

**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 17, 2021, 7:00 P.M.**

Chairwoman Gassen called the February 17, 2021 of the Architectural Design Review Board to order at 7:00 p.m. and requested a roll call:

1. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairwoman Gassen, Ms. Acks, Mr. Styczynski, Ms. Chalberg, Mr. Lerner, Mr. Renner, Mr. Reimer

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Stan Popovich, Community Development Director
Jason Zawila, Planning Manager
Flora Ramirez, Development Planner
Gabriella Baldassari, Development Planner
Josh Dausener, Management Intern

VISITORS: Chuck Gatto, 5123 Main Street, Downers Grove
David Hene, 5207 Main Street, Downers Grove
Erin Venezia, Downers Grove Downtown Management Corporation

2. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 13, 2021 MEETING MINUTES

Motion by Reimer, second by Lerner to approve the minutes of the January 13, 2021 meeting. Minutes were unanimously approved by voice vote. Vote: 7-0

3. OLD BUSINESS

Design Review Project – Chairwoman Gassen briefly explained how the meeting will be conducted. Planning Manager Zawila summarized that he will be covering the second portion of the downtown design review project and proceeded to explain that the meeting would focus on Task 2, which involves ADRB examining the review and approval process for downtown projects and if the board recommends any changes to the existing process. The following three key questions will be considered: 1) what type of construction triggers design review; 2) what are the regulations; and 3) who is the decision-maker.

Design Review Process – Manager Zawila explained the Village's current permitting process as it pertained to the building permit or entitlement process. Examples of such projects that went through the entitlement process included Marquee on Maple, Maple and Main and Burlington Station.

Examples of projects followed that 1) do not require a permit, 2) require a building permit, and 3) projects that involved Planned Unit Developments, special use, etc.

Director of Community Development, Stan Popovich, introduced the exercise for the evening, which was to consider the three above questions: 1) what improvements should require design compliance; 2) is design compliance recommended or required; and 3) who is the decision-maker. Per staff, tonight's focus would be on guidance and/or modifications with

staff to return at the next meeting with options. Questions of clarification followed with staff providing a brief overview of the various zoning districts: Downtown Core, Downtown Business, and Downtown Transition.

Exercise 1 - What improvements should require design compliance?

Director Popovich reviewed those items that did not require a building permit: 1) roof replacement, landscaping, gutters, window replacement, paint, siding and door replacement. Discussion by commissioners included concern about those projects that are completed and may not be in keeping with some of the guidelines the ADRB has discussed in the past. Examples stated include removal of a historic tree in the business area, painting a building that draws attention, installing framed siding on a historic brick building, or replacing glass windows with glass block.

Commissioners agreed that the certain items should be considered but refrain from placing too many layers on a business owner. An appeal process should exist. However, other commissioners felt the items being discussed were a building owner's decision and not to regulate more, noting building owners will regulate themselves. However, if the majority wanted to see such items removed, it was suggested to keep the restrictions out of the Downtown Transitional District, with single-family home uses in particular. Mr. Renner recommended that paint, window replacement, siding and door replacement be restricted to the Downtown Core. Chairwoman Gassen preferred that window replacement be administratively reviewed if it was not like for like. It was also clarified that siding did not need a permit and that she supported door replacement as not needing a permit, unless it was not like for like and could be reviewed by staff.

In summary, through polling the ADRB members it was recommended that landscaping, paint, window replacement, siding and door replacement adhere to have some level of compliance with the design guidelines.

Staff then moved the discussion towards improvements that currently require a permit. Through polling the ADRB members it was recommended interior remodel, fire system alarm, waterproofing and lawn irrigation, should not require any level of design compliance.

Discussion then occurred over other types of improvements that require a permit such as structural changes to roofing; fencing, air conditioning and generators (as it pertains to screening), parking lot repairs, and parking lot additions. Discussion followed as to what constituted parking lot repairs, when a permit is needed generally, and how an owner determines they need a permit.

Discussing detached garages and sheds (with single-family homes), Director Popovich noted both items required permits currently. Detached garages needed a permit but no design review is currently completed with them. Ms. Chalberg pointed out that with the Transitional District it was intended to be changing from single family to multi-family or low impact office, allowing the village to expand the downtown commercial district in such a way that it does not impact single-family dwellings negatively. If there was guidance provided on design, then there was no guidance or restrictions on fencing. It was further voiced that fencing does impact the way a streetscape looks and can negatively impact an area if not done properly. Further discussion occurred on if there could be a way to distinguish fencing by use in the Transition area – i.e., residential dwellings being used as offices versus true single-family dwellings.

Mr. Riemer supported that the rule be the same across all three districts -- whether a residential property or commercial property -- and the fact that the village should encourage businesses to come to the village, not push businesses away with many restrictions.

In summary, through polling the ADRB members it was recommended that detached garages and sheds should not require some level of design compliance, however roofing changes, fences, AC/generators, parking lot repairs and parking lot additions should have some level of design compliance.

Lastly, brief discussion occurred and in summary through polling the ADRB members, it was recommended that new window/door, façade renovations, additions, new-multi-family, and new commercial and entitlement cases continue to require some level of design compliance, as it currently does today.

Exercise 2 – Is Design Compliance Recommended or Required

Moving on to the next exercise, Manager Zawila proceeded to explain the second exercise that the commission would be going through. He explained that the term “guidelines” means, from the village’s perspective, a “recommended approach.” However, “regulations” were considered a requirement for the purpose of design review approval. Manager Zawila proceeded to review the process staff deals with for guideline compliance when it is a requirement – briefly reviewing projects that went through that entitlement process. Discussion followed on how staff reviews a request that falls under a guideline, noting there is no formal review body and staff tries to work its best with an applicant. Most applicants work with staff.

Director Popovich reminded the commissioners that if an item is required, the decision would come down to staff, an advisory board or the council giving the approval. If an item is recommended, staff will work with the applicant to follow the guidelines. Staff then reviewed the improvements that the ADRB recommended should have some level of design review compliance, but currently do not require a permit: landscaping, paint, window replacement, siding and door replacement. It was suggested that landscaping changes should be the decision of the property owner, but clarification was requested regarding the Village’s tree protection ordinance. Staff clarified that the potential for tree protection depended upon whether the tree was in the village parkway or on the owner’s property. Currently there was no tree protection ordinance for private property.

An inquiry was made on what the context was for the opportunity for staff to make recommendations. Staff stated since there is no process for work that does not require a permit that’s hard; but if there is a parking lot remodel then staff can catch it on the permit. Other times when people call in, the planners reference the design guidelines in addition to the zoning ordinance. Ms. Chalberg acknowledged staff’s ability in successfully encouraging landscaping improvements even though these improvements currently do not require design compliance. Other comments followed regarding if requirements are made that it creates a process that becomes so subjective, time-consuming, and works in the opposite and motivates an applicant not to do anything.

Dialog then turned to the Downtown Core District and whether the village wanted someone to paint their building facade pink with a commissioner emphasizing that the DC district needed to be protected because doing so could affect a neighbor negatively.

In summary, through polling the ADRB members recommended that landscaping, paint, window replacement, siding and door replacement shall be recommended to comply with the design guidelines.

Currently, roofing changes, fencing, screening, parking lot repairs, and parking lot additions were all recommended to comply with the design guidelines. For detached garages and sheds, commissioners agreed “no” for required compliance.

After brief discussion it was agreed by the ADRB members that detached garages and sheds should not require some level of design compliance, however roofing changes, fences, AC/generators, parking lot repairs and parking lot additions should continue to be recommended to comply with the design guidelines through the current building permit process as it occurs today.

After further discussion it was also agreed that new window/door, façade renovations, additions, new-multi-family, new commercial and entitlement cases should be required to comply with the design guidelines. However, during the discussion, Chairwoman Gassen, did favor leaving them as “recommended” but have an advisory board review. Director Popovich explained some of the challenges of having it recommended with an advisory board and suggested that it may be better to have it “required.” Mr. Renner asked to have “recommended” on windows and doors but “required” for new openings, façade renovations and additions but, again excluding single-family uses in the DT district. Lastly, a concern was raised by Mr. Styczynski that a committee could suddenly be designing a building who themselves had no financial input into the project or taking the risk. Comments and opinions followed as well as landmarking a property and the difference.

