

MINUTES OF THE PLAN COMMISSION
October 27, 2008

The regular meeting of the Plan Commission was called to order by Chairman Kurt Hezner at 7:03 p.m. at the Village Hall.

Members present: Chairman Kurt Hezner, William Cotey, Terry Howard, Mark Moore, Walter Oakley, and Andy Robinson.

Members absent: Howard Jaffe.

A quorum was established.

Village Staff present: John Spoden, Director of Community Development; David Smith, Senior Planner; and Pat Sheeran, Project Engineer.

Commissioner Cotey moved, seconded by Commissioner Robinson, to approve the September 22, 2008, Plan Commission meeting minutes.

Motion carried 6 - 0.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS:

**PC 08-22 Denali Spectrum Operations, LLC d/b/a Cricket Communications, Applicant
1050 E. Park Avenue**

Request is for a Special Use Permit for Personal Wireless Services Antennas with antenna support structures and related electronic equipment in order to install Personal Wireless Services Antennas and tower extension to an existing metal lattice tower for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District.

**PC 08-23 Denali Spectrum Operations, LLC d/b/a Cricket Communications, Applicant
1050 E. Park Avenue**

Request is for a Site Plan Permit for Personal Wireless Services Antennas with antenna support structures and related electronic equipment in order to install Personal Wireless Services Antennas and tower extension to an existing metal lattice tower for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District.

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, stated that the petitioner, Cricket Communications, is requesting approval for a Special Use Permit and Site Plan Permit for Personal Wireless Services Antennas with antenna support structures and related electronic equipment in order to install Personal Wireless Services Antennas and a tower extension to an existing metal lattice tower for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District.

Minutes of the October 27, 2008, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 2 of 14

Mr. Chad Gargrave, Cricket Communications, petitioner, presented the proposed tower extension and installation of additional personal wireless services antennas. Mr. Gargrave described the subject property. He stated that Mr. Ned Herchenbach is the owner of the subject property and that the antenna tower and its compound are leased by American Tower Corporation (ATC). He stated that the property is zoned I-3 General Industrial District. He stated that the existing tower does not have enough space to co-locate additional antennas at the height that they need to have. He stated that the existing tower is structurally sound for the proposed 25 foot height extension of the 101 foot high tower. He stated that Cricket needs a higher level for their proposed antennas. He stated that the proposed additional ground equipment will be located within the existing cell tower ground compound currently screened by a chain link fence already fitted with an opaque covering. He stated that the equipment pod to be installed on the ground is four feet by eight feet with cabinets two feet above ground. He stated that there will be three antennas attached at the requested height. He stated that they are requesting to amend the Special Use Permit and a Site Plan Permit in order to install the tower extension, antennas and the ground cabinets.

Mr. Gargrave made reference to the Zoning Code Section 12 Performance Standards for Personal Wireless Service Antennas and stated that the proposal by Cricket complies with all of the standards. He presented a topographical survey exhibit that shows the search ring that the petitioner did to show the availability of co-location opportunities. He stated that after the search it was determined that 1050 East Park Avenue was the most suitable location for Cricket Communication's proposed antenna installation. He stated that this proposal was before the Appearance Review Commission and received their recommendation for approval. He stated that he has addressed the Standards for the Special Use Permit and that the proposal complies with those standards. He stated that Cricket will service the site once or twice a month. He stated that no nuisances will be created. He stated that the noise will not be any more audible than an air conditioning unit. He stated that there will be no lights on the tower. He presented a propagation map to illustrate the signal area that will be captured.

Mr. David Pardys, Village Attorney, stated that Federal law states that consideration for approval for of Personal Wireless Service Antennas is not to be considered for their alleged health effects or environmental impacts.

Commissioner Oakley asked how high a cell tower needs to reach before the FCC requires any warning lights. Mr. Gargrave stated that they should be 200 feet or more.

Commissioner Oakley stated that he is concerned about the additional weight that the tower extension will place on the existing tower.

Mr. Gargrave stated that a structural analysis will be done and submitted with the Building Permit application.

