

Approved

**Village of Gurnee
Planning and Zoning Board Minutes
October 20, 2021**

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

Planning and Zoning Board Members Present: Chairman James Sula, Brian Baugh, R. Todd Campbell, Tim Garrity, David Nordentoft*, and Edwin Paff

Planning and Zoning Members Absent: Josh Pejsach

*The Chairman acknowledged the arrival of Mr. Nordentoft at 7:32 p.m.

Other Officials Present: Mr. David Ziegler, Community Development Director; Tracy Velkover, Planning Manager; Clara Gable, Associate Planner; and Gretchen Neddenriep, Acting Village Attorney

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of the following Planning & Zoning Board Meeting Minutes

Mr. Sula asked if there was any discussion to be had over the minutes as there was not, a motion was made, and--a vote taken--for each.

a. August 18, 2021

Mr. Paff motioned, seconded by Mr. Campbell, to approve the August 18, 2021 meeting minutes as presented.

Voice Vote:

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

Motion Carried: 6-0-0

b. September 29, 2021

Mr. Garrity motioned, seconded by Mr. Campbell, to approve the September 29, 2021 meeting minutes as presented.

Voice Vote:

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

Motion Carried: 6-0-0

Approved

4. Public Hearing: 35373 N. Juniper Street

Apinan and Supaporn Lachitavongs are requesting a Zoning Map Amendment to rezone property located at 35373 North Juniper Street from R-1, Residential in unincorporated Lake County, to R2, Single-Family Residential in the Village of Gurnee.

Ms. Gable introduced the item by stating that the petitioners are not in attendance and provided the following information on the request, referencing the petitioners' submitted application and the prepared staff notes: Apinan and Supaporn Lachitavongs are requesting a Zoning Map Amendment to rezone property located at 35373 North Juniper Street from R-1, Residential in unincorporated Lake County, to R-2, Single-Family Residential in the Village of Gurnee. In order to provide consolidated and efficient services, the Village has invited unincorporated parcels contiguous to the Village boundary to voluntarily annex into the Village. The first area the Village approached was the residential area south of Grand, near Spruce and Juniper, as properties in this area are completely surrounded by the Village of Gurnee. Three properties (one on Spruce Street and two on Juniper Street) have already elected to annex into the Village. The subject lot is approximately 20,000 square feet, which is in-line with the requirements of the Village's R-2 zoning district, which has a minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet and a minimum lot width of 100 feet. The principal building at 35373 N. Juniper Street meets the Village's R-2 setback requirement. The Planning & Zoning Board can make a recommendation on this petition that will be forwarded to the Village Board for final determination.

As this was a Public Hearing, Mr. Sula asked that anyone wishing to speak on this matter be sworn in. However, there was no one on behalf of the Petitioner, or in the audience, to speak.

Mr. Sula then asked if there were any questions or comments from members of the Board.

As there were no questions or comments from members of the PZB, Mr. Sula opened the floor to the public. As there was no one from the public there to make comments or ask questions, he then closed the floor to the public.

Mr. Sula asked if there were any more questions or comments, and suggested that—if not—a motion would be in order.

Mr. Garrity motioned, seconded by Mr. Baugh, to forward a recommendation to the Village Board on the petition of Apinan and Supaporn Lachitavongs for a Zoning Map Amendment to rezone 35373 N. Juniper Stree from R-1, Residential in unincorporated Lake County, to R-2, Single-Family Residence District in the Village of Gurnee.

Mr. Sula asked if there was any discussion to be had over the motion; as there was not, a vote was taken.

Mr. Sula also requested that the PZB notes on this matter be incorporated into the minutes, so that there is a record of appropriateness in this Petition and decision (referenced in Ms. Gable's introduction on the matter).