Public Comment – Opportunity 1

Chairwoman Gassen invited comments from the public.

Mr. David Hene, inquired of staff if a tenant moves out of a building and the new tenant comes in with either a permitted use or a continuation of an existing/non-conforming use, the landlord will have to apply for an interior build-out permit (recommended category) as well as applying for a signage permit. However, Mr. Hene did not see signage as a topic for discussion and asked whether it was addressed somewhere else in the context of the design guidelines. Per Director Popovich, an interior remodel was not recommended for compliance with the design guidelines. Per Manager Zawila as it relates to design guidelines, signs, were not part of the scope of the project, as currently the sign ordinance has very specific requirements for the downtown.

No further comments were received from the public.

Exercise 3 – Who is the Decision Maker

Manager Zawila briefly provided an overview of the last exercise, pointing out that there are a number of decision makers including property owners, staff, an advisory board, and Village Council. Director Popovich explained how changes could affect an item, such as having to hold public meetings and their impact. Examples followed by staff and different scenarios were presented by the commissioners clarifying who the decision maker is for those types of improvements that are recommended for design compliance.

Regarding those improvements that currently do not require a permit, comments followed that staff should be involved in the process in order to be persuasive toward a property owner. However, it was pointed out that if a project, such as painting came in, staff could make a recommendation on how to paint the building, but ultimately the owner made the decision. Commissioners felt that while the property owner could still be the decision maker on the five

items, the process could go through staff with staff educating the owner about the guidelines and having something like a sign-off sheet be used.

Before moving onto the next items, Ms. Chalberg raised the point that while staff put much effort into the revision of the Downtown Guidelines there was no compliance required, so far. Conversation raised by commissioners was that there could be consultation with staff and with this board, if it was made “required”. However, Director Popovich explained the challenges of that.

In summary, through polling the ADRB members recommended that landscaping, paint, window replacement, siding and door replacement, the property owners should be the decision maker, while staff should serve in a consulting capacity.

Regarding, roofing changes, fencing, screening, parking lot repairs, and parking lot additions, the property owners should be the decision maker, while staff should serve in a consulting capacity, which is the current practice.

Moving to the next set of improvements, after some discussion it was recommended that new windows, door openings, façade renovations and additions, commissioners agreed that staff would be the decision maker and the ADRB would be the appeals board. During discussion it was stated by Mr. Styczynski that he like the idea of staff being the decision maker these improvements. Staff can check compliance with the guidelines, but he did not want to see this become such a long drawn out process if staff can take care of it. Several agreed that the ADRB could be the appeals board to staff decisions. For new multi-family and new commercial, the commissioners agreed that staff should be the decision maker and that the ADRB be the appeal board.

Per a commissioner question, Director Popovich explained how a new multi-family building becomes a Planned Unit Development. Examples followed. Director Popovich further explained the current review process for special uses and planned unit developments. Through polling the ADRB members recommended that the Village should maintain the status quo as it relates to design review for special uses and planned unit development cases, which are currently reviewed by the Plan Commission.

Chairwoman Gassen asked staff when staff puts together proposals for the next meeting, to please consider that a goal is to get projects into public eye earlier into the process. Director Popovich explained that if the ADRB wanted to have an earlier review of projects, would it want to consider having an “ADRB-look” prior to a submission to the Plan Commission. Director Popovich agreed with some commissioners that it added another layer of administration, added another month to the process, and that zoning items would not be discussed by the ADRB. A commissioner asked whether staff could provide reports to the ADRB on projects that were going on, for the public’s sake. Chairwoman Gassen asked staff to provide some input on that matter in its report next month. General dialog followed on how staff publicizes a meeting to the public and to proactively notifying the public on projects or their changes.

Chairwoman Gassen invited public comment. None received. No final comments were received from this board.

Chairwoman Gassen asked staff to provide an update on the next steps for this process, wherein staff relayed it will take the input received tonight and provide some options at the March 17, 2021 meeting. A final draft of the Design Guidelines would also be provided.

Chairwoman Gassen invited public comment on general items. None received. Staff provided a brief update on its latest projects. Chairwoman Gassen thanked staff for working on the above matter. Manager Zawila voiced his pleasure at seeing the commissioners in person.

4. ADJOURNMENT

Chairwoman Gassen called for a motion to adjourn.

**Ms. Chalberg moved, seconded by Mr. Styczynski to adjourn the meeting at 9:54 p.m.
Motion carried unanimously.**

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

APPROVED

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

February 1, 2021, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman (Ch.) Rickard called the February 1, 2021 remote meeting of the Downers Grove Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. Because of the state mandated requirements regarding social distancing, the meeting was held electronically. Ch. Rickard provided an overview on how the public can participate via Zoom or through providing written comments to planning@downers.us. He then led the meeting in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Ch. Rickard (In Person); Commissioners Boyle, Dmytryszyn, Johnson, Majauskas, Maurer, Patel, Rollins (Electronically)

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Planning Manager Jason Zawila, Development Planner Flora Ramirez (In Person)

VISITORS: Chuck Wiley (Petitioner), Amy Olson, Victoria Protsyuk, Beth Brownson, Liz Pelloso, Claudia Kappel, Paul Bollinger, Mary Yurkovic, Michael Malinowski, Amy Olson, Betty Ann Morton, Jessica Lynch, Maureen Bialas, Gordon Goodman (Electronically)

Ch. Rickard entertained a motion to conduct the February 1, 2021 Plan Commission meeting electronically. (Commissioner Toth arrives remotely at 7:03PM)

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER MAURER, SECOND BY COMMISSIONER ROLLINS TO CONDUCT THE FEBRUARY 1, 2021 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING ELECTRONICALLY. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MAURER, ROLLINS, BOYLE, DMYTRYSZYN, JOHNSON, PATEL, MAJAUSKAS, RICKARD.

NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE 8-0

MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 7, 2020 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BOYLE. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER DMYTRYSZYN.

AYE: BOYLE, DMYTRYSZYN, MAURER, ROLLINS, JOHNSON, PATEL, MAJAUSKAS, TOTH, RICKARD.

NAY: NONE

APPROVED

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 9-0

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Ch. Rickard reviewed the procedures for the public hearing.

FILE 20-PLC-0027: A petition seeking annexation and rezoning from R-1, Residential Detached House 1, to R-4, Residential Detached House 4. The vacant property will be annexed with the default zoning of R-1, Residential Detached House 1. The property is located at the southwest corner of Jefferson Avenue and Downers Drive, commonly known as 5801 Springside Avenue, Downers Grove, Petitioner and Owner, Charles W. & Sigrid P. Wiley

Ch. Rickard swore in those individuals that would be speaking at tonight's public hearing.

Petitioner, Charles Wiley, explained that he lives in an apartment complex in Lisle and said he purchased the lot in August 2020. He shared his reasons why he chose to live in Downers Grove, explained that he originally started discussions of development with the DuPage County Stormwater Management Department and determined that water access could only be granted through annexation into the Village of Downers Grove. He did discuss the legal practicalities of pursuing an exemption from the annexation. A slide review followed. Mr. Wiley said he was only asking for rezoning from R-1 to R-4 due to the surrounding zoning districts.

Mr. Wiley explained the wetlands mitigation efforts will be reviewed under the building process but that ultimately the proposal met all of the requirements of the Village from a wetlands perspective, a stormwater management perspective, and no relief was being sought for any variances. The proposal was consistent with the surrounding properties which were zoned R-4, and he felt the proposed single-family home could be developed on the non-wetlands portion of the property which was consistent with the area and would add value to the surrounding properties; not diminish them.

To that end, Mr. Wiley relayed that he addressed all of the issues raised by the planning staff and asked for the commission's approval.

Ch. Rickard invited commissioner comments/questions. Commissioner Boyle inquired of the petitioner whether he spoke to anyone on the Council about the annexation wherein Mr. Wiley's said his attorney did have discussions with the Village's attorney on whether he could be allowed access to the Village's water supply without having to be required to annex into the Village, which was under Ordinance #3528, which was put in place to deal with water contamination issues.

