

**MINUTES OF THE PLAN COMMISSION**  
**September 27, 2010**

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

Members present: Chairman Mark Moore, William Cotey, Robert Guarnaccio, Walter Oakley, Andy Robinson, and Kurt Schultz.

Members absent: Scott Adams.

A quorum was established.

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

Commissioner Oakley moved, seconded by Commissioner Schultz, to approve the August 23, 2010, Plan Commission meeting minutes.

Motion carried 5 - 0.

**OLD BUSINESS:** None.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**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, stated that the petitioner, Advocate Condell Medical Center, was before the Plan Commission at their August 23, 2010 meeting requesting approval for an Amendment to a Planned Development Master Plan in order to approve a campus-wide sign program that includes a Unified Sign Criteria intended to create a clear identity and wayfinding system which is consistent with the new Advocate Health Care brand at Advocate Condell Medical Center campus in an IB, Institutional Buildings District located at 801 South Milwaukee Avenue.

Mr. Smith stated that the request was continued to the September 27, 2010 Plan Commission meeting in order to provide the petitioner an opportunity to revise the sign plans in response to concerns expressed by the Plan Commission and the public.

Mr. James Babowice, attorney representing the petitioner, introduced Roberto Orozco, Advocate Condell Medical Center representative to talk about the sign program.

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 2 of 24**

Mr. Orozco stated that the new sign program includes a sign design criteria and is symbolic of a guiding light to help direct both vehicular traffic and pedestrian wayfinding to the appropriate facilities on the medical center campus.

Ms. Sarah McKeen, Gensler, presented the sign program to the Plan Commission. She stated that sign type B-1 is a gateway sign for the secondary entrances along Garfield Avenue. She stated that they have reduced the height from 11 feet to 6 feet. She stated that sign type C will include a 9 foot cross logo and will be internally illuminated and secured to the building facade. She stated that type C will have two foot high letters.

Ms. McKeen stated that sign type D1 will include 16 inch text letter height on a pin metal back panel. She stated that sign type D2 are the building address number signs and will be back lit on a 3 foot back panel pin mounted.

Ms. McKeen stated that sign type F is similar to type D1, but will be illuminated red color letters.

Ms. McKeen discussed the sign type G window signs, sign type I which are the freestanding traffic directional signs and sign type J which are mounted on the parking lot light standards. She stated that type J signs will have white letters with color backgrounds. She stated that sign type K are freestanding traffic directional signs with changeable message panels. She stated that sign type L are freestanding pedestrian wayfinding signs with the cross logo included.

Ms. McKeen stated that sign type O are vehicular regulatory signs that include the cross logo and sign type S are 3' by 3' freestanding signs located at the entrances of the campus.

Ms. McKeen stated that there are to be three Landmark signs located at the front entrances of important campus facility buildings. She stated that each Landmark sign will be identified by its own color and are 11 feet tall.

Mr. Orozco stated that the parking lot J signs will be color coded to match the Landmark sign colors.

Ms. McKeen stated that sign type A1 proposed to be located at the Condell Drive entrance has been reduced to 23 feet in height. She stated that they are proposing to remove one tree that obscures the proposed location of the A1 entrance sign. She stated that the Advocate Condell campus is directly north of the C-5 auto dealer district which is permitted to have the taller sign. She stated that the existing Condell Drive entrance sign is only 6 feet in height and is difficult to see while driving along Milwaukee Avenue. She stated that the proposed taller sign will assist with drivers coming to the hospital finding the entrance.

Ms. McKeen stated that they have revised their Site Distance Triangle parameters and have agreed to move the A1 sign back 50 feet from the center line of the Milwaukee Avenue r.o.w. Ms. McKeen presented the Site Plan indicating sign locations

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 3 of 24**

Mr. Orozco stated that when people are driving to the hospital, potentially in a panic, the proposed sign program can more easily lead them to the emergency department of the hospital. He stated that the A-1 entry sign at Condell Drive and Milwaukee Avenue is adjacent to the C-4 and C-5 zoning districts which permit taller signs. The Condell Drive entrance sign has to visually compete with those other taller signs. He stated the proposed 23 feet tall A-1 sign shall improve patient safety.

Mr. Denny Kim, 614 Ames Street, asked for clarification of the Site Triangle.

Mr. John Spoden, Director of Community Development, stated that the Site Triangle is a defined triangular area at the corners of road intersections in which visual obstructions are prohibited from being installed in order to promote traffic safety.

Mr. Kim asked for clarification regarding the B1 sign height and locations.

Ms. McKeen stated that that the signs will not exceed a height of 6 feet and will be positioned so that they are perpendicular to the right of way, not face the right of way.

Mr. Orozco stated that the light will not be cast from the edge of the signs along Garfield Avenue.

Chairman Moore stated that the reduced height of the B1 type sign is good and he stated that the petitioner did a good job color coordinating the sign program. He stated that 23 feet tall A-1 sign is too tall. He stated that the one tree proposed to be removed, should be removed but that the other trees could be pruned back in order to install a shorter sign. He stated that a lower sign on the south side of the entrance should be considered.

Commissioner Robinson asked how many signs will go in now.

Mr. Orozco stated that those signs critical to the West Tower should go in first. He stated that sign types D1, D3 and the Landmark signs should also be installed immediately. He stated that they have not yet completed the design for the Center Club entrance sign and understand that they will need to come back to the ARC and Plan Commission when they are ready to present the new Center Club sign.

Commissioner Robinson asked when they will be complete.

Mr. Orozco stated that they anticipate completion of the sign installation by next August.

Commissioner Robinson stated that he does not have any problem with the A1 sign height.

Commissioner Schultz stated that the sign program has improved since the last meeting and that he has no problem with the proposed A-1 sign height.

Commissioner Cotey stated the change to the B-1 sign is good. He stated that other hospitals enhance their entrance signs and are typically lower.

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 4 of 24**

Mr. Spoden stated that Highland Park has a very restrictive sign ordinance.

Commissioner Cotey asked if both sides of Condell Drive could be enhanced with two lower signs.

Mr. Orozco stated that there is a lot of foliage in the way. He stated that the intent is to have a sign above any restrictions to the line of sight field of vision for drivers along Milwaukee Avenue as they come up the hill on Milwaukee Avenue crossing Valley Park Drive.

