

VILLAGE OF HUNTLEY
PLAN COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
Monday, February 16, 2021
MINUTES

5

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Tom Kibort called to order the Village of Huntley Plan Commission Special Meeting for February 16, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. The meeting was held in the Municipal Complex Village Board Room at 10987 Main Street, Huntley, Illinois 60142.

10

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Kibort led the Pledge of Allegiance.

15 **ROLL CALL**

PLAN

COMMISSIONERS: Commissioners Ron Hahn, Darci Chandler, Terra DeBaltz, Lori Nichols, Vice Chair Dawn Ellison, and Chairman Tom Kibort.

20

COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: Commissioner Robert Chandler

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Development Services Charles Nordman, Development Manager Margo Griffin, Village Manager David Johnson, Deputy Village Manager Lisa Armour, and Development Engineer Scott Hajek

25

4. **Approval of Minutes**

30

A. Approval of the January 25, 2021 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

A MOTION was made to approve the January 25, 2021 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes.

MOVED: Commissioner Terra DeBaltz

35

SECONDED: Commissioner Lori Nichols

AYES: Commissioners Darci Chandler, Ron Hahn, Terra DeBaltz, Lori Nichols, Vice Chair Dawn Ellison, and Chairman Tom Kibort.

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

40

MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0

5. **Petition(s)**

45

A. Petition No. 21-01.02, Venture One Acquisitions, LLC, as petitioner, and 92131 LLC, as owner, 41W368 Freeman Road, Discussion of the Proposed Annexation and Development of Approximately 260 Acres Commonly known as 41W368 Freeman Road, Huntley, IL.

Chairman Kibort announced Director Nordman would be speaking next.

5 Director Nordman thanked Chairman Kibort and stated he would give an introduction prior to allowing the petitioner to make comments and a presentation. Director Nordman stated he would also be giving a PowerPoint presentation.

10 Director Nordman reviewed the history of the petition. Venture One Acquisitions previously appeared before the Plan Commission on January 25, 2021 to introduce their project and to respond to initial questions, comments, and concerns from the Commission. Several members of the public also provided written comments that were read into the record as part of the public comment portion of the meeting. Director Nordman stated, tonight, in follow-up to the January meeting, and in anticipation of the Plan Commission public hearing scheduled for February 22, 2021, the petitioner will be covering their responses to the concerns.

15 Director Nordman stated, to further assist in the sharing of information with the public, a special webpage was created on the Village's website to make the petitioner's application, proposed plans, and additional information related to the proposed development available for the public to easily view. Additionally, residents that previously provided public comment regarding the project, and those residing within 250 feet of the proposed development were provided a notice for the meeting tonight, and for next Tuesday's public hearing.

Director Nordman then introduced Ryan Stoller from Venture One Acquisitions to personally respond to the previous concerns from the adjacent neighbors.

25 Ryan Stoller thanked Director Nordman and went through the comments and concerns, and updated design changes.

30 Mr. Stoller discussed improvements to the landscaping plans and showed renderings of street level views from Freeman Road and from the east property line. Mr. Stoller stated all the wetlands would remain untouched. The ponds will be natural with native plantings.

35 Previous comments from neighbors noted that the wetlands provide significant separation between the development to the east, but not necessarily screening for line of sight. Mr. Stoller responded to this by providing two section views to illustrate the distance and landscaping between the proposed development and the subdivision to the east. Renderings were also provided from the southeast and northeast illustrate the amount of existing and proposed landscaping.

40 Mr. Stoller commented on noise and stated the project would comply with all state and county noise regulations.

Mr. Stoller and his engineering consultant, William Bohne, of Jacob & Hefner, addressed concerns about stormwater runoff and the potential impact on the neighboring community.

45 Mr. Bohne discussed drainage flows (from east to west). He stated they are not changing that pattern, and by law they are not allowed to change that pattern.

Mr. Bohne stated stormwater runoff will be conveyed via various networks of storm sewer pipe and overland flow routes towards eight separate stormwater detention basins located throughout the site.

The proposed stormwater detention basins will have a combined stormwater storage volume of approximately 89 acre-feet (28,500,000 gallons) of water. The stormwater runoff will be slowly released towards two outfall locations, located at the southwest corner and the northwest corner of the site, in accordance with existing tributary areas to each outfall point. The proposed peak runoff rate from the site towards the outfall locations will be decreased by approximately 66% during the 100-year storm event, when compared to existing peak runoff rates. The proposed stormwater management system will perpetuate existing drainage from upstream properties and will not increase water surface elevations.

