

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

**FEBRUARY 13, 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 and directed Recording Secretary Wynne Progar to call the roll.

Present: Commissioners Vora, Spink, Michaelsen and Sutenbach  
 Absent: Commissioners Weiss and Hundhausen  
 Also Present: Community Development Director Gles and Recording Secretary Progar

**MINUTES: January 23, 2006 – Approved 4-0**

Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Michaelsen made the second to approve the Minutes of the Meeting of January 23, 2006 as presented. The results of the roll call vote were:

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

At 7:35 Commissioner Hundhausen entered the meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**#04307: David Schonback, NE Corner of St. Charles Road and Morton Road  
 Rezoning (Preannexation)  
 Continued from 12/12/05 Meeting  
 DISMISSED FOR LACK OF ACTIVITY – NO ACTION**

**#05292: Parkview Development, Southeast Corner of Gary Avenue and Lies Road  
 Final Planned Unit Development Plan - Partial  
 Continued from 1/9/06 Meeting**

At the request of the petitioner, to allow more time to complete the requirements for the Final PUD Plan, Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Hundhausen made the second to continue this matter to the meeting of March 13, 2006. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 [Commissioners Vora, Spink, Michaelsen, Hundhausen and Sutenbach]  
 Nays: 0  
 Absent: 1 [Commissioner Weiss]

**#05348: Universal Health II, LLC, 505 E. North Avenue  
 Special Use - Medical and Rehabilitation Facility**

Mr. Gles stated that the expected response regarding staff commentary on the request for the Special Use has not been received so staff is requesting a continuance of this matter to the next meeting. Commissioner Michaelsen moved and Commissioner Vora made the second to continue this matter to the meeting of February 27, 2006. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Vora, Spink, Michaelsen, Hundhausen and Sutenbach  
 Nays: 0  
 Absent: 1 Commissioner Weiss

**#05312 Dearborn Construction, Northeast Corner of Gary Avenue and Kehoe  
 Gary Avenue Corridor Review  
 Special Use - Shopping Plaza  
 Variations - Zoning**

Paul Conarty, Dan Lenaghan, and Charles Luchese were sworn in as witnesses in this matter. Mr. Conarty explained that the request is for a special use for a shopping plaza, variations for parking and landscape front setbacks and rear building setback as well as a Gary Avenue Corridor Review. The proposed development is a 16,160 sf multi-tenant commercial building on a 2.18-acre vacant property located on the east side of Gary Avenue between Thunderbird Trail and Kehoe Boulevard and is zoned B-2, General Retail District. There will be three access points, one is a right in/right out on the southerly portion of the property. The second will be a full service access at Thunderbird on the north end of the property and then an access for commercial purposes between the shopping centers to the north and this parcel. In regard to the parking and landscaping elevation drawings and landscape plans were presented. There will be 81 parking spaces provided and it was noted that all roof top mechanicals will be screened by parapet walls. There will be covered walkways and/or cloth awnings along the front of the building and there will be an architectural highlight of a waterfall and shallow pond in the center of the building. It was stated that following discussions with staff, there will some changes in the proposed landscaping in regard to salt tolerant shrubs and plantings. There were no comments or questions from those in attendance at the call for public hearing. Mr. Glees stated that Chuck Luchese and Leo Lenaghan of Dearborn Realty and Construction are requesting approval for the development of a B-2 General Business District zoned 2.18-acre site between Thunderbird Trail and Kehoe Boulevard along Gary Avenue. Dearborn is proposing a 16,160 square foot multi-tenant building that would consist of sixteen units. No tenants have been secured at this time. Dearborn is requesting the approval of a special use for a shopping plaza. Gary Avenue Corridor review is also required of this development. And finally, to accommodate the center on this shallow parcel, variations of three setback requirements are also being requested.

**Special Use – Shopping Plaza in B-2 General Business District**

The applicant is requesting a Special Use for a Shopping Plaza, which the Zoning Code defines as “a commercial development in excess of one acre of land, improved with a structure containing three or more distinct and separate retail businesses, also sharing common parking areas and access drives.” The proposed plaza would contain 16,160 square feet of space in an in-line multi-tenant building.

