

CITY OF OAK FOREST

PLANNING/ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

Wednesday

May 18, 2016

The Plan/Zone Commission meeting was called to order by Chairman Stuewe at 7:00 p.m. with Roll Call. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mr. Cowgill.

PRESENT: Mr. Riha
Mr. Walsh
Mr. Ziak
Mr. Schroeder
Mr. Cowgill
Mr. Wolf
Chairman Stuewe

ABSENT: Mrs. Morrissy
Mr. Oostema

PUBLIC HEARING - PZC CASE #16-007

Chairman Stuewe introduced PZC Case #16-007, Petitioner Kamal Kishore, Golf View Shopping Center.

Mr. Aman Kishore identified himself and was sworn in. Mr. Kishore explained that the shopping center tenants have been asking for an attention-getting LED sign. He added that the LED sign is to be located under the existing sign.

Chairman Stuewe asked for more information about the proposed sign. Mr. Kishore stated that there will be an LED signage board below the existing marquee sign that lists the tenants' names.

The Chairman asked whether anything else will be done to the existing sign. Mr. Kishore responded that the LED portion will be placed under the marquee sign so that it appears that it is one full sign.

Mr. Riha asked what the LED portion will show. Mr. Kishore stated that the tenants' specials will be advertised, such as

Subway, J.P. Tuxedo, etcetera. The tenants have complained that they don't get noticed in this location. The LED sign will help draw customers' attention to these businesses.

Chairman Stuewe noted that the area around the sign also needs to be upgraded, such as landscaping, etcetera. Mr. Kishore stated that they recently painted the marquee sign so that the color is more in line with the rest of the property. He added that they invested their entire budget in a higher-quality sign.

The Chairman explained the type of landscaping improvements the City would like to see; possibly brick around the base and poles, flowers, etcetera, to beautify the area. Mr. Kishore stated that their budget will not allow for brick, but they will consider improvements. He noted that they have been investing capital into the property every year, but have to do this at a reasonable pace so as not to burden the tenants with the costs.

Chairman Stuewe asked whether the signage improvements can be part of the Petitioner's next upgrade plans. Mr. Kishore responded that they will definitely consider beautifying the sign's base/poles with planters and flowers, etcetera.

Mr. Wolf asked whether the existing sign conforms to the Sign Ordinance. Mr. Dotson responded that this currently is a legal non-conforming sign.

Mr. Wolf commented that he appreciates the Petitioner's improvements to the property. He also recommended the new restaurant, stating that it is very good.

Mr. Wolf talked about various problems with the existing sign, such as the lack of illumination and the fact that the sign lists some businesses that are not there. Mr. Kishore agreed that the sign board needs to be cleaned up and the panel updated.

Mr. Wolf again asked what can be done to bring the sign into conformance. He noted that the sign is on an amortization schedule and will have to come down at some point. Mr. Dotson confirmed that there are 4 years left. Mr. Dotson noted that the existing sign is about 22 feet high, but the current Code limits pole signs to 15 feet high.

Mr. Dotson suggested that there may be some relief to these Sign Code standards based on the fact that this strip center has many units and a lot of frontage. He noted that this is one of the

few strip centers that needs to provide signage for so many units.

Mr. Dotson pointed out that the existing sign can remain at this height for the next 4 years, due to the amortization schedule. He briefly talked about the need to provide standards that fit the businesses in the community. He added that ground signs have a 10 foot height limit and pole signs have a 15 foot height limit, and reiterated that the sign in question exceeds the current Code limit. He and Mr. Kishore briefly discussed this.

Mr. Kishore summarized his understanding of what will be required in terms of the sign. He expressed his desire to work within the City's standards, stating that the Petitioners are trying to make the tenants happy and be good stewards of the property.

Mr. Wolf talked at length about the existing pole sign and what he believes the Code will require. He and Mr. Kishore discussed the requirements, citing the Eagle Gun Club sign as an example.