5

10

Mr. Bohne discussed the Drain Tile Investigation his firm conducted for the subject property. They identified any existing drain tiles that convey upstream flow and will perpetuate the existing flow pattern in accordance with the Kane County Stormwater Management Ordinance.

15

Mr. Bohne stated the proposed stormwater management system, consisting of storm sewers, overland flow routes, and stormwater detention basins has been designed to meet or exceed the minimum criteria set forth in the Kane County Stormwater Management Ordinance, along with any modifications recognized within the Village of Huntley standards. The stormwater management system has been reviewed by in-house Village of Huntley Engineering Staff (two Professional Engineers), along with the Village's third-party reviewer, Christopher B. Burke Engineering.

20

Mr. Bohne discussed mitigation measures regarding endangered species, and stated they would limit tree removal to times when Swainson's Hawk are not on property, and install special fencing to limit movement of Blanding Turtles.

25

Mr. Stoller addressed a question regarding the distance from the building to the east lot line. Mr. Stoller reviewed an exhibit illustrating the distance from the proposed building and parking areas to residential subdivision to the east. Those exhibits indicate there is approximately 1,000 feet from the edge of the trailer parking area to the rear of an existing home in the Prairie Oaks subdivision and approximately 1,525 feet from the proposed building to the rear of an existing home in the subdivision.

30

Mr. Stoller addressed the types of trucks being utilized at the site, and stated as per the traffic study, the site would operate as a Receive Center, which accepts bulk inventory and allocates it to fulfillment centers throughout the region. Mr. Stoller explained that semi-trucks delivering inventory would enter the site at the eastern driveway on Freeman Road and circulate counterclockwise around the building and exit the site on the new roadway.

35

Mr. Stoller also discussed the hypothetical buildout of the phase 2 portion of the site, and stated it was done to show the future traffic impact. Mr. Stoller also mentioned the eastern access and how it does not warrant a traffic signal at this time, but they do plan to construct the improvement.

40

Mr. Stoller discussed a question about the extent to which the traffic study considered Freeman Road to the east and the intersection of Freeman Road and Galligan Road. Mr. Stoller stated, since no truck traffic and only 15 percent of site-generated automobile traffic is expected to be oriented to and from the east on Freeman Road, the Traffic Impact Study included the intersection of Freeman Road and Carriage Way as the eastern limit of the study area. Traffic movements at Freeman/Carriage Way currently operate with minimal delays (levels of service A and B) and will continue to operate at levels of service A and B. Because the impact of site-generated traffic was determined to be limited at this intersection, it can be assumed that any impacts to the Galligan Road intersection (approx. 2.5 miles from the site) will

45

also be limited.

5 Mr. Stoller discussed the developer's requirement to pay a sizable Kane County Road Impact Fee, which is used to make improvements to roadways maintained by Kane County. Discussion ensued regarding Galligan Road being a Kane County maintained roadway and it has been identified for future improvements by the County's Comprehensive Road Improvement Plan.

10 Mr. Stoller stated the Village is proposing a condition of the Planned Unit Development, to restrict truck traffic from traveling east on Freeman Road. This same restriction was applied to the Weber distribution facility.

Mr. Stoller addressed the hours of operation for the business, and stated they do anticipate 24-hour operations.

15 Mr. Stoller discussed the photometric plan and light fixture specifications, and stated they only seek to provide site lighting to facilitate onsite operations within the paved vehicular areas and pedestrian areas. They do not seek to provide lighting around the perimeter green areas or wetland areas. The light poles along the eastern pavement will be located approximately 750' away from the site's eastern property line and will result in 0.0 Foot-Candles of light at the property line. Furthermore, the light fixtures will
20 be fully shielded/night sky friendly.

Mr. Stoller addressed the question of berming at the property line. He stated they have now made the commitment to the Village that they will berm the eastern property line adjacent to the phase 2 portion of the site.

25 Chairman Kibort asked about the Kane County Traffic Impact Fee. Mr. Stoller replied it was \$175,000.00. Discussion ensued on the use of those fees specifically for the transportation projects in Kane County.

30 Mr. Stoller stated he was very excited about bringing this project to the Village of Huntley. It will bring a significant number of well-paying jobs, and will be a plus for the community. He also stated they were not asking for any incentives to bring this project to Huntley, so no tax dollars would be spent on it.

