

PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF

JULY 1, 2013

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 Burr Ridge Village Hall, 7660 County Line Road, Burr Ridge, Illinois, by Chairman Trzupek.

ROLL CALL was noted as follows:

PRESENT: 7 – Cronin, Stratis, Grunsten, Scott, Grela, Praxmarer, and Trzupek

ABSENT: 1 - Hoch

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 June 3, 2013 Plan Commission meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 4 – Cronin, Grunsten, Stratis, and Trzupek

NAYS: 0 – None

ABSTAIN: 1 – Scott, Grela, and Praxmarer

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 4-0.

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Trzupek confirmed all present who wished to give testimony at the public hearings and introduced the public hearings as follows.

A. Z-11-2013: 6501 County Line Road (Lindell); Text Amendment or Variation

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

Mr. Pollock described the petition as follows: The petitioner represents the new owner of the home at the southeast corner of County Line Road and Plainfield Road. The owner would like to construct a six foot tall black steel ornamental fence along the County Line Road and Plainfield Road frontages of the property. The Zoning Ordinance restricts fences to the rear yard and to 5 feet in height. The petitioner requests either a variation for the fence or a text amendment.

Chairman Trzupsek asked for comments from the petitioner.

Mr. Dennis Lindell said he was the attorney for the property owner. He said that this was a unique house on a unique property. He said it draws a lot of attention because of its location and unique architecture. Mr. Lindell said the owner's primary concern is safety due to the attention given the house and its location at a very busy intersection. He said there has been a lot of trespassing and vandalism at the property. He added that the existing landscaping will be preserved, that the fence will blend with the gates, and will not block any sight lines.

Chairman Trzupsek asked for public comments.

Mr. Bob Becker, 6547 County Line Road, said he lives next door to the property and is delighted that they want to put a fence around the front of the property. He said numerous people have crossed onto their property and that the fence will enhance security for both properties.

Chairman Trzupsek asked Mr. Becker if he was concerned about people going around the fence. Mr. Becker said that the fence would not prevent that but would reduce the possibility.

There being no further public comments, Chairman Trzupsek asked for comments and questions from the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Cronin said that he they are asking for changes to the fence regulations for one property and that he does not see any hardship for a variation.

Commissioner Stratis said he shares Commissioner Cronin's concerns. He said that the location at a busy intersection may be unique but the concern with safety is one of equal value to all residents. He said that existing landscaping is the appropriate surround for the property. He added that he may be more sympathetic if the owner had lived there for a while and experienced safety and security problems. Commissioner Stratis said that the problems are more likely due to the vacancy of the home for so many years. He concluded that there are more 2 acre residential properties at busy intersections that would also want front yard fencing.

Mr. Lindell said that he would consider a five foot fence. Commissioner Stratis said that the variation would still not meet the findings for a variation.

Commissioner Grunsten said that one of the qualities of Burr Ridge is the openness without fences dividing the properties. She said that is a quality that should be maintained throughout the community.

Commissioner Scott said that there are similar parcels in the Village and he is struggling with finding anything unique about this particular property. He suggested that it may be

better if the fence were setback behind the landscaping. He added that he was not sure if he would support the variation even with this setback.

Commissioner Grela said that the property is somewhat unique but he does not see a hardship to grant a variation. He too said that he may consider the variation if the fence were setback behind the landscaping.

Commissioner Praxmarer said she believes the landscaping accomplishes the goal of providing security for the property. She added that she too would like to see the fence moved behind the landscaping if the Village were to consider approving the fence.

In regards to a potential text amendment, Chairman Trzupsek said that he does not see why a larger parcel should be allowed a front yard fence and not a smaller parcel. He said they both have equal needs for security and privacy. He said it would make more sense to have an amendment that allowed front yard fencing on any arterial street but that would be a large departure from the current standards of the Village and he believes would not be appropriate.

Chairman Trzupsek asked if anyone on the Commission sees any reason for a text amendment. There were no affirmative responses.

Commissioner Stratis asked how moving the fence behind the landscaping would work relative to the standards for approving a variation. Mr. Pollock said that the standards would be the same and they would still have to show a unique condition to the property that creates a hardship and a need for the variation.

There being no further questions or comments, Chairman Trzupsek asked for a motion to close the hearing.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Grunsten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Cronin to close the hearing for Z-11-2013.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Grunsten, Cronin, Stratis, Scott, Grela, Praxmarer, and Trzupsek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

Chairman Trzupsek asked for a motion regarding this petition. He said there should be separate motions for the text amendment and the variation.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Grela and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Cronin to recommend that the Board of Trustees deny the request for an amendment to Section IV.J of the Zoning Ordinance to allow 6 foot fences in the front buildable area of residential properties of 2 acres or more.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Grela, Cronin, Stratis, Grunsten, Scott, Praxmarer, and Trzupsek

NAYS: 0 – None
MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Grela and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Cronin to recommend that the Board of Trustees deny the request for a variation from Section IV.J of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a 6 foot fence in the front buildable area of the subject property.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Grela, Cronin, Stratis, Grunsten, Scott, Praxmarer, and Trzupek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

B. Z-12-2013: 15W150 South Frontage Road (Odyssey Hotels); Planned Unit Development

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

Mr. Pollock introduced the hearing as follows: The petitioner seeks to construct two, five-story hotels on the subject property. The hotels would be accessed from South Frontage Road. The proposed hotel brand names are Hampton Inn and Suites and Fairfield Inn and Suites. A PUD is required to allow 2 buildings on 1 lot and to allow the buildings to exceed the permitted height and floor area.

