

**Regular Meeting of the Combined Plan Commission/Zoning Board Of Appeals
Gregory J. Bielawski Municipal Center, Carol Stream, DuPage County, Illinois**

June 9, 2008

All Matters on the Agenda may be discussed, amended and acted upon

Chairman David Michaelson called the Regular Meeting of the Combined Plan Commission/
Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 7:30 p.m. and directed Recording Secretary Wynne Progar
to call the roll.

Present: Commissioners Anthony Manzzullo, Angelo Christopher, Ralph
Smoot, Lateef Vora, Dee Spink & David Michaelson
Absent: Commissioner Joyce Hundhausen
Also Present: Community Development Director Bob Glees and Wynne Progar
Recording Secretary

MINUTES:

Commissioner Vora moved and Commissioner Manzzullo made the second to approve the
Minutes of the Meeting of May 27, 2008 as presented. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Manzzullo, Christopher, Vora, Spink &
Michaelson
Nays: 0
Abstain: 1 Commissioner Smoot
Absent: 1 Commissioner Hundhausen

PUBLIC HEARING:

Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Christopher made the second to open the
public hearing. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

**#06362: VILLAGE OF CAROL STREAM – 500 N. GARY AVENUE
Text Amendments – Utility Structures
Continued from 4/14/08 meeting**

Mr. Glees said that once again, staff is asking that this be continued because we are still
working on it. The draft reports have been sent to the attorneys for review. Staff requests that
this matter be continued to August 11th.

Commissioner Christopher moved and Commissioner Smoot made the second to continue this
matter to the meeting of August 11, 2008. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 6 Commissioners Manzzullo, Christopher, Smoot, Vora, Spink
& Michaelson
Nays: 0
Absent: 1 Commissioner Hundhausen

**# 08109: PRINCE INDUSTRIES – 745 N. Gary Avenue
Special Use – Outdoor Activities and Operations**

Mr. Glees said that the applicant has received comments that require a certain amount of
redesign for this petition and he has provided a letter requesting a continuance to July 14, 2008
to allow the applicant enough time to find a solution to the design constraints.

Commissioner Spink asked if this is going to be enough time, given that there is a holiday and Mr. Glees said that since the petitioner is not present, it is the prerogative of the Commission to determine an exact date.

Commissioner Christopher moved and Commissioner Vora made the second to continue this matter to July 14, 2008. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	6	Commissioners Manzzullo, Christopher, Smoot, Vora, Spink & Michaelson
Nays:	0	
Absent:	1	Commissioner Hundhausen

**#07311: VP VENTURES – South Side of North Avenue – 800 ft. West of Gary Avenue
Annexation, Re-Zoning, Subdivision, Special Use Permit for Hotel, Shopping Plaza, Planned Unit Development, Preliminary PUD Plan, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, Sign Code Variations, North Avenue Corridor Review – (continued from 5/12/08 meeting)**

Commissioner Ralph Smoot recused himself at this point in the meeting.

Sworn in for testimony were the following: Bill Chaffee, India Knolla, and Denny Wright from Value Place, Jennifer Hellwarth and Tom Matthews from Gem Commercial Group LLC, Robert Parsons, Parsons Commercial Contracting, James G. Caneff, Roake & Associates, Wendy M. Reutebuch and Gregory L. Dose, Attorneys.

Gregory Dose introduced the team from Value Place and asked Robert Parsons to review the façade changes that were done in response to the comments at the last meeting. Mr. Parsons noted that façade material changes include a brick ledge with a full brick bottom half and the same details for the retail center to tie them together visually. The top half will be of masonry stucco instead of HardiBoard or EFis material. He commented that he divided the materials since he believes that an all brick façade doesn't have very much character.

