

**Regular Meeting-Plan Commission/Zoning Board Of Appeals  
Gregory J. Bielawski Municipal Center, Carol Stream, DuPage County, IL**

**September 22, 2008**

**ALL MATTERS ON THE AGENDA MAY BE DISCUSSED, AMENDED AND ACTED UPON**

Chairman David Michaelsen 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, Dee Spink and David Michaelsen
- Absent: Lateef Vora and Joyce Hundhausen
- Also Present: Assistant Community Development Director Don Bastian & Recording Secretary Wynne Progar

**MINUTES:**

Commissioner Smoot moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to approve the Minutes of the Meeting of August 25, 2008 as presented. The results of the roll call vote were;

- Ayes: 5 Commissioners Manzzullo, Christopher, Smoot, Spink & Michaelsen
- Nays: 0
- Absent: 2 Commissioners Vora and Hundhausen

**Public Hearing:**

Commissioner Manzzullo moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to open the Public Hearing. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

**08214: FEDEX – 150-180 Della Court  
Special Use Permit – Garages & parking lots for motor  
Vehicles not incidental to a permitted use**

Kevin Connelly, owner of the building was sworn in as a witness in this matter. He explained that the request is to have the property in regard to 150 – 180 Della Court rezoned from I – Industrial to S-2 Low Hazard Storage Use, which allows for covered parking. The reason for the request is that the Fed Ex facility at 205 Della Court, which is directly west of the property will be converting their existing employee parking lot into trailer parking. To accommodate or replace the approximately 51 displaced employee parking spaces they will create about 100 indoor parking spaces and an additional 52 exterior parking spaces located at 150 – 180 Della Court. Mr. Connelly said that they agree with items 1 through 7 that are included in the staff report.

At the call for public hearing the following people spoke in opposition of the request being made; Rick Campbell, 1N201 Mission Court, in concern of a staging area that will be even closer to the homes on Mission Court and the louder noise they will create every night, all night long. He also said that since there is no sound barricade or landscape screening for any further development and he contacted other entities such as Christian Grammar School that could be concerned about the emissions and noise as well. Jerry Latus also spoke of his concerns regarding the beeping of the trucks as they back up saying that when it goes on for hours at a time early in the morning, it drives a person

crazy. He also said that something else that needs looking into is the storm sewer discharge will have to be looked into before more blacktop is added.

Mr. Bastian stated that the applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit to allow a Garage and Parking Lot Not Incidental to a Permitted Use in the I Industrial District, in accordance with Section 16-10-2(B)(7) of the Zoning Code. Fed Ex Ground, located at 205 Della Court, wishes to create new parking facilities for its employees on the subject property, which is located directly adjacent to the Fed Ex property. The parking facilities would consist of the existing outdoor parking lot at the west side of the subject property, and also an indoor parking garage that would be created by remodeling the western portion of the existing building. The space to be converted within the building totals approximately 41,850 square feet, consisting of two units addressed as 150 and 180 Della Court. All traffic would enter and exit via the existing parking area west of the building, with no changes to the existing traffic pattern.

Fed Ex's intention is to relocate employee parking from the south side of their building at 205 Della Court to the new facilities at 150-180 Della Court. The Fed Ex plan is to replace the employee parking area at the south side of their building with an expansion of their truck parking and staging area. The Fed Ex facilities were granted a special use for outdoor activities for their truck operations in 1998, and at that time, facility expansions were contemplated. An expansion of the special use permit was granted in 2001 to allow for the first phase of the trailer parking expansion, and a second expansion of the special use permit was granted in 2003 to allow for the second phase of the trailer parking expansion. Fed Ex is aware that the current planned trailer parking expansion will require approval of another expansion of the special use permit. The applicant has advised staff that Fed Ex wishes to proceed with the current request for 150-180 Della Court before embarking on the request for the trailer parking expansion at 205 Della Court.

