VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION

VILLAGE HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
801 BURLINGTON AVENUE

December 5, 2016
7:00 p.m.

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order**

    a. **Pledge of Allegiance**

2. **Roll Call**

3. **Approval of Minutes** – November 7, 2016

4. **Public Hearings**

    a. **16-PLC-0054:** The purpose of the request is to consider an update of the Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan, which, if adopted will become the official plan for the Village as required by Section 1.12 of the Municipal Code. Village of Downers Grove, Petitioner.

5. **Adjournment**

<u>THIS TENTATIVE REGULAR AGENDA MAY BE SUBJECT TO CHANGE</u>

DRAFT

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

NOVEMBER 7, 2016, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Rickard called the November 7, 2016 meeting of the Downers Grove Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Plan Commissioners and public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

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

ABSENT: Mr. Cronin, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Quirk

STAFF: Rebecca Leitschuh, Senior Planner; Swati Pandey, Planner; and Scott Williams, Planner

VISITORS: Mr. Graham Grady, Taft/Law, 111 E. Wacker Drive, Chicago; Mr. Jason Jarrett, Okrent Kisiel Assoc., 122 S. Michigan Ave., Chicago; Mr. Branden Barnes, Fry's Electronics, 1641 Tarabelle Place, Naperville; Ms. Betsy Beckmann, 3812 Douglas, Downers Grove; Mr. Brian Reno, Ms. Shandra Weaver, Ms. Cristina Maggi, Ms. Siobhan Mooney with Stantec, 135 S. LaSalle St., Chicago; Mr. Rich Kulovany, 6825 Camden, Downers Grove; Mr. Michael Kasshent, U.S. Bank, 136 S. Washington, Naperville; Vinko Topic, 3830 Venard;

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

OCTOBER 3, 2016 MINUTES – MOTION BY MR. THOMAN, SECONDED BY MR. BOYLE, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

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-0044: A petition seeking approval of a Planned Unit Development and Zoning Map Amendment, rezoning from B-3 (General Services and Highway Business) to B-3/PUD. The property is located at the southwest corner of Finley Road and Opus Place, east of I-355, commonly known as 3300 Finley Road, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 06-31-101-017). Graham Grady, Petitioner; Urbs in Horto c/o Fry's Electronics, Owner.

Village Planner, Ms. Pandey summarized that the petitioner, Fry's Electronics, would like to create a Planned Unit Development in order to make changes to its existing wall and freestanding signage on the property and to rezone the property from B-3 General Services and Highway Business to B-

3/Planned Unit Development. An aerial view of the site was presented to explain the access challenges to the site.

A history of the site's signage from 2004 was explained by Ms. Pandey, noting the petitioner's current signage of 1,187 sq. feet was not in compliance with the village's adoption of its 2005 sign ordinance. Today's sign ordinance would allow the petitioner a total of 300 sq. feet of signage excluding some additional signage which would be discussed below.

Per staff, the petitioner was proposing 915 square feet of signage. The signage on the north and south façades would remain; the signage on Finley Road and Interstate 355 would be removed. A total of three (3) free-standing signs will be allowed for Fry's Electronics, two of which exist currently and one is proposed along the tollway, which is permitted per ordinance. The existing monument signs will remain. As a point of clarification, Ms. Pandey stated the existing four wall signs and the existing monument sign on the property constituted the allowed 300 square feet but with the removal of the wall signage on the east and west sides, the total signage became 915 sq. feet. The shared monument sign and the tollway monument sign is permitted in addition to the maximum allowance of 300 square feet. A red band was planned to be added to all four sides of the building.

Ms. Pandey closed her presentation by explaining how the petitioner's application met the village's Comprehensive Plan and said the signage was better aligned with the village's goals of the sign ordinance. A review of how the petition met the village's Standards for Approval followed. Staff recommended a positive recommendation to the village council subject to staff's conditions listed in its report.

Commissioner questions followed as to the distance of the southern wall signage to Interstate 355 and whether the monument sign was large enough to attract customers to the Fry location, given the speed and distance vehicles travel and given the retailer brought substantial retail tax revenue to the village. Ms. Leitschuh explained that the monument sign would have height issues whereas the wall sign would not. Further discussion followed.

Mr. Graham Grady with the firm of Taft Law & Hollister, Chicago, Illinois, introduced his team. He discussed that Fry's Electronics was pleased to remove its signs to bring the store into compliance but he also explained that the red band on the building was in response staff's suggestion to enhance the appearance of the building's walls. Further discussion by Mr. Grady followed regarding the signage and the fact that no residences were affected by it.

Mr. Branden Barnes, store manager for Fry's Electronics, emphasized that the store was trying to become more visible and the store contributed significant sales tax revenue to the village, additional signage was essential for the economic viability of the site.

Mr. Jason Jarrett, Okrent Kisiel Associates, Chicago, IL, a certified planner, confirmed he reviewed the proposal with respect to the PUD standards of the zoning ordinance and prepared the statement of compliance that was submitted as part of the application. He explained how he reviewed the proposal in further detail and provided his professional opinion.

Mr. Grady returned and confirmed that Fry's Electronics took over the blighted site in 2004, the sign ordinance passed in 2005, and he went before the Zoning Board but was denied in the area of hardship. Mr. Grady explained what prompted this application originally.

The chairman invited public comment. No comments were received. Public hearing was closed.

Mr. Grady asked the commissioners for a favorable consideration.

Mr. Maurer shared the positives of the building and its regional draw, but he also expressed the challenges of seeing the building from the expressway and applying "one signage ordinance to everything." However, he believed a compromise was being made and it was not harming anyone. Mr. Maurer also recommended not painting the red band because he believed it was extending the signage, costing the applicant, and it offered no benefit to the building.

Mr. Thoman believed what was being proposed was not out of character for a large retailer, noting the land use goal was to generate sale tax revenue for the village. While he stated the sign ordinance was a one size fit all from the start, he believed there were clear differences between 75th Street, the Ogden Avenue Corridor, Butterfield Road and other corridors where the sign ordinance did not fit and believed the village would have to address that in the future. He supported staff's recommendations but questions whether the monument sign was large enough to see.

Many of the other commissioners were in agreement with the above comments and also felt that the red band was not necessary. Staff explained to the commissioners how changes could be made to the proposal if desired and Mr. Grady offered to make those changes if the commissioners desired.

The chairman also shared positive comments about the proposal, noting the red band could be optional. He believed the review criteria for the PUD were met as were the zoning map amendment and that staff's recommendations were straightforward. However, he stated Mr. Thoman expressed concern about the sign ordinance changing in the future. He did not see the purpose of staff's second recommendation, however, since the PUD was being granted and the exception was the size, it was recommended by staff that the condition be included but Plan Commission can remove it, if desired.

Ms. Leitschuh stated if the sign ordinance were to change, the petitioner would fall under the new rules of the sign ordinance.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 16-PLC-044, MR. THOMAN MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL REGARDING THIS PETITION, SUBJECT TO THE FIRST CONDITION IN STAFF'S REPORT BUT NOT REQUIRE THE RED BAND TO GO ON THE BUILDING.

SECONDED BY MS. GASSEN. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. THOMAN, MS. GASSEN, MR. BOYLE, MS. HOGSTROM, MR. MAURER, CHAIRPERSON RICKARD
NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 6-0

FILE 16-PLC-0047: A petition seeking approval of a Zoning Map Amendment, rezoning from R-2 (Residential Detached House 2) to R-1 (Residential Detached House 1). The property is located at the southwest corner of 36th Street and Douglas Road, commonly known as 3604 Douglas Road, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 06-32-406-021). Elizabeth Beckmann, Owner.

Ms. Pandey reviewed the proposal and stated that the properties at 3604 & 3612 Douglas Road are under common ownership. The property to the north at 3604, was purchased by the owner with the intent of consolidating both properties and adding an addition to the north side of the home. In order to consolidate the lots, the home must be under the same zoning designation. The property to the north was R-2; the property to the south was R-1 and the owner wanted to designate the 3604 Douglas Road property as R-1.

Ms. Pandey explained that prior to any building permits being issued or final approval of the Plat of Consolidation, the village will require the owner to demolish the structures on the property. Per Ms. Pandey, the proposal met the goals of the village's comprehensive plan, the rezoning would have no impact on the layout of the street, and the standards for approval for the zoning map amendment had been met. Staff recommended a positive recommendation.

Staff and commissioners held a discussion on how the two lots could be consolidated administratively but some commissioners pointed out the benefits of simultaneously approving both the consolidation and the rezoning so as not to create any future hardships on the owner.

Petitioner, Elizabeth Beckmann, 3612 Douglas, Downers Grove, reviewed the three step process she was given: rezone, consolidate, and then develop/improve the property. She was seeking rezoning of the property with the intention to consolidate and then develop. She understood that she could be diminishing the value of 3604 if it she did not consolidate it. Ms. Beckmann confirmed she did understand that.

Chairman Rickard opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Richard Moran, 500 36th Street, Downers Grove, resides across the street from the property and supported the applicant.

No further comments were received from Ms. Beckmann.

Hearing no further public comment, public comment was closed.

Ms. Leitschuh explained what could happen to the lot should the parcel not be rezoned at this time. Again, more discussion followed. Mr. Thoman raised concern about setting a precedent creating non-conformities, citing 5100 Forest as an example and the same request for Main and Maple (garbage pick-up). While he wanted to see the owner benefit from her property, Mr. Thoman did not want the village to do something with unintended consequences. Ms. Leitschuh explained the additional expenses the applicant would incur should she have to return. She also explained the cost savings to the applicant by having the applicant go through the rezoning now and then administratively going through the lot consolidation later.

The chairman did not see any negatives to the approval of the application and the applicant appeared to understand the process.

Ms. Beckmann returned and believed Mr. Thoman needed to have an internal discussion about precedent-setting with the commissioners. She understood the negatives. She did not intend to subdivide the property. The property was purchased to add value to her existing property with the R-1 restriction.

Chairman Rickard proceeded to walk through each of the approval criteria for the zoning map amendment and agreed the criteria was met.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 16-PLC-0047, MR. MAUER MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL PER STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION IN ITS REPORT.

SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR MAURER, MS. HOGSTROM, MR. BOYLE, MS. GASSEN, MR. THOMAN, CHAIRPERSON RICKARD
NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 6-0

FILE 16-PLC-0049: A petition seeking approval of a Final Plat of Subdivision with 1 Exception. The property is currently zoned R-3, Residential Detached House 3. The property is located on the west side of Venard Road, approximately 165 feet north of Parrish Court, commonly known as 3830 Venard Road, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 06-31-407-016). Vinko Topic, Owner.

Planner Scott Williams reviewed the petition on the overhead. He reported that the surrounding properties and the large subject property were all zoned R-3. However, when the subject property was platted, the northern property line angles inwards reducing the lot width which was why there was an exception before the commission. The petitioner was seeking a subdivision of the lot. Dimensions and bulk requirements of the two separate lots were explained by Mr. Williams in greater detail. The lot would not be 75' wide as measured at the street setback line, but meets all other requirements and is eligible to seek an exception. The conceptual engineering was also presented.

The proposal was reviewed in accordance with the goals of the village's comprehensive plan and under the standards for approval. Staff recommended approval subject to the conditions in its staff report.

In response to drainage questions, Mr. Williams pointed out that the property was not previously developed under the current stormwater ordinance. Additional easements will be put on the proposed properties per the subdivision ordinance. Ms. Leitschuh added that whenever land is subdivided, there is an increase in properties' impervious surface, and an applicant must show how

it will be treated, stored, and distributed. Planner Leitschuh stated it was a standard requirement for going through the new single family permitting process.

Petitioner, Mr. Philip Wolf with Wolf Pack Development, 2510 Maple Ave., Downers Grove, explained that the drainage on the property flowed to the back corner of the site. He said the builder had recommended that he review the stormwater management devices required for new buildings with 2500 sq. feet of impervious surface, which was an infiltration base and a rain garden.

He referenced the plans for the two lots for the commissioners.

No questions from the commissioners followed. The chairman invited the public to speak.

Mr. Sean Black, 1420 Parish Court, inquired if the footprint of the buildings would change. He pointed out that two neighbors west from the property had water issues over the years and they had flooded basements.

Ms. Karen Martin, 1411 Wood, was fine with splitting the lots but said she does receive a lot of water and wanted to know how it would be addressed in the future.

Mr. Wolf proceeded to respond to the above questions by explaining future water run-off directions from the two sites, water storage, the accuracy of the footprints on the plans, and the location of the proposed rain garden.

Mr. Vince Topic, 436 Bunning Drive, Downers Grove, a local builder, explained his plans for the two homes which included being constructed one at a time.

Hearing no additional comments, the chairman closed the public hearing.

Per a question, Mr. Williams explained the approximately $24,000 listed in staff's recommendation was the appropriate donations to the school district and park district based on the new home.

Commissioners discussed the narrow lots being created by the subdivision and the fact the commission usually stayed with the 75 feet widths but that council also approved the 73-foot widths for three lots recently. The chairman pointed out; however, that the difference with this proposal was the side property lines were not parallel but they had the required width when measured from the street. Additional confirmation followed by Mr. Williams that a prior request earlier in the year did have certain conditions placed on it when village council approved it after the commission had denied the request.

Responding to Ms. Gassen's question as to what the hardship was for this property, Mr. Williams believed it was how the parcel was platted. At its narrowest point it was approximately 54 feet. Ms. Leitschuh also explained there were two ways to evaluate hardships: one as a hardship and one as a practical difficulty. She believed this request had practical difficulty in meeting the reasonable use of the property because of its dimensional difficulty.

Mr. Maurer raised the fact that neighbor comments included that an unattractive house currently sat on the property and a newer home could replace it; however, it would still remain on a very large lot and not in keeping with the neighborhood. Whereas, he believed the proposal was acceptable, more

fitting with the area, and most people would not notice if the setback was off one foot. From his own experience in development, he agreed the village would require the applicant to meet the stormwater requirements and take proper control measures to address the neighbors' concerns.

Chairman Rickard concurred and believed even with the subdivision, the lots were still somewhat larger but still made it more consistent with the neighborhood. Mr. Thoman reported there was already a precedent set for odd-shaped lots in the neighborhood. Mr. Boyle pointed out that the neighbors to the west of the lot had an RCP running between their lots and he hoped the builder would address any water issues before that point of collection.

Commissioners appeared to be fine with the five standards being met and staff's recommendation for approval with its four conditions.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 16-PLC-0048, MR. MAUER MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL SUBJECT TO STAFF'S FOUR (4) CONDITIONS IN ITS STAFF REPORT.

SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. MAURER, MS. HOGSTROM, MR. BOYLE, MS. GASSEN, MR. THOMAN, CHAIRPERSON RICKARD.
NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 6-0

FILE 16-PLC-0051: A petition seeking approval of a Special Use to permit a Drive-through Banking Facility. The property is currently zoned B-3, General Services and Highway Business. The property is located on north side of Ogden Avenue at the intersection of Seeley Avenue and Ogden Avenue, commonly known as 1512 Ogden Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (PINs 09-06-401-007, -008). Brian N. Reno, Stantec Architecture, Petitioner; 1512 Partners, an Illinois General Partnership, Owner.

Mr. Scott Williams reviewed the above petition, summarizing the request was for a special use to permit a drive-through for a banking facility in a newly constructed building. The existing building will be razed. A plat of survey was referenced and details about the proposal followed. Bulk requirements and setbacks for the drive-through were reviewed in detail demonstrating compliance with the zoning ordinance. Ingress and egress locations to the site were pointed out as well as vehicle stacking, pedestrian movement, and parking. Landscaping and lighting photometrics for the site were also reviewed.

Mr. Williams addressed how the proposal met the village's Comprehensive Plan and recommended approval with the conditions in staff's report.

Questions followed as to why IDOT had to review the proposal which staff responded it was for utility work and to verify maintaining existing curb cuts.

Petitioner, Mr. Brian Reno with Stantec Architecture, 135 S. LaSalle St., Chicago, stated he did have preliminary approval from IDOT regarding the curb-cuts providing one way access to and from the site.

Chairman Rickard invited the public to speak. None followed. Mr. Reno asked for consideration. Public comment was closed.

It was noted by the chairman that the approval criteria was met and staff was seeking approval with the six conditions listed in its report.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 16-PLC-0051, MR. THOMAN MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL SUBJECT TO STAFF'S SIX (6) CONDITION LISTED IN ITS REPOT.

SECONDED BY MS. GASSEN. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MR. THOMAN, MS. GASSEN, MR. BOYLE, MS. HOGSTROM, MR. MAURER, CHAIRPERSON RICKARD
NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE:

Ms. Leitschuh stated she expects to have a meeting the first week of December and on December 19th. She also announced that sometime in the new year additional training for new commissioners will take place.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:27 P.M. ON MOTION BY MS. GASSEN, SECONDED BY MR. THOMAN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF
`

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

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
MEMO

To: Plan Commission
From: Stan Popovich, AICP
Director of Community Development
Subject: **16-PLC-0019, Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan Update**
Date: December 5, 2016

The Village Council created the Comprehensive Planning Ad Hoc Committee (CPC) to update the Village's 2011 Comprehensive Plan (Plan) and to develop a downtown regulatory framework based on the Plan's Downtown Focus Area. The CPC has completed work on the updated Plan and during their November 14, 2016 meeting, they recommended forwarding the Plan to the Plan Commission for their review.

Comprehensive Planning Ad Hoc Committee (CPC)
In March 2016, the Village Council formed the CPC to oversee the review and update to the Plan. The CPC was comprised of nine members from the Plan Commission, Architectural Design Review Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, Transportation and Parking Commission, Stormwater and Floodplain Oversight Committee, Downtown Downers Grove Management Corporation and the Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation. The Village hired Houseal Lavigne Associates, the same consultant that completed the 2011 Comprehensive Plan, to update the Plan.

CPC Meetings
The CPC met seven times between April and November 2016 to review and update the Plan. The CPC reviewed each section of the existing Plan and recommended updates to the Plan which were then incorporated into the Draft Plan. As part of this review, the CPC reviewed an updated Downtown Focus Area Plan and new focus area plans for 63rd Street and 75th Street.

The draft Downtown Focus Area Plan was reviewed by the Plan Commission on June 27. The recommendations from the CPC and the Plan Commission were forwarded to the Village Council. The Council reviewed the Downtown Focus Area Plan at their July 12 and October 4 meetings. The Council recommendations were then incorporated into the Draft Plan.

Significant Changes
To facilitate the review of the Draft Updated Plan, the chart below identifies the significant updates that occurred to the Plan.

Section	Page # in document	Description
1	8	Changed first paragraph to reflect current conditions
1	11 - 13	Inserted summaries of plans that have been completed since the 2011 adoption
1	14 - 19	Updated demographic information

2	20 - 23	Included new vision statement based on improvements since 2011 and the 2016 Comprehensive Planning Process
3	26	Updated Future Land Use Plan based on improvements since 2011 and the 2016 Comprehensive Planning Process
4	39	Added subsection regarding Historic Preservation
4	42 - 43	Updated policy recommendations, including new policy recommendations on green buildings and historic preservation
5	50	Removed paragraph regarding Sign Ordinance
5	54 -55	Updated policy recommendations, including new policy recommendation on historic preservation
6	61	Updated North-South Traffic Flow based on completion of Belmont Road underpass
6	62	Updated bicycle mobility and safety section
6	65	Updated sidewalk section
6	66	Updated parking section
6	68-69	Included new policy recommendations on electric cars, car sharing and bike sharing programs
6	70-71	Included new policy recommendations on grade separated pedestrian tunnel with Metra and a bike rack system
7	73	Updated Downers Grove Park District mission statement
7	81	Included new policy recommendations on rain gardens and the enhancement of the tree canopy
8	84 - 85	Updated School District plans
8	88-89	Updated facilities discussion to reflect current status
8	92	Updated facilities discussion to reflect current status
9	102 - 103	Revised catalyst sites based on recent developments
9	104 - 113	Revised Downtown Focus Area based on 2016 Comprehensive Planning Process
9	116 - 117	Revised catalyst sites based on recent developments
9	118 - 121	Revised Ogden Avenue so that it is no longer separated into east, middle and west sections. Catalyst sites revised based on recent developments.
9	128 - 129	Included new 63rd Street Key Focus Area
9	130 - 131	Included new 75th Street Key Focus Area
10	137 - 143	Added descriptions for various implementation funding sources and incentives

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Plan Commission discuss the updated sections of the Comprehensive Plan and offer comments. At the conclusion of the meeting, staff recommends the Plan Commission forward the Plan to the Village Council with a positive recommendation.

