

APPROVED 06/27/16

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

JUNE 6, 2016, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Rickard called the June 6, 2016 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. Cozzo, Ms. Gassen, Ms. Hogstrom, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Quirk, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Thoman

ABSENT: Mr. Cronin; ex-officios Mr. Livorsi, Ms. Lupesco, Mr. Menninga

STAFF: Community Development Director Stan Popovich

VISITORS: Grady Hamilton, Johnny Carlson, David Paino, Tim Shogren and Mary Lucas with Trammel Crow Company; Aaron Roseth with ESG Architects; Scott Wilson, Jared Kenyon, and Tom Runkel with Kimley-Horn; John Polivka, 6016 Washington St.; Kathy Nybo, 5253 Blodgett; Julia Miller, 5329 Main St.; Elizabeth Friend; 5239 Main St.; William Hunnewell, 5329 Main St.; Larry Bejnarowicz, 5329 Main St.; Barb Webster, 5223 Carpenter St.; John and Kathleen Tully, 5329 Main St.; Jim and Sandy Blake, 5340 Lane Pl.; Ed and Mary O'Donnell, 5329 Main St.; Jim and Dolores Mulnenn, 5329 Main St.; Michael Hansen, 5329 Main St.; Bob Peterson, 6861 Camden Rd., Geoff Anderman, 5409 Washington; Jim Knight, 1101 Maple Ave., Bob Loizzi, 5329 Main St.; Brad and LuAnn Costell, 5910 Grand Ave.; Rich Kulovany, 6825 Camden Rd.; Michael Drew, 6200 Joliet Rd. Countryside; George Antos, 6200 Joliet Rd., Countryside; Andrew and Johana Graves, 1308 Gilbert Ave.; Don Renner, 1304 Maple Ave.; Dick Muchel, 5239 Main St.; Sally Conness, 1010 Curtiss St.; John LeDonne, 1930 55th Place; Todd Parsons, 417 67th St.; Charlotte Loizzi, 5329 Main St., Gail Bieschke, 5329 Main St.; Lillian and Michael Moats, 1100 Maple Ave.; Tom and Sue Weiler, 709 Maple Ave.; Theresa Schulz, 1307 Maple Ave.; Diane Bach, 5225 Main St.; Shannon Tully, 5413 Main St.; George Zerphy, 5748 Woodward Ave.; Charles Hannon, 940 Maple Ave.; Christine Martin, 701 Maple Ave., Jenny Levine, 5831 Dunham Rd.; Larry Vendor, 5329 Main St.; Jim Knight, 1101 Maple Ave.; Jeff Anderman, 5409 Washington St.; Rayna Gallt, 5439 Carpenter St.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

APPROVAL OF MAY 2, 2016 MINUTES – Page 6, under Standard No. 2, Mr. Quirk asked to delete the last sentence relating to increasing the stormwater fees. **MOTION BY MR. THOMAN, SECONDED MR. QUIRK, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES, AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0-1. (MRS. RABATAH ABSTAINS.)**

APPROVED 06/27/16

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

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

FILE 16-PLC-0023: A petition seeking approval of a Special Use to allow an office use to provide more than 4.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area and a Rezoning from M-1, Light Manufacturing to O-R-M, Office-Research-Manufacturing. The property is located on the northwest corner of Warrentville and Finley Road, commonly known as 2200 Warrentville Road (PINs 08-01-400-004, and -006). Adam Stokes, Agent of Nicolson Porter & List, Inc. and Arbor Vista LLC, Petitioners; Arbor Vista LLC, Owner.

Per the chairman, the applicant has requested to continue the above-referenced public hearing and staff also recommended a continuance.

MOTION BY MR. THOMAN TO CONTINUE FILE 16-PLC-0023 TO A DATE CERTAIN, THAT DATE BEING JUNE 27, 2016. SECONED BY MRS. RABATAH.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0.