Mr. Kishore reiterated that the sign will be a large capital expenditure which they will need to budget for over time. In the interim, he will make improvements to the landscaping and flowers at the base.

Mr. Kishore added that one tenant had intended to take an additional unit but was delaying his grand opening while waiting for the proposed LED sign. During this signage delay, the tenant in question decided against renting the extra unit. Mr. Kishore expressed disappointment at the loss of this \$250,000.00 lease agreement but stated that he wants to find solutions (with compromise).

Mr. Wolf reiterated his concern about the lack of illumination. Mr. Kishore agreed that illumination is the goal. He and Mr. Kishore discussed this.

Chairman Stuewe asked whether the Petitioner intends to revamp the lighting for the whole strip center, in addition to the LED light. Mr. Kishore agreed. He and the Chairman discussed lighting.

Mr. Walsh briefly talked about the Petitioner's struggle with vacancies and lighting. He suggested that this proposal be approved, even though it is a temporary fix/band-aid because the sign is amortizing over the next 4 years.

Mr. Cowgill asked whether a Condition can be included, requiring that the pole be wrapped within a year and the base flowers and landscaping be completed within 3 or 6 months. Mr. Kishore stated that the base/landscaping will be upgraded; however, he won't have a budget for the poles until early 2017. He agreed to work toward a solution.

Mr. Kishore added that he prefers wrapping the poles in brick rather than aluminum. He suggested that this could possibly be completed within the next 2 years; however, he would like the Commissioners' agreement that this will not need to be torn down at the 4-year amortization mark. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Kishore summarized that he would like some guidance before investing in brick and other improvements.

Mr. Ziak asked whether the Petitioner has considered putting the LED sign at the top. Chairman Stuewe pointed out that LED signs have a 10 foot height limit.

Mr. Ziak asked whether the Petitioner could have two signs, due to the large frontage and the number of tenants. A brief discussion ensued. Chairman Stuewe stated that the City does not normally allow two signs on one property.

Mr. Kishore stated that the LED sign has been built and paid for and is sitting in a warehouse. He is willing to work with engineers, move the sign if necessary, etcetera.

Mr. Ziak asked whether the sign is 2 panels, back-to-back. Mr. Kishore responded that it is a single enclosed panel which would go between the poles, not on top of the poles.

Mr. Dotson suggested that the Petitioner compromise and dress up the sign up to 15 feet, put some type of low base for visibility, and then move forward with the LED message center. When the amortization comes up, the Petitioner will have to reallocate the signage.

Mr. Kishore suggested brick planter boxes at the bottom for a reasonable quick fix. Long term, he agreed to dress up to the 15 feet. Mr. Dotson suggested wrapping the poles in decorative sheet metal, like Eagle Gun Club did. He and Mr. Kishore discussed options.

Mr. Kishore reiterated that the main problem is the budget. He explained that the tenants really want and need the sign, and the

sign is ready to install. He is ready to compromise and is open to suggestions so that they can move forward without being burdened with more costs. He stated that they want to do what is good for the tenants, which in turn will be good for the City.

Chairman Stuewe pointed out that the Commissioners need to make sure the established requirements are met. Mr. Kishore agreed.

Mr. Wolf showed Mr. Kishore pictures and explained what the City would like to see. A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Walsh commented that having the Petitioner fix half of the sign now and the other half in 4 years at amortization will be expensive and look silly.

Mr. Cowgill asked for clarification about the planter boxes. Using the picture, Mr. Kishore pointed out where the boxes would be located, noting that they would not be too intrusive or too high. A discussion ensued about the height only being a couple of feet, not 5 feet.

Mr. Cowgill again requested a timeframe for completion of the flower boxes. Mr. Kishore stated that they are already looking into landscaping and will add the flower boxes, which he feels can be finished within 6 months.

