

VILLAGE OF HUNTLEY
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
Monday, February 25, 2019
MINUTES

5

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Tom Kibort called to order the Village of Huntley Plan Commission meeting for February 25, 2019 at 6:30 pm in the Municipal Complex Village Board Room at 10987 Main Street, Huntley, Illinois 60142. The room is handicap accessible.

10

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Kibort led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

15

PLAN

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

20

COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: Commission Robert Chandler

ALSO PRESENT:

Director of Development Services Charles Nordman, Assistant Village Manager Lisa Armour, Development Engineer Scott Hajek, Development Manager Margo Griffin, Special Counsel Thomas Burney, and Certified Shorthand Reporter Joan Holub from Q and A Reporting

25

4. Public Comments None.

30

5. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of the January 14, 2019 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

Chairman Kibort stated he was absent at the January 14th meeting and therefore did not call the meeting to order.

35

A MOTION was made to approve the October 22, 2018 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes as corrected.

MOVED: Vice Chair Ellison

SECONDED: Commissioner DeBaltz

40

AYES: Commissioners Darci Chandler, DeBaltz, Hahn, and Vice Chair Ellison

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: Chairman Kibort and Commissioner Nichols

MOTION CARRIED 4:0:2

45

6. Petition(s)

A. Petition No. 19-2.1, Huntley Fire Protection District, petitioner, and Reiche Construction Inc., owner, ±2.23 acres located at the southeast corner of Jim Dhamer Drive and Hennig Road; PIN: 02-07-201-010, Request is for approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision and Site Plan Review for a ±10,239 square foot fire station.

50

SUMMARY

Director Nordman states the Huntley Fire Protection District (HFPD) is proposing to construct a new fire station to serve the southern end of the Village. The HFPD currently operates out of four stations and the Annex Building located on East Main Street. Director Nordman explained that in addition to this new, fifth station, the District is also proposing to expand the Annex Building and relocate the headquarters from Station 1 which is currently located on Coral Street. Director Nordman stated an application for expanding the Annex Building will be reviewed by the Plan Commission at a later date.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Director Nordman stated the subject property is zoned BP Business Park. A government use is a permitted use in the BP zoning district.

Site Plan

Director Nordman explained the proposed 10,239 square foot station will have frontage on both Hennig Road and Jim Dhamer Drive. Access to the main parking lot and a separate driveway for emergency vehicles leaving the station will be provided on Hennig Road. A driveway will also be provided on Jim Dhamer Drive for emergency vehicles returning to the station and access to the employee parking lot. The main parking lot accessible from Hennig Road includes 18 parking spaces and the employee parking lot accessible from Jim Dhamer Drive includes 12 parking spaces. (30 total parking spaces)

Building Elevations

Director Nordman stated the proposed building will use precast concrete as the primary building material, which is typical for buildings within the adjacent business park. The precast will be painted shades of beige/brown. A glass aluminum storefront entrance will be located on the north elevation facing Jim Dhamer Drive and will serve as the main entrance to the building. Glass bi-fold doors will be used to enclose the apparatus bay where emergency vehicles will be parked.

Signage

Director Nordman stated the proposed signage includes three wall signs, which consist of the District’s logo and text stating “Fire Station No. 5” and “Huntley Fire Protection District”. Relief is required from the Village Board to allow one additional wall sign. A new ground sign is also proposed along Jim Dhamer Drive that will measure 6’-4” in height. The ground sign will be constructed of precast concrete to match the building.

Final Plat of Subdivision

Director Nordman noted that the final plat of subdivision will resubdivide Lot 6 of Unit No. 1 Huntley Subdivision to accommodate the proposed fire station development. The proposed lot is 2.23 acres which exceeds the 1-acre minimum lot area requirement in the BP zoning district.

