

Approved

**Village of Gurnee
Planning and Zoning Board Minutes
August 18, 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, R. Todd Campbell, Edwin Paff, and Josh Pejsach

Planning and Zoning Members Absent: Brian Baugh, Tim Garrity, and David Nordentoft

Other Officials Present: David Ziegler, Director of Community Development, Clara Gable, Associate Planner, and Gretchen Neddenriep, Acting Village Attorney

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of the July 7, 2021 Planning & Zoning Board Meeting Minutes

Mr. Sula asked that some clarification be made in the minutes regarding the car wash informal. He noted that the minutes reflect that he is concerned that the project would be located at a point of entry into the Village. However, his concern is that it would be in a highly-visible location.

Ms. Gable acknowledged Mr. Sula's request, and the minutes will be amended.

Mr. Sula then asked if any other members of the Board had anything to discuss, and suggested that, if not, a motion would be in order.

Mr. Pejsach motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to approve the July 7, 2021 meeting minutes, as amended.

Voice vote:

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

Motion Carried: 4-0-0

4. Public Hearing: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments

Ms. Gable introduced the item by stating that the Village of Gurnee is requesting the following text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance: 1) Amend Article 8 (Uses) to add "Place of Worship" to the O-1, Restricted Office District, as a Special Use Permit; and 2) Amend Article 15 (Application Procedures) to update language pertaining to pre-application conferences/informal reviews. The first text amendment is proposed in response to the Informal Review that took place on 5-19-2021, where the Planning & Zoning Board indicated support for allowing this use in the O-1 district. The Planning & Zoning Board ultimately encouraged the informal review applicant to work with Village Staff on this proposed text amendment.

Approved

The second text amendment adjusts language from Article 15, which states “The purpose of the pre-application conference, which does not require a formal application or fees, is to provide informal advice and assistance to the applicant. Any opinions or advice provided are not binding with respect to any official action that may be taken on the application.” The proposed text amendment would strike the line “which does not require a formal application or fees.” Our pre-application conference (informal review) process does have a formal application; staff will also accept a letter requesting an informal review. Also, the zoning ordinance does not discuss fees, so staff felt this was an inappropriate place to state that no fees are required. At this time, staff does not have any plans to charge for informal reviews, but removing this language would allow for this to occur at a future date should the Village determine a fee to be appropriate, without the delay of a hearing for a text amendment. On this matter, the Planning and Zoning Board will make a recommendation that will be forwarded to the Village Board for their determination.

As this was a Public Hearing, Mr. Sula opened the floor to the public. After no response, he then closed the floor to the public.

Mr. Sula referred to conversation on this matter at a previously-held informal review. Mr. Sula and the other PZB members present concurred on this item, and there was no further discussion.

Mr. Pejsach motioned, seconded by Mr. Campbell, to forward a favorable recommendation on the petition of the Village of Gurnee to amend Article 8 (Uses) by adding “Place of Worship” to the O-1, Restricted Office District, as a Special Use Permit; and to delete language in Article 15 (Application Procedures) indicating that a formal application and fee is not required for a pre-application conference/informal review before Village staff or the Planning and Zoning Board.

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: Campbell, Paff, Pejsach, and Sula

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried: 4-0-0

5. Public Hearing: Way Through the Word Ministry Church Petition for a Special Use Permit to allow a Place of Worship (Church) at 151 N. Greenleaf Street

Ms. Gable stated that Way Through The Word Ministry Church is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow the establishment and operation of a place of worship (church) at 151 N. Greenleaf Street, formerly SCIL Animal Care. The subject property is zoned O-1, Restricted Office District. The Planning and Zoning Board will make a recommendation that will be forwarded to the Village Board for their determination. The applicant is in attendance tonight.

Approved

As this was a Public Hearing, Mr. Sula asked that anyone wishing to speak on this matter be sworn-in. Ms. Neddenriep conducted the swearing-in. Mr. Sula turned the floor over to the Petitioner.

Reverend Ellie J. Coleman, pastor of the Way Through the Word Ministry Church, gave a brief history of the Church's presence in the Village—indicated the location they have chosen to settle and establish their own presence, and then described the church's mission: "seek to minister through preaching, teaching and sharing the full gospel of Jesus Christ." The Reverend provided a list of services/programs offered by the church, including:

- Evangelism
- Fishers of Men
- Shepherding New Members
- Reach, Teach and Train (R.T.T. Ministry)
- God Needs Dads
- We Care Ministry
- Jail & Prison Ministries
- Daughters of Zelophehad

Mr. Sula asked what kinds of activities would be held at the Church.

The Reverend referred to the PowerPoint presentation provided:

- The premises will be operated and used as a religious establishment (i.e., church) to be comprised of Sunday morning worship services, religious education (i.e., Sunday School, weekly bible study) and various community outreach programs, such as Vacation Bible
- Hours of operation will not interfere with current neighborhood shared expectations. Per the application materials, hours of operation would be as follows:
 - Tuesdays: Bible Study/Prayers Services from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm
 - Sundays: Sunday School from 9:45 am to 10:45 am followed by Worship Services from 11:00 am to 1:00 pm
 - Special events throughout the year include summer vacation bible school, life enrichment, and evangelism seminars
- Neighborhood traffic will not increase as hours of operation are at nonpeak hours.
- Neighborhood and village nuisance ordinances will not be negatively affected by the operation of this establishment.
- The ministry would actively seek to build relationships and join with neighbors to maintain a respectful and peaceful neighborhood.

The PowerPoint presentation also offered maps and photos illustrating both the interior and exterior of the structure and site, including a proposed parking lot site plan.

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

Mr. Paff asked if they could recommend the parking lot on the property be repaired and striped, and Mr. Pejsach asked if that could be made a condition of approval.

Reverend Coleman responded that the repairs and striping are pending upon approval of the Church's petition.

Mr. Sula confirmed that the repairs and striping can be made a condition of approval (with which the Petitioner agreed). He then opened the floor to the public. As there no one from the public in

Approved

attendance to make comments, he closed the floor. He asked if there were any more questions/comments from members of the Board, and suggested that—if not—a motion would be in order.

Mr. Pejsach motioned, seconded by Mr. Campbell, to forward a favorable recommendation on the petition of Way Through the Word Ministry Church for a Special Use Permit to allow the establishment and operation of a place of worship/church at 151 N. Greenleaf Street, with the following conditions: 1) that the parking lot be striped to create one-way circulation of traffic; and 2) that the sections of the parking lot that are reduced to gravel be re-paved.

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: Campbell, Paff, Pejsach, and Sula

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Motion Carried: 4-0-0

Mr. Sula reminded the petitioner that this was a recommendation that would be forwarded to the Village Board, and that Village staff would advise as to the next steps in the process. He wished the Petitioner good luck.

6. Public Hearing: Leon Congenie (Juggernaut Tattoo)

Ms. Gable introduced this item by stating that Mr. Leon Congenie, with Juggernaut Tattoo, is requesting the following: 1) Major Amendment to the Gurnee Business Center Planned Unit Development to add “Body Modification Establishment” to the use list as a Special Use Permit; and 2) Special Use Permit to allow a “Body Modification Establishment” at 3900 Washington Street, Units F and G. The subject properties are zoned C-2/I-2 PUD. The PZB will make a recommendation that will be forwarded to the Village Board. The applicant is in attendance tonight.

