer pass for 11 homes that are already allocated  
9                   or potentially could be built here down here.

10                   So essentially shifting capacity  
11                   from here to down here. So those are really the  
12                   three petitions that we have for the village at  
13                   this time, and as we said earlier if there are any  
14                   questions we'd be happy to try and answer them for  
15                   anybody here tonight.

16                   CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.

17                   I just had one question. Was there  
18                   ever a -- a plat of -- does this area -- this space  
19                   have a plat? Did we ever see a -- like a  
20                   preliminary plat on that?

21                   MR. GETTS: I don't think this area was  
22                   ever platted. The reason why it's actually  
23                   Phase IV is because there was an original plat just  
24                   right here at the entrance and that was one, this

1                   became plat No. 2 and this became plat No. 3, but  
2                   there is not currently a plat 4 at this time and

3 that's -- we're hopeful to gain the preliminary  
4 plat at this time.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: This might be for your  
6 engineer. The drawings that I have here there's  
7 a -- looks like some kind of a stub road that comes  
8 off of the north/south road and comes down right at  
9 Lot 71. The drawing I have --

10 MR. DOHERTY: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: -- shows some kind of  
12 a --

13 MR. DOHERTY: Right. There's  
14 actually -- our roadways are private so they're on  
15 a roadway lot and not a right of way and that  
16 roadway lot was stubbed in this location for the  
17 road to extend through and loop to the west down in  
18 here.

19 That portion of the lot would be  
20 vacated and would actually become a part of Lot 71  
21 and a part of that vacated roadway lot would become  
22 part of the outlot for a stormwater retention.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. So that would be  
24 eliminated then?

44

1 MR. DOHERTY: That will be eliminated,  
2 yes, sir.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Any other  
4 questions for the Petitioners?

5 Mr. Sula.

6 MR. SULA: One question regarding the

7 setbacks. I kind of view the green space in  
8 between the lots as the moral equivalent of  
9 providing 30 foot setbacks, but are there any lots  
10 that would not have the benefit of the open space  
11 on --

12 MR. GETTS: No. They all actually have  
13 open space to them so, for example, these lots here  
14 all have common area of open space here. These  
15 lots that would, you know, be adjacent to one  
16 another we have this 20-foot open space buffer zone  
17 here.

18 These would be adjacent to one  
19 another up here, have this 20-foot area and then  
20 again on the western boundary this ranges from 20  
21 to about 25 feet to Marshall Field property.

22 To the north on these lots there is  
23 the -- The Merit Club Golf Course and then on this  
24 little eastern portion I believe this is 15 feet

45

1 and greater than 20 along in the south. So they  
2 all -- all these lots will have, in fact, some area  
3 of landscape buffer zone.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

5 MR. SULA: Jon, question for staff.

6 When you comment in terms of this  
7 shifting the sewer capacity from one part to the  
8 other, that is something that staff would view  
9 as --

10 MR. WILDENBERG: Yes. Would not exceed  
11 what we have already been granted.

12 MR. GETTS: Essentially what we're doing  
13 is shifting, you know, potential commercial  
14 capacity. Again, taking away from that and  
15 just -- and adding it to, you know, being able to  
16 shift it down here to have an additional 11 homes.

17 Again, if you think about these  
18 are, you know, more estate type homes. These are  
19 seven of them right here. So, you know, again, the  
20 whole thing I want to most importantly convey to  
21 the village is that everything we're doing here  
22 runs parallel and complimentary to what we've done  
23 so far.

24 I mean you see large open space

46

1 areas with prairie grasses and landscaped buffered  
2 areas. It's really think of it as perhaps an  
3 extension of what we've done with the first 36  
4 units.

5 MR. DOHERTY: We should mention these  
6 lots are all minimum 20,000 square feet. These are  
7 all above 10,000 square feet. There are no lots  
8 less than 10,000 square feet.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

10 Any other questions?

11 Mr. Smith.

12 MR. SMITH: Just out of curiosity how --  
13 what level of price are these homes going to be?



14 MR. GETTS: We are envisioning them  
15 starting roughly in the low to mid 300,000 and  
16 then, you know, certainly it's a function of, for  
17 example, these homes will have walkout basements.  
18 So those will certainly be more expensive than  
19 those that have standard basements.

20 And then, you know, it's a function  
21 of the upgrades and the options that the homebuyer  
22 will -- will select, but we're talking about really  
23 being in the -- in the low to mid \$300,000 range  
24 and then, obviously, going up from there.

47

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay.

2 MR. SMITH: Okay. A few years ago when  
3 I graduated from Warren High School did I ever  
4 dream or envision a golf course of this level would  
5 ever be in the village of Gurnee where one of the  
6 top pros from Chicago comes and plays at. I would  
7 never of dreamed of that.

8 MR. GETTS: We're actually very, very  
9 proud of not just the golf course but the entire  
10 development because it's something that the Getts  
11 family has put our name to. We're very proud of  
12 it.

13 Many people in the village know and  
14 I don't know if many of the people here know it,  
15 but we're proud to be hosting the -- the top  
16 championship in women's golf in the year 2000. The

17 Women's U.S. Open is coming to The Merit Club.

18 Just to, you know, give a benchmark  
19 as to what's going on the Women's U.S. Open is  
20 being hosted this week at Kohler at Black Wolf Run.  
21 So it gives us a lot of pride to be sort of lumped  
22 in there together to host the highest championship  
23 for women's golf in the year 2000. So we're very  
24 proud of that as well.

48

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I keep telling people  
2 it's 1999. It's 2000?

3 MR. GETTS: The year 2000. The  
4 Millenium Women's Championship.

5 So are there any other questions?  
6 We'd be happy to --

7 MR. MAIDEN: Just a comment on we had  
8 concerns about reducing office potential in other  
9 areas. The portion that they're looking to reduce  
10 it on is a very level wooded site and the  
11 opportunity to have reduction in parking in those  
12 areas -- actually it's not a real significant  
13 reduction, but it is an area that -- that's not  
14 just open field.

15 It's an area that really has some  
16 strong character for preservation and I think the  
17 lack of reduction in parking in that area is  
18 consistent with what we looked at on the  
19 comprehensive plan.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. This is a public

21 hearing so we're going to open the floor to the  
22 public.

23 Anyone who wishes to make a comment  
24 or ask a question may do so at this time. The

49

1 floor is now open to the public. Any questions or  
2 comments?

3 (No verbal response.)

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: There doesn't appear to  
5 be any so the floor is closed to the public and  
6 what's your pleasure, Mr. Cepon?

7 MR. CEPON: I'll make a favorable  
8 recommendation to amend the R-1 PUD, and if we can  
9 do it together --

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: No. We have to do it  
11 separately. So this would just be for the  
12 amendment to the R-1 PUD.

13 MR. CEPON: The R-1 PUD. Favorable  
14 recommendation to the village.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I have a motion. Do I  
16 have a second?

17 MR. FOSTER: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Second Mr. Foster for a  
19 favorable recommendation on the amendment to the  
20 R-1 PUD. All in favor of the motion signify by  
21 saying aye, all opposed nay.

22 Roll call, please.

23 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

24 MR. SULA: Aye.

50

1 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.

2 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

3 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepen.

4 MR. CEPON: Aye.

5 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.

6 MR. WINTER: Aye.

7 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.

8 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

9 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.

10 MR. SMITH: Aye.

11 MR. WILDENBERG: Rudny.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye.

13 Motion carried and it is so

14 ordered.

15 I'll entertain a motion for a  
16 favorable recommendation on the amendment to the  
17 C/O-1.

18 MR. SMITH: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion by Mr. Smith.

20 MR. SULA: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Second by Mr. Sula.

22 All those in favor of the motion  
23 signify by saying aye in roll call, those opposed  
24 say nay.

51

1 Roll call, please.

2 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.  
3 MR. WINTER: Aye.  
4 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.  
5 MR. FOSTER: Aye.  
6 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.  
7 MR. SMITH: Aye.  
8 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.  
9 MR. SULA: Aye.  
10 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.  
11 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.  
12 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepon.  
13 MR. CEPON: Aye.  
14 MR. WILDENBERG: Rudny.  
15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye.  
16 Motion carried. It is so ordered.  
17 Okay. Thank you. Good luck.  
18 MR. GETTS: Thank you very much.  
19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. The final matter  
20 on the agenda is the continued public hearing on  
21 the American Stores Properties, Inc.  
22 The subject property consists of  
23 approximately 75 acres and is located at the  
24 northwest corner of Route 120 and O'Plaine Road.

52

1 The property is zoned S, Suburban, in  
2 unincorporated Lake County.

3 The Petitioner is requesting  
4 annexation and rezoning to a Planned Unit  
5 Development that would accommodate commercial,

6 office and industrial uses.

7 Jon, do you have anything to add?

8 MR. WILDENBERG: Nothing.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Okay. Before we  
10 start this is a continued public hearing so anyone  
11 with the Petitioner who plans on giving testimony  
12 and also anyone from the public who wishes to make  
13 a comment or ask a question or even if you're not  
14 sure and you think you are you need to stand and be  
15 sworn in by the village attorney.

16 (Witnesses sworn.)

17 MR. WINTER: Mr. Chairman, before they  
18 begin I just for the record ask to be excused. I  
19 think I indicated to you earlier that I may have a  
20 conflict and so will not be voting on this  
21 particular matter.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I think I did  
23 put that into the record in the first public  
24 hearing.

53

1 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, thank you very  
2 much. Members of the Plan Commission.

3 My name is Robert Brown and I'm  
4 director of real estate for American Stores  
5 Properties which is a real estate construction  
6 entity of American Stores for Jewel/Osco.

7 We are continuing the hearing that  
8 we began at the last Plan Commission hearing. We

9 were at that meeting prepared to make a more  
10 detailed presentation, but it became apparent that  
11 there were some global issues that needed to be  
12 addressed before we proceeded, and we thank the  
13 Commission for highlighting those early on.

14 In this meeting because of the  
15 turnaround time that we have had to address those  
16 issues, both with our own consultants, staff and  
17 with the neighbors, we have had a limited amount of  
18 time to redo some of our exhibits.

19 So the format that we would like to  
20 take this evening is to take a step back, look at  
21 the entire development which includes the 75 acres,  
22 30 acres is under contract from the Lawson family  
23 to American Store Properties and the 45 acres to  
24 the west contiguous land lot by the Lawson property

54

1 except for the Eastwood Drive presently which is  
2 owned by Mr. Rosenquist who is the joint Petitioner  
3 with us this evening.

4 And we felt that the most  
5 meaningful way to do that would be to concentrate  
6 on the two or three major issues that were raised  
7 by both the public in the last Plan Commission  
8 hearing, also the Plan Commissioners, and even more  
9 importantly by the neighbors who attended a very  
10 large scale residential neighborhood meeting that  
11 we held last Thursday evening in council chambers.

12 This meeting was coordinated

13 through the Providence Village Homeowner's  
14 Association and we tried to notify as many  
15 neighbors as possible over in Providence Village,  
16 also Providence Oaks, those people that were also  
17 notified at the initial Plan Commission hearing.

18 And at that meeting we attempted to  
19 address one on one as many of the issues as the  
20 neighbors would care to raise focusing on the  
21 points of traffic, land use, Jewel/Osco's  
22 operations, other issues that we felt were -- were  
23 most noticeable and most noted in the initial  
24 meeting that we had with the Plan Commission and

55

1 the neighbors prior to that one.

2 So we -- we had over a hundred  
3 people that attended that meeting and we spent an  
4 hour and a half to two hours trying to address as  
5 many of those specific issues as we can. As we  
6 could.

7 Those people who did not have their  
8 questions answered or all their comments addressed  
9 one on one with our engineers and traffic and land  
10 use and real estate personnel were invited to fill  
11 out comment cards and we then reviewed those  
12 comment cards.

