



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
PLAN COMMISSION, VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK,
COOK AND WILL COUNTIES, ILLINOIS**

November 7, 2019

The Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission was held in the Council Chambers of Village Hall on November 7, 2019 at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Plan Commissioners: Curt Fielder, Acting Chairman
Eduardo Mani
James Gaskill
Lucas Engel
Angela Gatto
Tim Stanton

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Garrett Gray
MaryAnn Aitchison
Stephen Vick

Village Officials and Staff: Paula Wallrich, Planning Manager
Dan Ritter, Senior Planner
Barbara Bennett, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

PLAN COMMISSION ACTING CHAIRMAN FIELDER called to order the Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission for November 7, 2019 at 7:00 p.m.

COMMUNICATIONS

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the September 19, 2019 Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission were presented for approval. A Motion was made by COMMISSIONER ENGEL, seconded by COMMISSIONER GATTO to approve the minutes with one revision. The Plan Commission Acting Chairman Fielder called the meeting to order rather than Chairman Gray. The Motion was approved by roll call.

AYES: STANTON, MANI, ENGEL, GATTO, GASKILL, and ACTING CHAIRMAN FIELDER

NAYS: NONE

ACTING CHAIRMAN FIELDER declared the Motion approved as revised.

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES
FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION
SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2019 REGULAR MEETING

Item #1 **WORKSHOP: LENNY’S FOOD N FUEL 183RD STREET, LLC, 7401 – 7451 183rd Street** Consider a request to recommending that the Village Board grant Leonard McEnery on behalf of Lenny’s Food N Fuel 183rd Street, LLC (Contract Purchaser) an amendment to the North Creek Business Park Planned Unit Development Ordinance (Ord. 91-O-083) to permit an automobile service (gas) station with a convenience store to be a permitted use on the subject property. Additionally, to grant a Special Use Permit for a Substantial Deviation with exceptions from the Zoning Ordinance for the property located at 7401 - 7451 183rd Street in the ORI PUD (Office and Restricted Industrial, North Creek Business Park PUD) zoning district. Site Plan and Final Plat approval will also be considered as well.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Curt Fielder, Acting Chairman
 Eduardo Mani
 James Gaskill
 Lucas Engel
 Angela Gatto
 Tim Stanton

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Garrett Gray
 MaryAnn Aitchison
 Stephen Vick

Guests: Leonard McEnery, Petitioner
 Lyman Tieman, Attorney
 Michael Werthmann, Traffic Consultant, KLOA

Dan Ritter, Senior Planner gave a presentation as noted in the Staff Report. The Petitioner, Leonard McEnery on behalf of Lenny’s Food N. Fuel, 183rd Street, LLC is seeking an amendment to the existing North Creek Business Park Planned Unit Development, Special Use Permit for a Substantial Deviation from the PUD, Site Plan Approval and Final Plat of Consolidation Approval. The requests would allow for the construction of a new Food N Fuel gas station and convenience store on the property at 7451 183rd Street.

The property is zoned ORI (Office and Restricted Industrial) as part of the North Creek Business Park PUD. The PUD was originally approved and subdivided in 1991 with the ORI base zoning covering the full area with some commercial like hotels, restaurants, and daycares. In 1995, the PUD came back and a portion of the area included in the PUD that was adjacent to Harlem Avenue, was rezoned from the ORI base zoning to a B-3 (General Business) base zoning. Most of the PUD has been developed and includes a mixture of office, light industrial, educational, and commercial uses. This area is near I-80, Hollywood Casino Amphitheater, Tinley Park Convention Center, and a variety of shopping/service establishments. There is one existing Speedway gas station on the corner of Harlem and 183rd Street. All properties surrounding the subject site are in the same North Creek Business Park PUD.

This site is also located in the Urban Design Overlay District (UDOD), which promotes walkability, lesser front yard setbacks with parking in the back, and a more urbanized look. The PUD does not specifically mention automobile or gas stations as permitted uses. They are prohibited under the ORI zoning district, however this site is in a PUD and an amendment is possible to add in automobile/service stations with a convenience store as a permitted use.