**Access and Parking:**

As the site plans depict, two access points are located along Gary Avenue. The southern point is designed as a right-in/right-out entrance facilitating northbound traffic on Gary Avenue. The northern entrance has an existing signal at Thunderbird Trail, which allows full access with a dedicated left turn lane. The north end of the parking lot is aligned with the signalized intersection.

Access to the site is also accommodated by the existing retail development to the north of the site. Shared access connects the parking lots along the front of the buildings. However, it is proposed that the two commercial properties be separated to the rear of the buildings. This will avoid conflict with the location of the dumpster on the existing retail development.

As proposed, the shopping plaza would include 81 parking spaces. Based on the parking

requirements for shopping plazas, this building needs a minimum of 64 spaces. Parking requirements of future uses will be assessed individually to determine if enough parking spaces remain in the surplus to accommodate the use.

### **Architectural Design:**

The GAC standards encourage harmonious physical and visual relationships among developments along Gary Avenue to create a unique and unified appearance for the entire corridor. This development has provided design elements to help achieve this standard. The material for the façade uses Lannon stone and Lannon stone veneer, which is consistent with the natural stone materials that are found throughout the GAC. In the center of the building, a wall of Lannon stone will be the architectural focal point for this development, providing waterfalls over the surface ending in a narrow pond at the bottom of the wall. This area will also be highlighted with annual plantings and benches for patrons.

The elevations indicate the awnings and covered walkways will be provided for each storefront to provide continuous protection for customers. The area directly in front of the waterfall will not include a covering, because it would obstruct the view of this unique architectural detail.

### **Site Design:**

The long shallow building footprint reflects the long and narrow nature of the lot. Parking is generally located in the front of the building. The parking to the north is designed to facilitate traffic queues at the traffic signal at Thunderbird Lane and establish shared access to the development to the north.

Also with respect to site design, the GAC regulations require that pedestrian facilities should be considered within the site. This simple design provides sidewalks and covered walkways along the entire façade of the building. The parking lot dimensions do not necessitate further sidewalks; all public stalls are convenient to the storefronts. The detail plans of the elevations depict benches within the waterfall area to further accommodate pedestrians. Generally, we find the proposed pedestrian walkways to be acceptable.

### **Landscape Design:**

With respect to site landscape considerations, the corridor regulations were designed to allow flexibility in design but require a certain amount of landscape material on-site.

It is the designer's choice as to how to combine landscape materials on the site in order to meet the criteria of the ordinance and achieve the intent or concept of the corridor. As can be seen on the final Landscape Plan (Exhibit B), landscape materials are shown within the parkways and adjacent to the parking space and within the parking lot landscape islands.

The landscape islands depicted on the landscape plan measure about 3,460 square feet in area, which equals 12.5% greenspace, so the standard is met. The landscape islands are required to have 1,730 points of landscape material, and based upon the landscape plan, the islands would have 5,836 points of material, which far exceeds the required point value.

The GAC landscape standards require a landscape screen within the first five feet immediately adjacent to the parking spaces and drive aisle along Gary Avenue. The landscape screen requires 5,000 points of landscape material. The GAC also requires a landscape setback in the area between the landscape screen and the Gary Avenue property line, which requires 3,600 points of landscape material. Given the request for a setback variation within this area, the total landscaped area for these two distinct sections has been merged into one ten-foot strip. To simplify this review, both requirements were combined for a total 8,680 points. And the plan provides 9,960 points of material, and so staff believes the standard is met within the confines of the site constraints.

Overall, staff finds the landscape and site plans meet the GAC standards, with the exception of

the landscape setback variation discussed below.