Commissioner Cotey recommends that the petitioner consider revising the sign design for sign A-1.

Mr. Orozco stated that he is concerned about safety due to the trees obstructing the line of sight on the south side of Condell Drive.

Commissioner Cotey stated that consideration should be given to doing a traffic study.

Commissioner Oakley stated that the overall sign program is a good job done. He stated that consideration should be given to working with the State to get additional hospital signs installed along the major rights of way. He stated that he appreciates the revised sign height for sign type B-1. He stated that he has no problem with the height of sign type A-1.

Chairman Moore asked Staff if they agree with the revised Site Distance Triangle diagrams and regulations proposed by the petitioner.

Mr. Spoden responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Babowice stated that the intent of the proposed sign program is simplicity and safety. He stated that the proposed height for the A-1 sign is to make it easier to find the hospital. He stated that Advocate Condell Medical Center is the only Level Three Trauma Center in Lake County. He stated that the Lake Forest Hospital is located in a more rural area and would not require an entrance sign of the same height that is proposed for Advocate Condell. He stated that the Condell Drive entrance must visually complete with the taller signs of the auto dealers.

Chairman Moore stated that he believes that the Condell Drive entrance at Milwaukee Avenue could be further enhanced in lieu of the taller sign.

Mr. Babowice requested the Plan Commission's recommendation.

*In the matter of PC 10-26, Commissioner Schultz moved, seconded by Commissioner Oakley, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve 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, in accordance with the following criteria:*

## Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting

### Page 5 of 24

#### Sign Types:

- A1 Freestanding Monument Sign at the Milwaukee Ave entrance (Condell Drive) 23 feet high, 118 square feet in sign area, internally illuminated.
- B1 Freestanding Monument Signs (2) at the Garfield Ave, Golf Road Ave entrances. Each 6 feet high, 18.5 square feet in sign area, internally illuminated.
- C Main Building Façade Wall Sign (1) mounted at the main entrance of the west tower building, with a 45 square foot cross logo and 80 square feet sign, "Advocate Condell Medical Center".
- D1/D2 Wall and Canopy Signs throughout the campus, 3'x3' cross logo with 16" back lit lettering with 3 foot high white back-panels to mount on various buildings used to identify their uses and building addresses.
- D3 Freestanding Main Entrance Signs located near the main entrances of the principal buildings, nine (9') feet high, approximately 41 square feet in sign area.
- F Wall sign (1) emergency department identification wall sign three feet high, approximately 69 square feet in sign area.
- G Translucent cut vinyl letters and numbers and cross logo affixed to glass. Window/Door signs throughout campus, 3" high for letters, 9" high for address numbers.
- I Public Parking Entrance signs throughout the campus parking lots. Eight (8') feet high, approximately 32 square feet in sign area. Internally illuminated.
- J Parking Lot identity signs through the campus parking lots. Six square feet, four sided, mounted approximately 16'8" high on parking lot light poles.
- K Freestanding multi-panel message signs. 10'6" high, approximately 4'2" wide. Panels vary in width. Located at interior campus driveway intersections throughout.
- L Freestanding pedestrian level way-finding signs. 6'4" high, approximately 9 square feet of sign area, located throughout the campus.
- O/S Freestanding pedestrian level empathetic regulatory message signs. 6'4" high, approximately 9 square feet of sign area, located throughout the campus.
- Landmark: One at each public entrance. 11 feet high x 3 feet wide, internally illuminated with cross logo

#### Sign Regulations and Sign Design Standards:

##### Number of Signs Permitted

1. Freestanding entry signs (Types A1 and B1): one (1) per each public entrance to site.
2. Private Freestanding Traffic Directional Signs on campus (Types I, J, K and L) minimum number required.
3. Freestanding Building Identification Sign (Type D3): one (1) per building public entrance.
4. Wall/Canopy Signs (Type D1, D2 and F); one (1) per building public entrance.
5. Landmark sculpture: one at each major entrance drop-off.

## Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting

### Page 6 of 24

#### Maximum Gross Surface Area

1. Freestanding Site Entry Signs (**Types A1 and B1**): Not to exceed 119 square feet per sign face on Milwaukee Avenue and 18.5 square feet per sign face adjacent to all other rights of ways.
2. Wall sign Cross Logo (**Type C**): Not to exceed 45 square feet.
3. Wall sign Building Identification Sign (**Type D1**): Sign area varies depending upon length of text, shall not exceed three feet in height from bottom of sign to top of Cross Logo, Letters not to exceed 16 inches in height.
4. Wall sign Building Address Number Sign (**Type D2**): Sign area varies, shall not exceed three feet in height from bottom of sign to top of Cross Logo, Address Numbers not to exceed 16 inches in height.
5. Freestanding Building Identification Sign (**Type D3**): Not to exceed 41.5 square feet in sign area per sign face.
6. Wall sign Emergency Department (**Type F**): Not to exceed 69 square feet in sign area.
7. Freestanding Traffic Directional Signs (**Type I**) not to exceed thirty-two (32) square feet per sign face.
8. Freestanding Traffic Directional (Parking Lot Light Pole) Signs (**Type J**) not to exceed six (6) square feet per sign face.
9. Freestanding Traffic Directional Signs (**Type K**) not to exceed forty (40) square feet per sign face.
10. Freestanding Pedestrian Way-finding/Directional Signs (**Type L**) not to exceed six (6) square feet per sign face.
11. Freestanding pedestrian level empathetic regulatory message signs. (**Type O/S**) not to exceed 9 square feet of sign area.
12. Wall Signs (**Type C, D1, D2 and F**): Not to exceed a total for all wall signs of twenty-five percent (25%) of the square footage of the façade to which the signs are attached or painted.

