

**PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**  
**VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE**  
**MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF**  
**OCTOBER 2, 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:** 6 – Hoch, Broline, Grunsten, Praxmarer, Scott, and Trzupek

**ABSENT:** 1 – Stratis

Staff present were Village Administrator Doug Pollock and Assistant to the Village Administrator Evan Walter. Trustee Guy Franzese was also present in the audience.

**II. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES**

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Praxmarer and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to approve the minutes of the September 18, 2017 Plan Commission meeting.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 5 – Praxmarer, Scott, Hoch, Broline, Trzupek

**NAYS:** 0 – None

**ABSTAIN:** 1 – Grunsten

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 5-0.

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

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

**Z-11-2017: Special Use – 15W308 Frontage Road (VIP Paws); Special Use Approval and Findings of Fact; continued from August 21, 2017 and September 18, 2017.**

As directed by Chairman Trzupek, Mr. Walter described this request as follows: the hearing is a continuation for a special use approval for VIP Paws. Staff has requested that their petition be continued to the November 6, 2017 meeting, at which time the petitioner should either present to the Plan Commission or have their petition cancelled.

There being no discussion, Chairman Trzupek asked for a motion to continue the hearing for Z-11-2017.

At 7:33 p.m. a **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Hoch and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Grunsten to continue the public hearing for Z-11-2017 to November 6, 2017.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 6 – Hoch, Grunsten, Scott, Broline, Praxmarer, and Trzupsek

**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 6-0.

**Z-14-2017: 11650 Bridewell Drive (McNaughton Development); Text Amendment, Variation, and Findings of Fact**

As directed by Chairman Trzupsek, Mr. Pollock described this request as follows: the petitioner requests an amendment to Planned Unit Development Ordinance #A-834-20-16 to permit an R-5 Planned Unit Development on 19.76 acres rather than the previously approved 22.5 acres; with 44 single-family homes rather than 52 homes; and with changes to the street, landscaping, and building elevation plans; also requests variation from or an amendment to Section VI.H.4.b(6) to permit a Planned Unit Development on 19.76 acres rather than the required minimum of 20 acres.

Chairman Trzupsek asked Mr. Pollock to summarize the differences between the previously approved PUD at 11650 Bridewell and the petitioner's proposal in Z-14-2017. Mr. Pollock said that the previous approval had 22.5 acres on two parcels, the gross density was slightly lower for the current proposal, while the concept plan accounts for a 100 foot setback covenant on Commonwealth Drive and is generally similar with detached homes and common open space.

Richard Kozarits, representing the property owner, gave a brief history of the property from a zoning, engineering, and development perspective.

John Barry, McNaughton Development, described the site plan as being 44 single-family homes. He said that the proposal eliminated the 2.7 acres that were previously used by the Weekley proposal because McNaughton Development did not feel that they added value to the property. He described a dry-bottom creek bed that would be put in and act as stormwater retention. He discussed that the development would complete all concrete walk paths on Bridewell Drive and around the lake. He discussed the landscape plan, which would include a fence on the north side of the property as well as add a berm to further delineate the homes from I-55. He said that the petition proposed a 30,000 square foot land dedication to the Pleasant Dale Park District in lieu of part or all required monetary donations.

Mr. Barry said that sidewalks were a challenge due to the 100 foot setback covenant along Commonwealth Avenue. He said that the petition proposes installing a 4 foot carriage walk along the east side of the interior road instead of a traditional sidewalk with parkway between the walk and the street. He discussed the footprint of the buildings being generally 45 by 70 feet in dimension, which the owners would own while the HOA would maintain all other aspects of the property. He said that the floor plans would be ranch and two-stories with first-floor master suites. He said that the tentative price was in the \$700,000-800,000 range.

Chairman Trzupsek said that it appeared that the McNaughton proposal was much narrower from face-to-face than the Weekley proposal. Mr. Barry said that there is an average 78-foot face-to-face span compared to a 100-foot span in the Weekley plan.

Alice Krampits, 7515 Drew, asked if there were common parking areas. Mr. Barry said that there are extra parking spaces provided at a ratio of ½ space per unit. Ms. Krampits asked how wide the loop road would be. Mr. Barry said that the road would conform to all Village specifications at 28' wide and that they would not be dedicated to the Village. Ms. Krampits asked where the snow

would be plowed if the carriage way was present. Mr. Barry said that the plow drivers would need to be trained to place snow where there was no carriage way present on either side of the street.

