



VILLAGE OF PALATINE

VILLAGE HALL - COUNCIL CHAMBERS 200 E. WOOD STREET
PALATINE, IL 60067-5339 – (847) 359-9050
<http://www.palatine.il.us>

PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES • NOVEMBER 16, 2021

Village Hall - Council Chambers

Regular Meeting

7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Dennis Dwyer	Chairman	Present	
Patrick Noonan	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Teri Williams	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Eric Friedman	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Rodney Bettenhausen	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Robert Kolososki	Plan Commissioner	Present	
Stephen Fedota	Plan Commissioner	Present	

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Plan Commission - Regular Meeting - Nov 2, 2021 7:00 PM

RESULT:	TABLED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Dwyer, Noonan, Williams, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota

III. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Logistics Property Company - Preliminary Planned Development - Preliminary Plat of Subdivision - 607 E. Algonquin Road; 613 E. Algonquin Road; 623 E. Algonquin Road; and 1825 S. Roselle Road

Chairman Dwyer read the notice of public hearing that was published in the Daily Herald on November 1st, 2021 and mailed to the owners of the surrounding properties.

The following petitioner's exhibits were introduced:

1. Project narrative
2. Engineer Plans - Jacob Hefner and Associates - last revised on 10/28/21
3. Traffic Impact Study and 10/25/21 update - Gewalt Hamilton and Associates
4. Storm water management report
5. Site Data Site Plan - 11/01/21
6. Preliminary Plat of Subdivision - Jacob & Hefner Associates - revised on 10/29/21
7. ALTA Survey - Jacob & Hefner Associates - revised on 10/29/21
8. Landscaping Plans - Gary Weber and Associates - dated 10/28/21
9. Architectural plans, rendering, and elevations - Architects Plus - dated 9/22/21
10. Preliminary Planned Development and Subdivision applications and Real Estate Disclosure
11. Objections (Roddell, Kirsten, Lee, O'Reilly, Bentz, Roddell, Horn, Bogozinski, Kraska, McCardle, Lig, Megabuna, Shah, Kirsten, Dan, and Myers)
12. Legal notice
13. Revised site plan dated 11/15/21
14. Objection - Yesenia Baltierres
15. Objection - Karen McHale - 1st Ward Alderman - Rolling Meadows
16. Objection - Phil Strider Robinson
17. Objection - Residents of Town Homes of College Hill

Sworn in Petitioner:

Mark Schuster - Attorney - Bazos, Freeman, Schuster & Pope, LLC Law Firm, representing Logistics Property Co., LLC

Mr. Schuster provides introductions to the team that is present tonight which include:

Wil Freve - Logistics Property Co., LLC - Senior Vice President - Midwest Region

Ryan Blocker - Site Engineer

Daniel Brinkman - Traffic Engineer

John White - Architect

Mr. Schuster explained that they will be presenting a Preliminary Plat of

Subdivision for Lot F and a Preliminary Development Plan for the building, layout, parking and drainage. Mr. Freve is introduced and will provide the presentation.

Mr. Freve provided the background on Logistics Property Co. (will be referred to as "LPC") and explains that their headquarters are located in Chicago. LPC has had 13 industrial projects in the Chicago market and hopes that this location will be their next project. The plan for the site is to build a 368,000 square foot, Class A Warehouse/Light Industry facility. He states that a tenant has not been secured and this is considered a "speculative" project. The design will have the flexibility and ability to accommodate a single tenant or up to four tenants. He explains that LPC constructs what is considered as "Best in Class" projects. The building design intent is to have 36' interior clear height, extra wide column spacing, best in class truck court depths, pavement sections that would provide exclusive concrete pavement versus asphalt, which would stand the test of time, along with ample car and trailer parking and a top of the line roofing system. He also states that the property is adjacent to a MWRD Flood Control Facility and realizes that the proximity to a flood plain may have drainage issues. Their plan would provide oversized storm water detection and would be at least 20% more than code requirements. He states they would target top of the line tenants and hopes that the project would be received favorably by the marketplace.

