

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE
VILLAGE OF BUFFALO GROVE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 50 RAUPP BOULEVARD,
BUFFALO GROVE, ILLINOIS ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2023**

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 PM by Chair Mitchell Weinstein

Public Hearings/Items For Consideration

1. Consideration of a Fence Variation to Allow Replacement of a 6-Foot Solid Fence that Encroaches Within the Minimum Setback Along the Public Sidewalk for the Property Located at 1206 Sandhurst Drive (Trustee Weidenfeld) (Staff Contact: Andrew Binder)

Petitioners were sworn in.

Binder, Associate Planner, provided a background on the petitioner's fence variation.

Com. Spunt referenced packet page 15.

Com. Spunt asked how the fence would be constructed with the tree so close to the property line.

Abrams, petitioner, said it will have a box around the tree.

Com. Au asked staff if that neighborhood had a different setback.

Com. Moodhe commented that it may have been due to the extension of Deerfield.

Com. Moodhe asked if there were any other variations.

Binder said no.

Com. Moodhe commented that staff should consider amending the code of variations like these.

The public hearing closed at 7:42 PM.

Com Richards made a motion to grant a variation to Section 15.20 of the Buffalo Grove Fence Code to allow the installation of a 6-foot solid wood fence that encroaches beyond the minimum required setback for a fence along a public sidewalk along Deerfield Parkway at 1206 Sandhurst Drive, provided the fence shall be installed in accordance with the documents and plans submitted as part of this petition.

Com. Moodhe seconded the motion.

Com. Richards spoke in favor of the motion.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
----------------	-----------------------------

AYES:	Moodhe, Au, Davis, Weinstein, Richards, Sazen, Spunt, Worlikar
--------------	--

2. Consideration of a Planned Unit Development Amendment, Preliminary Plan, and Variations from the Zoning and Sign Codes to Allow the Construction of a Lazy Dog Restaurant with a Covered Patio at 51 McHenry Road (Trustee Weidenfeld) (Staff Contact: Kelly Purvis)

Purvis, Deputy Community Development Director, presented the background on the subject property.

Taylor, Golden Property Development, thanked the village for their efforts in helping to move the project forward. He discussed the process of creating a cohesive package for development. The variation for the sign, they believe is necessary for the building in a highly visible location. Additionally, he reviewed the operations of the business.

Michel, VP of design construction, thanked staff and the planning and zoning commission for their work.

Com. Moodhe asked if there is a separate pin for the property.

Purvis said yes.

Com. Moodhe asked for clarification of the revised document.

Purvis explained the changes to the parking.

Com. Moodhe referenced packet page 28.

Com. Moodhe commented that it looks like there is a landscape island near the handicap parking.

Taylor explained the changes to the parking and the ADA stalls to the north. The landscape island will be in conformance with Village code.

Com. Moodhe asked if they could explain the traffic flow.

Taylor addressed the traffic flow from the east.

Com. Moodhe asked if the patio is open during all business hours.

Taylor said the patio is open when they are open, year-round.

Com. Richards asked if there are any difference in BG location than any other location.

Taylor said there are components that are a little different to maximize the lot they must work with, but for the most part it is in line with their other locations.

Com. Richards asked if they talked with Jewel.

Taylor said they have talked with Jewel, but Lazy dogs owns their subject property and has an easement agreement in place which entitles them to share access and parking.

Com. Worlikar reviewed the variations. Worlikar asked about the sign's brightness and if they believe it will be an issue.

Michel said the sign is dimmable and would be happy to dim it and work with the Village should any issues arise.

Com. Worlikar asked if the traffic study has been done and if the number of parking spots is adequate.

Taylor said Lazy Dog Restaurants have a standard number of parking spots they require. He commented that a traffic study was not required, but believes that traffic flow should not be a problem.

Michel added additional comment on the number of parking spots.

Com. Worlikar asked if the patio was heated.

