

**VILLAGE OF HUNTLEY
PLAN COMMISSION & ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
JOINT PUBLIC HEARING JOINT MEETING**

Monday, February 27, 2012

MINUTES

5

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Tom Kibort called to order the Public Hearing Joint Meeting of the Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Huntley on February 27, 2012 at 6:32 pm in the Municipal Complex Village Board Room at 10987 Main Street, Huntley, Illinois 60142. The room is handicap accessible.

10

ATTENDANCE

15

PLAN

COMMISSIONERS: Commissioners Dawn Ellison, Robert Chandler, Len Stensing, Lori Nichols, J. R. Westberg, Ruby Hornig, and Chairman Kibort

20

COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: None

ZONING BOARD:

Members Christopher Habel, Tim Hoeft, Ronda Goldman, Donald Bond, and Chairman Jack Tures

25

ZONING BOARD

MEMBERS ABSENT: Members Lou Stanczak and Lee Linnenkohl

ALSO PRESENT:

Senior Assistant to the Village Manager Lisa Armour, Director of Development Services Charles Nordman and Planner James Williams

30

3. Introduction of New Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals Members

Plan Commission Chairman Kibort introduced and welcomed newly appointed Plan Commissioners Lori Nichols, who formerly served on the Zoning Board of Appeals, and J. R. Westberg.

35

Zoning Board of Appeals Chairman Tures introduced and welcomed newly appointed Zoning Board Member Tim Hoeft.

4. Public Comments

40

There were no Public Comments offered.

5. Approval of Minutes

45

A. Approval of the November 28, 2011 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

Chairman Kibort asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes. There were none.

50

A MOTION was made to approve the November 28, 2011 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes as written.

MOVED: Commissioner Horning
SECONDED: Commissioner Chandler

AYES: Commissioners Chandler, Stensing, Hornig, and Chairman Kibort
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: Commissioners Nichols and Westberg
5 **MOTION CARRIED** 4:0:2

B. Approval of the August 24, 2011 Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes

Chairman Tures asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes. There were none.

10 **A MOTION was made to approve the August 24, 2011 Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes as written.**

15 **MOVED:** Member Habel
SECONDED: Member Goldman
AYES: Members Habel, Goldman, Bond and Chairman Tures
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: Member Hoeft
20 **MOTION CARRIED** 4:0:1

6. Public Hearing(s)

25 A. Petition No. 12-2.1, Thomas Panzloff, 10408 Cindy Jo Avenue, Requesting approval of a Map Amendment to rezone said property from "R-1" Single Family Residence District to "R-3" Duplex Residence District and approval of relief to reduce the minimum required area and width for a lot containing a two-family duplex in the "R-3" Duplex Residence District.

Director Nordman reviewed a PowerPoint presentation of the petitioner's request.

30 **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Petitioner/Owner: Thomas Panzloff
11684 Barberry Lane
35 Huntley, IL 60142

Subject Location: 10408 Cindy Jo Avenue

40 Request: The petitioner is requesting approval of a Map Amendment to rezone the property from "R-1" Single Family Residence District to "R-3" Duplex Residence District and subsequently requesting relief to reduce the minimum required area and width for a lot containing a two-family duplex in the "R-3" Duplex Residence District.

Zoning, Land Use and Comprehensive Plan:

45 The zoning, existing uses and comprehensive plan land uses of the subject property and adjacent properties were reviewed.

DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY

50 Director Nordman stated that the petitioner recently purchased the two-family duplex and is now requesting a Map Amendment to rezone the property in order to obtain a conventional loan for the property. The petitioner has indicated that due to the use being non-conforming is it impossible to refinance the property or sell the property in the future.

This petition is subject to review by both the Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals because, as Director Nordman pointed out, the requested actions fall under the prevue of both advisory bodies. Specifically, the Plan Commission has the authority to review the requested Map Amendment to
5 rezone the property; however, they do not have the authority to review the request for relief from the minimum lot area and width requirements. Whereas, the Zoning Board of Appeals has the jurisdiction and authority to review the proposed relief for the lot area and width, but does not have the authority to review the proposed Map Amendment to rezone the property.