VILLAGE BOARD CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Director Nordman stated that on January 24, 2019, the Village Board conceptually reviewed the proposed site plan and building elevations for the 10,239 square foot building. The Village Board favorably reviewed the proposed plans and provided the following comments:

1. The Village Board suggested that the building elevation be enhanced to better reflect the character of the neighboring residential area. *The building renderings have been revised to reflect an elevation with more character and detail.*
2. The Village Board asked for confirmation that all roof mounted mechanical systems will not be visible from the street. *Only smaller condensing units will be roof mounted and they will be screened by an aluminum louvered screen such that they are not visible from the street. The remaining mechanical units will be installed inside the building.*

REQUESTED ACTION

5 Director Nordman stated the petitioner requests a motion of the Plan Commission, to recommend approval of
Petition No. 19-2.1, Huntley Fire Protection District, petitioner, and Reiche Construction Inc., owner, ±2.23 acres
located at the southeast corner of Jim Dhamer Drive and Hennig Road; PIN: 02-07-201-010, Request is for
approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision and Site Plan Review for a ±10,239 square foot fire station.

10 Staff recommends the following conditions be applied should the Plan Commission forward a positive
recommendation to the Village Board:

1. All public improvements and site development must occur in full compliance with the submitted plans
(see list of exhibits) and all other applicable Village Municipal Services (Engineering, Public Works,
15 Planning and Building) site design standards, practices and permit requirements.
2. The petitioner will comply with all final engineering revisions to be approved by the Village Engineer and
Development Services Department.
3. The petitioner shall obtain final approval of the Landscape Plan from the Development Services
Department.
4. All permanent and seasonal plantings must be replaced immediately upon decline.
- 20 5. In accordance with Section 155.221(A)(6) of the Subdivision Ordinance, the developer shall record the
final plat of subdivision with the Recorder of Kane County within three months of approval by the
Village Board.
6. No building permits are approved as part of this submittal.
7. No sign permits are approved as part of this submittal.

25 Adam Reiche, Reiche Construction, stated he did not have anything to add to staff's presentation.

Commission Darci Chandler stated she thought the location and layout of the station was acceptable.

30 Commissioner Hahn stated he did not have any question or comments.

Vice Chair Ellison asked if the station would have an engine and multiple ambulances. Huntley Fire Protection
District Chief Scott Ravagine stated there would be one ambulance and an engine truck.

35 Vice Chair Ellison asked how much time would be saved when responding to calls. Chief Ravagine stated they
would save 3 to 4 minutes responding to calls.

Chairman Kibort asked if there would be another station south of the tollway when development occurs there.
Chief Ravagine stated station 5 would cover the property south of the tollway.

40 Commission Nichols stated she did not have any question or concerns.

Commission DeBaltz asked if the fire district would be hiring addition personnel for the new station. Chief
Ravagine stated would not be hiring additional staff.

45 **A MOTION was made to recommend approval of Petition No. 19-2.1, Huntley Fire Protection District,
petitioner, and Reiche Construction Inc., owner, ±2.23 acres located at the southeast corner of Jim Dhamer
Drive and Hennig Road; PIN: 02-07-201-010, Request is for approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision and
Site Plan Review for a ±10,239 square foot fire station, subject to the following conditions of approval:**

- 50 1. All public improvements and site development must occur in full compliance with the

submitted plans (see list of exhibits) and all other applicable Village Municipal Services (Engineering, Public Works, Planning and Building) site design standards, practices and permit requirements.

2. The petitioner will comply with all final engineering revisions to be approved by the Village Engineer and Development Services Department.
3. The petitioner shall obtain final approval of the Landscape Plan from the Development Services Department.
4. All permanent and seasonal plantings must be replaced immediately upon decline.
5. In accordance with Section 155.221(A)(6) of the Subdivision Ordinance, the developer shall record the final plat of subdivision with the Recorder of Kane County within three months of approval by the Village Board.
6. No building permits are approved as part of this submittal.
7. No sign permits are approved as part of this submittal.