Asked if the petitioner had spoken to FEMA, since the site was a floodplain, Mr. Wiley indicated he did not but instead did initiate dialog with DuPage County who indicated that if he did want to access water, he would have to annex into the Village. In addition, similar discussions occurred with the DuPage County Stormwater Management department, the Village's planning staff, and he expected it would be addressed through the permitting process. Mr. Wiley did recall that he may have had to receive feedback from the Army Corp of Engineers regarding soil but that the topic never came up in discussions.

In addressing the staff report, Commissioner Maurer inquired of the petitioner whether there would

APPROVED

be any further plans to extend storm sewer services to the property, wherein Mr. Wiley indicated he hoped that was possible, given the limited area on the property, and since there was no room on the property to place a septic system. A storm drain was located outside the property and his expectation was to access storm sewer. Asked what other wetland mitigation efforts were being applied to the site, Mr. Wiley described that a buffer zone would be created outside the wetlands with post-construction best management practices that would drain from the area as well as a compensatory storage requirement, which he did not know the specifics of. He was working with an engineer on the matter. Furthermore, Mr. Wiley discussed the various surveys he had done on the property – wetland delineation survey, plat survey, tree survey, etc. and explained that vegetation would have to be replaced if cut down during the construction process in the buffer zone, guided by the stormwater management guidelines provided by DuPage County. He offered to get the information from the County.

Commissioner Dmytryszyn asked about the variance with the County and what the primary driver was for the R-1 versus R-4 zoning wherein Mr. Wiley summarized that it was a benefit in that it allowed to place the footprint on the property without impeding the wetlands. The County was amenable to a variance because it would minimize the impact on the wetlands, however, discussions never went further because of the need for water service.

Hearing no other commissioner comments, Ch. Rickard explained that two issues were of interest on the proposal: wetlands and the fact that a good portion of the property sat in an LPDA (Localized Poor Drainage Area). He emphasized the focus was limited to the zoning classification from R-1 to R-4 and the annexation was at the discretion of the Village Council and not the Plan Commission. Items such as stormwater management, LPDA construction, and compliance with wetland regulations were handled with the building permit application, which was handled by staff, and which review comments would have to be satisfied by the petitioner.

Ch. Rickard opened up the hearing to public comment.

Mr. Gordon Goodman, 5834 Middaugh, explained that given the uniqueness of the property, he believed that R-2 zoning versus R-4 zoning was preferable. He noted that R-2 zoning required a minimum of 15,000 sq. feet versus the R-4 zoning which required 7500 sq. feet. The other difference between the two zonings was the setback requirements from the street: For R-4 zoning it was 25 feet and R-2 zoning was 35 feet, citing Section 28.2.30 of the Zoning Ordinance, under Lot and Building Regulations, Table 2-2. He believed the Village should issue an exception to the setback from the street in order to preserve the lot to support one home under the R-2 zoning versus the R-4 zoning.

Ch. Rickard asked staff for clarification of Mr. Goodman's comments where he stated there was an opportunity to construct two homes under the R-4 zoning. Development Planner Ramirez confirmed that only one single-family structure could be constructed. However, Mr. Goodman stated that under the R-4 zoning, the lot was susceptible to subdivision.

Ms. Claudie Kappel, stated she lived in the area for 30 years and would speak to Mr. Wiley at some point.

Ms. Jessica Lynch, thanked the petitioner for being transparent with the proposal, and affirmed the flooding in the area. She pointed out that the criteria for approval of the site had to do with

APPROVED

property values increasing but she did not believe that with certainty. Contrarily, with the construction, she stated there could be additional flooding issues and could not affirm that her property value or the general area's property values would increase. She asked the Commission to consider those items.

Ms. Liz Pelloso, resident and Chairman of the Environmental Concerns Commission acknowledged that the site was being considered for voluntary annexation and it was contiguous to the Village's municipal boundary. Her statement included concerns about the petitioner's response to the Village's review and approval criteria, specifically Criteria 3 as it related to property value and the petitioner's response that the annexation would significantly increase property values. While she stated the annexation could increase property value, it could also affect public health and safety of residents by creating additional flooding that occurs on the site and in the area. As to Criteria 4, Ms. Pelloso pointed out that of the 0.95 acre site, 0.33 acres of the lot was considered wetland, which extended off the platted lot towards the roadway. Zoning the lot for residential development would set the lot up for actual development, which if occurred, would result in additional impervious surfaces and fill amendments to the natural soils on the site, creating run-off and decreasing the property's natural ability for water to percolate into the groundwater, leading to additional flooding.

Ms. Pelloso summarized that the site was an LPDA and a house was proposed to be constructed in a portion of that. She stated in her professional opinion the site needed to remain as such and was not a site for development. The proposed home would not have a basement and noted that within the public agenda packet it stated, *"The foundation will be flood-proof in accordance with a geotechnical report and the house will be reasonably safe from flooding."* Ms. Pelloso stated the words *"reasonably safe from flooding"* did not provide assurance that the home would not flood or assurance that development of the lot would not further increase flooding that the community currently faced. Her further concerns included having compensatory storage requirement around the home itself, assuming the owner did not encroach into the wetlands or storage areas over time. Since more than fifty percent of the site was wetland, she questioned if it was really an appropriate use of the property. Regarding Criteria 6, Ms. Pelloso pointed out that the value of a property to a community was not just its economic redevelopment value -- there was a reason why the land was not developed, even though platted, for over 100 years: it was a low area and a wetland area. The fact that the neighborhood residents previously petitioned the Village to obtain the property and keep it in its natural state reflected that its intrinsic value was open space wetland, and fauna habitat was being undervalued, if valued at all. The value to the community was its natural area, which was being used for floodwater, and filtration, which was not mentioned by the petitioner to the Village for review. Birds, small mammals, and amphibians used the property for coverage. Ms. Pelloso recommended postponing the proposal until additional and adequate information was provided to the Plan Commission and that the Village and Commission consider the message and precedence set in well areas and LPDA areas and its residents.

Mr. Michael Malinowski said he liked the presentation and provided no comment.

Ms. Mary Yurkovich, 5805 Springside, voiced concern about water run-off and would talk to the petitioner at a future time.

Mr. Gordon Goodman, 5834 Middaugh, addressed Ms. Pelloso's comments and stated that the R-1 zoning was appropriate if the Village was considering the area as open land because traditionally

APPROVED

such zoning was given to open land set aside for that purpose. In addition, the R-1 zoning would permit one structure to be constructed with a 40 ft. setback, which could be made an exception if the Village later decided construction was appropriate, after reviewing the floodwater criteria that are not a part of this zoning proceeding. He believed the Commission should not recommend R-4 zoning but to recommend either zoning or R-1 or R-2. He agreed the Commission needed more information before a decision is made and to investigate alternative zoning, as he suggested.

Planning Manager Jason Zawila explained for commissioners and the public that when the Village receives such requests, as the one being discussed, the property defaults to the Village's R-1 zoning which is the most restrictive. The surrounding zoning was reviewed and in this case the R-4 zoning was determined as the the predominant zoning district in the neighboring area. As for the comment that the site could have multiple homes, it was not the case and, in this case, it was for one single-family home.

Mr. Wiley responded that he had no plans to subdivide the lot and he liked the wetlands because it was like having a park in the back that could not be touched. To the comment about property values not increasing, he concurred, but if done carefully, it would have more economic value in the property. To other comments and whether the annexation was appropriate, he explained that the actual property being developed was about one-quarter of an acre, which was the average size lot in the Downers Grove Gardens subdivision. He believed he was developing a property that was suitable and suggested holding a discussion outside this public meeting.

Mr. Wiley also pointed out the site had many dead trees and vegetation as well as evidence of persons dumping trash and, therefore, having a home on the site would be appropriate. To not have a basement, was proper planning. As for whether the lot should be purchased and be kept from development, Mr. Wiley believed that the person in charge, who controlled how the lot should be developed, was well established. He had his experts review the site as well as the County and planning staff in order for the development to be done correctly. He stated he has been very transparent about his plans.

