

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

February 20, 2013

APPROVED MINUTES

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Chair Kaltsas called the regular meeting of the Joint Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals (PCZBA) of the Village of Lake Bluff to order on Wednesday, February 20, 2013, at 7:04 p.m. in the Village Hall Board Room (40 E. Center Avenue).

The following members were present:

Members: Sam Badger
Leslie Bishop
Mary Collins
Michael Goldsberry
Kurt Haller
Adam Moore
Gary Peters
Joan Kaltsas, Chair

Also Present: Drew Irvin, Village Administrator
Andrew Fiske, Village Attorney
Peter Friedman, Village Attorney
George Russell, Village Engineer
Gerald Nellessen, Building Codes Supervisor
Brandon J. Stanick, Assistant to the Village Administrator (A to VA)

2. Approval of the Minutes

Member Goldsberry moved to approve the minutes of the December 19, 2012 meeting with corrections to several typographical errors suggested by Chair Kaltsas. Member Bishop seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: (7) Badger, Bishop, Goldsberry, Haller, Moore, Peters and Chair Kaltsas
Nays: (0)
Absent: (0)
Abstain: (1) Collins

3. Non-Agenda Items and Visitors

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

There were no requests to address the Board.

Chair Kaltsas administered the oath to those in attendance.

4. A Public Hearing to Consider the following Proposed Changes to the Chevrolet Exchange Building Located at 1 Sherwood Terrace: (1) Approval of an Amendment to its existing Special Use Permit to Revise the Site Plan for the Property; (2) the Following Variations

from the Front Yard Setback Required by the Zoning Regulations; (i) a 10 ft., 11 in. Encroachment into the Front Yard to Allow for the Construction of an Attached Entryway Arch Design Element; (ii) a 6 ft., 1 in. Encroachment into the Front Yard to Allow for the Construction of a Façade Design Element at the Northeast Corner of the Existing Building; (iii) a 4 ft., 10 in. Encroachment into the Front Yard for the Entryway Lobby, and (iv) a 3 ft., 11 in. Encroachment into the Front Yard for the Northeast Corner of the Existing Building, and (3) Any Other Zoning Relief as Required

Chair Kaltsas introduced the item and noted when the petition leaves the PCZBA it will go to the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) for review of the proposed changes to the exterior of the building. Chair Kaltsas requested an update from Staff.

A to VA Stanick reported on February 1, 2013 the Village received a zoning application (final received on February 15th) from Sherwood Terrace, LLC. (Petitioner), located at 1 Sherwood Terrace. The Petitioner seeks to amend the existing SUP and variations from the Village’s front yard setback regulations for the construction of an attached entryway arch design element and related façade design improvements to fulfill the requirements of Chevrolet’s rebranding campaign.

Additionally, A to VA Stanick reported in September 2001 the Village approved Ordinance #2001-15, which granted three variations to allow for the establishment of a new automobile dealership (described above). The approved project included the extensive remodeling of the existing structure including an addition on the east elevation of the building. Although zoning relief was granted to allow for parking within 20 ft. of the easterly property line, no variations were requested for the improvements made to the east elevation of the building in terms of setback relief from the east property line running parallel to U.S. Rt. 41. When the current application was received a review of the plans reflecting the existing structure indicated two small corners of the eastern end of the existing structure extend into the required 100 ft. setback off of U.S. Rt. 41. These two areas of the building are shown in the detail on the lower half of Sheet “dd0.2, Existing Site Plan”. As noted on Sheet “dd0.2”, these two small portions extend 4 ft. and 4 ft., 10 in. respectively into the required setback. A review of the project files has been performed and no reference can be found which indicates that either Village Staff or the applicant identified the need for variations from the 100 ft. setback requirement for the structure. If the current proposed changes and requested variations for setback relief are granted it is recommended the setback relief for the previous changes made in 2002 also be approved to clarify and finalize this issue.

A to VA Stanick stated Village Staff has conducted the required zoning analysis and confirms the proposed plans, with the exception of the front yard setback, are in compliance with the Zoning Code.