Mr. Schroeder commented that the top four tenant names will be lost if the City requires capping at 15 feet. Mr. Kishore noted that those are double spots for Subway, Dotty's and J P Tuxedo, so they would be losing eight single spots if those are chopped off at 15 feet (both sides of the sign).

Mr. Schroeder asked where those tenant names then would be placed. Mr. Kishore responded that he is hoping for suggestions and solutions from the Commissioners, explaining that all the tenants want space on the sign.

Returning to Mr. Ziak's earlier question, Chairman Stuewe stated that Mr. Dotson has noted that there is a possibility for two pole signs, based on the square footage of the property. This would better accommodate the number of units. Mr. Dotson added that, when the Code was written, most Commissioners understood that some relief would be needed for the few larger strip centers.

Mr. Dotson pointed out that the issue will come up when the 4 year amortization comes up and the Petitioner will need to have a plan at that time. Mr. Kishore stated that asking for a plan tonight is making life very difficult. Mr. Dotson responded that the Commissioners are not asking for a plan tonight.

Mr. Kishore stated that they will be actively, aggressively trying to rectify the problems. Chairman Stuewe suggested that the Petitioner start actively presenting their plan at Year 3. Mr. Kishore agreed.

The Commissioners had no further questions. Chairman Stuewe opened the meeting to citizens' questions/comments.

Mr. Loy Rice, 6033 Brookwood Drive, introduced himself and was sworn in. Mr. Rice commented that he is not in favor of this "tacky sign". He feels that the Petitioner should make improvements behind the self-storage facility. The Petitioner stated that the self-storage facility does not belong to them.

Chairman Stuewe and Mr. Rice briefly discussed the self-storage facility which does not belong to the Petitioner. Mr. Rice reiterated that he is against the "tacky sign" because it will cause a lot of distraction to him and his neighbors.

Mr. Rice asked whether the sign has already been approved. Chairman Stuewe responded that nothing has been approved. Mr. Rice stated that he does not want any flashing sign.

Mr. Boguslaw Marusarz, 6029 Brookwood Drive, introduced himself and was sworn in. Mr. Marusarz asked where the LED will be placed. Chairman Stuewe stated that the LED will be approximately 8 feet up from the bottom of the sign, to the 10 foot mark.

Mr. Marusarz voiced concern that this flashing sign will be visible from his children's bedrooms while they try to sleep. Mr. Dotson responded that it will not be visible because the buildings are 12 feet high and the sign will be 8 feet high. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Kishore reiterated the height of the buildings.

Mr. Marusarz asked what will happen if the sign is installed and the flashing is visible all night. A discussion ensued. Chairman Stuewe noted that the illuminated portions will be

facing east/west so there is minimal likelihood of the residents being affected.

Mr. Marusarz reiterated his concern about what will happen if the light is a problem after the sign is installed. Mr. Dotson responded that the Code prohibits attention-getting devices and that the sign in question will not flash but will stream the messages. The amount of light will be no different than the lighting on the strip center itself. He added that, based on the height of the sign, Mr. Marusarz will not be able to read the sign from the bedroom windows.

Ms. Anna Marusarz, 6029 Brookwood Drive, introduced herself and was sworn in. Ms. Marusarz stated that she currently can see the sign and does not understand how the Commissioners can say they will not be able to see it. She asked whether the sign will be flashing all night or only during the daytime.

Chairman Stuewe reiterated that the sign will not be "flashing" but streaming. He pointed out that the sign is not there, so Ms. Marusarz cannot currently see it. Ms. Marusarz stated that she can see the existing sign. The ensuing discussion took place out of range of the recording device.

Mr. Cowgill asked whether the 6-month timeframe for the flower base can be added to the motion for approval. Chairman Stuewe responded affirmatively.

There were no further comments or questions from anyone. The Chairman requested a motion to close the Public Hearing.

Mr. Cowgill made the motion.

Mr. Ziak seconded.

Everyone was in favor and the Public Hearing was closed.