FILE 16-PLC-0021: A petition seeking approval of a Planned Unit Development, a Rezoning from DB (Downtown Business) to DB/PUD (Downtown Business/Planned Unit Development) and a Special Use to construct a mixed-use 115-unit apartment building. The property is located on the northeast corner of Main Street and Maple Avenue, commonly known as 946 Maple Avenue, 1000 Maple Avenue and 5245 Main Street (PINs 09-08-306-017, -018, -019, -020, -027, -028, -029, and -030). Trammell Crow Chicago Development, Inc, Petitioner; Robert E. King and Lynda A. King, Co-Trustees under Declaration of Joint Trust, and Chicago Title Land Trust Co, Trust Number 8002349926, and the Village of Downers Grove, Owners.

Community Development Director Stan Popovich reviewed the applicant's request and referred to the site on the overhead, locating the three properties involved: a village parking lot, a commercial building, and a non-conforming single-family residence. Proposed was a six-story, 115-unit apartment building 70 feet in height with retail on the first floor facing Main Street, with a lobby/common area and a second floor that included a number of amenities. Director Popovich reviewed the site plan for the proposal, noting there would be three levels to the parking garage, eight on-street parallel parking spaces on Maple Avenue with two designated spaces for a loading zone. Further details and amenities of the plan followed. Building elevations were further discussed, with Director Popovich explaining how the village's design guidelines played into the design of the proposed building. Building materials and building planes for the building were described and met the guidelines, as stated by staff.

The engineering site plan was reviewed in detail as well as the on-street parking spaces. A landscape plan was also reviewed.

Director Popovich summarized that an outside consultant was used to review the petitioner's traffic study which found that the intersections of Main/Maple, Main/Grove and Washington/Maple were

APPROVED 06/27/16

currently operating at an acceptable level of service. The only level of service not acceptable was the westbound Maple at Washington intersection, based on the amount of traffic traveling through the village during the evening rush hour. Per staff, the construction of this building and the construction of the Marquis on Maple would have no bearing on the unacceptable level of service. The public works department reviewed the study and had no concerns as well.

Director Popovich explained that the Main/Maple parking lot was constructed immediately prior to the construction of the parking deck to provide additional parking downtown during construction of the deck. He noted the parking lot was always intended to be a temporary parking area and that it would return to a redevelopment site, as identified in various Village plans, including a 2003 study, a 2006 RFP for redevelopment and the village's 2011 Comprehensive Plan. The village was not concerned about losing the parking spaces because enough on-street parking and parking deck spaces existed. This was confirmed with the Public Works Director. Staff supported the request to remove the 29 parking spaces.

Staff continued to elaborate on how the site met the village's comprehensive plan, met the village's bulk standards, and met the objectives for a planned unit development. Staff believed the proposal was consistent with the surrounding and existing zoning districts, which called for a mixed-use development, and recommended that the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the village council subject to staff's conditions.

Questions from the commissioners included clarification of who reviewed the parking study on the village's behalf, the height of the Marquis on Maple development, whether proper remediation was done on the site since one of the properties was a prior gas station, and whether the village "relaxed" the lot area per dwelling unit on any prior developments in the village. Director Popovich cited those developments. He further located the three feet of right-of-way that the applicant was dedicating on Maple Avenue and noted the location of the garbage collection area.

Chairman Rickard invited the applicant to speak.

Mr. Grady Hamilton, with Trammel Crow Company, introduced his team and reviewed some of the local developments his company worked on, including a development in Park Ridge. He explained the reasons why the high-end development had to be developed the way it was being proposed, i.e., due to the lifestyle of those who move into such developments.

Mr. Aaron Roseth, ESG Architects, Minneapolis, MN, confirmed the many projects his firm was involved with, including Trammel Crow Company. He explained how his company identifies good architecture, good scaling and creates a beautiful sense of place. He further discussed the changing demographics of the renting population to-date and the amenities they look for in detail.

Mr. Roseth pointed out the seven-foot grade difference that exists at Main Street where the building begins and then turns the corner to Maple Avenue, stating the goal was to keep the retail on Main Street as vibrant as possible. Positives about the building's scale, the positioning of the front door on the corner of the building, and the building's interaction with Main Street were mentioned.

