

VILLAGE OF HUNTLEY
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
Monday, September 22, 2014
MINUTES

5

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Tom Kibort called to order the Village of Huntley Plan Commission meeting for September 22, 2014 at 6:30 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 Tim Hoeft, Ron Hahn, Lori Nichols, and Terra DeBaltz, Vice Chair Dawn Ellison and Chairman Tom Kibort

20

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Commissioner Robert Chandler

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

A. Approval of the August 25, 2014 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

30

A MOTION was made to approve the August 25, 2014 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes as written.

MOVED:

Commissioner Hoeft

SECONDED:

Commissioner Hahn

35

AYES:

Commissioners Hoeft, Hahn and DeBaltz

NAYS:

None

ABSTAIN:

Commissioner Nichols, Vice Chair Ellison and Chairman Kibort

MOTION CARRIED

3:0:3

40

6. Public Hearing(s)

A. Petition No. 14-9.1 – Interstate Partners LLC, Lot 6A in Regency Square – Unit 1 (±1.92 acres located at the southwest corner of Route 47 and Langston Drive) - Requesting a Special Use Permit for a Drive-Through Food Service Establishment within the “C-2-PDD” Regional Retail – Planned Development District, and Site Plan Review for a ±8,000 square foot multi-tenant retail building, including approval of such relief as may be necessary to allow 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 Village of Huntley Ordinance (O) 1999.08.12.04 which established the Regency Square Development Guidelines.

50

Planner Williams reviewed a PowerPoint presentation outlining the request beginning with the petitioner, Interstate Partners LLC, 2860 Gavin Drive, Elgin, IL 60124 and the owner, Standard Bank and Trust Co., as Trustee #17383, Land Trust Department, 7800 W. 95th Street, Hickory Hills, IL 60457.

Planner Williams noted that the subject property is Lot 6A, Regency Square - Unit 1 (P.I.N. #02-05-276-005), the single 1.92-acre lot located immediately south of Interstate Partners' latest project which includes Aldi, Sport Clips and Brunch Café and north of the 7-Eleven / multi-tenant retail center.

5 Planner Williams continued the presentation noting that the petitioners' request entails a Special Use Permit for Drive-Through Food Service Establishment within the "C-2-PDD" Regional Retail – Planned Development District, and Site Plan Review for the development of a 8,080 square foot multi-tenant retail building, and related site improvements

10 *Summary*

Planner Williams stated that the petitioner is proposing construction of a new multi-tenant commercial building on the single lot located on the ±1.92-acre Lot 6A, Regency Square – Unit 1, zoned "C-2" Regional Retail District and is bounded by Princeton Drive, Langston Drive and Route 47 to the west, north, east, respectively. The proposed development includes an 8,080 square foot, three-unit multi-tenant building with a drive-through establishment earmarked for the southernmost tenant space.

15 *Building Elevations*

Planner Williams reviewed the proposed building elevations and noted that the use of brick, masonry materials and the architectural style of the proposed three (3) tenant facility is similar to the two developments to the north also constructed by the petitioner.

20 *Parking*

Planner Williams stated that the proposed sixty-four (64) stall parking lot, with the three (3) requisite accessible parking spaces, has been configured to allow cross-access to the existing development to the south and includes a single point of access from Princeton Drive and two access drives from Langston Drive. Additionally, Planner Williams stated that there are four (4) reserved parking spaces for the Athletico tenant space denoted by cross-hatched striping (differentiated from accessible loading space striping) at the northern portion of the parking area. Planner Williams also reviewed the following table summarizing the site's parking requirements:

	BLDG. AREA	REQUIRED SPACES	PROVIDED SPACES
Drive-Thru Restaurant (Unit D)	1,200 sf	12 (restaurant)	--
Retail Tenant Spaces	6,800 sf	27 (retail)	--
Total	8,080 sf	39	64

30 *Lighting*

As with the proposed building's architecture, Planner Williams pointed out that the proposed parking lot lighting for the subject site utilizes a shoebox style fixture similar to the style of fixture used for the Interstate Partners' other developments as well as the Walgreens and Chase Bank sites. Planner Williams noted that the proposed parking lot lights are a Challenger II Medium fixture is a flat lensed fixture that provides full-cut off.

