

APPROVED MINUTES
VILLAGE OF ANTIOCH
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD, REGULAR MEETING
Municipal Building: 874 Main Street, Antioch, IL
April 14, 2016

OPEN MEETING

Secretary Slazes called the April 14, 2016 Planning & Zoning Board meeting to order at 7:32 PM in the Municipal Building: 874 Main Street, Antioch, IL.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Secretary Slazes and the Planning & Zoning Board led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Roll call indicated the following members were present: Johnson, Weber, Ralston and Ipsen. Absent was member Kaiser. Also present were, Attorney Long, Director of Community Development Michael Garrigan and Secretary Slazes.

Member Johnson moved, seconded by Member Weber, to appoint Member Ralston as temporary chair for the meeting. Upon roll call, the vote was:

YES: 4: Johnson, Weber, Ralston and Ipsen.

NO: 0.

ABSENT: 1: Kaiser.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

None.

MEETING MINUTES

Approval of the February 11, 2016 Planning & Zoning Board Meeting minutes as presented—

Member Johnson moved, seconded by Member Ipsen, to approve the February 11, 2016 Planning & Zoning Board minutes as presented. Upon roll call, the vote was:

YES: 4: Johnson, Weber, Ralston and Ipsen.

NO: 0.

ABSENT: 1: Kaiser.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

OLD BUSINESS

PZB 15-06 – Request for a Planned Unit Development Amendment to revise the planned development of 64 townhome units at Sprenger Drive (east of Deercrest Drive), Walker Drive (northeast of Deercrest Drive), Kevin Court and Brian Court East to a development comprised of 38 single family homes—Petitioner: Troy Mertz, Antioch Land Trust – *Continued from the September 10, 2015 and October 8, 2015 and January 11, 2016 Planning & Zoning Board Meetings.* Per Director Garrigan, staff continues to work with Mr. Mertz and respectfully requests a continuance to the May 12, 2016 PZB meeting.

Member Johnson moved, seconded by Member Ipsen, to continue PZB 15-06 to the May 12, 2016 PZB meeting. Upon roll call, the vote was:

YES: 4: Johnson, Weber, Ralston and Ipsen.

NO: 0.

ABSENT: 1: Kaiser.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

PZB 15-07 – Request for a text amendment/special use to allow a resale shop building adjacent to the church – Petitioner: St. Ignatius of Antioch Episcopal Church – *Continued from the November 12, 2015 and January 11, 2016 Planning & Zoning Board Meeting.* Per Director Garrigan, the applicant has requested a continuance for one more month and turned to Attorney Long to provide details on the matter. Attorney Long then reminded the board that the issue at hand is regarding indoor bathroom facilities in the retail shop, in particular compliance with the Illinois Accessibility Code and the Illinois Plumbing Code. He went on to explain St. Ignatius did not agree with the Village of Antioch's interpretation of the applicable building codes and subsequently filed an appeal with the Illinois Department of Public Health (IDPH). He stated just a few days ago the IDPH issued their opinion to the effect that the Village's interpretation of the plumbing code was, in fact, accurate and denied the Church's request for a re-interpretation and at the same time denied their request for a variance. The IDPH has given St. Ignatius a 30-day period to come up with a corrective action plan which details how the building will be brought into compliance and a time frame for completion. He further explained if they do not come up with a corrective action plan or file the appropriate appeal within the time given, then the State would probably send their enforcement branch and St. Ignatius would be unable to use the building for any purposes. Attorney Long and Director Garrigan felt a continuance until the May PZB meeting is appropriate at this time.

APPROVED MINUTES

Member Johnson moved, seconded by Member Weber, to table PZB 15-07 to the May 12, 2016 Planning & Zoning Board meeting. Upon roll call the vote was:

YES: 4: Johnson, Weber, Ralston and Ipsen.

