

Approved 01/16/17

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING

VILLAGE HALL COMMITTEE ROOM
801 BURLINGTON AVENUE
NOVEMBER 14, 2016 - 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Gorman called the November 14, 2016 meeting of the Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan Ad Hoc Committee meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. and led the meeting with the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Dave Gorman, Irene Hogstrom, Ed Kalina, John Luka, Daiva Majauskas (7:05 p.m.) Jim Wilkinson

ABSENT: Members Carine Acks and Mark Thoman

STAFF: Community Development Director Stan Popovich

VISITORS: Devin Lavigne, John Houseal with Houseal Lavigne Associates; Don Rickard, 4735 Main St., Downers Grove; Amy Gassen, 5320 Benton, Downers Grove; Willis Johnson, 603 Rogers, Downers Grove; Dave Weiher; Bill Chalberg.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – OCTOBER 5, 2016

MINUTES OF OCTOBER 5, 2016 WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. KALINA, SECONDED BY MR. WILKINSON. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATION OF DRAFT UPDATED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

63rd Street - Director Popovich acknowledged the concept sketches for 63rd Street and 75th Street that were distributed, noting they will be inserted behind their respective discussions in the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Devin Lavigne, with Houseal Lavigne Associates, reported that the Meadowbrook sketches of the buildings would be detailed out better aesthetically; details followed of how that would be done. Per a question, Mr. Lavigne reminded the members that there was consensus that the intersection could not sustain commercial development due to traffic counts, the nearby interchange, and the mall receiving marginal commercial uses. He could not confirm at this time what type of multi-family uses would be designated for the site. A suggestion was made that more convenience/retail space could be added down Woodward Avenue, for conceptual purposes. A question followed as to when the zoning would change, i.e., now or when a developer steps in. Staff clarified further.

Approved 01/16/17

75th Street – Mr. Lavigne explained the location for this site will be slightly larger than the Bolingbrook Promenade and follow the lifestyle center similar to Deer Park where smaller retail is closer to the street for walking and taking advantage of the site off of the interstate. Details followed on how the illustration would reflect improved landscaping. Concern was raised that if a couple of anchor stores could not be retained, would there be another alternative, possibly having residential in the rear? Other comments followed that this intersection had poor traffic signals, walking from the east edge of the development to the west edge was not probable and it was not an attractive complex. Dialog followed that the rendering lacked the depiction of the pedestrian atmosphere that lifestyle centers generate.

Mr. Popovich suggested inserting some graphics to better define that pedestrian “feel.”

Concern was raised that this location was in-between the size of Yorktown and the Promenade and the location was too close to every other anchor and so if the right anchor was not drawn in, it could be an issue conceptually. Ideas floated around as to how to draw in certain retailers and the overall challenges of retail in general.

Mr. Lavigne discussed that he could decrease the amount of retail square footage, orientate the site differently, thereby bringing in another product such as residential off to the side or rear of the site. Again, ideas flowed and discussions of lifestyle centers and their goal -- to get pedestrians walking on-site -- followed. As a last point, Ms. Hogstrom pointed out that certain lifestyle centers (Deer Park, Geneva Commons) included high-end stores which the village was lacking.

Mr. Popovich referenced the key changes in his memo.

Page 38 – Referring to the tools/programs that the village should offer its residents who seek to renovate their homes, etc., someone recalled there was discussion by this group about a design manual being created but that the committee’s consensus was that it would “educate rather than regulate new construction.” This topic should be added/emphasized on page 42.

Page 62 – Regarding the discussion about bicycle mobility and safety on sidewalks, there was recollection that information stating that bicycles were allowed on sidewalks per state law but it was based on yielding to pedestrians and not allowing riders in the Central Business District. In response, Mr. Popovich indicated that staff was not comfortable inserting this section into the comprehensive plan and pointed out that the comprehensive plan was a guiding document and not a regulatory document. The chairman asked for member input on this matter.

