

**VILLAGE OF LAKE BARRINGTON
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLAN COMMISSION
MAY 27, 2010**

Approved

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

A Meeting of the Plan Commission of the Village of Lake Barrington was held on Thursday, May 27, 2010, at the Village Municipal Center, 23860 Old Barrington Road, and was called to order by Chair Karen Daulton-Lange at approximately 7:00 p.m. There were two people in the audience. On roll call, the following were:

Present:	Commissioners: Delisle, Puleo, Chair Daulton-Lange, Wood, Wrzeszcz
Absent:	Commissioner: MacKenzie, Menconi
Also Present:	Village Administrator Chris Martin Village and Attorney James Bateman

**2. CONSIDERATION PETITION TO AMEND EXISTING SUP AND TO RESUBDIVIDE
22044 PEPPER ROAD AND 1020 NORTHWEST HIGHWAY**

Mr. Martin noted that this petitioner previously appeared before the Commission requesting approval of a rezoning and planned unit development (PUD) for the property located at 22044 Pepper Road from the R-5 Single Family District to the M manufacturing zoning district. That petition was approved by the Village Board in May of 2009.

The petitioner is now proposing to replace the previous proposal by re-subdividing this property in combination with 28400 Northwest Highway (Swiss Automation). The purpose of this adjustment is: 1) to expand the Swiss Automation building to the north and east (across the existing lot line) 2) to create a new lot on Pepper Road for the development of multi-tenant building, and 3) to create a driveway connection from Route 14 to Pepper Road.

The petitioner is requesting the following:

1. Recommendation of approval of a subdivision, associated variances and other relief as necessary.
2. Recommendation of approval of a cut-through access to Route 14 from Pepper Road; per section 6-4-1.

The petitioner appeared before the Plan Commission on May 13. The Commission continued the public hearing to May 27th requesting the following adjustments. The Commission also agreed that access from Route 14 to Pepper Road should be permitted without condition.

- 1) Significant compliance with engineering requirements via Gewalt Hamilton Engineers.
- 2) Lighting plan and photometric.
- 3) Detail on retaining wall.
- 4) Detail on dumpster screening structures to be added to engineering drawings.
- 5) Soften pavement corners: a) just north and west of retention pond and b) just south and west of retail building (for easier turning)
- 6) Review ROW dedication confirm setback etc.
- 7) Add additional spruce trees to landscape.
- 8) Add key and easier ID of plants to landscape plan

Commissioner Questions and Public Comment

Chair Daulton-Lange requested public comment, there was none. Chair Daulton-Lange requested Commissioner comment and discussion which is provided within the attached transcripts. At the conclusion of Commission discussion Chair Daulton-Lange requested a motion as follows:

Motion was made by Commissioner Wood, and seconded by Commissioner Puleo that the Plan Commission recommend to the Board of Trustees the approval of the request of the Petitioner for Amendments to the Existing Special Use Permit and the Application for Preliminary and Final Resubdivision Approval of the Development of the Subject Properties. The Petitioner proposes to construct an addition to the existing building on a portion of the Subject Properties located at 28400 (a/k/a 1020) W. Northwest Highway, Lake Barrington, Illinois, known as Swiss Automation, Inc. that would include space for additional manufacturing facilities and, in addition, to construct a single commercial building with rental space on a portion of the Subject Properties fronting along Pepper Road and located at 22044 Pepper Road that would be suitable for multi-tenant retail, commercial or offices or other uses allowed in a Manufacturing Zoning District under the ordinances of the Village of Lake Barrington (“the Development”), subject to the following conditions:

THIS RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL IS BASED UPON THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS OF FACT, WHICH ARE HEREBY ADOPTED:

- A. That the Plan Commission has made this recommendation after carefully considering all evidence presented by the Petitioner at public hearings relative thereto;
- B. The Subject Properties are located within the corporate limits of the Village of Lake Barrington, and the legal descriptions of the Subject Properties are as follows:

PARCEL 1: Common address of Parcel 1: 22044 Pepper Road, Lake Barrington, Illinois.