Mr. Ritter displayed a rendering that was originally submitted prior to staff review comments. The Petitioner has submitted revised renderings today that were distributed to commissioners before the meeting. The updated renderings will also be presented in the staff report at the Public Hearing.

The use will include a 9,100 sq. ft. convenience store building that sells vehicle fuel and typical retail items. There will also be a Dunkin Donuts with a drive-thru, a second food service vendor, and a separate area intended for video gaming in the convenience store building. On the exterior the site includes fueling stations for 18 vehicles and four large trucks. This will be similar to other Gas N Wash stations in the area. Recently Tinley Park annexed the Food N Fuel station with a car wash on Harlem Avenue. There is also a Gas N Wash on 191st in Mokena and Cedar Road in New Lenox. This proposed station with function similarly and without a car wash.

The overall site will include the convenience store building, vehicle fueling area/canopy, truck fueling area/canopy, vehicle parking, a drive-thru lane, walkways, landscaping, a storage shed, and a dumpster enclosure. Additionally, new utilities will be provided to the building, such as water main, sewer lines, and lighting. Access to the site will be through two curb cuts, one on 183rd Street and one on West Creek Drive. The subdivision code requires that sidewalks are installed into any new developments that are proposed. Staff recommends the Petitioner install a sidewalk along both 183rd Street and West Creek Drive frontages.

West Creek Drive will be the primary access to this site. Staff has struggled with the 183rd Street access because its proposed as a full access and staff doubts that Cook County DOT will approve a full access there due to safety. Staff has recommended this be a right-in/right-out access due to proximity to two other full-access points. It has been proposed that sometime in the future that West Creek Drive would have a traffic light. This development and future development of the TPMH Center could meet the criteria for a traffic light but the Village would need to look into the traffic volumes and cost.

There are 68 parking stalls proposed on the site. This site is unique due to the mix of different uses proposed to be incorporated in the convenience store. Some of the demand may include overlapping customers. Someone getting gas may also purchase retail items and/or go to Dunkin Donuts. The proposed plan anticipates a need for 68 parking stalls following typical Zoning code parking requirements based on individual use.

- 34 parking stalls for retail use (1 space per 150 sq. ft.; 5,100 sq. ft. retail space/150 = 34).
- 17 parking stalls for dining/restaurant uses (1 space per 3 seats; 51 seats/3 = 17)
- 5 parking stalls for gaming machines (1 parking space per seat)
- 12 parking spaces for employees (1 parking space per maximum number of employees)

With 68 spaces (65 standard, 3 accessible) supplied based on the proposed plans, the parking requirements would meet the Zoning Code's minimum. Staff believes 68 spaces will be sufficient due to the unique mix of uses on the site.

The proposed landscaping is in general conformance with the Village's Landscape Ordinance, with a few exceptions. The proposal requests a waiver from the north bufferyard landscaping totals due to a substantial number of parkway trees already proposed to be installed. The Petitioner has indicated that additional landscaping along the 183rd Street frontage, especially trees, will block most visibility to the site. Staff recommends adding additional shrubs. The east bufferyard area has the ability to add additional landscaping a tree in an end island that has been left as lawn. The second waiver being requested is to the interior parking lot landscaping. The landscape code is not easy to comply with on a gas station property. The fueling area needs to remain free from obstructions and allow room for vehicle and truck movement throughout the site. Landscaping pots could be added.

Mr. Ritter displayed renderings of the structures. The architecture is relatively simple on the building. It will be similar to the other Gas N Fuel stations. The building primarily utilizes high-quality materials, including face brick (71% of exterior, excluding glazing) with stone around the base (14.2% excluding glazing). The remaining area of the building utilizes metal and EIFS for architectural treatments. The building will have a red metal coping/cornice around the top of the structure. The two fueling canopies are also proposed to be red in color. All mechanical equipment will be screened by the rooftop parapet.

There will be shingled canopies on the front facades. The canopy supports, dumpster enclosure, and storage shed are proposed to be wrapped in stone and brick that matches the convenience store structure in style and design. Updated renderings will be presented at the Public Hearing.

