

MINUTES
MEETING OF THE OAK PARK PLAN COMMISSION
VILLAGE HALL- ROOM 201
June 7, 2018
7:00 p.m.

A recording of this meeting is available on the Village of Oak Park Website: <https://www.oak-park.us/your-government/citizen-commissions/commission-tv>

PRESENT: Chair David Mann; Commissioners Glenn Brewer, Lawrence Brozek, Greg Marsey, Paul May, Jeff Foster, Joseph Flowers and Iris Sims

EXCUSED: Commissioner Nordman

ALSO PRESENT: Craig Failor, Village Planner; Greg Smith, Plan Commission Attorney

Roll Call

Chair Mann called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. Roll was called. A quorum was present.

Non-Agenda Public Participation

None

Approval of Minutes

May 3, 2018 – Approved as submitted - Commissioner Brewer made the motion to approve; Second by Commissioner Sims

Public Hearings

Plat of Vacation-Alley: (Stephen Mudjer): Madison Street @ Elmwood Avenue 427 Madison Street, 435-437 Madison Street, 507 S. Elmwood Avenue, 511 S. Elmwood Avenue; The Applicant seeks the vacation of an abutting 8 foot wide public alley located between the addresses referenced above. The portion of the village alley right-of-way to be vacated is approximately 8 feet in width (east to west) and 132.40 feet long (north to south).

Mr. Tim Kelly representative of the applicant provided a presentation on the alley vacation request. He indicated that the applicant does not have a plan for development but is interested in consolidation his parcels for more parking and possible access to the existing building via a garage door off of the vacated alley. He indicated that the vacant lot at the corner of Madison and Elmwood currently was not to code relative to the intended use. The Plan Commission members inquired about the proposed development, current use of the alley, the public benefit, and the Village's Policy on vacations. Plan Commission attorney Greg Smith provided an overview of the Village's Policy. The Plan Commission had further questions regarding traffic accidents, access and zoning regulations.

Cross Examination:

Three residents signed up for cross examination – only one asked questions. Mr. Stephen Legatzki questioned the applicant representative and staff. Mr. Legatzki asked about use of the alley, parking on the street, traffic studies, parking studies, police reports, property values and zoning.

Public Testimony:

Ms. Mary Jean O'Connor spoke about the history of her property at 507 & 511 South Elmwood. She indicated that she is in the process of selling 511 South Elmwood but will retain 507 for development

purposes. She indicated that she wishes to build Single-Room Occupancy units over a restaurant. For this she would need the alley to remain. She was opposed to the alley vacation.

Techa and Prentiss Harris spoke about purchasing 511 S. Elmwood and the need for a garage off the alley. They were opposed to the alley vacation

Tina Burnbaum spoke about her constant use of the alley and the need for access from Madison Street each day. She was concerned that residents may get trapped behind garbage trucks. She was opposed to the alley vacation. She read a letter of opposition from another resident on the alley.

Stephen Legatzki spoke of walking through the alley to Madison Street, safety issues, police response time, environmental issues, parking issues, and asked about village's cost savings. He was opposed to the alley vacation.

Joshua Inglis, realtor for Ms. O'Connor, talked about negative property values and impacts to the landlocked property at 507 S. Elmwood. Mr. Inglis read an opposition letter from a neighbor. He was opposed to the alley vacation.

Jeff Harris and Lisa Lee indicated their opposition to the application.

Plan Commission Discussion:

The Commission discussed parking restrictions, use of the alley, and indicated there was no public benefit for the alley vacation absent a development proposal.

Mr. Kelly provided a summary closing.

Mr. Legatzki provided a summary closing for the opposition.

Commissioners deliberated.

Commissioner May moved to deny the application; Commissioner Sims seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Flowers – yes to deny
Sims – yes to deny
Marsey – yes to deny
May – yes to deny
Brewer – yes to deny
Brozek – yes to deny
Mann – yes to deny
Foster - yes to deny

The motion to deny the application passed 8-0.

PC 18-06; Planned Development (Berwyn Properties, LLC); 6501 Roosevelt Road

Planned Development Approval with allowances: 1) Article 5.4 (RR District Dimensional and Design Standards) Section G.1 (Parking Placement): Relief is requested from the seven (7) foot front yard setback requirement to five (5) feet for parking spaces along the east property line. 2) Article 5.4 (RR District Dimensional and Design Standards) Section G.2 (Parking Placement): Relief is requested from the five (5) foot rear yard setback requirement for 26 parking stalls along the north property line to one (1) foot. 3) Article 5.4 (RR District Dimensional and Design Standards) Section H.1 (Street Frontage