35 Director Nordman mentioned to Chairman Kibort that he had a brief presentation as well. Chairman Kibort thanked Mr. Stoller, and gave the floor to Director Nordman.

Director Nordman stated he would like to go through some of the previous Plan Commission comments, some of which may have already been touched on by Mr. Stoller.

40 Director Nordman discussed the stormwater runoff comments already touched on by Mr. Stoller. Director Nordman stated in addition to the petitioner's engineers reviewing the project, the stormwater management system has been reviewed by in-house Village of Huntley Engineering Staff (two Professional Engineers), along with the Village's third-party reviewer, Christopher B. Burke
45 Engineering.

Director Nordman showed a slide with the project site and neighboring community. The slide displayed the existing water flow/drainage and indicated all drainage flowed from east to west. No water flowed

from the project site onto the Prairie Oaks subdivision.

5 Director Nordman addressed the distance from the proposed building to the east lot line. Director Nordman stated the petitioner has provided an exhibit illustrating the distance from the proposed building and parking areas to residential subdivision to the east. Those exhibits indicate there is approximately 1,000 feet from the edge of the trailer parking area to the rear of an existing home in the Prairie Oaks subdivision and approximately 1,525 feet from the proposed building to the rear of an existing home in the subdivision. Director Nordman showed slides delineating the distance between the project and the homes.

10 Director Nordman reviewed the type of trucks and how they would circulate around the site, and stated in the petitioner's traffic study, the site would operate as a Receive Center, which accepts bulk inventory and allocates it to fulfillment centers throughout the region. The petitioner explained that trucks delivering inventory would enter the site at the eastern driveway on Freeman Road and circulate counterclockwise around the building and exit the site on the new roadway.

15 Director Nordman reviewed the topics of 24-hour operations, and the two signalized intersections at Freeman Road.

20 Director Nordman discussed the traffic that could be generated by the site, and the extent to which the traffic study considered Freeman Road to the east and the intersection of Freeman Road and Galligan Road.

25 Director Nordman reviewed the petitioner's response; *"since no truck traffic and only 15 percent of site-generated automobile traffic is expected to be oriented to and from the east on Freeman Road, the Traffic Impact Study included the intersection of Freeman Road and Carriage Way as the eastern limit of the study area. Traffic movements at Freeman/Carriage Way currently operate with minimal delays (levels of service A and B) and will continue to operate at levels of service A and B. Because the impact of site-generated traffic was determined to be limited at this intersection, it can be assumed that any impacts to the Galligan Road intersection (approx. 2.5 miles from the site) will also be limited"*.

30 Director Nordman stated the developer would also be required to pay a sizable Kane County Road Impact Fee which is used to make improvements to roadways maintained by Kane County. Staff notes that Galligan Road is a Kane County maintained roadway and identified for future improvements by the County's Comprehensive Road Improvement Plan. Director Nordman stated a proposed condition of the Planned Unit Development would restrict truck traffic from traveling east on Freeman Road, and this same restriction was applied to the Weber distribution facility.

35 Director Nordman reviewed a slide indicating some proposed trees to be removed. The trees were not located in the wetland area.

40 Director Nordman discussed the upcoming Plan Commission Public Hearing for the petition, which is scheduled for February 22, 2021. Director Nordman stated, when the petitioner returns before the Plan Commission for the public hearing on February 22, 2021, the Plan Commission will be asked to consider the following development actions:

45 Amendments to the Huntley I-90/IL 47 Gateway Plan to identify the Property as appropriate for light industrial development

5 While the Gateway Subarea Plan of the Comprehensive Plan identifies similar uses, the plan is proposed to be amended to better reflect the proposed uses for the property. The amendment to the I-90/IL 47 Gateway Plan would identify the property for Light Industrial. It is currently shown as Business Park and Flex Space. The current designation states that appropriate land use activities within these areas include light manufacturing and production of specific types of goods, office-industrial flex spaces, especially those involving innovative technologies and health-care related offices and suppliers, home and corporate offices, including larger campuses, general offices and call centers, and research and development laboratories and testing facilities.