Northeast corner of building -

L-1 District minimum front yard setback from U.S. Rt. 41:	100 ft.
Existing encroachment:	4 ft. 0 in. (4.00%)
Additional proposed encroachment:	2 ft., 1 in. (2.08%)
Total variation:	6 ft., 1 in. (6.08%)

Northeast corner of entryway and arch canopy-

L-1 District minimum front yard setback from U.S. Rt. 41:	100 ft.
Existing encroachment:	4 ft., 10 in. (4.83%)
Additional proposed encroachment:	7 ft., 11 in. (7.92%)
Total variation:	12 ft., 9 in. (12.75%)

The design of the entryway arch is attached to the front entrance using a canopy design. The height of the archway is 22 ft. and is less than the maximum allowed height of 25 ft.

A to VA Stanick stated following the PCZBA's consideration of the application, the next step for the Petitioner is to appear in front of the Architectural Board of Review for consideration of the proposed changes to the site plan and then onto the Village Board for final approval.

Mr. Jeff Brown, architect/engineer representing the Petitioner, stated this is Chevrolet's ongoing program to upgrade all of its facilities. The upgrades are part of the interior space remodeling and the final step is to remodel the showroom and façade to meet the new Chevrolet standards. He stated the archway element is part of the design standard along with changes to some of the exterior materials on the front to upgrade the image for the new branding campaign and the future vehicles.

Chair Kaltsas inquired if the branding came from Chevrolet. Mr. Brown stated the branding comes from Chevrolet and General Motors and noted that each dealer is required to complete the branding as part of the franchise agreement.

Mr. Brown addressed the following standards for variations:

Practical Difficult or Hardship -

The building, as situated, requires the addition of a showroom entrance branding element on the U.S. Rt. 41 side of the property in order to meet franchise requirements. It would be impractical to destroy the current existing improvements due to the necessity of the existing space requirements

Unique Physical Condition -

This property continues to be a separate property and not part of the adjacent industrial park subdivision with frontage along U.S. Rt. 41. The area continues to be appropriate for an automobile dealership use as the general vicinity has been approved for the same use on several properties, including the property subject to this application, within close proximity to its location.

Special Privilege -

To grant the requested variations to allow for these minor encroachments would be consistent with previous actions taken by the Village related to this parcel.

Code Purposes -

The request to allow these variations does not violate the intention of the regulation. The variations, if granted, would continue to be consistent with other commercial retail operations in the same zoning area.

Public Health and Safety -

The existing facility has not had an impact on the supply of air and light to adjacent areas in any greater manner than the previous use (warehouse and storage uses) and improvement which has existed in the location since 1969. The granting of these proposed variations does not alter or intensify the existing facility and/or its operations.

Mr. Brown then addressed the following standards for special use permits:

General Standard -

A use variation was established in September 2001 to allow the operation of the existing vehicle dealership and an amendment was granted in October 2011 to the original ordinance. The existing use continues to be similar to other uses in the immediate vicinity and the impact to surrounding properties has been minimal because most retail traffic enters and exits using U.S. Rt. 41.

No Interference with Surrounding Development -

The surrounding area is fully developed and the existing automobile dealership use continues to be consistent with the uses that operate in the area in terms of intensity of use and bulk. As noted before, interference to other surrounding development has not occurred since operations began in 2001 and it is believed that future operations will not hinder or interfere with any future infill development of the built-out industrial park.

Adequate Public Facilities -

Retail traffic has and will continue to enter and exit from U.S. Rt. 41 minimizing impact to Sherwood Terrace and other interior loop streets. A curb cut exists along Sherwood Terrace and continues to allow for emergency, maintenance and “wholesale” traffic to access the site. A gate dividing the property prohibits “cut through” traffic.

No Traffic Congestion -

The existing use of an automobile dealership does not cause undue traffic or traffic congestion as the owner has sought and continues to maintain a curb cut along U.S. Rt. 41 providing retail traffic access to the site. At the time of the past petition it was determined with the proper deceleration lanes, access would not negatively impact traffic flow on or off U.S. Rt. 41.

No Destruction of Significant Features -

The property at 1 Sherwood Terrace continues to not contain significant natural, scenic or historic features. The existing special use allowed on the property has not and will continue to not significantly alter the existing landscape as no new improvements to the site are being proposed at this time (with the exception of signage).

Chair Kaltsas requested comments from the audience and there were no comments from the public.

Chair Kaltsas requested comments from the PCZBA.

