

APPROVED 06/17/15

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
VILLAGE HALL - COMMITTEE ROOM
801 BURLINGTON AVENUE

MAY 20, 2015, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Matthies called the May 20, 2015 meeting of the Architectural Design Review Board to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

PRESENT: Chairman Matthies, Members Mrs. Acks, Mr. Casey, Mr. Davenport, Ms. Englander, Mr. Riemer

ABSENT: Mr. Larson

STAFF: Village Planners Chrisse and Ainsworth

VISITORS: None

REMARKS FROM THE CHAIR

The chairman appreciated changing the night of the meeting and thanked Mr. Davenport for chairing the previous meetings.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – APRIL 23, 2015

The following corrections were noted: On page 1, correct Mr. Ken Lerner's name.

THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 23, 2015 MEETING WERE APPROVED, AS AMENDED, ON MOTION BY MR. DAVENPORT, SECONDED BY MS. ENGLANDER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Work Plan – ADRB Goals and Objectives – Village Planner Chrisse recapped last month's meeting for those who were not in attendance. Tonight's focus would be to work on the identified existing goals and narrow them down to an actionable work plan for the board. To that point, she recommended that the board: 1) review its current goals to see if they were relevant; 2) were they something the board's activities could help to support; and 3) in what way. She emphasized that timeframes did not have to be set tonight but would eventually in the future and the board would have to determine who was responsible, i.e., the Council, the ADRB, staff, etc.

Addressing the first goal, Mr. Matthies gave an example of a property he recently developed which could have turned out much differently. He asked if the board should start nominating certain areas to get neighbors discussing the preservation topic. Member/staff comments followed that the goal was relevant. There was a discussion about incentives that could be integrated into the existing regulations or options such as form-based code or a neighborhood conservation district plan overlay. Examples followed as to how a regulatory

APPROVED 06/17/15

overlay could be considered as an option and could address each area of need. Ms. Chrissie suggested that members develop a list of tools that could be used as a “menu of options” for different areas within the village and research the applicability of each option. Those options could then be prioritize for each neighborhood. Keeping the process simple by promoting an area as a historical district, was recommended; not regulating it. Mr. Ainsworth mentioned that there is a newspaper article where certain homes in Oswego received honorary preservation awards. Other positive stories followed.

Because the discussion kept returning to promoting and educating the public on preservation, Ms. Chrissie suggested that the board work on creating a list of promotional/ educational tools and activities. Ideas followed that the village could bring back Founders’ Day in coordination with historic preservation and continue the walking tours in various areas of the village. Or it could hold neighborhood meetings to identify what the residents liked about their neighborhood and what steps could be taken to protect the area. Another was for the ADRB to send a press release to identify five neighborhoods (one every year) for preservation in order to bring in residents of those areas and to begin a discussion with them.

To create public interest, other ideas included 1) discussing a building’s history that has been identified in the survey so that residents may want to research their own home, and possibly giving them a template to start with; 2) hold a village workshop that includes various entities where residents can learn how to research their own property and informational booths can be set up to provide resources to interested residents; and 3) the ADRB to provide helpful links on the village’s web site – like a clearing house – for its residents. As to an earlier concern about the fear of the unknown creating a fear among residents that their homes could be affected by the creation of a district, Mr. Davenport discussed that it could be a positive if done correctly/softly. Examples followed.

Conversation then centered on the fact that the board could take steps to promote preservation without funding. However, Ms. Chrissie explained that funding could be obtained through matching grants with the council’s approval. She noted that the state’s new grant cycle began in August but the board would have to identify its most important goal and get the residents and village council on board with it. Asked if a private match could be provided for a grant, Ms. Chrissie was not sure.

Mr. Davenport recommended identifying a neighborhood area, contacting its residents for their input, and starting the conversation of how those residents could protect their area. Following that meeting, members could then go to the village council with an action item(s). Chairman Matthies recommended proposing to the village council to “relax” the nomination requirements because he believed they were too restrictive for a neighborhood. Other dialog followed that the village council should review the historic preservation ordinance first and then come to the ADRB seeking direction, yet help residents in honoring their neighborhoods.

Ms. Chrissie suggested that the marketing effort would should be educational and informative because there is often a negative perception of historic preservation when it is not understood. Mr. Riemer shared what other regions of the county did to positively and effectively identify their historic areas using specific signage/markers which could be done in the village.

Discussing the possibility of a separate web page for the ADRB, Ms. Chrissie spoke about having a series of different maps each month on the web page to highlight surveyed homes of

APPROVED 06/17/15

various architectural styles: Victorian, Sears, Mid-Century Modern, etc. which could spark some additional residents, whose homes were not surveyed, to research their homes and in which staff could then archive. She shared how additional information could be provided on the web page.

Members agreed that having a bigger presence and a link to its web page was their first priority and discussed revising the title of the page to something other than “Historic Preservation”, i.e., “Architectural Design Review Board, ‘Dedicated to maintaining/continuing the character of Downers Grove.’” The survey could be added, followed by a list of the architectural districts under the title and what their historical significance was. Members agreed that the web page should be kept fresh and focus on positive promotion and education versus regulatory text. Mr. Ainsworth offered suggestions for organizing the web page. Questions arose regarding having a separate Facebook page for the ADRB. Ms. Chrissy stated that a variety of media could be used to send out information about historic preservation and the ADRB.

After much dialog and enthusiasm about what information could go on the web page, Ms. Chrissy asked clear direction from the board on its targeted activities. She asked members to list two or three of their own priorities to find some commonality amongst them. Consensus was to 1) have a better presence on web page; and 2) choose an area or neighborhood for designation. Ms. Chrissy supported the priorities; however, she described some of the marketing materials she would need in order to place them on the village’s web page as a start. She could make the survey information more readily available and interactive. Members discussed that the CLG and the survey/maps could be introduced as a start, followed by a designated neighborhood based on the survey done.

Staff and the board then discussed what was currently on the village’s web page and what the board’s page should reflect. The chairman suggested that the members come up with their five priorities, come to a consensus of what gets placed on the web page, and create links to the survey areas. Getting an interactive survey would be a long-term goal, wherein one member voiced concern about losing the potential grant funding come August. Additional dialog followed whether the interactive web page could be separately hosted, to which Ms. Chrissy offered to follow up. Chairman Matthies also asked how the board could get support from the village council on this matter, i.e., attend a council meeting?

There was a suggestion to hold off on the work plan in order to get a couple of activities completed first, such as getting a dedicated web page and populating its contents. Members concurred. Ms. Chrissy reminded the board that the work plan is a tool to communicate with council but also for them to understand that there are certain activities that require a budget.