10 Rezoning (Plan Commission Consideration)

Director Nordman reviewed that the petitioner is requesting approval to rezone 10408 Cindy Jo Avenue (on the east side of Cindy Jo Avenue, between Ronald Street and Edward Avenue) from “R-1” Single Family Residence District to “R-3” Duplex Residence District so the existing two-family duplex will be a conforming use. Currently, the two-family duplex is considered non-conforming and
15 if the structure were destroyed by any means to an extent of more than 50% of the replacement cost of the structure it could not be rebuilt as a two-family duplex. The existing structure was built in approximately 1971 and the Village has no record of the structure ever being converted from a single-family use or other approval that would allow it as a legal non-conforming use.

20 Director Nordman stated that as part of the petitioner’s application for a Map Amendment a statement of the need and justification for the proposed Zoning Map amendment was provided which addresses the following factors:

- 25 (a) The existing uses and zoning classifications of properties in the vicinity of the subject property.
- (b) The trend of development in the vicinity of the subject property, including changes, if any, in such trend since the subject property was placed in its present plan designation or zoning classification.
- (c) The extent to which the value of the subject property is diminished by the existing plan designation or zoning classification applicable to it.
- 30 (d) The extent to which such diminution in value is offset by an increase in the public health, safety and welfare.
- (e) The extent, if any, to which the use and enjoyment of adjacent properties would be affected by the proposed amendment.
- 35 (f) The extent, if any, to which the value of adjacent properties would be affected by the proposed amendment.
- (g) The extent, if any, to which the future orderly development of adjacent properties would be affected by the proposed amendment.
- (h) The suitability of the subject property for uses permitted or permissible under its present plan designation and zoning classification.
- 40 (i) The availability of adequate ingress to and egress from the subject property and the extent to which traffic conditions in the immediately vicinity of the subject property would be affected by the proposed amendment.
- (j) The availability of adequate utilities and essential public services to the subject property to accommodate the uses permitted or permissible under its present plan designation and zoning
45 classification.
- (k) The length of time, if any, that the subject property has been vacant, considered in the context of the pace of development in the vicinity of the subject property.
- (l) The community need for the proposed map amendment and for the uses and development it
50 would allow.

Lot Area and Width Relief (Zoning Board of Appeals Consideration)

Turning to the Zoning Board of Appeals consideration of the petitioner’s request which includes the

requested relief from the lot area and width, Director Nordman pointed out the proposed “R-3” Duplex Residence District requires a minimum lot area of 16,000 square feet and minimum lot width of 110 feet for a duplex. Director Nordman continued that the subject existing lot is 14,000 square feet and 110 feet wide; therefore, relief from the minimum lot area and lot with requirements is needed for a duplex in the “R-3” Duplex Residence District.

Similar to the Plan Commission standards for consideration of the zoning change, Director Nordman noted the standards for relief to be considered by the Zoning Board of Appeals are as follows:

- 10 (1) General Standard. No variation shall be granted pursuant to this Section unless the applicant shall establish that carrying out the strict letter of the provisions of this Code would create a particular hardship or a practical difficulty. Such a showing shall require proof that the variation being sought satisfies each of the standards set forth in this Subsection F.
- 15 (2) Unique Physical Condition. The subject property is exceptional as compared to other lots subject to the same provision by reason of a unique physical condition, including presence of an existing use, structure or sign, whether conforming or nonconforming; irregular or substandard shape or size; exceptional topographical features; or other extraordinary physical conditions peculiar to and inherent in the subject property that amount to more than a mere inconvenience to the owner and that relate to or arise out of the lot rather than the personal situation of the current owner of the lot.
- 20 (3) Non Self-Created. The aforesaid unique physical condition is not the result of any action or inaction of the owner or his predecessors in title and existed at the time of the enactment of the provisions from which a variation is sought or was created by natural forces or was the result of governmental action, other than the adoption of this Code, for which no compensation was paid.
- 25 (4) Denied Substantial Rights. The carrying out of the strict letter of the provision from which a variation is sought would deprive the owner of the subject property of substantial rights commonly enjoyed by owners of other lots subject to the same provision.
- 30 (5) Not Merely Special Privilege. The alleged hardship or difficulty is not merely the inability of the owner or occupant to enjoy some special privilege or additional right not available to owners or occupants of other lots subject to the same provision, nor merely an inability to make more money from the sale of the subject property; provided, however, that where the standards herein set out exist, the existence of an economic hardship shall not be a prerequisite to the grant of an authorized variation.
- 35 (6) Code and Plan Purposes. The variation would not result in a use or development of the subject property that would not be in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this Code and the provision from which a variation is sought were enacted or the general purpose and intent of the Official Comprehensive Plan.
- 40 (7) Essential Character of the Area. The variation would not result in a use or development on the subject property that:
 - 45 (a) Would be materially detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the enjoyment, use, development value of property or improvements permitted in the vicinity;
 - 50 (b) Would materially impair an adequate supply of light and air to the properties and improvements in the vicinity;

- (c) Would substantially increase congestion in the public streets due to traffic or parking;
- (d) Would unduly increase the danger of flood or fire;
- 5 (e) Would unduly tax public utilities and facilities in the area; or
- (f) Would endanger the public health or safety.

10 (8) No Other Remedy. There is no means other than the requested variation by which the alleged hardship or difficulty can be avoided or remedied to a degree sufficient to permit a reasonable use of the subject property.

REQUEST FOR MOTION

15 The PowerPoint presentation concluded with Director Nordman reviewing the petitioner’s request of the Plan Commission to recommend approval of Petition No. 12-2.1, 10408 Cindy Jo Avenue, a Map Amendment to rezone said property from “R-1” Single-Family Residence District to “R-3” Duplex Residence District.

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

- 1. No building plans or permits are approved as part of this request.

25 Director Nordman next reviewed the petitioner’s request of the Zoning Board of Appeals to recommend approval of Petition No. 12-2.1, 10408 Cindy Jo Avenue, Requesting approval of relief to reduce the minimum required area and width for a lot containing a two-family duplex in the “R-3” Duplex Residence District.

30 Staff recommends the following condition be applied should the Zoning Board of Appeals forward a positive recommendation to the Village Board:

- 1. No building plans or permits are approved as part of this request.

35 **A MOTION was made by the Plan Commission to open the public hearing to consider Petition No. 12-2.1.**

MOVED:	Commissioner Stensing
SECONDED:	Commissioner Westberg
AYES:	Commissioners Chandler, Stensing, Nichols, Westberg, Hornig, and Chairman Kibort
NAYS:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
MOTION CARRIED	6:0:0

45 **A MOTION was made by the Zoning Board of Appeals to open the public hearing to consider Petition No. 12-2.1.**

MOVED:	Member Goldman
SECONDED:	Member Hoeft
AYES:	Members Habel, Hoeft, Goldman, Bond and Chairman Tures
NAYS:	None
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
Tom Panzloff (petitioner), 11684 Barberrry Lane, Huntley, IL 60142
Dennis Mullaney, 10324 Cindy Jo Avenue, Huntley, IL 60142

Mr. Panzloff addressed the Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals stating the Staff's presentation sufficiently outlined his request and he is happy to answer any questions the advisory boards may have regarding the request.

Dennis Mullaney, 10324 Cindy Jo Avenue, stated he owns and lives in the residence two lots to the north of the subject property and asked if anyone knows how the duplex happened to have been built at this location.

Chairman Kibort stated it is unknown, therefore, the two-unit duplex structure is non-conforming given the existing zoning.