A discussion ensued about the type of flower box to be installed. It was agreed that a decorative oval-shaped flower box will go around the entire pole structure and in the center, 24 inches tall, with flowers.

Mr. Ziak asked to include the Condition that the lights are working and the tenants' names are updated. Mr. Kishore requested 3 months to accomplish this.

Mr. Ziak asked about the timeframe for the preliminary plans for amortization. Chairman Stuewe suggested 36 months. Mr. Kishore commented that it is in the Petitioner's best interests to have preliminary plans sooner rather than later. Mr. Wolf agreed.

Mr. Wolf suggested that the Petitioner proactively begin planning for the amortization. Mr. Dotson stated that the Petitioner will get a letter within 24 months regarding their preliminary sign plan. He noted that this also will help the Petitioner budget for the sign amortization. Mr. Kishore agreed to the 24-month timetable in order to have tonight's approval more forward. A brief discussion ensued.

(END SIDE A) (BEGIN SIDE B, in progress)

Mr. Wolf stated that by working with the City, the Petitioner may have options, such as signage at each end, etcetera. He strongly suggested continued dialogue between the Petitioner and the City. Mr. Kishore agreed.

Hearing no further questions or comments, Chairman Stuewe again requested a motion to approve PZC Case #16-007, Petitioner Golf View Shopping Center, for a Special Permit to allow the construction of an electronic message center to the existing shopping center signage at 6040-6080 West 159th Street, with the Conditions that the planter box at the base will be completed within 6 months, the lights will be working and the tenant signage will be updated within 3 months, and the Petitioner will present a sign plan within 24 months.

Mr. Walsh made the motion.

Mr. Cowgill seconded.

The Roll Call vote was taken as follows:

<u>AYES</u>	<u>NAYS</u>	<u>ABSTAIN</u>	<u>ABSENT</u>
Mr. Walsh			Mrs. Morrissy
Mr. Ziak			Mr. Oostema

Mr. Schroeder
Mr. Cowgill
Mr. Wolf
Mr. Riha
Chairman Stuewe

The motion to approve PZC Case #16-007 carried, 7/0, with Two ABSENT.

Mr. Dotson stated that the next City Council meeting will be June 14th; however, he advised the Petitioner to move forward with the permitting process and be ready to go forward as of June 15th. Mr. Kishore agreed and asked about the process, which was then explained.

PUBLIC MEETING - PZC CASE #16-006

Chairman Stuewe introduced PZC Case #16-006, Petitioner Malecky Builders.

Mr. Dotson stated that the Public Works Department has worked closely with the Petitioner regarding improvements to be made. If the Petitioner decides not to move forward with Public Works' infrastructure improvement proposals, the other route is to get final engineering from Baxter & Woodman.

Mr. Dotson explained that R-2 requires a 6600 foot minimum for each lot, with a 60 foot wide minimum for interior lots and corner lots. Based on Staff review, the property in question meets all conditions to be a subdivision and does not require any variances for the three lots.

Mr. Dotson stated that the City pushed hard for trees and sidewalks and the Petitioner has agreed to add sidewalks to the existing lot to the west, all the way around. He feels that this will greatly improve the neighborhood in that area. He noted that curbs are not being required because they do not currently exist in the area.

Mr. Wolf asked about the sidewalks. Mr. Dotson stated that the Petitioner is going beyond the property in question, in terms of sidewalks. He added that the proposed sidewalk will connect to

the Sheila Court sidewalk. Mr. Dotson then briefly talked about another property, to the west of this.

Mr. Ziak voiced concern about the setbacks for Lot 3, the corner lot. He noted that the depicted house appears to be plopped sideways on the lot. He explained his concerns and asked whether the City can stipulate how the house is placed on the lot.

Mr. Dotson stated that the City cannot dictate how the rooms are laid out inside a house. He explained that the corner lot square footage is larger because they are required to have more on the corner side lots. He also pointed out that the driveway is normally placed on the less-traveled road, as depicted.

