

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
REPORT FOR THE VILLAGE COUNCIL DISCUSSION
JUNE 14, 2011

SUBJECT:	TYPE:	SUBMITTED BY:
Draft Comprehensive Plan	Resolution Ordinance Motion ✓Discussion Only	Tom Dabareiner, AICP Community Development Director

SYNOPSIS

A draft comprehensive plan was prepared for Council discussion following nearly three years of public outreach, meetings and hearings. Staff seeks discussion and direction to allow preparation of a final draft plan for adoption by Council.

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

Final preparation and adoption of a Comprehensive Plan is one of the Strategic Plan Goals for 2011.

BACKGROUND

On June 14, following the Village Council meeting, Village Council members will have their first formal opportunity to review the latest version of the Draft Comprehensive Plan. The last Plan was approved on July 19, 1965 nearly 46 years ago.

The current effort began three years ago with selection of a consultant, Houseal Lavigne Associates. That team guided the Village through Total Community Development 3 (TCD3) in 2009, the preparation of an initial Draft Comprehensive Plan in 2010 by the citizen-rooted Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee, and multiple public hearings conducted in early 2011 by the Plan Commission. By design, TCD3 had a very broad reach and its relevant outcomes influenced, but did not dictate, much of the material considered by the Advisory Committee. Following a unanimous recommendation by the Advisory Committee, the Plan Commission refined and updated the document. The Plan Commission unanimously recommended the draft Comprehensive Plan distributed to the Council.

Both the Plan's content and the public process employed to develop it are truly *comprehensive*. The public record of these meetings is summarized both in the document and in the meeting minutes of the Advisory Committee and Plan Commission. The meeting minutes are attached and provided in chronological order, allowing an understanding of the evolution of many of the key concepts included in the current Draft.

Tuesday night, Village staff will provide an overview of the process and an introduction to the Draft Comprehensive Plan. The consultant will lead the Council through the document, focusing on the "Policies and Recommendations" at the end of most of the chapters, along with the Focus Area recommendations. Time will be afforded Council members to discuss each chapter before beginning the next chapter. A final Council Draft will result based on the comments and direction provided.

The Focus Areas are a unique and valuable component to the Draft, and an especially useful concept for communities which are largely built-out, like Downers Grove. There are five areas receiving this treatment,

which adds another layer of detailed not always found in comprehensive plans. In fact, if there is a key difference between the document from 1965 and the one now under consideration, it is the stark difference in the amount of land available for growth, as well as the current focus on redevelopment opportunities for long-term sustainability. This means that the plan contains but necessarily deemphasizes traditional land use approaches, which see only modest changes in the Draft, and focuses on the elements of a pre-existing and well-established built and social environment. Importantly, a common thread runs through both—maintaining the vital character of the community of Downers Grove.

Council members were provided copies of the Draft Comprehensive Plan in advance of this memorandum. Copies are available at the library and online. Meeting minutes from the citizens committee and the Plan Commission are also provided.

ATTACHMENTS

Draft Comprehensive Plan (Previously Distributed)

Also available online:

Section 1

<http://www.hlplanning.com/dnn/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=hgSG3agYw9o%3d&tabid=1048&mid=1415>

Section 2

<http://www.hlplanning.com/dnn/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=rBU5AQdc5gM%3d&tabid=1048&mid=1415>

Section 3

<http://www.hlplanning.com/dnn/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=YG7fU%2fmMlPI%3d&tabid=1048&mid=1415>

Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Plan Commission Public Hearing Minutes

APPROVED 3/23/10

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING

FEBRUARY 10, 2010, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman White called the February 10, 2010 meeting of the Comprehensive Plan Committee to order at 7:00 p.m.:

PRESENT: Chairman White, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Davenport, Mrs. Earl, Mrs. Hamernik, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Jirik, Mr. Thoman, Mr. Wendt

ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Dabareiner, Community Development Director; Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager; John Houseal, Houseal Lavigne Associates; Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates; Courtney Owen, Houseal Lavigne Associates

VISITORS: Mr. Rich Bollow (unconfirmed member), Mrs. Margy Sigerich (unconfirmed member), Commissioner Bob Barnett, Greg Bedalov, John Schofield

John Houseal welcomed the Committee and introduced himself and the team from Houseal Lavigne Associates. Mr. Houseal explained the general purpose of the meeting. He explained that the Committee meetings would be informal in nature and would be akin to working group meetings.

Introductions of the Committee members followed.

Mr. Houseal explained the expectations for the group. He noted that they were not expecting the members to be experts in each of the topics covered by the comprehensive plan. Rather, the Village was seeking a cross-section of the community to help guide the drafting of the final document. This group's collective day-to-day experience of the Village and its physical layout will be key to drafting the document. Mr. Houseal explained that meetings would occur monthly.

Mr. Houseal briefly explained what a comprehensive plan contains. He stated the plan is a policy document that provides the foundation for decision-making. He noted the State of Illinois has some requirements as to what topics the document should cover. The main focus of a comprehensive plan is the physical layout of the community and it will provide a legal foundation for all decisions relating to land use and development patterns.

Mr. Houseal explained that a comprehensive plan is not zoning or a promise of what will happen in the future. He indicated the plan would not dictate final designs or provide specific details on topics such as economic development, open space and transportation. Although the plan will address many of these areas, it will serve as a collective community vision and provides an action plan on how to achieve that vision. The comprehensive plan is a policy document.

Mr. Houseal explained that comprehensive plans updates should be routine – usually every 10 years, or so. He noted the Village has a comprehensive plan from 1965, which is outdated and irrelevant at this point. There has been no major update to the Village’s plan.

Mr. Houseal explained this planning process builds off the input received during the Total Community Development 3 (TCD 3) process. He provided some specifics about the TCD 3 process noting that it was a nine-month process that included multiple meetings and internet tools to receive community input. He went on to explain the participants raised many issues. These issues generally fell into nine categories. The comprehensive plan will address many of the topics raised during the TCD 3 process. Mr. Houseal stated creating a better model for communication and cooperation was the principal recommendation of TCD 3.

The duties of the Comprehensive Plan Committee were explained. Mr. Houseal stated the first step of the process is to prepare a vision statement for the plan. He noted visions typically have three components – categories, descriptors and measures. Several examples were provided.

Mr. Houseal passed out a preliminary vision statement based on the TCD 3 input. He provided instructions to the Committee. The Committee should review the document and be prepared to draft a statement for next month’s meeting.

Discussion of the vision followed.

Mr. Wendt expressed concern about the word “passive” under the “Parks and Recreation” heading. Mr. Houseal explained what “passive” means as it relates to park districts.

Mr. Houseal stated he would like to reach a consensus on the vision at the next meeting. Mr. Dabareiner provided some ideas for refining the statement including focusing only on issues that the Village controls. He stated the comprehensive plan will not provide programmatic recommendations for the School and Park Districts, but may affect how much land the Village sets aside for school and park uses.

Mr. Bollow asked if the categories were listed in order of priority. Mr. Houseal explained they were not prioritized and came straight from TCD 3.

Mr. Beggs asked where this group fits into the process as the Village does not have the ability to direct the School or Park Districts. He stated he did not have the expertise to tell those bodies how to address the community’s concerns.

Mr. Houseal stated the Committee did not need to be experts on the other local governments in Downers Grove. He noted the other taxing bodies’ input will be sought as part of the planning process. He explained the Committee’s role is to provide a vision and recommendations for the physical layout of the community. These elements should be based on the Committee’s collective experience in Downers Grove, not their individual expertise. Mr. Houseal explained the Village does not expect the members to be experts in every field.

Mr. Dabareiner re-iterated a majority of the input for this process is from TCD 3 and the final document will be a list of recommendations, not directives.

Mr. Houseal re-iterated they are reaching out to the other taxing bodies to ensure the final document includes input from them.

Mr. Thoman asked if Houseal Lavigne will be getting that input or if the other districts will be invited to the meetings.

Mr. Houseal stated Houseal Lavigne will be getting the input. That process is underway.

Mr. Thoman suggested letting the other taxing districts know when a topic that affects their mission is being discussed. Mr. Houseal agreed.

Mr. Thoman noted several repeating themes in the TCD 3 document. He was wondering if there would be an opportunity to combine some of those items. Mr. Houseal agreed some items could be combined.

Mrs. Hamernik stated concerns that the Village does not really have the ability to dictate education issues. She asked if the Committee was supposed to think of these issues outside of the Village's control in terms of land use or if there were other areas where they should be thinking about.

Mr. Houseal stated the comprehensive plan will not just focus on land use – although it will be a component. He stated as the document is drafted, detailed recommendations will be coming. Some of those recommendations may be general statements about maintaining the high educational standards and park services.

Chairman White stated it might be helpful for the Committee members to receive some examples of recent comprehensive plans. Mr. Dabareiner stated some examples can be found on the project web site. He noted a link from the Village's web page would be up shortly.

The Committee asked for the web site address. Mr. Lavigne stated the project web site was: www.hlplanning.com/dnn/dgcompplan.

Mr. Houseal proceeded to discuss an overview of the comprehensive plan components and timing. The components for the Village's plan are project initiation (tonight's meeting); existing conditions; preliminary vision, goals and objectives; sub-area framework plans; preliminary land use and development plans; and draft comprehensive plan document.

Mr. Houseal stated the next meeting would focus on the vision statement and existing conditions. He noted the Committee would receive the existing conditions report prior to the next meeting. He passed out a sample sub-area map.

The Committee discussed the map. Mr. Houseal explained the map was a sample product that was produced for Houseal Lavigne's response to the Village's RFP. He said it was only a draft and meant to show the type of work the Committee could expect for this part of the project. Mr. Houseal said there would likely be six areas that would be defined in the coming months. He noted there would likely not be a sub-area plan for the Fairview Station area. Based on input from TCD 3, they would likely focus on the area around 63rd Street and Woodward Avenue.

Mrs. Hamernik expressed concern about the areas that were depicted on the map. She stated the large unincorporated area between Maple and 63rd Street should be reviewed as part of this project.

Mr. Beggs noted that there are some important opportunities that deserve attention in the Fairview Station area. Mr. Houseal stated the area would be reviewed, there just would not be as much detail as typically appears in a sub-area plan. He stated the boundaries of the sub-areas are not set in stone and that the Committee would provide guidance as to what the actual boundaries for the areas. He re-iterated the map was simply a sample for tonight's meeting.

Mrs. Hamernik stated the Village might want to look at other areas other than Ogden and Downtown because those areas already have plans. Mr. Dabareiner stated those plans are a little outdated and need some revision. He also stated most of the items identified in the Downtown Plan are complete.

Mr. Jirik stated that Ellsworth Park is an area that really needs to be included with the Belmont area study because the underpass project will likely create many changes and opportunities in the area. Mr. Houseal agreed and stated those boundaries can ultimately be set by the Committee. He stated the scope and project budget really limited the plan to six sub-areas and they should keep that in mind as the process moves forward.

Mr. Houseal went through the tentative project schedule. The Committee discussed specific meeting dates. The fourth Tuesday of each month was the preferred date based on Committee consensus. Mr. Houseal stated the existing conditions report would be provided to members prior to the next meeting on March 23, 2010.

Mr. Dabareiner thanked the Committee and explained the importance of their role in preparing the comprehensive plan. He noted that if the Village gets sued over a development or zoning decision, the courts often look to see whether the community has a recent plan that was created through a public process. If there is such a plan, the courts side with the municipality more often than not. Older plans, such as the Village's, are subject to more scrutiny.

Mr. Dabareiner gave an overview of the Open Meetings Act and how it impacted communications between members. He stated members can not discuss topics related to the Committee meetings in groups larger than three – including email comments. He noted members could email staff and staff could forward comments to the others.

Mr. Beggs asked if Plan Commissioners present on this Committee would be able to vote on the matter when it comes up on the Plan Commission agenda. Mr. Dabareiner said he thought that they could, but he would double-check with the Village Attorney.

Mr. Dabareiner continued with an overview of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requirements. A discussion about specific FOIA requirements followed.

Mr. Houseal thanked the Committee for their time and input. He stated the process will be a fun and that Houseal Lavigne will attempt to keep the group on track. He asked for questions and comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

John Schofield, 1125 Jefferson Avenue, stated he was representing the Downers Grove Coalition for Managed Redevelopment (DGCMR). He stated the Coalition was eager to participate in this process and has three main issues:

1. The DGCMR will be providing some position papers offering its comments on the plan as far as preservation of residential neighborhoods and redevelopment are concerned.
2. The DGCMR is appreciative of the link with TCD 3, but there should be links made between the comprehensive plan and the Downtown Pattern Book.
3. He asked that the information be up on the web site as soon as possible.

Mr. Dabareiner said the web site is hosted by Houseal Lavigne and that things will be up shortly after meetings are completed.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 pm.

/s/ Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Planning Manager

APPROVED 4/27/2010

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING

March 23, 2010, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman White called the March 23, 2010 meeting of the Comprehensive Plan Committee to order at 7:00 p.m.:

PRESENT: Chairman White, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Bollow, Mrs. Earl, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Jirik, Mrs. Sigerich, Mr. Thoman, Mr. Wendt

ABSENT: Mr. Davenport and Mrs. Hamernik

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Dabareiner, Community Development Director; Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager; Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates; Dan Gardner, Houseal Lavigne Associates; Courtney Owen, Houseal Lavigne Associates; Brandon Nolan, Houseal Lavigne Associates

VISITORS: Commissioner Bob Barnett, Greg Bedalov, John Schofield, Tim Meaney, Lucy Lloyd, Megan Schroeder, Jack Dare

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the February 10, 2010. The minutes were unanimously approved by the Committee.

Devin Lavigne described the purpose of the meeting. He explained the Existing Conditions Workbook that was distributed for the meeting. He asked if there were any questions about the document.

Mrs. Sigerich noted that traffic counts for Belmont Road should be provided on page 40.

Chairman White if there was some missing permit information regarding multifamily building permits on page 32.

Mr. Lavigne noted they would look into those issues for the final plan.

Mr. Lavigne indicated the first item on the agenda was the continued discussion of the proposed sub-area plans. He stated they were looking for a consensus on what areas should be studied. He stated three sub-areas are identified in the Workbook – Ogden Avenue, Downtown and the Butterfield-Finley area. He explained that these three areas were identified based on input received during the TCD 3 process. Mr. Lavigne noted that Downtown and Ogden Avenue were the areas that received the most commentary during the TCD process.

Mr. Lavigne went on to explain these sub-areas would receive more attention, but did not mean other important areas would be ignored. He stated that other areas could be identified for additional study outside of the comprehensive plan.

Chairman White asked if the previous Ogden Avenue studies were still relevant.

Mr. Lavigne stated some of the recommendations were a little outdated, but that they would carry over the relevant recommendations as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Dabareiner noted that the 1999 Ogden Avenue Plan was based on data from the mid-1990s and current best practices for revitalizing older commercial corridors have changed drastically from that time.

Mr. Beggs stated it was more important to focus on the function of the corridors before discussing the specific properties.

Mr. Lavigne noted that it would be important to establish the desired function of the corridors. He stated they need some direction as to what areas are important to study.

Chairman White stated there were currently three areas proposed – Downtown, Ogden Avenue and Butterfield-Finley. He asked if members had thoughts for other areas that should be studied.

Mr. Bollow asked if there had been any determination on the number that could be studied as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Dabareiner indicated four or five areas could be studied as part of this process.

Mrs. Earl asked if the Committee could suggest additional studies of key areas and properties as part of the plan's recommendations. She noted 63rd Street would be an example where a two to three page subarea plan might not be able to capture all the issues in this area.

Mr. Lavigne stated that recommendations for additional studies could be included. He also stated that strategies for redeveloping similar types of properties, out-of-date shopping centers for example, could be created as part of the plan. He indicated these strategies could be developed for the Butterfield-Finley area and also applicable to Meadowbrook and the Grove.

Mr. Jirik said that the other sub-areas could serve as models for other key parts of the Village. For example, the principles developed for the Downtown may serve as guides for the areas around the Fairview and Belmont train stations. Additionally, the Butterfield-Finley plan may serve as a guide for 75th Street and 63rd Street. He stated this would be a method to keep the number down, but maximize the usability of the sub-area plans.

Mr. Beggs said the community needs to have a goal and a vision of what it wants to be before moving forward.

Mr. Dabareiner noted the Committee is only identifying the areas and that the overall plan vision would be developed before specific sub-area plans are completed.

Mrs. Sigerich stated that the areas surrounding the Fairview and Belmont stations are not like downtown.

Mr. Lavigne agreed, but indicated the historic development patterns – especially around the Fairview station are similar to Downtown’s – with mixed uses and buildings located near the street.

Mr. Jacobs stated he thought the Committee should identify the key areas and prioritize those that should be studied.

Mr. Thoman stated he thought the Ellsworth Business Park was an important area to study. The area provides a number of jobs and a good manufacturing tax base.

Mrs. Earl indicated she thought the area was functioning well.

Mr. Jirik agreed with Mrs. Earl, but noted that it might be subject to the most change once the Belmont Underpass is completed.

Mrs. Earl thought the Committee should look at something where there is a more immediate need or availability for redevelopment.

Mrs. Sigerich indicated she thought the area around Belmont and 63rd was underused and ripe for redevelopment.

Mr. Beggs stated south Main Street could become a medical node with the newly constructed Good Samaritan campus.

The Committee discussed adding Belmont and 63rd Street as an additional sub-area. The Committee came to a consensus about adding Belmont from Ogden to the Ellsworth area as a fourth sub-area.

Mr. Wendt asked if it was possible to extend the area to the intersection of Belmont and 63rd Street and treat this as a gateway to the Belmont Road corridor.

Mrs. Earl agreed that the 63rd and Belmont intersection should be included.

Mr. Lavigne stated he would want to look at the area around the Belmont Station and the Belmont-63rd Street intersection as separate sub-areas.

Mr. Jirik asked if Butterfield-Finley findings relative to the shopping centers could apply to Meadowbrook.

Mr. Lavigne stated they could for the most part.

Chairman White asked for consensus on the sub-areas. The Committee agreed to five sub-areas – Downtown, Ogden Avenue, Butterfield-Finley Corridor, Belmont Station/Ellsworth Business Park and Belmont-63rd Street.

Mr. Lavigne introduced Courtney Owen and noted she would be discussing the existing planning documents the Village uses. Ms. Owen asked the Committee to turn to pages 7-9 in the workbook. She provided an overview Village’s past planning efforts. Mr. Lavigne presented a brief summary of the TCD 3 process and outcomes.

Mr. Thoman asked how the public would be re-engaged in the Comprehensive Plan process given the TCD 3 efforts.

Mr. Lavigne noted the draft plans developed by the Committee would be subject to hearings and open house-type functions. He also stated the internet-based tools – such as an area for commenting on the plans and process and online mapping similar to the tools used in TCD 3 – would be used.

Mr. Lavigne introduced Dan Gardner and stated Mr. Gardner would be providing a summary of the Village's market and demographic trends.

Mr. Gardner presented the market and demographic analysis from the Workbook.

Chairman White asked how the Committee can account for many of the properties in the commercial areas not being in line with current development standards. Mr. Gardner said the location and demographic trends can off-set some of those factors, but not all of them.

There was a discussion about the market trends and the retail saturation in the area. Mr. Gardner indicated the Village will need to look to strengthen its retail corridors by mixing uses that generate people – such as office uses.

Chairman White asked for some additional explanation of the housing market.

Mr. Gardner started by saying Downers Grove's housing situation is fairing better than most others in DuPage County. He stated that the Village is characterized by young professional and empty nester households, which will increase the demand for townhouse and multi-family opportunities.

There was additional discussion about the demographic trends specifically focusing on the changing age of the Village's population.

Chairman White asked if there were any other questions that the Committee needed to discuss.

Mr. Beggs asked for a schedule of upcoming topics. Specifically, he wanted to know when the Committee would discuss the vision statement.

Mr. Dabareiner said they would be discussed at the May meeting most likely. He indicated the Village wanted to give the Committee a context for what is currently happening in the Village – starting with economic development, based on TCD 3 input.

Mr. Beggs also asked if the Committee could be provided with a copy of the Illinois statute regarding comprehensive planning. Mr. Lavigne said it would be posted on the project web site.

Chairman White asked for an overview of the rest of the process and alternative methods for the public to participate in the process.

Mr. Lavigne provided a brief overview of the upcoming meeting schedule. He also noted the public could provide comments and ask question via the project web site. He noted the mapping tool that

APPROVED 4/27/2010

was used during TCD 3 would be re-instated for the Comprehensive Plan project. Mr. Lavigne stated the meeting materials, including the Workbook, are posted on the project web site.

Chairman White asked for public comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

John Schofield, 1125 Jefferson Avenue, thanked staff and the consultant for posting the information on the web site in a timely manner. He asked if there would be any discussion about the environmental issues that were brought up during the TCD process.

Mr. Dabareiner stated those topics would be discussed at the April meeting and the supporting materials would be posted on the Comprehensive Plan web site later in the week.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 pm.

/s/ Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Planning Manager

APPROVED 6/22/10

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING

April 27, 2010, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman White called the April 27, 2010 meeting of the Comprehensive Plan Committee to order at 7:00 p.m.:

PRESENT: Chairman White, Mr. Bollow, Mr. Davenport, Mrs. Earl, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Jirik, Mrs. Sigerich, Mr. Thoman, Mr. Wendt

ABSENT: Mr. Beggs and Mrs. Hamernik

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Dabareiner, Community Development Director; Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager; John Houseal, Houseal Lavigne Associates; Dan Gardner, Houseal Lavigne Associates; Courtney Owen, Houseal Lavigne Associates;

VISITORS: Commissioner Bob Barnett, Commissioner William Waldack, Greg Bedalov, Julia Beckman, John Schofield, Tim Meaney, Lucy Lloyd, Megan Schroeder, Jack Dare, Chris Saricks

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the March 23, 2010. The Committee unanimously approved the minutes.

Tom Dabareiner presented an overview of the comprehensive planning process. The presentation included an example of how public input becomes part of a goal and plan objective. The presentation provided an overview of the public input process for Downers Grove and a schedule of future topics.

Chairman White asked that staff post the Power Point slides from the presentation on the Comprehensive Plan web site.

John Houseal provided an overview of the meeting agenda. He noted the Committee would continue to review the Existing Conditions Report. Mr. Houseal stated there were three distinct points in the comprehensive planning process. The first was the starting point, where the Committee is at, that reviews what a community has. The second phase is creating a vision and goals to tell a story where the community wants to go, the next step for the Committee. Third phase creates implementation strategies to describe how a community will achieve its vision.

Mr. Houseal provided a brief review of the topics reviewed at last month's meeting.

Mr. Houseal presented the Village's existing land use and zoning patterns. He described how the information feeds into the plan. Mr. Houseal asked if the Committee had any comments or questions about the report.

Mr. Jirik stated the Village needed to have viable commercial uses based on what is happening in the surrounding communities. He wondered how the Committee could decide on what the best strategies for meeting this challenge.

Mr. Houseal stated the Committee would need to look at market conditions, part of last month's discussion, and what is happening in the Village and its neighbors. He noted the Committee should focus on areas most likely to change. He indicated the Village would need to look for catalytic uses and not just straight retail uses to making the commercial corridors more vibrant.

Mr. Houseal stated he thinks there are three tests of capacity to finding viable and acceptable uses. The tests are: 1) Market capacity – will the market support the use, 2) Physical capacity – is the site physically suitable for the use and 3) Community capacity – will the community support the use.

Mrs. Earl stated there are some undesirable uses in the commercial and the challenge will be to eliminate these uses to free up land for desirable uses.

Mr. Houseal reminded the Committee to review the report and get any comments or questions to him or Village staff.

Mr. Houseal next presented the community facilities portion of the Existing Conditions Report. He stated they sent questionnaires to the service providers and public organizations.

Mr. Jirik asked if they looked at other organizations' plans to analyze the implications to the Village.

Mr. Houseal said they did look at other plans because the Committee needs to have an understanding of what is planned. The goal of the comprehensive plan should be to maximize the benefits to the residents.

Mr. Houseal next turned to the existing transportation system. He provided an overview of the street hierarchy. The Committee briefly discussed the street hierarchy. Mr. Houseal noted the street classification map is important when making development decisions.

The Committee briefly discussed mass transit conditions. Mr. Houseal stated transportation issues the most important addressed by comprehensive plans, but are often the last ones addressed because they are multi-jurisdictional and costly.

Mr. Jirik asked if the impending underpass would create problems for visioning and goals. Mr. Houseal stated it would not be a problem because the Committee would need anticipate the change and account for it in their recommendations.

The Committee discussed the parks and open space sections of the report next. Mr. Houseal indicated ideally the land use portion of the plan would dovetail with the Park District's master plan.

Mr. Houseal presented the environmental features section of the report to the Committee. He stated that the tree canopy was an important topic during the TCD3 process. He went on to say the

environment – tree canopies, creeks, etc. – can often be the most important and attractive features of a community.

Mr. Houseal explained the last two meetings reviewed the Downers Grove's existing conditions. He noted the workbook is a working document that the Committee will continue to use throughout the process.

Mr. Houseal stated the May meeting would begin the discussions regarding the vision and goals. He indicated the Committee would look at different categories and come up with different goals and objectives for those categories.

Mr. Jirik asked if the unincorporated areas surrounding the Village would be discussed. Mr. Houseal answered they would but the Committee might find that there is no advantage to annexation. He indicated this would be an important policy discussion that would arise.

Chairman White stated the Committee would need to consider future changes in the neighboring unincorporated areas. Mr. Jirik noted the Committee may need to check in with what the County is planning for the area.

