

VILLAGE OF HUNTLEY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Monday, August 11, 2008
MINUTES

5

CALL TO ORDER

Commissioner Kibort called to order the meeting of the Planning Commission of the Village of Huntley on Monday, August 11, 2008 at 7:00pm in the Municipal Complex Village Board Room 10987 Main St, Huntley, Illinois 60142. The room is handicap accessible.

10

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners: Dawn Ellison, Ruby Hornig, Tom Kibort, David Patterson and Len Stensing

15

MEMBERS ABSENT: Commissioner Russ Palermo and Chairman Hahn

ALSO PRESENT: Senior Planner Charles Nordman, Planner James Williams, Director of Development Services Lisa Armour and Recording Secretary Anita Powers of Karick & Associates.

20

Commissioner Kibort chaired the meeting in Chairman Hahn's absence.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

25

A. Approval of the July 30, 2008, Joint Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes

A MOTION was made to approve the July 30, 2008, Joint Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes.

30

MOVED: Commissioner Ellison
SECONDED: Commissioner Hornig
AYES: Commissioners Dawn Ellison and Ruby Hornig; and Acting Chairman Tom Kibort
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: Commissioners David Patterson and Len Stensing.
MOTION CARRIED 3:0:2

35

PETITIONS

40

A. Petition No. 08-8.1 Shepherd of the Prairie Lutheran Church, Southeast corner of Main Street and Manhattan Drive, Requesting approval of (i) Final Planned Unit Development for a Church; and (ii) Approval of such other 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, all pursuant to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, including specifically Section 156.120 et seq. (7:07-7:38pm)

45

Planner James Williams presented a PowerPoint presentation to the Planning Commissioners.

Petitioner’s Request

The petitioner is requesting that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the Village Board for the Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the Shepherd of the Prairie Lutheran Church proposed on the eight-acre property southeast of the intersection of Main Street and Manhattan Drive and such other relief as may be necessary to allow for development in accordance with the site plan that has been submitted.

Location

The subject eight-acre property-in-question is located southeast of the intersection of Main Street and Manhattan Drives adjacent to the east of the Huntley Village Hall.

Petitioner/Property Owner

Shepherd of the Prairie Lutheran Church
12101 Regency Parkway
Huntley, IL 60142

Planner Williams reviewed the Zoning, Land Use and Comprehensive Plan for the surrounding properties.

Development Summary

The annexation of the subject property was accommodated October 23, 2003 per Ordinance (O) 2003-10.91 which further served to approve the Preliminary Planned Unit Development for the eight-acre site including roadway dedications for Main Street and Manhattan Drive. With Phase I of the development, the petitioner is proposing to construct a 12,188 square foot, 250-seat, single-story church facility with associated 75-stall parking area and ingress/egress drives to both Main and Manhattan. The building’s entrance will face the parking area to the south and a dumpster enclosure is proposed for placement at the southeast corner of the site.

Planner Williams reviewed the specifics of the Lot, Area and Bulk Regulations and reported that the proposal is in compliance with the Village of Huntley Zoning Ordinance.

Future phases for the site include multiple building additions on the north, east and west sides of the “Phase I-structure” resulting in a 69,707 square foot, 600-seat religious institutional facility. Future development will provide for additional parking areas extending east from the “Phase I-parking area” and north along the east side of the eight-acre site along both sides of the drive aisle/fire lane constructed with Phase I. Future phases of the Shepherd of the Prairie Church project will require amendment(s) to the Final Planned Unit Development along with respective site plan review, recommendations and approvals.

Building Facades

Planner Williams presented renderings of the building facades.

As proposed, the exterior materials for the cross-gabled, T-plan, cream and taupe-colored building are primarily horizontal 4”- and 8”-wide cement board lap siding and cement trim boards with vertical siding gable end treatments. The south-facing “front” façade and entryway to the building will have arched windows above the aluminum-framed doorway. The north, Main Street-facing, side of the structure is adorned with an inset “cross” architectural element. The

dumpster enclosure, proposed at the southeast corner of the Phase I-site, will be constructed of materials similar in type and proportion to the exterior materials utilized on the principle structure with solid metal gates.

5 **Parking – Specific to Phase One**

Per Zoning Ordinance Table 8, Assembly Uses require parking stalls at a ratio of 0.3 for each seat, and given the 250 seats in the worship center, the petitioner has accommodated the requisite seventy-five spaces along with five (5) motorcycle spaces and a bike rack. The drive aisles and parking stalls meet the 25-foot width and 171 square foot (9’x19’) requirements, respectively.