35 *Landscaping*

Planner Williams noted that the Regency Square Development Guidelines – Landscape Design Standards specifies a number of landscaping requirements including: one tree / 1,000 square feet of green space; one tree per 50' of lot line perimeter; one tree per 50' of road frontage; one within each parking island and all landscaped areas are to be irrigated. Planner Williams noted that while the irrigation-requirement is specified on the site's landscape plan, the specifics regarding the relief requested for the other landscaping elements are detailed in the *Required Relief* portion of the presentation.

45 *Signage*

Planner Williams noted that there are three (3) ground signs are proposed for the site and are designed to appear similar to those on the Interstate Partners developments to the north. The Route 47 sign (Sign A) will measure

10'-3" in height and 56 square feet in area per side and located 25'-8" from the eastern property line within the 100 landscape easement. The Regency Square Guidelines allow one (1) ground sign per lot, require that signs do not exceed 6'-8" in height, 54 square feet in area and are located at least 100 feet from the Route 47 right-of-way. Relief is required from the Regency Square Guidelines for the size of this proposed ground sign as well as the additional two (2) monument signs proposed for the site.

Planner Williams also noted that there are two (2) monument signs (Sign B) proposed to the east of the easternmost Langston Drive driveway and adjacent Princeton Drive at the southwest corner of the site, respectively, measuring 6'-0" in height and 17.96 square feet in area per side.

In regard to building wall signage, Planner Williams pointed out that per the Regency Square Development Guidelines, one (1) wall sign per tenant or one (1) per street frontage (must be located on street frontage face of the building) is allowed. The northernmost Athletico tenant space fronts Route 47, Langston Drive and Princeton Drive; therefore, allowing three (3) wall signs for this tenant space (i.e. one on each road building frontage). The other two (2) tenant spaces will therefore have two (2) wall signs; One, on the Route 47 building frontage and the other on the Princeton Drive building frontage.

Planner Williams noted that the developer's previous projects were granted relief to allow a tenant's wall sign to measure two (2) square feet for each one (1) linear foot of the tenant's frontage and the length of the sign shall not exceed the linear frontage of the tenant's storefront. Planner Williams stated that the petitioner is requesting the same criteria be applied to this development to ensure uniformity.

Required Relief

Planner Williams reviewed the following elements of relief required from the Regency Square Development Guidelines for the proposed development plans:

Site Plan

1. A parking lot setback of 100 feet is required from Route 47 right-of-way. A setback of 39.00 feet is proposed.

Landscaping

1. Per the Regency Square Development Guidelines Landscape Design Standards, the development must comply with the following requirements:
 - i. One (1) tree is required per 1,000 square feet of green space, exclusive of parking lots perimeter requirements and buffer requirements - 15,000 s.f. of green space requires 15 trees; 6 trees proposed. Relief is required for nine (9) trees.
 - ii. One (1) tree is required per 50 feet of lot perimeter - the perimeter of the lot is 1,237 feet - Relief is required for 25 trees along the perimeter of the lot.
 - iii. One (1) tree is required per 50 feet of road frontage - The lot has 200 feet of Route 47 frontage requiring four (4) trees - No trees are proposed along the Route 47 frontage - Relief is required for four (4) trees along the Route 47 frontage.
 - iv. One (1) tree is required per parking island - no parking island trees are proposed - Relief is required to allow no trees in the parking lot landscape islands.

Signage

1. A ground sign must setback 100 feet from the Route 47 right-of-way. A setback of 28'-5" feet is proposed on each lot. Relief is required to encroach into the 100 foot setback.
2. A ground sign may not exceed 54 square feet per side. A ground sign of 56 square feet is proposed adjacent to Route 47. Relief is required for the ground sign to exceed 54 square feet.
3. A ground sign may not be greater than 6'-8" inches in height. A ground sign of 10'-3" is proposed adjacent to Route 47. Relief is required for the ground sign to exceed 6'-8".

4. One (1) ground sign is permitted per lot. Three (3) ground signs are proposed. Relief is required to allow two additional ground signs.
5. The total area of wall signage per tenant cannot exceed one square foot per lineal foot of tenant frontage and the length of the sign cannot occupy more than 60% of the tenant's linear frontage. Staff notes, the developer's previous project was granted relief to allow a tenant's wall sign to measure two (2) square feet for each one (1) linear foot of the tenant's frontage and the length of the sign shall not exceed the linear frontage of the tenant's storefront. The petitioner is requesting that the same criteria be applied to this development to ensure uniformity.

10 Plan Commission Conceptual Review

Planner Williams stated that as the Plan Commissioners may recall, their conceptual review of the project on August 25, 2014, yielded the following concern regarding the petitioner's proposal:

- There was concern that the proposed drive-thru vehicle stacking was not adequate to accommodate traffic during peak periods without blocking parking and vehicular circulation on the rear of the site.

