

*Village of Barrington
Plan Commission Meeting
Minutes Summary*

Date: November 12, 2019

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room
200 South Hough Street
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Anna Markley Bush, Chairperson
Dan Hogan, Vice-Chairperson
Robert Windon, Commissioner
Joann Lee, Commissioner
Richard Ehrle, Commissioner
Susan Ferry, Commissioner

Staff Members: Andrew Binder
Jennifer Tennant

Call to Order

Chairperson Bush called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m.

Roll call noted the following: Robert Windon, present; Richard Ehrle, present; Jeff Anderson, absent; Susan Ferry, present; Joann Lee, present; Vice-Chairperson Dan Hogan, present; Chairperson Anna Markley Bush, present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

#

Other Business

2020 Plan Commission Meeting Schedule

The Commissioners reviewed 2020 Plan Commission Meeting Schedule. After review, a voice vote noted all ayes, and Chairperson Bush declared the schedule approved.

#

New Business

PC 19-05: Special Use/Planned Development 353 W. Northwest Highway (Barrington Animal Hospital)

PETITIONER: RWE Management Company
16W361 N. Frontage Road, Suite 106
Burr Ridge, IL 60527

PROPERTY OWNER: Fifth Third Bank
1701 Golf Rd
Rolling Meadows, IL 6008-4227

The Petitioner is seeking approval of a Special Use Planned Development for the redevelopment and operation of a Veterinary Office and Kennel (Barrington Animal Hospital). The Petitioner is proposing to demolish a portion of the existing building and construct an addition and related site improvements including but not limited to parking, lighting, landscaping and signage. The subject property is zoned B-1 General Business Service District. The subject property is located in Neighborhood 4, and is designated for Commercial (Retail/Office) by the Village of Barrington 2010 Comprehensive Plan.

Chairperson Bush summarizes the agenda for the meeting and noted that the meeting will be adjourned by 9:30 p.m. The meeting will reconvene at a later date that will be noted before the meeting is adjourned.

Chairperson Bush begins by asking those in attendance who would like to address the Commission tonight. Chairperson Bush asks them to stand so they can be sworn in.

Mr. Hal Francke, attorney from Meltzer Purtill & Stelle Law Firm representing the petitioner, began by stating that he wasn't at the last meeting but is representing the Barrington Animal Hospital (BAH) for the of the Special Use Planned Development. Mr. Francke indicated that he and his team will be presenting a PowerPoint presentation and showing the changes that have been made since the last meeting and are open to answer any questions. Mr. Hal also stated that they have brought an additional expert, Dr. Thomas Thunder, who is an acoustic specialist. Mr. Hal understands that the matter will be continued. He stated that he and his team are not looking for a vote on the matter tonight as new information has been presented that everyone has not had a chance to review before the meeting.

Dr. Barb Stapleton stated that she is current owner of BAH. BAH was founded in 1906 and the current hospital was built in the 1930's. She purchased the business in 1991, and indicated that the business did not have the appropriate equipment that was needed for proper care of dogs. Since then, BAH has grown to a six doctor practice that provides excellent care for all their patients. Dr. Stapleton indicated that BAH provides a dental referral service that brings people in from outside of the community that benefits surrounding businesses by people exploring Barrington shops and restaurants. The business is growing every year as the community is growing and has just about outgrown their current space. She has a lot of

support from her clients as they have collected over 400 signatures from Barrington residents and over 60 signatures from recent clients.

Dr. Joanna Krol introduced herself and indicated that she has been a vet for close to 16 years. She indicated that she approached Dr. Stapleton about partnering with her when she was approaching retirement age. She indicated that she has experience owning and managing an animal facility. The facility had boarding, grooming and day care all in one facility as well as an animal hospital. She indicated that she takes her patients health very seriously. Dr. Krol wants to bring the same great level of care to this new facility within the Village of Barrington and set a new standard when it comes to animal care in Barrington. Dr. Krol stated that they are hoping to become leaders in the industry and make Barrington a prime destination for animal care for the surrounding community.

