

**PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE
MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF
MAY 16, 2016**

I. 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: 6 – Stratis, Hoch, Broline, Praxmarer, Grela, and Scott

ABSENT: 2 – Grunsten and Trzupek

Also present was Community Development Director Doug Pollock and Trustees Bolos, Franzese, Schiappa and Paveza.

Due to the absence of Chairman Trzupek, Vice Chairperson Hoch served as acting Chair of the meeting.

II. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to approve the minutes of the May 2, 2016 Plan Commission meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 4 – Stratis, Scott, Hoch, and Broline

NAYS: 0 – None

ABSTAIN: 2 – Praxmarer and Grela

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 4-0.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Vice Chairperson Hoch confirmed all those wishing to speak during the public hearing on the agenda for tonight's meeting.

V-02-2016: 638 Gregford Road (Bryant); Fence Variation and Findings of Fact

As directed by Vice Chairperson Hoch, Mr. Pollock described this request as follows: the petitioner proposes to replace an existing wood fence located on the side lot line. The existing fence is a seven-foot tall, solid wood fence that is located in the rear yard, side yard and front yard. The reason for the fence is to provide a screen between the subject property, a single-family residence, and the adjacent park which contains six paddle ball courts located approximately 50 to 60 feet from the common property line. The Zoning Ordinance limits the location of fences to the rear yard, requires that fences be at least 50% open, and limits the height to five feet. Thus, variations are required for the location, the height and the design of the fence.

Vice Chairperson Hoch asked the petitioner if he had anything to add. Mr. Christopher Bryant said that he is the owner and has nothing to add.

Vice Chairperson Hoch asked for public comments and questions. There were none. Vice Chairperson Hoch asked for comments and questions from the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Scott asked if the fence was needed for security reasons. Mr. Bryant said it was more about screening the noise and view of the paddle ball courts.

Commissioner Grela said in most cases he would not consider such a variation but due to the unique location of this property adjacent to the paddle ball courts he thinks it is justified.

Commissioner Praxmarer said she agrees.

Commissioner Broline said he looks favorably on this request due to the lights and noise from the paddleball courts.

Commissioner Stratis said he agrees with the other Commissioners as did Vice Chairperson Hoch.

There being no further discussion, Vice Chairperson Hoch asked for a motion to close the hearing.

At 7:37 p.m. a **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Grela to close the hearing for **V-02-2016**.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 6 – Stratis, Grela, Hoch, Broline, Praxmarer, and Scott

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 6-0.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Grela and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to adopt the petitioner's findings of fact and recommend that the Board approve **V-02-2016** subject to the compliance with the submitted plans.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 6 – Grela, Scott, Stratis, Hoch, Broline, and Praxmarer

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 6-0.

Z-07-2016: 1400 Burr Ridge Parkway and 11650 Bridewell Drive (David Weekley Homes); Rezoning, Text Amendment or Variation, Planned Unit Development, and Findings of Fact

As directed by Vice Chairperson Hoch, Mr. Pollock described this request as follows: the petitioner is seeking rezoning and a Planned Unit Development (PUD) to build 75, detached, single-family clustered homes on private streets. The property is located within the Burr Ridge Corporate Park and consists of 20.2 acres.

Vice Chairperson Hoch asked the petitioner for their presentation.

Mr. Robert Sodikoff, Attorney for the petitioner, introduced the petition and provided a summary of the findings of fact and the justification for the proposed zoning changes. He introduced Mr. Kevin Seay from Weekley Homes to describe the specific development plans.

Mr. Seay said he is the Land Acquisition Manager for David Weekley Homes. He introduced the consultants for the petitioner. He reviewed his company and their experience and attributes. Mr. Weekley then described the site plan, building elevations, engineering and landscaping plans.

Vice Chairperson Hoch asked for public comments and questions.

Ms. Kristy Tramontana said she is the General Manager for the Burr Ridge Village Center and also acts as the property manager for the Burr Ridge Park Property Owners Association. She said the Village Center and the Corporate Park Association support the proposed development. She said the neighborhood character of the development would add to the pedestrian feel of the entire area and the demographics of the neighborhood are identical to the target demographics for shoppers in the Village Center.

Ms. Carol Pangercic, 11450 73rd Place, said that she votes no for the development. She said there are already too many cars, too many bikes, and too many dog walkers and she does not know who the people are.

Mr. Frank Podczerwinski, 11475 73rd Place, said that we are swallowing up too much of the land. He said he is not against development but there are too many homes and too concentrated. He said that this development would kill the existing pond.