Mr. Freve presents site plan drawings and explains that there will be car parking on one side and dock parking on the other side of the structure. This would be a benefit as it would allow for the ability to separate car and truck traffic. He explains that the dock parking is planned to face the existing industrial park to the east. He talks about access points to the facility and explains that there is a 360 degree access around the facility which is a benefit for emergency vehicles, loading dock access, and for multi-tenant usage. He explains that there is also a right-in, right-out access point on the eastern side of the property.

Mr. Freve introduces Mr. Daniel Brinkman to discuss the traffic studies.

Daniel Brinkman, Assistant Director of Transportation for Gewalt Hamilton Associates, Inc.

Mr. Brinkman presented the Traffic Impact Study and provides information on how the studies are prepared and the parameters that were used for the conclusions. The study started with traffic counts from September of this year and also presented the traffic impact charts. He explains that a State requirement is to review the build-out and expected traffic outlook 5 years from the building's anticipated completion date. He states that the Algonquin Rd study projects to have a growth rate of approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ % per year between now and 2050. Mr. Brinkman states that in 2019 the vehicle count per day between Roselle & Quentin Rd was 31,000 vehicles and it is anticipated that it will increase to 33,000 by 2028. He provides further information on the project impact, relevant to the anticipated traffic changes. He states that the amount of traffic generated during peak hours from a project like this does not move the needle much or have a significant impact.

Mr. Noonan asks if the traffic study was based on traffic on Algonquin Road between Quentin and Roselle Roads.

Mr. Brinkman confirms that this is correct and also indicates that it is based upon IDOT published information.

Mr. Freve returns to the podium to discuss staff's conditions. He requests that LPC be allowed to revise Condition #7, which states that the landscape plan shall include a minimum 8-foot tall evergreens. He requested a revision to allow the 8' trees along Algonquin Road and 6' trees within the site that is not in public view. He also requests revisions to Condition #8 and would like to submit a revised plan. He explains the revisions and the changes to the screening walls. He explains that the screen walls along with the landscaping would be an additional sound barrier to the proposed project. He states that all other conditions were reviewed and have no additional requests. He is requesting Staff Recommendation for the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision and Preliminary Planned Development.

Mr. Kolososki questions the building design and asks if it could be flipped to allow the docks to face west.

Mr. Freve states that it was considered, but was ultimately ruled out because of conditions stipulated, during the sale of the property. The property purchase was approved by the Archdiocese, the owner of the purchased property and the property adjacent, St. Michaels Cemetery. It was their request to have docks on the eastern side as a courtesy to families that are attending services or visiting loved ones. Therefore, docks facing to the west is not an option.

Mr. Bettenhausen requests clarification of the site traffic study and specifically the access points for truck and car traffic.

Mr. Brinkman states that the intent is to have an eastbound right turn lane and westbound left turn lane which would be provided at the full access. Existing traffic at the full access will have separate left and right turn lanes, under stop sign control.

Mr. Bettenhausen asks if other routes to enter and exit property were considered. Mr. Freve states that other options are not viable due to the stipulations of the contract.

Mr. Bettenhausen inquires if the hours of operation will be 24/7

Mr. Freve states they would adhere to whatever the Village Code allows.

Mr. Vyverberg clarifies that the Village Code does not have specific hours of operations for the manufacturing facility. He cites the code and conditions. There are not specific hours of limitations for truck driving in the manufacturing district. He also states that once tenants are identified, the village would require a business plan submission and review for compliance.

Staff Statement:

Mr. Vyverberg states that the petitioner has summarized the plans and confirms the property was annexed into the village in September, 2020. He explains about the surrounding properties and explains the surrounding zoning maps and existing properties. He provides information on the proposed building and states the site area is 28.55 acres, 367,696 square feet with 34 proposed truck docks and 22 future docks. There would be 363 parking spots for cars and provides the building height and set back information.

Commissioner Dwyer inquires if the comprehensive plan consistent with the zoning.

Mr. Vyverberg states that he is not sure what the current comprehensive plan is for the residential to the north of the property. The manufacturing uses east of the subject property is in Schaumburg. He does not know what the Schaumburg comprehensive plan shows for that area.

Commissioner Dwyer talks about zoning and how it determines how a property will be developed. He states that properties annexed into the village are generally zoned R-1 by default.