13 There were a total of 15 residents  
14 that did that. We intend to respond to those  
15 residents individually after this meeting, but in



16 the interest of time we wanted to consolidate those  
17 thoughts and that really gave us, I think, a good  
18 heads up as to what the concerns of the neighbors  
19 are and, obviously, of the community in general.

20 So the presentation that we'll make  
21 this evening using the power point slides will be  
22 an overview of basically what we intend to cover  
23 this evening.

24 We're going to focus on --

56

1 basically there are two areas that are paramount to  
2 the neighbors and, obviously, the Plan Commission  
3 and the village as a whole, and those are the  
4 traffic issues and the land use issues and the  
5 compatibility of the proposed development to the  
6 land use plan, comprehensive plan and the  
7 ordinances of the village of Gurnee.

8 I might add that we have made  
9 substantial changes to the land use plan between  
10 the last Plan Commission presentation and this  
11 evening and Mr. Les Pollach from Kamaros, the land  
12 planners that we brought on board as part of our  
13 team will expand on that and try to address that  
14 very basic issue that was addressed to us at the  
15 last meeting and we'll also concentrate on traffic  
16 issues which we acknowledge are very significant,  
17 very substantial existing conditions and are far  
18 less than adequate.

19 So we're attempting to deal with

20 that situation as well in the overall development  
21 of the plan.

22 So, again, on this slide I'll kind  
23 of wind up, but we hope that we can address the  
24 major concerns and then with the direction of the

57

1 Plan Commission and any other input from neighbors  
2 or other community participants take those specific  
3 concepts back to the drawing board, come back with  
4 more detailed plans that would fulfill the  
5 requirements of the PUD petition that we initially  
6 were starting at the last meeting.

7 The points that we hope to  
8 highlight this evening would be that our original  
9 proposal was not in compliance with the  
10 comprehensive plan. That, obviously, came across  
11 loud and clear.

12 The comprehensive plan has been  
13 developed recently and we acknowledge that there  
14 needs to be some transition that addresses that  
15 plan in concert with what our proposal will be.

16 Secondly, as I mentioned, the  
17 traffic impacts. Thirdly, trying to ensure that  
18 the buffer between the development whether it's  
19 office service, commercial or some other use with  
20 the combined 75 acres is, in fact, adequate between  
21 the residents of Providence Village and that  
22 development.

23                                   Our initial plan you may recall had  
24                                   a 100-foot wide buffer all along the entire north

58

1                                   property line of the ASPI, Jewel/Osco and  
2                                   Rosenquist property abutting Providence Village.

3                                   We think that the plan you'll look  
4                                   at this evening -- at least the concepts that we're  
5                                   going to present to you -- will address some of  
6                                   those concerns and, hopefully, even enhance that as  
7                                   well as upgrading the esthetics along O'Plaine Road  
8                                   is also an issue that we heard addressed at the  
9                                   prior meeting.

10                                   Obviously, the appearance of the  
11                                   development including impacts from noise and  
12                                   lighting, architectural issues, compatibility with  
13                                   the -- the New England flavor of the Providence  
14                                   Village and Providence Oaks is another issue that  
15                                   was raised and very pertinent and also any  
16                                   potential security concerns with the proposed uses  
17                                   and be a commercial office service or other that  
18                                   can be addressed through good proper planning in a  
19                                   PUD for the entire 75 acres.

20                                   With that I would like to turn it  
21                                   over to Les Pollach of Kamaros who is the land use  
22                                   consultant of American Stores and Rosenquist have  
23                                   retained to try to address the specific issues of  
24                                   this entire site as it relates to the village of

59

1 Gurnee ordinances and comprehensive plan. Thank  
2 you.

3 MR. POLLACH: Thank you, Bob, and good  
4 evening. My name is Lesley Pollach. I'm a  
5 principal consultant with the firm of Kamaros, Ltd.  
6 We are a comprehensive planning and zoning firm and  
7 I'm here tonight to report to you upon some changes  
8 and approaches that have been taken by this -- this  
9 petition to better reflect the aspects of the plan  
10 are shared in conformance with the plan.

11 I was contacted sometime after the  
12 hearing and asked if I could review the plan and to  
13 review its relationship to the comprehensive plan.  
14 Your comprehensive plan has recently been prepared  
15 and adopted. It was prepared through a rational  
16 process.

17 It, obviously, is there as a  
18 significant guideline and the plan like all  
19 comprehensive plans tend to -- to address future  
20 development in pretty broad ways.

21 One it states as you know the  
22 drafters of the plan a revision of the setting of  
23 goals and policy and, secondly, it reflects  
24 those -- those policies in terms of a land use map

60

1 of which is on the scene -- it's on the easel and  
2 you no doubt are more familiar with that map than I  
3 so just excuse its distance from you.

4 Thirdly, it takes the principles

5 that are shown in the -- contained in the goals and  
6 policies and illustrated in this plan and we find  
7 in certain specific instances to show how they may  
8 be applied and also recognizes that as development  
9 moves to specific sites there could be particular  
10 instances identified because of the development  
11 realities or urban trends such that the land use  
12 pattern on the plan should be refined somewhat to  
13 reflect the spirit of the plan but also to reflect  
14 the conditions and the nature of the markets being  
15 addressed.

16 We think that with that in mind  
17 certain -- certain modifications in the concept  
18 that we have made to respond to the plan. The plan  
19 says two things about the subject site.

20 It says that the -- the uses  
21 located at 120 and O'Plaine should be office  
22 service uses and the plan also says that these uses  
23 fall within the regional corridor attracting uses  
24 of a regional nature.

61

1 One draws that -- that conclusion  
2 and that's a logical approach because it's at a key  
3 interchange yet as you review the -- the  
4 interchange composition and structure of the road  
5 system it may be that -- that there are certain  
6 mitigating factors that one might want to consider  
7 a more local set of uses at this site than regional

8 service uses.

9                                 Indeed, the -- the comprehensive  
10 plan says that office service uses are a hundred  
11 percent of the site surrounded by open space  
12 buffers. The plan applies to everything on all  
13 sides.

14                                 The buffers against the -- the  
15 tollway and 120 buffers that really happen as part  
16 of the road improvement project and it would happen  
17 fronting O'Plaine and -- and probably the property  
18 to the north would be as a result of development  
19 and development planning.

20                                 The original application proposed  
21 industrial type uses and commercial business uses.  
22 We are proposing a modification to that such that  
23 in terms of the absolute site itself, the usable  
24 part of the site, office service use is the

62

1 predominant use somewhere in the range of 74  
2 percent or so and the remaining corridor would be  
3 developed for commercial business uses. Indeed,  
4 the commercial business uses occupy actually  
5 probably about 20 percent, 61 acres of 75 acres in  
6 the site.

7                                 The land use pattern that you see  
8 here on this sketch represents the broad, broad  
9 land uses developed. The pink color corresponds to  
10 office service uses and the uses that would be in  
11 that area are employment type uses that would

12 happen with enclosed buildings, no outdoor storage,  
13 landscape settings on site so that would be eight  
14 and a half minimum. This is also proposed as a low  
15 rise type of development.

16 One of the issues of the region  
17 serving office service is that we could see more  
18 intensive types of uses being attracted to that  
19 site because of its exposure to both 120 -- its  
20 visual exposure to 120 and to -- and to the -- to  
21 the tollway where people might look to build  
22 signature buildings and establish a scale that is  
23 really much larger, especially related to the  
24 adjacent residential buildings than the one-story

63

1 or two-story buildings that are being proposed here  
2 as part of this development.

3 The area along the north property  
4 line, the tollway is again on the west edge, the  
5 south area comes up against Belvidere Road,  
6 Route 120, with a major section taken out to  
7 accommodate the tollway interchange and the east  
8 side of the property -- the east side of the  
9 property abuts O'Plaine Road.

10 The red section here is proposed  
11 commercial development, 16 acres of proposed  
12 commercial development. Along the -- the easterly  
13 edge of that is showing the area that would be  
14 reserved for open space running the average of

15 about a 50-foot super setback before we get to the  
16 parking lot -- or to the area that would begin to  
17 be the commercial site.

18 Along the north side of the  
19 property this green indicates the commitment of a  
20 hundred foot open space area that we established as  
21 buffer for the plan in picking up the extreme  
22 northwestern corner, an area of open space  
23 detention that would remain open.

24 We think that this -- that this

64

1 plan here conforms to the -- to the spirit of the  
2 plan and certain dictates of the plan. We think  
3 that this plan here provides, indeed, less  
4 intensive land use that might happen if this was  
5 all developed as -- as office service -- region  
6 serving office service development.

7 We think this provides the  
8 diversification of employment opportunity which is  
9 a goal of the plan by providing not only a range  
10 of -- of office and -- and distribution type of  
11 employment activity but also retail employment  
12 activities.

13 We think that the -- that the use  
14 of services is a convenience to the -- to the  
15 residents of Gurnee and, indeed, because this has  
16 more local orientation than it does regional  
17 orientation it would tend to generate traffic which  
18 is emerging from the community rather than from the



19 other side of the community.

20 And, lastly, because a portion of  
21 this area is retail development it will deal in  
22 excess of -- of development for land use property  
23 tax and you should get a significant increase from  
24 the sales tax revenue which would be somewhere in

65

1 the area alone of 250, \$400,000.

2 We say that -- that this reflects  
3 some of the local needs more particularly because  
4 access to this property doesn't really happen from  
5 the region serving roads. The region serving roads  
6 would be the tollway, the tollway interchange and  
7 Route 120 are not -- are access controlled or would  
8 be access controlled in this area.

9 Access to the site is by O'Plaine  
10 Road and O'Plaine Road is much more of a local road  
11 than it is a region serving road and because of  
12 that we have looked to say that the kind of  
13 development here should be really less intense  
14 rather than more intense.

15 If these were signature type of --  
16 of buildings one would want to have that so they  
17 could have access off a major road and, indeed, be  
18 directly linked to that regional traffic.

19 So it's for that reason we think  
20 that while we need to reflect the spirit of  
21 compliance so that compliance -- or reasonable

22 compliance you'll find smaller buildings which  
23 occupy sites in the acre or two acre area that are  
24 a range of servicing and office type uses.

66

1 But whatever happens there happens  
2 with enclosed buildings with no outdoor storage.  
3 If there were loading docks loading docks would not  
4 be facing the street and the like complemented by a  
5 16-acre commercial area would be by a Jewel  
6 facility.

7 So this is the proposal. We  
8 believe that the proposal in terms of the kinds of  
9 bases that are being discussed and, indeed, the  
10 buffers that are being proposed reflect the spirit  
11 of the plan within the context of this  
12 subdivision.

13 MR. LINDGREN: Hi. I'm Jerry Lindgren,  
14 the traffic engineer, and I won't dwell on this.  
15 We've been through this before on the traffic  
16 impact studies that we provided and this is really  
17 a summary of the types of things that we went  
18 through in terms of evaluating the petition and  
19 what the petition will be with respect to the  
20 development that we're talking about and the  
21 particular roadway and access improvements that are  
22 necessary in order to accommodate the development.

23 The existing roadways as you know,  
24 Illinois 120 and the tollway extension and Eastwood

1 are all under the Department of Illinois -- or the  
2 Department of Transportation, State of Illinois.  
3 O'Plaine is a county road as is Washington Street  
4 and the village has Cornell.

5 Access to the site as Les mentioned  
6 is provided primarily and singularly off of  
7 O'Plaine road. That would be a signalized  
8 intersection opposite Cornell.

9 We are proposing and it is my  
10 understanding even with the change in the plans the  
11 first phase of development would include all the  
12 roadway improvements that we discussed before.

13 That is, the extension of the right  
14 turn lane on O'Plaine, revision of the right turn  
15 north on Cornell, revision of the traffic signal at  
16 Cornell as soon as it's warranted and the  
17 improvements at the intersection of 120 and  
18 O'Plaine. That's basically summarized here.