As this was a Public Hearing, Mr. Sula asked that anyone wishing to speak on this matter be sworn in. Ms. Neddenriep conducted the swearing-in. He then turned the floor over to the Petitioner.

Mr. Leon Congenie, Jr., of Gurnee, began his presentation by expressing his desire to open a studio for his business, Juggernaut Tattoo. He then passed out packets he prepared—a shortened version of his business proposal—to Board members. Mr. Congenie identified himself as a 33-year-old tattoo artist with a dream of opening his own business. Explaining that he was nervous, he thanked the Board for allowing him to present his business proposal. Mr. Congenie offered a brief history of how he honed his craft and gained skills in running a business, and explained how he came to the decision to open his own business with which to share his talents. He asked members of the Board to look over the materials he gave them, and offered to answer any question they may have.

Approved

Mr. Sula asked Mr. Congenie what the hours of operation would be for the business. Mr. Congenie answered that hours would be 11:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., Tuesday through Saturday, and 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Sundays. Services would be by appointment only, with no walk-ins allowed.

Mr. Sula then asked how many employees the facility will have. Mr. Congenie explained that he currently has one employee, but hopes to have five tattoo artists and one body-modification artist to do piercings, micro-blading, and such, for a total of six artists, including himself.

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

Mr. Pejsach asked if there were any other licenses that would need to be obtained. Mr. Congenie answered that he would have to obtain a business license, and that all employees would have to complete training in preventing the spread of blood borne pathogens and in other areas of health and sanitation.

Mr. Campbell expressed concerned that there was no tinting in the windows to prevent the exposure of a client undergoing some kind of piercing or such. Mr. Congenie responded that any window in front of a work station would be tinted, and Mr. Charles Morgan, Juggernaut's piercing artist, added that privacy and discretion would be stressed.

Mr. Sula asked that Mr. Morgan be sworn-in. Ms. Neddenriep conducted the swearing-in.

Mr. Paff asked if there were any objections from other tenants in the building.

Village staff answered that there was not.

Mr. Sula asked staff to whom notice would have been given.

Ms. Gable responded that notice is required for all property owners within 500 feet (not necessarily the tenants renting spaces). She noted that there were also public hearing signs placed on the property for tenants to see. She noted that a few building tenants had reached out after seeing the public hearing signs, but were not concerned after finding out about the request.

Mr. Sula expressed concern over the visibility of the proposed location compared to other businesses of this kind within the Village that are "tucked away," as he described. Citing ordinance addressing the proximity of such businesses to businesses that serve alcohol, he also expressed concern that at least two restaurants were nearby—though, he acknowledged that ordinance did not specifically make reference to restaurants. Mr. Sula further stressed that it was not his personal taste, the optics of restaurants and such business in close proximity. Mr. Campbell concurred, expressing concern for families that may be shopping/dining in the area. Mr. Paff also expressed concern over the setting of the location (a strip mall) and was surprised that more neighboring tenants did not object.

Mr. Pejsach asked the other Board members if requiring tinted windows would make a difference to them, then asked the petitioner what plans were in place to provide privacy to clients and obscurity to others.

Mr. Morgan answered that vinyl would be used to cover the windows, curtains would be installed—and, countered that the restaurants brought up by Board members may be patronized

Approved

by their very own clients, as well. Mr. Congenie stressed that there would be no congregation around the building, as services would be provided by appointment only.

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

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

Mr. Pejsach stated that, with plans in place—as well as the conditions discussed (by appointment only, window coverings, etc.)—he felt there really was no problem with the proposed plans.

Mr. Morgan asserted the acceptance of such businesses in neighboring communities, and suggested that Board members themselves are the kind of clientele such businesses draw/serve.

Mr. Pejsach acknowledged the modesty of the proposed studio, noting that it would not have the neon signs and such often associated with this type of business. Mr. Paff acknowledged the subtleness of the other such businesses in the Village.

Mr. Pejsach asked Village staff if there had been any complaints regarding the other tattoo shops in the Village, and Mr. Ziegler answered that there has not been.

Mr. Morgan stressed that such a business can benefit a community by offering residents an artistic way to celebrate the birth of a child and/or other such rites of passage.

Mr. Sula posited that, while the other businesses of this type within the Village only had one artist, the multiple employees potentially working in this studio may draw more traffic.

Mr. Morgan countered that the number of employees is not really a factor, as they would not all be working at once. He also explained that, while he and Mr. Congenie would be employed by the business, the other artists would be independent contractors.

Mr. Sula asked if that was to mean that there would be a constant cycle of new workers, and Mr. Morgan responded by explaining that the independent contractors would not be cycling in and out, but—rather, are classified as such workers because they are essentially bringing/growing and serving their own clientele. Mr. Sula asked Village staff and the acting Village Attorney how this kind of employment would affect how a business would be licensed. Mr. Ziegler answered that licensing was based on the size of the space. With elaboration from Mr. Ziegler, Mr. Morgan likened this arrangement to owners of beauty salons renting stations to beauticians who bring their own clientele into the salons.

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

At that time, a woman from the audience stood up to speak. Mr. Sula—though having had closed the floor to the public—allowed her to speak after Ms. Neddenriep swore her in.

Amanda Mika, of Gurnee, questioned why there was such concern over the proximity of this proposed business to restaurants when there is a tattoo removal business in close proximity to restaurants. Mr. Ziegler responded that the difference lies in the classification of the different types of business.

Approved

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

Mr. Pejsach motioned, seconded by Mr. Paff, to forward a favorable recommendation on the Petition of Leon Congenie, Jr. to allow a Major Modification to the Gurnee Business Center Planned Unit Development located at the northwest corner of U.S. Route 41 and Washington Street, to add “Body Modification Establishment” as a Special Use, and a Special Use Permit to allow a “Body Modification Establishment,” specifically a piercing and tattoo shop, at 3900 Washington Street, Units F and G subject to the following conditions: 1) that the business operate by appointment only; 2) that the business operate in substantial conformance with the proposed business plans submitted to the Village; 3) that the business/facility obtain all required licensing by the Village and the state’s department of health; and 4) that the business install the proper tinting/covering of windows to provide modesty and privacy.

Mr. Paff asked if this needed to be two separate motions. Mr. Sula advised that it need not be. Mr. Sula asked if there was any discussion on the motion. As there was not, a vote was taken.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Paff, Pejsach

Nays: Campbell, Sula

Abstain: None

Motion Failed: 2-2-0

Mr. Sula explained that the petition would be forwarded to the Village Board without a recommendation from the PZB—that the Village Board has the final say, anyway—and that Village staff would advise as to the next steps in the process.

7. Public Hearing: Ron Sachs (16530 W. Washington Street and 34644 N. Cemetery Road)

Ms. Gable stated that Mr. Ron Sachs, with JJS Properties, is requesting the following for approximately 10-acres located at the northwest corner of Cemetery Road and Washington Street: 1) Zoning Map Amendment from E, Estate in unincorporated Lake County, to C-2 PUD, Community Commercial as a Planned Unit Development, and R-3, Single-Family Residential, in the Village of Gurnee; 2) Preliminary PUD and Site Plan Review approval for a retail/office facility and self-storage facility; and 3) Special Use Permit for a self-storage facility. The proposed use consists of approximately 10,200 sf of retail and 113,385 sf of self-storage. The PZB will make a recommendation that will be forwarded to the Village Board for their determination.

