



Michael P. Collins
PRESIDENT

Michelle Gibas
VILLAGE CLERK

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

**VILLAGE OF PLAINFIELD
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
RECORD OF MINUTES**

DATE: OCTOBER 20, 2009

LOCATION: VILLAGE HALL

Chairman Sobkoviak called the meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:38 p.m. after the conclusion of the Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Commissioners Renzi, Kiefer, Seggebruch, and Heinen; Chairman Sobkoviak; and Plainfield Fire Protection District

Absent: Commissioners O'Rourke and Sanders, ex-officio Commissioner Schrack, Plainfield Park District, Plainfield School District, Plainfield Library District, and Plainfield Police Department

Also Present: Michael Garrigan - Village Planner Village of Plainfield, Sara Javoronok – Planner Village of Plainfield, and Carol Millan – Planning Department Secretary Village of Plainfield

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The October 6, 2009 minutes were accepted as presented

DEVELOPMENT REPORT:

Village Planner Garrigan summarized the results of the Village Board meeting of October 19, 2009.

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

CASE: 1488-091109.CP
Request: Concept Plan Review
Location: Northwest Corner of Lockport Street and Route 59
Applicant: Vince Fazio

FAZIO OFFICE BUILDING

TIME: 7:41 p.m.

Village Planner Garrigan summarized the staff report. This is a two-story, four-square structure housing a law office and hair salon. The petitioner is seeking to proceed with the demolition of the existing structure. The demolition went before the Historic Preservation Commission and they recommended the owner proceed with a partial "Community Impact Statement" relating to the architect and architecture of the structure. The applicant is proposing a 19,740 sq. ft. structure in the Village's downtown. Village Planner Garrigan stated the applicant has made a number of modifications not within the Commissioners' packets. He showed slides of the modifications which are consistent with some of staff's requested changes outlined in the staff report. He went through the original proposed elevations and the modified elevations.

This site is within the B-5 Zoning District, which requires a zero setback. The applicant is proposing an 18' setback along Lockport Street and an 11' setback along Route 59, which is generally consistent with existing setbacks. A key aspect of the site is parking. Because the site is located within the Downtown zone there is some variance from the standard parking requirements, but this site would require 77 parking spaces for its use. He outlined the parking requirements for this site.

When the applicant comes through for formal site plan review, they will have to provide a specific parking plan to provide adequate parking for this proposed development. Based on staff's preliminary review and conceptual plan of this proposal, staff believes there is the potential that the applicant could provide the necessary parking by using adjacent on-street parking and adjacent municipal lots throughout the Downtown.

This site is critically important for the Village's Downtown and good urban design should be a critical element. He stated the Commission should look at the Lockport Street Guidelines and determine if what is being proposed is generally consistent with those guidelines. He went through some of the guidelines. He stated it is imperative that the applicant design a new structure that will integrate into the existing character and fabric of the Village's Downtown. He also went through the guidelines with respect to "Infill Development" in the Historic Urban Core. Staff has worked with the applicant and his architect in this regard to develop some elevations which staff believes are consistent with the guidelines. Originally, the applicant was proposing a 3 story building. Staff had some concerns and has worked with the applicant regarding the massing. Staff had concerns about the massing of the 3 story building as it faces Lockport Street. Staff does not believe the current 3 story structure is consistent with the character or the rhythm or massing of the existing buildings on Lockport Street. The applicant has worked with staff and has modified their elevations. He went through the revised elevations. Staff believes the applicant has made a "good faith" effort to address all the various guidelines in the Lockport Street Design Guideline Manual. Staff believes it would be appropriate to have a maximum of a 2 story structure along Lockport Street, which would be more consistent with the adjacent single-family home just to the west of this site and the Old St. Mary or Baci Ristorante. Staff believes massing is a critical design element within this site and should be considered very sensitively.

Staff has also requested that the applicant consider incorporating some traditional window fenestration on the first floor, which would match some of the historical store fronts. He stated the proposed revised elevations have generally followed that recommendation. The applicant's architect has incorporated some larger store front windows along the Rt. 59 corridor, which is consistent with staff's request. The applicant also has followed staff's request to incorporate material such as limestone or prairie stone along the first floor in lieu of brick to provide a more formal street wall along Lockport Street and Rt. 59. Staff believes architecturally that the applicant has made enormous strides, been very sensitive to staff's requests and recommendations, and believes the applicant has made every "good faith" effort to incorporate many of the elements of the Lockport Street Design Guidelines to create an architecturally sensitive building to the Village's historical fabric.

