

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

**March 14, 2005**

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

Chairman John Bentz 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 Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen, Hundhausen,  
Sutenbach and Bentz

Absent: Commissioner Vora

Also Present: Village Planner Don Bastian, Recording Secretary Progar

**MINUTES:**

Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Sutenbach made the second to approve the Minutes of the Meeting of February 14, 2005 as presented. The results of the roll call vote were:

|          |   |  |
|----------|---|--|
| Ayes:    | 3 | Commissioners Spink, Sutenbach and Bentz       |
| Nays:    | 0 |  |
| Abstain: | 3 | Commissioners Weiss, Michaelsen and Hundhausen |
| Absent:  | 1 | Commissioner Vora                              |

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**PRESENTATION:**

**#05048: Patrick Group, Jason Court  
Subdivision – Final**

Patrick Brushaber, 823 Sarah Ct. Elk Grove Village, IL was sworn in as a witness in this matter. He explained that the requested changes in the cul de sac have been made as requested.

Mr. Bastian said that in July of 2004, Patrick Brushaber presented his plans for a 12-lot (buildable) single-family residential subdivision off of Fair Oaks Road between the unincorporated subdivisions on Judith Lane and Riviera Court. A copy of the preliminary site plan reviewed by the Plan Commission at that time (Exhibit B) is attached for reference purposes. Since that time, there have been some minor changes to the subdivision layout that were made in order to 1) accommodate engineering design requirements, 2) address some concerns of adjacent residents, and 3) provide a modified path connection to the tot lot on the property to the east. In December of 2004, the Village Board adopted Ordinances 2004-12-70 and 2004-12-71, which approved the annexation and rezoning of the property. Since the 2004 approvals were only for the Preliminary Plan, the applicant is now requesting approval of the Final Plat,

in accordance with Section 7-2-6 of the Carol Stream Subdivision Code.

In review of the Final Plat, Community Development Department staff has no concerns or suggested modifications. The Engineering Services Department has reviewed the Final Plat and recommends approval as well, with no recommended conditions of approval. Staff recommends approval of the Final Subdivision Plat of Jason Court Subdivision.

Commissioner Weiss asked who would be responsible for the maintenance of Lot 14 and Mr. Brushaber said that there would be an association to maintain the pond and adjacent landscaping. In response to the question about the retaining wall it was established that there is a retaining wall at the back of the pond and this will also be maintained by the association. Commissioner Weiss asked if there was an entry sign anticipated for this development and Mr. Brushaber said that a sign was not anticipated at this point.

Chairman Bentz said that except for the change in the end of the cul de sac, which is beneficial to all, this is basically the same plan that was presented and he called for a motion on this matter.

Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Hundhausen made the second to recommend approval of the final plat of subdivision for Jason Court Manor. The results of the roll call vote were:

|         |   |   |
|---------|---|---|
| Ayes:   | 6 | Commissioners Spink, Weiss, Michaelson, Hundhausen, Sutenbach and Bentz |
| Nays:   | 0 |   |
| Absent: | 1 | Commissioner Vora   |

The petitioner was reminded that this matter will be heard by the Village Board at their meeting on March 21<sup>st</sup> and was advised to attend that meeting.

**04307: David Schonback, Northeast Corner of St. Charles Road & Morton Road Rezoning (Pre-Annexation) - Continued from 1/24/05 Meeting**

Mr. Bastian said that the petitioner has requested another continuance from this meeting to May 9, 2005 since he is continuing to revise plans for this matter. Staff is recommending a continuance to May 9<sup>th</sup> and if the matter is not ready for action at that time, they will request that the applicant withdraw the application.

Commissioner Weiss moved and Commissioner Hundhausen made the second to continue this matter to meeting of May 9, 2005 at the request of the petitioner. The results of the roll call vote were:

|         |   |   |
|---------|---|---|
| Ayes:   | 6 | Commissioners Spink, Weiss, Michaelson, Hundhausen, Sutenbach and Bentz |
| Nays:   | 0 |   |
| Absent: | 1 | Commissioner Vora   |

**#05032: Geneva Crossing Phase Two, Schmale Road North of Geneva Road Rezoning, Amendment to PUD Plan, Special uses Variation – Sign Code, Subdivision Preliminary/Final Planned Unit Development Plan**

The petitioner has requested that this matter be withdrawn from consideration. There is no formal action necessary for this request.

**#05018: Duke Construction, 121 and 131 E. North Avenue**  
***Special Use – Ancillary Retail Use***  
***Gary and North Avenue Corridor Review***  
***Variations - Gary and North Avenue Corridor Regulations***

Jamie Bonnevier and Andy James of Duke Construction were sworn in as witnesses in this matter. Ms. Bonnevier explained that the request is for a special use for ancillary retail use, Gary and North Avenue Corridor review and a request for variations to the Gary and North Avenue Corridor regulations. The proposed development would include a warehouse and retail showroom building for one tenant and there would be additional space for another tenant. Several elevation and site plan drawings were displayed and explained.

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

Mr. Bastian stated that Jamie Bonnevier of Duke Construction is requesting approval of a special use, Gary and North Avenue Corridor Review and variations for a proposed 171,090 square foot office, warehouse and retail showroom building that would be located on the approximate 10.5-acre property at the northeast corner of Gary Avenue and North Avenue. The building would contain 147,484 square feet of warehouse space, 11,906 square feet of office space, and 11,700 square feet of retail showroom space. The building would be built to accommodate two tenants; however at this time, only one tenant, Vaxcel International/Lighting Direct, is known. Vaxcel International, currently located in Glendale Heights, would occupy the southern 110,312 square feet of the building, which would include 90,706 square feet of warehouse, 11,700 square feet of retail showroom and 7,906 square feet of office area. The retail showroom component of Vaxcel International's use requires a special use permit in the Industrial District, as *retail sales as an ancillary use to the principal industrial use* is listed as a special use. Because of the location of the property at the northeast corner of Gary Avenue and North Avenue, Gary and North Avenue Corridor Review is required. The applicant is also requesting two variations from the Gary and North Avenue Corridor standards, including a building setback variation from Gary Avenue and a variation from the screening requirements for an overhead door and the loading dock doors.

**Special Use:**

As a note, a detailed discussion of the site design, building architecture and landscape design will be provided in the Gary and North Avenue Corridor Review portion of the report. As indicated in the January 18, 2005, cover letter from Jamie Bonnevier, the main building tenant, Vaxcel International/Lighting Direct is a privately owned business that is looking to locate their new warehouse, office and retail showroom facility to Carol Stream. The retail showroom would allow for the display and sale of their lighting fixture products. The Vaxcel operation is expected to employ 30 people in Carol Stream.