Jim Caneff said that one of the staff questions was regarding the drive-thru configuration was the amount of queuing that was provided for the drive-thru window and stated that they have not taken the time, at this point, to put the number of cars, usually a 20 foot length, but based on the length provided here, they are confident that they can find a location that would not obstruct a proposed doorway for a menu board or an order board, as well as provide the additional ten feet, or ten vehicles to queue up for a total of 15. He pointed out that the drive aisle, to bypass, is 15 feet wide to provide flexibility for the cars that are angle parked, to back out without encumbering the drive-thru lane. The drive aisle does provide emergency vehicle access as requested by Village staff and the Fire Protection District. Mr. Caneff said that there will be striping to indicate one way access as well as signage.

Peter Lofgren, Parsons Commercial Contracting, was sworn in at this time. He said that in regard to the signage they are going to be putting three signs on the building, one each on either side of the building and on the end of the building that faces North Avenue. He noted that they have gone to a monument sign that mounts on the ground and they will be submitting new information on this sign. There will not be a pylon sign.

Denny Wright, Value Place provided background information on Value Place in terms of its history and its concept, its business plan and its operations. He introduced India Knolla, director of training and she proceeded to explain the selection process and training requirements for all property managers. Mr. Wright then went over some Customer Surveys that were conducted at selected properties.

In response to a question, it was stated that each guest checks out and checks back in every week. It was also stated that it is a part of the routine for a property manager to become involved in community activities.

At the call for public hearing, David McCarthy, representing Carol Stream Stratford Inn, Inc.

He asked if there was a marketing study done to indicate that there is shortage of extended stay hotels in the area and Mr. Parsons said that there was information compiled from public information as well as market studies and noted that within a six mile radius there is one extended stay hotel in Hanover Park. Mr. McCarthy asked if a 108 unit is available and Mr. Parsons said that depending upon the size of the market area, Value Place has decided that a 121 unit is approved for this market place. In response to the question, Mr. Parsons said that the property manager is employed by Value Place management and reports to an area manager and the selection process begins between 90 to 120 after development starts. Mr. McCarthy asked if staff is available during late hours on weekends as well as regular hours and Ms. Knolla said that there is always an on site employee that can be accessed for guests. Mr. McCarthy asked Mr. Glees or Mr. Caneff or to both, saying that there was a reference to a, some sort of a wetlands report, it was actually the subject of a conversation with Ms. Progar and me this morning. Is there some sort of a wetlands report pertaining to the wetlands on this site. Mr. Caneff said that is a report that was prepared Encap and was, I believe it was submitted to the Village, either by their consultant, a wetlands ****Mr. McCarthy asked if there was a wetlands report ...in the files of the Village and Mr. Caneff said that he does not know about that personally, **** (****indicates subject was not using the microphone and/or there were extraneous noises on the tape so the remarks cannot be understood).

In response to the question about the wetlands extending in to the buffer and the parking lot, the answer was yes. Mr. McCarthy gave a handout to the Commissioners regard construction costs per room for different hotels and indicated that on page 9, a chart that shows the hotel/motel tax gone after 30 days and that on 50% of the occupants, there will be no hotel/motel tax collected. There was discussion regarding the variances being requested and it was noted that they were for the retail development and not the hotel. Value Place could get by without the changes being requested. It was determined that there are still no signed tenants, since there is no approval for the project and that the Value Place has not purchased the property for the same reason.

Wendy M Reutebuch, of Much, Shelist, Chicago, IL said she is appearing on behalf Inhouse Management and is here to gather information about the Value Place project and to express concerns that in the event there are any concessions in taxes, fees or licensing. She said that she has not attended any previous meetings and in reading the minutes of the May 12th meeting, it seems like there has been discussion there are issues in language regarding the conventional hotels in Carol Stream and extended stay. They want to make sure that, for the most part, the comparison is apples to apples, not apples to oranges in terms of fees, licensing, and inspections to Code and make sure there are no concessions for the extended stay versus the conventional hotel.

The owner of the adjacent property said that he thinks this is a great idea to have a hotel that has been changed to reflect everything that the Commission wanted. A beautiful looking building, on the front there is retail, which is something Carol Stream wants and needs and he thinks this is a great idea.