19 I think the -- the point that I  
20 would like to get to is that with the change in the  
21 plan we have virtually reduced the traffic  
22 generations on the site based on the analysis that  
23 we have done before and I haven't had a chance to  
24 update that because I was getting this plan about

1 the same time you people were in terms of the  
2 modifications.

3 So what's happened is with the

4 change virtually this area in terms of commercial  
5 and the generation range that we were using we  
6 virtually reduced the traffic on this site and  
7 during the peak hours by about 50 percent or very  
8 nearly that even though we did have some of the  
9 office service area.

10 Now, that makes me the guy with the  
11 double-edged sword, I guess, because if you listen  
12 to what Les said the office service is more  
13 regional orientation while the commercial on the  
14 site is more locally oriented.

15 From the standpoint of the office  
16 services we increase that, obviously, we increase  
17 the regional impact or the regional attractiveness  
18 so to speak of the development by comparison to the  
19 commercial, which is really more locally oriented  
20 or community oriented.

21 However, if you look at the general  
22 FAR's these types of developments what we had used  
23 in the original study and, Mr. Chairman, you and I  
24 had a little dissertation about that in terms of

69

1 well, how can you use .35 in one case and .8 in  
2 another and .8.

3 The bigger -- the bigger piece here  
4 and what we have compared is about a .35 -- between  
5 a .35 and a .5 FAR in terms of development there.  
6 Your ordinance would permit depending on the type

7 of use and I suspect they would have to come  
8 through the Commission up to a .8 if I'm not  
9 mistaken, but the -- those generations do not  
10 increase as much as what we took down.

11 In other words, we -- we knocked  
12 off about 50 percent of the commercial traffic that  
13 we had shown in our previous report; whereas, the  
14 office service district had only increased by  
15 about -- it increased about 50 percent, but that  
16 really only represented about a third of the  
17 traffic that we're talking about. So it was a very  
18 nominal increase.

19 Perhaps the more significant thing  
20 is -- is in commercial traffic during the evening  
21 peak hours is significantly reduced even though  
22 retail sales activities now are open in the morning  
23 periods the activity for retail sales in the  
24 morning peaks are very nominal by comparison.

70

1 The office service would increase  
2 that a little bit but with the traffic signal on  
3 the corner of Cornell and the interconnect with 120  
4 I believe that that would have a very minimal  
5 impact.

6 We would expect a further  
7 improvement in terms of the level of service from  
8 what we had anticipated before.

9 I think the key thing here is that  
10 right now there is a -- a problem at the

11 intersection of 120 and O'Plaine. Everybody is  
12 aware of the fact that it backs up on O'Plaine.  
13 The provision of the additional lane will certainly  
14 help that.

15 The improvement of the intersection  
16 at 120 and O'Plaine Road will improve the capacity  
17 there which helps reduce that backup. Is the  
18 backup going to go away a hundred percent, no. No.  
19 It won't. Not until major, major improvements are  
20 done in this area.

21 And that is the type of improvement  
22 that Les was talking about in terms of the regional  
23 system and what we anticipate at some point in time  
24 is frontage road ramps and grade separation at

71

1 O'Plaine and 120.

2 At that time then what happens is  
3 the relationship of O'Plaine to 120 and 120 to the  
4 freeway system changes significantly because of the  
5 grade separation, because of the interconnect road  
6 system as opposed to a major intersection with a  
7 regional route; i.e., 120, which is what it is  
8 today.

9 I think it will make O'Plaine much  
10 more local by character than it is now and we will  
11 probably have a major reduction in terms of the  
12 traffic on that roadway as it relates to today.

13 I really don't need to say much

14 more. I'm happy to answer any questions.

15 MR. BUSSMAN: My name is Ben Bussman.  
16 I'm with Weber, McGrath & Holmberg. I'm the  
17 project landscape architect.

18 This plan still reflects the same  
19 plan that was presented last week. What we wanted  
20 to talk about with this plan will carry through to  
21 any revisions to the plan would be the hundred foot  
22 wide landscape buffer. This landscape buffer would  
23 be installed the entire length around the corner in  
24 Phase I.

72

1 Our criteria for doing the  
2 landscape plan -- since this is a PUD we can  
3 essentially write our own criteria. We have  
4 intende on alleviating traffic congestion,  
10 especially in the morning peak hours.

11 At that point in time when the  
12 Jewel/Osco project would proceed which we've  
13 indicated in our petition is in a three to five  
14 year time frame. That has not changed.

15 We believe that a lot of other  
16 unknowns in the road system may be answered.

17 12 you're on the north side of the berm it'll be seven  
13 to eight, nine feet tall.

14 So there is a great change from one  
15 side of the berm to the other because the site is  
16 much higher than it does in Providence Village  
17 homes. That's essentially it.

18 MR. BROWN: We didn't want to bring a  
19 lot of other presentors up feeling that, again, the  
20 overview that we're trying to present this evening  
21 is to be able to obtain some direction from the  
22 community, from the Plan Commission so that we can  
23 begin to work on the specifics, but I think as  
24 we've attempted to highlight clearly traffic and

73

1 land use compatibility are the two major issues.

2 As Mr. Lindgren said, we're not  
3 going to solve the existing conditions. What we  
4 don't want to do is exacerbate them or contribute  
5 to any further increase and, in fact, with the road  
6 improvements that we can put in initially along the  
7 entire east frontage of the property of O'Plaine  
8 Road we believe that that will directly have a  
9 favorable impact on alleviating traffic congestion,  
10 especially in the morning peak hours.

11 At that point in time when the  
12 Jewel/Osco project would proceed which we've  
13 indicated in our petition is in a three to five  
14 year time frame. That has not changed.

15 We believe that a lot of other  
16 unknowns in the road system may be answered.  
17 Hopefully, the type of development that we're  
18 proposing and the scope of the development will  
19 encourage Lake County Transportation and the  
20 village of Gurnee and any other municipal agencies



21 to work together to upgrade O'Plaine Road even  
22 further beyond the limits of the property that  
23 we -- Mr. Rosenquist and American Stores  
24 Properties -- control to solve the problem or at

74

1 least increase the -- the traffic flow in that area  
2 until such time as the ultimate improvements that  
3 IDOT proposed would be fully changed and  
4 the ramp system occurs. No one really knows the  
5 timetable of that.

6 As the roadway is improved so, too,  
7 we believe will be the overall development concept  
8 of the plan.

9 Some of the points that were raised  
10 that we will be prepared to address in a subsequent  
11 presentation as soon as we can begin to detail and  
12 engineer the site consistent with the land use plan  
13 that we presented.

14 And, again, to focus on that the  
15 key -- the key improvement we believe is the moving  
16 of the road which formerly was along the entire  
17 north end of the property other than the hundred  
18 foot landscape buffer.

19 Now we've swung it to the south as  
20 quickly as we can to avoid any impact for noise and  
21 delivery vehicles or any other traffic associated  
22 with the commercial development which as Mr.  
23 Pollach has noted is substantially reduced.

24 We had a win/win situation with the

1 change in the concept by virtue of moving the road  
2 and creating the office service type of use as a  
3 transitional buffer use immediately south of the  
4 landscaped buffer.

5 We effectively have reduced the  
6 amount of developable area for commercial which we  
7 believe would be much more consistent with the  
8 intent of the type of land use that we're  
9 proposing.

10 And also the balance of the  
11 property to the west which is primarily the  
12 Rosenquist property would also then be office  
13 service which would be compatible again with the  
14 type of use in the lower density of traffic that  
15 the neighbors and the village plan seem to want.

16 Because of the requirements of the  
17 plan for ingress and egress all of which, of  
18 course, would be at O'Plaine would be traffic  
19 signal at Cornell by definition there is not much  
20 opportunity to increase the commercial area or any  
21 other use that would be a high traffic use.

22 Quite simply other retailers will  
23 not want to drive that distance off of O'Plaine  
24 Road down past what would be the Jewel/Osco templet

1 to -- to what little remaining retail would be  
2 available on the south and we consciously elected

3 not to increase the depth of the commercial  
4 property east/west feeling that this was more  
5 appropriate to the scope of the community type  
6 development that we've attempted to present here  
7 this evening.

8                   Again, the benefit of this type of  
9 a change would be that the site lighting and any  
10 other development specifics that might intrude on  
11 neighborhood quality of life would be mitigated.

12                   We now have a retail parking lot  
13 that's at least 350 feet south of the property line  
14 so there will be absolutely no diffusion or  
15 dispersal of lighting from this development,  
16 especially with the buffer of the office service  
17 north of Cornell Road is extended.

18                   Site signage will be addressed as  
19 we focus on the specific types of uses but, again,  
20 the orientation of the commercial clearly is  
21 intended to be at the intersection of O'Plaine and  
22 120 and as far away from the residents as possible.

23                   In summary, everyone knows  
24 Jewel/Osco. In fact, we've heard comments from

77

1 neighbors that with several stores in the area, one  
2 of which is in your community, two of which are  
3 also in the neighboring community to the east, why  
4 would we want to have another store in this  
5 neighborhood.

6 Well, that's the exact reason.  
7 Because it is a neighborhood, because we feel and  
8 our customers have told us that they do not want to  
9 shop more than five to seven minutes from their  
10 home.

11 The development that is occurring  
12 along O'Plaine Road both north of 120 and south in  
13 Waukegan and even down into some of the neighboring  
14 communities clearly is a north/south orientation  
15 and that traffic just does not appear to be  
16 traveling all the way to Grand Hunt and our  
17 existing store although it's very successful that  
18 seems to be a little bit farther away than many  
19 customers would like to travel from a convenience  
20 perspective.

21 Obviously, any other issues that  
22 relate to development of the Jewel/Osco and I'm  
23 sure our co-petitioner will acknowledge because it  
24 is an overall 75 acre project for dedication of

78

1 right of way and for landscape and green areas we  
2 have the ability to reduce the number of signs and  
3 to co-develop the site in a manner that would be  
4 consistent with a -- a larger parcel rather than  
5 see the piecemeal development that could ultimately  
6 occur if -- if our proposal was not accepted or the  
7 landowners elect to go in a different direction.

8 So we believe that the PUD approach  
9 is the proper one. The ability to work with Mr.

10 Rosenquist as a co-petitioner is a unique  
11 opportunity for us and, hopefully, for him and  
12 clearly he will observe any and all standards for  
13 the commercial and the office service districts as  
14 we get into the specific development plans.

15 As you noted earlier, Mr. Pollach,  
16 the PUD approximates a 75 -- 75 percent office  
17 service use, 26 percent commercial. This is a  
18 significant deviation from our original plan where  
19 closer to 60 percent was office service and 40  
20 percent was retail.

21 So we believe based on the feedback  
22 we've gotten from the neighbors, from the Plan  
23 Commission and other staff that this is more  
24 appropriate in keeping with the transitional area

79

1 AND the neighborhood characteristics that we're  
2 trying to serve.

3 Is that it?

4 MS. HANSEN: That's it.

5 MR. BROWN: Okay. At this point, again,  
6 we don't have specific revisions to the site plan  
7 other than as noted on the board that Mr. Pollach  
8 presented.

9 We do have people available who can  
10 answer any specific questions, myself included, for  
11 Jewel/Osco, the architect, the traffic engineer you  
12 heard from, land planners and we would welcome any

13 specific questions.

14 In sum we would like to leave this  
15 evening with a direction that the Commission and  
16 the village and, hopefully, the neighbors would  
17 agree that we've made a sincere effort to try to  
18 address many of the issues that were raised.

19 We have not been able to solve all  
20 of them, especially traffic that, apparently, is  
21 keyed up north of our site, but we believe that  
22 proper planning and working in conjunction with  
23 other municipal agencies that we can accomplish  
24 that over the next three to five years, which is

80

1 the initial development time frame that we're --  
2 that we're attempting to pursue here.