Questions for the petitioner included how the building was going to function mechanically (Magic-Pacs positioned in recessed facades, painted to match; some units on roof top); the reason for the synthetic grass, landscaping; and the building material. Mr. Roseth explained the building's first

APPROVED 06/27/16

two levels would be concrete; the first level lid would be concrete also with the five upper stories being wood frame construction. Sound proofing requirements would exceed village code.

Mr. Roseth described how the building's density was determined, pointing out that smaller units were now the trend because the amenities allowed for it. Square footage of the units were explained as well as how the development related to the overall makeup of the Chicagoland area. Parking stall width was another discussion topic, with Director Popovich confirming that the village's requirement was 9 feet by 18 feet in length. The proposed spaces were 8 feet-six inches due to the spaces being assigned to specific units and the fact that they were allowed to be six inches less on width and length if they were low turnover spaces. The building's security was explained as well as hours of operation for the common area amenities. Snow removal for the pool deck was also addressed.

Asked if young families would be living in the building, Mr. Carlson envisioned there would be some young families living there for 6 months or 12 months, possibly having a home built nearby. The typical demographic was the young professional without older children or the empty nester renting the three-bedroom. Lease renewals were estimated to be about 60%. Outside lighting, to be code compliant, would include lighting scones, lit entryways, signage, and lit pool deck area (per code). Signage would meet village code. As to the type of retail he envisioned, Mr. Carlson stated the Glen Ellyn development included a coffee shop, a high-end yoga studio, and a restaurant. For this development, his goal was to attract a restaurant. As far as adding any awnings, per the village's design guidelines, Mr. Carlson felt there was no need for the awnings, except for the main entrance. Regarding the south elevation, Mr. Carlson confirmed there would be no vehicle headlights coming through the garage façade.

The chairman invited the public to speak.

Mr. John Polivka, 6016 Washington, voiced concern about traffic backup to Summit Street regarding this development and not being able to travel westbound or make a left turn. He suggested removing some of the parking on Maple Avenue and creating a dedicated right-turn lane. He asked if there were projected numbers for those visiting the development.

Ms. Diane Bach, Spice Merchants, 5225 Main Street, voiced concern about losing the 29 parking spaces for her customers and other businesses' customers who travel long distances. She asked how the 10 allotted parking spaces would be accessed, their size, would there be signage for them, and their hours of access, etc. She asked if there were additional traffic studies done after the 2011 parking study. She asked if the recent April study was a one-day study or over a specific time period.

Ms. Kathleen Tully, 5329 Main Street, stated she attended the petitioner's prior presentation at Lincoln Center. Her concern was about water detention after storms, "dangerous" traffic congestion in the immediate vicinity, the amount of rental units on Maple Avenue overall, and the loading/unloading of garbage. She asked if the village was going to conduct its own traffic study and also asked if the pool could be placed on top of the roof to avoid looking at wet towels hanging over the balcony.

Ms. Shannon Tully, 5413 Main Street, has her business across the street from the proposed development. She supported the development since there was a need for rental units in the village.

APPROVED 06/27/16

She voiced concern about traffic congestion especially during rush hour, the stacking of cars from the Main/Maple intersection going back toward Washington. She inquired as to how many elevators would be in the building, were there proposed regulations for moving in and out, was there going to be a coded entry to a certain public door. She also suggested relocating the pool to the building's roof top.

Ms. Theresa Schulz, 947 Maple and 1307 Maple (residence), also agreed there was a parking detriment in the village and traffic issues existed, especially going west on Maple. She suggested installing a stop sign at Maple and Brookbank since it was a school bus stop. She voiced concern about moving trucks especially during the first year or two when the residents start moving in. She asked how the 40% of tenants who do move annually be managed.

Mr. Don Renner, 1304 Maple Avenue expressed concern about density, traffic flow, a change in character and the proposal being rental. He voiced concern about how the building would look 20 years from now.