15 Village Conceptual Review

Additionally, Planner Williams noted that the Village Board reviewed conceptual plans for the project at their meeting on August 21, 2014, and raised the following concerns about the petitioner's request:

- There was concern regarding a possible conflict between truck deliveries and drive-through traffic. The petitioner has provided a dedicated delivery/loading zone that does not obstruct the drive-through or parking lot drive-aisle in response to this concern.
- There was concern regarding a potential conflict with vehicles exiting the drive-through and vehicles backing out of the parking spaces adjacent to the drive-through exit. The petitioner has widened the island to the north of the drive-through exit to provide greater separation from drive-through in response to this concern.

20 Requested Action

Planner Williams stated that the petitioners request a motion of the Plan Commission, to recommend approval of Petition No. 14-9.1, Interstate Partners LLC, as Contract Purchasers and Standard Bank and Trust, as Trustee #17383, Lot 6A, Regency Square - Unit 1 (P.I.N. #02-05-276-005), Requesting a Special Use Permit for Drive-Through Food Service Establishment within the C-2-PDD" Regional Retail – Planned Development District, and Site Plan Review, including approval of such relief as may be necessary to allow development in accordance with the site plan that has been submitted to, and is on file with, the Village of Huntley.

Planner Williams noted that 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 and all other applicable Village Municipal Services (Engineering, Public Works, Planning and Building) site design standards, practices and permit requirements.
2. The petitioners will comply with all final engineering revisions to be approved by the Village Engineer and Development Services Department.
3. The petitioner shall work with Village Staff to place additional trees throughout the site, including the addition of trees along the Route 47 frontage.
4. Additional evergreen trees shall be added along to Princeton Drive to screen the rear of the building.
5. The petitioner shall obtain final approval of the Landscape Plan from the Development Services Department.
6. The petitioner is required to meet all development requirements of the Huntley Fire Protection District.

7. The allowable size of future tenant wall signage shall not exceed (2) square feet for each one (1) lineal foot of the tenant's frontage, and the length of the sign shall not exceed the linear frontage of the tenant's storefront.
8. The final location of the ground signs on Princeton Drive and Langston Drive shall be field verified so as not to obstruct vehicular sight lines.
9. No building plans or permits are approved as part of this submittal.
10. No sign permits are approved as part of this submittal.

A MOTION was made to open the public hearing to consider Petition No. 14-9.1.

MOVED: Commissioner Nichols
SECONDED: Commissioner DeBaltz
AYES: Commissioners Hoeft, Hahn, Nichols, and DeBaltz, Vice Chair Ellison and Chairman Kibort
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0

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
Mark Ebacher, Interstate Partners, 2860 Gavin Drive, Elgin, IL 60124

Mr. Ebacher addressed the Plan Commission and noted that the proposed building's architecture was not only consistent with the Interstate Partners' developments to the north, but, was also complementary to the 7-11 / multi-tenant center development to the south.

In regard to the proposed site's landscaping, Mr. Ebacher acknowledged that there were areas along the Route 47 frontage where additional hardwood trees could be planted.

Chairman Kibort suggested a combination of signage and striping within the parking area and drive aisle at the rear of the building may help to avoid any conflicts between the drive-thru stacking, loading areas, dumpster enclosure and parking stalls.

Chairman Kibort also suggested planting Hawthorne trees in this area and Vice Chair Ellison agreed that hardwoods trees including Hawthorne trees may be appropriate but that she certainly did not want Black Walnut trees to be planted on the site.

Additionally, Vice Chair Ellison suggested that the west (rear) building elevation should be improved with some sort of architectural elements including features added over doorways and/or the addition of planters.

Commissioner Hahn noted that the Plan Commission's conceptual review of the proposed project included the concern regarding the proposed setback relief for the Route 47 monument sign should not be greater than the relief considered with the previous Interstate Partners developments to the north.

Director Nordman pointed out that given the same size sign is to be used on this development as was used previously, then, the sign setback relief required would also be the same as what was required in the past and suggested that the petitioner revise the respective plans accordingly.

Commissioner Hoeft stated that he agreed with the Plan Commission comments so far and is content with the building's design provided the rear elevation is improved as previously suggested.

5 Vice Chair Ellison reiterated her concerns that additional trees should be planted where appropriate on the site and that the building's west elevation needs to be improved.