MOVED: Vice Chair Ellison

SECONDED: Commission Hahn

AYES: Commissioners Darci Chandler, Hahn, Nichols, DeBaltz, Vice Chair Ellison, and Chairman Kibort

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0

7. Public Hearing(s)

- A. Petition No. 19-2.2, Huntley Investment Partners, LLC, petitioner and owner, 11800 Factory Shops Boulevard (±60 acres); PINs: 02-16-101-016 and 02-16-101-006, Request is for approval of: (1) Amendment of the I-90/IL 47 Gateway Plan to change the designation of the property from Mixed Commercial to Light Industrial; (2) Removal of the property from the Planned Development District; (3) Rezoning of the property to the ORI (Office/Research/Industrial-Light Manufacturing) District; (4) A special use permit for warehousing, storage and distribution; (5) Special Use for Preliminary Planned Unit Development; and (6) Preliminary Plat of Subdivision.

SUMMARY

Director Nordman stated Huntley Investment Partners is proposing to redevelop ±60.23 acres of the former Huntley Outlet Center, 11800 Factory Shops Boulevard, with three speculative warehouse/distribution buildings ranging in size from 177,320 to 245,280 square feet. The petitioner is requesting to rezone the site from C-2 Regional Retail – Planned Development District to ORI Office/Research/Industrial-Light Industrial and a special use permit for warehouse distribution to allow development of the site in accordance with the proposed preliminary planned unit development (PUD). The proposed plan also requires amending the I-90/IL 47 Gateway Plan, which is a part of the Village’s Comprehensive Plan, to change the Land Use and Development Plan from Mixed Commercial to Light Industrial.

Director Nordman explained that over the past several years General RV has purchased approximately 14 acres of the former Outlet Center site from Huntley Investment Partners. This includes the RV dealership’s expanded storage lot and maintenance building addition that was completed in 2018 on approximately 8 acres and, most recently, an additional 6 acres that is located directly north of the proposed Lot 1/Building 1. General RV has yet to submit plans for the recently acquired 6 acre site.

Director Nordman stated the proposed plans by Huntley Investment Partners call for subdividing the site into three lots for the development of speculative warehouse/distribution buildings and creating two additional lots

dedicated to stormwater management. Access to the site would utilize the existing traffic signal at the former entrance to the Outlet Center. The roadway leading into the development would be a private road that would be maintained by the developer (similar to Weber Drive to the east). Director Nordman explained the following table provides a summary of the proposed buildings and breakdown of the anticipated uses:

5

Building Use

	Warehouse/ Distribution	Office	Docks	Total
Building 1 (Lot 1)	166,920 sf	10,400 sf	30 high docks / 2 grade level	177,320 sf
Building 2 (Lot 2)	230,160 sf	15,120 sf	48 high docks / 4 grade level	245,280 sf
Building 3 (Lot 3)	230,160 sf	15,120 sf	48 high docks / 4 grade level	245,280 sf
Total	627,240 sf	40,640 sf	126 high docks / 10 grade level	667,880 sf

Director Nordman stated the proposed warehouse/distribution buildings located on the east side of the private roadway would include truck dock doors on both the east and west elevations with office space located at the four corners of each building. Director Nordman explained that Building 2 would have 48 truck dock high doors and 4 grade level doors split evenly between the east and west elevations. Similarly, building 3 would also have 48 truck dock high doors and 4 grade level doors split evenly between the east and west elevations. Building 1 is located west of the private roadway and would have 30 truck dock high doors and 2 grade level doors on only the west elevation of the building. The office spaces would be located on the east elevation, facing the roadway.

10

15

STAFF ANALYSIS

Amendment of I-90/IL 47 Gateway Plan

Director Nordman stated the ±60.23 acre site is included as part of the I-90/IL 47 Gateway Plan that was approved by the Village Board on December 21, 2017. The plan identifies the future land use for the property as Mixed Commercial. The Mixed Commercial designation states the area should target a mix of commercial development that serves as a regional draw, such as general retailers, sporting goods stores, restaurant, and service uses.

20

Director Nordman explained that the petitioner is requesting to amend the I-90/IL 47 Gateway Plan to designate the subject site as Light Industrial.