Chairman Trzupek asked the petitioner for his presentation.

Mr. Rachit Dhingra introduced himself as the representative of Odyssey Hotels. He said that the development will add significantly to the tax base of the Village. He said the clientele would be similar to the Spring Hill Suites. Mr. Dhingra reviewed the hotel brands and went through a PowerPoint slide presentation. He introduced the Director of Construction Management, Mr. Eric Augst.

Mr. Augst described the site plan and building elevations and completed the PowerPoint slide show. He also showed building elevations, perspectives of the buildings on the site from four different angles and sign drawings.

Chairman Trzupek asked for questions and comments from the audience.

Mrs. Pat Svatos, 7506 Hamilton Avenue, said that the trees that are to be used to block the hotel buildings are old and are cut often because they interfere with the ComEd lines. She said they will not block the view in the winter. She said the property is adjacent to large residential lots, that there will be a negative impact on traffic on the frontage road, that five stories is unreasonable and that the development may cause stormwater problems in the area.

In response, Mr. Dhingra said that the customers will be corporate and there will not be congestion on the frontage road as they arrive at different times during the day. Mr. August explained the detention on the property.

Mr. Tom Koukol, 122 75th Street, asked about the height of the detention pond. He was concerned that the water from the pond would infiltrate the ground and raise the ground water on his property.

Mrs. Alice Krampits, 7515 Drew Avenue, said that stormwater is a big problem in the area and is concerned this development will make it worse. She said that the five stories are not appropriate for this site.

Mr. Bohdan Iwanetz, 7516 Drew Avenue, said that he will have to look at the hotel from his property. He said a better description of the berm is needed. He said that one story shorter would be better for the neighborhood. He said that the trees will make a difference but that it will still be seen in the winter. He added that he appreciates there will be no access from 75th Street.

Chairman Trzupsek said he would like to know how they photo shopped the building into the perspective photo. Mr. August said that he would story-pole it if needed.

Mr. Bruce Church, 7612 Hamilton Avenue, asked about the location of the bushes and trees along 75th Street. Mr. August said they were right on the property line. Mr. Church suggested an impact study on the effect of the hotels on residential property values.

Chairman Trzupsek asked if the Quality Inn was closer to 75th Street than the proposed building and parking lot. Mr. August said he was not sure but would find out.

Mr. Ivan Harrison, 7518 Hamilton Avenue, said that the Illinois Department of Transportation may one day construct a sound wall along I-55. He is concerned that the hotels may object to the sound wall.

Mr. Tom O'Toole, 15W115 79th Street, asked if a market study was done for the hotels. Mr. Pollock said that the developer had submitted a market study.

Mrs. Svatos said that she thought PUDs were for residential development where smaller lots are requested in exchange for open space. She said the property was not just zoned for hotels and there were other uses possible on this property.

Mr. Silvana Curlo, 7816 Drew Avenue, said that flooding is an ongoing problem in the area that has tried to be resolved unsuccessfully.

Mrs. Labus, 7612 Drew Avenue, said that her property has changed over the years and her back yard gets soggy even though she is on high ground. She said she does not want to see a five story building and that people from the hotels will walk through her neighborhood.

Mrs. Barbara Tatic, 7725 Drew, said that she has flooding problems but that tall buildings were not the answer.

Mr. Harrison added that he is concerned about the impact on the two residential properties on the north side of 75th Street.

Mrs. Svatos recommended that the hearing be continued to allow the petitioner to answer the questions that have been asked.

Chairman Trzupsek asked for questions and comments from the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Cronin asked about the security cameras that are proposed for the parking lot. Mr. Augst said that the cameras would be located throughout the parking lot and the hotels would be staffed 24 hours per day. Mr. Augst added that the parking lot setback from the east lot line would be adjusted to 15 feet as requested by staff.

Commissioner Stratis said that he understands the neighbors' concerns regarding stormwater but that the stormwater management regulations require that all stormwater be managed on site and that there can be no increase in impact of stormwater runoff from the property. Commissioner Stratis asked about the potential purchase of the IDOT easement in front of the property, if that area can be used for stormwater detention, if the developer would do underground stormwater detention or permeable pavers, and he suggested that the developer provide 110% of the required stormwater detention as further justification for the PUD. He also asked if the building would be LEED certified.