Ms. Sula asked that anyone wishing to speak on this matter be sworn in. Ms. Neddenriep, acting Village Attorney, conducted the swearing-in. Mr. Sula also asked that anyone speaking at the meeting to give his/her name, address, and affiliation as he/she begins. He turned the floor over to the Petitioner.

Mr. John Swierk, with DDCA Architects introduced himself as the architect working on the project for Mr. Ron Sachs. He introduced their team: Ron Sachs, Petitioner; Christine Sachs, Ron’s wife

Approved

(who runs a business called “Art Expressions”); Jason Sachs, Ron’s son; Jessica Sachs, Ron’s daughter; Jerry Callahan, the Petitioner’s attorney; Tom Nordloh, Landscape Architect for the project; Mike Anderson, Civil Engineer for the project; Tim Larkin, with DDCA Architects; and David Urbaniak with @Properties.

Mr. Swierk began his presentation with a slideshow. He stated that it is zoned E, Estate, in unincorporated Lake County, and has been vacant for 30+ years, except for barn and some outdoor storage which, in the past has included parts of carnival rides. Noting that the adjoining properties are zoned C-2 PUD (south east and south west corners) and C-1 on the northeast corner, and that the Gurnee Comprehensive Land Use Plan, which was modified in 2020, reflects commercial zoning for the subject property, they believe that their request is consistent with the Village’s Comp Plan designation. He summarized the requested petitions, which include: 1) Petition for Zoning Map Amendment from E, Estate, and R-1 or R-3, Single-Family Residential, and C-2, Community Commercial; 2) Annexation of the property; 3) Petition for PUD with Preliminary PUD approval for the commercial portion; and 3) Special Use Permit for a self-storage facility on the site. The R-1 or R-3 zoned portion is on the western edge of the north parcel, and provides for the continuation of Churchill Lane into the site. He noted that there are no plans for the residential at this time. Mr. Swierk noted exceptions (departures) that are requested as part of the PUD: 1) Self-storage as a Special Use Permit; 2) the use of architectural insulated metal panels for the portions of the self-storage buildings that are not visible from the streets (sample provided); 3) elimination of restaurants and banquet hall from the C-2 use list in order to limit traffic/parking; 4) restricting hours of operation; 5) requesting to use the west wall of the west buildings as the required fence buffer between residential (fencing will be provided where there are any gaps); and 6) provision of a 40-foot setback to the west property line versus the required 25-foot setback to preserve the existing tree line and allow the addition of the required buffer plantings. He gave an overview of the proposed project, which is to include a large retail facility of approximately 13,200 square feet—10,000 in which Ms. Sachs’ Art Expressions commercial art and framing business will be housed (currently located approximately about 2.5 miles away in unincorporated Lake County). The remaining commercial building will consist of approximately 1,000 square feet for an office for the self-storage facility and 3,200 square feet for future commercial use. He addressed a list of concerns expressed and offered what they feel are solutions to these concerns. Regarding traffic, he explained that the buildings along the north and west property lines are placed to create a sort of enclave to the facility, in order to protect the adjacent properties from noise, lights, etc. They anticipate approximately 15 visits a day, based on the activity of an existing 60,000 sq. ft. self-storage facility that Mr. Sachs owns/operates in Beach Park. Citing a national average hours-of-operation for self-storage facilities of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., they anticipate the average time of this facility will be around 8:30 a.m. to 7:15 p.m., with 95% of the traffic between 8 a.m. and 9 p.m. Per the Lake County website, there are approximately 21,000 cars a day on Washington Street, and about 2,300 on Cemetery Road. With about 15 cars entering each day, the self-storage facility won’t generate even 1/10th of one percent of existing traffic. Access to the site is limited from Cemetery Road. As for security, the facility will be under 24-hour-a-day security monitoring and

Approved

access will be limited by key-pad entry. All lighting will stay on the subject property and not encroach on to adjacent properties. Aesthetically, the buildings are designed with the continuation of similar design elements found on adjacent commercial buildings. Lastly, landscaping will meet the Village requirements and they do not intend to disturb any of the existing material on the north and west property lines. He pointed out the “L” shaped building at the corner of the site and noted that the portion that parallels Cemetery Road contains the commercial uses while the portion that parallels Washington Street is self-storage. The self-storage building is accessible only from the north. There is a self-storage building along the west property line that is only accessible from the east side, another along the north property line, and then two buildings in the middle that are both drive-up and walk-up climate controlled storage, accessible only once you get past the security point. The large building facing Cemetery is self-storage that is entirely climate-controlled. Detailing the exteriors of the buildings, Mr. Swierk explained that the façades facing Washington Street and Cemetery Road will be commercial-looking buildings with residential type materials (cement board siding, aluminum framed glass windows, stone and some metal roofing). Facades with the overhead garage doors, as well as the backs of the buildings that do not face the roadways, are proposed to be constructed of insulated metal paneling. Offering a sample of the paneling, he opined that it looks like precast concrete from a distance. He said that the panels come in a variety of colors and explained that, they plan to use a toned-down/neutral color. He explained that the material is heavily insulated, tongue-and-groove, and is not used because it's cheap, as it is not. The Washington Street elevation will appear like retail storefronts, even the portion of the building that is self-storage. He stated that there will be no parking in front along Washington Street and no access directly to this road. He provided a rendering of the retail building from Cemetery Road with Art Expressions at the south end, the self-storage office space to the north, and leasable area in the middle. He noted that the renderings with green overhead doors show the view from the internal circulation lanes that will not be visible from the perimeter of the development. Mr. Swierk then presented a sample of cement board and stone (accent) which is what will be used on the perimeter of the retail building. Concluding his presentation, Mr. Swierk asserted that this project will benefit the Village in several ways, including:

1. Provide small business owners flexible and cost-effective space.
2. Provide residents service during the most trying times of their lives (divorce, relocation, job loss, death in the family).
3. Serve the five senior living facilities within one mile of its location.
4. Have an extremely low impact compared to most commercial properties; noting the site is reflected as commercial on the Village's Comp Plan, it could potentially be developed with a gas station and/or multiple fast food restaurants.
5. Final design will be compliant with all Village requirements (lighting, landscaping, and storm water) and there will be no increase in surface run-off than what currently exists today; detention is located north of the northeast corner of Winchester Estates.
6. Concerns from previous PZB meetings have been addressed.

Approved

7. Additional tax base without burden on schools, water supply, wastewater and traffic; they anticipate an additional \$200,000 in real estate taxes.
8. Local and neighboring residential areas will be offered affordable and convenient storage needs and retail use.
9. Community will be provided with better use of property and enhanced curb appeal.

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

Mr. Paff stated that the developer did a good job trying to address some of the concerns that the PZB had at the previous informal meeting, offering that the proposed buildings are attractive and fit the area pretty well. He also expressed that that he likes the fact that the development is one-story, versus the two-story version they saw in the past. He also likes that the building along the west side is situated in a manner to block traffic, lights, and noise from the site. He did, however, state that he had a question regarding the property line. On the overall site plan, the trees are shown on the residential side of the property line, but on the landscape plan the trees are shown on the commercial property. Which is correct?

