

PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF

OCTOBER 17, 2011

1. ROLL CALL

The Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals was called to order at 7:30 P.M. at the Village Hall, 7660 County Line Road, Burr Ridge, Illinois, by Chairman Trzupek.

ROLL CALL was noted as follows:

PRESENT: 5– Cronin, Perri, Stratis, Grunsten, and Trzupek

ABSENT: 2 – Franzese and Bolos

Also present was Community Development Director Doug Pollock.

2. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Cronin and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Grunsten to approve minutes of the October 3, 2011 Plan Commission Meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 5– Cronin, Grunsten, Perri, Stratis, and Trzupek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 5-0.

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Trzupek confirmed all present who wished to give testimony at any of the public hearings on the agenda.

A. V-04-2011: 220-240 Shore Drive (Bronson & Bratton); Variation

Chairman Trzupek asked Mr. Pollock to provide a summary of this public hearing.

Mr. Pollock described the public hearing as follows: Earlier this year, the petitioner was granted a variation to allow a building addition with the total floor area exceeding the maximum permitted floor area ratio of 0.40. The Zoning Ordinance requires that non-conforming parking lots be brought up to code at such time that a building is expanded. The parking lot on the subject property provides a sufficient number of parking spaces but does not comply with the required curbing, landscaping or design standards. The petition proposes to provide some additional curbing and landscaping but is seeking a variation to allow the addition without all of the required parking lot improvements.

Mr. Pollock referenced a site plan showing the existing parking configuration, a plan showing the petitioner's proposal for curbing and landscaping, and a sketch plan prepared by staff showing staff's recommendations for providing curbing and landscaping. Mr. Pollock described the differences between the plans. He said the differences between the staff plan and the petitioner's plan were in the southwest corner of the property and described those differences as follows; the petitioner's plan shows double or tandem parking at the southwest corner of the property and a sand volleyball court while the staff plan would remove approximately 4,000 square feet of asphalt in this area and would not include the double parking or the volleyball court. Mr. Pollock said that the staff plan provides 120 parking spaces and the petitioner's plan provides 114 spaces without double parking and 127 spaces with double parking.

Chairman Trzupsek asked the petitioner for comments.

Mr. Greg Freehauf stated that he was the general contractor for the building addition. Mr. Mark Bronson, owner of the business, was also present.

Chairman Trzupsek asked for clarification on the area of green space that would be added if the staff recommended plan were implemented. After discussion, Mr. Pollock said that the area of the volleyball court was not taken into consideration when calculating the 4,000 square feet of green space added by the staff plan. Mr. Freehauf stated that both plans include significant removal of asphalt and replacement with green space; specifically along Shore Court and along Shore Drive where driveways are being eliminated or reduced in area.

Mr. Bronson explained that he is concerned about the amount of parking that is provided. He said that sufficient parking is available but that in the future, if additional parking is needed, the staff plan would not allow him to accommodate additional parking.

In response to Chairman Trzupsek, Mr. Bronson said that he has discussed the double parking with his employees and that specified employees have agreed to share a double parking space. He explained that two employees sharing the space work the same shift and would arrive at about the same time and depart at the same time so there would be no conflict with the double parking.

Chairman Trzupsek asked if there was anyone else in attendance who wanted to speak to this request. There being no one, Chairman Trzupsek asked the Plan Commission for questions and comments.

Commissioner Cronin asked if the double parking would be assigned to specific employees. Mr. Bronson said that they would be assigned. Commissioner Cronin also confirmed that the new landscaping along Shore Court would not block sight lines.

Commissioner Perri asked staff how the double parking would transfer to any future owner. Mr. Pollock said that if a variation is granted it would run with the land but he is not sure how or if that would impact the desirability of the property for a future user. Mr.

Pollock said that if the double parking variation were not approved, the number of spaces would be limited as if that row of parking were a single row of parking.

In response to Commissioner Perri, Mr. Bronson explained that garbage pick-up was done at the two loading bays and that garbage trucks do not have to drive through the parking lot.

Commissioner Stratis asked if large trucks can get through the parking lot. Mr. Bronson said that there are very few semi-trucks and that they would pull into the property from Shore Court and back straight out onto Shore Court. He said he knows from current experience that the truck turning at the northwest corner is difficult.

Commissioner Grunsten asked if the property would be in violation of the parking requirements with the addition and without the double parking. Mr. Pollock said that the petitioner's plan would have 114 parking spaces without counting the double parking and that this number of parking spaces complies with the Zoning Ordinance based on the Ordinance requirement for one parking space per 2 employees.

Commissioner Grunsten added that the bushes along the parking lot edge should be evergreens.

Chairman Trzupsek said he was concerned about the precedent of formally approving a variation for double parking. He asked staff what would happen if the Village approved the plan without the double parking and employees at some time began to double park. Mr. Pollock said that the Village would not consider that a violation on private property provided they have sufficient parking to meet the Ordinance standard. Chairman Trzupsek asked for a consensus from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Cronin suggested that the Plan Commission approve the petitioner's plan but without the approval of the double parking. He said that those parking spaces should be striped for a single parking space as per the Ordinance requirement.

Commissioner Grunsten said she agreed.

There being no further questions from the Plan Commission, Chairman Trzupsek asked for a motion to close the hearing.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Cronin and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Perri to close the hearing for V-04-2011.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 5— Cronin, Perri, Stratis, Grunsten, and Trzupsek

NAYS: 0— None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 5-0.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Perri to recommend variations from Section XI.C of the Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance to permit an addition connecting two existing buildings without full compliance with the required parking lot curbing and landscaping subject to compliance with the site and landscaping plan submitted by the petitioner except that the parking row adjacent to the southwest lot line shall be striped as a single row of parking.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 5– Stratis, Perri, Cronin Grunsten, and Trzupek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 5-0.

B. Z-23-2011: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment; Regulations for Stucco and Related Exterior Building Materials

Chairman Trzupek asked the Plan Commission if they wanted to continue this hearing so that the full Commission could participate in the discussion. Mr. Pollock responded that he did not object to a continuance but would like the Commissioners that are present to comment on the revised draft.

Chairman Trzupek first asked if there was anyone in attendance to speak at this hearing. There were none.

Commissioner Cronin asked about the revision that would discourage plastic, vinyl or aluminum siding rather than prohibit such materials. He said he wanted to discourage synthetic stucco but preferred to prohibit plastic, vinyl or aluminum siding.

Mr. Pollock said his only concern was the use of such materials as a window or door trim. In response, Commissioner Stratis said the text could be revised to indicate that the prohibition was for siding and did not apply to door and window trim.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Cronin and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Grunsten to continue the hearing for Z-23-2011 to November 7, 2011.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 5– Cronin, Grunsten, Perri, Stratis and Trzupek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 5-0.

4. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no discussion regarding any of the correspondence on the agenda.

5. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

A. PC-07-2011; 2012 Plan Commission Schedule

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Perri and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Grunsten to approve the 2012 Plan Commission calendar as submitted by staff. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote of the Plan Commission.

6. FUTURE SCHEDULED MEETINGS

There was no comment or discussion regarding future meetings.

7. ADJOURNMENT

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Cronin and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Perri to **ADJOURN** the meeting at 9:22 p.m. **ALL MEMBERS VOTING AYE**, the meeting was adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:



J. Douglas Pollock, AICP

November 7, 2011