

**MINUTES OF THE PLAN COMMISSION**  
**February 22, 2010**  
*(revised July 26, 2010)*

The regular meeting of the Plan Commission was called to order by Chairman Mark Moore at 7:01 p.m. at the Village Hall.

Members present: Chairman Mark Moore, Scott Adams, William Cotey, Robert Guarnaccio, Walter Oakley, and Terry Howard.

Members absent: Andy Robinson.

A quorum was established.

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

Commissioner Howard moved, seconded by Commissioner Adams, to approve the January 25, 2010, Plan Commission meeting minutes.

Motion carried 6 - 0.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**PC 09-16      Richard W. Burke and Allen L. Kracower, Applicants**  
**Approximately 97 acres generally located west of Butterfield Road, north of Park Avenue and the Conventional Franciscan Friars of Marytown, and east of Pine Meadow Golf Course and Saint Mary of the Lake Seminary**

**Request is for an Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan in order to change the land use designation from Public/Institutional to Residential for approximately 97 acres currently in an IB, Institutional Buildings District located west of Butterfield Road and north of West Park Avenue.**

This item has been continued to the April 12, 2010 Plan Commission meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**PC 10-03      Insite Re, Inc., Applicant**  
**200 East Cook Avenue**

**Request is for a Special Use Permit for Personal Wireless Services Antennas with related electronic equipment in an IB, Institutional Buildings District.**

**PC 10-04      Insite Re, Inc., Applicant**  
**200 East Cook Avenue**

**Minutes of the February 22, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 2 of 13**

**Request is for a Site Plan Permit for Personal Wireless Services Antennas with related electronic equipment in an IB, Institutional Buildings District.**

The applicant has requested that these items be continued to the March 22, 2010 Plan Commission meeting.

*In the matters of PC 10-03 and PC 10-04, Commissioner Adams moved, seconded by Commissioner Howard, to continue these items to the March 22, 2010, Plan Commission meeting.*

*Motion carried 6 - 0.*

**PC 10-05      Life Storage Centers, Applicant**  
**700-998 East Park Avenue**

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

**PC 10-06      Life Storage Centers, Applicant**  
**700-998 East Park Avenue**

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

**PC 10-07      Life Storage Centers, Applicant**  
**700-998 East Park Avenue**

**Request is for a Planned Development with Final Plan in order to develop Phase Two (2) of a 17.3 acre parcel of land that will include veterinary services for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District.**

**PC 10-08      Life Storage Centers, Applicant**  
**700-998 East Park Avenue**

**Request is for a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for a 17.3 acre parcel of land that will incorporate self storage, warehousing, office uses and veterinary services for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District.**

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, stated that the petitioner, Life Storage Centers, was before them at their October 27, 2008 meeting 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

**Minutes of the February 22, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 3 of 13**

previously addressed as 100 Solar Drive, now addressed as 700-998 East Park Avenue. Mr. Smith stated that the Plan Commission concluded their hearings on November 24, 2008, with Village Board granting approval in January 2009. Mr. Smith stated that at that time, the petitioner proposed to develop the subject property in three (3) phases, all of which were 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 Phase 1 was the rehab and reuse of the old Solar Corporation facility building located on the western portion of the site into the Life Storage facility, and some minor parking lot improvements and parking space re-striping. Mr. Smith stated that the petitioner's motto carried a 'Work-Ship-Store' promotional element with the intent to assist small businesses with office-warehouse-distribution incubator type facilities. Mr. Smith stated that the eastern portion of the site (Phase 2 and 3) was subject to a Concept Plan approval only showing 4 future buildings approximately 17,400 square foot in floor area for Phase 2, roughly located in the center of the parcel and a larger single 30,000 square foot building for Phase 3 on the eastern end of the site at a conceptual proposal with the intent to provide the smaller businesses the next phase transitioning from an incubator business environment to a more substantial business operation environment. 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 requested Special Use Permits for Warehousing and Storage and Office Uses for the subject property as well.