Commissioner Oakley asked if there is a wind factor to be considered for such a project. Mr. Gargrave stated that the structural calculations will take into consideration the wind loads.

Minutes of the October 27, 2008, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 3 of 14

Commissioner Cotey asked if the antennas will work at 111 feet. Mr. Gargrave stated that the antennas will not work well enough at 111 feet high.

Commissioner Cotey asked if 125 feet will allow co-location for other service providers. Mr. Gargrave stated that there will be space for additional co-locaters.

Commissioner Moore asked where the nearest Cricket facility is located. Mr. Gargrave stated that the nearest Cricket antenna is located at 1600 West Park Avenue.

Commissioner Moore asked for clarification of the signal coverage. Mr. Gargrave stated that cell phones generally receive and transmit signals within a two mile radius.

Commissioner Moore asked if the requested 125 feet height is needed due to the topography of the surrounding land. Mr. Gargrave stated that requested height is due to the topography and the surrounding foliage.

Commissioner Moore asked why lesser heights are acceptable for other carriers. Mr. Gargrave stated that the other carriers may have additional sites that are closer together.

Commissioner Howard asked what the maximum safe operating height is. Mr. Gargrave stated that a structural analysis is required.

Commissioner Howard asked what the percentage of dropped calls would be if the antennas were at the 75 foot height. Mr. Gargrave stated that the percentage of dropped calls would depend upon the number of customers traveling and living in the non-covered area. He stated that if calls do not fade out then they would transfer to the roaming system.

Commissioner Howard asked why 116 foot antenna height is not enough. Mr. Gargrave stated that the Cricket engineers determined the minimum height needed.

Commissioner Howard asked if Cricket were to leave the site, which would dismantle the facility. Mr. Gargrave stated that the American Tower Corporation, (ATC), would be responsible. He stated that Cricket would also solicit other carriers in that circumstance.

Commissioner Robinson asked how many Cricket locations there are. Mr. Gargrave stated that there are several in large and regional niche markets.

Commissioner Robinson asked for clarification about the existing tower.

Mr. Gargrave stated that it is an existing metal lattice tower, not monopole.

Chairman Hezner asked how many more antennas can be installed. Mr. Gargrave stated that he wasn't certain of the number of additional antennas that could be installed but the capability will be there to install more.

Minutes of the October 27, 2008, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 4 of 14

Mr. Chuck Paul, 301 Camelot Lane, asked for clarification of the address discrepancy between the public notice letter which indicated 1080 East Park Avenue and the agenda states 1050 East Park Avenue.

Mr. Smith stated that the 1080 address was known to apply specifically to the tower itself, but that the tower is located on the parcel of land that has the address number of 1050.

In the matter of PC 08-22, Commissioner Moore moved, seconded by Commissioner Howard, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve a Special Use Permit for Personal Wireless Services Antennas with antenna support structures and related electronic equipment in order to install Personal Wireless Services Antennas and tower extension to an existing metal lattice tower for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District, in accordance with the plans submitted.

Motion carried 5 - 1.

Ayes: Hezner, Cotey, Howard, Moore, Oakley
Nays: Robinson
Absent: Jaffe

In the matter of PC 08-23, Commissioner Oakley moved, seconded by Commissioner Howard, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve a Site Plan Permit for Personal Wireless Services Antennas with antenna support structures and related electronic equipment in order to install Personal Wireless Services Antennas and tower extension to an existing metal lattice tower for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District, in accordance with the plans submitted.

Motion carried 5 - 1.

Ayes: Hezner, Cotey, Howard, Moore, Oakley
Nays: Robinson
Absent: Jaffe

PC 08-24 **DRP Investments, LLC, Applicant**
844 E. Rockland Road

Request is for a Text Amendment to the Libertyville Zoning Code to include Electric Power Generation Facilities, but limited to Wind Power, as a Special Permitted Use in the O-2 Office, Manufacturing and Distribution Park District.