Michael Matthys, with Linden Group Architects, introduced himself and noted that BAH has been an outstanding neighbor at their exiting property and for the matter of the record, they have a letter from their neighbor. Mr. Matthys outlined some details about the proposed business. BAH will be open Monday - Friday from 7am to 8pm and Saturday from 8am to 2pm. Mr. Matthys indicated that there will be about 25 employees. The project will be constructed in two phases that will include boarding, daycare and grooming and the building will average around 100-90 dogs per day. That will include an average of 35 dogs will be seeking veterinary services, an average of 10 dogs for grooming services, an average of 33 dogs for day care and an average of 35 dogs for boarding.

Mr. Matthys introduced Bob Edwards with RWE Management Group. RWE is a company that specializes in the planning, development, design, and construction of animal care facilities. RWE specializes in animal care facilities in the region and together they have been involved over 200 successful animal care facility projects nationwide. Mr. Matthys indicated that all projects are good neighbors and don't have any concerns with any sound or odor issues.

Mr. Matthys continued with the overview of the changes that were made since the last hearing. In response to the neighbors, they have made a big effort and some concessions on the plan to adjust so that BAH can be good neighbors in the future. The proposed building is 12,570 square feet and reduced the kennels to 74 kennels. Mr. Matthys indicated that Village Staff has put together a summary of the changes that have been made in the Staff Report. Mr. Matthys reviewed the changes that were presented in the Staff Report with regards to building footprint, open space, parking spaces, number of kennels, number of outdoor play yards and play yard size.

Mr. Matthys continued that the play yards have been relocated from the rear of the building to the front of the building, away from the business to the south. The play yards to the front will have a seven foot high masonry wall. The indoor play areas have also been relocated and will not have any windows to the exterior of the building, but will have skylights that will bring in sunlight to the indoor play areas. The expansion of the indoor holding room will allow staff to clean the cages without having the dogs go outside. Chairperson Bush asked Mr. Matthys whether the fences were eight feet on the previous plans.

Mr. Matthys confirmed that the fence was eight feet before. Mr. Matthys explained that they recently did a project in Ground Point and they have seven foot masonry wall. Mr. Matthys indicated his concern that he did not want to present an eight foot masonry wall to the Architectural Review Commission and feels the seven foot tall masonry wall is adequate.

Chairperson Bush asked Mr. Matthys if they have moved the barking away from the daycare and moved it right next to an office building.

Mr. Matthys confirmed that with the initial plan had barking along the east property line. Mr. Matthys continued that Staff has brought up some concerns about sound levels along the east property line that will be brought up during the remainder of the meeting. Mr. Matthys indicated that they will provide more information on sound and have proposed a new alternative plan for the building footprint to rectify the issue of the play yard being adjacent to the east property line. The building also has a further separation from the east property line from five feet to eleven feet. The building has also been setback further away from the business to the south.

Mr. Matthys continued with the revised plan of the building and indicated that the business model was reevaluated to ensure that the number of kennels was sufficient for the business needs. Mr. Matthys continued with the changes of the floor plan since the previous plan. Mr. Matthys indicated that they have heard concerns from neighboring properties about the safety and concern of dogs going in and out of the building. With that concern, they are proposing a six foot fence that runs from the building to the south property line and runs along the south property line to the west. Mr. Matthys indicated that the fence is currently proposed at six feet, and has been addressed by surrounding property owners to raise the fence to eight feet. Mr. Matthys indicated that he and the applicant are willing to raise the fence to eight feet, but the Village code does not allow for an eight foot feet.

Commissioner Windon asked if a six foot fence has the ability to stop a dog from jumping over the fence.

Mr. Matthys said that some large dogs can jump over a six foot fence.

Commissioner Windon clarified that is the reason for the need for the seven or eight foot fence.

Mr. Matthys confirmed. The reason for the eight foot fence for the enclosure is because the dogs may try to get out of the enclosure since it is a play yard.

Mr. Robert Edwards, from RWE Management group, introduced himself. He indicated that a six foot fence is for the area when the dogs will be leashed in the parking lot. The reason for the seven to eight foot fence in the outdoor play area because the dogs will be off leash.

Commissioner Windon understands and noted that one of the concerns was if an animal were to get off leash while the dog was being taken inside.

Mr. Matthys confirmed on the reason for the eight foot fence within the plans if it was desired.

Mr. Matthys continued that the open space on the site has been increased.

Chairperson Bush asked if the play yards were considered open space.

Mr. Matthys replied that no, the play yards not considered open space.