All proposed signs meet the code requirements for size, number, and location.

The petitioner has proposed the following signs:

- Four wall signs (including one 15 sq. ft. interior tenant sign)
- Three gas station canopy signs
- Two directional “Trucks” canopy signs
- One Dunkin Donuts drive-thru menu board and clearance bar
- Four drive-thru directional signs (no logos)
- One monument sign 10’ ft. tall

The lighting plan for the proposed development complies with the new lighting standards for fixture type, illumination intensity, and light intensity at the property lines.

The Petitioner has provided a Photometric Plan that indicates light spillage of less than one foot candle at the roadway and property lines. All light fixtures are full cut-off and downcast to prevent glare on adjacent properties and roadways.

Special approvals needed are:

PUD Ordinance Amendment

As noted in the Staff Report this will amend the 1991 Ordinance. The proposed amendment adds an “automobile service station with a convenience store to the list of permitted uses but only on the subject property.

Special Use Permit for a Substantial Deviation

As noted in the Staff Report deviations from the Village Zoning Ordinance are considered Exceptions rather than Variations when located within a PUD and do not require the standard Findings of Fact as required with a Variation. Alternatively, Exceptions are looked at in terms of their conformance to their overall PUD’s design and goals.

Below are the specific Exceptions and Deviations being requested as part of the Special Use:

1. Exceptions from the Urban Design Overlay District (Section V)
 - a. Increased front yard setback (140.5’ proposed)
 - b. Allow parking in the front yard
 - c. Maximum of one curb cut per site (two proposed)
 - d. Required cross-access to adjacent properties (no cross-access to the south)
2. Deviations from the PUD Requirements and Sign Regulations (Section IX)
 - a. Allow parking in the front and side yards

Plat of Resubdivision

This will combine two of the parcels along 183rd Street. They will be taking a sliver of the parcel on the south to make the site a total of three acres. The eventual goal is to apply for a gaming license and three acres is a requirement of the state for gaming.

Lyman Tieman, Attorney for the Petitioner introduced the Traffic Consultant, Michael Werthmann, KLOA

Mr. Werthmann gave a presentation regarding the Traffic and Parking Evaluation for the development. The KLOA Evaluation is included in the packet.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FIELDER asked for questions or comments from the Commissioners.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FIELDER inquired regarding the sidewalk in the back connecting to the existing sidewalk. Mr. Ritter replied there is already a sidewalk connected to the public sidewalk. He noted he would take a better look at this prior to the Public Hearing since it is shown differently on the landscape plan than the site plan. There is a crosswalk and a small sidewalk proposed on the engineering plans though.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FIELDER inquired about the traffic on 183rd Street. It would be good for the Village to study a traffic light at one of the intersections. Mr. Ritter replied this was previously discussed with development proposals at West Creek Drive. With the future development of the TPMH Center it would likely be needed. The counts may not be high enough at this time but there will be 3 new developments completed since this was last looked at. He noted he would discuss this with engineering before the public hearing. ACTING CHAIRMAN FIELDER noted there is currently funding available by the state that could help the Village put in a traffic light. Mr. Werthmann noted it makes most sense to put a light on the West Creek Drive exit to help the trucks exiting the station and keep it as far away from the existing intersection to avoid backups.

Mr. Ritter noted the masonry on this building is currently 71% and it should be at 75%. Staff will discuss this and work with the Petitioner to address this prior to the Public Hearing.

COMMISSIONER MANI commented on the Open Items: #1 – Engineering should look at the right-in/right-out only, not full-access. #2 – The trees that are stipulated should be provided to maintain the character. #6 – The PUD should be amended so that other parcels in the area can have a gas station, like the TPMHC. If we amend this now it only benefits the Petitioner.