Member Badger asked if there were any existing violations. Building Codes Supervisor Gerald Nellesen stated the Community Development Department has no issues with the request.

Member Bishop expressed her concerns regarding paving and asked what percentage of the open part remains unpaved. Mr. Brown stated there intent is not to pave any additional space and the proposal is to have an arch built in front of the existing entryway.

Member Collins commented on the hardship story presented to the PCZBA at the previous meeting by the Petitioner. Member Collins stated the paving has not been done although the existing site plan shows the work has been completed and inquired of their intent to move

forward. Mr. Brown expressed his uncertainty regarding the landscape feature and expressed his belief the work may be completed during the spring.

A to VA Stanick stated it is Staff's understanding the petitioner will pursue the improvement within the time allowed. Member Collins recommended the petitioner come back to the PCZBA with the proposed landscape plans before proceeding with the construction. Member Collins stated the variation to the rear of the property was approved as a good faith promise conditioned on the petitioner promise to revise the plans to include additional landscaping.

A to VA Stanick stated the condition on that motion approved by the PCZBA had ultimately triggered a site plan review with the ABR. The ABR reviewed the landscape plan and submitted their recommendations to the Village Board. The plan was then approved by the Village Board.

Member Collins asked if the proposed landscape plans reflect the ABR recommendations. A to VA Stanick stated the plan presented tonight does not reflect the ABR recommendations.

Chair Kaltsas inquired of the time restraint for completion of work once the PCZBA has approved the request. A to VA Stanick stated the Petitioner has one year to complete the approved work.

Member Collins asked if the request could be approved with the condition the Petitioner come back to the PCZBA with revised landscape plans. A to VA Stanick stated the landscape plans have already gone through the approval process. Village Attorney Andrew Fiske advised any approval the PCZBA make on the application would be conditioned on all other responsibilities under the site plan of the current approval.

Member Goldsberry expressed his agreement with some of Member Collins' thoughts regarding the issue. He stated the reason the PCZBA is considering most of the changes are for corporate reasons and asked legal counsel if the PCZBA was within the special privilege guidelines. Village Attorney Fiske stated the determination as to whether the PCZBA satisfy the conditions for a special privilege is called a legislative decision and each member has discretion in terms of their evaluations of the proposal. In terms of the special privilege it is certainly appropriate to consider the purpose and use and noting a use has been granted for this property for the specific purpose of operating an automobile franchise. Lastly, Village Attorney Fiske expressed his opinion that it is relevant to evaluate the role of how that type of branding would impact the operation of a franchise.

Member Haller had no comments.

Member Moore asked if there were plans in the improvement process to screen the HVAC units located on top of the current structure. Mr. Brown stated those plans are not included in this proposal. Member Moore stated for the record there are some HVAC units on the roof of the structure which are visible from U.S. Rt. 41 and the Petitioner should consider additional screening.

Member Peters had no problems with the request in light of Chevrolet meeting the requirements of its franchise.

Chair Kaltsas expressed her agreement with Member Peters' comments.

Lastly, A to VA Stanick presented the PCZBA with a picture of the existing and approved landscape plan. Chair Kaltsas noted the approved plans will need to be completed within one year.

Chair Kaltsas recommended the item be considered in two parts, including consideration of the SUP and then consideration of the requested front yard setback variations.

Member Peters moved to recommend the Village Board approve the amended special use permit. Member Badger seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: (8) Badger, Bishop, Collins, Goldsberry, Haller, Moore, Peters and Chair Kaltsas
Nays: (0)
Absent: (0)

Member Haller moved to recommend Village Board approval of a 6.08% variation (6 ft., 1 in.) from the minimum front yard setback for the northeast corner of the building and a variation of 12.75% (12 ft., 9 in.) for the northeast corner of the entryway and arch canopy. Member Goldsberry seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: (8) Badger, Bishop, Collins, Goldsberry, Haller, Moore, Peters and Chair Kaltsas
Nays: (0)
Absent: (0)

5. **A Preliminary Review of a Petition Filed by Target Stores, Inc. and McVickers Development, LLC. to Establish a Process and Related Zoning Regulations for the Consideration of Planned Commercial Developments Located Within the Village of Lake Bluff and the Establishment of a Planned Commercial Development for the Former Shepard Chevrolet Property Located at 930 Carriage Park Avenue**

Chair Kaltsas introduced the agenda item and stated the item is a preliminary review of a petition and not a public hearing. Chair Kaltsas then recused herself and identified her conflict of interest with the petition and took a seat in the audience.