There was general discussion about the unincorporated areas and how they would be accounted for in the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Davenport noted he submitted some comments via the web site. He pointed out several corrections that needed to be made to the report.

Mr. Houseal announced that the next meeting would be May 25 at 7:00 pm in the Village Hall Committee Room. He noted the vision statement would be discussed along with a first draft of the goals and objectives. He stated materials would be provided to the Committee one week prior to the meeting.

Chairman White asked for public comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Jack Dare, 1656 Carol Street, stated it was difficult to predict trends, but he wondered if what other towns were doing to address energy conservation and carbon reductions.

Mr. Houseal noted there has been lots of discussion on this topic and that energy conservation can be a stated objective in the plan. He noted some communities, specifically Elgin, have sustainability plans. He went on to say that there would need to be some regulatory controls to meet the stated goal and objective.

Mr. Dare asked if these trends would lead to changes in the land use patterns or commuting patterns.

Mr. Houseal stated Downers Grove has a lot of the required infrastructure to facilitate these trends with three Metra stations, good Pace access and a local shuttle. He noted the document itself will

APPROVED 6/22/10

have a limited ability to directly address specific land use and commuting changes, but that recommendations could be made that address this trend.

Chairman White noted as some point the market capacity will dictate what happens around the train stations and transit routes.

Chris Saricks, 1666 61st Street noted that some things will happen that were never expected. He provided several examples of road projects that were not completed because of unforeseen environmental issues.

Tim Meaney, 420 Franklin Street, stated he liked the way the Carpentersville Comprehensive Plan's vision statements spoke about the future in the present tense. He said that kind of thinking is important for the Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 pm.

/s/ Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Planning Manager

APPROVED 6/22/10

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING

May 25, 2010, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman White called the May 25, 2010 meeting of the Comprehensive Plan Committee to order at 7:00 p.m.:

PRESENT: Chairman White, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Bollow, Mrs. Earl, , Mr. Jirik, , Mr. Thoman, Mr. Wendt

ABSENT: Mr. Davenport, Mrs. Hamernik, Mr. Jacobs and Mrs. Sigerich

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Dabareiner, Community Development Director; Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager; Stan Popovich, Planner; John Houseal, Houseal Lavigne Associates; Courtney Owen, Houseal Lavigne Associates;

VISITORS: John Schofield, Tim Meaney, & Jack Dare,

John Houseal provided an overview of the meeting agenda. He noted the Committee would be discussing the draft vision statement as well as the goals and the objectives. He indicated most of the material being reviewed at this evening's meeting was derived from the input received during the TCD 3 process. Mr. Houseal stated the Committee members had a lot of material to get through and should not feel that this is their only opportunity to comment on the draft vision, goals and objectives. He noted members would have the ability to get comments to staff after the meeting

Mr. Bollow asked for an explanation of the relationship between the comprehensive plan and the strategic plan.

Mr. Dabareiner explained the strategic plan provided to the manner in which the Village government functions. The comprehensive plan is focused on the land use and physical layout of the community. He indicated the comprehensive plan and TCD 3 projects were items that the Village Council identified during their 2008 Strategic Plan.

Chairman White noted that per Illinois state law comprehensive plans are specific legal documents that guide a community's land use planning. The Village's strategic plan sets policies and procedures for how the Village government functions.

Mr. Beggs agreed and noted he would be interested to see how the comprehensive plan will tie into the park and school district plans.

Mr. Bollow stated it seemed like a lot of issues listed in the draft vision statement had background studies. He questioned how the Committee could respond to those issues without having additional knowledge of those studies.

Chairman White pointed out that most of the information and issues were a direct result of input from TCD 3. He indicated the Committee's job is to determine if the vision accurately reflect what was said during the TCD 3 process.

The Committee discussed the results of TCD 3 and how it relates to the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Houseal reminded the Committee that the Village is looking for their unique perspective as residents of Downers Grove – members are not expected to be experts in each and every topic. Rather, the Committee members should use their practical experience of Downers Grove when reviewing topics and issues.

Mr. Thoman noted in some of the other comprehensive plans he reviewed, the vision statements took a “30,000-foot view” approach. He passed out an alternative vision statement that he drafted to the other members. He indicated this statement focused on the three primary themes from TCD 3 – the Village's primary strength is the residential neighborhoods and the commercial areas need to compliment those neighborhoods.

Mr. Thoman indicated the vision statement prepared by Houseal Lavigne seemed a little too refined.

Mr. Lavigne reminded the Committee that the draft vision statement is a vision for the comprehensive plan and is not necessarily the Village's official vision statement.

There was discussion on how to provide comments to the Village staff after the meeting.

Ms. Owen explained the draft vision statement and how it is broken down. She began to briefly describe each section.

Mr. Jirik provided some suggestions for page 1 as it relates to the attractiveness of the residential neighborhoods and downtown.

Mr. Beggs noted that when discussing shopping opportunities, the vision should take the different geographies of the Village into account.

Mr. Bollow asked what implications the vision statement would have on future Village efforts.

Mr. Dabareiner explained the comprehensive plan, including the vision statement, will not require the Village to do any thing. Rather, it will provide a policy guide for developing land use regulations and making development decisions.

The Committee discussed the role of the comprehensive plan and its legal implications.

Mr. Thoman expressed concern about using the term “green technology” as it relates to Ellsworth Park. He also indicated that the housing type should not be specified in the vision, rather the Village should express the desire to increase housing near the Downtown.

Mr. Beggs stated the vision seemed a little heavy-handed with the bicycle comments. Mr. Houseal indicated this was due to the Village's bicycle plan.

The Committee discussed the vision statement as it relates to the Downtown.

Mr. Bollow asked about “white elephant” ordinances.

Mr. Houseal explained those type of regulations were used to require large, big box retailers to post a security so that the building could be removed if the retailer moved from the site.

The Committee discussed the vision statement as it relates to the Butterfield-Finley Subarea. There was some discussion on the signage in the corridor and how it should relate to the surrounding toll roads.

The Committee then discussed the Ogden Avenue Subarea. Several comments were made about relocating undesirable uses including tattoo and massage parlors. The Committee also discussed the node approach to commercial development/redevelopment throughout the Ogden Avenue Subarea.

A discussion relative to the Ellsworth Park/Belmont Road Subarea followed. The Committee discussed the possibility of placing new commercial within the corridor as noted in the 2003 land use recommendations. It was realized that the market saturation would likely not allow for extensive retail in this area. There was some discussion about expanding the office uses on Maple Avenue.

The Committee concluded their discussion of the draft vision statement. Mr. Houseal indicated that the Committee should get any additional comments to staff in the next 10 or so days.

Mr. Lavigne introduced the draft goals and objectives. He indicated many of the items were taken directly from the TCD 3 input, but some of the objectives are more land use-focused.

Mr. Jirik questioned whether there were too many goals and objectives to achieve in a 10-year time period. He asked if some of the items should be prioritized. He noted the goals were too broad and should be actionable and measurable.

Mr. Dabareiner indicated the vision statement typically has a 10-year horizon. Goals and objectives typically have a 20-year horizon.

Mr. Lavigne added that the goals and objectives often carry over to future comprehensive plan updates.

Mr. Houseal indicated that the Committee has absorbed a great deal of information and had a great conversation over the course of the meeting. He reiterated that Committee members should review the vision, goals and objectives and provided comments to the Village staff in the next 10 days.

Mr. Houseal announced the Committee would continue to discuss goals and objectives at the June meeting. They would also begin their subarea discussion at the June meeting. Mr. Houseal noted the vision, goals and objectives can be tweaked as the process moves forward and encouraged Committee members to modify those sections based on the forthcoming conversations.

Chairman White asked for public comments.

APPROVED 6/22/10

PUBLIC COMMENTS

John Schofield, 1125 Jefferson Street, stated he thought the Village should aspire to have a consolidated government center as part of the Vision Statement. He indicated the goals focusing on improving the Village Hall and Police Department facilities should also include aspirations to have a governmental campus. He indicated the subareas being studied contained some sites that could accommodate such a campus.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm.

/s/ Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Planning Manager

APPROVED 8/24/10

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING

June 22, 2010, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman White called the June 22, 2010 meeting of the Comprehensive Plan Committee to order at 7:00 p.m.:

PRESENT: Chairman White, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Bollow, Mr. Davenport, Mrs. Earl, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Jirik, Mrs. Sigerich, Mr. Thoman, Mr. Wendt

ABSENT: Mrs. Hamernik

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Dabareiner, Community Development Director; Stan Popovich, Planner; Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates; Courtney Owen, Houseal Lavigne Associates;

VISITORS: Tom LeCren, Jack Dare, Lucy Lloyd, Barbara Jane Messler, Tim Meaney, Megan Schroeder, Greg Bedalov, & John Schofield

The Committee reviewed the minutes from the April 23, 2010 and May 22, 2010 meeting. The Committee unanimously approved both sets of minutes.

Mr. Lavigne reviewed the key focus area materials that were provided to the Committee. He noted each of the areas included catalyst sites with could foster strategic change in the area and land use concepts that could see parcels developing in a different way.

Chairman White noted the four focus area plans identify recommendations which are in some cases bold but not infeasible. It is a plan that the Village can stretch for and accomplish. He believed the key focus areas were well done by the consultant.

The Committee began by discussing the Belmont/Ellsworth Industrial Park focus area, specifically the Cameo development at Walnut and Maple Avenue. The Committee believed industrial or businesses uses were best for this area as the current residents are cut off from many services at this location. Further discussions centered on the number of vacancies or for sale units within Cameo.

A question arose regarding the potential road closure of Hitchcock Avenue at Belmont Road. Mr. Lavigne explained this intersection may become difficult to navigate with the new Belmont Underpass and that by closing Hitchcock Road, it may create more buildable area for the commercial properties adjacent to Belmont Road. He added that few residents would be impacted.

Mr. Thoman noted the vacant industrial parcel along Curtiss Street to the east of the Public Works building has the potential to be a new location for the Civic Center, Fleet Services and Police Station. A discussion ensued on the possibility of moving these services to the vacant Ogden and Lee site as well. It was noted there could be a conflict of uses between the existing industrial uses and a proposed Village Hall. EPA issues may arise as well. Mr. Lavigne recommended not

removing Village Hall services from the downtown as this has caused harm to other downtowns. It was noted the Police Department would prefer to be centrally located. With regard to the Post Office, it was discussed that a site within the industrial park may be best for the Post Office's distribution facilities rather than downtown.

A discussion ensued regarding Transit Oriented Development (TOD) recommendation around the Belmont Station. Typically, TODs require no more than a 10-minute walk and anything more than that, people will drive.

Mr. Jirik believed catalyst sites A & B might be best suited for office. Other committee members mentioned Naperville's Diehl Road corridor and how this area could provide a positive gateway to Downers Grove along Maple Avenue. The potential uses for sites A & B could include corporate campuses, vocational schools, offices, and institutional.

Ms. Earl noted that some support retail and restaurants could contribute positively to the mix. A discussion ensued regarding the location of commercial nodes near the Belmont Road and Maple Avenue intersection.

Mr. Davenport noted the importance of bicycling within the draft goals and objectives but noted that other than crosswalk improvements not much was shown for bicycles. Mr. Lavigne noted they had yet to prepare a transportation plan. The transportation plan would provide additional information that could be over-laid onto each of the four focus areas.

There being no additional comments with regard to the Belmont/Ellsworth Industrial Park focus area, the Chairman requested comments regarding the Downtown key focus area.

It was noted that based on May's discussion the idea of moving the train station from its existing location to the current Village Hall site was removed. The focus plan recommended relocating the Metra platform further east without moving the station to potentially alleviate the numerous blockages at Main Street and Forest Avenue. Mrs. Sigerich noted that the future opening of the Belmont Underpass, may redirect a significant portion of the pass-through traffic from Main Street to Belmont Road.

Ms. Earl noted the lack of parking on the north side of the tracks. She thought the Village should explore parking to the east of the Tivoli Theater. The Committee discussed the idea of 'skinning' the parking garage to hide it. With parking on both track sides, it may ease congestion and the back-up of southbound cars when the crossing gates are down. It was noted a permit swap could take place for those people wanting parking on the north side and those wanting parking on the south side. The Committee came to a consensus that parking on the north side was important.

The Committee expressed the uniqueness of the downtown in that it really is local businesses and not primarily chain stores, as seen along Butterfield Road. The Committee felt the downtown is authentic and quaint.

The Committee noted there were no catalyst sites north of the tracks. It was discussed whether the AT&T site on Forest Avenue and the properties immediately north and south of 4929 Forest could serve as catalyst sites. Discussion focused on whether AT&T could be relocated to the industrial park.

Discussion ensued regarding the Warren and Rogers Avenue corridor and whether that could become townhome oriented.

The Committee discussed the renderings, as shown on page 7, of the intersection of Main Street and Maple Avenue. The Committee liked both the building and park concept for the corner. Some felt the building could expand into the park area, making a smaller park or design feature. The Committee liked the building concept for the existing parking lot near Subway. Additionally, the Committee felt all four corners of Main and Maple could be improved and shown in the aerial image. Traffic concerns regarding this corner included the turning radii and parking. Mr. Lavigne noted a cash-in-lieu of parking program could be established.

Discussion ensued on whether the proposed extension of Constitution Park to Maple Avenue was well advised. It was noted the three lots proposed for a park conversion are isolated from Main Street and that Maple Avenue is not as associated with downtown as Main Street is. It was discussed if the three sites were not converted to parkland, maybe they could act as pedestrian trip generators. The Committee ultimately felt catalyst site G could extend along Maple Avenue to Lincoln Center.

The next topic discussed was the proposed commercial building within the parking lot between the Metra tracks, Main Street, Burlington Avenue and Forest Avenue. There was concern that a building at this location would create a tunnel effect and cause the openness of the area to be lost. The Committee felt a public plaza and open space would be a better fit in this area to allow train riders to view more of the downtown.

Mr. Davenport expressed that it is unfortunate that the downtown is described as 'north of the tracks' and 'south of the tracks.' Mr. Davenport noted it is too bad that the tracks are perceived as a wall when they really are not.

There being no additional comments with regard to the downtown, the Committee moved onto the Butterfield Road key focus area.

The first topic was the proposed I-88 westbound entry ramp from Highland Avenue using the existing vacant Circuit City site and the removal of the I-88 westbound entry ramp from Downers Drive. The new ramp would sacrifice the Circuit City site but has the potential to clean-up the intersection and create a full-service intersection. Mr. Lavigne noted the majority of traffic that enters I-88 from Downers Drive is pass-through traffic and that an entrance from Highland would eliminate some of the congestion Butterfield Road currently experiences. It was noted Downers Drive is a confusing route to navigate with the existing traffic pattern. A concern was expressed whether the Tollway Authority and IDOT would approve of this proposed change. Mr. Lavigne stated the Tollway and IDOT would most likely not pay for the change but if there were definitive benefits that could be expressed and shown to them, they are open to change. The Committee concurred that removing the Downers Drive tollway entrance and opening a westbound entrance from Highland Avenue should remain in the plan.

Mr. Lavigne noted that along the Butterfield corridor, there is not a national chain that is not in this location. With that in mind, there is a limited opportunity for new retailers so the idea is to re-organize and shift the pieces.

The Committee discussed the possibility of removing the 80-foot wide frontage road south of Butterfield Road. This closure would have to be part of a larger parcel assemblage and master planned development. This could include the development of a life-style center using both catalyst sites E & F. Mr. Bedalov noted that office developers are interested in these sites right now but they would want to maintain the frontage road while retail uses see the frontage road as a barrier.

It was observed that while parcel assemblage may be difficult with multiple owners and may delay development, it is best to have a plan in place so that when redevelopment occurs the Village and a developer understand what is anticipated for that area.

The discussion then focused on catalyst site D and whether it was appropriate to convert that to an industrial park. Mr. Jirik thought the plan was surrendering the commercial on the north side of Butterfield to industrial while trying to build up the south side. He felt it would be best to try and improve the commercial on both sides of Butterfield Road. It was stated the traffic circulation and visibility of catalyst site D are poor. Catalyst site D could also be used to entice a large single tenant.

There being no further comments on the Butterfield Road key focus area, the Chairman inquired if there were any comments regarding the Ogden Avenue key focus area.

Mr. Lavigne noted that they separated Ogden Avenue into three character areas. Each of these areas have unifying themes that defined them. Furthermore, there are no land use concepts developed for Ogden Avenue because the entire corridor is commercial. Mr. Lavigne noted there are two areas between the three character areas that are not discussed in detail because they do not have dominant characteristics that tie them together or to one of the three discussed character areas. It was noted there are a few large parcels in these two void areas that could be used for redevelopment. The Committee believed the plan should at least identify these voids and ensure that the overall goals and objectives of the Ogden Avenue focus areas be applied to these sections as well

The Committee felt the TIF district should be shown on the Ogden Avenue maps. Mr. Dabareiner reminded the Committee that the TIF district is set to expire in 2023.

Mr. Lavigne noted the west end character theme was automobile sales and related due to the larger parcels and deeper depths.

Beginning with the west end of Ogden, the Committee discussed catalyst sites D & E and expressed the possible uses for these sites, including a off-site campus facility, retail and auto dealerships. Mr. Bedalov noted more than half of catalyst site D has been purchased for such a use. It was noted that auto dealerships are starting to clump together industry wide and that it is better for everyone if they are close together. That is why the plan identifies moving the auto dealers to the west. There was a concern about the eastern Ogden Avenue Downers Grove auto dealers and losing their relationship to the automobile dealers in adjacent Westmont as these dealers are luxury type dealers.

A discussion developed with regard to beautifying Ogden Avenue through parkway trees and sidewalks.

A conversation stated that the west end catalyst site A is a great site for a big-box retailer. A smaller user might not be able to create the desired outcome for this site.

Site B is recommended for a public events center. The Committee was concerned a use like this may be too passive for Ogden Avenue and suggested a more active use such as a reception hall or banquet facility. A tax generating business would be best, it was felt.

The Committee believed that throughout the Ogden Avenue corridor residential feeder streets should be recommended for closure. Many streets do not line up with one another across Ogden Avenue and this creates traffic issues. The Committee also wanted to see more emphasis on the closure of curb cuts onto Ogden Avenue.

The central section was thought of as a key gateway to the Village and also as a location for medical uses. It was noted the school district is purchasing land adjacent to Prince Street and the football field and that may lead to the possibility of closing Prince Street prior to Ogden Avenue.

The BP site at the southwest corner of Ogden Avenue and Main Street was discussed as a type of model site for landscaping and signage. The site could be used as an example for other auto related uses.

The Committee discussed the importance of wayfinding signs being appropriately placed and the use of the McDonalds on east Ogden as an example site.

It was noted again that a stronger bicycle and pedestrian access focus should occur along Ogden Avenue as well.

The Committee recommended that the description of undesirable commercial uses needs to be more specific. Undesirable can be subjective and the Committee felt that for the Comprehensive Plan to have teeth, undesirable needed to be further explained as contentious and detrimental to the community or creating a character not consistent with the plan. It was noted that zoning can be used to facilitate uses that are consistent and complimentary to the vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

There being no other comments on Ogden Avenue, Mr. Lavigne noted the July meeting would move ahead by showing these four focus areas in the context of the whole community. The four focus areas are the areas that need the most assistance.

Chairman White asked for public comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Greg Bedalov, President, Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation, noted the business community has approached the Tollway Authority requesting 'Welcome to Downers Grove' signage along the tollway overpass at Ogden Avenue. He also noted the central and east Ogden Avenue focus areas need to provide for deeper lots. The lack of deep lots hampers development in these areas. Developers and the business community would like to have areas where additional depth could be achieved identified in the plan. The certainty would relieve some risk from the developers.

Mr. Bedalov noted as a member of the Downtown Management Board that the Board was considering a recommendation to Council that all surface lots in downtown be designated shopper parking only and that all commuter parking be located within the parking garage. Mr. Bedalov reiterated that office users would prefer to keep the Butterfield Road frontage road while retail users would prefer to see the frontage road removed.

John Schofield, 1125 Jefferson Street, stated there was no discussion and integration of a historical perspective in the proposed focus areas. Additionally, Lyman Woods and Midwestern University could be shown on the Butterfield Road focus area as a benefit to the office developments and assist with the heat island effect.

Tom LeCren, 545 Chicago Avenue, noted this was his first meeting in attendance and was confused about the vision statement. He expressed an interest in that part of the plan being clearly explained to people who may not have read anything about the plan before. He also noted his support for a park at the intersection of Main Street and Maple Avenue

There being no further public comment, Chairman White declared public comment closed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 pm.

/s/ Stan Popovich, AICP
Stan Popovich, AICP
Planner

APPROVED 8/24/10

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING

July 27, 2010, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman White called the July 27, 2010 meeting of the Comprehensive Plan Committee to order at 7:00 p.m.:

PRESENT: Chairman White, Mr. Bollow, Mr. Davenport, Mrs. Earl, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Jirik, Mrs. Hamernik, Mrs. Sigerich, Mr. Wendt

ABSENT: Mr. Beggs & Mr. Thoman

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager; Damir Latinovic, Planner; John Houseal, Houseal Lavigne Associates & Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates

VISITORS: Lucy Lloyd, Tim Meaney & Brian Slodysko, Chicago Tribune

Chairman White announced that he received an email from Tim Meaney and provided copies to the Committee members. He asked Mr. Lavigne to provide an overview for the night's meeting.

Mr. Houseal indicated that an additional focus area may be added by the Village Council. He stated there had been a request by the Council to look at the area around the Fairview train station. Mr. O'Brien stated the Council would be reviewing the modified scope shortly.

Mr. Lavigne reviewed the key focus area materials that were provided to the Committee. He started with the Belmont/Ellsworth area. He noted the changes regarding bicycle facilities, the addition of the catalyst site on Curtiss Street, east of the Sanitary District administration building and that the catalyst sites are now continuously numbered throughout the plan.

Mr. Davenport stated the plan should clearly identify that the numbers are for organizational purposes and do not indicate any level of priority.

Mr. Bollow asked for the logic in determining the location of bike lanes indicated on the sub-area plan. Mr. Lavigne noted the location of the bike infrastructure came from the Village's Bikeway Plan and the anticipated redevelopment described by the draft comprehensive plan.

Mr. Bollow clarified that the bike lanes indicated were meant for transportation and not just recreational cycling. Mr. Houseal stated that was the case. The recommendation for alternative transportation modes and connectivity came from the TCD3 discussions.

Mr. Bollow stated that it would be important to provide improved bicycle parking facilities at the Belmont train station and other locations in the area.

The Committee discussed the possibilities and challenges for adding bike lanes on Belmont Road. There was no consensus to add a lane due to traffic flow and safety issues.

Mrs. Sigerich noted that it might be difficult to close Elmore Avenue due to its limited connectivity to other streets. She stated that closing Hitchcock would be a good option if the Village were to move forward with the recommendation of closing some streets.

Mr. Houseal explained that they usually only indicate streets that would be candidates for closure due to the uses on the street and connectivity to the surrounding streets. He stated the Village would need to conduct formal traffic studies to determine the impacts to the surrounding street grid if it moved forward with this recommendation.

Mrs. Hamernik asked why the land use concept for this area included a recommendation for offices on west side of Thatcher Road, south of Hitchcock Avenue. She stated these properties already have viable industrial users and would be better classified as industrial.

Mr. Houseal stated their notes show the property should be classified “industrial” and that the map in the packet was incorrect.

Mrs. Hamernik went on to ask about the depth of the multi-family classification on the east side of Belmont Road. She noted that she generally agreed with the recommendation to change the Belmont frontage to multi-family, but that the proposed land use change encroached too far into the single family neighborhoods to the east.

Mrs. Sigerich agreed that multi-family land uses on Belmont would provide a good buffer to the single family residences to the east and Belmont Road. She indicated the neighborhood to the east contains some nice homes and that the multi-family should not go too deep into the area.

The Committee discussed how the maps should distinguish the multi-family designation from the single family designation. The Committee also discussed how far east the multi-family land use should extend.

Mr. Lavigne suggested adding a transitional land use classification.

Mr. Houseal suggested some text to specifically require that the multi-family uses should be located adjacent to and with Belmont Road frontage and not “leap frog” into the single family area. Any new multi-family uses would need to be designed to respect the single family neighborhood to the east.

Mr. Bollow stated he thought adding text would more clearly communicate the Village’s intention.

Chairman White confirmed there was a consensus on the following:

1. The Village should not encourage single family residences along the Belmont Road frontage.
2. There should be a transitional land use on the east side of Belmont Road to provide a buffer between the busy street and the residential neighborhood.
3. Transitional land uses should respect the single family nature of the neighborhood east of Belmont Road.

Mr. Jirik noted that the land use designation at the southeast corner of Belmont and Curtiss should be open space as the area was recently converted to a park and is in a flood plain.

There being no further discussion about Belmont/Ellsworth area sub-area map, Mr. Lavigne began to discuss the changes made to the Downtown focus area. He noted they added some additional catalyst sites north of the tracks and looked for opportunities for parking north of the tracks. Mr. Lavigne noted the park concept at the northeast corner of Main Street and Maple Avenue was not included in the revisions because of concerns about maintenance registered by the Park District. Mr. Lavigne also said they were recommending re-establishing the north-south alley between Main and Forest north of the tracks.

Mrs. Sigerich asked if the 5 lots at the southeast corner of Forest Avenue and Franklin Avenue were considered for a catalyst site. Mr. Lavigne stated the draft plan contemplates re-development but does not identify that site as a catalyst because of its position in the Downtown.

Mr. Wendt asked if some additional green space could be added north of the railroad tracks. He noted he was specifically thinking of the area north of Rogers Street on the east side of Main Street.