Mr. George Zerphy, 5748 Woodward Ave., said he recently moved from the Main/Maple area after living there for four years. Traffic increased while he lived there and he questioned the feasibility of the 2011 traffic study as a benchmark for today. Since his new home is a short drive away, when he does travel to the downtown area he uses the parking lot because of its ease of access. He believed losing it would be a detriment. He suggested another review of the traffic and parking issues would be in order and that the proposed building belonged in Naperville. He stated the target market for the proposal was in Naperville and not Downers Grove. The building would change the character of the area and the village.

Mr. William Honnewell, 5329 Main Street, president of Morningside Grove Condominium Association, expressed concern about traffic congestion during the rush hours; the safety of pedestrians in the area; water drainage from the building; and not a lot of parking for the businesses.

Mr. Bob Peterson, 6861 Camden Road, 1301 Warren Ave (business), shared his comments about the poor parking situation in the village; the fact that a number of developments were coming in but not providing enough parking; and that architects, when designing their buildings, are not providing adequate elevator space for tenants moving in/out, not creating an area where people can wait for a taxi, and not enough parking space for the moving trucks.

Mr. Charles Hannon, 940 Maple Ave., said while he welcomed the upscale development, he believed the proposed height of the building was an issue since the building would hinder views from his building (Marquis on Maple) and would cause shadow issues. Adding more traffic, parking issues and loading/unloading of trucks to the area, in addition to his building, would also impede traffic. He suggested the commission ask the developer to reduce the number of units to a more "modest" amount, similar to his development, possibly have five floors, and "do the deal" without the parking lot. He questioned the demand for such apartments in the village, in general.

In response, Director Popovich confirmed the development did meet the village's height regulations of 70 feet and the proposal was just under 70 feet.

Mr. Tom Weiler, 709 Maple Avenue, echoed the same objections as Mr. Renner, above, i.e., increased traffic on Maple Avenue, the development's density, and the change in the neighborhood

APPROVED 06/27/16

character. He voiced concern about the quick “domino affect”, given that the Marquis on Maple was the only building of its type between Avery-Coonley and the railroad tracks. He did find it ironic that someone from the Marquis voiced concern about the development’s scale, height, traffic, and units being obscured when it was the same concerns voiced by the community on his building. He questioned what the village wanted to do with the parking lot. He believed the development should have been zoned to Downtown Transitional versus Downtown Business along Maple Avenue. The area would look like a “canyon.”

Ms. Barbara Webster, 5223 Carpenter St., was sworn in by the chairman. Ms. Webster reminded the business owners that the tenants residing in the development would be patronizing their businesses and probably walking to the train and not using their vehicles.

Mr. Jim Weiss, 436 68th Street was sworn in by the chairman. Mr. Weiss said he has noticed that kids walk and shop the downtown stores, usually making small purchases, but he has also seen that in Naperville, where there is more parking available for their downtown. He believes there will be a negative effect with the proposal.

Ms. Kathy Nybo, 5253 Blodgett, emphasized that she wanted to live in the “village” of Downers Grove, where the community is friendly. She did not want to be another City of Aurora or Naperville. She did not understand why the village had to incorporate an under-utilized parking lot into an over-developed proposal, and believed something in-between existed. Height was also an issue and she believed the area would become a “tunnel” due to the tall buildings. She questioned why the village could not have more townhomes that are more in scale to what the town looks like. While the proposal called for a mixed-use development, she pointed out there were only two retail spaces.

She reminded the public that the parking and traffic figures were based on speculation but agreed issues would exist once the developers are “long gone.” She supported keeping the Main/Maple parking lot. She also pointed out that the renderings were reflecting seven trees and the developer was only installing two, which was not a good tradeoff for the size and density of the building. Lastly, she reminded the commissioners that the village’s motto was a “balance of progress and tradition” and asked that the commissioners keep traditions in mind when making a decision tonight.

Ms. Linda LaLond, business owner at 5226 Main Street, described her business and stated that all of the area’s businesses have patrons who utilize the Main/Maple parking lot to run in and purchase their wares/service and do not park at the parking deck to shop their stores. Losing the parking lot would be detrimental to her business and other businesses.

