

Approved

Village of Gurnee
Planning and Zoning Board Minutes
September 5, 2018

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, Tim Garrity, Richard McFarlane, David Nordentoft, Josh Pejsach, and Edwin Paff

Planning and Zoning Members Absent: None

Other Officials Present: Tracy Velkover, Planning Manager; Clara Schopf, Associate Planner; and Bryan Winter, Village Attorney.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of Meeting Minutes: July 11, 2018

Mr. Sula asked that “such those proposed” (last line, Page 2) be changed to “such as those proposed.”

Mr. Nordentoft noted two motions that had passed (carried) as being incorrectly recorded as “not carried.”

Mr. Nordentoft motioned, seconded by Mr. McFarlane, to approve the meeting minutes for July 11, 2018 with discussed revisions.

Voice vote:

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

Motion carried: 7-0-0

4. PUBLIC HEARING: Special Use Permit for McAllister’s Deli (6557 Route 132 Unit A)

McAllister’s Deli, which is proposing to occupy the tenant space vacated by Panera Bread at 6557 Route 132 Unit A, is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow a second wall sign (45 sq. ft.) on the south building wall.

Ms. Schopf introduced the item by stating that McAllister’s Deli is proposing to occupy the tenant space vacated by Panera Bread at 6557 Route 132 Unit A. The property is zoned C-2 PUD and is part of the Grand-Hunt Planned Unit Development. McAllister’s Deli is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow a second wall sign on the south building wall. Both proposed wall signs are approximately 45 sq. ft. in area. Per the Grand-Hunt PUD, each tenant is allowed one 60 sq. ft. wall sign, which may be split, if needed, into two signs as long as the total amount of sign area is not exceeded. The applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit for the second wall sign as the combined area of both signs exceeds 60 sq. ft. The underlying sign code would allow only one wall sign. An additional wall sign would require a Special Use Permit. As with all Special Use Permit petitions, the Planning and Zoning Board will make a recommendation that will be forwarded to the Village Board for their determination. The petitioner is in attendance to present his plans and answer any questions the board may have.

Approved

As this was a Public Hearing, Mr. Sula asked anyone wishing to speak to be sworn in; Mr. Winter conducted the swearing-in.

Mr. Sula asked if there was anyone present who would like to add anything more on behalf of the Petitioner.

Mr. Syam Thotakura stated that he was very happy to be opening his business in Gurnee. He then explained the reasoning behind his request. McAllister's is brand new to this area, and--given the somewhat obstructed view of the rather long, narrow strip in which it will be located—he is concerned that people may not even see signage if it is limited to the front of the shop. He also noted that the front of the store doesn't face a street.

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

Mr. Baugh asked if the directional sign was also part of the proposal.

Ms. Velkover spelled out the exact locations of the various signs in the strip mall, and clarified with Mr. Baugh that it is a proposed second wall sign on the back of the shop that is the subject of this request for a Special Use Permit. There is no request for a directional sign. That sign should have been removed from the packet. She apologized for that sign drawing remaining in the packet and creating confusion.

Mr. McFarlane expressed that he was okay with the sign as proposed, but asked about the proposed awnings. Specifically if they would be similar to those installed for Panera.

Mr. Thotakura stated that they would be a similar color to those existing for Panera.

Mr. Sula reminded the board members that the only issue being considered in this request was the proposed wall sign.

Mr. Garrity expressed concerned over setting precedent, asking what if neighboring businesses in the strip mall would also want to put signs up on the back of their shops.

Ms. Velkover advised to keep in mind that for this building, the minor PUD allowed the splitting of the 60 sq. ft. of sign area into 2 wall signs. So that signs on the rear of the building would be allowed if the two signs totaled no more than 60 sq. ft. However, McAllister's signs are each 45 sq. ft., which exceed the allowed amount by 30 sq. ft. It is only the sign's total size that requires the special use permit.

Mr. Sula expressed that he has no real issue with the proposed sign, citing the rather unique placement of the strip mall in which the shop is located (it is the rear of the building that basically faces the entrance to the development while the front of the building does not front a public street).

Mr. Pejsach noted the size of the variance, and asked if there were any other variances of this size (30 feet) in the Village, as he was also concerned about setting a precedent.

Mr. Sula clarified with Ms. Velkover that there is no particular guidelines in regards to how large a departure to the size can be requested, and that, should other businesses in this building desire to utilize signage on the rear of the building they could do so without a Special Use Permit unless the total square foot of signs exceeds the 60 sq. ft. allowance.

This prompted Mr. Nordentoft to add concern that a new bar, so to speak, could be set in regards to acceptable amounts of square footage of signage.

Mr. Winter advised that precedence is not likely to become an issue, as the process of requesting/approving a Special Use Permit is designed to allow consideration for any unique situations

Approved

brought up in the request (such as the placement of this particular strip mall in which the Petitioner's business is located) and to not recommend approval of requests unless there are any such unique situations brought up.

Mr. Paff offered that he feels the rear of the shop would look more attractive with reasonable signage on the back, and suggested it may be a good look for the strip mall, overall.

Mr. McFarlane noted that not all the businesses in the strip mall may necessarily need the same amount of signage, anyway (noting the significance of being on the end of the strip where there is frontage on Hunt Club Road) and conferred with Mr. Sula that the decision to be made this evening should be based on the expressed needs of this Petitioner, and not out of concern over a hypothetical request that may or may not be made in the future.

Mr. Paff clarified with Mr. Sula that both the front and rear signs are to be the same size.

Ms. Velkover stated that both signs are 45 sq. ft.

Mr. Garrity asked what would stop customers from entering the shop from the rear of the building if there was a sign in back.

Mr. Sula suggested that it would be unlikely, as most customers would realize that this was the back of the building.

At this time, Mr. Sula opened the floor to the public. As there were no responses, he closed the floor to the public.

Mr. Pejsach expressed that while hypotheticals are not what is considered in this vote, they, along with the excessive size of this signage, are still of concern to him.

Mr. Sula responded by suggesting it is the scale of the sign and its proportion to the building that should be considered. He clarified with Ms. Velkover that the sign code would allow a 46 sq. ft. wall sign, so scale-wise, a 45 sq. ft. sign would not appear to be out of scale.

Mr. Baugh and Mr. McFarlane verified with Mr. Thotakura that the green backing behind the lettering would only be on the sign in front of the building, not the one in the rear (which is only to have the white lettering).

Mr. Sula then asked if there were any more questions/comments from the Board, and stated that, if not, a motion would be in order.

Mr. Paff motioned, seconded by Mr. Garrity, to forward a favorable recommendation on the petition of McAllister's Deli for a Special Use Permit to allow a second wall sign (45 sq. ft.) on the south wall for 6557 Route 132 Unit A.

Mr. Sula asked if there was any discussion on the motion. As there was not, a vote was taken.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Baugh, McFarlane, Nordentoft, Paff, Sula

Nays: Garrity, Pejsach

Abstain: none

Motion carried: 5-2-0

Approved

Mr. Winter advised the Petitioner that this was only a recommendation, and that staff would advise him as to the next step, which is to appear before the Village Board for final approval.

5. Next Meeting Date: September 12, 2018

Ms. Schopf states that there is a Public Hearing on the agenda of the next meeting.

6. Public Comment

There were no public comments made at this meeting

7. Adjournment

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

Voice vote:

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

Motion carried: 7-0-0

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joann Metzger,
Recording Secretary, Planning and Zoning Board