Mr. Tom Nordloh stated that a tree survey will be completed at a later date, but that he has walked the site and a vast majority of the trees along the west property line are on the subject property. They have provided an extensive planting along that west property line, probably more than he has ever provided in his 40 years, with a mix of evergreen/canopy trees and shrubs. The planted trees would be east of the existing tree line.

A woman from the audience interjects. Mr. Sula asks her to wait until the floor is open to the public. Mr. Sula then reminds the Mr. Nordloh to address the Board.

Mr. Paff stated that it looks like a much larger buffer on the overall site plan than it does on the landscape plan, which is what concerns him. He stressed that that it looked like 40 feet to the existing trees, but in reality the existing trees are in that 40-foot-wide area. He asked the Petitioner to provide details on which buildings would be built in each of the phases of development, since Building #2 is important for blocking noise, lights, etc.

Mr. Swierk stated that the information is in the staff report, but that Phase 1 will include buildings 1, 2, 3, and 5, and will be built in 2022. Phase 2 will consist of building 4, and will probably be built a year later. Lastly, Phase 3 will consist of building 6, which will probably be built in 2024.

Mr. Paff asked what the height is of Building 2. Mr. Swierk answered that the building is 10 feet tall.

Mr. Paff clarified with Village staff that this is a C-2 PUD, noting that the C-2 district is defined as a high intensity, highway-oriented commercial use. The entrance to this development would be off of Cemetery Road, which is definitely not a highway. Village staff further clarified, "Community Commercial District," and Mr. Paff noted that—as a PUD—it is a bit different. While Mr. Paff feels the Petitioners did a good job trying to fit it in, he is not sure it is appropriate for the location.

Approved

Mr. Pejsach expressed that, compared to what was presented last year, these plans are a huge improvement. He added that he is happy with the progress, though agrees with the comments of Mr. Paff regarding landscaping and elevations. He stated that he has no questions at this time.

Mr. Sula stated that he is confused by the staff notes that show 2 options. Ms. Gable responded that those options reflect what Mr. Sachs presented at the Informal Review. Those are not what is being proposed this evening and were provided solely for comparison purpose. Before opening the floor to the public, Mr. Sula explained that all public questions and comments are to be directed to the Board, and the floor will be closed to the public after all questions and comments are taken. At that time, either Village staff or the Petitioner will address the question/issue. He added, for the record, that the PZB has received approximately 40 emails, none of which are in support of the project.

Mr. Chaten Howard, 369 N. Cemetery Road, stated that the southwest corner of his property would be opposite the northeast corner of the proposed development site. He is opposed to the combining of these two properties, as well as the zoning. He reminded that, last year, the Board was in opposition to a storage facility in this area. He visited the storage facility that Mr. Sachs owns and operates in Beach Park, and noted that facility is much smaller (by about 50%) and has much less impact on the neighborhoods, as there is already a commercial development right next door. Asserting the C-2 zoning is not consistent with the Village's long range plan (2040) for the Cemetery Road property, he expressed concern with commercial zoning moving into what is reflected as residential on the Village's Comp Plan and noted that the 100% of the detention is on the residential zoned land, leaving only a handful of homes that can be built on the residential portion. He has lived on Cemetery Road his entire life, living at 396 N. Cemetery for the last 10 years. His biggest concern though is storm water runoff. He provided photos of his property during many different types of rain events (light rains/heavy rains). The photos show the amount of water that comes through his property under current conditions, with a bunch of farm fields and no buildings or concrete parking lots. The storm pipe that outlets onto his property is 100% full. The Village Engineer told him that the pipe size might need to be increased, but he believes that enlarging the pipe will only bring more water to his property. He explained that, in the current state, water will back up on to his and his parents' property and enter his house through the garage, causing his basement to flood. This has happened on multiple occasions; dozens of times water has made it into his garage and his floor drains were able to take care of it before it entered his home. He stated that in a 10-year rain event, 70% of water is normally contained by the ground and that once this property develops; it'll take nearly 100% of 10-acres of runoff and discharge it into his yard. He will have to do something to fortify his property if this development occurs, as every inch of proposed concrete on that site is water that comes onto his property. Acknowledging that it is great they have a retention area, he asserted that—in a two-year flood they get a set amount of water coming out of the pipe, but—in a 10-year flood the developer will be allowed to discharge more of their water onto his property. He already has problems during the two-year flood event. Noting the approximately six acres of concrete and buildings on this property (that is currently farm field) will result in water on his property. Mr. Howard stated that, when the water is higher in the retention area, they will be allowed to discharge more and when it gets to the 100-year flood they can discharge everything and go over the emergency

Approved

overflow. He has three sump pumps and battery back-ups, but can't afford a full house generator. He walked the PZB through the photos that he sent of his property and expressed concern about leaves and mulch from the site clogging drains, adding to the problem. Lastly, he expressed other concerns such as noise, the proposed hours of operation (he reminded that 9:00 p.m. was considered too late at the informal and now they are proposing 10:00 p.m.), and lighting. He also noted that there is a light on the existing barn that is probably 10,000 lumens, adding that the proposed light at the entrance, close to his property, would be 20,000 lumens.

Ms. Michelle Adams, 6201 Brittany Court, thanked the board members for their time. She noted that she has lived in her home, which backs up to the subject property, for 21 years. She and her husband raised their family there, and explained that her kids walked and rode their bikes down the paved Cemetery Road and Washington Street pathway, and—rode the bus to school. She invited Board members to come sit on her patio and see the impact that this development will have on her home and neighborhood. She asserted her opposition to the applicant's proposal, as she feels it will have significant impact on the residents of Winchester Estates, Southridge, and the homes on Cemetery Road as a result of potential traffic, noise, and light pollution. She expressed concern that items in self-storage facilities are not inventoried, and that the contents are not disclosed. She also opined that people coming in and out of the facility throughout the day and night are given a level of latitude not seen in other consumer-based businesses; she feels this presents a serious risk, creating an environmental, health, safety, and crime issue for the surrounding residents. She also expressed concern that the entrance and location of the self-storage facility will be disruptive and present traffic congestion and safety issues for Gurnee residents who utilize the paved bike paths on Cemetery Road and Washington Street; the path is always full of runners, walkers, families with strollers, and bikers, and is an integral connector to several neighborhoods in Gurnee, as well as to the Lake County Forest Preserve. If approved, she worries that pedestrians would have to contend with inexperienced U-Haul drivers, boat trailers and other traffic coming in and out of the facility. She also feels the self-storage facility poses a concern for children who take the bus to school; there is a bus stop adjacent to the site, as well as school children who attend the Country Montessori School across Washington Street. She reminded that this is not the first time the Board is discussing a self-storage facility on the subject property. She provided specific quotes from the February 19, 2020 PZB meeting minutes of PZB members noting their concerns and dislike of self-storage, especially so close to residential. She asked "What has changed with the development?" She acknowledged that Mr. and Mrs. Sachs have revamped their plans for the self-storage on the site, but states that it is still a storage facility. She explained that the building directly adjacent to her back yard appears to be constructed of metal, and that she suspects the area will be illuminated late into the evening. She posited that the development will bring an increased risk of crime, noise, traffic, and light pollution and fears the potential devaluation of property values and quality of life for the adjacent residential areas reflected in the Village's Strategic Plan. Citing the 17 self-storage facilities within five miles of the subject site (five of which are located in Gurnee) she states that Inside Self-Storage, a professional services group that supports self-storage business owners, has suggested many communities have adopted best practices to limit the number of self-storage facilities to be no closer than three miles apart. She stated that there are seven self-storage facilities within three miles of the site. She asked if this is the identity that Gurnee wants.

