

Village of Bartlett  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
Minutes

July 7, 2016

Chairman Werden called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call

Present: M. Werden, G. Koziol, B. Bucaro, P. Hanson, L. Hanson

Absent: J. Banno

Also Present: J. Plonczynski, CD Director, A. Zubko, Planner

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the March 3, 2016 meeting.

Motioned by: P. Hanson

Seconded by: G. Koziol

Roll Call

Ayes: M. Werden, G. Koziol, B. Bucaro, L. Hanson, P. Hanson

Nays: None

Abstain: None

The motion carried.

**Case # 15-24 Exeter – Variations – (a) Loading docks in the corner side yard, and (b) Reduction in the number of required parking spaces**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

The petitioner, Jason DeFilippis, was present and sworn in. Other petitioners were present: Ken Lanner, Elmhurst Chicago Stone, Greg from Harris Architects and Bryan Rieger from the civil design team V3 but not sworn in.

**The following Exhibits were presented:**

- Exhibit A - Picture of Sign**
- Exhibit B - Mail Affidavit**
- Exhibit C - Notification of Publication**

**M. Werden:** Go ahead and present your case

**J. DeFilippis:** My name is Jason DeFilippis and I'm with Exeter Property Group. We're here today to discuss our development in Brewster Creek. A little background on Exeter, we control about \$3 billion of equity in funds in about 105 million square feet across the US. We have 12 different regional offices, I'm the regional officer for Chicago and St. Louis. I think everyone is familiar with the location of the site in the business park and wanted to point out they also own 1350 Munger which is directly south of this site. I have a building rendering for all to see and we like to keep it simple and stylish with minimal colors. Our site plan depicts a 421, 000 square foot building with 47 loading docks, 40 trailers which would initially be on the south side of the property and also landbanking some trailer stalls adjacent to those. We're also looking at 227 parking stalls with 222 landbanked. The first variance we're seeking is for the north loading dock variance. A couple things we worked with the Village on is one, I think it is consistent with the setbacks with the other buildings in the park specifically our 1350 Munger building. We looked at the setback from the street and the building is approximately 150'-200' setback from the street and there is a significant elevation change from the street to where the truck docks will be 6-11 feet so it will be significantly depressed from the main road. Additionally we worked with the Village on a landscaping plan to allow when traffic is going through or near the facility you will not be able to see the trucks that are adjacent to the site. For the parking variance I know this is a tough one that a lot of people are struggling with. We're very cognizant of it, we own a lot of property and we wouldn't want to build something that didn't work for a tenant. I brought copies of brochures and also have them on the PowerPoint if people wanted to see examples of three other properties of similar size range throughout Chicagoland. One of them is in Streamwood, one in Hillside and the third is in Aurora. All of the properties are similar in size. The 400,000 square building is in Aurora, 420,000 is in Streamwood and there's a 588,000 square foot building in Hillside. We will have more parking initially than all of those properties have and we have more landbanked parking than those properties have in total parking. We're cognizant of the code and respect that but the only reason I bring up other examples is that it speaks to user demand that other people are building these types of buildings and saying that 200 parking spaces is appropriate for that user size and I think what we've done is that we've accommodated the parking. The problems of the park have occurred in smaller buildings where people didn't have land area so we're already accommodating for the full parking that is required per code and also have another additional land area that we haven't identified a use for yet. It could be for even more parking or we'll see what the use demand might need. That's all I have, I'm happy to answer any questions or any thoughts or additional concerns.

**M. Werden:** I take it you have not had any type of deficiency on parking at the other locations?

**J. DeFilippis:** We have not and that building is also 400,000 square feet and there are 200 parking stalls and they're all on one side of the building and that's been sufficient for that use.

**M. Werden:** And for the record this would be a similar use and similar amount of employees and people coming in off the street?

**J. DeFilippis:** That's what we anticipate.

**M. Werden:** There's never a time of year where you would have some special occasion or event where people would be coming in and you wouldn't know where to put them?

**J. DeFilippis:** That's really going to be user specific but it is something that will be talked about with the user and they'll also be submitting for a certificate of occupancy which I think gives the Village a lot of leverage. At that time they'll know how many employees they'll have, peak employee times and see if it will be accommodated with the parking.

**P. Hanson:** How many different tenants do you anticipate in a building that size?

**J. DeFilippis:** I hope for one! The plan is a maximum of two. What the Chicagoland area is seeing that most users are in outdated facilities or have multiple facilities and want to consolidate into one location.

**P. Hanson:** What type of tenant would need 200,000 square feet?

**J. DeFilippis:** It's hard to say, there are a lot of manufacturing tenants, distribution tenants, a lot of food manufacturing that's existing in Brewster Creek so there might be some ancillary uses there. What we heard from Creative Werks is that they were a company that were in multiple facilities in the O'Hare market and what they found is that they wanted to keep one existing location at O'Hare but because of the size of the requirement they felt that they would really saturate the labor pool there and by coming out to Brewster Creek they could access a different labor pool but it was close enough so they wouldn't lose key employees.

**L. Hanson:** On this type of design, you say it's one or two tenants so is this basically warehousing or is there office space? Who would be inhabiting and what kind of office mix would you have as it looks like it's basically trucks coming in.

**J. DeFilippis:** What we've done is assign two areas for a spec office, because we'd really like to land a single tenant, we're going to build one of the offices first most likely the western most office and try to land one use for the entire building. We've also dedicated the northeast corner for office space as well.