Members and Ms. Chrissy proceeded to discuss the information that was currently on the village’s web site, and how the ADRB’s site could be set up the same way. Topics included the importance of transparency not only for the public but also for staff. In discussing the matter further, it was pointed out that two immediate priorities seemed to exist: 1) have a better presence on city’s web page; and 2) apply for a grant and use the money for either the web page or some other idea that could be discussed next month. Ms. Chrissy offered to email to members information from the CLG web site relating to the available grant. She also stated that she would follow up with the IHPA to find out what activities might impact the village’s CLG status.

APPROVED 06/17/15

In closing, Chairman Matthies asked that each member return next month with their five long-term goals and write down 5 or 10 ideas of what should be on the web page, to be discussed next month. Ms. Chrisse also suggested that as a starting point, members look at the web sites of other villages to see their navigation capabilities. She stated her goal for the next meeting was to get a separate page for the ADRB. The chairman reiterated that the board's six-month/one year goal will be to create the web page, clean it up, and use it as a marketing tool for the ADRB; members concurred.

For next month's meeting, Ms. Chrisse said she will email everyone the list she uses to keep them on point and will also draft a paragraph on how the ADRB was formed, for the board's review.

NEW BUSINESS – None.

PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

ADJOURNMENT

MRS. ACKS MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. MR. RIEMER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:04 P.M. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

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

Approved 7/6/15

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

MAY 4, 2015, 7:00 P.M.

Chairperson Urban called the May 4, 2015 meeting of the Downers Grove Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Plan Commissioners and public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairperson Urban, Mr. Bassler, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Quirk, Mr. Rickard, Mr. Webster

ABSENT: Mr. Cozzo, Mrs. Rabatah (ex-officios Davenport, Menninga, Souter)

STAFF: Planning Manager Stan Popovich; Village Planners Kelley Chrise and Patrick Ainsworth

VISITORS: Ken Rathje, Rathje Planning Services, Downers Grove; John Smykowski, Chadman & Associates, Chicago; Mr. Keith Neumann, Greenscape Homes, 4355 Wyndam Parkway, Warrenville; Michael Cassa, president, Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation, 5159 Mochel Dr., Downers Grove; Resident Marge Earl, Downers Grove; Carole Kempf, 4935 Rose Ave., Downers Grove; Eric Carlson, ECA Architects & Planners, 24 N. Bennett St., Geneva; Hitesh Patel, 1200 75th Street; Mr. Patrick Romer, 2265 Thyme Road, Naperville, Illinois; Patti McGuire, Bob DeMarke and Joseph Stevens, Transwestern Investment; Kent Ilhardt with Cushman, Wakefield, 200 S. Wacker Drive, Chicago; Mark Stenftenagel and Mary Beth Peters with Whitney Architects, Oakbrook, IL; Tim Sjogren with Kimley-Horn, Lisle, IL; Tim Reber with Woolpert, Oakbrook Terrace, IL

Chairperson Urban explained the protocol for the meeting and noted a change in the agenda order: Agenda Item 15-PLC-0011 would be moved to the end of the public hearings.

APPROVAL OF APRIL 6, 2015 MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE APRIL 6, 2015 MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. MATEJCZYK, SECONDED BY MR. RICKARD. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Chairperson Urban swore in those individuals that would be speaking on the following petitions:

FILE 15-PLC-0009 (continued from last month): A petition seeking approval for a Planned Development Amendment and a Special Use for a drive-through facility. The subject property is

Approved 7/6/15

zoned B-2, General Retail Business. The property is located at the northwest corner of Lemont Road and 75th Street, commonly known as 1200 75th Street, Downers Grove, IL (09-30-201-002). Eric Carlson, Petitioner, Hemant Patel, Owner.

Village planner Patrick Ainsworth explained where the location of the subject site was, noting the 2,400 sq. foot one-story structure included a gas station, a convenience store and a Dunkin Donuts. The petitioner was seeking to add a drive-through window and an 8-car stacking lane. Mr. Ainsworth pointed out the site's parking spaces and nearby sidewalk. In reviewing the drive-through, Mr. Ainsworth reported that the petitioner will be cutting through the existing sidewalk and creating new circulation patterns on the site that are not found with other drive-through designs within the Village. Details followed.

Mr. Ainsworth reviewed the minimum zoning standards for drive-throughs within the village's code. He stated the petitioner was seeking deviations from the new requirement of 25-foot setbacks from the adjacent non-residential property lines. The deviations included: a request for 1.75 foot setback from the northern-most point of the stacking lane to the north property line and a 13.8 feet setback from the western-most portion of the stacking lane to the western property line. Additional Zoning Ordinance requirements that the petitioner had meet included adequate on-site maneuvering circulation areas for vehicles and pedestrians and designed stacking lanes so as to not interfere with parking movements of safe pedestrian circulation.

After regular staff review and traffic manager review of the drive-through design, Mr. Ainsworth reported there were concerns raised which included the following: direct conflict with pedestrians and vehicles exiting the site; conflict with the two parking spaces adjacent to the exit lane; reduced visibility issues; and blocking the required off-street parking if overflow stacking beyond the 8-car stacking was necessary. Diagrams and a video followed for better explanation.

Due to the concerns raised regarding this petition, staff recommended sending a denial recommendation to the village council, pointing out that the request for a Planned Development amendment did not meet the village's standards for approval. While the improvements to the site did meet the requirements for the commercial corridor designation in the village's comprehensive plan, Mr. Ainsworth said the comprehensive plan also mentioned that parking areas must be safe for pedestrians and vehicles and not conflict with one another. Details followed. Regarding the three criteria for the special use request, while the use was an authorized use under Article 5 of the village's zoning ordinance, the request did not meet the last two criteria and staff found that the request would set a poor precedent for Planned Development No. 9.

Per questions from the commissioners, Mr. Ainsworth explained the circulation challenges with the new relocation of the refuse area -- it conflicted with the stacking lane. He explained the review and concerns found by staff on the submitted traffic study.

Petitioner and architect, Mr. Eric Carlson, with ECA Architects & Planners, Geneva, Illinois, respected staff's comments and hoped his presentation would ease some concerns, as there were challenges working through the petition with staff. Mr. Carlson stated he was the architect for the original gas station development. The Dunkin Donuts owner at that time wanted a drive-through but two other developers were interested in getting their project developed and did not investigate a drive-through. He understood there was a prior Dunkin Donuts at the site which was profitable and had a drive-through. However, the franchisee at that time still went ahead and had the Dunkin

Approved 7/6/15

Donuts developed without the drive-through. To date, the store is struggling financially and the franchisee understands that 60% of the business comes from the drive-through.

