

APPROVED 10/7/15

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
AND
AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
PUBLIC WORKS – LUNCH ROOM
5101 WALNUT AVENUE

SEPTEMBER 16, 2015, 6:30 P.M.

Chairman Pro tem Davenport called the September 16, 2015 meeting of the Architectural Design Review Board and AdHoc Subcommittee on Historic Preservation meetings to order at 6:33 p.m. and asked for a roll call:

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

PRESENT: Chairman Pro tem Davenport, Members Mr. Casey, Ms. Englander, Mr. Riemer

ABSENT: Chairman Matthies, Mrs. Acks, Mr. Larson

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

PRESENT: Chairman Behm, Members Mr. Birch, Ms. Gassen, Mr. Geocaris, Mr. Jarosz, Mr. Zimolzak

ABSENT: Mr. Leitschuh

STAFF: Deputy Village Manager Mike Baker and Planning Manager Stan Popovich

VISITORS: John and Kathy Hebert, 802 Maple Ave., Downers Grove; Don Richards, 4735 Main St., Downers Grove; Mr. Philip Shaw, 5117 Brookbank Rd., Downers Grove; Mr. Mark Thoman, 1109 61st St., Downers Grove; Mr. Rich Kulovany, 6825 Camden Rd., Downers Grove; Ms. Melissa Nyssen 900 59th St., Downers Grove; Mr. Scott Lazar, 808 Maple Ave., Downers Grove; Ms. Peg Knight, 1101 Maple, Downers Grove; Mr. Gordon Goodman, 5834 Middaugh, Downers Grove; Chuck and Byron Holtzen, 5226 Carpenter St., Downers Grove

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – AD-HOC SUBCOMMITTEE – SEPTEMBER 2, 2015

THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 2, 2015 AD-HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. JAROSZ, SECONDED BY MS. GASSEN. VOICE VOTE:

AYE: MR. BIRCH, MS. GASSEN, MR. GEOCARIS, MR. JAROSZ, MR. ZIMOLZAK, CHAIRMAN BEHM

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-0

APPROVED 10/7/15

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – ADRB – SEPTEMBER 2, 2015

THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 2, 2015 ADRB MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MS. ENGLANDER, SECONDED BY MR. RIEMER. VOICE VOTE:

AYE: MR. CASEY, MS. ENGLANDER, MR. RIEMER

NAY: NONE

ABSTAIN: MR. DAVENPORT

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 3-0-1

DOWNERS GROVE ORDINANCE – REVIEW TERM SHEET

Chairman Behm reviewed the powers and duties charged to each of the two committees by the Village Council. He reviewed the general duties and responsibilities of the Subcommittee and felt that both Boards were working with each other and proceeding to meet those duties and responsibilities. Asked if the two committees felt they were on task, general comments from the groups were positive and that they should focus on Goal No. 2.

In response to some questions, Mr. Baker handed out a term sheet that was focusing on narrowing down some of the ideas and concepts that may make their way into a draft ordinance. The draft ordinance would come at the next meeting. Mr. Jarosz had hoped to see a draft ordinance from village staff along with the ordinance from the Downers Grove Families for Sensible Historic Preservation in order to compare the two since some good recommendations were made in both documents.

After discussing the matter, it was decided to follow staff's lead and expand the term sheet to cover Goal No. 2 and the district idea. Mr. Baker explained how the term sheet was created in order to "capture" what the two committees had been discussing over the past meetings, finding common themes, and then becoming more specific. Details followed.

Key Proposed Changes to the Historic Preservation Ordinance

Addressing Key Proposed Change No. 1, Mr. Popovich asked for consensus whether a permit was needed on window and door replacements. A hearty discussion followed. Chairman Behm circled the discussion around and asked both committees if they agreed that if someone wanted to replace a window or door and the opening size did not change or affect the structure, did the applicant need a COA? If the door/window was the same size, the only concern Ms. Gassen voiced was would the replacements work with the character of the home? It was then brought up that the two committees would give leeway to siding, roofing and other elements, and if they were going to impose requirements for windows to include divided lights, etc., the committees had to be careful and consistent – remembering that the committees already discussed keeping structures versus making them historic and decreasing the loss.

The conversation then turned to someone removing a double-hung window and replacing it with glass block, wherein it was noted that was the very reason for the review process. But then it was brought up that a public hearing/notification process would have to take place. Dialog

APPROVED 10/7/15

followed that the windows/doors issue was minor compared to other aspects and if the two committees felt it was important for someone to review the windows and doors as it relates to the character to the home, then it should be important. Asked if changing the windows or door, or even the type of siding could affect a building's historic significance, some members thought it could. Mr. Casey mentioned the concise marketing piece that the City of Moline used for its landmarking.

Because so much time was spent on this topic, dialog followed that staff would take a straw poll of the members on each of the 13 Key Proposed Changes and if there were not objections, staff would move forward or make minor modifications.

Key Point No. 1 – No objections. Move forward.

Key Point No. 2 – No objections. Mr. Jarosz clarified that this applied to exterior improvements only. Members agreed to use standard language either found in other ordinances or use a graphic to depict the 90 degree angle suggestion, as suggested by staff. Move forward.

Key Point No. 3 – No objections. Move forward.

Key Point No. 4 – No objections. Staff will make minor revisions. Move forward.

Key Point No. 5 – No objections. Move forward.

Key Point No. 6 - No objections. Staff will research other codes. Move forward.

Key Point No. 7 – No objections. Move forward.

Key Point No. 8 – Ms. Englander noted that the provision is subjective. Staff noted in other situations, neglect is handled through the village's property code maintenance. A suggestion was made to refer to the village's property code maintenance and remove Key Point 8 all together.

Key Point No. 9 – No objections. Move forward.

Key Point No. 10 – No objections. Move forward.

Key Point No. 11 – No objections. Move forward.

Key Point No. 12 – No objections. Move forward.

Key Point No. 13 – Mr. Popovich introduced the idea of creating a sliding scale for approval based on the number of consenting property owners. Mr. Riemer suggested 100% consent would be less controversial. Mr. Casey suggested leaving it at 51% and the change should be made based on only one instance of a district being considered. He noted district may be a long way off.

Mr. Davenport noted that if it was changed to 100% it may appear that districts are not a priority. He noted he had no problem with the current ordinance. Chairman Behm noted it is hard to get a district but how do you make people comfortable with a district, 100% would make people comfortable. Ms. Gassen brought up the possibility of a non-contiguous district, but noted it would need to be thematic, i.e. all Four Squares or all Sears (kit) homes. Mr. Popovich confirmed a thematic district could not typically include various style homes in one thematic district. Chairman Behm noted the controversy with the 51%, while Ms. Gassen noted with 100% it may not increase the likelihood of a district being created. Chairman Behm noted the 100% gives people an opportunity to participate if they choose, but if they don't want to participate they don't have to.