Mr. Ebacher acknowledged that in addition to the trees they intend to plant along the Route 47 frontage, Interstate Partners agrees to explore opportunities to plant evergreens along Princeton Drive as noted in the conditions of approval for the project.

10 Commissioner Hahn stated that he is happy with the project provided the relief allowed for the setback of the monument sign adjacent to Route 47 is consistent with previous projects.

15 Chairman Kibort reminded the petitioner of his suggestion regarding signage and/or striping at the rear of the property to assist with traffic circulation.

Commissioner Nichols stated that she appreciated the consistency between the proposed architecture on the subject site and previous developments to both the north and the south.

20 Commissioner DeBaltz commented that she was happy with the condition that the location of the ground signs takes into account the sight-lines necessary for safe entry and existing from the development site.

There were no additional comments from members of the audience

25 **A MOTION was made to close the public hearing to consider Petition No. 14-9.1.**

MOVED: Vice Chair Ellison

SECONDED: Commissioner Hoeft

30 **AYES: Commissioners Hoeft, Hahn, Nichols, and DeBaltz, Vice Chair Ellison and Chairman Kibort**

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0

35 **A MOTION was made to recommend approval of Petition No. 14-9.1 – Interstate Partners LLC, as Contract Purchasers and Standard Bank and Trust, as Trustee #17383, Lot 6A, Regency Square - Unit 1 (P.I.N. #02-05-276-005), Requesting a Special Use Permit for Drive-Through Food Service Establishment within the C-2-PDD' Regional Retail – Planned Development District, and Site Plan Review, including approval of such relief as may be necessary to allow development in accordance with the site plan that has**
40 **been submitted to, and is on file with, the Village of Huntley subject to the following conditions:**

1. **All public improvements and site development must occur in full compliance with the submitted plans and all other applicable Village Municipal Services (Engineering, Public Works, Planning and Building) site design standards, practices and permit requirements.**
- 45 2. **The petitioners will comply with all final engineering revisions to be approved by the Village Engineer and Development Services Department.**
3. **The petitioner shall work with Village Staff to place additional trees throughout the site, including the addition of trees along the Route 47 frontage.**
- 50 4. **Additional evergreen trees shall be added along to Princeton Drive to screen the rear of the building.**
5. **The petitioner shall obtain final approval of the Landscape Plan from the Development Services Department.**

6. The petitioner is required to meet all development requirements of the Huntley Fire Protection District.
7. The allowable size of future tenant wall signage shall not exceed (2) square feet for each one (1) lineal foot of the tenant's frontage, and the length of the sign shall not exceed the linear frontage of the tenant's storefront.
8. The final location of the ground signs on Princeton Drive and Langston Drive shall be field verified so as not to obstruct vehicular sight lines.
9. No building plans or permits are approved as part of this submittal.
10. No sign permits are approved as part of this submittal.
11. Additional trees are to be added along Route 47 and Princeton Drive
12. Architectural feature(s) are to be added to the west (rear) building elevation
13. The Route 47 monument sign setback no less than 30 feet from property/right-of-way line
14. No walnut trees to be planted on the subject site

15 **MOVED:** Vice Chair Ellison
SECONDED: Commissioner Hoeft
AYES: Commissioners Hoeft, Hahn, Nichols, and DeBaltz, Vice Chair Ellison and Chairman Kibort
NAYS: None
20 **ABSTAIN:** None
MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0

7. Petition(s)

25 A. Petition No. 14-9.2 – Horizon Group Properties, Inc., Lots 1 and 2 of the Final Plat of Resubdivision for Huntley Automall Resubdivision No. 1 – Requesting approval of a resubdivision to remove a setback restriction on Lots 1 and 2 of the Final Plat of Resubdivision for Huntley Automall Resubdivision No. 1.

30 Director Nordman reviewed a PowerPoint presentation outlining the request from petitioner Horizon Group Properties, Inc. and owners Huntley Development Limited Partnership, 6250 N. River Road, Suite 10-400, Rosemont, IL 60018 at the subject location, Lots 1 and 2 of the Final Plat of Resubdivision for Huntley Automall Resubdivision No. 1. Director Nordman stated that the request is to remove a setback restriction on Lots 1 and 2 of the Final Plat of Resubdivision for Huntley Automall Resubdivision No. 1.