From an operational standpoint, staff has two concerns. The first is a safety concern, with respect to the possibility of an accidental impact by a vehicle through the common wall with the adjacent space to the east, which is currently occupied by a children's gymnastics facility. We would prefer that some type of protective barrier, such as guardrail, be installed along the common wall. Second, pedestrian access to the main Fed Ex building should be accommodated by means of a sidewalk along a portion of the cul-de-sac bulb as well as leading from the cul-de-sac to the building.

With respect to the code requirements for the proposed indoor parking structure, the building will need to properly address all building, fire, life safety and zoning code issues, such as proper ventilation, fire resistance rating of the separation wall, storm sewer pollutant discharge and handicapped space requirements, to name a few. The applicant has indicated this will be done as part of the application for building permit. However, in the event the building needs to be provided with ventilation exhausts, these should be provided at the west wall of the building, in order to preclude the possibility of Gary Avenue Corridor concerns. We also note that the proposed parking spaces inside the building do not appear to meet the dimensional requirements of the Zoning Code. Staff believes there is no problem or constraint with respect to meeting the required parking space and aisle dimensions, and so we have no objection to requiring that the dimensions be corrected as part of the building permit submittal.

Staff also evaluated the parking requirements of the remaining spaces in the building, which include the GymNasti gymnastics school and the Publishers Graphics warehouse. The parking requirements for those two occupancies are 33 spaces and 13 spaces, respectively, for a total requirement of 46 spaces, which is precisely the number of spaces existing on the east side of the building. Staff is satisfied that the proposed new parking facilities for Fed Ex employees will not cause a parking shortfall on the subject site.

With respect to the requested Special Use permit, staff does not object to the proposed use of the property for Fed Ex Ground employee parking, including an indoor parking facility. However, the concerns regarding proper compliance with building, fire and life safety codes, as

well as parking space dimensional requirements, will need to be addressed during the building permit process.

Staff recommends approval of the applicant's request for a *Special Use Permit for a Garage and Parking Lot Not Incidental to a Permitted Use* for the building and property at 150-180 Della Court, subject to the conditions noted in the staff report.

Commissioner Manzullo asked if what is being considered tonight has anything to do with the truck noise or the truck traffic or anything truck related but these things will be discussed at an upcoming request for the 205 address with an expansion to a Special Use and Mr. Bastian said that is correct, and Commissioner Manzullo said that he will save his truck related questions until that action is requested. Commissioner Manzullo said that he is concerned about the landscaping screen for the residents on Mission Street and he would want to have screening from the lighting. Mr. Bastian said that any additional screening or landscaping that we feel is warranted in association with the future request to expand the parking at 205 something will be taken care of at that point. With respect to the vehicles coming out of the building, the vehicles plan are going to be exiting straight west out of the building and there is a berm and an eight foot tall solid fence on the west side of the FED EX property, so he does not understand the concern the head light comment for that location and Mr. Bastian would like to reserve the opportunity to increase the amount of landscaping and screening at the 205 property when we review that application. Commissioner Manzullo said that he questions the reinforcement of the wall between the two buildings, asking if the guardrail is adequate or could concrete bollards be considered. Mr. Bastian said that bollards could be considered if the PC/ZBA makes it a recommendation and Mr. Bastian said that staff is comfortable with the guard rail, but that an alternative could be considered. Commissioner Manzullo said that he is not comfortable with just a guardrail and he feels that something more solid should be considered. Commissioner Manzullo noted that the petitioner said they were in agreement with the conditions in the Staff report, but he noted that the roof top mechanicals must be screened from all sides was not included. Mr. Bastian said that he mentioned that as an addendum, but he will add it as a condition.

Commissioner Spink said that she is against the project because while the building has children using another part of the building, she doesn't feel that any vehicles should be used in any part of a building connected to that unit. Even though there is a ventilation system, exhaust fumes can travel into any part of the connected units and children are very vulnerable to even small amounts of exhaust fumes. She is also concerned that if there would be a power outage, will there be something that will indicate that there is a measurable amount of bad air so that the occupants would know when it is time to leave the building just like a fire drill. Mr. Connelly said that he would consider adding a carbon monoxide monitor.