APPROVED 10/7/15

Members agreed to remove Key Point 13 and instead require 100% consent for a historic district.

Key Proposed Changes to the Administrative User-Fee Schedule

Key Point No. 1 – Dialog followed to eliminate the words “offset the impact of eliminating filing fees” and for staff to review the incremental increase in demolition fees and determine how it would affect the preservation efforts. Move forward.

Key Point No. 2 - No objections. Move forward.

Key Proposed Changes to the Application and Review Process

Key Point No. 1 – No objections. Move forward.

Key Point No. 2 – No objections. Move forward.

Key Point No. 3 – No objections. Move forward.

(The committees took a five minute break at 7:50 pm; reconvened at 7:55 pm)

Public Education and Awareness Strategies

Per Mr. Baker, if there was concurrence with the strategies it would be turned into a work plan.

Strategy No. 1 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 2 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 3 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 4 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 5 – Mr. Jarosz noted this item shouldn't be a priority right now and wondered how to define areas for new surveys. Overall, no objections but to add “continue to complete/update/revise” surveys. Move forward.

Strategy No. 6 - No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 7 – No objections. Mr. Geocar is suggested coming up with a hash tag for historic preservation in the Village. Move forward.

Strategy No. 8 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 9 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 10 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 11 – No objections. Ms. Gassen suggested the plaque be presented to the property owners at a Village Council meeting. Move forward.

Strategy No. 12 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 13 – No objections. Add anyone who does a “decent” rehab on a structure, new construction that matches what is in the neighborhood. Glen Ellyn has four categories. Move forward.

Strategy No. 14 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 15 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 16 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 17 – No objections. Add design guidelines as a resource. Chairman Behm suggested that members keep in contact with those surveyed property owners who expressed

APPROVED 10/7/15

interest in the possibility of landmarking their properties. A discussion ensued about what to say to those property owners and how to keep them interested. It was noted it would need to occur quickly so no time or momentum is lost. Mr. Davenport suggested sending interested parties a summary of what has been discussed by the Village. Move forward.

Incentive Strategies

Strategy No. 1 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 2 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 3 – Chairman Behm suggested “historic” improvements not only in districts, but throughout the Village to create character. Mr. Casey inquired about maintenance and how Special Service Areas have been used in the past. No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 4 – No objections. Move forward.

Strategy No. 5 – No objections. Staff was asked to clarify what was meant by a rebate program. Move forward.

Dialog followed regarding the earlier comment about disincentive where someone who wanted to demolish a building would have to pay a higher fee to do it and possibly think twice about demolishing it. However, in talking through the matter, Chairman Pro tem Davenport believed there was a “gray” area that existed and it could be a potential “tool” used for unintended purposes in terms of control from the village side.

Members discussed the reasons why someone would purchase a property only to demo the structure, i.e., the land was more valuable or the structure had the same value as the land. Mr. Davenport reminded everyone that increasing fees does not affect a builder when constructing a new home, wherein, it affects the owner who is adding on to his or her structure or remodeling a home.

Mr. Jarosz suggested an increase in demolition fees for new construction only. Mr. Zimolzak suggested an increased fee on demolition of historic properties, but the discussion was had about what would constitute a historic property. Just a surveyed property or a listed property. Talk of a having a two-tier fee structure for full teardowns and partial teardowns was suggested as was discussion about the village staff having a list of the “vulnerable” structures within the village, similar to Landmarks Illinois and the National Trust. Mr. Jarosz suggested contacting the various preservation organizations and the community and asking them for their top 10 vulnerable buildings in the village. The information could then be compared, publicized, and promoted, thereby educating the community and creating less discourse when the next “Edwards” house came up. Mr. Davenport noted there isn’t a precedent for that to occur, as the Plan Commission doesn’t go out and solicit comments. Mr. Geocariz suggested engaging middle and high school students in debates about preservation, getting them to talk and to talk about it at home.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Behm opened up the meeting to public comment and stated five minutes would be allowed for each person.

APPROVED 10/7/15

Mr. Philip Shaw, 5117 Brookbank Rd., welcomed historic preservation. He shared how his own father took him and his siblings to historic places when they were younger. He learned five standards about historic preservation from a professor. The subject property represents: 1) the first of its kind; 2) the last of its kind; 3) the best of its kind; 4) is associated with a famous figure; and 5) something historic happened at the site. He stated the committees were discussing public policy on private property and he recommended members to use the five standards, pointing out the Edwards House may have been 100 years old but age was not stated in the five standards. He said the village may have to catch up to acquire one of the five standards for historic preservation. He also reiterated many resources were available to the members and what the public needed was less administration.

Mr. Gordon Goodman, 5834 Middaugh, believed that Key Point No. 7 under “Changes to the Ordinance” was a good recommendation which he supported. He believed the village wanted to reduce the amount of procedure in the committees’ plan yet emphasize the benefits and objectives of historic preservation programs that the village wanted to sponsor. As to Key Point No. 12, he thought it was very innovative to have non-contiguous historic districts but believed a descriptive theme was necessary to identify them. He agreed with the suggestion for D.5. to continue to revise and update the historic building surveys but stated that once they were updated, they should be used. Mr. Goodman distributed copies of the provisions in the village’s current ordinance relating to granting a demolition permit, noting the permit can be granted on the basis of either a site restoration plan or following the first review of a construction plan. He cited the Edwards House as an example and believed that for historically significant buildings that have been identified through the village’s survey it was not appropriate to grant a demolition based on the fact that the building should no longer be located on the site. He hoped the two committees would revise the criteria for granting demolition permits based on the fact that buildings have a historic significance and are to be replaced by another significant building unless they are of public danger. Lastly, under E.3 Incentive Strategies, Mr. Goodman suggested looking at Geneva’s ability to accept private party donations and make certain improvements towards historic structures. Examples followed, noting it gives people a sense of participation.

Mr. Scott Lazar, 808 Maple Ave., appreciated the discussion about the 100% voluntary preservation combined with the non-contiguous approach and believed it would create much interest in the community. He believed there was an opportunity for interest and progress. Mr. Lazar asked the committees to have exceptions in the ordinance based on health and accommodation for those with disabilities.

Mr. Rich Kulovany, 6825 Camden Rd., appreciated the committees’ work and supported the 100% vote. Regarding education, he believed it would be good to get the high schools involved by having debates or essay contests and getting their families engaged.

