

MINUTES OF THE PLAN COMMISSION
August 23, 2010

The regular meeting of the Plan Commission was called to order by Chairman Mark Moore at 7:04 p.m. at the Village Hall.

Members present: Chairman Mark Moore, William Cotey, Scott Adams, Walter Oakley and Kurt Schultz.

Members absent: Robert Guarnaccio and Andy Robinson

A quorum was established.

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

Commissioner Cotey moved, seconded by Commissioner Robinson, to approve the July 26, 2010, Plan Commission meeting minutes, as amended.

Motion carried 5 - 0.

OLD BUSINESS:

PC 10-22 Richard W. Burke and Allen L. Kracower, Applicants
Butterfield Road and West Park Avenue

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

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, introduced the request to the Plan Commission. Mr. Smith stated that the University of St. Mary of the Lake, Mundelein Seminary (“Seminary”), was before the Plan Commission at their October 26, 2009, January 25, 2010, and April 12, 2010 meetings requesting approval to amend the Comprehensive Plan in order to change the land use designation from Public/Institutional to Residential for approximately 97 acres currently located in an IB, Institutional Buildings District.

Mr. Smith stated that at their April 12th meeting, the Plan Commission gave their recommendation for approval with the following conditions:

1. With respect to the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Planning Area One (1) prepared by AK and Associates from Public/Institutional to Mixed Low-Density Residential.
2. With respect to the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Planning Area Two (2) prepared by AK and Associates from Public/Institutional to Open Space.

Minutes of the August 23, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 2 of 10

3. With respect to the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Planning Area Three (3) prepared by AK and Associates, no change would be made and will remain Public Institutional.

Each of the aforementioned land use changes are subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The site only be developed as a Planned Development in order to allow for a creative design that reflects this environmentally sensitive area.
- 2) Any future residential housing development contains such Affordable Housing as may be required by Village ordinances which are in effect at time of development.
- 3) Any future development include a tree preservation plan that will protect and preserve trees that belong to the Village of Libertyville's list of desirable tree species and any historical tree as defined in the Village's Ordinance.

Mr. Smith stated that the motion carried. Mr. Smith stated that following the April 12th Plan Commission meeting and prior to this item being placed on the Village Board agenda for approval, the petitioner requested further amendments to the Plan Commission motion for approval. Mr. Smith stated that the petitioner submitted a revised petition that amended each planning area as follows:

1. With respect to the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Planning Area One (1) prepared by AK and Associates from Public/Institutional to remain "Institutional" land use with an overlay of Moderate Density Residential.
2. With respect to the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Planning Area Two (2) prepared by AK and Associates from Public/Institutional to remain "Institutional" with an overlay for Open Space.
3. With respect to the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Planning Area Three (3) prepared by AK and Associates, no change would be made and will remain Public Institutional.

Mr. Smith stated that subsequent to the petitioner's revised application submittal, Staff met with the petitioner to discuss and further define the petitioner's proposed land uses relevant to their proposal.

Mr. Allen Kracower, petitioner's agent, stated that the property is not public land. He stated that they are only asking to change Planning Area 1, the top portion. He stated that although they would have preferred to keep an Institutional overlay in Planning Area 1, they have agreed with Staff's recommendation.

Mr. John Spoden, Director of Community Development, stated that Staff gave consideration to low density versus medium density for Planning Area One. He stated that a density that is commensurate with an R-6 zoning might be the most appropriate. He stated that R-6 zoning exists to the south and west of the subject site.

Minutes of the August 23, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 3 of 10

Mr. Kracower stated that the petitioner agrees with the Staff report recommendation for Area One to become a Mixed Medium-Density Residential land use category. He stated that Planning Area's two and three should be kept as Public/Institutional but did not like the 'public' classification because it is private land not intended for public access. He stated that Area 2 not be classified as open space.

Chairman Moore asked for clarification of the 'public' land use designation. Mr. Spoden stated that the Comprehensive Plan refers to public/institutional as a land use category that identifies the major public and institutional uses including schools, Village facilities, libraries, post offices and churches.

Mr. Kracower stated that the Seminary is concerned about the eminent domain powers of such agencies as the Forest Preserve. He stated that because of that concern, he does not want to have an Open Space designation.

Chairman Moore stated that the petitioner is then only seeking a land use category change to Planning Area 1.

Mr. Spoden stated that such a change would require a new colored category in the Comprehensive Plan with maximum allowed densities articulated.

Dr. Moira Breen, 139 Woodland Road, stated that she is concerned about the proposed density being changed from low to medium due to the potential impact on the water system, sewer system, and the public school system. She stated that she is also concerned about the impact on traffic as it is already difficult to get out of her subdivision now.