Commissioner Spink said that she would like to know if there is anything in place that if power was lost, the circulation of air would continue throughout the building. Mr. Connelly said that this will be for employee parking only, and that there will not be anything but personal trucks and cars parking in that area. Commissioner Spink asked if at any time there are vehicles allowed to be stored in the building and was told that it would not be permitted.

Commissioner Smoot said that he appreciates FedEx having its operations in Carol Stream and he thinks that they have done a very good job so far. Commissioner Smoot noted that he appreciated the residents' concerns which he will discuss when Phase II when it is submitted. He said that FedEx will continue to be considerate of their neighbors and that he does not have a problem with a parking garage,

Chairman Michaelsen said that he would be a little concerned with the carbon monoxide in a building that will be used as a garage. Cars that are left long enough to cool off are harder to start and give off more emissions and carbon monoxide until the cars warm up. Staff will make sure that the proper things are in place for that. It does bring up the concern that if power is lost and one needs to get out of the garage, any overhead door nowadays has a chain pull that can open the garage door and while it is not an emission problem, it still is a problem regarding

getting the cars out. Chairman Michaelsen said that there is a gymnastics gym at the other end of the building and said that he is sure the Building Dept. will request a certain type of demising wall, a rated fire wall, maybe 2 hours, but that will taken care of by the Building Department. He questioned will there will be any additional lighting that would go on in the existing parking lot of the proposed building. There will be no additional lighting on the exterior of the building and the interior there will be lighting way over the recommended amount for a parking deck and the interior lighting will not be seen from the outside of the building. In response to the question of parking any box trucks, it was determined that only employee vehicles will be permitted to park in the building.

Commissioner Spink asked what type of security is there for the building and Mr. Connelly said that there will be either a key code for each employee that will only be able to use at a certain time of day, or a slide card. In response to the question of hours of operation, it was note that only FedEx will determine that.

Commissioner Manzzullo asked if the parking garage going was to be a completely enclosed structure, or is it going to vented in any other way that at the top of the garage? Mr. Connelly said that it will be a completely enclosed structure with two overhead doors on the west side of the building, with ventilation that meets or exceeds the building requirements for a covered parking structure.

Paula Price, Architect of record said that the wall between the parking garage and the gymnastics center is a four hour rated concrete block wall, double what is required by Code.

Commissioner Manzzullo said that during the cold weather many employees will sit and let their cars warm up for several minutes and since this is an enclosed building will there be some kind of device that will measure the amount of carbon monoxide and Mr. Connelly noted that there is a carbon monoxide detection system wired in with the exhaust system. Commissioner Manzzullo asked Mr. Bastian to explain the ratings between buildings. Mr. Bastian said that when there are different uses within the building, the different uses are required to be separated by a firewall that has a certain rating. The hazard level of each use dictates the rating of the firewall.

Commissioner Spink asked if there will be parking stop blocks for each space, or will there be just the guard rail on the wall and Mr. Connelly said that the Village requested a guard rail on the block wall and they will review the recommended bollards with Staff to decide what will be approved.

Commissioner Manzzullo moved and Commissioner Smoot made the second to recommend approval of the special use for the garage and parking lot not incidental to a permitted use, with recommendations for roof top mechanicals screening, and any additional landscape screening including some large evergreens. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	4	Commissioners Manzzullo, Christopher, Smoot and Michaelsen
Nays:	1	Commissioner Spink
Absent:	2	Commissioners Vora and Hundhausen

The petitioner was reminded that this matter will be heard by the Village Board at their meeting on October 6, 2008, and was advised to attend that meeting.

**#08215:                    LAWRENCE S. NORA/U- STORE-IT -120 Tubeway Drive**  
**Special Use Permit - Mini-Warehouse Zoning Variation – Floor Area Ratio**  
**Gary/North Avenue Corridor Review**

