

**VILLAGE OF BURR RIDGE PLAN COMMISSION/ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

**MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF JUNE 17, 2024**

**I. ROLL CALL**

The meeting of the Plan Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals was called to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Burr Ridge Village Hall Board Room, 7660 County Line Road, Burr Ridge, Illinois by Chairman Trzupek.

**ROLL CALL** was noted as follows:

**PRESENT:** 7 – McCollian, Parrella, Petrich, Broline, Stratis, Morton, and Trzupek  
**ABSENT:** 1 – Irwin

Planner Ella Stern was present.

**II. APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES – JUNE 3, 2024**

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Petrich and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Irwin to approve the minutes of the June 3, 2024 meeting.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 6 – Petrich, Stratis, McCollian, Broline, Morton, and Trzupek  
**NAYS:** 0 – None  
**ABSTAIN:** 1 – Parrella

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 6-0 with one abstention.

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Chairman Trzupek introduced the public hearings on the agenda. Chairman Trzupek requested to swear in all those wishing to speak on such matters on the meeting agenda and a swearing in of such individuals was conducted.

**A. Z-07-2024: 311 Shore Drive (Tesla); Special Use Amendment and Findings of Fact [CONTINUED FROM JUNE 3, 2024]**

Chairman Trzupek introduced the case and asked for a summary. Stern stated case Z-07-2024 was a request for an amendment to a special use to permit automobile rentals at an existing business pursuant to Ordinance #A-834-01-23 and Section X.F.2.a of the Burr Ridge Zoning Ordinance. Stern stated the property was zoned General Industrial PUD in the Hinsdale Industrial Park. Stern stated the petitioner requests an amendment to a special use to permit automobile rentals as an accessory use to the existing business. Stern stated the service will be provided exclusively to clients and customers of the body repair facility, Monday through Friday, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Stern noted that Tesla Motors intends to provide customers with access to temporary transportation when their vehicles are being repaired or serviced. Stern stated Tesla Motors was an auto repair facility that services vehicles involved in collisions, including work on frames, body

panels, and painting. Stern noted on January 23, 2023, Tesla Motors received a special use for automobile and equipment service, outdoor storage, and a fence. Stern stated the employees park within the fenced area, reserving the front parking spaces near the main entrance for customers. Stern stated that only the sale of parts was permitted, and repair work on vehicles was restricted to the interior of the building. Stern stated the special use approval was to allow outdoor storage of vehicles awaiting repair work (damaged) or completed and waiting for customer pick-up. Stern stated the vehicles actively undergoing work were stored indoors until completion. Stern noted the vehicles stored overnight and outside are within the fenced area. Stern stated Tesla Motors completed the build-out and fence, and there were no known issues with the operations. Stern showed the proposed site plan, noting the location of the five proposed parking stalls for automobile rentals. Stern stated that Tesla Motors currently employs 28 employees. Stern stated that there were two ADA spaces and 88 regular parking spaces. Stern noted that the Village's Zoning Code required two parking spaces for every three employees. Stern stated that Tesla Motors must have 20 parking spaces but will maintain around 90 parking spaces.

Chairman Trzupke confirmed the first five recommended conditions were from the previous special use approval, and staff included a sixth condition.

David Coulter, Tesla's representative, expressed enthusiasm about establishing a new rental program at the subject site. Coulter noted that Tesla had contributed to the community with the existing superchargers nearby. Coulter stated the rental cars would offer Tesla rentals to customers requiring vehicle repairs, ensuring a one-for-one vehicle exchange without increasing site traffic. Coulter stated Tesla planned to maintain a fleet of 20–30 vehicles on-site, aligning with their monthly repair volume, which may reduce overall traffic by providing immediate rental options. Coulter noted that the initiative was anticipated to generate additional tax revenue for the Village.

Commissioner Parrella confirmed with the petitioner that the facility would only offer rental cars and not provide loaner cars. Coulter noted that the site does not conduct any sales from the building and that the rentals are exclusively for customers receiving vehicle service.

Commissioner Petrich asked about the rental cars. Coulter pointed to the five dedicated spaces for rental cars. Coulter stated Tesla expected to manage a fleet of about 30 vehicles at the site, but three vehicles would be present. Coulter noted the additional rental vehicles would be stored outside the fence. Coulter stated that security was not a concern.

