

Approved 2/5/07

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

PLAN

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A MEETING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF NORTHFIELD
PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION

COMMISSION

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Northfield Plan and Zoning Commission taken at the Northfield
Village Hall, Board Room, Northfield, Illinois on the 10th day
of January, 2007, at the hour of 7:05 o'clock p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

GEORGE WARGA, Chair
JOHN DOLAN
DAN deLOYS
JOANNA STEIN
WILLIAM HIELSCHER
BILL VASELOPULOS
PHILIP JONES
ROBERT CALDWELL

MEMBERS ABSENT:

E. LEONARD RUBIN

ALSO PRESENT:

ANNE KANE, Director of Community Development

1 CHAIRMAN WARGA: I'd like to call to order the January 10th, 2007,
2 meeting of the Plan & Zoning Commission. I am George Warga, the Chair of
3 the Commission. And we will now have our Committee members introduce
4 themselves.

5 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: Bill Vaselopulos.

6 COMMISSIONER DOLAN: John Dolan.

7 COMMISSIONER CALDWELL: Bob Caldwell.

8 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: Bill Hielscher.

9 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Joanna Stein.

10 COMMISSIONER deLOYS: Dan deLoys.

11 COMMISSIONER JONES: Philip Jones.

12 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Good evening. The purpose of this meeting is to
13 hold a public hearing to review development proposals and provide a
14 forum for public input on proposed projects. This Committee then makes
15 a recommendation and a recommendation only to the Village Board of
16 Trustees. The Board will review the items or the item being discussed
17 tonight at their next meeting which is scheduled for January 16th, 2007.

18 When a public hearing is opened on a particular case, all
19 petitioners, objectors and any interested parties wishing to be heard on
20 the case will be asked to be sworn in. All parties will be then given
21 an opportunity to speak after the petitioner and the Commission had
22 completed their discussions. Prior to speaking, we ask that all parties
23 give their name and address or interest for the record. We also ask
24 that you speak into a microphone. We have a court reporter here.

1 Okay. Our first order of business is approval of Summary Notes of
2 the Plan & Zoning Commission, November 6, 2006. Do we have a motion?

3 COMMISSIONER STEIN: I move. So moved.

4 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Second? All in favor?

6 (Chorus of ayes.)

7 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Any opposed?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN WARGA: So moved. Our only item on the agenda tonight is
10 the **Fields PUD - 670-700 Frontage Road. Consideration and discussion of**
11 **a request for an Amendment to the Planned Unit Development approved**
12 **through Special Use Ordinance Nos. 94-812, 98-944, 01-1059, 02-1100 and**
13 **05-1256 to allow an approximately 38,000 square-foot expansion to the**
14 **automobile sales and service facility located at 700 Frontage Road, an**
15 **overall height variance to permit stainless steel design features which**
16 **measure 49 feet tall, a parking variance to reduce the number of**
17 **required parking spaces from 147 to 71 spaces for the office building,**
18 **and an expansion of the Special Use to incorporate the property located**
19 **at 770 Frontage Road into the existing PUD located at 670-700 Frontage**
20 **Road, submitted by Field BMW of Northfield. This is Case 2006-38.**

21 May we have all parties who are going to be speaking tonight on
22 this case please stand up so the court reporter can swear them in? Yes,
23 if you're going to speak, you must be sworn in now. Otherwise, you
24 cannot speak tonight. So, please, if you're interested, all raise your

1 right hand. If you may be speaking in, if you're not -- in case you
2 might be speaking, yes, please.

3 (Witnesses sworn.)

4 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Thank you. Okay. So, we would like to have on
5 behalf of the Petitioner BMW, who would like to present?

6 MR. McCULLOCH: I'll start.

7 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Hi, Dave.

8 MR. McCULLOCH: My name is Dave McCulloch representing Fields BMW.
9 Also we have with us tonight our architect, Jeff Brown, and Sherman
10 Lotta, our counsel. We're to present our expansion plans here and I'm
11 not sure what you'd like to start with. I'd be glad to have Jeff give
12 an overview of the project if that would be helpful for anybody. So, if
13 you'd like to start with that?

14 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Please.

15 MR. BROWN: Good evening. My name is Jeff Brown with the, I'm a
16 principal with the JRB Group Architects and we're the architects for all
17 of Fields' facilities here and elsewhere in the country. What we'd like
18 to do tonight is talk a little bit about, I'll give you a brief overview
19 of the project and then we can kind of go into what the specific things
20 we're asking for.

21 We did meet with the Architectural Commission on Monday night.
22 We're going back in February for some landscaping and site lighting
23 modifications we're going to make in the building itself. They approved
24 the elevations and design and everything in the site.

1 So, first off, what we're doing is basically, is we're looking at
2 several expansions of this building that will be phased in over a period
3 of time to complete this. One is the expansion of the service
4 department which incorporates additional service bays, service functions
5 such as service writers.

6 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Jeff, could we actually maybe turn? Some people
7 in the audience might be interested, too. I'm not sure -- we all have,
8 we actually all have some in our packages that, yes, similar to this.
9 So, let the audience see that. Thanks.

10 MR. BROWN: It incorporates the expansion of service bays to the
11 north and then the addition of additional service writers, additional
12 second floor parts department. The heights of these match the existing
13 building now. The addition of three new service writeup lanes so that
14 service traffic which currently comes in off the east side through this
15 portion of the building will now circulate around the back of the
16 building and into three interior service writeup lanes. This will help
17 facilitate their functions and keep everybody out.

18 And then, also, what we're trying to do is we're moving what is
19 currently the north driveway, it's going to move farther north. We're
20 going to abandon that one, move it a little farther north. And as part
21 of this whole expansion, the service traffic will now circulate the
22 north entrance and into the back of the building, sort of coming through
23 the main entrance and then having to kind of work their way around to
24 where they're supposed to go. So, it will help ease up the traffic.

1 Another part of this expansion is to add this iconic tower to the
2 building which is in keeping with the theme of all the other Fields BMW
3 facilities that we're doing and expanding and remodeling now to kind of
4 create a consistency throughout them. The tower itself is a gray glass
5 curtain wall that matches what's there, the white pylons, curving roof
6 with the gray standing seam metal roof.

7 In your packet, the height is, this is the 37 foot whatever it was
8 that we're talking about and this is the 49. It's the top of that
9 spire. Those are not flagpoles by the way. Everyone wants to keep
10 calling them flagpoles. There are nothing you can put on that. And I
11 don't think you'd want to go up there to do it anyway.

12 So, but the idea is to create a better, a newer image. Part of
13 BMW's requirements are periodically to update these and create a new
14 image, a stronger image and a more powerful image on the highway itself.

15 So, in doing this, this at night will become kind of be lit from the
16 interior and become much more prominent facing that. The back side of
17 this where it goes above the second floor is all solid wall. So, all
18 the light that's cast is cast towards the highway side of the project in
19 doing that.

20 Another part of this is over the years, since '94 we've, you
21 know, the circle looked like a really good idea in 1994. Over the
22 years, as the volume of all stores have increased, the circle has become
23 kind of a nightmare. And so, part of what we're doing in this phase
24 then is also to tear out that circle and reconfigure that into a more

1 rectangular linear pattern where we increase the customer parking which
2 is short. And it creates a little better flow of that customer
3 orientation to the building.

4 And in doing so, we're adding landscaping and lighting that
5 matches. Everything we're doing matches exactly what's there now,
6 colors, materials, everything. It's just kind of an updating and
7 refreshing of it and getting what they really need which is the
8 expansion of their facilities to handle the new loads. Along with that,
9 obviously all the interiors are getting gutted out and completely
10 redesigned at the same time.