Mr. Patrick Romer, 2265 Thyme Road, Naperville, Illinois, the Dunkin Donuts owner, summarized that he wanted a fair hearing and while he respected the commission's concern about safety, he believed that all parties could have a win-win situation by considering his proposal and listening to his presentation.

Continuing, Mr. Carlson reviewed the site plan on the overhead in greater detail. He was aware and made staff aware of the blind corner at the sidewalk at the exit area of the site. To address that issue, a stop sign and pedestrian walkway were added so that the pedestrians would be forced to walk a fence line to be more clearly seen for the cars exiting the drive-through. A raised paver would also warn drivers of pedestrians. Mr. Carlson addressed the challenge for current employee parking on-site, noting it left little for pedestrian parking but the majority of patrons who pumped gas usually left their cars at the pump while they ran into the convenience store. Having the drive-through would eliminate those vehicles that currently parked to patronize the Dunkin Donuts store. The six parking spaces, he stated, would be adequate for the convenience store patrons.

Addressing staff's concerns in its report, Mr. Carlson believed his client had a site "he was stuck with" and in order for the site to work, some non-traditional designs would have to make it work to minimize potential conflicts. As to concerns about multiple conflicts with pedestrians, vehicles, trash removal service, and gas pump interaction, Mr. Carlson pointed out that no other drive-through facility similar in design existed in the village. He further pointed out that the a.m. peak hours for service at a Dunkin Donuts store and a.m. peak hours for pumping gas were somewhat similar.

Discussing the maximum stacking lines for three various suburban Dunkin Donuts, Mr. Carlson explained the number of vehicles were 6, 6, and 7 respectively, and the vehicle stacking proposed at this store was a conservative 8 vehicles. The average stacking across-the-board was 3 to 4 cars with a maximum of 6 to 7. Trash pickup was scheduled for M-W-F between the hours of 5:00-5:30 a.m. with the donut store serving peak hours starting between 6:00-7:00 a.m. Air pumps / vacuums has sporadic activity throughout the day and not during the peak a.m. hours.

Mr. Carlson reviewed the scenario of a driver going through the drive-through and the fact that the driver would not be speeding away from the drive-through window, given the extra warnings when he left the window. This was consistent with other drive-through facilities. Mr. Carlson reviewed the truck movement for the garbage pick-up, sight lines, the location of the handicap parking stall, and raised the fact that pedestrians have to walk across a more busier drive-through lane(s) when walking into a McDonalds restaurant. He shared various examples of drive-through designs that included bisected parking that appeared to create little issues but work well, noting patrons and drivers alike "figure it out." He believed the issues raised were traditional issues and steps were being taken to raise awareness to the pedestrians and drivers of the site. A drive-through was needed for the site.

Chairperson Urban opened up the public comment portion of the meeting. No comments followed.

Approved 7/6/15

In closing, Mr. Carlson, referred to the site plan and believed the issues raised were “standard.” He believed the eight vehicle stacking was suitable for the location with all of its uses. To have all activities on the site occurring at once, he felt was rare.

Mr. Pat Romer, owner, returned and stated eight vehicles in the line would be great because he would not have to be before this commission. However, he offered to have a probationary period, if the commission desired, and asked for the commission’s support.

Hearing no further comments, Chairperson Urban closed the public hearing on this case.

Regarding the 25-foot setback and how many businesses currently met it or whether it was just for Planned Development #9, Mr. Popovich explained that the setback requirement was recently enacted with the new zoning ordinance adopted in June last year and this was the first new petition under the requirement. He added that staff does not have concerns with the setback requirement based on its location adjacent to the rear of adjacent commercial properties. Staff’s primary concerns are the pedestrian-vehicle and vehicle-vehicle conflicts created by the drive-through exit.

Mr. Quirk did not believe this would function any different than any other drive-through in the Village. Mr. Popovich explained the differences in layouts, namely this site bisects the parking area where other drive-throughs do not. Mr. Popovich cited the Panera on Ogden Avenue as a location where the drive-through lane was moved to not bisect a parking area. Mr. Ainsworth noted the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance call for the separation of vehicle and pedestrians.

Additional discussion occurred on the intensity of drive-throughs and whether there was a difference between the entry and exit points of the drive-through. Drive-throughs for car washes versus drive-throughs for fast food restaurants were discussed

Mr. Rickard voiced a concern with the drive aisle between the gas pumps and outbound drive-through traffic. He noted the narrow width of the exiting drive-aisle and it being gridlocked at some point if there are large vehicles or vehicles with trailers pumping gas. This could impact the drive-through, parking spaces, and access around the site. It just takes one driver to create potential gridlock during peak hours.

The Chairperson agreed with Mr. Rickard and noted that combined with the right-in right-out accesses restrict movements in and out of the site making it more complex. The Chairperson noted the restaurant users and gas users competing for the same space. She was concerned about traffic circulation and did not know if the property was large enough to fit a drive-through. Mr. Matejczyk shared the same concerns and noted coming out of the drive-through into the aisle there are issues with cross-traffic and gas pump users. It is a very tight space.

Mr. Webster acknowledged the difference of findings between the petitioner’s traffic consultant and staff’s report, and he disagreed with staff’s opinion that the service or facility was not in the public’s best interest. He agreed there was no similar design within the village and it was a unique parcel clearly meant for a car wash, but he did not agree that the standard was not met because a number of similar configurations existed throughout the suburbs and drivers did “figure it out.” He believed the use fit the property dimensionally, it complied, except for the setbacks, and the setbacks variances being requested backed against commercial properties that had no bearing on the properties. Continuing, he stated the parcel was not a street; it may not comply strictly with the

Approved 7/6/15

comprehensive plan; and if people visited the site and did not like its configuration, they simply went somewhere else. Lastly, he stated the owner was willing to try the special use for a probationary period. Mr. Webster supported the proposal and did not agree with staff's interpretation nor the village's traffic manager's opinion. He reiterated it was the owner's risk to put the use at his facility, as shown, and make some concessions for public safety. Other supporting remarks followed.

Mr. Rickard recommended that the six parking spaces be reworked for better safety and clearance.