As stated, the Zoning Code lists *retail sales as an ancillary use to the principal industrial use* as a special use in the Industrial District. The code language continues by stating,

provided that a parking ratio of 1:250 square feet of floor area is established for (the retail) use. Based upon this language, staff believes that the primary intent of the Zoning Code for requiring a special use for the ancillary retail use involves the need for adequate customer parking to be provided. As seen in the table on the following page, the Zoning Code requires 196 parking spaces to serve the proposed use of space within the entire building. This calculation includes a parking ratio of one space for each 250 square feet of retail showroom area. Specifically, the Zoning Code requires 47 parking spaces directly attributable to the retail showroom use, and staff believes that this will be more than adequate to serve the retail component of the total building use. Overall, 199 parking stalls are provided, which exceeds the amount required by the Zoning Code by three spaces.

Also for your information, the plans provide the required number (six) of handicapped accessible parking stalls.

In further evaluation of the retail sales component, the Village will receive sales tax revenue from the sales generated by the business. Although staff would have preferred for this entire property to have been developed for retail uses, which would be consistent with the Future Land Use Plan recommendation for Commercial use, the property has the I Industrial District zoning classification that allows the overall office, warehouse and distribution use proposed by the applicant. Staff has evaluated the requested special use from the aesthetic and operational standpoints. Aesthetic issues will be reviewed in more detail in the Gary and North Avenue Corridor Review section of the report. From an operational standpoint, the site, parking and traffic flow plan will allow for proper customer access to the retail showroom area of the business.

Gary and North Avenue Corridor Review:

Because the proposed development is located within both the Gary and North Avenue Corridors (GNAC), the Plan Commission must review and approve comprehensive development plans for the property to ensure that the proposal is in conformance with the corridor regulations. The Plan Commission has the authority to make the final determination of conformance with the GNAC regulations and Village Board consideration is not required. The sections of the GNAC regulations that apply to this proposal include site design, architectural design and parking/landscape design.

Site Design:

The proposed office, warehouse and retail showroom building would measure 171,090 feet and would initially be constructed with space for two tenants. As seen on the Paving and Layout Plan (Exhibit A), access to the site will be possible through a right-in/right-out point on North Avenue, or a full access point on Gary Avenue north of the CarQuest property. The site plan has been designed to allow for traffic to circulate completely around the building in either direction. With respect to the GNAC setback requirements, the proposed building and parking lot areas meet the minimum setbacks required by the regulations. However, the GNAC regulations also include a 100 foot *maximum* building setback, which the proposed building will exceed by a significant amount, as the building is shown to be set back about 225 feet from the Gary Avenue property line at the nearest point. The larger than allowed setback is the result of the "outlot" type uses already existing along Gary Avenue; specifically Fannie May Candies and CarQuest Auto Parts. The applicant is requesting a variation from the maximum Gary Avenue building setback, and this request will be evaluated in more detail later in this report. Other than the Gary Avenue maximum building setback being requested, the plan conforms to the other setback and floor area ratio standards required by the

GNAC regulations and the I Industrial District. The only change to the overall site design that staff recommends would be that the sidewalk shown on the north side of the parking lot, immediately south of the building, should be continued approximately 75 feet further east, to the end of the row of parking spaces. This would provide convenient customer access to the retail showroom entrance for all customers parking in the primary customer parking lot south of the building. The additional sidewalk would better achieve the intent of the GNAC regulation stating that, "pedestrian facilities should be considered within the site."

The building elevation plan (Exhibit E) and various color renderings (Exhibits F-1 through F-4) present the appearance of the proposed building. Generally speaking, the building will be constructed of precast concrete, with several areas of glass provided at various locations on the north, south and west elevations. The elevation plan proposes panel reveals and color blocking to break up the expanse of precast wall sections in addition to the windows and glass entrances. The east wall elevation contains a total of 20 doors, with three overhead doors and 17 truck dock doors.

The architectural review of this building in accordance with the GNAC regulations has been particularly challenging due to several factors. First, the property is located at the corner of Gary Avenue and North Avenue, which results in the full application of the GNAC standards to two sides of the building, and partial application of the GNAC standards to the other two sides of the building. Usually, projects undergoing the corridor review process have at least one entire wall that is not visible from Gary or North Avenue, which provides for a logical location for service areas, dock doors, or other unsightly mechanical equipment or service uses. The second factor that adds to the challenging nature of this review is that the proposed use is relatively truck dock intensive, with a total of 20 docks and doors on the east elevation, as mentioned. Of course, the corridor regulations require docks and service areas to be completely screened, which presents a challenge in this case. Finally, the client in this case wishes to have an overhead door facing Gary Avenue, to allow personal vehicles to be parked inside the building. Aside from the Building Code concerns that the indoor parking use will bring about, it also results in an overhead door facing Gary Avenue, which presents a concern from the standpoint of screening.

In evaluation of the architectural design, staff notes that significant improvements have been made to the appearance of the building since the original plan submittal, in response to staff comments. Even though staff had previously been told by the applicant that it was "not possible (to have continuous windows on the west side of the building) due to the use of racking," the plans have been modified to show windows running the entire length of the west elevation, spaced at one window approximately every 15 feet. Windows have also been added across the entire north elevation, which will be highly visible from southbound Gary Avenue traffic, at an average interval of one window every 25 feet. Exhibit F-1, which provides the view of the southwest corner of the building, indicates that an attractive glass curtain wall will be a prominent feature, and a glass showroom entrance feature will be provided at the middle of the south elevation facing North Avenue, as seen on Exhibit F-3. Staff's only recommendation regarding the use of glass and windows would be that the window system treatment should be continued for the remainder of the south wall elevation facing North Avenue, to break up what would otherwise be a monotonous elevation facing North Avenue. Staff estimates that approximately ten windows would be needed to continue the window spacing pattern that would be found on the west or Gary Avenue facing side of

the building.