Mr. Mullaney stated there was a fence recently removed along the north side of the subject lot that he wished would be replaced to help screen the subject lot's driveway and garage.

Chairman Kibort acknowledged Mr. Mullaney's letter, provided to himself and Chairman Tures, outlining his concerns about the petitioner's request including the fence, other rental properties on the street and previous and existing maintenance issues involving rental properties in the area.

In regard to property maintenance issues, Chairman Kibort advised Mr. Mullaney to contact the Village to investigate any cases where violations may exist.

Mr. Panzloff stated the removed fence Mr. Mullaney referenced was not his property and therefore he could not replace it and did not have enough room to the north of his driveway to build a fence without conferring with the neighboring property owner about "sharing" a replacement fence.

Commissioner Chandler asked if there were other duplexes in the area and if any of these units were rental properties and it was indicated there are several duplexes and some appear to be rental properties.

Commissioner Ellison arrived - 6:58 p.m.

Commissioner Ellison stated she had no particular concern with the petitioner's request.

Commissioner Stensing asked Mr. Panzloff what his plans were if the request for rezoning/relief was denied and Mr. Panzloff stated it would essentially make the property unsellable to anyone who would require financing to purchase the property.

Commissioner Ellison offered her belief the structure on the subject property was originally built as a two-unit duplex and Zoning Board Chairman Tures, a Cindy Jo Avenue resident, concurred that his recollection is that the property had always been a two-unit structure.

Commissioner Horning asked how many single family residences are around the subject property and

Director Nordman reviewed the zoning designations within the area noting the “R-3” zoned properties adjacent to Joan Avenue and at the northwest corner of Algonquin Road and Cindy Jo Avenue with the majority of other properties being single-family.

5 Mr. Panzloff added that the property adjacent to the north of the subject property is a rental property.

Zoning Board of Appeals Chairman Tures asked if any of the Zoning Board members had any questions or comments related to the requested relief required as part of the proposed re-zoning.

10 Member Habel had no comment.

Member Hoeft stated that while he was not necessarily in favor of the change of zoning in the middle of the block and the precedent it may set, he appreciates the request for re-zoning and subsequent relief is appropriate for correcting a past mistake.

15 Member Goldman stated she had similar reservations to Member Hoeft’s but gave the petitioner credit for investing in the property and trusts he will follow through with initiatives aimed at improving the property and properly maintaining it in the future.

20 Member Bond offered his concern the petitioner had gambled by purchasing the property without the proper zoning in place and now wanted to correct a situation affecting the marketability of the property. Member Bond stated the zoning did not prevent the petitioner from purchasing the property.

25 Member Hoeft added the petitioner should have performed due diligence by correcting the zoning affecting the property prior to purchasing the two-unit residential property.

Chairman Tures offered his perspective that the petitioner had already done a commendable job of improving the property and that a recommendation denying the request would be unwise.

30 Commissioner Ellison stated she believed the re-zoning and continued improvements to the property was a preferable way of minimizing an existing problem.

A MOTION was made by the Plan Commission to close the public hearing to consider Petition No. 12-2.1.

35 **MOVED:** Commissioner Ellison
SECONDED: Commissioner Stensing
AYES: Commissioners, Ellison, Chandler, Stensing, Nichols, Westberg, Hornig, and Chairman Kibort
40 **NAYS:** Commissioners
ABSTAIN: None
MOTION CARRIED 7:0:0

A MOTION was made by the Zoning Board of Appeals to close the public hearing to consider Petition No. 12-2.1.

MOVED: Member Habel
SECONDED: Member Goldman
AYES: Members Habel, Hoeft, Goldman, Bond and Chairman Tures
50 **NAYS:** None
ABSTAIN: None
MOTION CARRIED 5:0:0

A MOTION was made by the Plan Commission to recommend approval of Petition No. 12-2.1, 10408 Cindy Jo Avenue, a Map Amendment to rezone said property from “R-1” Single-Family Residence District to “R-3” Duplex Residence District, subject to the following condition:

5

- 1. No building plans or permits are approved as part of this request.