Mr. Ritter noted there are quite a few trees proposed in that area. The code asks for double the amount of trees in both the parkway and in the private buffer area. Placing two rows of trees would likely block most visibility to the site from the road. Those bufferyard requirements do not take into account if there are parkway tree requirements. Mr. Ritter replied B-3 zoning allows a automobile service(gas) station as a Special Use. To the north there is no PUD and a new one would be created. The other available sites in this PUD would likely not function well as a gas station. Allowing as permitted only on this site in the PUD functions similar as a Special Use.

Mr. Ritter reviewed the summary of Open Items:

1. Discuss the full access proposed on 183rd Street. Staff recommends the plans be revised to show only a right-in/right-out limited access to avoid potential traffic safety concerns.
2. Discuss the proposed landscape plan and requested Landscape Ordinance waivers. Discuss staff's recommendations and the ability to comply to a greater degree with the north and east bufferyard landscaping requirements.
3. Review the proposed architecture and materials used throughout the site.
4. Submit revised renderings based on prior architectural, signage, and site revisions. (Submitted)

5. An updated parking and traffic study/analysis is required showing the expected traffic and access movements to and from the proposed site. The Petitioner has been working with their traffic consultant (KLOA) on the study and it is expected to be completed by the workshop meeting. (Submitted)
6. Discuss the request to amend the PUD ordinance to permit an “automobile service station and convince store” as permitted use only on the subject site.
7. Discuss the need for an additional cross-access easement that connects to the vacant property to the south.
8. Discuss the Special Use for a Substantial Deviation from the PUD.

The Public Hearing will be on November 21, 2019

TO: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FROM: VILLAGE OF TINLEY PARK PLAN COMMISSION

SUBJECT: MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2019 REGULAR MEETING

Item #2 WORKSHOP - MASONRY TEXT AMENDMENTS

Consider recommending that the Village Board approve Text Amendments to Section II.B. (Definitions), Section III.U. (Site Plan Review), Section V.C.4. (Elevations and Facades), Section V.C.7 (General Requirements/All Business & Commercial Districts) and Section V.C.10 (Site Development Standards for Industrial Uses) of the Zoning Ordinance to incorporate masonry requirements for residential, commercial and industrial uses.

Present were the following:

Plan Commissioners: Curt Fielder, Acting Chairman
Eduardo Mani
James Gaskill
Lucas Engel
Angela Gatto
Tim Stanton

Absent Plan Commissioner(s): Garrett Gray
MaryAnn Aitchison
Stephen Vick

Guests: None

Paula Wallrich, Planning Manager gave a presentation as noted in the Staff Report. Staff is currently working with a consultant to update the Tinley Park Comprehensive Building Code. As part of the process certain sections of the Village's Code have been identified that are not typically addressed in a building code. Staff will be updating the building code and will be taking it out of the Building Code and entering it into the Zoning Code.

Staff is supporting the current brick masonry requirements for residential and commercial districts with some minor changes. Staff is recommending a change in the industrial districts that would continue to require masonry construction but not require the use of face brick on buildings larger than 80,000 sq. ft. In addition staff is recommending a change in the protocol for site plan review and is recommending architectural and site design standards to assist in the review of architectural and site plans proposed for non-residential structures. These amendments will streamline the review process and result in regulations that support economic development rather than function as an encumbrance to industrial growth.

Staff has created some guidelines and some architectural standards to help guide for consistent review. Along with that staff has addressed some actual percentages of masonry and brick on commercial and industrial districts.

There have been two updates to the building code. The first in 2001 and then in 2007. Each one of these revisions became stricter with higher requirements for brick. Homes in Tinley Park are required to have first floor be brick. Staff also started to look at this for commercial businesses. The commercial development in the community has adhered to that brick requirement more so than the industrial development.

Ms. Wallrich displayed examples of several buildings in the Village that have met the brick requirements.

In reviewing the current masonry or brick requirements for commercial and industrial buildings staff reviewed the construction requirements of neighboring communities. Many of these communities are providing waivers of their brick requirements.