10 The petitioners are requesting to amend the I-90/IL 47 Gateway Subarea Plan to designate the subject site as Light Industrial. Per the plan, appropriate land use activities within Light Industrial Areas include:

- 15 • Light manufacturing and mass production of specific types of goods
- Warehousing, shipping and distribution facilities that provide for the storage, shipping, and coordination of materials and goods, including finished products from local manufacturing (excluding cross-dock operations)
- Corporate/general offices, including larger campuses

20 Text amendments to the Huntley Zoning Ordinance, including amendments relating to creation of a new ORI-1 zoning district and standards for land use and planned unit developments within the ORI-1 district

25 The new ORI-1 district will serve to identify allowed uses and bulk regulations (setbacks, lot coverage, building height, etc.). The proposed development and design standards that would be specific to the subject site will be addressed by the Ordinance approving the Planned Unit Development (PUD) and annexation agreement.

30 Amendments to the Huntley Zoning Map to zone the Property in the ORI-1 zoning district

The granting of special use permits, planned development approvals, variations, and/or other zoning relief necessary to allow the Proposed Development on the Property

35 This approval would allow the northern lot to be developed for any of permitted or special uses allowed in the new ORI-1 zoning district in accordance with certain development and design standards and all other applicable codes and ordinances, but would not approve detailed plans. To undertake any future development on the northern lot that is within the PUD parameters, the owner would submit for administrative approvals (e.g. building permit, stormwater permit, access permit, etc.). The detailed plans would be reviewed by staff to confirm compliance with the approved development and designs standards and other applicable Village ordinances.

40 Approval of a preliminary and final plat of subdivision for the Property pursuant to the Huntley Subdivision Regulations

45 Director Nordman stated the Village Board will subsequently consider the annexation and annexation agreement for the Property as well as Plan Commission's recommendations for the above actions.

Director Nordman stated, upon approval of the requested actions any further subdivision of the northern lot would require subdivision plat approval in accordance with the Subdivision Code, but the discretionary zoning approvals would be in place.

5

Director Nordman concluded his presentation by stating, the Plan Commission is not required to provide a formal position statement on the proposal this evening, and the petitioner shall not be required to comply with any position statements which are offered. The discussion shall provide the petitioner with comments and concerns that should be considered as they proceed in the formal review process. The Plan Commission and its individual members are not bound by any comments made during the discussion and the petitioner acknowledges that it cannot claim in the future any reliance whatsoever on those comments.

10

Director Nordman stated there were several written public comments from the neighboring community and those were printed up and compiled for the Plan Commissioners to review.

15

Director Nordman thanked Chairman Kibort and the Commission and stated he was looking for Chairman Kibort to take over the public comment portion of the meeting.

20

6. **Public Comment**

Chairman Kibort stated he was prepared to begin the public comment portion of the meeting, and stated he would be calling on the public in the order they signed in on the sheet.

25

Mike Figolah, 41W092 Derby Court, stated he was there as a resident of Prairie Oaks Subdivision. Mr. Figolah stated the entire subdivision came together as a group and his statement is a coordinated effort to convey the concerns and opinions of the majority of the residents. Mr. Figolah stated his statement coincides with the written document which was submitted to Village Staff, and which the Plan Commission now has in front of them.

30

Mr. Figolah stated that many of the residents knew the Stade parcel was targeted to be developed as a business park. Mr. Figolah mentioned the Gateway Plan and pointed out the plan designated the land for Business Park. Mr. Figolah stated they did not believe that a business park was the same as a large distribution center. The residents believe the distribution use is in direct conflict with the serene setting of their subdivision.

35

Mr. Figolah stated that they are not trying to stop the project, and they know that it will be a benefit for the Village of Huntley, but they want the Village to listen to their comments and incorporate their recommendations into the project.

40

Mr. Figolah asked if he could call on Glenn & Shirley Dau, 41W193 Cheryl. Chairman Kibort agreed to allow the Dau's to speak next.

A brief discussion occurred with Vice Chair Ellison who inquired whether there was an exhibit showing where each neighbor lived. There was no such exhibit.

45

Glen and Shirley Dau stated they lived 41W193 Cheryl, which is at the end of Cheryl Court. Mr. Dau stated he attended the public meetings in 2017 for the Gateway Plan, and those plans showed the Stade Farm as Business Park, not Warehouse/Distribution.

Mr. Dau stated their subdivision is serene and quiet. This project will change the feeling of the subdivision. Mr. Dau asked for the developer to consider adding more trees, and a 10'-12' acoustical sound wall to buffer the sound of the development. Mr. Dau mentioned a project in Saint Paris, Ohio where they extended a sound wall along the entire edge of the property. Adding this type of wall along the entire east property line will assist in reducing the sound impact.