MOVED: Commissioner Ellison
SECONDED: Commissioner Stensing
10 AYES: Commissioners, Ellison, Chandler, Nichols, Westberg, and Chairman Kibort
NAYS: Commissioners Hornig and Stensing
ABSTAIN: None
15 MOTION CARRIED 5:2:0

15

A MOTION was made by the Zoning Board of Appeals to recommend approval of Petition No. 12-2.1, 10408 Cindy Jo Avenue, Requesting approval of relief to reduce the minimum required area and width for a lot containing a two-family duplex in the “R-3” Duplex Residence District, subject to the following condition:

20

- 1. No building plans or permits are approved as part of this request.

MOVED: Member Hoeft
SECONDED: Member Habel
25 AYES: Members Habel, Hoeft, Goldman, and Chairman Tures
NAYS: Member Bond
ABSTAIN: None
MOTION CARRIED 4:1:0

30

- 7. Petition(s)
 - A. Petition No. 12-2.2, Huntley Community Radio and Huntley Park District, 11419 Route 47, Conceptual Review of a Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment to allow a Radio Station as a Special Permitted Use in the “R-1” Single Family Residence District and review of a Special Use Permit to allow a Radio Station in the “R-1” Single Family Residence District. Plan Commission Consideration Only.

35

Planner Williams reviewed a PowerPoint presentation outlining the petitioners’ request:

40

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Petitioners: Huntley Community Radio, Ltd.
12171 Route 47, Suite 155
Huntley, IL 60142
45
Huntley Park District
11419 S. Route 47, Huntley, IL 60142

45

Subject Location: 30.43± acre Huntley Park District’s Deicke Park property adjacent to southwest of the Route 47/Mill Street intersection.

50

Request: Conceptual review of a proposed Community Radio Station to be located

within the Deicke Park District building at 11419 Route 47.

Zoning, Land Use and Comprehensive Plan:

- 5 The zoning, existing uses and comprehensive plan land uses of the subject property and adjacent properties were reviewed.

DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY

- 10 Planner Williams stated the Huntley Community Radio, a not-for-profit Illinois corporation, is proposing to locate a radio station within the Deicke Park Building located at 11419 Route 47. The station would occupy space that was occupied by the Huntley Park District's Finance Department, which moved into offices within the REC Center.

- 15 Planner Williams continued that the Huntley Community Radio station will broadcast news, information and alerts affecting the Huntley community and would initially broadcast as an internet radio station. The organization would eventually seek approval from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to establish and operate a low-power FM radio station (The FCC has yet to open a filing window for accepting applications for low-power radio stations; it is unknown when the FCC will begin accepting applications).

- 20 Prior to operating as a low-power FM radio station the organization will need to construct an antenna and transmitter. The proposed antenna will be approximately 100 feet tall and would be located adjacent to the Deicke Park Building. The antenna and transmitter, which will also require a Special Use Permit application at a future date yet undetermined, will allow the station to broadcast on the FM frequency which will reach an area within a radius of approximately 3½ miles. Huntley Community Radio is not requesting approval of the antenna at this time, but will return to request approval once the FCC begins accepting applications.

STAFF ANALYSIS

- 30 Planner Williams noted that the Huntley Zoning Ordinance allows a radio studio by right in the "ORI" Office, Research and Industrial district and as a special permitted use in the "B-2" Highway Service and "B-3" Shopping Center Business zoning districts. With Deicke Park zoned "R-1" Single Family Residence, Planner Williams continued that a radio studio is not a permitted or special use. Therefore, in order to allow the operation of the radio station within Deicke Park, a text amendment of the Zoning Ordinance would be required to allow a radio station within an "R-1" district subject to approval of a Special Use Permit. Additionally, the necessary antenna will require amending the text of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a radio antenna and tower within the "R-1" zoning district.