A note from Melissa Nyssen, 900 59th Street, who could not stay for the meeting, was read by Ms. Gassen. Ms. Nyssen supported having a delay period for demolitions especially if the home was historic. Alternatives could be explored, such as moving or buying it for a set period of time. Ms. Nyssen supported having a significant demolition fee for viable historic buildings.

Other topics discussed included that the definitions for contiguous and non-contiguous districts should be better defined other than just a “theme” for non-contiguous districts, i.e., a kit home versus a Sears home.

APPROVED 10/7/15

In closing, Chairman Behm recommended that the committees read the draft ordinances they were given either by staff or other entities and to review them, comment on what they like/dislike and send them to Mr. Popovich. Dialog followed on how staff would move forward with the draft ordinances previously discussed or supplied, the terms sheet, the input received tonight and what may have not been discussed.

A member asked Mr. Popovich how preservation ordinances address lead paint, asbestos, etc. and ADA requirements, wherein Mr. Popovich said there were no special standards for single-family homes since it was a federal regulation. However, it was suggested that the Moline document, which addresses some of those concerns, be sent to all members and staff.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. ZIMOLZAK MOTIONED TO ADJOURN THE AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION MEETING AT 9:00 P.M. SECONDED BY MR. GEOCARIS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

MR. RIEMER MOTIONED TO ADJOURN THE ADRB MEETING AT 9:01 P.M. SECONDED BY MS. ENGLANDER. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

Respectfully submitted,

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

APPROVED 10/05/15

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

SEPTEMBER 14, 2015, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Rickard called the September 14, 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: Chairman Rickard, Mr. Bassler, Mr. Cozzo, Ms. Hogstrom, Mr. Quirk, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Thoman

ABSENT: Mr. Cronin (ex-officios Davenport, Menninga, Souter)

STAFF: Planning Manager, Stan Popovich; Village Planner Patrick Ainsworth

VISITORS: Downers Grove residents Xhevrije and Fikri Osmani; Jim and Mary Coleman; John Stewart, Tony Hodermory, Tom LeCren, Roger and Jenny Bauman, Matt Klickman; Leslie Barrows, 726 39th St., Downers Grove; Scott Richards, 1130 Warren Ave., Downers Grove; James Stefanish, 18 Sixth St., Downers Grove; Jeffrey Figliulo, 1454 Arrowwood Lane, Downers Grove; Jim Kolodziej School District 99; Byron Wync, Wight & Co.; Anton Hodermarsky, Jr, 22 6th St

Chairman Rickard led the commission in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance and explained the protocol for the meeting.

APPROVAL OF AUGUST 3, 2015 MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2015 MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. COZZO, SECONDED BY MR. THOMAN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2015 MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 3, 2015 MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MS. HOGSTROM, SECONDED BY MR. THOMAN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Chairman Rickard explained the protocol for the public hearings and swore in those individuals that would be speaking on the following petitions:

APPROVED 10/05/15

FILE 15-PLC-0025: A petition seeking approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision to subdivide the existing property into two lots. The property is currently zoned R-3, Residential Detached House 3. The subject property is located on the east side of Victor Street, approximately 130 feet north of 6th Street, commonly known as 5307 Victor Street, Downers Grove, IL (09-09-323- 013). Xhevrije Osmani, Petitioner and Fikri Osmani, Owner.

Planning Manager Stan Popovich located the half-acre R-3 zoned property on the aerial photograph, noting it was 101 feet wide by 237 feet deep. The petitioner would like to split the parcel into two lots just under 51 feet each with two exceptions. The zoning ordinance and subdivision ordinance requires 75-foot wide lot widths when new lots of record are being created. Properties to the south were zoned R-4, properties to the west, north and east were zoned R-3. Mr. Popovich stated that the lot widths in the area ranged from 50 feet to over 100 feet wide. The lots on the petitioner's block were 60 feet plus in width (64% of the block) while the remainder were more than 69 feet wide. Lot widths for the lots west of the site were also shared.

Staff reviewed the comprehensive plan as it related to the proposed lot and pointed out that staff did not feel the proposal met the scale and character of the area due to the block the lot was located on. All of the other lots were larger than what was being proposed. The comprehensive plan notes in-fill redevelopment should be sensitive to the neighborhood context. Staff believed the proposed split could set a precedent and change the density of the area. Therefore, staff did not feel the proposal was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. While the petitioner meets the area requirements, it did not meet the lot width requirements. To date, there were no comments received on the proposal.

Should the petition be approved, staff would require a sidewalk fee in lieu of sidewalks being installed. The fees would be set aside for future installation of sidewalks. A parkway tree fee in-lieu and school and park donations would also be required of the petitioner.

Mr. Popovich reviewed the five standards that exceptions must meet under Section 20.602 of the Subdivision Ordinance and how the proposal did not meet those standards. Staff recommended denial of the petition; however, if the Planning Commission were to forward a positive recommendation, staff recommended to include the conditions listed in staff's report.

Commissioner questions/comments followed as to when the 50-foot lots to the west were platted, i.e. before the Comprehensive Plan (20 years prior) and were they within the village when they were platted. Ms. Hogstrom mentioned there was a home being constructed on a 50 ft. wide lot at 5226 Victor. She then asked staff to explain how the calculation for the school donation was determined because it seemed high. Staff indicated new population tables and value of land went into effect with the new subdivision ordinance. An explanation of how the rates were determined followed.

Petitioners Xhevrije and Frank Osmani were present. Ms. Osmani confirmed she and her husband were the owners of the property for six years and wanted to subdivide it. They initially wanted to build a home on the lot but with the change in the economy and their children grown, they still wanted to build a nice home and remain in the area but the lot was too large now and they wanted to split it. The Osmanis pointed out that new homes were being built on 50-foot wide lots. While they were not necessarily on their block, they were being built and were much smaller homes. Mr. Osmani stated he and his wife have been paying taxes on the property for six years and he has

APPROVED 10/05/15

been unable to sell the lot for the past two years. He believed the school donations and fees for the property were high. He was not sure how the property was being valued. Mr. Osmani stated he wanted to build something more reasonable and make life better for him. He also stated the existing home on the property was unique in that it was a little over 100 years old and the other homes in the area were 50 to 60 years. He believed the home was a teardown because putting money into it was probably not worth it, whereas the other homes could have additions.

Mr. Osmani stated he constructed homes for a living and also rehabbed homes. Ms. Osmani felt that the neighbors probably did not want to see a 6,000 sq. foot home on the lot either, which was out of character for the area but rather two modest homes that would fit into the neighborhood. Mr. Osmani added that the lots would not be affecting drainage either and believed the neighborhood would benefit from the subdivision.