#### Maximum Height

#### Minimum Required Setback

1. Freestanding signs on Milwaukee Avenue shall have a minimum required setback of fifty (50) feet from the center line of the right of way and for any freestanding sign located at an intersection of two streets not abutting a residential district shall have a minimum setback of five (5) feet from the property lines.
2. Freestanding signs along streets adjacent to residential districts shall be set back a minimum of 15 feet from all lot lines or from the public right of way.
3. Freestanding signs on the hospital campus shall be setback a minimum distance of five (5) feet from every lot line or from the public right of way.
4. No free standing sign shall encroach into the Site Triangle as depicted on pages 14, 15, 16 and 17 in the petitioner's revised sign plan dated September 13, 2010. Exceptions to this regulation may include the following:
  1. Fences not exceeding 4 feet in height, and with a ratio of the solid portion not

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 7 of 24**

- exceeding one-to-three. (i.e., a split rail or some equivalent fence would be permitted, while a solid stockade of board fence would not)
2. All shrubs, hedges, spreaders, etc., not exceeding a height of 33 inches above the street gutter level.
  3. Trees that are trimmed of limbs and sucker growth to a height of at least 10 feet above the street gutter.

**Landscaping**

1. Landscaping shall be restored to original condition or intent in accordance to the Planned Development Master Plan previously approved upon completion of the signage installation.
2. All A1 and B1 type signs shall have landscaping at the base of the sign that covers ground area equal to the sign area.

**Sign Colors, Materials and Font Types**

1. Staff supports the petitioner's proposed sign colors, materials and font types as presented in the petition plans.

**Sign Illumination**

1. Except for glass doors, glass windows or glass transoms, all signs that have internal illumination shall have opaque backgrounds, only permitting illumination to show through lettering and logo's.

*Motion carried 4 - 2.*

*Ayes: Guarnaccio, Oakley, Robinson, Schultz*

*Nays: Moore, Cotey*

*Absent: Adams*

**PC 10-29 Tranel Real Estate, LLC, Applicant**

**Request is for a Zoning Code Text Amendment to Section 5, the C-3, General Commercial District, in order to allow the installation of flag poles at a height of up to 80 feet.**

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, stated the petitioner is seeking approval of a text amendment that would allow flag poles to be a height not exceeding 80 feet in the C-3, General Commercial District with certain conditions as outlined in the DRC Staff Report. Mr. Smith stated that he will defer to the petition to explain those conditions in their presentation.

Mr. James Babowice, agent for the petitioner, stated that the petitioner is seeking approval for a text amendment to the Zoning Code. He stated that the proposed text amendment fills gap in the Libertyville Zoning Code. He stated that the Zoning Code is silent on flag height with an exception. He stated that there is a 25 foot height limit on flag poles when located in required yards. He stated

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 8 of 24**

that the best way to address this issue is with a text amendment. He stated that the page 15 of the Staff report states that the Zoning Code does not address the maximum height of flag poles except in required yards where they are restricted to twenty-five (25) feet. He stated that flag poles in the Zoning Code are not defined. He stated that an interpretation of a flag pole can be looked at as either a structure or an accessory structure. He stated that Village Staff have in the past limited the height of a flag pole to what the zoning district allows for maximum height for a structure if not in a required yard.

Mr. Babowice stated that there was an application for a text amendment relative to the height of flag poles submitted in 2006. He stated that the request for the amendment failed to pass at that time. He stated that Commissioner's Moore and Cotey gave their support at that time. He stated that the proposal in 2006 would have allowed for an 80 foot tall flag pole on all C-3 lots. He stated that the Staff took exception to that at the time.

Mr. Babowice stated that they have attempted to revise the proposed text amendment so that flag poles would be permitted on C-3 lots that border either an IB or OS zoning district and cannot be placed in the front yard that exceeds 25 feet.

Mr. Roch Tranel, Tranel Financial Group, business address is 1509 North Milwaukee Avenue, Libertyville, home address is 1010 Sandstone Drive, Libertyville, stated that he is involved with the Chamber of Commerce, MainStreet and the local rotary club. He stated that he is very passionate about putting up the flag and to show his patriotism. He stated that the flag was born on June 14, 1777 in Philadelphia. He stated that 50 stars represent each of the 50 sovereign states in the greatest constitutional republic that the world has ever known. He stated that the colors symbolize patriotic ideals and spiritual qualities of the citizens of our country. He stated that the red stripes proclaim the fearless courage and integrity of American men and boys and the self sacrifice and devotion American mothers and daughters. He stated that the white stripes stand for liberty and equality for all and the blue is the blue of heaven, loyalty and faith. He stated that the flag represents the eternal principals of liberty, justice and humanity. He stated that it embodies American freedom and freedom of speech. He stated that that it represents freedom of religion, freedom of assembly and the press and the sanctity of the home. He stated that it is displayed in every classroom through out the nation and every school yard. He stated that it has its own special day, flag day, being June 14th, set in honor of its birth. He stated that it has the sacred honor of symbolizing our birth right and our heritage of liberty. He stated that as you see it silhouetted against the peaceful skies of our country, it stands for who we are, no more and no less. He stated that it stands for one nation, under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all. He stated that the flag is flown all the time in the U.S. but in other countries, the flag is only flown for ceremonial occasions. He stated that the American flag is flown on tall flag poles in front of businesses, on short poles in our yards, from balconies of our condominium complexes. He stated that we pin the flag to our jacket, we paste it to windows of our cars and trucks. He stated that as soon our toddlers are able to hold a flag they wave it at the Libertyville Days event on the fourth of July. He stated that the flag is a great devotion and symbol of our nation that is uniquely American and demonstrates that we are indeed one nation and that whatever the differences that we have, the core values as Americans hold in common a belief of dignity, a love of liberty and a commitment to government for and by the people.

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 9 of 24**

Mr. Tranel stated that in other parts of the world people tend to see us Americans as overly sentimental about the flag but our system of government, regardless of its flaws, is the finest in the world and he is proud to display the flag. He stated that we have very good reason to display the flag. He stated that he is asking the Plan Commission to help him show his passion and appreciation by giving a positive recommendation to the Village Board for the requested text amendment.

Mr. Babowice stated that the nature of the petitioner's business is financial planning service.

Mr. Tranel stated that when a customer wants to meet with them, they will call ahead of time and schedule an appointment.