Mr. Vyverberg confirms that information is correct and is zoned R1 as a holding pattern. The Comprehensive Plan is amended later to show the preferred use for the annexed area.

Mr. Vyverberg continues and provides further information on the overall site plan. He explains the parking, sewer, utility, grading, and engineering plans. He talks about the landscaping plans and traffic plans. He reviews the rendering and site elevations, along with a tentative floor plan. The right-of-way setback from the residential properties is reviewed compared to the Weber. The proposed setback with the right-of-way is 210 feet.

Mr. Fedota questions how noise complaints would be handled since the property is straddled between two municipalities.

Mr. Vyverberg responds that complaints would be referred to the 911 emergency system and then routed to the Village of Palatine. Not aware of any cross agreements between villages.

Mr. Fedota and Commissioner Dwyer state there may be confusion as to who would handle the complaints.

Commissioner Dwyer opens the audience for statements and provides a summary of the concerns from emails that have been submitted. He states that the main concerns notes were noise, view from the residences adjacent to property, property values, traffic, changes to zoning, and location of exits.

Residents providing comments:

Ms. Sylvia Folette
2653 College Hill Circle

Ms. Folette states her concerns regarding emission and air quality.

Mr. David Niederhorn
522 E Algonquin Road

Mr. Niederhorn states his concerns regarding traffic and the planned developments impact on the residential area

Ms. Iga Pycinska
522 E Algonquin Rd.

States concerns regarding sound, pollution issues, family environment, landscaping and view.

Mr. Allen Miller
2591 College Hill Circle

States concerns about exit area and light spill.

Ms. Jan Albert
2620 College Hill Circle

States her reservations on the validity of the studies. States plans are speculative since tenants have not been identified. Concerns about the studies that are only looking 5 years out and seems short-sighted.

Mr. Bill Horn
895 Harrison

States he believes this type of business should be located off arterial highways and requests the commission listen to the voice of the people

Ms. Joyce McCardle
522 E Algonquin

States the annexation should not be allowed and also spoke to the traffic issues she believes will incur due to this project

Ms. Colleen O'Reilly
522 E Algonquin Rd.

States her traffic concerns and engine breaking noises.

Ms. Michelle Curran
2641 College Hill Drive

States her concerns regarding hours of operation and traffic

Mr. Nico (Unknown)
3605 College Hill Circle

States his concern regarding noise and requested that the access drives take into account the grading, so as not to have the headlights at the same grade as the residential parking lot across the street.

Ms. Marianne Roddell
522 E Algonquin Rd

States her concerns about the proposed project and the land usage

Mr. Dwyer indicated that many of these have been addressed during the meeting and requested that the petitioner, Mr. Freve, clarify the noise resolutions.

Mr. Freve states that Algonquin Rd is a 5-lane IDOT classified arterial road with a 45 mph speed limit with 31,000 vehicles per day. The chief generator of noise is the traffic that is generated from the project. States the project would increase traffic by 2%, which is not significant. The site plan indicates that the dock plan shows that first dock position is more than 350' feet away from the closest residential building; equivalent to a football field away. The traffic would not be a significant increase. He confirms that the project is warehouse, dry storage and is not a processing or manufacturing plant and the noise generated would be insubstantial.

Commissioner Dwyer requests Mr. Vyverberg address the concerns about the view.

Mr. Vyverberg states that he has viewed the property and explains that the property is not dissimilar to the current adjacent properties in Schaumburg, which are zoned for Planned Manufacturing uses.

Commissioner Dwyer states that the requirements for landscaping and the berm on the west side would provide an impactful solution to the view and noise concerns.

He also talks about property values and states that it is difficult to estimate the property values. He states that this is the job of a licensed appraiser. He addresses the traffic concerns and states that impact on traffic is not a legitimate reason for denying a petition. He also talks about the zoning & comprehensive changes and asks Mr. Vyverberg to clarify.

Mr. Vyverberg states that the property was unincorporated Cook County prior to September 2020. The Archdiocese contacted the village about annexation and access to infrastructure. Per Code, all property is annexed into the Village under an R-1 designation.

The Petitioner, of their own accord, reached a contract agreement to purchase the property from the Archdiocese and approached the Village.