Mr. Lavigne responded that the plan contemplates adding green spaces on private properties through addition of plazas as part of new developments. He indicated there were some nice green spaces near the downtown north of the tracks. He specifically said Washington Park and Prince Pond provide some nice green areas near Downtown.

Mrs. Hamernik asked that the Tivoli be added to the key Downtown destination.

The Committee then discussed the auto-oriented uses and the impacts those uses had on the Downtown. Mr. Lavigne noted that drive-through uses should not be banned Downtown, but that placement of the drive-through should be secondary to the pedestrian nature of the neighborhood.

Mr. Lavigne presented the concept for the intersection of Main and Maple. The Committee discussed the proposed land uses and the current condition. The Committee provided consensus that the future land use for Downtown should match the rendering of the Main and Maple intersection. They indicated a preference for new mixed-use developments at the intersection and preserving the large historic houses to the east on Maple Avenue.

Mr. Wendt asked if alternative paving materials were considered for the historic areas of Downtown. Mr. Houseal said they did not consider different pavement types for Downtown.

Chairman White asked if there were any additional changes or comments regarding the plan for Downtown. There were no additional comments.

Mr. Lavigne then presented the changes for the Butterfield Road area. He pointed out the land use change from “industrial” to “commercial” at the northeast corner of Butterfield Road and Downers Drive. He went through a rendering for the catalyst sites, including the southeast corner of Finley Road and Butterfield Road.

The Committee discussed the proposed rendering providing some comments about the design of a development on the south side of the Butterfield Road.

APPROVED 8/24/10

Chairman White asked if there were any additional comments or changes for Butterfield Road. There were no additional comments.

Mr. Lavigne explained the changes in the Ogden Avenue key area.

Mr. Lavigne pointed out the key intersections and transitional areas along the Corridor. The Committee asked that the language regarding extending the lot depths into the residential areas be modified to state, “consider” instead of “encourage.” Mr. Houseal stated they would add language that recognizes the challenge to create contemporary commercial development along the Ogden Avenue corridor given the shallow lot depths.

Mrs. Earl asked if the plan should enumerate undesirable uses that should be targeted. Mr. Houseal stated the plan was only a policy document and the zoning ordinance or other use controls should be used to regulate undesirable uses. The Committee discussed the language regarding discouraged uses and came to a consensus to leave the language as is.

Mrs. Hamernik asked if the plan proposed to close Highland Avenue, south of its intersection Ogden. Mr. Lavigne said that street closures could be an important catalyst to development on Ogden Avenue. He indicated, given the uses on Highland Avenue south of Ogden, this street would be a good candidate.

Mr. Houseal noted that giving or selling under-used or vacant rights-of-way to developers could be a great financial incentive.

The Committee asked that the use of right-of-way vacations be amplified in the plan.

Mr. Wendt asked if there was a proposal to extend the TIF district to the west. Mr. Houseal said there was no plan to extend the TIF, but legally it could be extended through a separate process.

Chairman White asked if there were any additional comments or changes for Ogden Avenue. There were no additional comments.

Mr. Lavigne handed out the first four chapters of the draft plan. He indicated the Committee would discuss these chapters at the August meeting. He noted most of the sections were already reviewed and revised based on the Committee’s input. Mr. Lavigne pointed out the draft land use plan and map were new. He stated this section would also be discussed at the August meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comment was received. As such, Chairman White declared public comment closed.

The meeting adjourned at 9:05 pm.

/s/ Jeff O’Brien, AICP
Jeff O’Brien, AICP
Planning Manager

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING

August 24, 2010, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman White called the August 24, 2010 meeting of the Comprehensive Plan Committee to order at 7:00 p.m.:

PRESENT: Chairman White, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Bollow, Mr. Davenport, Mrs. Earl, Mr. Jirik, Mrs. Hamernik, Mrs. Sigerich (at 7:05), Mr. Thoman, Mr. Wendt

ABSENT: Mr. Jacobs

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Dabareiner, Community Development Director; Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager; John Houseal, Houseal Lavigne Associates & Courtney Owen, Houseal Lavigne Associates

VISITORS: Greg Bedalov, Downers Grove EDC; Tim Meaney, John Schofield & Ron Waetchler

MINUTES:

Chairman White asked if there were any comments or changes regarding the minutes for the June 22 or July 27 meetings. No comments or changes were received. Chairman White declared the minutes from June 22, 2010 and July 27, 2010 approved.

Mr. Houseal explained the purpose of the meeting. He provided a brief preview of the upcoming schedule. He indicated that the Committee would be going over the first four sections of the plan at this meeting. He indicated the revisions to the sub areas and remaining plan sections would be distributed in September.

Mr. Thoman asked if the first section was just background information or if it was intended to be included in the final plan.

Mr. Houseal stated the section would be included as it is the draft first chapter of the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Thoman stated that the comment regarding the tree canopy discussion on page 8 was not accurately captured. He indicated the statement, "less of an issue to others" should be eliminated.

The Committee discussed how they wanted to review the draft plan sections. They determined that they should review the document from the beginning.

Mr. Jirik noted the pictures on the cover should be altered to show a vibrant community and downtown. He noted the existing pictures do not communicate a good image.

The Committee discussed the local and regional landmark maps. They asked the consultant to consider some additions and deletions to the maps. It was determined that Committee members can provide list to Village staff for changes to the landmark maps.

Mr. Houseal indicated the landmark maps would only be included in the document to provide readers with reference points for the Village's location.

The Committee discussed additional stylist and verb tense concerns. Mr. Houseal asked that the Committee focus on the substance of the document. He indicated if Committee members found grammar and/or scrivener's errors, they should provide them to Village staff so the corrections could be made for the final draft.

Mr. Jirik stated the comment regarding the community pool on page 10 should be discussed with the Park District.

Mr. Houseal said that Devin Lavigne and Village staff met with the Park District Administrator earlier in the day to discuss comments relative to the parks and recreation sections. The pool comments were discussed with Mr. Cermak and he provided additional direction for the final draft. He stated the Park District's comments would be incorporated in the next draft.

Mr. Jirik asked about the list of plans. He noted some concerns that the language in the section was not clear as to how the existing plans would work with and against the updated comprehensive plan.

The Committee discussed these concerns and came to a consensus to leave the language regarding the list of plans (page 12) as-is.

Mrs. Earl noted that all of the charts were missing. She asked what information those charts contained. Ms. Owen indicated the charts would be included in the next draft and mainly depicted the demographic data in a visual format.

The Committee began discussing the vision statement. Chairman White reminded the Committee that an email had been received from a resident, Tim Meaney, that suggested changes to the plan's visions.

Mrs. Sigerich asked if more specific language could be provided regarding the character of the Village's neighborhoods. She noted it might be a good idea to provide more specifics about what made Downers Grove's neighborhoods so desirable.

Mr. Davenport said the language should also provide some guidance for change to the neighborhoods.

Mr. Jirik indicated that some of the numbers and dates were inconsistent in the vision. He went on to say that the language regarding vacancies in the Downtown should be strengthened.

The Committee discussed the language regarding Downtown vacancies. They came to consensus that the sentence discussing businesses "flocking" to the remaining vacant spaces should be removed from the vision statement.

Mr. Beggs said that he was concerned the vision does not properly reflect what the Village's downtown is and will be.

Mrs. Hamernik agreed that the vision lacked language regarding small businesses and the Downtown's "home town" feel.

Mr. Jirik stated the vision should be modified to reflect some of the changes discussed in the sub area plans. Specifically, he noted the vision should include statements regarding improvements to the north-south traffic flow in the Downtown and the modifications recommended to the Butterfield-Highland intersection.

Mr. Thoman expressed some concern over residential objective #2. He was concerned that it sounded too accommodating to builders and developers.

The Committee discussed the language and determined that some minor modifications would be beneficial to clarify the meaning.

Mr. Davenport noted that residential objective #6 was too specific. He indicated that he agreed residential redevelopment should be consistent with the size and scale of the existing neighborhoods. He questioned whether the comprehensive plan's objectives should suggest a specific tool.

The Committee discussed this objective and determined that a general objective to ensure new development is consistent with existing neighborhoods would be more beneficial than suggesting specific tools.

Mr. Wendt noted his concern with the proposal that the sidewalk matrix be reassessed. He noted the Village was almost 80% complete with the matrix and that the Transportation and Parking Commission had recognized some areas – such as Denburn Woods – as unique and warranting alternative sidewalk solutions.

The Committee discussed the sidewalk matrix and agreed that there was already a process in place to grant exemptions to unique areas.

Mr. Thoman stated an objective should be added to enhance the public tree canopy.

Mr. Wendt asked that language should be included that encouraged constructing traffic calming solutions during road re-construction projects. Mr. Houseal noted this might fit better in the transportation goals and objectives, but that the language would be added.

Mr. Jirik asked if there were tools for the Village to make sure existing commercial centers were effectively screened from adjacent residential uses. He thought the Village could only encourage existing centers to comply.

Mr. Davenport thought the plan should contain some type of a definition for concepts such as Transit-Oriented Development (TOD). He thought a clear description of these items is important so that readers have a common understanding of the Village's goal.

Mr. Jirik stated an objective regarding finding a solution for improving north-south traffic Downtown should be added to page 26.

Mr. Thoman asked about restricting service-type uses in the industrial parks (Objective #9, page 27). Mr. Houseal explained the concerns with allowing service uses in industrial parks. The Committee discussed this issue and determined the objective is appropriate to maintain the character and industrial nature of the Ellsworth Business Park.

Chairman White asked if an objective regarding a new westbound ramp from Highland/Butterfield to Interstate 88 should be added.

Mr. Dabareiner noted the Committee needed to be careful about including specific solutions because the solution may vary with the land use, however, general statements about improving traffic in this area should be included.

Mr. Houseal agreed. He said they would add an objective to the transportation section that called for improvement to the circulation at the Butterfield-Highland intersection.

Mr. Davenport asked if objective #5 on page 28 was referring to new or existing cul-de-sacs. Mr. Houseal said both.

The Committee discussed this objective and its implications. Mrs. Sigerich suggested that the objective should focus on discouraging cul-de-sacs and dead-end streets as a means to improve traffic circulation.

Mr. Jirik said that objectives 3 and 8 in transportation goal #2 – regarding trail expansion – should include some language about new trails being context sensitive. He was specifically concerned about residents' privacy.

Mr. Wendt pointed out that objective 9 on page 28 should be modified so there was no reference to a new train station to reflect the Committee's previous discussions regarding the sub area plans.

Mr. Davenport pointed out that objective 13 on page 31 only references the LEED standards. He thought adding "or similar" would be important in case there were changes in the field of green building standards.

Chairman White asked for any additional comments regarding the draft plan sections. No additional comments were received. He reminded members to review their materials and provide grammar changes or other thoughts to staff prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Houseal said they will go back and make the changes discussed during the meeting. Those changes would be provided prior the next meeting along with the remaining plan sections. Mr. Houseal indicated the next meeting will start with a discussion of the proposed land use map.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

John Schofield, 1125 Jefferson, asked that a list of the changes to the proposed land use map be provided prior to the next meeting.

Greg Bedalov, President, Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation, noted the EDC was discussing some of the other tools to address the appearance of existing commercial properties and shopping centers. He asked that the plan's section on economic development contain some language regarding these alternative tools. He noted the EDC Board had been specifically discussing the use of Business Improvement Districts, Business Enterprise Zones and other tools.

No additional comments were received. As such, Chairman White declared public comment closed.

Mr. Davenport stated a list of changes to the proposed land use map would be helpful for the next meeting.

The Committee and staff agreed a list would be produced prior to the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 pm.

/s/ Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Planning Manager

APPROVED 10/26/2010

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING

September 28, 2010, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman White called the September 28, 2010 meeting of the Comprehensive Plan Committee to order at 7:00 p.m.:

PRESENT: Chairman White, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Bollow, Mr. Davenport, Mrs. Earl, Mr. Jirik (at 7:02 pm), Mr. Jacobs, Mrs. Sigerich (at 7:10 pm), Mr. Thoman, Mr. Wendt

ABSENT: Mrs. Hamernik

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Dabareiner, Community Development Director; Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager; Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates & Courtney Owen, Houseal Lavigne Associates

VISITORS: Christine B. Fregeau, 1918 Elmore Ave

MINUTES:

Chairman White asked if there were any comments or changes regarding the minutes for the August 24 meeting. No comments or changes were received. Chairman White asked for a motion to approve the minutes from August 24, 2010.

Mr. Davenport made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Bollow seconded the motion. Voice vote noted all in favor. Chairman White declared the minutes from August 24, 2010 approved.

Chairman White asked for Houseal Lavigne representatives to give a brief overview of the materials being reviewed at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Lavigne explained the Committee would be discussing the Land Use Plan. He noted that a list of proposed map changes, as requested by the Committee, was prepared to help the discussion.

There was a brief discussion about the best way to proceed through the changes. The Committee determined it would be best to go through the list individually and in order.

Mr. Wendt asked why the definition of the "corporate campus" classification was omitted from the workbook.

Mr. Lavigne explained it was an oversight that has already been corrected in the draft plan. He went on to describe the "office/corporate campus" land use category. Mr. Lavigne also described the change in item #1 (northwest corner of Finley Road and Brook Drive). He indicated the current use was a bank and the land use plan was changed to reflect the property's current use.

Mr. Lavigne introduced change #2 (southeast corner of Finley Road and Brook Drive). He noted the change in the plan reflects the properties' current use as light industrial. He noted the Village's

current future land use designation was commercial, but the properties function as part of the industrial park north of Butterfield Road.

Mr. Beggs asked if the Plan Commission would be bound to the new land use plan when making future recommendations on re-zoning.

Mr. Lavigne explained the Village would not be bound to strictly follow the land use plan. The plan and map represented land use recommendations based on current and anticipated conditions. He noted the specific development proposals might require slight deviations from the plan from time to time. Mr. Lavigne also noted the sub-area plan contained more specific recommendations for the Butterfield Corridor.

Mr. Lavigne introduced change #3 (southwest corner of Butterfield Road and Highland Avenue). He explained this change from commercial to office/corporate campus was made to reflect the Committee's recommendations for the Butterfield Corridor sub-area plan. He reminded the Committee that the discussion on these properties focused on creating a development similar to Highland Landmark.

The Committee discussed change #3.

Christine Fregeau, 1918 Elmore, asked if the land use change would encompass the University Plaza property.

Mr. Lavigne noted the land use recommendation affects properties east of University Plaza.

Mr. Lavigne introduced change #4 (south side of 31st Street east of Highland Avenue). He explained the existing land use designation is single family residential. He noted the recommended land use designation be changed to open space as the properties are part of Lyman Woods.

Mr. Wendt stated he would like to see some open space added to the northeast part of the Village to help with the community's stormwater mitigation efforts.

Mr. Dabareiner explained specific proposals acquiring properties to provide additional detention could still be carried out even if the land use plan did not designate a property as open space.

Mr. Lavigne introduced change #5 (Ogden Avenue between I-355 and Lacey Road). He indicated the properties are currently designated as office, research and manufacturing by the Village's Future Land Use Map. He noted they were being re-classified to "corridor commercial" based on the Committee's recommendations for the Ogden Avenue sub-area plan.

Chairman White asked if a flex category was needed for these properties given their current use.

Mr. Lavigne noted the corridor commercial category provides the general flexibility for the larger office uses that exist. He went on to say the sub-area plan has more specificity in how this area could develop over the planning horizon.

Mr. Beggs asked how the sign ordinance plays into the plan for Ogden Avenue as it relates to the larger office uses.

Mr. Lavigne stated the Village's sign ordinance should allow certain signage based on property and building size, which should accommodate the retail and office uses. He asked Village staff to confirm.

Mr. O'Brien confirmed the sign ordinance regulations.

Mr. Davenport asked if the Committee should make recommendations for improvements to the Finley Road-Warrenville Road intersection given the proposed land use classification.

The Committee discussed adding a policy to the transportation section of the plan. Members determined it would be desirable to add language to the plan to recommend changes to this intersection to improve its viability in the Ogden Avenue corridor.

The Committee asked about the difference between the zoning classification and the land use designation.

Mr. Dabareiner explained the relationship between the zoning ordinance and the land use plan. He stated the zoning ordinance is the main tool that implements a comprehensive plan. However, the zoning ordinance is a regulatory tool that governs the actual use of the property while the land use plan provides a guide to future development decisions. He stated a property's actual zoning classification could differ from the recommended land use designation.

Mr. Lavigne introduced change #6 (west side of Lee Avenue, south of Ogden Avenue). He stated the recommended land use would be changed from residential to corridor commercial. He noted this change was proposed to line up the commercial uses on the west side of the street with those on the east side. Mr. Lavigne also indicated this area is identified by the sub-area plan as one of the strategic locations where commercial depth could be increased.

The Committee discussed concerns about the single-family homes to the south of change #6. Members noted buffering and screening would be important for any commercial developments in this area.

Mr. Beggs asked if there was a possibility to expand the commercial areas to the south as part of change #7 (southeast corner of Fairview Avenue and Ogden Avenue).

Mr. Lavigne noted the recommended commercial land uses were extended to the south a little. He noted that specific development proposals could differ slightly from the land use plan.

The Committee discussed how to handle the distinction between commercial and residential land uses along the Ogden Avenue Corridor. Members expressed a desire to provide some notation or language that would allow flexibility for specific development proposals.

Mr. Lavigne indicated the text in the commercial areas section of the draft plan and the Ogden Avenue sub-area plan contained language that would provide the Plan Commission and Village Council the flexibility to extend commercial land uses into residential areas where proper screening and buffering could be maintained.

The Committee determined the language would be better than additional notations on the land use map.

The Committee discussed change #7 as it relates to the townhomes on Fox Fire Court. They expressed concern with designating the development as a commercial land use.

Mr. Dabareiner noted that the Village's Future Land Use Map already designated a portion of the development as commercial. He also indicated that even if the land use is shown as commercial, the zoning could remain residential until a developer seeks a zoning change.

Mr. Lavigne introduced change #8 (Downers Grove Sanitary District Treatment Plant). He noted the land use was being changed to institutional to reflect its current and future use as the treatment plant.

Mr. Lavigne went on to change #9 (northwest corner of Belmont Road and Burlington Avenue). He explained the changes were to reflect the new Metra parking lot at Haddow and Belmont as well as the existing single-family neighborhood to the west of Belmont Road.

The Committee discussed the proposed land use. The determined the neighborhood should be multifamily residential given its proximity to the Belmont train station. The Committee discussed how far west the designation should extend and determined that the new plan should match the current Future Land Use Map.

Mr. Lavigne introduced change #10 (northwest corner of Belmont Road and Curtiss Road). He indicated this change reflected the Committee's discussion and recommendations for the sub-area plan.

Mr. Lavigne discussed change #11 (north side of Maple, east of I-355). He indicated this change was on the Committee's sub-area plan discussion.

Mr. Wendt asked if the neighborhood commercial designation at the southeast and northeast corners of Maple Avenue and Walnut Avenue should remain.

Mr. Lavigne said the commercial land use recommendation was on the Committee's discussion.

Mr. Lavigne noted change #12 (west side of Belmont Road, north and south of Wisconsin Avenue). He noted this change represented a modification from the current land use designation of commercial back to light industrial given the properties' current use and position within the Ellsworth Business Park. The change also reflected the Committee's recommendations for the sub-area plan.

Mr. Lavigne introduced change #13 (east side of Belmont Road between the railroad tracks and Maple Avenue). He noted this change was based on the sub-area plan.

Christine Fregeau, 1918 Elmore Ave, noted concerns with the recommendation to close Elmore at Belmont Road. She stated it would be difficult for emergency vehicles to service this neighborhood given the limited access points if this intersection is closed.

Mr. Lavigne stated change #14 (southwest corner of Maple Avenue and Chase Avenue) recommended single-family attached land uses instead of commercial land uses. This change is proposed to match up with the existing townhouse development to the west.

Mr. Lavigne noted that change #15 (south side of Warren Avenue from Lee Avenue to Forest Avenue) was proposed to encourage continuation of the small offices that were recently constructed. He noted the industrial land use was no longer appropriate given modern standards for industrial property sizes and the area's proximity to residential uses.

Mr. Jirik questioned whether the depth was appropriate for office developments.

Mr. Lavigne said smaller, professional office buildings could fit on the lots.

Mr. Jirik asked if townhouses or other residential uses might be more appropriate.

Mr. Lavigne indicated residential could be used to transition from the railroad tracks. However, residential uses may not be as desirable given the nature of the railroad use.

Mr. Dabareiner indicated staff reviewed a proposed senior housing facility in this area. The proposal never went forward, but office and residential uses would be an appropriate transition to the single-family neighborhood to the north.

Mr. Lavigne introduced change #16 (intersection of Saratoga Avenue and Warren Avenue). He noted the land use designation was being modified from medium density residential to single family residential to reflect the existing trend of development.

Mrs. Sigerich noted that she thought the area would be appropriate for townhouses given the manufacturing use on the south side of Warren Avenue and the dense multifamily uses on the east side of Saratoga.

Mr. Lavigne indicated that Saratoga was already working as an appropriate transition from the dense developments on the east side of the street.

Mr. Lavigne discussed change #17 (east of Carpenter Street, north and south side of Curtiss Street). He indicated the recommended land use designation was being modified from dense multifamily residential to match the current land uses, a mix of single family, townhouses, and institutional uses. He noted the existing trend of development was working as a successful transition from the trend of development on and near Main Street.

Mr. Lavigne noted change #18 (north and south side of Rogers Street between Washington and Prospect) was being modified from industrial on the south side to mixed use. He indicated this recommendation was to make a transition between Downtown and the Fairview Station area. Mr. Lavigne stated the north side of the street was being changed to single family to match the existing trend of development.

Mr. Lavigne indicated area #19 (south side of Rogers Street between Prospect and Fairview) was being modified from industrial to office.

Chairman White stated it might be beneficial to discuss areas 19, 20 and 21 at the same time as they involve the Fairview Station area.

The Committee discussed the future of the Fairview Station neighborhood. Members expressed concerns about what the neighborhood would be in the future.

Mr. Dabareiner announced that the Village Council would be reviewing an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan contract to add the neighborhood as a sub-area plan. He indicated if the change was approved, the land use plan could change based on the recommendations of the sub-area plan.

Mr. Jacobs noted that the future of the neighborhood would greatly depend on if Pepperidge Farm continued operations on their property. He asked if staff knew whether they would maintain operations in this neighborhood.

Mr. Dabareiner said Pepperidge Farm has not approached the Village with plans to stay or leave. He noted the Village anticipates they will want to leave the area at some point in the future given the constraints of the site and transportation network.

The Committee discussed area #19 and noted that the mixed-use designation on the south side of Rogers Street should be extended east toward Fairview Avenue.

The Committee noted that in area #21, the multifamily designations would be more appropriate than the single-family designations in the area bounded by Maple Avenue, Fairview Avenue, Burlington Avenue and the Village limit.

Mr. Lavigne noted change #22 (south side of Hobson Road, east of I-355) was being modified from single family residential to institutional to reflect the existing church use.

Mr. Lavigne went on to area #23 (north side of 63rd Street between I-355 and Stonewall). He noted the recommendation for this area is to change the land use designation to office from medium density and single family residential. He indicated the recommendation was due to the heavy commercial uses on the south side of 63rd Street.

Mr. Lavigne explained that office uses would be a more appropriate transition to the residential neighborhoods to the north. He noted that office uses tend to be relatively passive during the evening hours and weekends. Small-scale office uses also produce less traffic than retail uses.

Mr. Jirik asked if the zoning would permit offices to be located in the existing houses.

Mr. O'Brien noted that a special use is available for a residential property on an arterial street provided it is adjacent to a commercially zoned property. He stated the ordinance does not count zoning across a street as being adjacent.

Mr. Davenport asked if the commercial designation is expanded to the north at the intersection of 63rd and Belmont.

Mr. Lavigne said it was being expanded a little because retail uses already existed on these properties and would likely need additional depth in the future.

Mr. Beggs reminded the Committee members of the previous development proposal that was rejected at 63rd Street and Janes Avenue. He noted that development proposal included retail uses with drive-through uses.

The Committee discussed the previous proposal and noted that the intense nature of that development would not be an appropriate transition to the residential neighborhood to the north. Members discussed that office uses could provide an appropriate transition to the neighborhood from the commercial uses on the south side of 63rd. The Committee indicated that residential uses on 63rd Street were probably marginal and not desirable given the change in the street's function.

Mr. Jirik asked if something could be done to indicate improving the connection between the Meadowbrook Shopping Center and the shopping center to the west.

The Committee discussed the importance of connecting the two shopping areas. Members noted that a better connection could improve the viability of Meadowbrook.

Mr. Lavigne stated that some recommendations regarding Meadowbrook could be found in the Commercial Areas section of the draft plan.

Mr. Lavigne introduced area #24 (south side of 63rd Street between Main Street and Saratoga Avenue). He stated the recommended designation for the properties fronting 63rd Street is multifamily residential to match the existing uses on the north side of the street. He also noted many of the single-family homes were used as rentals or for sale.

Mr. Lavigne noted area #25 (63rd Street and Fairview Avenue) was being modified to match the existing land use patterns.

Mr. Lavigne noted area #26 (Main Street, south of 67th Street and McCollum Park) was being modified to match the existing land use patterns.

Mr. Lavigne noted area #27 (east side of Dunham Road, north of Lemont Road) was being modified from medium density residential to single family residential to match the existing land use patterns.

Mr. Lavigne noted area #28 (south side of 75th Street, east of Fairview Avenue) was being modified to match the existing land use patterns.

Chairman White asked if there were any more comments on the changes. No changes were noted. He asked Committee members to forward additional thoughts to Mr. Dabareiner.