25

Rezoning and Removal from the Planned Development District

Director Nordman stated the ±60.23 acre site is currently located within the Planned Development District and is zoned C-2 Regional Retail. The Planned Development District was created as a result of the Prime Group Annexation Agreement in 1992 which annexed property that is now Sun City, the Village Green retail center (Jewel), the Automall, Huntley Corporate Park, and also the former Huntley Outlet Center. The Planned Development District established zoning districts and development regulations that were not in the Village’s Zoning Ordinance at that time.

30

Director Nordman further explained that the annexation agreement expired in 2012; however, the Planned Development District and the zoning districts and regulations which were created by the annexation agreement were previously incorporated into the Village’s Zoning Ordinance. The ORI zoning district is not included within the Planned Development District, which necessitates the need to remove the subject site from the Planned Development District to allow for rezoning from C-2 to ORI.

35

40

Director Nordman stated the proposed rezoning to ORI would allow the proposed warehouse/distribution upon approval of a special use permit. The existing C-2 zoning is intended for retail development and does not allow warehouse/distribution as a permitted or special use. As stated in the Zoning Ordinance, the ORI district is intended to provide for the development of office, research, and light manufacturing uses in high visibility locations adjacent to, and in close proximity to, major thoroughfares. Development in the district shall be characterized by an absence of nuisances in a clean and aesthetically attractive setting. The district shall permit light manufacturing operations which, by nature of the product, or magnitude of production, would be compatible with research, professional or business offices. Commercial uses shall be limited to those which are primarily oriented towards servicing those businesses located within the ORI district.

Director Nordman stated a comparison of the permitted and special uses in the C-2 and ORI zoning districts is provided in the staff report.

Special Use Permit

Director Nordman stated the ORI zoning district requires the approval of a special use permit for warehouse/distribution. The petitioner is requesting a special use permit for warehouse/distribution for the three buildings proposed on the ±60.23 acre site. Director Nordman explained that the petitioner is proposing to construct speculative buildings on the property, so there are not specific users/businesses identified as part of the special use permit. The petitioner is requesting the special use permit be granted for the benefit of the subject property and not limited to the owner or operator of the land.

Director Nordman noted that the petitioner has stated the speculative buildings are “consistent with the market for light industrial and warehouse-distribution buildings”. They further state that “owners and lessees of these types of buildings customarily change a number of times over the useful life of the building” and that “limitation on further transfer of property is only reasonable when the special use can have significant impacts on surrounding properties, such as gravel pits, landfills and the like”.

Director Nordman stated the Zoning Ordinance requires that a special use permit be deemed to relate to, and be for the benefit of, the current owner or operator of the use or lot in question rather than to the lot itself, except when otherwise provided by ordinance. Director Nordman stated the petitioner has requested the Village to approve an ordinance granting a special use permit for the benefit of the subject property and not limited to the owner or operator of the land.

Standards for Special Uses

Director Nordman stated special uses are those having some special impact or uniqueness that require careful review of their location, design, configuration and special impact to determine, against fixed standards, the desirability of permitting their establishment on any given site. They are uses that may or may not be appropriate in a particular location depending on a weighing, in each case, of the public need and benefit against the local impact and effect.

Director Nordman stated that when reviewing a Special Use Permit for warehousing, storage and distribution, the Plan Commission must consider the standards identified in Section 156.068(E) of the Zoning Ordinance. No Special Use Permit shall be recommended or granted pursuant to Section 156.068(E) unless the applicant establishes the following:

- (a) *Code and Plan Purposes.* The proposed use and development will be in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this Code was enacted and for which the regulations of the district in question were established and with the general purpose and intent of the Official Comprehensive Plan.
- (b) *No Undue Adverse Impact.* The proposed use, drainage and development will not have a substantial or undue adverse effect upon adjacent property, the character of the area or the public health, safety and general welfare.