PARCEL 2: Common address of Parcel 2: 28400 (a/k/a 1020) West Northwest Highway, Lake Barrington, Illinois
- C. The owner of record of the Subject Properties and the Petitioner, is KVM Development, LLC of 1020 W. Northwest Highway, Lake Barrington, IL 60010.
- D. The proposed amended special use and the proposed Development, if approved, will not alter the essential character of the Village, but instead the proposed use is directly responsive to the Comprehensive Plan in attempting to bring the first retail frontage to Pepper Road, which has been long desired by the Village;
- E. The proposed building designs of both the retail building, which shall include facebrick, precast concrete and limestone, and of the manufacturing warehouse addition to the Swiss Automation building will promote higher quality materials and design concepts within the Village;
- F. There will be no adverse impacts from the proposed amended special use or from the proposed Development;
- G. The proposed amended special use, if granted, will be consistent with the Lake Barrington Zoning Ordinance and Official Comprehensive Plan, as amended;

- H. Any potentially negative impacts from the proposed amended special use or from the proposed Development will be adequately mitigated;
- I. The proposed amended special use and the proposed Development, if approved, will not alter the essential nature of the Village.
- J. The proposed amended special use and the proposed Development will conserve property values and will protect the character and stability of other properties in the vicinity and in the Village in general;
- K. The proposed amended special use and the proposed Development, subject to the conditions recommended, will be a reasonable and proper use of the Subject Property, and the approval thereof will be in the best interest of the Village and its residents and in accordance with the intent and objectives of the Village of Lake Barrington Zoning Ordinance, as amended; and
- L. The proposed amended special use and the proposed Development will promote the general health, safety and welfare of the Village.

THIS RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL IS SPECIFICALLY SUBJECT TO THE PETITIONER'S COMPLIANCE WITH FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- A. Final Building Code and Fire Code, engineering, stormwater management, lighting, landscaping, and tree preservation reviews for the Development shall hereafter be conducted by the Village and complied with as part of the building permit process and prior to issuance of any Village site development or building permits for the Subject Properties.
- B. Signage on the Subject Properties shall comply with the applicable provisions of the Village Code and Zoning Regulations, and shall be approved in advance in writing by the Village and pursuant to a sign permit prior to installation thereof.
- C. The Village Board should consider securing consultant assistance, on behalf of the Petitioner, to bring retail tenants to the commercial and retail building at 22044 N. Pepper Road which will be part of the Development.
- D. Cross-access and shared detention easements between the Subject Property at 22044 N. Pepper Road and the Subject Property at 28400 W. Northwest Highway shall be approved by the Village Attorney and recorded by the Petitioner(s) prior to issuance of any occupancy permit for the Development.
- E. A front yard setback of twenty-two feet (22') from the new right-of-way line of Pepper Road shall be permitted, notwithstanding the fact that Section 8-4-6(K) of the Lake Barrington Village Code would otherwise require a front yard setback of thirty feet (30') from said new right-of-way line.
- F. The proposed landscaping, as shown on the Approved Plans, to be located along the North property line and along the East side of the detention basin shall be installed prior to the issuance of the final occupancy permit for the proposed addition to the Swiss Automation building.

On roll call vote, the vote on the matter was as follows:

YEAS: Commissioners Wood, DeLisle, Puleo Wrzeszcz and Chair Daulton Lange
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Commissioners Menconi and McKenzie
ABSTAIN: Commissioner Wrzeszcz

Chair Karen Daulton Lange declared that the motion carried and, thereafter, the Plan Commission briefly considered other business. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.

3. **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Commissioner Delisle and seconded by Commissioner Puleo to adjourn the meeting. The voice vote was unanimous, the motion carried, and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:00 pm.