11 Again, all the materials are exactly as what's there. New signage
12 package which just arrived, so that's going back to the Architectural
13 Commission next week. What we're asking for in here is the increase in
14 the amount of signage that we're allowed to have. And, again, a lot of
15 it is actually kind of circulation type signage to help find your way
16 around the ten acres of site.

17 Initially, the 770 building will remain as it is. We're putting
18 in a new landscape buffer here and reconfiguring their parking. So, one
19 of the things we're asking for is, based on the current count of what
20 population to that building is, to reduce the parking requirements. And
21 we're actually in this package providing more than what the number of
22 people are but part of that agreement also was that those leases are not
23 going to be renewed. There aren't going to be new leases let because we
24 obviously need that property. So, it's just a matter of as it phases it

1 out, it will get taken over and there will be another phase of
2 development in the future.

3 That's really kind of the package in a nutshell. I'd be happy to
4 answer any questions I can.

5 CHAIRMAN WARGA: A question I'd like to ask right away is with the
6 signage. What is -- I know it was a significant increase in this
7 package that we received, in the packet we have here. Where are you at
8 with the Architectural Commission as far as that?

9 MR. BROWN: That's going back, that's going to be submitted for
10 the February meeting. We just got the package from the sign company.

11 MR. McCULLOCH: We had hoped to have it on Monday night. I wasn't
12 able to receive it in time to get to Staff -

13 MS. KANE: You need to talk into a microphone for the court
14 reporter, I'm sorry.

15 MR. McCULLOCH: Sorry about that. Yes, we had hoped to get you
16 that on Monday night. Unfortunately, our sign vendor did not have that
17 information available to us. Since then, I don't know, Anne, if you've
18 -- we've seen it now. I don't think you at the Board have.

19 CHAIRMAN WARGA: And could you give us, you know, the direction of
20 what was discussed?

21 MS. KANE: Sure, I can just give a little overview of this
22 project, what's the focus of the Plan Commission's deliberations
23 tonight, what happened at Monday's Architectural Commission because it's
24 kind of in reverse of how it generally happens. And I understand

1 everything is sort of condensed.

2 As far as Monday's Architectural Commission meeting, they did
3 formulate a recommendation to move forward on the building sign, the
4 building materials and the facade modification. Petitioner has
5 indicated there was no sign package presented or considered because it
6 just came in too late for Staff to do an analysis of it for the
7 Commission. So, the sign package has not been even presented
8 preliminarily to the Architectural Commission.

9 Much of the discussion at Monday's meeting focused on landscaping
10 and lighting levels I think which has been probably the case as previous
11 amendments to the PUD have occurred over the last 13 years. The
12 Architectural Commission is hoping to reach a compromise where they may
13 not put in all the landscape islands that are required by code every 15
14 parking spaces where there's a new parking lot being expanded and
15 instead use some of that to put in some landscape screening on the
16 Village's property.

17 As you may or may not know, the residents on Happ Road is at an
18 elevation that's quite a bit higher than Fields itself. Between those
19 deep residential lots on the east side of Happ Road and the western
20 property line of Fields, there are three rights of way. The Village
21 owns a hundred-foot property, ComEd has a hundred-foot, and I believe
22 there's about a 25-foot railroad line of some sort, UP.

23 Architectural Commission wants to find a solution that rather than
24 putting shade trees in the rear of the Fields parking lot on the west

1 side of their building, to utilize some of those money to plant
2 landscape screening to protect the residents who abut these properties
3 to the west. So, that's part of their recommendation to the Village
4 Board.

5 I understand when an amendment was made back in 2005 to expand the
6 carwash, there was some discussion about screening the carwash building
7 itself. Since Fields never moved forward with that project, the
8 requirement for that landscape screening was never triggered. At that
9 time in 2005, there were differences of opinion on the Board whether the
10 hundred-foot Village owned property was sufficient in width to allow
11 both landscape screening and the hopeful eventual configuration of a
12 trail through there. And there is, to be honest, I've walked the site,
13 there's a lot of scrub growth back there. There's going to be removal
14 of some buckthorn which provides some desirable screening when its
15 leaves are out. So, it's just how to most effectively use those
16 materials to provide some mitigation for the residents.

17 And I believe they also got landscaping, the lighting and the sign
18 package. All remain outstanding with the Architectural Commission.

19 CHAIRMAN WARGA: When you talk about removing some of the islands,
20 are those, I mean, typically we see the islands like in Dominick's
21 where, because there is public traffic within the area and whatnot. And
22 now on a car dealership, there's a lot of cars out there that aren't due
23 to customers typically, you know, hopefully some of them are moving off
24 the lot.

1 MR. McCULLOCH: Right. Well, we have quite a bit of storage as
2 necessary, correct.

3 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Yes. So, is that --

4 MS. KANE: That would factor into it. I think that because they,
5 I believe by code based on their building site, they are only required
6 to put less than 200 parking spaces on the site. So, maybe that's
7 something else that factors into the discussion as to whether or not to
8 allow the elimination of parking lot islands because there are other
9 areas as you can see from the parking lot design where there are
10 landscape areas that are incorporated that provide landscape materials
11 which mitigate some of the negative effects of why you want landscape
12 islands and black asphalt parking lot to provide some cooling, some dust
13 protection, et cetera.

14 Whether or not they want, I mean, I can understand they probably
15 don't want trees, shade trees sitting over areas where they're storing
16 just detailed cars because birds like to sit in trees. So, there's
17 probably some good reason why we can eliminate landscape trees
18 especially if we can find a way to minimize negative effect on
19 surrounding properties.

20 COMMISSIONER DOLAN: So, how was it left with the Architectural
21 Committee?

22 MS. KANE: I believe, you know, they wanted to wait and get the
23 count of the existing tree survey of the office property because in
24 reconfiguring the office parking lot, there's going to be a lot of tree

1 removal. So, we don't have those specific caliper inches to determine
2 how much tree replacement Fields needs to do onsite or on the Village
3 owned property. That was left -- I would think that the discussion was
4 leaning towards allowing them to put some of the replacement trees in
5 the Village owned property rather than onsite.

6 COMMISSIONER DOLAN: And what about the lighting? What did --

7 MS. KANE: Fields has indicated a willingness to come back and
8 discuss with Staff various lighting alternatives, particularly along the
9 west side of their property where they will investigate turning off
10 lights during non-business hours to reduce, you know, the existing foot
11 candles, the glare, and just the aura that's created by this kind of
12 lighting element.

13 COMMISSIONER DOLAN: Now, is that something that we can, I mean,
14 is that a good faith that we're asking them or can we require that of
15 them?

16 MS. KANE: Oh, you can certainly require, the Architectural
17 Commission has final say in that area. And, you know, the Petitioner in
18 a public meeting indicated that they were going to come back, work with
19 Staff prior to the February meeting to get it to a level that's working
20 towards, you know, reducing the negative effects of these lighting
21 levels. So, yes.

22 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: And the lighting you're speaking of
23 pertains to the new expanded area?

24 MS. KANE: The new expanded area as well as --

1 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: What about that back parking lot?

2 MR. BROWN: Well, this is all new along here.

3 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: No, beyond it.

4 MR. BROWN: This is --

5 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: That start has lighting.

6 MR. BROWN: That's there and those lights are actually below the
7 fence. They're mounted on the inside of the fence.

8 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: So, the only additional lighting is the
9 new area.

10 MS. KANE: Yes, mostly on the northern portion. Plus, there were
11 some lights proposed in the eastern display area that exceeded the
12 height of the building. And the Petitioner has agreed to lower those
13 lighting standards to ensure that those lights are shielded by the
14 building as well.

15 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: Question.

