

PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE
MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF
AUGUST 21, 2017

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: 7 – Stratis, Hoch, Broline, Grunsten, Praxmarer, Scott, and Trzupek

ABSENT: 0

Also present was Village Administrator Doug Pollock and Assistant to the Village Administrator Evan Walter.

II. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Praxmarer and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Hoch to approve the minutes of the July 17, 2017 Plan Commission meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 6 – Praxmarer, Hoch, Stratis, Scott, Broline, Trzupek

NAYS: 0 – None

ABSTAIN: 1 – Grunsten

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 6-0.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Trzupek confirmed all those wishing to speak during the public hearings on the agenda for tonight's meeting.

**Z-08-2017: Zoning Ordinance Renewal – 101 Tower Drive (Global Luxury Imports);
Special Use Renewal and Findings of Fact; continued from July 17, 2017.**

As directed by Chairman Trzupek, Mr. Pollock described this request as follows: the hearing is a continuation for a special use approval for Global Luxury Imports. There was a consensus at the July 17, 2017, meeting to approve the special use on a permanent basis; the Plan Commission was debating what conditions should be applied to the special use approval. The pertinent conditions discussed were 75% of the gross sales should have an average price of \$75,000 or more (75%/\$75,000), 15% could be sold between \$10,000-29,999, and all other automobiles must be sold for \$30,000 or more, as well as a quarterly sales report provided to the Village to determine compliance with the conditions.

Gary Grasso, on behalf of Global Luxury Imports, requested that the Plan Commission make the special use permanent, eliminate the quarterly reporting requirement except when requested by the Village, remove the 75%/\$75,000 condition, and raise the percentage of sales between \$10,000-29,999 be raised from 15% to 20%. Mr. Grasso stated that the condition requiring showroom cars to be valued at \$87,500 or above was acceptable.

Chairman Trzupek asked if anything being requested will allow Global to sell more cars that they could not sell in the past. Mr. Grasso stated that the conditions would give them more flexibility online but would not impact their showroom inventory. He said that cars that are wholesaled do not count towards their conditional sales figures.

Chairman Trzupek asked to confirm that the petitioner requests the 75%/\$75,000 condition be removed. Mr. Grasso said that this is a request made in good faith that should no longer be on the record for this business.

Chairman Trzupek asked for public comment.

Alice Krampits, 7515 Drew, said that she felt that the gateway location of Global required certain conditions to ensure that they remained a luxury dealer and felt that the conditions should remain in place.

Commissioner Stratis said that he had no problem with eliminating the quarterly reporting requirement and the 75%/\$75,000 condition, as well as raising the limit on lower-priced cars from 15% to 20%.

Commissioner Hoch asked to clarify that the conditions proposed would ensure that 80% of the vehicles sold would be \$30,000 or more and that the showroom cars would be \$87,500 or more, and that she supported the proposal as presented.

Commissioner Broline said that the conditions were set by the Board of Trustees and supported the petitioner's proposal.

Commissioner Grunsten said that the petitioner was a good business and supported the petitioner's proposal.

Commissioner Praxmarer said that the petitioner was a good business and supported the petitioner's proposal. She said that concerns about traffic were not serious in her opinion.

Commissioner Scott said that he supported the petitioner's proposal and reiterated the importance of keeping the \$87,500 showroom minimum clause in place.

Chairman Trzupek said that he supported removing the sunset clause, the reporting requirement, increasing the lower-priced car threshold from 15% to 20%, and agreed that the \$87,500 showroom minimum clause should remain in place. He said that he preferred to leave the 75%/\$75,000 condition in place.

Commissioner Scott said that he had some concerns about removing the reporting requirement entirely, and that a longer timeframe would allow for consistent record-keeping.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Trzupek asked for a motion to close the hearing for Z-08-2017.

At 7:48 p.m. a **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to close the public hearing for Z-08-2017.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Stratis, Scott, Hoch, Grunsten, Broline, Praxmarer, and Trzupek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Scott and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Hoch to adopt the petitioner’s findings of fact and recommend that the Board of Trustees grant a permanent special use approval pursuant to Section X.E.2.a of the Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance for the continued use of the property for automobile sales and service subject to the following conditions:

- A. That 20% of all automobile sales may be between \$10,000-29,999;
- B. Automobiles displayed in the showroom shall have an average sale price of \$87,500 or more;
- C. That the petitioner shall provide records to the Village documenting the sales totals every six months.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Scott, Hoch, Stratis, Broline, Grunsten, Praxmarer, and Trzupek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