THE VILLAGE OF LAKE BARRINGTON'S PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF MAY 27, 2010 HAVE BEEN REVIEWED AND APPROVED

Village Administrator: _____

PLAN COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
VILLAGE OF LAKE BARRINGTON

(Continuation - Petition by KVM Development to
amend existing SUP and to resubdivide 22044
Pepper Road, Lake Barrington, IL and petition to
resubdivide 1020 Northwest highway, Lake
Barrington, IL)

* * *

23860 North Old Barrington Road
Lake Barrington, Illinois

* * *

Thursday, May 27, 2010

7:00 p.m.

LAKE-COOK REPORTING, LTD.
(847) 415-2553

1 PUBLIC MEETING
2
3 Thursday, May 27, 2010
4 7:00 o'clock p.m.

5 RE: Petition to amend existing SUP and to
6 resubdivide 22044 Pepper Road, Lake Barrington,
7 IL, and petition to resubdivide 1020 Northwest
8 Highway, Lake Barrington, IL

9 PLAN COMMISSION
10 VILLAGE OF LAKE BARRINGTON

11 * * *

12 Held on Thursday, May 27, 2010, commencing
13 at the hour of approximately 7:00 p.m., at 23860
14 North Old Barrington Road, Lake Barrington,
15 Illinois.

16 PLAN COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

17 Karen Daulton-Lange, Chairperson
18 Richard Delisle, Commissioner
19 Christina Puleo, Commissioner
20 Jack Wood, Commissioner
21 Mark Wrzeszcz, Commissioner

22 ALSO PRESENT:
23 James Bateman, Village Attorney
Christopher Martin, Village Administrator

1 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: I call this
2 continuation of the meeting of Village of Lake
3 Barrington Plan Commission to order.

4 Roll call, please.

5 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN:
6 Commissioner Delisle will be a few minutes late.

7 Commissioner MacKenzie is absent.

8 Commissioner Menconi is absent.

9 Commissioner Puleo?

10 COMMISSIONER PULEO: Here.

11 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN:

12 Commissioner Wood?

13 COMMISSIONER WOOD: Here.

14 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN:

15 Commissioner Wrzeszcz?

16 COMMISSIONER WRZESZCZ: Here.

17 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN: Chair
18 Daulton-Lange?

19 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Present.

20 This is a continuation of our
21 May 13, 2010 hearing, Petitioner KVM
22 Development, regarding the property on Pepper
23 Road and Northwest Highway.

1 APPEARANCES:

2
3 KELGOR CONSTRUCTION SERVICES, INC., by
4 MR. BOB PODGORSKI
5 7A Hillside Drive
6 Barrington, Illinois 60010
7 (847) 381-5510
8 General Contractor.

1 Mr. Martin, would you like to bring
2 us up to date?

3 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN:
4 Certainly. As you recall the Plan Commission
5 met just two weeks ago to review this, what is a
6 subdivision or resubdivision of two lots, one
7 fronting on Route 14, the other fronting on
8 Pepper Road.

9 The purpose of the resubdivision is
10 for the expansion of the existing Swiss
11 Automation building, which is a light
12 manufacturing facility on Route 14. Also to
13 recreate a new lot on Pepper Road for potential
14 purpose of a multi-tenant retail building there.
15 And three, to create a driveway
16 extension to Route 14 and Pepper Road to service
17 both properties.

18 The petitioner was provided at the
19 public hearing two weeks ago a list of items to
20 work on and as far as my review goes, I found
21 them all to be completed. And I want to thank
22 the petitioner for just an exceptional job in
23 returning the materials quickly and being

1 responsive to the Commission. That concludes my
2 report.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: A couple of
4 things that we asked for follow up on, I would
5 just like clarification. Gewalt Hamilton has
6 reviewed the plan?

7 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN: That's
8 correct. There are no significant engineering
9 items that are outstanding. There are several
10 small items that can be managed during the
11 permit process.

12 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: And the
13 right of way dedications, would you like to
14 address that?

15 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN: I'll let
16 the petitioner speak to that.

17 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: You were all
18 previously sworn in. So if you would like to
19 come up, state your name for the record, and
20 tell us about the right of way.