Community	Exterior Building Material Requirements by Building Type	
	Commercial	Industrial
Tinley Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-3,000 SF: 100% face brick • 3,001-40,000 SF: 75% face brick, 25% other masonry • 40,001-80,000 SF: 60% face brick, 40% other masonry • 80,001+ SF: 25% face brick, 75% other masonry 	
Mokena	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% masonry and glass 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% of front elevation must be masonry and glass • 75% of all other elevations must be masonry and glass
New Lenox	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Architectural precast concrete (exposed aggregate, acid etched, polished, honed, thin brick, stone veneer); or • Solid masonry (face brick, stone, exposed aggregate) on front and sides. Rear elevations can be common brick. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The total surface area of the front elevation shall be constructed of solid finish veneer, masonry or glass.
Orland Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Guidelines, does require brick from ground level to tops of windows 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Guidelines, does require brick from ground level to tops of windows
Lockport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Guidelines with levels of classes of materials which require % of brick 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Guidelines with levels of classes of materials.
Plainfield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design guidelines encourage utility brick, sandstone, native stone or glass; concrete block, split face block, pre-cast panels or EFIS are discouraged. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design guidelines require masonry materials including pre-cast concrete panels, split face block. No brick required.

Ms. Wallrich proceeded to outline the proposed text amendments:

1. Delete Section 305 Masonry from the Comprehensive Building Code;
2. Amend Section II.B. (Definitions) to include a definition for “*Masonry*”;
3. Amend Section III.U.(Site Plan Review) to include architectural review; provide architectural and site design standards;
4. Amend Section V. C. 4. (Elevations and Facades) to include masonry requirements for single-family detached, single-family attached, townhomes and all single-family semi- detached dwellings;
5. Amend Section V.C.7. (General Requirements/All Business & Commercial Districts) to include masonry requirements for all commercial districts including the Office and Restricted Industrial District and multi-family dwellings; and
6. Amend Section V.C.10. (Site Development Standards for Industrial Uses) to include masonry requirements for all industrial districts.

Ms. Wallrich provided an explanation of each amendment as outlined in the staff report and summarized as follows:

1. Delete Section 305 Masonry from the Comprehensive Building Code which will improve efficiencies and provide for a more comprehensive and consistent review of development.
2. Previously there was no definition for “Masonry”. The proposed amendment explicitly defines what can be included under this definition which includes brick, stone and pre-cast masonry walls.
3. Amend Section III.U. (Site Plan Review) to include architectural review utilizing architectural and site design standards. Reviews will be completed by staff unless it includes a zoning request which will then trigger a Plan Commission review. The architectural and site design standards will help guide the review and allow for more consistent enforcement of the masonry requirements and provide assurances of quality architecture as outlined in the architectural standards.
4. The proposed amendment for Section V. C. 4. (Elevations and Facades) will remain substantially the same except for the addition of “townhomes” that are not addressed in the current code. Multi-family structures of 3 or more units are regulated as a non-residential structure and will be included in Section V.C.7. for purposes of regulating masonry requirements.
5. The proposed amendment for Section V.C.7. (General Requirements/All Business & Commercial Districts) will include masonry requirements for all commercial districts including Office and Restricted Industrial District and multi-family dwellings.

Ms. Wallrich noted that the majority of the hotels in the village are located in the ORI districts and have been required to be constructed with brick since 2007 (with the exception of Woodspring as discussed above). Areas such as the North Creek (south of 183rd at West Creek Drive) and Hickory Creek (south of 183rd at 76th Ave.) Planned Unit Developments are zoned ORI with few vacant lots left for construction. She noted that the largest area available for development that is zoned ORI is along 191st street at 80th Avenue, Rte. 45 north of I-80 and the Tinley Park Mental Health Center. Since these areas will most likely develop with professional offices or hotels, staff is recommending they be regulated similarly to commercial districts which require the majority of these structures to be constructed of brick. The size of the building impacts the amount of brick required and provides for the use of alternate masonry materials to comprise portions of the building not required to be constructed of brick. It also provides for the use of alternate building materials to be used as accents. She noted that the use of design standards will assist in ensuring quality construction.