Attachments

CPC meeting minutes

Draft Plan

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING

VILLAGE HALL COMMITTEE ROOM
801 BURLINGTON AVENUE
APRIL 6, 2016 - 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Gorman called the April 6, 2016 meeting of the Downers Grove Comprehensive Planning Ad Hoc Committee meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Dave Gorman, John Luka, Carine Acks, Ed Kalina, Irene Hogstrom, Mark Thoman, Jim Wilkinson, Marge Earl, Daiva Majauskas

STAFF: Community Development Dir. Stan Popovich and Management Analyst Megan Miles

VISITORS: Michael Cassa, President, Economic Development Corporation, 5159 Mochel, Downers Grove; Don Rickard, Chairman, Plan Commission; John Houseal, Devin Lavigne & Ian Tobin with Houseal Lavigne Associates

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AD HOC COMMITTEE INTRODUCTION

The chairman invited members to introduce themselves. Community Development Dir. Stan Popovich discussed that this committee will be reviewing two projects over the next six months, including the Comprehensive Plan update and the Downtown zoning regulations. A review of the schedule followed. Once the Ad hoc committee has completed its work, recommendations will be forwarded to the Plan Commission for review and, ultimately, to the Village Council by December 2016. Agendas will be posted on-line.

INTRODUCTION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

A. Introduction of objectives, roles and responsibilities, deliverables and schedule:
Dir. Popovich summarized that the goal of the committee is to provide a detailed update to the village's five-year Comprehensive Plan (Plan) update. Details followed. The committee will be also be reviewing 63rd and 75th Streets as new key focus areas to be added to the Plan.

B. Project initiation workshop: Mr. Devin Lavigne explained how he intended to bring the plan and its map forward for the members to review. A history on how the village's comprehensive plan came about was explained. A break down of the various chapters within the comprehensive plan followed. Mr. Lavigne discussed that the current comprehensive plan was recognized in 2012 by the American Planning Association in Illinois as the best plan in the state. Further explanation of the review process followed by Mr. Lavigne.

Mr. John Houseal explained there was a difference of putting together a comprehensive plan initially versus a plan update. He further explained how he envisioned the revisions to the document would be made, including the two new sub-areas. Members were encouraged to provide their input. Mr. Lavigne emphasized that this committee was a working group and he would be providing information to the members prior to the meeting in order for members to understand what would be discussed and to be a target for the meeting.

Mr. Devin Lavigne asked members for their input on how they liked the plan, where the plan could be revisited, and, if there were other themes to be considered. He and Director Popovich also emphasized the plan was more of a reference guide versus a book that was read cover to cover.

Members noted active transportation such as sidewalks, bike paths, and in general, easier access to different areas. Mr. Lavigne agreed this area needed to be reviewed since it had "emerged" over the past five years. It was suggested a review of the transitional nature of the downtown area, review of retail in the 63rd Street corridor (at the Woodward intersection). Further comments included that the plan could facilitate a more vibrant downtown area and the Ogden Avenue corridor. One member noted re-establishing the implementation steps that follow each of the chapters; and create a Low Density Office Research Management zoning classification for the downtown area in order for doctors or lawyers to relocate in such developments.

Mr. Houseal pointed out for members that zoning was not planning; zoning was a tool to implement planning recommendations, and these two areas would be tracked simultaneously because if a regulatory strategy were to be created for the village to follow, the downtown or some of its downtown districts would have to be defined and zoned differently but, at the same time, converge at some point.

Continuing the input, members also suggested:

- a review of pedestrian walkways over or under train stations
- consider the types of non-traditional businesses the village wants to attract
- the possibility of residential parking permits
- the review of the sign ordinance and a review of 63rd Street at the Meadowbrook Shopping Center
- review the Public Transportation chapter since PACE was updating its plan
- reviewing historic preservation since the village had new tools now
- review the plan in the context of why would someone want to move to the village, why would a resident want to stay in the village, why would a person shop in the village, why is the Village desirable?
- protecting the village's urban forests
- reviewing neighborhood sustainability/sense of place as the village modernizes
- keeping the plan as short as possible with numerous graphics but continue to honor the TCD3 report
- considering a branding plan to tie in various downtown areas
- reviewing zoning code as it relates to stormwater and lot coverage plan
- considering a use for Hidden Lake

The chairman summarized that he preferred to keep the information in the plan that the committee believed should remain, and discuss it thoroughly, as opposed to just pulling it out.

C. Public Comment: Chairman Gorman opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. Cassa encouraged the committee to take advantage of the Economic Development Commission. If the committee was going to designate a certain part of the village as a particular type of use, such as office or retail, Mr. Cassa suggested that the committee consider whether there was a demand for the use. Also, he recommended that the village consider attracting the Millennial workforce to the local economy and ensure they can live in the village, have transportation and enjoy leisure time. It was a top priority for other cities.

Mr. Luka agreed the ratio of renters to homeowners was much different than in the years 2007-2008 and Millennials were not interested in home ownership as much as prior generations. Millennials wanted nice amenities with night life and access. The resident believed there had to be a new thought process. He did like the village's comprehensive plan.

Discussion followed on the convergence of the Millennials and the Baby Boomers and how housing models will be changing in the future to encompass both demographics in vertical housing (multi-family) structures. Home ownership was not a priority for either of the two demographics. Ideas and conversation flowed on this topic.

INTRODUCTION OF DOWNTOWN ZONING REVIEW

A. Introduction of objectives, roles and responsibilities, deliverables and schedule
&
B. Project initiation workshop:

Mr. Houseal reminded the committee that the village was parallel tracking a downtown regulatory strategy as well. The goal was to define the downtown better: what was the transition and what did it mean in terms of the sense of place of the transition area? Once that was defined, Mr. Houseal said it would be easier to draft a regulatory strategy to guide development that invests in the downtown.

Mr. Houseal proceeded to ask members for their input as to what they saw as issues to the downtown zoning uses, transitions, or development that has pushed the village to look at the downtown zoning, land uses, or built form currently. (Dir. Popovich provided a map of the downtown business zoning district and transition area for members to view.) Dialog followed that the committee will have to determine, through discussion, whether it wants one downtown district or possibly smaller individual districts, and look at the transitional zones between commercial and residential within the downtown districts. The City of Geneva was cited as an example of how it uses the downtown district and transitions from commercial to residential yet it defines the transitional zoning first.

Further discussion was raised on whether economic development gets suppressed in transitional areas so that something better and more useful to the community gets developed. Mr. Lavigne explained it was more of an appropriateness of character in certain areas. Details followed on how

he would define transitional zones and how he would define specific zones outside the transitional zone.

Turning the discussion back to members' input about the downtown area, Ms. Majauskas stated the downtown lacked "any sort of wow." It was uninviting and there was no vision. Other comments included the strip of land with industrial buildings on the south side of Rogers Street, between Maple and the downtown, impacted both the downtown and the Fairview/Maple area. The EDC plan recommended the consideration of multi-family or light office uses for the area. Overall, the area was unattractive.

It was then mentioned how various strategic zoning changes were made to the Village of LaGrange which eventually changed the downtown area completely in a successful way.

Mr. Lavigne summarized that members should focus on what will make the downtown better, what uses should exist, the character of the downtown, and to not focus on codes or regulations because his firm would draft those. Asked if staff kept an inventory of what businesses were working well and what businesses were moving into the new buildings, Mr. Popovich said that Linda Kunze with the Downtown Management Corporation would have that information.

Mr. Houseal encouraged members to walk or bike the downtown, and not drive, to get ideas, take notes, and get to know the areas. Conversation then led to the unattractiveness of the downtown alleys, parking garages, etc. (Dir. Popovich said he would provide pattern books to the members in the future.)

Mr. Houseal mentioned that members could contact him anytime through Mr. Popovich and, in turn, he would disseminate any information to the committee members.

Members were then asked to read Chapters 1 through 3 of the Comprehensive Plan and to hold off any discussion about the downtown zoning.

C. Public Comment: No comments.

ADJOURNMENT

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:42 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. LUKA SECONDED BY MS. EARL. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 9-0.

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

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING

VILLAGE HALL COMMITTEE ROOM
801 BURLINGTON AVENUE
May 4, 2016 - 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Gorman called the May 4, 2016 meeting of the Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan Ad Hoc Committee meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the meeting with the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Dave Gorman, Carine Acks, Marge Earl, Irene Hogstrom, John Luka, Mark Thoman, Jim Wilkinson

ABSENT: Ed Kalina, Daiva Majauskas

STAFF: Community Development Director Stan Popovich

VISITORS: Devin Lavigne and Ian Tobin with Houseal Lavigne Associates; Amy Gassen, 5320 Benton, Downers Grove; Don Rickard, 4735 Main St., Downer Grove; Gordon Goodman, 5834 Middaugh, Downers Grove; Linda Kunze, Downtown Management, Downers Grove; and Rick Kulovany, 6825 Camden Rd., Downers Grove

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MINUTES OF APRIL 6, 2016, WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. THOMAN, SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW

A. Chapter 1: Mr. Devin Lavigne explained how the plan was basically formatted from the original plan and mentioned the statistical numbers used in the plan were updated from the latest census. Asked if there were any questions about the demographic numbers, it was mentioned that it appeared the village was getting older and more wealthier and not many starter homes existed in the village. Dialog followed on the changes that were being noticed in the tables, i.e., the number of increased households, the aging population, and the lack of racial diversity in the village while the county grew in diversity. Asked whether the trends that have taken place over the past five years should be highlighted, Mr. Lavigne believed they should and stated the tables could be contrasted with the 2009 data, along with new text discussing the 2011 Comprehensive Plan and its five-year update process.