16 MS. KANE: Yes.

17 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: Question for the Petitioner, and again,
18 while understanding the Architectural Commission not this Commission has
19 the final say on the lighting issues, if we look at the area due west of
20 the service drive expansion --

21 MR. BROWN: This here?

22 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: Yes. First question is what is the
23 western wall of the service drive expansion? What's that going to look
24 like?

1 MR. BROWN: This is, there are some service doors that are under
2 the roof here. This is just a solid wall and some delivery doors for
3 the parts department.

4 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: I'm talking about particularly the --

5 MR. BROWN: This is -- material and there's four bays of glass in
6 there. So, this is kind of a transparent area when you're in that, you
7 know, from an interior standpoint. I mean, aesthetically from the
8 outside, it didn't really matter. But for the customer experience,
9 there are four sections of glass in this wall. You have glass overhead
10 doors at each end of it, but it's a fully enclosed space.

11 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: And the proposed hours of operation are
12 the same as currently exists as I understand it?

13 MR. McCULLOCH: They will remain the same as they currently are.

14 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: Okay, great. And then the last question,
15 and I appreciate hearing about Fields' willingness to try and consider
16 lights being out during certain non-operating hours for the lack of a
17 better term. Has that ever been considered to date under the current
18 operation?

19 MR. McCULLOCH: No, specifically because their display area up
20 front is, well, put it this way, in the last 11 or 12 years in working
21 with the Village as well as the residents, we have done quite a bit of
22 adjustment specifically in the west side where, you know, our concerns
23 there are more security oriented rather than display. So, we have a
24 little more flexibility back there. And we have, you know, cut down the

1 size of the poles I think at the last meetings we went through. And
2 those are the type of things we talked about actually the other night
3 also for the west side.

4 The specific lights that we were discussing to turn off were in,
5 not on the west property line, yet if you want to point them out, Jeff?

6 One that may be, you know, which obviously is, I hate to use it but,
7 you know, maybe pointing more toward the west. And those, depending on
8 our security level, when we see the new, if we put together some light,
9 what's the word?

10 MR. BROWN: Yes, we are having new photometric plans.

11 MR. McCULLOCH: New photometrics, I mean, I'm open to some
12 flexibility there depending on the light levels and for security only
13 really. Obviously we're not, we don't plan on a display. We have, that
14 area there is not a prime display area. So, if we have adequate
15 security lighting, then I think we may be able to do something like
16 that.

17 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: If I try and compare what I would call
18 the most recent parking space addition on the western end of the
19 property --

20 MR. McCULLOCH: The ComEd easement?

21 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: Yes, exactly. Now, if I'm looking at the
22 lighting legend and what is laid out for the spaces, the new proposed
23 spaces, again, immediately west of the service drive expansion, can you
24 describe for me please how the proposed lighting of those proposed new

1 spaces differ if it does from the ComEd spaces that exist?

2 MR. BROWN: Well, the ComEd spaces are, the lights are much lower.
3 They're actually mounted on the inside of the fence, so they're down
4 around seven feet actually and they're spaced out differently just to
5 illuminate, you know, for security purposes anybody who might be in
6 there. The lights along here in the past, in this property here because
7 this is about where the new 770 property starts right about in this
8 point here, these lights back here at one point in the many iterations
9 and changes over the years were lowered from the original height where
10 we took every pole off, cut them down, re-welded base plates, lowered
11 the wattages of the volts down to 400 watts and put them on 15-foot
12 poles. Those are staying.

13 Then new ones match those exactly. All the fixtures on the
14 perimeter of the site have what are called house side shields and
15 cutoffs, so that only light is cast. So, the light at the property line
16 is basically zero in terms of what it generates this way. Obviously any
17 time you light a large space, you're going to get a kind of glow effect,
18 but there is no light distributed directly off the property. Everything
19 is focused into here.

20 One of the concerns we have was that in this central area here is
21 that some of this light would spill that way. And so, these are the
22 ones we're talking about working with to alter the timing of those that
23 they go off at a certain time and see what the photometrics look like
24 when we play with some variations of that timing of when those lights

1 are on and off to see. So, because the big thing is you have a large
2 expanse that's concealed from the road and you want to make sure that
3 there is some deterrent to, you know, to unwanted activities back there
4 when you're not there, and generally for the police to drive through,
5 too, and keep the inside secure.

6 So, everything that was done lighting-wise matched exactly what's
7 there now in terms of illumination space, light space. We did agree
8 that, for some reason, these got put in a little higher. We're going to
9 send those back down to the building level so that they're all
10 concealed. And we picked a point to cut where the heights change out
11 and the wattages change.

12 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Any other questions by the Commission?

13 COMMISSIONER STEIN: I have a couple of technical questions.
14 Without seeing a contract of purchase, the PUD is going to now encompass
15 all the property?

16 MS. KANE: Correct.

17 COMMISSIONER STEIN: However, it looks like you're trying to keep
18 it into like three lots within the PUD. So, three delineated lots, we
19 don't have any coordinates or --

20 MS. KANE: Well, one of the conditions is that they do have to
21 come back and consolidate this property so that this building expansion
22 doesn't go over a lot line as it is right now. Prior to the issuance of
23 the building permit, they need to come back and get a plat of
24 consolidation approved.

1 COMMISSIONER STEIN: But do you have, you still will maintain
2 separate parking requirements for the Jeep building, the BMW building,
3 the office building? I mean, are we looking at, in other words, if it's
4 all one PUD and it's all one consolidated lot, the parking requirements
5 for that office building, can't you use the BMW space also?

6 MS. KANE: Yes, I mean, you can overall. Each component of a PUD
7 you would add the incremental additional parking on from zero, you know,
8 if you've got a 1,000 square-foot office building, you're going to need
9 X number of parking spaces. So, each of them build upon each other.
10 They're not really offsetting uses that could share parking, you know,
11 where one has peak hours in the evening, one has peak hours in the
12 afternoon. So, the parking variation, I guess Staff's support of the
13 parking variation is that we believe that we have a safety valve right
14 there, say we need to put the overflow parking drive into the BMW site,
15 we have that ability.

16 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Now, one lease is up before you even figure
17 you'll buy the building. Isn't that, one is up in March or February of
18 '07?

19 MR. McCULLOCH: Which one is that?

20 COMMISSIONER STEIN: It's four employees. I mean, it's the
21 smallest one.

22 MR. McCULLOCH: Yes, that's the small one? Yes. I mean, just
23 keep in mind our intentions here
24 are that --

1 COMMISSIONER STEIN: But there isn't any --

2 MR. McCULLOCH: The reason we're not completing our phases here is
3 the timing really. And as we go, and you've seen us in the last ten
4 years, we always think we have enough room and we outgrow it. So, what
5 that office building area will eventually be used for, what I could tell
6 you today may be different. I mean, we hope that we'd have room for
7 another dealership of a smaller nature maybe, but, or we may just have
8 to increase our parking.

9 So, I mean, our intentions are not to renew leases. I think there
10 is stuff in there to even restrict that. And of course we don't know
11 after we close whether some will want to vacate immediately anyway which
12 would probably work out. I mean, our intentions, we hope we don't have
13 to wait until the last guy to move out.

14 COMMISSIONER deLOYS: So, you're not planning on extending
15 everybody until 2011 when this last tenant goes out?

16 MR. McCULLOCH: No, as far -- no, you know, I don't know. We're -
17 -

18 COMMISSIONER deLOYS: So, your parking needs are going to
19 diminish.

20 MR. McCULLOCH: Should go down, yes. And it could happen sooner
21 than we even see there.

22 COMMISSIONER STEIN: On this photograph, it looks like there's 55
23 cars parked at that building. Would you think that's typical? Did
24 anybody look at it over a period of days or hours? I mean, you're not

1 even approaching the 71 spaces.