Ms. Wallrich went on to explain that the current Section V.C.7. (*General Regulations/All Business/Commercial Districts*) will remain generally intact with some minor changes for structures greater than 80,000 sq. ft.; instead of requiring 25% brick the amendment allows a choice of brick or decorative stone. Staff is recommending the current regulations for structures less than 40,000 remain as currently written with the addition of allowing the use of stone as a percentage of brick required.

She presented the following table which provides a comparison between existing and proposed masonry requirements.

B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, B-5 & ORI ZONING DISTRICTS			
SIZE	EXISTING	PROPOSED*	Impact
≤ 3,000 SF	100 % Face Brick	100% Face Brick (Decorative stone allowed for 30% of the brick requirement)	None- but provides flexibility with brick
3,001 – 40,000 SF	75% Face Brick, 25% other masonry (not defined)	75% Face Brick (Decorative stone allowed for 25% of the brick requirement), 25% other masonry as defined	None- but provides flexibility with brick with the use of stone and defines “other masonry”
40,001 – 80,000 SF	60% face brick, 40% other masonry (not defined)	60% face brick, (Decorative stone allowed for 20% of the brick requirement), 40% other masonry as defined.	None- but provides flexibility with brick with the use of stone and defines “other masonry”
≥ 80,000 SF	25% Face Brick, 75% other masonry (not defined)	25% Face Brick or decorative stone, 75% other masonry (not defined)	Less restrictive .No longer requires brick but does require 25% decorative stone in lieu of brick, defines “other masonry”

**15% of any one façade may use alternate building materials as defined in Section V.C.7.G. as architectural treatments, decorations or architectural accents*

Ms. Wallrich outlined the proposed text amendments which were included in the staff report. She also noted that these regulations will pertain to multi-family structures as well. She added that certain alternate building materials may be used for architectural treatments, decorations or architectural accents provided they do not constitute more than 15% of any façade. A list of the approved materials were included in the staff report. She noted a list of prohibited materials and the need for any additions to conform to the building materials used for the existing structure. If there is difficulty in matching the existing material, then the architectural design of the addition must provide an attractive transition to a new material that is consistent with current building material requirements.

6. Ms. Wallrich proceeded to discussed the recommended amendments to Section V.C.10. (Site Development Standards for Industrial Uses). She reiterated that staff is proposing to remove the masonry requirements from the Building Code and incorporate them into the Zoning Ordinance. She reviewed the current regulations and recommended the masonry requirements be incorporated into Section V. (*Supplementary District Regulations*) which provide General Regulations for Industrial Uses (Section V.C.10.). She noted that the current section references the “Industrial and Commercial Commission” which no longer exists and therefore all references to this Commission has been deleted; sections duplicating Subdivision Regulations have also been deleted.

Ms. Wallrich discussed that the M-1 (General Manufacturing) districts are primarily located south of 183rd Street west of 80th Avenue (Tinley Crossings PUD, Mercury Business Center and Northstar Business Center) and south of I-80 east of Oak Park Avenue and north of Prosperi Drive and the Hollywood Casino Music Center (First Industrial Realty PUD). She noted that the MU-1 (Mixed–Use Duvan Drive Overlay) district is located east of Harlem Avenue north of the Metra tracks. There are a few in-fill development or redevelopment opportunities but there are limited large scale development opportunities in these districts. Despite the limited development opportunities, the industry standard for these types of uses especially with structures greater than 40,000 sq. ft. does not require brick as currently required by the Building Code. The proposed amendments lessen the brick requirement for buildings greater than 10,000 sq. ft. but less than 40,000 sq. ft. by only requiring 50% of each façade as face brick or decorative stone. For structures greater than 40,001 sq. ft. but less than 80,000 sq. ft. the proposed amendment reduces the requirement from a 60% brick requirement to 25% brick or decorative stone but on the front façade only. The remaining facades are required to be masonry as defined but not brick. The masonry definition includes pre-cast concrete tilt up construction which represents the majority of the village’s current industrial building inventory as well as what our neighboring communities require. Structures greater than 80,001 sq. ft. in size are no longer required to have brick but are still required to be masonry as defined.

