

MINUTES
MEETING OF THE OAK PARK PLAN COMMISSION
REMOTE PARTICIPATION
October 27, 2020
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: Acting Chair Lawrence Brozek and Commissioners; Jeff Clark, Jeff Foster, Paul May, Nick Bridge, Paul Beckwith and Jon Hale

EXCUSED: Chair Iris Sims and Commissioner Tom Gallagher

ALSO PRESENT: Craig Failor - Village Planner and Gregory Smith – Plan Commission Attorney

Roll Call - Roll was called at 7:10pm. A quorum was present.

New Planning Commissioners were introduced: Paul Beckwith and Jon Hale.

Non-Agenda Public Participation – None

Approval of Minutes –August 24, 2020 and August 27, 2020

PC 20-06: Planned Development; 835 Lake Street Place; The Plan Commission will conduct a public hearing on a planned development application for a one building 84-unit multiple family complex in the R-7 Multi-Family Residential Zoning District. The Petitioner seeks the following allowances from the Oak Park Zoning Ordinance associated with the Planned Development application found in Article 4 - Table 4-1 Residential Districts Dimensional Standards; an increase in building lot coverage from a required 70% to 75%; an increase in density from an allowed 48 dwelling units to 84 dwelling units; an increase in height from the allowed height of 45 feet to 74 feet; a reduction in the west side yard setback from the required 10 feet to 5 feet; and a reduction in the required rear yard setback of 25 feet to 14 feet. The Petitioner is also requesting an indoor ATM use be allowed on the first floor within an R-7 Multi-Family Residential Zoning District.

The Plan Commission heard from one cross-examiner, Mary Darnall, who asked questions about traffic congestion in and around North Boulevard and the east-west alley south of the project site. Another series of questions were regarding the use and maintenance of the lot used for access to the development located between the east-west alley and North Boulevard. There were three persons in attendance for public testimony; Greg Marsey, Bob Moser and Mary Darnall. Mr. Marsey and Mr. Moser represented the condominium association adjacently west of the development site. Both indicated they were pleased with the negotiations between them and the developer, while also recognizing there loses such as sunlight, parking spaces, and

privacy. Ms. Darnall provided public testimony. She stated that she and her partner operate a business along North Boulevard that abuts the Lot 96 parking lot currently leased by the Village, but for sale as part of the purchase package with 835 Lake Street. The same concerns were raised regarding traffic and parking / use of the abutting parking lot.

The Plan Commission indicated that they had no concerns with the land use aspects of the development and supported the allowances. They also indicated that they felt the request by the Condominium Association to the west regarding adding security gates at either end of the private walkway should be supported – this was to be added as a condition in the Findings of Fact. The Applicant indicated their willingness to provide the security gates. The Plan Commission also asked the Applicant to register their project with the USGBC for LEED silver certification. The Applicant agreed to this request.

The main discussion by the Plan Commission was regarding the architecture of the building. Wight and Co. provided their review and the Historic Preservation Commission provided their review; both supporting the proposed architecture. Some Plan Commissioners felt that the design was not compatible within the historic area. Some did not support the color pallet or was not partial to the front façade design nor the balconies. They asked if the Applicant was willing to make changes and return. The Applicant asked that they vote on what was presented.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Beckwith, Seconded by Commissioner Bridge. Roll Call Vote as follows: Commissioners; Beckwith–yes, Bridge–yes, Foster- yes, Clark–yes, May–no, Hale-yes, and Acting Chairperson Brozek–no

The Plan Commission recommended approval of this application with a 5-2 vote.

Planner Failor read into the record the proposed conditions stated in the Findings of Fact report. The Plan Commission added a condition regarding the security gates between the condominium and proposed development.

A Motion was made by Acting chair Brozek, Seconded by Commissioner Hale. Roll Call Vote as follows: Acting Chairperson Brozek–yes, Commissioners; Hale-yes, Beckwith–yes, Bridge–yes, Foster- yes, Clark–yes, May–no.

The Plan Commission approved the Findings of Fact report with a 6-1 vote.

PC 20-09: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment: Approved Planned Development Timelines; The Plan Commission will conduct a public hearing on the text amendment application of the Petitioner for amendments to the Oak Park Zoning Ordinance. The Petitioner seeks an amendment to Article 14 (“Zoning Approvals”), Section 14.5 (“Planned Developments”), Sub-Section G (“Effect of Approval or Denial and Expiration”) of the Oak Park Zoning Ordinance regarding changes to, or elimination of, some of the timelines for approved planned development permit submittal, construction and completion phases.