Mr. Matthys continued to review the engineering of the proposed site. The proposed plan reduces the amount of impervious surface of the existing site by 3,000 square feet and is a reduction in the amount of storm water from the site today. Mr. Matthys continued to review the landscaping and landscape islands.

Mr. Matthys stated that there will be two phases of this project. Phase 1 will include an addition to the west of the existing building that will be focused on the Animal Hospital and will not include any boarding or daycare. Phase 2 will include boarding and daycare and it is not known when Phase 2 would occur. Mr. Matthys indicated that Phase 2 could be within three or more years.

Chairperson Bush asked Mr. Matthys if they are looking to approve something that may never be built.

Mr. Matthys replied that the hope would be that Phase 2 would be built within three years.

Chairperson Bush clarified that it could possibly never be built (Phase 2).

Mr. Matthys confirmed.

Mr. Matthys continued with concerns that were brought up by the neighbors during the neighborhood meeting. Mr. Matthys stated that traffic was one of the concerns from the neighbors and indicated that their team and the Village of Barrington provided traffic studies for the proposed project. Mr. Matthys also indicated that they provided a further traffic study showing the traffic counts and traffic impact for other permitted land uses compared to the Animal Hospital land use. He indicated that the BAH use is most closely related to a dental office use as it relates to traffic volumes. Mr. Matthys also indicated that they are removing access points off of Northwest Highway and Exmoor Avenue. Mr. Matthys reiterated the engineering scope of the project as well the proposed fencing.

Mr. Matthys stated that he and his team feel that the scale of the project matches the existing buildings along Northwest Highway. Mr. Matthys stated that the proposed site will be around 40% open space and the other sites around the project have around 20% open space.

Mr. Matthys stated odor and waste is another concern from neighboring property owners. Mr. Matthys presented on the PowerPoint slide the policy with regards to waste being removed and how the site will be cleaned on a daily basis. Mr. Matthys stated that disposal of medical waste is governed and is kept inside the building and picked up by a service. Medical waste will not be placed in the dumpster.

Dr. Tom Thunder AuD, FAAA, INCE, introduced himself and indicated that he has been a sound consultant in the Chicagoland area for over 35 years. He indicated that he is certified and educated in acoustics and sound. Dr. Thunder indicated that a separate sound consultant provided the sound study that was provided in the submittal. Dr. Thunder indicated that the sound contour shown was done by a software called Sound Plan and it is used widely among acoustic engineers to generate contours so that people can visualize how the noise dissipates over distance.

Dr. Thunder gave an overview of how sound works and how sound can decrease over distance with barriers that may block noise. Dr. Thunder gave a brief overview of interior controls of sound with materials such as carpet. He indicated that masonry blocks the sound when it concerns the exterior of the property. Windows or any type of opening are a weak link when it comes to sound that comes from within a building. Reducing the number of windows helps contain the sound within the building.

Dr. Thunder explained how sound is measured and how it compares to different sounds. He indicated that having a casual conversation with someone usually creates a sound of 60 decibels (dB). Every time you go up in 10 dB, you double the loudness of the sound. Dr. Thunder stated that he has reviewed the current Village Zoning Ordinance as it relates to sound and has indicated that the sound measurement is based off a numeric code and was most likely adopted in the late 1950's. Dr. Thunder pointed out that you cannot buy equipment that can assess the noise the way that the Zoning Ordinance is written. Dr. Thunder gave an overview of the ordinance and what type of sounds may come from each frequency. Dr. Thunder concluded that the Zoning Ordinance would limit the sound to around 62 dB, which is around the same amount of decibels as conversational speech.

Dr. Thunder showed how moving the play yards to the north significantly decreased the amount of sound going to the neighboring properties. He indicated the reason is because the building is a noise reducing element and blocks the noise that goes to the back. He continued that another change has been made to building to mitigate the noise that would affect the property to the east, west and the south. Dr. Thunder indicated that the sound is projecting in a good way towards Northwest Highway. High traffic roads like Northwest Highway have an average range of 65-75 dB by just standing near the road. He also indicated that the design of the building is also projecting the noise to another noise source, the car wash across the street, which car wash business generate an average of 80 dB due to the air dryers.

Robert Edwards indicated that is important to note the compliance issue. He indicated that based off the Staff Report the proposed project is not in compliance with the noise. Mr. Edwards asked Dr. Thunder if the new building design would be in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to sound.