VILLAGE BOARD CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

- 40 Planner Williams stated the petitioners' request was previously reviewed conceptually before the Village Board on October 6, 2011 and the Village Board referred the request to the Plan Commission. At that time the Village Board had asked about the proposed radio station's transmitting distance (approximately a radius of five (5) miles) and hours of operation (24/7 with live programming between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m. with some programs repeated after 6 p.m.).

REQUESTED ACTION

- 45 Planner Williams concluded the presentation by reminding the Plan Commission the review of the proposed project is conceptual and does not bind the Plan Commission or the Village to any additional review processes. Planner Williams stated the petitioners are in attendance this evening and would be welcome any feedback or questions regarding the proposal.

50 Finally, Planner Williams stated the public hearing to formally consider this request is scheduled for

the next Plan Commission meeting on Monday, March 12, 2012. Adjacent property owners and the general public will be notified of the public hearing in accordance with notification requirements as mandated by State Statute and Village Ordinance.

5 Commissioner Ellison stated that while she is comfortable with the radio station's location within Deicke Park she has concerns with the prospect of considering an antenna in the proposed location given the previous experience with petition requests involving cellular tower installations in that area.

10 Chairman Kibort stated the trees would provide screening of the antenna and that a 100'-tall antenna is similar to a ham radio antenna.

Commissioner Chandler was curious about the proposed radio station's programming.

15 Director Nordman introduced Pat Molohan, Secretary/Treasurer with Huntley Community Radio.

Mr. Molohan stated Huntley Community Radio is a not-for-profit 501 (C) (3) and the Huntley Park District may only lease space to not-for-profit corporations. Mr. Molohan continued that programming on the radio station may include shows offering preventative medical advice, Huntley High School-related activities, sports and entertainment, and remote broadcasts.

20 In regard to the possibility of a future antenna on the site, Mr. Molohan pointed out the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has regulations governing their installation as well as permitted radio station wattage. As pointed out in the conceptual review presentation, Mr. Molohan reiterated the low-power FM station application to the FCC has not been made, therefore the requirements currently unknown. Mr. Molohan stated he hopes the initial phase internet radio will help define their strengths and weaknesses.

25 Commissioner Stensing asked if there were any plans to remove trees and Mr. Molohan stated there are no presently no plans to remove trees and that the hope is placement of an antenna as close to the structure as possible to assist with signal strength.

30 Commissioner Nichols stated she was concerned with the limited amount of space on the north side of the structure where an antenna could be placed and Mr. Molohan offered assurances that all required safety precautions would be taken for the installation of a future antenna.

35 Commissioner Hornig and Chairman Kibort both offered their favorable opinion of the initial concept plan for the radio station.

40 There was no action required by the Plan Commission.

B. Petition No. 12-2.3, Juki Huntley Property LLC, Union Special LLC, Huntley Travel Baseball, Heat United Soccer Club, and Old School Wrestling Club, 1 Union Special Plaza, Conceptual Review of a Special Use Permit to operate Indoor Recreation Facilities in the "M" Manufacturing District. *Plan Commission Consideration Only.*

45 Planner Williams reviewed a PowerPoint presentation outlining the petitioners' request.

50

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Petitioners: Juki Huntley, LLC
Union Special, LLC
Huntley Travel Baseball
Heat United Soccer Club
Old School Wrestling Club
1 Union Special Plaza
Huntley, IL 60142

Subject Location: Two (2) lease spaces, 15,867 square feet and 5,238 square feet, within the Union Special facility

Request: Conceptual review of the proposed Special Use Permit for Indoor Recreation within the "M" Manufacturing zoned Union Special facility.

Zoning, Land Use and Comprehensive Plan:

The zoning, existing uses and comprehensive plan land uses of the subject property and adjacent properties were reviewed.