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, introduced the proposed text amendment. He stated that the petitioner, Aldridge Electric Company, located at 844 E. Rockland Road, is considering the future installation of an electric wind turbine on its property. Mr. Smith stated that as this would be the first installation of this kind in the Village of Libertyville and the fact that the Zoning Code does not list wind turbines as a permitted or special permitted use anywhere in the Village, it is necessary to amend the Zoning Code.

Minutes of the October 27, 2008, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 5 of 14

Mr. Smith stated that the petitioner therefore is requesting a Text Amendment to the Libertyville Zoning Code to include Electric Power Generation Facilities, but limited to Wind Power as a Special Permitted Use in the O-2, Office, Manufacturing and Distribution Park District. Mr. Smith stated that the petitioner will be back before the Plan Commission in a subsequent meeting to request approval for a site specific Special Use Permit and Site Plan Permit in order to install an electric power generating wind turbine.

Mr. Smith stated that Staff researched ordinances from various communities and reviewed bulk requirements established for wind turbines permitted in other communities. Mr. Smith stated that after reviewing other ordinances, Staff is proposing that wind turbines have two classifications, one is proposed to be called Business Wind Turbines which are 150 feet in height or less, and the other classification is proposed to be called Commercial Wind Turbines which would be taller than 150 feet.

Mr. Smith stated that other elements of the ordinance to be considered are turbine decommissioning and site restoration if the operation of a turbine should be discontinued.

Mr. Tim Morgan, architect representing the petitioner, described the Aldridge Electric site located at 844 E. Rockland Road and stated that although the discussion for tonight is only for the Zoning Code text amendment, the Aldridge site is presented as a sample application to illustrate how the Zoning Code text amendment can be applied to a site specific application.

Mr. William O'Donnell, Entegriy Wind Systems, Inc., 311 19th Street, Boulder, Colorado and consultant for the petitioner, stated that the wind turbine that the petitioner is requesting approval for on their site specific application will operate at 50 kilowatts and is intended for on-site distribution of electrical power. He stated that Entegriy Wind Systems do not have wind turbines in Illinois at the present time, but they are currently making other proposal in the State.

Mr. O'Donnell stated that in terms of any noise produced, the actual wind is louder than the turbine itself in most cases.

Commissioner Howard asked if the consultant has photos of wind turbines actually placed within a suburban environment. Mr. O'Donnell stated that they have installed similar sized turbines within 200 to 300 feet of schools in Maine and Indianapolis.

Commissioner Howard stated that he is concerned how a wind turbine of the proposed size will interact with neighboring residential communities and what should be done to help those neighboring residential communities to feel safe with a turbine in such close proximity. He stated that language should be incorporated into the setback requirement that is more restrictive when adjacent to residential districts. Commissioner Howard stated that he found ordinances from Pike County that regulate wind turbines. He stated that Pike County requires a setback that is three times the height of the turbine when adjacent to residential districts. He stated that he is concerned about the proposed proximity to the residential area.

Minutes of the October 27, 2008, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 6 of 14

Commissioner Howard asked for further clarification regarding how the wind turbine industry defines wind ratings. Mr. O'Donnell stated that Illinois has a Number 2 wind rating. He stated that the National Wind Resource Assessment includes the development and application of techniques for estimating the magnitude and distribution of wind resource over a selected areas. He stated that they also include the wind resource's certainty rating and the aerial distribution (percentage land area suitable for wind energy development) based on variations in land-surface form. Mr. O'Donnell stated that using wind as a natural resource to power wind turbines has various economic outcomes depending upon the wind velocities.

Commissioner Robinson asked for clarification of the lower drone noise levels that may be produced by the wind turbine. Mr. O'Donnell stated that all of the noise produced by the wind turbine is incorporated into the dBA calculations.

Commissioner Howard asked if the Mr. O'Donnell's company had any involvement with the wind farm located in Prince Edward Island. Mr. O'Donnell stated that the president of his company helped to start the wind energy facility located at the North Cape.