3 So with that I'll return it to the  
4 Chairman and we welcome any comments or questions.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.

6 The commercial parcel, what's the  
7 area of that parcel?

8 MR. BROWN: Katherine.

9 This is Katherine Hansen of A.  
10 Epstein who was instrumental in preparing the  
11 specific plans.

12 MS. HANSEN: This right here is a four  
13 acre area --

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Could you use the  
15 microphone.

16 MS. HANSEN: Oh, you bet.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Let everybody hear.

18 MS. HANSEN: This red area here is 16  
19 acres.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay.

21 MS. HANSEN: This area right here, the  
22 pink, office service is 7.74 acres, starting at  
23 this line right now is actually the property line  
24 between the Lawson property and Rosenquist

81

1 property.

2 This area is 35 acres, the pink,  
3 and this area down here is four acres. It's also  
4 office service. And the total -- the total area is  
5 75 acres and seven of it gets used right away in  
6 stormwater detention. We've designed a system that  
7 addresses the whole site.

8 In addition, we have five acres  
9 really that gets taken off in our roadway system  
10 and then what's left is the area for the office  
11 service and the commercial. So the pink adds up to  
12 47 acres and the red is 16.35.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Now, if -- if we -- if  
14 the 53 extension were to be built is that going to  
15 affect the shape of that we have now or the size of  
16 it?

17 MS. HANSEN: Yes. In our April 30th  
18 submission to the Plan Commission we did have a  
19 plan which showed the latest plans for -- from IDOT

20 that would show what would happen to this site if  
21 that were to happen.

22 And what we showed there was we  
23 designed the site such that this -- this would  
24 work, this development would work, even if that

82

1 came through, but the effect of it really is to  
2 take quite a bit of the acreage down here from the  
3 office service area.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But it doesn't affect  
5 the commercial site at all?

6 MS. HANSEN: No, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Now, what  
8 percentage of that commercial site would be  
9 necessary for the Jewel store?

10 MS. HANSEN: 12.35 acres. We have four  
11 acres here which really represents the landscape  
12 berm as well as the area for probably two  
13 out-parcels.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Any other  
15 questions from the Commissioners?

16 Mr. Foster.

17 MR. FOSTER: First a comment I wanted to  
18 say. I think meeting with the neighborhood is a  
19 critical part of the planning process so I really  
20 appreciate your doing that. The changes that you  
21 have indicated tonight are positive steps.

22 I want to just make sure I'm clear  
23 on the Chairman's question. What is the total



24 square footage of the commercial? I know that you

83

1 just said the Jewel would be 12.35 acres but what  
2 is the square footage compared to the --

3 MS. HANSEN: The square footage in the  
4 area that we described as 12.35 the Jewel/Osco  
5 right now we have about 70,000 square feet, but we  
6 have to understand -- well, we understand that that  
7 could change a little bit, but we have 70,000  
8 square feet on the plan as well as an additional 20  
9 for a total of, you know, a little over 90 right  
10 here.

11 As it relates to how much would be  
12 allowed on the out-parcels that's really discussion  
13 when you get in to more detail as to what's allowed  
14 on FAR.

15 So it's -- if you were to -- if  
16 you think four acres and you had .5 FAR that would  
17 give you an idea of how many square feet in  
18 addition you could support on that, but we haven't  
19 had those kind of detailed discussions yet but  
20 right here we're talking a little over 90,000  
21 square feet.

22 MR. FOSTER: And part of my question,  
23 too, Miss Hansen, was this compared to your  
24 previous proposal? I know it was over a hundred

84

1 thousand square feet. Do you have a figure in

2 square feet for your previous proposal?

3 MS. HANSEN: The previous proposal  
4 showed the same Jewel/Osco, same square footage.  
5 It also showed out-parcels again undefined in terms  
6 of how many and then it showed an additional 18.88  
7 acres.

8 We have the site plan here for  
9 additional commercial business and Bob is looking  
10 for the old site plan, but what that did was --

11 MR. FOSTER: But the total square  
12 footage was a hundred?

13 MR. BROWN: Of the parcels?

14 MR. FOSTER: In your previous plan. I  
15 was looking through this book. I didn't find it  
16 handily, but you have a figure of a hundred some  
17 thousand square feet.

18 MS. HANSEN: I believe 120,000 square  
19 feet is what somebody is whispering to me behind  
20 me.

21 MR. FOSTER: Okay. That's what I was  
22 asking.

23 MS. HANSEN: Okay.

24 MR. SMITH: I got a question. Have you

85

1 got any kind of idea -- you say you want to build a  
2 building, what it would look like, kind of an idea  
3 what the center is going to look like.

4 MR. BROWN: Sure. We have some thoughts

5 as to how that might work. I made -- I made it a  
6 point to drive through both Providence Village,  
7 Providence Oaks and as a matter of fact I don't  
8 think I've seen that many cedar shakes this side of  
9 New England.

10 That's certainly an element is  
11 something that would, hopefully, be incorporated  
12 into the development. Jewel and Osco attempted to  
13 tailor their stores where possible to communities.

14 We're attempting, obviously, to  
15 come up with a prototype building. The envelope  
16 that we're showing here, which is a 70,000 square  
17 foot building, is the largest building that we're  
18 building in the Chicagoland area.

19 Again, because of the long lead  
20 time before we would propose to build this  
21 development that will undoubtedly change but  
22 because it's a PUD the size would have to be within  
23 that building envelope. So it could not be larger  
24 without us coming back before the Plan Commission

86

1 again.

2 So we tried to show the maximum.  
3 Obviously, the size and the configuration of the  
4 building will dictate some of the architectural  
5 elements.

6 Our project architect, Peter  
7 Theodore of Kampers & Theodore (phonetic) is here  
8 this evening. We have not yet commissioned him to

9 begin work on any of the detailed architectural  
10 elements, again, because we thought it was  
11 premature given the context and the overview that  
12 we're trying to follow this evening.

13                   However, I have some of the other  
14 developments that we've done in the Chicagoland  
15 area tried to reflect the community elements.  
16 There's one in Glenview that was completed recently  
17 which reflected certain characteristics of that  
18 community asked for and also the co-developer  
19 required.

20                   We just opened a store in Wilmette  
21 that was quite unique because it was tailored to a  
22 very small site, roughly 40,000 square feet, as  
23 opposed to 70.

24                   I honestly don't know what this

87

1 building will look like, especially if its three to  
2 five years down the road, but I think we've gotten  
3 some clear direction in the community and from  
4 staff that Providence Village, Providence Oaks  
5 character is something that you wish to maintain  
6 and wish to retain, and I believe in talking to Mr.  
7 Rosenquist he would also acknowledge that -- that  
8 he, in fact, is the developer of the balance of the  
9 office service.

10                   So it's kind of a general answer  
11 but clearly we will acknowledge that that's

12 something that we must address.

13 Peter, do you have any other  
14 thoughts?

15 MR. THEODORE: No.

16 MR. BROWN: We have a lot of creativity  
17 that we're trying to bring to bear on this project.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Cepon.

19 MR. CEPON: Yeah.

20 Getting back to the acreage of the  
21 size. So you're saying about 70,000 square feet  
22 would be approximately 12 acres with -- I mean  
23 70,000 is the size of the store and then you add  
24 the parking lot and et cetera?

88

1 MR. BROWN: That's correct. And this  
2 particular plan -- it's difficult to see because of  
3 the color -- leaves a balance at the south end  
4 which could potentially accommodate another 15,  
5 20,000 square feet of -- of compatible shops which  
6 is typical in our neighborhood shopping centers.

7 We have the types of uses that  
8 people would like to see in the neighborhood that  
9 would be --

10 MR. CEPON: So with a 70,000 square feet  
11 store and the -- a parking lot that takes up  
12 approximately how much of your 16 acres?

13 MR. BROWN: Including the adjacent  
14 resident retail approximately 12 and a half acres.

15 MR. CEPON: Twelve and a half. Okay.

16 MR. BROWN: That's correct.

17 MR. CEPON: And then you've got

18 landscape and buffering --

19 MR. BROWN: Yes.

20 MR. CEPON: -- as part of that?

21 So you really reduced now  
22 theoretically excluding the Jewel and Osco you've  
23 probably left what, maybe two acres for development  
24 of some other type of business?

89

1 MR. BROWN: That's correct. Plus the  
2 out-lot area which could support one or two  
3 additional buildings like a bank, a national  
4 institution or a restaurant.

5 MR. CEPON: That was my next question.

6 MR. BROWN: That would be it.

7 MR. CEPON: What is being considered on  
8 the out-lot?

9 MR. BROWN: Total approximately four  
10 acres gives us a lot of flexibility and also the  
11 user coming in and building an upscale development  
12 that they would propose to build. And there would  
13 be an intervening road as we visualize it.

14 Again, it's hard to see on this  
15 plan. That would intersect us with Cornell Avenue  
16 extending west, that would then swing south and  
17 service the out-lot parcel and also service the  
18 Jewel/Osco and the adjacent use.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Miss Kovarik.

20 MS. KOVARIK: I really want to  
21 compliment you on the amount of work that you must  
22 have put in the last few weeks to balance what we  
23 desire in our comprehensive plan and the needs of  
24 the neighbors and what you've come up with.

90

1 I think you really put a lot of  
2 work into it. I'm really pleased that you've done  
3 that because I think you've got something we can  
4 work with.

5 MR. BROWN: Thank you very much. We did  
6 indeed.

7 MS. KOVARIK: You put a lot of work in  
8 here and it really made a difference.

9 MR. BROWN: We appreciate that comment.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Sula.

11 MR. SULA: I also concur. I appreciate  
12 the initial feedback.

13 Not to belabor the point of the 16  
14 acres, you've got 16 acres of which two -- probably  
15 two acres is going to be the Jewel/Osco building  
16 itself, right?

17 MR. BROWN: Approximately. When you add  
18 in the drive-through for pharmacy and -- and the  
19 potential expansion, yes.

20 MR. SULA: And you have four acres to  
21 the out-lots?

22 MR. BROWN: Right.

23 MR. SULA: And I understand the  
24 remaining ten acres is all parking and landscaping?

91

1 MR. BROWN: With the exception of maybe  
2 a half an acre at the south end and that would be  
3 compatible with shops, small shops. The balance of  
4 it would be parking and meet parking ratio  
5 development.

6 MR. SULA: Of the other roughly ten how  
7 much of that would be parking versus landscape  
8 buffer?

9 MR. BROWN: I can't really answer that  
10 because the parking lot engineering and detail  
11 itself would have to be addressed. As we have over  
12 at Grand Hunt Plaza there would be some internal  
13 landscaping, but we have to get into specifics of  
14 that as we re-engineer this site.

15 MR. SULA: Thank you.

16 MR. BROWN: Clearly it would be  
17 consistent with the village direction.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions?

19 Mr. Foster.

20 MR. FOSTER: Yes.

21 I don't know if this is the night  
22 of giving you guys all the compliments, but I can  
23 tell you that your store in Wilmette  
24 architecturally is outstanding. So I will make

92



1           that comment.

2                           In terms of the --

3                   MR. BROWN:  The architect is here.  He  
4           appreciates that.

5                   MR. FOSTER:  Okay.  You can see me after  
6           the meeting.

7                           In terms of the site orientation I  
8           think the commercial that's much better.  I simply  
9           don't have the site plan tonight.  Can you try to  
10          point out the orientation of the Jewel/Osco at 120.  
11          Can you just try to point out which direction the  
12          building will be facing.

13                   MR. BROWN:  Yes.

14                   MR. FOSTER:  I think it's parking over  
15          there.

16                   MR. BROWN:  It would be similar to the  
17          original plan and I'm not sure if I have that here  
18          facing east --

19                   MR. FOSTER:  Okay.

20                   MR. BROWN:  -- for the available  
21          parking.  I don't believe I have the original plan.

22                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:  The landscape  
23          plan.