The Village Engineer has outlined some site line views. There may be some concerns along Rt. 59 at the intersection of Lockport Street and Rt. 59. During the site plan review the applicant should provide a traffic analysis to make sure there are no obstructions at the intersection of Rt. 59 and Lockport St.

Staff believes the proposed concept plan provides a potential opportunity to provide a new economic energy to the Village's Downtown. Therefore, staff believes there will be the opportunity for redevelopment, which will provide economic revitalization for this potential corner. Staff believes though that any proposed infill project be sensitive to the historic character of the Village's Downtown and be consistent with the Village's Lockport Street Design Guidelines.

Staff is making a favorable recommendation of this proposed concept plan with three stipulations as outlined in the staff report.

Chairman Sobkoviak swore in the petitioners, Bob Gabel – United Architects in Joliet, and Vince Fazio – building owner. The petitioner did not have anything to add.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked if there was anyone in the audience who cared to ask a question or make a comment. There was no response from the audience.

Michael Lambert spoke first. He was representing his mother, Mary Alice Lambert – owner of 24012 Lockport Street; and Robert Navarro – owner 24008 W. Lockport Street. He stated Mr. Navarro invested in his building because he believed in the residential and small scale of that block which differs from the 500 block. It has its own unique character that helps create a unique sense of the Downtown Area. He stated his mother, Mary Alice Lambert, was one of the original developers of The Meeting Place and also has had a store there for 20 years. He stated the Village has invested a lot of tax dollars in this block. The Tawny Tortoise, Silky Florist and Baci Ristorante are undergoing work through the façade grant. There is more of a residential character of the neighborhood. This is a gateway. They have concerns about the use of a large building. They prefer the 2 story building on the site. They are not against redevelopment. They also have concerns about drainage issues on this site. He further stated parking is hard to find in evenings and staff should look at available parking. He asked that more creativity be explored and offered suggestions. Chairman Sobkoviak asked Michael Lambert if he is representing two parties and they are not really objecting to this development, but are pleading for sensitivity to the adjacent structures.

Michael Lambert stated basically that was the case. He further stated Mr. Navarro stated at the Historic Preservation Commission that he would prefer to see the historic house left and rehabilitated. They are not opposed to the redevelopment; they are opposed to the proposed redevelopment and the architectural expression of it.

Health Wright spoke next. He felt this looks like buildings the Village already has. He felt the elevations have come a long way from what he saw at the Historic Preservation Commission, but felt the applicant should keep going with the elevations. He felt there should be more zip on the corner.

John Bates spoke next. He has a business in the 500 block of Lockport Street and applauds the applicant with development in the downtown, especially during these economic conditions. He stated the Downtown lacks customers. Employees housed in this development could generate more business for the Downtown merchants.

There was no further response from the audience.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked the applicant if they were locked into the architecture as presented. He wondered if there was any flexibility to take into account the resident comments. Petitioner Fazio felt this was very, very good. It is something that he has envisioned for a very long time. He has been at the corner since 1995. He felt the architect captured his vision.

Commissioner Seggebruch agreed with the Historic Preservation Commission about the applicant submitting an Impact Study. He was not sure why the applicant wanted to demolish the building. Another approach might have been to renovate the house and do an addition to the north that possibly could step up to a 3 story. He further stated the applicant is looking at a different architectural style than what is already there. Applicant Fazio replied was he to understand the Italianate Style is only good for the 500 block and other areas in the Village and he cannot have it at the corner.

Commissioner Seggebruch had concerns about parking. He had concerns when the library expands and most of the parking to the north disappears. He thought with a new building the applicant should possibly think about a basement with some parking in the basement at least to cover the office parking. He was concerned that the new building goes much deeper onto the lot. There are very tight setbacks. A much more difficult fire access has been created around the building. There literally is no fire access around the west side of the building. He felt there would be a solid brick wall on the west side of the building. He talked about the deficiencies in the floor plan. Applicant Fazio stated they have not even gotten to that detail yet. This is a concept plan. A discussion followed between Commissioner Seggebruch and Applicant Fazio.

Applicant Fazio stated he has talked to a representative from the Library several times about parking. He stated the Library stated they would work with the applicant in any way to provide additional surface parking spaces.