35 *Development Summary*

Director Nordman noted that the Final Plat of Resubdivision for Huntley Automall Resubdivision No. 1 was approved by the Village Board on March 18, 1999. Director Nordman stated that it was the developer's intention at that time was to develop Lots 1 and 2 with two 26,480 square foot buildings that would share a common party wall. The Chevrolet dealership was later constructed on Lot 1; however, the proposed Buick/Pontiac dealer was never constructed on Lot 2. Director Nordman continued, noting that the shared party wall required approval of a zoning variation from the Huntley Development Limited Partnership Planned Development District Ordinance No. 92-07-13 which required a 30 foot rear yard setback and 35 foot building to building setback.

45 Director Nordman stated that the petitioner is now requesting approval of a final plat of resubdivision in order to remove the following restriction which requires the buildings on Lots 1 and 2 of the Final Plat of Resubdivision for Huntley Automall Resubdivision No. 1 share a common party wall:

50 *“One building is to be built over Lots 1 and 2. The center line of the party wall between the two units of said building shall be along the north line of Lot 2, therefore there shall be no setback requirement along the line between Lots 1 and 2.”*

Director Nordman pointed out that no other changes are proposed to the final plat of resubdivision.

Staff Analysis

5 Director Nordman stated that Staff has required the proposed final plat of resubdivision provide a 30 foot rear building setback line on both Lots 1 and 2 and that this is consistent with the rear yard setback requirements for the “C-2” Regional Retail zoning district.

Requested Action

10 Director Nordman concluded the presentation stating that the petitioner requests a motion of the Plan Commission, to recommend approval of Petition No. 14-9.2 – Horizon Group Properties, Inc., Lots 2 and 3 of the Final Plat of Resubdivision for Huntley Automall Resubdivision No. 1 – Requesting approval of a resubdivision to remove a setback restriction on Lots 1 and 2 of the Final Plat of Resubdivision for Huntley Automall Resubdivision No. 1.

15 Director Nordman stated that Staff recommends the following condition be applied should the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Village Board:

- 20 1. In accordance with Section 155.221 of the Subdivision Ordinance, the petitioner shall record the plat with the Recorder Kane County within three months. If not recorded within this time, the approval shall be null and void.

The Plan Commission members raised no specific concerns regarding the petitioner’s request.

25 **MOVED:** Vice Chair Ellison
SECONDED: Commissioner Nichols
AYES: Commissioners Hoefft, Hahn, Nichols, and DeBaltz, Vice Chair Ellison and Chairman Kibort
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
30 **MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0**

- B. Petition No. 14-9.3 – Faubl Family Dentistry, 11613 Main Street – Conceptual review of proposed elevations, site plan, and landscape plan for a ±1,876 square foot dental office.

35 Planner Williams reviewed a PowerPoint presentation outlining the request from petitioner Dr. John Faubl, 691 Bluestem Lane, Algonquin, IL 60102 requesting conceptual review of proposed elevations, site plan and landscape plan for a 1,876 square foot dental office on the subject property at 11613 Main Street at the southeast corner of Main and Grove Streets.

40 *Summary and Background Information*

Planner Williams stated that the petitioner is requesting conceptual review of a proposal 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 office building with associated parking, landscaping and other site improvements to accommodate the relocation of his dentist practice currently located on Vine Street.

45 Planner Williams noted 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. The petitioner/current owner 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. Planner Williams added that the B-4 district allows for healthcare uses, including dental, as a special use and that replacement structures must have a residential character and appearance.

Conceptual Plans

Planner Williams reviewed the conceptual plans for the proposed dental office that include a new single-story building in the center of the lot (approximately 0.42-acre) with a ten (10) stall parking lot on the south side of the lot. The dental office and associated parking is proposed to be screened by a six-foot tall wood fence extending along the south and east property lines. The single-point of ingress and egress to the parking lot will be provided by a driveway off Grove Street, which is the approximate location of the existing driveway for the single-family residence.

Planner Williams stated that the conceptual architecture for the one-story structure features a cross-gabled roof with shake-shingled/circular vent gable-end treatments and horizontal drop siding (LP Smart Siding). The entrance to the dental office is oriented toward the parking area to the south.

