

MINUTES OF THE
OAK CREEK PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
TUESDAY, SEPTMEBER 25, 2012

Mayor Scaffidi called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following Commissioners were present at roll call: Commissioner Dickmann, Commissioner Johnston, Commissioner Carrillo, Commissioner Bukiewicz, Mayor Scaffidi, Commissioner Michalski, Commissioner Correll and Commissioner Chandler. Commissioner Siepert was excused. Also present was Jeff Fortin Planner and Battalion Chief Mike Kressuk.

Commissioner Dickmann moved to approve the minutes of the September 11, 2012 regular Plan Commission meeting. Commissioner Johnston seconds. Roll call, all voted aye. The minutes were approved as submitted.

Significant Common Council Actions

There were no comments or concerns from the Commission.

Sign Appeal Hearing – Rawson & Howell, LLC
7001 S. Howell Avenue
Tax Key No.: 734-9028

Mr. Fortin explained to the Commission the applicant was requesting approval of two items at this meeting. The first item is a variance from Section 17.0706(j)(2), which states that for multi-tenant office, retail, or manufacturing buildings each tenant with their own individual entrance shall be permitted one wall sign per tenant. The applicant would like to have each tenant have the ability to have two wall signs, one on the east elevation and one on the west elevation. The proposed signs are aluminum faced with routed out letters that are internally illuminated.

Mayor Scaffidi opened the public hearing for comments and made three calls for comments or concerns. Hearing none he closed the public hearing.

Sign Appeal – Rawson & Howell, LLC
7001 S. Howell Avenue
Tax Key No.: 734-9028

Commissioner Bukiewicz commented he supported the request for the additional signs based on the four sided architecture of the building.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned if the sign ordinance was going to be updated to reflect the current trend in signage. Mr. Fortin stated they are working on it and should be bringing the suggested changes to the Plan Commission soon.

Commissioner Correll moved to approve the request for a variance from Section 17.0706(j)(2), allowing each tenant to have the ability to have two walls signs, one on the east elevation and one on the west elevation for Rawson & Howell, LLC located at 7001 S. Howell Avenue.

Commissioner Bukiewicz seconds. Roll call, all voted aye. The motion to approve carries.

Sign Plan Review – Rawson & Howell, LLC
7001 S. Howell Avenue
Tax Key No.: 734-9028

Mr. Fortin explained to the Commission the applicant was requesting approval of the Planned Sign Program to include two proposed wall signs for each tenant. Each tenant would be permitted to have their two walls signs and a panel on the monument sign. Each tenant panel would be similar in design with the grey routed aluminum faces and backlit acrylic lettering. Each sign would be 32 square feet in area.

The monument sign would be at the north end of the building and would feature space for up to 10 tenants. There will be address numbers on the brick base of the sign. The panels on the monument sign will match the color of the aluminum backgrounds of the wall signs.

Commissioner Correll moved that the Plan Commission approves the sign plan as proposed, subject to the following conditions:

1. All building and electrical codes being met.
2. All signs must conform to this planned sign program. Any deviations shall require Plan Commission review and approval.

Commissioner Chandler seconds. Roll call, all voted aye. The motion to approve carries.

Plan Review – Level Headed Carpentry (Robert Grams)
940 W. Oakwood Road
Tax Key No.: 925-9993

Mr. Fortin explained to the Commission the applicant was requesting site and building plan approval for a second story addition onto their existing building at 940 E. Oakwood Road. The addition would be residential quarters for the owners, while the first floor would remain a carpentry shop and showroom. The M-1, Manufacturing Zoning District permits residential quarters as an accessory use as long as it is for the owner or caretaker of the property. Unlike the business zoning districts there are no limits on the size or percentage of the building that can be used for residential uses.

The addition will be finished with fiber cement siding and the existing building, currently finished with painted smooth face cmu blocks, will be refinished with stone veneer. The City's zoning ordinance requires that 75 percent of the exterior perimeter of all manufacturing buildings must be finished with brick, glass, split-face block or other decorative masonry. Staff feels that this improvement will significantly enhance the exterior appearance of the building.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned if there would be any structural issues with the addition. Mr. Robert Grams, 1000 E. Stonegate, stated it would not be a problem structurally to add second floor to the existing building.

Commissioner Bukiewicz questioned if he would be living on site. Mr. Grams stated he would be living on site once the addition was completed.

Commissioner Dickmann moved that the Plan Commission approve the site and building plans for the proposed addition to the building at 940 W. Oakwood Road, subject to the following conditions:

1. That all building and fire codes are met.
2. That the applicant installs a fence to screen the dumpsters stored at the east side of the building.
3. That the remainder of the parking lot is paved by September 25, 2013
4. That the applicant submits the landscaping plan for review by the City Forester and Department of Community Development prior to installation.