Ms. Majauskas voiced that she, as a bike rider, believed that bikes should be allowed to ride on sidewalks, citing the safety concerns if they were not and citing 55th Street as an example of a dangerous street when traveling on bike. However, through further conversation and confirming that it was already legal to ride bikes on sidewalks, members agreed that language should exist in the plan to encourage bike riding, which staff pointed out that it did and would continue to do so.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Bill Chalberg, Downers Grove Bicycle Club, relayed that the City of Chicago allows children age 12 and younger to ride on sidewalks given their experience. He explained the issue with riding on sidewalks was people backing out of driveways and not seeing the cyclist. He suggested

Approved 01/16/17

obtaining some research and having riders ride on the sidewalk in the same direction as the traffic flow.

The chairman stated the preference was to allow safe bike riding off of the sidewalk where possible.

Regarding the topic of bike parking, Mr. Chalberg asked the committee to consider adding locations to park one's bike. Ms. Majauskas disagreed on adding more locations to park bikes.

Mr. Chalberg believed the riding of bikes in the street versus sidewalks was a personal preference.

The chairman entertained a motion to forward the comprehensive plan onto the Plan Commission for review and consideration.

MOTION BY MR. LUCA TO FORWARD THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO THE PLAN COMMISSION. SECONDED BY MR. KALINA.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

INTRODUCTION OF DOWNTOWN REGULATORY FRAMEWORK DISCUSSION

Director Popovich brought the committee up to speed regarding the Downtown Regulatory framework and how the framework, using various tools, achieves the Comprehensive Plan's vision for the downtown.

Mr. John Houseal, with Houseal Lavigne Associates, explained the committee may not achieve all of the text amendment language that would be adopted and placed into the code, but instead achieve different things for different areas of the downtown, as the plan defines and recommends for each of the three different districts in the downtown area. A review of the three areas (districts), as defined in the plan, were reviewed: 1) Downtown Core; 2) Downtown Edge, and 3) the Downtown Transition. Mr. Houseal explained the goal is to have a template for each of the areas which explains what the village is trying to achieve by the comprehensive plan. Each of the respective areas were reviewed by Mr. Houseal, who asked for input and final sign-off:

No comments on the three districts were voiced by the committee members.

Mr. Houseal proceeded to summarize the positives and negatives of the various zoning techniques that were available to achieve the goals of each of the three downtown districts, as referenced above: Euclidian (traditional zoning); Form-based code (regulated); Conditional Zoning; Design Guidelines (not regulated) and use through a Planned Unit Development (PUD) (regulated and usually has three triggers for the process).

Mr. Popovich shared the types of developments within the village that usually triggered the PUD process, i.e., mostly the mix of uses and not necessarily the location or size of the development in the downtown area. Outside the Downtown District, however, he stated the larger developments with multiple buildings, such as the hospital, Midwestern University and the Esplanade, were PUDs.

Approved 01/16/17

Mr. Houseal reminded the committee that they had to consider what they wanted to achieve for each of the three districts, given the tools they had, and provide a balance between controlled aesthetics versus property rights. Considering a question on the possibility of having two separate areas for the Downtown Edge (DE) district, Mr. Houseal believed that going forward there could be two districts within the Downttown Edge district, as well as two districts for the Downtown Transition district and then one set of standards for the Downtown Core, but he offered to hear comments from the other members.

Asked if the village was trying to encourage consolidation, was the village content with development being developed within the lot lines, or was there a better/worse technique the village wanted, Mr. Popovich explained that the issue with the Core was that the lots were small and unless the lots were consolidated, not many large developments would occur, especially between Burlington and Curtiss. But, that was not to say that there were past consolidations in the Core area. In the Edge area, Mr. Popovich explained that the lots were larger and offered more opportunity. He was of the belief that the village should plan for both.

