

VILLAGE OF HUNTLEY
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
Monday, October 27, 2014
MINUTES

5

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Tom Kibort called to order the Village of Huntley Plan Commission meeting for October 27, 2014 at 6:31 pm in the Municipal Complex Village Board Room at 10987 Main Street, Huntley, Illinois 60142. The room is handicap accessible.

10

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Kibort led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

15

PLAN

COMMISSIONERS: Commissioners Lori Nichols, Terra DeBaltz and Robert Chandler, Vice Chair Dawn Ellison and Chairman Tom Kibort

20

COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: Commissioners Tim Hoeft and Ron Hahn

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Development Services Charles Nordman and Planner James Williams

25

4. Public Comments: There were no public comments.

5. Approval of Minutes

30

A. Approval of the September 22, 2014 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

A MOTION was made to approve the September 22, 2014 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes as written.

MOVED: Vice Chair Ellison

SECONDED: Commissioner DeBaltz

35

AYES: Commissioners Nichols and DeBaltz, Vice Chair Ellison and Chairman Kibort

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: Commissioner Chandler

MOTION CARRIED 4:0:1

40

6. Public Hearing(s)

45

A. Petition No. 14-10.2, Dr. John Faubl, 11613 Main Street, Public Hearing to consider a request for a Special Use Permit for a Dental Office and Site Plan Review in accordance with the site plan that has been submitted to, and is on file with, the Village of Huntley, pursuant to the requirements of Section 156.204 of the Huntley Zoning Ordinance.

Director Nordman reviewed a PowerPoint presentation outlining the request from the petitioner, Dr. John Faubl, 691 Bluestem Lane, Algonquin, IL 60102 for a Special Use Permit for a Dental Office and Site Plan Review for the proposed 1,876 square foot dental office, associated parking area, landscape plan and other site improvements at the subject location at 11613 Main Street (Southeast corner of Main and Grove Streets).

50

Introduction

Director Nordman introduced the petitioner's request noting that he is proposing to raze the existing residential structure and garage at 11613 Main Street and redevelop the site with a single-story, 1,876 square foot dental

55

office building with associated parking, landscaping and other site improvements. Director Nordman pointed out that Dr. Faubl's office is currently located on Vine Street in the northwest portion of the Village.

5 Director Nordman stated that the subject property was rezoned by a previous owner from "R-2" Single Family Residential to "O-1-PUD" Office – Planned Unit Development in July 2005. Dr. Faubl purchased the property in 2007 and subsequently rezoned the property to "B-4" Adaptive Reuse in October 2009 (per VOH Ordinance No. 2009-10.44) with the intent of renting the property as a single-family residence until he was prepared to relocate his dental practice to the site. Director Nordman noted that the B-4 district allows for healthcare uses, including dental, as a special use. The Adaptive Reuse District use limitations dictate that replacement
10 structures have a residential character and a quality appearance on all sides of the building.

Required Approvals

The following review and approvals are required from the Plan Commission and Village Board for the proposed development of the 0.42-acre site:

15

- Special Use Permit for the Dental Office
- Site Plan Review

Special Use Permit

20 *Standards for Special Use Permits (1) General Standards.* No special use permit shall be recommended or granted pursuant to this Section unless the applicant shall establish that:

(a) *Code and Plan Purposes.* The proposed use and development will be in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this Code was enacted and for which the regulations of the district in question were established and with the general purpose and intent of the Official Comprehensive Plan.
25

(b) *No Undue Adverse Impact.* The proposed use, drainage and development will not have a substantial or undue adverse effect upon adjacent property, the character of the area or the public health, safety and general welfare.
30

(c) *No Undue Interference with Surrounding Development.* The proposed use and development will be constructed, arranged and operated so as not to dominate the immediate vicinity or to interfere with the use and development of neighboring property in accordance with the applicable district regulations.
35

(d) *Adequate Public Facilities.* The proposed use and development will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as streets, public utilities, drainage structures, police and fire protection, refuse disposal, parks, libraries, and schools, or the applicant will provide adequately for such services.
40

(e) *No Undue Traffic Congestion.* The proposed use and development will not cause undue traffic congestion nor draw significant amounts of traffic through residential street.
45

(f) *No Undue Destruction of Significant Features.* The proposed use and development will not result in the destruction, loss or damage of natural, scenic and historic feature of significant importance.