Chairman White asked if there were any general comments on the land use plan.

Mrs. Sigerich stated that changing the land use designation for the properties fronting the south side of Maple Avenue between Belmont and Sherman might be useful given the nature of the traffic patterns and current uses. She thought an attached single-family designation might be a better use for this area.

The Committee discussed the recommendation and determined that it would be more helpful to have general language in the plan about residential properties along arterial roads.

Mr. Lavigne indicated that there was already similar language in the Residential Areas section of the plan. He noted they would review this language to make sure it matched the Committee's expectations.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman White asked for public comments. No comments were received as such; Chairman White declared public comment closed.

Mr. Lavigne passed out the draft comprehensive plan to the Committee. He indicated the Committee has reviewed most of the content in the document. He indicated the Committee should focus on pages 47-98 as that was the new material. However, they would be discussing the entire document at the October meeting.

Chairman White reminded the Committee that the next meeting would be held on October 26 in the Fire Station 2 training room. He also announced the Committee would form a sub-committee to edit the document at the October meeting. Chairman White asked Mr. Dabareiner to explain the purpose of the editing sub-committee in more detail.

Mr. Dabareiner described the purpose of the editing group would be to review and suggest changes to the final document's grammar and punctuation. He noted other Committee members could send in their changes as well. Mr. Dabareiner stated the entire Committee should feel free to debate the substance of the document, but the editing group would focus on reviewing the final draft plan for correct grammar.

The Committee discussed the upcoming meeting schedule. Mr. Dabareiner indicated staff was hoping the Committee could forward a recommendation to the Plan Commission at their regularly scheduled meeting in November.

The Committee determined it might be helpful to schedule a second meeting in early November (November 3) in case it was needed to get the plan on a December Plan Commission agenda.

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 pm.

/s/ Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Planning Manager

APPROVED 11/3/2010

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING

October 26, 2010, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman White called the October 26, 2010 meeting of the Comprehensive Plan Committee to order at 7:00 p.m.:

PRESENT: Chairman White, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Bollow, Mr. Davenport, Mrs. Earl, Mr. Jirik, Mr. Jacobs, Mrs. Sigerich, Mr. Thoman, Mr. Wendt

ABSENT: Mrs. Hamernik

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Dabareiner, Community Development Director; Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager; Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates & Courtney Owen, Houseal Lavigne Associates

VISITORS: Greg Bedalov, Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation; Bill Wrobel, 7800 Queens Court

MINUTES:

Chairman White asked if there were any comments or changes regarding the minutes for the September 28, 2010 meeting. No comments or changes were received. Chairman White asked for a motion to approve the minutes from September 28, 2010.

Mrs. Earl made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Beggs seconded the motion. Voice vote noted all in favor. Chairman White declared the minutes from September 28, 2010 approved.

Chairman White asked for Houseal Lavigne representatives to give a brief overview of the materials being reviewed at tonight's meeting.

Mr. Lavigne explained the Committee would be discussing the draft plan. He noted the agenda suggested pages where the most attention should be given.

Chairman White agreed that it would be best to start by reviewing the pages suggested by the agenda.

Mr. Lavigne introduced the recommendations presented on Page 54 of the draft plan. He stated the page contained policies and recommendations for the Village's residential areas.

Chairman White asked if the numbers represented an order of priority for the recommendations.

Mr. Lavigne indicated the numbers did not represent a prioritization of the recommendations. He added the number system could be changed if the Committee desired.

APPROVED 11/3/2010

The Committee discussed the numbering of the recommendations. A consensus was reached that the numbers could stay, but a footnote should be added indicating the numbers do not reflect a prioritization of the recommendations.

Mrs. Earl asked if the word “foreclosure” was appropriate in recommendation #1. She noted that vacant buildings are not necessarily foreclosed.

Mrs. Sigerich added that it could be difficult to get action on foreclosed properties due to the complex nature of the process.

Chairman White suggested substituting “neglected” for “foreclosure.”

Mr. Davenport asked how a vacant property registry would prevent further damage to a neighborhood and help the Village enforce building and property maintenance ordinances for vacant properties.

The Committee discussed the problems associated with vacant buildings and how the Village handles enforcement on vacant properties.

Mr. Dabareiner explained the Village’s current practices for identifying vacant buildings and getting corrective action to resolve violations.

The Committee agreed that recommendation #1 should be revised to focus on vacant buildings and eliminate references to foreclosed properties.

Mr. Thoman expressed concern with the word “flexible” in recommendation #3. He stated it implied the Village should bend the rules for certain projects.

Mr. Davenport suggested that “cooperative” might be more appropriate.

The Committee agreed that “cooperative” was a better term.

Mr. Jirik noted that #4 should be clear that tree preservation references were for parkway trees only.

The Committee discussed the concern and determined the language was appropriate as it is currently written.

Mr. Jirik stated that #8 might be contradictory to statements made in earlier meetings regarding extension of the sidewalk network.

The Committee discussed the recommendation and determined the language was only applying to gaps in the existing network, not expanding the sidewalk network where it does not exist.

Mr. Wendt indicated that #s 12-14 seem to run together. He thought that recommendation #14 could be combined with #12.

The Committee agreed that recommendations 12 and 14 should be combined.

Mr. Davenport said he had some concerns with the wording for recommendation #5. He thought the word “ordinance” should be added after “New residential construction.”

He went on to say that recommendation #6 should be strengthened. He was concerned that an inventory/pattern book without teeth would not be an effective tool for protecting neighborhood character. He stated he thought a stronger tool, such as neighborhood conservation districts, might be more effective in discouraging development of out-of-scale buildings.

The Committee discussed how best to handle design regulations for single-family development.

Mr. Dabareiner reminded the Committee that recommendation #6 comes directly from comments made by residents during the TCD 3 process with regard to protecting neighborhood character. He explained how the Village currently uses the Downtown Pattern Book to foster better projects in the Downtown – even without the grant program. Mr. Dabareiner said that a residential pattern book would be the first step to developing historic districts or conservation districts.

The Committee noted that additional information would be needed on this recommendation and that further discussion should be had at the next meeting.

Mr. Davenport asked if recommendation #10 was referring to new construction, existing development or both.

Mr. Lavigne indicated it referred to both new and existing development.

Mr. Davenport stated the recommendation should be clearer.

The Committee briefly discussed how existing commercial development could be made to provide better buffers and screening to residential properties.

Mr. Lavigne noted that communities usually require upgrades when businesses come in for permits to remodel or perform other work.

Mr. Dabareiner agreed this is when the Village asks for upgrades.

Chairman White asked if there were comments about the commercial areas section of the plan.

Mr. Jirik stated the comment regarding limitations on sign variations on page 59 was too restrictive. He asked that the language be toned down so as not to restrict the Village’s ability to issue sign variations where hardships exist.

Mr. Jirik also explained concerns with some of the items in the “White Elephant Ordinance” section on page 63. He thought specific references to limits on store size and re-use plans should be removed. He noted his general agreement with the concept, but that store limits and re-use plans might be discouraging to potential developers.

The Committee discussed white elephant ordinances. The group asked if there were any specific examples in the area.

Mr. Lavigne noted that many communities throughout the United States use these ordinances to protect themselves for large, vacant stores. He noted many big-box users place restrictions on future purchasers or users to eliminate competition in the area. He indicated white elephant ordinances are simply provided as an example of good planning practices so that future large-scale retail spaces can be filled after their original tenants leave.

Mr. Lavigne went on to note that page 65 provided policies and recommendations for the Village's Commercial areas.

Mr. Jirik asked how licensing undesirable or nonconforming uses would help eliminate these businesses.

The Committee discussed the best methods for limited undesirable uses.

Ms. Owen indicated that Chicago places setbacks between similar businesses in their licensing requirements to limit the concentration of certain types of businesses in commercial areas.

Mr. Dabareiner explained that licensing can help place extra requirements on certain businesses. He indicated licensing is a good way to require annual inspections for compliance with health and sanitation requirements.

Mr. Thoman asked how long existing nonconforming uses could remain in operation.

Mr. O'Brien explained that as long as a nonconforming use remains in operation it is allowed to remain. The use only becomes amortized if it is out of operation for 18 consecutive months. He went on to explain the Village has only set an amortization date on junk yards and that these uses needed to cease in the 1980s.

Mr. Lavigne noted that they would be adding an additional recommendation to the commercial areas section to suggest cooperation with surrounding communities to cross-promote adjacent commercial areas. He noted this addition was based on discussion about the Meadowbrook Shopping Center relates to Woodridge's commercial development to the west.

Mr. Lavigne introduced the transportation section recommendations on pages 73-74.

Mr. Davenport noted that recommendation #1 on page 74 should include the DuPage County Forest Preserve District. He also stressed that recommendation #10 on page 73 should contain some language about finding a solution to any parking and circulation problems in the Downtown.

The Committee then discussed the need for a Downtown parking study.

Mr. Dabareiner indicated that a study would likely be completed in 2011, but that the Comprehensive Plan should not assume the results of that study.

Mr. Jirik raised a concern about recommendation #4 on page 74. He stated that "desire" for trails would not be a compelling reason for taking land dedicated for recreational trails.

The Committee discussed the recommendation and how land for trails would be acquired.

Mr. Lavigne noted that easements could be achieved through agreements and working cooperatively with residents where there was a need for trails.

Mr. Lavigne introduced the policies and recommendations for parks, open space and the environment on page 83. He noted that the section had been provided to the Park District for comments. The draft document reflects their changes.

Mr. Thoman said recommendation #8 should be revised. He stated that he was concerned with “appropriate” tree protection as trees are either protected or not protected during the course of construction.

Mr. Beggs suggested “appropriate” be changed to “effective.”

The Committee discussed tree protection and determined that “effective” would be a good substitute for “appropriate.”

Mr. Davenport asked for more description of the Public Area Beautification Plan, referred to in recommendation #5. Ms. Owen pointed out that there was more description related to that plan earlier in the section.

Mr. Lavigne stated that several comments had been made regarding aerators for detention ponds. He indicated those references would be modified.

Mr. Lavigne introduced the policies and recommendations for the community facilities section on page 98.

Mr. Davenport said he really liked the language in the un-numbered introduction paragraph in this section. He said the Village should work to facilitate regular meetings with the other local governmental agencies collaborate on important issues and facilities.

Mr. Jirik asked if the Village should add a process to bring the local governments to the table.

Mr. Lavigne pointed out that recommendation #9 speaks to the sharing of facilities.

Mr. Wendt stated that recommendation #11 seemed like the Comprehensive Plan could not address it. He noted that the plan could not solve the problem of homelessness.

Ms. Owen noted the Library identified the congregation of homeless individuals at their facilities as an issue for Downtown Downers Grove.

The Committee discussed the appropriateness of the homelessness issue for the Comprehensive Plan. The Committee felt the issue, while an important concern, did not belong in the plan.

Mr. Dabareiner reminded the Committee that the recommendation came directly from the facilities comments on page 95. He noted this concern came from a very specific issue the Library is facing at their facility. He stated the comment might need to be re-worded, but that it is appropriate as it relates to facilities and the Village’s regulations for use of property. Mr. Dabareiner noted that the

Village would want to make sure its zoning regulations did not inadvertently create barriers or complicate the existing issues.

Mr. Bollow agreed that homelessness was a big issue for the Village, but not for the comprehensive plan. He thought the Village would not want to add regulations regarding facilities for homeless individuals.

Mr. Davenport suggested that the Village may want to support efforts to address the Library and other Downtown businesses' concerns, but he thought the language "should lead" is too strong.

The Committee had additional discussion regarding the wording for recommendation #11.

Mr. Bollow asked what kind of obstacles stand in the way of providing facilities for homeless individuals.

Mr. Dabareiner explained the Comprehensive Plan recommendations would provide a base to evaluate the Village's regulations and implement new standards that may ease any restrictions that currently face these facilities.

Mr. Davenport stated the Library is just looking to manage the problem they currently have, not correct or eliminate the Village's homeless problem.

Mr. Jirik suggested adding language that suggests the Village and Library work cooperatively to monitor and address the situation.

The Committee determined the language in recommendation #11 be re-worked and presented at the next meeting.

Chairman White if there were any other major concerns from members of the Committee.

Mr. Thoman said he would like to re-open the discussion of changing the use for the Cameo development (northwest corner of Maple and Walnut). He stated that it is currently shown as catalyst site #4 on page 104 for the Ellsworth Industrial Park. He noted the plan suggests the site become office or industrial uses similar to the surround uses.

Mr. Thoman questioned whether the site would really become more than what it is today – a high-density residential development – in the 20-year planning timeframe.

The Committee discussed the appropriateness of the recommended land use change.

Mr. Lavigne explained that the site is not a great location for senior housing due to the lack of amenities – shopping, services, health care – and surrounding industrial uses. He indicated the site would eventually be redeveloped, but only way the site will be redeveloped to a more appropriate use is if the Village provides some specific recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Lavigne said that it is likely if the Village provides some specific direction, a single developer may start buying out units as they become available. He noted this would likely begin when 1) the

economy improves and 2) if the plan provides an indication that a different use would be more appropriate.

Mr. Dabareiner noted that increasing maintenance expenses sometimes force action on the sale of a property, as well.

The Committee discussed the recommendation to change the land use from high-density residential to office/corporate campus. The Committee reached consensus to leave the recommended land use designation as office/corporate campus.

Mr. Lavigne pointed out that Mr. Jirik and Mr. Thoman had sent in comments about the funding sources on pages 140-145. He indicated there was some concern from those members about providing specific funding information as this information can change based on availability and changes in State and Federal laws. He thought it might be appropriate to remove those pages and simply provide a reference on where to find funding sources on page 139.

Mr. Thoman clarified that he was concerned about the use of TIF districts. He wanted some clarifications that if TIF districts are used, they should follow a “pay as you go” model similar to the Ogden Avenue TIF district.

Mr. Thoman continued that he also had a question regarding special service areas (SSAs). Specifically, he was wondering what effect the increase in residential units in the Village’s downtown would have on future of the Downtown SSA. He noted that due to the increase in condominium owners, there may now be 51% of property owners that are opposed to the SSA tax and a loss of this funding source would drastically harm Downtown Management’s ability to provide its services.

Chairman White stated that the condominium owners would not be able to dissolve the SSA retroactively. He thought 51% of property owners could only block the formation of a SSA, not dissolve one in existence.

Mr. Lavigne clarified that the comment in the plan suggested that any new SSA would likely need to carve out objecting property owners.

The Committee discussed SSAs and how the existing SSAs could be affected if new owners objected.

Mr. Beggs stated he did not mind providing a list of funding resources, but he would not want to recommend specific sources.

Mr. Lavigne indicated they would be eliminating the pages containing the funding sources and replacing it with a references to places where the Village can look for money.

Mr. Beggs indicated he was not comfortable with the use of the term “Best Management Practices” (BMPs). He noted that he found some references to stormwater management requirements while researching the term, but was not sure if the term was specific to stormwater practices. He thought if the term was more general, it might lead to confusion for users.

Mr. Lavigne explained that the term “Best Management Practices” specifically refers to stormwater management practices. It was not a general term like “best practices.” He indicated that when the plan refers to “Best Management Practices” it is referring to stormwater infrastructure improvements.

Chairman White referred back to the Committee’s earlier discussion on governmental cooperation. He noted that there was more direction for intergovernmental cooperation on page 137.

Mr. Beggs asked if there was any update on the subarea plan for the Fairview Train Station neighborhood.

Mr. Lavigne explained the Village Council approved the addition to the contract at their meeting on October 19. He indicated that his staff was working on completing the plan and that it would be presented at next week’s meeting. The Committee could discuss the plan at their final two meetings.

Mr. Dabareiner stated that the Village staff was anticipating two more Committee meetings – one on November 3 and one on November 17. He indicated staff was hoping the Committee could make a recommendation to the Plan Commission at the November 17 meeting. He explained the Plan Commission would hold hearings for the plan in December.

Chairman White clarified that it would be subject to the edits made by the editing sub-committee.

Mr. Dabareiner said that was correct. He noted the editing sub-committee would be checking to make sure the document’s grammar and spelling was correct.

The Committee asked questions about the Plan Commission and the next steps in the process. It was explained that the Plan Commission would hold the public hearings and forward a recommendation to the Village Council. The first hearing would be on December 6 and, if needed, December 13. Village staff would begin to get information to the other Plan Commissioners so they can begin to review the document. Village staff was hoping to have the document to the Village Council for review in late December.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman White asked for public comments.

Greg Bedalov, President, Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation, noted that the Committee and the Comprehensive Plan should not limit the use of TIF especially for the Ellsworth Industrial Park. He stated that this area is approaching 250,000 square feet of vacant space and several other businesses were looking to expand, but the environmental issues in the park were a barrier. Mr. Bedalov explained that “pay as you go” TIFs would not provide the appropriate ability to finance major clean up efforts and would provide a dis-service to the Ellsworth Park.

Mr. Thoman clarified that the environmental remediate would present an extra-ordinary issue where a standard TIF district would be okay.

APPROVED 11/3/2010

Mr. Lavigne pointed out that the language about TIF was being removed from the plan because the Committee asked that the specific financial tools be removed in favor of general references to funding resources.

Bill Wrobel, 7800 Queens Court, said he was happy to hear the Committee discuss parking and traffic Downtown. He explained that he was recently observing the use of commercial space on the block bounded by Burlington on the north, Main on the east, Forest on the west and Curtiss on the south. He thought that parking in the alley on the private properties represented an inappropriate use in Downtown and that these areas would be better suited as commercial space.

Chairman White asked for other public comments. No additional comments were received as such; Chairman White declared public comment closed.

Chairman White reminded the Committee that the next meeting is scheduled for November 3 at Village Hall.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 pm.

/s/ Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Planning Manager

APPROVED 11/17/10

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING

November 3, 2010, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman White called the November 3, 2010 meeting of the Comprehensive Plan Committee to order at 7:00 p.m.:

PRESENT: Chairman White, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Davenport, Mrs. Earl, Mrs. Sigerich, Mr. Thoman, Mr. Wendt

ABSENT: Mr. Bollow, Mrs. Hamernik, Mr. Jacobs and Mr. Jirik,

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Dabareiner, Community Development Director; Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager; Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates & Courtney Owen, Houseal Lavigne Associates

VISITORS: None.

MINUTES:

Chairman White asked if there were any comments or changes regarding the minutes for the October 26, 2010 meeting. No comments or changes were received. Chairman White asked for a motion to approve the minutes from October 26, 2010.

Mr. Davenport made a motion to approve the minutes. Mrs. Earl seconded the motion. Voice vote noted all in favor. Chairman White declared the minutes from October 26, 2010 approved.

Chairman White provided a brief overview of the materials being reviewed. He also reviewed the upcoming schedule.

Mr. Dabareiner noted there were several remaining concerns the Committee had from the October 26th meeting. He also indicated the Committee would be review the sub-area plan for the Fairview station neighborhood.

Mr. Davenport re-stated his concern from the October 26th meeting relating to recommendation #6 for the residential areas. He asked what would be proposed to help preserve neighborhood character. He noted his preference for the neighborhood conservation district concept, but it was most important that residents have a tool to protect their neighborhoods from incompatible development. Mr. Davenport said he thought it would be a good idea to inventory neighborhoods and establish patterns similar to what was completed for Downtown. He did not think an inventory would need to be as in depth as the Downtown Pattern Book.

Mrs. Earl stated that she had given some additional thought to the appropriateness of addressing homelessness in the Comprehensive Plan. She did not think a large-scale issue like homelessness could be adequately addressed by a comprehensive plan. She asked if other plans included commentary on issues like homelessness.

Chairman White indicated the concerns surrounding homeless individuals might be best handled by the Human Services Commission. He noted the Comprehensive Plan could contain a brief statement to that effect.

Mr. Dabareiner provided an overview of comprehensive plan styles, noting that some plans used to address social concerns, but modern plans tend to focus on physical development and layout issues. He agreed the issue could come out of the plan, but could be sent to a more appropriate venue for additional review. He indicated the Village's Police Department was already working with the Library to address their immediate concerns.

Mr. Beggs agreed that the Village Council and Village Manager's Office are set up to handle large policy issues such as homelessness. He stated he was confident the Village would find solutions to address the specific concerns if they continue to persist.

Mrs. Sigerich asked how the plan would be affected by the removal of the recommendation.

Mr. Lavigne stated the specific recommendation would come out, but the concern would remain in the plan in the existing condition report and TCD 3 reports.

Mr. Wendt asked how the Committee's recommendations regarding homeless concerns would be forwarded.

Mr. Dabareiner explained that the statement would remain in the information from TCD3, which would provide support in the event the Village chose to more actively address the concerns surrounding homelessness.

Mr. Thoman stated it was important to mention that the Committee agrees that homelessness is a serious issue that should be addressed, but it is not in the purview of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Davenport agreed that the community is sensitive to this issue, but it is important to identify the proper venue and mechanisms to address it.

Chairman White asked for other concerns or issues.

Mr. Lavigne went back to Mr. Davenport's concern regarding protecting neighborhood character. He noted that different regulatory tools such as zoning requirements, design guidelines, etc. have their origins in comprehensive plans. After performing more research, he did not think a neighborhood conservation district was the most appropriate tool for Downers Grove. Mr. Lavigne thought a pattern book or similar study should be completed before updating the residential zoning regulations. He thought this study would be important to identify the different residential development patterns. Mr. Lavigne explained the Comprehensive Plan would be revised to suggest that additional study of the different neighborhoods would be important to ensure zoning regulations and other tools adequately protect character.

Mr. Dabareiner elaborated that the previous recommendation was too broad, but the new language would be tailored in a manner to make it more specific to protecting neighborhood character, which was direct from the TCD 3 input.

The Committee discussed the change and came to consensus the new direction was acceptable.

Chairman White asked if there were any other issues from the Committee. No additional comments or changes were provided.

Chairman White summarized the consensus on the two issues remaining from the October 26th meeting. He stated the Committee agreed the recommendation regarding homelessness could be removed from the Community Facilities section. Further, the Committee agreed the revised direction for protecting neighborhood character was appropriate.

Chairman White asked Mr. Lavigne introduce the sub-area plan for the Fairview station neighborhood.

Mr. Lavigne passed out copies of the sub-area plan to the Committee. He explained the general concepts for the plan were on the first page. Page two provided direction for the catalyst sites and the third page contained a redevelopment concept.

The Committee took a five-minute break to review the plan.

Mr. Thoman asked why the plan stopped at the northwest corner of Douglas and Rogers. He thought there were some residential properties on the north side of Rogers that would probably be redeveloped in the future.

Mr. Lavigne indicated they just picked a stopping point, but could continue the map west for the next draft.

Mr. Lavigne began summarizing the text and maps. He specifically pointed out the recommendations to complete a traffic circulation study and consider re-aligning the intersection of Maple Avenue and the railroad tracks.

The Committee discussed re-aligning Maple Avenue. They expressed concerns about limiting east-west traffic flow and eliminating an opportunity to cross the railroad tracks.

Mr. Davenport expressed concern about loss of business if the intersection is closed entirely.

Mr. Lavigne explained that the road could not be realigned until all of the impacts - both business and traffic - were fully vetted as part of a traffic study. He noted the current alignment created unsafe intersections at the railroad tracks and Rogers and Fairview.

Mrs. Sigerich asked if there was an opportunity for a grade-separated crossing at Fairview.

Mr. Dabareiner said there was not enough room, noting the length and space needed for an underpass design would basically undercut the Fairview Station sub-area.

Mr. Lavigne reminded the Committee that cut-through traffic in this neighborhood was one concern that was expressed during TCD 3.

Mr. Davenport asked about the status and design of the current proposal to reconstruct Maple's intersection with the tracks.

Mr. Dabareiner said he would find out the exact status, but that there was no final design because the plan was still in development. He clarified the TCD 3 concerns relating to cut-through traffic in the neighborhood. He explained the re-alignment of street grid is an interesting concept that would require major traffic studies with modeling to ensure problems would not be re-created elsewhere. Mr. Dabareiner indicated the Village might be surprised by the positive impact on cut-through traffic due to this change. He noted that at a minimum a small re-alignment of Maple would have positive effects on traffic safety and land use.

The Committee began discussing ideas for changing Maple Avenue's alignment. The Committee favored an idea where one-way traffic westbound was routed on the north side of the tracks and one-way traffic eastbound was routed on the south side of the tracks.

Chairman White asked the Committee if the language recommending traffic studies and potential re-alignment of Maple was generally acceptable. He stated the drawing should be modified to reflect the Committee's discussions.

Mr. Dabareiner noted that including a potential development scheme is important to plan's end-users.

Mr. Wendt asked if several alternative scenarios could be shown.

The Committee discussed what scenario should be shown in the plan.

Chairman White asked if there was consensus to use the one-way scenario for the plan drawing with the understanding that future implementation might differ depending on results of traffic studies.

The Committee agreed the one-way scenario would be preferred drawing to include in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Davenport expressed concern about potential conflicts between the current plans to modify the intersection of Maple and the railroad tracks and scenario that would be depicted in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Dabareiner explained the current plan is only meant to correct immediate safety concerns. He went on to note that the Village would not have final designs for this solution before the plan is sent to the Plan Commission and Council for review.

Mr. Beggs indicated he supported funding improvements in the neighborhood, but did not want to specify what type of funding, e.g., TIF, would be appropriate.

Chairman White re-iterated the Committee's consensus for the sub-area plan's traffic recommendations. He noted that modifications to Maple and/or other streets should be examined, but that there should be thorough studies preceding any changes to the street grid.

Mrs. Earl added that the number of crossings should not be changed.

Mrs. Sigerich stated that the Village would need to be careful to not push traffic to Hill Street and Whittier School.