Z-11-2017: Special Use Approval - 15W308 Frontage Road (VIP Paws) – Special Use Approval and Findings of Act

As directed by Chairman Trzupek, Mr. Walter described the hearing as follows: the petitioner requests special use approval as per Section VIII.C.2.aa of the Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance for a Kennel in a B-2 General Business District. The petitioner seeks to open a kennel at an existing building located at the northeast corner of North Frontage Road and Park Avenue. The property is improved with a commercial building and parking lot. The petitioner proposes to occupy the entire building with a kennel providing upscale daycare for dogs of all breeds, with services including play zones, private rest areas, grooming, and training facilities. The petitioner has indicated that overnight boarding may be a part of the business in the future but does not intend to offer this service immediately, and would keep animals indoors if this service were offered at a future time. Mr. Walter defined a kennel and added that pet shops and service stores are also listed as a special use in the B-2 Business District.

Gary Grasso, on behalf of VIP Paws, said that staff’s recommended conditions were acceptable to the petitioner.

Chairman Trzupek asked if animals would be kept unattended, outside during the day. Mr. Grasso said that this was not part of their business plan.

Chairman Trzupek asked for public comment.

Judith Mackowiak, 121 74th Street, said that she was worried about noise and smell coming from the property. Mr. Grasso said that dogs would not be kept outside overnight, and that it was not possible to guarantee that no smell would reach her property.

Alice Krampits, 7515 Drew, asked how many dogs would be at the facility at a normal time. Helen Lennertz, the petitioner, said that no more than 100 dogs would be kept indoors at one time. Ms. Krampits asked if trainings would be held outdoors; Ms. Lennertz said that the classes were smaller obedience classes held at off-peak times. Ms. Krampits asked how many employees would be hired; Ms. Lennertz said that the business model does not require more than five employees at this time. Ms. Krampits asked if the site would act as a shelter for dogs; Ms. Lennertz said that there would be no shelter operating on the premises.

Seda Kaplerivic, 7329 Garfield, asked where animal waste would be stored. Mr. Grasso said that the petitioner would comply with all Village and County ordinances regarding health codes. Ms. Lennertz said that the business would order sealed waste containers and have it be picked up twice a week. Ms. Kaplerivic asked if it would be possible to see a more specific site plan including building improvements.

A resident living at 7360 Park Avenue stated that he opposed the kennel at the proposed location.

Mark Thoma, 7515 Drew, said that the interior air will be ventilated and will affect the neighbors.

Ms. Mackowiak said that odor and air quality concerns were the primary reasons for her objection.

Commissioner Scott asked if there was a list of improvements available. Mr. Grasso said that a preliminary site plan was submitted. Commissioner Scott said that the quality of the structure and how it would contain the noise and smell was his primary concern, and was also opposed to the concept of overnight services.

Commissioner Praxmarer asked for the professional background of the petitioner. Ms. Lennertz said that she and her family have been in the grooming and daycare business for over 30 years.

Commissioner Grunsten asked if the petitioner's professional experience was a stand-alone business. Ms. Lennertz said that her business experience is primarily on a stand-alone basis. Commissioner Grunsten asked if the proposed outdoor play area was where training would take place. Ms. Lennertz said that this was the case.

Commissioner Grunsten asked if there was a standard number of persons or animals per square foot in a building. Ms. Lennertz said she was unaware of such a standard but would not put employees or animals at risk due to overcrowding.

Commissioner Broline asked what materials the walls were made of. Ms. Lennertz said that they were made of metal with drywall and insulation on the interior. Commissioner Broline asked how their business would differ from other kennels, specifically to the kennel on 83rd Street. Ms. Lennertz said that they plan to offer a similar range of services.

Commissioner Hoch said that she required more information to make a final decision and expressed concerns at the quantity of parking onsite.

Commissioner Stratis asked if the parking shown on the site plan was all that was included on the property. Ms. Lennertz confirmed this. Commissioner Stratis asked about the surface of the outdoor play area. Ms. Lennertz said it would be AstroTurf. Commissioner Stratis asked if each

animal would have their own kennel. Ms. Lennertz said that most kennels do not cage animals unless they were unruly towards other animals, but would have some to be prepared. Commissioner Stratis asked if part of the recommendation was to bring the parking lot into compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Walter said that the parking lot was currently non-compliant and that staff recommends curbs and landscaping if the petition were approved. Commissioner Stratis asked if parking could be added on the front of the building. Mr. Walter said that due to limited space available that it would be unlikely.