Approved

Wrapping up, she again invited the Board to visit her and her neighbors' backyards to get a clear understanding of their concerns, and declared that she doesn't want to stare at the back of a metal building out of her home, claiming the trees in that area are bare eight months out of the year.

Pete Stolcers, 6186 Brittany Court, stated that he also lives adjacent to the proposed facility and has been a tax payer for 28 years. He reiterated a lot of the concerns already expressed. He asked if the Board members would like to live next to this, declaring that it looks like a barracks. He posited that this would be an eyesore for the community, and expressed concerns over traffic, crime, lighting, the removal of trees and replacing them with metal buildings, and—the impacts on the wetlands and wildlife in the area (deer and cranes). He ended by explaining that while he didn't know what the extension of Churchill Lane would do for traffic, he asserts that it is very difficult with just 27 homes in Winchester Estates to get out of the subdivision.

Mr. William Smith, 34662 Cemetery Road, stated that his property is north of the subject site and that he is strongly opposed to a self-storage facility on the property. His concerns include traffic, noise, lights, property values, and stormwater detention, and questioned why a lift station has not been considered. He stated, with all due respect to Mr. and Mrs. Sachs, that there are plenty of areas to build a self-storage facility and that this is not the place.

Ms. Christine Blessing, 6189 Brittany Court, stated that her and her husband moved from downtown Chicago 5 years ago with a goal to live in a safe and quiet residential neighborhood, start a family, and raise their children. Like many homes adjacent to this proposed development, their home is setback far back on their lot. She noted that they have a small backyard and that the proximity of Building 2 to their home is petrifying as a mother of two toddlers. Based on the 40-foot setback, this 9,600 square foot, metal, public drive-up storage garage will be the closest to their home; approximately 90 feet from their back door. She thanked the Board for expressing numerous concerns at the Informal Reviews of the proposed self-storage facilities from last year. Noting that residents were made aware of this proposal two weeks ago, they appreciated reading every Board member's apprehensions—including how and what storage units are used for, specific concerns about the drive-up units along the west side of the site, and ultimately, its incompatibility with the adjacent residential property. Noting that the developer's project description indicates that Building 2 will be used as a "barrier" to existing homes to the west, blocking noise and lights, she questioned if using a noise generating metal garage is a genuine solution to screen noise, or if it is a way to save money. She asserted that, essentially, Building 2 will be used as a giant metal wall, 30 steps away, which then leaves the residents with either a dark storage alley or an alley with bright overhead lights in their backyards. She asked if there will be security cameras on the backs of the buildings, and if so, how will residents know if they are filming their families, since they are in such close proximity. She lamented that if this property is re-zoned, and graded for the construction of metal Building 2, her home will feel like a prison. She explained that they cannot just pick up their home and move it forward on their lot, and asserted that her home will no longer be a safe place to raise her two girls; she then asked if anyone else would let their kids out in their backyard to play behind a self-storage garage, or—fetch a Frisbee or ball that accidentally goes into the lot of the facility. She posited that this

Approved

development contradicts the Village's Strategic Plan, and pointed out that the original proposal had buildings spread across the property; after hearing concerns from the Board, all the buildings were moved closer together. She had assumed there were legitimate site orientation reasons for the original building placement, but—now, the plan has all the biggest, loudest buildings squished together, reverberating off of each other like a metal compound. While she thanked the applicant for trying to make Buildings One, Five, and the east side of Building Six more aesthetically pleasing from the road, she still wanted to talk about metal Buildings Two, Three, Four, and Six that make up a majority of the project (and are located closest to people's homes). Given the Village's Zoning Ordinance does not allow metal as a primary exterior building material, and the developer is asking for an exception to allow this, she would like to respectfully request that no exceptions be allowed for this development; should this project move forward, she asked that building materials meet or exceed code requirements. In regards to the heavy vegetative cover along the west property line, she noted that the brush behind their homes is not heavy and is a single row of trees (with buckthorn in between trees). Many of the trees have died or fallen down over the years; and, the trees are not evergreen, so for eight months of the year the views are transparent. She provided photos to show the Board members how close their homes are to the proposed facility, and the thin line of vegetation that will not hide their views. She stated that the Zoning Ordinance requires a continuous solid fence, wall, or hedge (a minimum four feet in height) along 100% of a yard where non-residential property abuts residential. The petitioner is requesting an exception to this requirement and asking that the walls of buildings along their north and west property lines and then connect fencing between these buildings be allowed to be counted toward this requirement. She respectfully asked, again—to protect the safety and wellbeing of their community—that the board deny this exception and require the developer to construct a solid wall as a screen. In regard to trees, while she understands that a tree survey has yet to be completed, the developer plans to only install the minimum number of required buffer plant material, based on the existing trees. She requests that the Board consider that the tree line, which is dying, be replaced by mature evergreen trees for year-round protection in numbers that meet or exceed required code. Also, should this project move forward, she would like to ask the developer to have an architectural and environmental acoustics engineer assess how the garage doors echoing off of the proposed concrete and other metal buildings in such close proximity will impact the adjacent homes (this will determine the appropriate STP and NRC ratings to inform the request for a solid wall for screening in accordance with the zoning ordinance). She then asserted that it is important to consider that the developer has already asked for multiple exceptions to the Zoning Ordinance for the construction of this facility; solid building materials, walls and sound barriers are expensive, so she can understand why they asked to not be required to install, but Village code is in place for a reason—to protect residents. Asking for not just one, but multiple exceptions to codes, makes her question how this facility will be managed from the start, not to mention, into the future as buildings depreciate. She stressed that they are not opposed to the development of the property; they are fine with the current barn, which was developed with an appropriate setback, and referred to residential-friendly businesses, such as the offices across the street (doctors, dentists, physical therapy, and such). She argued that, while you can debate crime statistics and property values, you cannot debate physical space; forty feet is forty feet, and a metal wall is a metal wall. She asked Mr. and Mrs. Sachs, as a family business, to respect their

Approved

families and reconsider the location for this business. Wrapping up, she then argued that—by the 200 signatures on the petition in opposition to this development, the 40 letters that were submitted, and the turn-out tonight—this project is a nuisance, the re-zoning of the property for this type of development is not appropriate, and the proximity to people’s homes is egregious.