Mr. Houseal stated he was not concerned about consolidations in the Core area because they would be regulated most strictly by built form. However, in the Edge or Transition areas, there could be the potential for very large developments through consolidation and so he cautioned Mr. Popovich about that. Mr. Houseal supported the idea of the two sub-areas for the Downtown Edge area but questioned where would the village locate a six-story building where there was not much room to work with. Mr. Popovich recalled the discussion was that the height could go up to six-stories but that more greenspace had to be added to mitigate the impact. And, as one moved more north to the Downtown area, development should move closer to the 0-foot lot line with no open space.

Discussing PUD versus as-of-right, Mr. Houseal asked if the village had concern in any of the areas of development where the village should have a say or review before a permit is issued. The committee then began discussing other villages that either had a design review overlay district or a PUD overlay district with Mr. Popovich sharing that the village never had a design review overlay district in the past and the village's philosophy was similar to Mr. Houseal's philosophy, i.e., to partner with the developers to get a good product. The difference between an overlay and a PUD was explained to the committee by Mr. Houseal.

Positive comments followed that the village's downtown had become a different look over the past 10 years, with a nice mix, and the little bit of freedom it had, was done well. Mr. Popovich shared that most of the downtown development had been through PUDs or design guidelines (generic) that were somewhat flexible and reviewed by staff. Again, Mr. Houseal stated that he did not believe it was in the best interest for villages to dictate architectural design and he proceeded to cite how different communities reviewed their plans. However, Ms. Hogstrom pointed out that by the time a plan comes to the Plan Commission it is too late to make comments on how a project looks. Mr. Houseal indicated that he can review the village's PUD process to find out if pre-conferences are held with staff or the board prior to a public hearing.

Mr. Popovich stated that staff does meet with developers to review the design guidelines in place and asks them to demonstrate how the guidelines will be met. Architects are also on staff. Asked if there was something not working, based on the zoning and procedures already in place, someone mentioned that a very tall building was coming on-line and the mere fact that it was something new

Approved 01/16/17

or different in the village. Conversation then followed regarding modern buildings, improved materials, EIFS, etc. being used in the construction industry today as compared to years ago.

Asked if the village wanted to allow as-of-right review in any of the three downtown districts, Mr. Popovich believed the village did not have a desire to have a PUD for all development and believed some triggers had to exist but they needed to be defined, such as over a certain height or certain uses. He believed owners should still be able to come to the village if they wanted to renovate their buildings/facades without having to go through a due process. He was open to hearing otherwise.

Mr. Houseal suggested that rather than having a Downtown Transition 1 or 2 that the village have one district with specific setbacks, up to four stories, as-of-right, and anything above it had to be a PUD. The developer had to convince the village that the development was appropriate but it also allowed the village and developer to work collaboratively together for a better product.

Conversation followed regarding the various types of downtown developments occurring in the communities of Elmhurst, Des Plaines, Arlington Heights and Oak Park.

Asking another question, Mr. Houseal asked the committee if a development was three stories tall in the Downtown Edge district, was the committee comfortable having the Transition district as four-stories, as-of-right, and anything above that was a PUD. Mr. Houseal supported this because it made sense and the fact that the village was stating it was willing to go up to six stories implied it wanted something taller in the area. Others agreed and discussed the reasons why – the value of the downtown becomes much greater, to renovate the older buildings will become more expensive to developers, and the village wants to encourage that by allowing developers to construct upwards. On the other hand, dialog followed that the limiting factor on how tall buildings can be will depend on the parking, which will be the defining factor.

Asked if there were water issues underground, Mr. Popovich was not aware of any currently.

Taking in the comments, Mr. Houseal summarized his take-away was to have a minimally invasive regulatory framework and to create an environment that would allow reasonable, as-of right, and not burdensome procedures. He would only put in place guidelines and procedures to ensure those projects “out of the norm” get reviewed.