Mr. Lavigne went on to explain the remaining points for the sub-area plan.

Mr. Davenport stated it was important to make connections between the Fairview neighborhood and Downtown while maintaining both areas' identities. He thought the Village should seek to create an identity for the Fairview neighborhood and that this point should be strengthened in the plan.

Mr. Lavigne continued through the plan.

Mr. Thoman stated that the plan should specifically reference adding trees to the landscape islands in the area's larger parking lots.

Mrs. Sigerich asked if Pepperidge Farms was staying in their current location.

Mr. Dabareiner stated that the Village has not heard of plans for Pepperidge Farms moving from their existing location. He said it is important for the Village to plan for their departure given the property's constraints and important relationship to the neighborhood.

Mr. Davenport added that it would be important to redevelop the site in fairly short time frame if Pepperidge Farms discontinues their use.

Chairman White agreed but noted that he did not think the Village should encourage them to leave the site. He also agreed the Village should plan for redevelopment if Pepperidge Farms leaves.

Mr. Dabareiner said the Village and the plan is not encouraging them to leave the site. He said that given the current trends and property constraints the Village should be realistic in their planning for this neighborhood, as it is likely Pepperidge Farms will seek alternative locations in the next 20-30 years.

Mr. Lavigne continued describing the concepts for the sub-area plan.

Mr. Beggs asked if the Committee could be provided with accident data for the Fairview neighborhood.

Mr. Dabareiner said the Police Department has that information and staff would provide that information at the next meeting.

Mr. Lavigne presented the catalyst sites.

Chairman White requested that language be added to the Pepperidge Farm site to suggest that redevelopment is a contingency plan if they leave.

The Committee discussed the plans for the Pepperidge Farm site and arrived at the consensus that the plan should not discourage them from remaining at the location.

APPROVED 11/17/10

Mr. Dabareiner asked Mr. Lavigne to provide more explanation on the LEED-ND concepts.

Mr. Lavigne provided an overview of the LEED-ND principles.

Chairman White suggested removing “Pepperidge Farms” and replacing it with “Fairview Area” as there are several sites in the area, which might lend them to a LEED-ND development.

Mr. Wendt thought the idea was inspirational and should be moved to the beginning of the section.

Mr. Thoman thought the LEED-ND discussion should come before the transit oriented development section.

Mr. Davenport asked for a brief explanation of LEED-ND’s advantages.

Mr. Lavigne explained some of the benefits.

Mr. Davenport thought that the principles set forth by LEED-ND were the most important ideas, not the specific “LEED” certification. He noted some concern about the future of the “LEED” designation and thought the plan should focus on the principles of LEED-ND development instead of the specific title.

Chairman White asked for additional comments. No additional comments were provided.

Chairman White went over the next steps. He noted the next meeting would provide an overview of the draft plan. He stated the Committee should focus their discussion on the changes to the residential design guidelines and character recommendations, the Fairview Sub-Area Plan. Chairman White stated if the Committee agreed with the changes, they should make a referral to the Plan Commission subject to changes from the Grammar Sub-Committee.

Mr. Lavigne said the Committee would have a revised plan next week incorporated all of the changes to date.

Chairman White then re-iterated that the Committee would refer that plan to the Plan Commission.

Mr. Dabareiner noted that Downtown Management provided some comments at a meeting earlier in the day. He asked Mr. O’Brien to provide a brief overview.

Mr. O’Brien provided some examples of the comments that he received specific to the Downtown Sub-Area plan. He indicated a formal letter would be provided prior to the November 17th meeting. He stated the Downtown Management Corporation was mostly in support of the plan, but there were some relatively minor adjustments to the language.

Mr. Dabareiner indicated the Committee should discuss the letter at the November 17th meeting and make the changes if they believe the comments are appropriate.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman White asked for public comments. No comments were received.

APPROVED 11/17/10

Chairman White reminded the Committee that the next and final meeting is scheduled for November 17 at Village Hall.

Mrs. Earl made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Davenport seconded the motion. Voice vote noted all in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 pm.

/s/ Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Planning Manager

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN COMMITTEE
PUBLIC MEETING

November 17, 2010, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman White called the November 17, 2010 meeting of the Comprehensive Plan Committee to order at 7:20 p.m.:

PRESENT: Chairman White, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Bollow, Mr. Davenport, Mrs. Earl, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Thoman, Mr. Wendt

ABSENT: Mrs. Hamernik, Mr. Jirik and Mrs. Sigerich

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Dabareiner, Community Development Director; Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager; John Houseal, Houseal Lavigne Associates; Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates & Courtney Owen, Houseal Lavigne Associates

VISITORS: Greg Bedalov, President, Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation.

MINUTES:

Chairman White asked if there were any comments or changes regarding the minutes for the November 3, 2010 meeting. No comments or changes were received. Chairman White asked for a motion to approve the minutes from November 3, 2010.

Mr. Thoman made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Wendt seconded the motion. Voice vote noted all in favor. Chairman White declared the minutes from November 3, 2010 approved.

Chairman White provided a brief overview of the materials being reviewed. He asked Mr. Lavigne to discuss the purpose of the meeting.

Mr. Lavigne noted that the purpose of the meeting was to finalize recommendations for the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman White asked if the Committee members were provided with the recommendations from the Downtown Management Corporation.

Mr. Dabareiner went through the recommendations from the Downtown Management Corporation. He noted that most of the recommendations are reflected in the draft plan. He explained the recommendations for softening the language regarding auto-oriented uses and strip malls Downtown were not made. After additional discussion, staff and Houseal Lavigne believe it is important to have stronger language to discourage auto-oriented uses Downtown. Mr. Dabareiner noted overall the Downtown Management Corporation was supportive of the draft Comprehensive Plan as it relates to Downtown.

Chairman White asked how the concerns surrounding social services and public uses were resolved.

Mr. Lavigne stated the words “social services” were removed from the Downtown sub-area plan.

Mr. Thoman asked if PADs program would be affected by removing “social services” from Downtown.

Chairman White did not think the program would be affected as PADs is also part of some churches’ mission.

Mr. Davenport asked for Mr. Lavigne to explain the changes to the historic preservation recommendations for Downtown.

Mr. Lavigne explained the changes that were made.

Chairman White asked for additional comments from the Committee.

Mrs. Earl noted that the map depicting the Maple Avenue re-alignment should contain labels for Fairview and Maple at a minimum. She asked if it would be worth noting that there was little support from the Committee to close the Maple Avenue crossing.

Mr. Dabareiner said the minutes really reflect the discussion and it was not necessary to include the statement in the final plan.

Mr. Davenport asked if additional language could be added to page 140 that qualified the intent for the Pepperidge Farms site should they decide to leave. He asked if the other changes could be presented.

Mr. Lavigne began presenting the changes to the document.

Mr. Thoman asked that the photo on page 1 be changed. He noted there might be some negative reactions to featuring the Tivoli Hotel.

The Committee began discussing changes in the document. The Committee came to the consensus that the photo on page 1 should be modified.

Mr. Lavigne went on to explain that the land use designation for the north side of Warrenville Road was modified from corridor commercial to corporate campus. He asked if that reflected the Committee’s discussion.

The Committee noted the change was reflective of their land use discussion.

Chairman White recalled the Committee requested the land use on west side of Thatcher Road be changed to “light industrial/business park” to match the east side of the street.

Mr. Houseal responded that the map would be changed to accurately reflect the discussion.

Mr. Wendt pointed out that the photo on page 61 was a great shot down Curtiss Street, but the “Do Not Enter” sign should be altered or eliminated. He also pointed out that 71st Street was incorrectly

labeled on the transportation map. He noted the street labeled as “71st Street” is actually Concord Drive.

Mr. Lavigne finished the presentation of the changes to the document.

Mr. Dabareiner presented traffic information for the Fairview area as requested by the Committee at their previous meeting. He indicated that there is an active traffic study in the neighborhood between Maple and 55th Street between Fairview and Main. He noted the data collection was 95% complete and a neighborhood meeting would be scheduled in January 2011 to present the findings.

Mr. Dabareiner added the intersection of the BNSF tracks and Maple would be under construction in Spring 2011 to address immediate safety concerns. He explained the change would eliminate the “hump” from the intersection, but that ultimately some more drastic changes would be needed to permanently address the safety concerns.

Mr. Dabareiner presented the accident data for the area. He noted the high number of accidents in the neighborhood – especially at the intersection of Maple and the railroad tracks – provide an argument that the Village needs to do something to improve safety and traffic circulation for the neighborhood.

The Committee discussed the information and agreed the sub-area plan for Fairview provides adequate direction for future land use and transportation improvements.

Chairman White asked for any additional changes or comments from the Committee. No additional comments were received.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman White asked for public comments.

Greg Bedalov, President, Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation, indicated he was concerned with the word “significant” as it relates to identifying historic buildings in the Downtown sub-area plan.

Mr. Davenport clarified the plan only calls for the Village to identify historic buildings. He stated that any formal protection for historic buildings would still need to receive owner consent and go through the Village’s landmark designation process. He noted the word “significant” should be removed from the Downtown plan.

Chairman White suggested that the word could be replaced with language suggesting that the Village facilitate identifying historic buildings.

The Committee discussed the changes and came to consensus that modifying the language as Chairman White suggested would be appropriate.

Mr. Bedalov asked if Catalyst site #26 on page 121 should stay in the plan given the fact that Pugi was proposing the expansion that the plan contemplates.

The Committee indicated the site and associated comments should remain in the plan.

Chairman White asked for additional public comments. No additional comments were received.

The Committee asked for specifics about the Editing Group.

Mr. Dabareiner explained the group would be formed to identify grammar and spelling errors. He noted the group would not be making any substantive changes to the document. He explained the group could only have 3 members to avoid conflicts with the Open Meetings Act. He indicated the Committee membership included the chairs of the Plan Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals and the Architectural Design Review Board – the bodies that would most often use the plan. He suggested these individuals – Chairman White, Mr. Davenport and Mr. Jirik – could be the members of the Editing Group.

Mr. Dabareiner encouraged other Committee members to continue to provide feedback to staff regarding grammar and spelling. He indicated staff would pass the comments along to the Editing Group.

Mr. Houseal indicated the document would remain substantially the same as the current draft. He noted they were working on some minor tweaks to the formatting of the document.

Mr. Thoman asked if there would be a table of contents or index.

Mr. Lavigne noted a table of contents and acknowledgement page would be added to the document.

Chairman White asked if there were additional comments from the Committee. No comments were received, as such, Chairman White as for a motion to refer the draft plan to the Village's Plan Commission.

MOTION:

Mr. Thoman made a motion to refer the draft Comprehensive Plan to the Village Plan Commission subject to changes requested at the November 17, 2010 and changes made editing group.

Mrs. Earl seconded the motion.

Voice vote noted all members in favor. As such, Chairman White declared the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman White announced the draft Comprehensive Plan would be discussed at a public hearing at the December 6, 2010 Plan Commission meeting.

Mr. Davenport made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Wendt seconded the motion. Voice vote noted all in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 pm.

/s/ Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Jeff O'Brien, AICP
Planning Manager

APPROVED 1/3/11

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

DECEMBER 6, 2010, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Jirik called the December 6, 2010 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:04 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Chairman Jirik, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Quirk, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Webster

ABSENT: Mrs. Hamernik, Mr. Waechtler

STAFF PRESENT: Village Community Development Director Tom Dabareiner; Village Planning Manager Jeff O'Brien; Village Planner Stan Popovich

VISITORS: Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence Ave., Downers Grove; Dr. Kathleen Goeppinger with Midwestern University; Mr. Dwight Todd with DWL Architects, 2333 N. Central Ave., Phoenix, AZ; Ms. Beth Simmons and Mr. Gary Mori with Hamilton Partners; Mr. Brian Slodysko with Trib Local; Ms. Christine Fregeau, 1918 Elmore Avenue; Mr. John Wendt, 1701 Concord Drive; Mr. Mark Thoman, 1109 61st Street; Dave Shindoll and Ed Hamilton with Mackie Consultants, Inc.; Devin Lavigne with Houseal Lavigne Associates

Chairman Jirik led the Plan Commissioners in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance. An explanation of the meeting's protocol followed.

NOVEMBER 1, 2010 MEETING MINUTES – MRS. RABATAH MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PREPARED, SECONDED BY MR. WEBSTER. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

Chairman Jirik swore in those individuals who would be speaking on File PC-18-10.

PC-18-10 A petition seeking a Preliminary Planned Development Amendment to P.D. #31 Esplanade for the construction of a five-story office building for a medical and dental clinic and a six-level parking garage on the property located on Lacey Road approximately 230 feet south of the intersection of Lacey Road and Woodcreek Drive, commonly known as 3450 Lacey Road, Downers Grove, IL (PINs 06-31-103-007 and 05-36-200-011); Hamilton Partners & Midwestern University, Petitioners; HP-AG Esplanade at Locust Point LP, Owner.

Mr. Stan Popovich, Planner for the Village of Downers Grove, discussed that the petitioner is requesting approval of a preliminary planned development amendment to Planned Development #31, Espalande at Locust Point to construct a five-story and basement medical and dental clinic building and a six-level parking garage at the property commonly known as 3450 Lacey Road.

The property, on the west side of Lacey Road, is approximately 230 feet south of the intersection of Lacey Road and Woodcreek Drive. Two strips of land provide the parcel with access to Woodcreek Drive.

The 213,316 square foot clinic building will be on the east side of the parcel and house medical and dental clinics as well as ancillary offices. The building will be clad with brick, pre-cast concrete panels and blue-tinted windows. A metal clad penthouse is located on the roof. Mr. Popovich showed the proposed elevations via the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Popovich informed the Commission that the 311,280 square foot, six-level parking garage, with one level below grade will be located in the middle of the site and contain 899 parking spaces. The garage will be constructed of pre-cast concrete with brick stair towers. Graphics of the proposed parking garage were shown.

Mr. Popovich noted the proposals meet the bulk regulations of the Zoning Ordinance as shown on page two of the staff report. He noted the proposal complies with the Future Land Use Plan and the Planned Development Standards of Approval.

With regard to public improvements, Mr. Popovich noted vehicular traffic would enter and exit the site off the existing driveway to Woodcreek Drive that currently serves the day care center. An east-west boulevard provides access to the parking garage while a north-south drive provides access to a circular drop-off drive to the clinic, a second garage access and a service drive to the clinic building. He noted staff was requesting an auto-turn exhibit from the petitioner to show that the Village's ladder truck can maneuver throughout the site.

Mr. Popovich noted a staff concern was the location of the construction entrance. As shown, only the existing drive would be used for construction traffic and staff is concerned about potential conflicts between the day care center users and the construction traffic. Staff would prefer a separate construction access point away from the day care center. Additionally, staff is requiring a traffic study be completed as part of the final planned development amendment process that takes into account a temporary construction entrance, an interim condition with only the single access point serving the Midwestern site, the existing day care and the approved but as of yet not constructed ASGE site and the final condition where the future building, expanded garage and second entrance from Woodcreek Drive is built.

With regard to stormwater, Mr. Popovich noted the overland flow route is clockwise around the building and staff is concerned with a potential pinch point between the service drive and south property line. Staff will require additional drawings and calculations that will ensure the proper drainage at the pinch point.

Mr. Popovich identified the two rain gardens that are proposed as best management practices for the site. He noted stormwater will be directed to the existing stormwater detention lake to the northwest of the site and that the capacity will be confirmed during the final planned development amendment process. The proposal will be required to meet the Village's Stormwater Management Ordinance.

Mr. Popovich noted staff is recommending sidewalks be installed on the site. He also noted new water and sanitary sewer services will be installed. Per IEPA regulations, the looped water main

will become a public main serviced by the Village. Mr. Popovich noted the Downers Grove Sanitary District provided a conceptual approval for the proposed sanitary sewer.

Mr. Popovich noted the Fire Department's concerns regarding the site plan. As shown, the Fire Department has some access to the west side of the building but to no other sides. The Fire Department requires two sides of the building, preferably opposite sides, be accessible to the Village's ladder truck. As such, staff is requiring the site plan be revised so that access is provided to two sides of the building. Mr. Popovich noted an automatic and manual detection system and automatic sprinkler system will be installed in both facilities.

Mr. Popovich reviewed the Forest Preserve's concerns regarding the proposal. Their first concern was that no future building be located within the drip-line of trees on the Forest Preserve property. Mr. Popovich explained how the Village's setback requirements would preclude development within the drip-line. Stormwater concerns would be addressed by the Village's Stormwater Management Ordinance. Additional concerns regarding erosion control blankets and landscape plantings have been provided to the petitioner. Mr. Popovich noted a landscape plan will be provided by the petitioner and will be reviewed by the Village Forester and the Forest Preserve.

Mr. Popovich noted the Standards for Approval of Planned Developments, as shown on page 5 of the staff report have been met and staff recommends the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Village Council.

Mr. Matejczyk stated a concern about a single entrance during an emergency situation and the potential traffic conflicts. Mr. Popovich noted staff is requesting a traffic study to further define the operational capacity of the entrance and whether a second entrance is required. Mr. Popovich noted the study could take into account how emergency vehicles would respond. Mr. Popovich noted based on Fire Department concerns, changes to the site may occur thus changing how emergency vehicles would respond to the site.

Mr. Popovich clarified that the proposed clinic building, parking garage and drives are under consideration tonight. The future proposed developments are not in consideration tonight and would require additional public hearings. He reiterated that the items under consideration tonight are for preliminary approval and the petitioner will be required to come back before the Plan Commission and Village Council for final approval of the plan.

Mr. Gary Mori, Hamilton Partners, noted the proposal is consistent with the Esplanade's long term objective to construct first class developments. He noted the proposal will add to the overall environment and create an amenity for the public. He stated Midwestern University will purchase the land from Hamilton Partners and is very happy that Midwestern University is coming to the Esplanade.

Dr. Kathleen Goepfinger, President and CEO of Midwestern University ("Midwestern"), noted they have admitted students and hired faculty for a dental school that was first discussed when Midwestern requested approval for their basic science building. She noted the students would be on the main campus for their first two years and then work at the proposed clinic the following two years to gain practical hands-on experience. The clinic will be open to the public.

Dr. Goeppinger, noted Midwestern's commitment to stay in Downers Grove for this project. She is anticipating around 100 new jobs will be created in the community.

She noted the plans may not be as refined as the Commissioners would like at this point but due to an agreement with Hamilton Partners, they are trying to close on the property before January 1st. They are going to come back before the Commission with refinements to the plan and have already commissioned a traffic study. Additionally, they have already decided to use the second road as the construction entrance so they will not disturb the children. Dr. Goeppinger noted they are refining the access points. She noted Midwestern has no issues with staff comments and is excited to have a second face of Midwestern University in Downers Grove.

Dr. Goeppinger clarified that the new campus will function as part of the main campus. She noted Midwestern staff will operate the clinic building and that faculty and students are part of the main campus. She noted both sites are one campus.

Mr. Matejczyk noted he looked forward to the final plan and was excited to hear that Midwestern is going to open the second access for construction and encouraged Midwestern to keep it open as a second entrance permanently. Dr. Goeppinger noted they are looking at traffic flow with regard to a second access.

Per a question, Dr. Goeppinger noted students would not be traveling back and forth between campus locations. The new clinic would have classrooms, conference rooms, and faculty offices so students will not have to travel between campuses on a daily basis. Dr. Goeppinger clarified that the boulevard street is intended for one-lane on either side of the median. Mr. Webster concurred with Mr. Matejczyk's traffic concerns.

Dr. Goeppinger noted the building would not have a 'back' side. They have spent time developing the building so that it appears as an attractive academic building because so many people have not seen Midwestern's main campus.

Mr. Popovich explained the comprehensive traffic study would encompass the future building, the expanded parking garage, the proposed ASGE building and the two access roads. Chairman Jirik asked if the traffic study came back and recommended a second entrance drive at this time, what would staff's direction be. Mr. Popovich noted staff would recommend a second entrance if the traffic study noted it would be necessary.

Chairman Jirik opened up the meeting to public comment. No comments followed. Public comment was closed by the Chairman. The petitioner had no closing statement.

Per a question, Dr. Goeppinger noted they have reviewed the Forest Preserve's comments and will take those into account. She noted her civil engineers are looking at a bird habitat issues on approximately two acres of the parcel, so they will be exploring that. She noted the future building could be a good number of years down the road.

Chairman Jirik noted that based on the staff report, documentation, and information provided to the Commission and with the conditions and additional information requested, the standards for approval of a planned development are fulfilled. Mr. Beggs believes the proposal is very desirable for the community and provides Midwestern with an opportunity to expand on the site.

Mrs. Rabatah noted it is a very exciting development for the university and Village.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE PC-18-10, MR. BEGGS MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE FINAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE STAFF REPORT DATED DECEMBER 6, 2010 AND WITH PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING PLANS PREPARED BY MACKIE CONSULTANTS, LLC DATED NOVEMBER 4, 2010 AND PRELIMINARY SITE PLANS AND ARCHITECTURAL ELEVATIONS PREPARED BY DWL ARCHITECTS & PLANNERS, INC. DATED NOVEMBER 4, 2010 EXCEPT SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO VILLAGE CODES AND ORDINANCES.**
- 2. THE PETITIONER SHALL FILE A PETITION FOR A FINAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT NO LATER THAN ONE YEAR AFTER VILLAGE COUNCIL APPROVAL IF SAID APPROVAL IS GRANTED. IF A PETITION IS NOT FILED WITHIN ONE YEAR, ANY APPROVALS GAINED FROM THIS PETITION FOR A PRELIMINARY PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT SHALL BE NULL AND VOID.**
- 3. AS PART OF THE FINAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT SUBMITTAL, THE FOLLOWING ITEMS SHALL BE SUBMITTED FOR VILLAGE REVIEW:**
 - A. A COMPREHENSIVE TRAFFIC STUDY. THE STUDY SHALL EXAMINE THE LOCATION OF A TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE WITHOUT NEGATIVELY IMPACTING THE EXISTING DAY CARE USE; THE INTERIM PROPOSED CONDITION ASSOCIATED WITH A SINGLE ENTRY POINT FOR THE DAY CARE, PROPOSED CLINIC AND GARAGE, AND THE APPROVED BUT AS OF YET UNBUILT ASGE BUILDING NORTH OF THE PROPOSED GARAGE; AND THE FINAL PROPOSED CONDITION WITH A SECOND BUILDING ALONG THE WESTERN EDGE OF THE PARCEL, AN EXPANDED PARKING GARAGE AND A SECOND DRIVE INTO THE SITE.**
 - B. ARCHITECTURAL, LANDSCAPE, SITE CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT, AND ENGINEERING DRAWINGS AND A TABBED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT REPORT.**
 - C. DOCUMENTATION CONFIRMING THE SUBJECT PROJECT PARCEL WAS INCLUDED IN THE PERMIT FOR THE EXISTING STORMWATER FACILITIES WITHIN THE ESPLANADE AT LOCUST POINT PLANNED DEVELOPMENT.**
 - D. A DESCRIPTION OF BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES THAT ARE INCORPORATED INTO THE SITE DESIGN AND HOW THEY WILL FUNCTION. THE APPLICABLE DESIGN CRITERIA SUCH AS SOIL TYPE, VEGETATION, AND LAND COVER CONDITIONS DRAINING TO THE BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICE ALONG WITH APPROPRIATE CALCULATIONS SHALL BE INCLUDED.**

- E. A SITE PLAN TO IDENTIFY HOW TWO SIDES OF THE CLINIC OFFICE BUILDING, PREFERABLY OPPOSITE SIDES OF THE BUILDING, SHALL BE ACCESSIBLE TO THE VILLAGE FIRE DEPARTMENT'S LADDER TRUCK.
 - F. AN AUTO-TURN EXHIBIT TO VERIFY MOVEMENTS AT THE ROUNDABOUT, THE CLINIC BUILDING ENTRANCE DRIVE AND THE TRUCK-DOCK SERVICE ENTRANCE DRIVE.
 - G. A SITE PLAN IDENTIFYING SIDEWALKS CONNECTING THE CLINIC AND PARKING GARAGE TO THE EXISTING SIDEWALKS ALONG LACEY ROAD AND WOODCREEK DRIVE.
 - H. A SITE PLAN THAT SHOWS THE EXISTING ENTRY DRIVE TO THE SITE IMPROVED TO INCLUDE SEPARATED ENTRY AND EXIT DRIVES.
 - I. A SITE PLAN WHICH SHOWS THE BOULEVARD'S LANDSCAPED MEDIAN EXTENDING TO MEET THE ROUNDABOUT'S CENTRAL LANDSCAPE MEDIAN. THE MEDIAN SHOULD BE CONTINUED TO ELIMINATE CONFUSION AMONGST MOTORISTS WANTING TO TURN LEFT INTO THE PARKING GARAGE. APPROPRIATE SIGNAGE SHOULD ALSO BE ADDED WHERE NECESSARY.
- 4. THE PROPOSED CLINIC BUILDING AND PARKING GARAGE SHALL HAVE A MANUAL AND AUTOMATIC DETECTION SYSTEM INSTALLED THROUGHOUT IN A MANNER ACCEPTABLE TO THE VILLAGE. ALL AREAS OF THE BUILDING SHALL BE PROTECTED.
 - 5. THE PROPOSED CLINIC BUILDING AND PARKING GARAGE SHALL HAVE A COMPLETE AUTOMATIC SPRINKLER SYSTEM INSTALLED THROUGHOUT IN A MANNER ACCEPTABLE TO THE VILLAGE. ALL AREAS OF THE BUILDING SHALL BE PROTECTED.
 - 6. UTILITY EASEMENTS FOR STORMWATER, WATER MAIN AND SIDEWALK IMPROVEMENTS SHALL BE PROVIDED TO THE VILLAGE THROUGH A PLAT OF EASEMENT PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY FOR EITHER THE CLINIC OR GARAGE. IF THE ABROGATION OF EASEMENTS IS REQUIRED, THIS SHALL BE COMPLETED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE PLAT OF EASEMENT.