In regard to the site's landscaping, Planner Williams pointed out that the plan includes foundation plantings and the preservation of several of the existing trees on the site. In addition to the site's existing trees, new trees along the respective street frontages will be required to meet the 1 tree / 40' requirement. Planner Williams noted that a small trash enclosure, on the east side of the office building, will serve to screen the trash receptacles used by the dental office and that exterior site lighting will be required to meet the Zoning Ordinance requirements

Staff Analysis

Planner Williams stated that although the proposed plans are conceptual at this time and comprehensive review of the proposal has not been completed by staff, staff has provided the petitioner with the following initial comments for the conceptual plans:

- The building elevation facing Main Street must be further enhanced to appear as if it is the primary/front building façade.
- The building elevation facing Grove Street should be improved to include additional windows and/or other architectural feature(s).
- The materials used for the trash enclosure (currently proposed to be wood) should match the primary material used for the building.
- A signage plan was not provided. Staff recommends a ground sign rather than building-mounted, as other adaptive re-use properties on E. Main Street have utilized similar signage and is more consistent with the residential nature of the area.

Planner Williams stated that in order to assist in the review of the conceptual plans, Staff recommends the Plan Commission consider the following questions as part of their review:

1. Is razing of the existing residential structure on the site to allow for the new dental office appropriate for this location?
2. Are the orientation of the building and the location of the building's main entrance acceptable?
3. Are the building elevations facing Main Street and Grove Street acceptable? Are there any architectural features that should be added to the elevations?
4. Is the wood fencing proposed for screening of the parking area and trash receptacles acceptable?
5. Are there any landscaping elements that should be added or altered on the plan?

Village Board Concept Review

Planner Williams stated that the Village Board reviewed the conceptual plans on September 18, 2014, and offered the following comments regarding the proposed project:

- 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 trash enclosure should match primary exterior material of the dental office building.
- The petitioner should investigate installation of a berm and landscape screen rather than a fence along the neighboring property lines.

Action Requested

Planner Williams concluded the presentation and explained that the petitioner is requesting that the Plan Commission review the proposed development to obtain feedback regarding the possibility of developing the plan as proposed and that this review is conceptual and does not bind the Plan Commission or the Village in any additional review processes.

The petitioner's architect, Tim Carson, Project Manager with Angus-Young Associates, Inc., addressed the Plan Commission and distributed two (2) revised plan alternatives, prepared for this evening's meeting, that include the Main Street- (north) and Grove Street- (west) facing elevations of the proposed building.

Vice Chair Ellison commented that she was concerned about razing the existing residential structure given that it is so old and therefore historical.

In regard to the proposed architecture of the proposed dental office, Vice Chair Ellison, offered that she believed the slope of the roof was too steep and that access to Grove Street via the existing driveway may be an issue for neighboring residents.

Mr. Carson noted that the steeper slope was an attempt to capture a Victorian-architectural style for the structure and he offered reducing the roof slope and/or adding a dormer to the Main Street-facing portion of the roof.

Additionally, Vice Chair Ellison suggested adding a sill accent on the bottom of the windows throughout the building and noted that she is appreciative of the petitioner's efforts to develop at this location.

Discussion ensued regarding alternatives for the exterior materials including the possibility of wider cement board siding.

Commissioner Hoelt stated that between the two revised building elevations he preferred Alternative Number 2 with a dormer and a reduced roof slope.

Commissioner Hahn stated that he was in favor any design elements that will help the proposed building look more from the era of the original structure.

Mr. Carson noted that the parking lot lighting will include an ornamental, historical-type fixture and asked the Plan Commission what their opinion was regarding the question of whether a fence or a berm/landscaping was more appropriate along the southern and eastern property lines.

Chairman Kibort asked if the Village Board had objected to the fence and Director Nordman stated that the Village Board preferred a berm and landscaping to screen the site's parking area.

Chairman Kibort stated that landscaping rather than a fence would only be appropriate if the landscaping was sufficiently dense to adequately screen the parking area from the neighboring properties.

Director Nordman noted that the Village Board encouraged the petitioner to communicate with the neighboring property owners to determine if they had a preference for one screening device over another.

There were no additional comments from members of the audience.

5

8. Discussion

Director Nordman stated that there currently is not a specific date for the next Plan Commission meeting, but that he would notify Plan Commission members as soon as the next meeting is scheduled.

10

Vice Chair Ellison announced that she was a member of group proposing that a veteran's war memorial be constructed in Huntley and noted that renderings of the proposed memorial would be available for review at this year's Fall Fest on September 26th through the 28th.

15

9. Adjournment

At 7:58 pm, a MOTION was made to adjourn the September 22, 2014 Plan Commission meeting.

MOVED: Vice Chair Ellison

20

SECONDED: Commissioner Hoeft

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

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

25

MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0

Respectfully submitted,

James Williams

Planner

30

Village of Huntley