

VILLAGE OF GURNEE

PLAN COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING

held

August 5, 1998

7:30 PM

GURNEE MUNICIPAL BUILDING

325 North O'Plaine Road

Gurnee, Illinois

1 PLAN COMMISSION:

2

3 DONALD RUDNY, Chairman

4 JIM SULA

5 LYLE FOSTER

6 BRYAN WINTER

7 KRISTINA KOVARIK

8 BILL SMITH

9 CARL CEPON

10

11 ALSO PRESENT:

12

13 JON WILDENBERG

14 TRACY VELKOVER

15 BARBARA SWANSON

16 BUTCH MAIDEN

17

18

19

20

21

22 Reported by: SANDRA K. SMITH, CSR, RPR

23 CSR License No. 084-003104

24

	PAGES
2	
3	
4	6-20
5	
6	
7	20-130
8	
9	
10	130-200
11	
12	
13	201-265
14	
15	
16	266-274
17	
18	
19	274-283
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The Village of Gurnee
2 Plan Commission meeting will now come to order.

3 Can we have roll call, please.

4 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

5 MR. SULA: Here.

6 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.

7 MS. KOVARIK: Here.

8 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepon.

9 MR. CEPON: Here.

10 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.

11 MR. WINTER: Here.

12 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.

13 MR. FOSTER: Here.

14 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.

15 MR. SMITH: Here.

16 MR. WILDENBERG: Chairman Rudny.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Here. Please join me
18 in the Pledge of Allegiance.

19 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. The first
21 matter is the approval of the July 1st, 1998 Plan
22 Commission minutes.

23 I trust you have all had a chance
24 to review those. Are there any additions or

5

1 corrections? Tracy, have you got some corrections?

2 MS. VELKOVER: I have some corrections.

3 Page 10, Line 22. It says pile-on and it should be

4 pylon. Page 11 there's a typo for height. And
5 Page 47 Line 20, Kolar is misspelled. And it says
6 Flat Wolf Run and it should be Black Wolf Run.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anyone else have any
8 additions or corrections?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: With that I'll
11 entertain a motion to accept them as presented.

12 MR. WINTER: So moved.

13 MR. SMITH: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion and second. All
15 those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye
16 in the roll call; those opposed nay. Roll call,
17 please.

18 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

19 MR. SULA: Aye.

20 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.

21 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

22 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepon.

23 MR. CEPON: Aye.

24 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.

6

1 MR. WINTER: Aye.

2 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.

3 MR. SMITH: Aye.

4 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.

5 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

6 MR. WILDENBERG: Rudny.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries
8 and it is so ordered.

9 The first matter is the Final PUD
10 Plat, Studio Plus. The subject property consists
11 of approximately two acres located at the northwest
12 corner of Grand Avenue and Dilley's Road at the
13 Auto Nation site.

14 The property is zoned C/B-2 PUD and
15 has preliminary PUD plat approval. Studio Plus is
16 requesting final PUD plat approval for an 87 room
17 extended stay hotel.

18 Jon, are you handling this? Or
19 Tracy, do you have anything to add to that?

20 MR. WILDENBERG: No other comments other
21 than we had one item yet to resolve at the time we
22 sent the packets out regarding lighting on the
23 site, but they've resubmitted the lighting plan and
24 it's been reviewed and found to be in conformance.

7

1 We do have somewhere
2 representatives from Studio Plus to answer
3 questions or go over the site plan in greater
4 detail if you desire.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So the Petitioner is

6 here. You're, sir, the Petitioner?

7 MR. HEALY: Excuse me, yes.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Did you have anything
9 else to present or did you just want to answer
10 questions?

11 MR. HEALY: I'm here to answer
12 questions.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Members of the
14 Commission, any questions or comments?

15 MR. FOSTER: I have a question.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Foster, go ahead.

17 MR. FOSTER: I guess I would just like
18 clarification on how this is defined as a hotel
19 based on the extended stay concept.

20 MR. HEALY: Much like the ESA was when
21 they came to you a year and a half ago. We are a
22 hotel company with kitchenettes in each of our
23 rooms catering to a niche unlike a conventional
24 hotel.

8

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Sir, could you please
2 use the microphone. Thank you.

3 MR. HEALY: Can you hear me?

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yeah. Any other
5 questions?

6 MR. FOSTER: Well, actually I don't

7 think that answers my question. I wasn't on the
8 Commission when they came forward with the other
9 property.

10 So I would just like a definition
11 as to -- because in terms of my vision for hotels
12 on that particular parcel this does not meet that
13 definition in my mind. I understand our
14 jurisdiction here is limited tonight but in voting
15 for this or for this particular motion I would just
16 like to feel comfortable that this is by its intent
17 a real hotel.

18 MR. HEALY: That's -- I don't seem to
19 understand what your question is. We are a hotel,
20 we're catering to the traveling public, much like
21 the ESA on the other side of the street. We are a
22 hotel company. What more can I tell you.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, maybe --

24 MR. HEALY: We have short term guests,

9

1 minimum stay of fourteen days. Average stay, I'm
2 sorry.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: What would be the
4 maximum stay?

5 MR. HEALY: Maximum stay I think is
6 governed by -- I think by the PUD of 30 days.
7 Well, it's not a domicile. It's not a permanent

8 residence for anyone. We're not set up for that.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Now, there is a
10 definition of hotel in our Zoning Ordinance. And,
11 Jon, maybe you could read that.

12 And then I guess the Commissioners
13 could then evaluate if they feel that this meets
14 the definition.

15 MR. WILDENBERG: I have a definition for
16 hotel and also for motel. They're fairly similar.
17 I can go over both of them if you wish.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Why don't you go over
19 both of them. I know somewhere I saw it in the
20 information some place you called this a motel. I
21 saw the word motel.

22 MR. HEALY: That's a misspelling then.
23 We are a hotel.

24 MR. WILDENBERG: The definition of hotel

10

1 under our Zoning Ordinance reads as follows:

2 An establishment which provides
3 lodging for transient guests in return for
4 moneterial reward and which provides customary
5 hotel services such as maid service, furnishing and
6 laundering of linen, telephone and desk service,
7 the use and upkeep of furniture and bellboy
8 service.

10 we begin to set a precedent with -- and I'm not
11 casting any aspersions necessarily on the
12 petition -- but if we begin to have a certain type
13 of hotel come in I'm just not comfortable that the
14 eventual buildout of this particular parcel will
15 bring in additional hotels of the type that perhaps
16 was originally envisioned so I think that's where
17 I'm expressing my concern. I don't believe it
18 anyway.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Winter.

20 MR. WINTER: I'd just like to add I
21 share in that concern. I think what we'll probably
22 have to do is maybe this is an area that we should
23 look at our ordinances and address this issue.

24 The definitions as they've been

12

1 reported tonight clearly don't put parameters on
2 the length of stay and I think that we should
3 recommend to staff that they look to see what other
4 communities are doing on that. I know some other
5 communities have resisted hotels of this sort,
6 whatever you want to call it, these types of
7 developments.

8 And I think maybe this is an
9 appropriate time for us to look at that. But under
10 the definition it doesn't seem like we do limit it

11 currently.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Are you suggesting that
13 we would hold off on this one or --

14 MR. WINTER: No, I think that he's
15 talking about a 30 day that he thinks is in the
16 PUD. I'm not sure that -- I'm not aware of that
17 being a limitation.

18 But I think if the Village passes
19 an ordinance to limit that further, I'm not
20 positive but I think that it would be binding on
21 some of these existing hotels provided it's a
22 reasonable limitation.

23 And that's what I'm suggesting is
24 that I see no basis to not approve this final plat

13

1 because it's come this far, but I think some of the
2 concerns that Mr. Foster has raised are good ones
3 and that staff should be looking into that.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So let me get this
5 straight. You're suggesting that if we looked at
6 some ordinance it would be in regards to maximum
7 length of stay or something like that?

8 MR. WINTER: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm not saying that we
10 should come up with the ordinance now, I'm just
11 trying to get an idea what you're looking for.

12 MR. WINTER: We don't want these to be
13 hotels that people are making a domicile, that
14 people are living out of and they're sending kids
15 to the schools and things like that. And that's
16 what we want to prohibit.

17 And I think that that could be
18 handled in the form of an ordinance that talks
19 about, you know, under public welfare provisions
20 that, you know, these units aren't made for people
21 to live in and in fact it is for a temporary basis
22 and that should be defined somewhere in our local
23 ordinance.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think that's a good

14

1 idea. I think my major concern would be is that if
2 for some reason the market for this kind of thing
3 deteriorated that they would convert it to
4 basically an apartment and I think what you're
5 suggesting would prevent that from occurring so.

6 MR. WINTER: And that has happened in
7 some other communities. I mean there's some motels
8 that you will find in the community or in this
9 County rather and people are living in them.

10 And that's what we have to -- you
11 know, I think we have to address that. I don't
12 know if we're going to address that but certainly

13 the Village is going to and I would recommend to
14 staff that they do that.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I guess since
16 we're kind of updating our Zoning Ordinance it
17 might be appropriate to include it in that.

18 Any other questions of the
19 Petitioner?

20 MR. SMITH: If we did update our
21 ordinances would it go back to these and apply to
22 these or would these being there already not apply?

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think our attorney
24 would have to look at that, but I think if it were

15

1 in -- certainly we're going to have a record of
2 this and I think their indication is that they
3 don't expect it to be a residence.

4 So I think if we don't interfere
5 with their operation, normal operation I think it
6 would be okay. But that's certainly something we
7 have to address downstream. But I think Mr. Winter
8 indicated I think you could get this to apply to
9 existing extended stay hotels.

10 MR. SMITH: Is 30 days unreasonable to
11 them? He seemed to feel that that was in the
12 Ordinance. Could we put this in this PUD here?

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: No, this is actually a

14 final plat, the PUD is already prepared. So I
15 think we would have to address that in our general
16 Zoning Ordinance and address it as a separate
17 issue.

18 Plus I think we want to address it
19 on a broader basis and not just on this one
20 property. Yes, Mr. Sula.

21 MR. SULA: I'm curious for staff, what
22 procedures do we have in place to ensure that the
23 stays do not go beyond 30 days?

24 MR. WILDENBERG: We do not audit every

16

1 stay in every hotel and it hasn't surfaced as a
2 problem, you know, either through the police or
3 fire department or anybody that gets into that
4 building on a regular basis to date.

5 So it's not an issue we've had to
6 really dive into up to this point in time.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Foster.

8 MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, I would just
9 notice a point of interest.

10 I think a recent article in one of
11 the local papers did indicate that it's quite
12 common that families have been using such
13 properties for several months as a place to live
14 for homes to be finished, et cetera.

15 So I think there's probably a
16 precedent in town now that people are using such
17 rooms longer than 30 days and I don't know what --
18 I recognize people need temporary places to stay,
19 but for me if that was clear from the beginning
20 that's one thing; but if it's not clear then it's a
21 different use that's going to take place.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I don't know, I
23 guess one of the solutions to me -- again, the
24 thing that we want to prevent is for this thing to

17

1 turn into a majority of full-term residential use.

2 And I suppose if you have a single
3 occurrence that happens now and then it's obviously
4 going to be -- if we did have an Ordinance it would
5 be difficult to enforce.

6 But the idea would be to have the
7 ordinance in place so that if it was abused you
8 could do something about it. Mr. Winter.

9 MR. WINTER: I think that they do
10 maintain a registry, don't you? Will you not?

11 MR. HEALY: Yes, we do.

12 MR. WINTER: And I think there would be
13 some mechanism to audit this but the problem is we
14 don't have the ordinance right now.

15 And I think that would be a

16 function of maybe the police or the public safety
17 could monitor that if we had an ordinance that
18 they're going to be required to keep that
19 information.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions or
21 comments?

22 MR. CEPON: Basically it's similar to
23 the Extended Stay, correct?

24 MR. HEALY: It's exactly the same as the

18

1 Extended Stay.

2 MR. CEPON: We've never had any problems
3 with the Extended Stay, have we, that you're aware
4 of?

5 MR. WILDENBERG: As far as really
6 extended stays, we don't have any knowledge of any.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: How long has that
8 Extended Stay been in operation?

9 MR. WILDENBERG: About a year and a
10 half, two years.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I guess I just have one
12 question in regards to the plat.

13 Does the plat meet all the PUD
14 standards--setbacks, landscaping, parking?

15 MR. WILDENBERG: Yes, it's been -- all
16 those PUD standards have been reviewed by staff.

17 As I said, really the only one
18 loose end we had before the packet went out was the
19 lighting plan and they did resubmit a plan that
20 does conform to the lighting standards in the PUD.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions or
22 comments?

23 (No response.)

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

19

1 motion for a favorable recommendation. Mr. Smith.

2 MR. SMITH: I'd like to make a motion
3 that we pass a favorable recommendation on to the
4 Village Board for the final PUD plat for the Studio
5 Plus hotel.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion by Mr. Smith.
7 Is there a second?

8 MR. WINTER: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Second by Mr. Winter.

10 All those in favor of the motion
11 signify by saying aye in the roll call; those
12 opposed nay. Roll call, please.

13 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

14 MR. SULA: Abstain.

15 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.

16 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

17 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepen.

18 MR. CEPON: Aye.
19 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.
20 MR. WINTER: Aye.
21 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.
22 MR. FOSTER: Abstain.
23 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.
24 MR. SMITH: Aye.

20

1 MR. WILDENBERG: Chairman Rudny.
2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries
3 and it is so ordered.
4 COURT REPORTER: Sir, could I get your
5 name?
6 MR. HEALY: Steven Healy, H-e-a-l-y.
7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I understand that
8 there's perhaps a little trouble hearing in the
9 foyer area so we're going to see if we can turn up
10 the volume a little bit.
11 Okay. The next matter is a
12 continued public hearing, American Stores
13 Properties, Inc.
14 The subject property consists of
15 approximately 75 acres located at the northwest
16 corner of Route 120 and O'Plaine Road. The
17 property is zoned S, Suburban, in unincorporated
18 Lake County.

20 MR. BROWN: Thank you, Chairman Rudny.
21 My name is Bob Brown. I'm director of real estate
22 for American Stores Properties which is the real
23 estate construction group of American Stores which
24 is the parent of Jewel and Osco who are the

22

1 proposed retail store that is intending to develop
2 on this property, at least on a portion of it.

3 It's heartwarming to see as many
4 people come tonight. We recognize many faces from
5 the neighborhood meeting and obviously it's an
6 interactive process. One of the reasons that we're
7 here tonight is that we've had a great deal of
8 interaction with the Village staff, with the
9 neighbors, other consultants to try to make this
10 the best proposed plan that we possibly can.

11 We recognize we probably won't be
12 able to satisfy everyone as to whether or not
13 there's any development here and if so what the
14 nature and scope of that development is, but we
15 intend to try to focus on the major components of
16 the plan and how they've changed since the initial
17 petition back in May.

18 And there have been substantial
19 changes, again with a lot of input and interaction
20 from the neighbors, community staff and the other

21 consultants that we have worked with.

22 As you know, we are a co-petitioner
23 with Tom Rosenquist who owns the 45 acres
24 immediately west of the Lossman property. The 30

23

1 acre Lossman property is on the absolute corner of
2 Route 120 and O'Plaine Road.

3 We as American Stores Properties
4 are the contract purchaser of that 30 acre parcel
5 which is unincorporated and Mr. Rosenquist's
6 adjoining 45 acres also unincorporated is
7 landlocked from any other road, O'Plaine or 120, by
8 virtue of IDOT property, the Providence Village
9 property and the Lossman property.

10 So for that reason -- Mr.
11 Rosenquist could not be here this evening, he has
12 relocated recently -- but he's a co-petitioner and
13 we'll do the best we can to try to address any of
14 the issues that relate to his property as well as
15 the Lossman property under contract to American
16 Stores.

17 The primary purpose of this
18 presentation this evening -- and we'll attempt to
19 get to the point, keep it brief because we know
20 there's a lot of input and comments from the
21 neighbors and also from staff we presume -- would

22 be first of all to review the site plan and the
23 land use designation changes since the initial
24 proposal.

24

1 For that purpose Greg Dose an
2 attorney for Ancel Glink will be our primary
3 presenter to discuss the land use issues and also
4 the very significant changes to the site plan that
5 we've incorporated since the initial round of
6 meetings.

7 Following that we'll ask Jerry
8 Lindgren of the consulting firm of KLOA, traffic
9 consultants to the project, to present the impact
10 of the proposed changes and the revised site plan
11 to the Commission and also to the community at
12 large to explain how the traffic impacts will
13 relate to this particular area.

14 Following that Ben Bussman,
15 landscape engineer from -- landscape architect from
16 Webster, McGrath & Alberg will present a rather
17 detailed presentation on the extensive landscaping
18 that we intend to incorporate into this project on
19 all sides and hopefully will answer or address most
20 of the issues that have been raised by neighbors as
21 well as by the staff and the Commission.

22 Finally, we have an architect

23 assigned to this project, Peter Theodore of the
24 firm of Kandoris & Theodore. His firm has done

25

1 probably more Jewel-Osco stores as well as other
2 retail facilities in the Chicagoland area than all
3 other architects combined over many, many decades.

4 They're very skilled at adapting
5 specific sites and architecture to specific
6 community issues and concepts. So Peter will
7 present some of our architectural concepts that we
8 hope will relate to the neighborhood and to the
9 area in question.

10 And then also we have
11 representatives who will be available to answer
12 questions from the engineering firm of A. Epstein &
13 Sons who are the consulting civil engineers to the
14 project for both the American Stores portion and
15 for the Tom Rosenquist portion as well.

16 So we'll attempt to get right to
17 the point, keep it brief and open it up for
18 questions. And if any questions relate to the
19 Jewel-Osco portion of the development or operations
20 I'll do my best to try to answer those as well.

21 So with that I'll turn it over to
22 Greg Dose of Ancel, Glink. Thank you.

23 MR. DOSE: Thank you, Bob. And I am

1 Stores Properties Jewel-Osco this evening.

2 Due to the absence of our land
3 planning consultant Les Pollach it's fallen on me
4 to review the revisions and refinements that we
5 have made to the site plan as well as the framework
6 of the underlying zoning and planning
7 classifications.

8 With regard to the site plan, if I
9 can get this thing moving a little bit here, we
10 undertook further analysis since we first came
11 before you with regard to the topography and
12 hydrology and vegetation on the site with the
13 intent of refining the development plan. And we
14 also had the opportunity to meet with the Village
15 staff and receive their design suggestions.

16 Taking a look at the existing
17 conditions of the site which are not mounted here
18 but are in the book which you received, we found
19 that the high points of the site are primarily in
20 the kind of the middle southwest area with the
21 stormwater basically flowing it turns out in three
22 directions.

23 We're kind of the head of three
24 watersheds it turns out. To the northwest, also to

1 the northeast and to the southeast in terms of the
2 stormwater flow.

3 This dictated some changes in our
4 stormwater management, stormwater basin location.
5 The largest basin, the only basin which we showed
6 you before was in the northwest corner. We've
7 maintained that but two additional basins were
8 added in the Phase I retail area. This one at the
9 immediate southeast corner of the site and then an
10 additional one immediately kind of south of the
11 curb in Cornell Avenue was extended through the
12 site.

13 The retention pond really -- for
14 the one on south of Cornell topographically really
15 belongs up in the northeast corner of the site,
16 that being one of the low points of the site. But
17 we did not choose to put it there because to do so
18 would have precluded putting a berm in that area
19 and probably necessitate the removal of a
20 significant number of the very mature trees in that
21 area.

22 So we put the pond for that
23 watershed in Phase I which would reduce the overall
24 developable area within Phase I.

1 We also revised our plans and
2 design standards to increase the amount of
3 perimeter landscaping and thus meet the directive
4 of the comprehensive plan.

5 It's hard to pick out from this
6 distance but the comprehensive plan envisions a
7 perimeter landscaping treatment for the site. We
8 had shown it before and we maintained the 100 foot
9 setback along the north side of the site adjacent
10 to the Providence Village homes and included with
11 that the berm at the height of 10 feet, a minimum
12 height of 10 feet throughout the area, stepping the
13 berm back from the north property line in order to
14 maintain the extensive role of the mature trees
15 there as well.

16 We've added a 40 foot landscape
17 buffer area along O'Plaine Road and that would
18 incorporate a landscape berm of about 3 to 4 feet
19 in that area as well. And then along Belvidere
20 Road and the Tollway frontages we've incorporated a
21 35 foot landscape setback for both building and
22 paved areas.

23 And this is far in excess of the
24 typical 20 percent or 20 foot setbacks, rear yard

1 setbacks which the Village's Ordinance requires in
2 office areas. And all of these buffer and setback
3 enhancements have had the effect of increasing the
4 green area on the site and reducing the developable
5 area.

6 Another change that was made to
7 enhance the green space of the site was to reduce
8 the overall width of the Cornell Avenue
9 right-of-way through the site. We started at 80
10 feet but when we get past the Phase I residential
11 area it increases to 60 feet.

12 Nevertheless, at staff's direction
13 we placed 20 foot utility easements on both sides
14 of the street rather than the typical 10 feet
15 that's required by the Village.

16 And this change increases the
17 amount of green space at the expense of developable
18 area again and also provides a narrower road
19 through Phases II and III which would make the
20 business park less desirable for the larger uses
21 which may result in less car and truck traffic.

22 Now with regard to the Phase I
23 retail area we showed you last time in the concept
24 the increases in buffering and in setback and in

1 detention basins have a net effect of making the
2 available land for actual retail development
3 reduced to 12 and three-quarter acres and that's
4 divided into two areas, two sites.

5 There's a 10.15 acre area which
6 would incorporate the Jewel-Osco store and some
7 additional in line stores and then a 2.65 acre area
8 along the -- behind the berm along the frontage of
9 O'Plaine Road which we are identifying for outlot
10 development.

11 This 12 and three-quarter acre area
12 constitutes as it's reduced here 24 percent of the
13 overall developable area which is about 53 acres
14 and just 16 percent of the entire acreage of the
15 site, the entire acreage being about 75 acres.

16 Now I'd like to shift gears a
17 little bit here to address the zoning and land
18 planning of the site as a whole. It's, first of
19 all, I think important to know what the current
20 zoning of the site is as well as the current
21 comprehensive plans so that our zoning proposal can
22 be viewed in that context.

23 The entire 75 acre site is
24 currently in unincorporated Lake County, as Bob

1 pointed out, not the Village of Gurnee. And if you
2 review the Lake County zoning map you will find
3 that the zoning classification -- let me get it out
4 here -- for the entire site is S for Suburban.

5 Now, as this Commission is
6 probably aware, Lake County has for several years
7 now used rather nontraditional land classifications
8 in their Zoning Ordinance such as Urban and
9 Suburban and Countryside and Estate and they do not
10 give an immediate idea of the type of land uses and
11 developments which are allowed there so you have to
12 dig through a very, very, thick, thick Ordinance in
13 order to kind of sort of what's permitted under
14 Lake County Zoning Ordinance.

15 Now in the Suburban classification
16 a wide range of uses are permitted. Residential,
17 office, retail shopping centers and industrial
18 development all can occur in the Suburban
19 classification.

20 What actually can be developed on a
21 particular site depends on the availability of
22 services and more importantly the type or
23 classification of roads which abut the site.

24 Now this site which has what are

1 classified as a collector road in O'Plaine Road

2 abutting it as well as if I get it correct an
3 arterial road such as Belvidere abutting it then it
4 qualifies for the most intense development
5 available within the Suburban classification.

6 That includes retail shopping
7 centers, office buildings with FARs up to point
8 five and industrial buildings with floor areas up
9 to a half a million square feet.

10 Thus under the current Lake County
11 zoning this site can be used exactly for what we
12 are proposing. Those who have testified to you
13 before when they were buying their nearby homes
14 checked the zoning on the site and determined that
15 no shopping center could be built here could not
16 have pursued the Lake County Zoning Ordinance very
17 closely.

18 I should also add, as you may be
19 aware, that Lake County is considering a major
20 change again to its Zoning Ordinance which would
21 bring back some of the traditional classifications
22 such as industrial and office and retail,
23 residential and so on. And in doing that their
24 zoning map will need to change and there's

1 consideration of looking back to the
2 classifications that the unincorporated properties

3 had prior to the current Zoning Ordinance that they
4 have. And this property I'm told was zoned
5 industrial under the old Lake County Zoning Code.

6 Now the Gurnee Comprehensive Plan
7 which is a guide to this Commission and the Village
8 Board with regard to annexation and zoning
9 applications identifies this site as
10 office/service.

11 And this is a guide as to what type
12 of uses are occurring and encourages the
13 development of office buildings and ancillary
14 service uses for the purpose of providing a range
15 of non-seasonal employment opportunities, a stable
16 tax base, and encouraging existing and new
17 businesses to establish themselves and grow in
18 Gurnee.

19 Now the Gurnee Zoning Ordinance as
20 you are well aware does not have an office/service
21 zoning classification. I will suggest that your
22 C/O-2 General Office classification really comes
23 closest to the office/service guidance given by the
24 comprehensive plan.

34

1 Now in terms of use and zoning
2 classification of this site -- and I'll get into
3 the specifics in a moment -- what we are presenting

4 here generally fits within the office/service
5 guidance with the exception, as our land planner
6 pointed out at the last meeting, of the Phase I
7 retail area which is primarily occupied by the
8 Jewel-Osco store.

9 But I would point out that your
10 comprehensive plan by its own terms is a guidance
11 document which does not etch anything in stone and
12 indeed addresses the need to be flexible and
13 accommodating of the needs and trends in the
14 community.

15 I would also point out that a
16 neighborhood retail shopping center anchored by a
17 Jewel-Osco store does in fact address many of the
18 goals of the office/service designation including
19 provision of non-seasonal employment opportunities
20 for a wide range of job skills and a stable tax
21 base which in this case would include both property
22 taxes and sales taxes and also the opportunity to
23 have an established business come to the community
24 and continue and grow.

35

1 In addition, it has been
2 appropriately located at the intersection of a
3 collector and arterial road and is readily
4 accessible to a large residential population.

5 Now in terms of the set zoning
6 classification we are seeking -- Mr. Chairman, you
7 pointed out we're seeking both C/B-1 and C/O-1
8 Restricted Office. And C/B-1 is neighborhood
9 business center, neighborhood retail district and
10 C/O-1 is a restricted office building.

11 What we are suggesting and what
12 we've presented in our design standards for you and
13 after extensive consultation with staff is that the
14 entire site, all 75 acres be zoned C/O-1. That
15 would be your lowest most restrictive office
16 district. Not the C/O-2 but the C/O-1.

17 That in addition the Phase I area
18 be concurrently zoned in the C/B-1 neighborhood
19 retail classification all under the umbrella of a
20 PUD with the guidelines and planning and plans and
21 everything else.

22 Now the way we suggest this would
23 work and the way we've laid it out in our design
24 standards which you should have received is that

36

1 for the Phase I retail area that classification
2 remain in place for five years unless the
3 Jewel-Osco store is built.

4 If the Jewel-Osco store is built
5 within five years then this continues on as a

6 permanent classification for the Phase I area. If
7 the Jewel-Osco store is not developed within five
8 years then the C/B-1 zoning would lapse, it would
9 be no longer available and this Phase I site would
10 join the rest of the site with the underlying
11 zoning of C/O-1 and be only available for the uses
12 which are laid out in the design guidelines for the
13 Phase II and III areas.

14 And that being office service,
15 business park community, business park development
16 and under the C/O-1 zoning requirements of your
17 ordinance.

18 So that is our proposal for the
19 zoning classification of this site. It would be a
20 five year window to build and develop the
21 Jewel-Osco store and if it doesn't develop in five
22 years then that opportunity lapses and nobody else
23 could step in and do the same thing.

24 And then also we would specify that

37

1 the Jewel-Osco store would have to be built first
2 before any other use could come in there. So the
3 outlot areas could not develop prior to the
4 Jewel-Osco coming in and you would find that there
5 would be no Jewel-Osco, it can't be the case. We
6 would limit it to the Jewel-Osco being the first

7 thing developed. And that's our proposal with
8 regard to that.

9 We've laid out in our design
10 guidelines the uses, a more restricted use list
11 than is in the C/B-1 but typical of a neighborhood
12 shopping center including the usual grocery store
13 and drugstore and dry cleaners and video stores and
14 potential for medical and dental offices and travel
15 agencies and the like. They're typical
16 neighborhood business uses, service uses.

17 We would limit, as the Village
18 does, drive-up facilities to a special use
19 situation. We would set special limitations on the
20 outlot area. Specifically, there could be no more
21 than three outlots in that area; that no more than
22 one of those could be a financial institution with
23 a drive-up facility; no more than one of those
24 could be a restaurant with a drive-up facility.

38

1 We've also put in that each site --
2 each use must be self supporting with its own
3 parking. There's no cross parking or shared
4 parking.

5 We've also incorporated in the
6 design guidelines the setback that I've indicated
7 along O'Plaine Road. And in our specific plans

8 Mr. Bussman will show you that we have adopted for
9 the landscaping both in that area and along the
10 berm area north of the Phase I area as well.

11 Site lighting, we're waiting for
12 your lighting ordinance to be reviewed and finally
13 adopted so that we can work with that as well.

14 Going back to the terms of signage,
15 we've got a number of limitations written into the
16 design guidelines for the Jewel-Osco stores. The
17 specific signage which Mr. Theodore will show you
18 this evening both for the store and offsite will be
19 -- will be the signage that Jewel-Osco can have.

20 We'll get into it more
21 specifically, but there would be one Jewel-Osco
22 store sign at the entrance at Cornell and another
23 one on the corner as well as the wall signage that
24 would come with the store.

1 For the outlots we're proposing
2 signage limitations significantly under those that
3 would be permitted in the C/B-1 District. It would
4 call for just one ground sign to be shared by all
5 the outlot uses, not one each.

6 And the -- if I can find -- the
7 signage for the wall signs would be limited to two
8 for each building at 75 square feet each sign.