Commissioner Dwyer addresses the concern of the right in and right out access being right across from the condominium building. He states the screen walls would help to mitigate the concern and talks about the possibility of relocation. He request Mr. Freve to clarify or provide any recommendations.

Mr. Freve states that they would work with staff to possibly move the access points to the east but it would need to be evaluated by the traffic study and refers to the traffic engineer, Mr. Brinkman.

Mr. Brinkman provides information about access points and states moving access points have ridged restrictions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

The Subject Property is a vacant and undeveloped portion of the cemetery property. It was previously located in unincorporated Cook County and annexed into the Village of Palatine in September 2020. The owner of the property entered into a contract to sell 28.55-acre property to the Petitioner. Although the Subject Property is vacant and unimproved, it is immediately adjacent (east) to property in Schaumburg, which is zoned for Planned Manufacturing uses. Those uses include several food development and distribution facilities, with associated truck and trailer parking. There is also a self-storage facility and other associated similar uses on the south side of Algonquin Road in Schaumburg. As noted, IL-Route 62 is designated as a Strategic Regional Arterial (SRA) and is also designated as a Class II Truck Route (State designated with at least 11-foot lanes). The Traffic Impact Study was reviewed and its conclusions accepted by the Village Engineer. The anticipated traffic generated from the site will not have any affect upon the Peak Hour operations of the road network in the area. The site plan complies with the bulk standard requirements in the manufacturing district and the engineering plans and Traffic Impact Study have been conditionally accepted by the Village.

As a condition of review, Staff is recommending additional/enhanced landscaping and the inclusion of additional screening along the north/east side of the property.

Therefore, Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Planned Development, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The Final Engineering Plans shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer, including the following:**
 - a. All watermain, regardless of pipe material shall have a #10 tracing wire taped or tied to the top of the pipe and a whip end brought to the surface at all valve vaults and fire hydrants.**
 - b. MWRD/WMO permit - as discharge is shown into an MWRD easement, this shall be clearly identified in the WMO permit and indicated on the plans.**
- 2. An Engineer's Estimate of Probable Cost shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.**
- 3. Uses shall be governed by the Manufacturing district use lists in the Village of Palatine Zoning Ordinance (note - this includes all of the required performance standards). Sign plans shall follow the Manufacturing district sign regulations.**
- 4. Review fees in the amount of 1.5% of total project improvement costs shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.**
- 5. As a component of the Final Planned Development, a Planned Development letter of credit in an amount acceptable to the Village Council shall be**

submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning.

6. A Public Improvement Letter of Credit shall be submitted to insure the completion of all public improvements, as defined within the Village Code, for an amount of 115% of the approved EEOC, along with a cash bond of 10% for the required one-year maintenance period.
7. The final landscape plan and screening plans shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning and shall include additional landscaping to screen the truck activities. All evergreen trees shall be installed at a minimum height of 8 feet on the northern side of the property, adjacent to the residential properties across Algonquin Road.
8. The final landscaping/screening plan along the northern and eastern property lines (proximate to the truck docks) shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Director of Planning and Zoning, to reduce any noise impact from trucks traffic and headlight sweeps. As part of these revisions, the front yard landscaped area north of the building, should provide an additional berm, to further provide additional landscaping and screening. The use of an additional screening could also be a component of the revisions on the northeast and eastern sides of the property.
9. The final photometric and lighting plan shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer. Light shields shall be required for all lights proximate to residential properties, at the determination of the Village Engineer. The use of pole mounted fixtures should also be evaluated on the north side of the property to ensure the appropriate cut-off from any additional light spillage.
10. The Petitioners shall submit a Subdivision Improvement Agreement in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney.
11. MWRD/WMO, IEPA water permit, and NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
12. The final traffic directional signage plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer.
13. The Plat of Subdivision shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village Engineer and Director of Planning and Zoning. All utilities shall be owned and maintained by the property owner. This shall be noted on the plat, along with the statement that the Village shall have the right, but not the obligation, to enter the site to repair a utility and change the property owner for the repair costs.
14. Cross access easements, declarations and a Reciprocal Easement Agreement for the entire property governing the maintenance of

access points, stormwater areas and any other common areas shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Attorney and Village Engineer as part of the Final Planned Development application process.