Commissioner Howard asked for clarification on advancing wind turbine blade technology. Mr. O'Donnell stated that engineers have been developing an improved dampening design.

Commissioner Howard asked if the proposed tower could be any lower than the proposed height. Mr. O'Donnell stated that the proposed height is needed due to the location of the wind fetch.

Commissioner Moore asked if other property owners who are not in the O-2 District can legally challenge the proposed text amendment. Mr. d Pardys, Village Attorney, stated that any other interested property owner or party has the same opportunity to apply for a Zoning Code text amendment.

Commissioner Moore asked if only the property owner will capture the energy provided by the proposed wind turbine. Mr. O'Donnell stated that the applicant will negotiate a power purchase agreement with ComEd.

Commissioner Cotey asked how the energy is transferred from the tower to the building. Mr. O'Donnell stated that there is a three phase induction motor. He stated that there is a junction box to the circuit breaker room. He stated that the wind turbine is on the user's side of the meter. He stated that there is a safety shut off mechanism.

Commissioner Cotey asked for further clarification of the security involved. Mr. O'Donnell stated that the bottom end of the tower ladder is 15 or 20 feet off of the ground. He stated that there will be a fence tower and the access door will always be locked. He stated that any extra energy produced that would not be needed by the building would be fed back out into the grid and subsequent utility billing would be discounted.

Minutes of the October 27, 2008, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 7 of 14

Commissioner Cotey asked what air displacement would be produced by the turbine itself. Mr. O'Donnell stated that there would be no ground turbulence.

Commissioner Cotey asked if there should be any required landscaping. Mr. O'Donnell stated that he has not typically seen landscaping installed at the base of the wind turbine. He stated that the Aldridge site is predominately a hard surface where the intended wind turbine is proposed to be located and not conducive for the installation of landscaping.

Commissioner Oakley asked if there will be any interference with other communication facilities. Mr. O'Donnell said that there will be no interference with other communication facilities.

Commissioner Oakley asked if the IB District is being considered for this proposed text amendment. Mr. Spoden stated that other districts will be considered in the future, but not with the current proposal.

Commissioner Oakley asked why the wind turbine is being considered for the Aldridge site. Mr. O'Donnell stated that the property owner is looking for economical ways to use power.

Chairman Hezner asked for clarification for the Special Use Permit for this proposed use. Mr. Pardys stated that the Zoning Code can be amended each time a different district is considered to include wind turbines as a Special Permitted Use.

Chairman Hezner asked for clarification as to maintenance of the turbine. Mr. O'Donnell stated that Aldridge will do most of the maintenance.

Chairman Hezner stated that other types of power generation facilities should be considered in the future. He stated that he is supportive of the proposed text amendment.

Commissioner Cotey stated if a future wind turbine is proposed near a residential area, then consideration should be given as to how it can be disguised as much as possible and how it can be landscaped. He stated that additional consideration should be given to further development to a Green Code and renewable resources.

Commissioner Howard stated that consideration should be given to adding language in the amendment to address more restrictive setbacks from residential districts.

Mr. Spoden stated that this item should be continued so that it is brought back to the Plan Commission with the site specific request for the Special Use Permit and Site Plan Permit for the Aldridge Electric property.

In the matter of PC 08-24, Commissioner Howard moved, seconded by Commissioner Moore, to continue this item to the November 24, 2008, Plan Commission meeting.

Motion carried 6 - 0.

**PC 08-27 Sprint/Nextel, Applicant
 481 Peterson Road**

Request is for a Special Use Permit for Personal Services Wireless Antennas with antenna support structures and related electronic equipment in order to modify an existing cell tower site by adding additional antennas and equipment cabinets for property in a C-3, General Commercial District.

**PC 08-28 Sprint/Nextel, Applicant
 481 Peterson Road**

Request is for a Site Plan Permit for Personal Services Wireless Antennas with antenna support structures and related electronic equipment in order to modify an existing cell tower site by adding additional antennas and equipment cabinets for property in a C-3, General Commercial District.