24                   MR. BROWN:  The landscape plan.

93

1                   MR. FOSTER:  Okay.  Okay.  That's fine.

2                   MR. BROWN:  Again, so in essence if this  
3          concept is proposed and perceived the building



8           berm I would like to see if there's some kind of  
9           agreement that is similar to what Auto Nation has  
10          as far as if they don't maintain the berm the  
11          village would take over and charge them for it  
12          essentially.

13                           The traffic Phase I development  
14          with the additional turn lanes what happens to the  
15          sidewalks when they -- as far as putting the  
16          sidewalk back where it is. Are they planning on  
17          putting it on both sides of the road?

18                           Traffic study they listed it as an  
19          LOSC or C-Plus. The traffic study has it at closer  
20          to Washington and O'Plaine rather than to 120 and  
21          O'Plaine. Is that an LOSE? I just want to know  
22          how is that acceptable under any circumstances.  
23          Thank you.

24                           CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. You know, I

95

1          think those -- those are all good questions. I  
2          have a feeling that what the Petitioner is looking  
3          for here is some general feedback on the land use,  
4          the general layout.

5                           The detailed questions regarding  
6          the berm, the traffic I'm sure we're going to be  
7          having other meetings to look at those details. I  
8          mean if you would like to ask those questions, fine  
9          but, you know, really their presentation on those  
10         things I think are going to be downstream.

11 I think right now and I'll --  
12 certainly the Plan Commission would like some  
13 feedback on the general land use and the layout and  
14 the idea that -- just, for example, the buffer  
15 areas.

16 You know, those are going to have  
17 to be looked at in detail. They have the new  
18 buffer area along O'Plaine that would have to be  
19 looked at in detail.

20 So I think right now we're kind of  
21 looking for some feedback on just the general  
22 concept and the land use. So thank you. We'll --  
23 we certainly will get to those questions.

24 MS. COE: They used the Grand Hunt

96

1 Center Jewel as an example. The way the project  
2 lays out and the way it is routed it seems the  
3 Auto Nation's site is a little bit closer as far as  
4 closer to the residents.

5 It has a similar -- as far as the  
6 tollway and the road system is pretty similar. I  
7 would like to see them go as far as what they did  
8 or the residents as far as the berming and the  
9 buffering.

10 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. Which location  
11 is that, ma'am?

12 MS. COE: The Auto Nation site. It's on  
13 Dilleys and Grand Avenue.

14 MR. BROWN: I thought you were



18 to explore but certainly you're correct that we do  
19 have to consider the zoning change here and there's  
20 always potential that, you know, certain uses in  
21 that CB/2 can go in if the planned use doesn't go  
22 in.

23 MR. SHARON: So Jewel decides not to  
24 build and it is rezoned CB/2 someone else could

98

1 come in, Super K mart could come in, Home Depot  
2 could come in, legally and build on the CB/2 if  
3 what they're asking for is CB/2, but that meets  
4 those -- meets that planned recommendation?

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I guess I can't answer  
6 your question right now. I think we have to  
7 explore that. At some time we have to, yes.

8 MR. SHARON: I think that we -- that  
9 what they've done with the presentation you would  
10 never expect a -- a Petitioner to provide an ugly  
11 plan. So this isn't a surprise and the compliments  
12 or the -- that's fine. I mean that's to be  
13 expected. That's why they're here. I think we've  
14 taken a zebra and handed it over and called it a  
15 horse, though.

16 Getting back to why we're really  
17 here is the rezoning. Can somebody please read  
18 what the zoning CO/1 that is currently zoned for.  
19 Read what that is. Does somebody have the zoning?

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. You have to  
21 remember it's not annexed in the village so there's

22 no zoning on it. It's only a designation in our  
23 comprehensive plan that would be for CO/1 office  
24 service district.

99

1 MR. SHARON: For the CO/1 office service  
2 district what exactly does that say could be built  
3 there?

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, it's a pretty  
5 long use list. There's -- you have permitted uses  
6 and there are, in fact -- it looks like generally a  
7 lot of offices, architects offices, attorneys  
8 offices, doctors offices. These would be permitted  
9 uses.

10 There are some public buildings,  
11 office buildings, parks and playgrounds. Then in  
12 the special use category they do allow some retail  
13 uses, drug stores and pharmacies, although I don't  
14 know that they would want another drug store in  
15 there, medical appliance stores, optician sales,  
16 restaurants. I think that's about it.

17 Then there's -- there are also some  
18 special use -- services uses, barber shops, credit  
19 unions, dental laboratories, funeral parlors, loan  
20 companies, travel agencies and special use and  
21 animal hospitals can be put in.

22 MR. SHARON: Are these considered less  
23 intensive uses than a CB/2?

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yes.

1 MR. SHARON: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: If you look -- first of  
3 all, some of these uses would be permitted uses in  
4 CB/2 and then you would get restaurants but any --  
5 you know, you could get restaurants who probably  
6 would be special use. So you get fast food  
7 restaurants, things of that nature.

8 If you look at the -- the  
9 description of the districts in the ordinance that  
10 describes the commercial office district as  
11 being -- the CO district as being less intense than  
12 something you would expect in transitional to  
13 residential versus CB/2 is a more intense zone than  
14 would be -- you would have to really make sure and  
15 scrutinize the locations that you select the CB/2.

16 MR. SHARON: The situation that we're in  
17 now is not typically what would be considered good  
18 planning. You wouldn't normally put a CB/2 up next  
19 to single family homes typically in most  
20 communities, or is that not true?

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, you would put  
22 it -- you would put it up against residential.  
23 Typically it would be multi-family residential to  
24 transition but, again, you still have some buffer

1 areas.

2 So typically you wouldn't put CB/2



3 against single family residential, but we do have  
4 it in town and that's in areas where, for example,  
5 a neighborhood commercial area like you have in  
6 South Ridge, for example.

7 South Ridge you have CB/2 on the  
8 corners and, again, if you have the right  
9 architecture, the right setbacks and buffer you can  
10 make that work.

11 I think what they're proposing here  
12 is -- is starting to move in that direction of  
13 being more neighborhood commercial district than it  
14 is a larger, more intense commercial district.  
15 So that's a way to look at it.

16 And the other thing is, too, they  
17 don't have it right up against residential. There  
18 is residential across the street, there's also --  
19 they do have some CO between the commercial, the  
20 CB/2 and the residential.

21 So they're using the CO as somewhat  
22 of a transition. I'm not saying that that's going  
23 to make it work, but that's what they're attempting  
24 to do.

102

1 MR. SHARON: One of the other concerns I  
2 have is that in any community if you take a look at  
3 the value of the homes, the investment that people  
4 put in the homes, I had to go back where I grew up  
5 in Lake Forest.

6 I had the pleasure of speaking in

7 front of the Plan Commission for the city of Lake  
8 Forest five pieces of property that was behind my  
9 mother's home that had gone undeveloped for about  
10 12 to 13 years and five times the city Plan  
11 Commission voted down the rezoning.

12 One of the reasons that they came  
13 up with was the fact that the city was very  
14 concerned about the residents and the value of  
15 their homes and the plan was actually put in in the  
16 1800's.

17 Developer, after developer, after  
18 developer came forward and said, you know, we  
19 really want to develop, no one has bought this  
20 property but we need to build something there and  
21 each time the Plan Commission said well, we're not  
22 concerned with how long it's been there and the  
23 fact that you want to build something there.

24 The fact is that that's not what

103

1 it's zoned for and by changing the zoning changes  
2 the flavor of the community, it changes the value  
3 of the homes.

4 Now, someone much more astute than  
5 I, the president of Bell Federal Savings, stood up.  
6 He built a home that wasn't even within eyesight of  
7 this property. Now, this gentleman owned a home in  
8 excess of a million dollar and he said this will  
9 affect the value of my home. My home isn't even

10 within eyesight of this. If I would send out an  
11 appraiser to appraise my home after what you  
12 propose to be built is built the appraisal of my  
13 home would be lower.

14 Well, after many years of the Plan  
15 Commission saying no, we won't do it, no, we won't  
16 do it somebody finally came forward with a plan  
17 that met exactly what the city of Lake Forest asked  
18 for.

19 So if you fight against it long  
20 enough and you believe in the value of your  
21 community you can make it work, but you've got to  
22 be tough about it. You really do.

23 It turns out that if you look  
24 around at some of these more affluent communities

104

1 and they don't get steamrolled over at all.  
2 They're very tough about what happens to their  
3 community. They're very strict about what the  
4 community look like.

5 In fact, I think if the Plan  
6 Commission takes a look at their own comprehensive  
7 plan Pages 69, 70, 71, 72 and 73 all have  
8 photographs of the way the city looks now on the  
9 entry into the city and the way they would like it  
10 to look.

11 You're talking about -- these are  
12 the things that people look for. It matters what  
13 it looks like.

14                   If the Jewel does decide to build  
15                   something here no matter whether they put berms and  
16                   had no -- whatever they put in to the landscaping  
17                   it's going to be different from having something  
18                   like we have a Greenleaf -- Greenleaf has office,  
19                   accountants, lawyer, doctors, and that's exactly  
20                   what it's currently zoned for.

21                   You're not going to have any  
22                   weekend traffic. So as far as the traffic report  
23                   goes this is nothing on the weekends compared to  
24                   what you have in retail.

105

1                   In the evenings you could run a  
2                   drag strip through these places. There's nothing  
3                   there after 6:30. That's considerably different  
4                   from a Jewel. Whether this is going to be open 24  
5                   hours or not a 70,000 foot Jewel has to be stocked  
6                   with 70,000 square feet of food in the aisles.

7                   That means that there's a lot of  
8                   deliveries and not delivered in Volkswagens either.  
9                   They're delivered in semitrucks, diesel semitrucks.  
10                  They're not quiet. This is a completely different  
11                  flavor from what it was zoned as.

12                  If you take a look at the whole  
13                  city there is a -- quite a bit of CB/2 in Gurnee.  
14                  Gurnee has a lot of CB/2. If they want to come in  
15                  to the community please build someplace where it's  
16                  already CB/2.



21 in our home -- in our subdivision from what I can  
22 see our home values have remained stagnant. People  
23 are not coming in and taking a look at homes,  
24 taking a look around the community saying well,

107

1 gosh, I've got Grand over here, I've got Gurnee  
2 Mills here, I've got Great America here. We heard  
3 about this. We know there's going to be some kind  
4 of entertainment village.

5 They're saying why, why would I  
6 want to live in this giant metropolis with all  
7 this. You get to a point where it's not worth it.  
8 We've already been told by the mayor that the city  
9 property taxes represent about three percent of our  
10 whole property tax bill.

11 So you get to a point where there's  
12 a law of diminished returns. What we now have to  
13 do is try to balance the community. That's part of  
14 the comprehensive plan. It's not used based on the  
15 tax revenue.

16 Part of the balance is having some  
17 office. The checkers that work at the Jewel aren't  
18 going to be able to afford our homes. Now it's  
19 nice that they've got -- they've got some more  
20 office in there.

21 That's nice. That's very nice, but  
22 a Jewel is not a quiet office building and it's not  
23 part of the plan and there's other places to put it

24 within the community and there's a lot of pressure

108

1 within this community for people to take the  
2 dollars above the sense up here. Thank you.

3 MS. RAMATAR: Roxane Ramatar,  
4 49119 Lexington West.

5 I want to address the dog and pony  
6 show they had for the homeowners last week. I went  
7 to that and although that was very nice there  
8 wasn't a homeowner that came out of there with a  
9 change of heart. Nobody came out of there agreeing  
10 that this was a good idea.

