

I: CALL TO ORDER: David Gauger called the Plan Commission Regular Meeting to order at 6:31 pm.

II: ROLL CALL:

A. Present

- 1: Don Schmit
- 2: Chris Polark
- 3: Michael Lescher
- 4: Jeff Bell
- 5: Kathy McGeehin
- 6: David Gauger
- 7: Bill Hart, Building Commission
- 8: Nancy Koske, Trustee

Not Present

- 1: Mark Warnecke

III: APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A: Michael Lescher made a motion to approved the minutes of the February 2, 2010 regular meeting as corrected.

Jeff Bell seconded the motion.

Aye: Jeff Bell, Chris Polark, Michael Lescher, Don Schmit, Kathy McGeehin, David Gauger.

Nays: none

Minutes approved as corrected

IV: OLD BUSINESS:

A: David Gauger asked members if they could move Old Business to after New Business since there are 2 informal hearings on the agenda.

- 1: All members were in favor of having the hearings first then moving on to Old Business.

V: NEW BUSINESS-INFORMAL HEARINGS/ REVA BAY

A: David Gauger asked if there were any representatives from Reva Bay.

B: Bob Washlow stated he and his former partner of Fred Lobe commenced to plan, zone and construct the project know as Reva Bay. Mr. Lobe passed way a year ago November and he is know the sole managing partner of the development company. Since its inception there have been 52 units built and sold, consisting of condos and town homes. He would like to proceed with the development of the property. Originally they asked for 100 units of zoning but because of density they requested and granted a PUD for 92 units. Because of reconfiguration they would like to increase the number of units from 92 to 108. He passed out an original density survey to members of the Commission indicating 900 thousand square feet of land which under the current R-4 PUD zoning would allow for 184 units but he would like an increase to only 108, 58.7% of the allowable density for the site. It is not their desire to create a high-density project. He stated they would like to change the style of some of the buildings increasing the open space on the property. They have met with the current homeowners and the new plans have been received well. He then passed out an original approved site plan and stated the changes are indicated by yellow the remainder of the site plan currently exists and is currently sold. At the entrance of the development, South end, there are two 6-unit town home buildings, exactly what has been approved at this time. There are some cosmetic changes they would like to make.

Change 1 would be to the gray stripe to the left of the buildings which originally was a proposed road to be built on the hilltop to access the buildings on the East. He feels the aesthetics are not good as the North side of the buildings are too large and present a large looking mass. The changes proposed are to enter the town home buildings from Reva Bay Drive allowing the garages to be buried in the hillside, reducing the mass of the building. It would also provide a rear yard on the East side of the building for each town home. There is no change to the sizing or number of units.

Change 2 is to the original 16 unit building. The original concept was for two 8 unit stacked flat buildings and he would like to substitute a single 24 unit building, the length of the proposed building is approximately the same as taking the two 8 unit buildings and pushing them together. The effect would be to eliminate the driveways and roadways between the two 8 unit buildings and increase the open space to the South of the buildings, opening more space between the structure and the waterway and a greater set back from the roadway.

Change 3 would be to the Northeast corner 16 unit building referred to as the East Shore. This building is identical to the 24 unit building except for the shorter length. This would replace the 8 unit town home building shown on the original survey and is substantially shorter increasing the open space about 50%.

There would be no changes to the 4-unit town house on what they refer to as "The Point" (entry to Grasslake Rd).

Summarizing; the two 6-unit town house buildings stay pretty much as is except for a few cosmetic changes. Two stacked flat buildings are eliminated and are replaced with a 24 unit building on the west shore and the 8 unit town house building is replaced with a 16 unit single building on the east shore. There would be no increase in height.

He then passed out the design of the 16 unit building to Commission members. He advised members the original design was raised off the ground with parking underneath but because of the soil problems pilings were not feasible so the building is at grade with one side of the building facing the waterways and the other facing the nature preserve. The design of the 24 unit building is identical. The total length of the 24 unit building is a little less than 250 lineal feet, which meets all of the health and safety requirements. Parking will be at each end surrounded by landscaping. They will be 2 bedroom, 2 bath condo units, 1100-1200 sq ft. He then passed out floor plans to members. There will be no change to the roadways or the general development of the property. In the past year sea and rock walls have been installed as required and the pads for all the buildings are complete. The utilities are in and ready to go and the infrastructure is essentially complete. He is requesting approval for the revised plan.

VI BOARD QUESTIONS:

A: David Gauger asked where the parking will be for the 16 and 24 unit buildings and how many bays per unit?

1: Mr. Washlow responded the parking will be grade level to the North and South of the 24 unit building. There is room for construction of a carport or garage.

