

**Village of Bartlett
Plan Commission Meeting
Minutes
June 8, 2017**

Chairman Lemberg called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

Roll Call

Present: J. Lemberg, J. Miaso (arrived @7:05), A. Hopkins, J. Allen
M. Hopkins, J. Kallas and T. Connor
Absent: D. Negele, T. Ridenour
Also Present: J. Plonczynski, CD Director

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the May 11, 2017 meeting.

Motioned by: J. Allen
Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Roll call

Ayes: J. Miaso, A. Hopkins J. Allen, J. Lemberg, J. Kallas, J. Lemberg and T. Connor
Abstain: None
Motion carried.

Case # 17-07 Everwash

**Preliminary/Final PUD Plan and Special Use Permit for a Carwash
PUBLIC HEARING**

Exhibit A - Picture of Sign

Exhibit B - Mail Affidavit

Exhibit C - Notification of Public Hearing Notice in Newspaper

J. Plonczynski stated the Petitioner is Thomas Kim on behalf of Everwash, LLC2, for a carwash on the west side of Schick Road, directly north of Chesterbrook Academy for a Preliminary/Final PUD Plan Review and a Special Use Permit for a carwash. The property was zoned in 1988 as a Planned Development as part of the Woodland Hills Ordinances 1988-13 & 1988-14. An Ordinance Approving and Granting Special Uses for the Planned Development of the Woodland Hills Property. All development within this area is guided by the approved Preliminary Site Plan for the Woodland Hills Planned Development.

In 1997, the subject property was identified as part of Lot 3 of a three (3) lot subdivision known as the Illini Partners VII, Unit 2 and was approved by Ordinance 1997-81. This is the development that brought Chesterbrook Academy and the Goodwill.

In 2001, the property was included in a Resubdivision of Lot 3 for Chesterbrook Academy which exists today.

The request for a Preliminary/Final PUD Plan and a Special Use Permit for a carwash to be located on 1.4 acres along the west side of Rt. 59, north of Schick Road.

The carwash would include a tunnel wash with accompanying vacuums and two indoor pet wash spaces located along the south side of the building.

The 19 foot tall building would be constructed with white concrete masonry with brown wood siding providing an architectural accent to the façade. Windows would be incorporated along both the north and south elevations to provide a clear view through the building while vehicles are accessing the tunnel wash.

Access to the site would be via two full curb cuts along Quincy Bridge Road (a private drive). The first is located along the north property line adjacent to the existing right-in/right-out along Rt. 59 that currently provides access to Goodwill and Chesterbrook Academy

Internal circulation on the site would primarily consist of a one-way pattern. Vehicles would travel through the tunnel wash and then exit the building from the east side.

The Petitioner has the dryer portion of the tunnel wash furthest away from the residential area. The vacuum mechanical unit has an exhaust silencer installed on the apparatus.

A berm with landscaping is proposed at the northwest corner of the site. A six (6) foot high wood fence with steel posts would be installed along the south property line along with

landscaping that would provide a buffer between this use and the adjacent outdoor play area of the Chesterbrook Academy located directly to the south.

General hours of operation for the carwash would be from 7:00 a.m. until 9:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and 7:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. on Sunday. Two (2) employees will generally be on-site and the carwash will always have an employee available while it is operational.

Engineering and Landscape plans are currently being reviewed by the Staff.

The Staff recommends approval of the Petitioner's requests subject to the following conditions and Findings of fact: Village Engineer approval of the Final Engineering Plans, Landscape and Photometric Plans; The Findings of Fact for the Preliminary/Final PUD Plan and the Findings of Fact for the Special Use Permit (carwash).

J. Plonczynski stated **T. Kim** is present if anyone had any questions.

T. Connor asked how far is the egress to the carwash from the residents. **J. Plonczynski** Stated it is about 80 feet.

T. Connor asked **T. Kim** if any of his other two car washes back up to a residential area and are there any noise problems with the dryers?

J. Lemberg stated before any questions are answered he will need to swear them in. The audience and **T. Kim** were sworn in by **J. Lemberg**.

T. Kim stated he resides at 623 Meadow Ct. Elk Grove Village. In response to **T. Connor's** question. **T. Kim** stated he has two other locations, one in St. Charles and the other in Lake in the Hills, both are near residential areas. The Lake in the Hills location is about the same distance that is proposed for the Bartlett site. **T. Kim** went on to say there are three sources of noise or of concern. One is the dryer blowers, which are positioned in the enclosed building at the exit of the wash, closest to Rt. 59. At the entrance you can barely hear it, that's why it is angled out. If you walk on the east side of the building you will definitely hear it. The second is a horn that goes off for the safety of the employees, which will also be positioned at the exit so it will not be heard on the other side. The third item of concern is the vacuum. Rather than have different vacuums everywhere, they centralized the sound into one producer to contain the noise as well as a silencer, similar to a car muffler. **T. Kim** stated this is not something that is standard, they added this feature to minimize the noise down to 54 decibels at the property line. To give an example, a truck will be over 100 decibels. The last thing they do is to add a board on board privacy fence around the enclosure to divert the sound away from the residence.