9 And that basically takes care of
10 what we have in mind for the Phase I. And there
11 are guidelines. We do have architectural controls.
12 Understanding the residential character of the area
13 across O'Plaine Road to the east that any
14 development in the outlot area would be a limited
15 building materials emphasizing brick and stucco and
16 also wood siding.

17 It would have to a have a pitched
18 or a mansard style roof and we feel -- and
19 furthermore each of those uses would have to come
20 before you for site plan and review so you could
21 specifically check on their architecture and make
22 sure of their compatibility.

23 Now with regard to the remainder of
24 the area in pink that we're calling our Phase II

40

1 and Phase III business park but which we're seeking
2 concept approval, again the zoning classification
3 would be the C/O-1 would be the underlying zoning
4 classification.

5 For development purposes we've
6 divided it into two areas, the area north of
7 Cornell and the area south of Cornell. The area
8 north of Cornell would be extremely restricted with
9 regard to both uses and density and height as well

10 as architecture.

11 We would permit only the stated
12 standard office service uses, you know, business
13 offices, medical and professional offices, those
14 sorts of things, complementary service uses such as
15 printing and reproduction services and that sort of
16 thing, office machine repair, indoor sort of
17 things.

18 So that would be the limitation on
19 the uses north of Cornell so that they're more
20 complementary, less intense adjacent to the
21 residential area.

22 South of Cornell we would have
23 those uses plus potential special uses such as
24 hotels and health clubs and child care centers and

41

1 that sort of thing.

2 Now, the bulk regulations north of
3 Cornell again restrict it to the C/O-1 with the
4 exceptional setbacks that I've already mentioned
5 that are 20 feet from Cornell, 100 feet from the
6 north property line.

7 Indeed the building coverage would
8 be limited to 50 percent. But that would exclude
9 consideration of the berm hundred foot setbacks.
10 So you could not include in either your FAR or your

11 building coverage the area that's been dedicated to
12 the berm setback buffer area. So that again that
13 would limit the intensity.

14 Also, height would be limited.
15 We're talking about one and possibly two story
16 buildings. One story buildings would be limited to
17 28 feet in height. Two story buildings could be 35
18 feet in height. But to get a two story building
19 would require a special use from the Village. So
20 you can only build as of right a one story building
21 28 feet.

22 Again, the architectural controls
23 are included. And that would be -- have to be
24 peaked or mansard style roofs again north of

42

1 Cornell and the limitation on the facade building
2 materials.

3 Now south of Cornell what we've
4 tried to do is emulate the bulk and use
5 opportunities that are -- that Mr. Rosenquist has
6 in his Grand Tri-State development, the OPI zoning
7 specifications for that because that has been so
8 tremendously successful for him and it has produced
9 an outstanding business park. He just wants to
10 emulate that here.

11 But again, remember that to the

12 south side of Cornell the area between Cornell and
13 Belvidere would be the opportunity for those a
14 little more intense uses. But again reserving the
15 area north of Cornell for the less intense more
16 design conscious uses.

17 So I think that we have -- in terms
18 of signage, still working with staff and trying to
19 communicate with Mr. Rosenquist about the signage
20 constraints within the business park. Also, we
21 would be limiting on lighting so certainly those
22 areas north of Cornell could not have light
23 standards higher than the bermat any place on
24 their property.

43

1 One point to make here is what
2 happens if this Phase I area does not develop
3 retail, the five years passes and the Jewel-Osco is
4 not there, how will that be treated. Again, it
5 would turn pink under this plan and it would be
6 subject to the same constraints with the exception
7 that the areas along O'Plaine would be subject to
8 the same rules.

9 The others along O'Plaine would be
10 subject to the same rules as the areas north of
11 Cornell. So the same height limitations, use
12 limitations, that sort of thing.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: If you could talk into
14 that mic, the people in the foyer can't hear.

15 MR. DOSE: I'm sorry. At any rate, that
16 really completes a quick overview for -- in terms
17 of our land plan and design guidelines.

18 And I'm going to switch it over to
19 Jerry Lindgren and talk about some traffic issues.

20 MR. LINDGREN: My name is Jerry
21 Lindgren. I did prepare the traffic analysis for
22 the subject proposal and the update and the
23 amendments.

24 And after trying to digest all of

44

1 what Greg said about the County zoning, the Village
2 zoning, the existing zoning and whatnot tried to
3 interpret the amount of office development that
4 could be developed outside of the retail area to
5 give you a handle on what we think the volumes
6 would be as a result of that type of development.

7 First off, with respect to site
8 access, as this development is proposed we are
9 proposing basically a five lane cross-section for
10 the access at O'Plaine. That's three exiting lanes
11 and two inbound lanes.

12 The exiting lanes would be striped
13 to have dual lefts with the center lane allowing a

14 through movement across into Cornell and a separate
15 right turn lane.

16 In addition to that we are
17 recommending a separate right turn lane be added to
18 the north approach to allow right turns into the
19 access and a separate left turn lane will have to
20 be striped on the O'Plaine to provide for access
21 from the south into the center as well as a traffic
22 signal which we believe will be warranted literally
23 with the buildout of the retail.

24 After the retail when you look into

45

1 the development of the office and the other roadway
2 improvements that we find to be needed, those
3 include the addition literally of a southbound lane
4 on O'Plaine Road all the way from Cornell to the
5 intersection of 120.

6 And I'll explain that in a little
7 bit more detail in a minute because I want to talk
8 about something else first, but -- and again, the
9 signalized access point is also a signal for
10 Cornell. So that's again part of the external
11 improvements.

12 We also have proposals relative to
13 120 and east -- 120 and O'Plaine which include the
14 provision of a right turn lane on the east approach

16 acceptable limits of the governmental agencies
17 involved. And basically that means I've got to get
18 it up to date at the point where it works. And in
19 some cases we can do a little better.

20 Now, in terms of trying to
21 understand how much office development might happen
22 on this segment we took the plan as proposed and
23 applied a point 35 FAR ratio to about 40.76 acres.
24 That translates into about 625,000 square feet of

47

1 office development.

2 Now that's a little bit lower than
3 what the existing zoning would permit. The
4 existing zoning would permit almost 40 percent
5 more. If you look at the entire site, and I
6 compared that with the volumes that would be
7 generated by our development plus the office
8 development at a point 35 FAR, I find in the
9 morning if this entire thing developed as office
10 even at a point 35 FAR the office in the morning
11 peak hour would generate more traffic than what
12 we're talking about because obviously retail sales
13 in the morning although it generates some traffic
14 it's nowhere near as significant as the heavy
15 inbound movement that we get with office
16 development.

17 If I look at it from the standpoint
18 of a point 35 FAR then as the whole thing is
19 developed as office it would be about 40 percent
20 more than what we would generate.

21 In the evening peak hour if you
22 develop the entire site at a point 35 FAR as office
23 it generates about the same traffic volume that we
24 do but a significant difference in terms of

48

1 directional orientation. 85 percent of that
2 traffic wants to come out of this office where we
3 have a much more balanced in and out movement at
4 that time.

5 On Saturday, we would still
6 generate more traffic on Saturday but the through
7 traffic on Saturday is less than what it is during
8 the peaks on the other days.

9 The other thing that you need to be
10 aware of is on a Saturday the peak of an office
11 development on a Saturday although we've combined
12 it with the same peak as the retail quite frankly
13 occurs much earlier in the day. Generally it
14 occurs before noon in terms of people using offices
15 on the weekend whereas the retail sales facility
16 actually peaks a little bit after noon, probably
17 one o'clock.

18 Why would I use point three FAR
19 when we talk about point five and point eight,
20 point five being in the County, point five and
21 point eight being the request relative to the
22 property.

23 I looked at the point five and
24 point eight. I averaged them out and I said that's

49

1 about point 65. I then looked at what's going to
2 happen to this property from the standpoint of the
3 improvements at the interchange of 120 and the
4 Tollway with -- I never get this right, I think
5 it's 432 or whatever it is they call it, it's 120
6 extended west and improved to 53 extended north
7 from Lake Cook and south of the County line.

8 What happens is half of this
9 property goes away. We lose probably 20 acres out
10 here. So for that reason I said all right, if I
11 take the point 65 and divide it in half I'm at
12 point three, something or other, I'm going to use
13 point 35 and apply it to the whole thing.

14 I know that sounds a little
15 convoluted but that's literally the rationale that
16 I was using in terms of a realistic approach on how
17 much traffic this office development would
18 generate.

19 If the improvements on the Tollway
20 system and 120 do not take place what happens is
21 with this development and natural growth and
22 normal -- not natural, normal growth in traffic.
23 And I guess we don't call traffic natural, it's
24 kind of natural to me. But it's normal growth in

50

1 traffic on O'Plaine Road would probably put us into
2 a five lane cross-section at O'Plaine and probably
3 bring it all the way up to Washington Street. And
4 that has nothing to do with this project, that
5 would probably happen whether this thing went or
6 not.

7 But the fact of the matter is we
8 might be a part of that obviously if we're
9 developing at the same time.

10 If the improvements are done at the
11 interchange of 120 and the freeway system as it's
12 extended and the Tollway, their proposed
13 improvements in fact call for a five lane divided
14 cross-section in here and a grade separation which
15 significantly improves the operations because of
16 the funding growth operation at 120 and O'Plaine
17 and obviously with the five lane cross-section it
18 would be more than enough to accommodate the type
19 of traffic that we're talking about.

20 I hope that's a little clearer than
21 what it sounds like to me. But the fact of the
22 matter is that eventually we're probably going to
23 end up with a five lane cross-section on O'Plaine.
24 That five lane cross-section has more than enough

51

1 capacity to accommodate what we're talking about
2 plus a great deal more in normal growths in
3 traffic.

4 And I'll quit now because I know
5 there's a lot of people that want to say something
6 this evening and there are several that have to
7 follow me. Thank you very much for your time.

8 MR. BUSSMAN: Good evening, my name is
9 Ben Bussman. I'm here to talk about plantings and
10 flowers and trees.

11 I want to start talking about the
12 existing trees that are on the site. The site has
13 a mixture of Elms, Boxelders, Black Cherry,
14 Walnuts of various sizes. There are some Oaks on
15 the site.

16 We intend to keep the existing
17 trees along the buffer, they are very densely -- or
18 they are very dense in their planting. They're 20
19 and 30 feet tall and they serve as a very good
20 buffer especially in the summertime.

21 To complement that buffer even
22 further we're going to add the berm as Greg
23 mentioned and plant the berm at a rate of three
24 trees per 100 feet, five understory or Evergreen

52

1 trees per hundred feet and five shrubs per hundred
2 feet.

3 Now the main buffers of the site
4 along O'Plaine Road and Belvidere Road will also be
5 densely planted. We'll plant Belvidere Road with
6 five trees per hundred feet, eight understory
7 trees, Evergreen trees per hundred feet and nine
8 shrubs per hundred feet. The buffer along O'Plaine
9 Road will be the same except we won't be planting
10 the shrub massing there.

11 The entire landscaping on this
12 property as shown here would cost roughly \$250,000
13 which is quite a commitment from American Stores.

14 The types of plantings that we'll
15 be doing on the site the material will range from a
16 full pallet. We'll plant ash trees, oak trees,
17 coffee trees, cirksberry, and we'll mass in some
18 lillies and some perennials, perennials and grasses
19 at focal points.

20 We worked this plan to be a good
21 neighbor and to show our commitment to the site.

22 I'll introduce Peter Theodore from Press
23 Architecture.

24 MR. THEODORE: Good evening. My name is

53

1 Peter Theodore.

2 Normally a building is not as
3 obscured by so much landscaping in commercial
4 developments as this one but as the author of Grand
5 Hunt Jewel-Osco you may know my penmanship and I've
6 done other projects throughout the Chicagoland area
7 as well as throughout the United States. I'm a
8 licensed architect in Illinois and I hold licenses
9 in various states outside of Illinois as well.

10 I'm proud of the design I'm going
11 to present to you tonight in the sense that it
12 deviates from the Grand Hunt Jewel-Osco. I'm also
13 proud of that design, but understanding the pallet
14 of the neighborhood, the need to address height and
15 massing, this design has really been evolving over
16 the course of two years.

17 And what I'm about to present to
18 you tonight represents a diverse pallet that draws
19 not only from the direct neighborhood but from the
20 community at large.

21 Designing a retail facility this
22 size is challenging in a couple of ways. For

23 everybody out in the hall, I apologize if you can't
24 see it and I'll hold it up briefly before I speak.

54

1 I'll just -- okay. Now hold your applause until
2 later. Normally you don't have such a good turnout
3 but you must have heard I was speaking tonight.

4 I also brought a sample board. And
5 really our goal here was to create a piece of
6 architecture that would be permanent, a piece of
7 architecture that would respond to the neighborhood
8 at large, and a piece of architecture that would
9 point you in the direction for future retail
10 development.

11 And even as we speak now this
12 design is evolving in the sense that the awnings
13 are going to take on the shake characteristic of
14 the house, the brick is derived from various
15 elements not found as much in the houses but on the
16 chimneys in some of the select residences as well
17 as the Village Hall.

18 The pallet of materials consists of
19 a hand molded face brick earth tone as can be found
20 on the city hall as well as throughout the Village.
21 Renaissance stone which is reminiscent of a
22 limestone, and color in the sense of sandstone
23 textured materials.

1 type is to really look at skill and massing and how
2 it relates. When we look at the -- I'll draw a
3 reference to the existing Jewel-Osco and how this
4 deviates from that.

5 The existing Jewel-Osco is
6 approximately 40 feet in height at its highest
7 point. This building is approximately 24 feet in
8 height. So in context to the residents in the
9 adjacent scale it's been lessened dramatically.

10 There's also a breakdown in the
11 scale in this building. If we think of this
12 building in a classical sense this building was
13 conceived -- if you think of a column there's a
14 base, a cap, and a shaft. And essentially what
15 this building attempts to do is to derive this
16 theme from that classical order.

17 The base is defined by prairie
18 stone or Renaissance stone, the shaft is defined by
19 masonry brick and the building again is capped off
20 by Renaissance stone terminating to the top of the
21 building.

22 The building is further broke down
23 in the sense of massing to break up the
24 mononeumatic nature or the aesthetic nature of the

1 building into three parts. The center portion
2 being a lighter pallet of materials and the outer
3 flanks being a darker color of material, thus
4 giving the appearance of three separate buildings
5 and breaking down the overall flavor of the
6 architecture so that it responds to a more friendly
7 smaller retail user.

8 The awnings are a unique set of
9 awnings in the sense that they come down to the
10 pedestrian scale and the pallet is derived from the
11 concept of a breeze chalet in the sense that the
12 sun passes across the awnings, the awnings are open
13 from the side and shadows are cast upon the
14 building as you can see depicted in the rendering,
15 breaking down the scale and enhancing the animation
16 as you move across the architecture.

17 The great deviation from
18 architecture of this type is that there's a
19 tendency to be a use of all the square footage
20 within a store thus prohibiting the amount of light
21 area on the front facade. And what I'm trying to
22 say is that the glass area on your typical large
23 retailers is relatively limited, adding to the
24 massiveness of the building.

1 What we've done here is we have
2 approximately 85 percent of transparency along the
3 front. That gives a light airiness to the
4 building, increases the visibility and security
5 standpoint of the building and really enhances the
6 overall architecture. Thus we give up something in
7 the sense that we're not capitalizing on all the
8 square footage to the front of the store but
9 allowing people to view the animated themes going
10 on within the store.

11 Now I'm not going to get into the
12 interior design of this store but the concept of
13 the store is a total deviation from the store that
14 you're used to in the sense that the inside and the
15 outside play upon each other and that we're
16 bringing a whole pallet of new departments,
17 interior decor, and a flavor that offers you the
18 widest variety of selection and choices.

19 We're proud of this architecture.
20 We think that it responds positively to the
21 community. We think that the pallet derives itself
22 from the community so that it harmoniously blends
23 into the surrounding adjacencies. And when you
24 look at this rendering you can also see an attempt

1 to bring landscaping up to the building.

2 Landscaping, I've worked very
3 closely with Ben Bussman and landscaping has been
4 very important. And I think that Ben simply stated
5 the amount of landscaping that's going into this
6 project. There's colonies of trees lining the
7 drive and the landscaping itself has actually been
8 brought right up to the building so that it relates
9 to the pedestrian and the building at the column
10 locations where we've lined our columns with
11 fountain grasses and perennial flowers so that
12 softens up the building.

13 When you look at this building it's
14 hard to appreciate the details from the distance
15 that you're seeing it, but people that are familiar
16 with my architecture realize that as you walk up to
17 the building, each part of the building, each
18 detail in the building relates on a human scale to
19 the human figure and that's often lost in retail
20 architecture. We think that this responds
21 positively to that.

22 I'm proud to be here tonight and to
23 present this project. I'm not sure that you're all
24 proud to have me here, but I've been very

1 successful in doing developments of this type with
2 communities that offer us less of an opportunity
3 for having setbacks like this.

4 We've just completed a project in
5 Wilmette, Illinois where our building abuts retail
6 at approximately 30, 40 feet from our building.
7 And the response to that was that it would never
8 work and that it would not be compatible to the
9 houses. And today I'm here and I'm proud to say
10 that it is a great success and that the neighbors
11 have responded favorably to it.

12 We're also completing projects in
13 other communities where the same concerns have been
14 voiced. We feel that the setbacks, the landscaping
15 and the architecture of this building really takes
16 advantage of all the lessons that we've learned in
17 the past in bringing them to your community.

18 I'll quickly get into the pylon
19 signs which being a prototypical design the typical
20 retailer would come in with a pole pylon sign with
21 a box and all of that on top of it. Understanding
22 the sensitivity of this project and the commitment
23 that American Stores would like to make to the
24 community, we set out to adhere to the current

1 regulations with a low ground sign not exceeding 8
2 feet and our monument sign not to exceed 20 feet.

3 The square footage of these signs
4 would be compatible with your ordinance. It would
5 not exceed that ordinance. And the architecture
6 draws itself off of the building onto the sign so
7 that the signs are no longer an appendage or an
8 afterthought but actually a piece of the
9 architecture.

10 It's been a pleasure talking to you
11 tonight and I'm here to answer any questions for
12 you. Thank you.

13 MR. DOSE: I believe that completes our
14 direct presentation. We're available for questions
15 and we look forward to it.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you. So
17 I'll open it up to the Commissioners first to ask
18 any questions or make any comments. Mr. Sula.

19 MR. SULA: I have several questions.
20 Let me try to get them in order the best I can
21 here.

22 The first question about the PUD
23 itself, I struggled in the document to find out the
24 hours of operation you're proposing for this thing.

61

1 I've heard conflicting things over the course of

2 time and I'm not quite sure where we are with hours
3 of operation.

4 With regard to site plan itself, it
5 seems to me I've heard some conflicting thing that
6 leads me to believe that we've taken a step
7 backward from last time.

8 With regard to south of Cornell
9 Avenue I thought I heard a comparison to Grand --
10 the Grand Tri-State project which I agree is a
11 nicely done project but when I was thinking of
12 office commercial on this particular site I was
13 thinking we were talking more along the lines of
14 things that are more similar to what's along
15 Washington and Greenleaf, not the opportunity for
16 light industrial.

17 With regards to the outlot, I'm not
18 sure why we even have to have an outlot to be very,
19 very frank. I don't think they work well. I
20 personally don't think that the Grand Hunt outlots
21 work well at all. They're difficult to get in and
22 out of. And I'd hate to see us have more here.

23 And we're concerned that the
24 detention pond had to be moved to facilitate tree

62

1 saving and I don't understand why we can't turn a
2 good portion of that to green space and allocate

3 more acreage in the back of the parcel to office
4 type use.

5 With regard to traffic, I didn't
6 hear anything in terms of what the impact on
7 Eastwood is. Right now Eastwood is a little bit
8 dicey to get out of in the morning sometimes and I
9 didn't hear anything in terms of how that would be
10 in the future.

11 And my final comment has to do with
12 architecture. Pallets was probably my worst
13 subject in college, but I am struggling to see how
14 the design fits in with the nearby community.
15 Frankly, it looks like Red Top in Libertyville to
16 me.

17 When I think of something that's
18 more better suited for the community I think of
19 something along -- and I appreciate that it's a
20 competitor of yours -- but the Bannockburn Green
21 Dominick's in my mind, that architecture is much
22 more fitting in the neighborhood than what I see on
23 the screen right here. That's all I have right
24 now.

63

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Why don't I let the
2 Petitioner get a few points in there, a few
3 questions. I'll let the Petitioner go through and

4 make sure that he addresses all of your points.

5 MR. BROWN: As to the hours of
6 operation, obviously that's dictated by the
7 customer needs and convenience. We normally
8 operate a store 24 hours a day because that's when
9 the customers tell us they would like to shop
10 depending on the traffic movements. If this store
11 does not warrant a 24 hour operation obviously it
12 doesn't make any sense from a business or economic
13 stand to do it.

14 Based on the studies that we've
15 done and the comparable stores that we've looked at
16 we believe that this trading area which has been
17 depicted in the Petitioner's information would
18 warrant a 24 hour operation. If it doesn't,
19 obviously we would not continue that operation.

20 And it's also a function of the
21 competition. If the competitors are operating 24
22 hours then we want to have a level playing field to
23 do so as well.

24 As far as the outlots, it's a very

64

1 simple answer. The economics of the project
2 dictate that 30 acres is a lot more than Jewel-Osco
3 needs for their own development. When we
4 originally were approaching the owners of the

5 property we requested a much smaller parcel and
6 they refused to partition the property so we are
7 forced to acquire 30 acres.

8 Obviously 30 acres will require a
9 much higher investment as far as infrastructure, as
10 far as landscaping and other improvements. We hope
11 to realize a minimal return on that and the
12 opportunity to develop outlots is normally part of
13 this type of a shopping center development.

14 As to the Eastwood plans, I think I
15 can answer for Jerry Lindgren. Eastwood would be
16 abandoned under this concept. That's always been
17 our intent. It only services the Rosenquist
18 property and the Lossman property. There's no
19 reason to keep Eastwood.

20 MR. SULA: Just to clarify, I'm thinking
21 Eastwood east of O'Plaine.

22 MR. LINDGREN: I can respond to that,
23 Bob.

24 MR. BROWN: East of O'Plaine?

65

1 MR. SULA: East of O'Plaine.

2 MR. BROWN: Okay. Then I'll defer to
3 Jerry.

4 MR. SULA: Tough to abandon.

5 MR. BROWN: Since we're not acquiring

6 any property east of O'Plaine I was assuming you
7 were addressing the property that we are acquiring
8 to the west which would be vacated. And again
9 I'll refer to -- defer to Jerry.

10 As to architecture, this is Peter's
11 rendering of one or two stores that we have done in
12 concept. We have tailored them to other
13 communities.

14 I think Mr. Theodore addressed the
15 flexibility that we would have to incorporate cedar
16 shakes or other new England style architectural
17 themes and we would have a commitment to work with
18 the Village to do that. So this was not custom
19 designed for this site, but I think it is
20 representative of the type of architecture that
21 we've done in other communities.

22 And one further point, when Mr.
23 Theodore mentioned our proximity to other
24 residential areas, his reference in Wilmette was to

66

1 within 35 feet of adjoining residential, not
2 retail.

3 In fact, that new store which just
4 opened in June is directly across an alley and we
5 had very substantial homes immediately next to
6 that. We've taken whatever precautions were

7 necessary to ensure that those neighbors'
8 lifestyles were not disrupted and they are
9 considerably closer than the proposed location of
10 our store here.

11 I think the site plan that we've
12 presented tonight evidences our willingness to try
13 to move that building as far away from residential
14 as possible, to curve the road to effectively limit
15 or reduce the amount of retail property that could
16 be developed, at a higher return quite frankly.
17 And so for that reason we've tried to address all
18 of the issues from setback to landscaping.

19 We know we've heard from
20 Commissioners as well as from some of the neighbors
21 that this intersection is one of the gateways to
22 Gurnee. We've tried to incorporate that concept by
23 eliminating the outlot potential near the
24 intersection and creating a landscape and detention

67

1 area in that particular location.

2 But we feel that the remaining
3 parcels south of Cornell extended and north of that
4 detention landscaped area would be appropriate for
5 outlots that would be self-sufficient as far as
6 parking. And each particular petitioner if in fact
7 those parcels were sold would have to come before

8 the Village Board and the appropriate commissions
9 to have approval for their particular building
10 style and architecture.

11 So I think that answers as many of
12 the questions as I can. Jerry, did you want to
13 address Eastwood Avenue east of O'Plaine.

14 MR. LINDGREN: The fact of the matter is
15 I really don't want to. To be honest with you,
16 there's not much that we can do for Eastwood.

17 Eastwood east of O'Plaine is an
18 intersection so close to 120 that I have to tell
19 you whether we do anything on this property or not
20 their situation is only going to get worse. It's
21 too close to 120 to put in a traffic signal.

22 There doesn't appear to be much
23 that we can do in the way of additional lanes. It
24 wouldn't do anything because the two movements that

68

1 are experiencing the worst situation is the left
2 turn out and the left turn in. And the left turn
3 out is probably the worst situation.

4 Now, what I suspect will happen,
5 assuming we develop or somebody develops here and
6 it's developed in the nature that a traffic signal
7 has to go in here, the people from Eastwood could
8 in fact come in here, turn around and come back and

9 go south and they would be able to do it through
10 signals.

11 Otherwise, I don't know what we
12 could do to be honest with you. And I'm not trying
13 to guild the lily or anything else. The fact of
14 the matter is that's an extremely difficult
15 situation. If I had my druthers to do it over
16 again, we would never have let it happen in the
17 first place. I say we, we in the industry.

18 I do know that the plans for the
19 interchange in this area is going to make a major
20 difference on Eastwood.

21 And unfortunately -- if somebody is
22 here from the paper I don't want to see Lindgren
23 says half of Eastwood is gone tomorrow in the
24 paper, but that's what the plans show that in fact

69

1 the interchange would be carried through here and
2 part of this property would probably be taken as a
3 part of the improvements.

4 Now again, I don't know exactly,
5 there's no detailed plans. All we're looking at is
6 concepts right now, but I'm trying to respond to
7 your question as honestly as I can.

8 I can't do anything about it today.
9 I really didn't -- I can't do anything about it in

10 the future other than to say that with the signal
11 here there is an opportunity for people to at least
12 go north to go south. And they have a way of
13 getting turnaround rather than having to go all the
14 way north up to maybe Providence Village and drive
15 around through there and turn around.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think Jon had
17 something to add regarding the Eastwood situation.

18 MR. WILDENBERG: The disposition of
19 Eastwood in the future has been a question that the
20 Village has been looking at over time.

21 One of the other possibilities that
22 could occur would be for Eastwood to ultimately
23 turn into a cul-de-sac street and then those
24 residences that are on Eastwood or feed into

70

1 Eastwood would have the availability of
2 neighborhood streets to get up to Cornell and then
3 access that future signal at Cornell and get onto
4 O'Plaine. That's another alternative that may also
5 transpire.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Jim, I don't know that
7 all your points were addressed.

8 MR. SULA: As a matter of fact, I know
9 specifically one wasn't and I have a comment.

10 The question regarding use was not

11 addressed at all in terms of what really is
12 intended on the south end of -- or the south side
13 of Cornell. I wasn't clear on that.

14 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry, I didn't make a
15 note of that. Specifically the use of what portion
16 of the property?

17 MR. SULA: Earlier in the presentation I
18 thought I heard a comparison to Grand Tri-State
19 for --

20 MR. BROWN: For the office component.

21 MR. SULA: -- the parcel south of
22 Cornell which I think was a departure from what we
23 talked about last time we were all here.

24 MR. DOSE: I don't think it's a

71

1 departure from what was discussed last time because
2 I think Mr. Rosenquist has always said that he
3 wanted his acreage in development to be, you know,
4 similar to and emulate the success he's had at
5 Grand Tri-State.

6 You know, we've taken away the
7 north of Cornell for that approach. In terms of
8 the south I think, you know, the C/O-1 zoning would
9 start with that as a base which allows a smaller
10 user so I think practically it will develop
11 differently.

13 Village where we restrict hours of operation for
14 moving equipment around and taking deliveries. And
15 I would encourage us to strongly consider that here
16 as part of the PUD.

17 Because I heard you loud and clear
18 last time we were all together, the concern with
19 delivery trucks coming in at all hours of the
20 night. That's it for now.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I -- let me
22 expand on your point because I think what you're
23 trying to get to on the office use that's south of
24 Cornell, I think there was something in the

73

1 information that indicated that those would be uses
2 similar to the Grand Tri-State business park.

3 The Grand Tri-State business park
4 is an underlying I-2 zone and it's I think a
5 restricted list.

6 So I don't -- you're asking for
7 this to be C/O-1, though, correct? So I guess I
8 don't see how you're going to make it -- I guess it
9 could be similar, but I guess it really wouldn't be
10 like the Grand Tri-State business park because you
11 really wouldn't be allowed any of the industrial
12 uses that are allowed in the I-2 District.

13 MR. DOSE: Then we're at a bit of a

14 disadvantage with Mr. Rosenquist's absence here,
15 I'm going to do the best I can on his behalf.

16 With regard to the area south of
17 Cornell and the way we've drafted the design
18 guidelines, south of Cornell would -- and I don't
19 want to cloak anything or hide it here -- would
20 allow what we've identified as so-called
21 miscellaneous uses that would include, you know,
22 laboratories and research and development
23 facilities that are, you know, in this area. And
24 that isn't a C/O-1 type use, but we would want to

74

1 make that opportunity available here.

2 We've also listed assembly service
3 and repair and testing services and uses, you know,
4 for the area south of Cornell again to address the
5 growth in an industry that's within Lake County and
6 ought to be encouraged.

7 So those are departure -- use
8 departure from the C/O-1 certainly but those are
9 the limits we would like to include those types of
10 uses on this acreage again south of Cornell.