21 MR. PODGORSKI: Bob Podgorski, Kelgor
22 Construction Services.

23 The -- at the request of, I guess

1 designed as that. We'll dedicate the eight feet
2 or so back to the Village, but we were hoping
3 the setback can go from our existing property
4 line, the 30-foot front setback, which would
5 just be to our parking lot, not building area,
6 conforming to the setbacks that were revised
7 years and years ago, so...

8 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: State that
9 in numbers, what would the variance be then?

10 MR. PODGORSKI: To basically use the
11 30-foot setback from the previous property line.

12 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Which was?

13 MR. PODGORSKI: Which was a 25-foot from
14 the center line of the road. So basically we
15 are --

16 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: So it's
17 five feet?

18 MR. PODGORSKI: (Continuing.) -- cutting
19 it down to 22 feet or 22-and-a-half feet for the
20 front setback of our new property line after we
21 dedicate the eight feet to the Village.

22 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: All right,
23 now I'm confused.

1 it was a letter we got from Gewalt Hamilton,
2 they wanted us to match the setback or property
3 line at the property to the southwest. From the
4 center line to the extension line everything was
5 25 feet, so the new plat has this dedicated at
6 33 feet, which matches the property to the
7 south.

8 The property to the north still has
9 a 25-foot setback from -- Pepper Road -- this is
10 where the confusion came in. Pepper Road is not
11 dead centered. It's askew there and it's a
12 section line or a quarter section line that's
13 actually what's on all the dimensions but Pepper
14 Road is to the east slightly -- or to the west,
15 I'm sorry, of what the actual right of way is,
16 leaving plenty of room on the east side to
17 future bike path or walking path, so works out
18 for future plans there.

19 The request we do have though is,
20 since we did all this engineering, which there
21 is -- and the building design and everything at
22 the old property line and the 30-foot setback,
23 we were hoping that we could keep our plans

1 Your new property line, what is the
2 setback from the new property line to your
3 parking your lot?

4 MR. PODGORSKI: Approximately 22 feet.

5 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Okay, versus
6 30 feet?

7 MR. PODGORSKI: Correct, which was our
8 old property line, which we designed everything
9 to --

10 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: So 22 --

11 MR. PODGORSKI: Approximate, yes.

12 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: To 30?

13 MR. PODGORSKI: It's 22-and-a-half and
14 there's decimals in there, so --

15 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Okay.

16 MR. PODGORSKI: (Continuing.) -- it's 22
17 something.

18 COMMISSIONER PULEO: Thank you for the
19 clarification.

20 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Jim, is that
21 something that has to go through a variance
22 process or can that be part of this?

23 MR. BATEMAN: This is the plan

1 (inaudible).
 2 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Does anyone
 3 else have any questions as far as the submittals
 4 that we received?

5 I do like your trash enclosure.
 6 MR. PODGORSKI: I've built and rebuilt
 7 many of them, so I know how I want to design
 8 them so they hold up.

9 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: It looks
 10 like they will hold up.

11 MR. PODGORSKI: Yes. The boxes don't
 12 slide into the thing. Brick does not bounce.

13 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN: Perhaps
 14 we should just go through the changes?

15 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Would you
 16 like to go through the Items 1 through 8?

17 MR. PODGORSKI: I don't have them in
 18 that form but we have some here.

19 We added the spruce trees on the
 20 landscape plan per Mr. Delisle's request, and
 21 clarified the key and noted which trees, it's a
 22 little easier to see which trees are where on
 23 the landscape plan. That was one of the

1 Is that --

2 MR. PODGORSKI: Is that the residential
 3 or that commercial?

4 COMMISSIONER WOOD: Residential.

5 MR. BATEMAN: I don't know that it's
 6 expressed quantification. I believe it's
 7 expressed as a concept.

8 "All exterior lighting shall be
 9 shielded so that direct illumination is not
 10 visible to an observer standing on the property
 11 line of any residential district at a height of
 12 five feet above the ground. This requirement
 13 does not apply to public street lighting. If
 14 any kind of exterior lighting is all or
 15 substantially modified in any manner, an
 16 exterior lighting plan shall be submitted to the
 17 enforcement office for approval prior to the
 18 implementation of the changes."