- (c) *No Undue Interference with Surrounding Development.* The proposed use and development will be constructed, arranged and operated so as not to dominate the immediate vicinity or to interfere with the use and development of neighboring property in accordance with the applicable district regulations.
- (d) *Adequate Public Facilities.* The proposed use and development will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as streets, public utilities (water consumption and waste generation), drainage structures, police and fire protection, refuse disposal, parks, libraries, and schools, or the applicant will provide adequately for such services.
- (e) *No Undue Traffic Congestion.* The proposed use and development will not cause undue traffic congestion nor draw significant amounts of traffic through residential streets.
- (f) *No Undue Destruction of Significant Features.* The proposed use and development will not result in the destruction, loss or damage of natural, scenic and historic feature of significant importance.
- (g) *Compliance with Standards.* The proposed use and development complies with all additional standards imposed on it by the particular provision of this Code authorizing such use.

15 Director Nordman stated the petitioner’s response to the standards is provided as an exhibit.

Director Nordman stated in determining whether the applicant’s evidence establishes that the foregoing standards have been met, the Plan Commission shall consider:

- (1) **Public Benefit.** Whether, and to what extent, the proposed use and development at the particular location requested is necessary or desirable to provide a service or a facility that is in the interest of the public convenience or that will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood or community. Additional facts to consider are those of job creation and aesthetics and enhancement of the Village’s reputation; and
- (2) **Mitigation of Adverse Impacts.** Whether, and to what extent, all steps possible have been taken to minimize any adverse effects of the proposed use and development on the immediate vicinity through building design, site design, landscaping and screening.

Preliminary Planned Unit Development

Director Nordman explained the purpose of a Special Use for a Planned Unit Development is to encourage imaginative design of coordinated land uses and to provide relief from the subdivision and zoning district requirements which are designed for conventional developments, but which may inhibit innovation and cause undue hardship with regard to the use of parcels which present technical development problems.

Director Nordman stated that when reviewing a Preliminary Planned Unit Development, the Plan Commission shall review and evaluate the Preliminary PUD in terms of whether the proposal:

- i. Is compatible with the Village of Huntley Comprehensive Plan and community goals.
- ii. Promotes high standards in design, site planning and construction.
- iii. Provides a safe and desirable living environment.
- iv. Preserves natural features of the site.
- v. Provides adequate open space for recreation and other community purposes.
- vi. Represents a creative approach in land development.
- vii. The design is compatible with adjacent properties and neighborhood.

Traffic

Director Nordman stated the petitioner has provided a Traffic Impact Study for the proposed development which includes the three proposed warehouse/distribution buildings and assumes that the 6 acres acquired by General RV is developed as approximately 45,000 square feet of retail. Access to the warehouse/distribution development for both trucks and passenger vehicles will be served by the existing signalized access roadway formally known as Factory Shops Boulevard. The study also assumes the 6 acre General RV site will use this route as the primary access upon development.

Director Nordman provided a summary of the report which included:

- Truck traffic will primarily be orientated to/from the west via IL 47 and the full interchange at I-90.
- The proposed warehouse/distribution development and the assumed retail development of the General RV parcel will generate less traffic on a weekday daily and peak hour basis compared to the former Outlet Center operating at full capacity.
- The existing improvements to Freeman Road will continue to be adequate to accommodate the proposed development. Therefore, no traffic control or roadway improvements are recommended along the Freeman Road corridor in conjunction with the development.
- The improvements to the IL 47 corridor and its interchange with I-90 do not require any further traffic control or roadway improvements in conjunction with the proposed development of the former Outlet Center.

Required Parking

Director Nordman stated the proposed site plan will provide a total of 708 parking spaces between the three warehouse/distribution sites. Additionally, building 2 provides 50 truck trailer parking stalls and Building 3 provides 40 truck trailer parking stalls. All truck trailer parking stalls will be located along the eastern edge of the site. The following table provides a comparison of the required and proposed parking on each of the three sites.