11 Again, we're limited to the uses
12 specifically listed in the design guidelines. They
13 do not include any outdoor activities of any sort.
14 They do not include, you know, warehouse or

15 distribution type uses that are permitted in the
16 I-2 district. So it is C/O-1 with additive uses,
17 you know, with the research and development type of
18 and high tech kind of uses that would be encouraged
19 here. If that addresses it.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So an expanded C/O-1.

21 MR. DOSE: An expanded C/O-1 use list,
22 yes.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions or
24 comments by the Commissioners? Mr. Cepon.

75

1 MR. CEPON: Well, Mr. Sula had about
2 three or four questions, the same ones I had.

3 I really don't like the idea of
4 outlots. I thought this was basically trying to be
5 a Jewel. And if it goes through that there would
6 be this Jewel and maybe a couple of little shops
7 next to it, but I definitely don't like the idea of
8 the outlots.

9 And outside of that I think I'll
10 hold my comments until the rest of the public has a
11 chance to have theirs because I think, you know, if
12 it's a case of property and buying it and whatever
13 then I guess that's a problem between you and the
14 people who own the land really.

15 I don't think we should be subject

16 to having outlots and the possibility of maybe a
17 drive-thru or a McDonald's or something like that
18 again on that corner just because of, you know, the
19 property period.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Any other
21 questions or comments from the Commissioners? Mr.
22 Smith.

23 MR. SMITH: I'll wait until later.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I just had one

76

1 question, I guess it's kind of clarification.

2 The gentleman who was giving the
3 presentation on the land use, you had mentioned
4 something about the fact that since it's
5 office/services designation in the comp plan you
6 indicated a use of C/O-2.

7 Could you clarify what you were
8 saying there?

9 MR. DOSE: What I was pointing out is
10 that your comp plan designates this property as
11 office service, office/service but that under your
12 Zoning Ordinance there's no specific zoning
13 classification of office/service.

14 Just my reading paging through your
15 Ordinance my thought was that, you know, a C/O-2
16 classification probably comes closest to what the

18 be developments that might include the
19 international headquarters of a large corporation,
20 large research and development facilities or office
21 parks of substantial size.

22 Due to the specialized nature of
23 this district, retail and service uses are
24 generally prohibited. This district is generally

78

1 located on primary thoroughfares and generally
2 requires at least five acres for each development.

3 So I just thought I'd point that
4 out that C/O-2 certainly I think with some kind of
5 restrictions could probably be considered there as
6 well.

7 MR. DOSE: Well, we would certainly like
8 to consider that. We were kind of taking staff's
9 direction on the C/O-1.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But you expand the use
11 list on the C/O-1 so.

12 MR. DOSE: In two instances, yes.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: But I'm saying a
14 corporate headquarter type of atmosphere with a
15 park like atmosphere certainly would possibly fit
16 in there.

17 MR. DOSE: I think some of the
18 discussion we had there -- and again, we're open to

19 it as well -- but given that we had one access
20 point off of O'Plaine Road here and while we have
21 good frontage on Belvidere and the Tollway, when
22 you come looking at the access probably would not
23 be as attractive to a major company headquarters
24 and just as a practical matter would develop with a

79

1 smaller group of buildings and small to medium size
2 businesses. I think that's what Mr. Rosenquist
3 anticipates. But nice to talk about this, thank
4 you.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Pardon me?

6 MR. DOSE: Nice to talk about this,
7 thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Sula.

9 MR. SULA: I looked at the minutes from
10 the last meeting and if Mr. Dose would like to look
11 at Pages 59 through 66 he can see for himself what
12 was said at the last meeting.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think at this time
14 probably I think we're going to have quite a few
15 people that want to ask questions and give comments
16 so I'm going to open the floor to the public now.

17 So if you could step up to the
18 microphone and if you could state your name and
19 address for the record we would appreciate your

20 input. Yes, sir.

21 MR. SANDERS: I'd like to be able to
22 address the Commissioners through a presentation
23 that we have.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yes. That would be

80

1 fine, go ahead.

2 Could you give your name and
3 address first, sir? You need to use the
4 microphone.

5 MR. SANDERS: While this is warming up,
6 my name is Kurt Sanders. I live at 4812 Kings Way
7 West in Providence Village.

8 I represent a group of local
9 residents, many of whom you are looking at tonight,
10 who would like to present their thoughts and
11 concerns on the proposal to rezone 120 and O'Plaine
12 Road.

13 I hope that you will find this
14 presentation easy to follow as we have taken
15 considerable time in collecting many local
16 residents' thoughts, professional considerations
17 surrounding the impact of the commercialization of
18 the parcel of land.

19 With that, I will go through the
20 presentation and hopefully many of you can see

21 this.

22 I am overwhelmed by the number of
23 residents as you are as well who have come here
24 tonight. Many of them have families at home, small

81

1 children, and obviously many of them shop at Jewel
2 stores.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did shop.

4 MR. SANDERS: Did shop.

5 I'd like to review the remarks
6 from the previous meetings that we've had. I'd
7 like to talk through the commercial impact on
8 housing prices. With us tonight we have Robb
9 Satten with ReMax Showcase, a professional realtor
10 who will implode his professional opinion on the
11 impact of the commercialization since he sells a
12 considerable amount of real estate in the
13 Providence Oaks area as well as Vernon Hills.

14 I'd also like to address some
15 subsequent traffic congestion consideration that we
16 have further than what you've seen here tonight as
17 an adjunct to what the traffic flow.

18 I would also like to show some
19 pictures of the Petitioner's commercial use, some
20 undesirable conditions in their commercial
21 buildings, photos of existing establishments in

22 Gurnee and an analysis of existing retail.

23 Can any of you see this or do you
24 need the lights down?

82

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You're not going to
2 have any success dimming the lights. The red is
3 hard to read, the lighter colors are fine.

4 MR. SANDERS: And then finally what I'd
5 like to do is on a positive note I suggest to the
6 Commissioners what we thought should be built there
7 as you had done with your comprehensive plan.

8 The parcel of land that we're
9 looking at here, although this is hard to tell, is
10 from a westerly view on the corner of 120 and
11 O'Plaine Road. As you can tell right now there
12 isn't any traffic consideration there obviously
13 because it's not commercialized.

14 Our thoughts here is that it is an
15 important portal to Gurnee and it needs real curb
16 appeal. I just want to briefly go back. Many of
17 the residents that were here tonight were not here
18 possibly at the first meeting, there was a Chicago
19 Bulls game going on.

20 The second meeting wasn't as well
21 publicized. Obviously we have gotten everybody
22 together tonight and I'm very pleased to have you

23 here. And I just want to go over a few of the
24 comments that we pulled out to just distill some of

83

1 the feelings that we had.

2 I know our intention was for this
3 property to be office/services. I heard Jim talk
4 that tonight, which would either be a large office
5 building campus style atmosphere, an office park
6 that's large enough to be an office park or smaller
7 offices that would provide professional services.

8 And if you read the Zoning
9 Ordinance, C/O-1 Restricted Office District is
10 intended to provide for the development of small
11 office structures which could be located
12 proximately to resident areas.

13 That's why we selected this as
14 office/services because we felt that this was the
15 most compatible with the existing uses.

16 A lot of the same comments tonight.
17 I remember hearing I'm really struggling with
18 having an industrial use so close to residential.
19 Again, we've talked about Eastwood, we've talked
20 about Providence Village, we've talked about the
21 impact. This is still a continuing thing
22 that I hear tonight.

23 It just doesn't seem to make good

24 melding of land uses from one to the next. I'm so

84

1 proud to hear that theme again reflected because I
2 thought at the second meeting we may not have sold
3 that. I think today looking at more detail you
4 hear these coming out again.

5 I have a question of why this
6 should be changed to C/B-2 and we were very
7 specific about wanting it to be office/services,
8 not C/B-2.

9 The types of establishment that
10 house up against the proposed side are primarily
11 New England cedar siding and wood shake roofs. I
12 think you saw in the proposal of the Jewel stores
13 tonight they're proposing shake awnings and I don't
14 see any shake awnings on those houses. For the
15 most part they are shake roofs and cedar siding.

16 We have a park that represents a
17 large area, let's see if I can get it in here.
18 Right in here. That is a safe and quiet
19 recreational place. When it is summertime there is
20 quite a bit of foliage here and in the winter time
21 obviously you can see right through it no matter
22 how dense they are.

23 With that I'd like to introduce
24 Robb Satten who is with ReMax Showcase and have him

1 just present to the Commission a very brief summary
2 of the impact.

3 MR. SATTEN: How do you do. My name is
4 Robb Satten, I'm with ReMax Showcase.

5 A little bit on my background, I've
6 been selling real estate for seven years in Lake
7 County. I grew up in Lake County. Providence area
8 happens to be one of my expertise, I do focus on
9 that area quite a bit, I've been selling in the
10 Providence area for about six years.

11 Background wise, I've got a GRI
12 CRS, they call it alphabet soup in our industry.
13 It just means that I've gone to a lot of schooling
14 and studied a lot of real estate to know what goes
15 on in the areas of residential.

16 Providence Village I can tell you
17 from a firsthand experience, I've had a house
18 listed a few weeks ago that just went under
19 contract and not more than about three days later
20 the buyer came back and said to us hold everything,
21 I heard there's commercial going in there, I don't
22 want to go forward with the contract.

23 I wanted to bring that to you
24 tonight as a first example in real estate what kind

1 of impact is going to happen to that area. I
2 believe the area is one of the few areas in Gurnee,
3 possibly in Libertyville, Vernon Hills that
4 continually goes up in value against all the new
5 construction that is going on in the area.

6 And I strongly believe my personal
7 opinion is going to be that this commercial project
8 or heavier commercial if it gets into it, is going
9 to have a very serious impact on the homes in that
10 area.

11 I'm not clear -- I would ask each
12 one of you that if you become one of my clients if
13 I could sell you a house in an area that has heavy
14 commercial around it, I can guarantee you what your
15 reaction would be. There's too much traffic in the
16 area and I don't feel there's going to be value
17 here down the road, let's go somewhere else.

18 I just wanted to present my opinion
19 to the Board. Thank you very much. Any
20 questions?

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Actually, I just had a
22 question. What do you think the impact would be if
23 it were let's say the office/services use that we
24 were talking about?

1 MR. SATTEN: Well, I think a very light
2 office without the drive-up stuff going on and the
3 food retail and everything I think there will still
4 be an impact. I don't think it will be as heavy,
5 but I do think there will be an impact.

6 I bring people from Libertyville, I
7 bring people from Vernon Hills, Mundelein. After
8 looking around those whole areas I bring them into
9 Providence Villages and they don't look back, I
10 sell them a house there. I see a lot of my clients
11 here tonight. A lot of my clients will move out,
12 but a lot of people come in and I see a lot of them
13 here tonight.

14 And they'll tell you that that's
15 just a place that's different than any place
16 around. I think this project will seriously hurt
17 that, hurt that area. Any other questions? Okay.
18 Thank you.

19 MR. SANDERS: This is continuing with
20 this theme.

21 There is subsequent traffic
22 congestion that I think has not been brought out
23 tonight. There's some impact of auxiliary routes.
24 I have an awful lot of trucks pictured here on the

1 right if you can envision that.

2 The Jewel-Osco's tend to demand
3 large industrial truck deliveries primarily during
4 the prime time but I don't think they're restricted
5 to the evening hours. There has been sightings of
6 trucks way after hours, 9 o'clock, 10 o'clock, even
7 though I understand that it's, you know, 7 o'clock
8 is their supposed cutoff.

9 Some of the things that I wanted to
10 bring to your attention is that area for industrial
11 truck delivery impacts Milwaukee Avenue, Washington
12 street, and north O'Plaine. If they're coming from
13 Milwaukee south there really isn't any good way for
14 them to get off other than off at Milwaukee Avenue.

15 At that point they have a decision
16 to make, do they go north or south. Many of them
17 of course thinking that the left turn in, left turn
18 in is going to be difficult, they will reverse the
19 route and come north on Milwaukee, if I'm correct,
20 and then they would go down Washington and then
21 they will come up O'Plaine Road.

22 So I'm assuming they would put a
23 couple more lights there and a couple more
24 left-hand turns.

1 The neighborhood impact tonight.
2 Let us not forget that we already mentioned about
3 some traffic turnaround flows through Providence
4 Village. We talked about Eastwood being cut off.
5 Obviously the commercialization of this area is
6 going to route an awful lot of traffic through
7 these areas that they don't have today.

8 And we just recently had an ice
9 cream social in Providence Village with more than
10 400 children showed up and they were probably under
11 the ages of ten years old. It is an extremely
12 small child neighborhood. As a matter of fact, if
13 some of them will show their hands, how many people
14 have children under ten years old?

15 (Audience responds.)

16 MR. SANDERS: And they all love ice
17 cream. The sound impact to residents. There's
18 nothing that was talked about here tonight as far
19 as a tractor trailer idling at 7 o'clock at night
20 at a Jewel at zero degrees temperature, which
21 Illinois has, and the sound that that makes
22 riveting through trees that don't have any leaves.
23 You can't tell me that that is not going to be
24 heard through that. And a small office complex

1 would not have these type of deliveries late at

2 night.

3 I even struggle to try to think of
4 the type of large industrial deliveries that we see
5 at the Greenleaf or Washington corridor.

6 There's also the diesel pollution
7 impact that -- I mean I can tell you that the wind
8 does flow that way in Providence Village and
9 around.

10 Now, this is something that we
11 talked about at the first meeting and I thought was
12 very important to bring back to the Commissioners.
13 Not to pick on the Petitioners, but it has to be
14 talked about a little bit, is we have Jewel
15 locations within an earshot.

16 We have a Lakehurst one that is 1.2
17 miles away. We have a Green Bay location that's
18 3.1 miles away. And we have a Hunt Club that's
19 4.2. Now if they've really done their analysis and
20 they've talked to all the residents that are going
21 to shop here, I can't imagine that the first thing
22 on everybody's mind is for God's sake put a Jewel,
23 you know, point 6 miles away from me.

24 But one thing is for sure, it will

91

1 take you the same distance time to get into that
2 Jewel than to go to the other ones. Okay.

3 And then lastly to bring this to a
4 closure is nothing hits home better than some
5 pictures. And these are actual untouched photos of
6 the Jewel-Osco's other locations that we talked
7 about.

8 And the reason why I did this
9 tonight is not to poke fun but to actually give you
10 what you're going to be looking at one to two years
11 from here, assuming that most of the Jewels fit
12 into that category.

13 We took pictures of the Hunt Club,
14 the Lakehurst and the Green Bay. I didn't wait for
15 things to happen. We just went out on a Sunday and
16 took these pictures. Some of them are very nice
17 and other ones struggle.

18 Here is a view of the Hunt Club.
19 And I'm sorry that the resolution isn't as good as
20 possible but understand this is the Hunt Club Jewel
21 from the intersection where the fire station here
22 is on the left. And it is hard for me to believe
23 that these type trees even though they are 10 feet
24 apart do a real good job to zone this out. These

1 trees have been in here for -- if somebody could
2 help me -- how long has the Hunt Club Jewel been
3 there?

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Three years.

5 MR. SANDERS: Three years. You would
6 think that those type of trees would be 40 feet
7 tall and as big as oaks. They're not. It is very
8 visible and that's the type of view that you will
9 see at 120 and O'Plaine when you come to Gurnee.

10 The landscaping buffer. I don't
11 know if you can see this, this actually doesn't
12 come out very well but the large landscaping buffer
13 that hides the residents behind here really does
14 not do it justice. And I feel sorry because when I
15 look at a proposal like this I remember that I,
16 too, have a home landscaping computer program that
17 allows me to put all these trees in here but
18 actually when I go to plant them I tend to get
19 these at Menards and they never grow for ten or
20 twenty years.

21 And I'm afraid that that's probably
22 what we're going to see on O'Plaine Road. This is
23 a closeup of the maintenance on the land berm. Now
24 I'm not sure who is responsible for that but that

93

1 is not an attractive site for us to look at and it
2 is very visible from behind the shingle.

3 Now, if you take a look at this
4 picture it is absolutely beautiful and it depicts a

5 Jewel that, you know, you would want -- one would
6 think would be there. But in actuality the section
7 up here that is at height at which the humans are
8 has a lot of picnic tables and a pallet lamp
9 against this front. It is not attractive. It
10 tends to be the realization of how commercial
11 establishment, far be it from Jewels, are generally
12 run. They use the front of the stores for, you
13 know, purposes that were not meant to be.

14 Here is another one at the Green
15 Bay Road, picnic table with people. This one is a
16 little dark but you can see that they have
17 Coca-Cola cans here, they have peat moss,
18 landscaping in the front for sale.

19 And the Jewel-Osco at Lakehurst.
20 Now granted, this was the same Sunday. I didn't go
21 around trying to figure out different days. This
22 at Sunday was another establishment at the
23 Lakehurst where they had an outdoor arena,
24 something going on at the same time.

94

1 Now, the part of this that I didn't
2 see, I'm checking, which is not there, okay, is the
3 behind the scenes. This is going to face, in my
4 analysis, this parcel of land here if I'm correct.
5 Now whatever goes in here has to look at this.

6 And I'm almost sure that that --
7 that the Rosenquists and whoever develops this is
8 not going to attract dental offices or any small
9 offices to look at that. They're not going to be
10 happy. And we're going to be back in this
11 condition saying we need the rest of this red
12 because no one else will build there.

13 This is at the Green Bay Road.
14 This is at the Hunt Club Road. And this is the
15 Jewel where the loading dock is and it is extremely
16 aggressive in its food. These are normal pictures
17 and I'm sorry to bring this to you, but these are
18 Sunday pictures.

19 Lastly, there's driving and
20 alcohol. Even though I didn't see it on this sign
21 very large, the Hunt Club Jewel has a very large
22 liquor area. There it is. And although this is
23 not to scale that liquor sign right there generates
24 an awful lot of people who sit there and drink

95

1 either outside of their car or unload cases of beer
2 into their coolers and go on driving from there.

3 I don't want that in residences of
4 Providence Village. I don't think people want it
5 in Eastwood and I don't think they want it in
6 Providence Oaks.

7 So what is the preferred
8 developments that the residents would like that are
9 consistent with the Gurnee Comprehensive Plan?

10 Okay. Here is a preferred
11 development on Milwaukee Avenue taken on a weekend.
12 Notice the empty parking lot. That is an FAR of
13 zero. This is an example of Washington Center
14 taken on a weekend. Notice the empty parking lots.

15 What I'm trying to tell you is we
16 are all used to congestion going to and from work,
17 we understand that. But on the weekends a lot of
18 us like to get away from it. And these type of
19 establishments which you have -- which I think that
20 you have the intent of zoning for that are
21 excellent examples of things that we would come
22 here and applaud.

23 Here is but last Greenleaf
24 Professional. It has real curb appeal. It has

96

1 landscaping. There is low truck delivery. There
2 is low impact on the area. It is an absolutely
3 beautiful establishment to go by.

4 So what I bring you to in
5 conclusion is take that concept, apply it here and
6 that's what I believe most of the residents who
7 will be talking to you tonight really want to see.

8 They want to see the zoning for this kept the way
9 you had intended it. Please make sure that you
10 vote with your heart and you vote with what you had
11 in mind.

12 I remember Chairman Rudny when you
13 said the plan is not made in concrete, it is
14 made -- and it's not made with putty, but when I
15 listen here tonight I smell pots and milk very
16 close to the stove and I think you do, too, that
17 this area here will become one after the other
18 after the other a rezoning project for you until
19 that final whole area becomes a total mess. Thank
20 you.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. We do have a
22 meeting to run and it was a very good presentation
23 and I would appreciate it, we've got a long agenda
24 and I don't want to cut anybody short but I think

97

1 you should try not to be repetitive.

2 I think a lot of good points were
3 brought out here. If you want to get up and just
4 say you agree with that gentleman, that would get
5 the message across to us.

6 So with that in mind, you know, we
7 all have an opportunity to speak but if it's kind
8 of the same thing we would appreciate it if you

9 just said ditto or something like that and passed
10 it on so we could move on because we do have a long
11 night ahead of us. Yes, sir, go ahead.

12 MR. DANIELS: My name is Robert Daniels.
13 I live at 1979 Sprucewood Lane.

14 Fortunately this gentleman said
15 most of what I was going to say because I was a
16 little bit nervous, I just found out about this
17 meeting about 6:30 this evening so I didn't come
18 that prepared.

19 I think, though, we have achieved
20 subdued saturation with the Jewel-Osco and this new
21 Jewel-Osco will be overkill. The other thing is I
22 moved here in November of '86 when the Village had
23 slightly more than 6,000 people and now we've got
24 over 25,000 people.

98

1 At that time I moved out here I
2 attended the Village Board meetings and the Zoning
3 Commission meetings on a regular basis. They had
4 at that time what they called a five year plan.
5 What that was is it set minimum goals. However,
6 unfortunately no maximum limits were set at that
7 time. We've exploded here. I think we've exploded
8 too fast.

9 My address that I gave happens to

10 be in Pembroke. If you know anything about Gurnee,
11 that's practically across the street from Gurnee
12 Mills. So I don't even live close to this
13 intersection and I'm against it.

14 I've driven north on O'Plaine Road
15 during the evening rush hour and I've seen how
16 congested it can get and this will only aggravate
17 it even if you do expand the road. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

19 MR. DUNN: My name is Terrence Dunn and
20 I live at 4698 Providence Village. I came here
21 tonight partly because I'm a neighbor and partly
22 because I thought I could be a credible witness
23 about the food service distribution and the like,
24 I'm in that business.

99

1 I'd like to ask the folks who
2 represent Jewel-Osco, no pun intended, but can you
3 tell me, folks, what a reefer is?

4 MR. BROWN: Say it again.

5 MR. DUNN: Can you describe for me what
6 a reefer is?

7 MR. BROWN: That's a slang for a
8 refrigerated trailer.

9 MR. DUNN: Can you describe for me, sir,
10 the decibel levels of a reefer when it is on?

11 MR. BROWN: I could if I had the proper
12 information with me, but I'm not an expert in that
13 area.

14 MR. DUNN: Would you believe me if I
15 told you that it was over a hundred decibels?

16 MR. BROWN: No, I wouldn't because I've
17 been involved in other presentations where we meet
18 the ambient noise levels and the local ordinances
19 for noise.

20 MR. DUNN: Could you tell me what the
21 ordinances for noise are in the State?

22 MR. BROWN: This is a technical issue
23 and I can assure you and the Commission that we
24 will observe all Village Ordinances and regulations

100

1 regarding noise.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. I think the way
3 we're going to work this is I kind of let you ask
4 that first question but we can't have a debate
5 here.

6 MR. DUNN: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think --

8 MR. DUNN: Then I'll make my point.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All the questions
10 should be addressed to the Plan Commission. We'll
11 take them under advisement. If we feel they're

12 appropriate questions, then we'll ask the
13 Petitioner to answer them for you.

14 MR. DUNN: I'll make my point very brief
15 then. I'm dealing with a similar situation where
16 we have a new plant in another state which I'll not
17 mention where there are residences nearby where the
18 reefers exceed the decibel levels allowed by the
19 State. No berm high enough, no number of trees
20 high enough and certainly not a 100 foot setback
21 can satisfy mutating that sound.

22 In fact, I would go so far as to
23 submit that 100 feet and 35 feet in Wilmette is
24 arrogance at its best. I ask you to deny their

101

1 request. Thank you.

2 MR. MAJORS: Good evening. My name is
3 Charles Majors and I'm at 4902 Kings Way West in
4 Providence Village.

5 One thing I would like to bring
6 up -- well, I have several issues. One thing I
7 would want to mention is that American Stores and
8 Albertsons have just merged together. There's
9 going to be a change in corporate philosophy as
10 happens many times when businesses merge together.
11 And Albertsons which typically has smaller stores
12 than Jewel, and that's been in the Tribune, will

13 probably change the way Jewel will be doing
14 business.

15 So that's one thing you need to
16 take a look at because the Jewel that is being
17 proposed is one of the largest Jewels in the State
18 of Illinois.

19 The second item I want to bring to
20 your attention is that Kings Park which is the park
21 in Providence Village is above the median size of
22 parks in Gurnee. It will be right next to
23 Jewel-Osco which is a liquor store. Is that the
24 type of environment that we want? I don't think

102

1 any other park in Gurnee has a liquor store next to
2 it.

3 Now for the third part I want to go
4 to the easel and put up some other information.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay.

6 MR. MAJORS: Sorry. I don't have
7 anything to hold this up with.

8 This is a plat from the State of
9 Illinois Department of Transportation. In
10 particular, the Lake County Transportation and
11 Improvement Project. And it shows the changes that
12 are going to take effect on 120, the Tri-State and
13 O'Plaine Road.

14 MR. SULA: Excuse me, I can't see from
15 where you're sitting or standing.

16 MR. MAJORS: Okay. This is the
17 Tri-State, 120 and O'Plaine Road. And it shows the
18 changes that they're going to do as far as ramps
19 from the different highways and it also shows the
20 lineage for the right-of-ways.

21 One part of the right-of-way goes
22 right over here and if we were to go to the
23 Jewel-Osco plan which is back here you're basically
24 cutting off this whole part right here.

103

1 Now if you'll put that back again.
2 It shows that from 120 to Providence Village the
3 right-of-way so that they can have access to the
4 highways and the interchange will take off
5 one-third of the land from 120 to Providence
6 Village. That again drastically affects the land
7 usage that we have here in that if this is 120 if
8 they take one-third back you're getting into the
9 middle of their store.

10 So if you take that into
11 consideration, I don't think they have enough land
12 for what they want to do and they have not taken
13 into consideration what IDOT is planning. Thank
14 you.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

16 MR. BALDI: My name is Brian Baldi. I
17 live at 811 Angelo in Gurnee. I've lived in Gurnee
18 all of my life and around the Waukegan area.

19 I've seen Jewel stores, just to
20 give a couple of points, up on Lewis and Sunset,
21 Grand Avenue and McAree. Now those stores have
22 died. They're dead and they were left tenantless
23 for a long time.

24 Now I can't see Jewel building

104

1 another store within a mile of an existing store
2 without closing it down and leaving it vacant.
3 Another thing I could see about building the new
4 Jewel here is that it working 24 hours a day. Now
5 that means lights and those are going to be on all
6 night. I disagree with that.

7 Now, I just don't go along with
8 having a Jewel in this area seeing what Jewel has
9 done before and they're going to do it again.
10 Thanks.

11 MR. DeBOISE: My name is John DeBoise.
12 I live at 2810 Providence Road. We were here not
13 too many months ago on the question of a
14 multi-family housing development on this site.

15 At that time the Village, the Plan

16 Commission said we see no reason to change our
17 zoning on this property. You stuck with the plan
18 you had. I think that the placard of these people
19 pretty well says it all. No reason to rezone.

20 The only reason that I can conceive
21 of was suggested by Jewel here which is we wouldn't
22 pay taxes on this store, the store would raise
23 sales tax. That is not a reason to rezone. Gurnee
24 is already awash with sales tax. It doesn't need

105

1 to get it from some place else. That is just like
2 the beggar thy neighbor policies that have been
3 proved foolish and short sighted in international
4 trade and investment.

5 This requires for you to stick to
6 your guns. You've got a plan, you considered it,
7 you approved of it, you have maintained it. There
8 is no reason to change it except that you want
9 Jewel's sales tax.

10 The price of that is very clear, it
11 was suggested by Robb Satten, housing prices. If
12 you want to see that in action today go up to
13 Antioch. There is a really nice subdivision up
14 there that has the everlasting misfortune to be
15 located in behind the Jewel. If you ask a retailer
16 -- or a realtor how to find it up there that's what

17 he'll tell you.

18 If you go to look at a house there
19 you will see a house that would ordinarily sell for
20 about 300,000 but you can have it for 225. This is
21 the problem that we're facing.

22 Jewel's convenience and necessity
23 is the only issue here. There is no public issue
24 of a need for a Jewel store with all of the

106

1 appurtenances on this property. Thank you.

2 MS. COURSHON: I need to apologize and
3 beg the Board's indulgence to swear me in as I have
4 arrived delayed.

5 (Witness sworn.)

6 MS. COURSHON: My name is Mary
7 Courshon, C-o-u-r-s-h-o-n, 55 Silo Court.

8 A few questions that don't need to
9 be addressed immediately, they're just for the
10 record. I have yet to clearly hear an explanation
11 as to why it would be necessary to move Jewel one
12 mile. What studies have been done to demonstrate
13 the increased usage of this facility by moving such
14 a short distance?

15 Is the zoning for the Jewel-Osco
16 merely speculation for development of this property
17 at this point, it's supposed to be an open zoning

18 because maybe we're going to build a Jewel there in
19 five years.

20 The proposed traffic adjustment
21 creates a you-bet-your-life interchange from the
22 Tollway for local residents similar to that at the
23 interchange on Grand and Dilley's Road.

24 Two 24-hour Jewels in Gurnee within

107

1 five miles of one another. I don't think anybody
2 minds if they need something at one o'clock in the
3 morning to drive that extra five miles.

4 And the last thing is the proposal
5 for additive uses as a blanket approval by the
6 Board, I would say that each one that's going to be
7 added to this lot should come before this Board for
8 approval on an individual basis. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

10 MS. KLEIN: Hi. I'm Donna Klein, 512
11 Long Hill Road.

12 My concern again would be why is
13 there a need for an additional Jewel. When I look
14 at the areas that Gurnee is growing in it seems to
15 be further west and north and certainly areas that
16 would be better accommodated by the Hunt Club Road
17 store or the one on Green Bay.

18 There's a lot of -- certainly

19 there's a lot of development off of O'Plaine but it
20 tends to be more into Waukegan. South of our area
21 ends where Gurnee ends and therefore maybe they
22 should consider a development in Libertyville or
23 Waukegan rather than Gurnee. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

108

1 MR. LUNDIS: My name is Bob Lundis. I
2 live at 1083 West Avenue. I live over in the
3 Pleasant Hill subdivision.

4 We're very concerned over there
5 about traffic. Last year before the improvements
6 on O'Plaine Road went in, I don't know how many
7 people drive through there at about five o'clock,
8 it was backed up over the toll bridge going that
9 way.