Dr. Thunder confirmed that the new design would be compliant based on the calculations by Soundscape, the sound would project 62 dB and that is the code. The average for barking dogs would be a lower dB. Dr. Thunder reiterated that it would be difficult to make that measurement of dB and the current code because of the other noise from Northwest Highway.

Chairperson Bush asked on Figure 2 and Figure 3 of the study provided, it shows the dog yards on the north side of site and questioned on why Figure 3 is louder or has more red within the site.

Dr. Thunder said that the more red is related to the source of the sound and the wall barrier. The more room for the sound and less barriers allows for more sound to escape within the front area of the property.

Vice Chairperson Hogan asked to be reminded about the chart regarding the noise levels and what level normal conversation is considered with regards to sound levels.

Dr. Thunder stated that a normal conversation is around 60 dB.

Vice Chairperson Hogan asked that a sound level of dog barking considered 62 (dB).

Dr. Thunder stated that if you are right up next to a dog when they are barking they can be up to 90 dB, but that's right up next to the dog. As you move further away from the dog, that sound will drop off significantly. Dr. Thunder stated that you are looking at the level of the receiving property measurement.

Commissioner Lee asked what is the decibel for traffic.

Dr. Thunder replied that it varies based on the volume, speed and mix of the traffic. Mix meaning how many trucks and vans. Dr. Thunder stated that it really depends on the type of road. He would not be surprised at this location if this road's average traffic sound level would be 65 dB.

Chairperson Bush asked if Dr. Thunder has taken any noise readings for this site.

Dr. Thunder replied that he did not take any readings.

Mr. Matthys stated that he wanted to finish the presentation by talking about other RWE dog facilities that are located near child care facilities. He reviewed several facilities that are by child day care centers. He continued that each of the dog facility cases do have something in common because the relationship between each dog facility and day care was a good relationship. He stated that is something the BAH would like to continue and make a good relationship with the day care center to the south and the surrounding properties.

Mr. Hal Francke thanked the Plan Commission. He stated that he is not looking for a vote tonight based on a lot of new information, most notably the information from Dr. Thunder. They would like to meet with

Staff about the noise concern after the meeting tonight. The reason for the continuance is so that they can provide more information to Staff to help with their concerns about the noise. He stated that the standards for the Plan Commission and the Special Use are satisfied. When you have Special Uses, the whole purpose of calling something a Special Use and to have a hearing is to get input from the neighbors and from the Staff. The purpose is to not say no, but to figure out what can be done and address the public impact with regards to health, safety, and welfare. With this particular case, we think everyone has done a good job on highlighting the issues that need to be addressed. The concerns from the neighboring properties have been appropriately and adequately addressed. He stated that with respect to meeting all the standards, addressing the all concerns, and for a business that has been in the community for decades, the Plan Commission can feel conformable recommending approval to the Village Board.

Mr. Hal Francke requested that due to the purchasing contract, the next Plan Commission meeting be scheduled for December 10, 2019.

Chairperson Bush asked Staff to proceed with their presentation.

Mr. Binder provided a summary of the proposal. Since the October 8th meeting, the Petitioner has held a second neighborhood meeting and has submitted revised plans. Phase 1 will consist of renovations to the existing building and an addition to the west of the site to accommodate the animal hospital. Phase 1 will also include the removal of the access drive off of Northwest Highway as well as parking, landscaping, and signage improvements.

Phase 2 will include an addition to the east of the existing building to accommodate the proposed kennel facility, which will include a dog daycare and an overnight boarding facility with suites for up to 74 dogs. Phase 2 will also include a fenced outdoor play area for the dogs in front of the building and the outdoor areas will be surrounded by landscaping as screening. Once Phase 1 is completed, the Petitioner has indicated that there is no timeline on when Phase 2 will be constructed and completed.

Mr. Binder indicated that Staff has provided a supplemental memo to the Plan Commission outlining the other permitted uses within the B-1 Zoning District, the most intense uses are likely microbreweries and restaurants. Staff has also provided the number of exceptions requested for other recent planned developments, with the number of exceptions ranging from 6 to 16.