The most significant remaining issue with respect to building architecture involves the screening of the overhead door facing Gary Avenue and the truck docks on the east side of the building. It is important to note that the applicant is requesting a variation from the specific GNAC regulation which states that truck docks and service areas shall be blocked from view from public ways. The applicant believes that they have provided the best possible screening of the truck docks on the east side of the building. In making this case, the applicant believes that the combination of 32 proposed evergreen trees, some of which will be eight feet in height at the time of planting, the grade change at the southeast corner of the property, and the position of the existing Invensys building toward the front of the property that is immediately to the east of this site, will cause the truck docks to be "very difficult to see." Exhibit F-4 provides a rendering of what the applicant believes the view of the truck dock area will look like from North Avenue. In review of this issue, staff believes that the rendering is somewhat optimistic in how it portrays the screening of the truck dock area. Staff believes that it could be possible that the truck docks could be mostly screened by the Invensys building and the grade changes that the applicant is proposing to build into the site in front of the truck dock area. However, a line of sight study was not provided to illustrate the view of the truck dock area from North Avenue. Such a study would have been useful in providing a more accurate idea of the view of the truck docks as seen from North Avenue, especially if the proposed landscape materials were removed from the plan. This would have better conveyed the impacts that the proposed grading changes and the presence of the Invensys building would have. The Plan Commission is asked to review the issue of the screening of the truck docks and provide feedback to the applicant as to whether the proposed screening plan is acceptable. Staff will discuss the requested variation from the screening requirement that the applicant is requesting in more detail after the landscape and parking review portion of this report.

The other aspect related to the variation from the screening requirement is the proposed overhead door on the west side of the building facing Gary Avenue. The purpose of the overhead door is to allow the business owner to park personal vehicles inside the building. The corridor regulations do not allow overhead doors to be visible from Gary Avenue. To minimize the appearance of the door, the applicant is proposing to install a residential style door that will be painted to match the color of the building. The applicant is also proposing to landscape the areas immediately adjacent to the door with a combination of ornamental trees and four, eight foot tall evergreen trees. The Plan Commission is asked to provide feedback regarding the appropriateness of an overhead door facing Gary Avenue, and Plan Commission feedback is also requested with respect to how adequately the proposed landscape materials will screen the view of the door from Gary Avenue. The variation request for screening will be discussed in more detail later in this report.

Overall, with respect to architecture, staff finds the building to be of acceptable design quality to meet the intent of the GNAC regulations, provided staff's recommendation regarding additional windows on the south elevation is agreed to by the applicant, and pending the additional discussion regarding the variation for overhead door and truck dock screening.

#### **Parking/Landscaping Design:**

The parking requirements and site plan were discussed in the Special Use section of this report, and the proposed number of parking spaces and the parking lot layout were found to be acceptable to staff. Staff's only remaining comment regarding parking is that the parking stalls shall be striped in accordance with the Village's looped parking stall striping requirements.

With respect to site landscape considerations, the corridor regulations were designed to allow flexibility in design but require a minimum amount of landscape material on-site. The amount of landscape material required is calculated by granting a point value to the type of landscape material provided and then requiring a certain number of points for specific areas of the development. For example, shade trees are worth 225 points each and evergreen trees are worth 275 points each. 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 Landscape Plans (Exhibits D-1 and D-2), landscape materials are shown in the landscape setback along North Avenue, along the parking areas on the west side of the building, adjacent to the access points off of Gary and North Avenues, along the east property line, and within the landscape islands within the parking lot.

There are a few aspects of the landscape design that require further discussion. First, it is worth noting that the applicant is proposing a landscaped area including a rock outcropping adjacent to the North Avenue entrance to the property, as seen on Exhibit D-2. This feature will help to create an attractive entrance to the property along North Avenue. The second item of note involves the intensive evergreen planting area at the southeast corner of the property. The evergreen trees are an important component of the applicant's efforts to screen the truck docks on the east side of the building from west bound traffic on North Avenue. Of the 32 evergreen trees planned for installation at the southeast corner of the site, 21 will be eight feet in height at the time of planting and 11 will be six feet in height. The screening of the truck docks will be discussed in more detail in the variation section of the report. The only other comment that staff has regarding site landscaping at this time involves a transformer that is shown in a landscape island on the west side of the building. Although the CarQuest building will block the view of the transformer when viewed directly across from the transformer from Gary Avenue, there will be angles at which both north and southbound motorists on Gary Avenue will be able to see the transformer. As the corridor regulations require all mechanical equipment to be screened from view from public streets, staff's first recommendation would be that the transformer should be relocated to the west side of the building, to a location that is not visible from either Gary or North Avenue. If for some reason this option is completely impossible, then the transformer will need to be heavily screened with evergreen landscaping, or a combination of fencing and landscaping. The applicant needs to also be aware that if there is any other mechanical equipment that is not shown on the plan, it too will need to be screened to the extent that it will not be visible from Gary or North Avenue. This is a requirement for both ground and roof mounted equipment.

Subject to the discussion in the variation section of the report, which follows, and the conditions that staff will recommend at the conclusion of this report, we find the overall landscape plan to be acceptable.

**Gary and North Avenue Corridor Variations:**

As indicated, the applicant has filed requests for two variations from GNAC standards. The first variation request, from Section 16-5-6(J)(2), is to allow the building to be set back more than the 100 foot maximum building setback from Gary Avenue, as the building is proposed to be set back 225 feet from Gary Avenue at the nearest point. The second variation request, from Section 16-5-6(K)(10), seeks relief from the complete screening requirement for overhead doors and truck dock doors from public streets.

In evaluating variation requests from the GNAC standards, the GNAC regulations provide direction that, *"In the event of unusual circumstances, or a particular hardship, the developer or property owner may request that the Plan Commission adjust the applicability of this section to existing development."* We note that the development of this site involves new development and not an existing development. As such, the direction in the GNAC regulations with respect to viewing this property as unique does not apply. Of course, the applicant still has the right to request the noted variations, regarding which we provide our analysis below.

With respect to the variation from the 100-foot maximum building setback from Gary Avenue, we believe that a unique situation exists because of the presence of the Fannie May and CarQuest Auto Parts businesses along Gary Avenue. These buildings would make it very difficult to design a typical building within 100 feet of Gary Avenue while still providing for customary traffic circulation and access patterns around the building, and would create building code concerns due to the proximity of the buildings to each other. In fact, staff would likely not support a design that complied with the 100-foot maximum setback from Gary Avenue, as it would result in an awkward building configuration that would pose logistical concerns for the development of the site. As such, staff supports the variation to allow the building to be set back 225 feet from Gary Avenue as opposed to a maximum of 100 feet, as required.

The variation request from the requirement that truck docks and service areas be completely screened from public streets is more troubling. It is staff's interpretation of the code language that truck docks and overhead doors are not supposed to be at all visible from Gary or North Avenue. In discussions with the applicant, staff has acknowledged that this property is somewhat unique because it is at the corner of Gary Avenue and North Avenue, which presents a difficult challenge with respect to completely screening the service area (truck docks) that is customary for an industrial building. Staff has suggested several options to the applicant with respect to screening the truck docks on the east side of the building, including constructing a wing wall that extends out to the east near the southeast corner of the building. This would effectively block views of the truck dock area from the south. Other suggestions that have been rejected by the applicant include the construction of a masonry wall along the east property line, constructing a masonry wall around the entire truck dock/court area, or possibly providing interior truck docks.