However, Mr. Popovich clarified that the issue, among staff, was the realization that a building could be constructed up to 70 feet in height and when it was acknowledged, the village realized it did not want that, which was how the Core district came about. The village was trying to protect the “Mayberry” part of town and not impinge upon it. Mr. Popovich believed how the village regulated the Core to keep the small town feel of downtown was important and how the village allowed for the economics behind it to work on the transition.

Mr. Houseal encouraged the village to develop some guidelines for the Core, Transition and Edge districts and then consider if it wanted to put in place some form of regulatory procedure to trigger the review or, to sit down with a developer and discuss it.

Discussion of relaxing the parking requirements followed with Mr. Houseal stating the 1.4 parking ratio was in keeping with the more progressive end of urban settings in suburban communities and

Approved 01/16/17

if a developer were to come in with a different figure, he would have to explain his/her case through a PUD or rezoning. Staff confirmed that was how it was done by the village currently.

Mr. Houseal closed the discussion by clarifying that zoning was not planning; it was a tool to implement planning. He would draft some framework language and return with a draft, reminding the committee that the draft will discuss the approach the village wants to take versus the actual amendment language.

Clarification followed that the setbacks should still be considered in the Downtown Edge 1 and 2 districts and then the height anywhere triggers the PUD. Graphics would be provided. Concern was raised by Ms. Majauskas who hoped to see a written draft since she believed that “the rules were only as good as the people behind them” and that staff could change over time and the village’s vision get lost. She cited the Village of Lisle as an example. Mr. Houseal discussed otherwise, stating that if the language is well written it can be interpreted even if staff turns over. No ambiguity would exist.

Asked whether Mr. Houseal or staff were using any of the remaining five zoning techniques or a compilation of them in other forms, Mr. Houseal explained that he still had to address the challenge of staff administering a zoning ordinance and reviewing the village’s current zoning ordinance. It would not be replaced in its entirety but tweaked where necessary since staff and the development community were currently using it. The goal was to make it user-friendly and fair to all parties using it.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The chairman invited public comment. None followed.

Staff confirmed the next meeting was scheduled for December 7, 2016.

ADJOURNMENT

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:10 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. KALINA, SECONDED BY MR. LUCA. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt

(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)

APPROVED 1/9/17

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

DECEMBER 5, 2016, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Rickard called the December 5, 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. Staff announced that Mr. Cronin had submitted his letter of resignation.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Rickard, Mr. Boyle, Ms. Gassen, Ms. Hogstrom, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Maurer, Mr. Thoman

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Stan Popovich, Director of Community Development; and Rebecca Leitschuh, Senior Planner

VISITORS: Charlotte and Byron Holtzen, 5226 Carpenter Street, Downers Grove; Mary Ann Badke, 5408 Carpenter Street, Downers Grove; Rich Kulovany, 6825 Camden, Downers Grove; Cindy and Christina Zaeske, 1130 Forest, Downers Grove; Ed Olsen, 5138 Lee, Downers Grove; Bill Chaubery, 1132 Curtiss 1-A, Downers Grove

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

NOVEMBER 7, 2016 MINUTES – MOTION BY MR. THOMAN, SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0. MS. JOHNSON ABSTAINED.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

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

FILE 16-PLC-0019: A petition seeking review, comments and a positive recommendation to forward the Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan update to the Village Council. Should Council adopt the update, it will become the official plan for the Village as required by Section 1.12 of the Municipal Code. Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

Director of Community Development, Mr. Popovich, on behalf of the Village, summarized the significant updates to the Plan, as referenced in the table included in the Staff Memo dated December 5, 2016. Mr. Popovich introduced the changes by explaining the history of the Comprehensive Plan: The original 1965 Comprehensive Plan; a new, award-winning plan was adopted in 2011 based on significant community outreach in Total Community Development III; a

APPROVED 1/9/17

minor revision made in 2015. This too is an update, not a total re-writing. Five years is standard planning practice to update a comprehensive plan.