Vice Chair Haller assumed the role as PCZBA Chair for this item. He reiterated the item is a preliminary review of a petition and not a public hearing. A formal public hearing will be scheduled during an upcoming PCZBA meeting. The purpose of this item tonight is for the PCZBA to:

- Review and discuss proposed regulations regarding PCDs within the Village; and
- Receive a presentation regarding the preliminary review of the Development Concept Plan submitted by Target Stores, Inc. and McVickers Development, LLC (Petitioner).

Vice Chair Haller stated the process for this evening is as follows:

- Staff will provide an update regarding the petition;
- The PCZBA will first review and discuss the proposed text amendment to establish PCD regulations as outlined in the memorandums from Staff and Legal Counsel;
- The Petitioner will then present information regarding the Development Concept Plan for a Target store and outlot buildings;
- Time will be provided for comment on the proposal; and

- Following public comment the PCZBA will review, discuss and question the Petitioner as appropriate regarding the Concept Plan.

Vice Chair Haller requested an update from Staff.

A to VA Stanick stated the Petitioners are seeking approval to develop a new PCD process and a new PCD for the former Shepard Chevrolet property located at 930 Carriage Park Avenue (SW corner of IL Rt. 176 and U.S. Rt. 41). The development is anticipated to consist of a new Target retail store, three outparcels for commercial uses and associated site infrastructure, i.e. landscaping, drives, parking facilities, stormwater management facilities and the extension of Shagbark Lane from IL Rt. 176 to Carriage Park Avenue and other site plan elements.

A to VA Stanick stated during late 2012 the Village heard from Oxford Development that they were seeking a large format retailer to anchor their planned redevelopment of the former Shepard Chevrolet site located at 930 Carriage Park Avenue. At its meeting on December 19, 2012, Village Administrator Drew Irvin presented an informational update to the PCZBA regarding the Sub Committee's progress on revising the L-2 Zoning District regulations, as well as a new tool to better facilitate the redevelopment of commercial properties, known as PCD. PCD's are a form of planned unit development which is a type of zoning approval designed to allow more flexibility to address specified land use objectives than standard zoning regulations would provide. A comprehensive description of PCDs is provided in a memorandum dated February 15, 2012 from Holland + Knight. As detailed on page 6 of the H+K Memorandum a two-part procedure that would take place during a public hearing is identified and encompasses: (i) a Development Concept Plan process and (ii) a Final Development Plan Process.

A to VA Stanick stated on January 16, 2013 Target Stores, Inc. (in conjunction with Oxford Development) conducted design charette workshops with the ABR and the PCZBA to solicit feedback regarding a proposed PCD; this included a review of preliminary building elevations and site plan. On January 30th the Village received a zoning application from the Petitioners for the redevelopment of the Shepard property and to amend the text of the Zoning Code establishing PCD rules and regulations. Lastly, he stated on January 31st Village Staff provided comments to the Petitioners regarding the preliminary application. The Petitioners revised the preliminary zoning application to address certain elements of Staff's review and resubmitted on February 8th.

A to VA Stanick stated the Petitioners has submitted a preliminary survey of the property reflecting the existing conditions of the property. A legal description has also been made available. The Petitioners show stormwater management facilities consisting of the rain garden and the 1.10 dry detention basin; however, it is required the Petitioner document meet the requirements of the Lake County Stormwater Development Ordinance, which regulates stormwater for all developments in Lake County. Details on the design will follow once site layout has been approved. In addition, the Petitioners have submitted an existing Plat of Topography, evidence the property is under contract, a proposed site plan, coverage exhibits, traffic study, that was received last week and is currently under review, and miscellaneous photographs.

A to VA Stanick stated the Petitioners have submitted a scaled drawing of a proposed site plan including proposed locations of buildings, streets, off-street parking areas, pedestrian and bicycle pathways, landscape plans, sidewalk plans, building elevations and cross sections of specific site areas. The Petitioner has re-submitted a letter regarding site plan characteristics which was

provided to the PCZBA prior to the meeting. The revised document provides a more detailed description of the easements associated with the project. The letter also includes site conditions, land characteristics, community facilities and utilities, existing covenants and easements and general information about surrounding uses with 0.5 miles of the site. The Petitioners have also provided a traffic study. A copy of the study has been submitted to Christopher B. Burke Engineering, the Village's traffic consultant, to review the results of the study and will be made available once it is reviewed.