Due to improper notification by the applicant, these items will be re-noticed for the November 24, 2008, Plan Commission meeting.

**PC 08-29 Life Storage Centers, Applicant
 100 Solar Drive**

Request is for a Special Use Permit for a Planned Development in order to develop a 17.3 acre parcel of land that will incorporate self storage, warehousing, and office uses for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District.

**PC 08-30 Life Storage Centers, Applicant
 100 Solar Drive**

Request is for a Planned Development with Concept Plan in order to develop Phase One (1), Phase Two (2), and Phase Three (3) of a 17.3 acres parcel of land that will incorporate self storage, warehousing, and office uses for property located in an I-3 General Industrial District.

**PC 08-31 Life Storage Centers, Applicant
 100 Solar Drive**

Request is for a Planned Development with Final Plan in order to develop Phase One (1) of a 17.3 acre parcel of land that will incorporate self storage, warehousing, and office uses property located in an I-3, General Industrial District.

**PC 08-32 Life Storage Centers, Applicant
 100 Solar Drive**

Request is for a Special Use Permit for Warehousing and Storage in order to develop a 17.3 acre parcel of land that will incorporate self storage, warehousing, and office uses for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District.

PC 08-33 Life Storage Centers, Applicant
100 Solar Drive

Request is for a Special Use Permit for Offices in order to develop a 17.3 acre parcel of land that will incorporate self storage, warehousing, and office uses for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District.

Chairman Kurt Hezner recused himself from these items due to a conflict of interest.

Board Member Cotey moved and Board Member Howard seconded a motion for Acting Chairman Mark Moore chair these items.

Motion carried 5 - 0.

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, stated that the petitioner, Life Storage Centers, is requesting approval for a Special Use Permit for a Planned Development in order to develop a 17.3 acre parcel of land that will incorporate self-storage, warehousing, and office uses for property located in an I-3 General Industrial District at 100 Solar Drive. The petitioner is proposing to develop the subject property in three (3) phases, all of which are submitted as a Concept Plan with the first of the three phases being a Final Plan as part of the overall Planned Development request. Mr. Smith stated that the warehousing and storage and office uses proposed for the subject property are listed in the Zoning Code as Special Permitted Uses for the I-3 District. Therefore, the petitioner is requesting Special Use Permits for Warehousing and Storage and Office Uses for the subject property as well.

Mr. Scott Hezner, petitioner, described the subject site. He stated that Bill Hicks owns the majority of the area around the lake which is adjacent to the site. He stated that Phase One will include the Life Storage facility proposed to be located in the large existing building with the rear portion of the building to be used for warehousing for another tenant. He stated that most of the occupants can begin as an incubator business and grow in size and scope to eventually move into any one of the Phase Three buildings. He stated that the main building could be occupied by contractor and trades people with space to provide drop off and pick up of material.

Mr. Hezner stated that the elevations for the LifeStorage facility include a corporate green on the LifeStorage logo. He stated that the elements in the wall lights have frosted lenses to reduce glare. He stated that no new detention will be required in Phase One and the exterior of the building will be refurbished with new landscaping.

Commissioner Howard stated that because Phases Two and Three are concept, then the three buildings shown proposed in the center of the site just east of the existing Solar building could become one building.

Minutes of the October 27, 2008, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 10 of 14

Mr. Hezner stated that the buildings in the center could change as Phases Two and Three are conceptual.

Commissioner Robinson asked for further clarification of what is meant as business incubators. Mr. Hezner stated that business incubators can be an off-shoot of a larger business. He said that they are typically small in nature and are often entrepreneurial. He said that they can store inventory albeit in smaller amounts.

Mr. Hezner stated that the sign program will be an organized sign program to unify the buildings on site and that the petitioner has agreed to not place phone numbers on windows.

Mr. Hezner stated that IDOT permit will eventually be necessary. He stated that storm water management will not be necessary at this time for Phase One. He said that a Preliminary Engineering Plan for Phase One is suitable.

Commissioner Moore stated that he is concerned about making a recommendation with all of the existing DRC Staff comments.