19 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: And it looks
 20 like you have the shoebox lighting in the --

21 MR. PODGORSKI: Yes, not a full
 22 lighting, yes.

23 MR. BATEMAN: And that is, those are the

1 requests.

2 One of the other requests was our
 3 softening two of the turns, curbed -- 90-degree
 4 turns on the parking lot -- or through the
 5 parking lot, which we now have even showing the
 6 truck route here -- was this a computer design?
 7 So we know that even a semi will make it through
 8 the parking lot easily now and that is one of
 9 the requests.

10 We have a photometric of the
 11 lighting showing the lighting plan and -- I
 12 think it maxes out less than a half a footcandle
 13 at the property line on the sidelines up to --
 14 yes, there is nothing over a half a foot at the
 15 property line.

16 One question is -- I could not
 17 locate it, is there an actual lighting
 18 requirement or ordinance or anything in the
 19 Village?

20 MR. BATEMAN: Yes, it is not a -- right,
 21 let me just --

22 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: I thought I
 23 had seen zero footcandles at the property line.

1 photometrics?

2 MR. PODGORSKI: Correct, yes.

3 MR. BATEMAN: Thank you.

4 MR. PODGORSKI: It was in the packet,
 5 and the small size which was -- it's not easy to
 6 read the full size, so I'm curious -- unless you
 7 have a magnifying glass, you are not going to
 8 see it in your packet.

9 COMMISSIONER WOOD: This parcel and the
 10 parcels adjacent to it are all zoned what?

11 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN:
 12 Manufacturing.

13 COMMISSIONER WOOD: Okay.

14 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: And the
 15 other item was the retaining wall which you
 16 provided --

17 MR. PODGORSKI: Correct, that's on our
 18 cut sheet, it didn't come through very well, of
 19 a wall and there is a detail. It is less than
 20 four feet in height so it technically doesn't
 21 need a geogrid area. We're using a heavy wall
 22 which I personally like.

23 And then one of the last things on

1 that was a detail of the trash enclosure which
2 we have a whole sheet on that. It matches right
3 to the front building with a steel, painted
4 steel gate and a built-in curb on the inside of
5 it.

6 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: And I think
7 you've done a great job. You addressed all our
8 comments from our meeting in such a short turn
9 around.

10 MR. PODGORSKI: We are trying to take
11 advantage of the summer.

12 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: We
13 received -- does this go in tonight -- the
14 easement agreement, a draft, which I would defer
15 to Jim Bateman to review. This is for the
16 maintenance of the shared improvements, that
17 would be basically the detention basin between
18 the two properties.

19 MR. PODGORSKI: And the access road.

20 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: And the
21 access road.

22 MR. PODGORSKI: Correct. The suggestion
23 that Mr. Bateman had last time are incorporated

1 photometrics are on those --

2 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Is that it, okay.

3 MR. PODGORSKI: That went right out the
4 next morning so...

5 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Yes, so the
6 new lighting placement would be over, so your
7 point is well taken, but I think it will be
8 taken care of --

9 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Well, it's on the
10 far side, it's on the north side of that
11 intersection where the truck turns out on down
12 that driveway, it's -- yes, right across the way
13 from there.

14 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: There is no
15 light there.

16 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Oh, well it's
17 shown, on here it is shown. The light pole base
18 is shown on this one.

19 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: On the --

20 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Oh, I'm sorry,
21 I'm sorry. Is that a stone drain then? This is
22 on C-5? This inlet protection device --

23 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: That's a

1 in there, basically on who oversees it, who
2 manages it.

3 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Do I have a
4 motion from anybody? I think you have something
5 drawn up.

6 Sure, let the minutes reflect there
7 is no public.

8 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: I just have one
9 comment really. I love this. Thank you for
10 taking care of everything.

