

APPROVED MINUTES
VILLAGE OF ANTIOCH
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
MUNICIPAL BUILDING: 874 MAIN STREET, ANTIOCH, ILLINOIS
August 12, 2010

CALL TO ORDER

The Antioch Planning and Zoning Board meeting was called to order by Chairman Burdick at 7:30 p.m. in the Municipal Building, 874 Main Street, Antioch, Illinois 60002.

ROLL CALL

Roll call indicated the following members were present: Karasek, Ralston, Kaiser, Dominiak and Ipsen. Also present were Chairman Burdick, Attorney Long and Deputy Clerk Folbrick. Absent: Weber.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

No report.

OLD BUSINESS

PZB 10-03 – Request for a sign variance approval for the construction of additional wall and ground signage in accordance with Title 10, Chapter 14, and Section 6 of the Antioch Zoning Ordinance, located at 322 W. Route 173 – Petitioner NJB Operations on behalf of Taco Bell – Director Nilsen explained that this matter was presented at a Village Board meeting, where it was remanded back to the Planning and Zoning Board in order to consider their amended request for an eleven-foot monument sign. The revision still requires a variance, and the board asked for the Planning and Zoning Board to hear the matter with proposed revisions.

Deputy Clerk Folbrick administered the oath to those who wished to testify.

Church Jordan, on behalf of the petitioner, reviewed the revised design, and requested a variance for a monument sign. Director Nilsen explained that the initial request for additional wall signage was approved, however the variance for the monument sign was denied. The previous monument requests were 25 feet and 15 feet. The current request is for an 11-foot sign. They further discussed the placement of the sign, landscaping, and setback requirements.

Director Nilsen said that since there are no unique circumstances to grant the sign variance, staff recommends denial of the request. Member Karasek asked if the bottom of the monument sign is included in the sign height. Director Nilsen explained that the entire sign is included in the height requirements, however the sign only is considered for square footage. Ms. Jordan asked if two monument signs could be considered; one for each brand. Director Nilsen stated that only one monument sign is permitted.

Member Karasek moved, seconded by Member Ipsen, to deny PZB 10-03 – Request for a sign variance approval for the height variance of 11-feet for a monument sign and maintain original recommendation from the May 13, 2010 Planning and Zoning Board Meeting to approve additional wall signage. Upon roll call, the vote was:

YES: 5: Karasek, Ralston, Kaiser, Dominiak and Ipsen.

NO: 0.

ABSENT: 1: Weber.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

NEW BUSINESS

PZB 10-05 – Request for a sign variance approval for the construction of additional wall signage within the Antioch Crossing PUD located at 483 Illinois Route 173; PIN 02-16-201-006; Petitioner VLand Antioch II LLC– Director Nilsen reviewed the request from the petitioner.

Mr. Chris Sotos, owner and manager of the multi-tenant building, stated the difficulty the tenants are having with their businesses and reviewed their request for a sign variance. He explained that the signs would all be of a uniform size, and may help increase business for the tenants resulting from improved rear signage visibility.

Deputy Clerk Folbrick administered the oath to those who wished to testify.

Member Karasek asked if the corner users would be allowed additional wall signage on the side. Director Nilsen said that they would not. Member Dominiak asked if the additional rear signage could still be uniform, but at a size that would comply with the code. Mr. Sotos replied that they could, however, the signs may be difficult to read.

Mr. Tony Morrone of Signco reviewed the proposed signs, and the request for increased square-footage.

Member Karasek asked what the square footage is for the signs in front of the building. Director Nilsen said that they were allowed smaller signs under the new code.

APPROVED MINUTES

Members discussed the variance request, difficulty seeing the signs under the current restrictions, signs on surrounding properties, and the possibility of increased business as a result of larger signs. Mr. Soto responded that his tenants have voiced concerns over the visibility of rear signage, and are struggling as a result.

Director Nilsen reported that there is a unique circumstance, being the only multi-tenant building with visibility issues, however the request of a 50% increase in square footage is excessive. He related that staff would recommend granting a variance of 24 square feet instead of the 34 square feet requested.

Member Karasek moved, seconded by Member Ipsen to approve PZB 10-05 – Request for a sign variance approval for the construction of additional wall signage within the Antioch Crossing PUD located at 483 Illinois Route 173 with the limitation of having one sign per tenant – one on the front and one on the back.

Member Dominiak asked for clarity if a tenant uses 2 spaces, if the sign could be doubly increased. Member Karasek stated that they would be limited to one sign, but it could be larger based on the sign code and the motion.

Member Dominiak added that she can understand how additional rear signage would help, however, doesn't see the need for a large sign to be visible from 500 feet.

Upon roll call, the vote was:

YES: 3: Karasek, Ralston and Ipsen.

NO: 2: Kaiser and Dominiak.