	Square Feet	Required Parking	Proposed Parking
BUILDING 1			
Warehouse/Distribution	166,920 sf	83	-
Office	10,400 sf	42	-
TOTAL	177,320 sf	125	204
BUILDING 2			
Warehouse/Distribution	230,160 sf	115	-
Office	15,120 sf	60	-
TOTAL	245,280 sf	175	175
BUILDING 3			
Warehouse/Distribution	230,160 sf	115	-
Office	15,120 sf	60	-
TOTAL	245,280 sf	175	329

Building Elevations

Director Nordman stated the petitioner has provided preliminary elevations and renderings for the proposed warehouse/distribution buildings. Final elevations will need to be provided for each lot at the time of Final Planned Unit Development. The preliminary elevations propose to use precast concrete panels as the primary building material with metal panel accents and vision and spandrel glass around the office portions of the buildings.

Director Nordman explained that further details on the proposed building materials and colors shall be required at the time of Final Planned Unit Development.

Landscaping

Director Nordman stated the proposed landscape plan will add landscaping along the Freeman Road frontage and clusters of shade trees and evergreen trees along I-90. The truck docks facing the private roadway will be screened with a row of evergreen trees and shade trees. Staff is recommending the width of the landscape buffer between the roadway and loading docks be increased to improve screening and the likelihood that plant materials within the buffer will survive. As proposed, the landscape buffer is only 15 feet. Staff is recommending the buffer be increased to 25 feet in accordance with the parking setback requirements for the ORI district.

Director Nordman explained that additional details, including foundation plantings and identifying the size and species of all plant material on the plan, shall be required with the Final PUD application for each of the development sites.

5

Signage

Director Nordman noted that the petitioner has provided proposed locations for development ground signs; however, designs for each sign have not been finalized. The petitioner has chosen not to present sign elevations with the Preliminary Planned Unit Development. A comprehensive sign plan, including detailed elevations, shall be required at the time of Final Planned Unit Development. Director Nordman noted that the former Huntley Outlet Center sign along I-90 would not remain.

10

Requested Relief

Director Nordman explained that as part of the application for Preliminary Planned Unit Development the petitioner has requested relief to increase the maximum building height in the ORI district from 45 feet to 49 feet. The petitioner explains the increase of 4 feet will allow higher parapet walls to provide screening of the rooftop mechanical equipment.

15

Director Nordman stated that no other relief has been requested as part of the Preliminary Planned Unit Development.

20

Preliminary Plat of Subdivision

Director Nordman stated the proposed preliminary plat of subdivision will create the three lots necessary for the three warehouse/distribution buildings. The plat also creates an Outlot C for the private roadway that will provide access to the three lots and to the 6 acres purchased by General RV. Additionally, a cross access and parking easement is provided between Lots 2 and 3 to allow trucks to access the docks on the east elevation of the buildings via the northernmost driveway on Lot 2. The easement also accommodates shared access to the parking lot located between Lots 2 and 3.

25

Director Nordman stated that all proposed lots conform to the 1.38 acre (60,000 square feet) minimum lot area and 160 feet minimum lot width required for the ORI zoning district. Lots 1-3 do not front on a publicly dedicated street as required by the Subdivision Ordinance; however, each lot will front Outlot C which is a private roadway to be maintained by the future property owner's association.

30

REQUESTED ACTION

Director Nordman stated that the Plan Commission is requested to open the public hearing and hear testimony from the petitioner and members of the public followed by questions from the Plan Commission. At the conclusion of the evening the Plan Commission is requested to make a motion to continue the public hearing to Monday, March 11, 2019.

35

Chairman Kibort requested a motion to open the public hearing.

40

A MOTION was made to open the public hearing to consider Petition No. 19-2.2.