SECONDED BY MR. MATEJCZYK.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. BEGGS, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. COZZO, MR. QUIRK, MRS. RABATAH, MR. WEBSTER, CHAIRMAN JIRIK

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0

PC-17-10 The purpose of the request is to consider the draft Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan, which, if adopted will become the official plan for the Village as required by Section 1.12 of the Municipal Code. The proposed comprehensive plan will replace the 1965 Comprehensive Plan; Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Community Development Director, Tom Dabareiner, introduced the Comprehensive Plan project. He indicated that the Village's planning consultant, Devin Lavigne with Houseal Lavigne Associates, and Planning Manager, Jeff O'Brien, would also provide information on this project. Mr. Dabareiner described what a comprehensive plan (the "Plan") was, explaining that the Plan incorporates the future goals and objectives of the village, the physical character of the community, the community's shared vision for the village, and works as a guide and a working document. Further explanation followed on what topics/information would be covered in the Plan's format and layout. Mr. Dabareiner reminded the commissioners that they will be using the Plan in their meetings as a reference guide.

An explanation followed the process to develop the Plan starting with the Total Community Development 3 (TCD-3) process. Mr. Dabareiner noted the staff and consultant used information gathered at the TCD-3 meetings and workshops and input from the Ad hoc Committee meetings. As a result, the consultant and the Ad hoc Committee were able to refine the information and focus on the technical matters of the plan. He stated the draft Plan was now before the Plan Commission to conduct its public hearing, with a possible recommendation to the Village Council for final adoption. A schedule of the plan's process followed on the overhead.

Houseal Lavigne consultant, Mr. Devin Lavigne, walked through the draft Plan, commenting that the process was unique and TCD-3 public campaign process was the most extensive ever undertaken by his firm. He summarized the business and resident surveys that were sent out, the various GIS maps created, and the resident/public body/business/student workshops that took place to receive input. He emphasized that the Plan was a guide to be referred to and amended, as necessary. In addition, Mr. Lavigne pointed out that with federal and state grants being sought, it was important for the Village to have an up-to-date comprehensive plan.

Continuing, Mr. Lavigne explained that the Plan will also be used as a economic development tool for the village which will be readable to the public, be user-friendly, and will include a long-range (15 to 20 years) planning vision. Each of the Plan's chapters were explained in more detail, calling attention to the fact that while the residential areas seem to be well established, opportunities for change will be in the commercial areas, such as the Ogden Avenue area, the Butterfield Road area, and the areas around the Fairview Station and Belmont Avenue Underpass. Implementation of the Plan, the final step, was summarized.

Closing the presentation, Mr. Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager for the Village, summarized that the Comprehensive Plan Committee, through its meetings and discussions over the past 10 months, referred the Plan to the Plan Commission on November 17.

Mr. O'Brien explained staff identified several keys issues based on the Committee's discussions and staff's review of the plan. He indicated the issues would help focus the Plan Commission's discussions and provide a valuable record for the Village Council when they review the Plan.

Mr. O'Brien indicated the key issues and anticipated discussion dates:

1. Recommendations regarding Design Guidelines (both Commercial and Residential) – January 2011;
2. Recommendations regarding enhancing Historic Preservation efforts – January 2011;

3. Recommendations regarding Code Enforcement/Property Maintenance programs and process – February 2011;
4. Recommendations regarding Village's Construction/Development Permitting process – February 2011;
5. Recommendations regarding Community Facilities responsibilities – March 2011;
6. Recommendations for Land Use, Transportation and Sub-Area Plans – April 2011; and
7. Final recommendation to the Village Council in April 2011.

Dialog among the commissioners centered upon the well-received input from the public, the vision statement, as drafted by the consultant and fine-tuned by the Comprehensive Plan Committee, and the fact that Downers Grove was a community that participated in the comprehensive planning process versus other communities. Chairman Jirik added to the discussion by explaining that the vision statement, as he understood it, was representative of what the community wanted, what was working correctly in the community, and keeping it “working right” but “making it better.” Mr. Webster also commended that he was impressed by the vision statement.

However, in going through the comprehensive planning process and in reviewing the draft Plan itself, Chairman Jirik shared his concerns of someone deciding to override “the well-defined intent of the community.” Mr. Dabareiner added that the challenge and opportunity for the Plan Commission will be to review the document for the entire community. He cited that while no one specific issue was raised as a community-wide issue, there were different issues from neighborhood to neighborhood which were important. And, in the process, he explained that the assumptions being made about economic opportunities in the community were different, not just due to the economy but due to the village's position in the suburban market place, with “unique roles to play” in the metropolitan area.

To the point, Chairman Jirik summarized that the TCD-3 process was basically an investment to discern the sense of the desires of the community, while the comprehensive plan was an attempt to summarize it into actionable items, and in which the Plan Commission had to decide if those items were really actionable.

Turning to the schedule of key issues, the Chairman suggested that staff add the month of April's discussion to March, in order to provide a buffer, if necessary. Also recommended was to have an updated draft Plan at each meeting with tracked changes so that the commissioners could see what changes took place at the previous meeting. Chairman Jirik asked Mr. Dabareiner what was expected from the commission's discussions before moving the Plan forward to the Village Council. Lastly, the Chairman suggested that review of the Plan be the only item on the Commission's scheduled agenda and that other petitions be heard during a separate Commission meeting.

A short dialog followed on how the deliberation would be recorded as compared to word or sentence changes. Mr. Beggs emphasized that the public needed access to the minutes of these meetings. Mr. Dabareiner concurred.

Chairman Jirik opened up the meeting to public comment.

Ms. Christine Fregeau, 1918 Elmore Avenue, said she is interested in seeing how the Comprehensive Plan moves forward. She still believes that many topics will be raised by citizens

APPROVED 1/3/11

who are not aware of the process and, therefore, cautioned the commissioners to not consider just TCD-3, keeping in mind TCD-1 and -2 and not to invalidate them. She expressed concern regarding specific recommendations regarding the closure some streets so they no longer have direct access to Ogden Avenue. She supported the changes being tracked.

On that note, the Chairman commented that certain aspects of the Plan are neighborhood-specific and he asked staff and the consultant whether there was a form of outreach available to them, wherein, Mr. Dabareiner stated that it would be difficult to provide specific outreach to every neighborhood during the Plan review process. However, if a recommendation such as a specific street closure were to be proposed in the future as a capital project, the Village would follow its normal procedures to notify affected residents and seek public input prior to any formal discussions or decisions.

Mr. John Wendt, 1701 Concord Drive, commented on the tremendous amount of work before the commissioners and he suggested that they not get caught up in the minutia. He believed the Plan was a good starting document but needed some fine-tuning.

There being no further comments, public participation remained open.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE PC-17-10, MR. MATEJCZYK MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO A DATE CERTAIN, THAT DATE BEING JANUARY 3, 2011.

SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. QUIRK, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MRS. RABATAH, MR. WEBSTER, CHAIRMAN JIRIK

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0

A brief dialog followed on the next meeting's agenda and whether one or two meetings would take place in January. Staff would notify the commissioners. Mrs. Rabatah asked if there were individual groups that were surveyed via the TCD-3 process. The Chairman wished everyone a safe holiday.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:36 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. WEBSTER, SECONDED BY MR. MATEJCZYK. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt
Celeste K. Weilandt
(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)

APPROVED 2/28/11

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

JANUARY 24, 2011, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Jirik called the January 24, 2011 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Chairman Jirik, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Waechtler, Mr. Webster

ABSENT: Mrs. Hamernik, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Quirk

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director, Tom Dabareiner, Mr. Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates; Planning Manager Jeff O'Brien;

VISITORS: Transportation and Parking Commission Chairman John Wendt, 1701 Concord Avenue; Greg Hose, 445 Austin; Marge Earl, 4720 Florence

Chairman Jirik led the Plan Commissioners in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

JANUARY 3, 2011 MEETING MINUTES - MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES, AS PREPARED, SECONDED BY MRS. RABATAH. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

File PC-17-10 (continued from 12/6/2010 and 1/3/2011 meeting) The purpose of the request is to consider the draft Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan, which, if adopted will become the official plan for the Village as required by Section 1.12 of the Municipal Code. The proposed comprehensive plan will replace the 1965 Comprehensive Plan; Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Chairman Jirik reconvened the public hearing for File PC-17-10 and reminded the commissioners as to how the comprehensive plan would be broken down for review and public comment, with this particular meeting focusing on two key issues: 1) Design Guidelines (Commercial and Residential), and 2) Historic Preservation. His hope was to complete all public comment by March 2011.

Chairman Jirik offered to swear in the public. No public came forward.

Chairman Jirik asked if the commissioners would be satisfied with discussing the two key issues but review them by major blocks, i.e., discuss the Design Guidelines and Historic Preservation for residential (pp. 49 to 56), followed by the same two for commercial, and with the remainder to discuss afterwards. Commissioners concurred with the Chairman's suggestion.

Comments were as followed:

Planning Manager, Mr. O'Brien, confirmed Mr. Beggs' question by explaining that Historic Preservation was mainly focused in the residential section of the plan but that there were references to maintaining key historic properties in the downtown area in the commercial areas plans.

Page 56, Item 7, Mr. Webster felt the statement was not very strong. Mr. Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates, discussed preserving character, which was not typically associated with 1970's housing. He agreed there was not much discussion about furthering current preservation efforts and agreed the statement was not especially strong. However, the commissioners were welcome to discuss the matter further.

Chairman Jirik reminded the commissioners that it was a question of how far does it want to legislate or regulate historic home design and pointed out that the plan was not advocating a strict regulatory program but, instead, was recognizing value to the community and providing principles to the community. He believed the statement offered more flexibility.

Page 56, Item 2, as to the variety of housing stock and where the statement came from and its intent, Mr. O'Brien explained that it was a recognition that residential neighborhoods do best when a variety of housing stock exists, including senior housing, multi-family housing, etc. Mr. Lavigne emphasized that this statement was in the plan so as not to promote a homogenous single-family community. Commissioners agreed that a statement of clarification needed to be inserted and to refer to the land use map in this paragraph.

Page 66, Item 5, per Mr. Webster's question about the expansion of Special Services Areas as they relate to the design guideline recommendations, Mr. Lavigne explained they were to be used as an implementation tool and funding mechanism. Mr. Beggs commented that he did not know the effects of such tools and, nonetheless, preferred to leave them in the document. Mr. Webster agreed with this statement and envisioned using similar tools on Ogden Avenue.

Page 66, Item 9, regarding the reinvestment at Finley and Butterfield Roads, Mr. Lavigne explained this issue pertained to the Butterfield Corridor from Interstate 355 to Interstate 294 and the fact that rents are lower in the area and occupancy is low, as compared Oak Brook. Calling attention to Lombard's reinvestment, he believed reinvestment for the Downers Grove section of the corridor was positioned very well for the right developer. Reinvestment was explained as "full scale redevelopment." Positive comments followed on how the location was positioned very well once the economy turned around.

Some comments followed regarding the Butterfield Road and Highland Avenue intersection. Mr. Beggs suggested this area could be enhanced it as an entrance to the Village.

Regarding the Highland Avenue/Interstate 88 configuration, Mr. Lavigne explained it would be beneficial to consolidate the access points at this interchange since the westbound access is located one half-mile to the west. He envisioned the new configuration would occur with the redevelopment of the former-Circuit City site. Mr. Dabareiner mentioned the Ad Hoc Committee discussed the different kinds of markets where this would appeal to redevelopment, especially since a nearby office market existed.

Mrs. Rabatah asked if specific gateways to the Village were discussed, wherein Mr. Lavigne suggested inserting the community gateways as a map symbol on page 67.

Returning to the residential areas, Mr. Beggs was satisfied with the presentation of the three categories of housing.

Regarding the topic of sidewalks, Mr. O'Brien discussed the goal of the Village, which was to have sidewalks on at least once side of a street. Further dialog followed. In general, commissioners were satisfied with the language in the plan.

Mr. John Wendt, 1701 Concord Drive, Chairman for the Transportation and Parking Commission, mentioned some of the discussions that came before his commission regarding sidewalks, specifically, that some residents did not want sidewalks due to existing and unresolved drainage issues or, the fact that there were safety issues and sidewalks should be installed. He believed that when addressing the sidewalk topic, it was from the aspect that the Village wanted to make the streets safer and to separate pedestrians from vehicles.

Turning to page 56 of the plan, Mr. O'Brien, noted that Recommendation No. 6 discussed residential design guidelines and whether the Village should have such a tool to guide new construction in residential areas. Mr. O'Brien asked for comments on this recommendation. Mr. Webster believed the recommendation was open and flexible, similar to the historic preservation recommendation, and he was supportive of same concept for residential design.

Mr. Beggs mentioned that the Community First group from Naperville put forth a book that uses such a tool for new construction, with a couple of nearby communities utilizing the booklet as well. The chairman summarized that, in effect, the Village was trying to respect the rights of the property owner yet at the same time understand the character of a neighborhood, i.e., providing the right type of balance.

Chairman Jirik added some minor verbiage changes. In general, commissioners were fine with the recommendations, agreeing that the text was written to allow for flexibility.

For the next meeting, February 7, 2011, Mr. O'Brien stated the commissioners will be reviewing three (3) key issues: 1) recommendations for the Property Maintenance/Code Enforcement programs; 2) the Construction/Development Permitting Process; and 3) the Community Facilities and Village services. The month of March will center on focus area plans, land use, and transportation plans. April will be the final discussion/wrap-up.

Additionally, Mr. O'Brien announced that the February 28, 2011 meeting will have a few applications and that he expects to hold two meetings a month through April. Pages for next meeting's discussion will be sent to the commissioners. Mr. Webster asked for clarification on what key issues will be discussed next month. A summary followed.

APPROVED 2/28/11

MR. BEGGS MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR PC 17-10 TO A DATE CERTAIN, THAT DATE BEING FEBRUARY 7, 2011, SECONDED BY MR. WEBSTER.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. BEGGS, MR. WEBSTER, MR. COZZO, MRS. RABATAH, MR. WAECHTLER, CHAIRMAN JIRIK

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:40 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. WEBSTER, SECONDED BY MRS. RABATAH. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt
Celeste K. Weilandt
(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)

APPROVED 2/28/11

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

FEBRUARY 7, 2011, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Pro tem Webster called the February 7, 2011 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Chairman Pro tem Webster, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Quirk, Mr. Waechtler

ABSENT: Chairman Jirik, Mrs. Hamernik, Mrs. Rabatah

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Tom Dabareiner, Planner Damir Latinovic; Consultant Mr. Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne Associates;

VISITORS: John Wendt, 1701 Concord Avenue, Downers Grove; Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence, Downers Grove; Mr. Mark Thoman, 1109 61st Street, Downers Grove

Chairman Pro tem Webster led the Plan Commissioners in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

File PC-17-10 (continued from January 24, 2011) The purpose of the request is to consider the draft Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan, which, if adopted will become the official plan for the Village as required by Section 1.12 of the Municipal Code. The proposed comprehensive plan will replace the 1965 Comprehensive Plan; Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Chairman Pro tem Webster reconvened the public hearing for File PC-17-10 and reminded the commissioners that the public was allowed to speak first, followed by deliberation of the commissioners, if necessary.

Chairman Pro tem Webster opened the meeting to public comment and swore in those individuals who would be providing public comment.

Director of Community Development Tom Dabareiner provided a brief update as to where the comprehensive plan was in the planning process, noting that three key issues would be discussed tonight: 1) Key Issue No. 3 - Recommendations regarding code enforcement and property maintenance; 2) Key Issue No. 4 - Recommendations regarding construction and development permitting; and 3) Key Issue No. 5 - Recommendations regarding the Community Facilities chapter, specifically facilities, government service, operational policies, etc. He believed Key Issue Nos. 3 and 4 were similarly related.

Provided the hearing is continued tonight, Mr. Dabareiner stated that next meeting's focus would be on recommendations for land use, transportation, and subarea plans.

Focusing on Key Issue Nos. 3 and 4, Mr. Dabareiner summarized that during Total Community Development 3 ("TCD3") some of the issues raised about code enforcement were based, he

believed, on peoples' negative experiences from previous years. However, over the past five years, he stated that code enforcement improved tremendously due to the review of performance standards within the Code Enforcement Department, staff retirement, and staff becoming more aware of its community. Mr. Dabareiner pointed out some of the text recommendations that should be considered struck from the plan due to better efficiency within the department and since the discussions from TCD3 did not accurately reflect what had occurred in more recent years.

Continuing, Mr. Dabareiner explained a success story with the building permit process, noting the initial permitting process five years ago averaged 63 days of review. Currently, that review process takes nine days on average due to better efficiencies. Nationwide, the standard is 10 days.

Commissioner comments/questions followed:

Mr. Matejczyk asked Mr. Dabareiner if he would propose any metrics moving forward to ensure the Village maintains its quality and have a continual review process, wherein Mr. Dabareiner suggested that it may benefit the Village to monitor national and regional code metrics and strive to match or improve them. Asked if the information should remain in the text, Mr. Dabareiner stated he would like to accurately reflect what has occurred. However, Mr. Beggs felt the comments (pg. 56) should remain in the plan since he felt they were a standard and should be strived for. Mr. Webster also agreed Item 3 accurately reflected how issues were being dealt with currently.

Turning to page 53, regarding the permitting process for residential areas, Mr. Webster, pointed out the language that needed to be clarified along the lines of what Mr. Dabareiner was conveying.

Mr. John Wendt, 1701 Concord Drive, suggested (on pg. 53, under Permitting Process) deleting the second sentence and change the third sentence to read as follow: "The village should monitor and maintain standards that meet national averages while continuing to expand on user-friendly compliance with standards."

Mr. Waechtler voiced concern about using the term "national averages" or whether another term could be used, wherein Mr. Devin Lavigne, with Houseal Lavigne Associates, clarified it was incorporating what Mr. Dabareiner had previous said about "national and regional" averages for the review process. Mr. Lavigne suggested not to revise the paragraph just yet but validate the TCD3 comments, noting that they were in the past, but that the Village responded by making changes to the permitting process, where they exceeded national and regional state averages, and it continues to look for ways to improve the permitting process, make it user-friendly, and make it easier for property owners to invest in their homes."

As to the "national average" term, Mr. Dabareiner stated staff based its target on what other communities were doing in the area and used information from the DuPage Council of Mayors and Managers on neighboring communities.

Mr. Waechtler suggested using the term "national average of similarly populated communities", wherein Mr. Dabareiner concurred it could be revised. Commissioners also agreed that Mr. Lavigne revise the language accordingly. (See page 63 to assist with page 65 for language to be used)

Mr. Dabareiner emphasized that on page 53, under Property Maintenance, he would like to incorporate language that explains the strides code enforcement staff has made and the fact that “more tools” were being utilized in the process.

Per a question by Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Dabareiner discussed the code enforcement process as compared to other, similar villages, and as it relates to staffing, consistent area coverage, and tools used.

The dialog then moved toward staff providing the new business owners of convenience stores a copy of the Village’s window sign ordinance, as raised by Mr. Waechtler. Mr. Dabareiner agreed and stated his first approach with the owners is to facilitate and explain the ordinance process.

Page 63, under the Commercial Design and Development Guidelines paragraph, Mr. Webster asked staff to clarify the words “should establish commercial design guidelines” since he said it appeared as if the Village did not have any guidelines, wherein Mr. Dabareiner stated those were specific tools being recommended. He explained that the Village currently had design guidelines for the downtown district only but that the Ogden Avenue Site Improvement Strategy (“OASIS”) program was recently initiated to address such items as those being raised by Commissioner Waechtler, i.e., property issues, sign clutter, etc .

Mr. Lavigne interjected and recalled for commissioners that he discussed Naperville’s Community First booklet that addresses such matters and that it was for developers and business owners to use best management practices. The booklet would be illustrative and pointed to the various codes to be followed.

Mr. Waechtler, as a recommendation, suggested that the words “should establish design guidelines” be deleted and replace it with the words “should establish and continue to implement commercial design and development guidelines and address commercial issues...” Staff concurred with the wording.

Page 56, Item 3 - language to be added to page 66, per Mr. Lavigne.

Pages 118-119 - Mr. Beggs recommended that the illustration be turned so that the North directional is at the top of the page.

Mr. Waechtler then raised dialog about an article in the *Wall Street Journal* discussing special service agencies and TIFs (tax incremental financing districts) and asked Mr. Lavigne to expand upon the difference between them and a redevelopment agency. Mr. Lavigne described those details for the commissioners, noting there is a duplication of services with a redevelopment agency, much overhead involved, and yet another layer of government managing a TIF. Mr. Waechtler offered to the commissioners of whether this idea about redevelopment agencies should even be mentioned in the comprehensive plan, as he did not support it and said it could leave the Village open to something it does not want.

Mr. Lavigne stated a number of villages/communities do have examples of agreements between them on this topic which results in creating a Special Service Area Agency, wherein Mr. Matejczyk believed it could be helpful to know this information if the issues does become a boundary crossing.

Pages 40-41 - Addressing Key Issue No. 5, Recommendations regarding the the Community Facilities chapter, Item No. 4, Mr. Webster asked what developing a long-range financial plan, etc. had to do with land use decisions typically found in a Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Lavigne explained it had to do with some of the projects that the Village has identified but currently has no funding to start them any time soon, i.e., an interchange at Highland/I-88. He explained many of the recommendations within the chapter were administrative actions but some were large-scale capital improvements which would affect long-range financial planning.

Page 40, Objective No. 1, as it relates to Substation Locations, Mr. Matejczyk suggested that due to the utility companies laying out their long-range plans early on, he recommending that the Village begin coordinating with the utility companies simultaneously before such request comes before the Village for approval. Mr. Lavigne appreciated the comment and would work it into the text.

Discussing Key Issue No. 5 again, the Community Facilities Plan chapter, Mr. Dabareiner pointed out that the first paragraph of the chapter summarizes the Village's future needs and long-range recommendations for each community service provider, i.e. an approach to work with other governmental entities, which he believed raised some concerns by individuals. However, he noted that there was potential re-write to address those concerns within this chapter, if necessary. He reiterated that the Plan Commission was only "advising" the Village in its comprehensive plan and not other government entities, such as the school district, the library district, etc. A better clarification for the term "support" followed, which resulted in a suggestion to replace it with a word "promote."

Dialog was raised regarding the recommendation of conducting a traffic study for the post office and the comments coming from the post office on this topic. Mr. Dabareiner felt discussions on this matter were addressed at a previous TCD-3 meeting and the Village was not in the business of providing a traffic study for the post office. Mr. Lavigne offered some better language to address the topic, but not to remove it entirely from the comprehensive plan, such as again to use the word "promote" rather than "support."

Page 100, No. 14 - It was noted that the recommendation for the relocation of the post office was to move the truck traffic further west but keep the distribution activities within the downtown area.

Mr. John Wendt, 1701 Concord Drive, recommended using language from the first sentence on page 100, Item No. 1, "the village should actively promote cooperation..." and insert that verbiage into the sentence regarding support for the school district. Mr. Webster liked the suggestion.

Returning to the post office study (No. 14), Mr. Webster asked whether the traffic study needed to be stated so specifically in the plan. Mr. Lavigne noted that on Page 114, the topic was addressed better and he could paraphrase it on Page 100. Mr. Dabareiner concurred.

Page 100, No. 15 -- Stormwater Management recommendation. Mr. Dabareiner stated the Village has, for the past few years, had a long-term strategy to reduce runoff in the Village and certain areas of the village were seeing those benefits. He believed the tense in the last sentence would need to be better clarified. Of further importance, he pointed out that some of the operational comments made in this chapter were not reflective of the character of the community and would have to be revised.

APPROVED 2/28/11

Returning to stormwater management paragraph, Mr. Waechtler proceeded to share his concerns about the Village supporting (financially) underwater detention for the park district in the future, calling attention to the fact that the park district needs to know the village is not setting a precedent in this Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Lavigne responded that the Village was built out and it will have to be creative in how it addresses future stormwater issues. Mr. Dabareiner agreed. Mr. Lavigne would rework the paragraph.

Page 97, right-hand column, as it relates to the Village conducting a life-cycle assessment, Mr. Dabareiner believed certain text should not be included and the focus should be on land use, location, building-type topics related to a comprehensive plan.

Mr. Waechtler asked for direction regarding permeable pavers and believed that if developers could get on board with such best management practices, it would be ideal.

Chairman Pro tem Webster opened up the meeting to additional public comment.

Mr. Mark Thoman, 1109 61st Street, reminded the commissioners that the comprehensive plan was supposed to address everything that has to do with the future of the Village. He stressed the importance of reading the background information of the goals and objectives which lead to the conclusions of the document. Lastly, he reminded the commissioners that the plan was a living document that needs to be revisited on a regular basis.

As a last comment, Mr. Beggs stated he agreed with Mr. Thoman regarding the comments about the police and fire departments.

In response, Mr. Thoman suggested that public safety, public service, and public works should be included in the future planning of the community because they are part of the community.

Mr. Waechtler stated he hoped Mr. Thoman did not disagree with him that the Village had to be careful it did not commit village funds to certain projects. As a member of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, and speaking personally, Mr. Thoman said he looked at the stormwater topic as a way to partner with other government entities to lower costs overall. He commented on the various ways his committee looked at addressing stormwater mitigation within the village. He suggested exploring the partnering option.

In closing, Mr. Waechtler appreciated the above information provided by staff. No further comments followed by the commissioners, nor the public.

MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO A DATE CERTAIN, THAT DATE BEING MARCH 7, 2011, SECONDED BY MR. WAECHTLER.

ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MR. COZZO, MR. WAECHTLER, MR. BEGGS, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. QUIRK,
CHAIRMAN PRO TEM WEBSTER**

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

APPROVED 2/28/11

Mr. Damir Latinovic announced that the next scheduled meeting was February 28, 2011 with three petitions on the agenda. Minor details followed on what those petitions included.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:30 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. COZZO, SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt
Celeste K. Weilandt
(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)

APPROVED 3/28/11

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

MARCH 7, 2011, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Jirik called the March 7, 2011 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Chairman Jirik, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Matejczyk, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Webster

ABSENT: Mr. Quirk, Mr. Waechtler

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Tom Dabareiner; Planning Manager Jeff O'Brien; Devin Lavigne Houseal Lavigne Associates

VISITORS: John Wendt, 1701 Concord Dr., Downers Grove; Marge Earl, 4720 Florence, Downers Grove; Mark Thoman, 1109 61st Street, Downers Grove; and Nick Vogel, owners Grove Reporter

Chairman Jirik led the Plan Commissioners in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

File PC-17-10 (continued from February 7, 2011) The purpose of the request is to consider the draft Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan, which, if adopted will become the official plan for the Village as required by Section 1.12 of the Municipal Code. The proposed comprehensive plan will replace the 1965 Comprehensive Plan; Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Chairman Jirik reconvened the public hearing for File PC-17-10 and reminded the commissioners that the Commission has been holding public meetings to consider various aspects of the Comprehensive Plan with the goal to make a final recommendation to the Village Council in April 2011. Tonight's discussion would focus on Key Issue No. 6 -- Land Use Plan, Transportation and Key Focus Area Plan Recommendations.

Chairman Jirik swore in members of the public wishing to speak on this topic.

Chairman Jirik asked for public comments. There were none.

Comments by the Commissioners followed:

Pages 43-48: Mr. Matejczyk noticed that along Warren Avenue it was designated Low Intensity Office. He asked if consideration was given to incorporate high density housing in the area since it was within walking distance to the train and close to the downtown area. He believed if offered a nice buffer to the area, specifically at the vacant lumber yard. Mr. Dabareiner responded the plan recommended Low Intensity Office due to the recent trend of development occurring in this area. He noted several professional office buildings had been constructed in this area in recent years. He suggested the recommendation was in response to the market's demands.

Mr. Matejczyk noted that much traffic is generated on Warren by the light manufacturing zoning. Mr. O'Brien added that if a developer were to come with a proposal for a residential use, the idea could be reviewed and its potential impacts would be compared against the proposed land use plan and proposed policies described in the plan for this area. He noted the lumber yard was previously considered for a senior housing development by a developer but the narrow depths of the lots and the proximity of the railroad made residential uses challenging in this area. Based on these factors, staff was recommending professional offices.

In response, Mr. Matejczyk stated office use would be a significant impact and detriment to the neighborhood. Mr. Lavigne responded that multi-family uses have similar impacts as professional offices. He agreed the lumber site was a unique site but stated the narrow depths of the lots presented a challenge, citing developments in Clarendon Hills near railroad tracks. Mr. Matejczyk supported a row house development there (multi-family) and hoped the plan would be flexible to incorporate such type developments.

The Chairman, however, explained if the proposed use was equal or lesser, presuming the market is moving that way, it was not necessarily inconsistent with the plan and justification would have to be explained to future petitioners. He reiterated that deviation from the plan could be considered, provided there was just cause.

On this point, Mr. Dabareiner directed commissioners' attention to page 46 and read the description of "Low Intensity Office", noting that anything that fits the description will fit in and be considered. Mr. Matejczyk noted concerns about signage, lighting, and business operations in relation to the nearby residential uses. He also thought a business office would generate increased traffic.

Mr. Beggs added that it was important to think very carefully about residential development between the railroad tracks and Warren Avenue, noting multi-family housing existed on the north side of Warren. He stated he would be concerned about the financial stability of the residential use and whether it was the kind of development he would want there. Mr. Webster agreed with Mr. Beggs, noting the little development that has occurred, has not been toward multi-family. He supported Low-Intensity Office since it already existed. Dialog followed that the plan would be reviewed periodically and the market would reflect what development has been taking place in the area.

In reviewing the current zoning map, Mr. Webster said it appeared that the Village was moving away from specific zoning categories and moving towards land use categories as part of the zoning map. Mr. O'Brien explained that once the comprehensive plan was completed, a review of the zoning ordinance would follow along with modifying the use lists to ensure it was compatible with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan's land use goals and policies.

Mr. Webster noted interest in the changes to the residential areas around the intersection of Maple and Walnut. He believed the market would drive the future development under discussion.

Returning to the vacant lumber yard parcel on Warren, Mr. Lavigne noted when his firm recommends Transit Oriented Development (e.g., mixed residential and commercial uses), the distance to a train station or bus stop is a key factor. He indicated research generally finds that individuals will only walk approximately 10 minutes before they begin to search for other modes of transportation. He believed the parcel on Warren would fall out of that 10 minute walk and

believed the east side of Belmont Avenue offered a better success rate for the multi-family uses – as recommended in the plan.

Mr. Matejczyk, noted it was the same distance from the lumber yard to the train as was the Belmont parcel area mentioned.

In discussing pages 55 and 56, a question was raised as to the meaning of a “building registration.” Mr. O’Brien explained that it was a list of vacant structures where the owner would have to provide the Village with a contact name and phone number in case there were maintenance or safety concerns. He indicated many communities are using these registries to track foreclosed buildings and reduce time for banks or other absentee owners to respond to the community’s concerns. The Chairman suggested revising the words to “building registration inspection program for unoccupied properties” or a similar explanation, to be clarified by staff.

Reviewing No. 9, Mrs. Rabatah asked about the restrictive words “lawn cutting and snow removal services”. She suggested inserting the words “such as,” wherein the Chairman suggested inserting the words “affordable services, such as...”

Addressing No. 13, Mr. Webster asked for clarification about senior housing be “lumped in” with multi-family housing. Mr. Dabareiner explained that some senior housing may be small single-family housing and not much difference exists with multi-family. He stated the language could be expanded further, if desired. Mr. Dabareiner stated that this idea was a movement being seen among the aging baby boomers. Mr. Webster supported the contents of No. 13.

Regarding No. 11, remove the word “negative”.

Regarding No. 10, the Chairman questioned what the mechanism and the expectation is for getting existing developments to increase their screening to residential properties. Mr. Dabareiner explained that there was that foundation that lays the groundwork for staff to develop regulations to ensure that when an owner or developer proposes a change to a use that is incompatible, additional buffering should be provided. He believed the statement was important to include in the Comprehensive Plan.

Regarding No. 8, the Chairman asked the commissioners whether they were fine with the statement. Commissioners appeared to be fine with the current wording of the statement.

Regarding No. 7, Mr. Cozzo questioned the last word in the statement, “enhanced” as it relates to historic preservation efforts.

Mr. John Wendt, 1701 Concord Drive, suggested using the word “embraced”. Commissioners concurred.

Reviewing the colored map, Mr. Lavigne explained that on this map the planned residential areas could be highlighted that were not indicated as “residential” in the land use plan, so that there is flexibility provided. The Chairman felt that going through that exercise may involve a more comprehensive review of all areas. Mr. Lavigne commented that he did not believe there would be many parcels and felt the entire plan should be flexible. Mr. Beggs felt it was already inherent in the plan. Mr. O’Brien agreed that some inherent flexibility already existed in some transitional

areas and believed the text of the plan explained how the Village would handle transitional land uses.

Page 55, Residential Map, Mr. Webster voiced concerns about the land surrounding the Belmont train station as being listed as mixed use and the idea behind it, wherein Mr. Lavigne explained it was an area that could be considered for transit-oriented development. He referred Mr. Webster to page 106.

Discussing commercial, pgs. 66-67, the Chairman suggested removing the word “negative” out of No. 12.

Pages 79-80, Transportation: Regarding the shuttle parking at the Belmont Area, Mrs. Rabatah asked whether the commission should show commuter parking lots on the transit map. Mr. Lavigne thought it was a good idea. As to the shuttle routes, Mr. Beggs saw that the transportation map acknowledged the current shuttle routes, which was beneficial to the residents. Comments followed that the variety of transportation offered in and around the Village was a great attribute

Regarding No. 9, addressing adequate parking, Mr. Webster asked whether there was some need for adequate parking now or in the future. Mr. Dabareiner, in discussing a parking study, said there was the assumption that parking was not adequate. Mrs. Rabatah suggested to identify commuter lots, possibly as an overlay. Mr. Lavigne noted that page 77 referred to commuter parking. Mr. Matejczyk also pointed out that to construct a downtown parking deck would invite more traffic to the area and probably be a detriment versus dispersing the traffic through the neighborhoods.

Furthering his point, Mr. Webster discussed that the text noted there was a “perceived” problem of inadequate parking Downtown. He queried whether it included commuter parking. Mr. Lavigne stated there were comments during TCD-3 about lack of parking downtown. In other areas where he had worked, this was common perception about downtown areas. Mr. Lavigne stated it was often the case where there was only the “perception” that downtown parking was inadequate because one was not able to park directly in front of a downtown store. He stated it was sometimes more of a mind-set than an actual deficiency in parking spaces. The commuter parking was a different issue entirely.

In response to a question, Mr. Dabareiner proceeded to discuss a prior experience with PACE as it relates to parking. He thought the plan adequately describes existing transit and believed this section of the plan made it clear more detailed transit studies would be needed before any route or transit-related parking changes occurred.

Chairman Jirik proceeded to discuss that one of the advantages to the Village was the ability to access the trains but with regard to the commuter parking, it should be done in such a way so as to enhance the quality of life for those in Downers Grove. He felt that if there was going to be remote commuter parking lots, could there be a way to develop them to promote micro-commercial centers in town, yet keep the retail in the downtown area as well. If so, he stated that it was adding to the quality of life and aiding careers. In response, however, Mr. Dabareiner explained there were studies that demonstrated that commuters get into their cars and leave and that those types of commuter lots are not a good economic tool except perhaps for a cup of coffee. Mr. Lavigne agreed.

Mr. Webster then raised the question of whether the Village really wanted commuter lots in the downtown area in the next 15 to 20 years, referencing the language in No. 9. Mr. Lavigne explained it was a matter of evolution of an area and once the land economics worked, parking structures would appear. He described it as a trade-off in that the former surface parking areas become available for development. He believed that Downers Grove could be ripe for a vertical parking lot and it would be beneficial to continue to monitor the lots and eventually consolidate them into a vertical lot to make other areas available for redevelopment. Chairman Jirik supported that as a recommendation, noting it was not being captured in the statement. However, Mr. Dabareiner suggested waiting for the results of the parking study.

Mr. Beggs suggested the following text: “The village should continue to plan for the provision of adequate parking in downtown Downers Grove, particularly as it relates to commuter parking.”

Mr. Matejczyk appreciated the number of places where bicycle corridors were mentioned, stating it was very appropriate.

Pages 104-107: Mr. Matejczyk drew attention to the bullet point of reducing the heat island effect, and discussed whether it would be beneficial to require reflective roofs on structures that are having their roofs replaced and whether it would be appropriate to mention the roofing and/or light-colored roofing materials in the statement. Mr. Lavigne supported the idea. He would also send information to the Chairman on a study performed regarding reflective materials.

Before moving on to the Key Focus Areas, Mr. Dabareiner stated to the commissioners that this section was unique to Downers Grove’s plan since it included details that most communities do not obtain in their comprehensive plan. He reiterated that different levels of details would now be discussed from this point forward. The Chairman concurred, noting that gateway signage was being discussed, changes in the commercial use along Belmont Avenue, and even preserving the manufacturing or higher density of residential in that area.

Regarding No. 7, Mr. Webster found the following verbiage “the village should forcibly annex...” interesting.

The Commission discussed the recommendations for the Cameo property at the northwest corner of Maple and Walnut. The Chairman explained that there was the presumption in the statement that sometime in the future there would be sufficient value to allow a developer to put together the parcels, collectively purchase them, and then redevelop them for another use, whether it was because the property was distressed or because of the proximity to the Interstate. He believed the area was also being pulled in many directions and a decision or vision on what to do with the area was necessary. The Chairman asked for staff’s thoughts regarding this recommendation.

Mr. Lavigne stated nothing specific came from the TCD-3 process regarding this property. He explained the area was not conducive to multi-family, since the occupants were mostly seniors, and there was nothing around them except for an ice arena, some manufacturing, and access to the expressway. A location where there is better access to services and shopping were a better option for senior developments. Another concern for the occupants, Mr. Beggs recalled, was financial and what it would cost them to live out the rest of their lives there.

Mr. O'Brien, after hearing some concerns, reiterated that plan was not suggesting the Village should condemn the Cameo property. Instead, the plan identifies the site as an opportunity for private investment at some point in the future. He indicated it was likely the zoning designation would remain multi-family for these properties until such time that a request was made to change it. He noted that would likely require a large financial investment from a private developer to buy-out current owners and redevelop the site.

The Chairman explained the language on pages 106-107, provided clarification on the recommendations for the intersection of Maple and Walnut and the Cameo properties. He noted the Plan Commission did not need to make any decisions on how or when the Village could pursue this change. Rather, the Commission only needed to note whether the proposed land use was appropriate should the opportunity for redevelopment arise. The Commissioners concurred the proposed designation would be appropriate given the right circumstances.

Per Mr. Cozzo's question, Mr. Lavigne explained the village's process for annexing property in the unincorporated areas of the village. Commissioners recommended removing the word "forcibly" prior to the word "annexation".

Turning the discussion to the Downtown section, Mr. Lavigne would change the legend on Page 109 as it related to existing auto-oriented businesses.

Mr. O'Brien explained that the illustration for Catalyst Site 16 reflected an idea to incorporate the former blacksmith building should redevelopment of the surrounding properties occur. He indicated the illustration was for example purposes only. Mr. Lavigne stated the intention was to keep the building. Mr. Webster questioned whether it could be relocated somewhere, just as other buildings had been. Mr. Beggs supported keeping it where it was. However, the Chairman reminded the commissioners that it was not a matter of whether the commission wanted it preserved, but rather, it was a demonstration of what could be developed in the area for future developers and nothing more. Mr. Webster still questioned what the Village wanted at this site.

Mr. O'Brien agreed with Mr. Webster in that the "notch" in the building left the building open for discussion for staff to discuss with any potential developers. He noted the drawing merely provides a discussion point when a potential development is brought forward. The Village would decide at that time if the building is significant and how it would be preserved.

Mr. Beggs supported the idea of doing something with the northwest corner of Maple and Main Streets. As to the development of the northeast corner of Maple and Main, Mr. Dabareiner envisioned any development there would have to include underground parking given the lot sizes. He noted that the illustration was merely an example of what could be developed on the site.

Mr. Lavigne indicated that all of the illustrations for potential developments included buildings that were actually constructed in the Chicago region.

Mr. Beggs reminded the commissioners that the Village was trying to establish a gateway at the southern end of the Downtown.

Reviewing the Butterfield Key Focus Area, Chairman Jirik suggested that on page 119 to break up the long façade. Mr. Lavigne stated they were working to make the modification to the drawing and modify its orientation.

Discussing Ogden Avenue (West Area), page 123 on the map, right-hand side, Mr. Webster confirmed the vacant parcel was part of a TIF district. Mr. Lavigne stated it was and the map should reflect this fact. Mr. Webster supported the reconsolidation of the auto dealers at the west end of the corridor.

Discussing the Center Area, Mr. Matejczyk stated that between Main and Belmont there was no controlled access to cross the street. He asked if there was consideration for a new traffic signal for this area. Mr. O'Brien stated there was an existing signal at Saratoga and Ogden. In addition, Village previously supported a signal at Lee and Ogden for a previous development. IDOT was amenable to the concept at the time. Mr. Lavigne stated traffic warrants would have to be met for a new signal.

East Area – Mr. O'Brien noted that at Catalyst Site 33, a CarX building was being constructed. However, the rest of the site could be a potential redevelopment candidate if the current tenant leaves.

Fairview Area - Comments followed that this area needed a vision. Commissioners noted that if Pepperidge Farm were relocated, it would require a railroad spur as they receive many of their deliveries via rail. Mr. Dabareiner stated the plan for Fairview works whether or not Pepperidge Farms remains at its current location. He indicated the Village hopes they stay on the site, but wants to be prepared if the plant were to close. General comments followed on the odd location of the plant and the general infrastructure challenges of the area.

In closing, Chairman Jirik suggested to the commissioners that when they receive the draft plan with tracked changes, to review it carefully, but as it is reviewed, if there is a concern or question, to develop it a bit more to a proposed solution in order to move the plan forward on April 4, 2011. If more time is needed, Mr. Dabareiner stated more time could be allowed for the commissioners to review the document. Once the document is completed, Mr. Beggs asked for a completed plan of what the Commission recommends to the Village Council. Mr. Dabareiner obliged.

MR. MATEJCZYK, MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO A DATE CERTAIN, THAT DATE BEING APRIL 4, 2011, SECONDED BY MR. WEBSTER.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. WEBSTER, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MRS. RABATAH, CHAIRMAN JIRIK

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

Mr. O'Brien briefly updated the commissioners on what to expect at the regular March 28th meeting.

APPROVED 3/28/11

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:00 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. COZZO,
SECONDED BY MR. WEBSTER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE
VOTE OF 6-0.**

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt
Celeste K. Weilandt
(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)

APPROVED 4/25/11

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

APRIL 4, 2011, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Jirik called the April 4, 2011 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Chairman Jirik, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Matejczyk, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Waechtler

ABSENT: Mr. Quirk, Mr. Webster

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Dabareiner, Community Development Director; Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager; Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne & Associates

VISITORS: Mr. John Wendt, 1701 Concord Dr., Downers Grove; Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence, Downers Grove; Mr. Mark Thoman, 1109 61st Street, Downers Grove

Chairman Jirik led the Plan Commissioners in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 28, 2011 MINUTES

The March 28, 2011 minutes were approved on motion by Mr. Cozzo, seconded by Mr. Beggs. Motion carried by voice vote of 6-0.

File PC-17-10 (continued from March 7, 2011) The purpose of the request is to consider the draft Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan, which, if adopted will become the official plan for the Village as required by Section 1.12 of the Municipal Code. The proposed comprehensive plan will replace the 1965 Comprehensive Plan; Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Chairman Jirik reconvened File PC-17-10 for public comment. He referenced the draft Comprehensive Plan, with tracked changes, noting the changes were the based on the meetings held to date. The Chairman explained that the Commission would be reviewing the changes page by page.

Page:

No. 1 - The current photograph will be changed, per Mr. O'Brien.

No. 6 - Delete the words "the Village" and insert the words "the Community's", as requested by the Downers Grove Park District.

No. 3 - The Chairman discussed the list of recommendations to achieve and the fact that they can be, but that not every one of them may be achieved, due to the constraints that may exist. He believed the draft plan needed to reflect that and proposed the following verbiage: "The Comprehensive Plan provides numerous recommendations/change that are designed to help the

Village, achieve its overall vision. These recommendations do not take into account fiscal, political, or other constraints. The recommendations also do not account for the best practices or future best practices. As such, the Village will need to re-evaluate the recommendations at regular intervals to keep the Plan current and in tune with the aspirations of the community and adapt it to changing political and fiscal climates.” The following words, “all to appropriately provide...” would be deleted. Chairman Jirik emphasized that he was proposing more flexibility and regular fine-tuning of the Plan.

Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence, questioned the word “political” being used in the above sentence since she felt it gives an air of politicism to the entire plan.

Chairman Jirik concurred and recommended inserting the words “societal and fiscal climates”.

Mrs. Rabatah recommended that the term “Comprehensive Plan” be consistently called “the Plan”.

Mr. Matejczyk asked for the reason behind removing the word “political”, wherein the Chairman explained that the term “political” constrained the plan and it should not. However, Mr. Matejczyk felt that if the political climate changes, then the Plan should also reflect the politics.

Mr. Beggs indicated he thought Ms. Earl was trying to maintain the Plan’s integrity as a non-political document.

Mr. John Wendt, 1701 Concord Drive, commented that the document should remain neutral and he agreed that the word “political” should be removed. He believed the Plan should reflect the aspirations of the community.

No. 12 - Mr. Dabareiner referenced a letter received from School District 99 asking for a change in the second paragraph of the Education section because it caused confusion. Staff was also fine with the suggested deletion and recommended deleting the words “It is difficult to abstract...” through the remainder of the paragraph.

Mrs. Rabatah agreed that the sentence could be read two different ways.

Commissioners discussed that it sounded like the commission was moving into school administration, which was not their purview. Staff concurred. Commissioners were fine with staff’s recommendation.

Mr. Cozzo closed by recommending that the following verbiage be used to end the paragraph “ultimately retaining high educational standards continues to be a top priority for the community.”

Mr. Lavigne offered to revise the language.

The Commissioner indicated that the paragraph did not have to be rewritten. Commissioners, after discussing the issue at hand, agreed to Mr. Cozzo’s recommendation, as indicated above.

No. 32 – Chairman Jirik suggested deleting the words “due to impactful”, and insert the words, “where there is: incompatible proximity to residential land uses, small lot sizes, or challenging lot configurations;” then delete the following word, “including”; “Industrial properties between Warren

Avenue and the BNSF Railroad Tracks and the BNSF Railroad are an example of an area exhibiting this characteristic.”

Chairman Jirik was not sure what the word “including” meant and questioned whether the area was being targeted for rezoning or was the area exhibiting an opportunity one could think about.

However, Mr. Dabareiner said the word “rezone” may have to be reviewed, given the fact that the Plan discusses reclassifying the areas.

Commissioners concurred with the Chair’s recommendation.

No. 40 - Chairman Jirik indicated the Commission would discuss these changes last given their extensive nature. (See page 5 of minutes.)

No. 52 - Chairman Jirik suggested in the 4th line, delete the words “workbook to protect” and insert “workbook to preserve”. He also noted that near the end of the section the phrase “regulation ensures a tool” should be revised to “regulation helps to promote”. Next line, after the word “redevelopment”, add the word “that”.

No. 53 - Property Maintenance – Chairman Jirik suggested the second line of the section should be revised as follows: delete the word “controls” and insert the word “characterized.” Under the second paragraph, third line down, delete the words “neighborhood organizations” and insert the words “homeowner associations.”

Mr. Beggs pointed out that the paragraph does not address those types of organizations which are not homeowner associations; for example, the organization that changed the financing of the brick streets.

The Chairman explained that this paragraph addressed entities that are empowered to enforce maintenance.

The Commission discussed that recommendation was not asking the Village to “enforce” but to work with the organizations and that the wording should reflect homeowner associations as an example, i.e., use the words “such as homeowner organizations, or similar groups.” Commissioners concurred.

No. 56 - Mr. Waechtler asked staff whether the Village had an ordinance dealing with foreclosed properties.

Mr. Dabareiner stated the Village did not have any specific ordinance other than the Village’s adopted property maintenance code. However, Mr. Dabareiner stated that within the Plan there were suggestions that the Village look at that issue.

The Commission discussed whether it was appropriate to substitute the word “foreclosed” with the words “foreclosed, abandoned or otherwise have fallen into disrepair,” since a home, not in foreclosure, could fall into disrepair and cause the same problem as foreclosed properties.

Mr. Dabareiner pointed out the discussion of foreclosed properties was to address a specific issue, since specific tools already existed to address the other property issues. He explained the question before the commissioners was whether to keep the discussion of the foreclosed properties, understanding it may be due to current economic conditions for a couple of years, or use the broader terminology suggested.

Mr. Waechtler emphasized to staff the importance of the Village exploring the creation of a vacant building registration and inspection program (ordinance), within the next year or so, for not only foreclosed properties but abandoned properties as well, since other communities had already done so.

Commissioners agreed to keep the foreclosure paragraph as is.

No. 56 - Item No. 2 - A suggestion was made to delete the words “residential areas should develop with” and insert the following words, “residential areas should provide for” since the Village was already built out and developed. Further down in the paragraph and prior to the words “organized by dwelling types”, insert the word “generally”, since the term allowed some flexibility.

No. 63 - Permitting - Mr. Lavigne stated this paragraph should be the same as Page 53, as it was similar in concept but applied to commercial property.

Regarding the topic of Transportation System Policies and Recommendations, staff was asked if the Village was considering the conversion of a parking lot into a parking garage currently, wherein Mr. Beggs recalled that Parking Lot D, along the railroad tracks, was once discussed.

No. 83 - Mr. O’Brien stated that he spoke to the Downers Grove Park District this afternoon who asked that the reference to “private recreational facilities” and the district’s agreement with the Maple Hill Pool be removed since no agreement now existed.

No. 97 - Commissioners agreed to delete the word “fully” and replace it with the word “substantially”.

No. 100 – Mr. O’Brien noted that in his earlier conversation with the Downers Grove Park District, they indicated that they like to add a couple more facilities (the Belmont & Ogden Recreational Center and the Lincoln Community Center) to the Village’s Community Facilities Map. He noted there was a separate map in the Plan showing locations of parks, forest preserves and recreation facilities.

Commissioners concurred to add the two facilities.

As to Item No. 10 on this page, it was recommended to delete the word “negatively”. Regarding Item No. 14, referencing the removal of the post office, add the words “retail postal functions” for better clarification.

No. 106 - Terraces - The Chairman suggested simplifying the paragraph with the following changes: “Multi-family Residential is a reasonable present use for this property. However, should the residents and owners of the Terraces and Cameo support redevelopment of the site for corporate offices, this transition would be consistent with the overall comprehensive plan for this area.”