### Variations

The setback requirements for this zoning district include a minimum rear yard of 40 feet. The front setback required in the GAC is 60 feet. In addition, the GAC standards require a 30-foot setback for parking lots. If the petitioner were to apply these minimums to this site, an 80-foot wide development footprint would have to accommodate both building and adequate parking. This is not feasible; therefore, the petitioner is requesting a total of three setback variations:

- A variation of the required front yard-parking setback from 30 feet to 12 feet
- A variation of the required front landscape setback from 15 feet to 12 feet.
- A variation of the required rear-building setback from 40 feet to 28 feet.

This property is a unique, undeveloped parcel.

*The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located.*

The granting of the variations would actually allow the retail development of the site as designated by the Village of Carol Stream Future Land Use Plan. The Future Land Use Plan encourages retail development here to service the area residents and enhance the Gary Avenue Corridor through a quality, harmonious development that integrates well with the corridor.

### Summary

In our evaluation of this project, we find that the criteria for the Special Uses for a shopping plaza are met, subject to conditions. We further find the requested variations to be acceptable as noted in this report and the Recommendation section. And we find the criteria for a development within the Gary Avenue Corridor have been met, subject to conditions.

Staff recommends approval of the Special Use for a shopping plaza, Gary Avenue Corridor Review, and the following Variations: a variation of the required front yard parking setback from 30 feet to 12 feet, a variation of the required front landscape setback from 15 feet to 12 feet, and a variation of the required rear building setback from 40 feet to 28 feet, subject to the following conditions:

1. 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;
2. That the Landscape Plan (Exhibit B) be amended prior to Village Board approval to reflect salt tolerant trees along the right-of-way; the materials table be corrected to reflect the number and materials identified on the plan graphic, and plant type typographical errors be corrected;
3. That the parking stalls shall be striped in accordance with the Village's looped striping requirements;
4. That all rooftop equipment shall be completely screened from view from the north, west, and southern exposures with parapet wall;
5. That only channel letter wall signs as depicted on the elevations and renderings (Exhibits D and E) shall be permitted, to maintain a more attractive and unified appearance of the building façade;

6. That separate building permits are required for all trash enclosures and signs;
7. That the developer provides a contribution for the Gary Avenue Sidewalk/Path with the amount to be determined and provided at the time of building permit review;
8. Final engineering plans for the retaining wall and compensatory storage must be approved by the Village of Carol Stream Engineering Services Department at the time of permit review; and,
9. That the development of the site and buildings will comply with all state, county and Village Codes and requirements.

Commissioner Michaelsen asked what type of retaining wall is planned for the retention pond and was told it would be a keystone wall. In regard to this question regarding lighting it was stated that there would be adequate approved parking lot and building lighting. Commissioner Michaelsen asked Mr. Glee if the existing retail in the adjacent area is on a wider lot and he responded that it is not, and there is a single lane behind that building, but during the development of this new project it was required that a lane sufficient to allow two lanes of traffic be constructed behind the building.

Commissioner Spink asked who will be responsible for maintaining the parking lot and was told that this owner will be responsible for the intersection drive and the proposed lot and the other owner will be responsible for the other lots. It was determined that each tenant will be required to use channel lettering on the building and also that it is too early to determine just what the tenant mix will be.

Commissioner Hundhausen asked what the depth of the pond is at the bottom of the waterfall and was told that it would be 6 to 8 inches, and in response to the question of maintenance it was stated that the owners of the property would be responsible for all maintenance required.

Commissioner Michaelsen asked if there will be any illumination of the waterfall and was told there will be illumination of the bottom of the pond.

Commissioner Spink asked if they will maintain the monument that exists at the corner of Kehoe and Gary and she was told that if it is on their property they will be responsible for the maintenance.

Commissioner Sutenbach said that this was a complete and comprehensive presentation. It is a unique piece of property limited in size and definitely meets the criteria for Gary Avenue Corridor review and the waterfall is something unique that isn't usually seen in a strip mall area. It can only enhance Gary Avenue.

Commissioner Vora asked if there is a limit to the amount of stores for the building and it was said that the division of the stores will be dictated by the market.