Ch. Rickard inquired if staff had any comments submitted electronically from members of the public. Staff stated that there was none. Ch. Rickard invited the petitioner to ask questions of the public. Mr. Wiley offered to the public that if they wanted to have discussions with any of the individuals who advised him on the proposal, to contact him by his email address:

chuckwiley12@gmail.com.

Development Planner Flora Ramirez came forward and summarized the petition before the Commission was for a zoning map amendment. The parcel location was noted and currently identified as unincorporated zoning district R-4. The petitioner was proposing to construct a single-family home with all building, zoning, and stormwater reviews to occur during the building permit submission phase. The petitioner was also seeking connection to Village water. However, Ms. Ramirez explained that, per Village policy, if an unincorporated property was requesting water, the property shall be annexed if contiguous to the municipal boundary and shall be reviewed solely by Village Council. If approved by Council, the default zoning for the parcel became R-1 Single-Family Detached House 1.

Development Planner Ramirez reminded the Commission that tonight's review had to do with the petitioner's request to rezone the property from R-1 to R-4 in order to bring the property into the

APPROVED

same zoning classification as the neighboring properties to the north and east. Slides of an aerial map and approval criteria for the zoning map amendment followed. Staff found the petition met the zoning map criteria.

Ch. Rickard entertained questions of the commissioners regarding staff's report. Responding to Ms. Majauskas' inquiry if a petitioner asks to be annexed into the Village whether it is by-right, Manager Zawila explained that anyone has a right to ask the Village and in this case the petition met the eligibility criteria for annexation since the request was for water service and the parcel was contiguous to the municipal boundary. However, it was up to the Village Council to ultimately approve or deny the annexation.

Commissioner Rollins questioned that if the single-family home was not constructed would the petitioner have to return to the commission/council if a multi-family was to be constructed on the property, wherein Ch. Rickard stated that within the zoning district, multi-family would not be allowed. In addition, if a future owner changed their mind, they would have to come before this Commission to rezone. Furthermore, if the current and/or future owner wanted to subdivide the parcel to build more than one home, this process would have to be repeated.

Commissioner Toth confirmed with staff that the difference between the R-1 and R-4 classification was the size of the lots and the side yard setbacks, wherein Development Planner Ramirez explained the largest difference was the street setback for the R-1 district at 40 feet while the R-4 street setback was at 25 feet. Commissioner Toth asked why the Commission would consider approving the R-4 when it appeared to fit better in the R-3 classification, wherein Ms. Ramirez explained that the Village was always looking at adjacent parcels for development patterns, which Ms. Ramirez pointed out and explained the proposed parcel would better match the development located across the street and to the side.

Responding to Commissioner Boyle's question about the parcel's current zoning, Ms. Ramirez explained that under the county's current zoning -- which was unincorporated -- the parcel was zoned R-4. Understanding that the Plan Commission had no purview over the annexation, yet was being requested to review the parcel as a conversion of R-1 to R-4, Commissioner Boyle has voiced concern that there was no existing zoning from the Village's perspective. However, Chairman Rickard explained that by default, parcels were annexed into the Village as R-1 and it was very common at the time of annexation that a request for a rezoning can occur, which this Commission was being asked to consider, based on the petition and staff's request, because it matched the surrounding zoning classes. Manager Zawila confirmed that tonight's request was consistent with past practices and policies, recalling a prior petition the Commissioners reviewed.

Commissioner Boyle shared concern about approving the rezoning prior to Council approving the annexation, wherein Ch. Rickard explained the Commission was not making a decision tonight and the lot would not be rezoned. Instead, he explained that Council would consider the rezoning in conjunction with the annexation; and, if the annexation was not approved, the rezoning did not occur.

Commissioner Dmytryszyn happened to point out a parcel zoned R-1 that was located across the street and down further from the lot and inquired why that was, wherein Manager Zawila referenced a slide, said he would have to research it, but presumed most likely the parcel may have been annexed into the Village and the default went to the R-1 zoning.

APPROVED

Ch. Rickard invited Petitioner Mr. Wiley to provide closing comments.

Mr. Wiley thanked the Commission for being able to present his case, stated he wanted to make the development work, and hoped to have an opportunity to discuss the matter with others to assure them that he would not be creating more flooding issues for the area.

Ch. Rickard asked staff if we received any additional written comments, before closing the public hearing. Manager Zawila confirmed receipt of Ms. Pelloso's written comments and would add them to the record.

Ch. Rickard proceeded to close the public hearing. He then opened up the meeting to commissioner deliberation.

Commissioner Majauskas did not support the request, pointed out the parcel was a natural flood plain and, if approved, would move the project forward and she was not willing to do that. She had no evidence that the request was a good idea and should be developed as being proposed. No mitigation plan existed, no evidence existed that the flooding will be exacerbated in the area, and there was concern the home would be constructed on a site that floods. The water would either have to flow to the neighbors or the sewers or to both. Hearing the petitioner offer to hold off-site discussions to review surveys and documentation, Commissioner Majauskas queried why those documents were not submitted to the commissioners prior. She needed to see the information in the packet. Agreeing with Ms. Pelloso's comment about the suitability of the property, Commissioner Majauskas pointed out that not all development was good development on all properties nor did commissioners know how the utilities would be hooked up. She stated it was not just about the taxes but what it could cost the Village – more flooding, more problems and neighbors complaining – and the money the Villages received would not go far enough to take care of the problems encountered. Commissioner Majauskas believed this case was a business deal -- the land was cheap, the petitioner constructs a home, sells it and moves on. She believed a decision was premature, more information was necessary, and she would vote in opposition.

In response, Ch. Rickard explained the petitioner was not obligated to submit mitigation plans nor stormwater requirements for construction and while he understood the above views, it was not under the commission's purview and it would eventually come forward. Manager Zawila cautioned the commissioners that the documentation being referred to be subject to regulatory review, i.e., staff administratively reviews the information as it pertains to code and the requirements. The documentation before the commissioners was appropriate for the requested map amendment, based off the standards provided in the packets. It was not intentional to leave out those documents as some of the information was still being reviewed, which is typical.

Commissioner Majauskas stated she believed the petition was premature and believed it was important to know all of the information.

Regarding the seven criteria to be considered for the rezoning and specifically referring to Criteria No. 2, *the extent to which a particular zoning restriction affect property values*, Commissioner Maurer confirmed with staff that the impact should be considered under the R-4 zoning and not the R-1, to which staff stated in the affirmative.

APPROVED

Commissioner Patel relayed that the concerns being voiced appeared to be relative concerns but they were outside the purview of this commission. He believed the rezoning request was reasonable.

Commissioner Rollins also concurred with Commissioner Patel's comments, appreciated the neighbors' concerns but also believed, from a Commission perspective they were not relevant to tonight's decision and the matter was straight-forward.

Commissioner Boyle, in reviewing the criteria, and in reviewing the draft motion, shared that some of the items stated were advantageous to the property itself while others were not. If the project moved forward, he believed it could impact the neighborhood, yet there was a chance it could not, and he was not sure of the commission's purview on that matter but reminded everyone of his earlier comment that the Village Council would ultimately be responsible for the annexation and zoning. He shared that it may have been one of the reasons why the site was vacant -- citing Criteria No. 5 -- due to not being suitable for residential. He saw both sides of the argument, agreed it was a difficult decision, and appreciated the petitioner's perspective in trying to minimizing the impact to the site. From the neighborhood perspective and zoning perspective it appeared to match the R-4 zoning and would fit within the zoning context.

Commissioner Dmytryszyn echoed the comments of Mr. Toth agreeing it was a challenging decision. He agreed with Commissioner Majauskas' comment, who said it well, noting that just because the neighboring properties were zoned R-4 did not mean it was right and much flooding existed. He believed having more distance between the buildings would provide better drainage in the area and should be considered. He would not support approval.

Commissioner Johnson agreed there were many issues with the property that needed to be considered. However, what the Commission was being asked was not related to the zoning. She felt the property could be rezoned to R-4.