Commissioner Oakley asked for clarification as to Staff's recommendation that the density proposal reflect an R-6 district density. Mr. Spoden stated that the recommendation is to allow an R-6 density, but the housing types can be more varied such as townhomes, clustered development, and single family detached homes in Planning Area 1.

Commissioner Oakley asked if any open space in Planning Area's 2 and 3 could provide open space credit for Planning Area 1. Mr. Spoden stated that the intent is for Planning Area 1 to be self contained and to provide its own open space requirement as a Planned Development.

Commissioner Oakley asked Staff to clarify the difference between an R-6 density allowance and an R-7 density allowance. Mr. Spoden stated that the subject site in Planning Area 1 could be developed as a Planned Development and not be a typical subdivision with each lot having a lot size of 7,500 square feet. He stated that the existing zoning will allow a density of 718 dwelling units and the proposed change to medium density will allow for 191 dwelling units.

Commissioner Oakley asked how Senior Housing could be accommodated. Mr. Spoden stated that in its current IB zoning, Senior Housing is listed as Special Use.

Commissioner Cotey asked what the permitted maximum height is in the IB district. Mr. Spoden stated that the maximum permitted height in the IB is 60 feet and 5 stories.

Minutes of the August 23, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 4 of 10

Commissioner Cotey asked if the requested land use change will require extensive text in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Spoden stated that Staff can craft the appropriate comp plan text language.

Commissioner Cotey asked the Village Attorney if he accepts a medium density residential development in Planning Area 1. Mr. David Pardys, Village Attorney, stated that as a process, he did not see any problems with it.

Mr. Kracower stated that he agrees with Staff's recommendation for Planning Area 1. He stated that he is requesting that no changes be made in the Comprehensive Plan for Planning Areas 2 and 3.

In the matter of PC 10-22, Commissioner Schultz moved, seconded by Commissioner Oakley, recommend approval for an amendment to the Village Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Definitions/Future Land Use Map (Figure 4.1) in order to change the land use designation with respect to approximately 33 acres located west of Butterfield Road and north of West Park Avenue, in an IB, Institutional Buildings District, as follows:

Planning Area 1: This shall require the addition of a new Future Land Use Definition in the Libertyville Comprehensive Plan Figure 4.1 Future Land Use Map. Any future residential housing development shall not exceed a maximum density of one dwelling unit per 7,500 square feet of land area in Planning Area 1. The new land use category definition shall read as follows: Mixed Medium-Density Residential - Areas intended to accommodate a mix of single-family, two-family and medium townhouse developments.

Each of the aforementioned land use changes are subject to the following conditions:

- 1) That the site only be developed as a Planned Development in order to allow for a creative design that reflects this environmentally sensitive area.*
- 2) That any future residential housing development contains such Affordable Housing as may be required by Village ordinances which are in effect at time of development.*
- 3) That any future development include a tree preservation plan that will protect and preserve trees that belong to the Village of Libertyville's list of desirable tree species and any historical tree as defined in the Village's Ordinance.*

Motion carried 5 - 0.

Ayes: Moore, Adams, Cotey, Oakley, Schultz
Nays: None
Absent: Guarnaccio, Robinson

NEW BUSINESS:

PC 10-24 Lake County Government, Applicant
400-800 W. Winchester Road

1125-1303 N. Milwaukee Avenue

Request is for a Special Use Permit for a Planned Development in order to further develop the approximately 172 acre Lake County Farm Government Center campus in an IB, Institutional Buildings District.

PC 10-25 Lake County Government, Applicant
400-800 W. Winchester Road
1125-1303 N. Milwaukee Avenue

Request is for a Planned Development Master Plan in order to further develop the approximately 172 acre Lake County Farm Government Center campus in an IB, Institutional Buildings District.

Due to improper notification by the applicants, these items will be re-noticed for the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission meeting.

PC 10-26 Advocate Condell Medical Center, Applicant
801 S. Milwaukee Avenue

Request is for an Amendment to the Advocate Condell Medical Center Planned Development Master Plan in order to complete a Unified Sign Criteria for Advocate Condell Medical Center campus in an IB, Institutional Buildings District.

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, introduced the request to amend the Advocate Condell Medical Planned Development. He stated that Condell Medical Center was before them at their October 22, 2007 meeting requesting approval for a Special Use Permit for a Planned Development with Concept Plan/Master Plan and various Zoning Map amendments in order to further develop the approximately 76.9 acre Condell Medical Center campus in an IB, Institutional Buildings District located at 801 S. Milwaukee Avenue.

