

**VILLAGE OF LAKE BLUFF
JOINT PLAN COMMISSION & ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING**

JULY 20, 2016

APPROVED MINUTES

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Kraus called to order the regular meeting of the Joint Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals (PCZBA) of the Village of Lake Bluff on Wednesday, July 20, 2016, at 7:00 p.m. in the Village Hall Board Room (40 E. Center Avenue).

The following members were present:

Members: Leslie Bishop
 David Burns
 Mary Collins
 Elliot Miller
 Gary Peters
 Steven Kraus, Chair

Absent: Sam Badger

Also Present: Village Attorney Benjamin Schuster
 Drew Irvin, Village Administrator
 Jeff Hansen, Village Engineer
 Brandon Stanick, Assistant to the Village Administrator (A to VA)

2. Non-Agenda Items and Visitors

Chair Kraus stated the PCZBA allocates 15 minutes for those individuals who would like the opportunity to address the PCZBA on any matter not listed on the agenda.

There were no requests to address the PCZBA.

3. Approval of the June 8, 2016 PCZBA Special Meeting Minutes

Member Collins moved to approve the June 8, 2016 PCZBA Special Meeting Minutes as presented. Member Burns seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

3. Approval of the June 15, 2016 PCZBA Regular Meeting Minutes

Member Bishop moved to approve the June 15, 2016 PCZBA Regular Meeting Minutes with corrections to typographical errors. Member Burns seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

4. Continuation of a Public Hearing to Consider the Following: i) a Special Use Permit for a Planned Mixed-Use Development to Permit the Construction and Maintenance of a 16 Unit Multi-Family Structure and Related Improvements (Development) at 120 E. Scranton Avenue (former PNC Bank Property); and ii) Any Other Zoning Relief as Required to Construct and Maintain the Development at the Property

Chair Kraus introduced the agenda item and noted this evening The Roanoke Group will provide updated information in relation to the previous presentation. The PCZBA will take additional

testimony, but will not vote on a recommendation to the Village Board regarding the proposed development. Additionally, the PCZBA will discuss the specific regulations proposed as part of the PMD ordinance.

Chair Kraus then commented on the content of an email that was sent before the meeting that he felt was offensive and encouraged all to tone down the rhetoric being used concerning this proposed development.

A to VA Brandon Stanick provided a brief update regarding the petition to redevelop 120 E Scranton Avenue (Block Three of the Central Business District) with a 16-unit multi-family building submitted by The Roanoke Group (Development). The petition also includes a text amendment to create planned mixed-use development regulations (Text Amendment). At its meeting on June 15, 2016 the PCZBA commenced with the public hearing to consider the proposed draft PMD ordinance and the proposed Conceptual Development Plan. This included a presentation from the Developer, comments from the public and a discussion among the Members of the PCZBA. At tonight's meeting the PCZBA will: i) receive a presentation from the Petitioner, take additional testimony, but will not vote on a recommendation to the Village Board regarding the proposed Development; and ii) take additional testimony and anticipates voting on a recommendation to the Village Board regarding the proposed Text Amendment.

Chair Kraus administered the oath to those in attendance and opened the public hearing.

Mr. Peter Kyte, representative of The Roanoke Group, presented a picture of the current conditions of the site and expressed his belief the proposal for the redevelopment of Block Three submitted previously by Uppercross Development did not fit in with Lake Bluff. Mr. Kyte showed several pictures of the proposal by The Roanoke Group in comparison with what the Zoning Code would allow as of right. He stated they are currently addressing the feedback received from the PCZBA from last meeting and will present revisions at the next meeting.

Chair Kraus opened the floor for comments from the Commissioners.

Member Collins expressed her concern the setbacks used with the example shown by the Petitioner may be incorrect. A discussion followed and A to VA Stanick advised the existing zoning for the property that was presented by the Petitioner will be reevaluated by Staff and Legal Counsel.

Mr. Kyte stated a more formal presentation will be presented at the August 2016 meeting.

As there were no further comments from the PCZBA, Chair Kraus opened the floor for public comment.

Mr. Charles Potter (resident) commented on housing trends in the surrounding area and noted Lake Bluff has a great mix of housing product with the exception of condominiums. He stated the proposal has beautiful architectural features that will blend in well with the community. He asked everyone to provide positive constructive feedback for redevelopment of the property because a commercial building at this location could negatively impact the community.