2 MR. McCULLOCH: All right. I mean, I don't know if the Village
3 did.

4 MS. KANE: No, we didn't do any, you know, site counts. But we
5 did rely on them to provide accurate employee counts. It was all --

6 COMMISSIONER STEIN: And there isn't any come and go traffic,
7 visitors or vendors?

8 MR. McCULLOCH: Not much.

9 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Not much.

10 MR. McCULLOCH: You know, the biggest visitor tenant there I
11 believe is National Data. And they have some evening things I think.
12 But, I mean, you know, certainly I don't expect you to take my word for
13 it but we see that lot everyday and it's rarely used beyond a quarter of
14 it or something. Very little use from what I see on a daily basis. But
15 I don't know.

16 COMMISSIONER STEIN: So, the lot consolidation happens --

17 MS. KANE: It will probably happen in the spring I imagine.

18 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Before the building improvement?

19 MS. KANE: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Okay. That doesn't go in front of the
21 Commission?

22 MS. KANE: Pardon me?

23 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Does that come in front of our Commission?

24 MS. KANE: Yes, yes.

1 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Oh, it will.

2 MS. KANE: It will. It was just a document that wasn't, you know,
3 it would have been nice to do it all up at the front but, you know, if
4 this wasn't approved then they would incurred the cost of getting a plat
5 of resubdivision prepared by a surveyor.

6 COMMISSIONER STEIN: And have there been any changes made to that
7 tower beyond what was approved in 2005? In other words, that was all
8 approved at one point.

9 MS. KANE: I think the design has modified but the --

10 MR. BROWN: Yes, the design changed. Before it was square.

11 COMMISSIONER STEIN: The heights are the same.

12 MR. BROWN: It was rectangular with a flat roof. Now it's got the
13 arc to it. And I think these three piers crept up a little bit because
14 of the arc of the roof now whereas everything was flat before. We had
15 to play with it a little bit to get those above where they needed to be
16 in the design. But it's pretty much, you know, we haven't changed it,
17 the shape changed a little bit and that's about it. We think it
18 actually came out better this time.

19 COMMISSIONER STEIN: And then, what about the underlying zoning to
20 take the 700 building which is now R-1 and make the entire PUD
21 underlying zoning in O-R? Is that done tonight? Is that --

22 MS. KANE: No, no. We didn't publish for that. You know, we just
23 think, you know, when this was originally approved back in 1994, I think
24 there was some hesitancy on the Village Board to go ahead and rezone

1 this property in the event that the dealership did move forward that
2 we'd retain the greatest control. It's now on a -- you know, my concern
3 having it as R-1 are that there are some permitted uses in the R-1.
4 Should, you know, we ever lose Fields at this site, we hope not to, but
5 if it became available, a church is a permitted use there. Would we
6 want to, you know, lose the revenue by having a permitted use just to
7 have the right to move into this facility?

8 So, I think in some ways it would protect the Village more so now
9 than what was contemplated back in 1994, to have the O-R designation.

10 COMMISSIONER STEIN: I don't want to keep talking but I am real
11 confused about the detention because there is something about permits
12 and --

13 MR. BROWN: I'll try to, well, yes, those are all technical issues
14 that are triggered by sizes and capacities. And actually it's really
15 triggered by where it's connected at.

16 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Exactly.

17 MR. BROWN: Is what really triggers it. Right now, several years
18 ago what used to be a detention pond on this end and a detention pond on
19 this triangle here were converted to underground storm water storage
20 vault.

21 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Right.

22 MR. BROWN: This one here is going to be increased in size and the
23 sewers that will be placed in here and this building's capacity required
24 to pass. This building has no detention right now. It was built long

1 enough ago that it didn't have the requirements that we're subject to
2 now. But by us doing it, it triggers this building because it's part of
3 this PUD.

4 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Right.

5 MR. BROWN: So, the capacity that's required for this building
6 throughout this building's parking lot is all actually going to be
7 incorporated in the design of the expansion of this underground storage
8 unit here. And then everything will be picked up and brought into this
9 and then taken off to Skokie Lagoons. So, that's, rather than doing a
10 bunch of different things and obviously ponds take up space, so nowadays
11 we're doing more and more of the underground storage as land becomes
12 less and less available to us and more valuable. So, this existing one
13 here will be expanded along here.

14 COMMISSIONER STEIN: And handled --

15 MR. BROWN: And then handled all internally along with this
16 building picking up into this unit now, too.

17 COMMISSIONER STEIN: And then, that new trash receptacle in the
18 back --

19 MR. BROWN: This one back here, yes.

20 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Is that a trash receptacle for that office
21 building while that office building is open?

22 MR. BROWN: You know, I'm not even sure where theirs is.

23 COMMISSIONER STEIN: I don't see where their trash is.

24 MR. BROWN: Theirs is kind of back in this area, too, but this

1 will be large enough to handle, you know, the overflow of that, too.
2 And this matches the building's materials and finishes and colors, fully
3 enclosed, gated.

4 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Philip, did you have something left to ask?
6 Okay. Any other questions by the Commission? Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: A couple of questions. The potential
8 access point in the back, if the parking in the old existing office
9 building needs to be, you need to access additional parking, which
10 spaces are you figuring --

11 MR. BROWN: It actually shows up on this site plan.

12 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: Right. That's the access point. Which
13 spaces would be available, would you make available to that building?

14 MR. BROWN: That, I can't answer that. They'd have to work that
15 out as to where they felt it was, you know, most suited. I would assume
16 that it would probably be right in this area here, closest proximity
17 type of thing.

18 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: Because that's directly where you're
19 going to have your traffic flow for your customers, your service
20 customers.

21 MS. KANE: I will say that the condition that is on the ordinance
22 and the condition of tonight's motion does allow the Village to
23 designate the overflow parking. And actually we were looking more at
24 the spaces just north of the Fields expansion area because it's opposite

1 the main entrance to that office building. It's kind of a protected
2 area and probably could be signed without excessive signage to direct
3 overflow parking from the 770 building.

4 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: Is there an exit and entry point to the
5 service department from that north end?

6 MR. BROWN: There is an exit out of the service department here.

7 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: And that's the area you're speaking of?

8 MS. KANE: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: Okay. The other question I had was
10 your operations, BMW's operations during this renovation, you're going
11 to stay operational, right?

12 MR. BROWN: Much to the dismay of the contractor, yes.

13 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: And how will that work in terms of
14 traffic flow? If you're eliminating the front northern entry point into
15 your parking lot and you're adding a new one to the north, will there be
16 a time where you'll only have one entry point to the lot which is right
17 by the front door so to speak?

18 MR. McCULLOCH: Specifically, Jeff maybe you can answer, but I
19 will say that obviously we need to stay in business. This construction
20 period could last over a year. We're going to have to break it down.
21 It will at least be three phases because we do need to operate. So, and
22 we're finalizing with the builder as to how those phases come into play.

23 But specifically as far as the curb cuts or --

24 MR. BROWN: It's a difficult thing. We would probably not get rid

1 of this northern curb cut until the last minute that we had to and not
2 until this one was built. We'd have to negotiate with the county to
3 allow us to keep this probably for construction traffic.

4 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: And that was my next question about the
5 whole construction traffic issue.

6 MR. BROWN: Initially, customers will still be bringing their cars
7 in for service through where the tower actually goes in the future which
8 is where the service drive is now. And so, customers will still come,
9 this will be probably the last piece to get done is this area here.
10 Service traffic still has to flow through here and in the existing
11 portion of the service department while we come in and build this end of
12 it, build this end of it, and then, again we're working on how you get
13 the service customers in there then while we're building this piece out
14 of it.