Commissioner Stratis asked if it were possible to install smoke eaters as found in casinos, and said that the building appears very small for the capacity of the business plan.

Chairman Trzupek said that it would be best to continue the hearing to establish a more specific site and building improvement plan. Mr. Grasso said that the petitioner would like to come back at the next meeting to address the Commission's questions.

At 8:28 p.m. a **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Grunsten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to continue the hearing for Z-11-2017 to the September 18, 2017 Plan Commission meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Grunsten, Scott, Praxmarer, Broline, Stratis, Hoch, and Trzupek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

Z-10-2017; Special Use Approval - 412 Rockwell Court (Spencer) - Special Use Approval and Findings of Fact

As directed by Chairman Trzupek, Mr. Walter described the hearing as follows: the petitioner requests special use approval pursuant to Section X.B.7.d of the Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance to permit outdoor on-site parking of business-related trucks. The petitioner seeks to operate a permitted business in an existing building located at the northeast corner of Grant Street and Rockwell Court just north of 79th Street. The property is improved with an approximately 140,000 square foot commercial building and private parking lot. The petitioner is seeking special use approval to store between 30-40 commercial service vans and trucks outside of the building on the property overnight; the Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance does not permit outdoor, overnight parking of commercial trucks in an industrial area. The parking of trucks outside of an enclosed building overnight is not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance. However, Section X.F.2.k of the Zoning Ordinance allows a special use request for outside storage “provided that storage is located to the rear of the principal building, is screened on all sides, does not exceed the height of the screening, and is not visible from any adjacent streets or residential areas”.

Roy Spencer, petitioner and owner of PermaSeal, described his business to the Plan Commission. He said that he is attempting to relocate his corporate headquarters from Downers Grove to Burr Ridge and the facility at 412 Rockwell was a good location. He said that he plans to improve the facility with a training center which would host regional trainings and seminars.

Chairman Trzupek asked when trucks leave and return to the facility, and whether they are dispatched during the night. Mr. Spencer said that trucks are loaded between 6:30-7am and return

between 3-6pm; he also said that emergency employees take their trucks home at night and no activity occurs on premises after the close of business.

Chairman Trzuppek asked for public comment.

Marilyn Patterson, 7630 Hamilton, said that she is opposed to outdoor truck parking.

Scott Graves, 7800 Hamilton, asked if the trucks were cargo vans or semi-trucks. Mr. Spencer said that his fleet is comprised of cargo vans, and any semi-trucks that will be on the property will be vendors delivering goods to the facility. Mr. Graves asked if there were pictures of the fence. Commissioner Stratis said that the fence will be solid if one is recommended.

Mr. Graves asked if the parking lot would be expanded. Mr. Spencer said he does not anticipate such a need.

Mr. Graves asked where the Village defined the rear of the property to be. Mr. Walter said that the parking lot to the east of the building represents the rear of the property in regards to zoning.

Mr. Graves asked how tall the fence needs to be to properly screen the view from 79th Street as well as the residential homes to the east. Mr. Walter said that there are trees on berms on both the south and east side, and staff recommended that an 8' solid fence be installed at these property lines to further screen the lot.

Mr. Graves asked if crime had occurred at the Downers Grove location. Mr. Spencer said that there were no crimes that occurred at their property as a result of break-ins.

Commissioner Stratis asked if Burr Ridge can collect sales tax from the business. Mr. Spencer stated that a very small portion of their business was retail-oriented and that services are only taxed under a use tax. Commissioner Stratis asked to clarify the nature of the special use request. Mr. Walter said that the special use request is to allow the petitioner to exceed the permitted amount of overnight parking in the Zoning Ordinance. Commissioner Stratis asked if security cameras and lights would be installed, and if they would be on all night. Mr. Spencer said that cameras lights would be installed and that they would be on all night. Commissioner Stratis asked if vehicle maintenance occurs on site. Mr. Spencer said that they do maintenance on site, but it is done indoors. Commissioner Stratis asked if any petroleum is stored on site. Mr. Spencer said that they do not store any petroleum on site. Commissioner Stratis asked if the petitioner was buying or leasing the property. Mr. Spencer said that he intended to purchase the property. Commissioner Stratis asked to summarize the improvements planned for the facility. Mr. Spencer said that the primary improvements will be for the training center, but new logistical improvements would be made as they were identified. Commissioner Stratis asked if outdoor speakers would be installed. Mr. Spencer said that he would not install outdoor speakers.