Providing his comments, Ch. Rickard summarized that the property was complicated but when looked at strictly as a piece of property while ignoring the other information, the rezoning to R-4 was an easy decision to make because it fit the surrounding districts and closely resembled the county's zoning. He reminded the Commission this was the first step in the process, the petitioner would have to go through multiple reviews, and scrutiny to prove what was being proposed on the site. It would include the resolution of engineering issues as it relates to construction in an LPDA and satisfying other ordinances as it relates to wetland mitigation. He also pointed out that there was beautiful construction done in such areas. He also added that if the petitioner did produce such documentation he did not believe himself nor other commissioners could completely understand the documentation. From a strict zoning perspective, he supported the request.

Commissioner Majauskas reiterated that the documentation was the commission's purview and the reason the Commission existed was to provide an opinion. She emphasized that much more information needed to be considered in the decision-making other than just the rezoning.

The Chairman entertained a motion.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL APPROVAL OF 20-PLC-0027, BASED ON

APPROVED

THE PETITIONER'S SUBMITTAL, THE STAFF REPORT AND THE TESTIMONY PRESENTED. THE PETITIONER HAS MET THE STANDARDS OF APPROVAL FOR THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT, AS REQUIRED BY THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE ZONING ORDINANCE AND IT IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

SECOND BY COMMISSIONER TOTH. ROLL CALL:

AYE: JOHNSON, TOTH, MAUER, PATEL, ROLLINS, RICKARD

NAY: BOYLE, DMYTRYSZYN, MAJAUSKAS,

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 6-3

Planning Manager Zawila noted that this matter will be on the April 13, 2021 Village Council agenda under the first reading. He asked the public to continue to use him as a resource. Manager Zawila appreciated everyone efforts in participating in the Zoom meeting and hoped to have an in-person meeting next time.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:38 P.M. ON MOTION BY MS. JOHNSON, SECONDED BY MS. ROLLINS. MOTION PASSED BY VOICE VOTE OF 9-0.

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt

Recording Secretary

(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)

APPROVED

**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES OF JANUARY 13, 2021 MEETING**

Chairwoman (Ch.) Gassen called the January 13, 2021 remote meeting of the Architectural Design Review Board to order at 7:00 PM. Because of the state mandated requirements regarding social distancing, the meeting was held electronically. Ch. Gassen provided an overview on how the public can participate via Zoom or through providing written comments to planning@downers.us.

1. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Ch. Gassen (In Person); Ms. Chalberg, Mr. Lerner, Mr. Renner, Mr. Reimer, Mr. Styczynski (Electronically)

ABSENT: Ms. Acks

STAFF: Jason Zawila, Planning Manager
Gabriella Baldassari, Development Planner

VISITORS: Chuck Holtzen, 5226 Carpenter Street; Irene Hogstrom, 1232 Gilbert; Kathy Nybo, 5253 Blodgett; Christie Kenny, 200 Shady Lane; John Kenny, 200 Shady Lane; MaryLou Lockerby (no address stated); Christine Martin, 701 Maple Avenue (Electronically)

2. MOTION TO CONDUCT THE DECEMBER 2, 2020 ADRB MEETING ELECTRONICALLY

Motion by Chalberg to conduct the January 13, 2021 Architectural Design Review Board Meeting electronically, as it is an essential meeting. Seconded by Styczynski. Roll call:

AYE: MS. CHALBERG, MR. LERNER, MR. RENNER, MR. REIMER, MR. STYCZYNSKI CH. GASSEN

NAY: NONE

Motion passed unanimously.

2. APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 2, 2020 MINUTES

Motion by Chalberg, seconded by Mr. Reimer to approve the minutes of the December 2, 2020 meeting.

AYE: MS. CHALBERG, MR. LERNER, MR. RENNER, MR. REIMER, MR. STYCZYNSKI CH. GASSEN

NAY: NONE

Motion passed unanimously.

3. PUBLIC HEARING

APPROVED

Ch. Gassen explained that there was one public hearing before the Board seeking landmark designation for the property located at 200 Shady Lane, Downers Grove. She described the procedures to be followed for the hearing, and asked anyone intending to speak at the meeting to be sworn in.

PUBLIC HEARING FILE 20-ADR-0001: A petition seeking a Historic Landmark Designation for the property commonly known as 200 Shady Lane, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 09-04-108-018). Christie and John Kenny, Petitioners and Owners.

Staff Presentation:

Gabriella Baldassari, Development Planner for the Village of Downers Grove, stated that the property is located 200 Shady Lane. The petitioner is seeking landmark designation for their property representing the Mid-Century Modern style of architecture. The house was built circa 1960. Ms. Baldassari displayed photographs of the house and reviewed the architectural features of home.

Ms. Baldassari explained that the home's exterior facades are composed of vertical wood siding and a contrasting stone chimney. Deep roof overhangs around the house, including over the front door, and floor to ceiling windows are additional Mid-Century characteristics. Natural light is secured through the clerestory windows on the south facade. Balanced asymmetry and expressed post and beam construction are also displayed. Ms. Baldassari stated that the staff believed the application meet the standards for landmark designation as provided on the slide.

Ch. Gassen asked if there were any comments or questions for staff from the ADRB members.

Several board members expressed their support of the petition and admiration of the home, none had any questions. There being no additional comments at this time, Ch. Gassen asked the Petitioner if they wanted to add any information.

Petitioner's Presentation:

Ms. Christie Kenny, 200 Shady Lane Downers Grove, IL shared that she and her husband spoke about their admiration of the community and neighborhood. She is hopeful that others in the neighborhood will follow in landmarking their homes. Mr. John Kenny echoed his wife's comments and thanked everyone for helping.

Ch. Gassen asked if there were any board comments or questions.

Chalberg, Lerner and Styczynski commented that they hoped others in the neighborhood would also landmark their homes. Additionally Renner and Ch. Gassen thanked the petitioner for their decision to landmark their home.

Ch. Gassen asked if there were any additional questions for the petitioners.

There being no additional comments at this time, Ch. Gassen asked staff if any comments had come in electronically.

Manager Zawila confirmed that no comments had been received electronically, and explained that he would read each name of the electronic meeting attendees to offer them a chance to speak.

APPROVED

1. Christine Martin, 701 Maple Avenue, thanked the Kenny's for landmarking their home, which she added is beautiful on the inside as well as the outside.
2. Kathleen Nybo, 5235 Blodgett, commented that the house is lovely and she hopes the neighbors will also landmark their beautiful homes.
3. Marylou Lockerby congratulated the petitioners for landmarking their home.
4. Irene Hogstrom, 1232 Gilbert Avenue, thanked the petitioners for landmarking their home and added that the interior was also designed in a mid-century modern design aesthetic.

Ch. Gassen asked if there were any comments from ARDB members regarding the public's testimony. There being no further comments, Ch. Gassen asked if the petitioner had any closing remarks.

Ms. Kenny thanked everyone for attending and the Friends of the Edwards House members for helping. Mr. Kenny thanked everyone for helping.

Ch. Gassen closed the public comment section and asked if the board had any final comments.

Board's Deliberation:

Ch. Gassen said she supported making this house a landmark. She commented that both the Friends of the Edwards House and the Illinois State Preservation Agency are great resources for the Village. She also added that there are no landmark districts in the Village currently but this could be a start to a district in the future.

There being no further comments, Ch. Gassen called for a motion.

Mr. Lerner moved that based on Staff's findings the Architectural Design Review Board make a positive recommendation to the Village Council for landmark status of 200 Shady Lane. Mr. Reimer seconded the Motion.

AYES: Mr. Lerner, Mr. Renner, Mr. Riemer, Ms. Chalberg, Mr. Styczynski, Ch. Gassen

NAYS: None

The Motion passed unanimously.

.....

Ch. Gassen shared with the public that ADRB is also working on a project related to downtown design guidelines.