Chairman Michaelsen said, let the record reflect that the staff report is hereby entered and made a part of the Minutes of this meeting.

Mr. Glees said this report serves as an addendum to the report presented at the May 12, 2008, Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. At that meeting, by a 5-0-1 vote, the Plan Commission continued the case to allow for additional information to be presented and for revisions to be made to the building elevations. The applicant has submitted new information regarding Value Place customers and a new Value Place building rendering. Specifically, attached for your review is a Value Place Guest Survey dated 4/20/08 - 4/30/08, a revised copy of Exhibit B, Sheet 1, and the original version of that exhibit for purposes of comparison.

At the May 12, 2008, meeting, several issues were raised by the Plan Commission and Village staff that required the applicant to submit additional or revised information. Below, each of these issues is identified, and staff presents an evaluation of how the provided information or revisions addresses the concerns.

1. Hotel Operations – The applicant has arranged for a hotel operations representative to be present at the June 9th continuation of the public hearing. The Plan Commission's questions and concerns should be addressed at that time.

Building Materials - The Plan Commission expressed their view that the hotel building depicted on Exhibit B did not meet their expectation with respect to the image of quality development within the North Avenue Corridor. Specific suggestions included a greater use of masonry and more interesting architectural enhancements. As shown on the attached exhibit, the applicant has revised the colors and shapes of the building architecture. The gables have been modified, the colors have been changed, the use of masonry has been increased and component shapes have been added to the face of the building. The brick extends essentially to the halfway point of the building height. The stucco would be in two colors ("Pecos Spice" and "Durango Dust"), with a third color ("Georgian Brick") used in the accent trim. In staff's evaluation, the architectural changes made by the applicant to address the concerns raised by the Plan Commission have resulted in an improved appearance to the building. We believe the building meets the architectural requirements of the North Avenue Corridor as specified in §16-5-6(K).

Special Use for Drive-Up Service Window – The Preliminary PUD Plan included in the Plan Commission's packet for the May 12th meeting showed a Drive-Up Service Window to be included with the proposed Shopping Plaza; however, no special use had been requested and the public notice did not include such a request. Since that time, the applicant has submitted a request for Special Use for Drive-Up Window, and the request has been properly noticed. Staff's evaluation of the request is provided below.

Special Use for Drive-Up Service Window

The applicant proposes to provide a drive-up service window as part of the 12,000 square foot shopping plaza. No user has been identified for the drive-up window; the applicant wishes to obtain approval in advance in order to facilitate his marketing of the property. The Preliminary PUD Plan depicts the drive-up window service lane as being located on the south and east sides of the building. The lane would be accessed via a one-way aisle located at the west end of the building. Staff has a number of fairly minor operational comments regarding the proposed layout, which we believe can be addressed with modifications to be made to the PUD Plan. These are as follows:

The Zoning Code requires a minimum stacking capacity of 10 vehicles, and this requirement appears to be met. However, the plan does not adequately define the full extent of the drive-up lane across the south side of the building, nor does it illustrate the vehicle stacking capacity. The lane should be defined by means of striping, and the vehicle stacking capacity should be illustrated.

The Zoning Code requires a minimum capacity of five stacked vehicles before the ordering station. The plan does not indicate the ordering station. The ordering station should be indicated and the stacking capacity should be illustrated.

Staff believes the parking island at the southeast corner of the building does not extend far enough to the south, so that vehicles would be able to drive out of the drive-up lane at the intersection of two drive aisles, which staff considers to be an unnecessary and undesirable conflict. The curbed island should be extended to the south so as to create a one-lane exit drive for the drive aisle south of the shopping plaza.

The row of diagonal parking to the south of the shopping plaza does not meet the dimensional requirements of the Zoning Code. The dimensioning should be revised to provide a 20.5-foot wide parking tier and a 15-foot drive aisle.