Mr. Smith stated that the petitioner is back before the Village seeking approval to amend the Special Use Permit for the Planned Development, Final Plan for Phase 2, and a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for the 17 acre parcel. Mr. Smith stated that the amendment to the Special Use Permit for the Planned Development is to allow for the inclusion of Veterinary Services and the Final Plan proposal is to construct a Veterinary Services facility in Phase 2 of the parcel. Mr. Smith stated that what was once the area identified as Phase 2 in the center of the parcel is now Phase 3 and vice versa. Mr. Smith stated that the petitioner is proposing to construct a 4,000 square foot single story Veterinary Services facility building along the eastern portion of the parcel which is the area now identified as Phase 2. Mr. Smith stated that the plan indicates that there is additional space for building expansion. Mr. Smith stated that Phase 3 is a revised Concept Plan showing two future conceptual multi-tenant buildings approximately 12,000 square feet in ground floor area and rehabbing the existing north buildings to accommodate future industrial tenants.

Mr. Scott Hezner, architect for the petitioner, stated that they are also proposing a Preliminary Plat and additional detention storage along with the Phase 2 Final Plan request. He stated that as they were preparing the plans for the animal hospital, they spoke to the owner of the adjacent lake, Mr. Bob Hicks. He stated that Mr. Hicks wants to keep as much of the natural foliage as possible along the edge of the lake. He stated that another change from the last presentation to the Plan Commission for Phase 1 is a new monument sign design and they have also renamed the center, the "Park Avenue Corporate Center".

Mr. Bill Zalewski, engineer for the petitioner from Jacob and Hefner Engineers, described the legal boundary of the subject site. He stated that there is a flood plain that parallels the lake's water edge. He stated that the proposed Plat of Subdivision will create 10 new lots and that the

**Minutes of the February 22, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 4 of 13**

animal hospital will be on Lot 9. He stated that the proposed improvements to the detention area take into consideration the proposed animal hospital. He stated that the flood plain will also be realigned or mitigated to accommodate the animal hospital which is shown to be constructed in the flood plain.

Mr. Dennis Kulak, KLLM Architects, stated that Lot 9 will be removed from the flood plain. He stated that Dr. Brown from the Green Tree Animal Hospital has outgrown her current location at the Green Tree Plaza. He stated the proposed 4,000 square foot new animal hospital is designed to allow future building additions. He stated that the animal hospital is not a boarding facility, but strictly a clinic. Mr. Kulak showed the original proposed building design with the brown and tan brick colors. He stated that the Appearance Review Commission requested some changes to the facade and recommended approval for an alternative building design. He stated that the color palette of the animal hospital blends in with the other buildings and future buildings for the Park Avenue Corporate Center.

Mr. Zalewski described the storm water engineering for the animal hospital.

Commissioner Howard asked where the gas and electric utilities will come from. Mr. Joseph Sclafani, construction contractor for the property owner, stated that the utilities will come from Route 176 to the west side of the proposed animal hospital.

Mr. Hezner stated that the planning process includes three phases. He stated that the smaller two buildings in the center of the parcel are suggested conceptual for Phase 3. He stated that the Site Plan layout provides better visual frontage along Route 176. He stated that the site will be 37% landscaped with approximate 7% of the parking lot interiors landscaped. Mr. Hezner stated that the building mass relates to each other across the entire site. He stated that the monument sign design has changed to reflect the architectural motif and by using related color patterns. He stated that there are elements to all three phases in the design and architecture that help to unify the whole site.

Mr. Jon Kendall, 122 Fourth Street, stated that the industrial property on the south side of Route 176 has been improved with new development in recent years, but the north side has been virtually left alone. He stated that this area along Route 176 is an entry corridor into the Village. He stated that he is concerned about the impact of more development will have on the Village of Libertyville. He stated that he would like to see Phase 3 come back before the Plan Commission for further public review and comment.

Chairman Moore stated that Mr. Kendall is referring to what used to be more commonly known as the Hough property on the south side of Route 176. He stated that developers in recent years have made some improvements to that property. He stated that the north side of Route 176 has been in its current condition for many years when it was owned by the Solar Corporation before the Life Storage company took it over. He stated that the petitioner has made an attempt to bring in a unified development with their plans and they will need to come back before the Plan Commission for Phase 3.

**Minutes of the February 22, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 5 of 13**

Mr. David Serdar, 221 West Park Avenue, stated that he supports any efforts to rehab the area and expand the tax base. He stated that the proposal makes sense.

