

REGULAR MEETING - COMBINED PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
Gregory J. Bielawski Municipal Center, Carol Stream, DuPage County, Illinois

JANUARY 23, 2006

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

Chairman Pro-Tem Donald Sutenbach 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 Vora, Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen, Hundhausen & Sutenbach
 Absent: None
 Also Present: Community Development Director Robert Glees & Recording Secretary Progar

MINUTES:

Commissioner Weiss moved and Commissioner Michaelsen made the second to approve the Minutes of the Meeting of January 9, 2006 as presented. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 4 Commissioners Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen and Sutenbach
 Nays: 0
 Abstain: 2 Commissioners Vora and Hundhausen
 Absent: 0

PUBLIC HEARING:

Commissioner Hundhausen moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to open the public hearing. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 6 Commissioners Vora, Spink, Weiss, Hundhausen, Michaelsen & Sutenbach
 Nays: 0
 Absent: 0

#05133 Integrity Development, 600 E. North Avenue
Special Use – Planned Unit Development
Planned Unit Development – Preliminary/Final Plan
Special Uses – Shopping Plaza, Drive-up Window, Outdoor Seating
North Avenue Corridor Review

Continued from 1/9/06 Meeting

Daniel Marr, Integrity Development, Judd Klein, architect, Kyle Hughes, representing Cardinal Fitness and Chip Belchenko, Starbucks Coffee Co. were sworn in as witnesses in this matter.

Mr. Marr reviewed the original requests and noted that the project requires a number of deviations from the specific standards of the community. He said that the Village's standard for parking would require spaces for 174 cars for this development and in studying the uses for the intended development and the demands of the individual tenant and how they function in relationship with one another in order to bring the parking into a more reasonable number. Mr. Marr commented that there are a number of reasons to not have a large number of parking

spaces some of which have to do with sustainability in the area, reducing the amount of impervious coverage that would need to be provided to meet the Village requirement is more excessive than it needs to be. The two primary elements for the property are Starbucks and Cardinal Fitness and the basis for the reduced request for parking requirements for each was determined by comparing their peak hours of use. Cardinal Fitness is a limited service facility that only offers basic fitness amenities such as circuit training, treadmills, free weights and exercise equipment. Their user/customer is there for a quick work out of 20 to 30 minutes, to take a quick shower and leave. Cardinal Fitness has provided that Monday evenings between the hours of 5 p.m. and 7 p.m., especially in the winter are their peak use hours and have between 45 and 60 people, conversely, Starbucks Coffee's peak hours are 6 a.m. to 8 a.m. in the morning. For those peak hours, Starbucks parking demand is approximately 17 cars and most of the business is done at the drive up window and Starbucks reports that from the time someone hits the order station to the time they hit the drive thru, which is about five cars, it is a matter of 45 seconds. As a consequence, the staffing level for the coffee shop is lower than the expectation of the requirements. In regard to the seating area that will be located at the northwesterly corner of the site, it will be landscaped and fenced to contain the activity and will contain 10 to 15 seats. The interior seating will be equivalent to that so the overall maximum load is significantly reduced. In putting all of the numbers together, the total peak demand would be 45 to 60 cars for Cardinal Fitness and about 15 to 17 cars for Starbucks so it would be somewhere about 60 to 75 cars total and adding into the parking for the remaining general retail, about 10,500 sf, the total of that is 42 cars for a total load of 113 cars. The proposal includes space for 124 cars and Mr. Marr stated that they are comfortably providing parking to meet the requirements of the actual facilities that are going to be operating on the site. He believes that as a result, the request for what would be a significant reduction in parking based on the municipal code, from 174 to 124, about 50 cars which may seem impressive on paper, in reality is more than adequate to meet the needs of the facility. Moreover having to park that 50-car excess puts a tremendous burden on the site. Those 50 extra spaces would require quite a bit of hard surface to the site and it is really overwhelming to deal with, and it would be very difficult to fit it on the site even if the buildings weren't there. Along with that, they addressed the drive up order station that allows for five cars that meets Village requirements. Another deviation requested was a reduction in the number of drive up stacking spaces, Village Code requires 10 and the request is for 8 and they can actually provide 9 if the last car is sitting at an angle at the entrance off of North Avenue. Also requested is a setback on the south side of the property in order to push the buildings as far to south as possible, and an encroachment into the setback along Schmale Road for parking and subsequent to that, there is a Village comment suggesting that the encroachment be increased slightly to allow the parking all parallel to the building and would allow a better alignment of the driveway for Starbucks. Pictures and spec. sheets were distributed showing the chairs and table to be used on the Starbucks patio. There is a concern on the treatment of the westerly elevation of the Starbucks building. An elevation drawing was displayed showing a series of glass panels that would have some graphics put into them. Also displayed were drawings of the monument signs that would be at the Schmale Road entrance and one at the North Avenue entrance and both comply with the Sign Code. It was also stated that there would only be channel letter signs on the buildings, but that they could be in the tenant's graphic style, that all of the roof top mechanicals will be screened by either the buildings architecture or by panel enclosures that would be open at the back for service, but not seen from the street.