Page 10 - Past Plans and Studies – Mr. Lavigne will add the 2011 Comprehensive Plan, the 2011 Downtown Parking study, the 2015 Economic Development Plan to Enhance the Sales Tax Base, the 2015 Downers Economic Development Corporation Strategic Plan, the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance adoptions and the updated 2015 Historic Preservation Ordinance. The studies will be added under the Background paragraph.

Vision Statement – The committee was asked whether there were new priorities that needed to be added. Changes for this section followed:

1. Add the five-year update to this section;

2. Page 20, the paragraph starting with the words, "continued reinvestment in residential neighborhoods…." add text about the new Preservation Ordinance and how it has lead to landmarking of historic properties. Add that the village is working to preserve historically significant structures;

3. Update the text under the Urban Forest to reflect the tree reinvestment that is taking place since the loss of the ash trees.

4. As a form of recognition, add verbiage about the various TCD-3 neighborhood study meetings that took place and include village staff, council members and citizens providing their input on issues of neighborhood safety, traffic issues, etc.;

5. In the paragraph that begins "Highly diverse and sustainable economic opportunities," add something about the influx of new residents in the downtown area and the residential opportunities in the downtown;

6. Revisit the Vision Statement one last time after the 63rd Street and 75th Street plans have been reviewed; and

7. Under Fairview Station -- which discusses the local transportation improvements – expand the text to include the new Pace bus routes. Mention that the station is in the process of being landmarked.

B. Chapter 2: See above.

C. Downtown Focus Area Plan: Mr. Lavigne explained how catalyst sites are sometimes incorporated into comprehensive plans and how they are defined. The village had nine catalyst sites identified (pg. 105). Members were asked to provide their input regarding the plan's catalyst sites.

1. Add text about a "well defined edge" of downtown as a key concept and clearly delineate it.

2. The development of Maple Avenue was discussed, noting it was a "reasonable transition" from higher density to lower density and could be used as a demarcation from the downtown area into the residential area.

Mr. Lavigne then read through Key Concepts and a general dialog followed regarding the various redevelopment sites that have come into the downtown and those that have left. The committee discussed redevelopment constraints, the need for more parking, specifically at the Tivoli parking lot, whether there was a demand for public plazas or more open space, such as a dog park. Dir. Popovich indicated there was no demand that he saw.

Leveraging a right-of-way in the downtown area was suggested as a way to gain parking due to the shortage of parking in general. Also mentioned by Mr. Thoman was the fact that a unified plan needed to be created to address five different garbage vendors.

Mr. Lavigne stated that an opportunity existed to pick up extra parking on Burlington Avenue with the existing parking lot being reconfigured to a one-way and to insert angled parking on Burlington with approximately 25 spaces.

Members, staff and the consultants discussed a number of ideas for the comprehensive plan, including the 48-unit apartment proposal for the 904-910 Curtiss site (Curtiss and Washington); using the space behind Village Hall for parking, expansion of the police station to come south toward Curtiss Street with the fleet maintenance portion to remain; and a grade separation for pedestrians to walk to the opposite of the railroad tracks. (pg. 103)

Lastly, someone suggested adding a striped bike route for the downtown.

Mr. Lavigne pointed out that the Downtown Plan mentioned to "prohibit new and redevelop existing non-pedestrian-oriented businesses" which, as he explained, basically resulted in removing drive-throughs and keeping those types of buildings in the corridors and not in the downtown area. One of the bays of a downtown bank was now being used for trash collection.

Mr. Popovich then discussed the U.S. Post Office stating that staff did not see any real issues with the mail trucks, but recommended reviewing the matter, possibly relocating the larger mail trucks somewhere else but keeping the retail aspect.

As far as considering "dedication of surface parking for shoppers and parking deck for commuters," Director Popovich said he would review the 2011 parking study to see if there was more discussion on the topic. Comments followed about a once-discussed Metra parking space exchange.

Other ideas that members expressed they wanted to see in the broad policy included increased bike racks on the peripheral edge of downtown; a unified garbage dumpster plan, a pedestrian grade separation and outdoor seating,

Catalyst sites were then reviewed. Sites to be added included the possibility of the Masonic Temple parking lot, the multi-family building south of that location, and locations for bike racks. A suggestion was made to review an empty strip of street next to the Tea Shop to become a dedicated dumpster area. Another suggestion was to encourage property owners north of the Moose Lodge to allow off-street access to the different parking areas versus having small fenced-off areas. One person recommended consideration in the zoning ordinance to change the special use for a drive-through facility to include each stall of the drive-through so that businesses do not use the un-used stalls for storing a dumpster or park cars etc.

Another catalyst site suggestion was the AT&T switching station parking lot since no one ever parked in its lot.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The chairman opened up the meeting to public comment:

Mr. Rich Kulovany, 6825 Camden, suggested consideration for zoning that allows bed and breakfasts in transition areas. He recommended having more emphasis on historic properties and the village becoming a destination. He also asked to protect the transition areas and to address the causing factors that are leading to stormwater issues. As to parking, he agreed more parking was a real need in the downtown area.

Mr. Gordon Goodman, 5834 Middaugh, was pleased to see that the post office retail space was going to remain, citing the various activities that take place at those locations. He asked to consider the post office as a potential historical landmark. He recommended that the village have a policy in place so that the village's catalyst sites be developed intact and not cannibalized, citing Catalyst Site No. 13 (Curtiss & Washington) which had been ruined by the development. He agreed that the village should acquire properties that are developed in floodways/flood plains in order to address the village's surface water management issue and that the new comprehensive plan recognize this as an important initiative of the community and cooperate with the park district to manage the land as public land.

In closing, Director Popovich announced that the next meeting was scheduled for June 1st with the focus on the Downtown Focus Plan and Chapters 4 and 5.

ADJOURNMENT

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:11 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. LUKA, SECONDED BY MS. EARL. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

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

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING

VILLAGE HALL COMMITTEE ROOM
801 BURLINGTON AVENUE
JUNE 1, 2016 - 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Gorman called the June 1, 2016 meeting of the Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan Ad Hoc Committee meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. and led the meeting with the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Dave Gorman, Carine Acks, Marge Earl, Irene Hogstrom, Ed Kalina, John Luka (arrives 7:03 pm) , Daiva Majauskas, Mark Thoman, Jim Wilkinson

STAFF: Community Development Director Stan Popovich

VISITORS: Devin Lavigne with Houseal Lavigne Associates; Amy Gassen, 5320 Benton, Downers Grove; Don Rickard, 4735 Main St., Downer Grove; Rich Kulovany, 6825 Camden Rd., Downers Grove

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MAY 4, 2016

MINUTES OF MAY 4, 2016, WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. THOMAN, SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0-1. (Majauskas abstains)

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW

A. Downtown Focus Area Plan: Mr. Popovich explained that Houseal Lavigne reworked the Downtown Focus Area Plan with new drawings. Next steps were explained. (Mr. Luka arrives.)

Mr. Devin Lavigne provided a brief overview of how he and Director Popovich approached the issues discussed at the last meeting and how they were incorporated into the current plan being presented tonight.

Key concepts of the Downtown Sub-Area Plan were reviewed in detail which included 1) improving the way-finding system in the downtown area; 2) incorporating green infrastructure (permeable pavers, etc.) wherever opportunities exist; and 3) developing boundaries for the downtown transition area (by using the functional sub-area map identifying the Downtown Core, the Downtown Edge, and the Downtown Transition areas.).

In addition, Mr. Lavigne stated the following additions were added to the plan in response to previous committee comments: 1) the parking deck should include real-time counters identifying available parking spaces; 2) reinforce that the Downtown is the focal point of the community; 3) identify areas to incorporate a centralized, well-screened garbage area for the businesses in the Downtown Core area; 4) encourage outdoor seating for restaurants/streamline the permitting process; 5) identify opportunities to expand sidewalks/create plazas, where appropriate, utilizing existing setbacks on buildings; 6) promote bike parking on the perimeter of the downtown so cyclists become pedestrians in the downtown area; and 7) investigate the feasibility of constructing a grade-separated crossing near the Metra station, possibly using grants from the railroad, ICC, etc.

Director Popovich invited committee comments regarding the above key concepts.

Ms. Earl questioned the location of a recently approved downtown redevelopment site located at the intersection of Rogers Street and Prospect Avenue, and what sub-area it fell into, i.e., Downtown Transition? Downtown Core? After some discussion, Mr. Lavigne recommended that the committee modify the boundary of the Downtown Sub-Area to include the site.

Adding to the discussion, Mr. Lavigne reminded the committee there were two pieces to the scope of work for the project: an update to the comprehensive plan and also developing a regulatory strategy to the downtown. He explained how the sub-areas could be considered: in built form and in land uses. Examples followed for the Downtown Core, noting that at some point, the village could add language in the plan that addresses drive-throughs.

As a general comment, Ms. Majauskas voiced that the downtown was a “mish-mosh” of buildings with no vision for the downtown or to invite the community to walk the downtown. She cited examples of other communities that offered inviting elements to their downtowns. Other members shared how “flat” the signage was in the village’s downtown area and it was suggested that the Downtown Core sign ordinance or design guidelines be revisited to include such things as fenestration of buildings, use indoor rooms as an extension of outdoor rooms, etc. Design guidelines from other communities were further mentioned as well as getting input from the Downtown Management group.

Per a question, Mr. Lavigne explained the purpose for creating the three sub-areas was to set a table for a third zoning district in the downtown area and to change some of the zoning, which would improve the transition in some areas and develop the downtown area more intensely with minimal impact on adjacent neighborhoods. Asked if landscaping could accomplish some of that, Mr. Lavigne described how that could be addressed in Downtown Edge Sub-Area.

Overall, members voiced positive comments about the delineation of the three sub-areas but mentioned that a branding element could be beneficial for the entryways to the downtown. Dialog followed on how “fluid” the boundary lines were for each of the three downtown sub-areas and whether they could be revised in a few years should the economy pick up, wherein Mr. Lavigne indicated that the Downtown Edge sub-area would be available to pick up such developments.