Mr. Peter McGuire (resident) expressed his opinion that the Village is asking the developer to build this proposal and the Village hasn't provided sufficient information for the property to be redeveloped. He inquired of the desire for higher density and stated the existing condominiums do not fit in the community. He stated this is a bedroom community and there should be three homes built on the property.

Chair Kraus stated the Village has not asked any developer to present a proposal to redevelop Block Three. The proposal to redevelop the block is made by the developer. He stated the revised Comprehensive Plan Downtown Future Land Use Plan classifies Block Three as multi-family and the north side of Block Two as multi-family.

Ms. Jean Niemi (resident) stated she lives behind the bank parking lot and expressed her confusion with the zoning process because the proposal is for a three-story building that doesn't transition well to the residential neighborhood. Ms. Niemi stated the proposed development does not accommodate transitional housing. She suggested the PCZBA wait until after August to vote because many residents are on vacation in August. She expressed her support for maintaining the green space on the east side of the property. She also inquired how a development of this side would affect the real estate market.

Ms. Kathryn Briand (resident) expressed her concern with the housing units not being quickly absorbed in the market. She also inquired what happens if the property fails and goes back to the lender. She asked if this was the right development for the Village and expressed her opinion it does not fit the desire to downsize or address a transitional housing need in the Village.

Ms. Karen Royer (resident) expressed her concern with the price points of the units noting that residents from this community won't be able to move into the development.

Ms. Julie Capp (resident) stated she has chosen to stay in the community because she loves the character of Lake Bluff. She stated she does not support the proposed development because it is inconsistent with the character of Lake Bluff. She asked if the developer could revise the proposal to meet the desired housing needs and not compromise the character of downtown.

Mr. Porter Vargas (resident) stated he conducted an analysis of single-family home sales over the last eight years in the price range of \$925,000 to \$1.2 million in Lake Bluff. There have been approximately nine homes sold in that price range since 2008 and there are currently 21 listed in the real estate market. He stated the additional 16 units will take approximately 21 months to sell and will add significant inventory to the Village.

Member Collins inquired how the developer concluded this was the right development for Block Three. Mr. Kyte explained the concept for the proposed development and why it would be a good fit with the existing area.

Member Collins asked why it has to be three stories. Mr. Kyte stated for us to make this work there needs to be 16 units with two parking spaces for each unit; parking for the property is driving the design. Mr. Kyte stated the owner went through a process with other potential developers and The Roanoke Group was selected. He stated it is expensive to construct a quality building and stated that without high density you cannot offer affordable pricing. Mr. Kyte

responded to comments regarding the Stonebridge Development and showed pictures of some of the improvements on the property.

Ms. Niemi (resident) stated she is more confused than before and inquired why Member Collins' questions weren't being addressed. She asked the PCZBA not to vote on the matter in August as this is a slippery slope and makes the process appear shady.

Mr. Kyte stated the architectural features will be softened but there will be no dramatic changes to the proposed development which will be presented at the August meeting.

Member Peters inquired about the width of the northern driveway. Mr. Kyte stated the rear alley is 20 ft. from curb to curb and noted it does exceed the 18 ft. minimum rear yard setback requirement. In response to a question from Member Peters, Mr. Kyte presented a graphic showing an example of a building that can be built currently on the CBD side of the property. He expressed his opinion the proposed development would be less intrusive as opposed to a 30 ft. commercial building.

A discussion regarding Downtown Design Guidelines ensued.

Member Burns moved to continue the public hearing regarding a special use permit or a planned mixed-use development at 120 E. Scranton Avenue to the August 17th PCZBA meeting. Member Miller seconded the motion. The passed on a unanimous voice vote.

5. Continuation of a Public Hearing to Consider a Text Amendment to the Village's Zoning Regulations Establishing Regulations for Planned Mixed-Use, Developments as a Special Use in the B Residence District (R-4), C Residence District (R-5) and Central Business District (CBD) (Text Amendment)

Chair Kraus introduced the agenda item and requested an update from Staff.

A to VA Stanick reported a draft text amendment to the Zoning Code establishing PMDs as a special use in the R-4, R-5 and CBD Zoning Districts was included in the PCZBA's packet for its discussion this evening.

Village Attorney Benjamin Schuster stated the PMD Ordinance creates a procedure and process for which someone can propose a PMD and pursuant to the process they would come before the Village Advisory Boards for approval. The purpose of the proposed PMD would provide flexibility to the Village Board and PCZBA to evaluate projects and have certain control over the development that may not take place under the current as of right regulations. Village Attorney Schuster reviewed the standards and conditions described in the proposed PMD Ordinance.