Commissioner Michaelsen asked what the square footage of one unit be and was told that it would be 1,000 sq. ft., he then asked if a tenant could have 5,000 sq. ft and was told yes. Commissioner Michaelsen said that he is concerned about the front appearance since it does show that a unit would have a window and a door. What would happen in the event you get a restaurant in there, how would the front appearance change? It was stated that if there was a tenant that would want one continuous amount of space then the developer would come back to the Board to amend the plan.

Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Michaelsen made the second to recommend approval of a special use for a shopping plaza, approval of variances for parking and landscape front setbacks and a rear building setback, all in accordance with staff recommendations. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Vora, Spink, Michaelsen, Hundhausen and Sutenbach
Nays:	0	
Absent:	1	Commissioner Weiss

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

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

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Vora, Spink, Michaelsen, Hundhausen and Sutenbach  
 Nays: 0  
 Absent: 1 Commissioner Weiss

**#05060: Regency Centers, Heritage Plaza  
 Preliminary Planned Unit Development Plan - Amendment  
 Final Planned Unit Development Plan - Partial  
 Plat of Subdivision - Preliminary  
 Continued from 1/9/06 Meeting**

*Gregory Dose and Tony Haslinger were sworn in as witnesses in this matter. Commissioner Sutenbach commented that the Board does not have a complete staff report, but there is enough to move this forward and hear the presentation. Mr. Dose gave the history of the attempts at developing this property originating in 1993. The area of concern for this part of the development is the south area of Heritage Plaza which was purchased by the Regency Centers. Mr. Haslinger said that they are proposing a plan to develop the land called the Phase III property at Heritage Plaza. The request is to amend the preliminary PUD plan for the Phase III land, approval of the final plat of Resubdivision and the Final PUD plan for Lot 4D. The results of the roll call vote were:*

Ayes: 5 Commissioners Vora, Spink, Michaelsen, Hundhausen and Sutenbach  
 Nays: 0  
 Absent: 1 Commissioner Weiss

Mr. Haslinger displayed a site plan and noted that this site has been marketed for over 15 years and this is the first real plan that have been presented to be developed. The proposal will split the property into 5 lots for a combination of restaurant and retail users. He added that this is a conceptual plan and it has not been marketed and won't be until it has met Village approval. Specifically on Lot 4D, they propose to build a 10,200 sf building that will be additional shop space to the center. The types of tenants would be similar to what is there now, restaurants or other small shop retail users. A rendering of the proposed building was shown and it was noted that it will match the current façade of the rest of the center. There will be additional architectural features added to back of the proposed building to enhance the appearance. Mr. Haslinger said that upon approval they will begin building immediately on Lot 4D and begin marketing the out-parcels to potential end users. He added that this land has sat vacant for over 25 years and they are the first developer to bring forward a market-reality plan that can rock the value of this property, not only for the owner but also for the Village through the retail sales tax generated through the new users.

Mr. Dose noted that this is a Jewel Osco anchored center and as such, they have quite a bit to say about the design and future tenanting and they have a very strong lease. Part of the work over the last year has not only been with the Village staff but also with Jewel Osco to put together a site plan and tenanting conditions that they could live with as well.

Commissioner Sutenbach asked if there was anything else to be presented about the other lots and Mr. Dose replied that they are seeking preliminary approval of the entire development and final approval on Lot 4D. The balance of the property will come forward as each of the previous developments are approved.

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

Commissioner Michaelsen ascertained that the front of the building would be facing the access drive and that parking would be across the drive with the use of cross walks.

Mr. Haslinger said that the parking would be much like it is in front of the Ace Hardware where the customer crosses the drive aisle to access the store. Commissioner Michaelsen stated that this is more than a drive aisle and asked if a traffic study has been done on how many cars use that access drive and was told that a study has not been done yet. Mr. Haslinger said that they do realize that there is a lot of traffic in and out of the center, and added that there will be striping and signs indicating pedestrian parking on the other side. Commissioner Michaelsen said that drivers do not pay any attention to signs and since he is a regular user of the shopping center he is aware of the amount of traffic going through there. He said that he does not like the idea of having a customer cross that street to go to that shop. It was noted that the parking lot lighting and building lighting will mirror what exists currently.