Mr. Perry Howard, 34693 N. Cemetery Road, stated that he owns property both in Gurnee and unincorporated Lake County. He stated that he received a phone call from the developer over the weekend was surprised that the developer was able to get information regarding his concerns expressed in a letter he sent to the Village. In any case, he is not totally against this proposal or the Village putting some type of business on that corner. However, his concern is storm water. He asked the Board if they received the photos and letter he sent; he explained that you can see the water coming over the road when the outlet is full (in front of the 369 N. Cemetery Road property). Elaborating, he stated that all of that water comes to his property, which is behind him. So, all the owner of 369 N. Cemetery Road has to do is divert the water to his property and it comes into his pond and it fills. He noted that he’s talked to the Village Engineer (Scott Drabicki), and the previous one before that, and also Mr. Muetz. He said when the Village was super-chlorinating the water over at their tank, he got some of that water on his property and it burned his grass. He called the Village, as he was concerned about getting highly chlorinated water in his pond, and was concerned about the health of his pond and the wildlife in it. He then expressed that he does not feel the Village should allow exceptions to its code for the development, and requests that the Board deny the request based on this concerns listed in his letter. He also shared part of his conversation with Mr. Sachs; he told him his concerns with water and that he had a way of fixing the problem—indicated in his letter—which is the installation of lift-pumps to Washington Street. So, instead of taking the stormwater and running it down Cemetery, through his and “the other guy’s” property on Cemetery, a lift-pump should be installed to take the water in the detention pond directly to Washington Street. He added that this has been done all over Gurnee and the rest of the County. Finally, he expressed his concerns over impervious surface, claiming dirt is going to absorb some water, but concrete and buildings will not.

Ms. Kay Meyer, 92 Foxboro Lane, stated that she is located to the south of the proposed development, having lived in Southridge for 26 years. She has been “educated” by coming to this meeting tonight, she thanked the Board and her neighbors. She appreciated the reduction in the shadow cast on the adjacent properties by the reduction of the building height from two stories to one, and pointed to the impact that barn-style building on the south side of Washington has on the adjacent homes. She conceded that she is older, has raised her children, and likes the idea of storage near her; she has children who have gone to college and need temporary storage as they get their lives started. She then noted that there may be an opportunity for the businesses in the area to work with each other—for instance, when the funeral home has a large funeral, there are traffic jams with cars parked off the edge of the road; she believes that they can make that corner safe for a lot of businesses. Her remaining comment was that she wished the room had better lighting and sound in order to hear and understand the Board members better at these hearings.

Approved

Mr. Brian Blessing, 6189 Brittany Court, stated that after reviewing the developers' plans, metal Building 2 will be 30 steps from his home and back door; with a 40-foot setback, it'll be 90-feet from his back door. He asked Board members to please imagine having over 113,000 square feet of metal public storage garages 30 steps from your window and door, and the impact it would have on your family, young children, neighborhood, and community. He stated that the Sachs' self-storage facility in Beach Park is nowhere near as proximate to homes as what it will be on this site. The Beach Park development has four buildings, making up collectively 65,000 square feet of storage space, half of what is proposed at this location. According to Google Earth, the Beach Park site is approximately 375 feet away from the nearest home and, sits behinds a wetland and woodland area. For context, their home is 420 feet from Cemetery Road; so, if they were granted the same 375 foot setback, there would be no room on the site for self-storage. He added that the Beach Park facility also advertises business and commercial storage, and accepts packages on behalf of renters—making it easy to make it an extension of someone's business. Although there might be signage posted and lease language to prohibit the storage of hazardous materials, with only three employees and some security cameras, he questioned who is actually keeping track of what is being stored. He also stated that he would like to call out that the developer provided a one-month sample activity report for an unidentified self-storage facility, claiming that it showed there were no visitors before 7:00 a.m. or after 10:00 p.m. Mr. Blessing felt this exhibit results in more questions than answers—such as those in regards to occupancy of the facility, etc. Explaining that babies sleep all day, children nap throughout the day, and more people are working from home, he asked Board members to imagine the sound of boats with flushing engines, idling trucks, doors slamming, the beeping of vehicles in reverse, and the like throughout the day. He also asked them to consider the consequences of children riding bikes or walking to the school bus around trailers, box trucks, and landscaping trailers entering and exiting the area all day. Wrapping up, he asked the Sachs to consider alternate properties for this project.

Jenny Han, 321 Churchill Lane, stated that she has lived in the neighborhood for 23 years. She asked Board members to imagine dinner and night—with the lights and noise 50 feet away; she expressed that it is “not a pretty sight.” Dismissing the \$200,000 thought to be generated in tax revenue from this proposed development, she feared the value of residential property would drop, along with the quality of life in the neighborhood. Personally, she felt approval of this development would give her reason to move out of Gurnee.

Amanda Mika, who does not live in the area, offered her perspective as someone who has faced a situation (in another area of the Village) similar to residents opposing this proposal. Her primary concern is the tearing down of trees. She feels that a tree survey should be conducted before any proposal is even considered. She is also concerned with lighting along the proposed alleyway, which she feels would be hazardous whether it is due to potentially disrupting lights—or, the lack of them.

Dolette Moore, 6121 Indian Trail, strongly opposes this project for the same reasons other residents have expressed. She and her husband—as well as her grown daughters—live in the

Approved

area. She owns another property on Washington Street. As a realtor, she insisted that property values will go down if it is approved.

Mohammad Samhan, 413 Churchill Lane, expressed concern about increase in traffic and the impact that this proposed project will have on the quality of life he enjoys with his grandchildren in this neighborhood.

Chris Smith, 34710 N. Cemetery, questioned the potential rezoning of this property, asserting that this use is far too heavy for this property. She suspects the residential property was obtained solely for the purpose of detention, and doubts it will ever come to fruition.

Kendra Saemann, 6116 Indian Trail Road, expressed concern over an experience she had in a similar storage facility. Based on her suspicion that a gentleman she had contacted through "Offer Up," (a selling platform on social media) was actually running a business selling used appliances in such a facility. She questioned the safety of such facilities if illegal transactions are taking place in them, endangering children and the elderly in neighborhoods in which they are located. She insisted that metrics, such as crime statistics, should be considered when deciding on the approval of such projects, not just site plans.

At this time, Mr. Sula closed the floor to the public.

Beginning to address some of the questions, comments, and concerns— Mr. Ziegler stated that many of the questions surrounded stormwater drainage. As with any development, the resulting increased amount of impervious surface subsequently increases the quantity of run-off. So, it is true that open ground will absorb water, and paving with concrete and buildings will increase run-off. He assured that that the Village abides by the Lake County Stormwater Management Ordinance, and is a Certified Community; as such, they will enforce those regulations. He added that the Village has several professional engineers on staff. Acknowledging that the quantity of water coming off the property will increase, he explained that it will come off the property slower. It is a fairly small drainage area that feeds to this area with some fairly significant slopes that bring the water quickly. So, as he summarized, there will be more water coming off the site, but it will be coming off slower due to being detained in the retention pond and then being slowly released. Some of those flash-flood situations should be mitigated, but there will be a slow trickle as water is released from the retention pond area. In regards to installing a stormwater lift station, Mr. Ziegler stated that, to his knowledge, the Village only has one in town and it is a backup system, not the primary system. He asserted that stormwater lift stations are not practical due to the size of the pump needed for a 100-year storm being very expensive, and that the size of the infrastructure makes it completely unreasonable. Open swales, pipes and natural drainage are always the most efficient way to convey moving water. He understands there is a significant drainage way that goes along Mr. Howard's property into the pond, and when Cemetery Road was rebuilt it followed that same drainage pattern. The proposed retention pond sits on the break point for the site, so that everything being paved on the site will run into the pond and be released slowly. Lastly, Mr. Ziegler

Approved

stated that he wanted to address the ROW extension for Churchill Lane, noting that this was a Village request as Winchester Estates has only one way in and out and the continuation of this road will give a relief value in the future (out to Cemetery), as properties to the north develop residentially.

