

**MINUTES**  
MEETING OF THE OAK PARK PLAN COMMISSION  
REMOTE PARTICIPATION  
December 16, 2021  
7:00 p.m.

A recording of this meeting is available on the Village of Oak Park Website: <https://www.oak-park.us/your-government/citizen-commissions/commission-tv>

**PRESENT:** Chair Iris Sims, Commissioners; Paul May, Jeff Clark, Larry Brozek, Nick Bridge, Tom Gallagher, Paul Beckwith and Jon Hale

**EXCUSED:** Commissioner Jeff Foster

**ALSO PRESENT:** Craig Failor -Village Planner, Greg Smith -Plan Commission Attorney, and Bill McKenna – Village Engineer

**Roll Call** - Roll was called at 7:01pm. A quorum was present.

Village Planner Failor read into the record a statement regarding remote participation and reviewed the public hearing procedures.

**Agenda Approval:** Motion by Commissioner Brozek, Seconded by Commissioner Hale. Roll Call Vote as follows: Commissioners; Brozek-yes, Hale-yes, Gallagher- yes, Clark–yes, Beckwith–yes, May-yes, Bridge-yes and Chair Sims – yes.

**Non-Agenda Public Participation** – None

**Approval of Minutes** – December 2, 2021: Motion by Commissioner Brozek, Seconded by Commissioner May. Roll Call Vote as follows: Commissioners; Brozek-yes, May-yes, Bridge-yes, Hale-yes, Clark- yes, Beckwith–yes, Gallagher–yes, and Chair Sims – yes.

**New Business / Public Hearings & Findings of Fact:**

**PC 21-06: 7 Van Buren Planned Development:** The petitioner, Oak Park Residence Corporation, requests approval of a planned development application for a six (6) story 45-unit multiple family building in the in the R-7 Multi-Family Residential Zoning District. The Petitioner seeks the following allowances from the Oak Park Zoning Ordinance associated with the Planned Development application, found in Article 4 – Table 4-1 Residential Districts Dimensional Standards: a decrease in minimum lot area from 35,100 sq. ft. to 11,085 sq. ft.; an increase in height from 45 feet to 71.85 feet; an increase in maximum building coverage from 70% to 85.17%; a decrease in minimum interior side setback from 9.05 ft. to 8.3 ft.; a decrease in minimum rear setback from 24.5 feet to 1.5 feet; a decrease in automobile parking from 34 spaces to 17 spaces; a decrease in loading area from one space to zero spaces. Continued from December 2, 2021.

Chair Sims opened the meetings with a review of the three outstanding items, bicycle parking, garbage collection at 801 S. Oak Park Avenue process, and Center for Neighborhood Technology parking review. Applicant, David Pope reviewed each of these items, then followed with the Applicant's summary statements focusing on the submitted spreadsheets regarding the development, village goals, changes in neighborhoods, stating that many buildings along Austin Boulevard could not be built today under current zoning regulations, and referenced many of the over 100 positive public comments submitted to the Plan Commission. Mr. Kevin Kell provided a summary for the objectors. Mr. Kell started by stating their support for affordable housing and sustainability by the developer. However, they do not believe the project meets the zoning standards. Nor do they believe the proposed development follows the business district plan or comprehensive plan. Several aspects of the plan do not meet zoning like compensating benefits to the neighborhood, height and massing of the structure, or other regulations such as, water and waste water capacity, maneuvering areas, shadowing of the surrounding properties and diminished light and air for neighboring condo building. Mr. Rolando Acosta, attorney for the applicant, provided the rebuttal statements. He reviewed all of the standards, which he stated were fully met. He reviewed the allowance standards as well, which he stated were fully met. The Commission then opened the deliberation section of the hearing. The Commissioners asked questions and made statements about the project. In general, the commissioners applauded the affordable housing and sustainability goals of the development proposal. Some felt that the developer is at risk for seeking tenants without a need for parking. Some felt that any potential parking increase would be minimal. They felt that the development meets the standard for planned development. Concerns were raised about ingress/egress to the building, parking shortage, bicycle parking, trash locations and access. Those that voted in opposition felt there were too many minor items to overlook for the larger development. The Plan Commission closed the public hearing for the application.

A motion was made to recommend approval of the Planned Development application. Motion by Commissioner Hale, Seconded by Commissioner Beckwith. Roll Call Vote as follows: Commissioners; Hale-yes, Beckwith- yes, Brozek – no, Gallagher-no, Bridge-yes, Clark–yes, May-no, and Chair Sims – yes

A motion was made to approve the findings of fact report as written: Motion by Commissioner Brozek, Seconded by Commissioner Bridge. Roll Call Vote as follows: Commissioners; Brozek – yes, Bridge-yes, Hale-yes, Beckwith- yes, Gallagher-no, Clark–yes, May-no, and Chair Sims – yes

**Van Buren Street Vacation (partial):** The petitioner for 7 Van Buren planned development is also requesting to vacate a portion of the Van Buren Street right-of-way abutting the subject property a length of 122.52 feet by 15 feet wide. There was no discussion of this item.

A motion was made to support the vacation of a portion of Van Buren Street. Motion by Commissioner Brozek, Seconded by Commissioner Hale. Roll Call Vote as follows: Commissioners; Brozek – yes, Hale-yes, Gallagher-no, Beckwith- yes, Bridge-yes, Clark–yes, May-no, and Chair Sims – yes

A motion was made to approve the findings of fact report as written: Motion by Commissioner Hale, Seconded by Commissioner Clark. Roll Call Vote as follows: Commissioners; Hale-yes, Clark–yes, Brozek – yes, Bridge-yes, Beckwith- yes, Gallagher-no, May-no, and Chair Sims – yes

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 10:01p.m. Motion by Commissioner Gallagher, Seconded by Commissioner Bridge. Roll Call Vote as follows: Commissioners; Gallagher- yes, Bridge-yes, Brozek-yes, Beckwith – yes, Clark–yes, May-yes, Hale-yes, Chair Sims - yes.

Prepared by: Craig Failor, Village Planner / Staff Liaison