(g) *Compliance with Standards.* The proposed use and development complies with all additional standards imposed on it by the particular provision of this Code authorizing such use.

Site Plan Review

50 The proposed site plan includes a ±1,876 square foot dental office building, trash enclosure, parking lot and landscaping on the 0.42-acre property located at the southeast corner of Main and Grove Streets. The existing driveway on Grove Street, widened to 24'-8", will provide access to the site's parking area.
55

Building Elevations

5 The single-story structure features a cross-gabled, architectural shingled roof with a dormer feature facing Main Street. The office building exterior is horizontal drop siding (LP Smart Siding) with wood cedar shake LP siding and spindle gable-end treatments at the peaks. Director Nordman pointed out that the main entrance to the dental office is oriented toward the parking area to the south and that the exterior of the proposed trash enclosure on the east side of the dental office will be the same horizontal lap siding installed on the principal structure.

Parking

10 Director Nordman noted that the proposed ten (10) space curbed parking lot includes the requisite single accessible space/loading area and 9’ x 19’ parking stalls meeting the Zoning Ordinance 156.106 Parking. (H) requirements as shown in the following table:

	BLDG. AREA	REQUIRED SPACES	PROVIDED SPACES
Medical, Dental and Optometry Offices/ Clinics (4 spaces / 1,000 s.f.)	1,876 sf	8	10

Landscaping

15 Director Nordman reviewed the proposed landscape plan for the site noting that the preservation of existing trees and the addition of trees on the site meets the requisite one (1) tree per forty (40’) feet requirement along the roadway frontage. Foundation plantings include various shrubs, an ornamental crabapple tree and viburnum at the northeast and northwest corners of the building, respectively. Screening of the trash enclosure includes gro-low sumac and reed grass plantings. The petitioner originally proposed a six (6’) foot tall wood dog-eared fence along the south and east property lines. The conceptual review of the project by the Village Board and Plan Commission included the request for an alternative to the fence. The petitioner has produced a revised landscape plan replacing the fence with a two (2’) foot tall berm and evergreen plantings along the south and east property lines for consideration; however, the petitioner’s preference is to screen the parking area with a fence.

Lighting

25 Director Nordman noted the site lighting includes two (2) ornamental fixtures mounted upon fifteen (15’) foot poles which provide the requisite 2.2 foot-candle average for the parking area and 0.1 foot-candle maximum at the property lines. Director Nordman added that a pair of floodlights will illuminate the proposed dental office ground sign with precautions taken to align those fixtures so as to eliminate glare that may distract drivers along the adjacent streets.

Signage

30 Director Nordman stated that the proposed ground sign for the site includes a four-foot tall, 7’-10 ½” x 18” (11.8 square foot) wooden sign in conformance with the requirements of both the Village’s Sign Ordinance and Commercial Design Guidelines.

Historic Preservation Commission

35 The Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the proposed project at their meeting on October 21, 2014 and offered the following comments:

- 40 ▪ The Commission was disappointed the rehabilitation and reuse of the existing structure was an option not more thoroughly considered by the petitioner.
- 45 ▪ The architectural style of the proposed dentist office building is incompatible with the architecture of the surrounding structures.

Plan Commission Conceptual Review

The Plan Commission reviewed conceptual plans at their September 22, 2014 meeting and raised the following concerns regarding the petitioner's proposal:

- 5 ▪ Reduce the slope of the proposed office building's roof and retain the proposed roof dormer feature included in the later revisions to the building plans. *The petitioner reduced the roof slope and added a dormer feature on the portion of the roof facing Main Street.*
- 10 ▪ The proposed combination of a berm and landscaping to buffer the east and south property lines was preferred over the fence alternative. *The petitioner has revised the landscape plan to include plantings and a berm along the respective property lines. The combined height of the berm and landscaping is six (6') feet.*

Village Board Concept Review

15 The Village Board reviewed the conceptual plans on September 18, 2014, and referred it to the Plan Commission to begin the formal development review and approval process. The Village Board's comments included the following:

- 20 • The dental office design should incorporate more historical elements that are more compatible with the surrounding architecture within the older portion of Huntley. *The proposed building elevations have been revised to incorporate more decorative architectural features and accents including turned-wood posts with bracket accents, spandrels between the posts and additional bracket accents at the gable roof peaks.*
- 25 • The proposed trash enclosure should match primary exterior material of the dental office building. *The plans were revised accordingly.*
- 30 • The petitioner should investigate installation of a berm and landscape screen rather than a fence along the neighboring property lines. *The petitioner has spoken with the adjacent property owners and the owner to the east has indicated no preference for the design of the buffering along the mutual property lines, while the property owner to the south preferred the fence.*

ACTION REQUESTED

35 The petitioner requests a motion of the Plan Commission, to recommend approval of Petition No. 14-10.2, Dr. John Faubl, 11613 Main Street, Public Hearing to consider a request for a Special Use Permit for a Dental Office and Site Plan Review in accordance with the site plan that has been submitted to, and is on file with, the Village of Huntley, pursuant to the requirements of Section 156.204 of the Huntley Zoning Ordinance.

40 Staff recommends the following conditions be applied should the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Village Board:

- 45 1. All public improvements and site development must occur in full compliance with the submitted plans (see list of exhibits) and all other applicable Village Municipal Services (Engineering, Public Works, Planning and Building) site design standards, practices and permit requirements.
- 50 2. The petitioner will comply with all final engineering revisions to be approved by the Village Engineer and Development Services Department.
- 55 3. The Village of Huntley will require adherence to Illinois drainage law and best management practices for stormwater management. The petitioner, its agents and assignees are responsible for not increasing the rate of stormwater runoff and will be required, to the extent practicable, to minimize any increase in runoff volume through "retention" and design of multi stage outlet structures.
4. The petitioner shall obtain final approval of the Landscape Plan from the Development Services Department.
5. All permanent and seasonal plantings must be replaced immediately upon decline.
6. The petitioner is required to meet all development requirements of the Huntley Fire Protection District.
7. No building plans or permits are approved as part of this submittal.

8. No sign plans or permits are approved as part of this submittal.

A MOTION was made to open the public hearing to consider Petition No. 14-10.2.

5 **MOVED:** Commissioner Nichols
SECONDED: Vice Chair Ellison
AYES: Commissioners Nichols, DeBaltz and Chandler, Vice Chair Ellison and
Chairman Kibort
NAYS: None
10 **ABSTAIN:** None
MOTION CARRIED 5:0:0

15 Chairman Kibort stated that a public hearing is being conducted and all audience members that would like to speak tonight must be sworn in. Chairman Kibort asked anyone wishing to speak to stand and be sworn in. The following individuals were sworn in:

Charles Nordman, Village of Huntley
John Faubl, 691 Bluestem Lane, Algonquin, IL 60102
20 Matt Honald, Angus Young Architects, 555 South River Street, Janesville, WI 53548-4783
Judy Melman, 11107 Grove Street, Huntley IL 60142
Larry Melman, 11107 Grove Street, Huntley, IL 60142
Diana Carpenter, Historic Preservation Commission

25 Dr. John Faubl addressed the Plan Commission and pointed out that he had contacted the adjacent property owners and the owner to the east has indicated no preference for the design of the buffering along the mutual property lines, while the property owner to the south preferred the fence.

30 Vice Chair Ellison asked what type of fence was originally proposed along the two property lines and Dr. Faubl stated that the type of fence proposed is a six (6') foot, board-on-board fence.

Mr. Honald, the petitioner's architect, addressed the Plan Commission and requested that the Plan Commission indicate whether the fence or the berm/landscaping is the preferred alternative for screening the proposed parking area. Additionally, Mr. Honald also requested the Plan Commission include in their recommendation whether or not the proposed dental office building elevations are acceptable.

35 Chairman Kibort asked Huntley Historic Preservation Commissioner Diana Carpenter to elaborate upon the recommendations that the Historic Commission had made regarding the proposed project.

40 Historic Preservation Commissioner Diana Carpenter stated that she did not intend to speak on behalf of the Commission this evening. Commissioner Carpenter explained that the Historic Commission's review of the proposed project focused upon their disappointment that the re-use and rehabilitation of existing residential structure was not integrated into the proposed project. Commissioner Carpenter stated that she personally believes the proposed dentist office would be better suited along Route 47. Commissioner Carpenter noted that in addition to the proposed razing of the existing historic structure, the construction of a new office building on the prominent corner near downtown and within an older neighborhood predominated by historic residential structures was also seen as unbeneficial.