Ms. Christine Martin, 701 Maple Ave., did not support the building and believed the developer would always win. She voiced concern about other developments in the future and the area losing the charm of Downers Grove. She found the proposed building to be sterile, generic, and looked like something found in every other town. She believed the Village of Hinsdale kept its vision by keeping its buildings low. Lastly, she found it disgraceful that the developer of the Marquis on Maple installed a wall up against the older home owners residing next to the Marquis on Maple and never compensated them.

APPROVED 06/27/16

Ms. Jenny Levine, 5831 Dunham Rd., echoed Ms. Martin's comments. She shopped the downtown area and used the Main/Maple parking frequently to avoid parking on Main Street. If she cannot find a parking space, she will travel to Naperville to shop, which she does not prefer. She asked the village to consider the parking and traffic issues before further developments take place.

Mr. Larry Bernowitz, 5329 Main St., (Morningside building) stated he moved to the village so he could walk the downtown area and he agreed crossing at Main/Maple would become a challenge. Other issues voiced included parking and the fact that if the development had a restaurant, parking would have to be allocated.

Mr. John Tully, 5329 Main St., believed the development should be on a full commercial street and not on Maple Avenue. He voiced concerns of increased traffic, suggested reconsideration of the traffic study after the Marquis development has been completed, the walking of pets and no more car shows.

Mr. Jim Knight, 1101 Maple Ave., moved into his area to specifically walk the downtown area and mingle with people. He discussed how parking has now overflowed into the residential area of Maple Avenue. Concerns included: where would service people park for those tenants who need them, the building was too large, and if this was the village's gateway, then the village should change the zoning because the home on the other side of the Marquis was for sale.

Ms. Rayna Gallt, 5439 Carpenter St., was sworn in by the chairman. Ms. Gallt shared the same concerns as previously mentioned, i.e., the parking, the neighborhood characteristics, the tranquility of the area that drew her to the village. She would like the area to remain as is.

Ms. Julia Miller, 5329 Main St. (Morningside Square) also agreed with the previous statements made regarding traffic, parking, and neighborhood character change. She voiced concern that more green space was being lost in the village resulting in water issues. Also, the intersection of Main/Maple was a safety concern with drivers not paying attention when pedestrians were crossing. Lastly, if children were going to be living in the building, the safety of the children and school bus pickup/drop-offs had to be taken into consideration. She stated that emergency vehicles have also had difficulty maneuvering the intersection with car traffic and train traffic, not to mention the oil tankers coming through the area.

Ms. Sally Conness, 1846 Grant Street and 1010 Curtis (business address) shared the importance of maintaining the character of the downtown but also voiced concern about the traffic and parking, pointing out she had customers who struggle with on-street parking in the area and that not everyone wanted to use the parking garage. To allow more retail, people and vehicles only to remove the parking, did not make sense. She questioned the demand for the demographics.

Mr. Jeff Anderman, 5409 Washington, strongly encouraged the village to do an independent traffic study of the area due to the fact: 1) the study was paid for by the developer; 2) the residents' provided their feedback; 3) there were changes that came with the Marquis building; and 4) the county had traffic changes planned for 55th and Main Streets. Mr. Anderman's understanding was that there was an exception being made as far as density and it raised concern as to whether the villages was being consistent with past practices.

APPROVED 06/27/16

Mr. Bob Peterson, 6861 Camden Road, stated he assisted the move-in/move-out of the first tenant of Stations Crossing who was told that her building would be sound-proof. Apparently the building was not, as he shared the short story of what that tenant heard one day.

Ms. Johanna Graves, 1308 Gilbert, voiced concern about water run-off from the building and drainage and requested the village conduct a stormwater study as part of the proposal.

(Chairman Rickard called for a five-minute break at 9:40 p.m.; meeting reconvened at 9:45 p.m.)

Chairman Rickard asked the petitioner to respond to the questions/comments raised by the public.

Mr. Grady Hamilton, with Trammel Crow Company, returned to the podium, explaining that the village's comprehensive plan directed his team how to evaluate properties and the zoning ordinance guides the development as to pertains to its bulk standards. Mr. Hamilton discussed the investment that was being made and how the owner would maintain the building long-term.