Mr. John Spoden, Director of Community Development, stated that it is Staff's recommendation that the petitioner's request be continued so that they can revise the plans in response to the Staff comments.

Commissioner Howard stated that the petitioner could go through all the items and then decide if a continuance is appropriate.

Commissioner Robinson stated that it will be difficult to make a recommendation with so many Staff comments.

Commissioner Oakley stated that there are too many Staff comments to make a recommendation tonight.

Commissioner Cotey stated that he is concerned about the proximity of the proposed development to the lake. He stated that he is concerned about shore line restoration

Mr. Hezner stated that the development will stay clear away from the shore line of the lake.

Commissioner Moore stated that he is not comfortable with the long list of conditions for approval that would be needed because of the long list of Staff review comments in the DRC Staff report.

Mr. Hezner stated that regarding Planning Division Staff comment No. 1, that "Staff is requesting that an interim Site Plan be created that shows that the Phase One parking lot include curbed barrier tree planting parking lot islands, perimeter curb, and fixed lighting standards. The tree planting islands shall be landscaped and accommodate at least 10% of the parking lot. This interim Phase One Site Plan should be installed if Final Plans for Phase 2 and 3 are not submitted to the Village

Minutes of the October 27, 2008, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 11 of 14

within 18 months of Village Board approval of the Final Plan for Phase One. Please confirm the timing and commitment for developing phase 2 and 3.” Mr. Hezner is asking for 36 months instead of the Staff requested 18 months. Mr. Hezner stated that he is uncertain about establishing any time commitments.

Mr. Spoden stated that Staff and the Village Attorney can examine how to address the time commitment in the ordinance.

Commissioner Cotey stated that he would like to see more effort in addressing natural landscaping such as bio-swales and rain gardens.

Mr. Hezner stated that in response to Planning Division Staff’s comment, “The petitioner has requested Planned Development Final Plan approval for phase one (1), yet Sheet C3.0 is titled Phase 1 Preliminary Engineering Plan”, Mr. Hezner stated that the Preliminary Engineering plan label is correct. He stated that the Final Engineering label will be applied at building permit submittal.

Mr. Hezner stated that the existing gravel drive will be removed and restored with seed blanket.

Mr. Hezner stated that because the final Site Plan is not yet known yet that they cannot provide a campus wide concept landscape plan.

Mr. Spoden stated concept landscape plan should be submitted to show the intent.

Mr. Hezner stated that detention can be used for rain gardens.

Commissioner Moore stated that he is concerned that the petitioner may not complete Phase Two and Three.

Mr. Hezner stated that that they wish to delay the installation of landscaping along Route 176 as Staff is requesting until the development of Phases Two and Three begin.

Mr. Hezner stated they will agree to submit a draft Covenants and Restrictions for the Planned Development and draft Development Agreement to be enforceable by the Village for review and approval prior to application and issuance of any building permits.

Mr. Hezner stated that they will work to try to eliminate any dead-end parking on the Site Plan. Mr. Hezner stated that they cannot anticipate what will be developed across the street so consideration to the alignment driveways between the subject site and the property on the south side of Route 176 cannot be committed to.

Commissioner Moore stated that when Phase Two begins, then the driveways should line up.

Mr. Hezner stated that they will incorporate the Staff requested guidelines into the Uniform Sign Criteria.

Minutes of the October 27, 2008, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 12 of 14

Commissioner Moore stated that he likes the proposed overall sign program, but that he does not want a phone number or the words “Self” or “Storage” on the signs.

Commissioner Cotey stated that he agrees that he does not want a phone number on the sign.

Mr. Hezner stated that the storage units are self-contained environmentally controlled units.

Commissioner Howard stated that he does not like the phone number on the sign and that the term, “Self-Storage”, conveys “Resident”, not “Business” storage. He stated that emphasis needs to be on the business side.

Mr. Hezner stated that marketing is on the business side.

Commissioner Robinson stated that does not like the phone number on the sign.