Mr. Popovich explained that Staff uses the plan on a daily basis, and that it is aspirational/visionary in nature to serve as a roadmap looking 15-20 years in the future. He explained that the plan does not set rules: that is the role of the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Popovich reviewed updates to the Plan:

Introduction: No significant changes

Section 1: Highlighted new plans since 2011, demographics updated (getting older and younger)

Section 2: Vision was a significant update (low impact design, additional tree canopy, multi-family and mixed use buildings, redeveloped commercial corridors, Ogden Avenue improvements)

Section 3: Land Use plan had minor modifications (map change in two locations and updated pictures)

Section 4: Add Historic preservation paragraphs, low intensity design, sidewalks updated (no longer have a sidewalk matrix), parkway trees improved, added historic preservation and parkway tree management policy recommendations

Mr. Thoman requested stronger language in Section 4 per parkway trees to not just replace, but actively seek out absent tree locations and place new trees.

Mr. Quirk, going back to Section 3, asked if the map change of the Future Land Use Map would stipulate a Zoning Map change. He expressed concern Meadowbrook Shopping Center and possibly limiting the current owner. Mr. Popovich responded that the plan would have room for interpretation to allow the owner to make use of their property.

Ms. Gassen said she felt the community was losing single family residential in a more affordable range, walkable to downtown. She requested to add language specific to “walk to town” or “proximity to town” in the Section 4 policy recommendations. Mr. Rickard cited the Downtown Focus Area and more form-based code in the Downtown Transition area regarding setbacks and yards.

Mr. Quirk asked a question whether Sears homes are protected, Mr. Popovich said not currently; that the Sears homes policy recommendation was from the 2011 plan and a way of drawing attention to the properties. Mr. Thoman participated in the 2011 ad-hoc committee and explained that it was identified for historical thematic districts. Mr. Maurer requested to change the reference to “Sears” homes as “kit homes.” Ms. Gassen requested to include language specific to continuing to identify ways to incentivize historic preservation.

Ms. Hogstrom requested to add more about trees as a method for stormwater mitigation and the mutual benefit. Also to encourage trees on private property. Mr. Thoman said trees on private property was a controversial topic five years prior. Used Wilmette as an example of a private land

APPROVED 1/9/17

tree ordinance. Ms. Hogstrom said she was not suggesting an ordinance, but something to encourage tree canopies on private property.

Ms. Hogstrom identified that improving access to the Forest Preserves, e.g., Hidden Lake, was discussed by the ad-hoc committee.

Mr. Popovich noted Section 5 included the elimination of the Sign Ordinance discussion, an update of 63rd Street to neighborhood commercial and added historic preservation as policy recommendation.

Mr. Boyle asked about revisiting downtown/commuter parking options. Mr. Popovich said there were past discussions about adding a parking deck north of the BNSF railroad tracks, but that with the carshare market developing, the idea was to wait and see how new markets may affect parking demand. Also, with the additional multi-family developments under construction, demand might change. Mr. Popovich said the bike plan was revisited and that design of a pedestrian underpath was discussed to cross the train tracks downtown.

Mr. Popovich provided updates on the following sections:

Section 6: Updated Belmont Road discussion, updated mobility discussion, updated maps, included discussions on new technologies, car & bike share, electric vehicles

Section 7: Not many changes. New Park District vision statement, updated maps, policy updates to include discussion on rain gardens and tree canopies.

Section 8: Updated school and village facility discussions.

Section 10 & Appendix: Added more descriptions of programs – Appendix was goals/objectives from TCD III.

Section 9: Focus Area Plans – There were five focus areas in 2011, seven now with the additions of 63rd Street & 75th Street. No significant changes were made to Belmont Ellsworth Focus Area. The Belmont Road underpass was added and former catalyst site #3 was developed so it was removed.