15 This was critical to keep separate because of the service drive
16 going through that area now. So, it's kind of messy, very messy, not
17 kind of messy, it's really messy. So, we're working with the contractor
18 right now to work out all those sequencings of how they need, where they
19 need staging, how they're going to keep their people out of the flow of
20 the customers and everybody else.

21 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: I didn't see where the Village had
22 questioned that or addressed that from a traffic standpoint or anything.
23 Do you have any thoughts?

24 MS. KANE: No, we didn't, you know, examine it in that manner kind

1 of as the phase development.

2 MR. McCULLOCH: You're talking about construction?

3 MR. BROWN: I think initially --

4 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: Yes, how construction impacts Frontage
5 Road because we've just gone through Frontage Road being reconstructed
6 as you know probably better than anybody.

7 MR. McCULLOCH: Yes.

8 MR. BROWN: I think how I would see it initially would be from
9 this point north the site will be closed off to customers, from about
10 this point and this will all be closed. Construction traffic will
11 probably be routed through one of these two initially if we build the
12 new one first then bring them through here. And customers will be
13 limited to this part of the site initially.

14 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: So, you're downsizing your storage
15 tremendously.

16 MR. McCULLOCH: Yes. Yes, that's why Phase II is in question. I
17 mean, not in question of doing but what to do with it because our
18 storage, and I fully think that we'll need to find temporary storage
19 during this for, you know, a sizeable portion of our inventory just to
20 make room for that.

21 COMMISSIONER VASELOPULOS: In Northfield somewhere?

22 MR. McCULLOCH: Hopefully. If anybody's got any suggestions, I'm
23 open. But you know, that is a challenging thing that we need to work
24 through, right, or we cut off our supply of cars which nobody wants to

1 do. Including me.

2 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Any other questions, Commission?

3 COMMISSIONER STEIN: I have just a question on a Staff requirement
4 because I know, I think it looked like there was some question about
5 meeting this requirement. And that is, given that Phase II of the
6 project may not be completed for five years, detention must be provided
7 for the full build-out. Since you don't know what the build-out is,
8 it's my understanding that the detention that is going to be provided is
9 for the office building as it exists now.

10 MS. KANE: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER STEIN: And the impervious surface that exists now.
12 There's no plans to guess.

13 MS. KANE: And I believe it was confusing to our own Village
14 engineer because there were lots of discussions about Phase I and Phase
15 II. As long as it's for full build-out of Phase I which is what you're
16 looking at now, that's acceptable and meets our Village code. And that
17 is the intention of that language.

18 CHAIRMAN WARGA: And if they exceed that during Phase II, they'll
19 obviously have to increase their storage.

20 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Okay.

21 MS. KANE: Yes.

22 MR. BROWN: Given that the lot is pretty much covered by the
23 building now, what we do probably isn't going to alter it very much. If
24 it becomes additional inventory space, the impervious surface is

1 probably going to be pretty close to matching each other by the time
2 we're with landscaping and islands and other elements of it and stuff.

3 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Is that drive around that building a one-way?
4 In one and out another or is it --

5 MR. BROWN: It's convoluted.

6 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Because I see the parking is slanted.

7 MR. BROWN: Yes, the parking, this drive actually is shared with
8 the building to the north of this. You actually kind of enter their
9 site and then cut into the space here, then it does go one way around
10 here and then back out.

11 MR. McCULLOCH: Yes. You're talking about the existing?

12 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Yes.

13 MR. McCULLOCH: The existing that I see, a lot of the employees
14 come in here, some go in over here. I believe this is the shared
15 driveway with the --

16 MR. BROWN: 778 building.

17 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Yes.

18 MR. McCULLOCH: But this building has parking over here. I think
19 this pretty much is supposed to be a one-way thing from what I see. But
20 certainly this is overlapping, this current slant -- they go in and they
21 go out of there. There's plenty of room in there.

22 COMMISSIONER STEIN: There's plenty of room.

23 MR. McCULLOCH: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Any other questions? Everybody good? Okay. We

1 have time now for any objectors to present. Anybody who wants to speak
2 to object? We also -- is this an objection? So, as an objection? And
3 your name and --

4 MR. PRESTON: Hi, my name is Philip Preston. I'm at 705 Happ
5 Road. I appreciate your letting me speak first. And also, I'm going to
6 great lengths to get two votes here. This is also Philip Preston at 705
7 Happ. And I'm sure he is in total agreement with what I'm about to say.

8
9 Anyway, first of all, I'm a business owner and I fully appreciate
10 that Fields BMW has to run their business and they want to bring
11 customers in and sell lots of BMW's. I love to see it. And so, to say
12 I'm in objection to their plans to grow their business, I'm not at all.
13 I encourage it.

14 Where I have issue is that, well, right now this time of the year
15 if you go in the backyard of my house, I've got a full acre lot. Now
16 you go in the backyard and you can read a book. It looks like a federal
17 prison behind me. And in the past, I've been to hearings in the past
18 regarding expansion of Fields BMW, and we've talked about lowering
19 lights, talked about, at least in my house I have security lights and I
20 have my motion detectors. All those things have been discussed many
21 years ago in a similar meeting.

22 And I can assure you, once you put your stamp of approval on it,
23 nothing is going to happen. The lights are going to stay in place.
24 There won't be any landscaping even if it was discussed in this meeting

1 unless you say it has to be there. And so, I would strongly encourage
2 you to help BMW grow their business but have some caveats that make them
3 a good neighbor. And that's all I'd ask for.

4 And where they're looking to expand is, they're currently right on
5 the edge of my property. Where they're looking to expand is going to
6 encompass my entire backyard. And as I said, if anyone wants to come
7 over and read a book any night in my backyard, you're welcome to. It
8 really is enormous and, you know, when the architect had mentioned,
9 well, this is just a row of 400-watt light bulbs. A 400-watt light bulb
10 is huge when you put it up on a 15-foot pole. And a string of those is
11 enormous.

12 So, I would just ask that you take into consideration striking a
13 good balance between being a good neighbor and selling cars. So, that's
14 all we have to say right now. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Thank you, Philip. We appreciate that.

16 MR. WHITE: My name is John White. I live at 691 Happ Road which
17 is directly west of this courtyard here. Do a line directly west of
18 there is my backyard and property. White, W-h-i-t-e, 691 Happ.

19 We have, ever since the lights went on ten years ago, we have
20 objected to them. We feel that they are in violation of the Village
21 code which requires that nobody maintain a nuisance which diminishes the
22 value of other people's property. And there is no question that the
23 brightness of those lights diminishes my property value, Phil, everybody
24 else who's along that section of Happ Road.

1 When the lights first went on, we complained about it. And I had a
2 meeting with Mr. John Fields, the executive of Fields. And he sent me a
3 letter and he said we are committed to cooperating with the Village in
4 an effort to provide additional screening on the rear of our property as
5 we both agreed screening would be most effective if either on the
6 Village or Commonwealth Edison property. Now, that's ten years ago.
7 Nothing has ever happened.

8 Since then, other meetings have been held. Other proposals that
9 Fields has dropped to this Commission and the Village Board have been
10 discussed. We have a commitment from the Village Board about five years
11 ago to provide landscaping along the Village owned right of way, the old
12 railroad track right of way. This makes sense because that is the
13 highest property, the old right of way of course was built on a higher
14 ground than anything around it. And it is the highest point and would
15 be the most effective place to have screening.

16 The Village said that they would provide mature evergreen trees to
17 provide that screening. It never happened. In September of 2005, I
18 guess it was when this expansion was first proposed or a different
19 expansion was proposed, there was a pretty general agreement among this
20 Commission in that you should go ahead and provide some sort of
21 screening. And we just want to ask that serious consideration be given
22 to making that a part of this expansion.