At the request of Member Collins, Village Attorney Schuster explained what happens to the existing zoning classification. He stated the underlying zoning will remain in the event a petitioner selected the PMD process. A petitioner may also chose not to undergo the PMD process and undergo review using the standards for review allowed by the existing zoning classification.

Chair Kraus stated the triggering of this PMD Ordinance for a mixed-use development would be at the request of a developer and/or property owner and will apply to all portions of Blocks Two

and Three. He asked if there were any other areas within the Village that this could apply. Village Attorney Schuster stated the application would be pursuant to an amendment to the zoning use table and the applicant would have to be in the CBD, R-4 District on lots adjacent to the CBD, which is the eastern portion of Block Three.

A discussion regarding where a PMD can be used ensued.

Member Miller asked about the advantage of a PMD. Village Attorney Schuster stated it allows a developer to construct something pursuant to an approved plan that could not be done as of right. He stated the PMD gives the Village control to review individual projects to ensure it is the most appropriate use of Village resources.

Village Attorney Schuster reviewed the PMD review process noting PMD petitions are considered by the PCZBA during a public hearing, after which time the PCZBA will make a recommendation to the Village Board. A discussion ensued.

Member Collins expressed interest in applicants conducting a preliminary review with the PCZBA. Village Attorney Schuster stated the preliminary review could occur before the development conceptual plan and noted the preliminary workshop could be extended to all petitioners. Chair Kraus asked that at the ordinance allow, at the petitioner's discretion, a preliminary workshop meeting prior to the formal public hearing process.

The PCZBA discussed the draft PMD Ordinance further and reached consensus to: i) require that PMD developments must go through the review process if construction does not occur within one year of approval; ii) remove the provision allowing the simultaneous review of Conceptual and Final Plans, and iii) remove the provision that provides the ABR the opportunity to review the proposed PMD independently of the PCZBA.

Member Peters expressed his preference to formally address height limitations in the PMD ordinance. A discussion followed.

Following the conclusion of the PCZBA's discussion, Chair Kraus opened the floor for public comments regarding the Text Amendment.

Mr. Rick Lesser (resident) expressed his agreement with keeping the discussion civil. There is confusion because the text amendment and proposal are being considered simultaneously. Mr. Lesser stated the Letter of Credit (LOC) is a key safeguard in the process but the Village's history with a LOC has been insecure. Mr. Lesser commented on the Stonebridge LOC and noted an LOC used for security is only as good as the Village's willingness to enforce it. Mr. Lesser stated a nine page memorandum was submitted to the Village showing the differences between the Village's existing PCD Ordinance and the proposed PMD Ordinance. He asked the PCZBA not to approve the proposed PMD. He expressed his preference to have the Village Board approve an ordinance before the PCZBA applies the standards to any development.

Comments regarding the status of the Stonebridge LOC ensued.

Mr. Mark Stolzenburg (resident) showed a redline version of the proposed PMD Ordinance showing how it differs from the existing PCD regulations. Mr. Stolzenburg stated he has identified and outlined the differences between the two regulations.

Chair Kraus stated this is the memorandum to which he referred earlier and stated there will be a response to this prepared by the Village Attorney.

Following a discussion, Village Attorney Schuster stated the memorandum will be transmitted as part of the record to the Village Board.

Mr. Stolzenburg reviewed the differences between the existing PCD regulations and the proposed PMD regulations.

Ms. Briand expressed her concern regarding the removal of language from the proposed PMD Ordinance regarding impact to surrounding property. She stated while there is some subjectivity if a development would impact neighboring properties it is not impossible to conclude. Ms. Briand stated residents are asking for transparency in this process and asked the PCZBA to consider the residents' recommendations and slow down the process.

Mr. Tom Zarse (resident) expressed his concern regarding the animosity displayed this evening. He inquired if the proposed regulations could provide some kind of remedy or a right to those property owners that are most affected by the proposed development. Village Attorney Schuster stated Illinois State law requires processes that afford neighbors and other residents to opportunity to be heard without giving them a direct veto to any type of proposal. Mr. Zarse stated removal of certain provision of the PMD Ordinance lessens the mechanisms in place to protect surrounding neighbors.

Village Administrator Drew Irvin responded to a comment regarding transparency and reviewed the application process and how the draft PMD Ordinance was drafted.