11 I stayed for an hour, I listened to  
12 all of it, I made comments. Nobody wants a Jewel  
13 yet. So although it's very nice they tried to calm  
14 everybody down nobody's had a change of heart.

15 The second thing I want to address  
16 is I -- I just can't even buy in to the traffic  
17 study. I just don't think the numbers are even  
18 close to accurate. I don't think its going to  
19 reduce any traffic.

20 I -- I wonder if anybody actually  
21 sat out there during peak hours or these are just  
22 tables done with a multiplication factor done in  
23 somebody's office.

24 The other thing that they had at

109

1 the village meeting was that there was -- it was

2 indicated that they were going to close Lakehurst  
3 and I have the same concern if in three years they  
4 decide to stay at Lakehurst because it's  
5 revitalized what is this piece of property going to  
6 be because it's rezoned. Maybe it is going to be a  
7 Super K. So those are my concerns.

8 MS. FREISTAG: My name is Laura  
9 Freistag. I live at 4915 Kingsway West.

10 I have a question for you, Mr.  
11 Chairman. What can the residents do to stop this?  
12 What -- will petitions help, will, you know,  
13 marching in the street? What can we do to send a  
14 message to you up there that we don't want this?

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think you're doing it  
16 right now. I guess -- I mean this is the public  
17 process that here is everyone's concerns and if the  
18 residents are opposed to this or if they're for it  
19 they should come out and speak at the meetings.

20 This is just to let you know the  
21 Plan Commission is an advisory board. We make  
22 recommendations to the village Board and that  
23 recommendation whatever it may be, either favorable  
24 or unfavorable, would then go to the village Board

110

1 and you'll have an opportunity again to speak to  
2 the village Board. Those are your elected  
3 representatives. They're the ones that make the  
4 decision and have the authority to approve this.

5 So you're going to have actually



6 another chance to make your voice heard, but I  
7 would say frankly petitions can be done, but I  
8 think the more effective way is for people to come  
9 to the meetings and speak just like you're doing.

10 MS. FREISTAG: Okay. So what we should  
11 do then is this, promote our residents in  
12 Providence Village that they should attend these  
13 meetings because frankly our -- the president of  
14 our association is -- is working with the Jewel and  
15 Osco because they used our mailing list to get  
16 everybody out to the little dog and pony show. So  
17 us residents are going to have to stand together  
18 and -- and bring everybody together to these  
19 meetings.

20 So at the end of the meeting when  
21 we find out when the next meeting is we will do  
22 some promoting around our neighborhood to get our  
23 people out here.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You should do that and

111

1 I will give everyone an opportunity to speak at the  
2 public hearing.

3 MS. FREISTAG: Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. WELL: My name is Jay Well. I live  
5 at 638 Plymouth Court. My backyard abuts the  
6 proposed development here.

7 Mr. Rudny and the Plan Commission,  
8 I would like to ask you specifically when you drive

9 into Gurnee down O'Plaine Road, which is a  
10 residential type road, do you want to see a  
11 commercial development, do you want to see  
12 Jewel/Osco Food Store that's open potentially 24  
13 hours a day?

14 What does that portray to future  
15 residents, visitors to the city? A big commercial  
16 Arlington Heights/Schaumburg type of area. No.  
17 This is our town.

18 I grew up on the North Shore.  
19 People have lived in Gurnee their whole lives. We  
20 have our lives invested here in our homes and in  
21 town. So use common sense, take a look and see  
22 what is being proposed.

23 You put the master plan together  
24 for one hundred percent office services. You

112

1 didn't mention commercial business usage period. I  
2 respect your decision or the town's decision to  
3 make that plan.

4 So let's discount what Jewel has  
5 proposed here and stick by what we planned for, one  
6 hundred percent office services. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

8 MR. NAVES: My name is Don Naves, I live  
9 at 4835 Kingsway West.

10 One of the things that really bugs  
11 me about this is if it is a 24 hour a day Jewel I  
12 have two of the cutest little girls you've ever

13 seen and there's something like 600 kids in our  
14 subdivision. It worries me about security.

15 I know they've tried to move it  
16 back some, but there is a park that my kids play at  
17 all the time and I let them go on the bike, there's  
18 nobody around there, and it bugs me that you would  
19 have parking there and have problems.

20 I don't have a problem with nine to  
21 five office buildings, any of that stuff, but when  
22 you start changing it to a 24 hour a day  
23 it's a really -- a grave concern on my part.

24 And the second thing is if the

113

1 traffic problem is decreased by 50 percent why put  
2 it there. You're not going to have enough traffic  
3 to make it go. So it doesn't follow suit.

4 I mean it seems like you want more  
5 traffic so I don't buy that -- that logic. Thanks.

6 MR. HOGUE: My name is Kevin Hogue and I  
7 live at 621 Plymouth Court in Providence Village.

8 I'm against this proposal for many  
9 reasons and I won't go into those yet. We'll keep  
10 our comments general.

11 In general my opposition to this as  
12 some of my other neighbors have voiced is that I  
13 think Gurnee right now is on the cusp of becoming a  
14 retail nightmare.

15 I have visited Naperville,

16 Schaumburg during the week, on the weekends and you  
17 can literally get gridlocked in traffic. In my  
18 opinion it's not a desirable community. They are  
19 not.

20 And also in my opinion I think our  
21 section of Gurnee is one of the nicest parts of  
22 this community. I think moving -- or changing the  
23 zoning to one of a Jewel store is just another step  
24 in Gurnee becoming a retail nightmare, and that's

114

1 why I'm against it. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

3 MR. MADER: Michael Mader,  
4 605 Lexington Square East.

5 I'm right behind what used to be  
6 the turnaround. There was a temporary turnaround  
7 on the -- on the landscape plans. Apparently,  
8 these two plans don't match so I'm a little  
9 confused with that.

10 I appreciate the fact that they're  
11 moving the road further away but at night I can  
12 hear trucks downshifting on 120. So I'm sure I'll  
13 hear this even if it's 250 more feet away.

14 So I'm concerned with the night  
15 time trucks delivery and, obviously, my property  
16 value and I don't have to reiterate everything John  
17 said because I agree with him and I would like to  
18 reiterate. Thank you.

19 MS. RAMATAR: It's me again, Roxane

20 Ramatar, Kingsway West.

21 You know, this presentation is  
22 definitely better tonight than it was last time,  
23 but I haven't heard anything different. So I'm  
24 curious why all of you have had such a change of

115

1 heart or an apparent change of heart because last  
2 time it was pretty obvious that you were very  
3 opposed to it and tonight we're getting  
4 compliments, we're liking what we're seeing and I'm  
5 wondering why. So it's more of a curiosity than  
6 anything.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.

8 MR. SPALDING: Hello. My name is Bill  
9 Spalding and I live at 46702 Providence Road.

10 I, too -- I want to state for the  
11 record that I am really opposed to developing and  
12 changing of the zoning.

13 I, too, visited the dog and pony  
14 show this last week of which there was  
15 approximately 125 people which I found no one in  
16 favor and what kind of irks me is they mentioned  
17 they had received 15 cards with issues or  
18 questions.

19 Well, I can tell you from the  
20 immediate time you entered the facility there were  
21 four areas, no one was kind of telling you what was  
22 going on. You just kind of saw clusters.

23                               There was no one handing out cards.  
24       No one really essentially promoting the use of

116

1       turning in a card, asking for feedback, things of  
2       that nature.

3                               They certainly were there answering  
4       questions defending themselves and speaking to the  
5       issues, but with respect to indicating 15 cards  
6       were returned and all these people came it's not a  
7       fair assessment as to the people that are adamantly  
8       opposed to it.

9                               I think the thing to concentrate on  
10       here is simply people buy the land in this  
11       neighborhood with the premise that it is light  
12       office services; okay? You're buying under the  
13       premises.

14                              And what would the purpose of  
15       zoning be if it's subject to change at any time for  
16       any reason unnoticed. I suggest we look up the --  
17       the word in the dictionary. It's as simple as that  
18       sounds. I mean there's a purpose to zoning.

19                              In addition to that there's a lot  
20       of other things that weren't raised that -- that I  
21       have a concern about in regards to the out-lots.  
22       You know, we have no control and what'll happen is  
23       there would be domino effect.

24                              What about the opposite

117

1 intersection across the street. That, too, someday  
2 is going to be commercial, you know, simply because  
3 of a domino effect.

4 What happens if they build the  
5 commercial and we approve the change there and then  
6 they come back and say we aren't able to develop  
7 the light office services, we would like to make it  
8 commercial.

9 You know, a lot of times it's a  
10 domino effect and that's how once they get one  
11 change that's how everything else dominos into that  
12 intersection becoming a dominant intersection.

13 Another issue that wasn't spoken to  
14 was if you're heading east on 120 anyone who turns  
15 left onto O'Plaine that -- that left-hand turn lane  
16 accepts six cars so, you know, it empties half the  
17 lane.

18 I think that there's issues on --  
19 on 120 itself for traffic heading in that direction  
20 that was not -- did not raise.

21 And really another thing if we look  
22 at common sense it brings no value. There is no  
23 reason to build the thing. There's four shopping  
24 centers within five miles -- or five, seven minutes

118

1 or ten minutes of which we all accept and we all  
2 shop there on a regular basis and there's simply  
3 not a need for another Jewel/Osco in the area.  
4 So those are my comments.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

6 MS. HAMLIN: My name is Mary Hamlin,  
7 4580 Providence Road.

8 The gentleman has brought up that I  
9 thought as we were going through the plan not only  
10 is there Highway 120 coming into O'Plaine Road but  
11 you're talking about a very congested road right  
12 now and you're going to add another stop a very  
13 short distance from a major stop line with a  
14 tremendous amount of backup.

15 In addition, it's already difficult  
16 to get in and out of Providence Village Home  
17 Subdivision as well as Providence Oaks. So you're  
18 compounding a problem that's already pretty bad to  
19 begin with.

20 So if we're looking at some of the  
21 logistics of traffic although I know you're not  
22 discussing them in detail tonight that's a major  
23 factor to us and since we're already having these  
24 problems I think it's just going to add to the

119

1 existing ones. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

3 MR. KARCZEWSKI: John Karczewski  
4 (phonetic), 63 Plymouth Court.

5 For the record I'm opposed to this  
6 as well. One thing that was kind of occurred to me  
7 as we're sitting here I was thinking about those



8 delivery trucks coming in.

9 I suppose they'll be coming from,  
10 you know, the north coming down 94. They can't get  
11 off at 120 so they'll -- I don't know -- maybe  
12 they'll get off at 21 and go up to that wonderful  
13 intersection at 21 and -- and come down Washington  
14 and come down O'Plaine.

15 So it's not only the truck traffic  
16 right there. You've got to deal with it in -- up  
17 in that area, too, unless they're planning another  
18 major revamping and adding exits to 94 getting off.

19 So I would just like to think about  
20 that as well. It's not as easy as all the trucks  
21 coming from Chicago up to here to make deliveries  
22 getting off on 120 and coming up to O'Plaine making  
23 a left-hand turn there and there's going to be some  
24 coming from the other direction as well.

120

1 Another thing, too, my house sits  
2 right at the corner before you can actually even  
3 turn on this road there.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The southeast corner?

5 MR. KARCZEWSKI: Right. On that  
6 southeast corner. For the life of me I know for a  
7 fact you've got to move that fence back to add a  
8 right turn lane. So I know my property value is  
9 going to go down dramatically. We're going to lose  
10 part of my back yard for that turn lane to expand.

11 Also, for the record I don't find

12 it a inconvenience to drive up to the Grand Hunt  
13 Club Store. It's a great store. I have no problem  
14 with it.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.

16 Anyone else?

17 Yes, sir.

18 MR. SANDERS: Kurt Sanders,  
19 4812 Kingsway.

20 I was curious, Mr. Chairman, last  
21 time you talked you embellished the Lakehurst and  
22 the impact -- and by the way if there was a Super K  
23 we would be just as opposed. I feel bad that we're  
24 picking on Jewel.