Mark Sullivan, architect, was sworn in as a witness in this matter. He explained that this is a unique situation, and stated that this is an existing building that is located at the

corner of Tubeway Dr. and Gary Ave. The proposal is to convert the eastern three quarters of the building a storage facility. The building is quite tall right now and the client's use does not require tall ceilings, so within the existing envelope of the building we will be able to put in two additional floors to come to have a three story storage facility. The western one quarter of building is going to be a tenant space for similar compatible use, cold or bulk storage, or even light manufacturing. There will very few changes to the site, what they are doing is adding a 6 foot board on board screen wall fence which will continue along the south side and then turn back at the  $\frac{1}{4}$  section to the west end of the site for the tenant. They are going to make a couple of changes to the entryway by cutting in a couple of extra new doors to allow fire egress out of the building and they have complied with all of Staff's suggestions regarding the window and doors as well as moving the fence. There will be a couple of new slot windows to punctuate the building and give it some articulation on the east and south elevation. On the inside of the building, that will be the termination of the corridor, so there will be light in that section of the building. There will be changes to the existing store front of the building by adding some windows, so there is some light and vent on the second floor, which will be the watchman's unit. There will be a new storefront entry on the first floor which will be a new entry to the facility and there will be a couple of handicap access ramps. There were no comments or questions from those in attendance at the call for public hearing.

Mr. Bastian stated that there are three requests being made by the petitioner to allow the U-Stor-It facility to occupy the building at 120 Tubeway Drive. The first is a Special Use for a mini warehouse, the second request is a variation to exceed the allowable floor area ratio for a mini warehouse and third is the Gary Avenue Corridor Review. As the petitioner indicated they wish to purchase the property at 120 Tubeway and convert it the majority of the building to a self storage facility. There are several components to this request, there are some minimal changes to the outside of the building including the addition of windows and doors and the fence that will be installed on the south side of the building. Essentially staff finds that the proposal addresses the criteria for a Special Use Permit, and the changes planned will be an improvement to the exterior of the building and an enhancement to the exterior architecture. With respect to the variation, Mr. Bastian said that the I- Industrial District has a floor area ratio of 0.8 but many warehouse uses have a specific lower floor area ration of 0.5. That requirement, staff believes, is based on the old design, which is a long, low one story buildings that are spread out over a piece of property typically. The request here, is to add a story within the building and to have three floors of space within the existing building. The proposed floor area ratio as calculated in the Zoning Code, is 1.11. Staff does not a concern with the request for the variation. because from the exterior of the building there is not going to be a visible increase in the intensity of the use of the property. With respect to the Gary Avenue Corridor Review, again staff is seeing this as enhancements to the property with the additional windows added, vertical design elements on the east side of the building which will highly visible from Gary Avenue. Originally there were a number of steel doors that were proposed to be added and Staff suggested to the applicant that windows be added to those doors to enhance the appearance as viewed from Gary Avenue and they have agreed to do that. The last comments from Staff is in regard to the fence and in the Staff report for the last meeting on 9/8, we have identified some concerns about the location of the fence that was proposed at that time, the revised plan that was presented tonight shows that the fence has been relocated to comply with all applicable Codes. One question Mr. Bastian asked the members of the Plan Commission to comment on, is that the Gary Avenue Corridor regulations require a six foot board-on board fence, they do not allow latitude in Staff or the Commission to approve other types of fences. Would the Commission support a text amendment that would allow Staff to approve a decorative style fence (wrought iron /aluminum style fence) which was originally proposed by the applicant. Certainly where screening is the

primary objective, there would be a solid fence, since that makes sense. Where access is concerned, a decorative wrought iron/aluminum style fence would be appropriate. Mr. Bastian said that staff would like to know if such a text amendment to allow a decorative style fence would be supported by the Commission.

To summarize, Staff recommends approval of the Special Use Permit for the mini warehouse, recommend approval of the variation for the floor ratio and approval of the Gary Avenue Corridor Review, subject to the conditions noted on page 8 of the Staff report, deleting the first condition that was in regard to the fence.

Commissioner Spink asked where the garbage is stored and how often is it picked up? Mr. Sullivan said that all trash is held within the facility and that it is picked up weekly.

Wendy Musick, Office Manager, was sworn in and said that they discourage people from leaving their garbage behind but there is a five yard dumpster on site.