Jamie Bickley, 18N129 Carriage Way, addressed the Plan Commission. Mr. Bickley spoke on the Traffic Study. Mr. Bickley stated the daily traffic impact of the development will add 5,600 vehicles. Mr. Bickley acknowledged Freeman Road was widened up to and including the project site; however, it remains a 2-lane road to the east of the development. He believes traffic will increase with workers traveling to the business, adding congestion in the area. Mr. Bickley stated consideration should be given to restricting all road traffic from traveling to the east from the project site. Mr. Bickley cited Section 3.6 of the Traffic Study, indicating no road improvements were planned to the east of the project site. Even with truck traffic restricted to utilizing Route 47, Mr. Bickley feels the buildout of the Project Pumpkin site, and surrounding properties (former outlet mall, and Weber lots) will increase congestion to the east, and additional road improvements should be considered. Mr. Bickley recommended consideration be given to improving the Galligan and Freeman intersection, restricting delivery trucks and semi-trucks from going east, and adding traffic regulating signage.

Scott Bennett, 41W118 Derby Court, addressed the Plan Commission. Mr. Bennett discussed sound and noise. Mr. Bennett asked the Plan Commission to pay special attention to how the noise of the 24-hour operation will impact the Prairie Oaks subdivision. Mr. Bennett mentioned the sound issues from trucks backing up, engines idling, and general trucking operations of a distribution center. Mr. Bennett stated consideration should be given to increasing plantings to buffer noise, and restricting hours of operation for certain activities.

Lynn and Richard Nowinski, 41W198 Charles Lane, addressed the Plan Commission. Mr. Nowinski stated their home is closer to the Phase 2 portion of the development. Mr. Nowinski stated they understand the project will likely move forward, but they believe it is better suited further away from a residential area. Mr. Nowinski stated they would like to see Phase 2 approvals come through separately.

Mr. Nowinski discussed the plans for Phase 2 in the Traffic Impact Study. Discussion ensued regarding the size of the Phase 2 development and the proximity of the buildings being very close to the homes to the east. He mentioned there is no natural divide (wetland or conservation) in phase 2, and insufficient buffering (less than 100-feet) is included in these plans. Mr Nowinski stated there would be noise and sight issues due to the close proximity, and he recommended increasing the buffer between the homes and the Phase 2 portion of the new development. Mr. Nowinski stressed his request to remove Phase 2 from the approval process until final plans can be studied. Mr. Nowinski closed by stating reduced property values would also impact their neighborhood if the project moves forward as proposed.

Mike Figolah addressed the Plan Commission, and stated he was encouraged by much of what has been discussed. He agreed, the Phase 2 plans in the traffic study, and the fact the zoning and use is included in this approval surprised everyone. He asked the Plan Commission to remove the Phase 2 portion from the petition.

5 Jim Murphy, 41W230 Charles Lane, addressed the Plan Commission. Mr. Murphy described his location as being the home which is most impacted by the Phase 2 development. He is the lot furthest to the west on Charles Lane. Mr. Murphy reviewed his exhibits, which showed slides of his home location, and discussed flooding issues in the rear of his property. Mr. Murphy requested the Plan Commission to not approve Phase 2.

10 Mr. Murphy reviewed slides depicting the proximity of his home in relation to proposed parking lot and “building c” in the Phase 2 development. He showed the views from his kitchen, and his bedroom. Mr. Murphy requested a 35-foot tall landscaped berm to be constructed along the east lot line for the Phase 2 portion. In addition, he requested an 8-foot fence to be placed on the berm.

15 Mr. Murphy canvassed his neighborhood and asked other neighbors to sign a petition requesting the 35-foot tall landscaped berm to be built on the east side of the Phase 2 portion. The petition also requested an 8-foot fence to be placed on the berm. Mr. Murphy submitted his petition with 34 signatures. Mr. Murphy would like the “Phase 2 berm” to be included with the approvals of the Phase 1 portion (Project Pumpkin).

20 Mr. Murphy discussed drainage/flooding issues with his property, and how he is worried the development will further increase the flooding. Mr. Murphy mentioned the land to the west was higher, and his land will not drain properly. Mr. Murphy would like the petitioner’s plans to accept all excess water flow from his land, and for Venture One to be responsible for any damage to his property due to excess water from their project site.