Mr. Binder continued that the Petitioner is requesting 13 exceptions from Zoning Ordinance and has eliminated 3 exceptions from the first proposal. With the first proposal, the Petitioner was seeking multiple exceptions to build an 8-foot vinyl fence within the rear and side yard of the site. Since then, the Petitioner has modified the site and is asking for 2 exceptions from the Zoning Ordinance to construct a 7-foot solid masonry wall/fence within the front yard for the outdoor play area. The Petitioner is requesting two exceptions as they relate to the proposed parking lot. It's worth noting that the Petitioner was able to comply with the Zoning Ordinance for the widths of the parking stalls at parking spaces along higher curbs thus eliminating an exception. The Petitioner was able to combine the wall signage on the front façade to

eliminate an exception needed for two wall signs, but the Petitioner is asking for an exception to reuse and relocate the existing nonconforming "Barrington Animal Hospital" sign as the sign exceeds the maximum height for wall signs by three (3) inches. Mr. Binder noted that the Petitioner was able to increase the open space percentage of the site from the original proposal from 31.3% to 39.1%; however, the proposed open space still does not meet the 50% open space requirement for a Planned Development. The remaining exceptions that are unchanged from the original proposal are the Special Uses, the transitional yard requirements, the glazed surface requirement, and the percentage of exceptions for Planned Developments.

Mr. Binder continued that in Staff's opinion, the Petitioner has submitted revised plans that address and/or alleviate many of the concerns raised about this project. The building footprint has been reduced from 14,560 sqft to 12,570 sqft, a 1,975 sqft reduction in size. The number of kennels within the facility has been reduced from 132 kennels to 74 kennels, a 44% reduction. The number of outdoor play yards has been reduced from 5 play yards to 3 play yards, which has reduced the square footage of the total outdoor play yards by 1,479 square feet. Additionally, all the outdoor play yards were removed from the rear of the building and relocated to the front of the building.

Mr. Binder stated that the Petitioner has also provided a sound study to address concerns about compliance with the noise ordinances of the Village. Mr. Binder stated that Staff finds that noise mitigation at the northeast section of the site remains the primary outstanding issue with the proposal. Staff finds that the proposed development does not meet two of the Special Use Standards, #4 and #7, as staff finds that based on the sound study that was provided by the Petitioner, it appears as though noise levels remain an issue on the northeast section of the site, and compliance with Village noise ordinances remains outstanding.

Mr. Binder stated that Village Staff would like to reiterate that the Petitioner has been incredibly cooperative and has made a very significant effort to address community concerns. But at this time, Staff is not prepared to recommend approval of the proposed project based on outstanding concerns regarding compliance with the Village nuisance noise ordinances. Mr. Binder stated that Staff does not recommend denial of PC 19-05 and encourages the Petitioner to further explore a slightly different building configuration, which might relocate the outdoor play area away from the east property line. The Petitioner has briefly contemplated this solution and has provided a conceptual building layout showing the relocation of the outdoor areas.

Mr. Binder indicated that Staff recommends a second continuance to either December 10th, 2019 or January 14th, 2020. Staff strongly recommends January 14th, 2020, to allow appropriate turnaround time and Staff review time. Staff does not believe there is a need for a third neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Binder concluded that in the event that the Plan Commission ultimately recommends approval of this project, Staff will be recommending conditions regarding noise control and the operation of the kennel business similar to those that were imposed on the Dog House of Barrington in 2008. Mr. Binder finished by taking any questions from the Commissioners.

Chairperson Bush asked if Phase 1 requires the elimination of the drive through facility.

Mr. Binder confirmed that Phase 1 will include the elimination of the drive through facility.

Vice-Chairperson Hogan asked if at the time Staff Report #2 was prepared, was Dr. Thunder's information provided.

Ms. Tennant stated that Staff had the sound report, but not the information about the reconfiguration.

Commissioner Lee asked if Phase 2 is approved, how much time does the petitioner has to build it until it expires.

Ms. Tennant stated that there is a potential to impose a time limit, which hasn't been done in the past. The approval would remain good.

Commissioner Lee restated that there would be no time limit, if one is not imposed.

Commissioner Lee asked Dr. Thunder about the alternative courtyard play area and if it has been analyzed like the other two plans.

Dr. Thunder confirmed that the sound has been analyzed for the figure 3 with the yard being placed away from the east property line. Mr. Matthys showed the layouts on the PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Tennant confirmed that the layout on the PowerPoint presentation is not within the packet.