Commissioner Hoch asked if the petitioner had met with staff prior to tonight. Mr. Walter said that the petitioner did have a pre-application meeting with staff. Commissioner Hoch asked if improvements could be made to the landscaping at the southwest corner of the property. Mr. Walter said that some landscaping improvements could be proposed, potentially incorporated into a sign.

Commissioner Grunsten asked if there was any public comment submitted before the meeting. Mr. Walter said that only information-seeking inquiries were made.

Commissioner Praxmarer asked what kind of loading and unloading would occur with the trucks. Mr. Spencer said that any materials related to the jobs that are needed are put in trucks. Commissioner Praxmarer asked if the business owned or leased vehicles. Mr. Spencer said the business owns the fleet and does not use sub-contractors.

Commissioner Scott asked if any site or landscaping plans had been submitted. Mr. Walter said that the Village hadn't received any documents yet, but that the petitioner would be doing so at a later time. Commissioner Scott asked if the petitioner was under contract for the property. Mr. Spencer said that they were not yet under contract. Commissioner Scott asked what the process is for siting a fence. Mr. Walter said that the siting the fence could be optimally done during the fence permitting process.

Chairman Trzupke asked if the petitioner would be adding drive-in doors. Mr. Spencer said that they were planning to add 3-4 additional doors. Chairman Trzupke asked if they would be using the docks at the front of the building. Mr. Spencer said he did not plan to initially use that part of the building. Chairman Trzupke asked where best to site the fence to accommodate the petitioner, but to not overbuild. Mr. Spencer said that he would prefer to site it parallel with the north wall of the building. Chairman Trzupke asked if the petitioner was aware of staff's recommendations and had any issues with them. Mr. Spencer said he was aware of them and found them to be acceptable.

Chairman Trzupke asked what staff meant by interior-facing fence. Mr. Walter explained that interior-facing meant that the fence posts and support structures needed to be on the inside of the fence.

Commissioner Stratis asked about a structure on the proposed picture. Mr. Spencer said that it was a temporary storage structure. Commissioner Stratis asked where the fence on the east lot line would be located. Mr. Spencer said he would go as far as necessary to encapsulate the parking lot. Commissioner Stratis said that he preferred staff's recommendation of an 8' fence to a 10' fence.

Chairman Trzupke asked about a structure on the south of the building. Tim McCahill, on behalf of the petitioner, said that this structure would be removed by the previous tenant upon closing.

Brian Graves, 7720 Hamilton, asked how many trucks will have back-up alarms. Mr. Spencer said that this feature was an OSHA requirement but the additional parking space would necessitate less backing up now.

Chairman Trzupke asked if it would be possible to orient the parking lot to have more pull-through spaces. Mr. Spencer said that he would explore this possibility.

Jill Graves, 7720 Hamilton, said she was concerned about safety with the building located close to Gower School. She also said she wanted to see more landscaping installed near the road. Mr. Spencer said that trucks would likely be naturally diverted to Frontage Road, bypassing Gower School, due to the location of their jobs.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Trzupke asked for a motion to close the hearing for Z-10-2017.

At 9:14 p.m. a **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Scott and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Grunsten to close the hearing for Z-10-2017.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Scott, Grunsten, Stratis Hoch, Broline, Praxmarer, and Trzupsek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Scott and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Stratis to adopt the petitioner’s findings of fact and recommend that the Board of Trustees grant special use approval pursuant to Section X.B.7.d of the Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance to permit outdoor on-site parking of business-related trucks in a G-I General Industrial District subject to the following conditions:

- A. All outdoor, overnight parking of vans and trucks shall be limited to the east parking lot.
- B. Outside overnight parking shall be limited to vans and trucks each with a weight not exceeding 24,000 pounds.
- C. A maximum number of 40 vans or trucks may be parked outside overnight on the property.
- D. Only vans or trucks owned and operated by PermaSeal shall be parked on the premises overnight.
- E. The east parking lot shall be screened along the south, east, and north portions, including along the east lot line extending to the center-lot line of Rockwell Court, with a solid, interior-facing, 8’ tall commercial-grade fence. Final fence plan shall be subject to staff review and approval.
- F. Landscaping shall be added along the south property line. Final landscaping plans shall be subject to staff review and approval.