Ms. Kathleen Blank, 11465 73rd Place, said that the presentation was lovely. She said she is an empty nester and that a third of the homes on her street are empty nesters. She questioned the parking and said she is opposed to the project. She suggested that the Village looks closely at the traffic impact.

Mr. Fred Boskovich, 11229 72nd Street, asked why the traffic study was not presented. He said that is very important. He said that safety is the first concern. He is concerned about safety on 72nd Street which cannot handle the traffic.

Dr. Ghasson Abboud, 206 Ambriance!, said that the land owner has the right to develop his land and that development under the existing zoning for offices would create a much bigger impact on traffic. He said this is a type of home needed in the Village and he supports the project. He said more residents in this type of housing would be good for the Village and good for the Village Center.

Mr. Don Craggs, 7215 Central Avenue, said this is too much density and does not like that there is only 10 feet between the homes. He said that traffic is bad on 72nd Street and he is opposed.

Mrs. Bonnie Craggs, 7215 Central Avenue, said there used to be a sign at Burr Ridge Parkway and Bridewell saying prohibiting right turns.

Mr. Seay said that he would like to have his traffic consultant provide an overview of the traffic impact study. He introduced Mr. Michael Workman of KLOA.

Mr. Workman described the traffic study and concluded that the traffic would not have a significant impact on the existing streets and that the existing zoning would generate 3 to 4 times as much traffic as the proposed development during peak hours. He also described the access to the development.

Commissioner Stratis asked about visitor parking. Mr. Joe Mathews, Land Planner for the developer, said that there is on-street parking provided and that there is a minimum of 18 feet of driveway for parking and that they can provide additional parking if requested.

Commissioner Stratis said that they could build over 200,000 square feet of office space which would be a minimum of 800 parking spaces and 500 to 600 cars. He said he agrees with the applicant that this would be less traffic impact than an office development. He said he is concerned about the width of the street.

Commissioner Grela clarified that this is a private street. He said that he lives on a private street and that recently someone had a party with 22 cars on his street. He said he is concerned about whether there was enough parking for guests.

Mr. Robert Prock, 7257 Commonwealth Avenue, expressed his concerns about preservation of the trees along the west side of Commonwealth, resident access to the ponds and the overall density of the project.

In response, Mr. Seay said that they would preserve the resident's access to the pond and that they will add more guest parking.

Ms. Ellen Raymond, 11538 Ridgewood Lane, said she is opposed to the density and believes it is too high. She said that she does not believe the developer has satisfied the PUD standards.

Mr. Marvin Sass, 7225 Commonwealth Avenue, said he is concerned the development is too dense. He said he has no problems with homes on the property but he thinks 75 is too many. He asked about the prices for the homes and in response, Mr. Seay said the homes would range from \$560,000 to almost 1 million.

Ms. Blank asked if the police and fire departments had reviewed the plan for emergency access and asked about the number of students that would be generated. She said that there could be 250 cars in this development as each home would have at least 2 to 3 cars. She also suggested that there could be a negative impact on the schools.

Mr. Seay said they had not yet submitted to the Fire District but that they would do that.

Ms. Cathleen Rhoades, 7201 Fair Elm said that traffic is already bad on 72nd Street and this would make it worse. She said that safety and density were concerns.

Mr. Don Raymond, 11538 Ridgewood Lane, said it was a nice design but it was too dense.

Mr. Andrew Morman said he owns the office building at 50 Burr Ridge Parkway. He asked if the property were converted to residential, would they still have to pay into the property owners association. Mr. Pollock said that is a private matter, but he is confident that the change from office to residential would not change the requirement to participate in the property owners association.

Ms. Allison Koehler, 7415 Arbor Drive, suggested that the developer be required to connect the pathway on the east side of the pond to complete the pathway around the entire pond.

Mr. Mark Toma, 7515 Drew Avenue, asked the developer about other projects they have done, if the detention area is included in the open space calculation, and said that he thinks there is no hardship that creates the need for the proposed density.

Ms. Raymond said she is skeptical about the home prices described by the petitioner and questioned how those were determined. Mr. Seay said they did a market study with a nationally known firm and determined the market for the homes.

There being no further public comment, Vice Chairperson Hoch asked for comments and questions from the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Stratis said that he has no problem with residential on this property and agrees that office is not a viable use for this property. He said it makes no sense for R-3 or R-2A with larger lots. He said he is concerned that it is not age restricted. He said that children would have an impact on the schools. Mr. Seay responded that this community is not for people with children. He said that they believe it is not necessary to make it age restricted because the design would preclude families with children.