Ellen Raymond, 11530 Ridgewood, asked what the benefit to the public is that would grant the petitioner a PUD. Mr. Barry said that the property would have existing buffers maintained and improved and have the pathways as well as the stormwater management be completed. Ms. Raymond asked what the facades would be made of. Mr. Barry said that they would be brick front with a prefabricated wood side and rear with the option of having brick on all sides.

Commissioner Scott asked how the stormwater would be managed within the neighborhood. Dwayne Gillian, V3 Engineering, explained the concept of a dry-bottom pond with native plants at the base to help water infiltrate through the ground. Commissioner Scott asked what type of curb would be installed. Mr. Barry said that a rolled curb would be installed to reduce the number of curb cuts. Commissioner Scott asked about side separations between homes. Mr. Barry said that 10 feet would be the average separation. Commissioner Scott asked about the waiver of impact fees requested by the petitioner. Mr. Barry said that they were considering making the subdivision age-restricted to mitigate the impact on the school district.

Commissioner Praxmarer asked about age-restricted developments. Mr. Barry explained that the designation is an option that is legally approved by the federal government. Commissioner Praxmarer asked if any homes are a side load. Mr. Barry said that one design option for an interior side load is available.

Commissioner Grunsten asked if the simulated bridge and entrance would have pavers. Mr. Barry said that both would have pavers. Commissioner Grunsten asked about street lighting. Mr. Barry said that street lights had not been discussed at this time. Commissioner Grunsten asked about mailboxes. Mr. Barry said that the federal government requires that all developments of this type have cluster-style boxes. Commissioner Grunsten asked about wetland impact. Mr. Barry said that there would be minimal wetland impact.

Commissioner Broline asked about access to the development. Mr. Barry said that the access on Bridewell was moved west on Bridewell to allow for more space between this entrance and Commonwealth Avenue.

Commissioner Hoch asked about sidewalks going through the entrance and how there is no access for pedestrians to exit the development without walking on streets. Mr. Barry said that the petitioners would commit to building sidewalk access on both sides of the entryway. Commissioner Hoch asked about the zoning of the lot to the west. Mr. Pollock said that the zoning could be left in place or the previous PUD could be revoked to revert it back to its prior zoning. Commissioner Hoch asked how the development would impact traffic volumes in the area. Javier Millan, KLOA, said that traffic volumes on Bridewell were not significant and that the infrastructure already in place would not be severely impacted by the addition of this development.

Chairman Trzupsek said that he was concerned that the back of the houses on lots 1-6 was facing Interstate 55 and Bridewell Drive. He said that he was also concerned about the sides of certain lots that were prominently exposed to the streets. Mr. Barry said that they had identified approximately nine key lots that would have extra first-floor masonry to help with noise and aesthetic quality. Chairman Trzupsek said that the concept of snow removal with a carriage walk was problematic.

Chairman Trzupsek asked if it would be possible to find 6-12 feet in the plan to accommodate a parkway and sidewalk on one side of the street. Mr. Barry suggested that he could put the sidewalk on one side of the street if he reduced the front setback on the other side from 25 feet to 20 feet. He said that would allow sufficient room for a 5 foot parkway, 5 foot sidewalk, and a 20 foot front setback on the other side of the street.

Paul McNaughton, McNaughton Development, requested that the Plan Commission make their recommendation subject to any conditions that they felt was necessary to grant the PUD, including the inclusion of sidewalks in the plan, in order to move the process along.

Chairman Trzupsek asked for a consensus for a parkway and sidewalk along one side of the interior road and on both sides of the entrance drive. All Plan Commissioners concurred with this suggestion. Mr. Pollock clarified that the sidewalk would be a continuous loop on the inside of the looped street.

Commissioner Grunsten asked if it would be possible to forbid stucco as an exterior wall material. Mr. Pollock confirmed that this was possible.