The applicant's response to the screening issue has been that significant grade changes at the southeast corner of the property, combined with the blocking effect of the Invensys building at the front of the property immediately to the east, and the intensive evergreen tree planting will effectively block the view of the truck docks. The rendering provided in Exhibit F-4 is intended to show the view of the south and east sides of the building, which includes the truck dock area. As stated, staff believes that



the rendering is optimistic with respect to the fullness of the landscape materials, and we feel that a line of sight plan with the landscape materials deleted would provide a more accurate picture of what the degree of truck dock visibility will actually be. Overall, given that the applicant has rejected staff's ideas that would, in our opinion, more completely screen the truck docks as seen from North Avenue, we cannot support this aspect of the requested variation. Staff asks that the Plan Commission evaluate the screening plan for the truck docks and make a determination as to its adequacy. The Plan Commission should make a recommendation regarding the requested variation.

The other aspect of the screening variation involves the overhead door provided on the west side of the building, facing Gary Avenue. The purpose of the door is to allow the owner(s) of the company to park their vehicles inside the building. Staff has repeatedly indicated to the applicant that the overhead door cannot be visible from Gary Avenue. In response to this, the applicant initially proposed to install a wooden fence and gate across the entrance to the overhead door, which would have had a low quality appearance. The current plan proposes to have the overhead door be of a residential quality, which would soften the appearance of the door. The applicant proposes to paint the door to match the color of the building, and the landscape plan indicates that a significant amount of landscaping will be planted adjacent to the overhead door, as well as within the large landscape island that will be immediately to the west of the door.

In review of the variation request to allow the overhead door on the west side of the building, staff's recommendation, based upon the direction provided in the corridor regulations, would be for the door to be removed completely from the west side of the building. Part of the reason for this position is that the aspect of parking the vehicles inside the building is not essential, or even related, to the operation of the business, but rather it is simply a wish of the new building tenant. We believe that the applicant and building tenant should examine other locations through which the vehicles could be brought into the building, for example, through an overhead door on the east side of the building. While this might not allow the vehicles to be parked exactly where the owner would prefer, it would still allow for the vehicles to be parked inside, and it would also better meet the intent of the corridor standards. It is worth noting that if the outlot parcel immediately to the west of the proposed overhead door were to be developed with a building, it is likely that such a building, combined with the proposed landscape materials, would screen the view of the door to a high degree. However, inasmuch as no building is proposed for the outlot parcel at this time, and staff believes that there are alternatives to having an overhead door on the west side of the building, we cannot support the requested variation. We request that the Plan Commission review the issue of the variation request for the screening of the overhead door on the west side of the building and provide a recommendation.

#### **Other Issues and Considerations:**

There are two other items requiring discussion regarding this proposed project, as listed below:

**Storm Water Management Plan** – The site development plans do not provide an on-site storm water management facility because volume for storm water storage attributable to development on this property was accounted for in the large regional storm water management facility on the property that is immediately to the north.

However, the storm water runoff generated by the development of this property needs to be fully conveyed to the storm water management facility on the property to the north. As of this time, the Engineering Services Department has not yet received plans that clearly demonstrate that this will be accomplished in accordance with the standards of the DuPage County Storm Water Management Ordinance. As such, the Engineering Services Department is recommending that the applicant's requests not be forwarded to the Village Board for final action until such time as they have received and approved the plans for the design of the storm water management system.

**Commercial Outlot Parcels** – The proposed development plan for the overall property would effectively result in the creation of two "outlots" fronting on Gary Avenue – one between Fannie May and CarQuest, and one north of CarQuest. Staff has been informed that Vaxcel International plans to maintain ownership of the property immediately north of CarQuest, for possible expansion possibilities and because it contains a primary entrance to their site. However, we have been informed that Duke Construction ultimately plans to sell off what would become an approximate 0.6-acre outlot between Fannie May and CarQuest. Staff believes that it is important and necessary to plan for the future development of this property at this time, since the development of the larger site as proposed by the applicant could have a direct impact on the viability of the future development of the outlot. For example, based upon existing access points and the median in Gary Avenue, staff believes that DuPage County will only allow a right-in/right-out access to the outlot property in the future. Because of this, staff believes that it is critical that a second means of access be provided for the outlot parcel. One option would be for cross access to be provided through the CarQuest property, which would allow a full access point for traffic that would wish to access the future outlot development. A second option would be for cross access to be provided to the north-south drive aisle on the west side of the proposed Vaxcel building. Staff recommends that the applicant be required to provide a solution to the access issue for the future outlot development that is acceptable to all parties prior to this matter being forwarded to the Village Board for final action.

**Summary:**

Staff can support the special use for retail sales ancillary to the principal industrial use, as it will provide a new shopping opportunity for Carol Stream residents and other members of the general public wishing to purchase lighting products. With respect to the Gary and North Avenue Corridor Review, staff can support the site design, architectural design and landscape plan, subject to the conditions noted below. Staff can support the requested variation from the maximum building setback from Gary Avenue, based upon the configuration of the property and the existing outlot type uses. Staff cannot support the requested variations from the screening requirements, as we believe that viable alternatives exist that would eliminate the need for relief from the screening standards.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends denial of the variation from the screening standards for the overhead door and loading dock doors, which in turn results in a staff recommendation of denial for the Gary and North Avenue Corridor Review. Accordingly, we recommend that the Plan Commission continue this matter so that the applicant can revise the plans with respect to the screening of the overhead door and the truck docks, and resubmit the

same for further review by the staff and Plan Commission. We would otherwise be in a position to recommend approval of the special use for retail sales, all other aspects of the Gary and North Avenue Corridor Review, and the variation from the 100-foot maximum building setback, subject to the following conditions:

That the sidewalk on the south side of the building shall be continued approximately 75 feet to the east, to the end of the row of parking that is immediately adjacent to the entrance to the retail showroom;

That the window treatment be continued on the south elevation of the building, with windows being spaced at an interval similar to the interval proposed on the west elevation of the building;

That the parking spaces shall be striped in accordance with the Village's looped parking stall striping requirements;

That the transformer that is currently shown in a landscape island on the west side of the building shall be relocated to a location on the east side of the building that is not visible from a public street, or if relocation is demonstrated not to be possible, that the transformer be heavily screened with landscaping or a combination of landscaping and fencing that will cause the transformer to not be visible from Gary Avenue;

That all mechanical equipment, whether it be ground mounted or roof mounted, shall be completely screened from view from Gary and North Avenue;

That no outdoor trash dumpsters or enclosures shall be permitted, for either building tenant;

That the overhead door shown on the west side of the building be deleted;

That the site, building and landscape plan shall match the attached exhibits, with the exception of any revisions that may be made to the plans based upon the recommendations of the Plan Commission or staff;

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

That the zoning requests shall not be forwarded to the Village Board for final action until such time as the Engineering Services Department has received and reviewed plans that present a storm water management system design that will satisfy the requirements of the DuPage County Storm Water Management Ordinance;

That the applicant shall be required to provide a solution to the access issue for the future outlot development that is acceptable to all parties prior to this matter being forwarded to the Village Board for final action;

That the applicant shall obtain sign permits for all site signage; and

That the construction and operation of the facility shall comply with all state, county and Village Codes and requirements.