ADJOURNMENT

Ch. Gassen called for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Reimer moved, seconded by Mr. Styczynski to adjourn the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

APPROVED

AYES: Mr. Lerner, Mr. Renner, Mr. Riemer, Ms. Chalberg, Mr. Styczynski,
Ch. Gassen

NAYS: None

The Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Village Staff

APPROVED

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

December 7, 2020, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Rickard called the December 7, 2020 remote meeting of the Downers Grove Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. Because of the state mandated requirements regarding social distancing, the meeting was held electronically. Ch. Rickard provided an overview on how the public can participate via Zoom or through providing written comments to planning@downers.us. He then led the meeting in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Rickard (In Person); Commissioners Boyle, Dmytryszyn, Johnson, Majauskas, Patel, Rollins, Toth (Electronically)

ABSENT: Maurer

STAFF: Planning Manager Jason Zawila, Development Planner Gabby Baldassari, Development Planner Flora Ramirez (In Person)

VISITORS: Pastor Mark Moore (petitioner), Robert St. Clair, Tim Emmerson, Nancy Hoekstra, Pamela Bosco, Tom Talaga, Peter Lazar, Jane Talaga, Ryan Horan, Lurann Harmon, Dan Horning, Deborah Gorden, Ryan Horan (Electronically)

Chairman Rickard entertained a motion to conduct the December 7, 2020 Plan Commission meeting electronically.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER ROLLINS, TO CONDUCT THE DECEMBER 7, 2020 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING ELECTRONICALLY. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER JOHNSON. ROLL CALL:

AYE: ROLLINS, JOHNSON, DMYTRYSZYN, BOYLE, MAJAUSKAS, PATEL, RICKARD

NAY: NONE

AWAY: TOTH

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 8-0

MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 16, 2020 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER JOHNSON. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER DMYTRYSZYN. ROLL CALL:

AYE: JOHNSON, DMYTRYSZYN, BOYLE, MAJAUSKAS, PATEL, ROLLINS, RICKARD

NAY: NONE

APPROVED

AWAY: TOTH

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 8-0

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Rickard reviewed the procedures for the public hearing.

FILE 20-PLC-0014: A petition seeking annexation, rezoning from B-2, General Retail Business, and R-1, Residential Detached House 1 to INP-1, Neighborhood-Scale Institutional and Public District and a special use for religious assembly use and private school. The property is located directly southwest of the intersection of Belmont Road and Inverness Avenue, commonly known as 5416, 5418, and 5430 Belmont Road, and 2097 Inverness Avenue, Downers Grove, IL. Petitioner and Owner, Belmont Bible Church.

Chairman Rickard swore in those individuals that would be speaking tonight.

Petitioner, Mark Moore, 5430 Belmont Road, Downers Grove explained the history of the church dating back to 1951, discussing its growth over the years, and the community outreach programs and services the church offered. He mentioned the parish's sister church (in Waukashaw, Wisconsin) had the same building as the one being proposed, using the same design firm. The current facility would be demolished and replaced with the proposed facility. Renderings of the new facility were depicted. The architectural design will encompass all sides of the building, not just the front façade.

Elevations of the building were then depicted noting the building height of the proposed facility from grade would be just over 30 feet. Floor plans followed: The first floor will be 22,000 sq. feet while the second floor will be roughed-in at 10,000 sq. feet until completed at a later time. The proposed site plan was also depicted, with Mr. Moore sharing that the north parking lot will be brick pavers, reducing the stormwater run-off. A depiction of the landscape plan followed with Mr. Moore stating the plan exceeds the Village's minimum landscaping requirements.

Per Mr. Moore, a neighborhood meeting was hosted last Monday (11/30) and questions from that meeting pertained to site drainage, whether the large tree in the right-of-way of Inverness Avenue would remain, and the maintenance of the current privacy fence along the southern property line moving forward. Mr. Moore explained those questions were answered: brick pavers will address the drainage, the tree will be removed but 12 new trees will be planted on Inverness Avenue, and the current privacy fence on the southern property line will be removed and replaced with a new six-foot fence to be installed directly on the property line. Finally, Mr. Moore reviewed each of the standards of approval for the petition in greater detail.

Chairman Rickard invited commissioner questions.

Per questions, Mr. Moore confirmed the second floor of the proposed facility would only be roughed-in. Further, he explained that the traffic study and parking requirements were taken into consideration for the second floor. As for the drainage being a prior issue, Mr. Moore was not aware of any current issues and only recalled the 100-year rainfall where everyone had issues. Asked why the traffic study was considering 200 students when the traffic table was listing 100,

APPROVED

Mr. Moore explained he would have to review the traffic study again but said the numbers provided for the traffic study were the same as what he had for the site plan, i.e., the numbers were for the worst case scenario, or a total of 150 preschool students and 100 students for the Christian School.

Additional questions included confirmation that the petitioner was combining all five lots into one lot of record, which Planning Manager Zawila confirmed the applicant would have to consolidate but it was not part of the commission's consideration tonight. He also added that the proposal conformed to the INP-1 District requirements (institutional zoning), while Planner Baldassari pointed out the proposal also met the requirements of the R5A District, as appropriate. Asked if the R5A District was the most restrictive, Planning Manager Zawila confirmed in the affirmative. Staff further confirmed the trash dumpster was located at the southwest corner of the property and Mr. Moore stated the material around the trash enclosure would be a different material around the pad with gates on the north side of the enclosure

Chairman Rickard opened up the public hearing to public comment.

Planning Manager Zawila read into the record the written comments from Peter Lazar (via email):

"I went to the neighborhood meeting for the redevelopment of the Belmont Bible Church on Monday night since I am a resident on a nearby property. Their plans have the removal of a 46" honeylocust tree located in the right-of-way. I find this disappointing as it is the largest tree on Inverness Avenue which it is located. When asked about this the Church responded that the Village has already approved removal of the tree. While I am disappointed that the street will be losing its largest right-of-way tree, my greater concern is the Church's landscaping plan is to replace this native tree with over a dozen right-of-way trees that are not native (mainly Japanese elms). Right-of-way trees are public, and the care that is put into them is a reflection of the residents of the Village, and requiring native trees be planted in public right-of-ways shows our community is environmentally friendly and forward thinking."

In response to Mr. Lazar's comment about the petitioner receiving approval for removing the tree by the Village, Mr. Zawila confirmed that approval was not received and the Village Council would make the final decision.

Ms. Nancy Hoekstra relayed that the proposal will be an asset to the neighborhood.

Mr. Tim Emerson said he had good dialog with the church but inquired how close was the trash dumpster to the privacy fence to the west or south, which appeared closer to the current location.

Mr. Tom Talaga, 2218 Tamarack, asked when the completion of the 22,000 sq. foot area would be completed and when the 10,000 sq. foot area would be completed.

In response to the above questions, Mr. Moore explained the tree will be removed for parking but prior, he described how he had saved the tree when the Village was installing the public sidewalks about 10 years ago. Regarding the landscape plan, he was open to speaking to a botanist about planting more native trees. The location of the trash enclosure would have its own screening and be located several feet from the south property line. Details followed. The timeframe for the project was to begin as soon as possible in 2021 with an anticipated timeframe of 10 to 12 months

APPROVED

for the initial construction. Finishing the second floor would depend on getting closer to the need for it, which he estimated a year or two year after the completion of the building.

Chairman Rickard asked if the commissioners had further questions. None were voiced.

Development Planner Gabby Baldassari, reviewing her staff report, summarized the location of the site under consideration and noted the two buildings that were currently on the property – a residential structure along Inverness and the existing church along Belmont. Two parcels were currently annexed into the Village as B2 General Retail Business while the other three parcels were part of DuPage County. With the map amendment request, the entire five lots would be consolidated into one parcel and rezoned into INP-1.

Existing conditions on the site, along with the surrounding area, were pointed out on the slide. Curb cuts, sidewalk locations, and parking lot surface were noted. Elevations and height (30.5 feet) were referenced. Planner Baldassari relayed that the commissioners could direct the petitioner to work with the village arborist in choosing suitable parkway trees. However, it was noted that the plantings being proposed were on the village's approved planting list. Staff felt the proposal met the criteria, and Planner Baldassari referenced a draft motion in her report for commissioners to use, if desired.

Chairman Rickard invited commissioners to further comment or voice questions. A question regarding the parking being evaluated if the occupancy number increased over time was asked. Planner Baldassari explained the possible evaluation pertained to the future build-out of the second floor with a higher estimation of students. Should the student number be higher, there was a section in the zoning ordinance that allowed for a shared parking calculation. Details of that calculation were explained.