With the minor revisions as noted above, the plan will show that the required vehicle stacking spaces for the drive-up service window will be provided, and that the physical characteristics of the lane itself will be satisfactory.

As stated in Section 16-15-8(E) of the Zoning Code, no Special Use shall be recommended by the Plan Commission nor approved by the Village Board unless the special use:

1. Is deemed necessary for the public convenience at the location.

A drive-up service window at the proposed location will provide a convenient service for Village residents and motorists passing by the site. As such, the use is deemed necessary for the public convenience at the location.

2. Will not be unreasonably detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare.

Given the safe access to the service window lane, the drive-up service window should not be unreasonably detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare.

3. Will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.

The surrounding properties are primarily commercial in use; as such, the proposed drive-up service window would not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood.

4. Will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.

The proposed drive-up service window will not impede the normal and orderly development of the undeveloped property to the west.

5. Will provide adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other important and necessary community facilities.

Utilities, access roads, drainage and necessary community facilities will be provided.

6. Will conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as the Village Board may in each instance modify such regulations.

The project is expected to conform to all applicable codes and requirements.

Based upon the evaluation criteria, staff supports the special use request for a drive-up service window.

Summary:

With respect to building architecture, we believe the changes made by the applicant to address the concerns raised by the Plan Commission have resulted in an improved appearance to the building. We believe the building meets the architectural requirements of the North Avenue Corridor as specified in §16-5-6(K).

Staff recommends denial of the requested Sign Code Variations.

Staff recommends approval of the requested Rezoning to B-3 Service District upon Annexation and of the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision

Staff recommends approval of the requested Special Uses for Planned Unit Development, Hotel, Shopping Plaza and Drive-Up Service Window, of the Preliminary PUD Plan, and of the North Avenue Corridor Review, subject to the following conditions:

That the multi-tenant shopping plaza building shall not be permitted to have more than 1,200 square feet allocated toward food service use;

That the Final PUD Plan shall include pedestrian facilities;

That the Final PUD Plan shall include revisions to the proposed Drive-Up Service Window lane, including:

the lane must be defined by means of striping,
the ordering station must be indicated,
the vehicle stacking capacity must be illustrated,
the curbed island must be extended to the south so as to create a one-lane exit drive for the drive aisle south of the shopping plaza,
the row of diagonal parking to the south of the shopping plaza must meet the Village's dimensional requirements;

That the stormwater management areas shall require final approval from the Engineering Services Department at time of building permit;

That traffic control signage shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Village Engineer;

That the access drive to North Avenue shall require approval from the Illinois Department of Transportation;

That the landscaping along North Avenue shall be a hardy, salt-tolerant variety to avoid winter die-off;

That all landscape materials shall be maintained in a neat and healthy manner, with dead or dying materials replaced with similar size and type species on an annual basis;

That the parking stalls shall be striped at proper dimensions per the Village Code and in accordance with the Village's looped striping requirements;

That all rooftop equipment shall be completely screened from view in all directions;

That all ground-mounted mechanical equipment shall be screened from view from surrounding public streets, and if landscaping is used, it must be equally effective in winter as it is in summer;

That all trash enclosures shall be constructed with masonry materials to match the masonry on the buildings;

That separate building permits are required for all trash enclosures and signs; and

That the development of the site and buildings will comply with all State, County and Village Codes and requirements.

Commissioner Manzullo commented that the setback for the six parking spaces was on the Preliminary PUD Plan. He stated that a lot of his questions were answered during the presentation but said that he is concerned with security for the building, specifically for the hours of midnight to 6 a.m... Mr. Porter said that there are three staff members that live on site as well as security that make rounds of the building every two hours, as well as cameras both inside and outside. In regard to cameras in the parking lot, it was determined that there are some legal questions that have to be decided on legal camera placement, but they will be installed when the sites have been determined. Commissioner Manzullo questioned that manner of identifying sexual predators that may try to register and the process was explained and that management would alert the police department regarding a change of address notification. Commissioner Manzullo asked if the petitioners agreed with the staff recommendations and was told they did agree. Commissioner Manzullo stated that he is in agreement with the staff recommendations.