Mr. Smith stated that after several public hearings in front of the Plan Commission, the Village Board approved the petitioner's request for the Planned Development Master Plan at their June 24, 2008 meeting. Mr. Smith stated that the Master Plan is intended to regulate future Advocate Condell Medical Center campus development of various facilities. He stated that these regulations include Development Standards to control building setbacks, building height, parking requirements, floor area ratio, lot coverage and landscaping. Mr. Smith stated that what was not included during 2007/2008 Plan Commission and Village Board review and approval process for the Master Plan was a campus wide sign program. Mr. Smith stated that at that time the condition for approval of the 2008 ordinance approving the Master Plan stated that a Master Plan campus wide sign program shall require an Amendment to the Master Plan in accordance to the Zoning Code regulations if submitted after approval of the current petition for the Master Plan.

Minutes of the August 23, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 6 of 10

Mr. Smith stated that on July 9, 2010, the petitioner submitted a campus wide sign program that includes a Unified Sign Criteria intended to improve the public experience by creating a clear identity and wayfinding system which is consistent with the new Advocate Health Care brand at Condell.

Mr. James Babowice, attorney agent for the petitioner, introduced the petitioner.

Mr. Roberto Orozco, Advocate Condell Medical Center, stated that Advocate Condell is proposing a unified sign criteria to promote the branding of Advocate throughout the medical center campus. He stated that the new sign program will promote safety guided by design statements in the program. He stated that the cross logo, illuminated within, on the signs is more than a symbol but is an icon.

Ms. Sarah McKeen, Gensler, presented the sign program with additional detail. She stated that the signs identified as B1 in the sign petition shall be located along the two entrances along Garfield Avenue. She stated that the wall sign identified as C in the petition is proposed to be installed on the main building approximately 47 feet above grade. She stated that sign design D1 is proposed to be mounted on all buildings that are named. She stated that sign type D2 are intended to be address wall signs and that sign type D3 is similar to sign type B1 in appearance and that there are seven signs planned for the campus. She stated that sign type F is for the Emergency Entrance on the building canopy which will be pin red letters. She stated that the glass doors will have letters affixed to the glass. She stated that sign type I.1 will be placed at the three main entrances of the main building. She stated that sign type J are for the parking areas and will be color coded. She stated that sign type K are directional/way finding signs.

Chairman Moore stated that people coming into the hospital campus are under stress and will need to identify the where they are and where they need to go easily.

Mr. Orozco, explained about the major entrances and how they will be highlighted with the new signage.

Mr. Carl Graf, 616 Ames Street, requested clarification about entrance signs. He stated that Condell has already constructed an elevated parking lot across the street with little screening. He stated that he is concerned about the traffic going in and out of the entrance across from Ames Street and Garfield Avenue intersection. He stated that the proposed sign at that Garfield entrance is too tall.

Ms. McKeen stated sign type L is intended for pedestrians and is not illuminated. She stated that sign type O is similar to type L, blue in color and function as parking regulations signs and not intended to be negative but intended to convey information. She stated that sign type S contain 'Smoke Free' area signs.

Minutes of the August 23, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 7 of 10

Commissioner Oakley asked about the DRC Staff report comment about the discrepancy in the plans on the sign size. Ms. McKeen stated that the six (6') foot height is correct and not the ten (10') foot height for the sign that Commissioner Oakley was referring.

Ms. McKeen stated that the three landmark signs are presented in three different colors and are internally illuminated.

Commissioner Cotey asked for further clarification of the landmark signs. Ms. McKeen stated that the color illumination lends to a more conducive way-finding for pedestrians to certain hospital campus facilities. She stated that they will function as points of reference.

Commissioner Oakley stated that consideration should be given to installing additional Engineer grade blue reflective aluminum hospital signs along the major streets such as Milwaukee Avenue.

Mr. Graf stated that he is concerned about the hospital entrance located at Garfield Avenue and Ames Street. He stated that the trees are gone along that west perimeter of the hospital campus that used to screen the hospital. He stated that he objects to sign type B1 being illuminated at that location. He stated that a lower sign would be better than the one proposed.

Mr. Erik Porter, 226 Coolidge Place, stated asked if the illumination will come out along the edge of the signs. Ms. McKeen stated that the illumination will not come out of the edge of the signs.

Chairman Moore asked the petitioner to explain the rationale for the height of the proposed Milwaukee Avenue and Condell Drive freestanding entry sign. Ms. McKeen stated that they have studied how readers of the sign traveling in vehicles along Milwaukee Avenue will approach the sign, their speed and letter size, etc. and determined that the proposed height is most appropriate for that location at the entrance.

Commissioner Schultz asked if the proposed height complies with the Zoning Code for the IB District. Mr. John Spoden, Director of Community Development, stated that if the property was not subject to a planned development, the IB District permits freestanding signs to not exceed a height of six (6) feet above grade.