Asked if the zoning that was being requested had an impact on previous approvals this commission has seen in recent months, pertaining to zoning maps or text amendments, than what was allowed in the area as it related to marijuana dispensaries, Mr. Zawila indicated the distance was 1300 feet but the amendment had not been finalized by the Village Council yet. It was also pointed out by staff that the church and the school existed first and was considered with the Village's review of that ordinance. It was likely the distance would not change much.

Ms. Pam Bosco, stated she owned the property just west of the parking lot – 2099 Inverness Road – which was the closest lot to the proposed lot. She expressed concern about the effects of the development on her property as it relates to setbacks and her driveway. Chairman Rickard explained to her the petitioner was not seeking any variance requests as to setbacks, height, etc. and the items were within regulation. Per Ms. Bosco's question regarding required distance from her garage, Planner Baldassari responded that the distance on west property line was 24 feet which exceeded the 20-foot requirement.

Ms. Bosco further asked if the impervious parking lot would take care of the drainage to which the Chairman proceeded to explain how the paver system worked and further explained that the commission was a recommending body and the plans were not final until the Village Council approved them. Mr. Zawila asked that Ms. Bosco email him directly to respond to her questions.

In closing, Mr. Moore thanked the commission for its time.

APPROVED

Chairman Rickard closed the public hearing and opened the meeting up to commissioner deliberation.

Commissioner comments were supportive. Staff interjected and explained to commissioners that one additional condition, as it relates to working with the village arborist on the parkway trees (petitioner was agreeable to it), could be added to staff's conditions, if desired. One commissioner voiced her concern about the traffic study, the maximum capacity, and the difficulty for vehicles to leave the church driving onto Belmont Road, especially during school hours. The Chairman was supportive of the arborist and the petitioner both determining the appropriate parkway trees from the approved planting list. It was mentioned by a commissioner that Belmont Avenue could be a DuPage County Road and that the Village may not have much influence to get a traffic signal at the nearby intersection, but it was a good recommendation. Another commissioner was not in favor of a traffic signal due to other heavy traffic in the area.

The Chairman entertained a motion.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 20-PLC-0014, AND BASED ON THE PETITIONER'S SUBMITTAL, STAFF'S REPORT AND TESTIMONY PRESENTED, THE PETITIONER HAS MET THE STANDARDS OF APPROVAL FOR REZONING, THE OCCUPANCY MAP AMENDMENT, AND THE SPECIAL USE AS REQUIRED BY THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE'S ZONING ORDINANCE AND IS IN THE PUBLIC'S BEST INTEREST. COMMISSIONER ROLLINS MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE PETITION, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS.

- 1. THE PLANS SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE STAFF REPORT DATED DECEMBER 7, 2020, THE PLANS PREPARED BY RYNEAR AND SON INC., DATED 6/22/20, AND MODIFIED 9/9/20, AND THE PLANS PREPARED BY EXCEL ARCHITECTS, RECEIVED 10/7/20, EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO VILLAGE CODES AND ORDINANCES.**
- 2. THE APPLICANT SHALL ADMINISTRATIVELY CONSOLIDATE THE FIVE LOTS INTO ONE LOT OF RECORD AFTER THE ANNEXATION IS RECORDED AND PRIOR TO BEING ISSUING A BUILDING PERMIT. EASEMENTS SHALL BE PROVIDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE.**
- 3. A FEE FOR THE REMOVAL OF THE TREE WILL BE ASSESSED DURING THE PERMITTING PROCESS. INITIAL ESTIMATES SHOW IT TO BE APPROXIMATELY \$4,000. THE APPLICANT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE REMOVAL OF THE TREE AND ASSOCIATED COSTS.**
- 4. APPLICANT MUST PROVIDE APPROVAL FROM THE DUPAGE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT RELEASE.**
- 5. THE BUILDING SHALL BE EQUIPPED WITH AN AUTOMATIC SUPPRESSION SYSTEM AND AN AUTOMATIC AND MANUAL FIRE ALARM SYSTEM.**
- 6. IN THE CASE THAT THE OCCUPANCY PROPOSED BY THE PETITIONER INCREASES OVER TIME, THE MAXIMUM CAPACITY WILL BE LIMITED TO WHAT IS ALLOWED BY THE SHARED PARKING CALCULATION**

APPROVED

**METHODOLOGY PROVIDED IN THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
ZONING ORDINANCE AND/OR THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR MAY REQUEST A PARKING STUDY THAT ENSURES PARKING
CAPACITY IS SUFFICIENT.**

SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JOHNSON. ROLL CALL:

**AYE: ROLLINS, JOHNSON, BOYLE, DMYTRYSZYN, MAJAUSKAS, PATEL, TOTH,
RICKARD**

NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 8-0

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:20 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. BOYLE,
SECONDED BY MR. DMYTRYSZYN. MOTION PASSED BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0.**

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

APPROVED

**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 2, 2020, 7:00 P.M.**

Chairwoman Gassen called the December 2, 2020 electronic meeting of the Architectural Design Review Board to order at 7:00 p.m. Because of the state mandated requirements regarding social distancing, the meeting was held electronically. Ch. Gassen provided an overview on how the public can participate via Zoom or through providing written comments to planning@downers.us.

1. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairwoman Gassen (In Person); Ms. Acks, Mr. Styczynski, Ms. Chalberg, Mr. Lerner, Mr. Renner, Mr. Reimer (Electronically)

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Stan Popovich, Community Development Director, Jason Zawila, Planning Manager (In Person)

VISITORS: Sam Vlahos, Paul Robertson (Electronically)

2. MOTION TO CONDUCT THE DECEMBER 2, 2020 ADRB MEETING ELECTRONICALLY

Motion by Chalberg, second by Acks to approve the minutes of the October 21, 2020 meeting. Roll call:

AYES: Chalberg, Acks, Styczynski, Lerner, Reimer, Renner, Gassen

NAYS: None

Motion passed unanimously.

3. APPROVAL OF OCTOBER 21, 2020 MEETING MINUTES

Motion by Chalberg, second by Renner to approve the minutes of the October 21, 2020 meeting, as corrected. (Planning Manager Zawila noted that he received revisions from Mr. Lerner where the wrong individual was referenced in certain parts of the minutes and will be updated with the approved minutes) **Roll call:**

AYES: Chalberg, Renner, Acks, Styczynski, Lerner, Reimer, Gassen

NAYS: None

Motion passed unanimously.

Ch. Gassen walked through the procedures for the public hearing for the following agenda item:

4. OLD BUSINESS

Design Guidelines Review Project – Manager Zawila recalled the direction received from the Village Council as it pertained to the village's design guidelines. The updated design guidelines will be discussed and staff will be taking comments on the draft text with the final document to be presented at the January 13, 2021 ADRB meeting. The December 16th meeting

APPROVED

will concentrate on Task 2 which will focus on the ADRB examining the review and approval process for downtown projects, permit types and include a discussion with the ADRB to determine if the board recommends any changes to the existing process. Key policy questions, as discussed at a prior meeting, will be discussed at the December 16th meeting. Those policy questions followed. Manager Zawila explained that on December 16th the ADRB will discuss and provide feedback on the following three questions: 1) what type of construction triggers design review; 2) what are the regulations; and 3) who is the decision-maker. A brief review of the 2009 Design Guidelines followed as well as how the updated guidelines will be reviewed, i.e., is the guideline new, or is it a carryover from the 2009 document or is it a revision to the 2009 guidelines. Manager Zawila provided further explanation.

Design Guidelines Draft – Manager Zawila explained how the document will be broken up into five parts with public comment to follow at the end.

Section 1 – Manager Zawila indicated this was a new section to the document that provides a background and parity with the village’s comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance.

Section 2 – Per Manager Zawila, this section was slightly revised to introduce the new sections related to utilities connection and parking facilities.

Commissioner Comments – A number of commissioner comments followed:

Page 2 - Downtown Core/Downtown Business: consider using the word, “services” or “businesses”, which staff offered to review or modify.

Page 3 (Section 2) – Reviewing the Scope of Areas, it was noted that utility and parking was missed in the guidelines.

Staff confirmed that the Definitions section will be listed in the new document and would include new terms. A suggestion was made that it would be helpful to refer back to the zoning ordinance when it applies.