Ms. Wallrich then presentd the following table which provides a comparison between existing and proposed masonry requirements. The breakdown of building sizes has been revised to add masonry requirements for structures of “3,001– 10,000 sq. ft.” and “10,001– 40,000 SF”.

M-1 & MU-1 Districts			
SIZE	EXISTING	PROPOSED*	Impact
≤3,000 SF	100 % Face Brick	100% Face Brick (Decorative stone allowed for 30%)	None- but provides flexibility with brick
3,001 – 10,000 SF	75% Face Brick, 25% other masonry (not defined)	75% Face Brick (Decorative stone allowed for 25% of the required brick area) , 25% other masonry as defined	None- but provides flexibility with brick with the use of stone and defines “other masonry”
10,001 – 40,000 SF	75% Face Brick, 25% other masonry (not defined)	50% Face Brick or decorative stone- Balance of 50% masonry as defined	Less restrictive –No longer requires brick but does require 50% decorative stone in lieu of brick, defines “other masonry”
40,001 -80,000 SF	60% face brick, 40% other masonry(not defined)	25% Face Brick or decorative stone on front façade only. Remaining facades masonry as defined.	Less restrictive - No longer requires brick but does require 25% decorative stone on front façade in lieu of brick, defines “other masonry”
≤ 80,001 SF	25% Face Brick, 75% other masonry (not defined)	No brick required, 100% approved masonry (defined)	Less restrictive- no brick required.

15% of any one façade may use alternate building materials as defined in Section V.C.7.G. as architectural treatments, decorations or architectural accents

The proposed text amendments and additions are identified in the staff report. In addition to the new regulations related to the amount of brick required the proposed amendments provide for alternate building materials that may be used for architectural treatments, decorations or architectural accents on the structure provided they do not constitute more than 15% of any façade; a list of prohibited materials was also presented and outlined in the staff report. Consistent with the amendments for commercial districts Ms. Wallrich discussed how additions must conform to the building materials used for the existing structure. If there is difficulty in matching the existing material, then the architectural design of the addition must provide an attractive transition to a new material that is consistent with current building material requirements.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FIELDER asked for comments from the Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER MANI noted that including brick can be difficult on the budget. He also noted the Architectural design should not restrict creativity.

Ms. Wallrich replied with these changes staff can be more flexible and should not restrict creativity.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FIELDER inquired if someone came in to retrofit a building, would this apply. Ms. Wallrich replied if it is an addition it would have to match the existing building but interior renovations would not initiate exterior improvements..

ACTING CHAIRMAN FIELDER inquired if Oak Park Avenue applies to this. Ms. Wallrich replied the Legacy District has its own requirements and staff can work on adjusting it to apply some of these requirements to this area.

The Public Hearing will be on November 21, 2019

GOOD OF THE ORDER:

1. Cannabis discussion on November 12, 2019 with a Public Meeting with Public Survey
2. Moving dirt on the Boulevard project.
3. Vroegh Eyecare continued to December 3, 2019
4. Union Square Townhomes have started the third building – approval for foundation only.
5. North of Ed & Joes – new owner has been given a façade grant
6. English Garden opens – Coming to PC for a Special Use – Multi Use Apartment
7. There is townhouse interest on Oak Park Avenue
8. Hotel Interest on Route 45
9. Banging Gavel is moving forward
10. SIP will be using Hardie Board Siding on all facades.

COMMISSIONER STANTON noted a vacant lot on Oak Park Avenue Parking Lot in very bad condition. Mr. Ritter noted he would have the Code Enforcement Officer investigate..

COMMISSIONER GATTO noted a for sale sign on the Bremen Cash lot. Mr. Ritter advised the incentive was not completed.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION

None at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

None at this time.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, a Motion was made by PLAN COMMISSIONER GASKILL, seconded by PLAN COMMISSIONER GATTO to adjourn the Regular Meeting of the Plan Commission of November 7, 2019 at 9:00 p.m. The Motion was unanimously approved by voice call. ACTING PLAN COMMISSION CHAIRMAN FIELDER declared the meeting adjourned.