

PLAN COMMISSION
VILLAGE OF DEERFIELD

The Plan Commission of the Village of Deerfield held a Workshop Meeting at 7:30 P.M. on February 11, 2016 at the Village Hall, 850 Waukegan Road, Deerfield, Illinois.

Present were: Larry Berg, Chairman Pro Tem
Al Bromberg
Jim Moyer
Stuart Shayman

Absent: Bob Benton
Elaine Jacoby
Mary Oppenheim

Also present: Jeff Ryckaert, Principal Planner
Dan Nakahara, Associate Planner

Public Comment on a Non-Agenda Item

No public comment on a non-agenda item

1. Prefiling Conference: Proposed Renovations to 636 Deerfield Road in the Shopper's Court PUD (former Overstock Furniture Building) and the West End of the Village Owned Parking Lot

Lawrence Freedman, Attorney, Ash Anos Freedman & Logan, explained that the petitioner requesting an amendment to the Shopper's Court Planned Unit Development (PUD) to make renovations to 636 Deerfield Road building. Mr. Freedman also mentioned that the petitioner has a potential tenant that may require a Special Use if ownership agrees to lease terms with the prospective tenant.

Johnathan Berger, Managing Member of Bensenville Associates, LLC and new owner of Deerfield Shopper's Court, stated that his passion is to buy well located real estate that is functionally obsolete and transform the building. Mr. Berger noted that the 636 Deerfield Road Building is a really well located building that needs some vision, money and municipal support; identifying it as a single user retail commercial building that can be divided into a multi-tenant building. In order to transform the 636 Building into a multi-tenant building, Mr. Berger stated that the following changes would need to be made to the building: 1.) The building would need multiple front door possibilities (identifying the east façade as the best place to have multiple front doors); 2.) In order to add multiple doors to the east façade, the sidewalk would need to be raised slightly to meet the floor of the building; 3.) There would be some steps and railings added to the east façade of the building for safety purposes and, 4.) Restriping in the municipal parking lot.

Mr. Berger identified a key design element on the east façade, sets back the doors and window two feet. Mr. Berger stated that this design element allows the following: 1.) It aesthetically add interest by creating layers and levels; and 2.) Sets the door back two feet allowing the door to only impact the sidewalk by one foot when it swings all the way open. Mr. Berger explained that the sidewalk is nine feet wide, and that by setting the door back by two feet pedestrians have eight feet of sidewalk to utilize at all times; maximizing the use of the sidewalk.

Mr. Berger noted that the 636 Building is an iconic and historic structure in Deerfield. He commented that the major changes would be on the east elevation with the addition of a sidewalk on the west side of the building so as to allow traffic to move around all 3 sides of the building. Mr. Berger explained that the west façade sidewalk would extend back to the northwest corner of the building, where a tenant with a cross-fit type business would fit perfectly (in a tenant space of about 3,000 feet). He pointed out that this type of business would be a good use for the northwest portion (back) of the building.

Mr. Berger also commented that as you move away from Deerfield Road and along the east elevation toward the back of the building he foresees tenants using the space for less retail, and more commercial types of uses.

Werner Briske, architect, Partners in Design Architects, stated that the building has a lot of potential, pointing out that the interior has an interesting design element with the bowstring trusses in the ceiling. Mr. Briske commented that their east property line ends at the east wall of the building and their proposed plan to make changes to the sidewalk is on Village property. He noted any change would require some form of municipal support. Mr. Freedman clarified that their request for "municipal support" is a request for an easement or license agreement from the Village.

Mr. Briske expressed that it has always been disappointing to enter the Village Center from the east on Deerfield Road because of the lack of development on the north side of Deerfield Road. He identified the remodeling of the 636 Building as an opportunity to enliven the north side of Deerfield Road as a retail gateway into the community. Mr. Briske feels that their proposed plans for the 636 Building is going to be the beginning of enlivening Deerfield's retail district. He reiterated that they are proposing to perform within the Village's property, which includes the following: 1.) The work on the sidewalk on the east elevation; 2.) Creating a stair at the south corner, and a stair and a ramp at the south end of the sidewalk; 3.) Raising the sidewalk to the entry of the building, and putting a railing across the sidewalk and, 4.) Restriping the parking lot. Mr. Briske stated restriping of the municipal parking lot would move the handicap spot from the north end to the south end.