10

Exterior Lighting

The petitioners are proposing Acorn Post Top Series lighting fixtures upon Leesburg Series poles by Sternberg for the parking area. Various utilitarian wall mounted lighting fixtures are proposed above doorways and recessed lighting employed main entrance on the south side of the structure. The Village’s Zoning Code and Design Guidelines require a 2.0 foot-candle average for the site and a 0.5 foot-candle maximum along the property line, respectively. The Photometric included in the petitioner’s plan packet reflects a lighting plan meeting both standards.

15

Planner Williams presented renderings of the proposed lighting fixtures.

20

Landscaping

The petitioners have provided landscape plans addressing both Phase I and Future Phasing of the subject property’s development. Foundation landscaping is significant particularly along the southern face, flanking the entry-way and under the insert “cross” feature on the north side of the building. Interior parking lot landscaping, including islands, bump-outs and the area around the dumpster enclosure serves to meet the Village’s “12%-requirement” for this element of the landscape plan. The Phase 1-site landscaping includes the planting of seven (7) trees (four (4) ornamental pears and three (3) Hybrid elms) on the east side of the Manhattan-sidewalk and five (5) trees (two (2) hybrid elms and three (3) autumn blaze maples) on the south side of the Main Street sidewalk

25

30

Planner Williams presented a landscape plan.

The Village’s Landscape Ordinance requires parkway trees planted at a rate of one tree for every 40-feet of frontage and perimeter trees are required every 75 feet. The petitioners seeking a recommendation and approval for relief to the parkway and perimeter landscape requirements until the future phases of the site are developed. Additionally, the petitioners are requesting deferral of the irrigation requirements for five years or until such time as the second phase building is permitted, whichever comes first.

35

40

The HVAC unit proposed within the interior side yard on the northwest corner of the building has landscaping screening including 3-foot-tall Miss Kim Dwarf Lilac directly adjacent to the west and north sides of the unit along with Colorado Green Spruce trees offering additional screening of the equipment from Main Street and the Manhattan/Main intersection. Field inspection of the landscape screening will be required to confirm it is sufficient.

45

The landscape plan has been reviewed by the Village consultants and the petitioner has revised plans and/or addressed the balance of those review comments.

Signage

The petitioner is proposing a single, two-face monument sign meeting the 6'-0" maximum height as per the Design Guidelines along with the requisite materials matching those materials utilized on the principle structure.

5

Planner Williams presented renderings of the proposed sign.

Final Planned Unit Development

10 In accordance with Section 156.124(E) of the Zoning Code, the Planning Commission shall review and evaluate the final PUD in terms of whether the proposal:

1. Is in general conformance with the previously approved preliminary PUD plans.
2. By virtue of its imaginative and creative design and benefits to the village, justifies the intended variations from the strict interpretation of the Subdivision Ordinance.
- 15 3. Requires additional conditions and restrictions to protect the public interest and adjacent areas, improve the development and assure compliance with existing village ordinances.

20 With the conclusion of the PowerPoint presentation, Planner Williams asked if there were any questions.

20

Acting Chairman Kibort asked about the future expansion. Planner Williams reviewed the footprint of the future phase.

25 Acting Chairman Kibort asked the petitioner about the request for the landscaping variance. Todd Carlson, from Carlson Architecture, stated that the request is based on an economic need; the petitioner would like to phase-in the landscaping. Mr. Carlson stated that the petitioner would be willing to adhere to the requirement for the number of trees at the time of planting.

30 Acting Chairman Kibort recommended that a management plan supplement the warranty on the landscaping.

35 Commissioner Stensing asked if sidewalks will be installed on Manhattan Dr during Phase I. Mr. Carlson answered yes. Commissioner Stensing asked if there will be trees in the islands. Mr. Carlson answered yes.

Acting Chairman Kibort asked how the sign will be illuminated. Mr. Carlson stated that there will be two external spot lights. Acting Chairman Kibort asked Staff to follow up with the petitioner to make sure the lettering is durable.

40 Commissioner Patterson suggested that the garbage be moved to an alternative location closer to the building. Commissioner Ellison noted that safety of the dumpster location should be considered. Mr. Carlson stated that his client wanted the dumpster in the proposed locations so it would not be located near the church's main entry.

45 The Planning Commissioners discussed concerns regarding the location of the ground mounted HVAC equipment which is towards the front of the building near the worship center. Mr. Carlson assured the Commissioners that the church is comfortable with the location and noted that future expansion will enclose the area and make it into an enclosed courtyard. Mr. Carlson

also assured the Commissioners that there will be adequate screening of the equipment using landscaping.