121

1 But let's go back to you had  
2 mentioned that the Lakehurst mall, you know,  
3 already had the Jewel and it had the zoning, had  
4 the trucking, was built that way and I remember you  
5 being fairly adamant about, you know, why would we  
6 continue to develop that area which it was intended  
7 for rather than draw away from that potential.

8 And I was wondering whether you  
9 were, you know, here tonight thinking -- are you  
10 still along that same lines?

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, you know, to be  
12 fair and honest this is the first time we saw this  
13 plan. You know, I was interested in what the  
14 neighbors had to say because I had no idea what

15 effect this was going to have on the residents.

16 I understand they made a  
17 presentation. I wasn't there. I didn't get any  
18 feedback from any residents --

19 MR. SANDERS: The first time -- so the  
20 first meeting I believe three or four of the  
21 Commissioners on the Plan Commission mentioned that  
22 Lakehurst should be -- continue to be developed.  
23 The Jewel is over there and that building more --  
24 more commercial over by Providence Village would

122

1 detract along with the ability to maybe revitalize  
2 itself.

3 Is that what I remember hearing  
4 last time?

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That's what I had said  
6 the last time is that we -- the Lakehurst  
7 development is a major commercial area. It's  
8 obviously deteriorating and there's -- actually  
9 since the last meeting there was a lot of talk  
10 about revitalizing and redevelopment of Lakehurst  
11 and, you know, I -- what I don't want to see is  
12 Route 120 and O'Plaine being a major commercial  
13 development when you have all the infrastructure in  
14 Lakehurst.

15 Now, if you start sizing this  
16 down -- we actually at one time had considered  
17 positively an informal meeting with residential  
18 with a -- called a neighborhood residential area.

19                   So that's something I think that,  
20           you know, that will be considered. I'm not saying  
21           that for or against it or anything, but I think we  
22           have to consider some of these things.

23                   If the commercial area gets too  
24           large then I think that you potentially could

123

1           undermine any redevelopment efforts at Lakehurst.

2                   And you also run in to the  
3           potential which I think we fully addressed once we  
4           get back to the Commission of the potential of  
5           Jewel -- let's say the plan is approved as CB/2 use  
6           and then Jewel for whatever reason says jeez, the  
7           Lakehurst redevelopment is working out nicely and  
8           then they decide to go back to Lakehurst and, you  
9           know, we're left with some CB/2 zoning that we  
10          really hate to see the CB/2 come in. We'll explore  
11          that. Have a lot of work to do here so give us a  
12          chance.

13                   MR. SANDERS: I really appreciate your  
14          listening to us because that led in to my second  
15          question, which is if a plan on developing this in  
16          three to five years, you know, it would behoove us  
17          if there's enough attention and questions that we  
18          continue in this process of -- of going down and  
19          looking, you know, and exploring this.

20                   Since we have a three to five year  
21          time frame there really is no rush to go ahead

22 and -- and, you know, rezone it. We can take a  
23 look at how Lakehurst is revitalizing, how other  
24 traffic studies as the gentleman before me talked

124

1 about, you know, secondary and tertiary problems  
2 coming out and the impasse of the IDOT study.

3 There's a lot of things that will  
4 really impact this area and although I like, you  
5 know, the way this is developing I consider -- I  
6 have enough time, I can keep coming to every one of  
7 these Plan Commissions.

8 I would implore you to just say,  
9 you know, let's keep going on looking at exploring  
10 these things as a three to five year development  
11 plan is fine. I mean it's not like they're going  
12 to build next year. So thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.

14 MS. KETCHACANO: My name is Nancy  
15 Ketchacano (phonetic), I live at 658 North  
16 Lexington Square West.

17 I also would like to say that I am  
18 not in favor of this project. I am one of the  
19 fortunate people who bought a house in the last two  
20 to three months in the Providence Village  
21 Subdivision.

22 We had no idea that Jewel was  
23 planning to even consider building on that corner.  
24 I can tell you from my standpoint coming in to the

1 area I would not have looked at a home in that  
2 subdivision if there was a Jewel going in on the  
3 corner.

4 We would not have even considered  
5 going in there and I don't think Jewel is listening  
6 to us when we say that we do not mind going to the  
7 other Gurnee store to shop. It seems that they are  
8 turning deaf ears.

9 Last time they were here they said  
10 they draw within a five mile radius. If you go to  
11 the -- I don't know what you call it -- the other  
12 store, it's only three miles from us. That is not  
13 to me a far distance to drive to go to the grocery  
14 store. So I just wanted to let you know.

15 The other thing is as far as  
16 speaking with the residents there was a sign posted  
17 for well over three weeks to the residents of our  
18 subdivision about the Jewel meeting.

19 However, nobody was told that this  
20 meeting tonight unless you attended a previous  
21 planning meeting. So maybe there aren't as many  
22 people here because they just didn't know about the  
23 meeting. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Just to comment on that

1 the -- we -- if we continue a public hearing we  
2 won't reissue a notice. That's typically not --  
3 not how it's done.

4 MS. KETCHACANO: I understand that's not  
5 up to you, but we as homeowners we should have done  
6 something to inform our other residents that this  
7 meeting was taking place because I will guarantee  
8 you that a lot of the people did not know this  
9 meeting was taking place for these purposes  
10 tonight.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.

12 MR. RYAN: Patrick Ryan. I live at  
13 4585 Covenant Court in Providence Village and  
14 myself, my family and I moved here in the last six  
15 months or so and we definitely would not have  
16 considered or would of reconsidered our options  
17 knowing that there was going to be a Jewel/Osco  
18 going in at this location. Or potentially.  
19 I think Lakehurst is a great location and they can  
20 stay there.

21 And I don't want to be known as the  
22 guy that lives behind the Jewel and so I stand up  
23 to give my opposition. Thanks.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

127

1 MS. FREISTAG: Laura Freistag,  
2 4915 Kingsway West.

3 I want to just reiterate what she  
4 said awhile ago. It was very fishy a sign by our  
5 entrances was put up said Jewel/Osco meeting,  
6 Providence Village meeting.

7                   So everybody -- all of us started  
8                   thinking oh, they're we're going to get together  
9                   and figure out how to fight this thing. Well, we  
10                  put two and two together. Within a couple days we  
11                  get a mailing -- not one mailing but two mailings  
12                  from Jewel/Osco inviting us to a meeting to watch  
13                  their dog and pony show.

14                 So we felt that it was -- it was  
15                 very fishy that our mailing list was given to  
16                 Jewel/Osco for them to promote, yet we were not  
17                 informed by our association that what this really  
18                 was was not a meeting for us to go come together as  
19                 an association but it was a meeting to come and  
20                 hear their dog and pony show.

21                 So we will be well prepared the  
22                 next time by the residents to be hear in full force  
23                 to make our opinions known. Thank you.

24                 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

128

1                   Any other questions?

2                   Yes, ma'am.

3                   MS. SANDERS: Nancy Sanders,  
4                   4812 Kingsway West.

5                   It's unfortunate that this is  
6                   taking a little bit of a negative tone. I don't  
7                   think we really have to be negative. I don't have  
8                   anything against Jewel, but the -- the one benefit  
9                   that Jewel/Osco gives us is kind of ironic, the  
10                  benefit that it's convenient to shopping.



11                               When we chose to -- or when we were  
12                               transferred from Columbus, Ohio up to here one of  
13                               the reasons we moved to Providence Village was it  
14                               was away from the traffic nightmares of Washington  
15                               and Grand and 21 and Hunt Club and I have to say  
16                               again I have no problem in going all the way to  
17                               Hunt Club.

18                               So one of the biggest benefits to  
19                               us is closeness is not a benefit at all. It's the  
20                               reason why we wanted -- one of the biggest reasons  
21                               why we bought in Providence Village that we're not  
22                               -- we don't have the congestion that,  
23                               unfortunately, the rest of Gurnee has.

24                               CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

129

1                               Anyone else?

2                               (No verbal response.)

3                               CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. The floor is  
4                               closed to the public.

5                               And I would just, first of all,  
6                               like to address the one lady's questioning. I  
7                               think she indicated that why was there a change in  
8                               the -- in the tone of the Commission this evening  
9                               to more positive.

10                               I don't know that I indicated that,  
11                               but I think clearly the plan has moved in a  
12                               positive direction. We -- this was the first  
13                               chance we had to see it. We want to take public

14 input.

15 Frankly, I was more interested in  
16 what the residents had thought because I know Jewel  
17 met with -- with them and I was interested to see  
18 if the residents felt more positively about this  
19 and, you know, I think you got the message across  
20 to us, but the Commissioners certainly -- I think  
21 you have to admit it's more -- it's a more positive  
22 thing now.

23 I'm going to open it up to the  
24 Commissioners to kind of see if we could give some

130

1 direction to Jewel and see if they want to  
2 encourage them to pursue this.

3 So the Commissioners any comments  
4 or questions?

5 Mr. Sula.

6 MR. SULA: First I'm going to start off  
7 by saying I'm not a disinterested party in those  
8 whole thing. I live in the very near area near the  
9 case of Providence folks so I sincerely care what  
10 happens in that neighborhood.

11 As far as my personal feelings  
12 about the -- the change of heart let's put it in  
13 perspective. Last time we were here we were  
14 looking at a total complete departure from what was  
15 in the comprehensive plan.

16 We were looking at something that  
17 was going from a total hundred percent office use

18 in the comp plan to no office at all, commercial  
19 retailer as well as industrial and, frankly, the  
20 industrial is the part that really concerned me the  
21 most.

22 I didn't want to see any light  
23 manufacturing as I get off the tollway course  
24 immediately adjacent to the Providence Village.

131

1 It's not appropriate.

2 Keep in mind here it's a comp plan  
3 and plans are not cast in concrete and as Don would  
4 say they're not chocolate pudding either, but we  
5 have to allow for reasonable flexibility and  
6 reasonable use of the land.

7 I think we're moving a long ways to  
8 making this more reasonable. Is it ideal yet?  
9 Probably not, but I think we can get there over the  
10 course of time with the proper amount of  
11 communication.

12 I think it's great that your  
13 mailing list was given out to Jewel. Otherwise,  
14 you would be here complaining that you're not being  
15 communicated to. The best way to solve this thing  
16 is to be communicated with. That's all I have  
17 right now.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Mr. Smith.

19 MR. SMITH: Yeah.

20 I think there's some misconception

21 over that CO/1. CO/1 is not nine to five Monday  
22 through Friday. CO/1 either by right or by  
23 special use can be fast food restaurants, could be  
24 pharmacies, could be drug stores, all of that kind

132

1 of stuff.

2 There's a lot of stuff that falls  
3 in there. They could put 24 hour a day restaurants  
4 in there. They could put five story high offices  
5 and that's why we're coming in with the idea that  
6 the traffic studies that I see are based on the  
7 density that they can put in the five story high.  
8 Five story high.

9 Right now they're saying one story  
10 high they're going to go. They can go five story  
11 high office buildings, put all the restaurants on  
12 the corner there, put a drug store, put a pharmacy  
13 by, you know. Or by special use. And so I think  
14 there's a misconception what CO/1 is. It isn't  
15 just nine to five uses.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Anyone else?

17 Mr. Cepon.

18 MR. CEPON: Yeah.

19 I think we've made some progress.  
20 I'm still not really totally sure that commercial  
21 should be on that. I have to agree with what --  
22 some of the residents.

23 I'm concerned that Gurnee is  
24 getting to the point where we're just going

1 commercial, commercial, commercial and, you know,  
2 that kind of scares me a little bit, too, because  
3 when you start building this here and then  
4 Rockenbach and things like that you get a lot of  
5 commercial in it.