- MOVED: Commission DeBaltz**
- SECONDED: Commissioner Nichols**
- AYES: Commissioners Darci Chandler, Hahn, DeBaltz, Nichols, Vice Chair Ellison, Chairman Kibort**
- NAYS: None**
- ABSTAIN: None**
- MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0**

45

50

Chairman Kibort stated that a public hearing is being conducted and all audience members that would like to speak tonight must be sworn in. Chairman Kibort asked anyone wishing to speak to stand and be sworn in. The following individuals were sworn in:

5

Charles Nordman, Director of Development Services
Gerald Callaghan, O'Donnell, Callaghan & Haddad
Michael Reschke, Prime Group
Adam Marshall, Newmark Knight Frank
10 James Schutter, Newmark Knight Frank
Cameron Trefry, Ware Malcomb
John Cerbus, Pearson, Brown and Associates

15

Mr. Michael Reschke, Prime Group, stated he was the Chairman and CEO of Prime Group. Mr. Reschke provided a summary of his company's history in Huntley. Mr. Reschke explained that Prime Group originally purchased several farms in the Huntley area in the late 80's and annexed them into the Village. Mr. Reschke continued by providing a further history of Prime Group's development history in the Village and history of the Outlet Center site.

20

Mr. Reschke continued by providing an explanation of the industrial, warehouse, and light manufacturing market. Mr. Reschke stated that tenants such as these come into the market and look for buildings that under construction or finished.

25

Mr. Reschke stated that the proposed buildings are high-quality buildings with attractive architecture.

Mr. Reschke introduced their industrial sales specialist, Adam Marshall.

30

Mr. Adam Marshall, Newmark Knight Frank, explained he was the marketing agent for the subject site. Mr. Marshall explained that he looked at the viability of different asset types that could potentially go on the site.

Mr. Marshall provided a summary of the industrial and retail market in the surrounding area. Mr. Marshall explained that the industrial market is very tight on supply and there is a demand for industrial. Mr. Marshall provided the Commission with an exhibit analyzing recent sales and leases.

35

At the conclusion of Mr. Marshall's presentation Chairman Kibort asked if the petitioner had anyone else that would like to present.

40

Mr. Gerald Callaghan, O'Donnell, Callaghan & Haddad, stated he was legal counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Callaghan stated they had their entire team available should the Commission have specific questions regarding any elements of the plan.

Mr. Callaghan noted that they did respond to the special use standards in the application. Mr. Callaghan offered to review the response to the standards otherwise they had nothing more to present.

45

Chairman Kibort asked if there were any members of the public that would like to speak on the petition. Chairman Kibort noted that there were no members of the public that wished to provide comment on the petition.

Chairman Kibort asked Commission Darci Chandler if she had any questions or comments on the petition.

50

Commission Darci Chandler asked if they considered retail for the site. Mr. Reschke stated they initially tried to revive the mall with additional leasing efforts.

Commission Darci Chandler asked if the truck parking spaces on the east side of the site were encroaching into the detention. Director Nordman asked the petitioner's engineer to respond to the question.

5 Mr. John Cerbus, Pearson, Brown and Associates, stated their plan avoids the existing wetlands and flood plain on the property.

Chairman Kibort noted that they will be required to follow the Kane County Stormwater Ordinance.

10 Chairman Kibort asked if any maintenance is needed to the wetlands. Mr. Cerbus stated that if any is required they would be willing to do it.

Commission Darci Chandler clarified that the petitioner does not have a tenants for any of the buildings yet. Mr. Reschke stated they did not.

15 Commissioner Darci Chandler asked how they came up with the plan for three buildings. Mr. Reschke stated it was designed with the possibility to combine buildings two and three.

20 Special Counsel Thomas Burney asked Mr. Cerbus to explain the stormwater management plan. Mr. Cerbus explained they compared the stormwater management plan for the original mall to what is currently proposed to confirm they were not increasing the impervious area on the site. Mr. Cerbus explained they will need to comply with the current ordinance with respect to water-quality treatment and include best management practices such as vegetative swales with native grasses and dry wells to promote infiltration.

25 Mr. Burney asked how the impervious surface of the proposed plan compared to the former mall. Mr. Cerbus stated it was below.

Discussion ensued regarding the amount of impervious area on the proposed plan versus the former outlet center.

30 Commission Hahn noted that he's been on the Commission for a long time and the proposed plan is not what was originally planned for the site.