In response to a question from Member Miller, Village Attorney Schuster stated there was communication between the Village Attorney and the attorney for the Petitioner throughout the process to provide comments on the proposed PMD Ordinance. He stated there was never any communication with the developer to rig the PMD Ordinance in favor of the developer, but to improve provisions by giving the Village more protection.

In response to a request from Member Bishop, Village Attorney Schuster read the provision (paragraph 16) which was removed from the PCD Ordinance. Chair Kraus read the standard provision in the PMD Ordinance which relates to the removed paragraph.

Chair Kraus reviewed the decisions before the PCZBA, and following a brief discussion, Member Bishop moved to continue the public hearing to consider a text amendment to the Zoning Code establishing regulations for planned mixed-use developments as a special use in the B Residence District (R-4), C Residence District (R-5) and Central Business District (CBD). Member Miller seconded the motion.

6. A Public Hearing to Consider: i) a Variation From the R-3 Residence District Minimum Front Yard Setback Regulations of Section 10-5-3 of the Zoning Code; ii) a Variation From the Required Front Yard Setback Impervious Surface Limitation Regulations of Section 10-5-7 of the Zoning Code; and iii) Any Other Zoning Relief as Required to Construct an Attached Garage by Enclosing the Existing Car Port Located at 225 W. Center Avenue

Chair Kraus introduced the agenda item and then requested an update from Staff.

A to VA Stanick reported on July 8, 2016 the Village received a zoning application from SB-WRA, LLC (Petitioner), property owner of 225 W. Center Avenue (Property), to convert an existing open walled carport on the west side of the residence into a fully enclosed two car garage (Project). The support posts of the existing carport are located 18.5 feet off of the westerly lot line. The minimum required front yard setback for a residence in the R-3 Zoning District in which the subject property is 30 feet. Therefore the westerly limits of the carport are located 11.5 feet into the required front yard setback and is considered to be an existing legal nonconforming condition. As such a front yard setback zoning variation is required because the conversion of the open carport to a fully enclosed garage is considered to increase the degree of the existing non-conformity. A front yard setback variation of 38.30% will be required.

Chair Kraus administered the oath to those in attendance and opened the public hearing.

Mr. Dave Block, Architect for the project, stated the request is to convert the existing open walled carport without enlarging the space and noted the two existing trees will remain.

As there were no comments from the PCZBA, Chair Kraus closed the public hearing.

Member Miller moved to recommend the Village Board approve a 38.30% variation from the R-3 Residence District minimum front yard setback regulations of Section 10-5-3 of the Zoning Code to allow a garage to encroach 11.5 ft. into the front yard. Member Burns seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: (6) Collins, Miller, Peters, Bishop, Burns and Chair Kraus
Nays: (0)
Absent: (1) Badger

7. A Public Hearing to Consider the Following Zoning Relief From the Following D Residence District (R-6) Regulations; i) Maximum Floor Area Regulations of Section 10-5I-6 of the Zoning Code; ii) Maximum Impervious Surface Coverage Regulations of Section 10-5I-7 of the Zoning Code; iii) Maximum Building Coverage Regulations of Section 10-5I-8 of the Zoning Code; and iv) any Other Zoning Relief as Required to Build a One-Story Addition on the Rear of the House at 29721 N. Environ Circle

Chair Kraus introduced the agenda item and then requested an update from Staff.

A to VA Stanick stated the lot is located in the R-6 Zoning District in the Sanctuary Subdivision which is the only area in the Village with the R-6 classification. The petitioner, submitted by Rick and Vicki Santos (Petitioner) requests zoning relief from the maximum floor area coverage and the maximum building coverage regulations in the R-6 Zoning District to construct a one-story addition to the rear of the house to serve as a first-floor bedroom (Project). The Project is 145 sq.

ft. in size and located in the southwest corner of the Property. He noted the R-6 District is intended to apply only to the lots in the Sanctuary Subdivision.

A to VA Stanick stated the maximum gross floor area permitted on the Property is 2,504.80 sq. ft. (0.4 x 6,412) and the existing floor area is 3,479.40 sq. ft. (gross floor area at time of construction in 1994). Pursuant to Section 10-5I-6, any lot existing as of December 11, 2000 that exceeds the maximum floor area required shall not be deemed non-conforming and the maximum floor area for any such lot shall be the floor area of the lot as of December 11, 2000. The Project is 145 sq. ft., but will create a total of 174 sq. ft. of adjusted gross floor area. The adjustment is because of the requirement that any space (from floor to ceiling) more than 10 ft. in height is increased by 10% for each foot (or fraction thereof) over 10 ft. Also, the existing deck does not count toward floor area because: i) it is located in the side or rear yard; ii) has a floor elevation of less than 30"; iii) has no railings; and iv) has an area (233 sq. ft.) of less than 3.5% of the total area of the lot. Additionally, the maximum building coverage permitted in the R-6 District is the same as that permitted in the R-4 Zoning District (typical east side lot) which is 1,923.60 sq. ft. The existing building coverage complies and is 1,854 sq. ft. The proposed addition will create an additional 145 sq. ft. of building coverage and exceed the maximum building coverage by 75.40 sq. ft.