Mr. Briske stated that changing this 14,000 square foot single user building into multiple tenants building is a great opportunity to enliven the building. He noted other changes to the building including utilizing the signature fin of the building as their

signage element to brand the building, the signage for their tenants including the steel beam brow with the signage sitting on top, so that the beams are slightly exposed; creating a shadow, as well as a unique feature in the Village, enhancing the landscaping in the corner between the front entrance and the parking lot entrance, raising the elevation on the east side, so that the sidewalk is level with the building, creating a retaining wall along the west side of the ramp with salvaged brick to match the rest of the building. Mr. Briske commented that they intend to sandblast the brick, tuck point and clean it; and possibly stain the brick, depending on the color of the brick that is exposed. Commissioner Moyer asked if they could bring the brick to the front of the building, instead of the having the white panels. Mr. Briske commented that they considered placing brick in the front of the building, but felt that the white paneling in the front livened the building and made the front stand out. Commissioner Moyer asked how the parking would change if they were given the approval to raise the elevation on the east side of the building. Mr. Briske replied that there would be no change in the number of spots in neither their parking lot, nor the municipal parking lot. He also clarified that their plans are to raise the sidewalks elevation to the existing curb line of the building only, and are not encroaching out to the parking lot spaces, so the parking lot will not be affected.

Commissioner Stuart Shayman inquired about loading and trash. Mr. Briske noted that loading and trash will most likely be done in the same area as it is done now, on the north side (back) of the building. There is a fairly large trash corral that is shared by tenants in the development in the northwest corner of the building. Commissioner Shayman asked if the trash coral would still work if they ended up with a restaurant type use in the building. The petitioners assured Commissioner Shayman that they had decided on keeping the loading and trash area in the same area even taking into consideration possible tenants or even a restaurant.

Chairman Pro Tem Berg asked if they were proposing back doors for the retail units. Mr. Briske responded that there would be back doors, and pointed out that there is a current existing back door in the north east corner, and another one further west; both of which would likely remain.

Commissioner Shayman pointed out that there is two-way traffic on the north side of the building and if this would remain with the addition of the three parallel parking spaces that will be added on the north end of the building. The petitioners noted that there is an existing apron there that would allow for the three parallel spots to be added, without interfering with the flow of the two-way traffic on the north side of the building. The petitioner noted that the drive aisle width north of the building remains at 24' with the propose parallel parking spaces.

Chairman Pro Tem Berg asked if the Village requires backdoor access for retail establishments. Commissioner Shayman commented that that would be dependent on building code requirements. Mr. Ryckaert suggested that the petitioners speak with the

Village's Building Department to discuss the backdoor requirements for the 636 Building.

Commissioner Al Bromberg asked the petitioners to confirm how many parking spaces the parking lot currently has, and whether the Zoning Ordinance would require them to add more parking spaces if they changed the layout and use of the building. The petitioners confirmed that there are 89 spaces currently on their lot, and in their parking lot plan the parking space count would remain the same (no spaces would be lost, and no spaces would be added). The 89 parking spaces do not include the 50 parking spaces on the Village's parking lot. Mr. Berger commented that the petitioners looked into the code requirements for the number of parking spaces required for building and noted that the Zoning Ordinance would not require more parking spaces unless they increased the square footage of the 636 Building, which they are not proposing. Mr. Ryckaert confirmed that because it is an older building it would be grandfathered in; however, he also commented that when the petitioners apply for Special Uses for the 636 Building, the Village will look into whether there is adequate parking based on the tenants' use of the building. Mr. Freedman commented that for non-Special Uses (permitted uses) that they would not have to add parking spaces, but if they were to apply for a Special Use permit like a restaurant then they would need to consider the adequate number of parking spaces based on the uses in the building.