Mr. Duane Laska, North Shore Sign Company, 1925 Industrial Drive, Libertyville, stated that he will explain what the mechanics of the flag pole itself are. He stated that the pole is an 80 foot high exposed height aluminum flag pole. He stated that it is a typical spun aluminum finish. He stated that it is a two piece with a seamless transition point just above midway of the pole. He stated that it is twelve (12") inches in diameter at the base and tapers up to a four (4") diameter. He stated that mechanically it is a very sturdy piece with 3/8 inch thick spun aluminum all the way up to the top. He stated that the halyard is internal to the pole. He stated that the halyard runs down the middle of the pole, not outside of the pole, this prevents the clanking sound. He stated that the base of the flag pole is three feet in diameter approximately eight to ten feet down into the ground with concrete and rebar as part of the foundation with both a lightning rod and a separate grounding rod. He stated that the pole is engineered to handle a flag of up to 20 feet by 30 feet in size in a 105 mile per hour wind with flag and up to 140 mile per hour wind without flag.

Mr. Laska presented photos of the Tranel Financial site with an aerial truck with the boom raised up to 80 feet in order to help the Plan Commission visualize the proposed flag pole height. He stated that one of the photo views was taken from across the street at Adler Park. He stated that it is probably one of the most visible angles. He stated that the photo shows that the flag would just clear the tree line which is at 70 feet in height. He stated that one of the photos shows the Fire Station communication tower which stands at 160 feet in height. He stated that another photo was taken from the Slotts Hot and KFC restaurant location where the truck boom clears the tree line from that view by about eight to ten feet. He stated that from another photo, angles change and the road changes and the truck boom just clears the tree line from that photo but a little less visible. He stated that the other antenna in the photo is the tower located at the Sheriff's substation that has been there since the 1960's right across from the McDonalds.

Mr. Babowice stated that there is a consistent statement represented in the Standards for Amendment namely that the proposed use of the flag pole and the flying of the American flag would facilitate patriotism and the feeling of patriotism. He stated that one of the reasons that they proposed that the flag pole height be located in the C-3 district that borders the IB or OS district is because in the IB district the Zoning Code allows structures to be a height of up to 105 feet depending upon certain circumstances. He stated that in close proximity to Mr. Tranel's property is the Villages tower that would dwarf any flag pole that would be in close proximity.

## **Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**

### **Page 10 of 24**

Mr. Babowice identified the various parcels in the Village that may qualify for an 80 foot flag pole with this text amendment. He stated that the flying of the American flag would not be a diminishment to the value of any one of the properties that would qualify under the proposed text amendment. He stated that how the American flag is flown is governed by the flag code and issues such as traffic safety and aesthetics cannot be factored in. He stated that there was a case in Schaumburg when the someone wanted to put up 13 flags but the Village responded by saying that they could only put up three flags. He stated that the court eventually ruled that the Schaumburg could not curtail that freedom of expression.

Mr. Babowice stated that the petitioner's location being adjacent to a four lane road and the Village owned communication tower nearby at double the proposed flag pole height there does not seem to be a challenge to the aesthetics of the proposal. He stated that he does not agree that there would be any diminution to the value of properties due to the flying the American flag. He stated that the property would be suitable for the flag pole due to being adjacent to a four lane road.

Mr. Laska stated that the petitioner would install the taller flag pole behind the existing the flag pole at 1509 North Milwaukee Avenue and there would be no impact on the existing structure on the property.

Mr. Babowice stated that the Village of Libertyville has not yet amended its noise ordinance. He stated that the current noise ordinance requires zero (0) decibels at lot lines. He stated that if someone were to cut their grass along the property line they would be in violation of the ordinance. He stated that he understands that the Village is currently working on the Zoning Code revisions. He stated that a noise study would be warranted with respect to flying a flag. He stated that he had looked for cases relative to the noise impact of flying a flag and stated that he could not find anything regarding this issue.

Mr. Tranel stated that this amendment would be good for the Village of Libertyville. He stated that he has received only positive feedback from MainStreet, his Rotary Club and the Chamber of Commerce. He stated that it would be a great community asset. He stated that he is proud to do this and that he hopes to get a favorable recommendation from the Plan Commission.

Mr. Tranel stated that he has Loraine Randolph, the manager from Great Lakes Credit Union and he has permission from Vicki Kiser, President from Great Lakes Credit Union. He stated that both of them support the proposed text amendment.

Mr. Laska presented another photo of the truck with the raised boom adjacent to the existing flag pole. He stated that the tip of the boom was 80 feet. He stated that there is another flag pole in the downtown visible from Winchester Road and from Rt. 176 which is located on top of Harris Bank building. He stated that the bank building is probably 45 feet in height with a 25 foot tall flag pole on top of it and it flies the American flag. He said that it is probably the most notable and recognizable to the people of the Village of Libertyville because of its great visibility up and down Milwaukee Avenue and its stately appearance on top of an attractive historical building.

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 11 of 24**

Mr. John Spoden, Director of Community Development, asked for clarification that it seemed from the petitioner's proposal any property in question would be bordering an IB or OS district.

Mr. Babowice stated that the property itself should be bordering the IB or OS district.

Chairman Moore asked if there is anyone in the public that would like to comment on the proposal. He stated that no one from the audience requested to speak so he turned to the Plan Commission members to make comment or ask questions.

Commissioner Oakley asked if the 45 foot height in the Staff report reflects the maximum permitted height in the district. He asked if there should be a setback requirement for a pole of that height.

Mr. Laska stated that the pole they are proposing is significantly setback.

Commissioner Oakley stated that the pole is proposed to be setback from the property line for Mr. Tranel's property but what about other properties.

Mr. Babowice stated that for a flag pole to be more than 25 feet, it would be required to not be located within the required front yard. He stated that they have added additional restrictions to the proposed text amendment that the 2006 application did not consider.

Commissioner Oakley asked Staff if other communities were researched to determine how they may have addressed this issue.

Mr. Spoden stated that Staff would still have to do that research to answer that question. He stated that if the Plan Commission should ask for that information, Staff could do that research.

Mr. Laska stated that in Green Oaks, the Harley Davison dealership has an eighty (80) foot flag pole.

Commissioner Oakley stated that there are certain restaurants that have flag poles with advertisements but they cannot have poles that exceed a certain height.

Mr. Babowice stated that the way the text amendment is written regarding secondary flags on the flag pole, other political entities, civic, philanthropic or religious groups would be permitted but there would be a restriction flags used as an advertisement.