Commissioner Vora asked what the daily rate would be and was told that there is a seven day minimum stay and that rate would be \$249.00 per week and each additional person was \$10.00. In response to the questions, it was noted that staff employees have living quarters in the same building.

Commissioner Spink asked if the hotel/motel tax would be generated since all guests must check out and check in on a weekly basis. Mr. Glees said that he could not answer that question at this time since it has been referred to legal counsel. Commissioner Spink noted that there will be 15 cameras at the hotel and asked how many would be at the retail center. Mr. Porter said that the developer does not generally place security cameras at the retail site, that it would be up to the property user to determine if they required security cameras and they would be responsible for them. In response to her question, it was stated that there are no other Value Place Hotels in IL, but there are some in Iowa and Kansas. Commissioner Spink said that she is concerned with the larger size of the proposed hotel, especially with the bad economy, and she is concerned that if things get worse, we could be left with a half finished project. Commissioner Spink asked exactly which employees live on site and was told that the property attendants live on site, but the property manager can live off site, in the event that he/she has a family. Ms. Knolla noted that some of the property managers are married to each other and work on opposite shifts. Commissioner Spink asked how the survey was done and was told that they were done with guests by the property manager of each location. Commissioner Spink said that she would like to see surveys done on a larger scale and commented that she is not sure about her decision.

Commissioner Christopher said that he feels that the surveys are not adequate for the IL area since you do not have any hotels here. He noted that he agrees with staff recommendations.

Chairman Michaelsen said that he has had most of his questions answered and that he is satisfied with the selection and training methods for the property managers and staff, and that they will portray a professional image and be pro-active in safety concerns for their guests. He noted that the petitioner has done a good job in dressing up the building with the brick and he was told that the brick would be on the back and front of the building. In regard to the Special Use permit for a drive-up window, Chairman Michaelsen said that he is not opposed to it, but wondered if it would stop a national account if it was denied. Mr. Parsons said that the concern about the stacking would be addressed and since the Village wants sales tax revenue, he believes that greater revenue would be generated with the drive-up window. He noted that there will be minimum luminescence from the parking. Chairman Michaelsen asked how many rooms per month have to be rented to meet expenses. Not including loans, there would have to be 10% to 15 occupancy and at 60% occupancy would be the break-even point. In response to the question it was determined that the hotel would be paying the head tax on a weekly basis.

It was determined that the retail signs will conform with the Codes and at this point the recommendation for denial of the Sign Code variations was withdrawn. It was also stated that there will be canopies on the ends of the building and that the gable roofs will have gutters or

some method of collecting the run-off from the roof. The trash enclosures will be of masonry and painted to match and that the retail mechanicals will be screened from all view. Commissioner Manzullo moved and Commissioner Christopher made the second to recommend approval of all of the requests in accordance with staff recommendations. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Manzullo, Christopher, Vora, Spink & Michaelson
Nays:	0	
Absent:	1	Commissioner Hundhausen

Commissioner Manzullo moved and Commissioner Christopher made the second to approve the North Avenue Corridor review in accordance with staff recommendations. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Manzullo, Christopher, Vora, Spink & Michaelson
Nays:	0	
Absent:	1	Commissioner Hundhausen

The petitioner was reminded that this matter will be heard by the Village Board at their meeting of June 16, 2008 and the petitioner was advised to attend that meeting.

Commissioner Manzullo moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to close the Public Hearing. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	6	Commissioners Manzullo, Christopher, Smoot, Vora, Spink & Michaelson
Nays:	0	
Absent:	1	Commissioner Hundhausen

At 9:45 p.m. Commissioner Manzullo moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to adjourn. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

FOR THE COMBINED BOARD