

MINUTES  
MEETING OF THE OAK PARK PLAN COMMISSION  
VILLAGE HALL- ROOM 201  
July 5, 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, Kristen Nordman, Paul May, Jeff Foster, Joseph Flowers and Iris Sims

EXCUSED: Commissioner Marsey

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

**Roll Call**

Chair Mann called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll was called. A quorum was present.

**Non-Agenda Public Participation**

None

**Approval of Minutes**

June 7, 2018 – Approved as submitted - Commissioner Foster made the motion to approve; Second by Commissioner May

**Public Hearings**

**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 revised information requested by the Plan Commission at the June 7, 2018 meeting. Mr. Turano provided a slideshow of the revisions to the proposed new office building, regarding the site design, fencing and building design.

Several plan commissioners expressed their support for the proposed changes and indicated the proposed eight (8) foot tall fence in its new position seven (7) feet from the property line at the sidewalk was not of issue. Due mostly in part to the extensive landscaping proposed between the sidewalk and fence.

The Plan Commission asked questions of Mr. Turano regarding irrigation of, maintenance of, and species of the proposed landscape materials. The Commission discussed security needs for the eight foot fence. The applicant briefly discussed improvements to the property which would reduce the heat island effect, such as the proposed white –albino roof material. The plan commission agreed that the original façade design and brick color was their choice.

The Plan Commission asked questions of Mr., Floyd Anderson, village's design consultant, about the proposed landscaping, fencing and building façade.

The Plan Commission deliberated and indicated support for the proposed planned development. They reviewed the Standards, Goals and Objectives from the zoning ordinance and found the development is in line with them.

Commissioner May moved to approve the application PC 18-06 (Planned Development); Commissioner Brewer seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

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

The motion passed 8-0.

Commissioner May moved to approve the findings of fact for application PC 18-06 (Planned Development); Commissioner Brewer seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Flowers - yes  
Sims - yes  
Nordman - yes  
May - yes  
Brewer - yes  
Foster - yes  
Brozek - yes  
Mann - yes

The motion passed 8-0.

**PC 18-06: Plat of Vacation- Street (Berwyn Properties, LLC): 6501 Roosevelt Road**

The Applicant is requesting approval of a plat of vacation for a portion of Scoville Avenue north of Roosevelt Road and south of the alley adjacently north.

Commissioner May moved to approve the application PC 18-06 (Scoville Avenue street vacation); Commissioner Sims seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Flowers - yes  
Sims - yes  
Nordman - yes  
May - yes  
Brewer - yes  
Foster - yes  
Brozek - yes  
Mann - yes

The motion passed 8-0.

Commissioner May moved to approve the findings of fact for application PC 18-06 (Scoville Avenue street vacation); Commissioner Brewer seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Flowers - yes  
Sims - yes  
Nordman - yes  
May - yes  
Brewer - yes  
Foster - yes  
Brozek - yes  
Mann - yes

The motion passed 8-0.

**Plat of Vacation-Street: (Elementary School District no. 97): Chicago Avenue @ Kenilworth Avenue (506 North Kenilworth Avenue):** The Applicant seeks the vacation of an abutting 66 foot wide public street right-of-way (currently green space) located adjacent the address referenced. The portion of the village street right-of-way to be vacated is approximately 66 feet in width (east to west) and 157 feet long (north to south). The right-of-way will be used to accommodate an addition to the existing school building.

Mr. Failor gave a brief overview of the agenda item. Mr. Matthew Gardner, attorney for School District 97 provided additional information and indicated the Village entered into an Intergovernmental Agreement on the vacation and dedication of North Kenilworth Avenue.

The Plan Commission discussed the application.

Commissioner May stated his recusal of the vote as he was a member of School District 97's advisory committee.

Commissioner Foster moved to approve the application North Kenilworth Avenue street vacation; Commissioner Sims seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Flowers - yes  
Sims - yes  
Nordman - yes  
May - recused  
Brewer - yes  
Foster - yes  
Brozek - yes  
Mann - yes

The motion passed 7-0.

Commissioner Brewer moved to approve the findings of fact for application North Kenilworth Avenue street vacation; Commissioner Foster seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Flowers - yes  
Sims - yes  
Nordman - yes  
May - recused  
Brewer - yes  
Foster - yes  
Brozek - yes  
Mann - yes

The motion passed 7-0.

## **Other Business**

### **Single-Family Residential Design Standards - continued discussion.**

The Plan Commission discussed the draft standards. It was requested that staff revised with a list of "shall" and a list of "should" regulations with graphics for the next available meeting.

## **Adjournment**

Commissioner Sims moved to adjourn. Commissioner May seconded. The meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Craig Failor, Village Planner  
Staff Liaison