

**VILLAGE OF ALGONQUIN
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
November 11, 2019**

AGENDA ITEM 1: Roll Call to Establish a Quorum

Chair Patrician called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

Mason called the roll, Commissioners present were: Patrician, Hoferle, Laipert, Neuhalfen, Postelnick, Sturznickel, and Szpekowski. Commissioners absent were None.

Staff Members present were: Ben Mason, Senior Planner and Brandy Quance, Village Attorney.

AGENDA ITEM 2: Approval of Minutes from the October 14, 2019 Meeting.

Chair Patrician asked for a motion on the minutes of the October 14, 2019 meeting. Commissioner Hoferle made a motion, seconded by Szpekowski, to approve the minutes. Motion passed by voice vote, with no nays.

AGENDA ITEM 3: Public Comment

Chair Patrician called for any public comment, being none, Patrician closed public comment.

AGENDA ITEM 4: Request for a Major Amendment to 2014 Final PUD, for building façade and signage modifications, and a Special Use Permit for a health club

Case No. 2019-16 Burlington / Planet Fitness, 1400 S. Randall Road

Petitioner: Mike Peirce, Storebuild LLC

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING AND ESTABLISH QUORUM

Chair Patrician opened the public hearing and asked to establish quorum. Commissioners present: Patrician, Hoferle, Laipert, Neuhalfen, Postelnick, Sturznickel, and Szpekowski. Commissioners absent: None. A quorum was declared.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Chair Patrician asked the petitioners to step up and be sworn in. Village Attorney Quance swore in the petitioners and verified proper legal notice.

Linda Kost of Realty Metrix and Mike Peirce with Storebuild LLC outlined the proposed division of the former Gander Mountain building into two tenant spaces. One would be occupied by Burlington retail department store, and the other by Planet Fitness health club. Burlington is an off-price discounter that appeals to millennials with a modern, fresh store design. Planet Fitness offers affordable gym membership packages and its unique no judgment zone, for those who want to work out in a comfortable atmosphere. The petitioner is willing to revise the elevation renderings to accommodate several changes recommended by Staff, but two critical components to the Burlington store brand are the proposed pure white EIFS for the storefront and its need to

incorporate a listing of product names under the business name on the wall and ground signs. Mr. Peirce noted the overall site is in a hole, below the level of Randall Road and the proposed signage would not be obtrusive.

STAFF COMMENTS

Chair Patrician asked Mason for the staff report. Mason outlined the request and draft findings of fact, and Staff recommended approval with conditions, including that a cornice be added above the Burlington storefront façade, the white EIFS material be converted to a tan or beige color, and that the Burlington signage be limited to the formal business name only.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Chair Patrician asked for any Commission questions or comments.

Hoferle asked if the proposed storefront wall signs meet Village Code size requirements, to which Mason stated the color renderings did not include dimensions but the wall signs will each be required to comply with the maximum 300 square foot size allowance. Hoferle stated the white EIFS proposed is too stark a contrast with the rest of the earth tone building colors.

Szpekowski agreed with Hoferle that the white EIFS proposed on the Burlington storefront façade was too stark.

Neuhalfen stated he supported Burlington's proposed signage which incorporates both the business name and some of its product names, as that is part of the store's brand. He noted though that the size of the signage must still comply with Village Code requirements. He indicated he did not have any concerns about the white color EIFS shown for the Burlington façade.

Postelnick stated Burlington's corporate branding interests are understandable, and that the white EIFS color helps the storefront to pop and stand out. He also mentioned he did not have any issues with Burlington requesting the store name and several of its product names on its wall and ground signage.

Sturznickel asked if the individual product names under Burlington's store name would be lit up, to which Ms. Kost stated the signs would all be back lit in a consistent design and color.

Laipert asked if the outdoor parking lot lighting would remain, to which Mr. Peirce stated he believed so yes. She asked about timing, to which Mr. Peirce stated Planet Fitness would ideally like to be open by the middle of next year some time, and that Burlington would likely be later on next year. She asked if the loading dock in back of the building would remain the same, to which Mr. Peirce stated yes.

Patrician stated he does not have any concerns about the white EIFS element on the Burlington storefront as proposed. He explained he had mixed feelings about whether Burlington should be allowed to have its product names below the business name. He asked Staff if it had concerns about a non-sales tax generating use like the Planet Fitness health club occupying a portion of the former retail building, to which Mason stated no and noted that it will serve to bring foot traffic to the surrounding businesses. Patrician asked if the proposed tenants are part of an all-or-nothing package, and what would happen if Burlington walked away if it was not permitted its corporate

storefront brand design; Mr. Peirce responded that Planet Fitness is separate and could potentially still move forward with its plans to take part of the building.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Patrician opened the public hearing and asked for any public comments.