At 8:49 p.m. a **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Grunsten and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to close the public hearing.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 6 – Grunsten, Scott, Hoch, Praxmarer, Broline, and Trzupsek

**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 6-0.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Scott and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Praxmarer to recommend that the Board of Trustees adopt the petitioner's findings of fact and approve an amendment to Planned Unit Development Ordinance #A-834-20-16 to permit an R-5 Planned Unit Development on 19.76 acres rather than the previously approved 22.5 acres; with 44 single-family homes rather than 52 homes; and with changes to the street, landscaping, and building elevation plans; also requests variation from or an amendment to Section VI.H.4.b(6) to permit a Planned Unit Development on 19.76 acres rather than the required minimum of 20 acres, all subject to the submitted plans and following conditions:

1. The homes on the inside of the looped street shall have a minimum setback from the sidewalk of 20 feet and homes on the outside of the looped street shall have a minimum setback of 20 feet from the curb.
2. A five foot wide sidewalk with a five-foot wide parkway shall be provided on both sides of the entrance drive permitting access to Bridewell Drive.
3. All sidewalks and paths around the lake be installed.
4. Stucco is not permitted as an exterior building material on single-family homes.
5. All key lots must have first-floor masonry on sides exposed to the road as well as have additional foundation landscaping.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 6 – Scott, Praxmarer, Hoch, Scott, Broline, and Trzupsek

**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 6-0.

## V. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

### **S-04-2017: 705 Village Center Drive (Hampton Social); Sign Variations**

As directed by Chairman Trzupek, Mr. Walter described this consideration as follows: the petitioner, Hampton Social, requests variations from the Burr Ridge Village Center PUD to permit more than one building sign per street frontage, to permit a blade sign larger than six (6) square feet in area, and to permit building signs of greater than 50 square feet per street frontage beyond the available balance of building sign area from other tenants, as well as Section 55.11.Y of the Burr Ridge Sign Ordinance to permit painted building signs on exterior walls. The square footage of each proposed sign is as follows: anchor (1510 square feet); ship's wheel (1287 square feet); lobster (754 square feet); and the crests (two signs; 112 square feet each). As a corner tenant in the Village Center, Hampton Social is permitted to install a building sign that is larger than their permitted 100 square feet by transferring part of the unused storefront sign area from non-corner and non-anchor tenants to their storefront if it is approved by the Plan Commission and Board of Trustees. As of the time of the consideration, the Village Center PUD had a sign area balance of 720 square feet.

Mr. Walter said that another petitioner was on the agenda for the October 2 meeting, Kohler Waters Spa (S-05-2017), who, as an anchor tenant, is also eligible to use the balance of additional signage, is requesting a similar variance to add 216 additional square feet beyond their permitted 50 square feet for a sign that they propose to install on their storefront. Mr. Walter said that recommending a variation be granted for S-05-2017 would leave a balance of 504 total square feet of signage available to Hampton Social and other corner and anchor tenants in the Village Center.

Steve Fiorentino, president of operations for Hampton Social, said that his company was excited to be coming to Burr Ridge.

Chairman Trzupek summarized the comments of the Plan Commission saying that the sign proposal was not consistent with the architecture of the Burr Ridge Village Center. Mr. Fiorentino said that the sign proposal was consistent with the signs at another location in the Chicago area and that they were trying to bring energy to their location in the Village Center.

Erica Stewart, Hampton Social, asked if the size of the sign or the painted medium was the issue. Chairman Trzupek said that while the signs were too large, there was no support to allow painted signs in the Village Center.

Chairman Trzupek said that the petitioner should work with staff to tailor their sign package to fit the Burr Ridge Village Center.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Hoch and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Grunsten to continue the consideration to the November 6, 2017 meeting.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 6 – Hoch, Grunsten, Scott, Broline, Praxmarer, and Trzupek

**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 6-0.

**S-05-2017: 775 Village Center Drive (Kohler); Sign Variation**

As directed by Chairman Trzupsek, Mr. Walter described this consideration as follows: the petitioner, Kohler Waters Spa, requests a variation from the Burr Ridge Village Center PUD to permit a building sign larger than 50 square feet. As an anchor tenant in the Village Center, Kohler is permitted to install a building sign that is larger than their permitted 50 square feet by transferring part of the unused storefront sign area from other tenants to their storefront if it is approved by the Plan Commission and Board of Trustees. As of the time of the consideration, the Village Center PUD had a sign area balance of 720 square feet. If a variance is granted for Kohler, a balance of 504 total square feet of signage would then be available to other corner and anchor tenants in the Burr Ridge Village Center.