A to VA Stanick stated the Petitioners have indicated construction of the Target building and related site improvements will take place simultaneously. The construction of the outlot buildings will take place as market conditions demand. It is recommended the PCZBA request the Petitioners to provide a phasing schedule for construction of the development. He stated the Petitioners' zoning application states Target Stores, Inc. and McVickers Development, LLC are the applicants. The Petitioners have submitted documentation that the property is currently owned by Mr. and Mrs. George Shepard and McVickers Development, LLC is the contract purchaser.

Village Attorney Fiske stated the PCZBA's consideration of the PCD's general concepts will cover the concept outlined in the memorandum and not a draft ordinance. The memorandum was prepared to provide an overview of how a PCD text amendment would work in terms of the structure of the regulations and the substance of what it may contain. Village Attorney Fiske briefly reviewed the various sections of the memorandum, including the: introduction and overview, intent and purpose, development standards and procedures.

Member Badger asked for examples of other communities in the surrounding area that have done this type of commercial zoning. Village Attorney Fiske stated the Village is unique in this situation because its Zoning Code already contains regulations for residential planned developments. He stated Legal Counsel and Staff have worked together to assemble some relevant examples from Oak Brook, LaGrange and Long Grove. PCD concepts are also used in nearby communities such as Highland Park and Northbrook.

Member Bishop asked if the examples were provided due to the outdated Village Comprehensive Plan. Village Attorney Fiske stated the application is independent of the Comprehensive Plan. In processing a petition such as this the PCZBA would be considering a number of different variations from the Zoning Code. PCD regulations allow this plan the ability to create more flexible ways to use the land. The proposed PCD regulations are not driven by the need to revise the Comprehensive Plan, but it works in harmony with the existing Comprehensive Plan.

In response to a question from Member Collins, Village Attorney Fiske stated the PCD would not eliminate the existing residential planned development regulations. Member Collins asked if it could be considered to allow for a uniformed approach to planned developments for the Village. Village Attorney Fiske stated there is a pending petition under the current PRD regulations that could complicate the current practice.

Member Collins asked if the PCD regulations could also apply to properties within the L-1 District for all the uses envisioned for the business park. Village Attorney Fiske stated this is something that should be discussed in terms of the scope, but the petition was submitted with regard to a specific development. The text amendment applies to the Code as a whole and is not specific to any single development.

Member Collins shared her preferences regarding the draft PCD regulations, including: encourage shared parking as a goal of the regulations; as a development standard emphasize pedestrian friendliness and connectivity; as a new parking and drive standard, “require connections to existing bike and walking paths and eliminate “to the extent possible;” and develop a list of items to be required for concept and final plan submittal.

Member Goldsberry stated the documents provided do not give us a way to set parameters on the appropriate size of the development. He also expressed his concern regarding an increase in traffic volume that a large format retailer may generate and requested more information on the type of traffic volume the Village should expect.

Member Moore expressed his satisfaction with the PCD regulations and recommended including a standard that the development will fit into the overall character and nature of the Village. He stated he would prefer the regulations require a complete application. The PCD application should be submitted with a traffic study that has been reviewed by Staff before coming to the PCZBA. Lastly, Member Moore stated the PCZBA needs information on how the retail development may impact the Village in regards to real estate, sales tax revenue and Village services.

Member Peters expressed his interest in reviewing actual PCD examples from Highland Park and Long Grove at the next PCZBA meeting.

Vice Chair Haller stated this is not a draft ordinance and the discussion tonight concerns ideas and concepts of what could go in a PCD ordinance. There has been a lot of good input and it seems the PCZBA believes it is worth taking the next steps forward to formulate an actual ordinance.

Member Bishop stated she is in favor of having PCD regulations and recommended they be more comprehensive for the Village and not just the L-2 District, but also the L-1 District.

Vice Chair Haller asked the Petitioner to commence with the proposed concept plan presentation.