Chairman Rickard opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. James Stafanison 18 6th Street, Downers Grove stated his backyard is the third yard in from 6th and Victor and clarified that he and his neighbors were at the previous meeting ready with comments but the case was continued to tonight and now there were less neighbors in attendance which was unfortunate because of the continuance. He did not support the proposal due to the anticipated construction noise, the potential for water problems, and the fact that it will affect the makeup of the neighborhood, as it is changing now. Two owners prior to this owner told Mr. Stafanison that a septic field exists in the northeast corner. A flood plain exists in the center of the site.

Mr. Anton Hodermarsky, Jr. owner of 22 6th Street is the second home on Victor Street and does not support the lot split due to the same reasons Mr. Stafanison voiced. His yard receives more water than the other homes on 6th Street and it collects in his yard. He stated a three-foot ledge was built on his property 20 years ago and the concrete was pushing forward which meant that land was pushing into his land. For the petitioner to say that construction will not affect anyone is false. He recently created a playground for his child and worried that if the proposed subdivision occurs, more water runoff would come into his property. He recommended the commissioners denying the petition.

Mr. Jerry Figliulo, 1454 Arrowwood Lane, used to have a 50 ft. wide lot and stated a nice size home could be built on a 50 ft. wide lot. He did not see anything addressing water issues in staff's report. He commented that he saw on the agenda a similar petition for Saratoga and Ogden which staff was supportive. However, he stated that if the commission was going to deny this petition, it should deny the Saratoga and Ogden petition. He also noted the other 50-foot wide lots that existed across the street and did not see why the petition should be denied, other than for the water issue.

In response to the comments, Mr. Osmani stated he has owned the house for six years and maintained his water and it did not affect his neighbors. He stated that the person before him who purchased his home two years ago should have put more thought in before he purchased his home and to view where his property drained because his property did not affect that neighbor. His property sat above his neighbors. With regard to creating gardens, etc., those neighbors never cared about the water until they flooded. It was their problem. He believed the water problems should have been fixed before they purchased their properties or when the subdivision was created that the issues began to occur. His property sloped to the north.

APPROVED 10/05/15

Regarding the noise, Ms. Osmani stated that a home will be constructed on the site – whether two homes or one -- and the neighbors will have to get used to it. Other noise factors were pointed out by Mr. Osmani and the fact that he paid for permits and the money was used by the village to maintain the streets, etc. Ms. Osmani added that a “mediocre” home will not be constructed but rather a home that blends in well with the neighborhood.

Mr. Osmani also clarified for the commissioners that when he initially started this process with the village, he was working with someone else and not with Mr. Popovich at the time. This person asked the village a number of questions and if there was a possibility of splitting the lots, otherwise he said they would not have paid the money to move it forward. Mr. Osmani stated he was told that “this is doable” and was supportive of the proposal. He stated that Mr. Popovich became involved two weeks ago and heard that Mr. Popovich was not supportive of the proposal and it was too late.

Mrs. Rabatah asked Mr. Osmani whether he was aware of the subdivision ordinance’s requirements for minimum lot widths when he purchased the lot, to which Mr. Osmani said he was not. He explained that he and his wife loved the property the way it was because they had young children but they eventually grew up and due to financial issues, they could not built on the lot nor did they want such a large parcel now. Per Ms. Osmani, six years ago she and her husband were not looking to split the lot but to build on it as it was.

Mr. Popovich provided a history of when the area was annexed and platted into the village. In the nine years he has been with the village, Mr. Popovich stated the lot widths had always been 75 feet for newly created lots. Mr. Ainsworth also confirmed that the 75 ft. wide lot standard came into effect in 1964. Asked if there was a zoning area that did allow 50 ft. wide lots, Mr. Popovich confirmed that the R-4 zoning was the smallest with many lots located north of the railroad tracks, and many were established when a plat of subdivision occurred in the 1920s or 1930s. Further explanation followed that when a subdivision comes in for a R-4 district, the lot must be 75 feet wide.

Public comment was closed by the chairman.

In reviewing the map on the overhead and in listening to the discussion, Mr. Quirk noted that about half of the Victor addresses had 50-foot wide lots. He did not believe they were impacting property values. Some commissioners felt the 50 ft. wide lots were common, especially across the street, while Ms. Hogstrom stated constructing one large home on such a large lot would not fit in the neighborhood and she agreed with the petitioner’s comments. Mr. Cozzo shared the dilemma he was in because he saw both sides of the argument. However, for him it was a matter of whether the commission agreed with the rationale for the standards or not. If not, then the petition should be denied. If the commission disagrees, then an accommodation needs to be done. Mrs. Rabatah, in being one of the longer standing commissioners, stated the commission has always adhered to meeting the subdivision ordinance with respect to the width; she did not hear a hardship.

Mr. Quirk, however, pointed out that the lot depth was unique as well as the square footage that was being retained for the lot, in that it far exceeded the 10,500 sq. feet. The lots were still very large. However, Mrs. Rabatah expressed concern about precedence and the fact that petitions prior to this were also denied. Mr. Thoman pointed out how these unusually deep lots used to be called “flag” lots due to the difficulty to get rid of them. He believed, however, the 75 feet stated in the

APPROVED 10/05/15

municipal code was very clear and he was not aware of any 100-foot lot within the village being split into two 50-foot lots. He believed that allowing the split would cause a precedent for other owners owning 100 ft. wide lots. Asked if he believed the 50 ft. wide lots would adversely affect property value, Mr. Thoman stated it would because every new house constructed in that subdivision would cause problems for the houses surrounding them. He cited how the village had spent large sums of money razing homes and creating dry and wet basins to remedy the problem of having too much impervious coverage in too small of an area in this area of the village. Ms. Hogstrom pointed to only four other properties that could possibly be split, whereas, Mr. Thoman argued that this would be a precedent set for the entire village and not just this particular area.

Mr. Cozzo reviewed the five standards one by one with one commissioner noting that while there was no trend for 50-foot wide lots, if the petition were approved, then a trend would be created, especially by a builder looking to purchase 100 ft. lots, tear down homes and subdivide them into 50 ft. lots, because land was becoming scarce. Mr. Quirk reminded the commissioners that they had to be mindful of balancing lot widths. He disagreed with staff's response to Standard No. 1 and was not sure what staff was trying to determine with regard to Standard No. 2 but pointed out across the street were six 50-foot wide lots. He agreed with No. 3.

A motion was entertained.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 15-PLC-0025, MR. QUIRK MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO DENY THE PETITION, AS PRESENTED, TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL.

SECONDED BY MR. THOMAN. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. QUIRK, MR. THOMAN, MR. BASSLER, MR. COZZO, MRS. RABATAH, XRIKARD.

NAY: MS. HOGSTROM

MOTION CARRIED TO DENY. VOTE: 6-1.