Chairman Trzupsek asked staff to clarify that this sign request would take 216 square feet of the total balance of signage available. Mr. Walter confirmed that the measurements were made to ensure that all vacant tenants would have access to their full amount of permitted signage based on the linear frontage of their tenant space.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Hoch and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Grunsten to adopt the petitioner's findings of fact and recommend that the Board of Trustees approve a variation to permit a storefront sign greater than 50 square feet for Kohler Waters Spa subject to compliance with the submitted plans.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 6 – Hoch, Grunsten, Scott, Broline, Praxmarer, and Trzupsek

**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 6-0.

**Balac Preliminary Plat of Subdivision and Variations from the Subdivision Ordinance**

As directed by Chairman Trzupsek, Mr. Pollock described this consideration as follows: the petitioner requests approval of a preliminary and final plat of subdivision for the above referenced property. The plat proposes to reconfigure two lots. The two existing lots both have frontage on Drew Avenue. The reconfiguration would result in the two lots both having frontage on 75th Street. The petitioner also requested certain variations from the Subdivision Ordinance. Specifically, the Subdivision Ordinance requires that all subdivisions provide certain infrastructure improvements. In this case, the developer/subdivider is responsible for street improvements on the adjacent side of Drew Avenue and 75th Street. Required improvements include pavement widening, curb and gutter, sidewalks and parkway trees on the adjacent side of both streets. The developer asks for a waiver of these requirements.

Chairman Trzupsek asked the petitioner to confirm for the record that no further variations were necessary to make the lots saleable. The petitioner confirmed that this was correct.

Commissioner Hoch asked about the flooding in the area of Drew Avenue. Mr. Pollock said that engineering and stormwater considerations were part of the subdivision process but were not part of the scope of the Plan Commission review.

Mark Thoma, 7515 Drew, said that the stormwater considerations should be seriously considered for the benefit of the neighbor of the proposed subdivision. Chairman Trzupsek noted this for the record.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Scott and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Praxmarer to recommend that the Board of Trustees approve the preliminary plat of subdivision for the proposed subdivision adjacent of Drew Avenue and 75<sup>th</sup> Street (known as Balac Subdivision) and approve a variation to waive the requirements for installing curbs and sidewalks subject to the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the submitted plat of subdivision.
2. Payment of a fee equal to the engineer's estimated cost of street and sidewalk improvements with said fee going into the Village's capital and sidewalk funds for future street maintenance and future sidewalks within the Village.
3. Planting of the required parkway trees for each lot prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for each of the two homes.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 6 – Scott, Praxmarer, Hoch, Grunsten, Broline, and Trzupsek

**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 6-0.

**S-03-2017: Sign Ordinance Amendment; Non-Commercial Sign Regulation, continued from September 18, 2017**

As directed by Chairman Trzupsek, Mr. Walter described this consideration as follows: this consideration was continued from the September 18, 2017 meeting of the Plan Commission. The purpose was to inform the Plan Commission of the details of the Supreme Court case *Reed v. Town of Gilbert* (henceforth: *Reed*) and how the ruling affects the Burr Ridge Sign Ordinance. The *Reed* ruling made content-based regulation of non-commercial signs unconstitutional.

Commissioner Grunsten asked if the ruling affects signs that dealt with sports and activities at schools. Mr. Walter said that those signs would be permitted under the amendments.

Commissioner Broline asked about defining the placement of signs, specifically related to the proposal of one sign per lot. Mr. Walter said that it was ultimately up to the Plan Commission to recommend a policy that would allow for non-commercial signs to be permitted on private property while also controlling sign pollution.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Hoch and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Grunsten to recommend that the Board of Trustees adopt the recommended amendment to the Burr Ridge Sign Ordinance.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 6 – Hoch, Grunsten, Scott, Broline, Praxmarer, and Trzupsek

**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 6-0.

**VI. FUTURE SCHEDULED MEETINGS**

Mr. Walter summarized the public hearings currently filed for the November 6, 2017 meeting as follows: a continuation of Z-11-2017 (VIP Paws) and S-04-2017 (Hampton Social). V-03-2017, a fence variation at 9S155 Madison Street (Piska), is also scheduled.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Hoch and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Scott to **ADJOURN** the meeting at 9:55 p.m. **ALL MEMBERS VOTING AYE**, the meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

**Respectfully  
Submitted:**

---

Evan Walter, Assistant to the Village Administrator