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

Mr. Glees stated that this report serves as an addendum to the report presented at the January 9, 2006, Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. At that meeting, by a 4-0 vote, the Plan Commission continued the case to January 23, 2006, in order to allow for additional information to be presented and for revisions to be made to the plans. The applicant has submitted new plans and elevations in response to the Plan Commission's concerns.

At the January 9, 2006, meeting, a number of issues were raised by the Plan Commission and staff that required the applicant to provide additional information or submit revised plans. Below, each of these issues is identified, with an evaluation of how the provided information or revisions address the concerns.

1. **Provide additional information regarding Cardinal Fitness, have a representative from Cardinal at the meeting** – Information is provided in the letter from Seiji Hart of Cardinal Fitness. A representative from Cardinal Fitness will be in attendance at the January 23, 2006, meeting.
2. **Provide additional information to support the reduction in parking** - The applicant intends to bring to the meeting representatives from Cardinal Fitness and Starbucks, as well as the architect who is most familiar with the parking analysis, in order to explain the information presented in the previous staff report and answer questions.
3. **Modify the design to “square up” the building** – This has been done.
4. **Provide information on possible future tenants** – Information is provided in the Prospect List.
5. **Add windows or some sort of visual interest to the west elevation** – Staff had suggested, and the Plan Commission concurred, that additional windows or some sort of architectural features should be added to the west wall facing Schmale Road, to enhance the appearance of the elevation. As shown on Sheets A2.0, A2.1 and A2.2, Starbucks is proposing either murals or glass panels to lend interest to the façade. The applicant has indicated that a textured brick band would also be added to provide relief, but this is not indicated on the elevation sheets. The Plan Commission is invited to comment on the alternative façade features.
6. **Provide sufficient sidewalk width on the west side of building** – Staff recommended, and the Plan Commission concurred, that the sidewalk at the west end of the retail building must be at least five feet wide. The applicant has reduced the length of the building so as to provide the necessary sidewalk width, as shown on the revised PUD Plan. Staff recommends that wheel stops be provided for the first six spaces at the west end of the building in order to prevent parked vehicles from overhanging the sidewalk and reducing the width.

As an alternative staff suggests that the westerly parking aisle could be brought parallel with the west end of the building so as to provide a uniform sidewalk width. Although this would cause an increased encroachment into the 20-foot parking setback, staff would be more comfortable with this than with the odd alignment of the sidewalk and parking spaces. The encroachment would be confined to less than nine spaces, and the sidewalk and parking aisle would be properly oriented.

7. **Provide additional details for the Starbucks patio** – The Plan Commission requested additional detail regarding the amenities to be provided for the Starbucks patio, such as the type of furniture materials, and the number and location of tables and chairs. Starbucks has provided information regarding the number and location of tables and chairs on Sheet A1.0, and information regarding the materials will be provided by the Starbucks representative at the January 23rd meeting.
8. **Provide drawings showing the contemplated signage** – The applicant has provided signage information on Sheets A4.0, A4.1, and the 1/16/06 revisions of the Starbucks

sheets.

9. **Show the ordering station associated with the Starbucks Coffee Shop on the PUD Plan, and provide at least five vehicle stacking spaces at the ordering station –**
This has been done.

Summary:

In staff's evaluation, the revised plans address some of the concerns raised by the Plan Commission and our 1/9/06 staff report. Items which have not been addressed, such as the ordering station, the treatment of the west wall and the type of patio furniture at the Starbucks, as well as the sidewalk at the west end of the building, need to be resolved before the Preliminary/Final PUD Plan will be brought to the Village Board for approval. The most significant unresolved issue involves the number of parking spaces to be provided. Staff invites further discussion regarding the parking issue among the Plan Commission members and the applicant.