Taylor said yes.

Com. Worlikar asked if there are accommodation for dogs.

Taylor said yes there are and places for the dogs to relieve themselves.

Com. Au asked if they anticipate curbside and delivery drivers.

Taylor pointed out the designated spots.

Com. Spunt asked about the additional handicap spot, commenting that there is a curb on one side.

Taylor said there is a path of travel.

Sianis, Assistant Village Engineer, said that it is compliant and there is a path of travel.

Com. Moodhe asked how many parking spots they are losing.

Woods, director of community development, explained the number of parking spots within the shared lot.

Com. Moodhe asked if there was ever an analysis of the increase of pedestrian traffic.

Woods, said it was looked at, but no they did not provide that during the Lake Cook Corridor Study.

Com. Moodhe asked if we could look at pedestrian flow.

Sianis explained who owns the roadways. He noted we can have that conversation with those agencies, but we do not control those signals.

Johnson, Deputy Public Works Director/Village Engineer, mentioned that the Village has started a multipurpose use path plan and pedestrian study.

Chairperson Weinstein addressed the standards and the variations. Referenced packet page 58.

Taylor said the four sides with a sign is due to the location. There is no monument sign.

Chairperson Weinstein asked if they could come back and place a ground sign.

Brankin, the Village Attorney, said they would have to come back for approval.

The staff report was entered as exhibit one.

The supplemental survey was entered as exhibit two.

Taylor thanked the Commission.

Public Hearing closed 8:17

Com. Richards made a motion to recommend approval the amendment to the Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Plan approved by Ordinance No. 82-6, as amended, with Variations to the Zoning and Sign Codes, to allow the construction of a new Lazy Dog Restaurant at 51 McHenry Road, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The proposed development shall be developed in substantial conformance with the plans attached as part of the petition.*
- 2. The Final Engineering plans shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village.*
- 3. Any directional or incidental signage added to the sign package shall be reviewed administratively by staff.*
- 4. The landscaping on the site shall be maintained in compliance with the approved landscape plan in perpetuity*

Com. Davis seconded the motion.

Com. Worlikar spoke in favor of the motion.

Com. Richards spoke in favor of the motion.

Com. Moodhe spoke in favor of the motion.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Moodhe, Au, Davis, Weinstein, Richards, Sazen, Spunt, Worlikar

3. Consideration a Plat of Subdivision; Rezoning to B-3 Planned Business Center and R-9 Multi-Family Dwelling District; Special Use for a Planned Unit Development; Special Use for Sale and Lease of Motor Vehicles on a Portion of the Site; Development Plan; Uniform Sign Package; with Variations from the Development, Zoning, and Sign Codes to Accommodate a Tesla Sales, Service and Delivery (SSD) Center on Lot 1 of the Proposed Subdivision, Commercial Uses (To be Determined) on Lot 2 of the Proposed Subdivision, and a Multi-Family Residential Building on Lot 3 of the Proposed Subdivision, Located at 915-945 Dundee Road. (Trustee Weidenfeld) (Staff Contact: Nicole Woods)

Woods, Community Development Director, provided a background on the subject property.

Developer thanked staff. Introduced the development team. Talked about introducing Tesla

Com. Au asked who the target resident is for the residential development.

Petitioner Andrew Juiris, of Double Eagle Development explained their target resident and that he believes the project matches the surrounding communities and their demand for similar developments.

Com Au asked if they had similar one in other areas.

Petitioner Juiris explained their operations in multifamily and residential development.

Com. Worlikar asked about the school impact and the study used.

Petitioner Juiris said there will be no restriction on the number of school children allowed to live in the development. They do have strict occupancy limits. They completed a school study, showing an impact of three to six school aged children.

Com. Worlikar asked what the entrance will look like from the east.

The petitioner said there will be three access points.

Com. Worlikar asked if there is a dedicated left turn.

Angspatt of Shorewood Development said there is full access out, middle has a dedicated left lane.