Commissioner Spink asked if there be no banks in this development and it was noted that when the property was purchased there was a notation on the deed that prevent any financial institutions into the space and the outlots. It was determined that the new buildings will be the same height as the existing units and Jewel has approved the elevation drawings.

Commissioner Hundhausen stated that she has had to brake sharply after turning into this access drive due to a vehicle attempting to turn left into the existing bank. She commented that the plans call for another access to be on the left hand side as well, what is that going to do to traffic? Mr. Haslinger said that they have worked closely with staff to minimize the amount of curb cuts. There will be two additional places that cars can take a left or a right from what is out there existing today and it is felt that minimizes the amount of points that cross access internally that allows the flow of traffic to go through these lots. Commissioner Hundhausen asked if the proposed next left turn could be moved away from the existing bank curb cut. Mr. Haslinger said that moving the drive could be looked at, but they do not control the lot where the bank drive is and they are looking at how to minimize the amount of breaks in this road and those seem to be the most logical points to put them in. Commissioner Hundhausen said that pedestrian markings are good, but is not sure just how effective they will be.

Commissioner Sutenbach said that he would like to a lesser amount of free standing buildings, he would like to see the development of Lot 4D be pushed back away from the access drive so there can be parking in front of there. Mr. Haslinger said that there was a lot of time spent discussing just these issues and considering that there has been zero income from this property in 15 years, and the amount of restrictions that are placed on the site, it is shown that there is more sales tax generated from smaller restaurants and intense retail stores than from a junior anchor box. Commissioner Sutenbach noted that there does have to planning for traffic articulation and congestion which have not been fully addressed. He commented that the road is too narrow now and asked if there is any way to reconfigure or widen it. Mr. Haslinger commented that there seems to be a conflict of not wanting more traffic, but wanting more retail space. He said that they feel they have maxed out the site for the market realities going forward. Commissioner Sutenbach said that it is the traffic articulation that is the concern, and if the access on the drive can be better spaced from the intersection it would benefit everyone. In response to the question of setting the building on Lot 4D back from the access drive, Mr. Haslinger said that the market realities are that if you put the building farther back from the drive aisle you are putting this building at a competitive disadvantage from the standpoint of the competitors to the east.

Commissioner Spink said that it is a hassle to cross the street as it sits right now. Mr. Haslinger said that if speed is the concern and safety we can look at adding a couple of bumps in here even though they can cause snowplow issues. He added that there are some other tradable ways to slow traffic down if it's the speed of the traffic that is the concern.

Commissioner Sutenbach said that this is a drive aisle and once you get past this you are in the shopping plaza, and asked if the building can be put on the other side of the road. Mr. Haslinger said that this would get into issues with Jewel, and he does not believe there will be any change decisions coming forth in the near future. It was stated that Jewel has approval rights over any development in this PUD and they have approved this proposal.

Commissioner Sutenbach questioned why they should take the first plan that has been provided in 15 years and asked if there are other options or footprints that could be considered. Mr. Haslinger said that there have been approximately 10 different layouts, but this is market reality, and it is the best that can be done and be developed out within the next couple of years. There is a safety concern; there is a traffic articulation concern as well as a tremendous reduction in floor space.

Commissioner Spink asked if Jewel will allow another drug store and was told they will not.