The importance of on-street parking, through the eyes of the businesses, was then discussed. Businesses did want on-street parking in downtown Downers Grove. However, more dialog followed regarding the challenges of traveling to the downtown area, in general, the fact that vehicles were cutting through residential side streets to avoid the downtown, and the fact that no

"ring road" existed to get around the downtown. However, a comment was made that the village could not have it both ways – it either has to have a street that moves or it has to have a slower area where people can park and mingle. Comments followed that another parking deck might be in order since it could help with retail development north of the railroad tracks.

Ms. Earl recalled how the village previously discussed the idea of relocating the downtown train platform to where the village hall was currently located in order to alleviate some of the congested traffic in the downtown area, but she believed it was only moving the problem further down the track and would hurt the downtown area because no one would want to stop and shop in the downtown area. Some members believed the issue needed to be revisited again. A last comment was made by Chairman Gorman that a "T" intersection at the Washington Street crossing and tracks could be created instead of the current intersection, and thereby forcing commuters to travel around the downtown area via Washington Street rather than remain on Main Street.

Returning to the parking issue again and its turnover on the street, it was suggested to shorten some time restrictions in order to get those who park longer to use the parking deck or peripheral edge. Another suggestion was to insert language into the plan to encourage parking for Vespas/motorcycles.

Turning to the topic of catalyst sites, Mr. Lavigne walked through the changes made from the last meeting. Concern was raised that parking was being removed for the Main/Maple parking lot. However, Director Popovich pointed out that the lot was created as a temporary lot while the parking deck was being constructed and it was never intended to be permanent parking. Surplus parking existed on the south side.

It was then pointed out by Ms. Majauskas that she was seeing many smaller multi-family developments being constructed in the downtown area with only one parking space being allotted. She shared concern about the shortage of parking spaces. However, another member shared how some of the parking spaces in the Acadia were being purchased by outside individuals since some residents in the building did not want to pay for them and commuters wanted them. Further dialog followed regarding the lack of parking spaces and low parking ratios for the area in general.

Staff was also asked to work on the order of the sub-areas and key focus areas in the plan, for consistency purposes.

B. Chapter 4: Moving to Chapter 4, Mr. Lavigne summarized that the chapter focuses on the residential areas plan which encompasses all of the recommendations and policies related to residential land use. Questions were raised regarding the clarification of "unique character" and "identity" of housing stock and what those terms meant exactly. One member pointed out that while it was easy to talk about historic preservation, she questioned how it gets accomplished. Members shared one example of how that would occur. Another point raised was the fact that preservation becomes difficult when the value of the lot exceeds the value of the structure on the lot and it becomes a tear-down because of it.

Mr. Lavigne pointed out that other tools existed in the pattern book to promote housing diversity. However, one member explained that teardowns over 10 to 20 years would offer diversity anyway because people used different architects, liked different varieties of homes, etc. and so diversity would occur naturally over time.

After distinguishing the difference between diversity of housing stock as compared to diversity village-wide, Mr. Lavigne suggested inserting the word "community-wide" in front of the word "diversity." Members then began discussing various topics including those towns that limit the issuance of demolition permits, lot coverage, tree preservation, and towns that have restrictions for impervious surfaces.

Conversation followed whether the Residential Area section was the proper place to insert a stronger policy recommendation for private tree planting and tree planting on public rights-of-ways. Mr. Lavigne said he would review the name of the section. Someone suggested adding language that states parkway trees are for the public and a resident should not be allowed to veto its planting in the village's right-of-way.

On the topic of housing affordability, Ms. Earl pointed out that the idea of housing affordability had to be looked at from the regional perspective, noting that Downers Grove backed up to other communities that offered affordable housing. She also clarified that it was also a matter of what type of housing a person wanted. For example, a starter home in the village or a two-story home on a large lot located in Plainfield. It was also pointed out that affordable housing included rental property.

On the topic of cut-through traffic, test driving through neighborhoods was a concern and it was suggested to include some language about that in the plan.

Last minute comments included encouraging green building initiatives in residential areas.

C. Chapter 5: Deferred to next meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The chairman opened up the meeting to public comment:

Mr. Rich Kulovany, 6825 Camden, walked through his slide presentation as it related to the new historic preservation ordinance. He discussed many developers tear down historic homes because they want modern amenities and they justify the reason that it makes economic sense to tear down the home. However, Mr. Kulovany explained that people can purchase a home, renovate its interior, and landmark it as long as the front facade remains intact. He stated that the Friends of the Edward House would like to see language in the plan that promotes historic preservation, since there was not a large percentage of historic homes remaining in the village. In addition, he pointed out the benefits of keeping the older homes: the lumber is usually old growth hardwood, a foundation exists, and less construction mess and noise pollution occurs as compared to new construction.

Ms. Amy Gassen, 5320 Benton Avenue, commented that she has heard from old residents that they want to downsize, live in a one-story home, yet want a small garden and to be able to walk to the downtown. She asked that to be considered when providing residential options. As to limiting driveways to be impervious, her concern was that garages would be pushed to the front of the lot and she did not believe the village should encourage that.

No further public comment was received.

Regarding an earlier comment about lot coverage and impervious surfaces, a suggestion was made by a member that it may be beneficial to use a calculation of whichever is less. It was also pointed out that another benefit with rehabbing a historic home as opposed to razing it and constructing new, was that an owner would not have to pay an impact feet to the school district or the park district.

Due to the July 4th holiday, Director Popovich said he would send an email to everyone to see what next meeting date worked best.

ADJOURNMENT

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:10 P.M. ON MOTION BY MRS. EARL, SECONDED BY MR. LUKA. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 9-0.

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

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING

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

Chairman Gorman called the July 14, 2016 meeting of the Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan Ad Hoc Committee meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Dave Gorman, Marge Earl, Irene Hogstrom, Ed Kalina, John Luka, Daiva Majauskas, Mark Thoman, Jim Wilkinson

ABSENT: Carine Acks

STAFF: Community Development Director Stan Popovich and Planner Rebecca Leitschuh

VISITORS: Devin Lavigne with Houseal Lavigne Associates; Amy Gassen, 5320 Benton, Downers Grove; Don Rickard, 4735 Main St., Downers Grove; Rich Kulovany, 6825 Camden Rd., Downers Grove

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – JUNE 1, 2016

MINUTES OF MAY 4, 2016, WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. WILKINSON, SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0.

REVIEW COUNCIL DISCUSSION ON DOWNTOWN FOCUS AREA

Mr. Popovich noted that the Ad Hoc committee discussed and forwarded its Downtown Focus Area Plan to the Village's Plan Commission meeting on June 27, 2016 and the Plan Commission, after discussion, decided to create a fourth sub-area in the downtown – the Center Area – with the recommendation that building heights be three to four stories versus the current 70 feet.
Mr. Popovich shared the discussion held at the July 12, 2016 Village Council meeting which, in summary, was that Council was more supportive of the Plan Commission's recommendation but the exact boundaries for the sub-area were yet to be determined by the council and no clear direction was provided to staff. Therefore, the discussion on the downtown development regulations was pulled from tonight's agenda and will be rescheduled to a future date, most likely the September meeting.

A gallery of photos of the downtown was placed on the overhead with Mr. Popovich explaining how the downtown changed over the past 20 years.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW (Chapter 5)

In prefacing the discussion for Chapter 5, Devin Lavigne with Houseal Lavigne Associates, asked for input on the following two corridors – commenting that the 75th Street corridor was very compact with a couple of malls, while the 63rd Street corridor was a mixture of residential and commercial. Mr. Lavigne proceeded to discuss the existing conditions for the two corridors listed below.

A. 63rd Street Charrette: Mr. Luka recalled he had mentioned earlier that the retailers were saying the western gateway to the village at 63rd Street and Woodward Avenue was not a major corridor and that the existing large retail center there was distressed, had significant amounts of parking, and included a variety of different uses. He suggested a change of use for the area to give developers an opportunity to construct mixed use or, as another alternative, shrink the retail space, add office, townhomes and/or rental units. The lot dimension was also a challenge there.

Suggestions included sprucing up the out-buildings, push the retail closer to the street and back fill it with rental units. Seven Bridges, on a smaller scale, was also discussed or possibly joining with the Village of Woodridge. Other suggestions included beautifying the corridor with parkway trees since there was a lack of them currently. A comment was made that there was some transition to a defined commercial look on the east side of Main Street and on the south side of 63rd Street.

For the unincorporated area on 63rd Street, Ms. Majauskas recommended the village trying to better control how the area gets developed or have some building codes in place, because to her, the county was more lenient as to what was allowed. Dialog followed that inserting townhomes or row homes fronting 63rd Street with some rear access would be better than some of the single-family homes along 63rd Street.

Chairman Gorman raised conversation that in the unincorporated areas where office use existed, there could be some lot consolidation to create larger parcels. The intersection was also signalized at Woodward. However, comments followed on the challenges that a proposed Walgreens experienced and, the fact that the developer eventually pulled the project.

Other observations included that the Green Knolls Center at Main and 63rd had a rear entrance for uses located in the basement of the mall. Someone mentioned taking some of the residential frontage and placing them into an "L" configuration. Other comments included that the entire shopping area had low appeal – it sat low and had poor visibility. Contrarily, others stated the CVS was the improvement for the site and the landscaping had been increased. Last comments included that the street was a challenge because the village did not control the land.

B. 75th Street Charrette: Mr. Popovich identified the area for discussion. General comments included the mall at the northwest corner of Lemont & 75th was challenged by the number of property owners (15 to 16 owners) and the fact that it sat too deep and there was a lack of cohesion of single ownership. Asked what could be done with that many owners, Mr. Lavigne stated the owners would have to be given incentives to redevelop the entire center with another developer. He thought a town center would be nice. Members cited the Promenade in Bolingbrook or a similar development, such as the new one in Burr Ridge, etc. as developments to consider .

Comments also followed that the value of the land and the houses around such developments had to have residents with disposable income for such developments and this site was very different. While Ms. Majauskas concurred, she added that if rental units were being placed above retail, the owners of those units may not support the retail and, therefore, more townhomes probably needed to be constructed instead. Hearing that this mall had similar square footage as the Promenade, Mr. Thoman suggested that a similar mall be created with a smaller version across the street. However, Mr. Lavigne stated that a residential component may have to be added to it, citing the Metropolis located in Indiana. Adding yet another comment, Ms. Earl pointed out the Randhurst Mall in Mt. Prospect did something similar with residential but now the mall was falling "flat" and there was not much interest in it.