Commissioner Bukiewicz seconds. Roll call, all voted aye. The motion to approve with a $\frac{3}{4}$ majority carries.

**PUD & General Development Plan Amendment – Syner g Hotel Development
239 & 325 E. College Avenue and 6440, 6460, & 6448 S. Howell Avenue
Tax Key Nos.: 719-9995, 719-9007, 719-9002-001, 719-9987-002, & 719-9986**

Mr. Fortin explained to the Commission the Common Council passed Ordinance No. 2600, approving amended conditions and restrictions and a general development plan for the Syner g hotel and airport parking proposal for the properties at 239 & 235 E. College Avenue and 6440, 6460, 6448, & part of 6508 S. Howell Avenue. That PUD required them to commence construction by April 20, 2012, which has not happened so the PUD is expired.

The new general development plan is similar to previous plans. There will be a 4-story hotel on S. Howell Avenue. This hotel will be a 108-room Four Points by Sheraton. There will still be a large off-premise airport parking lot containing 1187 spaces (the last proposal had 1531 spaces). The primary entrance to the parking lot will be off of S. Howell Avenue.

Commissioner Dickmann expressed concern for allowing two (2) twenty-foot high monument signs. Mr. Fortin explained the original plan allowed them to have a twenty foot high monument sign on College Avenue. Now what they are doing is doing it as part of the PUD instead of coming forward with a variance request in the future. It is being treated similar to what was done at the Fairfield Inn and Candlewood on 13th Street, they have a twenty foot high monument sign in lieu of having two monument signs. They have one monument sign with two tenants.

Commissioner Dickmann expressed concern because there were no other larger monument signs on Howell Avenue besides Classic Lanes, which was a remodel of an existing sign.

Commissioner Johnston expressed concern for the amount of time this has been going on and that a parking lot was driving this site. It is not a hotel, there are almost 1200 parking stalls on this site and he doesn't believe this is what the City is looking for here. There are some serious engineering concerns with the plan and he doesn't believe as it is laid out it will work. Mayor Scaffidi questioned he doesn't see this as a hotel development but as a parking lot. Commissioner Johnston confirmed that was how he viewed this development.

Commissioner Correll agreed with the concerns with the monument sign and had reservations about approving twenty foot high signs at this point. Mr. Fortin explained this would be the time to address the monument sign. They would have to come back to the Plan Commission with a sign plan but they would come back with a twenty foot high sign. If the Commission had issues with that they might want to allow it on College Avenue but a shorter one on Howell Avenue.

Mayor Scaffidi questioned the distinction between Howell and 13th Street. Commissioner Correll stated one is a hotel district and one isn't. Mayor Scaffidi commented this was a hotel project.

Commissioner Correll agreed but it was going into a district that is not a hotel district. Again he stated it was a parking lot that was going to be very visible now that it was not going to be a covered parking lot with a mid-sized hotel with a variance to have a larger monument sign. He does not support it in its current state.

Commissioner Michalski questioned what would not work with the engineering side of the plan. Commissioner Johnston explained the biggest concern would be the stormwater. It is a very small pond to have for the proposed amount of parking. Commissioner Michalski stated it was a smaller parking area than what was originally proposed. Commissioner Johnston explained it was still the same concerns they have had all along. None of the stormwater has been addressed at this time because it is still a concept plan. He feels they will be losing parking spaces and they will be changing the configuration of the site with the wetlands, the floodplain and the contamination that is out there on the site. Mayor Scaffidi agreed with the concerns but the Common Council has endorsed a hotel project. A lot of the land in the back a parking lot is a good and smart use actually. Commissioner Johnston explained if they are using 13th Street as an example there is not 1200 parking stalls associated with those two hotels. Mayor Scaffidi explained this was also a business that would be tied directly to the airport whereas 13th Street is not

Ms. Ethel Garret, 6410 S. Howell Avenue, commented this has been going on for a long time and at the present time the property is a bit unsightly and she would be happy to see something positive going on the site. She feels now is the time to do something.

Commissioner Bukiewicz commented he disagreed with the concern that the parking lot was driving this issue. The hotel and the tax base that is was bringing along with the jobs and the revenue. It is also part of a bigger plan that incorporates two more hotels down the stretch that will also share in the parking. The parking had to go in essentially to help get the project off of the ground. In regards to Engineering's problem with the stormwater they had more than two years to look at it and it was approved with the larger parking lot and pond. He fully supports the project and thinks it is a good project.

Commissioner Correll pointed out at their last appearance before the Plan Commission they wanted to start with just a parking lot and that idea was shot down. If it is a hotel project it should start with a hotel. They are back now and the buildings are down to one mid-sized hotel and they have eliminated only 20% of the parking spots. He does not feel a parking lot is the best use for the area.

