



Michael P. Collins
VILLAGE
PRESIDENT

Michelle Gibas
VILLAGE CLERK

VILLAGE OF PLAINFIELD
PLAN COMMISSION
RECORD OF MINUTES

TRUSTEES

Margie Bonuchi
Paul Fay
Larry Kachel
Bill Lamb
Garrett M. Peck
James Racich

DATE: November 2, 2010

Chairman Sobkoviak called the meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:03 p.m. and led the pledge to the flag.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners O'Rourke, Renzi, Sanders, Kiefer, and
Chairman Sobkoviak; Fire District

Absent: Commissioner Heinen, School, Park and Library Districts

Also Present: Jonathan Proulx, Planner;

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes from October 19, 2010 were accepted as presented.

DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Mr. Proulx stated the Mayor proclaimed next Tuesday as World Town Planning Day; the Mayor appointed Anthony Witt to the HPC; the Village Board approved the special use for Force Wrestling for the current location on Coil Plus Drive; and approved a site plan modification for an office building on the west side of Van Dyke Road that was previously before the Plan Commission at their November 1st meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

Case No. 1524-100110.SPR/FA STOCKADE BAR & GRILL

Mr. Proulx indicated this applicant is requesting a site plan review to renovate the existing building at 24108 W. Lockport Street and the addition of a partial second-floor to convert the building into a restaurant. The building is located on the north side of Lockport Street just west of the gravel parking lot that currently serves the Wine and Cheese Building. Historically the building has served as a municipal site for Village Hall, fire station jail and police station. The ArchiSearch survey shows this building would contribute to a Historic District on the National Register of Historic Places and would warrant local landmark status.

The lot is approximately 1,900 square foot with a 10-foot front building setback and a 5-foot rear building setback. The building backs to a public alley. Finnegan's Irish Pub Restaurant and Wine and Cheese are to the east with Klover and Company to the west; to the north is the public alley and additional office and to the south is Lockport Street and the Courtyard development.

Staff recommends the use of the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* ("Standards" for reference herein.) These standards were initially developed for use by the Department of the

Interior to regulate construction on properties in the Historic Preservation Fund grant-in-aid program. The standards are now widely used to evaluate proposed changes to historic buildings whether they are national landmarks, local landmarks, properties that are not yet landmarked but have the resources to be a landmark or even properties that are within a district or an area that would qualify for a district on the local or national level.

Staff highlighted three of the ten guidelines in the *Standards* as follows:

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

The applicant proposes to remove the existing storefront assembly and replace it with a transparent overhead door, which could be opened during seasonal good weather to provide direct access for the dining patrons. The applicant proposes to restore the pedestrian door to the historic location. The existing brick would be restored on the front elevation as well as the decorative cornice. The applicant submits the brick on the side and rear elevations have deteriorated to a point that the best course of action would be removal. There are three layers of brick on the sides and rear and only the outer layer would be replaced with aged brick. The applicant has submitted two opinions for the removal and replacement of the brick, one from a mason and one from a structural engineer. Both assessments indicate that repair is not feasible.

The second-floor addition is set back from the front elevation. It would mimic or mirror in some ways the architecture of the original building. Staff's understanding of the *Standards* is not to replicate fully the architecture of the original building. Several pictures of the view of the proposed building were presented. The question is if the bulk or mass of the proposed addition is acceptable to the Plan Commission. There are some things that could be done to reduce visibility from the street view such as reducing the size of the addition slightly or pulling it back further from the front of the building.

Staff has reviewed the overhead door with the Will County Health Department since writing the staff report and found that the Health Department may not permit this. Staff requests additional information regarding the type of railing or barrier that would be required for the second floor and what the visual impact would be.

Some other considerations are the location of the trash enclosure given that the project is essentially lot line to lot line; where utility meters would be located; the building department indicated the oven hood location could affect the exterior of the building; and the screening of the roof top mechanical equipment.

A restaurant of this size (2600 square feet) would normally require 26 parking spaces (1 space per 100 gross floor area), however this building is in the Downtown Parking Zone and as such is exempt as it is

less than 5,000 square feet. Staff believes there are 26 spaces available within 300 feet of the building. A landscape plan was not submitted as the project is lot line to lot line but if there is support we feel there are opportunities within the 10 foot setback area or on the roof top dining garden area. Staff would like to review a cut sheet or product specification for the specific light fixtures proposed.

Staff is supportive of the idea of a restaurant at this location and believes the second-floor addition can be done in a manner that would be sensitive to the historic resources of the building could be accomplished in a manner that is consistent with the *Secretary of Interior's Standards*. Staff welcomes direction and input from the Plan Commission.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked about the key recommendations mentioned in the staff report.

Mr. Proulx indicated the three biggest areas for direction are the removal and replacement of the original brick building materials on the sides and rear; does the Plan Commission consider the architecture and appearance of the second floor addition to be consistent with the character of the building; how to address the overhead door if it is not allowed.