Mr. Rick Dousman, 625 Broadway, stated that the back of the Life Storage building is dilapidated. He asked that the existing buildings on the north side of the property be rehabilitated. He is concerned about the impact upon the property values.

Commissioner Howard asked what the difference is between other districts in which veterinary services are permitted from the subject site's I-3 District designation. He asked if the land owners business model of incubator business strategy includes the current proposal to develop. Mr. Hezner stated that the incubator business strategy has become stagnant.

Commissioner Howard asked if the proposed animal hospital can serve as a model for other uses. Mr. Hezner stated that the proposed animal hospital is a creative application for the subject site and Planned Development.

Commissioner Howard asked if the property owner is making steps toward bringing in new uses to the site. Mr. Hezner stated that the animal hospital is an example of the efforts made by the property owner to bring in uses to the site.

Commissioner Howard stated that the previous submittal brought with it substantial debate. He stated that the question as to whether the Life Storage facility was an appropriate use or not was part of that debate. He stated that the animal hospital proposal seems to be moving the debate further down the path of questionable use appropriateness for the subject site and its zoning district as it is currently not listed as a Special Permitted Use and he is concerned that a text amendment was not requested in lieu of amending the Special Use Permit for the Planned Development in order to allow the veterinary services use. He asked the petitioner how committed to a multi-building plan versus a single building plan they are. He stated that the Appearance Review Commission seemed to like the two building plan for Phase 3 versus a single building plan for Phase 3.

Mr. Hezner stated that Phase 3 could change again before they come back with a Final Plan.

Mr. Sclafani stated that the previous Phase 3 one building plan was an attempt to demonstrate a plan with the maximum permitted impervious surface with its correlated detention capacity. He stated that they do not have a commitment to a two building Phase 3 building plan.

Commissioner Howard asked how the storm water will be handled and how will the detention discharge be handled. Mr. Zalewski stated that the detention has been calculated for all three phases. He stated that the discharge will be located at the east end of the facility. He stated that they developed a plan that will have the least impact on the lake.

Mr. Pat Sheeran, Village Project Engineer, stated that the proposed changes meet the Engineering Division objectives.

**Minutes of the February 22, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 6 of 13**

Commissioner Howard asked if the proposed animal hospital building was built elsewhere before. Mr. Kulak stated that it is a freestanding new building that was designed to meet the client's operation needs.

Commissioner Howard stated that the floor plan and footprint should have some flexibility that can both address the utility connections, Fire Department requirements, and meet the animal hospital doctor's needs. He asked if soil borings were done. Mr. Kulak stated that all electric and sewer connections will be accommodated and the soil borings had positive results.

Commissioner Howard asked if the future building expansion will affect the equipment room. Mr. Kulak stated that the design of the floor plan can accommodate future building expansions.

Commissioner Howard asked if the animal hospital doctor understands that their proposed building seems unrelated to the scale of the site as a whole. Ms. Laura Hoult, Green Tree Animal Hospital, responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that the petitioner did a nice job. He asked if there are proposed covenants with design guidelines.

Mr. Hezner stated that the design guidelines have intentionally been kept vague in order to help facilitate future development. He stated that the landscape plan has improved since the approval of Phase 1.

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that the building mix is like apples and oranges. He stated that he would have like to have seen a better attempt to coordinate the building designs.

Mr. Hezner stated that several participants were involved in the design of the animal hospital building. He stated that during the pre-application conference, Staff had no red flags.

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that the design does not mix well. He asked if parcel has been accommodated with a detention plan. Mr. Hezner stated that detention has been accommodated for the entire site.

Commissioner Guarnaccio asked if access easements are provided. Mr. Hezner stated that they will be provided for.

Commissioner Guarnaccio asked if improvements will be provided for the access drive. Mr. Hezner stated that the access drive from Route 176 will be modified during Phase 3, not during Phase 2. He stated that the Route 176 right of way is wide enough to accommodate a turn lane, but the property owner wishes to wait until Phase 3 to do that work.

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that he would suggest that the petitioner consider improving the continuity between Phases 2 and 3 with additional landscaping. He stated that since Lot 9, the animal hospital is a true stand along site that there should be additional buffering between Lot 9 and the rest of the site.