The plan calls for 2 parking spaces for each unit. The 16 unit building will be moved slightly South as shown and allow slightly more room for entry and parking to the South, with sufficient room to install carports or garages. Grade level parking will be invisible from the roads and the water and surrounded by landscaping.

B: Jeff Bell stated he thought the "pods" look like they are separated on the plan.

1: Mr. Washlow stated that is the look but there is an indentation between each "pod" to avoid the look of one massive building.

- C: Chris Polark asked about the difference between Reva Bay and Bright Water and the original approval of the PUD for 144 units in both projects. He understands Bright Water has its 44 units built. Reva Bay has 62 built.
1: Mr. Washlow corrected Mr. Polark stating Reva Bay has 52 units built.
- D: Michael Lescher asked for clarification about the number units.
1: Mr. Hart responded that 100 were approved. The original project was 144 units. The units were planned for the North side and the planned type of building takes up more room so they reduced the number of buildings using more space per building. The major difference between the projects is that Bright Water had major engineering problems and the plan was altered so that everything is out of the flood plain.
- E: Commission members, Mr. Hart and Mr. Washlow continued discussion on the total number of units/buildings in each project, acreage and density calculations.
Conclusion: Mr. Hart stated the developer should provide original drawings for non-water non-wet lands square footage.
- F: Michael Lescher stated it seems the units are smaller and referred to the original approval minutes. It appears they are losing the basements and garages.
1: Mr. Washlow stated the 8 town-homes will have walk out basements. A two-car garage could be provided for every unit.
2: Mr. Hart stated the buildings running East and West have walkout basements.
- G: Michael Lescher stated he would like to see how much space would be taken up if garages were being built. He further stated they are dropping a lot from what was approved and what is already there. Things have changed considerably from the original plan to the present date, and the commission would like to remain flexible, but it seems like they are now completely frame and the original minutes seem to reflect a large percentage of brick. His concern is about the building cost and size of the product and the amount of density requested.
1: Mr. Washlow answered it is combination of brick and vinyl siding.
- H: Chris Polark stated he thought it is necessary to view the project with and without garages to evaluate density
- I: Commission members and Mr. Washlow discussed parking, types of car-ports and garages and number of spaces allotted for each unit and guest parking.
1: Mr. Washlow stated they are taking guest parking into consideration and will take the Commission members' suggestions under consideration.
- J: David Gauger stated the commission will need a better landscape plan and how car ports, Garages and parking spaces will fit in.
- K: Michael Lescher stated he would be more comfortable with staying with 100 units because the units are smaller, the proposal of car-ports, the different exterior materials used and the mix of 2 different levels of units. After reviewing the new proposal the Commission may have other conclusions about density and building sizes.
1: Mr. Washlow stated these units will have to sell for substantially more than the original ones. He feels they will be bringing up the economic level. The "H" building units sold from a range of \$170,000.-\$205,000. and there is no way in today's market that the new units could sell for that price. The likely price would be \$215,000. to \$220,000 as the costs are now. The buildings have been bid with a local contractor and one from Chicago so he is confident about the numbers.
- L: Michael Lescher asked if storm water retention and infrastructure have been provided?
1: Mr. Washlow stated everything is in place.

M: Don Schmit stated he likes the project and asked if Broker Coop is invited according to the existing sign? He further stated he went back at night and there is very little lighting through out the project and asked about sidewalks. He also asked about the boat slips and if they are for rent?

1: Mr. Washlow stated The signs are remnants of the 2006 sales completion and should be removed.

The areas around the 16 & 24 unit buildings and walks to them will be lighted. They have no control over the town-home owners turning on their garage lights.

The boat slips are not for rent. The new slips are designed for the next phase of Reva Bay. They needed to be installed so they would not lose their rights. Slips are not deeded and cannot be used or occupied unless you are a unit owner according to the guidelines of the Reva Bay Boat Club. Slips are bought separately once you are a unit owner. There are 2 associations, the Reva Bay Home Owners' Association and the Reva Bay Boat Club Association. There are separate dues.

N: Chris Polark asked for clarification of the number of units.

1: Mr. Washlow stated originally they had rights to the land that is now Bright Water and Reva Bay. The whole area was 50+ acres of land. The Village approved 144 units, 44 to go to Bright Water and 100 to Reva Bay. The deceased partner decided to build 92 units. The 52 units built were built in accordance with the original plan. Additional requirements were imposed by the Lake County Storm Water Commission. Because of these requirements the peninsula was dug out, ponds were enhanced and then the original partner decided to drop a building. The real number is 144, 44 on the Bright Water side, 100 on Reva Bay, 52 have been built

O: Chris Polark then stated he would like to further his understanding of the original, existing and proposed project;

- the original PUD was for 144 units, 96 have been built, with 48 remaining to be built under the original PUD.
- They are now asking for 56 additional to be built, 8 more than the original remaining 48.