Commissioner Broline expressed support for the case.

Commissioner Stratis asked if there were EV chargers on the site. Coulter stated there were EV chargers on the site, behind the fenced area, but that the primary focus of customers at the site was vehicle repairs rather than vehicle charging. Coulter noted that establishing public EV charging in an industrial business park would require significant infrastructure investment. Coulter stated that customers preferred EV chargers similar to those in the Village Center, where they could charge their vehicles while engaging in activities such as shopping and dining. Commissioner Stratis asked if people could drop

off the cars in the evening. Coulter stated the vehicles and rental cars must be dropped off between Monday and Friday, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., to ensure the vehicles are secured.

Commissioner Morton confirmed with the petitioner that the 20–25 rental cars in inventory would be stored behind the fence, and five cars would be in the designated rental area. Commissioner Morton asked questions regarding the anticipated parking lot density. Coulter stated that an initial concern regarding parking density arises primarily during the launch of the rental process when vehicles are first brought to the site and rented out. Coulter noted it was not feasible to have all 30 vehicles on-site simultaneously due to parking constraints involving customer vehicles under repair, employee parking needs, and ensuring accessibility for emergency vehicles and site navigation. Coulter noted that rental operations were initiated with five vehicles at a time across all the centers to manage the logistical challenges effectively. Commissioner Morton questioned the Findings of Fact regarding serving the community at large and shorter service times. Coulter stated that the service benefits the community by offering a convenient option for efficient vehicle repairs locally. Coulter noted that the rentals primarily cater to Tesla customers, enabling them to drop off and pick up vehicles without needing to visit another rental. Coulter stated Tesla was committed to advancing their environmental goals by promoting a transition to a more sustainable future. Coulter noted the service was exclusive to Tesla collision centers, ensuring a quicker turnaround time for vehicle repairs through rapid vehicle swaps.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Morton and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Broline to close the public hearing for Z-07-2024.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 7 – Morton, Broline, McCollian, Parrella, Petrich, Stratis, and Trzupek  
**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 7-0

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner McCollian and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Parrella to approve the special use amendment to Ordinance A-834-01-23 for case Z-07-2024 to permit automobile rentals at an existing business, with Findings of Fact, and the following conditions:

1. The special uses are limited to Tesla Motors, Inc.
2. The development shall substantially comply with the submitted plans, attached as Exhibit A.
3. The fence is permitted to be up to 7' in height, within the side yard, and with the flat picket top as depicted on the plans attached as Exhibit A.
4. Vehicle repair work shall be confined to the interior of the building only.
5. Only the sale of parts is permitted. There shall be no sales of vehicles from the premises.
6. Only five parking stalls are permitted for automobile rentals as an accessory use to the existing business. The service must be provided exclusively to clients and customers of the body repair facility.

Stern noted that the June 24, 2024, Village Board meeting was cancelled, and the item would likely be on the July 8, 2024 Village Board agenda.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 7– McCollian, Parrella, Petrich, Broline, Stratis, Morton and Trzupke  
**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 7-0

**B. V-04-2024: 16W030 83<sup>rd</sup> Street (Double Good); Variations and Findings of Fact [CONTINUED FROM MAY 20, 2024]**

Chairman Trzupke introduced the case and asked for a summary. Stern stated that petitioner had withdrawn the case.

**C. V-05-2024: 6520 S. Elm Street (Broucek); Variation and Findings of Fact**

Chairman Trzupke introduced the case and asked for a summary. Stern stated that the property was zoned R-3 in the Hinsdale Farms Subdivision. Stern stated Elm Street was the front property line, and Dartmouth Court was the corner side yard. Stern noted that the petitioner seeks to construct an addition to the existing detached garage and a swimming pool and reconfigure the driveway. Stern stated the current detached garage is 474 square feet, and the petitioner seeks to add a 466 square foot addition to the existing 474 square foot detached garage, totaling 940 square feet. Stern stated the property was annexed into the Village of Burr Ridge in July of 2005. Stern noted that based on the Historic Aerial images, the garage was constructed prior to the property's annexation into the Village of Burr Ridge. Stern stated that it appeared that the detached garage was built between 2002 and 2004, while the residence itself was constructed in 1972. Stern noted the house was approximately 16 feet from the corner side yard property line, which did not comply with the minimum setback requirement of 30 feet. Stern stated the proposed addition to the detached garage was north of the existing structure and did not encroach further into the non-conforming setback. The petitioner requests a corner side yard setback of 4 feet and 9½ inches instead of the 30-foot minimum regulation and a rear yard setback of 9 feet and 7¾ inches instead of the 10-foot maximum regulation. Stern summarized the requested variations. Stern showed images of the proposed site plan and elevations.