5 Commissioner Patterson reiterated that there are no approvals associated with future phases of the project.

Acting Chairman Kibort asked if there were any comments from the audience. There were none.

10 **A MOTION was made to recommend approval of Petition No. 08-8.1, Shepherd of the Prairie Lutheran Church, SEC Main Street and Manhattan Drive, Requesting approval of (i) Final Planned Unit Development for a Church; and (ii) Approval of such other 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, all pursuant to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, including specifically Section 156.120 et seq., subject to the following conditions:**

1. All public improvements and site development must occur in full compliance with all applicable Village Municipal Services (Engineering, Public Works, Planning and Building) and approved site design standards, practices and permit requirements.
2. The petitioner shall obtain final approval of the engineering plans from the Village Engineer prior to the issuance of a building permit.
- 20 3. All easements and or license agreements required for off-site utilities, including plats of easement and the design for the storm water facilities, necessary to support development must be obtained prior to the execution of the Plat of Easement.
4. The Village of Huntley will require adherence to Illinois drainage law and best management practices for stormwater management. The petitioner is responsible for not increasing the rate of stormwater runoff and will be required, to the extent practicable, to minimize any increase in runoff volume.
- 25 5. The petitioner is required to meet all development requirements of the Huntley Fire Protection District.
- 30 6. No building plans or permits are approved as part of this submittal.
7. No sign permits are approved as part of this submittal.
8. In accordance with the Village's Commercial Design Guidelines, the proposed ground-mounted HVAC equipment shall be sufficiently screened from Manhattan Drive, Main Street and the intersection of those two roadways with landscape materials.
- 35 9. The development of Phase I shall be permitted to allow a deferral of parkway and perimeter property tree planting requirements for a period of five years or the permitting of the next Phase of development, whichever occurs first, in regard to the following:
 - 40 a. Parkway Trees
 - i. Frontage along Manhattan Drive – ±480' – 12 trees required
 1. Phase 1 development – 0 trees
 2. Future Phase or within five years – 12 trees total
 - ii. Frontage along Main Street - ±650' – 16 trees required
 1. Phase 1 development – 16 trees
 2. Future Phase or within five years – 16 trees total
 - 45 b. Perimeter Trees
 - i. Eastern Property Line - ±537 feet - 7 trees required

- 1. Phase 1 development – 0 trees
- 2. Future Phase or within five years – 7 trees total
- ii. Southern Property Line - ±650 feet – 8 trees required
 - 1. Phase 1 development – 0 trees
 - 2. Future Phase or within five years – 9 trees total

10. Irrigation Plan is to be submitted and approved for the site at such time as the next Phase of the subject property is permitted or five (5) years, whichever occurs first.

11. A three-year warranty on all landscaping materials and five-year warranty and management plan for all landscaping installed in association with stormwater maintenance elements of the project in accordance with the Village’s Landscape Ordinance and per revised plans submitted prior to future phase permit approval or five (5) years, whichever occurs first.

MOVED: Commissioner Patterson
SECONDED: Commissioner Ellison
AYES: Commissioners Dawn Ellison, Ruby Hornig, David Patterson, and Len Stensing; and Acting Chairman Tom Kibort

NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
MOTION CARRIED 5:0:0

B. Petition No. 08-8.2, Thomas and Jennifer Panzloff, 12117 Main Street, Huntley, IL 60142, Requesting approval of (i) Rezoning subject property from R-2 Single Family Residence District to B-4 Adaptive Reuse Business District; and (ii) Approval of such other relief as may be necessary to allow for development in accordance with the application submitted to, and which is on file with, the Village of Huntley. (7:39-8:17pm)

Senior Planner Nordman presented a PowerPoint presentation to the Planning Commissioners.

Petitioner Request

This application is filed for the purpose of rezoning the subject property from R-2 Single Family Residence District to B-4 Adaptive Reuse Business District and approving such other relief as may be necessary to allow for development in accordance with the application submitted to, and which is on file with, the Village of Huntley.

Petitioners & Property Owners

Thomas and Jennifer Panzloff
 11684 Barberry Lane
 Huntley, IL 60142

Location

12117 Main Street
 Huntley, IL 60142

Senior Planner Nordman reviewed the Zoning, Land Use and Comprehensive Plan for the surrounding properties.