Commissioner Cotey asked what the actual length and width of the flag is.

Mr. Laska stated that the flag pole is engineered to fly a flag not exceeding 20 feet by 30 feet in size. He stated that government buildings fly flags that are 20 by 35 feet in size but private buildings are permitted to fly flags up to 20 by 30 feet in size.

Commissioner Cotey asked what the actual setback distance from the road to the proposed flag pole location.

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 12 of 24**

Mr. Babowice stated that the survey that the petitioner has does not call out the distance between the road and the proposed flag pole location.

Commissioner Cotey stated that the Plan Commission won't know the setback distance of the proposed flag pole on the petitioner's property.

Mr. Tranel stated that he is sure that it is about 150 feet.

Commissioner Cotey stated that they should have the documents to demonstrate the setback distance.

Chairman Moore stated that the relevant issue for tonight's discussion should be tied to the proposed text amendment.

Commissioner Cotey stated that the setbacks should be defined in the text amendment itself.

Chairman Moore asked how the setback should be defined.

Commissioner Cotey stated that he is concerned that without having the setback defined in the text amendment there will be a precedent set.

Chairman Moore asked for clarification that the proposed text amendment as it is propose will prohibit the flag pole from being located in any right of way.

Mr. Babowice stated that the proposal prohibits the flag pole taller than 25 feet from being located within the required yard.

Commissioner Cotey stated that the proposal limits the flag pole to be restricted from the required yards, at the proposed height, but the setback is still not clearly defined.

Mr. Babowice stated that they can further define the flag pole location and revise to include setbacks, to be out of the side yards and to be restricted to in front of buildings only. He stated that they have attempted to draft the language of the text amendment that would work for the Village and allow the flying of the flag. He stated that they are amenable to allow further tweaking of the text language with the assistance of the Village Attorney David Pardys.

Mr. David Pardys, Village Attorney, stated that as the code currently reads regarding the regulation of flags would be considered content neutral because it simply limits the height of flag poles. He stated that the right of the municipality to regulate on a content neutral basis is well supported by the law. He stated that the current code restricts the height to 25 feet. He stated that the proposed amendment is also content neutral keeping in mind its talking about flag poles of any kind regardless of what might be flown on top of it. He stated that if the height is changed to 80 feet, it is not limited to flying the American flag, it can be any kind of flag.

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 13 of 24**

Commissioner Cotey stated that the petitioner's proposed text amendment does limit it to other political, civic, religious or philanthropic entities.

Mr. Babowice stated that the proposed amendment is limited to the American flag and certain other entities. He stated that for example if they flew the American flag and below it the Village of Libertyville flag, they could do that. He stated that if they wanted to fly the flag of the State of Illinois, they could, but they could not fly any type of commercial flag.

Mr. Pardys stated that he is comfortable with that, in the sense that it allows flags of other political entities to be included.

Commissioner Cotey asked what the meaning of 'political entities'.

Mr. Babowice stated that political entities would include the State of Illinois, Village of Libertyville, County of Lake, things along those lines.

Commissioner Cotey asked if they could fly the Tea Party flag because that is a political entity.

Mr. Babowice stated that is not the intent of the proposal.

Commissioner Cotey stated that it may not be the petitioner's intent but someone else reading the proposed text change, could have the intent.

Mr. Babowice stated that they could tweak the text language to meet the intent of the proposal. He stated that it is not the intent to fly the insignia of some other advertisement.

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that he would support the amendment if it were to fly the U.S. flag and only the U.S. flag.

Commissioner Schultz stated that it seems way too big. He stated that he visited the site he felt that it would look too tall. He stated that there are better and more respectful ways of displaying the American flag. He stated that when he sees these huge flags, they seem too much 'in your face' and obnoxious. He stated that to use the other cell phone towers behind the property as a reason to put up a flag at that height isn't justification. He stated that it could potentially become visual pollution. He stated that everyone flies the American flag and he flies it himself but cost of flying a flag at the height and size proposed comes into question. He stated that everyone coming a mile up the road will be able to see it. He stated that it may be the petitioner's intent to fly the flag so that it can be seen from a substantial distance but it seems to be way over done. He stated that if was forty (40) feet in height, he might be in support of that. He stated that the flag on top of the Harris Bank works because it fits within a sense of scale but when there is a one story building behind an 80 foot flag pole flying a 600 square foot flag does not seem to work. He stated that it will be loud and is concerned about noise that it would generate. He stated that it is good that there would be an internal halyard to reduce the clanking sound. He stated that he would like to see a noise study before the

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 14 of 24**

Plan Commission even considers the text amendment. He asked how close to residential properties the petitioner's property is.

Mr. Spoden stated that the petitioner's property is adjacent to multiple residential.

Commissioner Schultz stated that he is in support of the petitioner flying the flag but the proposed text amendment is too high.

Commissioner Robinson stated that he agrees with everything that Commissioner Schultz stated. He stated that there is a lot of distance between 25 feet and 80 feet in height. He stated that a 600 square foot flag size is like what you would see at a truck stop and not patriotism. He stated that a flag pole and flag of the proposed size is not what should be seen in an area like this. He stated that a flag pole and flag of the proposed size draws attention to oneself and is too tall. He stated that the existing towers in the area are static with nothing waving on those.

Commissioner Robinson stated that the proposed text language is unclear if the maximum number of flags on a flag pole is limited to one (1) or not.

Mr. Pardys stated that the proposed ordinance does not regulate the number of flags on the flag pole. He stated that although distinguishing between commercial and non-commercial speech may be a better distinction to make, the way the proposed text amendment is written, it would allow the U.S. flag, civic, philanthropic, religious groups and other similar entities to fly their flag on the flag pole, it should be neutral as to what can be flown on the flag pole.

Commissioner Robinson stated that he is asking for clarification as to the number of flags on the pole is permitted. He stated that the proposed text amendment is not well written in that aspect.

Chairman Moore stated that one might be able to clarify the issue of limiting the number of flags on a single flag pole. He asked the Village Attorney if the text can be written to allow only the American flag or should it be content neutral.