**Minutes of the February 22, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 7 of 13**

Mr. Hezner stated that they had designed the access drive in Phase 3 as a horseshoe shape that goes through the whole site without direct parking on it.

Mr. David McCallum, landscape architect for the petitioner, stated that when Phase 3 comes in for final approval they can then re-examine the site plan for landscape continuity at that time.

Commissioner Cotey stated that the subject site is a gateway into the community. He stated that the Planned Development was well thought out and he liked the business incubator idea. He stated that it encouraged entrepreneurial energy. He stated that regarding Lot 9, he does not agree with the Appearance Review Commission recommendation that supported the alternative animal hospital building plan. He stated that he prefers the initial animal hospital building plan elevations. He stated that he prefers the stone front facade not the monolithic stone facade. He stated that regarding the perimeter landscaping, the requirement for high growth trees should be relaxed and more prairie natural plant species should be introduced. He stated that the Appearance Review Commission recommendation should be disregarded.

Commissioner Adams stated that if Lot 9 cannot be incorporated into the overall site design, then it should be designed as an outlot. He asked what the time table is for construction improvements to the rear buildings behind the Life Storage building.

Mr. Sclafani stated that they need tenants. He stated that he anticipates that 2010 will have an improved market quality.

Commissioner Oakley asked for clarification of the two monument signs proposed for the property. Mr. Kulak stated that one freestanding sign is proposed for the animal hospital and the other is proposed for the overall business park.

Commissioner Oakley asked for clarification of potential site flooding issues. Mr. Zalewski stated that the animal hospital building pad is planned to be raised above the flood plain.

Chairman Moore asked for Zoning Code clarification regarding the regulations for a Planned Development and its ability to accommodate uses not listed in a particular zoning district.

Mr. David Pardys, Village Attorney, stated that the Zoning Code does discuss in the Planned Development section its ability to consider allowing a use in a zoning district that does not list that use in that district. He stated that the Village has not received such an application in the past so therefore this proposal, although it is not prohibited, would be a first for the Village. Mr. Pardys advised the members of the Plan Commission that the petitioner's request was, historically, unusual with respect to its application of the Planned Development concept. Mr. Pardys stated that typically, Planned Developments within the Village only allowed for variations from the bulk and setback requirements of the Zoning Code and that he is unaware of any precedent in the Village for utilizing the Planned Development concept to allow uses within a development which otherwise were not permitted or specially permitted in the zoning district in which the subject property was located. Mr. Pardys noted, however, that the language of Section 16-13.1 of the Zoning Code apparently contemplates the possibility of utilizing Planned Developments to relax the use regulations within a development. He further suggested that case

**Minutes of the February 22, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 8 of 13**

law supports the concept of utilizing Planned Developments in this manner. He noted that because a Planned Development is a special use, and subject to public hearings and specific standards, the approval of a new use in this application would not necessarily create a precedent for approving similar requests in the future. He concluded, however, that action on this matter could create a precedent, in a more general sense, of allowing the Planned Development tool to be utilized to modify use restrictions within zoning districts.

Commissioner Cotey stated that if the petitioner had requested a text amendment to allow veterinary services as Special Permitted Use in the I-3 District, then the Village could have avoided the issue of considering the amendment of a Special Use Permit for a Planned Development as the alternative method of allowing the veterinary service use in the I-3.

Mr. Hezner stated that the animal hospital is an isolated use for an isolated development. He stated that it was done this way so that the I-3 zoning district would not have to be changed in the Zoning Code.

Chairman Moore stated that the proposed veterinary service use is not consistent in the I-3 District. He stated that there is a danger of a precedent in placing an unlisted use into the I-3 District. He stated that it falls outside what the site should contain and that the Plan Commission should consider this precedence for future developments.

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that perhaps rezoning the property should be considered.

Mr. Hezner stated that would be difficult to rezone property that is being considered for a Planned Development.

Commissioner Oakley stated that consideration could be given to making a special exemption in this case.

Chairman Moore stated that the Plan Commission's role in this case is to make an interpretation and to make a recommendation to the Village Board.

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that the Plan Commission's role is to not just interpret the Code but to also help the petitioner.

Chairman Moore stated that the Plan Commission should be careful to not step around the Code just to make requests work.