In response to concerns about lighting, Mr. Swierk stated that they submitted a photometric study that indicated they meet all ordinances. Further, there are no lights on the back side of Building 2. In regards to activities beside storage occurring in the units, he stated that no one is allowed to conduct any repair work, construction work, repairs to vehicles, or operate a business out of any unit. Management of the facility is important, and Mr. Sachs is local and will be on-site at this facility. When someone signs a lease for space at their facility, these rule will be stipulated, and enforced by management as part of the renter's contract. He also stated that there will be no security cameras on the west walls or beyond the buildings' walls; it is not their intent to see into anyone's back yard.

In regards to some of the landscaping questions, Mr. Tom Nordloh mentioned that the petitioner wanted to count the existing trees toward their required plantings.

Mr. Sula asked about the hours of operation for the self-storage facility. Mr. Sachs responded that the industry average is 7:00 a.m. to 10 p.m. He noted that, on average, most people do not get to their storage units until 8:30 a.m. or later and leave by 7:15 p.m. He presented a slide which reflected that 90+% of activity is between those hours. After those hours, the facility will be totally locked down and gated. They are proposing to have sensors on every interior door so that, hypothetically, if someone did breach the fence, an alarm would go off if a door was opened after-hours.

Mr. Sula asked if Village staff had any statistics on crime associated with self-storage facilities. Staff responded that they did not, but Mr. Sachs stated that his facility in Beach Park, which has been in operation for just a year, has had no crime/calls to 911 and stated that he has a statement from the Sheriff's Department indicating such. He noted that he also called another facility located on Washington Street, approximately 2.5 miles away, in front of College of Lake County. That facility is open 24/7 and, in the last year and a half, which is as far back as the Sheriff's Department would go due to the amount of time to get such information, it was found that there were no calls regarding that facility, either. He acknowledged that it is a small sample, but asserted that there is a stigma of crime attached to self-storage that it simply not backed by facts. He assured that there is so much security surrounding such facilities that crime is not an issue.

Mrs. Sachs stated that she has been in business in the Gurnee area for 25 years and is a resident of Gurnee. This will be her business' location, in 10,000 square feet of retail on the corner. She explained that she will have her art gallery in that location and that she works with a lot of high-end artwork and designers and that she would not place her business next to something that would detract from it. She and her husband have developed self-storage before and had a lot of concerns by residents in that area; she understands these concerns. She lives in Gurnee and

Approved

doesn't want property values to be lowered, as this is a business she hopes will continue in their family and wants this to be a representation of where she plans on living for the rest of her life. She doesn't feel that what they are proposing here, and what they've developed in Beach Park, will be detrimental to the area. The material proposed for the building is not steel and the Village will not allow steel; cement board is a residential material and therefore, will blend with the area. She stated that if some of the homeowners to the rear of the site want to pick out some additional shrubs or plants that would make them feel better about the views, she is willing to offer this. Concluding, Mrs. Sachs stressed that they want to work with the community.

Mr. Sula asked someone to address the material for the west side of building 2. Mr. Swierk responded that it was proposed as insulated metal paneling, which is a sound-rated as well as insulated panel, but that in speaking with Mr. Sachs just now, he indicated that they would be agreeable to installing a masonry wall on that elevation. He stressed that this is not an issue of expense, as the metal paneling is probably the same cost as a masonry wall.

Mr. Sula asked Ms. Gable if there were any other questions that hadn't been addressed yet.

Mr. Ziegler stated that he wanted to address some of the traffic questions. He began by stating that that he did some research through the International Engineers Transportation Manual; this manual projects, based on international studies, trip generation numbers for different types of uses. He explained that self-storage is one of the lower trip generators for commercial uses. The manual indicates less than seven trips per day would be generated per 100 units. So, the proposal of 850 storage units would translate into less than 60 trips per day. A trip is both directions, in and out, so that means 30 trips in and 30 trips out. He noted that compared to other commercial uses that could locate on this property under the C-2 zoning, this use pales in comparison in regards to traffic generation. He also stated that, because the curb cuts into the site are within the turn lanes of the Cemetery Road intersection, he reached out to Lake County DOT since they maintain Washington Street and services the traffic signal at that intersection. He wanted to know if they would require a traffic study. He said that the County responded that a traffic study would not be required because the use is self-storage and the traffic generation is low.

Mr. Sula stated that there were some concerns about conflicts with the pathway. Mr. Ziegler responded that there is an existing 10-foot wide pedestrian path that runs north/south along the west side of Cemetery Road that would cross the parcel's two access drives. He explained that this is no different than any other development existing along Washington Street in which access crosses the path along that roadway (i.e., Stonebridge). He stressed that pedestrians are always going to have to watch for vehicular traffic, and—based on the use--the frequency of vehicular trips is on the low side.

Mr. Pejsach stated that he wanted to address the west buffer and why trees are proposed but not a fence. Mr. Sula clarified that the applicant is asking to be allowed to use the west wall of Building 2 as their fence. Mr. Swierk added that they could put a fence along the west property line but that the insulated metal paneling or a masonry back wall, whichever the board decides to require,

Approved

acts as a sound wall. That, combined with a big tree buffer, is almost like having your own forest in your back yard. The fence seemed redundant with the solid building wall.

Mr. Sula then asked if the code indicates where the fence has to be located, and Mr. Ziegler responded that the code does not dictate location, other than in the buffer yard. Mr. Sula clarified with Village staff that the buffer yard is typically 25 feet, but that in this case the developer is proposing a 40-foot wide buffer yard. Mr. Swierk then added that using the building wall, versus a fence, will create more open area in which they can stagger the planting of trees. He also stated that they are not looking for any variances on trees, as they want to provide a good buffer for the residences. Mr. Sula encouraged them to use as many non-deciduous trees as possible in that buffer.

Mr. Pejsach stated that there was a request for an acoustic study, and asked if there is any information available on the noise generated by a self-storage facility. Mr. Ziegler responded that the Village adopted the State of Illinois Sound Ordinance into the Zoning Ordinance, explaining that the ordinance is based on consistent mechanical noise (such as exhaust fans and such). Intermittent sounds are time-weighted over an hour time frame, so that noise generated for a handful of seconds--generated by an overhead garage door opening and closing--would be averaged over an hour. He felt it would be highly unlikely for there to be the amount of noise generated on the site weighted over an hour of time that would create a violation of state and local ordinance.

Mr. Swierk stated that one resident mentioned looking out from their property and seeing overhead garage doors. He explained that there are no garage doors on the west wall of the west building; rather, it is a solid wall. He added that it is 40 feet from the residential to that wall, then up 10-feet (the height of Building 2) to the top of the building, and—another 15 or 20 feet before you reach a drive aisle for the storage units. He stated that it is doubtful anything will be heard from this area.