Commissioner Michaelsen commented on the landscaping and berming being proposed for the east side of the building and asked if a pre-cast screen wall was considered instead of using evergreens. It was noted that the evergreens and landscaping would be more attractive to view. Ms. Bonnevier added that they could tighten the trees together some more and add some additional trees in order to make it a more dense screen.

Commissioner Michaelsen commented that he agreed with staff regarding the overhead door on the west elevation but cannot offer a solution that would be acceptable to the client and still meet the intent of the corridor regulations.

Andy James stated that as he understands the regulations, the requirement is that the door not be visible from Gary Avenue and that it is obvious from the rendering that it is not visible, nor would it ever be visible. He also noted that this will be a residential door and is much shorter than a commercial size door. Commissioner Michaelsen said that the rendering is showing a basic idea and there is no way to know what this will look like from Gary Avenue. Ms. Bonnevier commented that the rendering depicts that the door will not be seen.

Commissioner Spink asked if they will provide a line of sight study since that would provide a lot of answers. Ms. Bonnevier commented that it was never made clear that a line of sight rendering would be necessary until they received the staff report on Friday and they could not get one in time for this meeting. Commissioner Spink said that she would like to have that done. She asked if there was anyway possible for the tenant to use an overhead dock door as an entrance to where he can park his car without having to install another door. Mr. James said that they are selling this building and it will not be leased. He noted that the prospective buyer would like to have this overhead door as a convenience issue rather than a practical issue for parking inside during the winter months and he would like to pursue screening this door from Gary Avenue in deference to the wishes of the perspective owner if possible.

Commissioner Spink asked if they were going to relocate the transformer from the west side and it was determined that that would not be a problem and they put some additional landscaping around it. Commissioner Spink asked if a wing wall could be put behind the proposed landscaping and Ms. Bonnevier said that it was considered but it was thought that the benefits do not outweigh the costs. Commissioner Spink said that it appears that the renderings depict growth ten years out and not how it will look at the outset. Ms. Bonnevier noted that the installation will be trees of five years growth and that they can bring them closer together and add more trees.

Commissioner Spink asked what is the solution for access to the future outlot and Mr. James said that there had not been consideration of that until the staff report was received. He said that they will ultimately have to address the issue, but not today. He asked how the issue is germane to the current requests. He indicated that they will not be ready to subdivide the property until sometime around August of this year and that they are willing to work with staff on this matter, but feel that this should not hold back the rest of the project.

Commissioner Sutenbach asked if the cut-outs shown on the west wall could be put on the north wall as well and was told that those are scuppers to allow drainage from the roof and it would not be feasible to do it on the other side. Commissioner Sutenbach commented that they do provide relief from the monotony of the wall. He commented that an additional site plan or rendering that depicts how the building will look with cars in front of it and trees etc. would be very helpful.

Mr. Bastian said that there are several issues that need to be addressed such as engineering, the access issue, and whether or not the Plan Commission feels that the

elevations and landscape plans and architectural designs are ready to be approved.

Commissioner Hundhausen said that she is concerned about the outlot and that she would like to see the amount of landscape put deeper into the parking lot and asked if they would be willing to extend the line of trees to the north. It was agreed that they would add more trees. Commissioner Hundhausen said that she would like to see the line of sight from several aspects.

Commissioner Weiss asked if they agreed to extend the sidewalk as noted in the staff report and it was stated that they agree to do that. He asked if there will be special accommodations for the retail customers and it was stated that customers could drive to the dock doors to load their purchases. Commissioner Weiss noted that there are several specific building code concerns to allow parking of motor vehicles with the building and it was stated that those specific requirements have already been included in the building plans.

Chairman Bentz said that he does not see the concern for the overhead door considering that the setback from Gary Avenue is 225 feet. He said that it should not be visible with good screening and landscaping and the probability that there will be another building in front of it and with the door painted the same color as the building he doesn't see it as a visibility problem. He said that he would also like to see line of sight drawings specifically showing the visibility west bound on North Avenue and well as the site from Gary Avenue and what would be seen. The special use for the ancillary retail sales is not a big issue. In response to the question regarding the storm water management issue, Mr. Bastian said that that issue is not something that is dealt with at the Plan Commission level and that the special use issue can go forward on its own.

Mr. Bastian said that he would like to clarify a couple of things; the applicant made the statement that in preparing some of these elevations, they thought the idea was that one should not be able to see the doors, well, the renderings are supposed to be accurate and depict what the real world is supposed to be not completely obliterate a dock door or an opening in the building with trees. It is easy to draw a plan so you can't see what is behind it, that is not what a rendering is supposed to show, it should show what the building will look like on the day that it opens. It was not staff's direction to have them prepare renderings that depict anything but what it will look like when it opens up. With respect to not having time to put together a line of sight study, it is understandable, but it is always incumbent upon the applicant to provide the Commission and staff with whatever information they think they have that will show their compliance with the requirements. A line of sight study is nothing new and it could have been prepared on their own initiative. In regard to Commissioner Spink's suggestion of a wing wall, there is an 80' wide landscape island that if there was a wing wall there for the entire 80', combined with the evergreen screening, would reduce the window of visibility that traffic on North Avenue would have of the truck dock area. A possible recommendation would be that if the Plan Commission would allow the overhead door on Gary Avenue to remain, a condition could be imposed that this door must remain closed at all time except for the owner to enter and /or leave.

Commissioner Spink asked if there were going to be shopping carts for the retail customers and if so, where in the parking lot would they be corralled. It was noted that initially there will not be shopping carts.

Chairman Bentz commented that there need to be more detailed renderings as well as line of sight drawings. He said that the building is very monotonous and there needs to be some vertical relief. It was suggested that the dark gray color could be continued to show some contouring. The top part of the walls need additional architectural details and something to break up the expanse of the walls.

Commissioner Spink asked if there would be signs on the building and it was determined that there will none on the building, but possibly a sign on North Avenue and possibly a painted logo on the building.