Mr. Glees said that the items that need to be completed have to do with;

Parking, the preliminary PUD Plan contains a parking table and it shows how the proposed plan would provide parking in conformance with the Zoning Code requirements. However, there is an issue with respect to the calculated number of parking spaces. Staff and the petitioner are having some dialog right now as to how many parking spaces are actually required by the Code and how many would be beneficial to provide. At this time we believe that the eventual parking number will turn out to be somewhere close to what the petitioner is showing, but we believe that the calculations right now are not accurate. Second; the proposed architecture for the remainder of this center has not really been addressed. Staff recognizes that several of the outlots may one day contain national tenants whose architecture is an element of their identity and therefore cannot be determined at this time, but staff would like to get something from the petitioner that addresses what the architecture may be, whether there will be any architectural guidelines in general for the overall Phase III. With respect to landscaping and greenspace the proposed landscaping exhibit for the preliminary PUD plan and the final PUD plan have not yet been finalized so there have not been any calculations done to determine if enough parking lot green space has been provided. Finally, with respect to some of the comments heard tonight, with respect to concerns about traffic conflicts, location of access points off the main drive, we would like to take some of those comments back to the engineering department for discussion and see if there are some tweaks that could be performed to the plan that would be acceptable to the petitioner or if there are any other ideas that can be generated, whether any aspects of the plan may provide beneficial safety aspects that haven't been pointed out. In the staff report, for instance, the engineering department at some times has suggested measures known as traffic calming measures and we know that having curves in the road can tend to slow traffic down. We're wondering, whether perhaps, just by its nature, the curves in the access road maybe a good feature that will provide a calming effect on the traffic and enhance safety in some way. Perhaps the locations of the access points off the drive could be addressed and maybe, if the engineering department believes that the plan can be made a little bit safer and can explain why to the Plan Commission we could get a memo from them that could be included in the packets for the next meeting.

Commissioner Sutenbach commented that there is very poor drainage on this access road around the curves after a good rain so that needs to be addressed. Commissioner Michaelsen said that he believes this is because that parcel sheet drains on to the road .

Commissioner Hundhausen moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to continue this matter to the meeting of March 13, 2006. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Vora, Spink, Michaelsen, Hundhausen and Sutenbach
Nays:	0	
Absent:	1	Commissioner Weiss

**#05349:            Dominic N. Signoretta / Fritz Duda Company, 500-520 E. North Avenue  
Special Use - Planned Unit Development  
Special Use - Shopping Center  
Preliminary Planned Unit Development Plan  
Variation - Fence  
Variation - Sign  
Zoning Changes - From I to B-2 and From B-3 to B-2  
North Avenue Corridor Review**



Dominic Signoretta, Mike Harman, Carl Kronstead, and Mike Waggoner were sworn in as witnesses in this matter. Mr. Signoretta gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the history of the property and its owners and a concept review of the proposed development of the property. He explained that requests are for a Special Use for a Planned Unit Development, a Special Use for a Shopping Center, approval of a preliminary Planned Unit Development Plan, Variations to the Fence Code and the Sign Code, Rezoning a part of the property from I to B-2 and a part of the property from B-3 to B-2 as well as a North Avenue Corridor Review.

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

Mr. Glees stated that Dominic Signoretta, on behalf of the Fritz Duda Company, the property owner, is requesting zoning approvals and building code variations that would allow for the redevelopment of the McKesson property, located at the southwest corner of North Avenue and Schmale Road. The 292,000 square foot McKesson building is located over 300 feet away from the adjacent roadways, and with the demolition of a vacant office building located along the North Avenue frontage in December of 2005, the properties along the North Avenue and Schmale Road frontages are vacant. Fritz Duda Company is proposing to construct a commercial shopping center on the vacant properties, consisting of 66,000 square feet of commercial floor space among five separate buildings. Four freestanding buildings would be located along North Avenue, two of which could either be retail or restaurant uses, and the fifth building would be a 30,000 square foot multi-tenant retail building located along Schmale Road. Tenants for the buildings have not yet been identified. To accommodate the proposed redevelopment, the applicant is requesting a Special Use for Planned Unit Development, approval of the Preliminary PUD Plan, a Special Use for a shopping center, rezoning of the commercial property to B-2 General Retail District, variations from the Sign Code and Fence Code, and North Avenue Corridor Review.