45 Dr. Faubl responded that the cost to rehabilitate the existing structure was a factor in why the existing structure could not be refurbished to accommodate the dental office use. Additionally, Dr. Faubl noted the proposed dental office will hopefully have a limited impact upon the neighborhood. Dr. Faubl further explained that his business does not require Route 47 visibility and that property on Route 47 is much more expensive.

55 Judy Melman stated that her family has lived in the neighborhood for twenty-nine years and believes the dentist office is the most appealing non-residential use that has been proposed for the subject site and she appreciates the proposed design of the dentist to appear more residential in-character. Ms. Melman stated that she would

prefer the berm/landscape alternative for screening the parking area and believes the parking area will be adequate for accommodating parking for the office and hopefully avoid the necessity for any on-street parking. Lastly, Ms. Melman was concerned that snow removal from the site is performed in a manner that does not block the adjacent sidewalks.

5

Larry Melman addressed the Plan Commission, noted that he is a former Historic Preservation Commission member and pointed that although he is not necessarily happy that the historic existing structure is to be razed to accommodate the redevelopment of the site he understands why this is necessary. Additionally, Mr. Melman noted that he is also in favor of the berm/landscaping alternative rather than the fence for screening of the proposed parking lot for the site.

10

Vice Chair Ellison stated that she is generally opposed to the idea of redevelopment of property zoned “B-4” Adaptive Reuse when replacing a historic structure with new construction.

15

Vice Chair Ellison asked if the Historic Preservation Commission had any recommendations to improve the architecture of the proposed building.

Historic Preservation Commissioner Carpenter stated the Commission did not provide any recommendations to improve the architecture of the proposed building. Commissioner Carpenter explained the discussion focused more on the desire to preserve the existing house.

20

Director Nordman stated the Historic Preservation Commission was specifically asked if there was anything they would like to see changed to improve the proposed building and the Commission did not provide any specific recommendations. Director Nordman explained it was the consensus of the Commission that the proposed architecture was incompatible with the surrounding structures and there was nothing that could be done to make it fit into the neighborhood.

25

Chairman Kibort suggested a compromise for the parking lot screening which includes the fence as well as landscaping, particularly at the southeast corner of the property.

30

Commissioner Nichols stated that she likes the proposed ornamental light fixture and prefers the alternative for the screening of the parking area that includes the berm and landscaping rather than the fence.

Commissioner Chandler stated that he appreciates the changes to the architectural design of the proposed dentist since the conceptual review of the project and although he favors the berm/landscaping he appreciates the fence with landscaping, particularly at the southeast corner of the site, would be sufficient compromise.

35

Commissioner Chandler asked what the square footage of the existing residential structure was and Dr. Faubl stated he was not sure of the square footage, but estimated it was approximately 1,300 square feet.

40

A MOTION was made to close the public hearing to consider Petition No. 14-10.2.

MOVED: Vice Chair Ellison

SECONDED: Commissioner Chandler

AYES: Commissioners Nichols, DeBaltz and Chandler, Vice Chair Ellison and Chairman Kibort

45

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED 5:0:0

50

A MOTION was made to recommend approval of Petition No. 14-10.2, Dr. John Faubl, 11613 Main Street, Public Hearing to consider a request for a Special Use Permit for a Dental Office and Site Plan Review in accordance with the site plan that has been submitted to, and is on file with, the Village of

Huntley, pursuant to the requirements of Section 156.204 of the Huntley Zoning Ordinance subject to the following conditions:

1. All public improvements and site development must occur in full compliance with the submitted plans (see list of exhibits) and all other applicable Village Municipal Services (Engineering, Public Works, Planning and Building) site design standards, practices and permit requirements.
 2. The petitioner will comply with all final engineering revisions to be approved by the Village Engineer and Development Services Department.
 3. The Village of Huntley will require adherence to Illinois drainage law and best management practices for stormwater management. The petitioner, its agents and assignees are responsible for not increasing the rate of stormwater runoff and will be required, to the extent practicable, to minimize any increase in runoff volume through “retention” and design of multi stage outlet structures.
 4. The petitioner shall obtain final approval of the Landscape Plan from the Development Services Department.
 5. All permanent and seasonal plantings must be replaced immediately upon decline.
 6. The petitioner is required to meet all development requirements of the Huntley Fire Protection District.
 7. No building plans or permits are approved as part of this submittal.
 8. No sign plans or permits are approved as part of this submittal.
- Condition added by the Plan Commission:
9. The berm/landscape screening alternative of the parking lot to the east and south is preferred.

