

**Long Grove Plan Commission & Zoning Board of Appeals (PCZBA)  
Regular Meeting Minutes ---October 4, 2016**

Present: Chairman Fred Phillips, Commissioners Jeff Kazmer, Shelly Rubin, Jodi Smith, Charles Cohn, Helen Wilson, William Peltin.

Also Present: James Hogue, Village Planner, Bob Pickrell, Village Attorney, and members of the public.

**1. Call to Order:** Chairman Phillips called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

**2. Visitor's Business:** None

**3. New Business:**

**PUBLIC HEARING:** – Consideration of new evidence and testimony regarding a petition for a special use permit, and any other relief necessary, including modification of the previously approved PUD ordinance and site plan for Lot 46 of the Savanne PUD/Subdivision, relief from the 500 foot separation requirement between residential districts and properties as well as a tower height of 130' and other setback requirements to allow the installation, maintenance and operation a monopole telecommunications tower and related facilities on a portion of the property at 1670 Checker Road and within the R-2 PUD District submitted by PI Telecom Infrastructure T, LLC.

Chairman Phillips read the request into the record. He reiterated the previous deliberations of the PCZBA on the matter at the May 3, 2016 Regular PCZBA Meeting. He noted additional information had been presented to the Village Board by the petitioner which could not be considered outside of a public hearing. Therefore the Village Board remanded the petition back to the PCZBA.

Due to the nature of the Public Hearing and the relative location of Chairman Phillips' home to the parcel that is the subject of the Hearing, Chairman Phillips recuses himself from the discussion and vote regarding this matter. Commissioner Smith moves to elect Commissioner Kazmer as *chairman pro tem* for purposes of this meeting agenda item. Commissioner Peltin seconds the motion. On a voice vote, all ayes. Motion carries.

*Chairman pro tem* Kazmer swore in witnesses who are to give testimony in this matter. Planner Hogue was asked to summarize the staff report prepared for this request. He notes that petitioner for the Temple Chai cell tower request attempted to present new information to the Village Board regarding this request. That action was considered inappropriate as the public hearing on the matter had been closed. The matter was referred back to the PCZBA for further consideration.

Information received to date consists of the correspondence to Mr. Derick McGrew and dated August 17<sup>th</sup> 2016. No additional information has been received. Additional evidence/testimony may be presented at the hearing.

The approved PCZBA minutes of the May meeting when this request was first heard as well as the staff report presented to the PCZBA at that time were provided. This is for use as a reference by the PCZBA. The staff report sets forth relevant zoning data as well as wireless antenna regulations and special standards for relief as well as issues for PCZBA consideration.

Richard Riley, attorney for petitioner PI Telecom Infrastructure T, LLC, spoke on behalf of

petitioner and discussed his power point presentation. The presentation emphasized the need for cellular coverage in the area, how the site was determined, and how the search ring for maximum coverage in the area was determined. He notes this is tower is needed to provide “infill” coverage. Mr. Riley also explained that T-Mobile has been denied permission to construct the tower in other possible locations such as the Forest Preserve District property to the south. Deliberations continue at the Forest Preserve District regarding the placement of these structures on Forest Preserve District Property. This matter has yet to be resolved. No other suitable structures for co-location of the antenna exist in the area. Mr. Riley explained that this is a grid issue and, similar to a public utility, they are seeking to serve the entire area. The power point photographs and diagrams showed what the “monopine” would look like and is the best option for the area. It is a unique structure that would camouflage the tower and all carrier equipment above ground. He referenced the Hilco letter and indicated based upon that analysis there would be no substantial impact to property values in the area. He reiterated the benefits of the proposed tower at this location namely expanded wireless coverage, a need for greater capacity based upon greater demand.

Mr. Riley then indicates that David Kunkel, Hilco Real Estate Appraisal, was present to explain his correspondence of August 17, 2016 regarding the impact of the proposal on property values in the area. Mr. Suhaib Najeeb, an engineer for T-Mobile is also present to answer questions regarding the proposal.

Mr. David Kunkel, Certified Real Estate Appraiser with 25 years of experience, explained the “Hilco Report”. He notes he is not a “hired gun” and has no interest in the tower. He was hired to provide an objective opinion of the proposal on property values one way or the other. He notes based upon past studies of other sites, property values near towers are not negatively impacted. When constructed and established towers tend to “disappear” over time as people become accustomed to them. He has not been able to find a negative correlation between property values and towers. This location is a large piece of property near other commercial properties. Numerous towers exist in a four mile radius of this property.

Mr. Riley then reviewed the standards for tower construction. He cited an impact study done by Olympia Fields is nearly identical to this situation. He concludes with the comment that this is a good site to address a problem which will not go away with this necessary but intrusive infrastructure.

Commissioner Wilson then asked if what is the coverage radius of a tower and with a 125’ tower how many miles could be covered ? The petitioner responded that coverage depends on tower height and that taller towers get better coverage. A 125’ tower would get approximately 10 miles of coverage, maybe more. It was noted this tower expansion is capacity driven and the goal is to “off load sector” of existing towers on the area.