Mr. Dhingra responded that he would like to purchase the IDOT easement but that they would not sell the easement. He said he liked the idea of detention on the easement but that area is the highest point of the land. Mr. Augst said that they would have certain LEED qualities to the building but would likely not be LEED certified.

Commissioner Stratis also asked about lighting on the building. Mr. Augst said that there would be downward lighting on the building. Commissioner Stratis said he was concerned about lighting on the side of the building facing the residential area.

Commissioner Stratis said that the property is not suitable for retail and given the options available, the use should be office or hotel. He added that a traffic engineer should be engaged to analyze the traffic impact and that he believes it is important to construct a fence along the south, east and west property lines.

Commissioner Grunsten agreed that a fence should be provided. She also noted concern with the buffer on the south lot line as the trees may not always be there. She suggested adding evergreens to this area.

Commissioner Scott asked if both hotels would be built at the same time. Mr. Dhingra said he was not sure but the Hampton would be built first if they are not built at the same time.

Commissioner Scott said he was struggling with whether the PUD provides sufficient public benefit to justify the additional floor area and building height. He said he was particularly concerned about justifying the additional building height. He shared the concern about the tree line being deciduous and the lack of screening in the winter time.

Commissioner Grela stated that he thinks the petitioner has not demonstrated the need for a Planned Unit Development. He said that he is not pleased with the lack of continuity in the presentation, noting that some of the plans differed from other plans. He said that the partial payment for a sidewalk is not sufficient to satisfy the request for a PUD.

Commissioner Praxmarer said that she needs to digest all of the information that has been presented and the questions asked. She expressed her concern about the preservation of trees along the east and south lot lines.

Chairman Trzupke asked about the east elevation of the Hampton Inn building. He said he was concerned about the large blank wall facing east. He wondered if that was the elevators and he said he was concerned with a blank wall facing County Line Road.

Chairman Trzupke summarized the concerns expressed at the public hearing as follows: Further details regarding stormwater management needs to be provided and he agrees with Commissioner Stratis that it would be good to provide additional stormwater management to contribute to the justification of the PUD. The buffer on the south lot line is relying on existing deciduous trees and additional details, with year round landscaping, should be provided. A fence should be provided along the south, east and west lot lines. A traffic study should be done to measure the impact on area streets and to determine the exact configuration of the driveway access to South Frontage Road. The petitioner has failed to justify the floor area and building height requested for the PUD.

Commissioner Stratis asked the petitioner if the project would work with 3 story buildings. Mr. Dhingra said he does not think that would work.

Chairman Trzupke asked the petitioner to quantify the economic impact of the project. He noted that the petitioner has said the hotels would have a significant economic impact but has not quantified that claim.

Chairman Trzupke asked how the Commission would like to proceed.

Commissioner Grunsten said that the Commission needs more information. She said that she is still not certain if the demand is sufficient to warrant the additional hotel rooms represented by the additional height and floor area. She suggested the petitioner consider two, four-story hotels.

Commissioner Cronin suggested continuing to a future Plan Commission meeting.

Mr. Pollock said that the next meeting is July 15 and after that is August 5. He questioned whether the petitioner would be able to get all the information by July 15 as it would actually be due by July 10.

Mr. Dhingra said he would like to try to get the information for the July 15 meeting.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Grunsten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Stratis to continue the hearing for Z-12-2013 to July 15, 2013.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Grunsten, Stratis, Cronin, Scott, Grela, Praxmarer, and Trzupsek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

Mr. Pollock asked the audience to check with Village staff before July 15 to make sure the hearing would continue on that date as it is quite possible that it would be continued again to August 5.

4. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no discussion regarding the correspondence.

5. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

A. S-03-2013: 15W150 South Frontage Road (Odyssey Hotels)

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Grunsten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Stratis to continue the hearing for S-03-2013 to July 15, 2013.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Grunsten, Stratis, Cronin, Scott, Grela, Praxmarer, and Trzupsek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

B. PC-05-2013: Annual Appointment of Plan Commission Vice Chairperson

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Cronin to recommend that the Board of Trustees appoint Commissioner Dehn Grunsten as Vice Chairperson of the Plan Commission for a one year term expiring on June 9, 2014. The **MOTION WAS APPROVED** by a unanimous voice vote of the Commission.

C. PC-06-2013: Revised Plan Commission Schedule

It was noted that Commissioner Grunsten was not on the revised schedule as a Commission representative for a Board of Trustees meeting. Mr. Pollock said he would revise the schedule and bring it back to the next meeting.

6. FUTURE SCHEDULED MEETINGS

There was no further discussion regarding future scheduled meetings.

7. ADJOURNMENT

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Grunsten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Stratis to **ADJOURN** the meeting at 11:10 p.m. **ALL MEMBERS VOTING AYE**, the meeting was adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:



July 15, 2013

J. Douglas Pollock, AICP