6 So I think we should still look at  
7 it and -- and maybe we can analyze it. I don't  
8 think we can make a decision right now.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Foster.

10 MR. FOSTER: I wanted to respond, Mr.  
11 Chairman, to the -- at least the one question and  
12 the overall comments about what may appear to be a  
13 change of heart.

14 I think the comment I made was in  
15 the sentence of a positive step in the right  
16 direction. I think that reflects as I said a few  
17 minutes ago a change from industrial zoning to  
18 office services and three quarters of the site  
19 being office services which is consistent with the  
20 comprehensive plan.

21 It seems that we have perhaps at  
22 least a minimum of 20,000 square feet reduction in  
23 the commercial retail component which I think is  
24 significant.

1 The site plan has a different  
2 orientation which, again, I think is in the right

3 direction. You know, what you build there. I  
4 don't think anyone has made that kind of decision.

5 I think we're trying to indicate to  
6 the Petitioner -- I think part of our job is to  
7 give the Petitioner a fair hearing and that's --  
8 that's part of my role here. That this is in the  
9 right direction.

10 I think my -- my comment for future  
11 direction would be that at this vantage point  
12 because this is kind of far out still I wish there  
13 could be some more definition of office services  
14 because office services are skilled and one of the  
15 things that the Commission has talked about and  
16 will talk about it again.

17 The comprehensive plan is kind of  
18 what I would call an upscale office park area with  
19 a road configuration. I'm not sure if they would  
20 lend itself that way. I know also we responded  
21 positively to a main center, the kind of office  
22 services configuration. So I think, you know, we  
23 don't -- you need to get some kind of a hint or  
24 vision of the office services component.

135

1 I am very concerned about the  
2 corridors of Gurnee and this is certainly an  
3 important strategic corner to our town and so its  
4 appearance, how it develops, is very important I  
5 think to the comprehensive plan but as well as to

6 residents in general.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Anyone else?

8 (No verbal response.)

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I would like to just  
10 clarify a little bit on the CO uses. I think I had  
11 read some uses off before.

12 Now, as far as permitted uses are  
13 concerned those are pretty much all just offices,  
14 doctors offices, attorneys offices, things of that  
15 nature.

16 The -- you can have restaurants.  
17 Basically the retail usage would be drug store,  
18 pharmacy, medical appliance stores, optic sales and  
19 restaurants, but those are all special uses and  
20 what that means is that the Petitioner if they  
21 wanted to put a restaurant in they would have to  
22 come up before this Board and the village Board to  
23 get a Special Use Permit.

24 It would have to be a public

136

1 hearing, the public would be noticed and everyone  
2 would have an opportunity to be involved to comment  
3 and voice their opinion in that regard.

4 So I just wanted to clarify that on  
5 the CO list and I think Mr. Foster's comments to  
6 the Petitioner might consider that in maybe coming  
7 up with a restricted CO list to prevent any  
8 restaurants or anything like that from coming in.  
9 I think people would be concerned about that.

10 I think as far as -- it's up to the  
11 Commissioners, but it seems to me that we may need  
12 to take this at least another step further if  
13 that's okay with everyone.

14 I think even -- even some of the  
15 people in the audience said maybe we can continue  
16 to peruse this and maybe see what some of the  
17 buffer areas look like.

18 I was particularly concerned. I  
19 hope the Petitioner keeps in mind that the --  
20 certainly Providence Village is to the north of  
21 this site, but we also have residential which would  
22 be right across the street on O'Plaine Road and I  
23 know you do have a buffer area in there and I would  
24 hope that you're planning on making that somewhat

137

1 unique and attractive so that the people that are  
2 living right across the street would be buffered  
3 from this -- the commercial development.

4 Also, I guess I had a question for  
5 Butch. I think the concern was brought up that  
6 let's say this were to be approved -- say it gets  
7 approved as a use that the Petitioner is asking for  
8 and three years is a long time, somewhere down the  
9 road the Petitioner says, you know, we decided not  
10 to build a Jewel, what happens at that point?

11 MR. MAIDEN: Well, we could build in  
12 standards that you could limit the appearance, you



13 can limit the landscaping, you can do all the  
14 performance factors, but you're correct. We could  
15 not demand that Jewel build this as the only use  
16 that would be permitted.

17 But I think there are other things.  
18 Fortunately, this is an annexation. We have a lot  
19 of ability to provide additional limitations on  
20 that annexation agreement.

21 So there are things that you can do  
22 to -- to limit that and make sure that what they  
23 represent as the intended appearance if an  
24 alternative use comes in then it must also meet

138

1 those criteria on appearance.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I looked up  
3 another thing. I was kind of studying this. If --  
4 maybe the land planner can answer this question.  
5 Was there any consideration given -- I take it you  
6 would be asking for an underlying CB/2 zoning on  
7 this?

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's correct.  
9 Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Was there any  
11 consideration in making it a CB/1?

12 MR. DOSE: I'm Greg Dose, attorney for  
13 Jewel/Osco.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Would you use  
15 the microphone, please, so everyone can hear.

16 MR. DOSE: Very briefly we were still

17 looking at the CB/2 as the underlying zoning  
18 because it seemed more compatible with the  
19 Jewel/Osco Store.

20 We can take another look at that  
21 and I think the concerns about limitation of uses  
22 we've presented that before and we would be glad to  
23 refine that list and make sure that the uses that  
24 would be here would be compatible with a

139

1 neighborhood setting and, if you want us to look at  
2 that further we will.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Just from what I  
4 looked at it seems to me that the Jewel would be  
5 a -- an acceptable permitted use in that zone but  
6 then you would be restricted -- it seemed to me  
7 like you couldn't put a K mart in that from another  
8 use standpoint. Why don't you take talk a look at  
9 that.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We will.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So do we have any other  
12 comments?

13 Yes, Jon. Go ahead.

14 MR. WILDENBERG: Just real quickly. If  
15 people are interested in picking up copies of the  
16 zoning ordinance or an excerpt of a particular  
17 section of the zoning district they are available  
18 at the hall eight to five Monday through Thursday  
19 this week, Monday through Friday typically, and you

20 just come on and get it. We could mail them to  
21 you.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. So we have the  
23 zoning ordinance on the Internet as well. So do  
24 you want to give them the address?

140

1 MS. KOVARIK: Gurnee dot Illinois.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: For the village  
3 Internet why don't you give the village hall a call  
4 and I'm sure they'll give you the address.

5 So it sounds like we're at the  
6 point where a motion would be in order. Okay. It  
7 looks like the next available time we would have  
8 would be August 5th.

9 Would that be okay for the  
10 Petitioner?

11 (No verbal response.)

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Who's the  
13 spokesperson? Mr. Brown.

14 MR. BROWN: It seems like we've got a  
15 couple of key individuals that won't be available  
16 on the 5th and, in fact, if there's a way -- I  
17 guess focus on the 29th. Is that not possible?

18 MR. WILDENBERG: There's a joint  
19 workshop session scheduled between the Plan  
20 Commission and Zoning Board that night to discuss  
21 update of the zoning ordinance and particular  
22 village overlay history.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That happens to be the

24 difficulty. The next regular meeting is the 15th

141

1 of July --

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That would work.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: -- and that -- well,  
4 except --

5 MR. WILDENBERG: Six Flags.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: See, the problem is  
7 that you picked a bad time. We're sewed up. We  
8 have these special meetings going over our zoning  
9 ordinance on any off nights.

10 So what's the date after the 5th  
11 then?

12 MR. WILDENBERG: 19th of August.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: What about the 19th of  
14 August?

15 MR. BROWN: Obviously, if that's the  
16 earliest the Commission can entertain our proposal  
17 what we intend to do, obviously, is to proceed with  
18 the next level of detail as we had at the initial  
19 petition.

20 We had envisioned that that would  
21 be a two to three week time frame and if there's no  
22 other meeting that's available between now and that  
23 date then we certainly would -- would request that  
24 we be on the agenda, but we also want to proceed

142

1 with the detail level of the planning that would be

2 consistent with again what the Petition -- or what  
3 the Commission would request or require to bring it  
4 to a vote.

5 We do have some contractual timings  
6 under our existing option that would suggest that  
7 we move through the Plan Commission in whatever  
8 timely fashion we can, but you're saying there's no  
9 other meeting now between the middle of August.

10 We would like to at least know that  
11 we can proceed with the detail level of planning,  
12 hopefully, to bring it to a vote at that point in  
13 time.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Well, I can't  
15 guarantee a vote.

16 MR. BROWN: I understand that. We would  
17 like to at least be able to have the materials  
18 available so if the Commission determined it was  
19 appropriate that they could do so.

20 MR. CEPON: I would assume that we would  
21 get some of that before?

22 MR. BROWN: Absolutely. Yes. We  
23 intended to -- we originally envisioned a timeline  
24 of the hearing being July 29th. We were gearing

143

1 toward that date so clearly we will provide the  
2 information sooner than -- than that.

3 We appreciate that and, again, we  
4 apologize that we were scrambling to put together

5 the concept plan and much of it was -- much of it  
6 was responsive to the neighborhood meeting although  
7 many of the comments indicated that perhaps we  
8 didn't address all the issues. Certainly we  
9 appreciated feedback and we would like to proceed  
10 with the information that we have.

11 MR. DOSE: Let's take the 5th.

12 MR. BROWN: Take the 5th?

13 MR. DOSE: Take the 5th.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So you'll take the 19th  
15 then?

16 MR. DOSE: 5th.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay.

18 MR. FOSTER: I was just going to say in  
19 terms of direction -- I mean I -- I do want to  
20 convey to the Petitioner that -- that the concerns  
21 of the residents will be taken seriously and I just  
22 hope -- I'm concerned that some of the comments --  
23 I do hope that there will be some kind of ongoing  
24 dialogue with the neighbors, though.

144

1 So I just wanted to go on the  
2 record saying that I think that's extremely  
3 important, you know, that whatever happens that the  
4 neighbors are communicated with.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Also at that  
6 public hearing I will give an opportunity for  
7 residents and the public to speak again. So --

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So is it the 5th

9 or the 19th?

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Oh, you want the 5th

11 now? Okay.

12 MR. DOSE: We'll take the 5th.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All right. Make a

14 motion.

15 MR. SMITH: I make a motion we continue

16 the hearing to August 5th.

17 MR. SULA: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motioned by Mr. Smith

19 and seconded by Mr. Sula to continue the meeting

20 August 5th here at the village hall at 7:30.

21 All those in favor of the motion

22 signify by saying aye in roll call. Opposed say

23 nay.

24 Roll call, please.

145

1 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

2 MR. SULA: Aye.

3 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.

4 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

5 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepon.

6 MR. CEPON: Aye.

7 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.

8 MR. SMITH: Aye.

9 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.

10 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

11 MR. WILDENBERG: Rudny.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye.

13 Motion carried and is so ordered.

14 MR. SMITH: I make a motion to adjourn  
15 the meeting.

16 MR. SULA: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion and second.

18 All those in favor of the motion  
19 signify by saying aye in roll call. Those opposed  
20 say nay.

21 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.

22 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

23 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.

24 MR. SMITH: Aye.

146

1 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

2 MR. SULA: Aye.

3 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.

4 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

5 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepon.

6 MR. CEPON: Aye.

7 MR. WILDENBERG: Rudny.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye.

9 Motion carried. Meeting is  
10 adjourned.

11 (End of proceedings.)

12

13

14

15



16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

147

STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
 ) SS:  
COUNTY OF L A K E )

I, SUSAN R. PILAR, do hereby certify that I am a court reporter doing business in the County of Lake and State of Illinois; that I reported by means of machine shorthand the testimony given at the foregoing Report of Proceedings, and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid.

---

SUSAN R. PILAR, CSR, RPR  
Notary Public, Lake County, IL  
CSR License No. 084-003432.