Commissioner Cohn noted no neighbors in the area were in favor of the request and substantial relief from the existing regulation is requested including the proximity to the adjacent nursing home (setbacks) and lot coverage. He does not see this as a “special case” with regard to the relief requested.

Mr. Riley noted that per the existing village ordinance there was an ability to relax the established standards for “the public good”.

Commissioner Wilson noted the relaxation of the 110% separation requirement of tower height from adjacent structures and in particular the nursing home to the east. She was concerned with

the safety of the residents in that structure. She also notes the site presently “built out” in terms of lot coverage.

Commissioner Smith notes the safety and environmental concerns referenced are not sufficient to recommend denial of the request. She is concerned with site and requested relief including lot coverage however.

Mr. Riley responded hazards from fire or structural integrity of these structures and equipment are rare.

Mr. Peltin noted the “Hilco” document conclusions identify issues other than value. He notes examples were specific to certain communities only not and necessarily Long Grove.

William Blackburn, 1647 RFD indicated he had a power point presentation in rebuttal to what the petitioner had presented if the PCZBA needed to see it.

Mr. Jeff Whitehead, representing the Hope Lutheran Church, 1660 RFD, noted that the proposal was not discussed with them. His concerns are with the “monopine camouflage” and aesthetics of the tower. He is opposed to the request.

Mr. Bart Canady, 1650 RFD referenced the height and visibility of the St. Mary’s Steeple which is 90’ tall. He noted the tower is taller and less attractive than the steeple. Existing trees will not protect site lines in this instance. He also had objections to the “monopine camouflage” treatment of the tower and was opposed to the request.

Ms. Renee Clark, a member of the Hope Lutheran Church Council is a realtor also. She is surprised by the finding of the “Hilco” document and based on her real estate experience finds towers to be a major obstacle in the sale of single family homes.

*Chairman pro tem* Kazmer asked if there was any further testimony to be given. Hearing none he closes the public hearing and requests motion on the request.

Chairman Cohn made a motion to recommend denial of the application for an amendment to the existing special use permit for a planned unit development, the special use permit request and variations for the property at 1670 Checker Road to allow the construction of a new personal wireless service and support structure and related facilities as the property is fully developed. The motion is seconded by Commissioner Wilson. On a voice vote, all ayes. Motion passes.

**PUBLIC HEARING** – Consideration of a request for amendment(s) to the Village Code for the Village of Long Grove, and specifically Title 5, Chapter 9, Section 5-9-5 “Signs” of the Zoning Regulations, including without limitation modifications to the regulations regarding signage in the Village of Long Grove, Illinois.

Chairman Phillips then resumes the duties of the Chair and reads the request into the record. He swore in witnesses who are to give testimony in this matter.

Planner Hogue noted On May 4<sup>th</sup> 2016 staff was made aware of illegal “Small Real Estate” signs placed on properties at 111, 302/308 Old McHenry Road and 404, 405 and 440 Robert Parker Coffin Road. The properties in question are zoned under the B-1 Historic District regulations under the jurisdiction of the Village of Long Grove.

This request is being made by the Village Board in response to the aforementioned signage posted in the B-1 District. He noted issue of signage was last considered with the comprehensive update to the Village Zoning Code in 2007 and minor amendments to the B-1 District signage in 2011. He reviewed those regulations with the PCZBA and offered options for consideration.

The PCBZA favors limiting the number of such signs to one per property and leaving the size at 6 square feet. They also favor a height limitation not to exceed 7 feet from the adjacent grade of the building to the upper most limits of the sign when attached to a principal structure.

A motion was made by Commissioner Peltin, seconded Commissioner Kazmer, to continue this item to the November 1<sup>st</sup> Regular meeting date to allow staff time to prepare a text amendment to the zoning code per the direction given at this meeting. On a voice vote, all aye. Motion carries.

**4. Old Business:** none

**5. Approval of Minutes: September 6, 2016 meeting.**

A motion was made by Commissioner Cohn, seconded by Commissioner Wilson, to accept the September 6, 2016 minutes as submitted. On a voice vote, all ayes. Motion Passes

**6. Other Business:**

**2017 Meeting Calendar & VB Attendance Roster** – Planner Hogue presented the 2017 meeting calendar noting that of 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesdays has not been changed. He did note a conflict with the 4<sup>th</sup> of July Holiday and indicates any business for that month would be scheduled for the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting date. Commissioners Smith and Wilson have been added to the Attendance Roster.

A motion was made by Commissioner Kazmer, seconded by Commissioner Wilson to accept the 2017 Meeting Calendar as submitted. On a voice vote, all aye. Motion carries.

**Update; Proposed amendments to the Village of Long Grove Comprehensive Plan –**

Planner Hogue notes that due to a variety of reasons the process has been a bit delayed. A draft of the plan has been created and is being reviewed by the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee. Their recommendations will be forwarded to the PCZBA for consideration.

**7. Adjournment**

Commissioner Kazmer makes a motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Wilson. On a voice vote all ayes. Meeting is adjourned at 8:55 pm.

**8. Next Regular Meeting: November 1, 2016**

Respectfully Submitted,

*James M. Hogue*

James M. Hogue,  
Village Planner