Ms. Laurie Jones, Target Senior Development Manager, expressed her appreciation to the Village for partnering with Target to develop the proposed plans. She stated we are here tonight to seek additional feedback before developing the final plan. Ms. Jones provided a brief overview of the relationship between Target and McVickers Development, LLC. She stated McVickers Development, LLC., which currently has a purchase agreement with Mr. and Mrs. Shepard, presented the property to Target last fall. During the real estate negotiation between Target and McVickers Development, LLC. it was decided Target would lead the development since it is purchasing the majority of the property.

Ms. Jones stated Target may be considered the developer for the entire project which includes the outlot buildings and the Target tract; McVickers Development, LLC. is the owner of the outlot parcels. She stated although Target is taking direction from McVickers Development, LLC. the intent is to work together to facilitate a site plan that will respond to the Village’s feedback, as well as Target’s business needs. Lastly, Ms. Jones introduced the following members of the development team: Bob Branson and Bruce Dunley (Oxford Development); Heather Sexton (Target Design Project Architect); Joe Kaltsas (Entitlement Coordinator) with Kimley-Horn Associates; Jennifer Harry (Project Manager); Justin Muller (Project Engineer); Mark Kaltsas

(Landscape Architect) and Steve Friedland of Applegate Thorn and Thompson (Land Use Attorney).

Mr. Joe Kaltsas stated the intent of this presentation is to present the revised preliminary conceptual project design that incorporates the feedback from the charette meetings. Mr. Kaltsas advised one of the major concerns regarding the project was the need to respect the quality and character of the Village. He briefly gave a history of east and west Lake Bluff and stated west Lake Bluff is an intentional commercial corridor and the proposed project appears to be consistent with the area. Mr. Kaltsas stated this is a market area Target feels has been underserved and customers would benefit from having a location in Lake Bluff. He stated they have met with many of the surrounding neighbors and adjacent property owners and some expressed their support for the proposed project because of the increased exposure to their businesses and some neighbors were less enthusiastic, but not totally opposed.

Mr. Kaltsas showed slides of the current view from IL Rt. 176 and U.S. Rt. 41 from the southeast corner and from the bridge on the northeast corner and noted the location has the benefit of natural buffering both in terms of the slope and vegetation. He noted it is their intention to preserve as much of the existing vegetation as possible.

Ms. Heather Sexton, Target Design Project Architect, briefly reviewed the feedback received from the previous meeting regarding possible enhancements to the south and north elevations of the building and the possibility of creating a design element at the northwest corner. She reviewed the revised changes for the proposed east elevation entrance which includes a large amount of glass. She stated the entire elevation will be brick with accents of decorative stone and proposed modifications for the center portion of the building to break up the parapet and massing element in the center.

Ms. Sexton noted windows are proposed along the middle section to break the massing and a parapet to add color at the southeast corner. Ms. Sexton reviewed the changes to the north elevation and stated the intent is to add some transparent design by installing a clear glass wall revealing the inside sales floor. Ms. Sexton stated the changes to the west elevation include brick returns and a gateway feature at the corner. The revisions allow consistency around the store while not creating the exact design on each elevation.

Following the presentation by the development architect, Mr. Kaltsas summarized the feedback received concerning the site plan and the intent to maintain the existing mature vegetation around the perimeter of the site and added green space next to the building. The other sustainable improvements, which include: enhancing the bike/pedestrian connectivity; proposing a dark sky compliant parking lot lighting plan to help reduce light pollution and glow from the site; incorporating a ring garden to add habitat features to the project and assist in stormwater management; and constructing a LEED compliant building that should reduce water and energy usage by 30%.

Mr. Kaltsas reviewed the access road provided along the north elevation and noted its curve design helps to preserve the trees near the bike path and allow room for additional landscaping around the building. Mr. Kaltsas discussed the U.S. Rt. 41 setbacks and noted the proposed revision of 60 ft. from 35 ft. To assist his explanation he presented an illustration of the embankment at the U.S. Rt. 41/IL Rt. 176 intersection showing the distance of the setback in relation to the roadway and the proposed building and site.

Mr. Mark Kaltsas, landscape architect, stated the discussions at the previous meeting encompassed integrating the site more so into the community and to take advantage of the existing site characteristics. He stated the great advantage to this site is the connectivity to the North Shore Bike Path, and as a result, the trail has been integrated as a site amenity. He also presented plans for a welcoming plaza that would allow customers to rest and park their bikes.