MOVED:	Commissioner Nichols
SECONDED:	Commissioner DeBaltz
AYES:	Commissioners Nichols, DeBaltz and Chandler and Chairman Kibort
NAYS:	Vice Chair Ellison
ABSTAIN:	None
MOTION CARRIED	4:1:0

B. Petition No. 14-10.3, John Wuich, 11006 Route 47, Public Hearing to consider a request for Site Plan Review, including approval of such relief as may be necessary to allow for development in accordance with the site plan that has been submitted to, and is on file with, the Village of Huntley, pursuant to the requirements of Section 156.204 of the Huntley Zoning Ordinance.

Planner Williams reviewed a PowerPoint presentation including that the petitioner/owner of the subject site is John Wuich, 11633 Joan Avenue, Huntley, IL 60142 and he is requesting Site Plan Review for the proposed parking area, drive aisle, site improvements and relief necessary for the “B-2” Highway Service-zoned property located at 11006 Route 47, the single 0.18-acre lot (PIN 18-28-376-091) located on the east side of Route 47, two lots south of the Huntley Court retail center.

Introduction

Planner Williams stated the petitioner is proposing to construct a parking lot for the converted residence located at 11006 Route 47. The building was previously used for business/office uses, but has sat vacant for several years. In this intervening period, the completion of the Route 47 widening occurred and the necessary right-of-way for the widening project was taken from along the property’s frontage. This eliminated the few parking spaces that were located at front of the building. As a result, there are no parking spaces for the 1,239 square foot building. In accordance with the Zoning Ordinance, the building requires five (5) parking spaces to accommodate an office use.

Planner Williams continued, stating that the petitioner, who also owns the neighboring property to the south (11008 Route 47), is proposing to construct a six (6) space parking lot at the rear of the property, which includes the requisite single accessible space, in order to market the building for lease. Relief would be required to

reduce the required drive aisle width from 24 feet to approximately 14'-8" for the driveway accessing the parking lot.

5 Planner Williams noted that in conjunction with the formal request for site plan review and the necessary relief for the proposed parking lot, the property will also require relief for the non-conforming setback created as part of the taking for the Route 47 widening project. The property is zoned "B-2" Highway Service which requires a 30 foot front yard setback. The taking for the Route 47 widening resulted in a front yard setback of 12.3 feet.

Required Approvals

10 Planner Williams stated that review and approvals are required from the Plan Commission and Village Board for Site Plan Review, including necessary relief.

Staff Analysis

15 Site Plan Review

The proposed site plan includes a ±2,500 square foot, six (6) stall parking area, including a single accessible parking space, served by a single, 14'-8"-wide driveway along the south side of the lot providing ingress/egress from Route 47. Planner Williams stated that the petitioner has requested relief from the requirement that parking lots include a six-inch high concrete curb. Otherwise, the parking area will accommodate the required 9' x 19' parking stalls with wheel stops.

Landscaping and Lighting

25 Planner Williams reviewed the proposed landscape plan for the site which meets the Zoning Ordinance requirement that parking areas be effectively screened from residentially zoned properties with a fence and/or evergreen hedge. Additionally, the petitioner plans to install a six (6') foot tall board-on-board fence along the east (rear) and north (side) property lines, preservation of some of the existing trees on the site, and the planting of hydrangea and day lilies added along the parking area perimeter and adjacent to the front and northwest corner of the building.

30 Planner Williams noted that the proposed lighting for the site includes two (2) existing wall-mounted fixtures on the rear (east) and south side of the building, with the parking lot illumination further augmented by two (2) metal halide shoebox style light fixtures.