With respect to staff's conditions, Mr. Ainsworth noted a revision to the stop sign location, wherein Mr. Popovich stated the stop sign revision could be handled through the engineering department. Chairwoman Urban entertained a motion.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 15-PLC-0009, MR. WEBSTER MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING STAFF CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT AND SPECIAL USE SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE STAFF REPORT, THE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS PREPARED BY ECA ARCHITECTS, DATED MARCH 18, 2015, THE ENGINEERING PLANS PREPARED BY PEARSON, BROWN & ASSOCIATES, INC., DATED MARCH 18, 2015 AND THE LANDSCAPE PLAN PREPARED BY IBD, DATED MARCH 18, 2015, EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO THE VILLAGE CODES AND ORDINANCES;**
- 2. THE HANDICAP PARKING SPACE AND ADJACENT ACCESS AISLE SHALL BE RELOCATED AND AMENDED ON ALL SITE PLANS TO COMPLY WITH THE ILLINOIS ACCESSIBILITY CODE;**
- 3. THE ICE MACHINE AND THE PROPANE CABINET SHALL BE RELOCATED FROM THE MAIN ENTRANCE ELEVATION TO ELSEWHERE ON THE PROPERTY IN ORDER TO MAINTAIN ADEQUATE ACCESS WIDTH ON THE SIDEWALK;**
- 4. THE PROPOSED CROSSWALK SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED OF A DIFFERENT PAVEMENT MATERIAL THAN THE ADJACENT DRIVE-THROUGH LANE AND DRIVE AISLE; AND**
- 5. THE RELOCATION OF THE STOP SIGN BE ADDRESSED, AS PROPOSED BY STAFF.**

SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. WEBSTER, MR. QUIRK, MR. BASSLER, MR. MATEJCZYK

NAY: MR. RICKARD, CHAIRPERSON URBAN

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 4-2

15-PLC-0014: A petition seeking approval for a zoning map amendment from R-1 Residential Detached House 1 to R-4 Residential Detached House 4. The property is located on the east side of Rose Avenue approximately 170 feet south of Hadow Avenue, commonly known as 4933 Rose

Approved 7/6/15

Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (08-12-111-005). Greenscape Homes, LLC, Petitioner; John Pergler, Owner.

Mr. Ainsworth discussed that this parcel was part of a larger parcel that was annexed to the village between 2011 and 2012 and was automatically designated as an R-1 zoning district, per state statute. A vacant home currently sits on the property currently and was under contract. The plat of survey followed with setbacks noted. The petitioner was seeking an R-4 zoning request to come closer to compliance with the village's zoning ordinance. Other R-4 zoned properties were pointed out on the overhead. While the property would not be in full compliance with the village's zoning code, Mr. Ainsworth explained that that a single-family detached home could be constructed on a non-conforming lot of record as long as the setback requirements were met. He shared how this parcel would fit better into the context of the neighborhood.

Planning staff supported the request and recommended forwarding a positive recommendation to village council, finding that all seven criteria for rezoning were met.

Per the chairwoman's question, front yard setbacks of the adjacent properties were noted by staff.

Petitioner, Mr. Keith Neumann with Greenscape Homes, 4355 Wyndam Parkway, Warrenville agreed that he was trying to bring the lot into conformance and acknowledged that the parcel was part of a larger parcel annexation in 2011-2012. Mr. Neumann stated he held a neighborhood meeting and three neighbors attended the meeting who had general questions.

No questions followed from the commissioners. Chairperson Urban invited the public to speak.

Ms. Carol Kempf, 4935 Rose Avenue, Downers Grove, stated she never was contacted by the petitioner. She asked if the village was planning to rezone the area to which Mr. Popovich stated the village would be reviewing all zoning areas at some future time. Lastly, she asked what the next steps were after the rezoning; staff responded.

Hearing no further comments, the public hearing was closed. Comments followed that the zoning appeared appropriate and was the trend for the neighborhood.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 15-PLC-0014 MR. MATEJCZYK MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL.

SECONDED BY MR. BASSLER. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. BASSLER, MR. QUIRK, MR. RICKARD, MR. WEBSTER, CHAIRPERSON URBAN

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

15-PLC-0015: A petition seeking approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision to create an outlot and Rezoning to B-3, General Services and Highway Business, Special use for Personal Vehicle Repair

Approved 7/6/15

and Maintenance and Sign Variations for the newly created outlot. The subject property is currently zoned O-R-M, Office-Research-Manufacturing, and is located on the East side of Authority Drive between Ogden Avenue and Warrenville Road, commonly known as 2651-2655 Warrenville Road, Downers Grove, IL (08-01-302-056, -057, -060, -061). Transwestern Investment Group, Petitioner; Corrodors JV, LLC, Owner.

Village planner, Ms. Kelley Chrise, explained the petitioner was seeking to create an outlot to construct an automotive service center. Details of the site followed. It was noted that adjacent zoning was O-R-M, Office-Research-Manufacturing, and B-3, General Services and Highway Business. A survey of the site was placed on the projection screen with an overlay of the original platted underlying lots. Currently, two five-story office towers existed on the site with only 20% space occupied, connected by a common area structure. A two-story parking deck, surface parking, and detention pond were noted on the campus.

A photograph of the surface parking lot was referenced, noting it was the location for the proposed automotive service center, and had very few vehicles parked in it at 9:00 a.m.

Per Ms. Chrise, the petitioner was proposing to construct a 14,000 sq. foot automotive service station on the outlot to complement the office use of an international tenant. The tenant will use the campus for their North American headquarters that will occupy the office space of the entire south tower. The petitioner will dedicate 10 feet of additional right-of-way along Ogden Avenue to comply with the arterial road width requirements. Both lots will comply with the Subdivision Ordinance.

The second request by petitioner, as explained by Ms. Chrise, was for a rezoning of Lot 1 from O-R-M to B-3, General Services and Highway Business, which is consistent with other properties along Ogden Avenue. The petitioner held a neighborhood meeting pursuant to Zoning Ordinance requirements and the summary from that meeting was attached to staff's report.

Per staff, another request focused on a special use for personal vehicle repair and maintenance for the service center which would provide interactive training space for local business partners; allow for the maintenance of the tenant's fleet of executive vehicles; provide retail services to high-end clients; and serve as a proto-type for future North American locations.

The petitioner has requested full access at Ogden Avenue from IDOT although staff has yet to receive their comments from IDOT. A secondary, full access is located at Authority Drive. The petitioner will be installing two monument signs – one at Ogden Avenue and Authority Drive, and the other immediately located in front of the auto service center (60 sq. feet sign, about 15 feet tall).

Ms. Chrise proceeded to review the traffic study done by Kimley-Horn, which developed a base line study based on full occupancy of the tower. The study revealed that the full occupancy of the building would result in high delays and queues during peak hours and estimated volume would increase by more than 400% at full capacity. Ms. Chrise also pointed out the building was constructed "by right" in the 1990s which did not require a traffic study at that time. The traffic study notes that the addition of the auto service center will have minimal impact on traffic in the area once the office is fully occupied. However, staff has added a condition for the petitioner to provide a traffic signal warrant analysis at the Ogden Avenue/Authority Drive intersection upon

Approved 7/6/15

occupancy of the tower and auto service center in order to ensure adequate traffic movement exists at this location.