Mr. Pardys stated that if the Village limits as to what can be displayed then it may be deemed as regulating speech which he would be concerned about. He stated that the same concern would not be there if the regulation is about the flag pole height which is content neutral.

Commissioner Robinson stated that he is not concerned about content just the number of flags on a single pole.

Mr. Pardys stated that the Schaumburg case did express whether or not there was a burden on the numbers of flags in terms of free speech.

Mr. Babowice stated the problem in Libertyville with regards to flag poles in required yards, it is content neutral. He stated that the problem is that there is no designation as to what can be flown when outside of the required yard. He stated that this is the reason for the propose text amendment

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 15 of 24**

language. He stated that the informal interpretation up to this point is to limit flag poles to a height that does not exceed the maximum permitted height for a structure in that district when not in the required yard. He stated that they are trying to create a content neutral designation for flags in the area that is not within the required yard.

Mr. Pardys stated that currently the code is silent at defining a flag pole. He stated that the current restriction is on the height of flag poles in required yards. He stated that there are restrictions for accessory structures in any zoning district. He stated that principal structures are limited to 45 feet in height in the C-3 district and accessory structures are limited to 15 feet. He stated that the question then becomes is a flag pole an accessory structure or a principal structure. It is a structure because it is mounted permanently to the ground. He stated that it is up to the Plan Commission and Village Board as to whether or not it should be considered an accessory structure or not. He stated that the proposed amendment could be amended further to enhance the content neutrality.

Chairman Moore asked what Commissioner Robinson's comfort level is with the proposed amendment as written.

Commissioner Robinson stated that he would like to see additional language that would limit the number of flags on a single flag pole.

Chairman Moore asked the Village Attorney that when regarding the content neutrality, it is not just what is on the flag but how much is on the flag pole.

Mr. Pardys stated that there are cases that suggest that regulating the numbers of flags could be a burden on speech. He stated that if a restriction on the number of flags on a flag pole is supportable by law.

Chairman Moore stated that if the Village allows the flag pole then the Village cannot regulate what goes on the flag pole.

Mr. Pardys responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Robinson stated that he is opposed to an 80 foot tall flag pole and even more opposed because the Village cannot restrict the number of flags that can be placed on the flag pole.

Commissioner Oakley asked for clarification as to how the flag pole would be illuminated.

Commissioner Robinson asked if the flag would be flown all the time. Petitioner responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Laska stated that what is proposed is one 400 watt fixture pointing upward towards the flag. He stated that it is not a lot of light and that doesn't take a lot of light once the light hits the flag itself.

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 16 of 24**

Commissioner Cotey stated that someone could fly a Packer flag on the flag pole. He stated that if someone flies an obnoxious flag of some sort, he is concerned about the public safety if it is startling to see in heavy traffic.

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that if it cannot be limited to the American flag on the pole only because of the content issue then he cannot support the proposal.

Commissioner Schultz stated that if it cannot be limited to the American flag he agrees with Commissioner Guarnaccio. He stated that he understands that this limitation may impede freedom of speech.

Chairman Moore stated that the issue at hand is a flag pole.

Mr. Pardys stated that the current limitation is on flag poles. He stated that there is no limitation as to what can be run up a flag pole. He stated that the proposed amendment would put a limitation on what can be flown on the flag pole to avoid some of the concerns expressed by the Plan Commission but by doing that there may be a burden on freedom of speech.

Chairman Moore asked the petitioner if he currently has a flag pole on his property. Petitioner responded in the affirmative.

Chairman Moore asked the petitioner how he would like to proceed with his request.

Mr. Babowice stated that at the moment there appears to be some questions as to what the text should include and they want to make sure that they get the text right and that it is content neutral. He stated that he could work with Mr. Pardys relative to the content neutral text language relative to flying the American flag and other political subdivisions and would pass constitutional muster. He stated that the intent of Mr. Tranel is to fly the American flag and they understand that there is an application as to the area being the north end of Libertyville where the roads are busy. He stated he could work with Mr. Pardys on the text language to make certain that the text amendment remains content neutral.

Mr. Pardys stated that they could work on the text language but the proposal before the Plan Commission is regarding the height of the flag pole and that in itself is a content neutral regulation at the moment. He stated that the petitioner is requesting an amendment relative to height and other limitations. He stated that the question then becomes if those additional limitations create further problems.

Chairman Moore stated the petitioner is asking for a flag pole height between 25 and 80 feet with certain provisions. He stated that at least one of the Plan Commissioners would support the proposed text amendment if it were only the American flag. He asked the Plan Commission member if they want to give the petitioner any guidance as to whether they are comfortable with the flag pole at a height of 80 feet.

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 17 of 24**

Commissioner Cotey stated that he is concerned about the height.

Commissioner Oakley stated he supports the 80 feet height flag pole as long as it is limited to the American flag only.

Chairman Moore asked for clarification of the Staff report regarding its reference to what the current code permits for flag pole height.

Mr. Spoden stated that the code is silent on the flag pole height when not located in the required yard. He stated that the code limits the flag pole height to 25 feet when located in the required yard. He stated that Staff has interpreted the code to allow a flag pole to go up to 45 feet in the building envelop because of the height requirement of that district. He stated that if they treated the flag pole as an ancillary structure, the flag pole height would be limited to 15 feet. He stated that Staff does not believe that they have the authority to give a permit for an eighty (80) foot flag pole. He stated that the code limits properties to three flag poles.

Commissioner Cotey asked for the Zoning Code section that regulates the flag pole.

Mr. Spoden stated that the height limit is stated in the use limitations of each zoning district. He stated that there are allowances in each district for certain setbacks for certain uses.

Mr. Tranel stated that in his previous application back in 2006 they were looking for a 100 foot flag pole and at the time agreed to bring the height down to 80 feet. He stated that the tree height in Lake County is seventy (70) feet. He stated that if you are traveling south on Milwaukee Avenue you will not be able to see the flag until you are almost next to our property. He stated that when you are traveling north, you can see the top of it from the old KFC. He stated that they raised the truck boom in order to visualize the height and to demonstrate that it would not be obnoxiously high. He stated that it fits into the tree line and the area very well.

Chairman Moore stated that it is designed to be above the tree line.

Mr. Tranel stated that it is designed to be slightly above the tree line.