23 I told a story the last time I appeared before this Commission and
24 I'll tell it again. Years ago when Kraft wanted to build a commercial,

1 their office buildings over on what had formerly been a cornfield over
2 there, I was the senior warden of the Episcopal Church at that time.
3 And they came to us and asked us if we had any recommendations after
4 reviewing their plans. And we asked that a berm be built at the edge of
5 the property, be landscaped with evergreen trees, and they did so. And
6 now you can stand in the property, in the church property, you can't
7 even see those commercial buildings. There is no light pollution. No
8 visual pollution.

9 That, ladies and gentlemen, is a, in my opinion, an example of a
10 good commercial neighbor. And I certainly wish that Fields had that
11 same sort of commitment. And I feel that we should ask Mr. Fields to do
12 what he says he wants to do. He is making a commitment to cooperating
13 with the Village in an effort to provide additional screening, that's
14 what he said. Well, if he's willing and if the Village is willing, then
15 I hope it happens. Thank you very much.

16 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Thank you, John. Any other speakers, objectors?
17 And we have time for interested persons' or parties' presentations. We
18 have time now for Petitioner rebuttal to these comments, and I'm curious
19 to hear what your side of these issues have been.

20 MR. McCULLOCH: Well, I didn't know I had to rebut them, to be
21 honest with you.

22 CHAIRMAN WARGA: You don't have to.

23 MR. McCULLOCH: And we certainly respect our neighbors, whether
24 they know that or not may not be certain about. And I have been

1 fortunate to be involved with the issues in the past dating back to day
2 one. And I think maybe, I'll admit to some, maybe some fuzziness from
3 ten years ago. I have to say that, you know, some of the things that
4 Mr. White is referring to may have been brought up during one of our
5 expansion plans that we didn't go forward with for example.

6 But I will say that the ones we have, and that's what the record
7 is for and anybody can look at it, and certainly if there was any
8 commitments that we made on the record that we have not fulfilled, we
9 stand today willing to fulfill them. And the only reason they weren't
10 fulfilled is obviously a mistake.

11 I have been fortunate enough to sit through many architectural
12 which a lot of this I think is more architectural oriented, but we have
13 and will continue to try to be flexible where we can in the areas of
14 lighting and landscaping. And some of these things that we just talked
15 about or just heard from were addressed the other night and we continue
16 to have that flexibility, you know. As I think Anne stated earlier,
17 we'll be looking at the tree count and what we're not going to be using
18 and we're going to be replacing that. It doesn't make sense to put
19 islands in the middle of our, on the perimeter of our storage lot or
20 would it make sense to take that money that we'll spend and use it to
21 where it would benefit our neighbors.

22 We're, you know, we're fully, we'll listen. We'll talk. That's
23 what it's all about I think. So, you know, I don't want to rehash the
24 changing of the lenses or the changing of the wattages or the changing

1 of the size of the poles and the shielding, the additional shielding. I
2 mean, maybe some would say that it wasn't enough, I don't know. But
3 from where we sit here, we have continued to try to work with not only
4 the Village but with some of the neighbors also, those are that
5 concerned especially, and to try to improve the situation.

6 And I hope some of that has had, I generally don't hear the
7 feedback that that has helped but I have to assume that some of these, I
8 certainly hope some of the things we've done in the past have helped
9 because then we're always short on time. I hope from where those sit
10 behind us, where the ComEd, where we rent space from ComEd and we put up
11 a, I think we put up a higher fence than what was normally allowed in
12 the Village would help that situation somewhat, too. And when we come
13 here with new proposals, we're not coming in here, you know, we're
14 sensitive to that.

15 Yes, did we have 25-foot poles back there on a proposal that's a
16 mistake? You know, we discussed these things and I'm surprised it
17 happened. We're not trying to raise the height of the poles on our west
18 property where all we're concerned about is security. More security.
19 So, maybe we've made some mistakes but, you know, we tried to help when
20 we put that fence up on our ComEd, I mean, all this is a great expense
21 and, you know, in some cases we would hope not to have to do such
22 things. But we put wall packs on, you know, a foot below the bottom of
23 the fence to give us security lighting in an area that's not well looked
24 after and where we have a lot of inventory and employees' cars and

1 frankly employees going back there at some hours of the night, too.

2 So, you know, we have and we will continue to be sensitive to
3 those around us on one hand. But we also need to be conscious of
4 feasibility. And that's the kind of thing that I'm always looking out
5 for. But I think I would hope that our working with the Architectural
6 Commission that we can work through this, and from where I sat the other
7 night, I think some very good suggestions came up. And I don't think,
8 the things that were discussed from where I sit, none of them were
9 issues that I think we can't overcome based upon the suggestions that
10 were made.

11 Any questions? I'll be glad to answer them.

12 CHAIRMAN WARGA: I think to comment on one of the matters that Mr.
13 Preston brought up and that you alluded to, that there was at our last
14 meeting that we approved for the carwash some expansion and some
15 rebuilding that.

16 MR. McCULLOCH: Right.

17 CHAIRMAN WARGA: There was some screening that was to go with
18 that. But since that project didn't go forward, hence the screening
19 wasn't done at that time. Going back to your letter from Mr. Fields
20 that was sent to Mr. White, certainly I think that the Fields operation
21 is, personally John Fields himself is a man who will stand behind his
22 word and I'm sure he would be personally upset knowing that you were
23 not, your promise was not fulfilled.

24 COMMISSIONER DOLAN: If I could say in support of the residents

1 that live back there, I do also. There have been maybe two or three
2 meetings where they were looking for changes where they did say that
3 they would put in trees. And it's never been done. If it had been done
4 back at the beginning, you probably wouldn't have anybody sitting there
5 right now.

6 MR. McCULLOCH: Right. Well, we learn, I mean, I don't think any
7 of us, I certainly wouldn't have foreseen the dramatic effect of our
8 lighting especially in the fall. And I think, if I remember back,
9 that's when it really blew up when the leaves fell. So, you know,
10 again, and since then, we've tried to adjust and combat that as best we
11 can. But I don't know and I have to reiterate that we're here, I
12 certainly don't stand here and John Fields wouldn't stand here to make
13 promises that we won't fulfill. We may object to things from time to
14 time but we won't make promises that we won't fulfill.

15 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Was there any stipulation at that '05 PUD
16 amendment that required, I remember this discussion went on at length,
17 that required screening to be put on the Village property? Because I
18 know we talked about the Village property.

19 COMMISSIONER DOLAN: I believe it was.

20 COMMISSIONER STEIN: And that would be the most effective place to
21 put any --

22 COMMISSIONER DOLAN: I think it was 30 trees were going to be put
23 in on the west side.

24 MS. KANE: I believe those 30 trees were going to be pretty close

1 to the carwash building expansion itself just to provide some buffering
2 of that long expansive wall. As far as a final agreement on putting the
3 trees in the Village owned property, I don't believe there was ever a
4 Village Board decision on that because of the differing concerns that
5 landscape installed in there would prohibit the future installation of a
6 trail, that one would preclude the other. That is what Stacy has
7 informed me happened in 2005 when it was last discussed with the Village
8 Board. And that matter remained undecided.

9 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Oh, okay. I thought that trail was going
10 along the UP right of way which is a separate right of way.

11 MS. KANE: That is a separate right of way. But there is an
12 existing, I mean, I walked the site last week and certainly I think one
13 does not have to preclude the other. There is a ten-foot trail and a
14 hundred-foot Village owned strip of property. I'm confident that our
15 forester planner and a licensed landscape architect could come up with a
16 list of evergreen species that could be appropriately planted. In fact,
17 it appeared that one of the neighbors may have gone ahead and just
18 planted some trees in the ComEd right of way at his own discretion and
19 his own risks. Excuse me, on the Village property.