Commission Hahn asked if they would construct all three buildings at the same time. Mr. Reschke stated they would start with the western most building first. Mr. Reschke explained that it would allow them to market lots 2 and 3 to one large user.

35 Commissioner Hahn stated he would like to see a dense area of landscaping at the southeast corner of the site because it is highly visible from the tollway.

40 Commissioner Hahn stated he is concerned that there should be no unused vehicles being stored on the site. Commissioner Hahn further explained that the trailers should be heavily screened with landscaping so they are hidden from the tollway.

Vice Chair Ellison stated she liked the look of the building and requested the engineer come back with clearer numbers regarding the amount of impervious area on the site versus the former mall.

45 Commission Nichols asked what their marketing efforts were for commercial/retail. Mr. Jim Schutter, Newmark Knight Frank, stated he was a retail specialist. Mr. Schutter stated they presented the site at the International Conference of Shopping Centers in Las Vegas, New York and Chicago. Mr. Schutter explained that they have also presented the site to supermarkets, Home Depot, Lowe's, and many others with no interest.

50 Mr. Schutter stated that retail users would prefer to be on Route 47.

Mr. Schutter stated they also had the site listed on CoStar and Loopnet.

5 Commissioner Nichols asked what feedback they received about Huntley. Mr. Schutter stated they were not interested. Mr. Schutter stated that he's been in real estate for 30 years and it's a very challenging time.

Commissioner DeBaltz asked if they would construct the interior improvements of the buildings or wait to find a user. Mr. Reschke stated the interior of the building would be built-out when a user is found.

10 Commissioner DeBaltz stated she would prefer that the site remain for retail or similar type uses such as a hotel or restaurants.

Chairman Kibort reiterated his concern that the condition of the existing wetlands is reviewed a part of the project.

15 Mr. Burney asked the marketing team if the site was considered a high-profile site. Mr. Schutter stated it wasn't high profile because there was no user for it.

20 Mr. Burney asked if the site was unique. Mr. Schutter stated that people like the tollway visibility. Discussion ensued regarding the lack of large sites in the surrounding area with tollway visibly and easy access to an interchange.

Mr. Burney asked Mr. Marshall to explain the type of users that could occupy the buildings. Mr. Marshall stated that it would likely be distribution, logistics providers, or light manufacturing.

25 Discussion ensued regarding the storage of trucks and storage containers.

Mr. Burney asked if there were employment projections for the site. Mr. Cameron Trefry, Ware Malcomb, stated employment projections are difficult to provide because the buildings are speculative and it depends on the operations of the user. He explains that a distribution center could have hundreds of employees working on the floor.

30

Discussion ensued regarding the architectural design of the buildings.

Mr. Burney asked why the petitioner couldn't wait until a user is found to request a special use permit from the Village. Mr. Reschke stated users need a building they can move into quickly.

35

Discussion ensued regarding the request for special use permits for warehousing, storage and distribution.

Chairman Kibort requested a motion to continue the petitioner to March 11, 2019.

40

A MOTION was made to continue the public hearing for Petition No. 19-2.2 to Monday, March 11, 2019, at 6:30 p.m.

45	MOVED:	Commission Nichols
	SECONDED:	Commissioner DeBaltz
	AYES:	Commissioners Darci Chandler, Hahn, DeBaltz, Nichols, Vice Chair Ellison and Chairman Kibort
	NAYS:	None
	ABSTAIN:	None
50	MOTION CARRIED	6:0:0

7. Discussion

Director Nordman stated the next Plan Commission meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 11, 2019.

8. Adjournment

At 8:25 pm, a MOTION was made to adjourn the February 25, 2019 Plan Commission meeting.

MOVED: Vice Chair Ellison
SECONDED: Commissioner Darci Chandler
AYES: Commissioners Darci Chandler, Hahn, DeBaltz, Nichols, Vice Chair Ellison, and Chairman Kibort
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
MOTION CARRIED 6:0:0

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Nordman

Director of Development Services
Village of Huntley