25 Discussion ensued on the drainage for the area, and the future engineering review for the Phase 2 portion.

30 Patricia Mierisch, 18W529 Carriage Way, addressed the Commission. Ms. Mierisch discussed the endangered species, and the mitigation process. She was interested in learning more. Ms. Mierisch had concerns about the increase in traffic on Freeman Road, and mentioned the grade school with many busses located on Galligan Road. Ms. Mierisch discussed the Kane County Sheriff department explained that they service the unincorporated subdivision. She stated they rarely see patrols in their subdivision. Regarding the building and parking lot lighting, Ms. Mierisch stated she does have concerns about the lighting reflecting into the homes. Ms. Mierisch agreed with her neighbors on previous statements, and concluded by thanking the Commission for listening to her comments.

35 Carol and Mike Dyrek, 41W148 Charles Lane, addressed the Plan Commission. Ms. Dyrek stated most of her concerns have already been stated by neighbors, and thanked them for their comments. She added, as an original homeowner, how much she has enjoyed the location for the last 20 years. Like others, she is nervous about the changes and the impact that will come with this development.

40 Vicki Pattentude, 18N556 Carriage Way, addressed the Plan Commission. Ms. Pattentude thanked all of her neighbors who came together and worked on gathering comments for this petition.

45 Chairman Kibort asked if there were any additional comments from residents at this time. There were none.

Chairman Kibort asked the petitioner if they would like to address any of the comments brought up at this time.

Village Manager David Johnson asked to speak to the Galligan/Freeman intersection prior to the petitioner answering questions. Villager Manager Johnson stated the Galligan/Freeman intersection is not located within the jurisdictional boundaries of the Village of Huntley. Village Manager Johnson stated Village of Huntley businesses have contributed a lot of money to the Kane County Traffic Impact Fees over the years, and he believes those dollars would be better suited for such an improvement.

Mr. Ryan Stoller asked Mr. Bohne to discuss the endangered species and mitigation measures. Mr. Bohne stated the Swainson's Hawk have been seen on the land. In order to mitigate the impact, they will be limiting tree removal to times of the year where the hawks are away (migrating or nesting in other areas). The impact on the Blandings Turtle will be mitigated by installing exclusionary fencing prior to the start of construction (keeping the turtles out of the construction zone entirely). They have been working with the IDNR on the approval of these mitigation measures.

Mr. Stoller stated they have been working with the Village to address the concerns of the residents of Prairie Oaks.

Mr. Stoller stated the site plan for Phase 2 in the traffic study was purely hypothetical as there is no known user at this time. The intent of the traffic study is to study the maximum traffic that could be generated for a development. The phase 2 plans in the traffic study should not be considered as reality for this project.

Mr. Stoller addressed the requested berm for the Phase 2 portion. He stated they would be willing to commit to build a 20-foot tall berm (with conifers on top of that) along the eastern property line for Phase 2.

Mr. Stoller and Mr. Bohne discussed the topo maps at the location of 920 to 919, and this would alleviate some of the flooding on Mr. Murphy's property. Mr. Bohne stated the high elevation between the Stade farm and Mr. Murphy's property is actually on the ComEd parcel, and Venture One has no control over this land, and cannot change the elevation.

Mr. Bohne stated none of the work done on the Venture One site would increase any flooding on any Prairie Oaks property. By law, they cannot.

Village Manager Johnson stated he would have Village staff make an attempt to reach out to ComEd to see if an agreement could be reached that may assist with the issue.

Development Engineer Scott Hajek stated Mr. Murphy's land has a closed depression. This issue would not be alleviated by adjusting the height of the ComEd parcel. Discussion ensued on Mr. Murphy's parcel and historical drainage issues.

Mr. Bohne stated Venture One will be installing 8 detention basins to mitigate runoff. Mr. Murphy's property is upstream.

Chairman Kibort asked for any comments from the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Darci Chandler stated she felt the residents have covered many of her questions. She appreciates the work the petitioner has done since the last meeting. Commissioner Darci Chandler stated

she would like to see Phase 2 to come back with more detail, addressing concerns from residents. Commissioner Chandler is reluctant to give approval for Phase 2 at this time.

5 Commissioner Ron Hahn commended the residents for their input. He stated he would like to know more about Phase 2 as well.

10 Commissioner Hahn asked Village Manager Johnson about warrants and the potential for a future Galligan Road traffic light. Village Manager Johnson stated if the intersection were in Huntley, he would require the improvement to be made and paid for by the developer; however, that intersection is in another community/jurisdiction entirely. Huntley has no control of it, and we cannot force developers to make improvements outside of our jurisdiction.