10 With the new improvements things
11 have been a little bit better temporarily, but
12 something like this can easily offset that and
13 create a traffic nightmare.

14 We've had petitioners on the other
15 side, the south side of 120 come in and wanted to
16 put in 200 townhomes there and we fought against
17 that and had them put single family homes in.
18 We've had apartment complex proposals come in, we
19 had a CarMax proposal that came in there and all

20 those luckily have not gone through.

21 I hate to see this Jewel come in
22 and on the north side of the road create the
23 nightmare that we've fought against on the south
24 side time after time.

109

1 And I don't see the reason for them
2 to move from Lakehurst which is going to be
3 redeveloped within the next couple of years and all
4 the traffic, the systems to handle traffic are
5 already there. Why do you want to put something in
6 a place where a Tollway ramp is going to be. And
7 it's going to look messy and it's going to detract
8 from our neighborhood. Thank you.

9 MS. FRYSTAK: My name is Laura Frystak.
10 I'm at 4915 Kings Way West.

11 One of the things that hasn't been
12 talked about so far this evening is crime and an
13 increase in crime that tends to revolve around the
14 commercial developments and retail.

15 Every week I look at the Gurnee Sun
16 and I look at their little plot where they chart
17 out where all the crime happens. There doesn't
18 seem to be any crime in the Providence Village
19 neighborhood. The only crime that we experience
20 right now is the bunnies who eat all of our

22 here tonight? Is he here by chance? Well, I
23 called and I wanted to have a little discussion
24 with him regarding his stocks. And his stocks were

111

1 that he deferred to the process, the process of
2 which he appointed you to decipher a
3 recommendation, listen to the public and the
4 process, it will come to the surface and the answer
5 will be found.

6 With that note I suggest that we
7 stop wasting these gentlemen's time, our time. I
8 think the answer is obvious. I ask that we vote, I
9 ask that you all vote against it including Mr.
10 Smith and that we call for a vote and just stop the
11 acts immediately and quite wasting everybody's time
12 because I think it's pretty obvious.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think what the Mayor
14 has said is that there is a process. And if we did
15 that then we would be circumventing the process.

16 The process is that there are
17 Commissioners up here that have a lot of
18 experience, we look at all the issues. And
19 typically the Village Board respects our
20 recommendation.

21 In fact, if you looked at the
22 history of the vote of the Village Board you'll

23 find that it's probably over 95 percent of the time
24 they have voted as the Plan Commission has

112

1 recommended.

2 And there are instances where they
3 need to consider other things besides just planning
4 issues. But the Plan Commission looks at the
5 planning issues and things like the comprehensive
6 plan and the land use.

7 And I think that we need to follow
8 through on that process. And what you're doing is
9 excellent, we're getting feedback from the
10 community, we're getting -- the Petitioner is
11 giving us their best shot at what they feel will
12 work here and then the Plan Commission takes it
13 under consideration and it goes -- that
14 recommendation then goes to the Village Board. So
15 that's the process.

16 We're not going to change that.
17 We're going to continue on with the meeting. And
18 we may or may not vote tonight based on the amount
19 of information we have and we may want to get more
20 information. It may take another meeting.

21 Unfortunately, the process is
22 generally a slow one. But it's better to do it
23 slowly and correctly than to jump on something just

24 because we want to get it over with.

113

1 MR. SPAULDING: I understand that, but
2 three meetings already with not one person getting
3 up and speaking to -- for it, I think it just
4 indicates that we've had enough meetings and we're
5 in it for the long haul.

6 And at this point I can see the end
7 result coming and we're wasting everybody's time by
8 continuing to waste meetings, hoping to wear us
9 out, hoping that there will be a Bulls game and we
10 won't come, hoping that some way the process will
11 eventually turn in their favor. That's the gist I
12 get.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I disagree with
14 you because I certainly would be one that would
15 want to try to get the process done as soon as we
16 can but the fact that so many people come out and
17 that we hear everyone takes a long time.

18 We have three or four other matters
19 on the agenda tonight. We're probably going to be
20 here until midnight. So it doesn't serve anyone's
21 interest to, you know, continue on in the length of
22 time.

23 We have to possibly continue the
24 meeting because it's going to be more convenient

1 for everyone and that's -- we have to decide that
2 after we get all of your input. So please
3 continue.

4 MS. BLAKELY: I'm Vicky Blakely. A lot
5 of things have come up here tonight, but there is
6 something that I'd like to focus your attention on.
7 And this has to do with the rezoning, it doesn't
8 have to go directly to what Jewel might do with the
9 property or someone else might do with the
10 property. It refers to rezoning to a high
11 intensity such as C/B-1 zoning.

12 If you look at this property, and
13 three or four people spoke to this about the
14 uniqueness of this property, you will notice that
15 because of requirements it's going to be a one
16 entrance in and one entrance out.

17 If you want to put in a grocery
18 store which is going to have flow both in and out
19 with customers going in and out half an hour, 45
20 minutes, if you want to put in the outlot there
21 with restaurants they're not going to exit directly
22 onto O'Plaine, they're going to have to get onto
23 Cornell to go out.

24 We haven't heard anything yet about

1 what is going to be the ambient noise from traffic
2 standing there waiting for traffic lights. We
3 haven't heard about the backup. We haven't heard
4 about the flow of traffic to get from those outliers
5 to get to that street if people are coming out of
6 Jewel parking lot or any other. And you have
7 restaurant patrons trying to come out. There's
8 going to be traffic jams.

9 So I would recommend you look at
10 this very carefully and recommend not to rezone
11 into something that's going to have this type of
12 high density where we have to rely on one stop
13 light and one in and one out.

14 MR. BOLUS: I'm Gary Bolus. I live at
15 4548 Providence Road. I'd like to thank the
16 Albertsons Corporation for being here tonight.
17 That is a new issue and I just wanted to add that
18 as a question because that is a takeover or a
19 merger and in the name of Albertsons. It's no
20 longer American Foods so they don't represent
21 American Foods tonight so that is a new issue.

22 There is one way in and one way
23 out. And if you do populate this to its fullest
24 extent I would -- my other question was is that

1 safe within our guidelines of fire and ambulance or
2 will you eventually have to cut some other access
3 in there from a safety standpoint?

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That would be reviewed
5 by our fire department and there may be an
6 emergency access required that would only be
7 accessible to fire and police.

8 MR. BOLUS: Possibly through the park or
9 somewhere.

10 MR. WILDENBERG: It wouldn't be through
11 the park. It would be off of O'Plaine Road would
12 be the second access.

13 MR. BOLUS: Somewhere else because of
14 safety concern.

15 And then finally I just -- you
16 know, I'm trying to be as objective as possible.
17 But, you know, the city and the village has spent a
18 lot of time and you have spent a lot of time
19 planning. We've spent a lot of money on this plan,
20 all of us together as a Village community.

21 And I think it's pretty arrogant
22 for somebody to come in here and say this is
23 unincorporated property and we can build on it
24 right now with the existing zoning. I think that

1 kind of disregards all the planning and the details
2 and the thoughts and the wishes of the people in
3 this community and that's how this presentation
4 started out tonight.

5 So I just had to add that in there
6 that Lake County, sure it's zoned with an S or
7 whatever from 19 whatever, I don't know. But there
8 is a Village plan and it's a 25 year plan. We've
9 invested a lot of time and a lot of taxpayer money
10 into that plan.

11 And that question is still on the
12 table so I won't ask it again. All right.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

14 MS. MAYER: Hi. My name is Sherry
15 Mayer and I live at 605 Lexington Square East which
16 if any of you know is right at the tree line.

17 So the proposed Jewel would be
18 behind my home and I'm not happy with that. Many
19 years ago in one of our first Providence Village
20 meetings I got the opportunity to hear Mayor Welton
21 speak and he discussed the comprehensive plan and I
22 was pretty impressed with it.

23 I didn't know there was a plan for
24 Gurnee. I've been here since I was 17 years old

1 when there was absolutely nothing out on Grand
2 Avenue but a Holiday Inn. That was it, if you
3 could imagine.

4 I don't want a Jewel behind my
5 house. First off, I do have a number of points.
6 The noise level. I can open my windows in my
7 bedroom at night and at two o'clock in the morning
8 be awakened by if you can imagine a truck hitting a
9 pothole or whatever.

10 This has got to be out on 120 or
11 out on 94. And it has to do with the wind and the
12 way that the noise travels. And I can only imagine
13 what will happen if we put up all this industry and
14 the Jewel and everything else. And I don't want to
15 listen to it. I don't want to listen to it at one
16 o'clock in the morning, I don't want to listen to
17 it at one o'clock in the afternoon.

18 In my neighborhood we have children
19 who travel up and down O'Plaine Road. They're
20 going back and forth to our library. This library
21 is for our kids; is it not? I don't want my kid
22 hit by a truck or hit by increased traffic.

23 They're trying to get to the
24 school, they want to go swimming. I don't think

1 that that's right. I overhead someone talking

2 about permanent pieces of architecture and yet what
3 are we planning to do with the Lakehurst Jewel?
4 Was that not built as a permanent piece of
5 architecture? Was it always planned to be a Jewel?

6 And we talk about being good
7 neighbors. What kind of neighbors are you planning
8 to be to those individuals who will now have an
9 empty building to deal with? Those words came from
10 the Jewel people. And I'm sorry, I don't think
11 that is being a good neighbor.

12 I just don't see any compelling
13 reason to change from the comprehensive plan. You
14 haven't given us anything. And the bottom line, I
15 don't want a Jewel, that's it.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Anyone else have
17 a question or comment?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. At this time
20 we'll close the floor to the public.

21 And Members of the Commission, do
22 you have any comments or questions for the
23 Petitioner? Mr. Cepon?

24 MR. CEPON: No, I don't.

120

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Foster.

2 MR. FOSTER: I would have a question,

3 Mr. Chairman, of the transportation consultant with
4 respect on in terms of the ingress and egress out
5 of the parcel in terms of how many cars are able to
6 be stacked and how successful you think that's
7 going to work.

8 MR. LINDGREN: One of the reasons that
9 the -- I'm Jerry Lindgren for the record -- that
10 the first cut into that road is located where it is
11 is so that we have the stacking that we need at
12 this location to accommodate the traffic at the
13 traffic signal.

14 I think for the most part it's
15 going to work quite well. Understand that you have
16 several locations where traffic can get in and out
17 as well as other locations here. We didn't see
18 that as a particular issue or presenting a problem.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is there anything else?
20 Ms. Kovarik, do you have something?

21 MS. KOVARIK: I, too, like Mr. Sula was
22 under the impression that that would be low
23 intensity office uses both on the north and south
24 side, with the C/O-1 District, I would not like to

121

1 see that. I would be adamantly opposed to the
2 miscellaneous use for industrial and light assembly
3 and all that.

4 I also, and I said this before, I
5 really like this plan, I think the egress south of
6 Cornell, the retention areas and everything.

7 My biggest objection would be to
8 the outlots. Three outlots is way too many. And I
9 would be totally opposed to that and then the
10 industrial uses. So there may be some room for
11 compromise.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other comments?

13 MR. FOSTER: I guess as Ms. Kovarik
14 proposed it, I did want to ask if the Petitioner
15 would be open to eliminating at least one outlet
16 because that's something I think would be -- would
17 help.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I guess I might
19 stimulate a little conversation here.

20 The plan as I see it, certainly you
21 did a nice job of planning it. The question is
22 does it belong there. And I still have the
23 question that Mr. Foster asked in the very first
24 meeting is what is the compelling reason to deviate

122

1 from the comprehensive plan.

2 And I guess I would present that to
3 the Commissioners and I guess I still don't see a
4 compelling reason. I went through the information

5 a couple hours beforehand and it seems like the
6 convenience issue seems to be the only rationale
7 that one can give for wanting to convert this to
8 not really a retail area but really to put a Jewel
9 in.

10 And I guess I don't think that that
11 is a compelling reason so maybe you guys can help
12 me out or tell me what the compelling reasons are
13 to deviate from our comprehensive plan.

14 Mr. Sula.

15 MR. SULA: I certainly don't have a
16 compelling reason, but one thing I think we need to
17 explore is I'd like to hear our own staff's opinion
18 in terms of what the Petitioner has given us as an
19 interpretation of the S zoning because I think we
20 need to understand that and have official
21 Village/staff opinions on that.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That's a good idea.
23 Because I know there was some things pointed out
24 about, you know, what the County can put in here

123

1 but I think there may be parameters that are beyond
2 what the Petitioner indicated as far as, for
3 example, would the County actually consider putting
4 in retail use right next to residential.

5 MR. WILDENBERG: I think as the

6 Petitioner alluded to in their presentation, the
7 County's Zoning Ordinance is structured a little
8 differently than what you see in most communities
9 including Gurnee's.

10 It's what they call a performance
11 based zoning concept wherein there is really a
12 broader range of uses that are allowed within a
13 specific zoning district and you can accomplish
14 those uses if you can meet the performance
15 standards that are listed in that zoning district.

16 And those performance standards
17 vary with the intensity of use proposed on the
18 property itself and also with the intensity of uses
19 that are adjacent to the use that's proposed.

20 So I believe the Petitioner is
21 correct from what I've seen of the County's
22 Ordinance, the Suburban District does allow for
23 that broad array of uses from single family
24 residential to multi-family to office, commercial

124

1 and industrial.

2 But then the site has to
3 demonstrate that it can meet various floor area
4 ratio requirements and setback requirements and
5 landscaping requirements and the traditional things
6 that we also look at.

7 So we can supply you with a copy of
8 the -- or an excerpt of the County Zoning Ordinance
9 and show you what the Suburban District says but I
10 believe in essence that's a correct statement on
11 their part.

12 And Mr. Maiden is here tonight from
13 our planning consultant. I know their firm does
14 also do a lot of work for that County Ordinance.
15 He may wish to amplify.

16 MR. MAIDEN: I think Jon has done an
17 excellent job of summarizing it.

18 Without doing a detailed site
19 analysis you couldn't get into the specifics of the
20 intensity of the use. But they have made an
21 accurate representation of the range of uses that
22 are allowed under the Suburban zoning
23 classification. And they have the performance
24 standards if they can satisfy those.

125

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: What about services
2 available to the site through the County, though?
3 Are they limited there?

4 MR. MAIDEN: That is one of the
5 performance factors. They would have to show that
6 they could get adequate access to a sewer. And
7 right now the most convenient access is the Village

8 sewer.

9 Whether they could get access to
10 the sewer and meet that criteria, that would be an
11 obligation they would have to prove.

12 MR. WILDENBERG: And I also believe in
13 this area the North Shore Sanitary District has a
14 main at O'Plaine Road that could be accessible to
15 the particular property for service as well.

16 In the past, since this property is
17 unincorporated, it did have an option to also look
18 at development within another neighboring community
19 to the south and in the last year and a half to two
20 years I believe the Village and the City of
21 Waukegan have entered into a boundary agreement
22 whereby the Village of Waukegan will not seek
23 annexation of this particular property on the north
24 side of Route 120.

126

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thus limiting
2 availability of services from Waukegan or
3 annexation by Waukegan.

4 MR. WILDENBERG: It would I guess limit
5 annexation by Waukegan. I guess the question of
6 whether or not they could make their utilities
7 available might be a different story. I'm not
8 exactly sure on that.

10 I know we're kind of putting our staff on the spot
11 here because I understand that they've only had a
12 few days to review these plans so really I don't
13 think they've had an opportunity to really look at
14 all the details.

15 Also I understand that our traffic
16 consultant has been contacted on this and we have
17 not received a report back from him on the traffic
18 study.

19 You know, I really think at this
20 point our staff is -- understandably couldn't be
21 prepared to really address any of the details of
22 the plan as they should.

23 So I would suggest -- despite what
24 some people might think, we're not trying to wear

128

1 anybody down here -- but I really would suggest
2 that we continue this, also put some thought in
3 again to the land use because I think we as a
4 Commission need to really address that. I think
5 that's still the key point here.

6 And, you know, we really haven't,
7 like I said, come up with any compelling reasons
8 why to deviate from the comp plan. So maybe we can
9 work on that and at the next meeting address that.

10 Does that sound like a good

11 suggestion? So I'll entertain a motion to continue
12 the meeting. Mr. Sula.

13 MR. SULA: I move that we continue the
14 meeting and I'd also ask the staff to try to do the
15 best that they can to try to interpret the S zoning
16 to this particular site to give us a little more
17 guidance into what could be potentially an
18 overriding issue.

19 MR. SMITH: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We have a motion and
21 second but we do need a date and time and location.

22 MR. SULA: I moved it. Again, I move
23 it for here.

24 MS. VELKOVER: September 2nd.

129

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. So September 2nd
2 here at the Village Hall at 7:30. Sound okay?

3 A motion to continue the meeting
4 to September 2nd at the Village Hall at 7:30 PM.
5 Motion and second.

6 All those in favor of the motion
7 signify by saying aye in the roll call; those
8 opposed nay. Roll call, please.

9 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

10 MR. SULA: Aye.

11 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.

12 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.
13 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepen.
14 MR. CEPON: Aye.
15 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.
16 (No response.)
17 MR. WILDENBERG: Absent. Foster.
18 MR. FOSTER: Aye.
19 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.
20 MR. SMITH: Aye.
21 MR. WILDENBERG: Rudny.
22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries
23 and it is so ordered. Thank you very much for
24 coming.

130

1 We're going to take about a five
2 minute adjournment. We do have a number of other
3 matters so if everyone could clear out into the
4 foyer, we would appreciate that.
5 (Recess taken.)
6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The meeting will come
7 to order. Okay.
8 The next matter is a public hearing
9 on the U.S. Post Office. The subject property
10 consists of approximately 6 acres located at the
11 northwest corner of Washington Street and Cemetery
12 Road.

13 The Petitioner is requesting to
14 rezone the property from E Estate in unincorporated
15 Lake County to C/B-1 Neighborhood Commercial in the
16 Village of Gurnee.

17 A special use permit is requested
18 to allow the establishment and operation of a U.S.
19 Postal facility on the site. Is Jon here? Okay.
20 Why don't you go ahead. I don't know that Jon has
21 anything to add. If you're the Petitioner, if you
22 could please proceed with your presentation.

23 This is a public hearing so anyone
24 who is going to testify for the Petitioner and also

131

1 anyone from the public who wishes to make a comment
2 or ask a question on this matter needs to stand and
3 be sworn in by the Village Attorney.

4 (Witnesses sworn.)

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Please proceed
6 and state your name and affiliation for the record.

7 MR. KENNY: I'm Jim Kenny from the U.S.
8 Postal Service. I'm the real estate project
9 manager.

10 I've been in pursuit of a site
11 within the Village of Gurnee for the last two and a
12 half years to try to facilitate this much needed
13 public service. Our existing facility is way under

15 of FGM Architects Engineers.

16 MS. KOVARIK: So it is Cemetery?

17 MR. SUGINO: Yes, ma'am, it is Cemetery.

18 MS. KOVARIK: Why are asking for C/B-1
19 rather than a public zoning?

20 MR. KENNY: Zoning is a very difficult
21 issue for the Postal Service and for Federal
22 agencies in general.

23 We approached -- I approached the
24 Village administration some time ago about this

133

1 particular site. Whether it falls in an
2 institutional use or whether it falls in a
3 commercial business dash one use is really not
4 directly relevant to us other than it relates to
5 the value of the property in question.

6 As I understand it, this property
7 was reviewed by the Village some time ago with the
8 intent that it may be incorporated or brought into
9 the Village under some future annexation and that
10 the likelihood would be some sort of commercial
11 business use which would be a normal use for that
12 particular parcel.

13 And it was because of that and
14 under some sort of proposed annexation and future
15 zoning consideration we requested that. We would

17 complicated question.

18 Vernon Hills was a very unique
19 project. One of the main reasons and the principal
20 reason we are where we are in Vernon Hills is
21 because the Village solicited the developer for
22 that as a donation to the post office to encourage
23 the construction of a facility and a post office
24 within Vernon Hills.

135

1 Vernon Hills up until that post
2 office was built did not have a post office. And
3 in order to encourage the construction of a post
4 office within their own community they made a site
5 available and donated it to us and that's why we're
6 there. That's the only reason why we're there.

7 MS. KOVARIK: What about Libertyville?

8 MR. KENNY: Libertyville we did a search
9 for a site and that site was selected as being
10 available to us.

11 We initiated a search here two and
12 a half years ago and we wanted to confine our
13 search to O'Plaine Road, Washington Street and
14 Grand Avenue and as far west as the Tollway or
15 Riverside Drive.

16 We started discussions with a
17 parcel of property on the northeast corner of

18 O'Plaine Road and Washington and we went through
19 various planning phases with the Village
20 administration and staff and it was deemed to be
21 unusable and we couldn't meet certain requirements.

22 We could meet our Postal
23 requirements but we couldn't meet certain Village
24 requirements at that time having to do with the

136

1 setbacks and landscaping, bikepaths, et cetera,
2 berming. So we had to -- we had to vacate any
3 ideas relative to that site.

4 We then started and I think you
5 entertained a rather extensive review of Mr.
6 Green's plans at one time under his PUD when we
7 were looking at trying to utilize Mr. Green's so
8 that we could stay within the general geographic
9 area of the Village business, the library and the
10 Village Hall, et cetera.

11 That was not deemed available to
12 us. Essentially he withdrew any opportunity to
13 continue to work with us and continue to develop
14 the property.

15 We went back into the marketplace
16 and we looked at a number of other locations and
17 this location seemed to be the most suitable for
18 both our residential customer, our civilians so to

19 speak, community residents, as well as the
20 businesses without yet tying us up inside of a
21 heavy congested commercial district.

22 MS. KOVARIK: What about some of the
23 office parks, maybe the Auto Nation site?

24 MR. KENNY: Nothing was available to us.

137

1 In the discussions with the staff nothing was
2 brought to our attention. And we did rather
3 extensive searches to try to find a five to six
4 acre parcel to develop on.

5 MS. KOVARIK: One of my concerns is the
6 post office is kind of like the cornerstone of a
7 downtown of a village center, you know, along with
8 city hall and the fire station.

9 MR. KENNY: That's exactly why we were
10 trying to --

11 MS. KOVARIK: Here we're getting so
12 fragmented with some things here and some things
13 there that moving the post office really starts
14 moving the center.

15 MR. KENNY: That's why we really
16 concentrated our efforts within the
17 O'Plaine/Washington/Grand Avenue geography.

18 And now because of an expressed
19 concern and desire on the part of the Village the

20 post office not only in addition to constructing a
21 new facility over at Cemetery and Washington is
22 also going to retain its existing facility right
23 here within your district.

24 MS. KOVARIK: That's now.

138

1 MR. KENNY: So that's a major
2 consideration. Our new post office will have a
3 lobby that's as large as our existing post office
4 in its entirety.

5 MS. KOVARIK: Doesn't Cemetery Road have
6 a weight limit on it for trucks; do you know?

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't know. Jon, do
8 you know?

9 MR. WILDENBERG: It's posted but there
10 may be some roadway improvements that would be
11 necessitated by the type of traffic for certain
12 business on Cemetery Road.

13 MR. KENNY: We have taken up certain
14 traffic issues and we have done traffic studies on
15 that property relative to our usage.

16 And we're under discussions right
17 now with the Village, Cemetery being a Village
18 street or road, to enhance that and widen it and
19 put in appropriate acceleration, deceleration,
20 left-hand turns to ease that potential congestion.

21 MR. CEPON: What about the facility you
22 have? I guess it's Depke's property or behind Poor
23 Richards where you have all the --

24 MR. KENNY: It is located in Depke's

139

1 building and we will be vacating that. That will
2 be vacated and all that operation will be moved
3 into the new facility as well as some will be
4 absorbed I'm sure here -- on this side of the
5 Tollway would be absorbed over here in this retail
6 facility as well.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do you have an exhibit,
8 a large exhibit, a plan view of the proposal with
9 you or --

10 MR. KENNY: Like a large color rendering
11 or something of a bird's eye view?

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It doesn't have to be
13 color, just an enlargement.

14 MR. KENNY: I don't think we do at this
15 time. But we can certainly try to make one
16 available if that's what you'd like.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It just would have been
18 nice because I think there may be some people that
19 might be interested in seeing it.

20 But can you explain the --
21 basically the usage of the building, where the

22 employee parking is going to be and where it's
23 expected that the public will park.

24 And because I know one of the big

140

1 problems you had with the old post office when it
2 was first built was you just had the one entrance
3 coming into that parking lot that looks just like
4 the one that I see here. And everybody kind of got
5 in everybody's way and then you had to put the
6 other entrance in.

7 So could somebody address that?

8 MR. KENNY: Frank, can you address that?
9 I don't have a copy of the plan here in front of
10 me.

11 MR. SUGINO: Yes. Basically the south
12 side of -- the building is facing to the south
13 basically or facing to the Washington.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Correct.

15 MR. SUGINO: And all the traffic will be
16 coming in from Cemetery Road. Now first one -- or
17 first to the -- closest to the Washington will be
18 customer entry. And we provide something like 42
19 customer parking spaces in front of the building.

20 And then we do have on the same
21 exit but going to the other way is so-called mail
22 drop lane. So that will be one way out. And then

23 on the backside of it would be the employee and
24 trucks and so forth coming in from the northern

141

1 part of the property.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do you have that many
3 employees? It seems like there's a lot of parking
4 back there.

5 MR. SUGINO: Yes, that's including all
6 the employees parking as well as so-called the
7 carrier vehicles.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Oh, I see, okay, park
9 the carrier vehicles.

10 MR. SUGINO: They have to be parked in
11 that particular property overnight and so forth.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I guess I'm still -- I
13 don't know, maybe the other Commissioners have got
14 it, but I'm still not sure how that entrance works
15 for again only --

16 MR. SUGINO: One of the things that we
17 were placed on or told by the Village was in fact
18 that we have to have an entrance at minimum of 200
19 feet from the intersection of Cemetery and
20 Washington. Therefore, as you can see, it's going
21 about 200 feet to the north.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Jon, have we had our
23 traffic guy look at this?

1 at it and there are I think some concerns regarding
2 the number of curb cuts involved. I don't know
3 that that has come to a conclusion yet with Bud and
4 our traffic consultant.

5 There are plusses and minuses to
6 the way that it's proposed right now and Bud is
7 trying to work on a plan that might cut it from two
8 to -- or from three to two curb cuts, but that's
9 something still under consideration.

10 MR. KENNY: We're not necessarily, you
11 know, stuck with that particular ingress and egress
12 and customer service lane for drop boxes.

13 However, the Post Office,
14 recognizing we're a national company and we have
15 some 40,000 post offices in the United States, we
16 have found in the development and construction of
17 our new facilities in trying to segregate customer
18 parking and drop box parking and not mixing the two
19 together works quite well for us.

20 Even though it may look a little
21 bit confusing on a piece of paper, it works quite
22 well for us in most of the facilities that we build
23 today. Where we have a high concentration of
24 on-site customer parking and drop box it just works

1 real well then to keep the stream of traffic where
2 all people want to do is drop off a letter or
3 several letters out of the mainstream of those
4 people wanting to park.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I understand that. I
6 think that's good. But I guess I'm kind of
7 concerned about having the same problem that we had
8 when the old post office first opened where you
9 found all these cars in and you've got people kind
10 of backing out and it seems like if there would be
11 some way to loop that so that they had an exit that
12 might kind of come back around through the --
13 somehow through that -- I know you don't want to
14 route them through the employee parking but kind of
15 build the road there or something that would get
16 them out behind the post office.

17 MR. KENNY: I'm just trying to get a
18 copy here so I can refresh my memory. It's been
19 awhile since I've seen that.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think this is the
21 same kind of problem you had in the old post office
22 when you first built it.

23 You only had one entrance coming in
24 and they had to come in and go out that entrance

1 and that was a real problem.

2 MR. KENNY: I see where you pull in and
3 pull out. I had talked with -- and I don't know if
4 it's practical, but I had in my initial discussions
5 with the Village administration we had purposely
6 stayed away from making any kind of a curb cut,
7 although there is an existing curb cut for the
8 current property owner, on Washington Street.

9 But whether we could have an
10 ingress, for instance, and off of -- we could also
11 offer, you know, off of Cemetery, coming off of
12 Cemetery we could offer a right-hand turn only or
13 something, you know, to loop out and come back off
14 of Washington as some alternative so that it
15 doesn't get congested in there. And it would be
16 like you're referring to.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I see what you're
18 saying, if you just made a loop further south and
19 then have it exit on Washington maybe you could do
20 a right turn in right out.

21 MR. KENNY: I think anything is feasible
22 and practical with whatever the Village may want
23 and in also trying to work with the County because
24 Washington is a County highway and so therefore out

1 of the jurisdiction of the Village.

2 It was suggested to me initially
3 that we stay and limit our curb cuts to Cemetery by
4 the Village administration so as not to have to get
5 involved in curb cuts with the County.

6 But the site planning and the
7 finalization of the site planning is something
8 that's mechanical in nature, it can be worked out
9 to the satisfaction of both the Village and
10 ourselves and I'm sure if the County comes into
11 play with the County.

12 And like I say, it's mechanical in
13 nature and it can be resolved.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay.

15 MR. CEPON: Have you thought about --

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We do have some
17 other -- I'm sorry, Carl, go ahead.

18 MR. CEPON: Did you think about there's
19 property to the north of you --

20 MR. KENNY: Yes.

21 MR. CEPON: Have you thought about the
22 security and the fencing and such?

23 MR. KENNY: The Smith Brothers
24 Landscaping who are present.

1 MR. CEPON: Yes.

2 MR. KENNY: Yes, we have considered that
3 and we've had discussions with the north property
4 owners as to how we're going to preserve and
5 segregate our properties from theirs and landscape
6 it and berm it and create a nice setting so as not
7 to disrupt their usage.

8 We have also maintained the tree
9 line along the west property line so as not to be
10 obtrusive to the residences to the west.

11 MR. CEPON: The only thing I have a
12 question on is if the Village's zoning --

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You have to speak in
14 the microphone.