11 The lighting plan, if you look at
12 the traffic plan with the trucks, it's really
13 handy to see how -- the truck still, you know,
14 barely makes that corner. And if you look at
15 the turning radius, it's exactly where that
16 light standard was going to be. And I
17 recommend -- I think we are going to support
18 this the way it is, but as an owner you might
19 want to move that light fixture three to
20 six feet over and you will save yourself the
21 cost of a tag on that one, so...

22 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: I think part
23 of the issue with that, Rick, is the

1 storm drain.

2 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Storm drain,
3 okay.

4 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: So strike
5 that comment?

6 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Yes. Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Jim, would
8 you like to go over the proposed motion you
9 prepared?

10 MR. BATEMAN: Sure. Basically it
11 describes the proposal in Part 1.

12 Part 2 there are findings of fact.
13 It says the Plan Commission has made its
14 recommendation after carefully considering all
15 the evidence presented by the petitioner, gives
16 the common address of, and the legal description
17 of both properties and the pin numbers. It
18 indicates that KVM Development is the owner. It
19 indicates that the proposed special use and
20 development will not -- the proposed amended
21 special use and development will not alter the
22 essential character of the Village, that it is
23 responsive to the comprehensive plan attempting

1 to bring the first retail frontage to Pepper
2 Road, that the building was designed, the
3 materials are high quality and -- the design
4 concepts are high quality, there won't be any
5 adverse impacts from the proposed special use of
6 the development.

7 The proposed amendment special use
8 if granted is consistent with the zoning
9 ordinance of the comprehensive plan, any
10 potential negative impacts will be adequately
11 mitigated, and the development will not alter
12 the essential character of the Village, will
13 conserve property values and protect the
14 character and stability of other properties in
15 the vicinity.

16 These are basically required
17 findings relative to a special use for planned
18 development.

19 It's in the best interest of the
20 Village and its residents and consistent with
21 the intent and objectives of the zoning
22 ordinance, and the proposed development will
23 promote the general health, safety, and welfare

1 Village attorney and recorded prior to the
2 issuance of any occupancy permit for the
3 development.

4 And finally a front yard setback of
5 22 feet from the new right-of-way line of Pepper
6 Road shall be permitted notwithstanding the fact
7 that Section 8-4(K) of the Village of Lake
8 Barrington Code would otherwise require a front
9 yard setback of 30 feet.

10 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Okay.

11 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Does that address
12 what condition the outlot is to be in after
13 construction? Do they landscape that, is that
14 required, or do they have to establish turf
15 there by ordinance or...

16 MR. BATEMAN: Well, they would be
17 required to stabilize the site consistent with
18 the stormwater, the watershed development
19 regulations of the Village in that event. I
20 don't know that you have to address that. I
21 don't know that they have addressed --

22 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: The condition of
23 that lot when you're done, is it pad ready, is

1 of the Village.

2 We left the building code, fire
3 code, engineering, stormwater management,
4 lighting, landscaping, tree preservation, final
5 reviews for the permit process notwithstanding
6 the fact we have essentially final engineering
7 here.

8 What I'll do is incorporate by
9 reference the approved -- as a group exhibit all
10 the plans you received and reviewed for this
11 evening.

12 Signage on the front property has
13 to comply with the Village Code and the zoning
14 regulations in part thereof, and they have to
15 secure sign permits prior to installation of
16 those.

17 It repeats the recommendation
18 relative to the Village considering securing
19 consultant assistance relative to bringing
20 retail tenants to the retail building on Pepper
21 Road.

22 It provides cross-access easements
23 between the properties, shall be approved by the

1 it graded, is it --

2 MR. BATEMAN: Maybe they can answer
3 that.

4 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Can you speak to
5 that a little bit?

6 MR. PODGORSKI: Yes. Our intention at
7 this time is to have it pad ready; of course we
8 will have four to six inches of topsoil on it so
9 the grass will grow and not just be gravel in
10 the meantime, which goes along with the
11 requirements that I'm sure we will have from
12 Gewalt Hamilton as far as stabilizing the
13 property before it's turned over.

14 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Will any of those
15 plants be installed on that site?