A summary of what the Commission is looking for is a proposal for access to the outlot when it is subdivided, garage door on the west side without landscaping and then with the landscaping view from across Gary Avenue, continuation of the sidewalk on the south side and then the southeast corner when it is first planted from Gary Avenue and a view from the building next door and what will be seen while driving down Gary Avenue, added architectural relief on the building itself and a wing wall extending from the landscape island or some alternative, change the location of the transformer and show landscape and screening from Gary Avenue.

Commissioner Sutenbach moved and Commissioner Hundhausen made the second to recommend approval of the special use permit for ancillary retail use. The results of the roll call vote were:

|         |   |   |
|---------|---|---|
| Ayes:   | 6 | Commissioners Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen, Hundhausen, Sutenbach and Bentz |
| Nays:   | 0 |   |
| Absent: | 1 | Commissioner Vora   |

The petitioner was reminded that this matter will be heard by the Village Board at their meeting on March 21<sup>st</sup> and was advised to attend that meeting.

Commissioner Sutenbach moved and Commissioner Hundhausen made the second to continue to the Gary and North Avenue review and the request for variation to the Gary Avenue and North Avenue Corridor regulations continued to the meeting of March 28<sup>th</sup> to allow the petitioner time to prepare the additional information requested. The results of the roll call vote were:

|         |   |   |
|---------|---|---|
| Ayes:   | 6 | Commissioners Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen, Hundhausen, Sutenbach and Bentz |
| Nays:   | 0 |   |
| Absent: | 1 | Commissioner Vora   |

**#05019: Duke Realty, 815-955 Kimberly Drive  
Variation – Landbanked Parking**

Jamie Bonnevier, Duke Realty was sworn in as a witness in this matter. She explained that the request is to landbank 85 spaces since they will not be required at 815 – 955 Kimberly Drive.

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

Mr. Bastian stated that Wilfrid Freve of Duke Realty Corporation is requesting a variation to allow required parking spaces to be landbanked on the property at 815-955 Kimberly Drive. The property is improved with a 406,000 square foot warehouse and distribution facility, with 250,902 square feet of space in the building currently leased by Expo Design. Duke Realty Corporation has executed a lease with Niven Marketing Group to occupy the remaining 155,494 square feet of space in the building. Based upon the somewhat large amount of office space that Niven plans to have in their

portion of the building, measuring about 28,000 square feet, the Zoning Code requires a relatively high number of parking spaces to serve the use. However, the applicant has indicated that the existing parking available on the site far exceeds the actual parking needs of the two tenants combined. Rather than construct additional parking spaces to meet the Zoning Code requirement, the applicant has instead filed an application seeking approval to landbank required parking spaces on the property through the variation process. In accordance with Section 16-13-2(G) of the Carol Stream Zoning Code, Wilfrid Freve is requesting approval of a variation to landbank 85 parking spaces on the property.

When justified, the Village has approved the landbanking of required parking spaces to allow industrial businesses to reduce the amount of pavement that must be installed and instead maintain the land as greenspace. In this particular case, the majority (66) of the proposed landbanked stalls would be located in an existing grass area on the east side of the building. Thirteen stalls would be added onto existing rows of parking on the site, while six spaces would be striped onto existing hard-surfaced areas in the vicinity of truck docks on the west side of the building. In the past, landbanked parking spaces have typically been accounted for almost exclusively in greenspace areas of industrial properties, but recently, there have been a few requests approved by the Village in which parking spaces were shown to be landbanked upon existing asphalt or concrete truck maneuvering or drive aisle areas. In this case, staff does not object to a small percentage (7% of the total number of spaces to be landbanked) of the parking spaces being landbanked on existing asphalt areas. As a note, in all cases, the Village has retained the right to require that all of the required parking spaces be installed if it is ever determined that the spaces are necessary.

| Use of Space | Area of Use  | Code Requirement                                | Spaces Required   |
|--------------|--------------|---|-------------------|
| Expo         |              |   |                   |
| Office       | 5,683 s.f.   | 1 space for each 250 s.f.                       | 22.7              |
| Warehouse    | 245,219 s.f. | 4/1 <sup>st</sup> 1,200 s.f., then 1/1,500 s.f. | 166.7             |
|              |              | <b>Total Parking Required for Expo</b>          | <b>189</b>        |
| Niven        |              |   |                   |
| Office       | 27,917       | 1 space for each 250 s.f.                       | 111.7             |
| Processing   | 10,776       | 1 space for each for 600 s.f.                   | 18                |
| Warehouse    | 116,801      | 1 space for each 1,500 s.f.                     | 77.9              |
|              |              | <b>Total Parking Required for Niven</b>         | <b>208</b>        |
|              |              | Total Parking Required – both tenants           | <b>397 spaces</b> |
|              |              | Total Parking Provided                          | <b>316 spaces</b> |
|              |              | Spaces Requested for Landbanking                | <b>85 spaces</b>  |

As seen in the table, the Zoning Code requires 397 parking spaces to serve the entire building based upon the use of space by the existing tenant, Expo, and the proposed tenant, Niven. It is important to note that while the Zoning Code requires 189 spaces for Expo based upon their use of space, the attached letter from Expo Senior Logistics Manager Travis Szwaist indicates that their present operation includes only one shift,

with that shift having only 10 employees. Mr. Szwest also states that he does not expect an increase in workforce at this location in the next five years. Finally, in his letter dated January 18, 2005, Wilfrid Freve of Duke Realty, owner of the building and property, has indicated that their lease agreement with Expo allocates a maximum of 80 parking spaces to Expo for use. Staff has requested a copy of that lease agreement for verification of this restriction. Based upon employee counts and the lease provision, once verified, it is clear that Expo uses far fewer than the 189 parking spaces required by the Zoning Code.

The Zoning Code requires 208 parking spaces for Niven Marketing Group, based upon their proposed use of space in the building. In the letter dated January 11, 2005, from Donald Hubbard, President-CEO of Niven, Mr. Hubbard indicates that they have 44 full-time employees and one shift of plant assembly flex-labor that ranges from between 20 and 100 employees daily. This results in a maximum daily employee count of 144 people. Mr. Hubbard points out that most of the flex-labor employees either car pool or use transportation provided by Total Staffing, which would serve to reduce the number of employee vehicles parked on the property.

Considering that there are 316 spaces presently available on the property, and that Expo is limited to use of only 80 spaces per their lease agreement (and they only actually need 10 spaces), the remaining 236 spaces would be more than adequate to meet the number of spaces required for Niven by the Zoning Code, 208. Further, the maximum number of spaces used by Niven, even factoring in their five-year growth estimates, would be 154, and this assumes no carpooling or transportation provided by Total Staffing, which is the current arrangement. Based upon these factors, and the fact that the Village always requires as a condition of approval for landbanked parking variations that required parking must be installed at the request of the Village if deemed necessary by the Village, staff can support the request to landbank 85 parking spaces on the property.