Chairman Trzupke clarified that the proposed plan involved expanding the existing detached garage to the north of the structure. Chairman Trzupke confirmed the petitioner requested to exceed the 30% rear yard lot coverage. Stern noted the petitioner requested approximately 300 additional square feet for a future patio; however, without a patio, the proposal did not exceed 30% of the rear yard area.

Commissioner Morton questioned if the renovations to the existing single-family home increased the ground area.

John Broucek, the petitioner, stated yes. Commissioner Morton confirmed that if the backyard proposal had been submitted with the initial house plans, staff might have approached issuing the permit differently. Commissioner Morton noted that there was no cure for the setback issues, but there was a cure to permit the detached garage addition by reducing the size of the proposed patio. Stern confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Stratis expressed concerns regarding the variance request, stating that while the proposal appeared acceptable in two dimensions (2D), the challenge was to justify a hardship. Commissioner Stratis mentioned previous cases where variances were requested for reasons such as accommodating large vehicles like RVs, which historically had not been viewed as unique hardships. Commissioner Stratis noted that the current proposal did not increase the existing violation of the 4-foot and 91/2-inch setback but exacerbated non-compliance by suggesting further expansion. Commissioner Stratis noted the Zoning Ordinance regulations were to bring properties into compliance rather than allow expansions of non-conforming structures. Commissioner Stratis expressed concern regarding setting a precedent for future requests. Commissioner Stratis asked the petitioner if he had looked into an addition to the existing home.

Broucek stated his Chevy Sierra did not fit inside the garage due to vertical constraints and the length, as the vehicle extended approximately two feet beyond the 20-foot length of the garage. Broucek noted that he had not looked into an addition.

Commissioner Broline recognized that the size of vehicles had increased over the past few years. Commissioner Broline noted that he did not find a hardship based on the land. Broucek stated the truck did not fit within the detached garage. Broucek confirmed that the size of the structure was permitted, but a variance was needed for the setbacks. Broucek asked if the structure would comply if he were to demolish the detached garage and relocate it 30 feet from the corner side yard. Commissioner Broline noted there may be an issue with the 9-foot clearance.

Commissioner Petrich questions the 77 square feet mentioned in the Findings of Fact. Broucek stated that the neighbor's property ran adjacent to theirs. Broucek noted that the plans submitted for a driveway change proposed crossing into the neighbor's property, which was approved at first. Broucek stated that after the permit was issued, the Village informed him that the construction was not permissible. Broucek noted that the driveway had to be relocated to its current position. Broucek requested to see the small strip of land owned by the neighbor on the aerial view. Stern pointed out the 77-square-foot strip of land. Broucek stated that the neighbor would not sell the portion of land, and he would still have to install a taller garage door.

Chairman Trzuppek agreed with Commissioner Stratis regarding the two-dimension plan. Chairman Trzuppek noted the challenge of finding a hardship that met the criteria for granting a variance. Chairman Trzuppek stated that corner lots often present more complications, noting that if the property were not on a corner, the setback requirement would be 10 feet instead of 30 feet. Chairman Trzuppek recognized that while the garage was initially compliant, the regulations do not permit expansions on non-conforming

structures. Chairman Trzupcek supported the proposed garage addition to the north, noting it was not obtrusive. Chairman Trzupcek expressed concern regarding the constraints imposed by the location of the home and rear yard. Chairman Trzupcek stated that the relocation of the garage, which was initially compliant, may not be reasonable.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Morton and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Parrella to close the public hearing for V-05-2024.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 7 – Morton, Parrella, McCollian, Petrich, Broline, Stratis, and Trzupcek  
**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 7-0

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Morton to deny the variation request from case V-05-2024 to permit (1) a corner side yard setback of 4' 9 ½" instead of the 30' minimum regulations, (2) a rear yard setback 9' 7 ¾" instead of the 10' maximum regulation, and (3) a combined horizontal area of all accessory buildings, structures, and uses to exceed the 30 percent maximum regulation, with Findings of Fact as amended by staff.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 4– Stratis, Morton, Petrich, and Broline  
**NAYS:** 2 – Parrella and Trzupcek

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 4-2

The Commission and Broucek discussed the existing detached garage and setbacks.