A. Hopkins questioned the stacking of cars, it looks like it would hold 21 cars. If it is filled up and cars are stacking up on Quincy Bridge Road will there be an employee directing traffic? **T. Kim** started yes, absolutely. There are three pay lines specifically for something

like this. All of the pay lines are automated and have RFID readers, there are no transactions. This is similar to an IPASS. Most members will be zipping through, but employees will be on site. This site will never operate without an employee and they will make sure the flow is going well and safety is of the utmost concern for the employees and the customers. If there is excessive stacking an employee can start directing traffic. **A. Hopkins** asked what the maximum number of employees would work at one time and where would they park. **T. Kim** stated on a busy day there would be three to four employees at one time. There are two employee spaces and next to the ADA parking, there is additional parking. **A. Hopkins** asked if this site will have a detailing service or a third party that would wax cars that will take up additional space. **T. Kim** stated there isn't a plan for this type of service, the main business is in the express tunnel wash. Customers will stay in their vehicles, then either exit, use the vacuums or use the pet wash.

M. Hopkins questioned **T. Kim** about the sound issue. The Lake in the Hills location it at 54 decibels at the property line, however it cannot be measured at this location because the vacuums are not installed. **M. Hopkins** stated since this is **T. Kim's** third carwash, he is concerned with this issue. **M. Hopkins** asked if the noise from the throat of the tunnel as measured from the property line will be less than 54 decibels. **T. Kim** stated yes, that's correct, the biggest noise producer at the property line would be the vacuums that measures at 54. **M. Hopkins** stated perhaps he is wrong but 54 decibels is a moderate conversation level, modest amount. **J. Plonczynski** stated he didn't know the exact amount but there are performance standards in the industrial district where they use it but 54 decibels is not considered above normal speech pattern. **T. Kim** stated when he is standing at the property line talking with someone he doesn't need to raise his voice for them to hear him. It is on all day with a low hum, not a high pitched sound. **M. Hopkins** asked if **T. Kim** considered moving the vacuums to the island on the east side of the property along Rt. 59. **T. Kim** stated they did look at that but there were a few issues. They tried to combine it with the trash enclosure for servicing, and to move it to the east side it would be difficult for a truck to maneuver in that area. **M. Hopkins** stated the trash could stay there, he was asking if they considered moving the vacuum equipment to a different location. **T. Kim** stated the other reason of not wanting to move the vacuums is that direction is for visibility to the site. There are places that the vacuum producer be put at the exit of the tunnel without an enclosure because it is weather resistant, that could be an option but it will not look as nice. **M. Hopkins** state since that is the biggest noise culprit it seems one of the worst selection of the alternates that are on the site plan. His second question was regarding the finish on the building. **T. Kim** stated it is a CMU that is painted white with a patterned contemporary look with white wood and store front glass. They will be using their collection of color pallets and finishes. **M. Hopkins** asked if this is a standard CMU with paint on it. **T. Kim** stated it is a standard CMU, split face on the bottom section and all of it is painted with a weather resistant paint, for weather and appearance. This design is almost identical to what was done in Lake in the Hills. (The laptop with pictures of the Lake in the Hills facility was passed around to the Committee members). **M. Hopkins** stated he hopes **T. Kim** understands his concerns with taking a modern building and taking

the bottom of the barrel in terms of materials and do a neat architectural expression with it. **M. Hopkins** continued he thinks it is a cool thing but raw painted concrete block is what is put on the back of a retail center and not front and center on a new building. **T. Kim** stated he appreciates the feedback but hopefully the images will speak for themselves. He did acknowledge that CMU cost wise, is not considered an expensive item but it more about how you make it look and what you do with it. **T. Kim** stated his original background was urban environment using an adaptive reuse of old dilapidated buildings, which has become somewhat of a trend. **M. Hopkins** stated the overall composition is great and they have spent a lot of money on the glass and the wood but front and center facing the street is painted block, maybe there is some other alternatives out there that have more of a finish than raw painted block. **T. Kim** stated the appearance of the site from Rt. 59 directly head on is also of great concern to Everwash since that is their book cover. **T. Kim** believes (from the images that are being passed around) the combination ends up looking very slick and modern. **M. Hopkins** stated this is not an architectural review committee but the concern is the impact of this property to the surrounding neighborhood and if this will have any effect on them. It is something to be cautioned about. **M. Hopkins** went on to say it is a great building composition but the material is of concern to him. Perhaps there is an affordable alternative. **T. Kim** asked now that the images have been passed around what are **M. Hopkins** thoughts. **M. Hopkins** stated that material without an embellishment still look like the back of a retail center. This is a concern that this is a precedence that we are setting to future buildings being developed.