Continuing, the existing utilities and stormwater facilities were sufficient for the site. Sidewalk connections were noted between the office building and the service center. Other services to the site were noted: garbage pick up, deliveries, training, auto repair work; and sufficient parking and stacking spaces. As a proposed condition of approval, it was noted that lighting at the site was to be lowered to security level or turned off due to adjacent residential uses and due to the nearby hotel. Detail of the auto service center floor plan was described by Ms. Chrissy, as was the proposed service centers' building materials.

One of the requested sign variations would allow three wall signs on the south facade to face Ogden Avenue due to the two planes of the facade and because the building was a multi-use facility. Two of the signs will be box signs, while the third sign will be applied lettering on metal banding, which will maintain the company's branding concept. Elevations of the building/signs followed, noting the north elevation would be the primary entrance for trainees. A second sign variation is being requested to permit a sign on the north facade. The sign for this facade is to ensure adequate visibility for people coming from the north entering Authority Drive. The proposed signs, although requesting two variations for the number of signs, would not exceed the total sign allocation of 300 square feet.

Ms. Chrissy discussed how the proposal met the requirements of the village's code and the goals of the comprehensive plan. She recommended the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the village council subject to the conditions in staff's report.

Questions followed whether the access would run with the property under the reciprocal agreement (it would); whether the public would have access to the property (it would); and the details of the signal analysis that was to be done since there would be full occupancy of the building and whether those costs would be shared among other property owners. Per Ms. Chrissy, staff was only recommending that the petitioner have a signal analysis done due to the increased traffic anticipated. Mr. Popovich confirmed it was a recommendation to the petitioner only because staff had not received concurrence from IDOT in terms of what requirements would be necessary. Discussion followed from staff that in addition to the anticipated increased traffic from the occupancy of the building, the traffic study also took into account future traffic projections from Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning. The future no-build language was a base line with no new construction taking place (service center) and full occupancy of the tower only. Lastly, per the chairwoman's question, box signs were allowed at this location.

Mr. Michael Cassa, president of the Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation, 5159 Mochel Drive, Downers Grove, stated he was contacted by Transwestern Investment Group who had an international client searching for a site for an auto service center. Details followed on the economic importance of this development: new construction, new jobs, largest business to come to the village since DeVry came to the village in 2009. The Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation supported the project and appreciated staff's cooperation with the petitioner.

The petitioner's team came forward and introduced themselves: Mr. Joseph Stevens with Transwestern Investment represented the owner/petitioner; Mr. Kent Ilhardt with Cushman,

Approved 7/6/15

Wakefield, 200 S. Wacker Drive, Chicago was the realtor representing the client; and Mr. Mark Stenftenagel was with Whitney Architects. Mr. Stevens discussed the opportunity before the commission, noting the outlot was an important part of the corporate headquarter's identity. The site was underutilized but offered much parking. Mr. Hillhart shared the physical building/land requirements needed for his client. Mr. Stenftenagel addressed the signage noting the branding opportunity was important for future sales of the petitioner's concept across the country and internationally.

Asked what the proposed architecture was supposed to say about the company, Mr. Stenftenagel explained the company was a very high tech automotive company and the materials used were chosen by the company, which is known for using such materials in their buildings.

Chairperson Urban opened up the hearing for public comment; no comments followed. The petitioner had no further closing statement. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioners discussed that the opportunity to find a site that suited the office headquarters and outlot was unique and it was a benefit to fill the office tower space. Access was good to the site and the signal warrant analysis was understandable and could be beneficial to the tenant. However, Mr. Quirk voiced concern as to where the funding would come from with the traffic analysis. He did not believe it was the petitioner's responsibility to fund the analysis and it did not need to be a condition in staff's report. Mr. Webster, however, provided his perspective of why it was necessary, shared his own personal experience, and believed staff could require it because it was one of the standards. Further dialog followed. Continuing, Mr. Webster believed all of the other standards were met and he did not see any issues with the sign variations being requested.

WITH RESPECT TO 15-PLC-0015, MR. RICKARD MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE PROPOSED FINAL PLAT OF SUBDIVISION, REZONING, SPECIAL USE AND SIGN VARIATION REQUESTS TO CONSTRUCT AN AUTO SERVICE CENTER AT THE CORRIDORS OFFICE COMPLEX SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE CORRIDORS RESUBDIVISION PREPARED BY EDWARD J. MOLLOY & ASSOCIATES, LTD., DATED APRIL 28, 2015; SITE IMPROVEMENT PLANS: CORRIDORS SERVICE GARAGE, PREPARED BY WOOLPERT INC., DATED APRIL 29, 2015; AND ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS FOR THE AUTO SERVICE CENTER, PREPARED BY CHADHA & ASSOCAITES, DATED APRIL 3, 2015, LAST REVISED APRIL 28, 2015, ATTACHED TO THIS REPORT EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO VILLAGE CODES, ORDINANCES, AND POLICIES;**
- 2. A RECIPROCAL ACCESS EASEMENT SHALL BE GRANTED TO BOTH LOTS FOR ACCESS TO THE SHARED ACCESS POINTS AND PARKING;**
- 3. A COMPLETE SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS IS REQUIRED FOR THE OGDEN AVENUE AND AUTHORITY DRIVE INTERSECTION WITHIN ONE YEAR OF THE TENANT'S OCCUPANCY OF BOTH THE OFFICE TOWER AND THE AUTO SERVICE CENTER; AND**

Approved 7/6/15

- 4. WITHIN 30 MINUTES OF THE CLOSE OF THE AUTO SERVICE BUSINESS, ON A DAILY BASIS, THE OUTDOOR LIGHTING SHALL BE EXTINGUISHED OR REDUCED TO SECURITY LEVEL.**

SECONDED BY MR. MATEJCZYK. ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MR. RICKARD, MR. MATEJCZYK, MR. BASSLER, MR. QUIRK, MR. WEBSTER,
CHAIRPERSON URBAN**

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

15-PLC-0011: A petition seeking an amendment to Article 5, Allowed Uses; Article 9, Signs; and Article 13, Administration and Enforcement, of Chapter 28 of the Municipal Code. The purpose of the request is 1) to amend Section 28.5.010 to permit limited warehousing activities in the O-R Office Research zoning district; and 2) to amend various sections within Articles 9 and 13 with regard to enforcement provisions and fines. Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

For the village, Mr. Popovich explained that two amendment requests were before the commissioners: the first was to allow storage, processing and distribution of finished consumer-ready products, as a special use, and the second request was to clarify provisions in Articles 9 (sign ordinance) and 13 (administration and enforcement provision). He explained there were basically two locations for O-R Office Research districts in the village -- 31st and Highland Avenue, and a single site in the Esplanade Properties. Allowed uses in the O-R district were referenced. Proposed was a special use for storage/warehouse and staff was requesting a special use so that a public review process took place. The text amendment would limit the size of such warehousing and limit the type of product that would be completed. It also limited the distribution methods for the products. Mr. Popovich explained where such text amendment would be listed in the village's ordinance, noting there the special use standards would have to be followed, along with three additional approval criteria: 1) the use would not be detrimental to the existing parking, loading and circulation patterns; 2) the existing building was suitable for the proposed use; and 3) the use would not be injurious to other tenants in the building.