Ms. Hogstrom stated she felt what the petitioners were proposing fit better with the neighborhood than what could be constructed, which would not come before this commission, and would not fit in with the neighborhood.

FILE 15-PLC-0027: A petition seeking approval of a Special Use to permit a drive through facility with a variation. The property is currently zoned B-3, General Services and Highway Business. The property is located at the southeast corner of Saratoga Avenue and Ogden Avenue, commonly known as 1201 Ogden Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (09-05-302-001 & 002) Vequity LLC Series XVII Downers Ogden, Petitioner and Owner.

Village Planner Mr. Ainsworth located the property on the overhead and reviewed the zoning surrounding the subject property. The site included a one-story vacant commercial building and the petitioner was interested in redeveloping the property into a one-story 5,280 sq. foot retail space that would house two tenants, one of which would be a bank with a drive-through ATM machine and no

APPROVED 10/05/15

teller window. Part of the site was under remediation due the former gas station. He noted a landscape plan for the proposal. Per staff, the petition met all code setbacks except for a one-foot drive-through setback to east property line. Parking spaces, elevations, and signage were referenced as was the parking calculation for each individual use for the two tenants. Staff did not know the exact layout of each space due to the two tenants not signing their contracts yet, but staff did support the 37 spaces when approximately 24 spaces were required. Parking ratio calculations for the two proposed tenants were explained in detail.

Discussing the 10-foot drive-thru lane for the single ATM teller (east elevation), Mr. Ainsworth stated a one-foot setback was being proposed while a 25 feet setback was required, specifically for safety regulations in the design of the drive-through (i.e., pedestrian safety). Mr. Ainsworth stated the petitioner proposed multiple safety elements in the Site Plan to separate the pedestrians from the vehicles. Additionally, staff is placing a condition on the application for a solid six-foot fence to separate the Starbucks drive-thru to the east from the bank's drive-thru lane. Entry and exits for the site were noted on the site plan with staff explaining the petitioner will be using different pavement material to identify the pedestrian connections from the main entrances to Ogden Avenue and to separate the pedestrian interaction from vehicles.

Mr. Ainsworth reviewed the various aspects of the comprehensive plan that supported the petition, stating it was a corridor commercial land use which was auto-oriented but at the same time placing the ATM drive-thru lane on the east side for this specific location was the most logical. Staff supported the proposal.

Per a commissioner's question, Mr. Popovich stated the setback for the Starbucks drive-thru was no more than one or two feet and when it was approved the village at that time did not have the setback separation from businesses. Conversation followed that there were no issues with the Starbucks drive-thru and that staff was basically putting the two drive-thru lanes together – Starbuck's west drive-through with the ATM's east side drive-through to keep the outside areas pedestrian-friendlier. Should the use change/intensify, it could trigger the petition to return to the commission.

Petitioner, Mr. Ryan Murphy, 468 Hill Avenue, Glen Ellyn, part of the developer team from Vequity, LLC, XVII Downers Ogden from Chicago, discussed the challenges of the site: it was tight, it was an assembled parcel, a tank was being removed and a right-in/right-out was being created. In general, he explained how the petition was part of a movement of financial institutions to a smaller format and working with other retail/restaurants. The request for the variance had to do with keeping the drive lane away from corner of Saratoga and Ogden, away from pedestrian traffic, and aesthetics. The building would house two tenants. Building materials were referenced and construction would begin in Spring 2016.

Chairman Rickard opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Jerry Figliulo, 1454 Arrowwood Lane, Downers Grove, explained in his own words why the site plan was created by the petitioner the way it was proposed. He was glad a fence was mentioned. He voiced concern that: the drive-thru lane was tight; was narrow at 10 feet; trucks unloading; and cyclists locking their bikes at the east end and walking into the drive-thru lane. He believed a fence could assist with that. Concern about garbage and snow removal were mentioned. He favored one tenant at the site also.

APPROVED 10/05/15

Ms. Linda Carpowitz, 4530 Forest, Downers Grove, agreed with the previous gentleman's statements and worked for many years as a bank teller at a national bank and expressed concern about the servicing of the ATM machine, having armored trucks in a tight lane, and high school students walking straight across the lanes, not paying attention and walking to Starbucks. Snow removal was another issue and she questioned why there had to be two tenants in the building.

Mr. Michael Welsh, works at 1205 Ogden Avenue. He stated he has interest in a nearby property. He voiced concern about adding two businesses and a drive-thru to the corner, stating he has seen every traffic signal get knocked down via accidents over the years that he has worked in the area. He stated Saratoga was a narrow street and it was not able to handle the traffic that was there. Much pedestrian activity took place in the area and safety was a concern. He recommended a traffic study be done if one had not.

Petitioner, Mr. Ryan Murphy, returned and responded to the above questions. He offered to work with staff on a fence detail where it was not solid a fence necessarily in case an emergency arose and a driver had to get out of a car. Also, the use proposed was the lowest use and was consistent with the zoning. The ATM would be loaded/unloaded internally with no armored truck, He offered to work with staff regarding the relocation of the bike rack and to locate an area to plow the snow. The garbage dumpster could be something that could be rolled out to the truck. And he noted not many cars would be driving through the ATM lane in general because no teller existed.

Per staff, the minimum width for the drive-thru lane was 10 feet, which the chairman believed was fine for slower, controlled traffic versus a regular 12-foot lane. A narrow landscape strip was also pointed out which would allow for someone to exit their vehicle in case of an emergency.

The chairman closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

Per Mrs. Rabatah's question regarding an area for plowed snow, Mr. Popovich stated there was seven feet of land on the south property that could be used, as well as space adjacent to Saratoga.

Questions followed from the commissioners regarding what was meant by a change in pavement material, what cases would have to return to this commission if the use changed, and the fact that the site was challenging to develop but the criteria for the special use were met, as stated by Mr. Cozzo. The nine criteria used for the variation were also seen as being met. Mr. Thoman was glad to see a government-owned property go back on the tax rolls. Mrs. Rabatah emphasized to the petitioner to work with staff to relocate the bike rack; staff concurred.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 15-PLC-0027, MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS 1-9 AS STATED IN STAFF'S REPORT.