DEVELOPMENT SUMMARY

Planner Williams continued the presentation stating Juki Huntley Property LLC and Union Special LLC, property owner and local private company affiliate, respectively, have applied to the Village of Huntley for an Indoor Recreation Special Use Permit within the "M" Manufacturing zoning district. The Special Use will allow three local sport organizations: Huntley Travel Baseball (HTB), Heat United Soccer Club (HU) and Old School Wrestling Club (OSW) to use lease spaces within the Union Special facility.

Planner Williams noted the Huntley Travel Baseball and Heat United Soccer Club will share a 15,867 square foot lease space on the ground floor, while the Old School Wrestling Club will utilize a 5,238 square foot space on the upstairs level of the facility.

In terms of the use of the two lease spaces, Planner Williams pointed out the three organizations intend to use the spaces primarily on weekday evenings and weekends, with peak usage between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. weekdays. During the peak usage time, each organization may have as many as 15 to 20 participants. The sports organizations' participants are generally between the ages of eight (8) and eighteen (18) years of age and are typically dropped off at the facility thereby utilizing a modest amount of the Union Special facility parking. The peak usage times differing from other businesses within the Union Special facility and minimal parking required for the use are both cited as reasons why the petitioner expects little if any conflict with the proposed Special Use.

REQUESTED ACTION

Planner Williams concluded the presentation by reminding the Plan Commission the review of the proposed project is conceptual and does not bind the Plan Commission or the Village to any additional review processes. Planner Williams stated the petitioners are in attendance this evening and would be welcome any feedback or questions regarding the proposal.

Finally, Planner Williams stated the public hearing to formally consider this request is tentatively scheduled for the Plan Commission meeting on Monday, March 26, 2012. Adjacent property owners and the general public will be notified of the public hearing in accordance with notification requirements as mandated by State Statute and Village Ordinance.

Commissioner Ellison asked where the sports organizations would enter and exit the facility.

5 Tom Bartel, Vice President with Union Special, stated the Huntley Baseball and Heat Soccer clubs would access the building from the east and Old School Wrestling Club will use the south side entrance to the building. Mr. Bartel added that the building is secure and entry requires a key card.

10 Commissioner Chandler asked if participants were exclusively club members and if there were ever any sport exhibitions where spectators would be expected and Mr. Bartel stated the use of the facility was exclusively limited to the respective club’s player and coaches with no exhibitions.

Commissioner Westberg asked if there were any plans to open the lease spaces to the general public and Mr. Bartel stated there are no plans for accommodating members of the general public at this time.

15 There were no additional questions regarding the proposed request and no action required from the Plan Commission.

8. Discussion

20 A. Downtown Streetscape Conceptual Plans

Director Nordman reviewed a PowerPoint presentation outlining proposed streetscape alternatives for the Route 47/Main Street intersection and downtown area prepared by Village consultant Christopher B. Burke Engineering, Ltd. and presented to the Village Board at their meeting on February 2, 2012.

25 Director Nordman also reviewed the potential cost estimates for each component of the streetscape improvements and emphasized the long-range perspective the proposed project must take in order to fund the project responsibly efficiently and financially over several years.

30 Comments from the Plan Commissioner and Zoning Board of Appeals Members included suggestions for integrating the Village’s gazebo-logo in the design, flags at the southeast corner of the Route 47/Main Street intersection and memorial to war veterans and patio was suggested for the northeast corner.

35 9. Adjournment

At 8:22 pm, a MOTION was made to adjourn the February 27, 2012 Joint meeting by the Plan Commission

40 **MOVED: Commissioner Ellison**
SECONDED: Commissioner Hornig
AYES: ALL
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
45 **MOTION CARRIED 7:0:0**

At 8:22 pm, a MOTION was made to adjourn the February 27, 2012 Joint meeting by the Zoning Board of Appeals

50 **MOVED: Member Habel**
SECONDED: Member Hoeft
AYES: ALL
NAYS: None

ABSTAIN:
MOTION CARRIED

None
5:0:0

Respectfully submitted,

5 *James Williams*

Planner

Village of Huntley

10