Chairman Moore stated that he would be more supportive with a 45 foot height recommendation because of continuity with the code and relationship to other structures.

Mr. Babowice stated that he would like for the request to go to a vote but remove item number two (2) from the roman number iii so the it reads, "Any use of a flagpole display for other than the United States flag."

Mr. Babowice stated that the initial paragraph beginning with, "Flagpoles installed in the ground and having a height greater than 25 feet to a maximum height of 80 feet, .." would remain. He stated that the second part beginning with, "Any use of a flagpole display for other than the United States flag." Would end with the United States flag.

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 18 of 24**

Mr. Pardys stated that it is up to the petitioner as to how they seek the amendment, however, the end of number two reading, "is prohibited" should remain.

Mr. Babowice stated that it would read that the use of the flag pole of this particular size for these particular lots in this particular district be limited to flying just the U.S. flag.

Chairman Moore asked for clarification of the changes being discussed to the proposed amendment.

Mr. Spoden stated that the clarification is for the property that borders IB or OS districts not when the district borders those IB or OS districts.

Chairman Moore stated that in response to Mr. Spoden's clarification, the word 'property' should be inserted between the words 'district' and 'borders'.

Mr. Babowice stated that the limitation of yard location should be applied to all required yards, not just front yards.

Mr. Spoden stated that there is no required interior side yard in the C-3 district.

Mr. Babowice stated that the text amendment then applies to required front, rear and corner side yards.

Chairman Moore stated that he will read the proposed text amendment with the changes discussed.

5-4.5 Bulk, Space, and Yard Regulations.

g. Specified Structures and Uses not in required Side Yards. The following structures and uses, except as limited below, may be located in the C-3 General Commercial District:

- 6) Flagpoles having a height of not more than twenty-five feet (25) feet; and
  - (ii) **Flagpoles installed in the ground and having a height greater than 25 feet to a maximum height of 80 feet, provided the flag pole is not located within a required yard in the C-3 general commercial district and further, provided the C-3 general commercial district property borders either an IB or OS zoning district; Any use of a flagpole display for other than the United States flag, is prohibited.**

Chairman Moore asked the petitioner if this is the text that they would like to put forward to a vote.

Mr. Babowice responded in the affirmative.

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 19 of 24**

*In the matter of PC 10-29, Commissioner Robinson moved, seconded by Commissioner Guarnaccio, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve a Zoning Code Text Amendment to Section 5, the C-3, General Commercial District, in order to allow the installation of flag poles as follows:*

5-4.5 Bulk, Space, and Yard Regulations.

- g. Specified Structures and Uses in required Yards. The following structures and uses, except as limited below, may be located in the C-3 General Commercial District:
- 6) Flagpoles having a height of not more than twenty-five feet (25) feet; and
- (ii) **Flagpoles installed in the ground and having a height greater than 25 feet to a maximum height of 80 feet, provided the flag pole is not located within a required yard in the C-3 general commercial district and further, provided the C-3 general commercial district property borders either an IB or OS zoning district; Any use of a flagpole display for other than the United States flag, is prohibited.**

*Motion failed 2 - 4.*

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

**PC 10-30 Life Storage Centers, Applicant**  
**700-998 East Park Avenue**

**Request is for an Adjustment to the Planned Development Final Plan in order to change approved land uses for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District.**

Mr. David Smith, Senior Planner, stated 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 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, 2009, with Village Board granting approval in January 2009. Mr. Smith stated that 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 over-all Planned Development request. Mr. Smith stated that Phase One 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-stripping. Mr. Smith stated that the eastern portion of the site (phase 2 and 3) was subject to a concept plan approval only showing future buildings for phase 2, roughly located in the center of the parcel and a larger single building for phase 3 on the eastern end of the site at a conceptual proposal.

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 20 of 24**

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 returned to the Plan Commission to seek 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 Village Board approved an amendment to the Special Use Permit for the Planned Development to allow for the inclusion of Veterinary Services and the Final Plan proposal to construct the Green Tree Animal Hospital in Phase 2 of the parcel. Mr. Smith stated that Phase 3 was a revised concept plan showing two future conceptual multi-tenant buildings with additional rehabbing of the existing north buildings to accommodate future industrial tenants. Mr. Smith stated that a Building Permit for construction of the **Green Tree Animal Hospital** as part of the Phase (2) Two was issued on September 14, 2010 and is currently under construction.

Mr. Smith stated that for the current petition before the Plan Commission by the petitioner is to assign additional land use categories that are not otherwise listed in either the Zoning Code permitted or special permitted uses Sections or by what is currently approved for this particular planned development. He stated that the petitioner is proposing to take the subject site into a new direction as to the types of land uses they are wanting to include in their park.

Mr. Smith stated that the property is zoned I-3 General Industrial District which permits certain industrial, manufacturing, fabrication, assembly type uses and related service operations such as construction contractor type services. Mr. Smith stated that many of the Special Permitted uses listed in the I-3 General Industrial District are more intense in terms of their activity with heavier manufacturing uses, motor freight transportation services, etc.

Mr. Scott Hezner, Hezner Corporation and agent for the petitioner, stated that they are seeking approval for uses that are more commercial friendly. He stated that the Plan Commission should have received the proposed list of uses that the petitioner is requesting approval to be included in the subject site's Planned Development. He stated that in the Staff report, the recommendation is to remove the list of industrial uses identified under letter K. He stated that they disagree with removing the proposed industrial uses under letter K as they are more akin to light processing or assembly type uses and not heavy industrial uses. He stated that the processing is more of a benign activity. He stated that the delivery and receiving activity of the light assembly or processing type uses can be coordinated on the campus as a whole and that the uses proposed under K should be kept on the list of proposed permitted and special permitted uses of the Park Avenue Corporate Center.

Mr. Hezner stated that he is requesting to add another use currently not on the proposed list of permitted uses. He stated that he would like to add a use that involves the rebuilding of specialty antique cars to letter (f) (4) under the permitted use list category. He stated that this propose use is for high end cars in a secured enclosed environment. He stated that consideration could be given to naming this land use as Specialty Car Care Restoration and Maintenance.