Mr. Edwards stated that he talked to Staff after receiving the Staff report, that there could be a solution to Staff's concerns and there must have been a misinterpretation of the Village sound code. Mr. Edwards stated that they came up with a new floorplan solution.

Mr. Matthys stated for the continuance, they will provide a full revised documents with the new floorplan. Mr. Binder confirmed that mansard roofs are prohibited in the B-1 District, so that's why they have looked for an alternative to the courtyard plan.

Chairperson Bush asked the Plan Commission if they had any other questions for Staff. None were asked. Chairperson Bush opened the meeting for public comment.

Al Bushour, 720 S Northwest Highway, stated that he owns a photography business across the street. Al explains that he is very impressed by the detail that everyone has gone through to try to get the issues resolved. He believes this is a very wonderful business for Barrington to have and it would be a real shame to see if they have to go elsewhere to be able to continue the growth that they need. You just have to believe the BAH business and the planning that went into this.

Carol Shubert, a Barrington resident, has a granddaughter that goes to the Barrington day care center. She believes that the proposed building is too big and will create a large traffic problem. She says a lot of traffic is around the area and this business will create more traffic around the site without a light. She continued that issues with traffic and the amount of dogs being at this site.

Mary Handmond, stated that she has been a BAH customer for 24 years and a business neighbor for 10 years. She stated the business has been nothing but great.

Dillon Nelson, owner of the Doghouse of Barrington, stated he loves Barrington Animal Hospital and has a good working relationship. He continued that he thinks Barrington Animal Hospital does not know what they are getting themselves into with daycare and boarding. He explained the need for spaces for dogs and the concern he has about dogs being closer to Northwest Highway.

Rick Noak, owner of the apartment building 565 Carl Ave, stated that a vet office would be great and the location for this use would be great. He opposes the dog daycare and kennel facility. He does not support the location of the dog daycare and kennel facility at this location due to noise and traffic.

Terrie Blanke, owner of the Barrington Community Child Care Center, indicated several concerns about the project. Ms. Blanke stated that there will be a huge increase in traffic. When the bank was in operation, people previously parked in their parking lot at the child care center. Ms. Blanke indicated that the proposed building is too large. It is approximately 3 times the size of the day care center building. She doesn't want her children or her staff to have to listen to barking and smell the odors. Ms. Blanke continued that locating this business at this location will devalue the surrounding properties and devalue the child care business. People will select another child care provider if this business is located here. Ms. Blanke indicated that she respects what they are proposing, but that this is not the right place for this business.

Dennis Holgon, part owner of the day care center, stated that he has multiple concerns about the traffic studies conducted. He asked Staff if the traffic reports are available and how the study was conducted.

Mr. Binder stated that the traffic study was done by an engineering consultant and can be reviewed at Village Hall or you could submit a FOIA request.

Mr. Holgon asked if the traffic study was done before or after the closure of the Fifth Third Bank.

Ms. Tennant replied that the study is done based on the proposed uses and prepared by traffic engineers.

Mr. Holgon asked if the traffic engineers knew about the access being closed with the new proposal and if Staff is confident with the traffic study.

Mr. Binder stated the traffic engineers were given the site plan and he is confident with the traffic study.

Mr. Holgon asked about the number of variations for the project and Mr. Binder presented the number of variations for the project. Mr. Holgon continued to talk about his concerns about the traffic.

Bill Hartman, 1200 S Hough Street, stated that he is a cat person and expressed his gratitude to the Barrington Animal Hospital. He continued that there would be no increase of traffic.

David Nelson, 100 E Station Street, thanked the Plan Commission for their service to the community. Mr. Nelson expressed his concern about traffic and the new underpass construction traffic. He also expressed his concern about the daycare center being so close to the dog daycare facility.

Dr. Barb Stapleton explained that there is traffic at their current location. Dr. Stapleton explained the commuter lot access land swap, and talked about this location being the perfect spot for their business.

Cindy Geriky, a Barrington Hills resident and client of BAH, asked Dr. Thunder the decibel level of a screaming child.

Dr. Thunder has measured a screaming child and it can easily exceed 100 dB.

Ms. Geriky stated that screaming children exceed the sound of dogs. Ms. Geriky stated concerns about traffic with a child day care center and the hours of each business. Ms. Geriky discussed the success of the Barrington Animal Hospital.