Mr. Greg Trapani, 1800 E Northwest Hwy, Arlington Heights, IL, explained in this plan they have 10 acres and in the original plan they had 15 acres. Mayor Scaffidi commented it now provides for the residents a buffer of significant width that wasn't there previously.

Mr. Fortin explained this is a general development plan that is going to layout similar to this. The parking lot may change and, may get reduced due to stormwater pond sizes but the hotel will still be out in the front and they can work out the stormwater issues as they go forward. They are still requiring a berm but not a six foot high berm because it is not that close the residential area.

Commissioner Correll questioned how many parking spots were eliminated from the original count. Mr. Eric Nordness, 1800 W. Roscoe, Chicago, IL, stated they are down to 1180 from 1550. They are continually working on the stormwater and greenspace issues with the site. The hotel comes with a significant landscape package and the signage they will work with the

City on. The hotel becomes its own monument in its own way. The hotel drives the revenue and the capitol allocation in terms of how much it takes to build this project. The hotel is three times the capital just to get going just from the infrastructure. They view this as a hotel project and the bottom is phase one. They did not want to layout exactly how phase two was going to look because they felt it was a little disingenuous until they layout the bottom and figure out what the best second use hotel would be. They would like to have the flexibility to move it around the parcel and come back and work on it.

Commissioner Johnston explained the Engineering department has not seen any plans on this as far as engineering calculations for the ponds; these are all just concepts that have been drafted. Commissioner Johnston questioned if there was a split off of one of the hotels would they still be able to maintain the 30 percent greenspace requirement. Mr. Fortin explained because it was being done as a PUD they would need to maintain the 30 percent within the boundaries of the PUD as was established with previous submittals.

Commissioner Michalski stated it was a unanimous vote from Council to go along with this proposal but he does want to see it done right. He views this as more than just a hotel. He views it as a parking lot that is going to generate funds and as a hotel. He did express concern for not opening up the parking lot before the hotel opens up. Mr. Fortin confirmed it was in the TIF agreement and there was a provision in the PUD that no building permits for parking could be issued until the hotel permits were taken out. Commissioner Michalski was in agreement with that process but questioned how low of a sign they would agree to. Mr. Nordess stated they were open to it and any reasonable signage would be acceptable.

Mr. Ken Haggerty, 300 E. Jewel Street, stated there were no storm sewers on Jewel Street. From the west they get MATC's water and from the south they get the water from the church. He expressed concern for the retention ponds with the proposal and where they would drain to. Mayor Scaffidi explained the ponds can improve the drainage and help the situation on Jewel Street.

Mr. Haggerty questioned how they would get sewer services to the hotel on Howell Avenue. Commissioner Johnston explained it was part of this plan that the lift station on Jewel will be taken out and it will be gravity sewer that runs out to College. It will get up to the MIS sewer that runs in College Avenue.

Commissioner Dickmann commented because the hotel would be on Howell Avenue and the hotel would be its own monument sign he would like to see it stay with a ten foot monument sign. On College Avenue because there would be so much future development they might be able to go with a twenty foot sign later on. They could request a variance in the future for a twenty foot sign if necessary on College Avenue.

Commissioner Michalski commented if eight foot was the standard he was in favor of the eight foot height and then they would be only willing to look at a higher sign in the future.

Mr. Jim Beyer, 320 E. Jewel Street, questioned who owned the property to the south. Mr. Fortin stated it was a Stramowski property.

Commissioner Dickmann moved that the Plan Commission recommends to the Common Council that the proposed amendments to the Planned Unit Development and General Development Plan for the properties at 239 and 325 E. College Avenue and 6440, 6460, and 6448 S. Howell Avenue be approved after a public hearing with the following changes:

1. Section 9 – b and c are to be removed.
2. Section 9 – d. remove the first and last sentences from the paragraph.

Commissioner Michalski seconds.

Roll call, Dickmann; aye, Johnston; aye, Carrillo; aye, Bukiewicz; aye, Scaffidi; aye, Michalski; aye, Correll; nay, Chandler; aye. The motion to approve carries.

**Official Map Amendment – Section 6 (Southfield Apartments)
6871 S. 13th Street**

Mr. Fortin explained to the Commission in 2005 they approved site, building, and landscaping plans for an expansion of Southfield Apartments. The lands where the expansion occurred contained an officially mapped cul-de-sac. However, the project was developed with a private road that connected to an existing private road in the older part of the Southfield apartments complex. Therefore the officially mapped cul-de-sac is no longer needed so staff is recommending that it be removed from the official map.

Commissioner Bukiewicz moved that the Plan Commission recommend to the Common Council that the Official Map amendment for Section 6 is approved as proposed, after a public hearing.

Commissioner Correll seconds. Roll call, all voted aye. The motion to approve carries.

Commissioner Carrillo moves to adjourn. Commissioner Correll seconds. Roll call, all voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.