V-02-2017: Fence Variation - 10S650 Oak Hill Court (Berliner) - Variation and Findings of Fact

As directed by Chairman Trzupsek, Mr. Walter described the hearing as follows: the petitioner requests a variation pursuant to Section IV.J.1.b of the Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance to permit a fence in the interior side yard. The petitioner represents the owner of 10S650 Oak Hill Court, a 0.67 acre property with a single-family residence. The existing home was built prior to annexation of the property into the Village. A fence was previously located on the rear and side yard lot line abutting the property to the west at 16W250 93rd Place. This fence was installed prior to the property’s annexation into the Village. Mr. Walter said that to the best of his knowledge, the fence had collapsed in 2016 and under current Village policy, a collapsed fence can no longer be maintained and must be replaced. The owner seeks a variation to construct a fence that will extend from the rear yard into the side yard of the property.

Ian Berliner, on behalf of the property owners, said that the petitioners are seeking the variance to permit the fence in their side yard was for security. He said that the lot has a unique orientation. Mr. Berliner said that the petitioner removed the fence under the direction of the Village code inspector with the understanding that they could replace it on the same location.

Marina Krtinic, 10S650 Oak Hill, said that she was informed by Cheryl Smith, Village of Burr Ridge Code Enforcement Officer, that the fence must be removed due to its condition. Ms. Krtinic said that she was under the assumption that the fence could be replaced on the location where it originally stood because it was legally non-conforming. Ms. Krtinic said that fences on side lot lines were common in her subdivision and that her fence would not be located in a unique position.

Chairman Trzupek asked for public comment.

Serge Luka, 10S681 Oak Hill, said that the fence only allowed in the rear yard does not look complete and the variance should be granted.

Robert Racic, 720 Hartford Lane, said that his mother owns the property at 16W250 93rd Place, and that she prefers the variance to be denied.

Commissioner Scott asked if staff had seen a copy of the proposed siting of the fence. Mr. Walter said that staff had seen it and the location is the only element of the fence that is non-compliant.

Commissioner Praxmarer said she was concerned about the new fence being non-conforming.

Commissioner Grunsten asked about public comment on this matter. Mr. Walter said that the only objection that staff has received was from the neighbor, Ms. Racic. Commissioner Grunsten asked about the nature of fences in the area as to whether they have been given variances as well. Mr. Walter said that it is likely that some of the fences in the Oak Hill Subdivision are legally non-conforming but could not give any exact figures.

Commissioner Broline asked where the front door is on the property. The petitioner identified its location.

Commissioner Hoch said she was against granting the variance based on her interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Stratis said that he interprets this lot to be a corner lot, and that the lot was unique enough to warrant a variance.

Chairman Trzupek said that while the lot is unique, the proposed fence location would be in the neighbor's front yard. Chairman Trzupek asked if Ms. Racic would remove her objection if the fence was moved off of her property. Ms. Racic said that she wished to maintain her objection regardless of which property the fence was located.

Mr. Pollock said that it would be difficult to set a precedent for allowing a fence variance based on the location of a previously existing fence.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Trzupek asked for a motion to close the hearing for V-02-2017.

At 9:50 p.m. a **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Scott and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Stratis to close the hearing for V-02-2017.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Scott, Stratis, Grunsten, Hoch, Broline, Praxmarer, and Trzupek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Scott and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Stratis to adopt the petitioners findings of fact and recommend that the Board of Trustees approve a variance from Section IV.J.1.b of the Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance to permit a fence in an interior side yard, subject to the following condition:

- A. The fence must be stained if it is made of wood.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Scott, Stratis, Grunsten, Hoch, Broline, Praxmarer, and Trzupke

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

Z-09-2017; Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment - Permitted and Special Uses in the B-1 District

As directed by Chairman Trzupke, Mr. Walter described the hearing as follows: the petitioner requests consideration for an amendment to Section VIII.B of the Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance to reclassify all special uses as permitted uses in B-1 Business Districts. Although the amendment would apply to all properties in a B-1 District, the petitioner currently owns the property at 74-326 Burr Ridge Parkway, otherwise known as County Line Square and is primarily interested in permitted uses for County Line Square. County Line Square contains various retail and service uses including but not limited to a grocery store, a dry cleaner, and several restaurants. The B-1 District is intended “to provide a location suitable to accommodate a combination of retail, service, and office uses in a commercial and business district.” Several amendments have been made to the B-1 Business District in recent years regarding the classification of permitted and special uses in an attempt to uphold this intent. In 2009, an amendment was made in an attempt to preserve the original intent of the Business District; the Plan Commission felt that the following uses did not necessarily meet the prescribed intent for a permitted use in the B-1 and B-2 Districts and were made special uses; these were banks and financial institutions, financial services offices, insurance offices, medical, dental, and optical offices and clinics, real estate offices, and travel agencies. In the Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance, there are currently 45 uses listed in Section VIII.B.1 as permitted uses and 40 uses listed in Section VIII.B.2 as special uses in the B-1 Business District. A complete list is available for review in the attachments. The petitioner is requesting that all 40 special uses in the B-1 District be re-classified as permitted uses.