Mr. Pardys stated that he is concerned with the self storage connotation.

Mr. Hezner stated that they will adjust the proposed freestanding signs to be out of the Site Distance Triangle at the commercial driveways.

Mr. Hezner stated they will revise the plan sheets that include the title ‘New PUD Site Plan’, to include subtitles that convey that Phase One is Final Plan and Phases Two and Three are Concept Plan.

Mr. Hezner stated that they will include foot candle illuminations at all property lines within Phase One.

Mr. Hezner stated that they will identify all public right-of-way traffic lanes, including turn lanes on the scaled plan sheet exhibits after they receive a response from IDOT.

Mr. Hezner stated that Page 16 of the KLOA Traffic Impact Study has been provided to Staff.

Mr. Hezner stated that they will comply with IDOT requirements regarding any proposed access improvements is required prior to the issuance of any building permits for this project.

Mr. Hezner stated that they will try to align their access drives with the existing conditions of the property to the south although it may not work well.

Mr. Spoden stated that consideration should be given to asking KLOA to revise their report with consideration of the property to the south not being redeveloped.

Mr. Hezner stated that they will have KLOA revise their report relative to Phase One of the project.

Minutes of the October 27, 2008, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 13 of 14

Mr. Hezner stated that they will revise the site plan so that there is less of a disconnect between the buildings and parking lots from the proposed detention area on the far east portion of the site. Mr. Hezner stated the signs are black and white and color elevations of the signs would not be necessary. Mr. Hezner stated that they just submitted revised sign plans that show the dimension the overall length and width of the two proposed signs.

Mr. Hezner stated that they agree that all light fixtures will be arranged to prevent direct glare of beams onto any public or private property or street by the use of luminaire cutoffs. Mr. Hezner stated that they will paint the existing mechanical roof top equipment and any new equipment will be screened.

Mr. Hezner stated that they agree to comply with the Building Division and Fire Department review comments. He stated that the tree inventory should be shown on the landscape plan.

Commissioner Robinson stated that he would like to wait and see the revised plans before making recommendation.

Commissioner Howard stated asked what the monetary benefits would be for the Village from Phase One of the project.

Mr. Pardys stated that the Plan Commission should stay away from basing their recommendation for the Planned Development on tax revenues.

Commissioner Howard stated that he is concerned about how stored items are segregated and controlled.

Mr. Hezner stated that most of the storage units are 10 feet by 10 feet in floor area with netted ceilings.

Mr. Spoden stated that a previous concern was storage of food.

Commissioner Howard asked if there will be fire safety shutoff rooms. Mr. Hezner stated that they will include the life safety components in the plans.

Commissioner Cotey asked that the projection of truck traffic for Phase One be shown in the traffic report.

Commissioner Oakley asked if occupancy permits will be issued. Mr. Spoden stated that occupancy permits will be issued only if a business is located there.

Commissioner Moore asked for clarification of Staff's comment regarding the time period between Phase One and Phase Two.

Minutes of the October 27, 2008, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 14 of 14

Mr. Spoden stated that Staff is concerned about the unimproved parking lot potentially never getting improved. He stated that the condition is requested by Staff in order to get some assurance that if the second and third phase is not developed, then there will be complete curb and landscape island improvements to the existing parking lot.

Commissioner Moore stated that he is concerned that the second and third phases do not get developed.

Mr. Hezner stated that he cannot say what potential tenants the owner is currently talking to, but he can say that they are talking to prospective tenants for the second and third phases.

Commissioner Moore stated that he recommends that this project be continued to next month.

Mr. Hezner stated that they will define Phase One more clearly in the revised plans. He stated that Elgin has a similar facility and business model as being proposed at the Solar site.

In the matters of PC 08-29 thru PC 08-33, Commissioner Cotey moved, seconded by Commissioner Howard, to continue these items to the November 24, 2008, Plan Commission meeting.

Motion carried 6 - 0.

COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Oakley moved and Commissioner Robinson seconded a motion to adjourn.

Motion carried 6 - 0.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 p.m.