#### Summary

Based upon the information provided, staff finds that the applicant has demonstrated that the number of spaces required by the Zoning Code is excessive. Our analysis indicates that this request represents a proper use of the landbank provision of the Zoning Code.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the request for a variation to landbank required parking spaces at 815-955 Kimberly Drive, subject to the following conditions:

1. That if deemed necessary by the Village, the landbanked parking stalls shall be installed by the property owner as shown on the attached site plan;
2. That the actual number of spaces present on the site upon approval of this request shall be 316 spaces, and that a minimum of 316 spaces must be maintained on the site at all times;
3. That the number of landbanked stalls reflected on the plans is 85;
4. That if installed, the parking spaces shown in the landbanked areas shall meet the greenspace and striping requirements at the time of installation, and shall



- also meet the other Village Code requirements, such as maximum allowable slopes for parking lots;
5. That the landbanked stalls, if installed, shall be designed in accordance with the approval of the Engineering Services Department, specifically with respect to maintenance of the overland flow routes;
  6. That at the time that a new tenant enters the building, the property owner must apply for a reaffirmation of the landbank variation, which will require review by the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals and final approval by the Village Board; and
  7. That the facility must comply with all state, county, and village codes and requirements.

Commissioner Weiss said that this request is based on the use of the building by its current tenants and how it could be determined if a different tenant came into the building. Mr. Bastian said that there are a number of ways that it would become obvious to staff that there was new use.

Chairman Bentz commented that landbanking is something that is encouraged in the industrial area since green space always looks better than an asphalt parking lot. Commissioner Weiss moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to recommend approval for a variance for landbanking parking spaces at 815-955 Kimberley Drive.

The results of the roll call vote were:

|         |   |   |
|---------|---|---|
| Ayes:   | 6 | Commissioners Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen, Hundhausen, Sutenbach and Bentz |
| Nays:   | 0 |   |
| Absent: | 1 | Commissioner Vora   |

The petitioner was reminded that this matter will be heard by the Village Board at their meeting on March 21<sup>st</sup> and was advised to attend that meeting.

**#05027:            Dave Larson, 496-512 St. Charles Road  
Variation – Outdoor Parking and Equipment Storage**

Robert McNees, on behalf of Dave Larson was sworn in as a witness in this matter. He reviewed the recent rezoning of this property from B-4 to B-3 and stated that the request is for variance for outdoor parking and equipment storage. There have been a couple of problems that have occurred in this process of applying for the variation, including the amount of the loan that will repair the roofs of the buildings and repave the parking lot. The amount of the loan is dependent upon the rents received from the current tenants, who are mostly all long term. Basically there are not sufficient funds to correctly pave the area where the tree service will put their vehicles. Service Master requires the variance in order to park their vans overnight as they are a 24 hour service company. Steve's Tree Service has a lot of heavy equipment, including a cherry picker, which is very tall. Mr. McNees said that Mr. Bastian has been very helpful in helping to modify the request and he noted that the applicant can agree to the conditions except for # 1 and # 2, which asks to relocate the fenced storage area about 60 feet to the west and that the fenced storage area be improved with an all weather surface that meets with the specification as provided by the Village Engineer. The owner cannot afford to pave the area indicated in the staff report and requests that he be allowed to leave the area

where the tree service equipment is stored as it has been for a very long time. The Service Master trucks would be parked on the newly paved original parking lot. There are two to three trailered vehicles that are being stored at the site. The large white semi trailer will be removed. Apparently the request to continue to use the fenced-in area for the tree service vehicles will require a revision to the variation notice. The second concern that the owner has with paving the area that is to be fenced in is that the equipment that the tree service contractor uses will tear up the paving in that area due to doing a turning motion with the vehicles as opposed to just driving straight in. Mr. McNees said that it was suggested that the area could possibly be covered with compacted gravel as a cost saving measure, but it appears that this would not be any less expensive than concrete or pavement.

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

Mr. Bastian stated that there are several businesses in this area that would like to have outdoor equipment and vehicle parking. This would require a variance to the Zoning Code. The applicant has provided information regarding the tenants in the building and the space that they occupy. First, ServiceMaster, which provides 24-hour cleaning services, would like the ability to park up to six of their yellow vans outdoors in the parking lot when the vans are not out on service calls. The second tenant, who wishes to conduct outdoor storage and parking activities, is Steve's Tree Service. A list of the equipment and vehicles associated with Steve's Tree Service business is provided in your packet. It is staff's understanding that all of the equipment and vehicles associated with Steve's Tree Service will be parked entirely within the proposed 60 by 127 foot screened fence area to be located generally at the southwest corner of the site. The third tenant requesting approval of outdoor parking is Airmakers, Inc., which is an HVAC contractor's business. Airmaker's uses one van in the operation of its business, and wishes to park the van outdoors in the parking lot.

The other primary consideration regarding the variation request that staff believes requires detailed evaluation involves aesthetics. One aspect of the variation request involves the outdoor storage of equipment, more specifically, the equipment listed for use by Steve's Tree Service, which is included as an attachment to this report.

Recently, the equipment has been stored out in the open on the site on unimproved areas, which represents a violation of the Village's Property Maintenance Codes as well as the Zoning Code. As seen in Mr. McNees's letter dated March 4, 2005, and on the Plat of Survey, the applicant is proposing to construct a 60 by 127 foot chain link fenced area for the storage and parking of equipment. The chain link fence would be seven feet in height, and would include screening slats on all four sides. An access gate would be located on the north side of the fenced area. Other improvements that the applicant is proposing to make include cleaning up the overgrown scrubby area along the south property line, mulching this area and installing five, four foot tall evergreen trees along the perimeter to the east of the new fenced storage enclosure area. The applicant is also proposing to construct three chain link fence trash enclosures. The chain link fencing will include screening slats. Finally, to address the poor condition of the existing parking lot, the applicant also proposes to completely repave and re-stripe the entire parking lot by May 31, 2005.

In review of the request to park up to seven business vehicles outdoors on the property on a regular basis, staff has no objections given the excess parking that exists to serve the business uses in the two buildings. In fact, staff would ask the applicant to determine whether either ServiceMaster or Airmakers wish to obtain approval at this

time to park additional vehicles outdoors, to allow for future growth. This way, the applicant or businesses would not need to apply to the Village again to increase the number of vehicles that they wish to park outdoors.