Roll Call Vote:

Approved

Ayes: Baugh, Campbell, Garrity, Nordentoft, Paff, and Sula

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried: 6-0-0

5. Minor Special Use Permit Amendment: Petition of Anthony Pontiac Buick/GMC Inc. (5589 Northridge Drive)

Anthony Buick/GMC Inc. is seeking a minor modification to their Special Use Permit for a vehicle dealership. The proposed amendment includes a reduction in building size (reduced by approximately 17%), along with changes related to the site plan/layout, parking areas, and architecture. The property is zoned C-2, Community Commercial District.

Ms. Gable introduced this item by stating that Anthony Buick/GMC Inc. is seeking a minor modification to their Special Use Permit for a vehicle dealership. The proposed amendment includes a reduction in building size (reduced by approximately 17%), along with changes related to the site plan/layout, parking areas, and architecture. The property is zoned C-2, Community Commercial District. The applicant is in attendance tonight.

Mr. Jesse Treuden, Senior Project Architect with The Redmond Group, walked Board Members through a PowerPoint Presentation outlining the proposed changes:

Site Plan Revisions

- Reduced overall building square footage 16% - 17%
 - Original Floor Plan: 40,400 square feet
 - Proposed Floor Plan: 33,730 square feet
- Moved building to the north to reduce site development costs and create a larger buffer for the residential properties to the south
 - Decreased distance to Northridge Drive by 80 feet
 - Increased distance from south property line by 130 feet
- Relocated the car wash from the south side of the building to the west side of the building (non-residential side)
 - Car wash exit will be facing north
- Removed one access point off Northridge Drive
- Relocated the southwest access point to work with the new parking lot layout
- Removed one site monument sign located on the west side of the property
- Reduced the number of light poles from 88 to 74
- Added double row of parking (tandem parking) for inventory along Northridge Drive for increased efficiency in parking lot layout

Approved

Exterior Elevation Revisions

- Reduced overall width of showroom
- Reduced height of glazing at the showroom
- Relocated the car wash to the west side of building
- Omitted the clerestory glass at the west elevation
- Revised OH doors on west elevation
- Reduced overall length of building
- Revised OH doors at carwash to insulated doors
- Relocated the car wash to the west side of building
- Reduced overall length of building
- Revised OH doors at carwash to insulated doors
- Reduced number of OH doors on east side of building and changed them to insulated doors with vision panels

Overhead Full Vision Doors

Roof Screens

Landscaping Maintenance Strip (gravel)

Concluding his presentation, Mr. Treuden asked the Board if there were any question.

Mr. Sula asked members of the Board if they had any questions or comments.

Mr. Nordentoft offered that most of these changes will be an improvement to the site, and expressed appreciation for the distancing from the neighboring residential area. He acknowledged the sacrifice of some landscaping along Northridge Drive, but felt it was a fair exchange for what was gained on the back side of the site.

Mr. Sula then asked if there were any more questions or comments, and suggested that—if not—a motion would be in order.

Mr. Campbell motioned, seconded by Mr. Nordentoft, to approve the petition of Anthony Buick/GMC for a Minor Amendment to a Special Use Permit to allow the establishment and operation of a vehicle dealership on property in Northridge Plaza (5589 Northridge Drive) in substantial conformance with the plans presented this evening to the PZB.

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

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Baugh, Campbell, Garrity, Nordentoft, Paff, and Sula

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Approved

Motion Carried: 6-0-0

Mr. Sula then wished continued success with the project.

6. Informal Review: Fence Windscreens and Slats

Feedback is requested on a possible text amendment to regulate windscreens or slats on chain link fences in residential districts.

Ms. Gable stated that staff has been approached on at least two occasions in the past few months as to whether we allow windscreens on chain link fences (similar to those often used around sports courts) both on residential and non-residential properties. These windscreens can be opaque or semi-transparent and offer a cost-effective way to provide privacy and protection from wind and sun. Staff has some concerns about the appearances of windscreens, especially if they become torn/ripped or damaged over time, as fabric is not as durable as other customary fencing materials and would need to be replaced more often.

In non-residential districts, fence types other than barbed wire and electrically-charged fences are not regulated. In residential districts, the Zoning Ordinance prohibits certain materials, including solid plywood, scrap lumber, temporary fencing, and similar non-customary materials.