Commissioner Stratis said that his main concern with the deviations proposed via the PUD is the street widths. He asked if all sides would use the same brick material as shown on the elevations. Mr. Seay said that they would use hardy board on the sides and rear walls.

In response to a question from Commissioner Stratis, Mr. Seay said they would like to leave Commonwealth Avenue alone. He said they have a nice quiet street and he wants to avoid making any changes to the current conditions. Commissioner Stratis suggested that the residents be asked for their preference regarding street improvement.

Commissioner Stratis asked about development of the property under the R-5 District without any deviations from the code. He wondered how many homes could be built under the normal R-5 standards. He suggested that if it cannot be developed under the straight R-5, perhaps the seller needs to lower the price. Mr. Seay responded that they are less than the density of Chasemoor and the difference is Weekley is proposing detached units rather than attached. He said this was because the type of buyer they are targeting prefers a detached unit.

Commissioner Stratis concluded that he likes the idea of residential on this property that he would like to see it be age restricted, and he would like for the density to be reduced.

Commissioner Broline said he was not understanding the concern about the width of the streets. Mr. Seay said the streets will meet Village standards for street widths and only the right-of-way is reduced.

Commissioner Broline asked what they are doing regarding the waterways. Mr. Seay said the lake is maintained by the Burr Ridge Park Association and that this subdivision will contribute to that maintenance. He said the lake is regulated by the Army Corps and rather than modify the lake for their storm water detention, they decided to create their own storm water facilities. He said that they would collect storm water separate from the existing lake, filter that water and regulate its flow into the lake. He said as a result, the water from this property that goes into the lake will be cleaner and the quality of the lake will improve. Mr. Dwayne Gilligan from V3 engineering confirmed and provided additional detail.

Commissioner Broline asked about traffic patterns and access to 72nd Street. Mr. Seay said the traffic study measured existing conditions and the impact of this development. He said the intent of the design was direct traffic to Burr Ridge Parkway and not to Bridewell Drive.

Commissioner Praxmarer said that she is concerned about density and guest parking. She said that there is not sufficient guest parking. Mr. Seay said that they meet or exceed the Village Ordinance but they will look into adding more guest parking. He described the various places that guests can park on the street and in designated areas.

Commissioner Praxmarer asked about snow removal and where they would put snow. Mr. Seay said that they have asked their maintenance people to provide a report on how they would do snow removal and where they put snow.

Commissioner Praxmarer asked about the density of the projects Weekley has done in the Chicago area. Mr. Seay said the Glenview project was 48 units but he did not know the acreage.

Commissioner Grela said that he thinks this project is good but not for Burr Ridge. He said the project is sub-standard. He said he sees no benefit of this project to the community. He mentioned that other projects put in a park and sidewalk connection is not sufficient. He said that the traffic impact would be substantial on 72nd Street. He said the project should be designed to meet the standards of Burr Ridge. He said he is not convinced that there is a need for this project. He suggested 36 units built to subdivision standards of the Village. He said he is not questioning the quality of the project but instead the subdivision standards. He questioned the idea of a maintenance free project. He said residents don't do maintenance themselves anyway but just call others to do the maintenance. Mr. Seay said their intent is that the residents would not have not worry about calling anyone and particularly, when empty nesters go on vacation for extended periods of time.

Commissioner Grela said that development for the sake of development is not good. He said from his perspective, no less than half the number of homes would be appropriate and that the setbacks would have to meet code. He noted the through lots and that they are not desirable. Mr. Seay said that they see this site as being different from other locations in Burr Ridge and that they do not think they could sell homes at such a low density in this location.

Commissioner Grela described the original failure of the Savoy Club project. He said he was concerned about homes next the highway and the noise. In response, Mr. Seay said that because of the location of the property next to the highway is why he would not want to build larger homes on larger lots.

Commissioner Grela concluded that he cannot support the project.

Commissioner Scott said he agrees with the developer's analysis of the market and agrees that we will not likely see an office development on this property. He said something residential is probably the best option for the property. His concern, he said, was the density. He said there is nothing quite like this in the Village. He said the other cluster homes in the Village are less dense and more clustered rather than in a row. Commissioner Scott said he has no problem with an R-5 at this location if it looks like Chasemoor but he does have a problem with R-5 if it looks like the proposed development.