15 Village Manager Johnson asked Engineer Greg Sanders of CBBEL to speak to the required warrants. Greg Sanders stated the warrants require specific studies including the volume of traffic and safety concerns. This study is typically done within the jurisdiction the intersection is located in. Discussion ensued on warrants and traffic.

20 Commissioner Hahn stated he does envision Freeman Road to the east will be getting much busier with employees coming and going that way. Commissioner Hahn added he was impressed to know that Venture One is contributing \$175,000.00 toward the Kane County Traffic Impact Fees for this project.

25 Commissioner Hahn asked if there was an opportunity with this project to bring in any commercial tax dollars from a point of sale location. Deputy Village Manager Lisa Armour stated, thus far, this project is not anticipating commercial sales tax.

Mr. Stoller stated they have worked on facilities with point of sale commercial tax; however, this building is a Receive Center with warehouse use only.

30 Commissioner Hahn stated he did not want to see outside storage of inoperable vehicles at this location.

Mr. Stoller addressed the Plan Commission regarding gaining Phase 2 approval. He stated they have worked very hard with the Village to set up specific standards, including setbacks, lighting, berming, landscaping, and specific uses. Venture One feels they can address the questions now by invoking a specific list of narrow standards.

35 Vice-Chair Ellison thanked the residents for coming out to the meeting and offering their written and oral input on the project. Vice Chair Ellison stated she is opposed to approving Phase 2 at this time. She is concerned about the drainage, and the setbacks for Phase 2.

40 Mr. Stoller stated he would be willing to increasing the setback in Phase 2.

Chairman Kibort stated it is more difficult for the Plan Commission to approve projects with unknown variables.

45 Chairman Kibort asked about a soundwall. Mr. Stoller stated that he would be willing to look at soundwalls, berms, and landscaping.

Chairman Kibort and Vice-Chair Ellison both were pleased to hear they are willing to continue to work on minimizing the sound and visual impact.

5 Chairman Kibort commended the residents for their very thorough comments. He stated he felt the Prairie Oaks residents have presented educated comments and ideas, have addressed the Commission in a positive way, and have shown they are willing to give some compromise, all in an effort to protect their homes.

10 Vice Chair Ellison inquired about how many projects Venture One has completed. Mr. Stoller stated they have completed 2 dozen projects in the last 10 years.

15 Chairman Kibort inquired why Venture One needed Phase 2 approval now. Mr. Stoller stated annexing and developing the entire Stade parcel requires a huge investment up front. Without the clarity of gaining the approvals now for Phase 2, it would be difficult for Venture One to justify the investment.

Mr. Stoller restated, they are willing to continue to work with the Village to set up specific standards, including setbacks, lighting, berming, landscaping, and specific uses.

20 Chairman Kibort discussed zero foot candle at property lines, night sky friendly, and shielding of the lighting.

25 Commissioner Nichols thanked everyone. She is in favor of the landscaping plan. Commissioner Nichols asked the developer to come back with increased setbacks. This would make her feel better about approving the Phase 2 plans.

Commissioner Nichols mentioned Carriage Way and perhaps investigating a sign regarding no truck traffic.

30 Commissioner DeBaltz appreciated all the comments from the residents. She felt the residents were willing to work with the Village to get the project done in a fair manner. She is also appreciative of all the changes that have been made so far with the negotiations and meetings between the developer and the Village.

35 There were no further comments from the Plan Commission.

Chairman Kibort thanked everyone for their professionalism, and he looked forward to meeting again next week for the formal public hearing.

40 7. **Discussion**

Director Nordman restated, the Public Hearing for Venture One's Project Pumpkin would be held February 22, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. in the Village Board Room.

45 8. **Adjournment**

At 9:02 pm, a MOTION was made to adjourn the February 16, 2021 Plan Commission meeting.

MOVED: Vice Chair Ellison

SECONDED:

AYES:

NAYS:

5

ABSTAIN:

MOTION CARRIED

Commissioner Lori Nichols

Commissioners Darci Chandler, Ron Hahn, Terra DeBaltz, Lori Nichols, Vice Chair Dawn Ellison, and Chairman Tom Kibort

None

None

6:0:0

Respectfully submitted,

Margo Griffin

10

Development Manager
Village of Huntley