Staff was approached this summer by McClure's Garage as to whether they could replace their fence with a chain link fence and utilize an opaque windscreen. This fence was allowed as fencing types other than barbed wire and electrically-charged fencing are not regulated in non-residential districts. The condition was added that "The fence and windscreen fabric cover is to be kept in good condition at all times. The windscreen fabric cover must remain attached to the chain link fence and must be replaced if it becomes torn/ripped."

Most recently, a Pembroke resident called in early October asking if he could install a chain link fence with a windscreen around his single-family property (not part of an HOA). The Zoning Administrator determined that it would be allowed, as both chain link fencing and windscreens could be considered customary fencing materials and are not specifically prohibited by code. Staff is seeking feedback as to whether the Planning & Zoning Board is comfortable with windscreens in general or feels that windscreens not associated with sports/recreational courts should be prohibited in residential and/or commercial districts.

Concluding, Ms. Gable stated that staff surveyed 14 nearby communities regarding windscreens and early in in this research, identified another question for the PZB to consider: whether to allow or prohibit slats in chain link fences, as these could be used similarly to make a chain link fence appear more solid. Our Zoning Ordinance does state that "A chain link fence with slats is not considered a solid fence," which was put in to prohibit the use of this fence type for garbage enclosures, but does not outright prohibit the use of slats. Of the 14 communities surveyed, six would allow windscreens and slats subject to various conditions (only along rear and interior side

Approved

lot lines, additional landscaping/screening required, etc.) and eight communities would not allow windscreens or slats at all.

Mr. Sula began the discussion by stating that he felt these fencing materials had no place in or adjacent to residential areas.

Mr. Garrity concurred, stated that he wouldn't like his neighbors having such fencing—that he felt it wasn't a good look for the community—and expressed doubt that upkeep required to maintain such fencing would be kept up with by those having it, leading to complaints from yet other residents.

Mr. Paff agreed, stating that he really didn't like chain-link fencing to begin with, agreeing that upkeep would not be met. He also questioned the quality of materials that would be used.

Mr. Campbell noted that easier-to-maintain wood fences aren't even always kept up, so a lesser aesthetically-pleasing type of fencing would look even worse if not maintained.

Mr. Nordentoft also concurred with his fellow Board members.

Mr. Baugh concurred, and added that he would like to see chain-link fences prohibited.

Ms. Gable asked if Board members felt this way in regards to such fencing in both residential areas and commercial areas, clarifying with Mr. Sula that in regards to fencing, the Village's distinction is simply between "residential" and "nonresidential" areas" and that distinguishing fencing regulations for commercial versus industrial uses would not be possible without extensive revisions to the current ordinance. The overall consensus is that such fencing, even in commercial and industrial area, was not appropriate.

Ms. Velkover added that such fencing is already somewhat prohibited in industrial areas, as the current ordinance is very specific that this type of application cannot be used as a solid screen to screen outdoor storage areas. This is prohibited because when you move past such a fence, such as in a car, you get close to full views into the outdoor storage areas.

Ms. Gable then asked if feelings were similar in regards to windscreens as slats, and the general consensus is that they are.

Mr. Sula then wrapped up this discussion, as feedback was noted by Village Staff.

7. Next Meeting Date: November 3, 2021

Ms. Gable stated that there are no public hearings set for this night, but that it is possible for there to be some non-public hearing items. Mr. Sula stated that the PZB's 2022 meeting schedule should be scheduled for review in the near future. Ms. Velkover stated that it is set for review at the Board's next meeting.

8. Public Comment

Approved

Mr. Sula then opened the floor to comments regarding any issues not on this evening's agenda; as there were no comments made, Mr. Sula closed the floor to the public.

9. Adjournment

Mr. Baugh motioned, seconded by Mr. Garrity, to adjourn the meeting.

Voice Vote:

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

Motion Carried: 6-0-0

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joann Metzger,
Recording Secretary, Planning and Zoning Board