Development Summary/Rezoning

The petitioners are requesting approval to rezone their property located at 12117 Main Street from R-2 Single Family Residence to B-4 Adaptive Reuse. The rezoning is requested to allow for the petitioners to convert the existing single family residence to an office for their media buying agency. The proposed conversion will allow for the business to operate on the first floor of the building and business related storage on second floor. No sleeping quarters are permitted within the structure as part of the office conversion. The petitioner has indicated the business has three full time employees and will operate Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

The Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals reviewed and recommended the Village Board approve the Adaptive Reuse zoning district on September 24, 2007, and September 26, 2007, respectively. The Village Board subsequently approved the Adaptive Reuse zoning district on October 11, 2007. The Adaptive Reuse district was intended for residences located on East and West Main Street where it may no longer be desirable to live due to the increased traffic levels on Main Street. This petition is the first request to rezone a property to Adaptive Reuse. The conversion of the residence at 11510 East Main Street for First Loan Mortgage Inc. is a similar project, however, First Loan Mortgage is zoned "O" Office. Senior Planner Nordman noted the Adaptive Reuse zoning district had not been created at the time First Loan Mortgage was established at 11510 Main Street.

Senior Planner Nordman presented photos of the front and rear of the building along with a map outlining the Adaptive Reuse Zoning District.

Proposed Site Improvements

Most notably, the petitioners are proposing to construct a bituminous parking lot at the rear of the property. The parking lot would provide seven (7) parking spaces, including one handicap space, which exceeds minimum parking requirements. The parking lot would be lit, when necessary, by existing spot lights located on the south and east elevations of the house. The existing gravel drive would also be improved with a bituminous surface. To screen the parking lot from surrounding properties the petitioner is proposing to construct a 6 foot tall shadow box cedar fence. The proposed fence would be installed along the south, east and west lot lines where the property abuts single family residences.

Senior Nordman presented a site plan illustrating site improvements.

The subject property presently shares a driveway entrance on Main Street with the residence located to the east. However, a formal ingress/egress easement does not presently exist for the shared portion of the driveway. To formalize the continued use of the shared driveway the petitioners and neighboring property owner have drafted a driveway easement agreement that will allow each owner to utilize the shared portion of the driveway. The agreement would be recorded with the County and would be attached to a title search on the properties.

Improvements to the existing residence would mostly occur within the interior of the structure to comply with ADA requirements. At this time, the only exterior improvement that has been discussed is the construction of a deck and ramp leading to a new exterior building entrance on the rear façade of the building. The new entrance would be created to provide a handicap accessible entrance into the structure. It is important to note, the structure has been landmarked

by the Huntley Historic Preservation Commission and any change to the exterior of the structure will require review by the Historic Preservation Commission prior to the issuance of a building permit.

5 **Requested Relief**

Any property owner in the Village may apply for a Zoning variation from the strict interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance. Such application should be accompanied by an accurate description of the property, a description of the particular circumstance which necessitates a variation and the relief sought. All public hearing and notice requirements of the Village's Zoning Ordinance are required. The petitioner has met all of the aforementioned requirements.

When evidence in a specific case shows conclusively that literal enforcement of any provision of the Zoning Ordinance would result in a practical difficulty or particular hardship because of unusual surroundings or condition of the property involved, or by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness or shape of a zoning lot, or because of unique topography, underground conditions or other unusual circumstances, the Zoning Board may recommend, and the Village Board may grant, by ordinance, a variation to permit just enough relief from literal enforcement as will allow a reasonable use of the property involved for the uses permitted in the zone in which it is located.

The petitioner is requesting the following relief to accommodate the proposed site improvements:

1. The Adaptive Reuse District requires parking to be setback a minimum of 10 feet from all lot lines. The petitioner is requesting relief to locate the parking lot within 10 feet of the east and west lot lines. Specifically, the turnaround area adjacent to the west lot line will be setback 5 feet and the eastern edge of the parking lot will be setback 9.4 feet from the east lot line. Relief is also required for the existing gravel driveway to be paved and remain in its present location, which encroaches into the 10 foot required setback. The existing driveway is setback approximately 2 feet from the east lot line.
2. The Petitioner is requesting relief to not provide curb and gutter around the perimeter of the parking lot as required by Section 156.073 of the Zoning Code. The petitioner has cited the cost of installing the curb and gutter as a hardship. Per the engineering department, the request is feasible and reasonable.
3. The petitioner is requesting relief to reduce the required width of parking lot drive aisles from 25 feet to 18 feet. The proposed 18 foot drive aisle would extend the length of the driveway which provides access to the parking lot at the rear of the property. The drive aisle between the parking spaces would measure 25 feet, which conforms to drive aisle width requirements.

Senior Planner Nordman noted that the Fire Department has reviewed the proposal and finds no problems.