Staff recommends approval of the Special Uses for Planned Unit Development, a shopping plaza, drive-up window service and an outdoor seating area, of the Preliminary/Final Planned Unit Development Plan, and of the North Avenue Corridor Review, at 600 E. North Avenue, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the inline retail building shall not be permitted to have more than 3,825 square feet of the floor area allocated toward food service use. If more than 3,825 square feet of food service use is desired, then the food service user that would bring the food service use above 3,825 square feet must submit an application for a minor PUD amendment through which process staff and the Plan Commission would re-evaluate the adequacy of site parking;
2. That if a recurring parking shortage is observed and documented on the site upon full build-out and occupancy, then the Village staff shall have the ability to reevaluate, and possibly lower, the 3,825 square foot food service floor area allowance at the time of building permit review for any new food service use;
3. That the Preliminary/Final PUD Plan must be revised to show the ordering station associated with the Starbucks Coffee Shop, and that at least five vehicle stacking spaces must be provided at the ordering station;
4. That the applicant must provide details regarding the type of tables and chairs that are proposed for the outdoor patio seating area for Starbucks, for review and approval by the Plan Commission and staff. If the Commissioners approve of the presented materials this condition can be deleted.
5. That separate building permits are required for all trash enclosures and signs;
6. That the plans be revised to provide glass panels or murals with a textured brick band on the west wall of the Starbucks building; The Commission should provide direction as to which alternative is preferred.
7. That the Preliminary/Final PUD Plan be revised to align the parking area and sidewalk with the west end of the building, staff recommends that the width of the sidewalk be resolved in this manner and if the Plan Commission concurs then this condition should be included with the conditions of approval.

8. That only channel letter signs, and not box signs be permitted for the wall signage for the entire inline building;
9. That all rooftop equipment on both buildings be completely screened from view in all directions;
10. That all ground mounted mechanical equipment shall be screened from view from surrounding public streets;
11. That this development shall be subject to approval of a storm water management plan and final engineering design by the Engineering Services Department;
12. 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;
13. That the drainage and utility easement along the east property line be vacated, prior to the issuance of a building permit, so as to not cause the building to be constructed over the easement, and that the utilities in the easement, if there are any, must be relocated, so that the easement can be vacated;
14. That the parking stalls shall be striped in accordance with the Village's looped striping requirements; and
15. That the development of the site and buildings will comply with all state, county and Village Codes and requirements.

Commissioner Sutenbach stated that this is a PUD and there is no special variance that we are reducing the number of parking spaces required from 174 to 124 and asked if it becomes a part of the PUD plan? Mr. Glees responded that Commissioner Sutenbach is correct and added that by nature of the PUD process certain Village standards can be relaxed as a trade-off for beneficial aspects of the plan. No specific variations are approved, however, for the information of the Plan Commission and the Village Board, the staff report includes what actual deviations from the standard are being proposed so that the plan can be better evaluated.

Commissioner Sutenbach asked if conditions # 1 and 2 are strong enough to give staff the authority to make the necessary changes if parking does become an issue in this development. Mr. Glees said that these conditions provide the Village authority to adjust the parking requirements if required.

Commissioner Michaelsen said that the furniture for Starbucks as shown is acceptable, but he would like to see exactly what the fence will look like and Mr. Belchencko did provide a drawing showing the type of fence to be used which is a 42" wrought iron fence. Commissioner Michaelsen said that he would prefer glass panels on the Starbucks building and in regard to parking he would agree with having parallel parking and making the sidewalk one specific width. He said that he still is not convinced that Monday evenings are the only peak hours for the fitness center.

Commissioner Spink asked if this development will be using the service alley at the rear of the property and was told that they do not intend to use it as there is a walkway to the service entrance and that trucks could not use it since it is on the adjacent property. It was determined that employees will not be parking at the back of the building and that this will be a condition of a lease with the other users. Commissioner Spink asked if there will be security for the locker and showers area and was told that there will be a security person at the entrance to the locker area. There will be an area for childcare and there will be from 3 to 5 employees present. In response to the question, the hours of operation were given as 5 a.m. to 10 p.m., and that there are no exercise classes allowed as a part of the business model, which is to provide for quick

workouts of short duration, something like fast food for exercise. Commissioner Spink asked if the signs were going to contain "The Shoppes at Carol Stream" and was told no, since they want to maximize the exposure of the individual tenants. It was stated that there is no intention of asking for a changeable copy sign. In response to the question about the prospective tenant lists, Mr. Marr said that this location will be best for a quick serve type restaurant and the size of the buildings and parking would not allow any larger type sit down restaurants. Commissioner Spink said that she would prefer to see glass panels rather than a mural. Mr. Marr commented that these will look like a window, but they are actually glass spandrel and will not have any back lighting. Commissioner Spink said that she is having a hard time with this development since it is a gateway to the community and what has been presented is just another shopping center with boring buildings. She added that she agrees with parallel parking and commented that there needs to be more stacking spaces at the drive up window at Starbucks because it is going to busier than is proposed.

Commissioner Hundhausen said that she would like to see glass panels and textured brick. At her request the parking numbers were recapped and Commissioner Hundhausen asked if they agreed with all of the conditions in the staff report and was told yes.