Jim DeBruyn, on behalf of Robert Garber, said that the purpose of the request is to maximize the amount of permitted uses in the B-1 Business District to maintain the viability of the petitioner’s property.

Chairman Trzupke asked if going through the special use process was difficult for potential tenants. Mr. DeBruyn said that more permitted uses allows for easier marketing of the property and simplifies the process for both the petitioner and the Village.

Alice Krampits, 7515 Drew, said that she opposed wholesale changes to the Zoning Ordinance. She said that the Village should retain a role in the economic development of properties in the B-1 Business District.

Commissioner Stratis said that he would be amenable to discussing each use individually but could not support the nature of the request. Mr. DeBruyn said that most of the permitted uses are retail-oriented in nature, while most of the special uses were service-oriented in nature.

Commissioner Broline said that the Village needs to have a say in certain special uses, such as banquet halls. Mr. Walter said that the purpose of the B-1 Business District is to provide retail services directly to the residents, as there was not a large amount of available retail space in the Village.

Commissioner Praxmarer said that she agreed with staff's interpretation of the B-1 Business District and did not support the request.

Chairman Trzupke asked about the context of the 2009 change to the Zoning Ordinance which added several special uses. Mr. Walter said that the change was made to ensure the retail-oriented nature of the B-1 Business District.

Chairman Trzupke said that he thought that the commercial market may have changed from 2009 to the present. Mr. Pollock said that there did not appear to be much turnover at properties in B-1 Business Districts.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Trzupke asked for a motion to close the hearing for Z-09-2017.

At 10:08 p.m. a **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to close the hearing for Z-09-2017.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Stratis, Scott, Grunsten, Hoch, Broline, Praxmarer, and Trzupke

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to recommend that the Board of Trustees deny an amendment to Section VIII.B of the Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance to reclassify all special uses as permitted uses in B-1 Business Districts.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Scott, Stratis, Grunsten, Hoch, Broline, Praxmarer, and Trzupke

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

IV. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no discussion on correspondence.

V. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

S-02-2017: Conditional Sign Approval – 7425 Wolf Road (Pleasant Dale Park District); Conditional Approval and Findings of Fact

Mr. Walter summarized the request of the petitioner as follows: the petitioner is requesting a conditional sign approval pursuant to Section 55.04.B.2 of the Burr Ridge Sign Ordinance to permit a ground sign in a residential district. The proposed sign will feature the logo for the Pleasant Dale Park District as well as contain the text "Walker Park Recreation Center". The proposed sign conforms to the Sign Ordinance in all facets.

Matt Russian, Pleasant Dale Park District, said that the goal of the Park District is to unify the aesthetic nature of the signs at their property on Wolf Road.

Chairman Trzupsek asked why the Plan Commission needed to approve this sign. Mr. Walter said that all ground signs in residential districts, such as the petitioner's, must receive conditional sign approval. Mr. Pollock said that other signs in the park are either not regulated by the Sign Ordinance because they are not visible from the street, or they are exempt because they are private wayfinding signs.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to adopt the petitioner's findings of fact and recommend that the Board of Trustees approve a conditional sign approval as per S-02-2017.

ROLL CALL VOTE was as follows:

AYES: 7 – Stratis, Scott, Praxmarer, Grunsten Hoch, Broline, and Trzupsek

NAYS: 0 – None

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 7-0.

VI. FUTURE SCHEDULED MEETINGS

Mr. Walter said the filing deadline for the September 18, 2017, meeting was August 21, 2017. Mr. Walter said that there is a special use petition for a curling club, a special use and variance petition by St. Mark's Montessori School to put a fence in a corner side yard, and the continuation for VIP Paws. No filings had been made for the October 2, 2017, meeting and the deadline is September 5, 2017.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Hoch to **ADJOURN** the meeting at 10:20 p.m. **ALL MEMBERS VOTING AYE**, the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

**Respectfully
Submitted:**

Evan Walter, Assistant to the Village Administrator