Mr. Waechtler asked why the Terraces and Cameo were a focus.

Chairman Jirik recalled there was a previous discussion about protecting the manufacturing use and the fact that the Terraces was a residential island which was not near any shopping or other services. Also, he recalled the commissioners discussed the nearby interchange and the higher and better use for the land.

Mr. Mark Thoman, 1109 61st Street, stated he was a member of the Comprehensive Plan Commission when the above issue was raised and stated that the site was a consistent land use for the last 50 years and that three of the four corners of the intersection were high density multi-unit residential even though isolated from shopping, dining and other services. He stated the Terraces was a car-oriented residential area, primarily with seniors and obtainable housing and nothing indicated that the use would change over the next 15 to 20 years. He believed there was no reason to address this area at this time.

Mr. Beggs noted that it was difficult to envision the site as a Highland Landmark-style development.

Mr. Dabareiner indicated the development would likely have to be more like a lower profile, corporate/industrial headquarters to fit into the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Waechtler raised the point that there were not very many buildings for senior-type living.

Mr. Dabareiner pointed out that identifying such area was addressed in the Plan and had the Village have to start with a clean slate again, he did not envision a development, such as the Terraces, be constructed in the area.

Responding to Mr. Thoman's comments, Mr. Lavigne stated that the reason the land use was flipped to the north side was because the multi-family use extended into the industrial park and was not in harmony with the other uses. South of Maple Avenue was all residential.

Mr. Dabareiner emphasized that there was no intent to single out or "go after" the site. He stated that options were being presented now given the age of the buildings. He noted that the 15 to 20 year horizon could be too long.

Chairman Jirik recommended the following verbiage: "Indicating it is a reasonable present use, but if the residents are supportive of redevelopment to corporate office, this transition of land use would be consistent with the overall use of this Plan."

Mrs. Rabatah recommended deleting the word "best" and inserting the words "may be suited".

Mr. Lavigne read his version, which commissioners supported.

Mr. Waechtler recommended leaving out the reference to the residents and owner verbiage. He asked if the long-range view of the property could be tied to the long-range view of the property to the east (an unincorporated area).

Mr. Beggs suggested the following verbiage: “This prospective use is compatible with the projected suggestion for the unincorporated area immediately to the east,” i.e., tying No. 4 to No. 5 in the last sentence.

No. 106 - Maple and Belmont - Third line down, delete the words “better regulate” and insert the words “better manage and improve”.

No. 118/119 - Revise maps to reflect North at the top. Mr. Lavigne stated the change was underway.

No. 116 - Mr. Waechtler asks to initial capitalize the words “Tollway Authority.”

No. 40 - Mr. Dabareiner notes that page 40 references the list of the eight (8) remaining building-related items after the extensive deletions.

Mr. Beggs raised issue with the first words in Item 3, noting it states that “The Village should coordinate the review and input of new development proposal with all affected public agencies...” He expressed concern about placing the Village in the position of the coordinator.

Mr. Lavigne noted that the Village was already in the position of coordinator with a number of agencies. Further clarification followed by Mr. Lavigne, who also confirmed there was no suggestion of power or authority in the word “coordinator” and that the paragraph was referring to new development proposals.

Mr. O’Brien further explained how certain petitions are forwarded to various agencies for their input on projects.

Chairman Jirik then proposed the following verbiage: “The Village should coordinate plan review activities of new development proposals with public agencies and departments, such as the fire department...”

Mr. Beggs concurred agreed it removed some of the burden off of “coordinator”. Staff and commissioners were comfortable with proposed wording as well.

Same page - Item No. 2, delete the words “create a publicly available alternatives analysis” and in its place, insert “create and publish an alternatives analysis”.

Item No. 4 - Delete the words “maintain a positive channel of” and insert the words “maintain regular communication”. Last line, delete the words “for better” and insert the words “to achieve better”.

Chairman Jirik asked if Commissioners or public had additional input to provide before submitting the draft for final approval, the commissioners and the public had nothing to provide.

Chairman Jirik declared public participation open at this point and entertained a motion to continue the public hearing to a date certain, that date being May 2, 2011.

APPROVED 4/25/11

MRS. RABATAH, MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO A DATE CERTAIN, THAT DATE BEING MAY 2, 2011, SECONDED BY MR. WAECHTLER.

ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MRS. RABATAH, MR. WAECHTLER, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO,
MR. MATEJCZYK, CHAIRMAN JIRIK
NAY: NONE**

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

Mr. O'Brien confirmed the commission will hold its regular meeting on April 25th with one agenda item (Saratoga and Prince). Additionally, hard copies of the Comprehensive Plan would be available to the commissioners prior to the May 2nd public hearing meeting.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:02 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. COZZO, SECONDED BY MRS. RABATAH. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt
Celeste K. Weilandt
(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)

APPROVED 5/23/11

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

MAY 2, 2011, 7:00 P.M.

Vice Chairman Webster called the May 2, 2011 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Vice Chairman Webster, Mr. Beggs, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Quirk, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Waechtler

ABSENT: Chairman Jirik

STAFF PRESENT: Tom Dabareiner, Community Development Director; Jeff O'Brien, Planning Manager; Stan Popovich, Planner; Devin Lavigne, Houseal Lavigne & Associates

VISITORS: Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence, Downers Grove; Mr. Mark Thoman, 1109 61st Street, Downers Grove; Art and Karen Fletcher, 4700 Stonewall; Dr. Kathleen Goepfinger with Midwestern University; Mr. Dwight Todd with DWL Architects, 2333 N. Central Ave., Phoenix, AZ; Dave Shindoll and Ed Hamilton with Mackie Consultants, Inc.

Vice Chairman Webster led the Plan Commissioners in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 25, 2011 MINUTES

MR. QUIRK MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES, AS PRESENTED, SECONDED BY MR. COZZO. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. COZZO, MR. QUIRK, MR. BEGGS, MR. MATEJCZYK, MRS. RABATAH, MR. WACHTLER, VICE CHAIRMAN WEBSTER

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED: VOTE 7-0.

Vice Chairman Webster reviewed the protocol for the meeting. A change in the agenda followed:

Vice Chairman Webster swore in those individuals who would be speaking on File PC-11-11.

File PC-11-11 A petition seeking a partial right-of-way vacation of the 83-foot wide unimproved Chicago Avenue right-of-way running east and west immediately north of and adjacent to the property commonly known as 4700 Stonewall Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 09-07-100-010). Art and Karen Fletcher, Petitioner and Owner.

Mr. Jeff O'Brien, Village Planning Manager, summarized the petition before the commissioners was for the unimproved, but dedicated, right-of-way ("ROW") vacation for Chicago Avenue running between Woodward and Stonewall Avenues. The ROW sits at the southwest corner of the intersection of Chicago and Stonewall Avenues. It is 83 feet wide and the areas east and west of the site are 66 feet long. The petitioners are requesting to purchase the south 53 feet immediately adjacent to their property. Total ROW to be vacated is 53 feet by 220 feet long. The utilities located on the south side of the ROW will be located in a public utilities and drainage easement and, therefore, no construction of structures (except fences or driveways) would be allowed. The sidewalk within the northern 30 feet of the right-of-way will remain and be maintained because it is part of a regional trail way plan.

The petition complies with the Village's Land Use Plan and Zoning Ordinance. However, setback changes will include a six-foot side yard setback, or, 10% of the lot width.

To date, no objections have been received for this petition from the village's police department, public works department, or other agencies. However, staff did receive a phone call requesting that the sidewalk remain open to the public and that no new homes be built on the property, wherein Mr. O'Brien confirmed the sidewalk would be public and access would remain. The easements would prohibit any new construction of structures.

Directing commissioners' attention to the dais, Mr. O'Brien noted two emails he received from the residents of 4702 Woodward who opposed the petition. He clarified that the current shed, under construction, was on the petitioner's property. To date, all four property owners adjoining the alley have consented to the vacation and their letters were attached to the packet. Staff called attention to the fact that staff and the Plan Commission were making findings as to whether the vacation is a necessary use for the ROW in the future, and staff has determined that the public interest can be protected with the easement in the 53 foot section that is being vacated.

Staff recommended compensation for the alley and referenced its monetary figure in the staff report. Staff recommended approval of the petition with the three conditions on page 4 of its staff report.

Vice Chairman Webster opened up the petition for commission comment. Mr. Matejczyk inquired about staff's statement that "the easement will prohibit any construction within the vacated right of way except for driveway or fence" and whether it would preclude an addition to petitioner's home, wherein Mr. O'Brien confirmed it would preclude the statement. Petitioners could construct up to the old property line, however. Mr. Matejczyk also confirmed with staff that vacating the section would permanently close the street, to which Mr. O'Brien confirmed in the positive, stating the matter was addressed prior with the Public Works Department. He summarized some of the dialog that took place with the Public Works Department.

Regarding the shed under construction and its location, Mr. O'Brien explained that the matter was addressed earlier in the year and the petitioners were made aware of their options, which the vacation was one of staff's options to make the shed a legal construction. The current shed is 6 feet off the north and west property lines and will be legal with the vacation. The owners' permit application was dependent upon the outcome of this petition.

For clarification purposes, Mr. O'Brien stated the parcels would likely be given identification numbers for taxation. He indicated the lots would be separate – the existing lot where the home is

and the vacated parcel. He noted the petitioners could consolidate the properties by filing a request for a plat of consolidation. He did not think that was necessary in this case. Concerning staff's recommendations, Mr. Waechtler asked staff if it was appropriate to mention that "Nothing is to be built on the vacated land" even though mentioned earlier in staff's report, wherein Mr. O'Brien stated that he uses the standard easement language for all vacations unless the applicant is seeking something special. Per another question, staff clarified the required setbacks, to date, were 25 feet from the east property line, 20 feet from the west property line, 6 feet from the south property line, and 24 feet from the north property line. In the future, the petitioner would get to use the 10%, i.e., 6 feet from the north property line, while the other setbacks would remain the same.

Asked if any other lots in the area went through from one street to another, Mr. O'Brien pointed out that one existed to the north at the northern edge of Coopers Hollow Park, with a 14 ft. wide alley. Mr. Beggs further asked whether the two lots would be end-to-end, wherein Mr. O'Brien responded in the negative. Further clarification followed by Mr. O'Brien that the lot itself would exist, along with a right-of-way lot, and each lot would have a pin number and each could be sold separately. However, he reported the county Assessor's Office would have to address such a matter. Since it was not a buildable lot, a lot consolidation could be done if the petitioners desired.

Per Mr. Quirk's question, there was one neighbor (2000 Chicago Avenue) that inquired about purchasing the remaining land but the person did not follow through with the process. Per Mr. Waechtler's question, staff confirmed the sidewalk at north of 4701 Stonewall travels to Hooper's Hollow Park and continues on to Chicago Avenue.

Petitioner, Mr. Art Fletcher, 4700 Stonewall, Downers Grove, summarized that the reason for his petition was to expand more on his property and, initially, when he purchased the property, there was concern about the street continuing through the property. He believed by taking this step it would not allow the street to continue through. In speaking with other neighbors, they agreed that having a through street was not a very good idea. Mr. Fletcher stated he did not realize that because he had a corner lot that the north property line would be 25 feet; he assumed it would be a 6-foot setback like everyone else. He explained the shed at the northwest corner of his property that was being constructed replaced an old shed. However the new shed, being larger than 100 sq. feet, had to meet village code and when he was constructing it, the village visited on-site and communicated to him that it was in violation of code and they explained the setbacks. Mr. Fletcher explained that, currently, as his house sits, he cannot build a walk-out deck on his property but by acquiring the property to the north, it will allow him that. He commented on the landscaping he was proposing and also mentioned the monetary benefits the village was receiving by him purchasing the property, i.e., up front money and the fact that the village will not have to maintain the vacated property.

Regarding the emails not supporting the ROW vacation, Mr. Fletcher stated that had he known earlier, he would have invited 10 to 15 of his neighbors in support of the petition. He thanked the commissioners for their consideration.

Per Mrs. Rabatah's question regarding the shed, Mr. Fletcher explained he was replacing a dilapidated shed with a larger shed and it was his mistake. His family includes four children and many bikes and no room exists to "hang out" in the yard.

APPROVED 5/23/11

Vice Chairman Webster opened up the meeting to public comment. No public comment followed. Public comment was closed.

Petitioner had no closing comments.

Mr. Matejczyk appreciated petitioner's professional-looking petition and supported the proposal. Mrs. Rabatah, recognizing the petition met the village's requirements, the appropriate neighbor consents were provided, and the utility companies were notified, she supported the proposal also. Mr. Webster agreed the petition met the findings of fact and entertained a motion.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE PC-11-11, MR. MATEJCZYK MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE VACATION SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE STAFF REPORT DATED MAY 2, 2011.**
- 2. PRIOR TO FINAL VILLAGE COUNCIL CONSIDERATION, A MYLAR COPY OF THE FINAL PLAT OF VACATION INDICATING A 53-FOOT PUBLIC DRAINAGE, UTILITY AND UTILITY ACCESS EASEMENT ALONG THE ENTIRE LENGTH AND WIDTH OF THE RIGHT OF WAY TO BE VACATED.**
- 3. PRIOR TO EXECUTION OF THE PLAT, THE PETITIONERS SHALL PAY A TOTAL OF \$15,527.23.**

SECONDED BY MRS. RABATAH.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. MATEJCZYK, MRS. RABATAH, MR. BEGGS, MR. COZZO, MR. QUIRK, MR. WAECHTLER, VICE CHAIRMAN WEBSTER

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0

File PC-13-11 A petition seeking a Final Planned Development Amendment to P.D. #31 Esplanade for the construction of a five-story office building for a medical and dental clinic and a six-level parking garage on the property located on Lacey Road approximately 230 feet south of the intersection of Lacey Road and Woodcreek Drive, commonly known as 3450 Lacey Road, Downers Grove, IL (PINs 06-31-103-007 and 05-36-200-011); Midwestern University, Petitioner and Owner.

Vice Chairman Webster swore in those individuals who would be speaking on File PC-13-11.

Mr. Popovich, Village Planner, summarized that the petition is for a Final Planned Development Amendment to Planned Development #31, Esplanade at Locust Point, for the construction of Midwestern University's five-story medical and dental teaching clinic and a six-level parking garage at 3450 Lacey Road. Mr. Popovich noted the petitioner's preliminary proposal was reviewed by the Plan Commission at their December 6, 2010 meeting and subsequently received Preliminary Planned Development approval from the Village Council in late December 2010.

Mr. Popovich reviewed the existing zoning on the property and noted tonight's approval was for the portion of the development on the central and eastern side of the overall site. Mr. Popovich reviewed the site layout and noted the clinic building will house classrooms, laboratories, clinic spaces, exam rooms and office. The exterior will be clad with precast concrete panels, face brick, blue-tinted windows. A mechanical penthouse will be located on the roof. The main building entrance will be on the west façade while a service drive and entrance are located in the basement on the south side of the building. Mr. Popovich noted the slight differences in the site plan from the previous December submittal and how the current clinic building proposal complies with the Zoning Ordinance are shown in the staff report.

Mr. Popovich reviewed the six level parking garage next. He noted all six-levels will be above grade, the garage and stair towers will be clad with sandblast textured concrete panels and blue-tinted windows. All vehicular access will now be from the east façade, as opposed to the north and east in the December submittal. Mr. Popovich noted the slight differences in the site plan from the previous December submittal and how the current parking proposal complies with the Zoning Ordinance are shown in the staff report.

It was staff's belief that the proposal complies with the Future Land Use Plan and the Village's Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Popovich noted the petitioner is proposing two entrances from Woodcreek Drive, the existing entrance adjacent to the day care site and a new western entrance. He noted the existing drive will be improved to include two exit lanes and a single entrance lane. The western drive will be used as the construction entrance and will remain in place after construction is complete. Mr. Popovich noted the construction entrance was a point of concern during the December approval process and the western construction entrance addresses this concern.

Mr. Popovich noted an east-west boulevard connects the two Woodcreek Drive entrances and provides access to the parking garage, circle drive and service drive. Mr. Popovich noted the service drive on the south side of the building would be open only to service and emergency vehicles and will be gated or fenced to prohibit other vehicles from entering the area. He noted the service drive exits onto Lacey Road and will be designed to ensure that it does not appear as an entrance for vehicles traveling south on Lacey Road. Mr. Popovich stated an existing raised landscape median within Lacey Road will prohibit exiting service and emergency vehicles from turning left (north) onto Lacey Road. It will also prohibit northbound traffic from attempting to enter the drive as well.

Per staff's request back in 2010, the petitioner completed a comprehensive traffic study.

Mr. Popovich noted the study examined circulation based on the existing day care, the proposed Midwestern developments and the ASGE development. The study found all four intersections surrounding the site would operate at acceptable levels of service and the surrounding streets have sufficient capacity for the anticipated traffic. Mr. Popovich noted the study recommends back-to-back turn lanes on Woodcreek Drive, a widened exit drive adjacent to the day care, and the service drive exit to be designed to discourage illegal entry to the service drive. Staff concurs with those recommendations.

Continuing, the stormwater overland flow routes and storm sewers have been modified since the December approval, so the Village's previous concern about storm water flow pinch points has been

addressed with rain gardens and retaining ponds. The proposal will meet the Village's Stormwater Ordinance and Best Management Practice requirements.

Mr. Popovich pointed out the proposed sidewalk from the clinic to the Lacey Road sidewalk. The trash enclosure was previously located in the front yard but has now been moved further west in the service area. Mr. Popovich noted the new utility services and that conceptual approval from the Downers Grove Sanitary District has been granted. Regarding concerns from the public safety agencies as to providing access to two sides of the building, the petition provides access on three sides of the building (north side, circle access drive, and the south side). All lanes have been designed appropriately for emergency equipment access and both the clinic and parking garage will have a manual and automatic detection system and an automatic sprinkler system.

Per the Forest Preserve's concerns regarding non-native plantings becoming invasive, staff agrees with the Forest Preserve and agreed that the plans should reflect more native plantings.

No other public comment was received by staff regarding this project. Staff believed the proposal was substantially similar to the preliminary approval previously granted in December 2010 and believed the standards for planned development approval were met along with the village's bulk requirements and Zoning Ordinance. Overall, staff believed the proposal was "in harmony" with other developments in the Esplanade and would not impede other developments in the area. Staff recommended the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Village Council with the conditions listed on page 7 of staff's report.

Asked if the Forest Preserve recommended any types of non-native plant species or limiting them, Mr. Popovich believed the Forest Preserve did not recommend that the petitioner completely not use any non-native but were more concerned about those that can become invasive. He referenced the list that was provided by the Forest Preserve. Mr. Beggs noticed that there was a discrepancy of what was being recommended by the Forest Preserve and to what was being proposed. He believed consistency in discussing invasive plants was necessary.

Mr. Beggs shared his concerns about the topography of southbound Lacey Road, just to the north of the intersection of Woodcreek Drive, and asked whether the traffic study addressed the service trucks exiting south from the driveway, given the curve and hill and the speed of traffic. Mr. Popovich stated the traffic study did not address the topography issue at that intersection and the traffic consultant did not appear concerned about it due to the infrequency trucks would be exiting the service drive. He believed enough distance existed to see a truck exiting. Mr. Waechtler shared the same concern and mentioned the addition of signage to warn motorists about construction trucks or general traffic entering/exiting that drive. Mr. Popovich, however, clarified that there would be no construction trucks entering/exiting on Lacey Road because construction traffic would only be using the northwest construction entrance. Also, if vehicles exiting the site on Lacey Road did become an issue, Mr. Popovich and Mr. O'Brien agreed that the Traffic and Parking Commission would address it through a site/distance analysis, if this commission desired.

Mr. Popovich confirmed the village's traffic engineer did review the traffic study but he did have some initial concerns about the traffic counts being done in December, i.e., holiday traffic. More recently, the study was amended in April and the village's traffic engineer was fine with the findings in the addendum traffic study. On Page 2 of the traffic study, Mr. Waechtler pointed out that his understanding was that the village's unposted speed limit was 25 MPH and not 30 MPH, as

stated in the traffic study. Mr. Popovich was not sure. Mr. Waechtler further inquired about the various acronyms being used relating to traffic levels of service.

Per Mr. Cozzo's question regarding the first entrance off of Woodcreek Drive having a raised median (north end of the site), Mr. Popovich believed the raised median would not extend far and there would be the ability to turn into the daycare facility. Mr. Cozzo asked if it would be desirable not to have a left turn lane into the driveway at that point and direct traffic to the daycare center to the south drive. Mr. Popovich stated that was the intention, with the idea that cars exit from the northern entrance. He would have to confirm in the plans where the median ended. Regarding the one-way in and one-way access to the parking garage and the circle drop off area, staff was comfortable with the design of the internal roadway system, and reminded Mr. Cozzo that the Fire Prevention Division did review the plans and was fine with them. Mr. Cozzo also confirmed with staff that there was a raised landscaped median between the north- and south-bound traffic on Lacey which would prohibit a left turn into the other access drive. Mr. O'Brien explained for Mr. Cozzo that emergency vehicles would only enter from the western or eastern entry drive off of Woodcreek. Mr. Cozzo voiced concern that if there was an obstruction at the service entry, how would emergency vehicles get into the site? Mr. Matejczyk also shared his concern on this point.

Petitioner, Dr. Kathleen Goeppinger, President and CEO, with Midwestern University, recalled the commissioners' discussion in December 2010, and she recalled the commissioners were concerned about traffic, and to meet commissioners' request, a second drive was added to provide better traffic flow to leave the site. As to the median near the daycare facility, it was provided to direct families into one entrance and out the other. She mentioned that Midwestern has had discussions with the daycare about that arrangement and there were supportive. Additionally, she stated that if ASGE needed entrance/exit access, she wanted to be able to accommodate them. She was available to answer questions.

Regarding an earlier question about explosives on site, Dr. Goeppinger clarified there was a limited number of oxygen tanks on the site but no explosive materials or compounds.

Mr. Beggs brought up the invasive plants discussion and, after looking at the list herself, Dr. Goeppinger admitted she would take the question to her landscape architect and be open to any modifications the commissioners suggest.

Because the traffic consultant was not present, Mr. O'Brien provided an explanation of the traffic levels of service for Mr. Waechtler. Mr. Waechtler asked staff to confirm the regulatory speed limit for the village. Mr. O'Brien concurred. In general, Mr. Waechtler agreed with Mr. Matejczyk in that the proposal was designed well and it was a good addition to the community.

Vice Chairman Webster asked to point out the exact location of the trash enclosure and the nearby retaining walls, wherein Dr. Goeppinger pointed them out on the overhead, noting the enclosure would be hidden with vegetation for screening purposes and the bottom of the retaining wall would be nine feet below Lacey. The top of the retaining wall would be six feet high. Mr. Popovich further explained how the enclosure would be situated lower than the grade and unless a person was looking specifically for the trash enclosure, it would not be seen from Lacey Road.

APPROVED 5/23/11

On the site plan, staff clarified it made the recommendation that the northern part of the driveway be increased from 18 feet to 20 feet to meet the village's standard to allow for fire truck access. The petitioner was fine with staff's recommendation.

Vice Chairman Webster opened up the petition for public comment. No public comment. Public comment was closed. A motion was entertained.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE PC-13-11, MR. BEGGS MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSTIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL, AND INCLUDE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATIONS ON PAGE 7 OF ITS STAFF REPORT. SECONED BY MR. MATEJCZYK.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. BEGGS, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. COZZO, MR. QUIRK, MRS. RABATAH, MR. WAECHTLER, VICE CHAIRMAN WEBSTER

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0

File PC-17-10 (continued from April 4, 2011) The purpose of the request is to consider the draft Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan, which, if adopted will become the official plan for the Village as required by Section 1.12 of the Municipal Code. The proposed comprehensive plan will replace the 1965 Comprehensive Plan; Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Mr. O'Brien drew commissioners' attention to the draft comprehensive plan, noting it contained the changes from last month. The only outstanding item that was not included was the drawing for the Butterfield Road catalyst sites, which Mr. Lavigne provided tonight. Staff indicated that if there were no other comments from the commissioners staff recommended taking final comments from the public.

Commissioners had no specific comments as to the document content.

Vice Chairman Webster reconvened File PC-17-10 for public comment and swore in those individuals who would be speaking.

Ms. Marge Earl, 4720 Florence, Downers Grove, discussed the hard work that went into the document. She noted that the process allowed for a great deal of public input. She noted that input was received from the public, the Comprehensive Planning Commission, TCD 3 participants and the Plan Commission. She encouraged the commissioners to support the document when it comes before the Village Council and to let them know that "the document is a good document."

Mr. Waechtler also agreed much work and good thought went into the document.

Mr. Matejczyk concurred. and stated he was impressed with the document. He went on to state that he was more impressed with the process that went into creating the document, which was a credit to the Village.

APPROVED 5/23/11

Vice Chairman Webster entertained a motion.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE PC 17-10, MRS. RABATAH MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL AND ADOPT THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, AS PRESENTED. SECONDED BY MR. COZZO. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MRS. RABATAH, MR. COZZO, MR. BEGGS, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. QUIRK, MR. WAECHTLER, VICE CHAIRMAN WEBSTER

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0

As to next steps, Mr. Dabareiner stated that the document may possibly move to a standing committee prior to the Village Council meeting in order to review the material in depth.

Mr. O'Brien informed the commissioners that the next meeting will be May 23rd with three items on the agenda. A discussion ensued regarding whether those items could be combined with the June 6th meeting. Staff noted that the public hearing notices had already been published but that no additional second meetings were scheduled for the remainder of the year.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:50 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. BEGGS, SECONDED BY MRS. RABATAH. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt

Celeste K. Weilandt

(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)