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 21 of 24**

Mr. Chris Barry, Life Storage Centers and petitioner, stated that they have an opportunity to give occupancy to a physical fitness type use tenant for building C and they are negotiating with Dance Center North to possibly occupy building B2. He stated that building A2 is being looked at by other interested parties. He stated that he is not looking for heavy industrial type users. He stated that they intend to plan a harmonious business park but they want the flexibility to include light assembly type uses. He stated that the Specialty Car Care tenant is for high end car restoration with no painting.

Commissioner Robinson asked for clarification about Staff's recommendation to remove the assembly type uses under letter K of the proposed list of uses.

Mr. John Spoden, Director of Community Development, stated that Staff saw the inclusion of the industrial uses as a conflict with the uses that the petitioner is beginning to attract.

Commissioner Schultz stated that he agrees with Staff to not allow the list of light assembly uses from the letter K category.

Commissioner Guarnaccio requested clarification regarding the potential on site truck traffic.

Mr. Hezner stated that building A has multiple truck dock doors, building B has one truck dock door, building A2 could be a series of uses that would be born out of the Life Storage Center activity.

Commissioner Guarnaccio requested clarification of the building sizes.

Mr. Hezner stated that building B2 is approximately 37,000 square feet in floor area, building B1 is approximately 25,000 square feet in floor area and building C is approximately 12,500 square feet in floor area.

Commissioner Guarnaccio stated that it could be a site design issue. He stated that it might be possible to isolate the parking areas for buildings B2 and B1. He stated that it might be possible to design curbed islands within the parking lot to separate uses but he cannot make a determination about tonight's land use change request without seeing a site plan.

Mr. Hezner stated that it is the petitioner's intent to secure the land use changes before committing to a new site plan layout. He stated that the new direction that the petitioner is going is to mix commercial uses with light industrial uses.

Commissioner Cotey stated that he is ok with the proposed land use changes as presented.

Commissioner Oakley stated that he is ok with the proposed land use changes as presented. He stated that he is concerned about removing the industrial uses as they could serve as business incubator facilities.

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 22 of 24**

Chairman Moore stated that the site's Planned Development as previously presented has changed. He stated that the petitioner is coming back multiple times to amend the Planned Development. He stated that this Planned Development is and has been evolving without cohesiveness.

Mr. Hezner stated that there is cohesiveness and that the purpose of the Planned Development is to allow the flexibility of uses.

Chairman Moore stated that the site is now changing to a condition in which there will be parents dropping off kids, there will be a physical fitness facility, public storage is on the site now and will mix with highly consumer oriented types of uses. He stated that there does not appear to be consistency.

Mr. Hezner stated that there is a logic to the intended success for the site. He stated there will be benefits to the businesses and a natural draw to the this center because of the mix.

Mr. Barry stated that it is impossible to go all commercial. He stated that he does not want heavy truck traffic on the site. He stated that they will try to separate out the back buildings from the site to alleviate the concerns of the conflict of the uses. He stated that they need the flexibility in the uses. He stated that his tenant will go to another town without a positive vote from the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Cotey asked what the Village's Comprehensive Plan show the subject parcel should be.

Mr. Spoden stated that the Comp Plan indicates that the subject site should be heavy industrial.

Commissioner Cotey stated that he sympathizes with the petitioner that there is a consumer oriented market driven force happening.

Mr. Barry stated that he has no intention to allow heavy industrial uses on the site.

Commissioner Guarnaccio asked if the assembly/processing uses under letter K be listed as Special Permitted Uses.

Mr. Barry stated that the Special Use Permit process is too lengthy. He asked if he could just weed out some of the uses on the list but keep the majority of them under letter K.

Mr. Spoden stated that to exclude some but keep other assembly uses under K becomes problematic for the Village to administer.

Chairman Moore stated that it becomes problematic when the Planned Development is evolving away from the original intent.

Mr. Spoden stated that the issue of concern is the mix of uses for the site. He stated that the Life Storage Center facility is a conducive land use that could be compatible with commercial uses or it

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 23 of 24**

could be compatible with industrial uses however the proposed mix of industrial uses with commercial uses would not work. He stated that Staff has advised the petitioner that with the Life Storage facility, they need to choose one direction or the other but to not mix commercial with industrial uses on the site.

Mr. Barry stated that consideration could be given to putting retail towards the front of the site and then make observations about the traffic patterns. He stated that he is surprised to find out now that mixing the assembly type uses would be problematic.

Mr. Spoden stated that he has made it quite clear that the petitioner will need to choose one direction over the other in previous meeting with the petitioner.

Mr. Hezner stated that the predominate use on the site will become commercial. He stated that he would like to add the Specialty Car Care use as a permitted use for this Planned Development. He stated that the assembly uses could be re-categorized as Special Permitted Uses and they will add the Veterinary Service use to the list per Staff's recommendation because the Green Tree Animal Hospital as previously approved.

Mr. Barry asked how long it does the Special Use Permit approval process take.

Mr. Spoden stated that the S.U.P. process takes a minimum of 90 days.

Commissioner Guarnaccio asked if the petitioner must apply for the permit prior to granting occupancy.

Mr. Spoden answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Hezner stated that he would like rescind his request to have the Specialty Car Care service considered. He stated that he would like to work with Staff to have this use clarified further. He requested a recommendation from the Plan Commission.

*In the matter of PC 10-30, Commissioner Robinson moved, seconded by Commissioner Guarnaccio, to recommend the Village Board of Trustees approve an Adjustment to the Planned Development Final Plan in order to change approved land uses for property located in an I-3, General Industrial District as follows:*

That the proposed '**Text Amendment to Existing Planned Development**' exhibit list of permitted and special permitted uses be approved except that the following land uses be added:

- All of the uses listed under Permitted Uses (k) Processing, Assembly and Alterations with certain limitations be added as a Special Permitted Use.

Furthermore that the following land use be added:

**Minutes of the September 27, 2010, Plan Commission Meeting**  
**Page 24 of 24**

- Veterinary Service as a Special Permitted Use.

*Motion carried 5 - 1.*

*Ayes: Cotey, Guarnaccio, Oakley, Robinson, Schultz*

*Nays: Moore*

*Absent: Adams*

**COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCUSSION:**

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

Motion carried 6 - 0.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m.