Requested Relief

35 Planner Williams noted that the relief requested for redevelopment of the subject site included the following:

1. Section 156.038 (B-2) Highway Service District (C) (3) Minimum Yards requires a thirty (30') foot front building setback. The front building setback is approximately 12.3 feet, therefore requiring 17.7 feet relief.
- 40 2. Section 156.106 of the Zoning Ordinance requires 24'-wide drive aisle widths. The drive aisle width serving the proposed parking area is approximately 14'- 8", therefore requiring 9' - 4" relief.
3. Section 156.106 of the Zoning Ordinance requires parking areas to be bordered by a six (6") inch high concrete curb. Relief is required for not installing this design element.

45 Village Board Concept Review

The Village Board reviewed the conceptual plans on July 17, 2014, and referred it to the Plan Commission to begin the formal development review and approval process. The Board's comments included the following:

- 50 • The Village Board generally supported the petitioner's plan to remove some of the existing trees at the rear of the property to accommodate the proposed six (6') foot tall fence along the east and north property lines.
- 55 • The Village Board asked about the proposed renovations to the building. The petitioner noted the proposed work includes remodeling of the building's interior to accommodate the office space(s), rebuilding of the front porch, rear deck/stairs and repair of the building's roof.

- The Village Board asked if the petitioner intended to install exterior site lighting. While noting his willingness to comply with site lighting requirements, the petitioner stated that he hoped to lease the property to businesses with generally daytime business hours between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m.

5 Action Requested

The petitioner requests a motion of the Plan Commission, to recommend approval of Petition No. 14-10.3, John Wuich, 11006 Route 47, Public Hearing to consider a request for a Site Plan Review, including approval of such relief as may be necessary to allow for development in accordance with the site plan that has been submitted to, and is on file with, the Village of Huntley, pursuant to the requirements of Section 10 156.204 of the Huntley Zoning Ordinance.

Staff recommends the following conditions be applied should the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Village Board:

1. All public improvements and site development must occur in full compliance with the submitted plans (see list of exhibits) and all other applicable Village Municipal Services (Engineering, Public Works, Planning and Building) site design standards, practices and permit requirements.
2. The petitioner will comply with all final engineering revisions to be approved by the Village Engineer and Development Services Department.
- 20 3. The Village of Huntley will require adherence to Illinois drainage law and best management practices for stormwater management. The petitioner, its agents and assignees are responsible for not increasing the rate of stormwater runoff and will be required, to the extent practicable, to minimize any increase in runoff volume through “retention” and design of multi stage outlet structures.
- 25 4. The petitioner shall obtain final approval of the Landscape Plan from the Development Services Department.
5. The petitioner shall obtain final approval of the Lighting Plan from the Development Services Department.
6. All permanent and seasonal plantings must be replaced immediately upon decline.
7. The petitioner is required to meet all development requirements of the Huntley Fire Protection District.
- 30 8. No building plans or permits are approved as part of this submittal.
9. No sign plans or permits are approved as part of this submittal.

A MOTION was made to open the public hearing to consider Petition No. 14-10.3.

35 **MOVED: Vice Chair Ellison**
SECONDED: Commissioner DeBaltz
AYES: Commissioners Nichols, DeBaltz and Chandler, Vice Chair Ellison and
Chairman Kibort
NAYS: None
40 **ABSTAIN: None**
MOTION CARRIED 5:0:0

Chairman Kibort stated that a public hearing is being conducted and all audience members that would like to speak tonight must be sworn in. Chairman Kibort asked anyone wishing to speak to stand and be sworn in. The following individuals were sworn in:

- Charles Nordman, Village of Huntley
- James Williams, Village of Huntley
- John Wuich, 11633 Joan Avenue, Huntley, IL 60142
- 50 Mary Ellen Moerke, 11004 Route 47, Huntley, IL 60142

John Wuich addressed the Plan Commission and stated he welcomed any questions or concerns there were regarding his request.

55 There were no comments from members of the audience.

Commissioner Chandler requested clarification for how the storm water was to be accommodated from the site and Mr. Wuich noted that storm water is to be directed to the inlet located at the northwest corner of the site.

5 Commissioner Chandler asked if the widening of the Route 47 and the subsequent loss of parking spaces at the front of the building triggered the necessity for the proposed rear yard parking lot and Planner Williams confirmed that this was integral reason for Mr. Wuich's project.