Mr. Kaltsas reviewed the proposed common area for the outlot parcels and noted this area can better utilize some of the existing open space and create a space where people could eat and drink. In relation to the overall site and landscaping he noted the intent of the plan is to create an integrated landscape design along IL Rt. 176 corridor that would add cohesiveness and relate with the existing building design. As you come into the site the intent is to break up the amount of impervious area by integrating additional landscaping that can sustain plant material.

Mr. Kaltsas stated the interior islands of the parking lot and along the proposed drive have doubled in size to better sustain the landscape within those areas. He stated an identifiable entrance has been created by utilizing the open space to enhance the pedestrian experience as customers enter the store. The interior islands throughout the parking lot have been enlarged to approximately 11% of the Target building parking lot. The overall green space has increased since the last meeting from 21% to 25%. The screening around the loading dock and the truck loading area was increased and the intent is to plant at a rate of 100% opacity with larger evergreen species.

Mr. Kaltsas stated they plan to create an infiltration area around the perimeter of the site to get water into the ground and to make a modern prairie utilizing native and low maintenance plants. The bike path has been extended along the eastern property line down to the south end and around the proposed infiltration area to extend along Carriage Way all the way to the west side of the site.

Mr. Joe Kaltsas stated the purpose of the stormwater management elements are to promote filtration, increase the quality of water leaving the site, decrease the value and peak rate of the run off and serve as an amenity by creating a visual gateway from U.S. Rt. 41. He stated the driveway width for the loading and truck dock areas was decreased to approximately half the width to ensure safety and improve the view of the truck area. Mr. Kaltsas provided statistics regarding the delivery of goods from the distribution center and stated refuse will be collected one to two times per month from an enclosed area. The trailers at the loading dock will be parked in an enclosed area so the store can load and unload the trailer.

Mr. Kaltsas reviewed the proposed signage for the site and noted the designs presented are not the proposed designs but will reflect the building and site design and he showed various types of signage.

Mr. Kaltsas stated the demand on Village services would vary according to the store and situation. According to Target, the Village should expect one to two police calls per week. He noted there are a couple of fire calls per year for minor fire issues.

Mr. Kaltsas thanked the PCZBA for its feedback and opportunity to continue development of the plan and expressed his belief the development will increase the vitality of the commercial corridor which will benefit the entire western area.

Vice Chair Haller requested comments from the audience.

Ms. Susan McMurray (454 Simpson Ave.), downtown business owner, asked if any studies were done regarding the impact a big box store would have on local businesses. She stated this is a good opportunity for Lake Bluff to reap the benefits of incoming tax dollars, and should the project move forward, find a way to work with Target to install signage directing people from Target into the downtown.

Ms. Catherine McGuire (610 Lincoln Ave.) expressed her concern for the impact Target may have on the existing Dominick's store. She noted the 2011 annual report for Target reports approximately 25% of its sales are grocery items; this could directly conflict with the existing Dominick's store. She expressed her concern regarding future development plans for the proposed Target store and the impact it may have on Village services, as well as traffic. She recommended an independent traffic study be conducted prior to moving forward with the project.

As there were no further comments from the public, Vice Chair Haller requested comments from the PCZBA.

Member Peters expressed his appreciation to Target's representatives for addressing the Village's comments. He noted his concerns regarding traffic impacts and the economic impact Target may have on surrounding businesses.

Member Moore complimented the Target team for improving the plans. He expressed his interest in reviewing the traffic study when it becomes available, as well as the impacts on public services and surrounding businesses a Target store may generate.

Member Goldsberry thanked the Target team for listening to the feedback provided by the Village. He expressed concerns for the impact traffic will have on the area, as well as the economic impact on other businesses and overall public safety of the project area. He expressed his uncertainty regarding the route around the rear of the property and requested more details be shared in the future. Member Goldsberry expressed his opinion from a planning perspective that he believes there are other projects that should be considered for this property because overtime Lake Bluff is feeling more like a city than a village.

Member Collins expressed her satisfaction with the increased landscape in the parking lot. She expressed her concern regarding traffic issues within the parcel, specifically regarding the width of the Shagbark extension. Further, she expressed concern for the safety of bicyclists and the number of truck trailers parked on the premises after hours. Member Collins suggested the developer consider increasing the density of the retail establishments.