The Downtown Focus Area came before the Plan Commission in June for the Commission's review. The Commission's and Comprehensive Planning Committee's recommendations were forwarded to the Village Council in July and October, with individual meetings with Council members in between. As a result, three functional subareas were developed. The Comprehensive Planning Committee is working on developing a regulatory framework for these three areas (rules and regulations). These would build off the Comprehensive Plan and set the rules for downtown development. The regulatory framework would come back to the Plan Commission in spring.

Some concept recommendations have been updated, including potentially historic buildings on the map. Catalyst sites were updated with some removed and some added. Ms. Gassen identified the catalyst sites needed renumbering (did not match maps). Ms. Gassen requested to add something specific to the historic blacksmith shop downtown. She also corrected the discrepancy of "neighborhood transition" versus "downtown transition." Mr. Quirk identified that the Downtown Transition district needed to extend east of Prospect, beyond the current development. Mr. Quirk

APPROVED 1/9/17

asked about the key concept specific to Rogers and Main, and asked for clarification on “auto oriented uses.” Mr. Popovich explained it was describing drive-throughs and strip centers. Mr. Maurer asked if that use was more appropriate for Ogden. Mr. Popovich responded that the uses in the commercial building at Rogers and Main are appropriate uses for the DT district, however the building is incompatible with downtown guidelines as the building is setback from the street with parking along Main Street which does not create a streetwall.

Moving on, Mr. Popovich noted Butterfield Road Focus Area catalyst sites were updated. The Ogden Avenue Focus Area was combined (previously three areas, now one continuous corridor) and the catalyst sites were updated. Mr. Quirk asked about the future use of Packey Webb’s current dealership location. Mr. Popovich replied the intention was to attract another dealership.

Fairview Focus Area had no significant changes with plans remaining the same.

The 63rd Street Focus Area is new. The Plan notes this corridor is not the most effective commercial corridor with a range of uses present including schools, single-family, multi-family, commercial, and churches. The Meadowbrook concept is to convert Meadowbrook to neighborhood commercial with multi-family residential.

The 75th Street Focus Area is new as well. This corridor includes commercial nodes with a Corridor Commercial designation and single-family and multi-family residential. New key concepts include reviewing the Knottingham Subdivision to provide more efficient services. The consultant developed a concept plan for redevelopment of the Grove Shopping Center into a lifestyle center. The Comprehensive Planning Committee suggested developing a concept with more big box and broken up a little with multi-family on west

Chairman Rickard opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Rich Kulovany, 6825 Camden, Downers Grove, expressed the desire to see development applications earlier in the process saying the community finds out about a petition after much effort/money has already been invested. Mr. Kulovany referenced an email he forwarded to the board previously and recommended a design review board for citizen input before developers invest money to say if it does/does not “fit in.” Mr. Kulovany said he and Ms. Gassen were invited to attend a Landmarks Illinois Suburban Alliance meeting in Glenview where form based code was discussed. They later called Trammell Crow, the developers in Glenview’s revitalization development to ask about the process/review. He then listed six communities they contacted, passed around a copy of Wheaton’s design guidelines as an example, and request a design review balance between Glenview (full public involvement) and Wheaton (staff implementation). He suggested the creation of an ad-hoc downtown design review board. Mr. Kulovany also suggested changing name of Architectural Design Review Board to include historic preservation in the name. Mr. Quirk asked if the downtown design review board would apply to all redevelopment in downtown, including businesses that can develop by right as this would create an additional layer of oversight. Mr. Kulovany responded that the downtown should move forward with form-based code alongside design professionals to determine guidelines. Mr. Popovich reminded the commission that according to the Illinois Open Meetings Act, board members cannot “respond all” to emails sent to the group. Mr. Popovich suggested adding language to the plan about considering a downtown design review board, to be further discussed by the Comprehensive Planning Ad Hoc committee. Mr. Quirk expressed concern that the creation of another board could enable others to interfere by

APPROVED 1/9/17

adding time and money to the process, a concern for current owners versus developers who have no existing investment in the properties. Mr. Kulovany said the first task of the downtown design review board could be to survey the downtown by professionals.