Someone suggested inserting restaurants or bars to the area, wherein the conversation turned to the challenges of a restaurant located in a residential location. Ms. Majauskas reminded the committee that it had to consider what would draw people from other surrounding communities – "make it pretty, nice and interesting."

As to how the this area could be tackled, Mr. Lavigne explained it was suggested to staff to visualize it as a fully redeveloped, mix-use center, with some form of management association recommendation that would take care of the maintenance, unify the hours of operations, and coordinate efforts for snow removal, etc. He cited the property across the street as an example.

When asked what resources staff would have to assist in developing a landlord association as a first step, Mr. Popovich indicated the Economic Development Corporation (EDC) did reach out to the property owners prior but that staff could assist in the process as long as there was a vision for the long-term. Mr. Thoman then confirmed the committee would be recommending that the village create the vision and the EDC could approach the landlords. However, Ms. Earl cautioned members that redevelopment of the corner site would have to be careful so as not to cause the other corner to decline; others concurred.

Turning to the text of Section 5, a suggestion was made to update the text on page 48 with the new sign ordinance language; page 49 – mention branding under the Facade Improvement Program; simplify the gateway signs; remove the Downtown Downers Grove sign on Fairview since it was confusing; encourage the redevelopment of buildings within the malls to be located closer to the sidewalk (citing the Standard Market as an example), with parking in the rear. Mr. Lavigne proceeded to discuss the recommendation for using parking maximums versus minimum parking requirements, whereby half of the parking would be placed in front of the retail and the other half in the rear, as overflow, with stronger street orientation/placement. The committee agreed to include this topic in the comprehensive plan.

A question was raised by Ms. Earl as to whether the village should have a committee to review the architectural details of buildings that come in for redevelopment, or whether staff should be working with the applicant before he/she meets with the Plan Commission. Mr. Lavigne noted where the development guidelines were currently discussed in the comprehensive plan and recommended to develop design guidelines for other commercial areas apart from the downtown.

<u>Chapter 6</u>: On Page 60 – update the north/south traffic flow (Belmont/Metra); Page 61 – update the bicycle and pedestrian plan; Page 63 - confirm bike trails plan with county and public works; Page 66 -- update the Public Transit Plan. A suggestion was made to push for a code that

would allow legal bicycling on sidewalks but yielding to pedestrians, not including the Central Business District.

Per a question about the sidewalk completion program, Mr. Popovich indicated that the village completed the sidewalk matrix and now the village was going neighborhood by neighborhood or when residents requested a sidewalk. However, one member pointed out the matrix was not completed and the village "got into construction and switched gears to maintenance." Challenges of some sidewalks were discussed among various members, with the point being to complete the connections so pedestrians could navigate better. Page 65 – update the bus routes and remove mention of the shuttle; update Metra ridership numbers (if available).

Next, the discussion moved toward unused commuter parking spaces and having more accessibility for Vespas, motorcycles and smaller zip cars to promote small use vehicles. Someone recalled their suggestion for a potential pedway underpass at Main Street. A lengthy discussion followed regarding moving the Fairview station further east in order to allow the gates to go up and traffic continue over the railroad tracks.

Chapter 7: Page 73 – in reviewing the Hidden Lake map, someone brought up the idea of having a parking entrance/access off of Lacey or Finley which could become a community benefit and tie it into existing paths. A question arose about annexing Maple Grove Forest Preserve. Mr. Popovich stated he would forward the park maps to the park district to see if there were any updates that could be added and also update the DuPage County Regional Trail System map. Again, Ms. Majauskas emphasized the need for the village to plant more trees, shrubs and flowers to make the village attractive to people.

For stormwater control, a suggestion included planting natural wild flowers or creating natural areas in the parkways (with consideration of height). Page 80 – Ms. Hogstrom cautioned staff about the invasive Japanese Knotweed. Mr. Thoman recalled he brought up a prior discussion about having a mandatory parkway tree planting program and asked if language could be inserted into the comprehensive plan where the village is more proactive in replacing its tree canopy. Page 78 – Wooded Areas – add another paragraph about replacing parkway trees that are lost and give homeowners a variety of tree species to choose from. Another suggestion: continuously connect the chapters to the comprehensive plan; and stress the importance of the Belmont Prairie nature preserve (Nature Preserve Commission oversees).

Chapter 8: Mr. Popovich quickly reviewed the updates to Chapter 8. Page 89, under Public Works, the second paragraph discussing "stormwater" it was suggested to have the text in a more prominent place or role. Others thought the section should be moved into the Open Space and Natural Features but also mention such natural plantings as being good for the village's stormwater system. Asked if an entirely new section called "Environmental Issues" could be drafted, staff stated it was already addressed in Chapter 7 and the section could be re-named.

Dialog followed whether the village was still considering a Civic Center Plan, wherein Mr. Popovich mentioned that there was still dialog about it and it was a good idea to leave it in the plan but modify the paragraph with current ideas. Staff believed the term "Civic Center Campus" fit more appropriately since some of the buildings were separate from each other.

Per staff, the colors on Page 91 would be updated. Dialog followed on whether storm shelters should automatically be constructed after a weather-related event.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The chairman opened up the meeting to public comment: None received. (Mr. Thoman suggested to move public comment up earlier in the meeting due to the late hour.)

Chairman Gorman stated the next meeting will be August 3, 2016. Ms. Earl stated that when discussing the Key Focus Areas at the August 3rd meeting, that while specific sites are identified for redevelopment, she stated there were nothing identified on what the village wanted to save in the comprehensive plan, citing the village had already lost some significant buildings. Regarding the Fairview train station area, she also suggested to unify the street lights so the area looked like it was an activity area.

ADJOURNMENT

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:35 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. LUKA, SECONDED BY MR. KALINA. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0.

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

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING

VILLAGE HALL COMMITTEE ROOM
801 BURLINGTON AVENUE
AUGUST 3, 2016 - 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Gorman called the August 3, 2016 meeting of the Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan Ad Hoc Committee meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. and led the meeting with the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Dave Gorman, Carine Acks, Irene Hogstrom, Ed Kalina, John Luka, Daiva Majauskas, Mark Thoman, Jim Wilkinson

ABSENT: Member Marge Earl

STAFF: Community Development Director Stan Popovich

VISITORS: Devin Lavigne and Ian Tobin with Houseal Lavigne Associates; Don Rickard, 4735 Main St., Downers Grove; Miles and Amy Boone, 117 2nd Street, Downers Grove

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – JULY 14, 2016

MINUTES OF JULY 14, 2016 WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. KALINA, SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW – (Section 3)

Mr. Devin Lavigne, with Houseal Lavigne Associates, reported that this section pertains to the village's land use plan which describes the various land uses that are desired in the community and will be used to form zoning decisions. The plan acts as a policy guide. Mr. Lavigne stated he was looking for comments on the land use map and the various land use classifications, but more specifically, he asked members to closely review the Office and Corporate Campus classification, since there appeared to be a large surplus of empty corporate office space/office buildings along the east/west tollway. However, it was pointed out by one member that the occupancy rate for corporate office space was over 93% in Downers Grove and there was going to be more development coming, seeing that the east/west corridor at I-88 and I-355 was the most sought after corridor for office space.

General discussion followed that Downers Grove's stock of office buildings was newer and more compatible for tech firms than some of the older buildings located in Oak Brook and elsewhere.

Asked if there was going to be a "Downtown Center" area identified on the land use map, Mr. Popovich explained that due to a council member vacancy and the matter being held off at the village council level, this matter would not be discussed until September. However, staff envisioned that the center would remain as Downtown Mixed Use and then refer back to the Sub-Area Plan for a specific map.

Adding to the discussion about the Downtown and the idea that Millennials seem to prefer housing with a lot of "amenities", Ms. Majauskas stated she did not see a lot of amenities in the downtown area, i.e., shoe stores, bars, or hip cafes and asked how the village planned to attract that specific demographic to move into the four buildings planned for the Downtown plan when those amenities were not being offered. She emphasized that the village needed a reason for those Millennials to come to the downtown versus them traveling to other vibrant towns such as Oak Park or Naperville. She cited examples.

Mr. Thoman commented that the transit-oriented development aspect was problematic for the village in that most of the existing buses were commuter buses to the train or to/from Joliet to Yorktown. He still voiced his thoughts that although people liked to consider the village urban development, it was still a suburb. He preferred to see stronger language in the Downtown Commercial Mixed Use area speak about compatible heights and compatible vistas to attract the single-home buyer "who wants to believe they're still living in Mayberry."

Still, other comments followed that HUD released a recent report on the housing ownership percentage which dropped to a 51-year low, or approximately 40% of the U.S. population renting its housing and the village should not ignore that. It was pointed out that suburbs that had high ownership ratios with medium to high household income, and included five-, six- or seven-story rental units in the downtown, included such communities as Wheaton, Arlington Heights, and Mt. Prospect. However Mr. Thoman pointed out that the seven-story buildings in Wheaton were located on the ring of the downtown.

Conversation was raised that the village had to consider a 50/50 housing stock, adapt to it, and consider the new millennium, which included Millennials, middle agers and seniors, all living within a building (aging in place). Dialog continued that the amenities had to be available to draw the residents; however, dialog also followed that "amenities" was a broad term and what did it really include, i.e., access to the city, forest preserve system, bike routes, etc.? Other comments followed that the village eventually would have to find out what works and what does not, within the next two years when all the units come on-line.

Asked if there were anymore issues with the sections of the land use plan, comments included:

- clarification of a small parcel near the corner of Ogden Avenue and Downers Drive (south side of Ogden, northeast of the park site; pg. 26), which staff identified as a water tower, i.e., identified as a "utility".
- Did the committee want to distinguish a different kind of mixed use around the Belmont Station? (Staff felt it would be good to keep it as a long-term goal.)
- Add language about the cottage industry, i.e., a small brewery was mentioned.
- Should language be added to the definition of Office/Corporate Campus – reconfigure the area and expand the envelope at the corner of Warrenville and Belmont/Finley Rd. to make

it more adaptable for 21st century corporate headquarters or commercial properties, where the layout is open, no cubicles, high traffic and there is an increased parking ratio rather than the typical four and one-half spaces per 1,000 square feet? (Staff mentioned that the language should mention that new office development should keep up with the trends in development and trends in employee density.)