Standards): Relief is requested from the requirement for sixty percent (60%) of the street frontage occupied by building. The proposed building street frontage will be approximately thirty-four percent (34%). 4) Article 5.4 (RR District Dimensional and Design Standards) Section J.7.a (Building Features and Accessory Structures)(Fences and Walls): Relief is requested from the five (5) foot height limit for the security fence surrounding the parking lot to allow an eight (8) foot high fence. 5) Article 7.4 (Building Design Standards) Section A.1.b (Building Façade Standards): Relief is requested from the requirement for the façade to change in texture or masonry pattern in a wall that exceeds 30 feet. The proposed Roosevelt Road façade will contain a forty (40) foot long glass entry area and a one-hundred and ten (110) foot long office wall panel. 6) Article 7.4 (Building Design Standards) Section A.4.a (Building Façade Standards): Relief is requested from the requirement for the building front to be similar in proportion to traditional commercial storefronts, typically between 25 and 40 feet wide. The proposed building is a single office use maintaining a cohesive look for the building on all four sides. 7) Article 7.4 (Building Design Standards) Section A.4.b (Building Façade Standards): Relief is requested from the requirement for display windows at ground level. The proposed building does not contain retail uses for the public. 8) Article 10.3 (Off-Street Parking Design Standards) Section B.2 (Access): Relief is requested from the requirement to provide internal pedestrian circulation in the parking lot. There is no dedicated pedestrian circulation in the parking lot. 9) Article 10.3 (Off-Street Parking Design Standards) Section G (Landscape and Screening): Relief is requested from the requirement that all parking lots and structures must be landscaped in accordance with Article 11. There is some proposed landscaping in the parking lot. 10) Article 10.4 (Required Off- Street Vehicle and Bicycle Parking Spaces) Section D.1 (Same as Section B.3, C.2 & C.4): Relief is required to eliminate the requirement for covered long-term bicycle parking spaces for 30% of the required bicycle spaces. 11) Article 10.6 (Bicycle Parking Standards) Section C.3 (Location): Relief is requested from the requirement to locate all of the required short-term bicycle parking spaces within fifty (50) feet of the building entrance. A portion of the short-term bicycle parking spaces are proposed to be located within less than seventy-five (75) feet of the building entrance. 12) Article 11.7 (Required Parking Lot Interior Landscaping) Section A: Relief is requested from the requirement to provide landscape islands between every ten (10) parking spaces. Two (2) six (6) foot square diamond shaped tree planters are proposed to be installed. 13) Article 11.7 (Required Parking Lot Interior Landscaping) Section C: Relief is requested to eliminate the requirement to terminate rows of parking stalls with a landscape island. 14) Article 5.4 (RR District Dimensional and Design Standards) Section I.1. (Building Façade Elements) Table 5-11 (RR District Required Façade Elements): Relief is requested from the requirement for the building entrance to face Roosevelt Road. The building entrance is proposed to face west abutting the parking lot.

The applicant, Anthony Turano presented the application. Mr. Turano provided a slideshow of the development discussing the need for the new office building, the site design, the vacation of Scoville Avenue and briefly talked about the allowances being requested.

Mr. Failor presented the staff report. He mentioned the planned development process and detailed the allowances, compensating benefits, public art and vacation requests. He reviewed the relevant Comprehensive Plan and Roosevelt Road Plan recommendations.

Mr. Floyd Anderson with *Wight and Co.*, the Village's architectural consultant, relayed his memorandum observations and recommendations to the Plan Commission relative to the proposed office building. He discussed the building façade, landscaping and fencing. He felt it was a good addition to Roosevelt Road.

The Plan Commission asked questions of Mr. Anderson and made statements relative to the building's façade, fencing and landscaping. Additional information was requested of the applicant regarding a depiction of the site with the fencing. Further discussion ensued regarding the building façade relative to brick color. The Commission discussed security needs. The applicant indicated security was very important as crime has occurred in the area and impacted his employees. Commissioners asked for crime statistics in the area. A discussion of public art ensued. It was suggested that the decorative fencing along Roosevelt Road could be used for public art. The applicant will review. The applicant also

indicated they would review vegetation changes, the heat island effect in the parking lot and brick color in the pavement.

Cross Examination:

Two individuals signed up for cross examination. Ms. Molly McNally asked questions about security, crime, lighting and street closure.

Mr. Dave Miklos asked questions about truck parking in Berwyn.

Public Testimony:

Mr. Viktor Schrader, OPEDC, showed support for the application.

Ms. McNally indicated she was neutral.

Mr. Miklos indicated he was neutral.

Ms. Mary Goetting indicated support for the development.

The Plan Commission deliberated. They discussed fencing options, public art options and the elevation. They asked that the applicant return with additional items for their review.

Commissioner Brewer moved to continue the application PC 18-06 (Planned Development) to their regular meeting of July 5, 2018; Commissioner Brozek seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Flowers - yes
Sims – yes
Marsey – yes
May – yes
Brewer – yes
Foster - yes
Brozek – yes
Mann – yes

The motion passed 8-0.

Other Business

None

Adjournment

Commissioner May moved to adjourn. Commissioner Sims seconded. The meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Craig Failor, Village Planner
Staff Liaison