Commissioner Moyer asked Mr. Ryckaert to confirm that the 50 parking spaces in the municipal lot are Village owned. Mr. Ryckaert confirmed that is the Village municipal parking lot holds 50 parking spaces. He added that there is a shared parking agreement made in 1960 among the Shopper's Court ownership, the church, and the Village. Commissioner Moyer asked if the 50 parking spaces in the municipal lot would be available for overflow parking for the 636 Building. Mr. Ryckaert confirmed that the municipal lot could be used for overflow parking, and that it was a 3-hour parking in the municipal parking lot. Commissioner Moyer responded by asking if the parking spaces available in the municipal lot would be taken into consideration during a parking study, and whether the municipal lot required Parking Permits to park there. Mr. Ryckaert confirmed that the municipal lot would be taken into consideration during a parking study for the 636 Building, and that the lot was not permit enforced, but that there are signs posted limiting customers to a maximum of 3-hour parking. Mr. Freedman commented if (hypothetically) that if they were to apply for a Special Use for a restaurant that their parking study could take into account how much of the municipal lot would be available at any given time to handle that use, since the 636 Building would be allowed to use the municipal lot along with the rest of the tenants in Shopper's Court and general public.

Chairperson Pro Tem Berg asked for comments from the Commissioners. Commissioner Bromberg commented that he thought their plans looked great, and that they would need to meet with the Appearance Review Committee (ARC) to go over signage requirements and any exterior changes. The petitioners commented that they had met with the ARC, and felt that it was a productive meeting. The petitioners have

made several changes to their signage plans based on the ARC's suggestions, and they felt that their new signage plans were in sync with the ARC's recommendations. Mr. Ryckaert asked if the petitioners could show the Plan Commission the new signage plan for the 636 Building, and explain the changes that they had made since they met with the ARC. Mr. Berger pointed out that one of the ARC's main concerns was the long term effects on the appearance of the building especially, if the signs were to attached directly to the building. The ARC asked the question of what happens after a tenant leaves and their signage is taken down. What happens with the holes in the walls from where there signage used to be. Mr. Berger explained that the ARC was concerned about how they would then cover the holes in the walls, and whether or not new panels would match due to oxidation from the sun. Mr. Berger commented that their solution to the ARC's concerns was to pull the signs off the wall with steel rods even though they will be requesting a variation as their signage exceeds the maximum amount of inches that the sign can protrude outwards from the building. Mr. Ryckaert asked the petitioners about the size of the lettering and the steel beams on their signage. Mr. Briske responded that the signs are 24 inches for a single line, and the steel beams are projected to be about a foot off the wall. Mr. Berger commented that the sign criteria for the 636 Building mimics the sign criteria for the rest of the Deerfield's Shopper's Court. He noted that the letters are 24 inches tall which is the same height of the letters on signage in the rest of Shopper's Court, with the only difference being the signage protruding further off of the wall. Commissioner Shayman asked if the signs would be internally illuminated. The petitioners confirmed that the signs would be internally illuminated, which includes the 636 Building identification sign.

Commissioner Shayman asked the petitioners to expand on their intentions to place public art on their 636 Building. Mr. Berger commented that they plan to have some artists come view the building and the space. He feels that there is a unique opportunity to utilize the nine masonry squares on the west elevation to incorporate some form of public art. Mr. Berger also noted that they will have two sculptural bike racks on the west elevation of the 636 Building.

Commissioner Bromberg asked if the petitioners had anything planned for the other building where Italian Kitchen currently resides. Mr. Berger commented that his focus is on re-stabilizing the tenants in that building, as well as working with the Italian Kitchen. He recognizes that Italian Kitchen is a staple within the community, and the owners have expressed that they want to stay and invest in their space. Mr. Berger is also in conversation with the rest of the tenants, and is working on renewing their leases. He is planning on investing in a new roof for 646-660 building.

Commissioner Berg asked is there is currently a sidewalk on the west elevation. Mr. B noted that currently there is no sidewalk on the west elevation but there is a curb with three parallel parking spaces which would be moved to the north side of the building (spot for spot) as they discussed earlier. The petitioner is also proposing to remove the landscaped islands that sit in front of the nine square masonry feature.

Commissioner Berg also asked if the petitioners had discussed raising the sidewalk on the east side with the Village. The petitioners confirmed that they were in discussion with the Village on raising the sidewalk on the east side. Commissioner Berg inquired as to whether there was an agreement or easement for the existing sidewalk on the east elevation. Mr. Ryckaert commented that there would likely be an agreement made with the Village as to who was responsible for maintaining the sidewalk.

Document Approval

The Plan Commission approved the minutes from the January 28, 2016 meeting and the Northwest Quadrant Report and Recommendation. The motion passed by voice vote.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,
Mary Glowacz