**L. Hanson:** So the interior is basically warehouse and trucks?

**J. DeFilippis:** Correct, it's primarily warehouse but it could also be used for manufacturing. In the Creative Werks building about 50% is currently used for storage of the finished good. If people don't know what they do they're a candy company and right now they're working on manufacturing the plastic candy canes filled with Reese's or M&M's. They actually make those at the facility. So they're making the red plastic bodies and plastic caps for Christmas. So 50% is used for storage and 50% for warehousing.

**G. Koziol:** So you're going to be using this for one or two tenants, will it be basically used for incoming on one side and outgoing on the other?

**J. DeFilippis:** Generally that's how people would use a facility like this would be the plan.

**G. Koziol:** The future trailer stalls on the north side of the building, from my visit out there and what you describe the property is going to sit below road grade and the fact that you're going to put vegetation and landscaping it'll basically be blocked from view?

**J. DeFilippis:** Absolutely, that's one of the things we went through with the Village, is actually outlining how we stage the trees that would block it completely.

**G. Koziol:** And these areas are going to be paved with markings for the trailers to park?

**J. DeFilippis:** So what we want to do is build the southern trailer parking initially which is generally sufficient for this product but sometimes users want more trailer parking so they at least have the location to add more trailer parking if needed but won't put it in unless needed.

**G. Koziol:** And on the west side of the building, one marked future and landbanked which is 50 and 50 and further west is additional parking which will not be built at all, just landbanked?

**J. DeFilippis:** The 50 and 50 further west parking is all going to be landbanked. There are the white parking spaces on the plan consisting of about 84 parking stalls that is adjacent to the building that will be built with the building.

**G. Koziol:** Question to staff, why the comment about that they should consider building 100 more parking stalls up front?

**A. Zubko:** We just felt more comfortable if they put in 100 more parking stalls but since staff has been looking at this over time we feel confident in the landbank agreement that we're drafting that if it is needed that they will be required to put it in. And they've actually shown landscaping to meet our landscape requirements in the future if this parking was put in as well. So that was our initial assessment that we wanted 100 more but over time we've felt more comfortable.

**M. Werden:** So if this was built now there would be more green space and an attractiveness to this lot?

**A. Zubko:** Correct, also in your packets and on the PowerPoint shows the extra landscaping that will be put in if the landbanked parking is ever put in.

**P. Hanson:** What's the average size of the facilities out there now? Are there any as large as this?

**A. Zubko:** No, this will be the largest building and Creative Werks will be the second largest at 400,000 square feet. This is also the only other one we've granted a variance on for parking as well and has a landbanked parking agreement.

**B. Bucaro:** What's the mechanism on requiring them to add additional parking?

**A. Zubko:** We're still drafting the agreement and Exeter actually has not seen it yet but the attorneys will be working together. Some of the reasons will be obviously if they're over parked on their own property, start parking along Brewster Creek Blvd. Those are the main two reasons. We can force them to put parking in, the petitioner will put up a bond in case we need to put it in as the Village. I don't think it would ever come to that.

**B. Bucaro:** There would be some timeline. How much time would they have to develop?

**A. Zubko:** Yes it would depend on what time of year. We would give notice as to when the parking stalls would need to be installed. It is outlined in the agreement.

**G. Koziol:** I know from past there have been parking issues out there. If a parking issue happens it's strictly driven by the tenant or tenants in the building. I really like the idea of landbanking it if you don't need it. Why have 100 empty spaces?

**P. Hanson:** To plow and maintain and more asphalt.

**A. Zubko:** That is why we feel a little more confident with the variance as well as they do have the ability and location to put it in as the other sites don't have anywhere to go.

**P. Hanson:** I have to commend you on the landscape plan that's been presented. I travel quite often and all you see is big concrete buildings with little landscaping. This looks very positive.

**M. Werden:** I would have to agree with the landscaping comments, so many times along Route 59 because of the widening that was the excuse there was not enough room for landscaping. This case there will still be green grass and landscaping and only asphalt if it's needed. I hope more people do landbanking.

**G. Koziol:** I think this is a well thought out plan from the parking, landbanking, the trees and shrubs, you deserve anatta boy on this one.

**J. DeFilippis:** Thank you.

**B. Bucaro:** Is the building elevation on the north side and south side for the truck docks the same with that depression?

**J. DeFilippis:** Yes it is.

**M. Werden:** Anyone else? Let's open it up the public hearing. Any further discussion or motions?

**P. Hanson:** I would like to make a motion to send a positive recommendation to the Village Board for Lot 9C1, Exeter #15-24.

**G. Koziol:** I second that.

**M. Werden:** At this time it was moved by Hanson and seconded by Koziol. At this point we'll close the Public Hearing portion. Any further discussion? With none please call the roll:

**Ayes: P. Hanson, G. Koziol, B. Bucaro, L. Hanson and M. Werden**

**Nays: None**

**M. Werden:** We shall pass on a positive motion to the Village Board. Stay in touch with Angela as to when it will be on the agenda.

**J. DeFilippis:** Thank you very much!

**M. Werden:** Old Business, New Business.

**J. Plonczynski:** No Old business but I wanted to remind everyone that next Thursday we will have a joint meeting with the Plan Commission and Economic Development Commission on the TOD plan. Just to remind you the Plan Commission will start at 7pm and then the joint meeting will start at 7:30 and we'll try to seat as many as we can up front, please come.

**P. Hanson:** I make a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:22

**G. Koziol:** Second.

All unanimous in favor Ayes!