Commissioners were asked to consider the use and how it related to the village's O-R districts within the comprehensive plan and how it supported office development along Interstates 88, 355, and the Butterfield Road corridors. Per staff, the use would have to be compatible with other uses in the O-R district and the Class A office space that is found within the O-R district. Lastly, Mr. Popovich reminded the commissioners that the parking and circulation would also have to be considered.

Regarding revisions to Article 9, changes would include placing a numerical address to the monument signage under Section 9.060, the *Downtown Business/Downtown Transition*, in the Fairview concentrated business district. Under Section 9.120, *Enforcement*, temporary signs and signs that did not require a permit were better clarified, such as garage sale signs or political signs. Illegal signs would be given a ten-day removal notice since they were more a permanent-style installation.

Approved 7/6/15

Lastly, Section 13.020, *Enforcement Provisions for Fines*, etc., clarified where the fines were located, i.e., Chapter 1.

Dialog followed on how manufacturing and processing were becoming less of a fine line and having the extra overview by the commission was beneficial. Adding to that, it was pointed out by Mr. Webster that this appeared to be an active request to change how Class A properties could be leased and he agreed that having such checks and balances were appropriate.

Chairperson Urban opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Michael Cassa, President of the Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation, 5159 Mogul, Downers Grove, stressed the importance of the Class A office market being very important to the village's local economy and thanked staff for their attention to detail on this matter.

No further public comment followed; public hearing closed.

Per a question, Mr. Popovich stated he did review some similar ordinances in Illinois regarding this matter, but there were variations in the ordinances, such as being classified under Research & Development. Mr. Ainsworth also shared his own experience, coming from another community, and mentioned the request was in line with many other communities in Illinois. General questions followed on whether the special use would be tied to the building or the tenant. Chairperson Urban shared her own experiences with such use, noting it becomes a case by case basis.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 15-PLC-0011, MR. WEBSTER MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCI, AS PRESENTED.

SECONDED BY MR. RICKARD. ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MR. WEBSTER, MR. RICKARD, MR. BASSLER, MR. QUIRK, MR. MATEJCZYK,
CHAIRPERSON URBAN**

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Popovich announced there may be one item for next month, but it is still under staff review. He also announced that it was Mr. Matejczyk's last meeting. Mr. Popovich thanked Mr. Matejczyk for his many years of services to this commission. Mr. Matejczyk also stated it was an honor to have served this commission.

Mr. Michael Cassa, President of the Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation, returned and stated this was his first time attending a Plan Commission meeting and he was very impressed with how the meeting was run.

Approved 7/6/15

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:40 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. RICKARD,
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 6/24/15

**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
APRIL 22, 2015 MINUTES**

Call to Order

Chairman White called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Roll Call

Present: Mr. Domijan, Ms. Earl, Ms. Majauskas, Mr. McCann, Mr. Mosey, Mr. Zaba,
Ch. White

A quorum was established.

Staff: Kelley Chrissie, Planner
Stan Popovich, AICP, Planning Division Manager

Also Present: John Tillotson 5232 Benton Ave.
Charles Smart, 4804 Main St.
Gordon Goodman, 5834 Middaugh Ave.
Joe Abel, 200 Forest Ave., Glen Ellyn
Ken Lerner, 4933 Whiffen Pl.
John Hebert, 802 Maple Ave.

Minutes of February 25, 2015 meeting

Mr. McCann moved, seconded by Mr. Domijan to approve the minutes of the February 25, 2015 meeting as presented.

All in favor. The Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting Procedures

Chairman White explained the function of the Zoning Board of Appeals, and reviewed the procedures to be followed during the public hearing, verifying with Staff that all proper notices have been published with regard to the case on the Agenda. He called upon anyone intending to speak before the Board on the Agenda item to rise and be sworn in, as the public information portion of the meeting is an evidentiary hearing and comments made during this portion of the meeting are considered testimony. Chairman White explained that members of the Zoning Board of Appeals all have had the opportunity to review the documents for the petition prior to the meeting. In order for a requested variation to be approved there must be a majority of four votes in favor of approval. Chairman White added that the Zoning Board of Appeals has authority to grant petitions without further recommendations being made to the Village Council. He noted that Staff would make its presentation first, followed by comments by the Petitioner. He said that if anyone in the audience wishes to speak either in favor of or in opposition to a petition, they would be able to do so following the Petitioner's presentation. When the public participation portion of the meeting is closed, the Board will deliberate on the information provided and vote to either approve or deny the petition.

.....

APPROVED 6/24/15

15-ZBA-0002: A petition seeking a height variation for an accessory structure. The property is currently zoned R-4, Residential Detached House 4, and is located on the south side of Maple Avenue, approximately 110 west of Fairmount Avenue, commonly known as 743 Maple Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 09-08-402-021); Lauri Wast & John Tillotson, Petitioners & Owners.

Staff's Presentation:

Ms. Kelley Chrisse, Planner for the Village of Downers Grove, stated that the petitioners are requesting a height variation to permit the repurposing of an existing principal structure as an accessory structure. The subject property is commonly known as 743 Maple Avenue and is located on the south side of Maple Avenue, approximately 110 feet west of Fairmount Avenue, and is zoned R-4, Residential Detached House 4, improved with a single family home and detached garage and is surrounded by R-4 zoning. Ms. Chrisse said that the structure is a two-story residence built in 1898 consisting of approximately 1,400 square feet. The petitioners have looked into adding on to the structure, however, doing so would affect its integrity. The only other structure currently on the property is a detached garage. Access to the property is via an alley south of the property that is entered via Fairmount Avenue. She showed a diagram of the proposed reconfiguration of the property that is underway. Ms. Chrisse then displayed the proposed site plan for the property. She noted that the aforementioned house is currently vacant and the petitioners propose to repurpose it as an accessory structure. The proposed primary structure, the Edwards House, currently sits at 942 Maple Avenue. The petitioners have been in discussion with the Village for relocation of the Edward's House to enable the house to become the principal structure on the site. It will be used as a single-family detached house. If the Edwards House is not relocated, a new principal structure will be constructed on the property. The accessory structure will continue to face Maple Avenue, and the existing garage will be demolished. In terms of setback it will be 28-feet from the rear lot line, and 8-feet from the east lot line. It will be 190-feet from the front setback. The house will be located on the newly purposed property and access will be from the alley. The first floor will be used as a garage, with the second floor being used as a studio or a loft. The proposal is not to change the existing façade. The only changes proposed are to relocate it and modify it to convert it to a detached garage. The existing height of the structure on its current foundation is 28-feet, 10-inches tall, but the relocated height will be 26-feet, 10-inches. The height of the structure, as relocated and repurposed, requires a height variation since the maximum height is 23-feet per the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Chrisse showed photographs of the existing structure from the Maple Avenue right-of-way, as well as elevations of the repurposed house, and the access from the alleyway. In 2001 the Historical Society declared Maple Avenue as an Honorary Historic District. The property was surveyed in the architectural survey of 2013, and will be updated with the new information provided with this petition.

The proposal is consistent with recommendations found in the Comprehensive Plan, which calls for preserving and enhancing single-family neighborhoods. The Plan also recognizes development pressures in originally subdivided neighborhoods in close proximity to the downtown area. The petitioner proposes to preserve the structure that sits on the property as well as the Edwards House to retain some of the Village's heritage.

Ms. Chrisse said that the modernization of these residential structures should not conflict with historic preservation, and the ability to repurpose the structure that is relatively small in the scope

APPROVED 6/24/15

of single family homes today would fit that recommendation. In terms of this proposal and the unique circumstances of this proposal, the average size of a new home in 2014 was approximately 2,600 square feet, which is about twice the size of this home. In terms of trying to modify the structure to make it more suitable to modern housing preferences, that would significantly alter the appearance of the structure, thereby losing its historical integrity. Maple Avenue has long been regarded as a community asset and this house has been part of that corridor for more than a century. The proposal to repurpose the house will make it consistent with other properties in the area that has a clustering of detached garages along the alleyway. The petitioner hopes to preserve this structure as well as the Edwards House, thereby retaining some of the Village's rich history.

Regarding Standards for approval, Staff finds that they are all met as noted in Staff's Report dated April 22, 2015, pages 3 and 4. Staff recommends approval subject to the conditions listed in Staff's report, which requires that the property must be transferred prior to the relocation of this structure, the structure must be nominated for historic designation within a year, and the variation would only apply to the existing house as long as the integrity is maintained even if the structure could not be designated historically for whatever reason that may be.

Mr. Domijan asked if they would be able to have a house with a garage. Ms. Chrise said it is possible if they wanted to have an attached garage and a detached garage that they would be entitled to one, provided that they meet all other requirements of the Ordinance. Mr. Domijan asked if the "coach house" would have some additional living space upstairs, and Ms. Chrise responded that it is "usable" space, though there will be no bathroom facilities and there has been no discussion about plumbing facilities of any kind for the accessory facility. The petitioner said it is being considered more as an office space or recreational area. Mr. Domijan then asked for purposes of consistency how much of a house can comprise a garage area and Ms. Chrise said there is no maximum amount stated.

Mr. Mosey said the reports mentions 1898 as the age of the building, yet the historical survey says construction was in 1910. Ms. Chrise said that would also be updated. Some of the information was estimated and since the survey was conducted additional data has been obtained. Mr. Mosey asked if this does not happen, is this petitioner tied in directly with the Edwards House only. Ms. Chrise said the petitioner would still want to see this happen.

Mr. Domijan said there is a timing issue here as they are seeking a variance trying to convert this to an accessory structure, yet it cannot exist until a principal residence exists. In addition they have to grant a variation that goes with the land on a purchase agreement that is not complete and a lot reconfiguration that does not exist. Ms. Chrise said that the variation would be conditioned upon the completion of a lot reconfiguration and the property changes ownership. If that is not met the variation does not occur. As to timing, in order for the Village to issue a permit to move the existing house to the rear of the lot as an accessory structure, the petitioner has to have a building permit for a single-family home whether it is the Edward's House or a brand new house. They would have to have the plans approved.

Chairman White said that if there were no principal structure, this house would be the principal structure and no variation would be required. Ms. Chrise responded that they would not be able to locate it where it is because the setbacks would need to be 10% of the lot width. The validity of the variation depends upon meeting the conditions stated. Ms. Chrise said the variation would be valid as long as they met the requirements and the timing issues would come into play.

APPROVED 6/24/15

The variation would not be null and void if they didn't have the principal structure plans in for review. It could be tied into the same permit.

Mr. Mosey asked if the historical survey is done. Ms. Chrisse said that there are other parts of the community that are still being recommended for survey and the Architectural Design Review Board is creating a work plan to review the properties now.

Ms. Earl disclosed that she is on the Board of the Pierce Downers Heritage Alliance, has no financial interest in this case or the Edward House, has made no donations nor has any funds or interests monetarily on behalf of the Edward's House or this case, and as to the information on page 28 of the historical survey, it is her work. She also stated that she recused herself from the vote by the Pierce Downer Heritage Alliance Board's decision to support this petition.

Petitioner's presentation:

Mr. John Tillotson of 5232 Benton Avenue, Downers Grove, said they have owned the property for twenty years. They became attracted to Downers Grove and this property and thought the existing home was a beautiful historic home. They have always had an emotional attachment to the house, in particular his daughter. They lived in the home for the first five years, and their needs grew beyond the size of the home and have maintained it as an investment property. They presently live around the corner from the subject property. They have always been perplexed on what to do with the property. They did not want to see the existing house demolished and replaced with a really large house that didn't fit the area. Everyone who has seen the home or been inside has recognized its historical and unique character. Their latest plan was to put an addition onto the home, which would stay true to the architectural style to the home. They learned about the Edward's House and chose to try and save the Edward's House. They wanted to find a way to relocate the Edward's House to their property but they would have to knock down their existing historic house. While talking with the mover, they said they were told that moving the house would be easy to do, and would cost approximately what it would cost them to build a new three-car garage. That is how they got the idea of using the house as an accessory structure. There is an environmental impact that they see by simply repurposing the house to the back of their lot. There is sufficient space on the lot. Mr. Jerry Moore is the seller of the back parcel to allow the relocation of the Edward's House. With respect to the Edward's House, it is still active and they are unsure whether it will ultimately happen. They are prepared to follow-through with the relocation of the Edward's House onto their property. They intend to move back to the property no matter what. If the Edward's House does not go through, they will build a primary residence on the lot. They have become very passionate about historical preservation and think it is an important thing to do in Downers Grove.