P: Michael Lescher asked Mr. Hart to check on the lighting because of the variances on road widths and lighting pertaining the type of lighting required in the original minutes. He then asked if it were possible to add brick to the units?

1: Mr. Hart stated it was the garage light variance but he will check.

2: Mr. Washlow answered "yes" enhancements could be made but may affect the cost

Q: David Gauger stated he thought aesthetics conformance to the existing units would make them look better and not different. He then asked if the building would be fully sprinkled and how would a fire truck get to the 6 town-homes on Grasslake Rd?

1: Mr. Washlow stated they are not asking for any code variances. The fire trucks would get down Reva Bay Drive

2: Mr. Hart stated the Fire Marshall looked at it and likes the plan.

R: Kathy McGeehin asked if the units were in the flood plain?

1: Mr. Washlow stated everything is above flood plain as part of the engineering requirements from the beginning.

2: Mr. Hart stated everything is out of the flood plain.

S: Bob Washlow then thanked the Commission for their time and suggestions and would take their comments under consideration and figure out the next step.

VII: BOARD COMMENTS

A: None

VIII: AUDIENCE COMMENTS

A: None

IX: ADJOURNMENT:

A: David Gauger declared the Reva Bay Informal Hearing closed at 7:50pm

X: INFORMAL HEARING/SUNDIAL FARM

A: Bill Hart informed members the plat displayed was the latest version of Sundial Farms. They are acre+ units with a cul-de-sac at the end of the road so there would have to be a 60' pavement at the end of the road for turn around.

B: David Gauger asked was the purpose for feed back from the Commission or just to let them know what was coming?

1: Mr. Hart stated their comments would be appreciated. The lot size and style are similar to what is existing.

C: Michael Lescher asked if they were meeting code for road widths and cul-de-sacs? Is there any variance? Are streetlights and sidewalks code?

1: Mr. Hart stated it is Estate Zoning. The final design may change slightly but at this point this is what he owns.

Street lights and sidewalks are in Estate Zoning.

D: Jeff Bell asked if this was an annexation?

1: Mr. Hart responded "yes"

E: Michael Lescher asked about the ownership of property on either side of the road?

1: Mr. Hart stated Dave Laurene owns that property with an approved town-home project.

F: Chris Polark asked what issues the Commission needs to be concerned about?

1: Mr. Hart stated at this point there are none.

2: Mr. Gauger stated that from previous feed back he has met their recommendations.

G: Chris Polark asked if this was going to be a private road or will it be dedicated to the Village at completion?

1: Mr. Hart stated he had talked about a private but is being encouraged to dedicate it to the Village. Private roads create problems and the roads need to be built to state specs.

XI: BOARD COMMENTS

A: Chris Polark asked a procedural question about the Reva Bay PUD, if it needs to be amended or do they need a new one? He referred to 9-1-6-11 and 12.

1: Mr. Hart answered they are just amending since there are major changes. Minor changes need no action. This project has been inspected by many agencies, reducing the size of the buildings, removing one road will be above what is needed. The main issue is the number of units and the layout of the buildings.

2: Mr. Gauger stated they have the authority to approve or deny.

XII: AUDIENCE COMMENTS

A: None

XIII: ADJOURNMENT:

A: David Gauger declared the Sundial Farm Informal Hearing closed at 7:55pm.and returned to Old Business.

XIV: OLD BUSINESS:

- A: David Gauger stated Chapter 3 changes passed tonight are the latest corrections. Point of order; the red are newly introduced changes into this chapter so if they are deleted it is not needed. He then asked for changes from members.
- B: Corrections and changes discussed
Pages 3-7, 3-8
- Downtown to be changed to Town Center in all sections
- Consistency to be used in all sentence structure, punctuation, capitalization and underlining
- Downtown Business District is actually a Zoning District so does not need to be changed
- C: Michael Lescher asked Trustee Koske for her input regarding the Downtown Zoning District and if the group she is meeting with is going beyond downtown? He feels if they are going beyond downtown it should be renamed Town Center Business District.
- 1: Trustee Koske answered they are still meeting, but the Downtown Business District is still the Downtown Business District.
- D: Kathy McGeehin stated the decision was made at the last meeting that Town Center should be used in all areas and the word “district” should be stricken.
- E: Michael Lescher asked if the first paragraph on page 3-7 will set the tone the whole section?
- 1: Members discussed capitalization
- F: Discussion of additional changes;
- Page 3-9
- “Utilizing” changed to “Utilize”, sentence structure and punctuation
- Page 3-11
- Spelling
- Page 3-12
- Totally delete
- Page 3-15
- Mr. Lescher reported that he and Mr. Warnecke were asked to blend in the material on this page. The more they looked at it the more they decided it addressed different things than what is addressed in the development area sections and they feel it should just remain where it is.
- G: Mr. Polark reported that he and Mr. Schmitt took the North Sub Area and basically removed the comparison part of the text and took what the Plan said what it wanted the North Sub Area to be and replaced in the Key Development Areas what the Plan said should be there. There was a one to one correlation to what was removed and added in areas 1 through 6. There was no correlation of Rte 12 with what was done for the mayor. It is OK to leave in what is there for the sub-area discussion but he is concerned about the content of development areas 10 and 11. He feels the only thing left to develop in 10 is the Helios property and it needs to be added. The new #11 does not include Big Hollow school or the Northeast corner of Rte 12. He feels it should be added or a new sub area added to cover those properties.
- 1: Mr. Gauger stated Development area 10 was site specific and 11 was site and location specific.
 - 2: Mr. Lescher questioned the Helios property fitting in with the Master Plan.
 - 3: Mr. Bell felt it should be medium density residential