Traffic engineer, Tim Shogren, with Kimley-Horn, explained the background of his company and the experience his company brought to this project. Acknowledging that traffic was subjective, he explained how the state and federal government require a certain protocol but that the village required something more substantive in its traffic study – including the study of traffic over various days and evenings, pedestrian and bike activity and parking. The third party traffic consultant, he stated, reviewed Kimley-Horn's methodology and approach and concluded that the proposed project would have no material impact on traffic operations in the study area. Details followed. Other nearby developments were taken into consideration, as requested by village staff.

Responding to the question of the 10 on-street parking spaces, Mr. Hamilton stated eight spaces would be located on Maple Avenue with two being marked for periodic loading/unloading while two striped spaces would be located on Main Street. There was no public parking within the development's parking structure. There was also the possibility of having valet parking with the restaurant, if necessary.

Mr. Shogren further explained the methodology used in relation to the traffic traveling westbound on Maple Avenue and its impact on vehicle access to and exit from the proposed building. He stated there were a number of recommendations in the traffic study to address the issue, which he summarized in detail. He further addressed how the spaces for loading/unloading were determined and how they would be managed using on-site management staff. Mr. Hamilton also elaborated on the move-in schedule and the moving trucks that typically are used in such scenarios.

As far as the number of required parking stalls needed, Mr. Hamilton stated 162 parking stalls were being provided for the 115 units and were more than enough spaces for residents, staff and visitors, citing the Park Ridge and Glen Ellyn developments as examples. Residents would have FOB access to the parking garage, as well as their guests, once registered by the tenant.

Mr. Jared Kenyon, civil engineer, addressed how his firm followed the DuPage County's and the village's ordinance requirements for the stormwater and drainage study. Details followed.

Addressing operations, Mr. Hamilton confirmed the proposed building would have two elevators, one of which would be a freight elevator. Garbage would be collected inside the trash enclosure

APPROVED 06/27/16

within the parking garage and then moved out by the on-site management for the garbage hauler. Regarding HVAC issues, Mr. Hamilton indicated that many of those issues would be handled by the on-site maintenance supervisor and, if necessary, access to the parking garage could be scheduled by the on-site supervisor if additional service visits were required. Regarding the pool area, it would be kept in a first-class manner and towels over railings would not be allowed nor would loud noise. Pets would be walked in the neighborhood and the building would include the pet spa.

Per Mr. Hamilton, long-term ownership of such developments was a major investment by investors, due to the caliber of the project and due to the locations of where they existed. He explained that the demographics of the tenants were desirable and were the type of persons who favored walking over driving to the downtown area. Lastly, Mr. Hamilton shared that security cameras would be positioned throughout the entire development as would on-site management staff.

Mr. Popovich reconfirmed that the proposed building's height met the village's bulk regulation; a third-party traffic consultant (KLOA) who did review the traffic study, had some comments, and the study was returned to the developer who was asked to revise its study. Per Director Popovich, there was no required green space for the downtown, which was stated in the ordinance. Valet parking was allowed under the municipal code. Mr. Popovich briefly touched upon the evolution of the village's comprehensive plan (approved in 2011 and currently under review by an ad hoc committee). The development was a catalyst site. The surrounding zoning of the property (Downtown Business) was also explained by Mr. Popovich. Mr. Hamilton also clarified that the proposed development provided code compliant parking, whereas some of the other prior projects were seeking parking and density variances. He added that the investment his firm makes coming into such projects is guided by the village's comprehensive plan and having many discussions with staff to ensure a good project that complies with the village's requirements.

Hearing no further comments, Chairman Rickard closed the public hearing and invited the commissioners to deliberate.

Per Ms. Johnson's question, Director Popovich explained some of the nearby projects that have been approved or were under construction: the Marquis on Maple with 55 condo units, 904-910 Curtiss Street with 48 apartment units, and 5100 Forest with 89 apartment units.