Mr. Wolf and Mr. Dotson briefly discussed corner lot setback requirements and a specific property on 155th Street.

As there were no other questions or comments, Chairman Stuewe requested a motion to approve PZC Case #16-006 for approval of the preliminary plat of subdivision, subject to the City Engineer's and Public Works' approval, for the three-lot Subdivision located in the R-2 Single Family Zoning District at 5033 West 149th Street (the southwest corner of 149th Street and Lavergne Avenue), also known as the Klosinski Subdivision.

Mr. Cowgill made the motion.

Mr. Schroeder seconded.

The Roll Call vote was taken as follows:

<u>AYES</u>	<u>NAYS</u>	<u>ABSTAIN</u>	<u>ABSENT</u>
Mr. Cowgill			Mrs. Morrissy
Mr. Wolf			Mr. Oostema
Mr. Riha			
Mr. Walsh			
Mr. Ziak			
Mr. Schroeder			
Chairman Stuewe			

The motion to recommend approval of PZC Case #16-006 carried, 7/0, with Two ABSENT.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Stuewe requested a motion to approve the minutes of April 20, 2016. No additions, deletions or corrections were requested.

Mr. Cowgill made the motion.

Mr. Schroeder seconded.

The Roll Call vote was taken as follows:

<u>AYES</u>	<u>NAYS</u>	<u>ABSTAIN</u>	<u>ABSENT</u>
Mr. Cowgill		Mr. Walsh	Mrs. Morrissy
Mr. Wolf			Mr. Oostema
Mr. Riha			
Mr. Ziak			
Mr. Schroeder			
Chairman Stuewe			

The motion to approve the minutes of April 20, 2016 carried, 6/0, with One ABSTAIN and Two ABSENT.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Mr. Dotson stated that the City will have a new Planner, Katie Ashbaugh, beginning May 23, 2016. The next PZC meeting will be June 1, 2016. Mr. Dotson also stated that there are façade improvements and sign packages that he would like the Commissioners to look at.

Mr. Dotson stated that he did not include in this agenda a text amendment for Staff to do more reviews at the sign package level. He is letting that issue die because he feels the Commissioners are not yet comfortable enough to have Staff review such proposals. He stated that this issue should not move forward until there is a policy and/or precise writing that addresses the Commissioners' expectations.

Mr. Dotson stated that there are planned workshops and a joint meeting with the E.A.C. in the near future.

COMMENTS - UPDATES

Mr. Schroeder asked about the status of The Ale House annexation petition. Mr. Dotson responded that the annexation probably will not work out due to some existing issues on the property that are beyond the owner's control. He noted that water and sewer issues were discovered during the environmental inspection for the project. Mr. Dotson believes the property has been shut down. A discussion ensued.

There were no other comments or questions from audience members.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Stuewe requested a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Cowgill made the motion.

Mr. Ziak seconded.

Everyone was in agreement and the meeting adjourned.

CHAIRMAN JAMES L. STUEWE

PLAN/ZONE COMMISSION MEETING

MEETING DATE: 18 May 2016

PETITIONER: PZC Case #16-007
Kamal Kishore (Golf View Shopping Center)

ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 6040-80 West 159th Street

REQUEST: To recommend approval of a Special Permit to allow construction of an electronic message center to the existing signage, with stated Conditions

VOTE: Motion to recommend approval Carried, 7 Ayes, 0 Nays, with 2 Absent

PLAN/ZONE COMMISSION MEETING

MEETING DATE: 18 May 2016

PETITIONER: PZC Case #16-006
Malecky Builders

ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 5033 West 149th Street

REQUEST: To recommend approval of the preliminary plat of subdivision, subject to the City Engineer's and Public Works' approval, for a three-lot subdivision located in the R-2 Single Family Zoning District

VOTE: Motion to recommend approval Carried, 7 Ayes, 0 Nays, with 2 Absent.