Member Collins expressed her concerns regarding the number of proposed signs and asked if the signage would be shared with the other businesses in the area. Mr. Joe Kaltsas stated the free-standing signs are the only free-standing signs on the property. There would be wall signs on the outlot buildings that could come in later to be reviewed by the Village pursuant to its regulations. Member Collins asked if other businesses would be shown on the proposed blade sign in addition to Target. Mr. Kaltsas stated Target would be the only store identified on the blade sign. The proposed signage for the outlot parcels could have more than one if there are multiple users in an outlot parcel building.

Member Bishop expressed her satisfaction with the updated plans. She recommended Target take another look at the design for the outlot buildings and possibly create a plan that would

compliment the Village, as well as the larger building located on the other side of the parkway. Member Bishop suggested they consider grouping all the landscape features together instead of spreading them out across the parking lot.

Member Badger expressed his preference for screening any HVAC units on the roof of the building. He commented on the proposed LEED compliant building and expressed his curiosity about the level of certification Target intends to achieve. Member Badger expressed his agreement with the other PCZBA Members regarding the outlot parcel design. Member Badger commented on the bike path connectivity and the possibility of connecting the path with Carriage Way near the truck dock. Lastly, Member Badger inquired of the type of tax revenue the project would bring to Lake Bluff and the overall economic impact it would have on the area.

Vice Chair Haller thanked the Target team for the revised plans and taking into account the concerns of the Board. He expressed his opinion the project appears to be moving in a positive direction. Vice Chair Haller stated his main concern is the road from Carriage Park to Shagbark and how the roadway would be used. Motorists may attempt to maneuver around the light at Waukegan Rd. and IL Rt. 176 and this action could impact traffic flow in the area.

Vice Chair Haller inquired of the store hours for a normal Target and how they would impact traffic. He expressed his concern for the amount of impervious surface and asked if some type of pervious material as opposed to asphalt. Lastly, Vice Chair Haller stated one of the benefits to the Village of doing a PCD is it allows the Village to control not just the development of one or more parcels but allows us to develop in a much more cohesive fashion.

In a response to the comments from the PCZBA, Mr. Joe Kaltsas summarized the following:

- Target will evaluate the impact the development would have on local businesses;
- Target will evaluate the plan to ensure traffic impacts are mitigated;
- Target will work with the Village to determine safe roadway widths;
- The trailers would remain onsite overnight and return to the distribution center on a daily basis;
- The parking lot located in the southeast corner is designed as an overflow lot for employee parking during fourth quarter operations;
- Target will ensure the bike path adjacent to the eastern outlot is protected with green space or a decorative railing; and
- Target will continue working with the PCZBA and Village Staff to refine the outlot buildings.

To clarify an earlier point, Mr. Branson stated retail operations are preferred uses for the outlot buildings. However, the plan is to also include small office uses.

Mr. Joe Kaltsas provided clarification regarding the term LEED compliant and noted Target has gone to great lengths to design the building as efficient and sustainable as possible within the economic realities in which they operate. However, the project will be built to comply with LEED requirements, but will not be certified.

Vice Chair Haller thanked everyone for the presentation and invited Chair Kaltsas back to the dais.

Chair Kaltsas returned to the dais and assumed her position as Chair.

6. **Continuation of a Public Hearing to Consider Amendments to the Existing Stonebridge Planned Residential Development**

Chair Kaltsas continued the public hearing to the March 20, 2013 meeting.

7. **Consideration of a Revised 2013 Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Schedule**

Member Collins moved to approve the revised 2013 PCZBA Meeting schedule. Member Goldsberry seconded the motion. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: (8) Badger, Bishop, Collins, Goldsberry, Haller, Moore, Peters and Chair Kaltsas
Nays: (0)
Absent: (0)

8. **Commissioner's Report**

Chair Kaltsas advised the next PCZBA Meeting is scheduled for March 20, 2013

9. **Adjournment**

As there was no further business to come before the PCZBA, Member Goldsberry moved to adjourn the meeting. Member Moore seconded the motion. The motion was approved on a unanimous voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Brandon J. Stanick
Assistant to the Village Administrator