Com. Worlikar asked about the eastern most entrance.

Angspatt said they share that entrance with the park district.

Com. Worlikar asked if there would be two super charges for the EV vehicles.

Angspatt noted there will be four super chargers.

Com. Worlikar asked if there are any power issues.

The petitioner said they are currently working with ComEd, but there should be ample power available for the chargers.

Com. Worlikar asked if the location will be sales, collision, and service.

Bovack, general manager of the Tesla Lisle location, said it will not be collision center, only service and sales.

Com. Worlikar asked what kind of volume they see for service.

The petitioner said they expect 10 to 15, 40 cars per delivery, 20 parking spots for employees.

Com. Richards asked if they could walk through the phases of 1 and 2 and what will be on lot 2.

Schriber of Shorewood Development explained the process of development for phase 1 and 2. He indicated they have not identified a tenant for Lot 2 as they are looking to find the right fit.

Com. Richards asked if the lot could be used for overflow parking for BG High School.

Schriber said the first step will be to tear down and safely secure the site.

Com Moodhe asked if management will be on-site for the residential development.

Juiris said the development will have on-site management; service technicians will also be there full-time. Professional staff will be that 24/7.

Com. Moodhe asked if the parking garage is included in the total count for parking spots.

Woods explained the parking count.

Com. Moodhe asked what the density of other developments are in our similar developments in town.

Purvis, provided the density information.

Com. Moodhe asked for clarification on the deliveries of vehicles to the site.

Angspatt explained the truck turn analysis and the number of cars that are being delivered.

Sianis, Assistant Village Engineer, provided clarity to the truck analysis.

Com. Moodhe asked if the entrance is right in right out.

Sianis said it looks like full access and it is currently full access.

Com. Moodhe asked how soon the demo would start.

Schriber said depending on timing, December.

Com. Moodhe asked staff if B4 would allow tesla to still build.

Woods explained what kind of retailers could make use of the B4 district.

Com. Moodhe asked staff if it is special use.

Woods explained the requirements and the variations of the Special Use.

Com. Davis asked about the traffic flow west as it relates to lot 3 and the apartments.

Juiris explained the traffic flow out of the apartment buildings.

Com. Saxena referenced the letter provided to the Commissioners.

Woods provided clarity to what was mentioned in the letter from the resident.

Com. Saxena asked if the development cuts off access to the park.

Woods said it will add more access.

Chairperson Weinstein reviewed the variations being asked for lot one.

Schriber explained the sign variation is for the main intersection, a 5-foot height increase from the code. He referenced national tenants and the need for variation.

Chairperson Weinstein reviewed the variation for the residential development.

Juiris explained the desire for the sign as proposed.

Chairperson Weinstein reviewed the variations being asked for the residential building itself.

Juiris explained the desire for the height of the building as proposed.

Chairperson Weinstein reviewed the variations being asked for parking.

Juiris addressed the number of parking stalls provided in the plan.

Com. Au asked if the garage parking allows for a second car.

Juiris reviewed the parking scenarios.

Com. Au asked if they will be giving parking stickers and guest parking.

Juiris reviewed guest parking scenarios.

Com. Worlikar asked about the design of the residential building.

Juiris said the Melody Farms development was a reference for them.

Com. Weinstein asked about the packets that have been handed out to Commissioners from staff.

Purvis reviewed the documents.

The staff report was entered as exhibit one.

The certificates of publication were entered as exhibit two.

The emails and comments that were received by staff were entered as exhibit 3.

Public Comment

Buffalo Grove Resident, 883 Stonebridge Lane, expressed concerns regarding the development, specifically noting concerns about the public notice and the availability of documents at the Village.

Buffalo Grove Resident, 1261 Radcliff Rd, expressed concerns regarding the development expressing concerns about traffic and snow removal.