Sections 3 & 4 – Manager Zawila explained that this section focused on site and building design. However, he clarified there may be guidance for transitional districts that may not be appropriate for buildings in the Downtown Core (DC) District or the Downtown Business (DB) District, but could see buildings that have the appearance of single-family home but are used for commercial purposes, small scale office buildings, or townhomes. Further details followed.

Commissioner Comments – A number of commissioner comments followed:

Section 3, A3 – Gaps in Street Wall – The new wording appears to discourage the idea of having plazas, or outdoor dining areas whereas the previous wording was positive.

Section 3, C1 – Fences Compatible with the Residential Neighborhood – The wording implies that there should be no fencing and it should be reworded more positively.

Section 4, A3 – Corner Buildings – Consider specifying that both street sides be considered facades at a corner building. Staff to review wording.

Section 4, D1 – Color – Consider whether to list dark colors not as an accent color and not primary color; do not put limitations on color due to it being subjective; consider streetscape when working with colors. Staff would review and get future feedback from commissioners.

APPROVED

Page 11, Item 4 – Alleys being Lit – Consider the type of pavement material for alleyways, such as tying it into a sidewalk or ensuring it is attractive. Staff mentioned the different requirements for alleys in the public right-of-way vs. a private alley, and indicated the matter could be looked at. Different materials could be considered, per staff.

Page 8, bottom – relating to Dark Colors – It was suggested to consider rewording.

Page 4, Item 1, Street Wall – more clarification needed. Avoid Driveways Mid-Block: if someone is at mid-block and no alley exists, it becomes unavoidable. Per Manager Zawila, this matter would be reviewed on a case by case basis but the intent was to limit curb cuts.

Page 4, Section 3a – Building Placement – refer back to the Zoning Ordinance for better clarification.

Page 5, Item A6, Transition District – Define what is meant by “building back to align with others on the street” and how is that determined. If residentially-designed buildings in the Transitional District are going to be considered, then the current residentially-designed buildings in the Downtown Business district should also be considered.

Page 5, Item B2, Building Massing – While it applies to the Downtown Core and Business, should building massing be considered in the Transition Area or is there a reason why not. Staff explained the thought was not to have additional limitations.

Page 6, Item 4, Downtown Business District – Stepping back using Line of Sight Methodology -- While it was understood on the side that may face a Downtown Transition zone, should a building be stepped back for a DB use facing a Downtown Core area? Per Manager Zawila, this topic was in the Comprehensive Plan. The Transitional District did have specific setbacks, but if there was an opportunity to have a similar setback, that was the thought process. He would ensure parity exists with the Village's Comprehensive Plan.

Per Manager Zawila, with regard to maximum height of Downtown Core buildings, where the setback is unknown for the upper stories, as compared to the Downtown Business District, the buildings in this area would be taller with a 70-foot height per the zoning and, based on the discussions staff had regarding the preference survey, it may be appropriate to begin setting back the taller business buildings that may be adjacent to the Downtown Core or Downtown Transitional Districts. A commissioner suggested implementing a two- or three-story structure and then stepping back; staff would review.

Page 7, Item 4 – Providing a walkway to the street to the building - Staff was asked for clarification, wherein Manager Zawila confirmed it meant a walkway from the public sidewalk to the front door.

Page 9, Item 2 – Materials – EIFS or Dryvit – should one be used over the other? Per Manager Zawila, the trademark for Dryvit would be reviewed.

Page 9, Item 4 – Materials – Downtown Transition Materials – should it discourage vinyl siding or should it consider certain qualities of vinyl siding since some were now at a higher quality. Manager Zawila, asked to hear more comments on the suggestion.

Page 11, Item 3 – Choosing light bulbs that emit a warm tone for exterior building – It was suggested to insert a Kelvin number (2700k) and define what is a warm tone. It was also suggested to remove the term “bulbs” and insert “lighting” to cover all lighting.

APPROVED

Page 10, Under Lighting – Provide illumination on front/rear entries to ensure customer/employee safety – Consider specifying all entries.

Sections 5, 6, 7 – Manager Zawila explained these sections focused on building elements and was organized by top, middle and base and carried over from the 2009 Design Guidelines.

Page 13, Elements D2, Rear Entrances Comparable to Front Entrances – Language may be too strong. For Knee walls/Windows installed without a knee wall that open to the sidewalk, staff confirmed those were for such instances where a restaurant has a dining area where panels can open to the sidewalk. Staff indicated there will be a picture associated with this topic.

Page 14, Item 4E – Awnings – Internally illuminated awnings – Staff recalled an incident where a vinyl awning was lit underneath where some commissioners felt it was inappropriate for the downtown area. It was suggested to add that awnings with signage internally illuminated should be prohibited, while decorative lighting would be appropriate.

Page 12, Item A1, Commercial Storefronts, Relatively Thin Framing Elements – Consider adding storefronts with a thicker mullion design and be large display windows.

Page 12, Item B1, Entrances – Orient primary building entrances to a public street – It was suggested to add “entrances to a public space.”

Page 14, Item 3, Windows – Clarification of “window glazing may be located on upper stories only and should be clear and less slightly tinted...” Manager Zawila would follow up with the carryover, but indicated the point was to not have tinted windows on the ground floor, but it could be appropriate for the upper stories.

Page 15, Windows – No guidance was being given to the Downtown Transition Area. Manager Zawila would review, possibly expand on it, and return language to the ADRB in January. Both Manager Zawila and Director Popovich noted that because there were some residentially-designed commercial buildings in the area, they did not want to limit the window design, especially to private residential homes.

Page 15, Section 3, Windows– consider whether to add text that if a window is going to be replaced – whether historic or not – should any replacement window fill the entire opening. Manager Zawila recalled the commissioners did not support half-filled windows and the text was a carry-over from the previous guidelines. Dialog followed that if a building already had replacement windows, were only half filled, and renovations were being proposed, would it be required to fill in the original or only that portion that had been changed prior. Per Manager Zawila, the current guidance was as stated. Director Popovich’s preference was that if the previous window replacement filled half way but the old opening could be detected, the space should be filled entirely. However, if the window replacement was completely filled and redesigned, then it could not be returned.

Sections 8 and 9 – Manager Zawila explained that utilities consideration and parking lots were two new topics under these two sections. The utilities consideration could have some limitation as to where they can be located. However, there was an ability to provide some guidance.

Section 2 – While it currently addressed utilities/parking not being visible from nearby streets, sidewalks, and customer parking, it was suggested to add verbiage about what is

APPROVED

acceptable and using landscaping as a possible buffer. Per staff, landscaping was covered in another section but if not totally covered, verbiage could be added as an option. (Director Popovich refers to the buffering of refuse containers either by a certain size wall or by evergreens, which text can be used in this section.)

Introduction to Section 8 – Define the term “utility structure.”

Page 18, Item 8.2 – Per Ch. Gassen, any time references can be made to the village’s zoning ordinance, it should do so.

Document Format – Manager Zawila indicated the photos on the overhead were examples of what the guidelines document will look like and many graphics will be provided in the document. Planner Flora Ramirez was thanked for her design scheme on the document. Manager Zawila invited comments from the commissioners. All comments about the format were positive.

Public Comment

Chairwoman Gassen asked staff if any written comments were received on this matter. Per staff, no comments were received. Ch. Gassen invited comments from the public.

Mr. Robertson – Did not have any comments but thanked the ADRB for its “hard work.”

Final Commissioner comments included revising the wording about process, specifically about wording being regulatory or advisory.

Ch. Gassen reminded everyone this topic discussion will continue at its December 16, 2020 Zoom meeting. Manager Zawila presented a couple of slides on what tasks will be presented and discussed at the next couple of meetings. He asked the ADRB to look in their emails for their next meeting materials and videos, noting that an invitation will be also be extended to the Downers Grove Downtown Management Corporation.

5. NEW BUSINESS – None

6. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

7. ADJOURNMENT

Ch. Gassen called for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Reimer moved, seconded by Mr. Styczynski to adjourn the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

Roll call:

AYE: Reimer, Styczynski, Acks, Chalberg, Lerner, Renner, Gassen

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