**D. Z-05-2024: 340 Shore Drive (Factor 75); Special Use and Findings of Fact [CONTINUED FROM MAY 20, 2024]**

Chairman Trzupcek introduced the case and asked for a summary. Stern stated that petitioner requested the case be continued until the July 1, 2024, Plan Commission meeting.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Petrich and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Stratis to continue the public hearing for Z-05-2024 until the July 1, 2024 meeting.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 7 – Petrich, Stratis, McCollian, Parrella, Broline, Morton, and Trzupcek  
**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 7-0.

**E. Z-06-2024: Zoning Ordinance Amendment Warehouse and Warehousing (Village**

**of Burr Ridge); Text Amendment and Findings of Fact [CONTINUED FROM  
MAY 6, & MAY 20, 2024]**

Chairman Trzupke introduced the case. Chairman Trzupke stated the discussion originated from concerns raised during the CNH proposal, where existing regulations for Light Industrial (L-I) and General Industrial (G-I) zoning districts regarding warehouses and warehousing were incomplete and ambiguous. Chairman Trzupke noted the Plan Commission requested a public hearing to define warehousing and a warehouse. Chairman Trzupke stated on June 10th, the Board of Trustees directed the Plan Commission to hold a public hearing on potential Zoning Ordinance text amendments to review the entirety of Section X: Manufacturing Districts and Section XIV: Rules and Definitions, specify any presently listed use as either permitted, special, or prohibited, as appropriate, and identify and classify uses not currently listed in Section X or Section XIV as permitted, special, or prohibited, and define them. Chairman Trzupke noted the public hearing for the text amendment would be held on July 15th, 2024. Stern confirmed the Plan Commission may wish to withdraw case Z-06-2024 and incorporate the information and research for warehousing into the new text amendment (Z-08-2024). Chairman Trzupke noted the discussion tonight must be confined to the manufacturing districts, specifically the definitions of warehouse and warehousing in the L-I and G-I districts. Chairman Trzupke asked the Commission about withdrawing the petition to address the Manufacturing District as a whole.

Commissioner Parrella stated she supported the review of the text amendments holistically. Chairman Trzupke agreed with Commissioner Parrella.

Chairman Trzupke opened the discussion to the public. There were no public comments.

Commissioner McCollian noted the inconsistencies in the interpretation of zoning definitions across different districts (R-A, L-I, and G-I). Commissioner McCollian stated that some uses were reiterated across zoning districts with additional regulations, and the language varies, which could lead to ambiguity in interpretation. Commissioner McCollian suggested a more structured approach where definitions build upon each other logically, such as starting with the R-A district and then specifying the additional uses for the L-I district and further additions for the G-I district. Commissioner McCollian noted a discrepancy regarding schools in different zoning districts: in the L-I district, schools are restricted to enclosed buildings, whereas in the G-I district, schools are not explicitly limited to enclosed spaces, potentially allowing outdoor activities such as CDL training facilities. Commissioner McCollian stated that refining the definitions could improve clarity and consistency in the Zoning Ordinance regulations.

Commissioner Stratis supported the draft language regarding the definition of warehousing and manufacturing under the L-I permitted uses. Commissioner Stratis noted that 40 percent was a standard percentage in Zoning Codes. Commissioner Stratis agreed with Commissioner McCollian regarding most Zoning Codes being hierarchical.

Chairman Trzupke inquired about the definition of a motor freight terminal. Stern showed the definition of a motor freight terminal on the screen. Commissioner McCollian questioned the inclusion of assembling in the motor freight terminal

definition. Commissioner McCollian questioned the inclusion of storing and warehousing in the definition of the manufacturing establishment.