15. The monotony code shall apply to all building elevations:

Sec. 6-42.1 Exterior Building Design: When rear and side elevations are visible from public streets or neighboring properties, exterior building design and detail on all elevations shall be coordinated with regard to color, types of materials, number of materials, architectural form, and detailing to achieve harmony and continuity of design.

16. The final dumpster locations and required screening materials shall be submitted in compliance with Village Code, pursuant to Sec. 6-42.2 Screening: (a)

Trash containers and outdoor storage areas shall be screened from public streets, pedestrian areas, and neighboring properties. The screens should be designed to be compatible with the architectural character of the development. Trash screens shall also meet the requirements of Chapter 12 of this code. These screens shall be constructed of durable materials similar to those of the building and shall have solid (opaque) walls and doors, as part of the Final Planned Development application process. The final locations could also require the submission of a revised auto-turn, in a manner acceptable to the Director of Fire Prevention.

17. All rooftop equipment shall be screened in compliance with Code:

(b) Roof-top equipment screening: 1. New Construction. All mechanical equipment and other similar devices located on any roof shall be visually and acoustically screened on all sides. Design and detail of such screening on all elevations shall be coordinated with regard to color, types of materials, number of materials, architectural form, and detailing to achieve harmony and continuity of design with the major portions of the building.

18. All of the loading docks shall utilize a dock seal mounting to the exterior of the building, in a manner acceptable to the Community Development Director. The dock seals would then allow for the trailers to connect and provide interior loading and unloading activities and thereby reduce exterior noises.

19. As part of the Final Planned Development and pursuant to the revised project narrative, the Petitioner shall submit the proposed business and operations' plans (identified tenants) for Staff review for compliance with the manufacturing use list and standards.

Mr. Friedman inquires if the condition regarding lighting on the north side of the building and the use of light poles.

Mr. Vyverberg states that is correct and the condition was to ensure that in addition to light shields it was to ensure there would be no other light spillage to the residential properties.

Mr. Friedman asks if sidewalks are being considered.

Mr. Vyverberg states that the sidewalk was required and were part of the revised submitted plans.

Mr. Bettenhausen inquires if an IDOT permit will be required.

Mr. Vyverberg states the petitioner is aware it is required and application has been submitted.

Mr. Noonan made a motion to close the public hearing.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Kolososki states his concerns regarding the size of the building.

Chairman Dwyer notes that traffic increase is inevitable.

Mr. Fedota talks about noise concerns and also states that a residential application would probably not be a solution for this parcel.

Mr. Friedman states that based on the zoning that is already in place he feels that continuing the existing use type for this parcel makes sense to him.

Mr. Fedota makes a motion to approve Case #21-83 with 21 conditions

Motion 2nd by Mr. Noonan

Vote taken

Mr. Friedman - Yes

Mr. Fedota - Yes

Mr. Noonan - Yes

Mr. Bettenhausen - No

Mr. Kolososki - No

Ms. Williams - Yes

Chairman Dwyer - Yes

Motion is approved by a vote of 5-2

Mr. Noonan makes a separate motion to suggest that the Petitioner consider removing (1) structural grid, approximately 54 feet, from the north side of the building.

Motion 2nd by Mr. Friedman

Vote taken:

Mr. Friedman - Yes

Mr. Fedota - Yes

Mr. Noonan - Yes

Mr. Bettenhausen - Yes

Mr. Kolososki - Yes

Ms. Williams - Yes

Chairman Dwyer - Yes

Motion is approved by a vote of 7-0

Communication:

Mr. Vyverberg states Village Council approved the Final Plan Development for Architects Corner.

Confirmation will be provided regarding the meeting scheduled for 12/7/21 and states the meeting for 12/21 has been cancelled.

Introduces Alex Bradshaw - a welcome addition to the Planning & Zoning Department for the Village of Palatine.

Mr. Friedman made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Noonan. Unanimously passed.

RESULT:

RECOMMENDED TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]

AYES:

Dwyer, Noonan, Williams, Friedman, Bettenhausen, Kolososki, Fedota

IV. COMMUNICATIONS

V. ADJOURNMENT