- Should there be language to encourage and allow energy/water/wind efficient buildings to be constructed? (Members favored that suggestion.)
- Regarding a building located at Fairview Station (Maple and Fairview Avenues) that is designated as Mixed Use, would there be additional mixed use around the station? (Staff suggested reconciling the paragraph.)
- Referring to an area along Warren Avenue between the railroad tracks and Warren is it confirmed as all Light Intensity Office?

PUBLIC COMMENT

The chairman invited the public to speak. No comments followed.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW (Section 9)

Belmont / Ellsworth – Mr. Lavigne walked through the changes for this focus area. Per a question on what a "unified streetscape" meant, Mr. Lavigne offered to show some photographs or cross-section of the street. Continuing, he stated that with the underpass improvement and because more traffic was traveling that way, opportunities for lot consolidation existed which could draw investors to the area. He asked to think about expanding the area into the current residential area to allow other mixed uses, in general. However, Ms. Majauskas suggested not dividing up the area and possibly keeping the area multi-family and not necessarily retail, as she did not see retail as a big draw. She also saw the area as a cut-through. Mr. Lavigne explained the reasoning behind the two cul-de-sacs depicted in the plan, i.e., access restrictions, or possibly using a round-in or right-out design.

Staff discussed with Mr. Lavigne the idea of adding new graphics and possibly an overlay regarding the potential for corporate campuses along Maple as well as something around the mixed-use at the Belmont Station. A question was also raised regarding the unincorporated area behind the golf course up to Ogden Avenue.

Butterfield Road – Mr. Lavigne reviewed the changes for this focus area – adding pedestrian/bike accommodations and crosswalks, to the area. The Red Roof Inn would remain but be moved into Catalyst Site 21. It was suggested to promote more hospitality businesses near the Red Roof Inn. Someone pointed out that the proposed train line running along I-88 to Highland Avenue, as discussed in concept by CMAP, was missing. Mr. Lavigne would confirm if the train extension was in CMAP's vision.

Ogden Avenue – Ms. Majauskas voiced concern that there were a number of issues associated with Ogden Avenue, such as the various sizes/ shapes of the lots, the buildings were much older, and petitioners were constantly asking for zoning changes. Consolidating the lots would improve the street so that larger buildings could be placed on the lots. A solution would be to establish a minimum lot size and grandfather the older lots. Good examples within the village were cited,

especially examples of commercial expansion into residential neighbors throughout the corridor. Mr. Popovich recalled elsewhere in the plan there was mention of expanding the lot depth of Ogden Avenue and, while it was a good idea to consolidate the smaller lots, the village had to still support the businesses that existed. Other challenges were discussed as well as a discussion about reducing the number of curb cuts on Ogden Avenue. Ms. Hogstrom saw an opportunity to add "street" trees on Ogden Avenue, which would beautify Ogden.

Staff proceeded to discuss the various catalyst sites (west end of Ogden) that had activity on them: Site 23, Site 27, and Site 26. Since Catalyst Site 32 on the east end of Ogden was developed with Fresh Thyme, Mr. Popovich suggested moving the catalyst sites kitty-corner to the northeast corner of Florence and Ogden (the former Downers Grove Yamaha) since there appeared to be some interest in redeveloping the block. Asked what the committee wanted to keep as Site 31: Luxury Motors development or Five Guys development, or both, the committee, after a short dialog, agreed that Five Guys development should be removed. Dialog then turned to having gateway signage on the east end, possibly utilizing the area behind Panera.

Fairview – Mr. Lavigne spoke about this site as a neighborhood center with a different feel. Gateway features were pointed out. Member comments included: 1) adding some "fun" restaurants to the area versus the Belmont corridor; 2) when some of the old industrial uses move out, opportunity existed to redevelop the area; and 3) make the area more walkable/bike-friendly.

Also mentioned by the chair was the suggestion to eliminate the at-grade crossing at Maple. However, he preferred that a traffic study be done first. Adding to the Maple Avenue dialog, Mr. Lavigne described how he wanted to eliminate the high-speed cut-through for the area using a deliberate left turn at Douglas and Rogers Streets so that a square footage opportunity becomes available for new development. However, there was concern raised that much traffic would be utilizing that left turn and that the village would have to look at making Fairview and, possibly Main, as through-streets. Flooding issues in the nearby parking lot (NW corner of tracks on Fairview) were then expressed. Additional members acknowledged the same problem. At the same time, it was also pointed out by someone that the area may have been designed to collect rain and that businesses on the east side needed that parking.

Per a question, Mr. Popovich indicated that staff was receiving calls on the empty gas station site located at Fairview Avenue and 2nd Street and the Perma-Seal site.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The chairman opened up the meeting to public comment regarding the above topics.

Miles and Amy Boone, 117 Second Street, own buildings 1519 through 1523 Fairview and asked for staff's clarification about the Comprehensive Plan's "suggested use" for redevelopment concepts and whether they were just being discussed or were going occur, wherein Mr. Popovich explained it was a concept currently, citing an example. Ms. Boone stated the two of them just purchased the building six weeks ago and no one discussed this plan with them. She and her husband had a plan and were moving ahead with their plan for the building. Mr. Popovich stated there was nothing stopping them from renovating their existing building and the plan was basically a vision for the area.

Ms. Boone shared what the plan was for her building and just wanted to express concern that they did not want to spend more money on improvements if the village had a different plan for their property. She asked for staff to explain what the process was should there be changes to the plan, to which staff explained the comprehensive plan further detail.

Ms. Boone was asked to share what businesses she had in her building and what she envisioned for the area, to which she responded that the tenants included a blind shop, ICL (Illinois Right to Life), a Pilates studio, and a chiropractor (weight loss). The upper story would house a photography co-op with an art gallery and painters. Long-term she would like to see a coffee shop/restaurant with Tobias especially during the summer where they can incorporate live music with an art show – like a cultural event. Mr. Boone concurred, stating that much foot traffic and train traffic already walked the area.

Staff agreed that the Boone's were great property owners and that they could get the other property owners involved and excited about redevelopment of their properties. Ms. Majauskas proceeded to shared some of the small garden shopping districts she saw near Tulane University in New Orleans. She agreed Fairview would be "perfect" for the area.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW (Section 10)

Mr. Lavigne recalled for the members that the text regarding the Implementation chapter, discussing available funding sources, would be returned and better described. Details followed on what would be added and "bulked up" in the text. Also noted by Mr. Lavigne was that rather than the village have an Action Agenda (like many communities) the village would not because it was difficult, as the consultant, to choose the village's priorities. Therefore, Mr. Lavigne recommended upon adoption of the comprehensive plan, that the village form an implementation committee or subcommittee to determine the village's priorities and funding sources, based on what was being discussed at this committee.

On that note, Mr. Popovich mentioned to the members that Village Council establishes its high priority action items on a two-year schedule and the review of this plan was one of those updates. He pointed out that there will be an update to the zoning map to take place after this ad hoc committee completes its charge in order to update those areas that were annexed into the village and some to match up zoning.

Continuing, Ms. Hogstrom and Mr. Thoman recommended adding language in the Public Communication/Outreach section to mention that the village uses social media to update residents on various projects as well as videos promoting outreach to the community. Mr. Popovich

commented on some of the videos that have been completed to date and which could be added to the section.

On another brief matter, Mr. Popovich discussed what the next steps were for the subcommittee since Commissioner Olsen left the village council. He would follow up the comprehensive plan review schedule with Mr. Lavigne, commenting that the goal was to complete this plan by the end of the year. Mr. Lavigne thought it could still be accomplished. Staff would update the members.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW – PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED SECTIONS

Members were then asked if they wanted to add additional information to the previously discussed section that they may have forgotten.

Referring to the map on page 26, a member mentioned that the large green space in the NW corner was an underutilized parcel wherein it was mentioned that it was owned by the forest preserve but that it should have an access off of Finley or Lacey. Someone also pointed out that nearby was a Low Intensity Office zoned next to a Office Corporate Campus parcel which would give access to Hidden Lake and Morton Arboretum from that side. Staff added that it could be zoned Office Corporate Campus with the developer, as part of the development, provide access for the parking.

Dialog was also raised regarding an area in the village's planning area and staff needing to work with the forest preserve on who owns the site and whether the owner would want the access or not.

PUBLIC COMMENT - None.

Staff would confirm with members whether a September meeting would take place.

ADJOURNMENT

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:20 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. LUKA, SECONDED BY MS. ACKS. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 8-0.

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

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AD HOC COMMITTEE MEETING

VILLAGE HALL COMMITTEE ROOM
801 BURLINGTON AVENUE
OCTOBER 5, 2016 - 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Gorman called the October 5, 2016 meeting of the Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan Ad Hoc Committee meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the meeting with the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Chairman Dave Gorman, Carine Acks, Irene Hogstrom, Ed Kalina, John Luka, Mark Thoman, Jim Wilkinson

ABSENT: Member Daiva Majauskas

STAFF: Community Development Director Stan Popovich

VISITORS: Devin Lavigne and Ian Tobin with Houseal Lavigne Associates

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – AUGUST 3, 2016

MINUTES OF AUGUST 3, 2016 WERE APPROVED ON MOTION BY MR. LUKA, SECONDED BY MR. THOMAN. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

REVIEW UPDATED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN– (Introduction; Sections, 1-3)

Director Popovich prefaced the discussion by explaining that Sections 1 through 3 will be reviewed as word changes and following next month with text and illustrations in the final format. He asked members to provide input. The chairman announced that the public would have an opportunity to speak numerous times throughout the meeting.

SECTION 1
Demographic Profile – Someone asked where the increase in income figure ($75,000 per year) came from and whether it was due to having an older population. Mr. Lavigne offered to follow-up with the background data.