Commissioner Stratis noted storing may be defined as short-term warehousing. Commissioner Parrella agreed with Commissioner Stratis. The Commission discussed potential definitions.

Commissioner Broline addressed light industrial usage, emphasizing warehousing and the regulation of truck traffic associated with the primary business activities. Commissioner Broline expressed concern that the 40% usage guideline does not adequately address the issue of managing truck traffic. Commissioner Broline discussed vendor control inventory and truck traffic.

Chairman Trzupke questioned if the amount of truck docks could be limited. Stern stated the Commission could potentially limit the amount of truck docks. Stern noted there was a minimum truck dock limitation. Commissioner Stratis suggested implementing a limit on the hours of delivery and requiring a special use for businesses wishing to deviate from the regulation.

Chairman Trzupke asked how many L-I districts were within the Village. Chairman Trzupke expressed concerns about making amendments to the regulations that would make current businesses non-compliant.

Commissioner McCollian discussed a potential overlay district for the CNH property.

Commissioner Broline questioned if hours could be limited if the vendor or principal business maintained control. Commissioner Stratis noted businesses were in charge of maintaining compliance.

Stern discussed the staff report information for the July 15th Plan Commission meeting.

Commissioner Stratis suggested a broad provision for a prohibition against motor freight terminals. Stern noted the Zoning Ordinance defines a motor freight terminal but was not a permitted use. Commissioner Stratis discussed the Saia Trucking facility and stated the property was grandfathered. Commissioner Stratis discussed motor freight terminals.

Commissioner Petrich asked if the Commission would review the Research Assembly district. Stern stated the R-A district was within the Manufacturing district, and the Plan Commission could review the district.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Parrella to direct the Village to withdraw case Z-06-2024 and incorporate the case into the upcoming text amendment (Z-08-2024).

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 7 – Stratis, Parrella, McCollian, Petrich, Broline, Morton, and Trzupke  
**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 7-0

#### **IV. CORRESPONDENCE**



Chairman Trzupek questioned the proceedings of the Board meeting concerning case V-01-2024. Commissioner McCollian noted there was an inconsistency in the Ordinances.

**V. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

**A. S-01-2024: 15W451 91<sup>st</sup> Street (Burr Ridge Middle School); Conditional Sign Approval and Findings of Fact**

Chairman Trzupek introduced the case and asked for a summary. Stern stated the property is zoned R-1/R-3 in the Burr Ridge Middle School Subdivision. Stern stated the petitioner is Burr Ridge Middle School, owner of the building at 15W451 91st Street. Stern stated the petitioner is seeking conditional approval as per Section 55.05 of the Sign Ordinance for a wall sign at a non-residential lot in a Residential District. Stern noted the Sign Ordinance allows each non-residential lot in Residential Districts to have one sign for a non-residential lot or parcel, provided it did not exceed 16 square feet in area. Stern stated the petitioner requested one non-illuminated wall sign on the subject property. Stern noted that the sign is 13.94 square feet and complies with the Sign Ordinance regulations. Stern stated that the subject property currently had one ground sign along 91st Street. Stern noted that the proposed sign is subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees upon review by the Plan Commission. Stern showed the illustration of the proposed sign and sign location.

Chairman Trzupek noted the sign complied with the regulations, but a conditional sign needed Board approval. Stern confirmed conditional sign approvals did not require a public notification.

The Commission stated support of the proposed sign.

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner Stratis and **SECONDED** by Commissioner Morton to approve from case S-01-2024 to permit the conditional sign, with Findings of Fact.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 7 – Stratis, Morton, McCollian, Parrella, Petrich, Broline, and Trzupek  
**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 7-0

**VI. PUBLIC COMMENT**

There were no comments.

**VII. FUTURE MEETINGS**

There were no comments.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

A **MOTION** was made by Commissioner McCollian and **SECONDED** by Commission Parrella to adjourn the meeting at 8:08 p.m.

**ROLL CALL VOTE** was as follows:

**AYES:** 7 – McCollian, Parrella, Petrich, Broline, Stratis, Morton, and Trzupsek

**NAYS:** 0 – None

**MOTION CARRIED** by a vote of 7-0.

Respectfully Submitted:



Ella Stern  
Planner