NO: 0:

ABSENT: 1: Kaiser.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

NEW BUSINESS

PZB 16-02/AAA – Request for annexation and rezoning to Commercial B-3 for the property commonly known as 22221 W. Il Route 173; PIN 02-16-400-025 – Petitioner: Robert Buehler

Director Garrigan presented the staff report stating the applicant wishes to annex into the Village so they can connect to Village utilities which are adjacent to the subject site. The applicant is working with Staff on the long term conversion of this building from its semi-service/industrial use to a more retail oriented building. Any future retail use of the site would require a re-imagining of the building with more contemporary store fronts. The applicant is proposing to annex approximately 9.5 acres in the Village and rezone to B-3. The site is contiguous to the Village's Facility Planning Area and is identified as commercial in the Village's Comprehensive Plan. Director Garrigan summarized by stating staff would recommend that the proposed annexation is a logical extension of the Village's municipal boundaries.

Director Garrigan then addressed the request by the applicant to be zoned B-3 (Service and Wholesale Business District). Their intention is to connect to Village utilities enabling them to remove their current septic field which would allow expansion of their parking area. B-3 zoning is consistent with the existing uses of the building which includes a cabinet business and a number of smaller light industrial users. He further explained any rezoning consistent with Illinois law should be consistent with zoning and land uses in the surrounding area, be consistent with the Village's policies and Comprehensive Plan, shall not have any negative impact on the surrounding properties and be consistent with the trend of development in the adjacent area. He stated the zoning of the subject property to B-3 is generally consistent with the commercial character of the surrounding area. Director Garrigan also pointed out that any new development along Route 173 must comply with the Village's "Route 173 Corridor Plan" which was adopted by the Village Board and made part of the Village's Comprehensive Plan. The applicant is not immediately proposing to make any modifications to the subject site and therefore in the near future would not be meeting any of the highlighted principals in the Route 173 Corridor Plan. Based on that fact, staff would be looking for the applicant to make a commitment within the annexation agreement to address some of the highlighted principals within the Village's corridor plan as highlighted below:

- 1) Staff believes that there is an opportunity to provide more comprehensive planning for this site and the adjacent commercial properties to the west and east. A common access point one day could be constructed that would line up with the main access point into the Wal-Mart development and provide a unified common access point to this site and the Waste Management site to the west. This type of plan would meet the requirement to enhance connectivity between properties.
- 2) There is an opportunity for the applicant to submit a future concept plan showing how this site would integrate into any future development to the west or redevelopment to the east with a common cross access drive, uniform landscape buffer between properties and a more extensive landscape buffer along Route 173.
- 3) Any submitted concept plan could show a circulation plan based on the future improvements within this site and any redevelopment of the adjacent parcels. Consistent with good planning, staff would be looking to minimize the access points on Route 173 and would be looking for good cross-access circulation between this site and adjacent parcels in the future.
- 4) The applicant should identify in any Annexation Agreement how the landscaping along Route 173 will be enhanced and the aesthetic character of the subject site will be improved and meet the landscape standards as outlined in the Route 173 Corridor Plan.
- 5) The applicant has a conceptual plan for a comprehensive re-imagining of the subject building into a more retail oriented façade facing Route 173. To address the required "principal" for enhanced architectural design, staff would be looking for this elevation to be incorporated into any future Annexation Agreement.
- 6) Staff would be looking for the applicant to identify pedestrian connections and sidewalk connections within the subject site and how they would connect to the adjacent properties in the future. The Village's Route 173 Corridor Plan identifies the need for good pedestrian connections and there is a need for a sidewalk along the south side of Route 173.
- 7) Consistent with the design criteria in the Route 173 Corridor Plan, staff believes that there is an opportunity to incorporate a conceptual entrance monument as part of this development which would provide some additional visual interest to the subject site.
- 8) There remains an opportunity to incorporate a unified sign plan for the subject site as part of any future re-imagining of the subject site. In addition, there is an existing billboard that should be removed in the

APPROVED MINUTES

future with a reasonable amortization period. The removal of the existing billboard is consistent with the Route 173 Corridor Plan.