Commissioner Weiss commented that reports received have stated that this may be a Cardinal Fitness or it may not and asked for an explanation. Mr. Hughes explained that he represents one group that operates out of Seattle, Washington and they have some facilities in Chicago, Indianapolis and Milwaukee under the Cardinal Fitness banner, however they also do a similar concept, same machine setup and same business model operating under Ideal Fitness. Part of name may change, but it would be operated under the same ownership group. Commissioner Weiss asked if there will be any outdoor amenities for the fitness center and it was said there would not be. In response to the question in regard to reserved areas for the different retail areas the answer was there would not be reserved areas for any retailer.

Commissioner Weiss commented that in regard to the prospective tenant list there are some that would more desirable than others and said that the developer should be aware that the Village is looking for high end retailers that will generate sales tax revenue and that he would like to have this noted in the record. He added that he would prefer to have a mural on the Starbucks elevation.

Commissioner Sutenbach commented that he understands that there are challenges on this site, it is small and there are underground stormwater management issues. He said that he would like to see the glass panels and the textured brick band.

Commissioner Weiss moved and Trustee Hundhausen made the second to recommend approval of a special use for a Planned Unit Development, a PUD preliminary/final plan, and special uses for shopping plaza, outdoor seating, ancillary to a coffee shop use and drive-up window service in accordance with the recommendations of staff, adding to the recommendation to the Village Board that the PC encourages that additional tenants be sales tax generating businesses. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	6	Commissioners Vora, Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen, Hundhausen & Sutenbach
Nays:	0	
Absent:	0	

The petitioner was advised that this matter will be heard by the Village Board at their meeting on February 6, 2006 and was advised to attend that meeting.

The Commissioner Weiss moved and Commissioner Hundhausen made the second to approve the North Avenue Corridor review as presented. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Vora, Weiss, Michaelsen, Hundhausen & Sutenbach
-------	---	---

Nays: 1 Commissioner Spink
Absent: 0

**#05347: D & R TECHNOLOGY, LLC, 400 E. FULLERTON
SUBDIVISION – FINAL**

Carolyn Suzzi, 1378 Green Trails Dr. Naperville, IL representing D&R Technology, was sworn in as a witness in this matter. She explained that D&R Technology is requesting a Resubdivision of the former Glenbard Graphics property at 400 E. Fullerton Avenue to provide for a lot line adjustment. The current Lot #1 consists of a one-story building and fronts directly on Fullerton Avenue and is the place of operations of D&R Technology. Lot # 2 is vacant. D&R is proposing to change the lot lines in order to add 110 feet from Lot #2 onto Lot #1 for additional parking. It was noted that the remainder of Lot #2 would be sold to Panattoni Development Company.

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

Mr. Glees said that Carolyn Suzzi, on behalf of D&R Technology, has filed an application to resubdivide the 13.3-acre property located on the south side of Fullerton Avenue between Kimberly Drive and Center Avenue. As explained by Ms. Suzzi in her cover letter, D&R Technology is the record titleholder of the property at 400 Fullerton Avenue, which consists of a 4.5-acre lot and an 8.8-acre lot. The D&R facilities are mostly located on the northerly 4.5-acre lot, except for a parking area which extends into the vacant southerly. D&R Technologies wishes to expand the parking lot and sell the remaining property; therefore, the proposed plat of resubdivision would assemble 0.9 acres of the southerly lot to the D&R Technologies lot, which would become proposed Lot One. The remaining portion of the southerly lot, proposed Lot Two, would be sold to Panattoni Development Company.

Staff finds the plat to be in conformance with the requirements of the I Industrial District, which is the zoning classification for the property. The Engineering Services Department has reviewed the plat and recommends approval.

Staff recommends approval of the Final Plat of Glenbard Graphics Resubdivision.

Commissioner Michaelsen asked if there will be a common driveway for the two lots and is that drive able to handle truck traffic and who will maintain it. Donald Suzzi, CFO of D&R Technology, was sworn in as a witness in this matter and said that according to the contract with Panattoni it will be the joint responsibility to upgrade and maintain this driveway.

Commissioner Spink asked if there is any outdoor storage on the property and was told no. it was also stated that it is not know just what the development company is planning for that lot, only that it will be offered as a build to suit contract.

Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Michaelsen made the second to recommend approval of the request for a final plat of re-subdivision for the Glenbard Graphics Subdivision.

The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 6 Commissioners Vora, Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen, Hundhausen &
Sutenbach
Nays: 0
Absent: 0

The petitioner was advised that this matter will be heard by the Village Board at their meeting on February 6, 2006 and was advised to attend that meeting.

Commissioner Michaelsen moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to close the public hearing. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	6	Commissioners Vora, Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen, Hundhausen & Sutenbach
Nays:	0	
Absent:	0	

At 9:25 p.m. Commissioner Weiss moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to adjourn. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

FOR THE COMBINED BOARD