Mr. Campbell stated that he wanted to discuss the west buffer; not from a sound standpoint, but from a security standpoint. He posited that, if someone wanted to get into the facility, they could go in from the back (where there is no fence). Mr. Swierk responded that anyone looking to break in would have to climb a 10-foot building wall and crawl over the roof of the building. Mr. Sula clarified that the request for a waiver is for that portion of the fence proposed by the building; there would still be fencing connecting between the buildings to provide a continuous secure facility.

Mr. Paff asked if they have any studies indicating the impact that self-storage facilities have on adjacent residential property values. Mr. Swierk answered that they have a real estate professional present who can address this question. Mr. David Urbaniak, commercial broker with @Properties, introduced himself as specializing in developments of many different kinds. In the past five to six years, he has specialized significantly in self-storage. To be clear, he stated that he does not have a financial interest in the development, nor is he part of the transaction or ownership. He was

Approved

simply asked to attend and answer any questions that were pursuant to specifics of the self-storage industry. He added that there are some 50,000 self-storage facilities operating in the U.S., and this is a point of conversation on the Internet and at self-storage conferences. However, there is no empirical evidence that being adjacent to, contiguous with, or associated anywhere near a Class A facility like this, has any impact on property values. He stressed that, as a broker, it is important for him to know this. He added that you can find a lot of information online about people who are coming, like the crowd this evening, to talk about that, but what you won't find is any evidence to support the contention that property values diminish in relation to self-storage. He acknowledged some other comments made by the public—in regards to crime, traffic patterns, etc. In regards to crime, he offered to separate “perception from reality.” He explained that crime is based on where a facility is located, and indicated that the kind of security the Petitioner is proposing (cameras and gates) reflects something that the industry has been working toward for a while (since back when self-storage was driving up on a gravel road and opening a garage door to your unit). He also noted that he was here before the PZB with the other developer who proposed self-storage for this property, and that this proposal is far better than what was proposed back then. Finally, he noted that he sold a self-storage facility in Huntly that got its Certificate of Occupancy two years ago this month, which is 75% occupied, and there have been no 911 calls or criminal events at that facility. He understands that this is just one facility, but he said that he's been associated with many and can talk about the perception of crime versus the reality of the situation in regards to most such facilities.

Mr. Paff stated that he looked online and found a study that a community-completed appraisal report, and it actually showed that 70% of the properties that weren't by the storage units sold for less than the ones by the storage units; this was done nearby five different storage facilities.

Mr. Paff also stated that the Comp Plan reflects commercial, but asked if it states which commercial.

Ms. Gable stated that on the Comp Plan, the northern parcel shows Medium Density Residential and that the southern parcel (hard corner of Washington and Cemetery) shows Commercial, but does not suggest a specific commercial zoning district.

Mr. Sula clarifies that the land proposed with residential zoning will consist of detention, land for possible residential properties in the future, and a dedicated right-of-way.

Mr. Swierk, thanked the Board and offered to introduce an engineer to speak in regards to Stormwater.

A member of the audience interjected. Mr. Sula asserted that the floor has been closed to the public.

Mike Anderson, engineer on the project, stated the drainage issues aren't related to the land use being self-storage, and that the issues will be the same regardless. He conceded that the detention area might be smaller for a residential development, but would be similar for any commercial

Approved

development, and—asserted that it doesn't matter if the development is residential or commercial in terms of the rate of the release of storm water from the site.

Mr. Pejsach acknowledged that, while many of the questions were answered with solutions, (Lake County DOT, State of Illinois/Village of Gurnee noise ordinance, Lake County storm water detention, etc.) he still felt this is a “tough one,” and--while a lot of the concerns were addressed--he doesn't know what else could be put on the property. He inquired as to whether or not the residents knew it could be commercial when they moved in. Mr. Sula explained that it is unincorporated Lake County, and Mr. Paff indicated that it is zoned Estate in the County.

Mr. Pejsach asked what could go on the land right now under the County zoning designation. Mr. Ziegler responded--single-family residential or agricultural use (what is basically there right now). But, the development would be in the county. Mr. Ziegler explained that, at the time the property is developed, it would need to be annexed into the Village for water and sewer service, and added that he believes the property was designated with commercial or service under the previous Comp Plan.

Mr. Campbell asked, for their exception request, if the PZB is going to remove their request for building material since they indicated they would put in a masonry wall instead. Mr. Sula responded that the PZB would specify what the Petitioner testified to.

Mr. Ziegler clarified that the petitioner indicated a change in material for the back side (west side) of building 2. He believes the other areas where they were proposing the insulated metal paneling is still proposed to be this material. Mr. Swierk responded that Mr. Ziegler is correct; they still wish to use the insulated metal paneling on the interior of the site, where it's not visible from the street. He also noted that it is only really between the doors (about 18”), as the doors are eight-foot-tall, with the header over the garage doors (approximately one-foot). Mr. Swierk added that this area is not visible at all until you access the area through the gates.

Mr. Paff stated that he is torn on this matter. He's concerned that a different C-2 use could result in even greater impacts for the area. However, he doesn't like the site design and believes a greater setback should have been provided to the residential area; if there was another 40 feet of setback from the tree line to plant the required buffer plantings, then he would have felt better about the plan. Mr. Sula reminded Mr. Paff that the code required setback is 25 feet. Mr. Paff stated that he understands that. Then, Mr. Pejsach asked if that was the code for C-2. Mr. Sula explained that it is the code for separation of commercial from residential. Mr. Swierk responded, stating that it appears that the canopy of the trees along the west property line take up about 25 feet and they are proposing their building to be 40 feet back and if they plant that area per code, he is not sure what any additional setback gains.

As discussion came to an end, Mr. Sula suggested that a motion would be in order.

Approved

Mr. Paff motioned, seconded by Mr. Pejsach, to forward a favorable recommendation on the petition of Ron and Christine Sachs for the following, in substantial conformance with the plans presented before the Planning and Zoning Board:

1. Zoning Map Amendment from E, Estate in unincorporated Lake County, to C-2 PUD, Community Commercial as a Planned Unit Development, and R-3, Single-Family Residential, in the Village of Gurnee, as proposed;
2. Special Use Permit for a self-storage facility; and
3. Preliminary PUD and Site Plan Review approval for a retail/office facility and self-storage facility.

Mr. Sula requested to add to the motion a requirement that the west wall of building 2 be constructed of masonry, and that they emphasize planting non-deciduous trees in the west buffer area. Mr. Paff added those conditions to the motion and Mr. Pejsach seconded the amended motion.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: None

Nays: Campbell, Paff, Pejsach, and Sula

Abstain: None

Motion Failed: 0-4-0

Mr. Sula explained that the PZB is a recommending body and that their recommendation will be forwarded to the Village Board. He stated that staff will let the petitioner know when this matter will be scheduled before the Board.

Mr. Sula then thanked everyone in attendance for their participation.

5. Next Meeting Date: September 1, 2021

Ms. Gable stated that there are no public hearing items scheduled for this meeting, but that there could be some non-public hearing items.

6. Public Comment

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.

7. Adjournment

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

Voice Vote:

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

Approved

Motion Carried: 4-0-0

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Joann Metzger,
Recording Secretary, Planning and Zoning Board