Mr. Walter Trillhaase, 618 Ames Street, stated that he supports the hospitals effort to improve their way-finding signage. He stated that as a resident living adjacent to the hospital campus he is concerned about the height of the entrance sign near Garfield Avenue. He asked if consideration could be given to reducing the branding aspect by removing the blue cross on the sign. He stated that as presented, the entrance sign is overwhelming.

Commissioner Schultz stated that the overall proposal is attractive.

Minutes of the August 23, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 8 of 10

Commissioner Cotey stated that he is concerned about the traffic flow at the west entrance.

Mr. Orozco stated that the Garfield Avenue entrance is not the main entrance.

Commissioner Cotey asked the petitioner if they would be willing to tone down the size of the Garfield Avenue entrance sign. He stated that it appears the landmark sign is not close enough to the west tower.

Commissioner Adams stated that he agrees that the Garfield Avenue entrance sign should be toned down.

Commissioner Oakley stated that the petitioner should reduce the illumination of the sign at the Garfield Avenue entrance. He stated that the petitioner should follow-up with IDOT to get more hospital signs installed along the r.o.w.

Chairman Moore stated that he likes the proposed sign package overall. He stated that the perimeter/entrance signs are too large. He stated that a shorter sign at the Condell Drive entrance should be considered. He stated that the eleven (11') foot entrance signs along Garfield Avenue are too tall as well.

Mr. Orozco stated that the Milwaukee Avenue/Condell Drive entrance sign is in competition with the new vehicle dealer property sign heights and the trees in close proximity so they need a taller sign at the Milwaukee Avenue entrance.

Chairman Moore stated that a lower monument sign that partially wraps around the detention area would be better at the Milwaukee Avenue entrance.

Mr. Orozco stated that a sign that low would become lost from the line of site of Milwaukee Avenue vehicle traffic.

Mr. Babowice stated that the Milwaukee Avenue entrance into Advocate Condell Medical Center is adjacent to the car dealers who are permitted to have much taller freestanding business signs. He stated that Condell's proposed sign height is necessary. He stated that he would like to meet with Staff to discuss the site distance triangle issue as well. Mr. Babowice asked if the B1 sign could be removed from the Plan Commission motion for recommendation.

Chairman Moore asked if the petitioner is requesting a continuance. Mr. Babowice stated that the petitioner could replace the B1 type sign with a D3 type sign at the Garfield Avenue entrance.

Ms. McKeen stated that the D3 type sign is two (2) feet shorter and the logo is smaller.

Minutes of the August 23, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 9 of 10

Mr. Orozco stated that the cross logo on the D3 type sign is reduced by six (6) inches in each direction.

Mr. Graf stated that he would still have the same concerns, the D3 sign is still too excessive for a residential neighborhood.

Commissioner Oakley asked for further clarification of the illumination of the sign.

Ms. McKeen stated that the illumination shows from the front of the sign, not from the edge.

Commissioner Adams stated that the sign at the south Garfield Avenue entrance would be more visible.

Commissioner Cotey stated that it is important that Condell including some sort of branding logo on the signs.

Commissioner Schultz stated that a smaller sign at the Garfield Avenue entrance is better. He stated that as proposed, the entrance sign at Garfield and Ames looks more like the main entrance.

Chairman Moore stated that the height is more of a concern than the illumination. He stated that the A1 sign height should be reduced as well as the Garfield entrance signs. He asked the petitioner how he would like for the Plan Commission to proceed. Mr. Babowice requested that an informal poll of the Plan Commission members be taken prior to the motion and recommendation.

Commissioner Oakley stated that the Garfield entrance sign have a lower height.

Commissioner Adams stated that the Garfield entrance sign not exceed six (6) feet in height.

Commissioner Cotey stated that the Garfield entrance sign have a lower height.

Commissioner Schultz stated that he was ok with a nine (9) foot sign height.

Chairman Moore stated that all the entry signs should be lower in height. He stated that the petitioner should consider a shorter and wider sign design.

Mr. Babowice requested that the Plan Commission members make a recommendation on the sign package tonight, but exclude signs A1 and B1. He stated that he would also like the opportunity to work with Staff on an amended site distance triangle definition.

Chairman Moore stated that it is better to not separate out parts of the petition but that a motion on the entire sign plan should be made.

Minutes of the August 23, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting
Page 10 of 10

In the matter of PC 10-26, Commissioner Adams moved, seconded by Commissioner Cotey, to continue this item to the September 27, 2010 Plan Commission meeting.

Motion carried 5 - 0.

Ayes: Moore, Adams, Cotey, Oakley, Schultz

Nays: None

Absent: Guarnaccio, Robinson

COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Cotey moved and Commissioner Adams seconded a motion to adjourn.

Motion carried 5 - 0.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m.