

PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF

JUNE 2, 2014

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 Trzupke.

ROLL CALL was noted as follows:

PRESENT: 6 –Hoch, Praxmarer, Sheth, Grela, Scott, and Trzupke

ABSENT: 2 – Stratis and Grunsten

Also present was Community Development Director Doug Pollock.

2. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Praxmarer and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Grela to approve minutes of the May 5, 2014 Plan Commission meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 6 – Praxmarer, Grela, Scott, Hoch, Sheth, and Trzupke

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 6-0.

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

There were no public hearings scheduled.

4. CORRESPONDENCE

There were no questions or comments regarding the Board Report or the Building Report.

5. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

A. S-03-2014: 6900 Veterans Boulevard (CNH); Traffic Directional Signs Variations

Chairman Trzupke asked Mr. Pollock to summarize this request. Mr. Pollock summarized the request as follows: CNH seeks approval to erect three traffic directional signs each of which exceeds the maximum permitted sign area. The Sign Ordinance permits an unlimited number of traffic directional signs but restricts the size of each sign

to 4 feet in height and 4 square feet in area. The proposed signs would each be 7 feet tall. Two of the signs would be 24.5 square feet and one would be 19.25 square feet.

Mr. Pollock added that this is a very large property and that the existing signs are far less than the maximum permitted area of signs and that the proposed traffic directional signs would be internal to the property. Mr. Pollock said that the staff recommends approval of the sign variations.

The petitioner was represented by its property manager, Mr. Kevin Waller. Mr. Waller said he had nothing to add to the staff summary of this request.

Chairman Trzupsek asked for questions from the public and there were none. He then asked for questions from the Plan Commission.

In response to Commissioner Scott, Mr. Waller said the signs would not be lit. He said they were originally designed to be lit but that CNH decided against illumination.

Commissioner Grela said that due to the size of the parcel, he does not see any problems with the signs.

Chairman Trzupsek asked about other traffic directional sign variations. Mr. Pollock said that Harris Bank and Chase Bank originally asked for such variations but changed their plans to comply. He said those properties did receive variations for other signs.

There being no further questions or comments, Chairman Trzupsek asked for a motion.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Hoch and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the sign variations as requested by S-03-2014 subject to no additional principal signs be added to the property.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 6 – Hoch, Scott, Praxmarer, Grela, Sheth, and Trzupsek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 6-0.

B. PC-03-2014: 140 Tower Drive (AMS Mechanical); Informal Review

Chairman Trzupsek asked Mr. Pollock to summarize this request. Mr. Pollock summarized the request as follows: The owner of the property at 140 Tower Drive, AMS Mechanical, is considering an addition to their building to accommodate growth and with the intent of staying at this location in Burr Ridge. The proposed addition would be located 15.5 feet from the east side lot line rather than the required 40 feet and the total floor area would be 68,304 square feet (0.443 FAR) rather than the permitted 61,750 square feet (0.4 FAR).

Mr. Pollock stated that this is an informal discussion and anything said by the Plan Commission regarding potential variations is tentative pending the public hearing.

Mr. John Berzanskis introduced himself as the owner of the business. He said his business needs more room and they want to stay at this location in Burr Ridge. He said that at this time he is exploring his options. Mr. Berzanskis said the business has been at this location for 15 years and would like to stay for another 15 years.

Chairman Trzupke asked why the addition was to side when there appears to be more room in the back. Mr. Berzanskis said that relocating the loading to the back would interfere with parking and that the internal operations are more conducive to a side yard addition.

Chairman Trzupke asked how many more employees would be accommodated by the addition, Mr. Berzanskis said they currently have 65 employees at this location with 15 to 30 part time people and they would expect to add about 17 more employees.

Commissioner Scott asked about an addition to the west side of the building. Mr. Berzanskis said there is parking on the west side and if they built to the west, the east side would not accommodate the same number of parking spaces.

Commissioner Grela said that he would like to see the business stay in Burr Ridge but is struggling with the proposed 62% decrease in the side yard setback. He said he would like to see what the neighbor would say about a side yard setback variation.

Commissioner Praxmarer noted there appears to be lots of room in the back for an addition. Mr. Berzanskis said that they would lose up to 30 parking spaces and he wants to maintain a balanced front façade. In response to another question from Commissioner Praxmarer, Mr. Berzanskis said that the trucks deliver pipe and similar material for the hearing and air conditioning business.

Commissioner Sheth said he would too would like to know what the neighbor thinks of the side yard variation and noted that it is a substantial variation from the code.

Commissioner Hoch said that the building was beautiful and noted that there is a parking lot adjacent to the side yard where they are proposing a variation. She added, however, that one of the reasons this industrial park is attractive is the green space surrounding the buildings and she would be concerned about reducing that green space to the side of this building. She suggested making the encroachment smaller or pushing it further from the street.

Chairman Trzupke noted that they would be removing two driveways and only creating one new driveway so there would be some increase in green space in the front yard. He said that the setback variation may create an undesirable precedent but that it may also be the least intrusive of the various alternatives for expanding the building. He asked about a west side addition rather than an east side addition as there is more area on the west

side. Mr. Berzanskis replied that he would be concerned about impacts on parking and on the interior flow of operations.

Mr. Berzanskis asked if a greater setback from the street would help for the east side addition. Chairman Trzuppek said it may help a little.

There being no further questions, Chairman Trzuppek summarized the Plan Commission's review stating that there may be some justification for the FAR variation because some of the additional floor area is in second floor offices which does not increase the impervious surfaces but that satisfying the requirements for a setback variation would be more difficult.

C. PC-04-2014: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment – Accessory Residential Structures

Mr. Pollock reported that the Board has directed the Plan Commission to conduct a public hearing to consider an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance regarding the rear yard setback for an accessory building. He said that in response to complaints about a building under construction, Trustee Bolos asked staff if the setback was correct. Mr. Pollock said that in this case, the building met the minimum 10 foot rear yard setback. He said that although the maximum size of an accessory building varies by zoning district and generally ranges from 750 to 2,500 square feet, the rear yard setback is a standard 10 feet in most residential districts. He said the consideration would be to require a larger rear yard setback for larger buildings.

After some questions and discussion by the Plan Commission, Mr. Pollock concluded that the public hearing would be scheduled for an upcoming meeting.

D. PC-05-2014: Annual Appointment of Plan Commission Vice Chairperson

Mr. Pollock said that the rules of the Plan Commission require the appointment of a Vice Chair each year and that the Plan Commission nominates a Commissioner for the position and the Board appoints the Vice Chair. He said the only duty of the Vice Chair is act as Chair in the Chairman's absence.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Hoch and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Praxmarer to recommend that the Board of Trustees appoint Commissioner Greg Scott as Vice Chairman for a one year term expiring on June 9, 2015. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote of the Commission.

6. FUTURE SCHEDULED MEETINGS

Mr. Pollock stated that there are no public hearings scheduled for June 16, 2014.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Scott and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Sheth to cancel the June 16, 2014 meeting. The **MOTION CARRIED** by a unanimous voice vote of the Commission.

7. ADJOURNMENT

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Sheth and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Praxmarer to **ADJOURN** the meeting at 8:30 p.m. **ALL MEMBERS VOTING AYE**, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

**Respectfully
Submitted:**



July 7, 2014

J. Douglas Pollock, AICP