15 MR. CEPON: We've noted the zoning to
16 sort of consider the fact if they go to C/B-1 we've
17 got to make sure that if the post office doesn't go
18 there that it doesn't change the zoning.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I guess if I
20 understood you correctly, you don't care if we make
21 it -- if it's -- C/O-1 were acceptable.

22 MR. KENNY: I've had enough discussions
23 with the Village administration that I feel
24 comfortable in the fact that if a reasonable

1 petition came in, something other than our own
2 usage for a C/B-1 that it could be granted.

3 And so therefore if you wanted to
4 zone it institutional business as under the OMB
5 guidelines I wouldn't have a problem with that.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I guess I would
7 turn to our staff and the planning consultant.

8 I mean we could either -- I mean
9 either P or C/O-1 would be acceptable, wouldn't it?
10 Wouldn't that allow a post office as a permitted
11 use?

12 MR. MAIDEN: Well, this is an annexation
13 so you do have flexibility on those particulars.

14 If you wanted to zone it public
15 and make whatever limitations as part of the
16 annexation agreement.

17 The same is true with the C/O-1.
18 It does list I believe public office buildings, it
19 doesn't specifically say post office. I think
20 that's something we want to clarify for the update
21 of the Zoning Ordinance.

22 But again, since it's an annexation
23 if that's your pleasure I think it can be built
24 into an annexation agreement.

148

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. So do we have

2 any other comments from the Commissioners?

3 MR. SMITH: It's encouraging to see that
4 you're building a building that you're not going to
5 outgrow before you get into it. The one over here
6 before you ever got in it it was too small.

7 MR. KENNY: I guess you could maybe say
8 that that was poor planning on the part of the post
9 office.

10 But then again when I listened to
11 some other people talk up in front of us that have
12 been in town for a long time you had very rapid
13 growth over a ten or fifteen year period.

14 MR. SMITH: But it was smaller than the
15 one you're in.

16 MR. KENNY: And of course being a
17 resident up near this general vicinity all my life
18 I understand all the growth that has taken place up
19 from Lake County and all the way across from the
20 lake all the way out through in through McHenry and
21 Crystal Lake and all those areas. And they've had
22 accelerated growth. And we did fall significantly
23 behind the power curve, yes.

24 MR. SMITH: You moved from a bigger

149

1 facility to a smaller facility. I think there was
2 more square footage over there on -- by the Dairy

3 Queen than there was when you moved.

4 MR. KENNY: And we're undertaking
5 facilities, you've probably read about it in the
6 Daily Herald, up here in Gurnee and Lake Zurich and
7 Round Lake and we're looking at other communities
8 in the area that have grown rapidly.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I might point out to
10 the Commissioners I've been advised that there's a
11 sign involved with this. You want to put a sign on
12 the corner?

13 MR. KENNY: The post office does have
14 standard signage that comes out of Washington that
15 we do have to follow as part of our developmental
16 or construction regulations. I don't know how that
17 fits in with Village signage usages.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, we have a Sign
19 Ordinance. I mean you don't have a sign at the
20 post office now, do you? Other than don't you say
21 post office on the building, right?

22 MR. KENNY: Yes, you may be right. Our
23 design criteria changes over the years and
24 sometimes daily, weekly, monthly.

150

1 But we do have standard signage.
2 Our people in Washington because of our Federal
3 sovereignty and that create national signages to be

4 used by the post office to one standard and we are
5 required to --

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I appreciate that
7 but I mean would you be willing to not put the sign
8 up? I think we all would know where the post
9 office is. I mean you don't need to advertise.

10 I don't know how the rest of the
11 Commissioners feel.

12 MR. KENNY: That might be an
13 administrative thing. I would have to yield to the
14 sovereignty. We'll work with you with whatever you
15 may have to do to accommodate.

16 MR. SUGINO: Jim mentioned that the
17 postal has the certain standard that we must
18 follow. And that particular signage happened to be
19 the one they say that we have to have. So we
20 didn't have much choice.

21 MR. KENNY: We don't want to get into a
22 big debate over a sign. The Village -- rest
23 assured, the post office, we want to be good
24 neighbors. We want to provide a good community

151

1 service, a much needed service and we're not going
2 to let a sign get in the way of providing that
3 service.

4 MR. WILDENBERG: Just so everybody is

5 clear on what we're talking about here --

6 MR. KENNY: We're going to have to -- we
7 have to do something. And I mean this stuff, you
8 know, is brought upon us by a higher level down in
9 Washington but we do have to maintain certain
10 flexibilities these days with the communities.

11 MR. WILDENBERG: Again, just so we all
12 have an understanding of what the actual sign that
13 at least we have on the plan in front of us
14 indicates it's roughly about a 40 square foot sign
15 face and it's mounted 18 feet high in the air and
16 proposed to be on the corner of Cemetery and
17 Washington.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 18 feet?

19 MR. WILDENBERG: That's not a real --
20 that's not an excessively tall sign in the overall
21 scheme of things. I would point out to you,
22 however, given the location --

23 MR. KENNY: There's some American flags
24 out there that are that big.

152

1 MR. WILDENBERG: Given the location you
2 may want to look at some kind of a lower ground
3 mounted monument sign or perhaps building itself
4 will serve as enough identification.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm trying to make your

6 development a better development. I think that the
7 post office where they have the letter signs on the
8 face of the building have always looked attractive,
9 it looks official.

10 And I think in this particular case
11 given the character of the area I think you want to
12 minimize any signs along Washington to try to
13 maintain a more residential character. And even
14 some of the commercial uses we have there we
15 encourage more residential type buildings and
16 things of that nature.

17 So I think you're fitting in here
18 fine. I think -- I honestly don't think it needs
19 signing and I think it's going to detract from the
20 appearance of your building. I think it's going to
21 be a nicer development if you just put the wall
22 sign in.

23 MR. KENNY: Our policy today is we work
24 with the communities and listen to what they have

153

1 to say and we interject those thoughts and those
2 comments into our overall plan.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Well, we
4 appreciate that.

5 Do we have any other comments?

6 MR. FOSTER: I have a question. I think

7 the traffic matter is a problem. I hope it gets
8 resolved, but I don't think that's going to work
9 very well the way it's been presented to us.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. What do you guys
11 think about the -- Mr. Winter.

12 MR. WINTER: I think I'm just going to
13 follow up on what you said. Is it my understanding
14 that you don't mind if a motion were made tonight
15 to designate this as public?

16 MR. KENNY: That's correct.

17 MR. WINTER: Okay. I'd make a motion
18 then that we recommend a favorable recommendation
19 to rezone --

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Wait, wait. We have to
21 open it to the public.

22 MR. WINTER: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Sorry about that. I
24 think it's probably a good opportunity now since we

154

1 were going to go to a motion is that we open the
2 floor to the public.

3 If anyone has a comment or
4 question, please step up to the mic and state your
5 name and address for the record even though you
6 have done that before.

7 MS. COURSHON: She told me she knows how

8 to spell my name. Mary Courshon, 55 Silo Court.

9 I am extremely concerned about the
10 traffic pattern over there. Not only the three
11 entrances off Cemetery, even if you try to widen it
12 at that point the current post office access we're
13 looking at almost six lanes across over here,
14 O'Plaine, you know, with the right turn lane and
15 then the secondary road, you know, for escaping
16 from Alcatraz.

17 Unfortunately, those things are
18 negative. No matter what they do to Cemetery it
19 already backs up forever on Washington Street.
20 It's going to be a very difficult situation to do
21 that.

22 I'm not against the post office
23 being one of my neighbors but I'm against the
24 amount of traffic that the post office is going to

155

1 generate.

2 We're already having difficulty
3 with the expansion of the Montessori school over
4 there with the various things. They've been
5 wonderful neighbors, but if you're trying to turn
6 left off of Washington onto Cemetery to go into
7 South Ridge and somebody is trying to pick their
8 kids up at the Montessori you're practically rear

9 ending them because of how short that driveway is.

10 And based on the three driveways
11 that is proposed at Cemetery and that being an
12 access from the industrial park the traffic at
13 Cemetery is going to be a nightmare. We reduced
14 the speed limit because of the residential
15 situation. I know because I got a ticket there.

16 So that if we have the
17 fluctuations in speed and we have the increase in
18 traffic in addition to the industrial park I'm very
19 concerned about the safety at that entire
20 intersection.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.

22 Anyone else? Yes, ma'am.

23 MS. MILLER: Hi. My name is Theresa
24 Miller and I live at 6177 Brittany Court.

156

1 The post office parking lot as it's
2 proposed is going to be right up my back yard.
3 There is a tree line there and when we originally
4 heard about the post office going in there we
5 thought well, maybe if they just put up a fence
6 then we won't be able to see very much and it will
7 be okay.

8 But now that I've had a chance to
9 see the plans I think that the rest of my neighbors

10 that will be backing up onto the post office are
11 going to be very concerned that what they're going
12 to be looking at is a bunch of post office vehicles
13 parked back there and deliveries that are going to
14 be probably coming early in the morning maybe. I
15 don't know what time the post office does
16 deliveries, too, in the evening.

17 So I'm kind of concerned as to why
18 it's being -- right now it's zoned E which I assume
19 Estates means homes are proposed to go in there.
20 If the post office doesn't go in and you zone it
21 for commercial what other commercial properties
22 could potentially go there?

23 I would like to hear more about the
24 traffic impact. I think that it is going to

157

1 severely impact the traffic in the area.

2 Especially since on the agenda
3 tonight is also a proposed McDonald's for
4 Washington Avenue which I have -- this is the first
5 I've heard of that. And I think that the whole
6 traffic situation on Washington and Cemetery is
7 going to be severely impacted. Plus I don't think
8 I'll like the view very much.

9 So I think that I wouldn't like to
10 hear a motion on rezoning it tonight because I

11 think some of the other residents are really not
12 very aware of what exactly is going to take place
13 when a post office goes in there.

14 We had originally heard that there
15 was going to be this small post office and some
16 nice retention pond. And I don't see any retention
17 pond in the plans. So I think you should keep it
18 open for the public to still come and discuss the
19 issue.

20 MR. MILTON: Mark Milton, 59 Silo
21 Court. I guess I'm concerned about a couple of
22 things that I would have liked to have seen more
23 plans shown so that we have an understanding of
24 what was going on here.

158

1 I'm a little bit concerned about
2 hearing the we'll work with you but this is the way
3 that Washington has to have to it. So I'm not
4 convinced by the willingness of the post office to
5 work, for example, with the sign with the other
6 attitude as well.

7 My major concern, though, reflects
8 around the traffic. Already it can take five
9 minutes to get from Milwaukee Avenue to Cemetery
10 Road and even longer to get up to Hunt Club Road.
11 And with the other proposal that was suggested here

12 of the curb cut onto Washington Street right out
13 onto Washington Street I'd hate to think of the
14 traffic congestion if somebody then tried to turn
15 left going eastwards on Washington Street there.

16 If it's only right turn then
17 people have got to go all the way down to Hunt Club
18 and up Hunt Club to come back to go west to go back
19 east. So I'm not convinced that the access to the
20 site is going to not increase the already large
21 traffic delays that you have on Washington Street.

22 MS. THOMA: Barbara Thuma, 1883
23 Gatewood. I'm wondering, there is this talk about
24 an entertainment village going in that area also

159

1 and has shown that there's a need for improvement.

2 Have there been any conversations
3 between the entertainment village or the post
4 office with the Lake County Department of
5 Transportation or any kind of coordination of
6 widening? Somehow they can all get together and
7 maybe widen Washington Street to accommodate some
8 of the traffic.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.

10 MS. COURSHON: Round two. Mary
11 Courshon, 55 Silo Court.

12 The gentleman did express that

13 previously the property that's immediately next to
14 the post office currently was viewed as a
15 possibility for expansion and such and because of
16 berms and some of the other things that were
17 required I'm presuming this has also something to
18 do with zoning and changing zoning and being
19 flexible to change the requirements, et cetera, et
20 cetera.

21 I don't know, if we're going to be
22 changing zoning to do one thing, why don't we
23 change zoning to just expand where they already
24 live?

160

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Thank you.

2 MR. DOLSLAW: My name is Gary Dolslaw
3 (phonetic). I live at 6177 Brittany Court. I'm a
4 new resident actually to the Village of Gurnee.

5 I bought my house in Winchester
6 Estates just last October and bought it really
7 because I really fell in love with the area and
8 some of the buildings and architecture in the area
9 and really loved the house. And the whole
10 neighborhood actually is semi-custom homes and
11 they're not inexpensive.

12 When I heard about the post office
13 coming in of course I didn't see any plans or any

14 details about anything and wondered a little bit
15 about how the traffic could possibly be handled on
16 Washington and Cemetery considering now when I try
17 to leave Winchester Estates and get onto Washington
18 it can take an awful long time because the traffic
19 lights at Cemetery back up Washington all the way
20 to Hunt Club Road.

21 And now we're going to have
22 semi-trailers. I don't even know how you're going
23 to get a semi-trailer down Cemetery Road. It's a
24 little country road. And you're going to be

161

1 pulling those into a parking lot that looks like
2 it's going to hold like 150 trucks or something
3 making noise from early in the morning until late
4 in the evening with overhead lights going, who
5 knows, 24 hours a day.

6 I'm really quite shocked that the
7 community is even planning this. I agree with
8 Kristina, I mean the post office is the heart of
9 the community. All the communities I've ever lived
10 in the post office is by the village hall, by the
11 public library. It's a place where people go to
12 take care of their community related or their
13 affairs. And it's a central focal point of the
14 community.

15 And now you're going to move it
16 into an area that is residential, that has a
17 certain styling of buildings. And if you go across
18 Washington and look at the complex there where the
19 doctors' offices are and everything there's a
20 certain look and feel. And now we're going to
21 build a post office.

22 As nice as the new design on
23 Washington is, it looks like a huge red warehouse.
24 And that's exactly what we're going to see there

162

1 now.

2 I'm very disappointed in the way we
3 saw the plans and everything. I don't think it was
4 communicated to the public well. I don't think
5 anybody in the neighborhood realizes the
6 massiveness of this parking lot that's going to be
7 put behind our very expensive homes that in the
8 winter regardless of the tree line you can see that
9 field as clear as day.

10 And just shocked. Obviously, the
11 house is going to plummet in value as will the
12 neighborhood. It's really disappointing to see the
13 community planning in that way in a disjointed
14 manner, putting key facilities in various locations
15 making it less accessible and the poor traffic

16 planning. There are a lot of issues that still
17 need to be discussed here. Thanks.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you. Anyone
19 else? Yes, ma'am.

20 MS. MILLER: Theresa Miller, 6177
21 Brittany Court.

22 I'd like to add that we moved from
23 Crystal Lake actually and the post office there was
24 a beautiful place actually and it's built in a

163

1 commercial industrial area very far away from any
2 homes.

3 I don't think that post office
4 impacted homes in the Crystal Lake area at all and
5 I don't see why the post office is not moving onto
6 the O'Plaine Washington area that the gentleman
7 said that they had looked into at one point. I
8 mean it seems a perfectly logical place. There's a
9 library there and the existing post office and the
10 Village Hall.

11 There's certainly adequate, you
12 know, the two main streets to be going in and out
13 of the post office on. And it seems like that is
14 the most logical place for it rather than moving it
15 way out into, you know, a perfectly lovely
16 residential area. I think that it's actually very

17 poor planning. Thank you.

18 MR. BARRY SMITH: Barry Smith, 34710
19 Cemetery Road. My mom's property does face it on
20 the one north. Side and I guess the concerns that,
21 you know, looking at the plan here now there's not
22 a lot of detail to it but for berming wise what
23 type of screening is going to be put into the north
24 side and the west side.

164

1 Is there going to be any berms
2 going in there on the west side and the north?

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Actually, we'll get
4 into that. That's a good point. That's been
5 brought up by the people whether there would be
6 some fencing or berming.

7 MR. BARRY SMITH: Some sort of elevation
8 wise to keep sound.

9 And I guess the next thing is
10 lighting. Is this going to be like security
11 lighting or is this going to be like Osco's
12 lighting or it's going to be on all the time?

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We did get a lighting
14 plan.

15 MR. BARRY SMITH: Yeah, I see the last
16 one shows. And then I guess traffic would be the
17 next -- the next main one on Cemetery Road, how

18 wide are they going to widen -- how wide are they
19 going to widen it?

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'm sorry, how wide are
21 what?

22 MR. BARRY SMITH: Are they going to
23 widen it, to what point to allow all the traffic
24 coming in and out?

165

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You mean are they going
2 to widen Cemetery you said?

3 MR. BARRY SMITH: Correct, yes. And
4 basically that's about it. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

6 MR. SUGINO: If I may. As far as
7 Cemetery Road is concerned, we'll be completely
8 reconstructing the Cemetery Road for the depth of
9 the parking and it will be 600 some odd feet. We
10 will be meeting the Illinois state highway design
11 requirements.

12 And also another information
13 regarding the traffic, some gentleman mentioned the
14 semis. As far as this facility is concerned, we
15 receive only nine trips by the semis a day, that's
16 all there is as far as Cemetery is concerned.

17 MS. COURSHON: What time of the day?

18 MR. MILTON: What time?

19 MR. SUGINO: One at between 3 and 4
20 o'clock in the morning. One at 5 to 6, one at 8
21 and 9, one at 10 and 11, one at 12 and 1 o'clock.
22 Two between 1 and 2 and one 3 and 4 and one more
23 between 5 and 6.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Wait. Wait. This is

166

1 not a debate here.

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I want to ask one
3 more question.

4 Does the post office store fuel on
5 their property as well?

6 MR. KENNY: No, we discontinued that
7 practice some time ago.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So just the
9 drainage from the vehicles will be impacting the
10 surrounding area.

11 MR. KENNY: Drainage from the vehicles?

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The spillage and
13 leaks and oil leaks and the things like that.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: See, now we don't want
15 to get into debate.

16 MR. KENNY: I don't know that we have
17 that.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: If you have a question,
19 I didn't close the floor to the public yet.

20 Is there anyone else that has a
21 question or a comment? Okay. The floor is closed
22 to the public.

23 And I think obviously the -- you
24 know, there was a concern about the traffic

167

1 situation. I don't know if -- Mr. Winter.

2 MR. WINTER: I think a good point was
3 brought up on Washington Street. And I just
4 wonder, and I'll make this available to those
5 people.

6 This does show a retention pond,
7 the lighting one, the lighting map we have. Am I
8 correct in that this is a retention pond?

9 MR. SUGINO: Yes.

10 MR. KENNY: Yes, at the north end of the
11 property.

12 MR. WINTER: As far as the parking as a
13 possible alternative -- and I agree with everybody
14 else that you're going to have to look into that --
15 even if you had a circle down here like they do at
16 the library so that you're just not backing in and
17 backing out, and it looks like you might have some
18 room here because I'm wondering about Washington
19 Street as well. Being so close to the intersection
20 I don't know that the County is going to let you

21 have a curb cut on that.

22 But to have some easier way for
23 that traffic to reroute itself to get out of that
24 parking lot.

168

1 MR. KENNY: If it's mechanical in
2 nature and if it's achievable I don't think we have
3 any objection to doing it. We just have to know
4 what that input is.

5 Nothing in this drawing at this
6 particular point in time unless it's mandated for
7 us to incorporate into our facility like number of
8 parking spaces allocated for employees, number of
9 parking spaces for handicapped personnel, et
10 cetera, and people, there's some flexibility in
11 this.

12 What we need is some feedback
13 through the Village and the administration and, you
14 know, the planning department and that to let us
15 know what those thoughts are. Nothing I don't
16 think is not achievable.

17 MR. WINTER: As a follow up, too, with
18 regards to the residential perimeter has there been
19 any discussion about berming?

20 MR. KENNY: We have had some discussions
21 in our office about berming. And again, that's an

22 architectural feature that could be designed into
23 it and possibly achieved to minimize, you know, any
24 potential, you know, complaints from the neighbors

169

1 or to try to put up some sort of a nice landscaping
2 buffer.

3 One thing we do have, and that's in
4 our existing post office, is we have a number of
5 residential units directly behind and adjacent to
6 our post office.

7 And to the best of my knowledge I
8 have never heard a complaint out of any of those
9 residential people in the deliveries that Frank
10 recited in our traffic plan right now with one
11 between 3 and 4 or 2 or 3. Whatever it was, you
12 know, we have that currently. That is currently
13 taking place right now.

14 There isn't going to be any change
15 or drastic modification to our operational plans as
16 a result of this new building that isn't already
17 going on.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other -- Ms.
19 Kovarik.

20 MS. KOVARIK: The housing that backs up
21 to the post office now is multi-family, right?

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That's correct.

23 MS. KOVARIK: So it's not single
24 family.

170

1 MR. KENNY: But we don't receive the
2 complaints with any kind of dieseling or decibels
3 or whatever.

4 MS. KOVARIK: But there is a difference
5 when you're looking at zoning changes when we're
6 look at densities. I would like to have a copy of
7 the traffic study before I make a decision on this
8 issue.

9 And I know you talked about being
10 willing to make a lot of changes, but before I
11 would vote I'd like to see those changes on paper
12 as far as signage and ingress and egress and the
13 buffering and the fence.

14 I wouldn't feel comfortable voting
15 without actually having seen it, especially the
16 traffic study because Washington is horrendous,
17 it's a nightmare any more.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yeah, I think that -- I
19 don't know how the other Commissioners feel but I
20 think we might want to have more information on the
21 traffic and the plan work.

22 I think I'd like to see a better
23 plan with the traffic circulation and also more

24 details on exactly what you're going to do to

171

1 buffer this from the residents. And also, you
2 know, maybe some presentation to show what these
3 things look like rather than just, you know, kind
4 of talking about them. And also some commitment on
5 the sign and kind of make things a little more
6 concrete.

7 I don't know how the other
8 Commissioners feel. Mr. Sula.

9 MR. SULA: One thing I would be
10 interested in hearing is I agree with the comment
11 that was made earlier that it's going to look like
12 a large one story industrial building.

13 Are there any elevation choices or
14 alternatives here? There are other public
15 buildings that are already in the community, some
16 which are recently built with pitch roofs and are a
17 more fitting setting to the surrounding community.

18 MR. KENNY: Our current plans are
19 standardized except for selection of brick. The
20 entrances are standardized. Architectural features
21 on the entrances are standardized.

22 They have to meet certain criteria
23 under Federal guidelines developed by the post
24 office out of Washington and so there's very little

1 flexibility in design.

2 MR. SULA: I interpret --

3 MR. KENNY: I apologize again, you know,
4 if you're used to getting more comprehensive plans
5 than what we've provided. We went by what we
6 thought or what we interpreted from the Village
7 administration to be sufficient.

8 The post office, the Postal Service
9 by virtue of its nature being a Federal agency is
10 not necessarily geared like the Jewel-Oscos in
11 developing thousands and hundreds of thousands of
12 dollars in renderings and drawings, et cetera, in
13 advance of a project.

14 We typically are not mandated under
15 the Constitution to comply with local zoning and
16 ordinances, et cetera so the steps we're going
17 through here by virtue of the nature of being a
18 Federal agency are somewhat reversed on us and
19 we've had to reverse and change gears and try to
20 meet the needs of the Village in anticipation of
21 this meeting.

22 So it's -- it's a little bit
23 awkward for us but we try to address the issues
24 with what we thought would be sufficient.

1 MR. SULA: I guess to get back to my
2 question now.

3 Could we possibly explore those
4 areas where there's a little flexibility to somehow
5 deal with the aesthetics?

6 MR. KENNY: As I mentioned with regard
7 to the building itself other than the selection of
8 bricks many of the features are already decided for
9 us in Washington, they come out of a publication,
10 there's very little flexibility.

11 To meet individual communities'
12 desires and criteria if somebody wanted a red brick
13 colonial with four pillars in front of it as an
14 example, we don't have that flexibility. If they
15 wanted a pitched roof versus a flat roof, we don't
16 have that flexibility.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I guess I'm not sure
18 what flexibility --

19 MR. KENNY: One of the issues I would
20 like to bring out, I don't mean to interrupt you,
21 is that the Federal Government, we have been on
22 this project for two and a half years. We have
23 spent a great deal of time trying to search out a
24 site.

1 I have spent numerous meetings up
2 here in the Village with the Village
3 administration. We have put out numbers of public
4 advertisements.

5 Our concept of building a new post
6 office in Gurnee has been highly publicized. You
7 have been approached by other developers in the
8 concepts to meet the needs of the post office. We
9 don't have -- our fiscal year is up September 10th
10 or 12th. We have this money budgeted for this
11 fiscal year.

12 We are on a cash basis. We either
13 spend it or we lose it. I don't know if this
14 project will come around in one more year, three
15 more years or five more years. I don't have
16 that -- make that decision. But I do know we're on
17 a cash basis and I do know that we have money
18 allocated to spend for this project this fiscal
19 year. If we don't spend it, I don't know when our
20 district will get back to it.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I don't know that
22 we want to get into the financing of the project.

23 MR. KENNY: No, but I have to.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I understand. But, you

1 know, we're trying -- we're trying to work with
2 you. I mean I think this is our building, too.
3 This is what we're paying for as taxpayers.

4 And I guess my question was going
5 to be what flexibility do we have? I don't
6 understand what flexibility we have. It seems like
7 every time we ask a question we can't do it because
8 Washington wants it a certain way but then you say
9 you're willing to work with us but --

10 MR. KENNY: We will work with you on
11 landscaping.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Only one of us can talk
13 at a time because there's a court reporter.

14 And so I guess we're just trying to
15 find out what is the flexibility that you have.
16 And we don't want to -- obviously the traffic is a
17 major concern. We don't want to get into a
18 situation like we did in the first post office
19 where the traffic flow was a nightmare. And we're
20 just trying to avoid that.

21 And our traffic planner will work
22 with you, but I think I agree with Kristy, we want
23 to see these things before we put our stamp of
24 approval on it because at this point I don't know

1 what we've got.

2 MR. KENNY: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And they don't have to
4 be color renderings. You can make -- I'm just
5 saying that maybe they could make an enlargement so
6 that we can discuss it more easily and you can show
7 us what you're talking about when you describe
8 certain traffic flows or something like that.

9 We're not asking for a fancy
10 presentation like Jewel puts on, we're just -- we
11 just want to communicate, that's all.

12 MR. KENNY: As far as flexibility is
13 concerned, we have flexibility in site adapt,
14 ingress and egress, parking lot layout within the
15 constraints offered by the property itself and the
16 location of the property in proximity to an
17 intersection and the distances off.

18 We have flexibility in some berming
19 and applying some berming and providing adequate
20 screening, you know, at the desires of the Board.

21 We don't have a lot of
22 architectural flexibility. We could relocate and
23 redesign this site to try to fit all of the
24 features that we have here in the way that they're

1 featured in this particular drawing in some other

2 fashion. And I don't know that it's not
3 achievable if it was looked at from a different
4 perspective with a different eye from somebody
5 within the Village administration or planning and
6 development or something like that.

7 We would entertain that and we
8 would look at that and we would try to -- if it was
9 more practical and feasible we would certainly
10 address it and apply it.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Well, this is
12 part of the process, too, because this is part of
13 the Village here and we give feedback and, you
14 know, we try to work with our staff and we trust
15 our staff in many areas but we're trying to give
16 some feedback to you right now.

17 We're also trying to give feedback
18 to staff so then they know when they go back to
19 work with you what direction we want them to go in.
20 And that's what we're trying to do now, we're just
21 trying to go through that process. So Mr. Sula.

22 MR. SULA: Just given some of the things
23 that you can and can't deal with in terms of
24 flexibility here, it would seem to me a more

178

1 natural place for this thing to be located would be
2 in the Grand Tri-State office complex much similar

3 to the way the Lincolnshire post office is.

4 MR. KENNY: Right on. But you know
5 what, I investigated that and I met with them and I
6 tried to buy some property. There was nothing
7 available, they wouldn't sell it.

8 So that property that was available
9 further from Tri-State south of us and they tried
10 to configure a couple other parcels that are owned
11 by different owners and they tried to assemble it.

12 Prior to my investigation here I
13 discussed it with the staff and the administration
14 here in the Village Hall, it was not achievable.

15 Also I discussed it with the
16 property that's diagonal directly from the Holiday
17 Inn, I can't remember the owners' names at this
18 time, and they entertained it and I talked with
19 their consultant, their real estate consultants and
20 they would not offer.

21 So I have gone through and your
22 Village administration is familiar with all of the
23 different parcels of property that we have looked
24 at and examined. And many of which we had looked

179

1 at as options or alternatives to this were somewhat
2 suggested that we not entertain those as possible
3 locations.

4 When I mentioned this location it
5 was highly suggested and recommended it would be a
6 good location.

7 MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman.

8 MR. KENNY: We pursued it on that basis.

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yes, Mr. Foster.

10 MR. FOSTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 I had kind of just decided that I
12 really would just be quiet probably respecting the
13 hour, but since I delayed my family vacation
14 because I thought this meeting tonight was very
15 important what do I have to lose.

16 I have to say this for the minutes,
17 I think I took kind of a resigned attitude that
18 based on the fact this was a Federal entity there
19 was probably not much that we can do. And that
20 seems to be what we're hearing.

21 And I will just say this for the
22 record. First, I agree wholeheartedly with what
23 Ms. Kovarik says, I do feel that the post office is
24 a central centerpiece of any community. I think it

180

1 makes an extremely important community statement
2 how our post office looks.

3 I thought that the post office in
4 Buffalo Grove, for example, is a very attractive

5 post office that fits in with the town center
6 concept in Buffalo Grove. And I just have a gut
7 feeling that this is probably a mistake in terms of
8 this location.

9 I do sense that there's a lot of
10 direction that's been given to you, sir. And, you
11 know, I'm not trying to say by who or by what. I'm
12 being honest with myself tonight as a Commissioner,
13 I do not see any difference between what I would be
14 voting on in this decision than our previous
15 decision around the Jewel store.

16 Perhaps the makers here are not as
17 well organized but I happen to think that the
18 impact of this on Winchester Estates or whoever
19 else is around there is just as significant.