Chairman Rickard agreed there would be some type of traffic impact to the area and asked for staff's interpretation of the traffic study, wherein Director Popovich agreed there would be an increase in vehicles but he also explained that peak times, levels of service and other variables were taken into consideration for the study. Based on that information, he stated that there was no real changes in level of service based on the proposed development nor the Marquis on Maple development, and it was at the "acceptable" level of service. The only issue was the westbound Maple Avenue (at Washington) which was and would continue to operate at a "poor" level of service. Another study variable considered by the consultant, the third party reviewer and staff was including regional growth.

Mr. Quirk brought the discussion back to three considerations: 1) the special use (apartment use); 2) the zoning map modification to overlay the PUD; and 3) the establishment of the planned unit development, each consideration with their respective requirements.

APPROVED 06/27/16

Reviewing the criteria for the planned unit development, Mr. Thoman agreed with many of the residents' comments regarding the density of the project and its height, stating it was one full story taller than the Marquis project. To him, the commissioners overlooked the community's response to that project, which basically "broke the block" as far as the height of the facade. This development he believed could have had its height stepped down to the Main Street side of the development with a more reasonable facade within a two-block area of downtown. He did not believe the project was consistent with the comprehensive plan, citing page 106-107 of the plan. The density was too high and the business community voiced numerous comments that its patrons relied heavily on the existing parking lot. Mr. Thoman voiced concern about bringing a six-story building onto Main Street. Mr. Thoman noted we are not an urban area; we are a suburban area. He did not support the proposal.

Mr. Quirk appreciated the 'loaf of bread' analogy that Mr. Carlson used earlier. He noted the development could move forward by right with the same size building if the developer lowered the number of units but increased the number of bedrooms with the same size building. He thinks the building is great. He was a bit concerned how it would look relative to other buildings but it isn't a huge issue. Mr. Quirk thought tapering back a small component of the building on the west side to transition better could work. He supported the project but sympathized with the residents regarding the traffic issues. He felt this was a really good project and would complement the direction the Village is going.

Mrs. Rabatah shared her concerns about the traffic study stating it offered no practical aspect to make any decisions, as it was highly numerically oriented. Mr. Popovich noted you could draw conclusions from the numerical approach that all traffic studies are completed by. There is empirical data provided in the highly technical document. Mrs. Rabatah noted traffic concerns were raised not only by the residents but from some of the commissioners. She saw a disconnect between the study and from what the residents and commissioners were saying.

The chairman shared his own experience regarding traffic since he lived on Main Street. He pointed out the proposal could be approved by-right with less units and more bedrooms and that the applicant was not requesting much relief. He agreed that if the density was right and the development was five stories tall it would be more acceptable since that appeared to be the standard for the area. Mr. Popovich proceeded to cite some of the existing buildings in the village that were 70 feet in height.

In general, Mr. Quirk stated that he rarely saw drivers entering or exiting Station Crossing. He stated the area was already congested, in general, and that based on the other multi-family projects in the village, he believed that providing parking for vehicles was not going to increase the overall traffic count that much.

Ms. Johnson noted the amount of everyday traffic and the loss of parking. Ms. Gassen, agreed that reducing the development by one story would help with the density issue and possibly help with the parking. The opportunity would be now.

However, Mr. Popovich, recalled the 7-foot grade difference for the building, noting that on Main Street the height reflected 70 feet while on the Maple Avenue side it was approximately 63 feet. He noted the Marquis on Maple height was about 56 feet without the cornice. The proposal met the village's height regulation.

APPROVED 06/27/16

Mr. Cozzo believed the proposal did meet the comprehensive plan because the corner site was never intended to stay a parking lot and the 29 parking spaces were going to be lost regardless. Instead, the project self-contained the units' parking, it met village code, and it removed 29 parking spaces that were never intended to be parking. However, it also provided 10 parking spaces and it was a catalyst site to the downtown business area. The village's forefathers for the downtown business area also determined that 70 feet in height should be the standard. Mr. Cozzo explained how the development met the village's ordinances and regulations and said the only criteria that was not being met was the density. The congested traffic would always exist. He did not see the proposed development substantially changing the character of the downtown area and supported the proposal. While he preferred the height to be reduced it was not a reason to vote against the proposal.