Commissioner Scott asked for clarification regarding the acreage dedicated for the storm water pond and the open space at the south end of the property. He said if you remove the 5 acres from the density calculation, you have a much higher density. Commissioner Scott said the perception of the density is what people will see. He said there are other ways to get to the density without

pushing everything to one area of the property. Mr. Seay said they intentionally designed the subdivision in this manner so that everyone can enjoy the open space.

Vice Chairperson Hoch said she also has a problem with the density and believes that this is too many homes for the property. She said she does not see any compelling reason to change the Comprehensive Plan for this development. She suggested that if the Village know what we want to see on this property that we consider rezoning the property accordingly.

Vice Chair Hoch read into the record the comments received from Chairman Trzupsek who could not attend the meeting. Chairman Trzupsek's comments included questions about the emergency access, the enforcement of variety in home types, whether the developer is going to build on speculation, guest parking, the pocket park, responses to the traffic review study, and whether the Comprehensive Plan should be amended for the proposed project and whether this project and this property is really a transitional area.

Mr. Seay responded that they will work with the Fire District regarding the emergency access gate, that they would have a monotony code to ensure variety in housing types, that some show houses would be built on speculation but the majority of homes would be built for customers, that they will provide additional information regarding the guest parking and the traffic study, and that they do believe there project would be transitional use between the Village Center and the residential neighborhood to the east.

Vice Chairperson Hoch asked if there were any further questions or comments.

At 10:19 p.m. a **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Grela and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to close the hearing for **Z-07-2016**.

Mr. Pollock said that if the hearing is closed, there would be no opportunity for further information to be provided. Commissioner Grela said they had heard from everyone.

Commissioner Stratis suggested that the hearing be continued so that Chairman Trzupsek and others could ask questions.

Commissioner Grela said he thought all questions were answered.

Mr. Pollock suggested asking the petitioner if they want a continuance and if they are willing to reduce the density.

Commissioner Broline said he would like to continue the hearing and get answers regarding parking and other issues.

Vice Chair Hoch asked the petitioner if he would be willing to reduce the density. Mr. Seay said they would like to provide information regarding parking, access and similar issues but is not willing to reduce the density in half as was suggested. He said he is willing to continue the hearing and may be able to reduce the density somewhat but not by a lot.

There being no further discussion, Vice Chairperson Hoch asked for a roll call on the motion to close the hearing.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 5 – Grela, Scott, Stratis, Hoch, and Praxmarer

NAYS: 1 – Broline

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 5-1.

Commissioner Grela said that he will make a motion to deny based on the density and the lack of compliance with Village standards.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Grela and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to direct staff to prepare findings of fact and recommend that the Board deny **Z-07-2016**.

Commissioner Broline said that he has talked to other people who are looking for ways to stay in the community when they need to downsize their homes. He said he has heard that in Hinsdale and believes it to be true in Burr Ridge. He said residents would like to have more places to stay in the Village and they want different types of places to live such as proposed. He said that Chasemoor has been very successful and continues to be. He said he cannot imagine any zoning for the subject property that would be preferable to the proposed project at this location and that office would be more traffic and that R-2 or R-3 would not be successful.

Commissioner Grela said that if they are not willing to reduce the density, there is no reason to continue.

Commissioner Stratis said he agreed, but that he does think this is the right type of project for this property. He added that the issue of traffic on 72nd Street is larger than this project and should be addressed by the Village Board.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 6 – Grela, Scott, Stratis, Hoch, Broline, and Praxmarer

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 6-0.

IV. CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Pollock said he has nothing to add to the Board Report.

V. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

PC-03-2016: Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan – Burr Ridge Park Sub-Area

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to recommend denial of the **PC-03-2016**, an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 6 – Stratis, Scott, Hoch, Praxmarer, Grela, and Broline

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 6-0.

Z-05-2016: 10S371 Madison Street (Valincius); Adoption of Findings of Fact

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to adopt the findings of fact as presented.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 6 – Stratis, Scott, Hoch, Praxmarer, Grela, and Broline

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 6-0.

VI. FUTURE SCHEDULED MEETINGS

Mr. Pollock said there were two matters scheduled for the June 6 meeting.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Scott and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Stratis to **ADJOURN** the meeting at 10:27 p.m. **ALL MEMBERS VOTING AYE**, the meeting was adjourned at 10:27 p.m.

Respectfully
Submitted:



J. Douglas Pollock, AICP

June 6, 2016