- 4: Mr. Gauger thought it should stay as the Master Plan calls for. The Pan Commission should not back down from their vision.
- 5: Members discussed the numbering
- H: David Gauger concluded the area fits into the South Central Rte 12 and asked if it should correlate with South Central Rte 12?
 - 1: Mr. Polark stated the word “adopt” should be removed from Page 3-14 a, b, c, & d.
 - 2: Mr. Lescher stated the phrase “into the Comprehensive Plan” should be removed in all areas.
- I: Chris Polark stated on Page 3-19 Development area needs to be re-written and he will reword original 12 now new 11 to include Big Hollow, Dominicks, Jewel and finish Key development areas. He asked members to email him any suggestions they may have for Key Development areas
- J: David Gauger asked for volunteers to check the figures stated in chapter 3 for validity and make sure they are still applicable. He asked Mr. Hart for an update on the mapping
 - 1: Mr. Lescher and Ms. McGeehin will work on these figures.
 - 2: Bill Hart stated Mark is working on updating the maps with the info he provided. They will be printed out on 11x17 sheets to match the book.
- L: David Gauger then went onto Fox Waterway/Island Plan.
 - 1: Trustee Koske would mention it to the mayor and get the Village’s thoughts on whether they are interested in pursuing the matter. She will relate the mayor’s answer when she gets it.
 - 2: Mr. Lescher stated he asked if they knew about the plan and they would be glad to enter into discussions with the Village in the future.

XV: COMMENTS:

- A: Michael Lescher asked about the Rte 12 annexation.
 - 1: Trustee Koske stated Howard announced at the last meeting that he had gotten new information to the state as requested but has not heard from them but is hopeful he will.
- B: Nancy Koske told the members about the seminar she attended regarding bike paths. The term “bike path” cannot be used but the term “bike route” can. Dan Miller will be working on this and there is a meeting with Metra about the clean up of the 4 corners and he will bring up the bike route at that time. Nancy Schuerr will be looking at additional ways to get people to Lakefront Park and back into town with signage, they would like to do this without sending a lot of money.
- C: Bill Hart stated the Village approved a Special use on State Park and Covington for a storage facility across from Vacation Village which is expiring. He needs a motion to extend the time frame for the Special Use for one more year so it is not lost.
 - 1: Mr. Gauger asked for a motion.
- D: MOTION: Jeff Bell made a motion to extend the Special Use for a storage facility for CJW Development on State Park Rd and Covington.
Ayes: Jeff Bell, Kathy McGeehin, Chris Polark, Michael Lescher, Don Schmit, David Gauger
Nays: None
Motion passes
- E: Bill Hart then informed the members that this is his last meeting as he is retiring. Frank Urbina, the current building inspector, will be assuming Mr. Hart’s responsibilities until the next appointment is made. He will, however, serve as a consultant for the balance of the year.

- 1: Commission members extended their congratulations to Mr. Hart
- 2: Mr. Gauger thanked Mr. Hart for his guidance and stated that he has learned more than he thought he would.
- 3: Ms. McGeehin stated she went to the Building Department when she was thinking of purchasing her house and Bill knew the history of the house and part of the reasons she bought the house is because she thought Bill really knew his job and good things must be going on in Fox Lake.
- 4: Mr. Bell stated Mr. Hart is a history book

XVI: ADJOURNMENT:

A: Jeff Bell made a motion to adjourn the Plan Commission Regular meeting at 8:50pm.

Chris Polark seconded the motion

Ayes: Don Schmit, Jeff Bell, Chris Polark, Michael Lescher, Kathy McGeehin,
David Gauger.

Nays: none

Meeting adjourned at 8:50pm.

Respectfully submitted by:
Sue Langowski
Secretary