20 CHAIRMAN WARGA: I would like to recognize Bobby Moore. If you
21 could take a microphone, Bobby? And Bobby is one of our Village
22 Trustees and she has some information to share.

23 TRUSTEE MOORE: I wasn't planning to talk but my recollection at
24 the Board was that we did feel very confident that we could fit the

1 landscaping on the Village right of way. There was plenty of room for
2 that and that we were more than willing to have it there because that
3 was the highest point that would be the best buffer for the Village
4 residents. And to be a good neighbor to our commercial entity and our
5 neighborhoods, we felt that that would be something that we could allow.

6 What we didn't ever conclude is who was going to pay for the
7 landscaping. And we felt at that time when the building went in to do
8 the carwash, that would be the buffer that they would pay for. And
9 instead of having it against the wall which would do no one any good, it
10 would just sort of bury a wall and nobody could see it anyway from the
11 higher point that they are concerned about. We really felt that it
12 needed to be elevated to create a full buffer year round, so it had to
13 be evergreens.

14 So, that had been thoroughly discussed and it was just basically
15 when it came to when was it going to happen. So, I'd like to hear about
16 it more at the Board meeting if that's something you'd like us to have
17 discuss.

18 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Thank you. Anne, was this issue discussed at
19 length at the Architectural meeting?

20 MS. KANE: Yes, I would say that this is where the focus of their
21 discussion was. And again --

22 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Did the objectors here voice these concerns at
23 that meeting?

24 MS. KANE: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Okay.

2 COMMISSIONER deLOYS: Who is in charge of monitoring if there is
3 any light spillage which is outside of the laws? Does anybody actually
4 monitor that or do they just -- how does that work? How does -- are
5 they in compliance at this point?

6 MS. KANE: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER deLOYS: They are in compliance.

8 MS. KANE: They are in compliance. Because to measure,
9 photometrics are a very tricky matter to regulate. They're not so
10 tricky to monitor. You can take a light, I'm not even sure what it's
11 called but there is a meter reading that you can hold on a property and
12 you can see that there is spillover. But by our code, they do meet the
13 letter of the law.

14 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Final questions by the Commission? Any closing
15 remarks if any by Petitioner, objectors, interested persons or Staff?
16 We have time for a final deliberation or a motion.

17 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Just as a point of discussion, I'd just like
18 to bring up, you know, what if anything that we can do about having
19 Fields cooperate with the Village to put in screening on the Village
20 property. I mean, what leeway do we have?

21 MS. KANE: Oh, I think we've got -- what leeway? I think the
22 Village is in a strong position. I mean, certainly we've got their
23 attention now because we could, the Village Board will have final say
24 over whether to grant this PUD amendment to allow their building

1 expansion. As I said Monday night to the Architectural Commission, it
2 certainly would help Staff, the Petitioner and the Village Board who
3 will make the final determination if the Architectural Commission and
4 the Plan and Zoning Commission also want to forward a recommendation to
5 the Village Board strongly encouraging the use of any tree bank moneys
6 submitted by the Fields BMW for this expansion to be used to put in
7 landscape screening in the Village owned property. Does that --

8 COMMISSIONER STEIN: At the highest point.

9 MS. KANE: Yes, at the highest point. And in fact, I'm sorry that
10 I don't have this Exhibit R. Engineering consultant is just putting
11 together an exhibit that I hope to have for Monday night's meeting
12 illustrating a cross section from the center line of Happ Road to the
13 center line of Frontage Road just cutting through these properties to
14 really demonstrate the change in elevation and the topography and to
15 illustrate the advantages of putting in some evergreen materials in.
16 Hopefully that highest point, that's on Village owned property.

17 COMMISSIONER DOLAN: Which is what I was asking earlier about, is
18 there something that we could require or --

19 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Item number 8 --

20 COMMISSIONER DOLAN: As a recommendation.

21 CHAIRMAN WARGA: We can look at item number 8, if we could
22 strengthen the wording of that particular segment. Maybe our legal
23 counsel, Mr. Hielscher, can --

24 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: And Mr. Jones.

1 CHAIRMAN WARGA: And Mr. Jones also, we have two. Yes, that's
2 right. Mr. Jones, if we could create some language that would make that
3 a little stronger? Define --

4 MS. KANE: I can tell you what the Architectural Commission said
5 if I can find their update. Sorry, I thought I had their update with
6 me. Which I don't.

7 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Do they have a lawyer on the Architectural
8 Commission?

9 MS. KANE: I'm sorry?

10 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Do they have a lawyer on the Architectural
11 Commission? Do they? Okay. My job is to delegate.

12 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: My suggestion would be that we add to
13 Item 8 in our issue sheet which reads the final details of building
14 elevations, landscape and lighting shall be subject to the review and
15 approval of the Architectural Commission, and the Plan & Zoning
16 Commission strongly recommends to both the Architectural Commission and
17 the Village Board that any final landscape plans incorporate as much
18 landscape screening as possible so as to minimize any impact as a result
19 of the Fields expansion on neighboring property owners but also to
20 minimize impact of Fields operations as it exists on today's date.

21 MR. McCULLOCH: Can I follow up again?

22 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Sure.

23 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Please, come back.

24 MR. McCULLOCH: I hope you'll be careful. And if I heard that

1 correctly, it sounded, and I don't mean to be brash but it's like an
2 open checkbook. And there needs to be some limitations as to, I mean,
3 you know, maximizing -- you know, I understand I think what the intent
4 was but I feel that there was too big of a door left open as to, you
5 know, what the cost.

6 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: Well, as far as the door being left open
7 so you understand, we make a recommendation to the Village Board which
8 is a non-binding recommendation.

9 MR. McCULLOCH: Okay.

10 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: Just so you understand.

11 MR. McCULLOCH: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN WARGA: So, you'll have time to work out these details
13 and, you know, work with the neighbors again and the Architectural
14 Commission and try to tighten that up.

15 MR. McCULLOCH: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Figure out a solution.

17 MR. McCULLOCH: Good.

18 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: I think it's pretty much the consensus of
19 this Commission that for whatever reason, and I'm not trying to lend any
20 fault be it to Fields, to the Village, to whomever, but for years there
21 has been talk and talk and talk of screening being done to help out
22 these neighboring property owners and nothing has ever been done. You
23 know, I don't think we have to wait for an expansion to get some
24 screening done. Heck, we can do it any time. And again, I am not

1 pointing fingers, and there's a lot of issues because of course we have
2 three rights of way back there and just getting something done is
3 difficult.

4 But it seems like, you know, the ball has just been dropped for
5 years. I'm not saying who dropped the ball but clearly it's been
6 dropped. And it's time to pick it up.

7 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Okay. Do we have a motion?

8 COMMISSIONER JONES: I would just suggest adding one thing to
9 that, and maybe it's evident but I think maybe we should make it
10 explicit in the number 8 and to add to that, you know, any final permits
11 or approvals from the Village would be contingent upon completion of all
12 landscaping and lighting requirements that are in the plans that would
13 be finally approved by the Village. I think that's, you know, it's
14 implicit and everything but I think for the sake of the neighbors we
15 should make it explicit.

16 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Agreed.

17 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Can we review what this reads now?

18 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Would you like to read the, just the segment
19 number 8 or the --

20 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Just number 8, what we've done with it.

21 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Okay, just the --

22 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: I'll read my part and then, Philip, you
23 can pick it up when I add a comma.