The Plan Commission recommended modifications to the timeline changes that were originally proposed by the Oak Park Economic Development Corporation regarding approved planned development applications.

Current Zoning Ordinance requires: 1. A building permits shall be submitted within 9 months from Village Board approval for a planned development application. 2. The developer shall commence construction within 18 months of Village Board approval. 3. The development shall be completed within 36 months from the date of Village Board approval.

The Oak Park EDC recommended: 1. Elimination of the building permit submittal requirement of 9 months from the date of Village Board Approval. 2. Extend the construction start date from 18 months to 24 months. 3. Eliminate the end of construction milestone for 36 months to a timeframe that the developer established in the planned development application.

The Plan Commission recommends: 1. Extend the building permit submittal requirement from 9 months to 12 months. 2. Eliminate the construction start requirement. 3. Keep the construction completion date of 36 months from the date of Village Board Approval.

The Plan Commission felt that there should be a start and end to the process. How it functioned in between would be up to the applicant / developer.

A Motion was made by Commissioner May, Seconded by Commissioner Foster. Roll Call Vote as follows: Commissioners; May–yes, Foster- yes, Beckwith–yes, Bridge–yes, Clark–yes, Hale–yes, and Acting Chairperson Brozek–yes.

The Plan Commission supported the recommended changes to the Planned Development timeline with a 7-0 vote.

The Plan Commissioner had no questions but asked that changes be made to the draft findings of fact report as amended.

Motion was made by Commissioner May, Seconded by Commissioner Foster. Roll Call Vote as follows: Commissioners; May–yes, Foster- yes, Hale–yes, Beckwith–yes, Bridge–yes, Clark–yes and Acting Chairperson Brozek–yes

The Plan Commission approved the Findings of Fact report with a 7-0 vote.

PC 20-10: Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment: Use Restrictions for DT-1 & DT-2 Sub-Districts;

The Plan Commission will conduct a public hearing on the text amendment application of the Petitioner for amendments to the Oak Park Zoning Ordinance. The Petitioner seeks an amendment to Article 8 (“Uses”), Section 8.3 (“Use Restrictions”), Sub-Section A (“DT Districts”) of the Oak Park Zoning Ordinance regarding exceptions to the 50-foot setback retail use restriction in the DT-1 and DT-2 Sub-Districts, including, but not limited to, art and fitness studios, health clubs, indoor recreation and business service centers.

The following recommended uses, not currently allowed, were deemed by the EDC and now the Plan Commission, to be service-retail uses that will complement the current list of permitted and special uses allowed at grade level or on the ground floor within the first 50 feet of the street lot line in the greater downtown area, in particular DT1 and DT2: 1.) Art and Fitness Studios; 2.) Health Clubs; 3.) Indoor Recreation uses; and 4.) Business Service Centers. The Plan Commission indicated that this could help in reducing the vacancy rate in the downtown area.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Hale, Seconded by Commissioner Beckwith. Roll Call Vote as follows: Commissioners; Hale-yes, Beckwith-yes, May-yes, Foster- yes, Bridge-yes, Clark-yes and Acting Chairperson Brozek-yes.

The Plan Commission supported the recommended additions to the retail exception list as proposed with a 7-0 vote.

The Plan Commissioner had no questions or changes to the draft findings of fact report.

Motion was made by Commissioner Bridge, Seconded by Acting Chairperson Brozek. Roll Call Vote as follows: Commissioners; Bridge-yes, Acting Chairperson Brozek-yes, May-yes, Foster-yes, Hale-yes, Beckwith-yes and Clark-yes.

The Plan Commission approved the Findings of Fact report with a 7-0 vote.

Other Business – Work Plan 2021 – The work plan was approved as submitted by a unanimous roll call vote.

Motion was made by Commissioner May, Seconded by Commissioner Foster. Roll Call Vote as follows: Commissioners; May-yes, Foster- yes, Hale-yes, Beckwith-yes, Bridge-yes, Clark-yes and Acting Chairperson Brozek-yes

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:02 a.m. October 28, 2020– Motion by Acting Chair Brozek, Seconded by Commissioner Bridge. Roll Call Vote as follows: Acting Chairperson Brozek-yes, Commissioners; Bridge-yes, Foster- yes, Beckwith-yes, Clark-yes, May-yes, and Hale-yes

Prepared by: Craig Failor, Village Planner / Staff Liaison