ABSENT: 1: Weber.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

OLD BUSINESS

PZB 10-04 – Request that the properties that fall within the designated geography defined as the Form Based Downtown Overlay be rezoned and official zoning map of the Village amended to reflect designated land use categories as shown within the proposed land use map – Petitioner Dustin Nilsen on behalf of the Village of Antioch – *Continued from the July 8, 2010 Planning & Zoning Board Meeting.*

- Deputy Clerk Folbrick administered the oath to those who wished to testify. Deputy Clerk Folbrick read aloud two letters into the record.

Mr. Charles Cermak, Antioch resident, asked who the petitioner was, and for an explanation of the process. He also asked if the impact of a form-based code is known. Attorney Long explained that the board is simply considering a code, and will decide whether or not to adopt the drafted code, and what should be included if adopted.

Mr. Bill Waschow, village resident, stated that he would like to see the downtown area improved, however is concerned with the future sale of his home. Director Nilsen explained the current code's potential effect on the downtown area, and how the proposed code would protect his home and the historic downtown.

Members discussed the surrounding communities that are accepting the grant opportunities from the RTA. Attorney Long explained that the RTA provided the grant opportunities to communities so that they may consider drafting codes that would allow for denser areas to increase ridership, and decrease vehicles on the road.

Mr. Robert Bigelow, business owner, expressed concern with the possibility of eminent domain on his property. He indicated that Glenview residents have had difficulty with the form-based code adopted by that community. He stated that he is unhappy with the development of the downtown area, and expressed concern with the possibility of a financial burden on residents and business owners. Mr. Bigelow further discussed parking, liabilities, and the problems facing business owners.

Director Nilsen responded to public comment and questions, and provided a summary of the request, and a history of the Village's code adoption and comprehensive plans. He explained the involvement with the RTA, and that there is a shared goal. Antioch wants to increase its business and visitors, and RTA wants to increase its ridership. He reviewed the 4 different public workshops that were held, as well as the creation of a steering committee. He said that the form based code is a proposed set of restrictions that codify what is valued in downtown Antioch today. Director Nilsen added that there is no sale of property that would trigger any changes, however changes to current existing uses and new construction would have to comply with the new code if adopted. He said that this code supports development, and provides opportunities for investment.

Member Ipsen asked if there was currently a plan for the downtown. Director Nilsen replied that there is a master plan within the comprehensive plan. He stated that if approved, this code would change the rules that guide future development. Member Ipsen asked when the transitional core may begin to change. Director Nilsen wants to develop something regardless of market conditions, and have two development groups that have expressed interest in pursuing the development of this property. Any redevelopment would depend upon the finances of the potential developers.

APPROVED MINUTES

Member Dominiak clarified that current B-2 zoning would have more flexibility under the proposed code, and the emphasis would be protecting the downtown look. She asked why the boundaries included in the proposed code were located where they were. Director Nilsen responded that he needed a close proximity to the train station, and easily replicated areas.

Member Ralston expressed concern with the communication to the community about the project. She thinks it's a good idea, but would like to educate the community better on how it works.

Member Karasek asked if business owners were included in the preparation of the code, and discussed its compatibility with the comprehensive plan and its boundaries. Director Nilsen replied that workshops were held before the document was created, and the document reflects the opinions expressed by those present at the workshops.

Member Kaiser asked if a hybrid type of code has been considered. Director Nilsen said that the proposed code has a hybrid element, but Antioch is not urban enough to adopt a hybrid code.

Member Ipsen said that he thinks it is a good goal, but would like to keep a B-3 zoning designation for Antioch Electric until they sell. Director Nilsen explained that while the zoning may change, it will not change his business operations. Mr. Volling stated that his concern with the zoning change is that it will hurt the sale of the business.

Member Dominiak asked if there were architectural standards included, and how that would be applied and enforced. Director Nilsen replied that there is no anti-monotony mandate within the proposed code, however the architectural standards are thematic.

Mr. John Tsarpalas, property owner, expressed concern with the larger changes happening at his property locations, and asked if economic feasibility studies could be done. Director Nilsen explained that the concept plans are not master plans, and the idea is to eliminate the rules that are currently in place, and replace them with rules that are context sensitive.

Member Karasek asked why the properties located on the Lake Street business corridor were not included in the form based codes. Director Nilsen replied that the cutoff point was Hillside Avenue and it is based partially on the comp plan.

Member Ralston moved, seconded by Member Ipsen to continue PZB 10-04 to the September 9, 2010 Planning & Zoning Board Meeting. Upon roll call, the vote was:

YES: 5: Karasek, Ralston, Kaiser, Dominiak and Ipsen.

NO: 0.

ABSENT: 1: Weber.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, Member Ralston moved, seconded by Member Dominiak to adjourn the Planning and Zoning Board meeting at 10:27 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lori K. Folbrick
Deputy Clerk