Mr. Domijan asked the square footage of the existing structure, and Mr. Tillotson said the record says it is 1400 square feet with two small bedrooms on the second level. Ms. Chrisse said the footprint is 935 square feet, which falls below the 1,000 square feet maximum for accessory structures.

There being no further questions, Chairman White called upon anyone in the audience who wished to speak in favor of or in opposition to this petition.

Mr. Charley Smart of 4804 Main Street, said he was President of the Downers Grove Heritage Corporation, commonly known as the Blodgett House Group. They were responsible for identifying, moving and saving the Blodgett House from demolition and eventually donating it to

APPROVED 6/24/15

the Downers Grove Park District where it now exists as part of the Historical Museum. Mr. Smart then voiced his support of this request, which would allow repurposing the Edward's House onto the subject property. He noted that there are two primary benefits to active reuse. Consideration should be given to the positive impact on the environment by minimizing construction waste and putting unnecessary pressure on overused landfills. In this case, repurposing the house at 743 Maple to the subject property will aid in preserving the character of the community, and reflecting the demographic of the locale in that period of Downers Grove's history.

M. Joseph Abel of 200 Forest Avenue in Glen Ellyn stated he is a planning and economic development consultant. He was retained to review the Standards that have to be met for the variation, and to provide his opinion as to the proposed use. He noted his background in terms of familiarity with the Village's Ordinances, stating he has been involved in the general area for more than 17 years. He reviewed the Zoning Ordinance, walked the site and visited with some of the surrounding neighbors to determine the character of the neighborhood. He then reviewed the Standards. He referred to documents he placed on the dais for the Board's review with regard to the addition of the rear lot to the site. If the repurposed structure had to be lowered, it would destroy its historic credibility and would lessen its value. Mr. Abel provided photographs explaining the reasons why he believed the petitioner's request should be granted. He noted in an aerial photograph the distances between the subject property and the adjacent buildings. Mr. Abel said that the repurposing and relocation of the existing structure would not in any way alter the character of the surrounding area. From a land use standpoint the area is totally residential, and the relocated structure will continue to fit in with the historical character of the neighborhood. He said that even if the owners had to rebuild their existing home, it would also be built to fit in to the architectural design of the location. Mr. Abel said that going through all the standards and conducting field surveys of the area it is his professional opinion that granting this variation will in no way affect the character, value, or adjoining properties in any negative way.

Mr. Ken Lerner of 4933 Whiffen Place said he represented Pierce Downers Heritage Alliance and is speaking in favor of this variation. The Alliance's mission is preserving the natural and cultural heritage of Downers Grove and they believe granting this variation is consistent with that mission, and is an appropriate use of the Zoning Board's power to grant variations. They agree with Staff's recommendation and previous speakers' comments regarding the value of historical preservation to the Village. He emphasized the uniqueness of this particular petition and situation, noting that granting a variation in this situation allows the preservation of an older structure, and possibly two older structures. This would be a hardship to not only the Tillotsons and the immediate neighborhood, but to the Village in general in terms of what the homes mean to the preservation of the historic aspect of the neighborhood.

Mr. Domijan asked, in researching the subject property, whether there was any disclosure of any historic significance regarding the property. Ms. Chrise said that it was more of a survey concerning the property itself rather than researching prior ownership or events related to the building. Mr. Lerner said in the process of land marking property that type of information is generally brought forward.

Dr. Gordon Goodman of 5834 Middaugh, Board member of Pierce Downers Heritage Alliance, said he was offering testimony as a fifty-year resident of the community. He has enjoyed watching this house in the Christmas season, as it looks like classic Downers Grove. He hoped that the Board's agreement with the variation would preserve the beauty of the house. He also

APPROVED 6/24/15

wanted to point out that this is a very large lot for R-4 zoning with 125' frontage. The lot could be susceptible to redevelopment, different scale and different appearance. This petition would stabilize the lot, whether or not the Edward House is moved to the site. Dr. Goodman said he strongly supports the Board's approval of this variation.

Mr. John Hebert of 802 Maple lives across the street from the property. He is happy to see this house being saved. He doesn't think this use and moving of the house will impair the neighborhood in any way. Other houses in the area have auxiliary structures on the property, including 809, 819 and 806 Maple, which all have accessory structures. He sees no problem with this request.

There being no further comments or discussion, Chairman White closed the opportunity for further public comment.

Board's Deliberation:

Mr. McCann said he is generally in favor of this. He doesn't see this as creating a precedent for similar petitions in the future. He believes the request is consistent with the character of Maple Avenue.

Mr. Mosey said he thinks Staff has done a wonderful job of putting together various components of plusses and minuses in this case. Also, Staff's willingness to preserve Downers Grove is commendable in this particular situation.

Mr. Domijan said this has a lot of moving parts that puts an onus on Staff to monitor. He thinks the creative use of the property merits a lot of weight. This is a unique use for the property. As for the timing, Mr. Domijan said that Staff will have to monitor this closely.

Ms. Majauskas said the most interesting comment she heard was that this would keep the R-4 lot as big as it is. She agrees that Staff will have to monitor all aspects of this request closely.

Chairman White asked if there would be a problem with adding a condition that the variation requires that the petitioner submit within a reasonable time plans for a primary structure. Mr. Popovich said if they don't move the house within a year the variance is null and void anyway. This is not unusual but also not unprecedented for Staff.

Mr. Zaba concurs with the previous statements and finds there is a hardship with bringing the structure into compliance and retaining the historical integrity.

Ms. Earl said she agrees that this meets the Standards for approval.

There being no contrary opinion from the Board, Chairman White called for a Motion.

Mr. Zaba moved that in case 15-ZBA-0002, the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the petition subject to the conditions in Staff's report dated April 22, 2015. Ms. Majauskas seconded the Motion.

**AYES: Mr. Zaba, Ms. Majauskas, Mr. Domijan, Ms. Earl, Mr. McCann, Mr. Mosey,
Ch. White**

APPROVED 6/24/15

NAYS: None

The Motion to approve carried unanimously.

.....

Mr. Popovich said there is one petition for May. He noted that this was Chairman White's last meeting and thanked him for all the years of service he has given to the Zoning Board of Appeals. He joined the ZBA in 1996 and has been Chairman since 2002. Chairman White is leaving the ZBA to serve on the Village Council.

ADJOURNMENT:

Ms. Earl moved, seconded by Mr. Zaba, to adjourn the meeting.

All in favor. The Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman White adjourned the meeting at 8:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Tonie Harrington
Recording Secretary