A question followed regarding the bike and pedestrian plan and whether the comprehensive plan allowed bikes on sidewalks but yielding to pedestrians. Mr. Popovich explained the bike and pedestrian plan was removed because staff was concerned about safety on shared sidewalks and preferred that it not be included

Mr. Devin Lavigne, with Houseal Lavigne Associates, explained some of the challenges with shared sidewalks while others voiced that a balance was needed.

SECTION 2

Mr. Lavigne indicated the section "Vision for the Future" was discussed more in depth in the plan and invoked a bit more excitement to the "story." Comments included that verbiage be added about the village's strong sense of community and pride and having enhanced entryways identifying Downers Grove and its major developments.

SECTION 3

Mr. Popovich pointed out some of the changes under Section 3. No other input followed.

PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

REVIEW OF UPDATED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW (Sects. 4-8)

SECTION 4

Mr. Popovich mentioned the largest changes in Section 4 fell under Neighborhood Character and being sensitive and respectful to architectural diversity and historic preservation. The topics of CLG and tax freeze programs also fell under the section. A change was recommended to add the word "voluntary" to preservation, i.e., "facilitate the voluntary preservation…" Someone recalled that this committee did not discuss the preservation workbook/manual, wherein Mr. Lavigne explained that at the back of the plan there was mention that a guide or tool should be created or developed…. which could be used for residents (and developers) to make smarter decisions regarding tear downs and in-fills and how their homes could best fit into the neighborhood -- more of an education tool. Examples followed, with Mr. Lavigne explaining it was a guide book and not a regulatory book.

Comments followed that the village did not want stock housing lining up the street and that a home should fit in with the character of the neighborhood. Recommendation No. 5 of the Residential Policy Guide was then referenced.

Dir. Popovich recalled that initially this topic may have come about with the tear-downs in older historic areas. He suggested adding to the last sentence something about being in the "historic core of downtown" versus "all throughout town". Mr. Lavigne reminded the members the intent was to educate and not regulate; he would rework the verbiage into the sentence and soften Recommendation No. 5 to match what was talked about in the text. This paragraph would also encompass a person doing extensive remodeling.

Regarding the paragraph discussing cut-through traffic (pg. 34 digital version), the sentence that discusses "automobile dealerships along Ogden Avenue" -- someone suggested adding the word "local" and deleting the word "along." And to add the words, "and conducting."

Turning to Policy Recommendations addressing stormwater mitigation, Ms. Hogstrom asked if there could be verbiage to encourage more tree preservation and tree planting. Mr. Popovich would add "preservation" to the second sentence.

SECTION 5

Under Stormwater Management, it was suggested to add "lot coverage requirement" in this section.

Someone asked whether the preference for first floor retail/dining was addressed in the downtown area, wherein Mr. Popovich explained there was no focus area plan for downtown for review tonight because it was just discussed last night at the village council level; however, he would provide an update on the Council discussion later in the meeting.

SECTION 6

Regarding the earlier topic of bikes and pedestrians sharing sidewalks in the downtown area, Chairman Gorman proceeded to discuss Lombard's code where he works, as it relates to bikes and pedestrians. He recommended not striking out the entire bike/pedestrian section, noting that the village's code can state that cyclists have to yield to pedestrians outside the Central Business District. Discussion then followed on the various types of cyclists that would probably use the sidewalks – children and those who ride leisurely. Hard-core cyclists would prefer to ride faster and would probably use the main arterial roads. Dir. Popovich relayed that he would speak with staff and the bike plan group and review the text again to see if there was a compromise for the comprehensive plan.

SECTION 7 – None.

SECTION 8

Under School District 58, someone asked what the word "adequate" really meant to which both Dir. Popovich and Mr. Lavigne said it was the district's term. A couple of members recommended using a different word; staff would review.

Focus Area Plan

Belmont/Ellsworth – Messrs. Lavigne and Popovich walked through the changes made in this focus area (mainly the graphics). Mr. Wilkinson recommended that staff add in this focus area the village's traffic study which included the golf course up to Ogden Avenue in the residential area.

Butterfield – Catalyst Site C4 will include the Red Roof Inn property. Regarding the elimination the of Downers Drive on-ramp if westbound access is provided at Highland Avenue, one member saw the on-ramp as an amenity and said it would be a benefit to the businesses versus removing it. Staff believed the intent was to consider a full access at Highland Avenue.

Mr. Lavigne also mentioned that he added the exploration of connections to Hidden Lake Forest Preserve in this focus area. Dialog followed regarding the Arboretum's restoration project that was occurring in that area as well.

Catalyst site (pg. 130) – Staff to re-arrange the paragraphs.

Ogden Avenue – Mr. Lavigne shared how the entire corridor was reviewed and the "notes" that were added.

Catalyst Sites – D7 was currently under development and members agreed to remove it from the plan. It was noted that D3 was added.

A review of the east side of the Ogden Avenue corridor followed, noting the CarX should be removed from Catalyst Site D11.

Mr. Lavigne mentioned that he added introduction paragraphs to the entire section as well as added a land use map. He was thinking of expanding on the key concepts. Examples followed. Dir. Popovich voiced support for expanding the key concepts.

Fairview – Mr. Lavigne recalled there was mention of the Maple Avenue realignment so the text was kept in the plan. Dir. Popovich believed it could remain. Businesses that were relocating to or from the area were discussed.

63rd Street – This focus area was newly added. Mr. Lavigne explained there was discussion about the overall commercial viability at the west end of this area. It included Catalyst Site F1 being split with frontage on 63rd remaining retail while the south half could be converted to multi-family residential. Mr. Lavigne said if the committee supported it, he would bring back the plan with a potential development concept that would show townhomes, keeping outlots along 63rd Street and adding a frontage road to connect the two and then include a site for a use like a pharmacy. Mr. Lavigne further discussed a segment between Woodward and Springside where residential uses were backing up to 63rd Street and that is the preferred development pattern.

Key concepts remained the same with only the suggestion of adding a TIF district to the Meadowbrook Center. Adding a gateway sign to the community, connecting residential areas to the shopping area, and adding sidewalks were also added to the paragraph. Consideration for multi-family uses behind Meadowbrook was another recommendation in the plan. Mr. Lavigne stated the plan now encouraged more horseshoe driveways on residential properties to improve safety and access. For the east end, he stated that a number of areas could be beautified. Dir. Popovich believed the Chase Bank location was a good site to use as a beautification example because of its landscaping and shared driveways with Jewel.

Mr. Thoman asked if stronger language about parkway trees could be added for the 63rd Street segment, starting at Brookbank and heading west, with staff possibly working with the county on an intergovernmental agreement regarding same.

Members spoke about the Meadowbrook Shopping Center and how it was a development of the past. The empty lot made if feel like the businesses located there were not very good. Dir. Popovich proceeded to draw a concept plan for the site that was discussed previously. Mr. Lavigne added that a couple of recommendations were included in the section just to show what could be included on the site and how to connect the nearby residential with commercial uses.

75th Street – Mr. Lavigne idenitifed the one catalyst site for 75th as being the Grove Shopping Center, which was challenged by ownership. However, there were ideas that included a TIF district, parcel assembly, gateway signs at both ends of the corridor, and making improvements to pedestrian crossings and connections to county trails. Details followed. He recommended using the Kimco Mall, located on the east side of Lemont Road, as an example for good landscaping. Dialog then followed regarding the 3-D rendering that was to be depicted – it would be a multi-family development with retail, similar to the Bolingbrook Promenade, with height being considered due to the nearby residential uses.

Lastly, Mr. Lavigne mentioned the need to work with the Village of Darien to explore the implications of fully annexing the Knottingham subdivision into either community for efficiency purposes.

Dir. Popovich distributed copies of the Council discussed Downtown Focus Area Plan, recalling that during the past summer the Comprehensive Plan Ad Hoc Committee developed some sub-areas for the village's downtown. It was reviewed by the Plan Commission which had recommended creating four sub areas. Village Council reviewed this topic in July and had more areas of discussion. Per Dir. Popovich, staff eventually met with individual council members from July through September to discuss their ideas. All comments were consolidated and staff came up with three main areas – the Downtown Corridor, the Downtown Edge, and the Neighborhood Transition Area. Details of each area were explained by Director Popovich.

From that meeting, two areas that council members recommended to be removed from the Downtown Focus Area Plan included four single-family properties on the north side of Gilbert Avenue just immediately west of Forest Avenue (to go back to Residential Focus Plan) and an older apartment building on the far east side, just south of this site (to go back to Residential Focus Plan). The building fronted Maple Avenue but was more oriented north and south.

Dir. Popovich said he would review this matter with Mr. Lavigne, whose team would put the above in a similar format in the comprehensive plan and present it at the next meeting.

Drawing to a close, Dir. Popovich stated that in November he hoped to present to the committee a complete plan and receive a recommendation to the Plan Commission, followed by Council in January. Staff would also be presenting and discussing the Downtown Development Regulation at the next three meetings with a recommendation from this committee in January to the Plan Commission and then to Council in March.

A comment was made by Ms. Acks that a six-story building could potentially be built at Washington and Rogers to which staff confirmed a tall building could based on the Downtown Focus Area Plan. Staff has spoken in the past with interested parties who had looked at three-story apartment buildings at the location. Ms. Acks questioned staff why the site could not be identified as Downtown Edge. Dir. Popovich indicated this matter was discussed last night at the Council meeting.

Ms. Acks and other members shared their concerns about the potential for a six-story building being constructed at the corner of Washington and Rogers – whether residential or commercial. Mr. Popovich discussed some of the challenges of the site, including the parking and the grade change. Ms. Acks stated that development should slope down as one gets closer to

residential areas; others felt the same way. Someone voiced that six stories was too tall yet three stories was not enough. Staff would relay the committee's concerns on this matter.

The schedule of meetings was briefly discussed. Dir. Popovich said he would send out an email regarding alternate meeting dates for November and January.

SECTION 9 – None.

SECTION 10

Staff stated the zoning ordinance reference was updated in this section.

PUBLIC COMMENT- None

ADJOURNMENT

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:10 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. LUKA, SECONDED BY MR. KALINA. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 7-0.

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