### **Special Use – Planned Unit Development**

Fritz Duda Company is requesting that a Special Use for Planned Unit Development be approved for the property. From the developer's perspective, obtaining approval of a Planned Unit Development would allow for multiple buildings to be placed on the single commercial lot, as proposed, with an industrial lot set back behind the commercial buildings. In addition, the Village's planned unit development process allows the possibility for some flexibility in zoning standards, as will be discussed in detail later in this report.

Staff notes that the property is somewhat unique in terms of a commercial development in that it is currently occupied by a large industrial building, which would remain as a neighboring use to the proposed commercial property. Out of necessity, access to the two uses would be provided by means of common driveways. However, the applicant's proposed design was developed with the intention of separating traffic flows to the extent possible. To that end, a separate truck access drive was provided to the far south end of the property on Schmale Road, and the connection points between the two uses have been minimized.

In view of these factors, and due to the high profile nature of this property in Carol Stream, staff does not object to the developers' request for a Special Use for Planned Unit Development for this property. The other special use requests, and specific details of the plans, will be discussed in detail in the remaining sections of this report. In addition, the developer is requesting several deviations from Zoning Code standards as part of the Planned Unit Development process. The requested deviations will be discussed in detail later in the report.

The applicant is requesting a Special Use for a *Shopping Center*, which the Zoning Code defines as "a commercial development in excess of ten acres of land, improved with a structure

of at least 50,000 square feet and containing five or more distinct and separate retail businesses." The proposed shopping center would contain a total of 66,000 square feet of space in five buildings, with two 12,000 square foot buildings that could either be commercial or restaurant uses, two 6,000 square foot commercial buildings, and a 30,000 square foot in-line multi-tenant building. Upon completion of this report, staff will analyze in detail the characteristics associated with access, parking, architecture, landscaping and land banked parking. At this time the staff recommendation is to complete the review of materials recently received from the petitioner, complete the detailed analysis of the report, check the feasibility of the engineering with respect to stormwater management and check for conformance with the various requirements of the Zoning Code and bring the final staff back to the Plan Commission. Staff is suggesting that the matter be continued to the February 27, 2006 agenda.

Commissioner Hundhausen commented that the proposal is very nice. The proposed buildings and landscaping should be very effective in hiding this large box.

Commissioner Michaelsen said that this proposal will be a great improvement and in response to the question on the height of the warehouse building it was noted that the warehouse building is 33 feet tall and the surrounding buildings will be 24 feet tall and therefore provide a screening for the larger building.

Commissioner Vora commented that this is a good plan.

Commissioner Sutenbach said that he would like to see more detail about the 30,000 sf building to see if it is too long and that there is some relief so that it would appear that they were separate. It was demonstrated on the elevation drawing of how it would be similar to the other proposed buildings. In response to the question as to why there will not be a long building on North Avenue similar to the one on Schmale Road, it was noted that the setbacks along Schmale Road differ from those on North Avenue. It was determined that there will be additional plans and drawings to show the four-sided architecture of the four buildings.

In regard to the question about generating foot traffic from the apartment complex on the other side of Schmale Road, it was noted that there will be additional sidewalks put on Schmale Road to the south of the project that will lead to the internal walkways of the development. In regard to additional signalization on Schmale Road, Mr. Glees said that he would check with engineering on that.

Commissioner Hundhausen asked if there will any other changes to the existing building beside the front entrance and was told no.

Commissioner Hundhausen moved and Commissioner Michaelsen made the second to continue this matter to the meeting of February 27, 2006. The results of the roll call vote were:

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Vora, Spink, Michaelsen, Hundhausen and Sutenbach
Nays:	0	
Absent:	1	Commissioner Weiss

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

Ayes:	5	Commissioners Vora, Spink, Michaelsen, Hundhausen and Sutenbach
Nays:	0	
Absent:	1	Commissioner Weiss

There was discussion regarding a letter received by the Plan Commissioners from Cardinal Fitness. Mr. Glees asked those members who would like to receive e-mail updates on future matters to provide their e-mail addresses.

At 9:55 p.m. Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Michaelsen made the second to adjourn. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.