Director Garrigan explained Staff would continue to work with the applicant to address the highlighted issues with respect to the Village's Route 173 Corridor Plan. Based on the above analysis, staff is recommending the Planning and Zoning Board make a favorable recommendation that the proposed Annexation of the subject property is a logical extension of the Village's municipal boundaries. Additionally, staff is also recommending to the Planning and Zoning Board that the proposed rezoning of the subject site to B-3 is consistent with the adjacent commercial properties and long term trend of development along the Route 173 corridor.

Secretary Slazes then administered the oath to those wishing to testify. Mr. Craig Krandel, attorney for the petitioner, introduced himself and stated the property in question is actually owned by Colony Investments, LLC. His clients are seeking B-3 zoning with their annexation and are hoping to attract more retail/service businesses. He produced an artist's rendering of what the property in question could possibly look like in the future and said modifications could be made to each individual unit when needed, i.e. removing garage type overhead doors and replacing with window fronts. He reiterated his client's desire to connect to Village utilities. Petitioner Robert Buehler then explained the modifications to the existing building would be on an individual unit basis as needed. Mr. Buehler did state their most immediate wishes would be to connect to the Village's sanitary line and take out the mound septic system at the front of the property, but also stated their well is functioning just fine and are not currently interested in connecting to the Village's water.

Member Johnson inquired about expansion of the parking area and asked about what type of lighting they would use. Mr. Buehler answered that their first priority would be safety and that there would probably be no immediate work on the property. He would anticipate parking lot expansion not starting until spring of next year and that some variables exist with regards to the property just to the west of his which is Waste Management. Attorney Krandel stated any lighting in the future would be discussed with staff and would conform to Village standards. Member Johnson asked about access to the property in question. Currently their access is to the east with a joint access drive for the Buehler property and the property to the east. Eventually the petitioner would like to have cross access directly from the Walmart but stated that would depend on what happens with the Waste Management property. Member Johnson asked if any existing leases were for extensive terms precluding property changes. Mr. Buehler stated no current lease is over five years. Member Ipsen asked if the applicant would submit a design to the Planning and Zoning Board after the annexation and zoning to B-3 is granted. Director Garrigan explained Staff would like to include as much detail as possible in the annexation agreement. He further explained the PZB will be reviewing a "Site Plan Review Ordinance" next month but this is not currently in place and legally the applicant is under no obligation of that proposed ordinance. He stated the two questions facing the board this evening is whether to annex the property and whether to approve B-3 zoning. In regards to site planning, that would have to go in front of the Village Board and staff would work with the applicant to insure the Village's wishes are met. Member Johnson expressed concern that no changes would be made for possibly 10 to 15 years and Director Garrigan explained certain language can be added to the annexation agreement, i.e. a certain percentage of improvement within a certain time frame to alleviate that situation. Chairperson Ralston then inquired as to the possibility of granting the annexation, the septic field is removed and nothing further is done to the property. Mr. Buehler stated that is not their intention and their goal is to make the property more profitable and attract more retail business within the Village limits. There being no further discussion, Chairperson Ralston asked for separate motions for the annexation and zoning.

Member Ipsen moved, seconded by Member Johnson, to approve the annexation of the property commonly known as 22221 W. II Route 173 (Colony Investments, LLC).

Upon roll call the vote was:

YES: 4: Johnson, Weber, Ralston and Ipsen.

NO: 0:

ABSENT: 1: Kaiser.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

Member Ipsen moved, seconded by Member Johnson, to approve the zoning of the property commonly known as 22221 W. II Route 173 (Colony Investments, LLC) to Commercial B-3.

Upon roll call the vote was:

YES: 4: Johnson, Weber, Ralston and Ipsen.

NO: 0:

ABSENT: 1: Kaiser.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

PZB 16-03/TA – Proposed Text Amendment to the Street Graphics Regulations, Village Code Chapter 14.