There being no one interested in speaking, Chair Patrician closed the public comment and asked for a motion.

COMMISSION MOTION ON PETITION

Commissioner Postelnick made a motion to approve the request by the petitioner Storebuild LLC for a Major Amendment to 2014 Final PUD, for building façade and signage modifications, and a Special Use Permit for a health club at 1400 S. Randall Road, consistent with the plans submitted by the petitioner, the findings of fact listed in the November 11, 2019 Community Development memorandum, and the conditions recommended by Staff with two exceptions: 1) the petitioner be allowed to use the pure white EIFS material color proposed for the front façade of Burlington and 2) that the petitioner be allowed to use their proposed sign package for Burlington which includes the business name as well as product names. Seconded by Commissioner Neuhalfen. Chair Patrician called for a voice vote on the Motion: AYE: Laipert, Neuhalfen, Postelnick, Sturznickel, Szpekowski, and Patrician. NAY: Hoferle. Absent: None. Motion passed, 6-1.

AGENDA ITEM 5: Request for a Major Amendment to 2005 Final PUD, to allow for residential development, and Re-zoning from B-2, Business to R-5, Residential

Case No. 2019-17. Esplanade Second Resubdivision Lots 1-2, 2330 & 2500 Esplanade Dr.
Petitioner: Amanda Panozzo, Synergy Property Holdings LLC

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING AND ESTABLISH QUORUM

Chair Patrician opened the public hearing and asked to establish quorum. Commissioners present: Patrician, Hoferle, Laipert, Neuhalfen, Postelnick, Sturznickel, and Szpekowski. Commissioners absent: None. A quorum was declared.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Chair Patrician asked the petitioners to step up and be sworn in. Village Attorney Quance swore in the petitioners and verified proper legal notice.

Stephen Daday, attorney for the petitioner, and Steve Madura, Hilco Real Estate outlined the proposed re-zoning request. The petitioner foreclosed on the properties in 2010 and has attempted to market for commercial uses the past several years without success. The petitioner is requesting re-zoning to residential to allow for such products as senior housing or assisted living, which have expressed interest.

STAFF COMMENTS

Chair Patrician asked Mason for the staff report. Mason noted that the properties are currently zoned for business use, with the option of residential units above commercial uses. Staff appreciates and recognizes the marketing efforts made to date by the owner and broker, but does not recommend modifying the current zoning. The Village has not approved speculative zoning for properties without end users as part of an application, and Staff recommends retaining the

underlying zoning and Special Use approval that any residential units on the subject property be located above commercial uses. The property to the west is similarly zoned for mixed-use commercial and residential, and the properties to the north, east and south all have commercial zoning.

COMMISSION QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Chair Patrician asked for any Commission questions or comments.

Sturznickel suggested the petitioner submit a plan for the type of senior housing or assisted living development they would like to obtain zoning for, to which Mr. Daday stated developers will not spend the time and money to do so without support from the Village and Staff for that type of development on the property.

Laipert stated changing the Village's zoning map is not a trivial matter and expressed concern about doing so on a speculative basis.

Hoferle stated Esplanade never developed as it was originally planned for, and explained he would be open to having residential development feathered into the subject property.

Postelnick noted the market is strong for rental apartments.

Szpekowski stated she would be open to changing zoning for the property to allow residential.

Patrician asked short of changing the zoning for the property, what do developers want to hear, to which Mason clarified residential is already permitted as a Special Use on the property provided it is above ground floor commercial. Mason noted another alternative could be to consider permitting "horizontal mixed use" on the property – rather than vertical, multi-story - where for example, the parcel closer to Corporate Parkway be required to have a commercial use, and the second lot further back from Corporate be considered for residential or senior housing.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Patrician opened the public hearing and asked for any public comments.

There being no one interested in speaking, Chair Patrician closed the public comment and asked for a motion.

COMMISSION MOTION ON PETITION

Commissioner Hoferle made a motion to approve the request by the petitioner Synergy Property Holdings LLC for a Major PUD Amendment and re-zoning of the parcels from B-2, PUD Business to R-5, PUD Multi-Family, based on the Zoning Code's recognition that new types and procedures in land development or redevelopment are emerging and that the mixing of uses and variations in heights and yards can produce satisfactory and lasting results, if property designed and planned, without adverse influence upon surrounding property (Village Code Section 21.11). Seconded by Commissioner Sturznickel. Chair Patrician called for a voice vote on the Motion: AYE: Hoferle, Postelnick, Sturznickel, Szpekowski, and Patrician. NAY: Laipert and Neuhalphen. Absent: None. Motion passed, 5-2.

AGENDA ITEM 6: New/Old Business

None.

AGENDA ITEM 7: Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was seconded and a voice vote noted all ayes. The motion carried and the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ben Mason, AICP
Senior Planner