Commissioner Manzzullo said that he is ok with the request. He asked the petitioner if he is now taking the fence out, and Mr. Sullivan said that originally the decorative fence was screening the parking to the east, and then Staff said that it was not allowed in the GAC, so they removed it to be in compliance. They then moved the fence around to be inline with the east side of the building, it continues across the south line of the property and then returns to the end of the building. As far as the wrought iron fence, Commissioner Manzzullo said that he is concerned that if it is approved now, there might be another petitioner asking for the same thing so he would not be in favor of a text amendment for a variance to the GAC. Commissioner Manzzullo said that in thinking about Commissioner Spink's observation about trash, he hopes that should anyone leave a couch or some other large amount of objectionable materials, that the manager would call for a special pick-up and not have set out until the next pickup. The manager said that is their practice, and that they agree to all of the staff recommendations.

Chairman Michaelsen asked if there were going to be security cameras and Mr. Sullivan said that there will several security cameras throughout the facility, inside and out and that they will be monitored 24/7. In regard to the hours of operation, it was stated that the office hours are 9a.m. to 6 p.m. but that people would have access to their storage units from 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. In response to the managers' quarters, it was noted that there will someone on site 24/7. Chairman Michaelsen said that he would not mind doing a text amendment and allowing a decorative fence, but he will side with the other Commissioners. He also asked if there are rules not permitting storage of chemicals, or flammables and Ms. Musick replied that these items will be forbidden in the storage area. Mr. Sullivan noted that each level has a fire suppression system as required by the Code.

Commissioner Spink asked if there two exits for the tenant space and was told that there were two exits to meet the Code and that the tenant space was in the area behind the office. Commissioner Spink said that she does not want a text amendment to change GAC regulations, because each case should be considered on its own merit.

Commissioner Smoot said that he would not be in favor of a text amendment.

Commissioner Christopher said a text amendment would be ok with him.

Commissioner Spink moved to recommend a Special Use Permit for a Mini Warehouse, a variation for floor area ration, and with the deletion of the 1<sup>st</sup> recommendation, Commissioner Christopher made the second. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Manzzullo, Christopher, Smoot, Spink & Michaelsen
Nays:	0	
Absent:	2	Commissioners Vora and Hundhausen

The petition was reminded that this matter will be heard by the Village Board at their next meeting on October 6, 2008 and was advised to attend that meeting.

#06362

VILLAGE OF CAROL STREAM – 500 N. GARY AVENUE  
**Text Amendment – Utility Structures**  
 Continued from 8-25-08 Meeting

Mr. Bastian said that he knows that this has been before the Commission before and he does not want to repeat all of it, but would like to go the questions that were asked at the last meeting. He directed the Commissioners to pages 1 & 2 where the answers from the attorney have been provided. There was a question about who will be responsible for the landscape screening? The response from the Village Attorney is that the Village could go after either the property owner of the Service entity, but keep in mind that AT&T put most of their boxes in the right- of- way so that would be the entity to go after, but the way the amendment is crafted, the Village couldn't force the terms of the Zoning Ordinance against either the owner or the service entity. The second question had to do with the limitation of the tree being alive for only a year. The Village attorney stated that they have removed the one year limitation and staff would always like to see that landscaping be maintained in perpetuity and the language reflects that. With respect to access, the third question, access to the utility equipment and how that relates to screening, there are separation requirements that need to be maintained so that the utility cabinets can be accessed for work to be done. The attorney points out that the effectiveness of screening will be affected by the need to set back the landscape from the box, so the question is whether landscaping with a set back is better than no screening at all. which would answer yes. If the service entity damages the landscaping, who is responsible, and again we would go after the service entity for that and any of these are going to be a special use and will have conditions of approval and will be subject to enforcement just as everything else. Can a property owner ask that the screening and landscaping requirement waived? Regulations would allow this to be determined on a case by case basis.

There were no questions or comments from those in attendance at the call for public hearing.

Commissioner Manzzullo he believes that this text amendment has been done thoroughly and he is in agreement with the responses from the Village Attorney.

Commissioner Smoot said that these utility structures just mess everything up. The Village could go after the service entity or it could go either way with the resident. He suggested that the owner be taken out of the whole thing by letting the homeowner make an agreement with one or the other and then if there are any lapses the Village should go after the service entity.