20 I would envision that from mid
21 October to Christmas you will have a tremendous
22 traffic situation because the post office is a
23 tremendous generator of traffic. I do believe
24 that, you know, as taxpayers in this country that

181

1 this unit of government should be responsive to
2 some of our wishes and desires.

3 And just personally speaking one of
4 my wishes and desires is that it has an
5 architectural significance. And that two, I really

6 would have loved to have seen it being at the
7 center. I was extremely disappointed when
8 apparently those plans did not work out. That
9 would really be my desire. Or as you suggested,
10 sir, in the Grand Tri-State -- or as Mr. Sula
11 suggested.

12 So I guess I'm just simply going on
13 record as saying that I do have concerns. I'm
14 taking this position as a Commissioner so, you
15 know, if I feel uncomfortable with something I will
16 say it for the record because if something gets
17 constructed, as a resident of this town if I drive
18 by it, if I look at it and if I had something to do
19 with it in terms of the planning process I want to
20 be comfortable with saying I either was with it or
21 I was not.

22 And I do feel that the residents
23 here have a legitimate concern. I do think there's
24 going to be a lot of people that will be looking at

182

1 the employee parking lot and the trucks and the
2 postal vehicles.

3 And, you know, I'm not sure that
4 will ever get really heard or understood, but I do
5 sympathize with that and I just think that traffic
6 wise I think with this site in terms of the kind of

7 vision we have for Gurnee as a community is not
8 that site.

9 So I'm kind of like this, if we're
10 going to spend our money, let's spend it in the way
11 it makes the most sense and not just by a gut
12 feeling that I feel that this makes the most sense.
13 You may have to go on and do it, but I at least
14 want to get this off my chest because I'm here
15 tonight. Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Anyone else?

17 MR. SMITH: I feel exactly like Lyle.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You feel exactly the
19 same. That's good. That's what I like to hear.
20 Short and to the point.

21 MS. KOVARIK: Are all the sites in Auto
22 Nation unavailable? Did they sell every site in
23 there? I mean that's another type of commercial --

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Can you speak into the

183

1 mic.

2 MS. KOVARIK: I'm sorry. The Auto
3 Nation site with that access road is kind of
4 similar to Grand Tri-State and it's off Grand.

5 Is there enough sites left in
6 there?

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You know, I don't know

8 what process was gone through to locate this site.

9 MR. KENNY: Excuse me, we physically
10 went out there and examined it and I met with the
11 property owners, I met with their agents.

12 We discussed various properties.
13 There is only several that could be assembled. One
14 owner was holding out and he would not participate.
15 The properties, the principal of the Tri-State park
16 would not sell the properties to the post office,
17 he wanted more signature presence there and not a
18 post office. I exhausted that opportunity.

19 I also exhausted the opportunity,
20 as I mentioned, kitty-corner to the Holiday Inn. I
21 don't remember those particular peoples' names but
22 they dragged their feet and they weren't sold on
23 this and historically that's their nature.

24 MS. KOVARIK: What about the Auto Nation

184

1 parcels? What was there, eleven lots in there?
2 Dilley's and Grand. It's just now -- they just now
3 put in the road.

4 MR. KENNY: I don't know. They weren't
5 interested in the time in talking to us.

6 We have been on this project for
7 two and a half years. I don't know what their
8 motivation may or may not have been.

9 See, one of the problems is that
10 way back to the original discussions of us trying
11 to locate a parcel right here on O'Plaine Road and
12 that was our initial endeavor because we thought --
13 and I specifically thought it was a heck of a good
14 location but I couldn't get participation on the
15 part of ownership.

16 So we can't necessarily appease all
17 the people in town to try to do what they want us
18 to do and still try to deliver the mail of which
19 we're discharged to do under the Constitution and
20 try to provide the best facility to do it and go
21 around trying to, you know, to get people to sell
22 property they don't want to sell which was the case
23 in point right here on O'Plaine Road and
24 Washington.

185

1 MR. SMITH: I guess my question is you
2 say you have nowhere to move on the architectural
3 but did you have anything to do with the one in
4 Buffalo Grove?

5 MR. KENNY: Pardon me?

6 MR. SMITH: Did you build the one in
7 Buffalo Grove?

8 MR. KENNY: As a matter of fact I did
9 with the Village of Buffalo Grove. They financed

10 the construction of it.

11 MR. SMITH: How can they have a
12 different looking one that's not cut out of a
13 cookie cutter?

14 MR. KENNY: Because we had a change in
15 administration. At that time we had a Postmaster
16 General by the name of Tony Fran in California. He
17 was a very progressive individual and he permitted
18 us to have certain flexibility then. Then came in
19 Bob Lorenzen and he was here for six years and he
20 took that flexibility out and standardized.

21 And those are the standards which
22 we're currently operating under. I would be happy
23 to sit here and say in consideration give us the
24 annexation and the zoning, we'll build whatever you

186

1 want to build, I'd love to make that consideration.
2 I'd love to come out and build a Buffalo Grove. I
3 use Buffalo Grove as an example of a project that
4 I've done and I'm very proud of. But I don't have
5 that flexibility any longer.

6 MR. FOSTER: Well, I guess I'm not
7 totally crazy because you cite that as a good
8 example, too.

9 MR. WINTER: Mr. Chairman, point of
10 order. If the request is just for the zoning, this

11 is for zoning as to public use, correct?

12 MR. KENNY: That's all I want to do
13 right now, sir. We don't want to design it, we
14 don't want to do anything with it, but we just want
15 to get it in as a parcel and work out whatever we
16 got to do to work it out.

17 MR. WINTER: As far as staff is
18 concerned I mean as far as berming, making sure it
19 fits or taking into consideration the residential
20 nature of this area, there would be sufficient
21 hearings for that or approval processes down the
22 line if --

23 MR. WILDENBERG: No. If you zone it
24 public land, the post office is a use by right.

187

1 They come in and meet the zoning district standards
2 and there are -- there are no other meetings if
3 they come in for permit and they build according to
4 the standards.

5 That is one of the dilemmas with
6 going with that zoning approach. I think that's
7 why one of the suggestions is to try to look at
8 doing something in the special use nature that may
9 allow us to tie in the development standards.

10 MR. KENNY: I don't want to create any
11 kind of a disharmony, but the issue of zoning is

12 not really -- from an operational standpoint is not
13 really important to the post office, recognizing
14 its Federal sovereignty and the rights granted
15 under the U.S. Constitution.

16 We don't zone property when we buy
17 property. If it's residential property, we pay
18 residential prices for it. We can build -- as a
19 Federal entity we can build on residentially zoned
20 property. That's not the question.

21 The question here as far as the
22 post office is concerned is annexation and
23 annexation for the use of public utilities. If
24 we're located in the County we could get public

188

1 utilities and access the public utilities to that
2 site, we may not even have to stand here and talk
3 about annexation or the question of zoning.

4 MR. WINTER: Jon, is that accurate?

5 MR. WILDENBERG: Yeah, yes.

6 MR. WINTER: I was asking our staff
7 person.

8 MR. WILDENBERG: Yeah.

9 MR. WINTER: Are you suggesting that
10 that would be the alternative if you're not
11 successful?

12 MR. KENNY: No. No, I didn't say that.

13 I just wanted to answer the gentleman's statement.

14 MR. WILDENBERG: The annexation
15 procedure under Illinois Statutes allows the
16 municipality we believe the opportunity to enter
17 into a pre-annexation agreement with an entity and
18 enter into a contract and establish development
19 standards.

20 And I think that's -- if this
21 project moves along it will at a minimum be a
22 pre-annexation agreement of some kind that lays out
23 the development parameters regardless of whatever
24 zoning we should designate.

189

1 So it's a tricky issue given their
2 sovereignty, okay, that's a little different to
3 deal with versus what we usually look at when we're
4 dealing with private entities coming in like Jewel
5 and so forth.

6 So it's something that we have to
7 try to create the best site plan possible with the
8 tools we have available, you know, regardless.

9 MR. WINTER: Well, my concern is if the
10 post office is determined to go ahead with this
11 site, you know, to facilitate as much input as we
12 can instead of, you know, saying we don't want it
13 there and --

15 I think we need more details. And hopefully maybe
16 we can start getting the message across that
17 there's got to be a better site in our community.
18 We have so many --

19 MR. KENNY: Sir --

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: -- available.

21 MR. KENNY: Sir, I wish I would have
22 come up here in front of you two and a half years
23 ago, okay. And I wish I would have gotten the
24 participation that I solicited out of the Village

191

1 two and a half years ago about locating a suitable
2 site within this community.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, nobody ever asked
4 me two and a half years ago so I don't know.

5 MR. WINTER: As far as your deadline,
6 you mentioned some September date.

7 If we were to continue this to our
8 next meeting -- well, would you need to have
9 approval by the Board of Trustees by this September
10 date?

11 MR. KENNY: I need annexation, sir, for
12 the utilities.

13 MR. WINTER: And I thought you said you
14 had a date for this project.

15 MR. KENNY: We have a budgetary date and

16 the end of our fiscal year is September. Our
17 cutoff is in alignment. Our cutoff date is several
18 weeks before the end of the fiscal year for the
19 Federal government as a Federal agency, independent
20 Federal agency. So our cutoff date is like
21 February 10th or 12th -- September 10th or 12th I
22 mean.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think that you only
24 have one Village Board meeting where they can vote

192

1 on this and that's August 17th and I don't think
2 you can get notices out in time anyway even if this
3 was approved tonight. I don't think you could make
4 your date.

5 There's no Village Board meeting
6 on, what is it, September 7th because that's Labor
7 Day. So there's only one -- there's only one
8 Village Board meeting and that wouldn't be time to
9 get the notices out.

10 MR. KENNY: I guess that's the way it
11 goes. I have no jurisdiction over it, I have no
12 control over it so I don't know what to tell you.
13 This has been ongoing and we've been trying to meet
14 the criteria of the Village and trying to move this
15 thing along for months so.

16 MS. KOVARIK: Have you had the money for

17 the last two and a half years and now you're going
18 to lose it or you can't include it in the '99
19 budget?

20 MR. KENNY: I can't include it in. We
21 have no guarantee it will available.

22 MS. KOVARIK: So it was in only in the
23 '98 budget if you found the property?

24 MR. KENNY: I started this project in

193

1 '95 with the intention of trying to find a site in
2 '96 and '97. There was money available in those
3 years. I have no guarantee that the money will be
4 available in '98 because we have other projects
5 coming on stream and I don't know what our
6 operating district will do if they're turned down
7 on this particular zoning.

8 See, that -- I'm a real estate
9 broker internal within the Post Office so to speak
10 if you can get that business picture. I have
11 operating districts that direct me as to what they
12 want to do, they're my customer. And they can just
13 as easily set this aside and go work on other
14 projects or try to readdress it.

15 MS. KOVARIK: Without the traffic study
16 I don't think we can make an informed decision as
17 to whether that's an appropriate location or not.

18 At minimum, you know, we'll have to address the
19 ingress and egress.

20 MR. KENNY: We turned over a traffic
21 study just recently. I don't think there was
22 anything within that study that indicated any kind
23 of tremendous adversity.

24 Especially pending, you know, the

194

1 improvements that we were going to make to Cemetery
2 Road and widening Cemetery Road 600 feet.

3 MS. KOVARIK: Washington is bad.

4 MR. KENNY: With sidewalks.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Now, Jon, are we going
6 to -- I mean how long is it going to take, you said
7 you had some concerns on the traffic.

8 How long is that going to take to
9 iron out?

10 Are you working with our traffic
11 consultant and the post office in advising them on
12 what to do? How is this working?

13 MR. WILDENBERG: The Village engineer
14 has looked at it and he has the initial concerns
15 and our traffic consultant will also have input.

16 But this, believe it or not, is
17 not, you know, a large scale project. We've got a
18 30,000 square foot office building here on six

19 acres of property. I'm not a traffic engineer, but
20 just in seeing projects over the years my gut
21 feeling is that there is going to be a way to
22 technically afford very ready ingress and egress to
23 the property and not affect the street systems as
24 they're currently flowing.

195

1 And they do have to make
2 improvements to Cemetery Road. So my gut feeling
3 is that those traffic issues will technically be
4 resolved or that there will be a technical
5 resolution to them. Unfortunately, I can't tell
6 you exactly what those resolutions are sitting here
7 right now, but we will come to them and then we
8 will be able to get back to you.

9 MR. WINTER: Mr. Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Winter.

11 MR. WINTER: I guess my thought is that
12 we should come to some resolution in light of the
13 hour. My thought is to make a motion or have
14 someone else make a motion.

15 Or does staff really think that
16 it's going to help us to have another meeting on
17 this?

18 MR. WILDENBERG: Well, that's kind of
19 your call.

20 MR. WINTER: Well, I will say this. I
21 am not necessarily in favor of waiting for a
22 traffic study based on what you've said tonight,
23 based on, you know, what we know about the size of
24 this building and our familiarity with some other

196

1 things in our past experience.

2 So I would not be inclined to wait
3 for the traffic study and then just vote it up or
4 down and move on a recommendation to the Board of
5 Trustees. They will be able to read all of our
6 criticisms of this proposal and make their
7 decision.

8 But because of the urgency that is
9 being suggested here and some other factors, I
10 don't know that we're going to be able to do much
11 more on it other than advise staff to monitor this
12 and keep working on it and see what the Board of
13 Trustees want to do with it.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Why don't we maybe
15 follow the suggestion I had earlier where we
16 would -- it sounds like the consensus is that we
17 would want to advise the Board that they should
18 urge the post office to find a different location
19 and we think this location is a bad location for
20 the post office.

21 But given the fact that we may be
22 required to accept them at that location these
23 issues must be addressed by the staff, it must be
24 resolved. The traffic situation must be resolved

197

1 to the agreement of our staff, the buffer area to
2 the residents, our lighting standards must be met
3 and the signage must eliminate the sign at the
4 corner.

5 MR. WINTER: I'll so move, make that
6 motion. What are you suggesting in terms of the
7 actual as far as zoning? Are you addressing the
8 public versus C/B-1?

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I would say we should
10 really keep it either public or C/O-1 because in
11 our comprehensive plan that's what is called for
12 and I would just --

13 I think any of those zonings could
14 be handled within the annexation agreement, but I
15 don't know, I don't feel comfortable going with a
16 C/B-1.

17 MR. WINTER: How about C/O-1 because
18 that seems like we might have a chance of retaining
19 some control over it versus public then.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Would that be
21 acceptable to staff?

22 MR. SMITH: I'll second that motion.
23 MR. SULA: Can I ask a question?
24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We're up to discussion

198

1 on the motion.

2 MR. SULA: I'm not sure if the motion is
3 to send a favorable or an unfavorable
4 recommendation.

5 MR. WILDENBERG: You can send a report.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think we can just
7 send a recommendation to the Village Board being
8 that they urge the post office to locate in a
9 different site, that we feel this site is
10 inappropriate for the post office in our community.

11 And however, if because of legal
12 considerations that the post office will be able to
13 basically go in there despite what we say, then
14 these issues must be addressed. And I think that
15 we have those pretty well defined on the record.

16 Is there anything else that anyone
17 thinks needs to be added?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Jon, why don't you go
20 through what we've got here.

21 MR. WILDENBERG: Resolution of traffic
22 improvements with a traffic study dealing with

23 buffer enhancements, fencing, lighting, removal of
24 the pylon sign at the corner and recommendation of

199

1 underlying C/O-1 zoning.

2 MS. KOVARIK: Ingress and egress.

3 MR. WILDENBERG: That would be included
4 within the traffic study and necessary
5 improvements.

6 MR. SULA: And given the architectural
7 limitations a more suitable location.

8 MR. WILDENBERG: I think that's kind of
9 in a preamble to that.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: They went through the
11 architectural considerations, there was one way --

12 MR. SULA: Well, if I heard properly
13 there's no flexibility other than a one story
14 flattened building. And I think there was concern
15 as to what that impact had on the -- the impact of
16 putting that there would have on the local area.

17 MS. KOVARIK: It's going to look like a
18 warehouse.

19 MR. SULA: If it's going to look like a
20 warehouse it should be in a warehouse area.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Got that, Jon?

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think the Board
23 had already sent a letter.

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: It's already seconded,
2 but we have a motion by Mr. Winter and seconded by
3 Mr. Smith. And I think we've got the motion pretty
4 well defined.

5 All those in favor of the motion
6 signify by saying aye in the roll call; those
7 opposed nay. Roll call, please.

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: Winter.

15 MR. WINTER: Aye.

16 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.

17 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

18 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.

19 MR. SMITH: Aye.

20 MR. WILDENBERG: Chairman Rudny.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye.

22 Motion carries and it is so
23 ordered.

24 MR. KENNY: Thank you very much.

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We still have three
2 more matters. Do we continue on? It's only 11:30.
3 What's your pleasure? Do you want to continue?
4 All right.

5 The next matter is the public
6 hearing of McDonald's. The subject property
7 consists of 2.3 acres located at the northeast
8 corner of Hunt Club Road and Washington Street. A
9 portion of the property is zoned E Estate in
10 unincorporated Lake County while the remainder of
11 the property is zoned R-1 Single Family in Gurnee.

12 The Petitioner is seeking approval
13 to rezone the property to a combination of C/B-2
14 Community Business District and C/O-1 Restricted
15 Office District. A McDonald's restaurant and
16 office building is proposed for the site.

17 A special use permit is also
18 requested to allow the establishment and operation
19 of a drive-thru window for the proposed McDonald's
20 restaurant. I think it sounds like it was a
21 McDonald's office building, but it's a separate
22 office building.

23 Jon, do you have anything to add?

24 MR. WILDENBERG: No. I think we've seen

1 or dealt with this petition a couple times before.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So again this is a
3 public hearing so anyone who is going to be with
4 the Petitioner giving testimony and also anyone
5 from the public who wishes to make a comment or ask
6 a question needs to stand and be sworn in by the
7 Village attorney.

8 (Witnesses sworn.)

9 MR. EIDEN: Good evening. My name is
10 Mark Eiden, E-i-d-e-n. I'm the attorney for
11 McDonald's on this project. The project is located
12 at Hunt Club Road and Washington Street, northeast
13 corner.

14 The property currently consists of
15 three parcels that are all equal size. They're 132
16 by 330 feet and they're roughly here, here and
17 here. The western most parcel is already in the
18 Village and is zoned R-1. The two parcels to the
19 east are in the County. They're zoned Estate.

20 The Petitioner proposes to take all
21 three parcels and subdivide them into two lots
22 which this is Lot 1, this is Lot 2. The request is
23 to zone Lot 1 into a C/B-2 District for a
24 McDonald's restaurant with a drive-thru. Plans --

1 detailed plans have been submitted to staff and we
2 have those plans with us this evening.

3 Lot 2 to the east we propose to
4 zone C/O-1. We have no current plans at this time,
5 however staff has requested that since we don't
6 have plans for what would be built here which would
7 essentially be in the nature of an office building
8 that we propose specific development standards for
9 any structure on that property.

10 We have worked those standards out
11 with staff. We have included them in our draft of
12 the annexation agreement since this is an
13 annexation with respect to the two eastern most
14 parcels. And in that way we try to make whatever
15 is built here compatible with what we propose for
16 Lot 1.

17 Additionally, this evening in
18 addition to the rezoning we are seeking a special
19 use on Lot 1 for the drive-thru for McDonald's. I
20 have submitted to the Village some months ago our
21 petition for rezoning and our petition for special
22 use and in those petitions we addressed the several
23 tests that are applicable with respect to rezoning
24 and special use.

1 I could go through our responses to
2 each of those, but in the interest of time if you
3 have those petitions and if you've read them I
4 could merely incorporate them into my testimony by
5 reference or I'll go through the highlights. I'll
6 do that at your pleasure.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I would say go the
8 shortest way and the Commissioners will ask
9 questions if they want details. We have all the
10 information and I think most of us have had a
11 chance to review it so.

12 MR. EIDEN: I'm not one of those who
13 likes to hear myself speak so I'll be abbreviated.

14 We have submitted, as I said, the
15 petitions for rezoning, for special use, we have
16 submitted petitions for annexation of the two
17 eastern parcels and a draft annexation agreement
18 which again includes the restrictions on the
19 eastern most parcel for which there are no proposed
20 plans at this point.

21 We've also dealt quite a bit with
22 staff. We've responded to every request that
23 they've made of us I think to their satisfaction.
24 We intend to comply or have complied with the plans

1 that we've presented so far with the Village sign,
2 parking, lighting and landscape ordinances so there
3 are no significant variations that are being
4 requested.

5 Originally we had proposed
6 variations for parcel two, but Al Maiden truly made
7 some modifications to our plan which we accepted
8 which instead of placing the proposed commercial
9 building pad in the center of Lot 2 and having
10 parking surround it, it was moved to the far
11 eastern edge with the parking to the west side with
12 the stipulation that there would be extensive
13 landscaping along that eastern edge to buffer the
14 residential areas that are currently in the County
15 to the east.

16 Some of the highlights on the
17 various tests that are normally met with a rezoning
18 and a special use I'll go through. The two corners
19 here across Washington which would be the southeast
20 corner and here at the northwestern corner were
21 both in the last several years zoned C/B-2 which is
22 the same zoning that we're requesting for the
23 McDonald's.

24 One is a bank down here. It has a

1 drive-thru facility not unlike the request for

2 McDonald's except you get money at the drive-thru
3 and hamburgers at the McDonald's.

4 The Amoco has a special use for a
5 car wash. I understand that there is full access
6 to both of those sites from both streets on either
7 side. I looked at the findings of fact for the
8 Amoco approval that was given some years ago.
9 Those findings indicate that the C/B-2 use and zone
10 is appropriate for the area, that it's consistent
11 with area growth and that there is no impairment of
12 property values with that zone and use and I find
13 that to be an appropriate argument here as well.

14 The C/O-1 zone here was proposed --
15 we originally requested C/B-2 on the entire tract.
16 The C/O-1 zone was proposed by the Village as a
17 less intense buffer between the use on the corner
18 and whatever develops around here. Currently
19 residential, possibly residential in the County up
20 here. I think these are very sparsely developed at
21 this time but you never know what's going to happen
22 in the future.

23 The sewer main is at the property
24 boundary. The water main is across Washington

1 Street. The residential portion of the property
2 that is currently in the Village, when you do the

3 numbers on that and you check the setbacks there is
4 only point 43 acres of developable land as
5 residential on that lot and it butts up against
6 what is a five lane cross-section which renders it
7 fairly undesirable as a residential use and not in
8 character with what's been developing in the
9 immediate area.

10 We have not received directly or
11 through staff any formal protest, although I know
12 there are members of the public here this evening.

13 With respect to the special use,
14 the fact that customers are allowed to remain in
15 their cars to purchase their food to us does not
16 seem to endanger the health, welfare of the Village
17 residents or those who are visiting the McDonald's.

18 Oftentimes the endangerment of
19 safety and welfare, that sort of thing is an issue
20 with special use. However, this being just a
21 drive-up I don't see where that applies.

22 Any traffic issues that have to be
23 resolved with respect to this site. First off, we
24 will be gaining access solely from this site. We

208

1 will not rely on any off-site properties for
2 access. So it's self-contained with respect to
3 access.

4 And finally, I'll note that with
5 respect to some unresolved issues, all of which
6 relate to traffic, we know that we have to honor
7 whatever the relevant governmental authorities
8 dictate for the site and we're currently dealing
9 with Lake County DOT and the powers that be.

10 We are requesting full four way
11 here on Hunt Club and on Washington Street as well.
12 However, that issue is open and we'll be willing to
13 discuss that at length with the relevant
14 authorities.

15 With that, in the interest of time
16 I'm just going to introduce the people that are
17 here. They'll make brief presentations to give you
18 a little more detail on the project. Some will,
19 not necessarily everybody; but I want you to know
20 they're here in case you have specific questions.

21 First off we have some
22 representatives from McDonald's, Jim Stotland
23 (phonetic) and Rick Dolan. We have Chris Wilson
24 from Marchris Engineering for engineering and site

209

1 plan, Mike Rogers from McDonald's for architecture,
2 Dave Fiore and Sherri Whitman from John Fiore
3 Nursery for landscaping, and Jerry Lindgren from --
4 is it LOLA, Jerry?

5 MR. LINDGREN: KLOA.

6 MR. EIDEN: KLOA For any traffic issues.

7 I would ask the Commissioners in
8 the interest of time, of those consultants are one
9 or more or all of them more important than another?
10 We could begin with the site plan I would guess,
11 move to our architecture and then maybe discuss
12 landscaping and traffic last? Would those --

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That would be fine.
14 And I'd say, you know, at this point give an
15 overview because then we'll get response from the
16 Commissioners in the areas that would have more
17 interest and you may be able to then embellish
18 their presentation at that point.

19 MR. EIDEN: Okay. Why don't we start
20 with the site plan then so we can get a little
21 detail on the project.

22 MR. DOLAN: Good evening. As we have
23 worked with staff from the Planning Commission on
24 about three -- not public hearings but in workshop

210

1 scenarios, we've gone through the site plan
2 rendering and architectural look to the building.

3 As Mr. Eiden indicated, we're
4 proposing two access points into the site, one off
5 of Washington, the other off Hunt Club. Based on

6 the traffic consultant's report and with staff we
7 have set up the access points to be in line with
8 the bank access on Washington and with the access
9 point to the Amoco off Hunt Club.

10 Our traffic flow on the lot would
11 be typical of a McDonald's in that it would be
12 counter-clockwise where we enter our drive-thru
13 lane facility from the east, circle around. There
14 would be a speaker for drive-thru sales. As you
15 would place the order you would come around to the
16 west side of the building, pay at a window pay
17 point and then pick up the product at the
18 drive-thru pick-up window.

19 You would then proceed off site by
20 use of either the full cut access on Washington or
21 the full cut access on Hunt Club.

22 The facility itself is roughly
23 4,200 square feet. And then we've worked with
24 staff in the computation for parking stalls. We

211

1 exceed what is needed for parking itself.

2 And we've worked very diligently
3 with staff in regards to the architectural. Just
4 to keep my portion brief, I'd just like to turn
5 over the architectural portion to Mr. Mike Rogers.
6 He can address our go arounds with what we've come

7 up with.

8 COURT REPORTER: Could you state your
9 name?

10 MR. DOLAN: Rick Dolan.

11 MR. ROGERS: Mike Rogers from
12 McDonald's. Architecturally through the previous
13 workshops that we had gone through we had submitted
14 more of what is known to be a prototypical
15 McDonald's design and we evolved.

16 The last time we were before you we
17 showed you this particular plan and I think at that
18 time indication was that you were looking for
19 something that was a little more, well, different
20 than the prototypical McDonald's.

21 In this case there was an attempt
22 to try to get some prairie style articulation.
23 However, the McDonald's roof, it was stated at
24 least by some of the Commissioners that that

212

1 perhaps was too McDonald's in its image so we have
2 looked at a couple of alternative schemes.

3 This one in particular emerged as
4 something that we wanted to submit before you.
5 Also, we have the material and color sample board
6 there. Last time there was a little bit of
7 confusion about what the particular colors are. So

8 the colors that you see are on the rendering, and I
9 attempt to simulate the actual color samples that
10 you see here, which basically some neutral earth
11 tones augmented by green accent striping.

12 The general flavor is more of a
13 contemporary styling of McDonald's. You know, it's
14 somewhat limited because it's an operational
15 building, it needs to work. It is a single story
16 building so some of those things are pretty
17 limited.

18 The signing and imagery that
19 McDonald's has. Particularly in getting away from
20 the McDonald's roof, which is a trademark and it's
21 very important to our business, we do have some of
22 the standard arches to basically highlight from the
23 standpoint of signage.

24 The base material starting from the

213

1 bottom would be a brick wainscot in the style and
2 color texture that you see there. The base wall
3 surface material is a stucco or drive-it, EIFS it's
4 known as material, in two tones.

5 Basically the majority of the
6 building would be the off white tone you see here
7 and the accent color, if you will, would be a
8 little bit of the dark tan which you see here on

9 the pediments which are in a cascading effect and
10 emerging to a peak. Pretty contemporary look.

11 In terms of trying to develop
12 strong horizontal lines, as you can see, that go
13 throughout to form a banding. And the green
14 striping you see at the cascade as well as at the
15 peak. And also some coloration of a stucco banding
16 through there.

17 The signage, basically the major
18 signage is shown on the south elevation, the
19 Washington Street elevation, the full word
20 McDonald's. The other two elevations would have
21 just the simple arch on the facade. And on the
22 rear no signage at all.

23 Architecturally I guess that's
24 pretty much it. The public area, the customer

214

1 service area and dining areas basically have the
2 glass and the rest of the surfaces are opaque with
3 the exception of the drive-thru windows that are
4 punched into the facade on the west off the Hunt
5 Club Road elevation.

6 Maybe I do want to mention that you
7 mentioned -- Rick mentioned the drive-thru system
8 and the speaker. Operationally it should be
9 mentioned that a customer order display which is

10 kind of a new feature that McDonald's is going to
11 be using shows a digital readout of the orders
12 which helps with the accuracy and helps the
13 customers understand that the order was in fact
14 correct and gives them their totals. So that cuts
15 down on some of the confusion and should be a nice
16 feature. And that would be at the rear of the
17 north elevation.

18 MR. FIORE: David Fiore.

19 MS. WHITMAN: Sherri Whitman.

20 MR. FIORE: Basically the landscaping
21 again, as Mark had mentioned, the north border and
22 the east borders not knowing exactly what's going
23 to happen there in the future is very intense again
24 really with the input from the Village and whatnot.

215

1 It's very heavily landscaped
2 through here. That's at least a 50/50 of deciduous
3 and Evergreen all the way around but a good mix of
4 fall color, spring blooming periods and that sort
5 of thing. And again, there's quite a bit of large
6 Evergreens and whatnot on the borders buffering
7 this building here as well.

8 Here, this being the part where
9 it's the main intersection here, there's a lot of
10 shade trees and that would leave the owner stored

11 landscaping exposed. It would keep it very wooded.