24 COMMISSIONER JONES: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: The final details of the building
2 elevations, landscape and lighting shall be subject to review and
3 approval of the Architectural Commission, and the Plan and Zoning
4 Commission strongly recommends to both the Architectural Commission and
5 the Village Board that final landscape plans incorporate as much
6 landscape screening as possible so as to minimize any impact to the
7 neighboring property owners as a result of not only the expansion of the
8 operation of Fields but as a result of the existing use of Fields as
9 exists today, comma.

10 COMMISSIONER JONES: Then I would say, and all final permits will
11 be contingent on completion of the landscaping plan that appears in the
12 final plan approved by the Village.

13 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Could we just change that so it says that we
14 recommend to Architectural and the Village Board that the final
15 landscaping plan include a plan for screening the property, et cetera,
16 et cetera, instead of saying as much screening as possible?

17 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: Well, I think we're trying to send a
18 message to the Village Board and the Architectural Commission as best we
19 can. And I think everybody agrees that there is going to be a plan for
20 screening. But I think everybody, you know, has kind of agreed for
21 years that we need to do some screening but nothing has happened.
22 Personally, I would see it, I prefer we send to them a stronger message.
23 But I don't know how everybody else feels about that.

24 CHAIRMAN WARGA: I certainly will say that I support that the

1 wording is clear and specific, and the strength of the message I don't
2 think is offensive. I think we have had a great relationship with
3 Fields. We appreciate having Fields in our Village and certainly
4 contributing what they have to the Village. And so, I hope, Dave, Jeff,
5 that you don't find that offensive in how this has been discussed.

6 MR. McCULLOCH: No. I'll just make one brief comment in that at
7 any time we're talking about the Village property and cost, that
8 certainly we can be a part of those negotiations. But the Village
9 itself is, it is their property, it is their -- it's a long trail. The
10 expense could --

11 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Be shared.

12 MR. McCULLOCH: And the Village is a part of that also, you know,
13 and that the final use, I don't know if it's ever been said but I think
14 there are some, you know, some people worried about security back there
15 frankly, too. So, there's a lot of it in the Village's hands. We'll
16 work with the Village. So, from that respect, I would agree.

17 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER STEIN: Okay, thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Yes. We have a great Village Staff and I'm
20 confident that things will be able to be worked through.

21 MS. KANE: I can assure you.

22 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Do we have a final motion?

23 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: I would suggest that this Commission **move**
24 **to approve and recommend to the Village Board for approval an amendment**

1 to the Fields BMW Special Use/PUD Ordinance Nos. 94-812, 98-944, 01-
2 1059, 02-1100 and 05-1256 to expand the PUD to include the property
3 located at 770 Frontage Road and to allow a 36,791 square-foot building
4 expansion to the automobile dealership located at 700 Frontage Road with
5 a height variance to permit the tower to be 37'-6" and the stainless
6 steel spires to be 49'-0" in height along with a variation to allow 71
7 parking spaces to be provided when 147 are required for the property at
8 770 Frontage Road, in accordance with the Petitioner's Presentation
9 Packet and Application Materials, date stamped received December 4,
10 2006, subject to the following conditions:

- 11 1. An approval pursuant to any requested review by a Village
12 consultant, staff member, Board or Commission shall be an approval
13 of only those items specified in any motions, resolution,
14 ordinance, or written report. Under no circumstances shall such
15 an approval be deemed to be the approval of any other matter by
16 virtue of the fact that those other matters may appear on the
17 supporting documents such as a site plan, engineering plan, or
18 plat that was subject of the review. Neither shall any such
19 written approval be deemed to be an approval of any matter, which
20 is within the jurisdiction of any other Village consultant, staff
21 member, Board or Commission or any County, State, Federal Agency.
- 22 2. All provisions of Ordinances #94-812, #98-944, #01-1059, #02-1100,
23 and #05-1256 not expressly amended through this application shall
24 remain in full force and effect.

- 1 3. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit for the addition, the
2 Petitioner shall file and receive approval of a Plat of
3 Consolidation to ensure the entire building is located upon one
4 lot and the appropriate setback provided.
- 5 4. A minimum of 136 parking spaces shall be allocated on the Fields
6 BMW (700 Frontage Road) site for the service department, parts
7 department, sales office and customers of this facility.
- 8 5. No additional leases, expansion of existing leases, or extension
9 of leases shall be approved by the Petitioner for the office
10 building located at 770 Frontage Road.
- 11 6. The parking variation granted for the 770 Frontage Road property
12 shall lapse with the final tenant lease expiration or January 31,
13 2011, whichever comes first.
- 14 7. The Village, at its sole discretion, shall have the right to
15 require installation of the temporary access drive between the
16 Fields BMW (700) and office building (770) properties as depicted
17 on the Site Plan, Sheet dd1.1, prepared by JRB Architects, dated
18 2/11/06, last revised 12/28/06; the Village shall also reserve the
19 right to designate the overflow parking area location and any
20 direction signage associated with such modifications.
- 21 8. The final details of the building elevations, landscape, and
22 lighting shall be subject to the review and approval of the
23 Architectural Commission. The Plan & Zoning Commission strongly
24 recommends to both the Architectural Commission and the Village

1 Board that any final landscape plans incorporate as much landscape
2 screening as possible so as to minimize any impact as a result of
3 the Fields expansion on neighboring property owners but also to
4 minimize impact of Fields operations as it exists on today's date,
5 and all final permits will be contingent on completion of the
6 landscaping plan that appears in the final plan approved by the
7 Village.

8 9. There is expressly approved an amendment to Ordinance No. 02-1100
9 to increase the allowable signage area for the Fields BMW
10 property. The overall square footage, design and aesthetics of
11 any modified sign package is subject to the review and approval of
12 the Architectural Commission.

13 10. The Petitioner shall be required to comply with all local, state
14 and federal codes for the addition, including, but not limited to,
15 the Illinois State Plumbing Code, International Fire Code, and
16 BOCA.

17 11. The existing fire alarm and sprinkler system must be extended into
18 all building expansion areas.

19 12. The proposed site layout provides adequate fire lane accessibility
20 to the structure, and subsequent Site Plan modifications shall be
21 subject to the review and approval of the Fire Prevention
22 Inspector.

23 13. Final storm water detention calculations and detailed drawings
24 shall be provided with any future Site Work Permit applications.

1 14. The floor drains in the Service Area of an automotive service
2 garage indicate the presence of "objectionable waste", as defined
3 by the MWRD, which requires the installation of triple basins and
4 a MWRD Permit.

5 15. The proposed detention basin ties into an existing underground
6 facility, previously reviewed, approved and permitted under MWRD
7 Permit #02-503, therefore, the proposed modifications will require
8 an amended MWRD Permit.

9 16. The modifications to the office building parcel trigger detention
10 requirements. Given that Phase II of the project may not be
11 completed for five (5) years, detention must be provided for full
12 build-out in Phase I.

13 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Do we have a second?

14 COMMISSIONER CALDWELL: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN WARGA: All in favor?

16 (Chorus of ayes.)

17 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Any opposed?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN WARGA: So moved. Again, this is a recommendation and a
20 recommendation only to the Village Board. And the discussion will
21 continue on July -- or excuse me, January 16th of 2007 for final
22 approval by the Village Board.

23 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: And is there an Architectural meeting
24 between?

1 MS. KANE: No.

2 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: No?

3 MS. KANE: No. It will go with the subject to the Architectural
4 Commission's approval of those final --

5 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Do we have any new business to discuss? Can we
6 have a motion to adjourn?

7 COMMISSIONER HIELSCHER: Motion to adjourn.

8 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Second?

9 COMMISSIONER CALDWELL: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN WARGA: All in favor?

11 (Chorus of ayes.)

12 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Any opposed?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN WARGA: Thank you, everybody. I appreciate it.

15 (Whereupon the above meeting concluded at 8:22 p.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24