Commissioner Howard stated that with or without precedents, issues have come back to haunt the Village because of previous approvals. He stated that the proposed animal hospital building does not fit and it needs to tie in better to the overall site.

Mr. Bob Edwards, RWE Management, stated that animal care facilities usually don't fit in. He stated that an industrial setting makes more sense for this type of use. He stated that there isn't a better place for this animal hospital to go.

**Minutes of the February 22, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 9 of 13**

Dr. Brown stated that they have outgrown their current location. She stated that the proposed location is a nice entry into the Village and their proposed building design is aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Sclafani stated the animal hospital is proposed to go on one acre. He stated that there is an opportunity for future growth. He stated that the Zoning Code does provide for the zoning request technique that they are asking for.

Chairman Moore inquired as to the direction of the petitioner at this time. Mr. Hezner requested that the Plan Commission vote on the issues before them.

*In the matter of PC 10-05, Commissioner Oakley moved, seconded by Commissioner Howard, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve an Amendment to the Special Use Permit for a Planned Development in order to develop a 17.3 acre parcel of land that will incorporate self-storage, warehousing, office uses and veterinary services for property located in an I-3 General Industrial District at 700~998 East Park Avenue.*

*Motion carried 5 - 1.*

*Ayes: Adams, Cotey, Guarnaccio, Howard, Oakley*  
*Nays: Moore*  
*Absent: Robinson*

*In the matter of PC 10-06, Commissioner Howard moved, seconded by Commissioner Oakley, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve a Planned Development with Concept Plan in order to revise plans for Phase Two (2) and Phase Three (3) of a 17.3 acres parcel of land that will incorporate self storage, warehousing, office uses and veterinary services for property located in an I-3 General Industrial District at 700~998 East Park Avenue.*

*Motion carried 5 - 1.*

*Ayes: Adams, Cotey, Guarnaccio, Howard, Oakley*  
*Nays: Moore*  
*Absent: Robinson*

*In the matter of PC 10-07, Commissioner Guarnaccio moved, seconded by Commissioner Oakley, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve a Planned Development with Final Plan in order to develop Phase Two (2) of a 17.3 acre parcel of land that will include veterinary services for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District, subject to the following conditions:*

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that he would like to include Commissioner Cotey's comments regarding his recommendation to go back to the original building elevations and landscape changes. He stated that he would like to include his concerns as well regarding the landscape median in the driveway on the west side of the subject property.

**Minutes of the February 22, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 10 of 13**

Mr. Spoden asked if Commissioner Guarnaccio wants these comments incorporated as part of the motion. Commissioner Guarnaccio stated the he does want the comments as part of the motion subject to the two conditions.

Mr. Spoden asked for clarification if the conditions include the landscaped island in the drive aisle. Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that he does want the landscaped island within the drive aisle as part of Phase Two.

Chairman Moore stated that they are not sure if the petitioner is agreeing to that as part of Phase Two, but should be part of Phase Three.

Mr. Scott Hezner stated that it should be part of Phase Three because that is when the driveway will be improved with three lanes. He stated that they aren't making improvements to the curb cut along Rt. 176 as part of Phase Two.

Commissioner Guarnaccio asked if a curb cut improvement at Rt. 176 is necessary in order to install a driveway median. He stated that they are doing a lot of work there anyway including the creation of a detention pond.

Mr. Hezner stated that there is a lot of work going on there.

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that he is not suggesting that the petitioner should create the third lane in the drive aisle, but only a landscaped median.

Mr. Hezner stated that at this point and time it would only be the creation of the median, but the benefit of the median will come when Phase Three is developed. He stated that he prefers to see how the remainder of the site gets developed then a well deserved and well educated decision can be made based upon the future adjacent development.

Chairman Moore asked for clarification as to when the driveway median is to be installed.

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that the petitioner is requesting that the driveway median wait to be installed during Phase Three.

Mr. Joseph Sclafani stated that he is trying to accommodate the Plan Commission. He stated that he could do a four foot wide median, but may need to put in a pork chop curb at the apron.

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that he doesn't want the petitioner to go through that brain damage.

Mr. Sclafani stated that he could commit to putting the median in during Phase Three. He stated that his fear of doing it now is that IDOT will mess him up.