16 MR. PODGORSKI: Because of our landscape
17 and tree ordinance and all that, we are going to
18 try to put in as many trees as we possibly can
19 in the tradeoffs. So anything that doesn't get
20 in the way of future construction will be in
21 this phase.

22 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: How about the
23 plants that border the detention basin, is it

1 your intention to put those in? It looks like
 2 it's still on this property but it --
 3 MR. PODGORSKI: It's still -- it won't
 4 affect the actual construction of the building
 5 so it will go in.
 6 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: You think those
 7 will go in?
 8 MR. PODGORSKI: Yes.
 9 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Would you
 10 like it in the ordinance?
 11 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: At least the
 12 hedgerow that sits in front of the detention
 13 pond, if you could put that in the ordinance,
 14 they do have to comply with the watershed
 15 ordinance. And then there's the -- is there
 16 a -- what's to the north, and those people
 17 probably want that hedgerow addressed on the
 18 north edge of the property. I think everything
 19 else probably gets destroyed when they are
 20 building the building and paving so...
 21 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: That's the
 22 burning bushes.
 23 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Yes, if we could

1 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN: So just
 2 for my -- pad ready means?
 3 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: It means it's
 4 graded to final grade where the pad, it's within
 5 two inches of where the stone will go for the
 6 building pad. Is that --
 7 MR. PODGORSKI: Correct, yes.
 8 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: So
 9 basically --
 10 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN:
 11 (Inaudible).
 12 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: No, generally not
 13 pad ready but --
 14 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: But somebody
 15 who is going to be building the building doesn't
 16 have to bring in or haul any dirt?
 17 COMMISSIONER WOOD: For clarity with
 18 respect to setback -- go ahead, Jim.
 19 MR. BATEMAN: No. Why don't you -- I
 20 have to complete my thought anyway.
 21 COMMISSIONER WOOD: Clarity with respect
 22 to setback, the difference there has to do with
 23 a strip of land that is going to be used for the

1 address the hedgerow on the north edge of the
 2 property and maybe the hedgerow in front of the
 3 stormwater detention.
 4 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: So along the
 5 north property line and the burning bushes along
 6 the east side of the detention basin.
 7 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Would that be --
 8 MR. PODGORSKI: Yes, definitely. That's
 9 our intention, so, I don't want to have to tear
 10 up more than we have to. I'm trying to make
 11 this site development as complete as possible.
 12 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Right.
 13 MR. BATEMAN: So the landscaping along
 14 the north and east sides of the detention?
 15 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: The north
 16 property line --
 17 MR. PODGORSKI: North property line and
 18 east side of the detention pond.
 19 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE:
 20 (Continuing.) -- east side of the detention
 21 basin.
 22 MR. BATEMAN: East side of the detention
 23 basin.

1 Village purpose?
 2 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: We had
 3 dedicated right of way, the property line went
 4 to the center of the road before...
 5 COMMISSIONER WOOD: Right.
 6 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: And when
 7 they dedicated the right of way -- or when we
 8 were shown the original plan, they were going to
 9 let the north right of way run, which was less
 10 than south of the right of way. We asked them
 11 to put it back to what the south right of way
 12 was, that's 33 feet on that side; and what they
 13 are asking for is to have the setbacks from the
 14 old right-of-way line, the one they proposed to
 15 the north, existing to the north rather; so in
 16 essence the parking lot 30 feet setback from
 17 right of way, it's 22 setback from the new right
 18 of way, which I personally don't have a problem
 19 with because that's supposedly retail, and as a
 20 retail owner you have your parking lot a little
 21 bit closer, it's more visible to the traveling
 22 public and it might draw in more people.
 23 COMMISSIONER WOOD: Okay.

7 (Pages 22 to 25)

1 MR. BATEMAN: The original ordinance for
2 this proposal -- actually had recited in the
3 ordinance said they had to dedicate the 33 feet,
4 so...