A to VA Stanick stated the total floor area variation is 174 sq. ft. or 5.00% and total building coverage variation is 145 sq. ft. or 7.82%.

Mr. Lance Chelsey (Airoom Architects), representing the property owners, stated the proposed modification will be done in the future and includes extending the dining room in anticipation of converting a portion of the dining area into a first floor bedroom. All other bedrooms in the house are on the second floor and the ability to have a first floor bedroom in the future would allow the Petitioner to age in place and remain in the community.

Member Collins stated the petition is an example of a personal hardship and not a zoning hardship.

Mr. Santos stated the proposed addition does not extend beyond the back deck and will not impact existing open space on the property. He stated the neighbors adjacent his property have been informed and did not express a concern with the Project.

Member Bishop expressed her concern with the PCZBA allowing this because the plans do not show any walls for a bedroom. All that is provided are plans for an extension of the dining room. Member Bishop expressed concern for approving plans for the future without seeing the final plan.

Mr. Santos stated when the time comes to use the space as a bedroom he will put in some type of separation to allow egress and ingress.

Member Miller stated the proposal is for an extension to the dining room and not a bedroom because closet space is not being provided. He also inquire if there was a full bath on the first floor.

Ms. Santos stated there is space near the first floor bathroom that could be converted to a shower in the future.

In response to a question from Member Miller, Mr. Santos noted the neighbors on both sides of his house do not have an issue with the proposal.

Member Collins stated the PCZBA received a letter from a nearby neighbor expressing concern for the proposed Project. A copy of the letter was shared with Petitioner. Member Collins expressed her opinion allowing the Project would set a precedent for future projects.

Member Burns stated he does not see any particular physical characteristic of the property that necessitates building additional square footage.

Chair Kraus asked if the house could be modified without expanding the existing footprint.

A discussion followed.

Chair Kraus offered to continue the public hearing to allow the Petitioner time to work with Staff to explore other options.

Member Burns moved to continue the public hearing to the August 17, 2016 PCZBA Meeting. Member Collins seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

8. A Public Hearing to Consider: i) a Variation From the Maximum Height Regulations of Section 10-9-4 of the Zoning Code for Fences on Residential Properties; and ii) any Other Zoning Relief as Required to Replace an Existing Wall Located Around Portions of the Perimeter of the Property at 733 Ravine Avenue

A to VA Stanick stated the Petitioner has requested the PCZBA continue the public hearing to the August 17th meeting.

Member Bishop moved to continue the public hearing to the August 17, 2016 PCZBA Meeting. Member Collins seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

9. A Public Hearing to Consider: i) a Variation from the Maximum Gross Floor Area Regulations of Section 10-5-6 of the Zoning Code; and ii) a Variation from the Minimum Accessory Structure Side Yard and Rear Yard Setback Requirements of Section 10-5-9 of the Zoning Code; and iii) any Other Zoning Relief as Required to Construct a Detached Garage in the Rear Yard of the Property at 311 E. Center Avenue

Chair Kraus introduced the agenda item and then requested an update from Staff.

A to VA Stanick stated the Village received a zoning application from the property owner of 311 E. Center Avenue (Property), to build a 440 sq. ft. detached two car garage, at a height of 16'8", in the rear and side yards of the property (Project). The Project is located 2' from the easterly interior side yard lot line and 3' from the rear yard lot line. According to the Petitioner the proposed detached garage encroaches into the side and rear yard setbacks to provide for a much more navigable entry into both garage stalls.

A to VA Stanick stated pursuant to Section 10-5-9C of the Zoning Code the minimum accessory structure setback from the interior lot line and the rear lot line is 5'. The existing shed (133 sq. ft.) will be removed and a detached two car garage will be constructed in the southeast corner of the

Property. As proposed, the construction of the garage (440 sq. ft.) will encroach into the easterly interior side yard setback by 3' and encroach into the rear yard setback by 2'. The floor area of the garage will not count toward the total gross floor area if the requested zoning relief from the minimum accessory structure setback regulations is granted. By granting the requested zoning relief the garage would be classified as conforming.