Julie Hanson, an employee of the Barrington Community Children Care Center, opposes the BAH due to the health and safety of the employees and children. She stated concerns about people loitering and walking their dogs near the daycare center.

Heather Jenson, 621 W. Main Street, expressed her appreciation of everyone's comments. She stated that she is a proponent for the BAH project and stated that 56% of US households have a pet. She continued that pet owners need a convenient location for pet care and BAH is a community business that should stay.

Dr. Nancy Ryan has known Dr. Stapleton for many years and is a proponent for the BAH. Dr. Ryan asked the Plan Commission how the Heinen's development dealt with traffic.

Chairperson Bush stated that they hired their own police to deal with traffic.

A member of the public stated that she has known Dr. Stapleton for many years and appreciates the care of the Barrington Animal Hospital.

Eric Stall stated that his concerns are about having the dog day care and not about the vet clinic. Mr. Stall said that he feels the Phase 2 of the project should not be approved due to the objections.

Dan Wolfram, worked and lived in the Barrington area, stated that the BAH is an excellent clinic. But he has two children at the daycare center, and expressed his concerns about turning left on Northwest Highway.

Malinda Martin, employee of the Barrington Community Child Care center, expressed her concern about putting a wall in front of the property.

Ms. Tenant asked the Plan Commission for any specific feedback to the Petitioner about the proposed plan.

Chairperson Bush expressed that she wants to see the alternative plan for the next meeting that was only presented on the PowerPoint presentation. She also wants Staff to study the proposed layout so that the Plan Commission does not have to continue the project to another public meeting.

Commissioner Ferry asked about the Traffic Study.

Ms. Tenant explained that there are traffic studies within the packet that were conducted by the Petitioner and confirmed by the Village's consultant. The traffic study also shows additional uses and the impact of traffic of those uses.

Commissioner Windon would like more detail on the new proposed plan and more information on the sound. Traffic will always be an issue with this site, but he is more concerned about the sound of this use and how the sound would affect the children.

Chairperson Bushed asked Staff to set up the next meeting dates.

Ms. Tennant stated that it is Staff's very strong recommendation to continue the meeting to January 14, 2020.

Chairperson Bushed asked the Plan Commission if they are okay with the January 14th for the continuance.

Commissioner Windon asked Staff what is needed.

Ms. Tennant stated that the applicant will have to submit revised plans for the Commission's consideration and the submittal deadline for the December 10, 2019 meeting would be next Monday.

Chairperson Bushed asked Staff to see the plans more than 4 days before the meeting and asked the public and stakeholders to review the plans before the next meeting.

Commissioner Windon asked about the submittal deadline and the review time for staff.

Ms. Tenant explained the staff review and the timeline needed.

Mr. Francke expressed his wishes to continue the meeting to December 10, 2019.

Vice-Chairperson Hogan stated that Staff is very hard working and does need adequate time to review the plans accurately.

Ms. Tenant stated that Staff does need to review the sound code and research the information to ensure a better recommendation.

Commissioner Windon motioned and Vice-Chairperson Hogan seconded the motion to continue PC 19-05 to January 14th, 2020 on the Special Use Planned Development for the redevelopment and operation of a Veterinary Office and Kennel (Barrington Animal Hospital).

Roll call Vote: Mr. Windon, yes; Ms. Lee, yes; Ms. Ferry, yes; Mr. Anderson, absent; Mr. Ehrle, yes; Vice-Chairperson Hogan, yes; and Chairperson Bush, yes. The vote was 6-0; the motion approved.

#

Minutes

October 8, 2019

Vice-Chairperson Hogan made a motion to approve the October 8, 2019 meeting minutes. Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. A voice vote noted all ayes, and Chairperson Bush declared the motion approved.

#

Other

Vice-Chairperson Hogan talked about the first Comprehensive Plan Meeting and wanted input on how to better improve the meetings for better input.

Ms. Tennant agreed with Mr. Hogan and talked about the improvements made on the next meeting.

Adjournment

Vice-Chairperson Hogan made a motion and Commissioner Windon seconded to adjourn the meeting at 9:36 p.m. Chairperson Bush declared the motion approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Binder
Planning & Zoning Coordinator

Approved: January 14, 2020