J. Lemberg asked if anyone else had any questions or comments. No one responded. He opened the meeting to the Public. If anyone wished to speak. No one spoke, the Public Hearing was closed. Residents then changed their minds. **J. Lemberg** then asked that they fill out a witness form.

D. Root, who resides at 1422 Quincy Bridge Court was concerned about how the lighting from the site as well as headlights were going to effect the residents in Brentwood.

T. Kim stated there would be a fence as well a berm to solve this problem.

D. Polowy who resides at 1406 Quincy Bridge Court stated he went to **T. Kim's** facility in Lake in the Hills where **T. Kim** talked with him for close to 45 minutes. **D. Polowy's** main concern was the noise. **T. Kim** showed him a single family home near the main vacuum location. The Lake in the Hills facility seemed much further away from the homes compared to what it will be in Bartlett. **D. Polowy** stated a car, truck or motorcycle pass is about 100 to 110 decibels but it's only for a few seconds, the vacuums are 14 hours. **D. Polowy** stated while talking to **T. Kim**, **T. Kim** would do anything in his power to rectify any problems that may occur after the carwash was put in place to make sure you could not hear much of the carwash or the vacuums by the residents. **T. Kim** stated if the sound is of concern there are several things that can be done.

J. Lemberg asked if anyone else in the audience had any other questions or comments. The Public Hearing portion of the meeting was closed. **J. Lemberg** asked if anyone from the Committee or Staff have any questions or comments for the petitioner.

M. Hopkins asked **J. Plonczynski** if the Village Engineer was satisfied with the curb cut on Quincy Bridge being so close to the right in right out. **J. Plonczynski** stated at that point Quincy Bridge Road is a private lane, not a public street. **M. Hopkins** stated he was talking about the practicality, once it is built out there will people be waiting. **J. Plonczynski** stated the right in right out has been there for some time, and it is IDOT approved. There is no problem coming in and accessing the site in this manner. The stacking pattern is there because it is our requirement, unless it is a very busy day, they believe there is enough room. **M. Hopkins** stated if the Village Engineers are happy with this but perhaps it should be a right out and no left in. **J. Plonczynski** stated they have looked at the total buildout and there were no big concerns of being over stacked. The majority of the traffic pattern even from the Goodwill and Chesterbrook Academy is to come down to Schick and out through the light.

J. Lemberg asked if there were other questions or comments.

M. Hopkins suggest there be a condition of approval that the developer take the extra steps to add soundproofing material or sound buffering steps within the enclosure for the vacuums.

J. Lemberg asked if they should combine the motion for the PUD and the Special use or should they be separate. **J. Plonczynski** stated the PUD is for the PUD Plan and that's more of a Subdivision Site Plan kind of thing. If you are going to add an extra condition he suggested doing it as two motions, one for the PUD (Site Plan) and another for the conditions that **M. Hopkins** suggested for the Special Use.

J. Lemberg asked for a motion for the Preliminary and Final PUD recommending approval for the Petitioner's request Subject to the Findings of Fact.

Motioned by: T. Connor
Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Roll call

Ayes: J. Miaso, A. Hopkins, J. Allen, T. Connor, J. Kallas, M. Hopkins
Nays: None

All in favor.

Motion Carried.

J. Lemberg asked for a motion for a Special Use Permit for the Petitioners request subject to the following conditions A - F and **M. Hopkins** sound proofing would be G which is additional soundproofing added to the vacuum enclosure to reduce the sound as measured at the property line below 54 decibels.

Motioned by: M. Hopkins

Seconded by: J. Miaso

Roll call

Ayes: J. Miaso, A. Hopkins, T. Connor, J. Kallas, M. Hopkins

Nays: J. Allen

Motion Carried.

J. Lemberg wished the petitioner good luck.

Old Business/New Business

J. Plonczynski stated he wasn't sure if he had any old business, but new business there will be a meeting next month, on July 13, with possibly three items. The Ridge Building was approved by the Village Board on Tuesday night for construction in the Brewster Creek Business Park. Alden Bartlett Estates project was moved on the Village Board for a final vote on June 20th.

J. Lemberg asked if no one had any questions or comments was there a motion to adjourn.

Motioned by: J. Kallas

Seconded by: J. Miaso

All in favor.

Motion Carried.

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 P.M.