APPROVED 10/05/15

SECONDED BY MR. BASSLER. ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MR. COZZO, MR. BASSLER, MS. HOGSTROM, MR. QUIRK, MRS. RABATAH,
MR. THOMAN, CHAIRMAN RICKARD**

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0

FILE 15-PLC-0030: A petition seeking approval of the following items: 1) Rezoning from R-1 Residential Detached House 1 to INP-2, Campus-scale Institutional and Public District at Downers Grove South High School campus; 2) Institutional Master Plan for the Downers Grove South High School campus; 3) Rezoning from R-4 Residential Detached House 4 to INP-2 Campus-scale Institutional and Public District at Downers Grove North High School campus; 4) Institutional Master Plan for the Downers Grove North High School campus; and 5) a plat of vacation and dedication of public rights-of-way for Forest Avenue at Downers Grove North High School campus. Downers Grove South High School campus is zoned R-1, Residential Detached House 1 and is located at the southwest corner of Dunham Road and 63rd Street, commonly known as 1436 Norfolk Street, Downers Grove, IL (PINs 09-19-101-002 and 09-19-200-003). Downers Grove North High School campus is located at the corner of Grant and Main Streets, commonly known as 4436 Main Street, Downers Grove, IL (PINs 09-05-307-005, -006, -007, -008 & -16 and 09-05-308-001, -003, -004, -005, -006, -007, -008 & -009, and 09-05-309-001 and 09-05-314-005, -006 & -007). School District 99, Petitioner and Owner.

Mr. Popovich summarized the background of this request explaining that Downers Grove South is requesting a rezoning from an R-1 to an INP-2 which is a campus scale and Institutional and Public Zoning district. The site is located at the southwest corner of 63rd Street and Dunham Road. The neighborhood area surrounding this site was mainly R-3, Residential Detached House 3 with some pockets of R-1 Residential Detached House 1. The INP-2 zoning district recognized the uniqueness of a campus scale development but Mr. Popovich pointed out that there would be no proposed improvements to the building or to the site and the proposal was about setting up development parameters, through an institutional master plan, moving forward for the school district. A review of the site plan followed, noting the school has chosen to follow the underlying R district zoning requirements in terms of the bulk standards, but they have made a change to the interior building height for a request of 42 feet (maximum) to their current 35 to 37 feet. Approximately 740 parking spaces will be provided. Some sign allowances were being requested. Photos of the school campus buildings followed along with a traffic circulation plan and a description of the various types of parking spaces that exist for administration, staff, and the student body.

To date, Mr. Popovich explained that South High School was requesting approval for a 60 sq. foot monument sign at the corner of Dunham Road and 63rd Street. Generally, properties were allowed 36 square feet, but Mr. Popovich stated it was a larger property (43 acres) and staff believed the size of the sign was appropriate for the campus scale and it would comply with the sign ordinance with its setback and height regulations

For the Downers Grove North High School campus, Mr. Popovich summarized the district was seeking approval for an INP-2 zoning classification with the site straddling on both sides of Main

APPROVED 10/05/15

Street. The adjacent R-4 residential zoning was pointed out by staff with some R-6 and B-3 zoning to the north along Ogden Avenue. Boundaries of the proposed INP-2 zoning were noted on the overhead, along with regular and transitional setbacks for the bulk requirements.

While North High School was not proposing additions, renovations, or improvements, they, too, were setting up future development parameters through an institutional master plan. Mr. Popovich walked through the various uses and buildings on the campus and pointed out that North High School will be following the underlying single-family residential bulk standards with the only request being the request for 42 feet of interior height. As to signage, the school was looking to increase its signage to 306 sq. feet from its current 296 sq. feet. An overview of the campus buildings followed along with a description of the various types of parking spaces that exist for administration, staff, and the student body.

Per staff, both high schools were in compliance with the village's zoning ordinance; no public improvements were required or requested and the fire department confirmed the sites had adequate access. North High School was, however, requesting that if their current 50 sq. foot sign needed to be replaced in the future, that it be allowed to be replaced it with a 60 sq. foot sign. Staff felt the size of the campus and its location on a major arterial street was sufficient for the replacement of a 60 sq. foot sign. Also, Mr. Popovich stated that village staff was requiring an administrative lot consolidation to consolidate the many parcels underlying the campus as well as the east parking lot. As part of staff's research, it was discovered by the petitioner that two areas were not vacated – a portion of Forest Avenue which would T into Sherman Street (north side) and then a cul-de-sac on the south side. Details followed on how the clean-up of these underlying parcels and vacations/land swaps would take place so no future issues would exist.

A review of this area and how it fit into and met the village's Comprehensive Plan was explained by Mr. Popovich and the fact that the Standards for Rezoning under Section 12.030.(i) had been met. In addition, an institutional master plan would help set up the future development parameters for both the South and North campus. Staff believed the vacation and dedications of right-of-way in this proposal met the village's vacation policy. Staff recommended approval of all of the requests for both high schools subject to conditions listed on page 15 of staff's report.

Commissioner questions followed as to: 1) how was the 150 feet buffer was derived; 2) confirmation that the schools were not proposing to work on any projects for the master plan, except for the signs; and 3) would future projects come before this commission (accessory buildings would not). Examples followed.

Mr. Jim Kolodziej, for School District 99, 6301 Springside, stated the district, at this time, did not submit a master plan for construction. However, he explained the rezoning to INP-2 would allow the recognition of the two school campuses to be non-residential. The schools would become institutional properties, serve unique educational uses, and require flexibility when considering future development. The proposal met the standards set forth by the village zoning ordinance for rezoning to INP-2. Only the signs were being proposed at this time. Specifically, the sign at North High School was non-compliant which was another reason why the district began the rezoning. Mr. Kolodziej stated that the purpose of the district's application was to cause the rezoning of its existing campuses to better conform with the village's amended zoning ordinance.

APPROVED 10/05/15

Asked how the neighborhood meeting went, Mr. Kolodziej indicated there were some good questions but toward the end of the district staff's presentation, the residents inquired as to what it meant for the future wherein Mr. Kolodziej stated the district was working on a master plan but was in the early stages and gathering information about future education. Further explanations followed.

Chairman Rickard opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Tom LeCren, 545 Chicago Ave., voiced concern that the North High School sign on Main was non-conforming and this rezoning got around that but that staff clarified the sign would remain and become conforming. He asked for clarification about the setback for the school building on Main Street and confirmed with staff that currently there are no electronic signs allowed.

Mr. Roger Bauman, 4500 Prince Street, expressed concern about the rezoning and was there a reason the district was rezoning except for the sign. He asked what else could become conforming that was previously non-conforming.

Ms. Jenny Bauman, 4500 Prince Street, found it difficult to understand why the district would go through such a large change for two signs which she believed was a red flag. She feared what could happen in the green zone, i.e., bleachers, lights, etc. and preferred seeing the master plan first. She wanted the community protected.

Ms. Debra Walsh, 4525 Highland Ave., agreed with the concerns above and voiced concern of what could be built. She recommended holding off, noting the schools were close to residential homes.