12 As far as instant gratification,
13 you will definitely have it with the design that
14 we've got on the plan right here. And this is all
15 per the Village's input and whatnot with the
16 landscaping that we worked with them and this is
17 their revision on this here.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: East side,
19 please. You didn't describe the east side at all.

20 MR. FIORE: What I talked about first,
21 the east part here again was one of the more
22 intense. As you can see, it's very heavily
23 landscaped over here.

24 There's also -- there's a berm here

216

1 and a berm here as well to elevate the plantings
2 and to get more height out of them initially.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What's the
4 elevation?

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We're going to give an
6 opportunity for you to ask questions.

7 If you want to continue with your
8 presentation.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sorry.

10 MR. FIORE: As far as just an overview
11 on the quantities, 44 shade trees 40-inch which is

12 an extreme -- that's a large size shade tree that
13 we use initially. We have about 40 8-to-10-foot
14 Evergreens. There are 40 6-to-7-foot ornamental
15 trees. 110 5-foot ornamental shrubs. 228
16 3-to-4-foot shrubs. 83 low Evergreens, the
17 junipers and whatnot. And 197 lower shrubs as
18 well. So again, it's a very intense landscaping
19 plan.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We'll open the floor to
21 the public and you can ask questions and you can
22 address them later.

23 MR. LINDGREN: I'm Jerry Lindgren on
24 traffic and I just want to make two comments.

217

1 Both access points happen through
2 Lake County Department of Transportation as
3 well as being reviewed by your traffic consultants
4 and we're willing to work with them on that.

5 I think you'll see a change that
6 we've already initiated between the landscaping
7 plan, there's a slight offset here in terms of the
8 driveway opposite the service station. And in the
9 revised plan here you can see that that offset has
10 been taken out. And that's one -- it wasn't a big
11 offset but we would like to have it aligned as
12 closely as possible to help reduce confusion for

13 the drivers.

14 The other item I would mention is
15 that just very quickly, it's in the report for your
16 further consideration, is that 73 percent --
17 through a lot of facilities that we've done at
18 McDonald's we find that about 73 percent of the
19 morning peak hour traffic is already on the road.
20 It's not new traffic. We're not generating a lot
21 of new traffic to this intersection. 73 percent of
22 it is probably in this area already.

23 At noontime we find almost 50
24 percent or about 47 percent based on the statistics

218

1 and then in the evening about 63 percent.

2 The facility is very much like a
3 service station and for that matter a drive-thru
4 banking facility where it's highly oriented towards
5 the traffic that is already on the roadway.
6 Obviously one of the reasons they want to be on a
7 corner like this. And I would be more than happy
8 to answer any questions that you have.

9 We do have to satisfy variances
10 from the Lake County Highway Regulation Access
11 Ordinance. So those are all very specific things
12 that we have to go through as well as satisfy your
13 traffic consultant and your engineer.

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you. That's it?
15 Okay. Do the Plan Commissioners have any questions
16 or comments? Mrs. Kovarik, go ahead.

17 MS. KOVARIK: How come I'm going first
18 all the time tonight?

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You weren't first every
20 time.

21 MS. KOVARIK: I'm going to start with
22 traffic. In your traffic study you say there will
23 be absolutely no impact to the existing roadway
24 system.

219

1 Being familiar with Washington, you
2 know, it's backed up, it's total gridlock at all
3 times. And also there was 67 accidents at that
4 intersection in 1997. It's the second worst
5 intersection for accidents in Gurnee. It is the
6 number one intersection for accidents with
7 injuries. There was 18 injuries at that
8 intersection in 1997.

9 I think the traffic pulling in and
10 out of there is only going to exasperate the
11 situation with people trying to make lefts out of
12 McDonald's across Washington or trying to make
13 lefts onto Hunt Club trying to go south.

14 I don't think that your traffic

15 study addressed the improvements that are obviously
16 needed at that intersection already because of the
17 amount of accidents that we're having there.

18 MR. LINDGREN: Do you want me to
19 respond?

20 I've discussed this with you once
21 before, I'm familiar with what you're talking
22 about. And you're right, there's a lot of traffic,
23 there are a lot of accidents and this is a very
24 heavily trafficked area.

220

1 The access points on this have been
2 located as far as they can from the intersection
3 and opposite existing access points. The traffic
4 as a result of this type of development is not
5 unlike that that we would have with a service
6 station or for that matter a drive-thru bank. We
7 have a service station, a bank, bank and this type
8 of facility.

9 One of the reasons that we look at
10 that is because most of the traffic is oriented to
11 the existing traffic on the roadway. Even though
12 we have to anticipate that there will be some left
13 turns, the majority of the traffic that's going to
14 want to use this facility would probably be
15 oriented in a right turn manner because this is a

16 trip that is in between trips.

17 It's either from work to home or
18 during midday it's that trip that's made in
19 addition to the shopping trip or the trip from the
20 office to lunch and then back.

21 So we do have a better situation in
22 terms of this type of development as opposed to,
23 for instance, a straight shopping center type
24 operation where in fact a lot of people would want

221

1 to come and go back the same way.

2 I'm not trying to diminish the
3 impact to the intersection, but this type of
4 operation obviously minimizes it a lot more than
5 other things that could happen.

6 The other thing is that you -- that
7 is in the report, as you know, this access point
8 and this access point both if we go through the
9 County requires us to have a left turn lane and a
10 right turn lane at both access points.

11 Now, right now that's a virtual
12 impossibility from the standpoint that I'm looking
13 at because we have an existing left turn lane that
14 goes south on Hunt Club that traverses all the way
15 across the frontage of our property and beyond.
16 And it's currently used both by the bank and as

17 part of the intersection.

18 So we're ending up with a left turn
19 that would be in through traffic. Not the best of
20 all worlds, but I suspect we'll minimize that
21 movement significantly.

22 And I still have to comply with the
23 County and I'm not sure just exactly how we're
24 going to work that out with them. Likewise, here

222

1 we have existing left turn lanes on Hunt Club to go
2 east on Washington and we may in fact have to do
3 here the same thing that was done over here at the
4 bank. In other words, create a longer left turn
5 lane so that we can have stacking.

6 We will have some left turn
7 movements. I wish I could come up with a
8 development that had absolutely no left turn
9 movements at all, but there aren't very many of
10 them.

11 The fact is that the County may
12 restrict us at one of those locations either right
13 turns in and out or perhaps right turns in and out
14 and left turns in and no left turns out.

15 Again, that's something that we
16 have to go through with the County and see if we
17 can work that out.

18 MS. KOVARIK: And if you don't work it
19 out the situation just remains bad.

20 MR. LINDGREN: If we can't work it out
21 with the County then we can't develop quite
22 frankly.

23 MS. KOVARIK: All right.

24 MR. LINDGREN: I mean from a traffic

223

1 standpoint if I can't get it worked out it just
2 doesn't -- from my perspective it doesn't happen.

3 MS. KOVARIK: Well, I hope the County
4 recognizes the significant amount of accidents and
5 injuries. It's not just accidents, there's
6 injuries, number one.

7 And let me talk about the
8 appropriateness of changing the zoning here and I'm
9 going to use your own justifications that were
10 included in our packet.

11 The northwest corner does have
12 C/B-2 zoning but it will never have homes anywhere
13 around that corner. We know that. We knew that
14 when we decided to allow that Amoco gas station to
15 go in there that there would be a church to the
16 north and a farm to the west.

17 The bank even though it is zoned
18 C/B-2 at the southeast corner, it is a one story

19 bank, it's low intensity, definitely a different
20 type of use than a drive-thru restaurant.

21 The southwest corner was
22 recently -- preliminarily recently went through
23 preliminary to do a C/O-1 District. There again,
24 it's not an intense retail.

224

1 Your justification for allowing
2 this development, in the first paragraph you talk
3 about the neighborhood and the neighbors using it,
4 but then you go on to talk about where you're going
5 to draw your customers from. The 17 million
6 visitors at Gurnee Mills which already has two
7 McDonald's, the Six Flags which attracts another 3
8 million visitors which also has a McDonald's right
9 close by.

10 You're talking about Hunt Club
11 being widened to five lanes, which I know is going
12 to happen and I know they need to do that just to
13 meet the current demand. They're not widening it
14 in anticipation of this further development.

15 You also as a justification used
16 Auto Nation as an example that there was 750 people
17 that opposed it but the Plan Commission went ahead
18 and approved it anyways.

19 I don't really follow your line of

20 thinking there that the Auto Nation which was not
21 really a zoning change has anything to do with this
22 McDonald's. I was hoping you could explain that.

23 I also tried to confirm last week
24 and today about this full Tollway interchange at

225

1 Washington and including the Highway 21 interchange
2 to Washington. The Tollway -- the public relations
3 person for the Tollway would not confirm that for
4 me so I'm not sure if your facts there are true.

5 Again, then you go on to talk about
6 this McDonald's being here to serve the local
7 neighborhood but then in the next paragraph you
8 justify it with the 10 to 12 thousand seat arena,
9 the 1,100 hotels, the shops, the theaters, the
10 restaurants that we are in the process of talking
11 about possibly an entertainment village going in
12 there.

13 But again, I don't know whether
14 your McDonald's is trying to attract the regional
15 business, the regional draw. You're using the
16 regional draw as your justification and in the
17 other sentence you talk about the neighborhoods.

18 You talk about all the other -- you
19 talk about Dominick's and the Planet Hollywood and
20 the Grand Hunt shopping center, you want to talk

21 about all these other developments but those were
22 in C/B-2 areas that the comp plan wanted to be
23 C/B-2, they were not in areas that were zoned
24 single family.

226

1 Again, you go on to talk about the
2 new Steven Spielberg Game Works and the Bass Pro
3 Shop as all these things being a draw for this
4 McDonald's when there's already two McDonald's
5 there at Gurnee Mills.

6 You talk again about the Hunt Club
7 community park as being another draw and that is
8 not a foregone conclusion. The pool has not passed
9 referendum. It will be just a neighborhood park
10 and I don't feel the neighborhood kids will be
11 walking down Hunt Club which is very, very heavily
12 traveled just to go to the McDonald's.

13 You say it's consistent with our
14 comprehensive plan and I strongly disagree with
15 that. You say it would not diminish the property
16 values. I do agree with that, I don't think it
17 would have any impact on property values.

18 You say it's a non-intensive use
19 and it is a very intensive use, the McDonald's. I
20 can look at any of the McDonald's that are already
21 in town, they're all very intensive. And our

22 intent in the comp plan is not to turn Washington
23 in a commercial corridor and McDonald's is an
24 intensive use.

227

1 We really wanted small neighborhood
2 type businesses that are easy to walk to, to use,
3 and we wanted to get away from people always having
4 to use cars. That is not an intersection you can
5 easily walk through, to, or across. So I don't
6 really see the compelling reasons for going against
7 the comp plan.

8 MR. EIDEN: On the first several points
9 under item three in the petition where we cite
10 various other commercial enterprises in the area,
11 the point was not to say that that's where we're
12 drawing from.

13 Point three which is a part of your
14 application wants or requests that we discuss the
15 recent rate at which land is being developed in the
16 area.

17 And what we're trying to
18 demonstrate there is that within the area on all
19 sides of us, to the north at Gurnee Mills, to the
20 west toward Grand Hunt, and to the east possibly
21 the 94 interchange which I agree is not a foregone
22 conclusion but is much talked about, all around us

23 there is this type of -- this type of development
24 and probably more intensive development and we then

228

1 proceed to cite many examples of those.

2 The idea is not to say that this is
3 a regional McDonald's drawing business from all
4 these places. It's intended to show that we are
5 trying to locate a McDonald's in an area that is
6 very commercially active on all sides.

7 MS. KOVARIK: But those activities are
8 in areas in our comp plan which are proposed to be
9 commercial.

10 MR. EIDEN: Yes. And you are correct
11 about the -- I do say in the application that
12 although the zoning is at variance with the
13 comprehensive plan which is residential and this
14 site here is residential and I tried to address
15 that by indicating of course on this piece right
16 here you've got point 43 acres of setbacks on a
17 five lane cross-section.

18 I think perhaps maybe when that
19 was -- I don't know, I'm just guessing -- when the
20 comprehensive plan with respect to this area was
21 adopted I'm not sure that it did take into account
22 everything that's occurred there in the recent
23 past.

1 this property as Suburban which would allow a much
2 more intense use of course as you well know.

3 The proposed use as I've stated
4 here conforms to the adjacent existing uses
5 recently approved being the bank and the gas
6 station. And I duly note your comments about what
7 surrounds them.

8 As a matter of fact, Jerry, do you
9 have anything on the intensity of the use of the
10 McDonald's versus a bank or any of the trip
11 generations or anything of that nature?

12 MR. LINDGREN: Well, the actual volumes
13 of McDonald's might be higher but the amount of
14 traffic that we draw from the adjacent traffic is
15 probably slightly higher, too.

16 So it becomes a balancing act in
17 terms of what is happening. They're all similar
18 types of trips comparable to the service station.

19 It's highway oriented type
20 operation and I think the fact that you've got some
21 regional draws in the area that are using these
22 roadways is one of the reasons that we would
23 anticipate probably a right turn in right out
24 predominance because this is a trip that's in

1 between the other trips.

2 And I would say the service station
3 over here is probably generating very close -- we
4 did a count in a couple of the hours, it's very
5 close to what we would expect at the McDonald's.

6 And it's the same type of trip,
7 people don't go to the gas station very often just
8 because they're going to go to the gas station and
9 then come home. So again, we're doing that same
10 type of thing.

11 Likewise with the bank. Again,
12 it's a convenience trip during the times when
13 you're going from one place to another and the
14 magnitude of trips varies.

15 At noontime we're probably a little
16 higher. At other times the service station might
17 be a little bit higher in the -- higher, you know,
18 in the morning. Or actually we find service
19 stations probably generate more at night in terms
20 of the people coming home because it's a less time
21 restrained trip. But again, they're comparable but
22 they vary all over the place.

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I've got one correction
24 to make to something you said.

1 You said our comprehensive plan
2 reflects that the western portion was R-1, that's
3 not true. The comp plan reflects this entire
4 parcel as being office/services.

5 MR. EIDEN: I understood that it was low
6 density residential, but I defer to your
7 understanding.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: There's no question
9 about it in the comprehensive plan. It has that
10 existing zoning, but the comprehensive plan
11 reflects that that use would be -- we certainly
12 don't anticipate that there's going to be continued
13 residential use there.

14 And the use that's to the south,
15 the bank, is -- that property is actually reflected
16 on the comprehensive plan as office/services
17 because the use is office/services. It is zoned
18 C/B-2 but the actual use that's on there is
19 basically a C/O-1 use.

20 So that's -- so the comprehensive
21 plan reflects actually the three corners as Ms.
22 Kovarik indicated as office/services and only the
23 northwest corner as the C/B-2 which personally I
24 don't agree with, but it got in and it's there and

1 we have to live with that.

2 But I'm sorry, go ahead.

3 MR. EIDEN: That's fine. I mean we
4 should continue with the comments.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I don't know if you
6 finished with addressing Ms. Kovarik's comments.

7 MS. KOVARIK: I'd like to understand how
8 you figure this McDonald's adds value.

9 When we change zoning there's a
10 compelling reason to say the neighborhood doesn't
11 have that, they need that. South Ridge is packed
12 with kids. Without the playland, the South Ridge
13 people are still going to go to Dilley's or to 120
14 for the playland.

15 You know, other than the schools I
16 don't think -- I don't see where it's adding
17 anything to the neighborhood. The convenience is
18 already there. Most people if they're going to
19 throw their kids in the car to go get fast food
20 between the time it takes to bundle them up and
21 unbundle them and put them in the car and belt them
22 in, you're not going to just go to McDonald's,
23 you're also going to stop and get milk and you're
24 probably going to make a deposit at the bank and

1 run through Blockbuster and get a movie. I don't
2 see a compelling reason here. So see if anybody
3 else has anything.

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other comments?

5 Mr. Foster.

6 MR. FOSTER: No.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I guess, you know, we
8 had formal hearings on this and I'll get right to
9 the point.

10 We had the formal hearings on this
11 and I think the land use thing was a big question.
12 We felt that this was a deviation from the
13 comprehensive plan but we left the door open for
14 you in saying well, if you came up with something
15 that was unique and fit in with the character of
16 the -- the residential character of the community
17 around you because you basically are surrounded by
18 residential there that we would consider a project
19 like this where you have a kind of combination of
20 the office and the C/B-2 restaurant use.

21 So I guess I'd ask the
22 Commissioners do you think they accomplished what
23 we asked for? Mr. Sula.

24 MR. SULA: Well, in looking at the

1 architectural review I'm not sure I was in the same
2 meeting that you all were in but I thought we said
3 we didn't want a flat roof, we wanted a sloped
4 roof.

5 And this looks like something that
6 should be in El Paso instead of the Midwest. I'm
7 just dumbfounded.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Cepon, you're
9 shaking your head in agreement?

10 MR. CEPON: I'm looking -- I agree with
11 that. I think we were looking for something unique
12 and we were looking like even a combination of
13 office and McDonald's in the same thing.

14 And I don't know, I really wonder
15 maybe even building that office building next to it
16 and probably just put the McDonald's on the corner
17 because the future development would be the office
18 site.

19 But I don't -- and I have to agree
20 with the young lady sitting next to me that we
21 still should -- they're not adding anything to it
22 by having a McDonald's there. You know, we still
23 should keep that C/O-1.

24 In fact, to be very honest with

1 you, I was just thinking about this, I'm almost

2 thinking that that particular property would
3 probably be better for a post office than Cemetery
4 and Washington.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yeah, they would have
6 two entrances.

7 How about this side of the table,
8 what do we have? Mr. Foster, did you want to say
9 something?

10 MR. FOSTER: I don't know. I thought
11 during the informal hearings that we said there was
12 some trend that we would lend some support but I
13 think I did expect something different coming back
14 in terms of the renderings. I don't think the
15 renderings were what we expected based on the
16 feedback. So that is a concern.

17 I guess I don't think I have any
18 real strong objection, I just need to understand
19 some of the concerns that have been expressed. I
20 don't think that's probably the number one choice,
21 but I do recognize that Hunt Club Road and
22 Washington is a very busy intersection and, you
23 know, commercial is probably the trend that's going
24 to be there. But I'm concerned that there are some

236

1 concerns that are being voiced.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Smith.

3 MR. SMITH: I don't have a problem as
4 much with the use but I'd like to see something
5 more prairie style looking. It just -- I've seen
6 other McDonald's that surely look different than
7 that.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: At home I have a
9 prairie school design book. I don't know, maybe I
10 should bring that in and show it to them. I agree
11 with you, I don't think this is what Frank Lloyd
12 Wright had in mind.

13 Mr. Winter, did you have anything
14 to add?

15 MR. WINTER: Well, as far as the
16 architect, I think we have tried to make
17 suggestions on that. But actually, that part of it
18 doesn't affect me as much because I really think
19 our role is to assess the land use here, to make
20 suggestions in a way that we can be helpful and but
21 really we don't have an architectural review aspect
22 to the ordinance.

23 So I guess I'm a little concerned
24 about the berming. Apparently you're going to fill

237

1 in this property and the berms are going to be okay
2 if we measure it from the adjoining property, but
3 I'm just wondering whether that berming is going to

4 have the intended affect of screening this if
5 you're going to have the property up higher than
6 what it currently is.

7 I look on the grading plan and, for
8 instance, the east boundary you start out at 748
9 and go as high as 758. But I think it might be a
10 problem that the property where you have parcel one
11 you're showing the building starting out at 755 so
12 the berm isn't going to be blocking that building.

13 And so I think that's a greater
14 concern that I have for the neighbors. Maybe I'm
15 misreading that so I'll give you a chance to maybe
16 respond. That would be a greater concern for me.

17 As far as this corner, this has
18 been a problem. The comprehensive plan doesn't
19 show it as residential and so I guess with
20 reluctance, you know, knowing that this isn't going
21 to stay residential that if the berming was right I
22 would be inclined to vote for it; but I just want
23 to make sure that these people are going to have
24 proper screening.

238

1 It sounds like the landscaping is
2 going to be good, but again am I reading that right
3 as far as the berm? Particularly on the east
4 side.

5 MR. WILSON: Yes. Chris Wilson,
6 Marchris Engineering.

7 We have on the east side here, we
8 have starting at 748 the property line and we're
9 using a two-to-one slope to get the maximum amount
10 that we can right now.

11 And going up that high as the
12 highest point is 758 and that's about the best we
13 can do. We've been working with staff on that and
14 they've suggested that we get the berm as high as
15 we can. So we've tried to do the best that we
16 could there.

17 And they've also brought up some
18 drainage issues which we've addressed as far as the
19 existing property to the east on that.

20 MR. WINTER: But see, my point is even
21 though you're going to have a 10 foot berm only 3
22 feet of it is going to really block the building
23 that you're going to build there, right?

24 MR. WILSON: Correct.

239

1 MR. WINTER: That's the problem I have
2 with the berm. I mean it's -- you know, unless the
3 landscaper says it's --

4 MR. DOLAN: Rick Dolan, McDonald's. I
5 don't know that the intent by staff when we were

6 talking about putting in the berm was to totally
7 hide our building.

8 It was suggested by staff that we
9 put in landscaping and a berm that came 3 to 4 feet
10 high. Now, that we have tried to maintain and I
11 believe we do get that. And then on top of the
12 berm would be the landscaping.

13 I think we've done a fairly good
14 job of surrounding our parcel with the berm and
15 landscaping to meet all the ordinances.

16 MR. WINTER: Okay. I guess my
17 understanding was that typically we want to have a
18 berm of 4 to 5 feet high.

19 MR. DOLAN: Again, we've put in a berm
20 at a two-to-one slope which is the maximum we can
21 go to maintain stability. And with that result we
22 can get a berm that is 10 foot high on the east, 8
23 foot high to the north.

24 But again, the intent of the berm

240

1 is not to completely hide our building. We don't
2 want to build a development and completely hide it.

3 MR. WINTER: I understand that for the
4 street access but for the residential I think the
5 incentive is to do some masking of the parking and
6 the building so I disagree with you.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Tracy may shed some
8 light on this.

9 MS. VELKOVER: I was going to say that
10 the intent wasn't to screen the building but the
11 intent was to screen the cars on the site in the
12 parking lot, the drive-thru. And that's why we
13 were attempting to get a 4 to 5 foot high berm
14 measured from both sides of the berm.

15 Now what's happened is because
16 they're raising the site approximately 5 feet we do
17 get a 5 foot -- more than a 5 foot height berm when
18 measured from the adjacent properties to the north
19 and to the east but from on-site because the site
20 has been elevated we effectively only get a 2 to 3
21 foot high berm.

22 And that's the concern is that then
23 we're not going to be able to screen the cars and
24 the drive-thru that we were originally intending to

241

1 do.

2 MR. WILSON: If you look at the existing
3 grades to the east that are roughly 750, 747 to
4 750, you have the elevation here and then you're
5 going to have another elevation up here.

6 The person is going to physically
7 have to look, you know, at a higher angle in order

8 to look up through the screening with the trees and
9 shrubs that's going to be placed around there. So
10 I don't see how the cars can -- you know, you're
11 going to be able to see the cars or not.

12 MR. WILDENBERG: Well, we've experienced
13 over the years we have tried to consistently make
14 the berm height at a minimum effective from both
15 sides of the berm, you know, because we've run into
16 this situation before and we really do try to avoid
17 that.

18 MR. WINTER: I would be interested to
19 hear some public comment on this.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I was going to say, I
21 think that was the next step. We'll give you an
22 opportunity. I'm sorry it took so long, but we'll
23 give the public an opportunity to speak on this
24 issue.

242

1 So anyone who wishes to make a
2 comment or ask a question, step up to the mic, if
3 you could give your name and address for the record
4 and if you could address your comments and
5 questions to the Plan Commission.

6 MR. COURSHON: Okay. My name is John
7 Courshon. I live at 55 Silo Court.

8 I have several items. I was here

9 last year when there was some discussion, I don't
10 think it was a public hearing but there was some
11 discussion about a McDonald's going in along with
12 the service station.

13 And it seemed to me at the time
14 that the opinion of the Commission in general was
15 that we didn't want that corner to get any busier
16 than it already is.

17 And I heard the term I think
18 commercial corridor a few minutes ago. And I'm a
19 little disappointed that there seems to be the
20 sentiment that it's okay to put a McDonald's there
21 and that you're talking about berms and you're
22 talking about parking and you're talking about the
23 architectural style of the building when I think
24 the issue should be the use of that area and should

243

1 there be a McDonald's there.

2 When we moved in there it's
3 strictly a residential area. I didn't want to live
4 a block away from a McDonald's and I wouldn't have
5 moved there if there had been a McDonald's there.
6 So I'm concerned about that.

7 I don't want to smell the
8 McDonald's 24 hours a day and I would ask each of
9 you how you would feel if wherever it is that you

10 live -- and I know where Kristy lives because she's
11 one of my neighbors -- but the rest of you, how you
12 would feel if there was a McDonald's going in a
13 block away from your house?

14 So the other point I want to make
15 and/or just emphasize which was kind of brought up
16 because there are four McDonald's within five
17 minutes of that corner. And I know McDonald's is
18 having growth problems in the United States, but I
19 don't think putting a McDonald's on every single
20 corner in every town is going to solve that
21 problem. Thank you.

22 MR. SELINGER: Rob Selinger, 16926 West
23 Washington. I agree with all of the statements the
24 first gentleman made. I actually have the property

244

1 just east of this site.

2 Several issues. I'm curious, we
3 really didn't talk anything about the office
4 building which to me looks like it will be about 10
5 feet from my living room window which is something,
6 you know, obviously nobody would like to have.

7 The other issue I see is the
8 traffic issue with safety with left turns is huge.
9 I drive almost over 30,000 miles a year. The most
10 dangerous spot I drive every day is turning left

11 into my driveway from westbound on Washington.

12 I mean they're going to have dead
13 customers turning left in there if something isn't
14 done with the turn lane. So that is a major issue.

15 I do appreciate the Board's
16 concern. I think you guys brought up some great
17 points. The real question is yeah, I mean
18 obviously I don't want to live next to a
19 McDonald's, I didn't move out here to live next to
20 a McDonald's.

21 The issue is, though, do we need
22 another McDonald's? I mean no. The answer to that
23 is no. And it's not going to solve McDonald's
24 problems with U.S. growth. It's not going to

245

1 answer that situation.

2 I could go on forever, but it's
3 late. And but they're -- yeah, the whole berm
4 thing, the lighting, obviously the Amoco is a
5 horrible eyesore. We as residents were never
6 invited into that arena at all. Believe me, in the
7 winter the lights at Amoco, you know, and that's a
8 long way from my house now, they come shining into
9 my house. You know, it's ugly. Thanks for your
10 time.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you.

12 MR. SELINGER: Oh, one more thing.
13 Several comments I found interesting, Kristina
14 busted your attorney on several items that were not
15 accurate in his initial statement.

16 The fact that he doesn't think that
17 it's going to impede property values I think is
18 totally insane. I think my property would be
19 deflated tremendously by being next to a
20 McDonald's.

21 And really, can you address some of
22 the issues on this office building? What is it
23 for?

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, I think they're

246

1 at this --

2 MR. SELINGER: Is it used as an
3 afterthought or is it going to be a parking lot?

4 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: We'll have them address
5 that. I think basically at this point they don't
6 have any plans, the office building they're showing
7 is conceptual.

8 In other words, they don't intend
9 on at this time building an office building. It's
10 going to be some time in the future and may be a
11 long way off. But we'll have them address that.

12 MR. SELINGER: Thank you.

13 MR. CAMPBELL: My name is Bob Campbell.
14 I live at 16894 Washington Street. I live
15 directly east of Rob.

16 When the Floods were -- the Flood
17 property was going to be developed on the southeast
18 corner of Washington and Hunt Club Road, you all
19 expressed concerns about having, you know, a
20 McDonald's or a Standard station or a gas station,
21 you know, on that corner and what it would do
22 within the neighborhood.

23 Somehow that project went away.
24 The developer there said it was going to -- it was

247

1 going to be an improvement for the neighborhood.
2 You didn't think it was going to be an improvement
3 for the neighborhood at that time, I can't see how
4 a facility like this would be an improvement for
5 the neighborhood now.

6 Somehow, like you said, the
7 Standard station got in there. I don't understand
8 how it did either. I -- you probably know why it
9 did. I don't know how it ever wound up being built
10 there.

11 The matter of property values in
12 the area. I have a great concern over that because
13 I've lived there for 12 years and the first couple

14 years that I lived in that area I watched my
15 property values increase dramatically.

16 As soon as all the subdivisions and
17 everything were being built around me I saw my
18 property value stagnate. Although the Assessor
19 didn't think that they were stagnating. Although I
20 refinanced my house three times since I've lived
21 there and every time that I've got an appraisal on
22 the house it hasn't been anything near what it was
23 three years after I moved into the house.

24 The last time I refinanced was four

248

1 years ago. So basically eight years later my
2 property values haven't really increased at all in
3 eight years. So anything that develops in the
4 area, first of all, you can't just consider whether
5 it's commercial property or McDonald's or anything
6 else.

7 Like all the housing developments
8 that are being built in the area also impact houses
9 like ours, you know, that are in an unincorporated
10 area. We're on well and septic. Why would anybody
11 want to buy a house that's on Washington Street
12 when they can go over to South Ridge or they can go
13 over to Winchester Estates and buy a house there
14 that's on -- you know, that's got public sewers and

15 public water or city water, you know, everything.

16 And I think having a McDonald's it
17 would be -- you know, the building would probably
18 be 150 feet from Rob's house. You could add 132
19 feet onto that and that's where it's going to be
20 away from my house. I don't think you would want
21 to live that close to a McDonald's either, you
22 know.

23 I was going to make a suggestion
24 before that I would swap the people that don't want

249

1 the post office for the McDonald's. I would take
2 the post office on the corner. And if you want to
3 do something about traffic in the area I suggest
4 you put something like a police station on that
5 corner or a dentist's office where people don't
6 want to go.