A to VA Stanick stated pursuant to Section 10-5-6 the maximum gross floor area permitted on the Property is 2,483.20 sq. ft. (0.4 x 6,208) and the existing floor area is 2,982 sq. ft. The Property is classified as legal nonconforming as it was built prior to the adoption of the Zoning Code. The floor area on the Property is comprised of the two story principal structure, stoops, deck and steps, as well as the shed. The Petitioner proposes to demolish the existing deck and steps (463.50 sq. ft.), as well as the shed (133 sq. ft.). A to VA Stanick stated should the PCZBA vote to recommend granting the zoning relief from the minimum accessory structure setback regulations, Staff recommends the PCZBA also consider a condition requiring the Petitioner to remove the existing deck/steps in addition to the planned demolition of the shed. By requiring this condition the zoning relief from the maximum gross floor area regulations would not be required.

A discussion ensued regarding the existing tree on the easterly lot line, as well as the neighboring detached garage in the rear yard.

Member Peters inquired of the impact to any drainage on the site. Neal Gerdes, architect for the project, expressed his belief there will be no impact to drainage on the property.

Following a request from Mr. Gerdes to poll the PCZBA, the commissioner's expressed their desire that more thought be given to the application and contact made with the south and east neighbors regarding the project.

Member Bishop moved to continue the public hearing to the August 17, 2016 PCZBA Meeting. Member Collins seconded the motion. The motion passed on a unanimous voice vote.

10. A Public Hearing to Consider: i) a Special Use Permit to Allow the Operation of a Physical Fitness Facility (SIC 7991) at 960 North Shore Drive, Unit #6; and ii) any Other Zoning Relief as Required to Operate the Physical Fitness Facility

Chair Kraus introduced the agenda item and then requested an update from Staff.

A to VA Stanick stated the Village received a zoning application from Lyft Health and Fitness, LLC requesting a Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow the operation of a physical fitness facility at 960 North Shore Drive, Unit #6. He stated earlier this year a request from Vlad's Gym, Inc. for a SUP to operate a physical fitness facility at 910 Sherwood Drive, Unit #23. The Petitioner will operate a physical fitness facility in a multi-tenant building mainly comprised of office and service uses. According to the Petitioner, the physical fitness services are provided in small groups (10 to 15 people). Also, in addition to small group training, the Petitioner provides personal training, specialty training, sport specific training and youth athletic training. The Petitioner states as part of the submittal the 2,000 sq. ft. of space will be used for gym equipment and 3,300 sq. ft. for an indoor turf field. The remaining space will be used as a reception area, athlete lounge and offices.

A to VA Stanick stated it was unclear from the application materials when the fitness facility closes Monday through Friday and on Saturday. He stated required parking in the L-1 Zoning

District for production, assembly and office uses is 1 space per 600 sq. ft. of floor area (or 54 spaces) and there are 55 spaces available. Parking requirements related to the requested use are currently not available in the Zoning Code.

Member Burns asked if there are definitive guidelines on noise. A to VA Stanick stated noise is one of many standards identified in the code to regulate the performance of buildings.

In response to a question from Chair Kraus, Petitioner Andrea Brown stated the rear loading dock will not be used. The group classes start at 5:30 a.m. and additional classes are offered throughout the day. The personal training and open gym time will be conducted in between the classes. She stated the evening hours maybe extended due to the youth programs but anticipates the facility will close between 9:00 and 10:00 p.m.

In response to a question from Member Collins regarding parking, Mr. Ted Brown, Property Owners, stated there is sufficient parking spaces at the building.

Member Miller moved to recommend the Village Board approve a special use permit to allow the operation of a physical fitness facility at 960 North Shore Dr., Unit 6. Member Burns seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: (6) Miller, Peters, Bishop, Burns, Collins and Chair Kraus
Nays: (0)
Absent: (1) Badger

11. Commissioner's Report

Chair Kraus reported the next regular PCZBA meeting is scheduled for August 17, 2016.

Member Miller expressed his preference to continue the Planned Mixed-Use Development until the September 21, 2016 PCZBA Meeting. A discussion followed.

12. Staff's Report

A to VA Stanick had no report.

13. Adjournment

As there was no further business to come before the PCZBA, Member Miller moved to adjourn the meeting. Member Burns seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 12:04 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brandon Stanick
Assistant to the Village Administrator