Both the chairman and Mr. Popovich confirmed that there was no proposed construction but if there were major changes they would have to come before this commission and Village Council. Per staff, the petitioner was still examining the future of education and the village wanted to get the district into the proper zoning classification. At the same time, the rezoning assisted with accomplishing the goals of the village's comprehensive plan. Further explanation followed. Per Mr. Quirk's question, Mr. Popovich indicated that if District 58 came to the village to rezone, staff would work with them to get the proper zoning classification.

Mr. Jim Kolodziej from District 99 reiterated that the village created the INP-2 classification specific to large institutions and the district was taking advantage of it because it was available. He believed the two large campuses should be within that zoning. The district's master facility plan was not completed but once it is, it would have to come before this commission. Mr. Kolodziej explained that the sign was non-compliant for two years and he did not believe it would be right to use taxpayers money to knock the sign down and move it 3 feet over to make it conforming. He also noted that no sign existed at South High School and it could not be installed unless the school was classified under INP-2. Estimated engineering costs and attorneys fees for the application were approximately \$20,000.

The chairman closed public comment.

Asked what becomes conforming that was not conforming when the zoning is changed, Mr. Popovich explained that once the master plan is approved, the items in it become conforming. More specifically, he pointed out on the slide that anything new between the green and red lines had to meet the 35-foot building height because that was the maximum height for the abutting R

APPROVED 10/05/15

districts, but anything between the green lines heading north could be up to 42-feet which was established as the maximum height in the new zoning. Examples and clarification followed by staff. No further questions followed and a motion was entertained.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 15-PLC-0030, MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL REGARDING SOUTH HIGH SCHOOL'S REQUEST TO REZONE FROM R-1 TO INP-2, CAMPUS-SACLE INSTITUTIONAL AND PUBLIC DISTRICT 2 AND THEIR INSTITUTIONAL MASTER PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE ONE CONDITION IN STAFF'S REPORT.

SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. COZZO, MS. HOGSTROM, MR. BASSLER, MR. QUIRK, MRS. RABATAH, MR. THOMAN, CHAIRMAN RICKARD

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 15-PLC-0030, MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL REGARDING NORTH HIGH SCHOOL'S REQUEST TO REZONE FROM R-4 TO INP-2, CAMPUS-SACLE INSTITUTIONAL AND PUBLIC DISTRICT 2, THEIR INSTITUTIONAL MASTER PLAN, AND THE PLAT OF VACATION AND DEDICATION OF THE PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY FOR FOREST AVENUE, SUBJECT TO THE TWO CONDITIONS IN STAFF'S REPORT.

SECONDED BY MRS. RABATAH. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. COZZO, MRS. RABATAH, MR. BASSLER, MS. HOGSTROM, MR. QUIRK, MR. THOMAN, CHAIRMAN RICKARD

NAY: NONE

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0

Mr. Popovich mentioned the upcoming petitions for the next two meetings. A proclamation will be announced next month at the council meeting for National Community Planning Month.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:44 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. QUIRK, SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt

Celeste K. Weilandt

(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
Stormwater and Flood Plain Oversight Committee Meeting
September 10, 2015 7:00 p.m.

Downers Grove Public Works Facility
5101 Walnut Avenue, Downers Grove, Illinois

I. CALL to ORDER

Chair Gorman called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. A roll call followed and a quorum was established.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Chair Gorman, Mr. Ruyle, Mr. Scacco, Mr. Schoenberg, Mr. Wicklander

Members Absent: Mr. Civito, Mr. Crilly

Staff Present: Karen Daulton Lange, Stormwater Administrator

Public Present: Lorraine & Jim Smalley – 246 56th Street

III. APPROVAL of February 2, 1015 MINUTES

Mr. Schoenberg made a motion, seconded by Mr. Ruyle to approve the June 11, 2015 minutes as presented. Motion carried by voice vote of 5-0.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

The Smalley's expressed concern that during the 2013 flood the water came over the berm on the south side of their subdivision (through the rear yards of properties on Whitefawn Trail). She stated that the Village has not been maintaining the creek through the 56th St. right of way; it used to be grass and well-manicured, and now it is not.

Mr. Smalley spoke about similar flooding that occurred in the 1996 flood. The preliminary flood maps fairly reflect what occurred in April, 2013. He described how he and his neighbors took in water; including from the creek overflow and sewer back-up.

Mrs. Smalley discussed the Westmont basins, and said that the grading goes up between the basins. Staff input included that there is an equalizer pipe between the basins. In addition, there was a breach in the berm during the 2013 floods. There is a structure that was undermined and water breached between 205 & 207 Whitefawn. Westmont has been out a couple of times and filled the breach. Chair Gorman asked if Westmont has surveyed the top of berm elevation and if the overland flow route has been established. Staff talked about the 2013 Flood report, and that the study by ERA indicated that the Westmont basin overflowed through the overland flow route to the west of Deer Creek subdivision and their basins were also flooded from the flood plain of the golf course.

Mr. Smalley expressed concern about three large homes that are being built on Fairview which will contribute to flooding. Staff responded that those homes are in Westmont and they would need to comply with the County's stormwater ordinance with respect to PCBMPs.

Staff explained that the 56th Street right of way used to have Ash trees, which were removed a few years ago due to emerald ash borer. The additional sunlight encouraged spontaneous growth of plants. Staff met with the HOA last year, and it was discussed that the Village would come through in the spring and cut down the overgrowth, leaving roots in to help with streambank erosion, and then the HOA would keep the overgrowth trimmed down from there, until an enhancement program is established. We did notice that after the trimming this spring, the creek bed is undermined in some areas and muskrats were observed. When this portion of the creek is under a streambank stabilization program, it will not be replaced with grass, but native plants with deep roots to support erosion control and water quality. It is the Village's responsibility to maintain, but enhancements such as the streambank stabilization have not been designed/budgeted yet. This area is identified in the 2014 Stormwater Project Analysis, and it is anticipated that all such work would be coordinated together.

In response to an inquiry from Mr. Scacco, Staff explained the Preliminary map review process, and that at the Draft Map stage, we expressed concern over areas that were mapped as floodway near Fairview and 56th, and the County did some changes. Mr. Scacco asked about the entry into the subdivision, and Mr. Smalley said he moved his cars to Cumnor near 56th Court to avoid flooding.

Mrs. Smalley stated that the flood plain map elevations go up, the preliminary maps show about a two foot raise. Chair Gorman explained that since in a mostly developed areas, land use changes were minimal and current codes require detention. Staff added that the elevations can raise from newer modeling methods, and rainfall events are changing with the climate changes. Mrs. Smalley thought using permeable pavements would help with flooding. Staff explained that the permeable pavements certainly help with the smaller, more frequent rain events, but are not much help for a large rain event.