Commissioner Christopher said that you can't fight City Hall, so he will go with the Staff recommendation.

Chairman Michaelsen suggested that since the utility company would have request a permit for the installation and after the permit has been issued, the work done, a final inspection shows that not all of the work is complete, then the entity will be given notice as to how many days they have to come into compliance and then the fines start.

Commissioner Manzzullo moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to recommend approval of a text amendment regarding Utility Structures as presented by Staff. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 4	Commissioners Manzzullo, Christopher, Spink & Michaelsen
Nays: 1	Commissioner Smoot
Absent: 2	Commissioners Vora and Hundhausen

The matter will go to the Village Board at their meeting on October 6, 2008.

Commissioner Smoot moved and Commissioner Christopher made the second to close the public hearing. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

## PRESENTATION:

**CENTRAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION-1065 FOUNTAIN VIEW DRIVE**  
*Gary Avenue Corridor Review*

Ron D'Aversa, was sworn in as a witness in the matter and he explained that he is here for the approval of the Gary Avenue Corridor Review for 1065 Fountain View Drive which is a proposed commercial medical building. He said that staff has reviewed the proposal and asked that decorative building lighting be added on all four sides and they agree.

Mr. Bastian said the applicant is requesting Gary Avenue Corridor Review for the north commercial building within the Fountains at Town Center Planned Unit Development in accordance with Section 16-5-6 of the Zoning Code. One of the conditions listed in Ordinance 2004-11-64 states that, "the north commercial building will be required to receive architectural design approval through the Gary Avenue Corridor Review process in the future, prior to the construction of the building."

As stated, the only aspect of the Gary Avenue Corridor (GAC) Review required for the north commercial building regards the architectural design of the building. The parking, landscaping and site design improvements have already been approved and installed for the north commercial building. However, aspects of the proposed building do have an impact on parking and landscaping, and these issues will be discussed later in this report.

The two completed commercial buildings on the east and west sides of Fountain View Drive establish the architectural design theme for the commercial portion of this overall development. These buildings primarily feature brick construction and include stone bases, columns and banding, green awnings, green metal seam roof elements, and decorative light fixtures. As seen on the proposed building elevation plan (Exhibit C) and color rendering (Exhibit D), the north commercial building would closely adhere to the design theme established by the two existing buildings. The primary building material will be dark brown face brick, which will match the brick used in the east and west commercial buildings. A limestone base and sill is shown on all four sides of the building, as are a horizontal limestone band and limestone accent columns. Decorative light fixtures are also shown on the front (south facing) building elevation, and green awnings are shown above the two building entrances.

The most noteworthy architectural design differences include the reduced use of glass in the building elevations, and the residential style architectural roof shingles versus the green metal seam roof elements found on the two other commercial buildings. The reduced use of glass is appropriate based on the intended office use of the building, as opposed to the retail use of the other buildings, for which use visibility into the tenant space is more desirable. Regarding the proposed residential style roof design, the applicant has stated that architectural shingles will match the roof design in the residential portion of the development, and with this building being located at the transitional area between the commercial and residential portions of the development, the proposed architectural shingles are appropriate. Staff supports the reduced use of glass due to the intended office use, and also supports the residential style roof shingles as opposed to a green metal seam roof on this building. The only suggestion that staff has regarding the architectural design is that the decorative light fixtures proposed on the front (south facing) building elevation should be continued around all four sides of the building, on the stone accent columns. On the side of the building facing Fountain View Drive, such lighting would enhance the streetscape view of the building. On the side of the building facing the parking lot, such lighting would enhance the appearance of the building from the parking lot and help illuminate the sidewalk. Finally, on the north side of the building, such lighting would enhance the appearance of the building as seen

by southbound motorists on Fountain View Drive and from the residential portion of the development.