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that he is sensitive to the IDOT issue and also understands the work required to put in the infrastructure work needed to re-align the flood plain and going through the site development, but creating a drive aisle median is a throw in the bucket. He

**Minutes of the February 22, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 11 of 13**

stated that installing it during Phase Two shouldn't be an issue as long as it doesn't affect IDOT. He stated that he thinks it should be incorporated in Phase Two.

Mr. Spoden stated that for clarification the two conditions for approval include first, going back to the original building elevation and the second, is to install a landscaped island within the drive aisle west of the building. He stated that these are part of the motion.

Chairman Moore stated that the first condition is going back to the original building elevation with the stone masonry.

Mr. Bob Edwards stated that to simplify the condition, the Plan Commission can state that it is to go back to the original elevation.

Chairman Moore stated that the second condition is the installation of a landscaped median in the drive aisle.

Mr. Hezner stated that there was a third comment from Commissioner Cotey regarding the trees, maybe working in an alternative method of landscaping versus putting in all the trees so that it doesn't shield the detention area.

Commissioner Cotey stated that Staff addresses it in their *(Planning Division)* comment number nine, *(which states that, Staff is concerned about the engineering and design of the proposed detention. The intention from the Phase One of the Planned Development was to have that area integrated into the development as a feature to highlight the lake, but the proposed plan seems to create a straight, flat bottom area with landscaping trying to hide the lake.)* He stated that there then should be more prairie style landscaping.

Mr. Spoden stated that if the Plan Commission is asking for a revised landscape plan they should be specific so that when the petitioner comes in for permit, Staff should have something to base its review on.

Mr. David Pardys asked if the petitioner is agreeing to all of these conditions.

Mr. Spoden asked if the area being discussed is adjacent only to the animal hospital or also with the basin.

Commissioner Cotey stated that they have to keep it consistent.

Chairman Moore stated that the three conditions include; (1) use of the original elevations of the building, (2) Installation of a landscaped median at the east entrance, and (3) use of prairie style landscaping to the north of the proposed building and the basin area to the north of the building.

Commission Cotey stated that he was satisfied.

Commissioner Oakley made the motion.

**Minutes of the February 22, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting  
Page 12 of 13**

Commissioner Adams seconded the motion.

Mr. Hezner asked for clarification about the stated landscape changes.

Chairman Moore and Commissioner Cotey looked at the landscape plan and made inaudible comments.

Mr. Hezner stated for clarification that there are two separate developers responsible for the two essential areas for Phase Two, one for the detention area and the other for the animal hospital lot.

Commissioner Cotey stated that he was referring to a prairie style landscaping along the perimeter of the basin along the entire parcel.

Mr. David Pardys stated that there was an amendment to the motion.

Commissioner's made a mix of several vaguely audible and inaudible comments regarding the motion that was made.

***Roll call vote was taken to complete the motion.***

*In the matter of PC 10-07, Commissioner Guarnaccio moved, seconded by Commissioner Oakley, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve a Planned Development with Final Plan in order to develop Phase Two (2) of a 17.3 acre parcel of land that will include veterinary services for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District, subject to the following conditions: 1) The Green Tree Animal Hospital building elevations initially presented to the Appearance Review Commission be approved; 2) A landscaped driveway median to the west of the Green Tree Animal Hospital building be improved as part of the Phase 2 Final Plan; and 3) Alternative prairie type landscaping plantings be included between the lake and the animal hospital building and around the perimeter of the detention basin located to the east in lieu of additional trees.*

*Motion carried 4 - 2.*

*Ayes: Adams, Cotey, Guarnaccio, Oakley  
Nays: Moore, Howard  
Absent: Robinson*

*In the matter of PC 10-08, Commissioner Oakley moved, seconded by Commissioner Howard, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for a 17.3 acre parcel of land that will incorporate self storage, warehousing, office uses and veterinary services for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District.*

*Motion carried 5 - 1.*

**Minutes of the February 22, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 13 of 13**

*Ayes: Adams, Cotey, Guarnaccio, Howard, Oakley*  
*Nays: Moore*  
*Absent: Robinson*

**COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Howard moved and Commissioner Guarnaccio seconded a motion to adjourn.

Motion carried 6 - 0.

Meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.