Mr. Smalley thought Deer Creek would have fared much better in 2013 if the Westmont basin had not overflowed. Mr. Ruyle inquired about the size and width of the berm. Staff responded that on the Westmont side it is mowed, but it appears that over the years the homes have landscaped their side but you can't tell when you are out there where the exact property line is. Mr. Smalley said that in addition to the breach between 205 & 207 Whitefawn that the home at 217 Whitefawn got water over the berm and their basement windows broke. He asked if there were proactive plans in the Village for emergency events. Staff said there were, and in 2013 we did robo-calls about the rain coming. She went over how to sign up for notifications, and to get information on the Village's website, and the services we provide, such as evaluating and suggesting improvements on individual drainage.

Chair Gorman thanked the Smalley's for their attendance. In response to the Smalley's question, he explained that the Council is in charge of prioritizing and allocating funds for stormwater maintenance and improvements.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Stormwater Funding

Chair Gorman reiterated the comments he made on behalf of himself, and not as Chair of the SW&FPOC, to the Council recently. The Stormwater Utility fee has been critical to projects and felt they helped with residential flooding. He thinks the SWU fee is vital.

Mr. Scacco asked if the Committee should make a formal statement to the Council saying as much. Mr. Ruyle said he attend a recent Coffee with the Council and spoke with Commissioner David Olsen, who explained his philosophical objections to the SWU fee. Mr. Ruyle asked if he thought residents understood that most of them are paying less with the fee then when it was included in their property taxes. He thinks the Village should do more outreach to the Community to help residents understand all the drainage issues we have and how to fund solutions. Mr. Scacco suggested articles on what the Village does could be put into *Hometown Times* and other outreach venues.

Mr. Ruyle made a motion that the Chair draft a letter to the Council on the importance of the Stormwater Utility fee. There was discussion amongst the Committee that questioned if this issue should be more of an educational nature rather than a letter which may politicize the Committee, which is not the intention. Motion carried by voice vote of 5-0.

VI. STAFF REPORT

See Attachment 1.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No further public comment.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Preliminary Flood Plain Maps

Discussed during Staff Report – See Attachment 1.

B. Stormwater Policies

Village resolutions Res 95-18 and Res 2009-91 which concern Village policy to preserve wetlands, and natural stream configurations and maintenance of stormwater control structures and creek channels were discussed.

Concerning Res 95-18 the Committee agreed that it was good that there is a policy to preserve wetlands and natural stream configurations.

Concerning Res 2009-91, it was noted that if an applicant for a cost share program is denied they can appeal to the SW&FPOC. It was noted that this is a good administrative process.

Mr. Schoenberg noted that Priority 3 relates to public property and it was explained that the Village pays for any portion in the public right of way. Staff said that the cost share program has benefited many who avail themselves to the program and that staff member Susan Quasney has put together a guide for homeowners.

Section G of the policy refers to maintenance of creeks and it was reiterated that the Streambank Stabilization program asks for permanent maintenance easements but not all owners give them. This program is both maintenance and enhancement, so we don't always get the permanent easements but move forward if we get temporary easements to improve.

Chair Gorman asked that the Committee discuss a sandbag policy at an upcoming meeting.

IV. ADJOURN

Mr. Schoenberg made a motion, seconded by Mr. Scacco to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m. Motion carried by voice vote of 5-0.

Attachment 1.

Staff Report September 10, 2015

A. HMGP

Three out of the four homes in the program have closed and demolition and restoration is expected to begin later this month. Our police department used the three homes for SWAT exercises. The fourth home is under bankruptcy and it is doubtful if the bank will cooperate with the Village to purchase.

B. Preliminary Floodplain Maps

The comment period for the Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps is now closed. Staff submitted over 30 comments for consideration of changes. A 90-day appeal period is expected to begin later this year, and after reviews and resolution of comments and appeals, it is expected that the FIRMs will become effective in the spring of 2017.

Staff partnered with the Village of Lisle to host a second Open House on the FEMA Preliminary Floodplain Maps giving our residents another opportunity to meet with staff to discuss the potential impacts of the new mapping. Prior to the Open House held at the County in July, robo-calls were made to everyone in the Village with a public telephone number or who has signed onto our alert system if they were near or in existing or proposed floodplain regarding the new maps.

The comment period for the Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps is now closed. Staff submitted over 30 comments for consideration of changes. A 90-day appeal period is

expected to begin later this year, and after reviews and resolution of comments and appeals, it is expected that the FIRMs will become effective in the spring of 2017.

D. St. Joseph Creek Stream Corridor Assessment

CBBEL has completed their inspection of the creek from Carpenter to the DGSD plant and has prepared a report on the condition of the creek. The purpose of this project was to study and identify areas of St. Joseph's Creek that have seen streambank erosion infestation by invasive species, blockages and any other deficiencies that may need repair or restoration. The report will be used for grant opportunities as well as planning future improvements. Staff is working on a webpage that supplies information on why maintaining creeks is important, and it will be posted there in the near future.

E. SW&FPOC Members Reappointed

On August 18th, Mayor Tully reappointed Anthony Civito & William Wicklander to three-year terms expiring August 31, 2018.

F. Urban Flooding Awareness Act

In August 2014, the UFAA was signed into law, compelling the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) to partner with other agencies to prepare a report on urban flooding. The final report has been issued and a copy distributed to you all.

The report includes recommendations for local governments, many of which the Village of Downers Grove already employs, including site visits with property owners to identify flood damage reduction actions, stormwater ordinances that incentivize reduction of impervious areas and infiltration of stormwater, updated stormwater atlas information, and participation in CRS.

At the September 1 Council meeting Mayor Tully suggested that the SW&FPOC review the UFAA and compile a report on how the Village of Downers Grove stacks up to the recommendations of the report.

G. CDBG-DR Grant

DuPage County is now receiving funds under Public Law 113-2 as a result of the federal disaster declaration from April, 2013. The County is administering said funds through the CDBG-DR grant program. A CDBG-DR grant would give us the potential to acquire a single family home and an adjacent vacant lot. St. Joseph's Creek flows through the vacant lot, and both lots are in the floodway/floodplain. These properties were included in our original HMGP grant submittal, in 2014, but were ultimately not pursued due to exceeding maximum purchase costs by FEMA. If purchased, these two parcels, which are adjacent to other Village owned parcels, will be incorporated into the next phase of Streambank stabilization on St. Joseph Creek – South Branch (DR-022). This will greatly improve the Village's ability to make meaningful improvements to the creek through this area, improving flood overflow routing and compensatory storage along this stretch of the creek, thereby alleviating downstream flooding of homes and property. It is expected this will go before the Council next week for a resolution allowing staff to submit the application.