10 Commissioner DeBaltz asked if the drive aisle providing ingress/egress to and from the proposed parking lot was intended to be one-way in and one-way out and Mr. Wuich confirmed that relatively narrow width of the drive aisle necessitates that this would have to work that way.

15 Vice Chair Ellison noted that Mary Ellen Moerke, 11004 Route 47, the neighboring property owner to the north, was in attendance and asked if she had any concerns regarding the petitioner's proposed project.

20 Mary Ellen Moerke acknowledged that her air conditioner condensing unit encroaches on Mr. Wuich's property and Mr. Wuich stated that he is aware of the encroachments that exist between the properties and is willing to work around these existing conditions. Mr. Wuich pointed out the proposed fence along the north property line of his property is configured to accommodate the encroachment.

Ms. Moerke stated that she is concerned that the proposed project does not contribute to any flooding in her basement.

25 Mr. Wuich stated he certainly does not want the proposed project to contribute to any problems on any of the adjacent properties.

Director Nordman pointed out that the Village Engineer has reviewed the stormwater design for the proposed project.

30 Vice Chair Ellison encouraged the petitioner to limit the lighting on the site to impact the adjacent properties as little as possible.

35 Discussion ensued regarding the screening alternatives along the north side of the subject property and the direction arrived at was to specify evergreen landscaping to replace the fence along the north side of the subject site.

Ms. Moerke stated she preferred the landscaping rather than a fence along her property line.

40 **A MOTION was made to close the public hearing to consider Petition No. 14-10.3.**

MOVED: Commissioner Chandler
SECONDED: Commissioner Nichols
AYES: Commissioners Nichols, DeBaltz and Chandler, Vice Chair Ellison and Chairman Kibort
45 **NAYS: None**
ABSTAIN: None
MOTION CARRIED 5:0:0

50 **A MOTION was made to recommend approval of Petition No. 14-10.3, John Wuich, 11006 Route 47, Public Hearing to consider a request for a Site Plan Review, including approval of such relief as may be necessary to allow for development in accordance with the site plan that has been submitted to, and is on file with, the Village of Huntley, pursuant to the requirements of Section 156.204 of the Huntley Zoning Ordinance subject to the following conditions:**

1. All public improvements and site development must occur in full compliance with the submitted plans (see list of exhibits) and all other applicable Village Municipal Services (Engineering, Public Works, Planning and Building) site design standards, practices and permit requirements.
 2. The petitioner will comply with all final engineering revisions to be approved by the Village Engineer and Development Services Department.
 3. The Village of Huntley will require adherence to Illinois drainage law and best management practices for stormwater management. The petitioner, its agents and assignees are responsible for not increasing the rate of stormwater runoff and will be required, to the extent practicable, to minimize any increase in runoff volume through “retention” and design of multi stage outlet structures.
 4. The petitioner shall obtain final approval of the Landscape Plan from the Development Services Department.
 5. The petitioner shall obtain final approval of the Lighting Plan from the Development Services Department.
 6. All permanent and seasonal plantings must be replaced immediately upon decline.
 7. The petitioner is required to meet all development requirements of the Huntley Fire Protection District.
 8. No building plans or permits are approved as part of this submittal.
 9. No sign plans or permits are approved as part of this submittal.
- Condition added by the Plan Commission:
10. Landscape screening to replace the proposed fence along the north property line of the site.

MOVED: Vice Chair Ellison
SECONDED: Commissioner DeBaltz
AYES: Commissioners Nichols, DeBaltz and Chandler, Vice Chair Ellison and Chairman Kibort
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
MOTION CARRIED 5:0:0

7. Discussion

Director Nordman noted that the next Plan Commission meetings are Monday, November 10, 2014 and November 24, 2014.

8. Adjournment

At 7:55 pm, a MOTION was made to adjourn the October 27, 2014 Plan Commission meeting.

MOVED: Vice Chair Ellison
SECONDED: Commissioner Nichols
AYES: Commissioners Nichols, DeBaltz and Chandler and Vice Chair Ellison and Chairman Kibort
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
MOTION CARRIED 5:0:0

Respectfully submitted,
James Williams
 Planner
 Village of Huntley