Ms. Hogstrom also preferred lowering the height by a floor. At the same time, Mr. Thoman pointed out how there was discussion tonight regarding the consistency of density within the downtown area, which was one of the goals in the comprehensive plan. For now the proposed building was not consistent with any other building on Main Street, but he believed it would eventually become consistent on the side of Maple Avenue.

Addressing the standards for the PUD, Item E specifically, Mr. Quirk believed the 29 parking spaces were not the issue and patrons would eventually adjust and find parking to shop. Further dialog followed that the proposal would make an impact, but whether it was negative or not, could not be determined. Mr. Cozzo pointed out that one resident said there was the potential for the businesses to gain another 115 new customers in the downtown area. However, he also pointed out to the commissioners that the proposal did not meet the density requirement and that factor could be an argument for denial if they chose. Mr. Thoman returned to Item D under the PUD and said he did not understand what the public benefit would be if the developer presented their proposal under conventional zoning regulations as opposed to the PUD. It was a moot point if there was only a difference of opinion regarding the density issue.

Turning to the zoning map amendment request, commissioners reviewed each of the seven requirements in detail and had no concerns other than it did not meet the density requirement under the comprehensive plan. Special Use requirements were reviewed with no issues raised.

Mr. Popovich explained the breakout of the impact fees for the development. Mr. Quick asked that breakouts for impact fees be included in future development proposals.

Ms. Gassen asked her fellow commissioners if they wanted to include any additional conditions to address the residents' concerns. Addressing the public, she added that the Plan Commission had no say in what the proposed building should look like. No additional conditions were voiced and again, Ms. Gassen reiterated that she did not know if there was enough argument to deny the project and had wished it was more sensitive to the community. Ms. Hogstrom concurred.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 16-PLC-0021, MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING STAFF CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE SPECIAL USE, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND REZONING SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE STAFF REPORT, RENDERINGS,**

APPROVED 06/27/16

ARCHITECTURE PLANS PREPARED BY ESG ARCHITECTS, INC, DATED MAY 23, 2016, AND ENGINEERING AND LANDSCAPE PLANS PREPARED BY KIMLEY HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC, MAY 23, 2016, EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO THE VILLAGE CODES AND ORDINANCES.

- 2. THE PETITIONER SHALL CONSOLIDATE THE THREE LOTS INTO A SINGLE LOT OF RECORD PURSUANT TO SECTION 20.507 OF THE SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF ANY SITE DEVELOPMENT OR BUILDING PERMITS.**
- 3. PRIOR TO ISSUING ANY SITE DEVELOPMENT OR BUILDING PERMITS, THE PETITIONER SHALL MAKE PARK AND SCHOOL DONATIONS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$668,116.88 (\$604,035.78 TO THE PARK DISTRICT, \$47,088.75 TO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT 58, AND \$16,992.35 TO HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT 99).**
- 4. THE BUILDING SHALL BE EQUIPPED WITH AN AUTOMATIC SUPPRESSION AND AN AUTOMATIC AND MANUAL FIRE ALARM SYSTEM IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE VILLAGE'S REQUIREMENTS.**
- 5. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF ANY BUILDING OR DEVELOPMENT PERMITS, THE PETITIONER SHALL PAY TO THE VILLAGE A \$1,000 FEE-IN-LIEU PER VILLAGE APPROVED PARKWAY TREE SUBJECT TO VERIFICATION BY THE VILLAGE FORRESTER.**

SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. COZZO, MR. QUIRK, MRS. GASSEN, MRS. HOGSTROM, MRS. JOHNSON, CHAIRMAN RICKARD

NAY: MR. THOMAN, MRS. RABATAH

MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 6-2

Mr. Thoman explained he voted Nay given the discussion above. While he believed the corner needed to be developed, it needed to be downsized. He was concerned as to what kind of profile it would present to Main Street that was out of character with the rest of Main Street. Mrs. Rabatah echoed Mr. Thoman's comments but also agreed it was beautiful development.

Mr. Popovich provided a quick update for the upcoming June 27th meeting.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:20 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. THOMAN, SECONDED BY MRS. RABATAH. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0.

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