Commissioner Heinen asked how the parking spaces are allocated. Village Planner Garrigan stated at some point there will be a critical mass where the Village will have to look at parking comprehensively. Staff has been doing annual parking surveys. There is a perception there is a parking crisis in the Downtown. Based on the evidence staff has looked at, that is not the case. The firm of Teska Associates has also looked at the parking and agrees with staff. During peak periods, there may be some challenges, but overall there is not a parking crisis Downtown. Obviously, as more "infill" or redevelopment occurs, parking will have to be revisited.

Commissioner Seggebruch stated there is more intensive development than what is currently present, so obviously it will create more of an additional parking demand. Village Planner Garrigan stated during the formal site plan review, there will be more of a formal analysis of parking.

Commissioner Renzi was in favor of the plan and gave his reasons for that. He felt it would be beneficial to bring additional employees into the Downtown. He liked that the applicant worked with staff to come up with better looking elevations. He thought parking underneath the building is a nice thing, but did not know what that would do to the cost of the building. Petitioner Fazio stated they thought about that, but there is not a pretty way to put it in. Commissioner Heinen agreed with Commissioner Renzi in regard to staff working with the applicant on the changes. He likes the changes in regard to the massing and the fenestrations. He thinks it is a pretty building.

Commissioner Heinen asked if the streetscape design would be extended along Lockport Street in the Plaza area in front. Petitioner Fazio stated it will continue on up to the building. Commissioner Heinen felt that was important. Commissioner Heinen had a concern about utility connections and hoped the streetscape on Lockport Street would not be torn up.

At 8:35 p.m. Commissioner Heinen made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the Concept Plan for the Fazio Building subject to the three stipulations in the staff report.

1. Compliance with the requirements of the Village Engineer;
2. Compliance with the requirements of the Plainfield Fire Protection District,
3. Incorporation of some of the architectural modifications as outlined in the staff report.

Commissioner Renzi seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

Aye: Kiefer, Heinen, Renzi, Chairman Sobkoviak
Nay: Seggebruch

The motion is carried 4:1

CASE: 1489-092309.TA ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT
Request: Zoning Ordinance Test Amendment (*Public Hearing*)
Location: Village-wide
Applicant: Village of Plainfield

TIME: 8:35 p.m.

Planner Javoronok summarized the staff report. Notice regarding this text amendment has been published. Staff is proposing text amendments to two sections within the Sign Code Section 9-99 and Section 9-100. These are due to requests from business owners and sign contractors, as well as a few housekeeping issues.

Section 9-99 – Figure XI-2

- Adding a graphic shown in the staff report.
 - ✓ Apply primarily to raceway wall signs
 - ✓ Allow for additional sign area, but not change calculation of area
- Changing projecting signs to have a minimum clearance of 9' above grade
- Spelling correction from “thirteen” to “thirteen”
- Change of measurement descriptions (A = height of sign face) and (B = width of sign face)

Section 9-100 (3) (a) (iii)

- Central Sign District –number of projecting signs permitted, but not total area
- One wall sign per building, store space, entry

Planner Javoronok concluded her staff report.

Chairman Sobkoviak asked if there was anyone in the audience who cared to ask a question or make a comment.

Heath Wright spoke. He asked that in the Central Sign District projecting signs text and graphics must have a minimum clearance of 8 feet above grade be kept instead of changing it to 9 feet above grade. Planner Javoronok stated that would be fine. The Plan Commission also agreed. Planner Javoronok was trying to clarify and make this consistent since the graphic said one amount and the text and ordinance said another amount. Commissioner Renzi asked if both should be changed. Planner Javoronok stated both the graphic and text can be changed to 8 feet.

Commissioner Seggebruch stated this could be more than one projecting sign as long as it equals no more than 12 square feet of projecting signage. He also asked if the per building, store space, or entry relates to facades at all. Planner Javoronok stated they could use the Masonic Lodge as an example. They would be allowed to have one projecting sign for each of their two businesses that face Lockport Street and if there was another business that faced DesPlaines Street, they would be allowed to have a projecting sign for that as well. There could be a projecting sign for each entrance.

At 8:45 p.m. Commissioner Seggebruch made a motion that the Plan Commission recommend approval of the text amendments to Article XI: Signs of the Zoning Ordinance, as outlined in the staff report and per the comments made at the Plan Commission meeting..

Commissioner Heinen seconded the motion.

Chairman Sobkoviak called for a vote by roll call.

**Aye: Seggebruch, Heinen, Renzi, Kiefer, Chairman Sobkoviak
Nay: None**

The motions is carried 5:0

DISCUSSION:

None

ADJOURN:

Since there was no further business before the Commission, Chairman Sobkoviak adjourned the meeting at 8:46 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Carol Millan
Recording Secretary