Chairman Sobkoviak sworn in both Jason Morales and Mark Carlson.

Mr. Morales said he knows Will County changed their ruling about the opening of store fronts last year and he is willing to keep this as a store front. Mr. Morales said they have to remove the wooded doors as they are rotting away. Mr. Morales wants to move the man door to where it was 100 years ago and the remainder of the opening will be retained with tinted glass.

Mr. O'Rourke asked if Will County's codes allowed any type of opening or just not all the way to the ground.

Mr. Morales said Will County does not want a fixed opening as birds can fly in or animals can get in. Our original idea was because it was a jail house was to have some kind of bar that would prevent animals from entering.

Mr. O'Rourke asked if the window upstairs would be fixed and closed. Mr. Morales said yes.

Mr. Renzi asked about the slope of the roof and how they would level the second floor. Mr. Renzi asked if the second floor roof would maintain the same angle of roof decline.

Mr. Morales said it is a considerable slope and it is their thought to remove the roof framing and lower it to the 2 X 10's thereby flattening the roof. The structural support will be above the roof and the decking would be at the same level as the second floor. They are looking at a 4 foot parapet.

Chairman Sobkoviak said a normal pitch has to be 1 inch for every 12 feet.

Mr. Proulx stated the applicant is the owner of the building so we have been had an opportunity to provide input through the process. One of the things we identified was to step the building back to provide some differentiation between the original structure and attempt to maintain a single story profile on the front.

Mr. Kiefer asked the height of the structure once the second floor was added.

Mr. Proulx said to the parapet the dimension is 28ft.

Mr. Renzi asked if the back entrances were fire doors. Mr. Morales said the back entrances are secondary egresses.

Mr. Renzi asked if the steps were turning onto the 5 foot setback and if permanent steps could be located within the setback. Mr. Proulx indicated this is something that would need to be reviewed during the building permit process. Mr. Carlson indicated the stair have to be 36 inches wide. Mr. Carlson indicated the stairs were drawn incorrectly and they will have to find a way to make it work. The door location could move in order to get the stairs in without encroaching. Mr. Proulx said the applicant will have to revise the stairs to fall within the property line. Mr. Renzi asked how this can be done. Mr. Morales said they could put the back door in 5 feet so the steps can be started within the building. Mr. Renzi said if you do that you will have to tear out part of the back wall so you are arguably destroying some of the significance historic resources. Mr. Morales agreed they would lose some of the back wall. Mr. Morales indicated there are stairs inside the space to get to the second floor as well as an elevator in the corner.

Mr. Sanders said because of the location of the door they would not have enough of a landing to clear the door if you started lower. Mr. Carlson said they would move the door.

Mr. O'Rourke said they would need a variance if they build within the setback. Mr. Proulx said the stairs would be allowed within the 4.75 feet as long as it does not fall on the public alley.

Mr. Renzi asked about the parking for the restaurant. The downtown is becoming restaurant row with everyone using the same parking spaces. Mr. Proulx stated the Village periodically re-evaluates parking regulations in the downtown area. The Village has checked parking in the downtown at peak times in the downtown and found available parking on the street and in the five off street parking lots that the village owns never exceeded 60 percent. Sometimes you cannot park immediately next to where you are going but that is not necessarily a bad thing as you then pass the other shops. At some point the Village may have to invest in additional parking.

Mr. Renzi asked what does significant historic resource mean. Mr. Proulx indicated this is the last and oldest municipal building dating back to 1900. This building served the function of the building we are now sitting in a century later and Mr. Proulx believes this single story building is unique architecturally. A combination of the historic use and the architecture itself are reasons we should be sensitive to any modifications.

Mr. Sanders said essentially there was this building and the building across the street which were mirror images in their construction. Those two buildings were the outskirts of town 100 years ago. The commercial area was east of that point. Mr. Proulx said as you moved west it became more of an industrial type of area. Chairman Sobkoviak said the street car barns were down there too.

Mr. Sanders said when we are developing the Central Area Plan for this area do we need to look at the properties on either side and behind it to see how it is going to fit in as we move forward. Mr. Proulx said we hope to see a building in place of the gravel parking lot to the east someday. Mr. Proulx said if a two story building were to go there it would minimize the visibility of the building we are considering tonight; but if it were a building that attempted to build to the lot line and there was a desire to have a party wall or shared wall like we see in the 500 block of Lockport the proposal to step back the footprint would kind of preclude the ability to have a shared wall on the property line as proposed.

Mr. Sanders asked if construction of a new building between existing buildings has taken place anywhere else. Mr. O'Rourke said it can be accomplished.

Mr. O'Rourke suggested deferring to the people who have experience with regard to the changes to the facade. Mr. O'Rourke asked if this building was a landmark.