With the conclusion of the PowerPoint presentation, Senior Planner Nordman asked if there were any questions.

Commissioner Ellison advised Senior Planner Nordman that the list used to notify surrounding property owners was not current.

Acting Chairman Kibort informed the petitioner that any sign requested in the future would need to be historic in design. Mr. Panzloff stated that they do not have any plans for signage at this time. Mrs. Panzloff noted that they do not need a sign since they do not accept walk-in business.

5 Commissioner Ellison stated that the neighbors are concerned about the possible change in water drainage and asked if the curb and gutter relief will hurt the neighbors. Senior Planner Nordman stated that the property slopes slightly and drains into the southwest corner of the lot. The petitioner is not required to provide detention area and the Village Engineer has presented recommendations including the addition of a rain garden. Senior Planner Nordman noted that
10 there is approximately 38 ft between the proposed parking lot and the property line. Acting Chairman Kibort noted that there is a porous concrete material on the market that may be a good choice for the parking lot.

15 Commissioner Ellison asked if there is an agreement with the neighbor on the shared driveway. Mr. Panzloff stated that he spoke to his neighbor last week and his response was favorable. He expects to hear back from him soon regarding the proposal he gave him last week.

20 Commissioner Stensing asked where the main entrance to the building will be. Mr. Panzloff stated that the main entrance will be on the east side and there will be a new door to accommodate the proposed ramp for ADA access. Mrs. Panzloff noted that the ramp is proposed for the rear of the building in order to preserve the historic look in front.

25 Commissioner Patterson asked if they will be paving the neighbor's portion of the driveway. Mr. Panzloff answered yes, if acceptable to the neighbor. Commissioner Patterson asked if the trees in the area will interfere with the driveway. Mr. Panzloff answered no.

Acting Chairman Kibort asked if there were any comments from the audience.

30 Mr. Tom Conley, a member of the Village of Huntley Historic Preservation Commission, spoke in favor of the petition. Mr. Conley gave background on the property and discussed ADA requirements and his concern that the adaptive reuse requirements may be too cost restrictive for property owners. Mrs. Panzloff stated that they are working closely with the Village on cost-saving measures.

35 Acting Chairman Kibort stated that the Planning Commission would like direction from the Historic Preservation Commission regarding historic signage and lighting guidelines. Mr. Conley stated that the Commission does not have a recommendation yet.

40 **A MOTION was made to recommend approval of Petition No. 08-8.2, Thomas and Jennifer Panzloff, 12117 Main Street, Huntley, IL 60142, Rezoning subject property from R-2 Single Family Residence District to B-4 Adaptive Reuse Business District and approving such other relief as may be necessary to allow for development in accordance with the application submitted to, and which is on file with, the Village of Huntley, subject to the following conditions:**

45 **1. All public improvement and site development must occur in full compliance with all applicable Village Municipal Services (Engineering, Public Works, Planning and**

Building) standards, Huntley Fire Protection District requirements and Illinois Department of Transportation practices and permit requirements.

2. The petitioner shall obtain final approval of the engineering plans from the Village Engineer prior to the issuance of a site grading permit or building permit.
3. The petitioner is required to meet all development requirements of the Huntley Fire Protection District.
4. The Village of Huntley will require adherence to Illinois drainage law and best management practices for stormwater management. The petitioner is responsible for not increasing the rate of stormwater runoff and will be required, to the extent practicable, to minimize any increase in runoff volume.
5. Should the Driveway Easement Agreement not be executed and the shared driveway is no longer viable, the petitioner shall construct an acceptable driveway and apron.
6. Any signage proposed in the future shall comply with the restriction of the Village's sign regulations (Chapter 153) and the Commercial Design Guidelines. Such signage shall also require the issuance of a sign permit prior to installation.
7. Trash receptacles shall be stored within the existing garage.
8. The petitioner shall obtain the approval of the Historic Preservation Commission for any exterior modifications.
9. No building plans or permits are approved as part of this submittal. A separate fence permit shall be required prior to construction of the fence.

MOVED:	Commissioner Stensing
SECONDED:	Commissioner Hornig
AYES:	Commissioners Ruby Hornig, David Patterson, and Len Stensing; and Acting Chairman Tom Kibort
NAYS:	None
ABSTAIN:	Commissioner Dawn Ellison
MOTION CARRIED	4:0:1

ADJOURNMENT

At 8:20pm, Commissioner Stensing made a MOTION to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Hornig, unanimously approved. Motion Carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Anita M. Powers
Recording Secretary
Karick & Associates