No new parking spaces are proposed with the construction of the north commercial building, and the parking that has been installed complies with the approved PUD Plan. However, there are two issues related to parking that warrant further discussion. First, the Village has received complaints from some of the existing businesses in the east and west commercial buildings that there is not enough parking to serve the businesses in the area. As such, staff directed the applicant to conduct an hourly parking study to quantify parking demand, the results of which are included in your packet with the letter dated June 30, 2008, from Ron D'Aversa. The entire commercial area of the Fountains at Town Center contains 228 parking spaces, 28 of which are on-street spaces on Fountain View Drive. The hourly parking counts obtained by the applicant reflect a maximum parking space usage of 56 spaces, which occurred during the 7:00 pm hour on Thursday, June 19, and again during the 11 am hour on Saturday, June 28. As noted in the applicant's comment response letter, it was observed that the on-street spaces are the first to be occupied, and only after most of the on-street spaces are in use do motorists search for spaces in the other parking lots. In staff's opinion, employees of the businesses may be using the on-street spaces. Since the on-street spaces are most convenient for shoppers, the retail employees and managers should park in the lots behind and to the north of the east and west commercial buildings. In his letter dated September 3, the applicant indicates that he has met with each individual business owner and has been assured that employees are no longer parking in the on-street spaces. The applicant has installed "10-minute only" parking signs for five of the on-street spaces, which should help keep spaces available for businesses that have a quick customer turnaround. The applicant has also installed a sign in the island in the traffic roundabout informing motorists that there are additional parking spaces behind the commercial buildings. Based on the parking data that has been provided and our own field observations, staff does not believe that there is an actual shortage of parking spaces.

The GAC regulations require mechanical equipment to be screened, whether roof mounted or ground mounted. The basement floor plan shows a large mechanical room in which most of the building mechanical equipment will be housed. However, the applicant has advised staff that two air conditioning condenser units will be installed outdoors near the east corner of the building, and electric and gas meters would also be located in this vicinity. The landscape plan shows that three, eight-foot tall techny arborvitae evergreens will be installed to screen the view of this mechanical equipment. These evergreens, combined with the other landscape materials shown on the plan, should adequately screen the mechanical equipment. The plan also shows that additional evergreen shrubs and perennials will be installed along the front (south facing) building elevation, to enhance the appearance of the front of the building. The only other comment that staff has with respect to landscaping is that any of the required landscape materials in the islands or landscape areas around the building that are dead or in poor condition should be replaced prior to the occupancy being approved for the north commercial building.

Staff recommends approval of the GAC Review for the north commercial building at the Fountain at Town Center development, subject to the conditions noted in the Staff Report with the including of conditions that no extra dumpsters be added and the tenants use the dumpsters in the east parking lot and the condition about adding the additional light fixtures.

Commissioner Spink commented that when the parking survey was taken, it was before Vangelo's and Bel Gustos were open, and asked if a later survey was taken. Mr. D'Aversa said that Vangelo's was open and it didn't appear that Bel Gusto's would be a problem since they are a take-out or delivery business. It was stated that there have

now been 10 Minute parking signs and signs directing to other parking lots. Mr. Bastian said that the Sign Code provides regulations for traffic control signs.

Commissioner Manzzullo said that this building will be a dental office, so will there be any late hours, such as after 7:00 p.m. It as said that possibly on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Commissioner Manzzullo said that he does not think that parking will be an issue, he asked if the petitioner was in agreement with all of the staff recommendations and was told they were.

Chairman Michaelsen asked how long is the lease with the dentist and it was stated that the dentist will be buying the building. His next question was in regard to the architectural roof, why was that chosen instead of what is out there on the other buildings. Mr. D'Aversa said that part of it is styling, and part of it is transitional building to go from commercial and residential. Chairman Michaelsen then asked for a motion on petition.

Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Smoot made the second to approve the Gary Avenue Corridor Review. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Manzzullo, Christopher, Smoot, Spink & Michaelsen
Nays:	0	
Absent:	2	Commissioners Vora and Hundhausen

At 9:20 p.m. Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Manzzullo made the second to adjourn. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Manzzullo, Christopher, Smoot, Spink & Michaelsen
Nays:	0	
Absent:	2	Commissioners Vora and Hundhausen

FOR THE COMBINED BOARD