Mr. Proulx indicated that the building is not currently landmarked and is not in a historic district. This is a similar process we use for projects whether they are a landmark or recommended for a landmark.

Mr. O'Rourke asked if it was Staff's hope to maintain the original design of the bi-fold doors and further suggested doors that could go over the glass that could be closed. Mr. Proulx indicated he would support having doors that would reflect what was there originally but I would not rule out having a store front similar to what the applicant identified as an alternative. Mr. O'Rourke asked if the applicant was open to that suggestion. The response was yes.

Mr. O'Rourke asked if we could restrict a tent being placed in the beer garden. Mr. Proulx if it was to become permanent we would look for a site plan review. Mr. Proulx did not know how a temporary tent would be handled. Mr. Renzi said a tent would impact the massing and if we were going to do this it should be conditional as to the length of time it would be permitted. Mr. Kiefer said to remember like the temporary sign they might be able to extend the time with permits back to back. Mr. Proulx said it could be made a stipulation. Mr. Sanders said anything put there would almost have to be structural.

Mr. O'Rourke asked about the noise level coming from a roof top and suggested some form of landscaping would be helpful. Mr. Morales stated they had not thought of landscaping as they are at the lot line except maybe in front where the window is located.

Chairman Sobkoviak opened the meeting up for public comments. No one approached the microphone.

Mr. O'Rourke asked about the trash enclosure. Mr. Morales stated we talked about putting a dumpster two doors there where is a pad that has multiple dumpsters now. Mr. Proulx indicated that there is some shared space by the Wine and Cheese store. We could work with the applicant to formalize an agreement with the property owner.

Mr. Renzi felt this should not be approved without a designated garbage disposal area. Chairman Sobkoviak said we could make it a stipulation.

Mr. Kiefer asked where the heating and ventilation would be located. Mr. Carlson said on the first floor there will be an air handler unit inside and a condenser will be on the high roof. We plan to minimize the mechanical units on the roof.

Mr. Renzi asked about the interior drawings. Mr. Morales indicated they plan to recess the coolers into the ground with stainless steel lining with a stainless steel platform with the evaporators under the platform and use a special type of glass that you can walk on so you can see the kegs.

Mr. Renzi asked about the location of the heating and cooling units. Mr. Morales indicated the heating and cooling units are not shown on the drawing but indicated where they would be located.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked if the commissioners wanted to add a stipulation for an agreement for the offsite trash container.

Mr. O'Rourke said that is not the only option they have but did feel the issue should be resolved. It was suggested the additional stipulations be that the issues of landscaping and location and/or disposition of trash be resolved prior to presentation to Village Board. A commissioner noted landscaping was already included in stipulation number 3.

Chairman Sobkoviak sworn in Wendi Wanner.

Ms. Wanner asked what the current users have for garbage removal. Mr. Morales said they probably haul it out. Mr. Kiefer said the changing of the use will generate a lot more trash.

Mr. Proulx asked if the commissioners had additional input with regard to the architectural style of the second floor.

Mr. O'Rourke stated the second floor looks okay but was concerned with the beer garden sign. Chairman Sobkoviak stated he did not think the concerns with people looking up were founded due to the numerous crosswalks. Mr. Renzi liked the architectural double doors to give the illusion of a door.

Mr. Renzi liked the design.

Mr. Sanders asked if the Village has any ordinances with regard to umbrellas and tables on a second floor patio. Mr. Proulx said we do regulate what furniture is used on public sidewalks as part of the permit process, but for private property this would fall under site plan requirements. This is the first time we have considered a roof top garden scenario. We will take that under advisement.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked for additional comments.

Mr. Kiefer said one of the main points was the door on the front and it sounds like the applicant has agreed to alter it.

Commissioner O'Rourke made a motion to recommend approval of the site plan review for the proposed facade modification and building addition at 24108 W. Lockport Street, subject to the following three (3) stipulations in the staff report and the additional fourth stipulation added by the Plan Commission:

- 1. Compliance with the requirements of the Village Engineer.**
- 2. Compliance with the requirements of the Plainfield Fire Protection District.**
- 3. Submittal of a revised building elevations and landscape plan incorporating recommendations from staff and/or the Plan Commission; and**
- 4. That the trash/garbage enclosure and location be formalized in accordance with Village sighting and sanitation ordinances prior to presentation to Village Board.**

Commissioner Sanders seconded the motion.

Vote by Roll Call: Commissioner Kiefer, yes; Commissioner Renzi yes; Commissioner O'Rourke, yes; Commissioner Sanders, yes; Chairman Sobkoviak, yes. 5 yes, 0 no, 1 absent. Motion carried by a vote of 5-0.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Renzi stated the Police Department particularly the Dare Department had partnered with the Foundation for Excellence for the Haunted House located in the basement of the Police Department and it was really neat and well attended. Mr. Renzi expressed Kudos to all who participated.

Adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by

Merrilee Trotz
Recording Secretary