The variation request for outdoor equipment storage is a bit more difficult and has the potential to be problematic. This property is located on the edge of an area that is generally undergoing commercial redevelopment. By approving the establishment of an outdoor equipment storage area on the property, it is likely that such a use will remain in existence for many years to come. While the applicant is taking steps to minimize the negative appearance issues related to the outdoor storage, it will not be possible to effectively screen all of the equipment in the fenced storage area. For example, the bucket truck, dump trucks, and pick up trucks will all still be visible from outside the fenced storage area because of their height in relation to the height (seven feet) of the screening fence. One suggestion that would help to further reduce the impact of the storage area would be to have it located all the way back to the far southwest corner of the site, as opposed to its current position that is closer to the center of the southern section of the property. Staff believes that adequate access to the storage area could be maintained if this were done. Staff also believes that the fenced vehicle and equipment storage area should be paved, in spite of the applicant's request to not pave the area. Based upon the heavy equipment that will be stored in the area, the storage area will quickly become rutted, which will lead to the tracking of mud onto the parking lot and nearby public streets, which would not be acceptable. Further, the Zoning Code requires that all parking areas shall be improved with an all weather material in accordance with the specifications approved by the Village Engineer. Accordingly, it is staff's recommendation that the outdoor storage area be paved with either asphalt or concrete. To allow the fenced parking and storage area to not be paved would require approval of a separate variation, and staff did not prepare the legal notice for this request to include a variation from the parking lot surfacing requirements of the Zoning Code.

This property for some time has been in a deteriorating state of maintenance, and outdoor equipment storage and parking uses not allowed by the Village Code have also taken place for several years. Although the improvements proposed by the property owner are significant, and if implemented, would result in a more acceptable appearance of the property, the Plan Commission is asked to consider whether the outdoor parking and equipment storage uses are in keeping with their vision for this area. Staff believes that the negative impacts associated with the outdoor parking and storage uses could be minimized if specific operational and property maintenance conditions were required.

Staff recommends approval of the variation to allow outdoor vehicle parking for six ServiceMaster vans and one Airmakers van, and also for outdoor equipment storage, subject to the conditions listed below.

That the fenced storage area shall be moved about 60 feet to the west, so as to be more completely screened;

That the fenced storage area shall be improved with an all weather surface that meets with the specifications as provided by the Village Engineer;

That the entire parking lot shall be repaved and re-striped in accordance with the looped striping requirements of the Village, no later than May 31, 2005;

That three trash dumpster enclosures constructed from six foot high chain link shall be

installed as shown on the Plat of Survey, and that screening slats shall be installed on the three sides of the enclosures not abutting a building or the retaining wall;

That the fenced storage area shall include screening slats on all four sides;

That the scrub and brush area near the south property line shall be removed, with five, four foot tall evergreen trees installed to the east of the fenced storage area, with appropriate mulch also being installed;

That all of the vehicles and equipment associated with Steve's Tree Service shall be parked and stored within the fenced storage area, and that the gates to the storage area shall be closed at all times except when vehicles or equipment are actively being brought in or out of the storage area;

That six ServiceMaster vans and one Airmakers van shall be permitted to be parked outdoors on the property; and

That the property, businesses and all improvements shall be operated and installed in accordance with all applicable codes and requirements of the state, county and Village.

The request of the petitioner to not have this area paved requires a variance to the standard for paving parking surfaces. This was not included in the public notice and would have to be republished. There is not sufficient time for publication to meet the legal requirements to have this on the next agenda, so the earliest hearing would be on April 11, 2005.

Chairman Bentz asked if the petitioner wants to apply for the additional variance and Mr. McNees responded that he would like to have the continuance and said that this would also give time to clean up the issues of additional vehicles for Service Masters and the Airmakers.

Commissioner Michaelsen commented that he would have concerns about drainage if the areas were not paved. He noted that pavement has to be put down that will support and accommodate the weight of the vehicles that will be driving over it. Commissioner Michaelsen said that in driving the site he noted that there is a dock area that is full of water and has extension cords running through it and there are gas cans stored in an open truck.

Commissioner Spink said that she is concerned about the financial concerns of the owner. Mr. McNees commented that the owners were able to secure a loan that will cover the basic repairs necessary, but it is not enough to cover the paving of an additional 60'x127'. The current leases of the tenants are sufficient income for the loan, but leases are not for the term of the improvement loan.

Commissioner Sutenbach asked if these have been long term tenants and he was told that were. He stated that he would like to have the information on who all of the tenants are and how long they have occupied these spaces.

Commissioner Hundhausen said that she would like to see this area cleaned up, especially the area of the tree service storage. She would also like to see the area between this building and Culvers screened as well.

Chairman Bentz said that he would go along with having a sufficient base to support the equipment that will be used. If the move to the west is not acceptable, maybe some landscaping along the fence would buffer it from St. Charles Road.

Commissioner Hundhausen moved and Commissioner Michaelsen made the second to continue this matter to the meeting of April 11, 2005, allowing the petitioner to make upgrades to the site plan. The results of the roll call vote were:

|       |   |  |
|-------|---|--|
| Ayes: | 6 | Commissioners Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen, Hundhausen,<br>Sutenbach and Bentz |
| Nays: | 0 |  |

Absent: 1 Commissioner Vora

**#05025: Village of Carol Stream, Village Wide  
2005 Official Zoning Map**

Mr. Bastian stated that as required by State Statute this is the annual zoning map that includes all of the annexations and zoning district amendments. This has also been enhanced to include the delineation of the Gary and North Avenue Corridor Overlay Districts.

Commissioner Hundhausen moved and Commissioner Spink made the second to recommend approval of the acceptance of the Official 2005 Zoning Map. Mr. Bastian commented that it may be possible that the Flood Plain indications will not be shown on this map as it actually is not a zoning matter. The results of the roll call vote were:

|         |   |  |
|---------|---|--|
| Ayes:   | 6 | Commissioners Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen, Hundhausen,<br>Sutenbach and Bentz |
| Nays:   | 0 |  |
| Absent: | 1 | Commissioner Vora  |

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

|         |   |  |
|---------|---|--|
| Ayes:   | 6 | Commissioners Spink, Weiss, Michaelsen, Hundhausen,<br>Sutenbach and Bentz |
| Nays:   | 0 |  |
| Absent: | 1 | Commissioner Vora  |

Under New Business, Mr. Bastian noted that there will be a training exercise at the meeting on April 11, 2005 at 6:00 p.m. The Village Board has been invited and there will be a boxed dinner for everyone. It should last about 1 to 1.5 hours and the regular meeting will continue after the session.

At 10:00 p.m. Commissioner Spink moved and Commissioner Hundhausen made the second to adjourn. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

FOR THE COMBINED BOARD