5 The landscaping along the north
6 property line and along the east side of the
7 detention basin shall be installed prior to the
8 issuance of the final occupancy permit for the
9 proposed addition to the Swiss Automation
10 building, seems to me that's the best hook to
11 hang it on, and it says final occupancy permit;
12 so if for example they finished in the winter,
13 you give them a temporary and wouldn't final out
14 the temporary, that temporary occupancy permit
15 until they have done the landscaping in the
16 spring.

17 There is another issue that Rick
18 had raised about -- oh, do we want to mention
19 site stabilization -- I do think it's, I think
20 my impression is that it is adequately covered
21 by --

22 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Lake County
23 Stormwater --

1 MR. BATEMAN: (Continuing.)-- Lake
2 County Stormwater Management.

3 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: So I think we
4 leave that alone.

5 MR. BATEMAN: So we have basically taken
6 the draft motion that you have and added the
7 recital relative to acknowledging the front yard
8 setback variation that can be granted as part of
9 the special use for planned development, and
10 second the mentioning that the proposed
11 landscaping along the north property line and
12 along the east side of the detention basin shall
13 be installed prior to the issuance of the final
14 occupancy permit for the proposed addition to
15 the Swiss Automation building.

16 COMMISSIONER WOOD: So based upon that
17 motion, I would like to make that motion for the
18 Plan Commission to approve.

19 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: What he
20 said?

21 COMMISSIONER WOOD: Correct.

22 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: I hear a
23 motion. Is there a second?

1 COMMISSIONER PULEO: Second.

2 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Roll call.

3 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN:

4 Commissioner Wood?

5 COMMISSIONER WOOD: Yes.

6 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN:

7 Commissioner Puleo?

8 COMMISSIONER PULEO: Yes.

9 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN:

10 Commissioner Delisle?

11 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: Yes.

12 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN:

13 Commissioner Wrzeszcz?

14 COMMISSIONER WRZESZCZ: Yes.

15 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN: Chair

16 Daulton-Lange?

17 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Yes.

18 So this will be going to the Board

19 for our recommendation --

20 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN: Next
21 week, Wednesday, rock it through.

22 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: And you
23 recommend the petitioner be here?

1 VILLAGE ADMINISTRATOR MARTIN: Yes, I
2 do -- maybe not all three of you but certainly
3 one if there are any questions. Typically it's
4 not as intense of a process.

5 And I sent Bob -- I sent you an
6 e-mail to get additional copies, not tomorrow
7 but Tuesday, that's fine. We will get them.

8 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: Do we have
9 anything else our agenda, anything coming up?

10 June 24, don't set a meeting for
11 that date.

12 COMMISSIONER PULEO: What are you
13 saying?

14 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: June 24
15 don't set a date for that date, I'll be busy.

16 COMMISSIONER PULEO: Well, at least you
17 have your priorities.

18 COMMISSIONER DELISLE: I'll make a
19 motion that we adjourn.

20 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: All those in
21 favor?

22 (Chorus of ayes.)

23 MR. BATEMAN: Back on the record.

1 Commissioner Wrzeszcz is going to
2 change his -- well, you can -- why don't you do
3 it for the record, just you are going to
4 withdraw your positive vote and indicate instead
5 abstention.

6 COMMISSIONER WRZESZCZ: I would like to
7 withdraw my positive vote and abstain on it.

8 MR. BATEMAN: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER WRZESZCZ: Abstain.

10 I would like to disclose that
11 Spaceco Engineering is a sister company of the
12 company that I currently work for.

13 CHAIRPERSON DAULTON-LANGE: And the new
14 plans came from Spaceco Engineering.

15 (Whereupon the meeting
16 concluded.)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
2)
3 COUNTY OF LAKE)
4
5
6

7 I, Carla P. Letellier, a Certified
8 Shorthand Reporter of the State of Illinois, CSR
9 No. 084-003315, do hereby certify that I
10 reported in shorthand the proceedings had in the
11 aforesaid matter, and that the foregoing is a
12 true, complete and correct transcript of the
13 proceedings had as appears from my stenographic
14 notes so taken to the best of my ability.

15
16 *Carla P. Letellier*
17 
18 CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
19
20
21
22
23