Buffalo Grove Resident, 953 Old Arlington Court, expressed concerns regarding the proposed development, specifically about the lot line, the proximity of the residential development, and flooding.

Buffalo Grove Resident, 955 Old Arlington Court, expressed concerns regarding the proposed development, specifically concerns regarding the public notice, the proximity of the residential building and its density, and flooding issue.

Buffalo Grove Resident, 951 old Arlington court, expressed concerns regarding the proposed development, specifically the proximity of the residential building and flooding.

Buffalo Grove Resident, 959 Old Arlington Court, expressed concerns regarding the proposed development, specifically the proximity of the residential building, the lack of notice and flooding.

Buffalo Grove Resident, 971 old Arlington Court, expressed concerns regarding the proposed development, specifically the proximity of the residential building and flooding.

Buffalo Grove Resident, Mill Creek Subdivision, expressed concerns regarding the proposed development, especially traffic from the density of the area.

Buffalo Grove Resident, 955 Old Arlington Court, expressed concerns regarding the proposed development.

Com. Richards made a motion to extend the meeting.

Com. Moodhe seconded the motion.

Ryan Blocker, the project Civil Engineer addressed stormwater concerns.

The public hearing was closed at 10:29 PM.

Com Richards motion The PZC recommends approval of a Plat of Subdivision; Rezoning to B-3 Planned Business Center and R-9 Multi-Family Dwelling District; Special Use for a Planned Unit Development; Special Use for sale and lease of motor vehicles on a portion of the site; Development Plan; Uniform Sign Package; with Variations from the Development, Zoning, and Sign Codes to accommodate a Tesla Sales, Service and Delivery (SSD) center, a multi-tenant commercial development, and a multi-family residential building on the property located at 915-945 Dundee Road, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The proposed project shall be developed in substantial conformance with the plans attached as part of the petition.*
- 2. The Final Engineering plans shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village.*
- 3. The Final Plat of Subdivision shall be revised in a manner acceptable to the Village.*
- 4. The final Landscaping Plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Village Forester.*
- 5. The multi-family development elevations will be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Architectural Review Team.*
- 6. The freestanding residential development sign shall be located a minimum of 10 feet from the property line, and a line-of-site exhibit provided to the satisfaction of the Village Engineer, prior to issuance of a building permit.*
- 7. The base of the residential sign shall match the materials of the principal structure on the lot.*
- 8. Any directional or incidental signage added to the sign package shall be reviewed administratively by staff.*
- 9. An appropriate connection and access easement between the residential development and Bison Park shall be established through the south portion of the Tesla site.*
- 10. The landscaping on the site shall be maintained in compliance with the final landscape plan in perpetuity.*
- 11. The petitioners shall enter into a Redevelopment Agreement in a form and substance acceptable to the Village.*

The motion was seconded by Com. Spunt

Com. Spunt spoke in favor of the motion.

Com. Worlikar spoke in favor of the motion and addressed resident concerns.

Com. Richards spoke in favor of the motion.

Com. Au spoke in favor of the motion.

Com. Davis spoke in favor of the motion.

Com. Moodhe spoke in favor of the motion.

Chairperson Weinstein spoke in favor of the motion.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Moodhe, Au, Davis, Weinstein, Richards, Sazen, Spunt, Worlikar

Regular Meeting

Other Matters for Discussion

Approval of Minutes

10/18/2023

1. Planning and Zoning Commission - Regular Meeting - Jul 19, 2023 7:30 PM

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
AYES:	Moodhe, Au, Davis, Weinstein, Richards, Sazen, Spunt, Worlikar

Chairman's Report

Committee and Liaison Reports

Committee Liaison provided an update on the last Village Board Meeting.

Staff Report/Future Agenda Schedule

Staff provided information on the future agenda schedule.

Public Comments and Questions

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:49 PM

Kelly Purvis

APPROVED BY ME THIS 18th DAY OF October, 2023

Mitchell Weinstein, Commissioner