7 I think that -- I think it's going
8 to draw traffic off of Grand Avenue. I think
9 people that sometimes would go down Washington
10 Street would have a tendency to take Grand Avenue
11 in order to go to McDonald's to stop and get
12 something on the way home. And also in the
13 mornings if they want to pick something up for
14 breakfast rather than having to go down to Grand
15 Avenue they could go down Washington Street. And I

16 think it would increase the traffic on Washington
17 Street quite a bit.

18 I think it would also pull them off
19 of 120 because now people that are going west
20 because we've got a lot of traffic that goes into
21 Round Lake and Round Lake Beach and further west,
22 those people get to stop at either the McDonald's
23 on Grand Avenue or they can -- now they could stop
24 at the McDonald's that's on Route 120 and 45.

250

1 If they would normally go through
2 Hainesville or go to Hainesville on Washington
3 Street maybe somehow having the McDonald's on 120
4 and 45 took traffic away from Washington Street and
5 diverted it. I think it's going to wind up
6 increasing it quite a bit.

7 And you're right about the traffic
8 at Cemetery Road, the backups are all the way back
9 to the Tollway many times in the afternoon. People
10 don't let me turn into my driveway. Right now if
11 I'm heading east they think it's a big deal to be
12 able to be the first one to the red light at Hunt
13 Club Road and they will not let me turn into my
14 property.

15 I could see that being more
16 congested and then everybody parking there in front

17 of my driveway and I won't be able to turn in there
18 that way either. So I don't think it's good deal.

19 MR. MILTON: Mark Milton, 59 Silo
20 Court. I'd like to reiterate what some of the
21 other people have said about the traffic problems
22 there. And I'm surprised at how few accidents
23 there actually are at that intersection alone.

24 I'm just waiting for one of the

251

1 emergency vehicles to take a car out there. I can
2 only imagine what the extra traffic that the
3 McDonald's is going to generate that it's going to
4 make things far worse there.

5 Another thing that I am curious
6 about particularly relates to the berming and the
7 screening because this is going to be very, very
8 visible from my house. If Hunt Club Road, if
9 Washington is widened, what does that do to the
10 screening that you have there for the property?
11 Does it mean that you have it now but when the road
12 ultimately is widened again you lose it, you lose
13 the protection?

14 And really any semblance of a
15 pacification to the residential neighborhood, you
16 have made -- it's gone away.

17 I'm not convinced that I know who

18 is going to be using the McDonald's. I know where
19 the people are coming from, I'm not sure where
20 they're going to. Although I do appreciate one of
21 your major customer sources will be the high
22 school, kids going between two campuses. So in
23 that respect I admire you the way you've put it
24 there.

252

1 I also have a concern about if it
2 does go in there with the lighting that goes in
3 there, one of the things that I'm not sure where
4 the lighting ordinance takes into account is that
5 there's a problem that we've had with the Amoco,
6 all the properties on South Ridge are lower than
7 that corner.

8 So when you did -- shades were put
9 around the lights on the Amoco a lot of the glare
10 wasn't cut off because you're looking from a lower
11 elevation up into the lights. So if anything does
12 go in there I would really appreciate very good
13 screening to the lights so it doesn't illuminate
14 that corner any more than it already is.

15 And the same on the signage. It
16 really is a residential neighborhood there. We
17 have other things, I mean the bank, somebody
18 mentioned about the amount of traffic that a bank

19 takes. I mean I can stare out at the bank there
20 and I never see anybody go through the bank. That
21 drive-thru is hardly ever used.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's 9 to 5, too.

23 MR. MILTON: And I wouldn't acquaint
24 that drive-thru on the bank to anything that

253

1 McDonald's is doing. I think that's a totally
2 different situation.

3 And we're not the only people that
4 don't think we need it. I'm certainly not going to
5 use it and I could walk to it. Thank you.

6 MS. MILLER: Theresa Miller, 6177
7 Brittany Court. I'd like to agree with all the
8 other residents that have commented. I don't think
9 we need a McDonald's there.

10 I think that it's just going to
11 create a hangout for the kids and it's a bad
12 intersection for the kids to be hanging out on.

13 And I just want to go on record as
14 saying I'm kind of disappointed in the whole
15 process that we're going through here because here
16 McDonald's is here with all these great plans and
17 everything. And the first issue we dealt with
18 earlier this evening, you know, these people have
19 been here three times already and they're voicing

20 all these negative opinions and yet everything
21 seems to be moving forward and like everything is
22 already going to happen and we're just here to go
23 through the motions.

24 And I find that a very frustrating

254

1 situation. I mean I know we're not talking about
2 the post office any more, but that seems like the
3 post office is going to go in there whether we do
4 anything about it or not.

5 I didn't even hear about the
6 McDonald's until coming here tonight and I came for
7 a totally different issue and had no idea there was
8 a McDonald's that was going to go onto Washington.

9 And I think that -- I'm not sure if
10 it's the Planning Commission or if it's the Village
11 of Gurnee as a whole but I don't think you're doing
12 a very good job of informing the public as to what
13 things are being planned for the neighborhood.

14 We're supposed to have some
15 comprehensive plan and I don't think the public is
16 very much aware as to what the plan is and what
17 things are going on in the community. Thank you.

18 MS. COURSHON: Mary Courshon, 55 Silo
19 Court. Just several questions.

20 What is the current McDonald's

21 definition of the area of saturation? How many
22 McDonald's do you need for every two square miles?

23 I'm somewhat confused about your
24 assertion that there's been no protest about the

255

1 McDonald's, no negativity about McDonald's moving
2 in. It was -- I think it was about a year ago
3 because it was a June sort of Planning Commission
4 meeting when McDonald's and Shell was pitching the
5 wares to transpire there.

6 And it was very definitively said
7 at the Planning Commission meeting at that time
8 that that traffic was going to be too intense, it's
9 not our purpose, it's la, la, la, la, la. It must
10 have been a whole different group of people that
11 are representing McDonald's today.

12 I would be interested in knowing
13 their hours of operation. I would be interested in
14 knowing how they're planning on doing their garbage
15 control because by nature we're pretty much slobs
16 as human beings. I mean when we miss those cans at
17 McDonald's and the winds come up and I have all the
18 McDonald's bags in my back yard is somebody from
19 your company going to come and clean it up?

20 Is this McDonald's also going to
21 sponsor special events like the nostalgic

22 McDonald's over there on Grand Avenue so we've got
23 all these cars parked and then we have thousands
24 more driving through just to see what's parked

256

1 there.

2 We had an altercation, whatever,
3 with Amoco regarding the lighting because the
4 original lighting that was put in there was not the
5 appropriate EPA lighting for a residential area.
6 And we talked to Amoco's attorneys. They changed
7 their lighting and it did improve; but as Mark had
8 said, we're still on a lower elevation and it is
9 still significant even with the shading.

10 When we moved into that area there
11 was a house still on the corner before the bank
12 even put the little bank mobile up there. And the
13 way it was landscaped I could not see from my
14 living room that corner because of the trees and
15 the bushes that were there.

16 The old trees that were there, we
17 were told there was supposed to be fines if you
18 take down an old tree. And well, you know, if
19 you've got money it doesn't matter, you just pay
20 the fines. Now we're just looking right through
21 the intersection. I look at the beautiful Amoco in
22 spite of the berm that the bank put in that doesn't

23 screen the bank at all.

24 Now we're looking at Mickey D's

257

1 supper club over here and they're going to put in
2 another berm with some more trees on it that isn't
3 even going to shake a bird for crying out loud let
4 alone me looking at those lights. I mean I can't
5 see stars from my deck hardly now. Let's put up
6 the McDonald's. What's the use in moving out to a
7 suburban area when you have no suburban ambience
8 left?

9 In 1996 North Shore magazine was
10 quoting the property values of different towns and
11 villages along the north shore. One of the two
12 towns along the north shore whose property values
13 went down was the Village of Gurnee.

14 And so I need to bring this to your
15 attention because the consistent overdevelopment
16 and if we continue to ignore the comprehensive plan
17 of this Village, all of us that have bought homes
18 here whether it's for retirement purposes or to get
19 away from the city because we're willing to commute
20 the 75 minutes every day to do this, we might as
21 well have bought on Lake Shore Drive because the
22 lighting is going to be the same, the noise is
23 going to be the same, and the crime is going to be

24 the same. Read our own papers.

258

1 I think I've pretty much complained
2 about everything now. I would like to pose to the
3 Board, I have a petition here from many of the
4 residents of South Ridge protesting the building of
5 the McDonald's on that corner.

6 Do I hand that to you?

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Yeah, you just bring it
8 right up here.

9 MR. FAY: My name is Pete Fay. I live
10 at 34615 North Hunt Club Road. It's the horse
11 farm just to the north of this proposed property.

12 I've got a couple of issues. I'm
13 an engineer by background so I understand why they
14 want to build up and get their building more
15 visible. But by doing that, by doing that all
16 around me I end up being the low person in the
17 neighborhood and I get all the water.

18 Whether you've got retention ponds
19 or not, gravity always works. I drain properly I
20 think a half a mile of five lane on Hunt Club Road
21 right onto my property right now and it's got quite
22 a swale going out to the wetlands in the back and I
23 don't think this would help that at all.

24 The other thing I understand is

1 that the elevation and the berming and all that
2 there is four issues that I see. The lights would
3 be coming straight into my picture window from the
4 drive-thru.

5 I have a pony farm, I expect people
6 seeing horses out there will trek across my
7 property and other people's property to come to say
8 hello. They do it already, but having a business
9 giving viewpoints would be a nuisance I think.

10 Noise and light all come to mind,
11 trash, berming and plants. I don't think it can
12 handle all that. I do commend you on staying very
13 late tonight.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Sue Schroeder, 62 Silo
15 Court. I just have one comment in addition to
16 everything that's been said that I agree very
17 strongly with.

18 The safety issue was brought up and
19 you said you didn't see any reason why there would
20 be a question of safety.

21 Well, the number of -- the area of
22 screening you're putting around this, it looks like
23 it's going to be pretty much closed or you're
24 trying to kind of close it off within the entrances

1 or exits. McDonald's or any other fast food type
2 restaurants tend to be hangouts for kids who don't
3 have anything else to do.

4 Being that it's going to be in the
5 vicinity of so many neighborhoods, it's going to be
6 hey, let's go to McDonald's and hang out, get a
7 Coke or something, nothing better to do. If
8 everything is blocked off that well from the street
9 what's to stop car thefts, what's to stop robbing
10 McDonald's in itself?

11 You said people will be safe
12 because they're in cars driving through the
13 drive-thru. Well, there's people going in and out,
14 they're going to be eating, we're talking about
15 nighttime, we've all got young children in the
16 neighborhood. And I don't want them exposed to
17 anything that close. If we wanted to live in this
18 type of an area we would have moved into something
19 right next to Gurnee Mills.

20 The safety I think is a very big
21 issue. There is going to be a lot of people
22 hanging out there and not always the most desirable
23 types.

24 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Thank you. Anyone

1 else?

2 (No response.)

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

5 And I guess I'd just like to first
6 address the one lady's comments about the process
7 because I know it can be frustrating at times.

8 But maybe it seems like it moves
9 forward when people are opposed to something but
10 the Petitioner has a right to a fair hearing and we
11 need to have the entire hearing. We need to hear
12 everything. We need to get all of the information.

13 The Plan Commission takes that
14 under advisement and then we make a decision.
15 Sometimes that takes three and four meetings. That
16 doesn't mean because it's moving forward that we're
17 necessarily agreeing with them or agreeing with the
18 citizens. We're trying to take input from both
19 sides.

20 So we -- it's a long process
21 unfortunately. So just because it's moving forward
22 doesn't necessarily mean that it's moving forward
23 in a positive direction. And, you know, we try --
24 that's why we try to take all the input.

1 Unfortunately, it takes a long time
2 as you can see tonight. And, you know, we probably
3 have too many matters up tonight but it's a long
4 drawn out process and it's -- I hope you can
5 understand that.

6 So I think probably I still have
7 the question of the land use. And I know I heard
8 some comments from the Commissioners regarding the
9 fact that this is going to develop into something
10 and it's going to probably be commercial so I guess
11 there will be -- a McDonald's is okay.

12 But I -- if you look at the
13 comprehensive plan, and I -- you know, I've been on
14 the Commission a long time, I've been working many
15 of the comprehensive plan updates and I know we
16 always looked at this intersection as not an
17 intense commercial district.

18 We wanted to keep a residential
19 character. And I think that's why the Plan
20 Commission in the informal hearings said look, this
21 is supposed to be office/services, it's supposed to
22 be something like the bank across the street.

23 But we would entertain a McDonald's
24 if it fit in that character. And I come back to

1 that. That's why I think in this particular
2 case -- normally we don't get involved with
3 architecture, but I think in this particular case
4 that was an important element. I think that was
5 really stressed in the informal hearings.

6 So I agree with what some of the
7 residents were saying that the comprehensive plan
8 is very important, that we try to stick to that as
9 best we can. And again, as Mr. Foster said in the
10 other hearing, you know, we need compelling reasons
11 to deviate from it.

12 And I guess I don't see the
13 compelling reasons here and maybe the Commissioners
14 can help me out there and indicate what those
15 compelling reasons are. Mr. Winter.

16 MR. WINTER: Well, I just want to say
17 that I'm not inclined to vote in support of a
18 favorable recommendation based on the fact that I
19 think the berming and I think the public has made
20 some comments on it, it's really not going to be
21 good for the neighbors.

22 I don't know if you want that
23 motion now or do you want that to be -- let them
24 answer some of these questions for purposes of the

1 record?

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, it's really up to
3 the Commissioners. If you feel you need more
4 information --

5 MR. WINTER: I don't feel I need any
6 more information.

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Mr. Foster.

8 MR. FOSTER: I'm going to state, too,
9 Mr. Chairman, I don't feel I need any more
10 information.

11 I think that the comments of the
12 residents were very helpful and I do want to
13 support what I feel tonight that this should not go
14 forward.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Any other questions
16 from the Commissioners?

17 MR. SULA: I concur.

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I'll entertain a
19 motion.

20 MR. WINTER: I'll make that motion to
21 make an unfavorable recommendation on the petition
22 as it's presented and that that recommendation be
23 forwarded to the Board of Trustees.

24 MS. KOVARIK: I'll second.

265

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Do I have a second.

2 MS. KOVARIK: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Ms. Kovarik is the
4 second. So we have a motion and a second for an
5 unfavorable recommendation to the Village Board.

6 All those in favor of the motion
7 signify by saying aye in the roll call; those
8 opposed nay. Roll call, please.

9 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

10 MR. SULA: Aye.

11 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.

12 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

13 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepon.

14 MR. CEPON: Aye.

15 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.

16 MR. WINTER: Aye.

17 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.

18 MR. FOSTER: Aye.

19 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.

20 MR. SMITH: Aye.

21 MR. WILDENBERG: Chairman Rudny.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries
23 and it is so ordered.

24 The next matter, a public hearing,

1 Wendy's Old Fashioned Restaurant. The subject
2 property consists of approximately one acre located
3 at the northwest corner of Grove Avenue and Delany

4 Road.

5 The property is zoned C/B-2 PUD.
6 The Petitioner is seeking approval of a special use
7 permit to allow the establishment and operation of
8 a drive-thru at a proposed Wendy's Restaurant. So
9 why don't you go through with the -- oh, it's a
10 public hearing so we need to have anyone with the
11 Petitioner or anyone from the public who wishes to
12 make a comment on this or ask a question needs to
13 stand and be sworn in by the Village attorney.

14 (Witnesses sworn.)

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Please proceed.

16 MR. MARSH: Thank you. In the interest
17 of time, I'll be very brief. We have a
18 presentation, but a very short variation.

19 We're seeking a variance for a
20 drive-thru window as you mentioned on the northwest
21 corner of Delany and Grove. We plan to build a
22 typical Wendy's much the same as you have already
23 in town in front of the Target and across from
24 Gurnee Mills.

267

1 The building itself will be
2 approximately 3,000 square feet. We'll provide 47
3 parking stalls and it will have stacking in excess
4 of eight cars for the drive-thru window. Two

5 access points, one on Grove which will be a full
6 access, one on Delany which will be an in and out
7 only, right in and right out.

8 And other than that, I have my
9 engineer who is in charge of the project, Jeff
10 Gylling is also here and I'll throw it open if
11 there's any questions.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, first of all, I
13 want to make a little correction. You said you're
14 asking for a variance and I don't think that's
15 technically correct.

16 MR. MARSH: Special use, I'm sorry.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So let the record
18 reflect that correctly. Do we have any questions
19 from the Commissioners?

20 MS. KOVARIK: Yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Ms. Kovarik.

22 MS. KOVARIK: What did you say your
23 drive-thru stacking is, how many cars?

24 MR. GYLLING: It shows eight on the plan

268

1 but that's erroneous. It's actually nine which I
2 think exceeds the requirements. I believe the
3 requirement is eight and we show nine. And that is
4 shown on CE1.

5 We brought drawings, mounted

6 drawings. And on the CE1 plan that was prepared
7 by -- the CE1 plan that was prepared by Marchris
8 shows eight cars stacking when in actuality it's
9 actually nine. They failed to show the car at the
10 pick-up window number two which is the one closest
11 to the front of the restaurant closest to Delany.

12 MS. KOVARIK: The only reason I liked
13 your plan and I really had no issue with it, the
14 drive-thru at the Wendy's at Grand and Hunt is just
15 very -- you know, they stack way out onto the
16 circular driveway there and I just wanted to make
17 sure that we're avoiding that problem.

18 MR. GYLLING: Yeah, that's a weird --
19 that's a non-traditional stacking for our
20 drive-thru, absolutely.

21 One thing that Greg failed to
22 mention was the fact that our plan to the best of
23 our knowledge complies with the landscaping
24 requirements, setback requirements, lighting

269

1 requirements, signage requirements.

2 We are seeking -- to the best of
3 our knowledge we are seeking no variances. And
4 I've got -- if we want to go through the building
5 elevations I've got that drawing as well. But to
6 try to expedite it --

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Well, if the
8 Commissioners want to see that they can ask for it.

9 MR. SULA: The only item that needs
10 attention is the special use for the drive-thru,
11 right?

12 MR. MARSH: The drive-thru, right.

13 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Right, that's
14 actually -- I want to point out that this property
15 is already zoned C/B-2 PUD. And, Jon, this meets
16 all of the PUD standards? And the only thing that
17 we're looking at here really is a special use
18 permit for the drive-thru portion.

19 Any other questions? Mr. Winter?
20 Nothing. Okay. I think there's a gentleman that
21 you wanted to ask a question or make a comment so
22 the floor is open to the public.

23 MR. DEHART: My name is Wayne Dehart
24 (phonetic), the branch manager of Steiner Electric

270

1 at 4210 Grove.

2 The only real concern I have is the
3 traffic there and how will the drive-thru impact
4 that specifically during rush hours as people like
5 to block Grove Avenue and make a right. And I
6 guess that's the big issue, blocks customers for me
7 and my employees.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You're on Grove?

9 MR. DEHART: We're on the corner of
10 Grove and Lee.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You're concerned now
12 how the drive-up is going to impact?

13 MR. DEHART: How it will add in making a
14 bigger mess of the traffic problem that's already
15 there.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Can you address that?

17 MR. GYLLING: I can address that. Our
18 traffic, northbound traffic on Delany, the only way
19 to access our site would be to come down -- is that
20 Grove -- down Grove and enter our parcel at the
21 rear.

22 Once they enter our parcel they
23 need to lap around the interior to get into our
24 drive-thru cueing line. So the chance of having

271

1 any cars hanging out into Grove Avenue is slim to
2 none. We would have to be completely wrapped
3 around our facility to have that occur.

4 MS. KOVARIK: Kind of like at Grand and
5 Hunt.

6 MR. GYLLING: So that should not be an
7 issue. There's two things I'd like to bring to the
8 Board Members' attention.

9 One of those -- and they're minor
10 but I just want to get it on the record. The
11 Wendy's monument sign that we have requested, it's
12 shown in elevation view here. It is a monument
13 sign, it's only 10 foot tall by 9 foot in length.
14 We currently show it on -- you could see it best on
15 sheet CE1.

16 We'd like to get that moved or
17 relocated actually to the intersection. That is
18 located in the wrong position.

19 And the second item has to deal
20 with our menu board. That also is shown -- and I
21 apologize for this -- this also is shown in the
22 wrong position. That needs to be moved closer to
23 our building and it needs to be moved up
24 approximately two car lengths.

272

1 So those are the two changes that
2 we would need to make to these plans.

3 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Jon, I take it would
4 those be a problem as far as --

5 MR. WILDENBERG: As long as they can
6 meet the minimum setback requirements that we have
7 for about 72 square foot, 75 square foot signs I
8 mean you would have to be at least 7 and half feet
9 set back from the property line wherever you move

10 it when you move it down to the corner.

11 It looks like you've got plenty of
12 room.

13 MR. GYLLING: This should not be an
14 issue.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Is there anybody else
16 from the public that has a comment or question?

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: The floor is closed to
19 the public.

20 And, Jon, just on the man's
21 question regarding the traffic, did you guys look
22 at this plan or did our traffic consultant look at
23 it?

24 MS. VELKOVER: No, we didn't have them

273

1 take a look at it. We talked to Bud about it and
2 he thinks the existing road system can accommodate
3 it without requiring a traffic study so he did not
4 require one.

5 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So staff is --

6 MS. VELKOVER: He did not feel --

7 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: So staff is satisfied,
8 though, that this will be acceptable?

9 MS. VELKOVER: Correct, correct.

10 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Any other

11 questions? Mr. Smith.

12 MR. SMITH: I'd like to make a motion
13 that we pass a favorable recommendation on to the
14 Village Board.

15 MR. SULA: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion and a second to
17 forward a favorable recommendation.

18 Any discussion?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All those in favor of
21 the motion signify by saying aye in the roll call;
22 those opposed nay. Roll call, please.

23 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

24 MR. SULA: Aye.

274

1 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.

2 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

3 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepon.

4 MR. CEPON: Aye.

5 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.

6 MR. WINTER: Aye.

7 MR. WILDENBERG: Foster.

8 (No response.)

9 MR. WILDENBERG: Absent. Smith.

10 MR. SMITH: Aye.

11 MR. WILDENBERG: Chairman Rudny.

12 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Aye. Motion carries
13 and it is so ordered. Thank you.
14 MR. MARSH: Thank you.
15 MR. GYLLING: Thank you.
16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: I think we're getting
17 to the end here.

18 This is a public hearing of Red
19 Lobster. The subject property consists of
20 approximately two acres located on an outlot of
21 Gurnee Mills mall.

22 Red Lobster is seeking approval of
23 a special use permit to allow the sale of alcoholic
24 beverages on the existing exterior elevated railed

275

1 deck to customers waiting to be seated. Okay.

2 Jon, do you have anything?

3 MR. WILDENBERG: We just have comments
4 from police and fire, I'll read it to you real
5 quickly.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: All right.

7 MR. WILDENBERG: The police have
8 reviewed the situation and the proposed screening
9 and I think is comfortable with it. The fire has
10 suggested modification to the gate arrangement
11 and --

12 MS. FRATUS: That's fine.

13 MR. WILDENBERG: And I believe those are
14 the only comments.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Since this is a
16 public hearing anyone from the Petitioner and
17 anyone from the public who wishes to make a comment
18 stand and be sworn in by the Village attorney.

19 You have to, too, ma'am.

20 (Witnesses sworn.)

21 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. So please
22 proceed if you have anything to present.

23 MS. FRATUS: No, just everything that he
24 was saying.

276

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: You just want us to ask
2 questions. I take it the modifications -- are you
3 aware of the modifications that the fire department
4 has asked for?

5 MS. FRATUS: For the extra gate.

6 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: On the gates.

7 MS. FRATUS: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And you're --

9 MS. FRATUS: Yes, they're comfortable.
10 Yes, we'll do that.

11 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: And you'll do that,
12 okay. Any other questions?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. We'll open
15 it -- apparently the lady would like to say
16 something.

17 MS. LOCKHART: My name is Tina
18 Lockhart. I'm representing White Castle. This is
19 our next door neighbor.

20 We just wanted to ask a couple
21 questions. First of all --

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Could you speak into
23 the microphone, please?

24 MS. LOCKHART: Sorry, this is my first

277

1 time here.

2 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: That's okay.

3 MR. LOCKHART: But anyways, first of
4 all, we were wondering about since they're going to
5 be serving liquor on the balcony we were
6 wondering -- most likely that would bring more
7 business to them.

8 And when it was around their
9 opening time that we had a lot of problems with,
10 for example, their customers parking in our lot.
11 And we were wondering if they were going to help us
12 out with this if it becomes a problem. And
13 basically my district told me to come here and talk
14 to you guys about this.

15 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: What place are you
16 from?

17 MS. LOCKHART: White Castle, the next
18 door neighbor.

19 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Have you contacted
20 anybody in the Village in the past about the
21 parking problem or --

22 MS. LOCKHART: Actually, you know, we
23 spoke to -- when it first started happening we
24 called the police department and we called Gurnee

278

1 Mills to see what exactly we had to do about it.

2 And we put up signage White Castle
3 parking only, et cetera, et cetera. And actually
4 we had a problem because we did go over there and
5 talk to Red Lobster, I'm not sure of your partner's
6 name, she had blond hair. But anyways, we spoke to
7 her about it and she said she understood, et
8 cetera, et cetera.

9 But then once we had to tow a
10 couple cars she got upset and she came to us. So
11 that's mainly our main concern because we want to
12 make sure our customers, you know, are being number
13 one for us, you know, while theirs are for them.
14 Because we want them to make money also, we just
15 want to make sure we are working together.

16 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay. Well, that's a
17 legitimate concern. Okay. Thank you.

18 I don't think there's going to be
19 anybody else so the floor is closed to the public.

20 Jon, is there -- you know, we had
21 this -- I heard we had this problem with some
22 other -- Lone Star I remember there was some
23 parking concern there and they wanted to expand and
24 they didn't have adequate parking.

279

1 Now do they have adequate parking
2 for their facility?

3 MR. WILDENBERG: Yeah. I'll defer to
4 Tracy, I haven't reviewed the plan.

5 MS. VELKOVER: I don't have that
6 information right in front of me.

7 In the case of Lone Star they only
8 had like 50 some parking spaces. In the case of
9 Red Lobster we took a look at how many seats they
10 had and how many employees to see if they could
11 meet our parking ordinance.

12 And then we also went to the fire
13 department and asked them based upon the area that
14 they were occupying, proposing to occupy on the
15 deck how many people could be accommodated there
16 per the fire department's code.

17 And based upon that information we
18 calculated the parking and they are able to meet
19 our parking requirements.

20 Now that's not to say there may
21 not -- there may be a problem, but they do meet our
22 code. Where in the case of Lone Star Steakhouse
23 with the addition of the outdoor cafe they could
24 not meet our code.

280

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Right, I remember that.
2 I guess that's all we could do really is that they
3 meet the parking requirements.

4 So if there's a problem I would
5 think hopefully you could work it out between
6 yourselves or maybe Gurnee Mills could come up with
7 some suggestions.

8 Jon, I don't know, do you guys
9 typically -- can you get involved with that in some
10 way or help out?

11 MR. WILDENBERG: Sometimes we do, but
12 generally it's worked out between the owners and
13 they come to an understanding on how to operate.
14 And Gurnee Mills does also intercede. So we try to
15 get things worked out between the parties.

16 MS. LOCKHART: Can I say one more thing?

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Sure.

18 MS. LOCKHART: It hasn't been a problem
19 lately, I want to point out. We're worried because
20 they're going to start serving the alcohol on the
21 porch it might become a problem again.

22 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Maybe they'll get tired
23 of waiting and come over and buy some sliders.

24 MR. WILDENBERG: We're about ready to go

281

1 over there right now.

2 MR. SMITH: Because they can park closer
3 if they park at White Castle, is that it, that they
4 don't have to walk as far?

5 MS. LOCKHART: I think that's the main
6 thing.

7 MR. SMITH: What if you put some kind of
8 divider acrossed there?

9 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Why don't we see how it
10 works out because it seems like they're kind of
11 working it out and I'm sure the Village can help
12 out.

13 So with that I'll entertain a
14 motion for a favorable recommendation.

15 MR. SULA: So moved.

16 MR. SMITH: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Motion by Mr. Sula,
18 seconded by Mr. Smith.

19 All those in favor of the motion
20 signify by saying aye in the roll call; those
21 opposed nay. Roll call, please.

22 MR. WILDENBERG: Sula.

23 MR. SULA: Aye.

24 MR. WILDENBERG: Kovarik.

282

1 MS. KOVARIK: Aye.

2 MR. WILDENBERG: Cepon.

3 MR. CEPON: Aye.

4 MR. WILDENBERG: Winter.

5 MR. WINTER: Aye.

6 MR. WILDENBERG: Smith.

7 MR. SMITH: Aye.

8 MR. WILDENBERG: Chairman Rudny.

9 MR. RUDNY: Aye.

10 Motion carries and it is so
11 ordered. I hope you're going to have Sam Adams on
12 tap.

13 MS. FRATUS: Tap and bottle, whichever
14 you want.

15 MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a
16 motion to adjourn.

17 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Okay, motion to
18 adjourn.

19 MR. CEPON: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Second. All in favor
21 say aye.

22 (Aye responses.)

23 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Opposed, nay.

24 (No response.)

283

1 CHAIRMAN RUDNY: Meeting is adjourned.

2 (The hearing concluded at 1:05 a.m.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21
22
23
24

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2) SS:
3 COUNTY OF L A K E)
4
5

6 I, SANDRA K. SMITH, CSR, RPR, do
7 hereby certify that I reported by means of machine
8 shorthand the testimony given at the foregoing
9 REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS, and that the foregoing is a
10 true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes
11 so taken as aforesaid.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

SANDRA K. SMITH, CSR, RPR
Notary Public, Lake County, IL
CSR License No. 084-003104

22

23

24