Director Garrigan presented the staff report for a new sign ordinance which highlighted the differences between the current sign code and the proposed sign code. His presentation included many visuals which he used to explain the proposed sign code. He began with monument signs, increasing

APPROVED MINUTES

the total height from 8 feet to 10 feet. He would like to eliminate all pylon signs, stating any business currently having a pylon sign and wishing to modify would need to change to a monument sign. He stated the Antioch Downtown District would have separate requirements to keep the character of the historic downtown district intact. Signs in commercial districts (i.e. Route 173 corridor) would have different regulations. Temporary signs would require a permit that would be valid for 30 days and three permits per year would be allowed. Currently lit cabinets are not allowed, but would be permitted in the new ordinance. For larger commercial projects over 50,000 square feet, a monument sign would be allowed up to 15 feet in height. Every monument sign will require a brick or stone base, columns and caps with extensive landscape plantings at the base. Wall signs have little changes and do not seem to be a problem. Current businesses would not have to change existing signs, but new owners would need to comply with the new ordinance. Ground signs will be allowed in the downtown area if it is sandblasted and not higher than 6 feet in height and a total of 20 square feet. "A" frame signs would be allowed in the downtown district. LED signs are the new trend in signage and the current ordinance does not allow the message to change more than once in every 24 hours. The new ordinance would allow LED signs and the message would have to remain static for 15 minutes, and would only be allowed on an IDOT arterial.

Member Johnson commented that he likes the idea of maintaining the historic character of the downtown district and he is in favor of keeping the sandblasted signs for downtown. He does not like the idea of neon signs or LED signs. He is in favor of smaller signage and is not in favor of increasing heights and would like to keep a "minimalist approach" to signs.

Member Ipsen asked if Director Garrigan has any photos of a franchise sign with external illumination. He responded no and that there are very few communities with that type of sign, i.e. Nantucket and Carmel, California. Member Ipsen also wanted to state he likes the neon "OPEN" sign. Director Garrigan further explained if they maintain a minimalist approach, there may be many more variances requested.

Member Ralston stated she also likes the "OPEN" sign and that it doesn't need to blink. She also likes to see the protruding signs in the downtown district. She has no problem with the added 2 feet to the monument signs or the internally illuminated boxes. She also promotes having rear signage on businesses that back to a parking lot.

Antioch Township resident Paul Green wished to add his comments. He feels signage is very personal for all involved. He is aware the sign code goes back to 1976 and was re-written in 2009 by Dustin Nilsen and if this code passes, many signs in Antioch now would be legal non-conforming. He also stated he feels this code addresses commercial/business uses but not residential (i.e. garage sales, political signs, etc.). Director Garrigan responded that those signs would be exempt and that there is a list of exempt signs. Mr. Green stated the Village should regulate the size of the signs even if they're exempt. Attorney Long advised those types of signs are regulated by State code and the Village is prohibited from changing. Mr. Green also feels a procedure for variances should be left in the sign code. He also feels a definition page should be provided in the code. He would also like to see the sandwich board signs in the downtown district regulated better, i.e. removed during parades and possibly only allow them during business hours. He also feels more attention should be paid to civic and community signage as he feels these are "hot spots". He suggested sign violations go to Antioch's adjudication court.

Mr. Paul Johnson, a Village resident, inquired about the Culver's sign and why that LED message board was allowed. It was explained to him that sign went in before the sign code was changed in 2009.

Village Trustee Mary Dominiak made a suggestion regarding the downtown district where she has seen other towns that have little flags on each business stating they are open. There was no further discussion on the matter.

Member Johnson moved, seconded by Member Weber, to table PZB 16-03/TA for further consideration until the May 12, 2016 Planning and Zoning Board meeting. Upon role call the vote was:

YES: 4: Johnson, Weber, Ralston and Ipsen.

NO: 0.

ABSENT: 1: Kaiser.

THE MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, Member Ipsen moved, seconded by Member Weber to adjourn the regular meeting of the Planning & Zoning Board at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy M. Slazes
PZB Secretary