Ms. Cindy Zaeske, 1130 Forest, Downers Grove, was supportive of the downtown design review board. She said such a board could help keep the look of the town, and that she thought guidelines would not stop creativity, but would “challenge” it.

Ms. Christina Zaeske, 1130 Forest, Downers Grove, expressed her support for downtown design review/regulations. She said local modern development consisted of “drab boxes”, in an “American assembly-line style.”

Mr. Ed Olsen, 5138 Lee, Downers Grove, an architect of 40 years, moved to Downers Grove five years prior because of the community’s “quaint” feeling. He was concerned about the “build-up” in the downtown, and “paving over” of green space and stormwater implications. He said the community should be able to dictate to developers an architects the desired design.

Mr. Popovich suggested that the Comprehensive Plan Ad-Hoc Committee would discuss the implementation plan in its next phase of review, and emphasized that this phase (the review of the comprehensive plan) was “aspirational” in purpose, not “implementation.” Mr. Rickard said that the basics of design guidelines (e.g, height) were part of the zoning ordinance. He asked if the proposed design guidelines would be a separate plan or part of the comprehensive plan. Mr. Popovich said they were completely separate: that the implementation steps could be to propose changes to the zoning ordinance, and/or to hire a consultant to develop design guidelines.

Ms. Gassen said more time was needed to review the draft. Mr. Popovich said staff could provide hard copies of the comprehensive plan and highlight changes. Mr. Quirk asked if Plan Commission was required to make a recommendation, or just fulfilling a formality to review. Mr. Popovich said Plan Commission was required to review with a recommendation. Mr. Thoman proposed sending back the Downtown Focus Area section to the ad-hoc committee over concerns of design. Mr. Popovich said any proposed design regulations would be part of a two-step process, with the development of design guidelines as part of the second step: implementation. Ms. Gassen requested a redline copy of all changes to the comprehensive plan, the November Comprehensive Plan Ad-Hoc Committee meeting minutes, and a hard copy of the comprehensive plan update.

Mr. Rickard expressed support of looking into the creation of a downtown design review board. Ms. Leitschuh emphasized that historic preservation and design review guidelines have different intentions, and that design regulations do not guarantee the preservation of the existing building stock or feeling of a community. Mr. Maurer said he found the zoning ordinance to be the appropriate tool to foster new development (height, material, setback) per the communities desired characteristics. Ms. Gassen said she did not associate the design guidelines with historic preservation, but to evaluate “what we are replacing buildings with.” She said it was not to prolong the process with developers, but to give feedback from the beginning, and create design guidelines with “teeth in them.” She requested placing “for consideration” in the key concepts language to further nudge discussion around design guidelines. Mr. Boyle asked what would be the process to develop implementation steps. Mr. Popovich replied that the steps would be discussed first by the Comprehensive Plan Ad-Hoc Committee, then Plan Commission, then Village Council. Mr. Rickard asked how the group would create guidelines to “objectively” apply to downtown, and how

APPROVED 1/9/17

they could avoid subjective reviews which would be difficult to enforce with differing opinions. Mr. Maurer also expressed concern about objective versus subjective criteria. He warned against freezing the Village in a faux version of past and still not achieving the overall objective. He said progressive buildings can be complementary.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 16-PLC-0019, MR. THOMAN MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING UNTIL JANUARY 9TH, AFTER RECEIPT OF THE REQUESTED MATERIALS TO BE PROVIDED BY STAFF.

SECONDED BY MS. GASSEN. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. THOMAN, MS. GASSEN, MS. HOGSTROM, MR. MAURER, CHAIRPERSON RICKARD

NAY: MR. BOYLE, MS. JOHNSON, MR. QUIRK

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 5-3

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:30 P.M. ON MOTION BY MS. GASSEN, SECONDED BY MR. QUIRK. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 8:0.

/s/ Rebecca Leitschuh