

APPROVED MARCH 4, 2019

**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING**

MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 4, 2019

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Rickard called the February 4, 2019 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:00 PM and led in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Ch. Rickard, Ms. Gassen, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Kulovany,
Ms. Majauskas (arr: 7:07), Mr. Quirk, Ms. Rollins,
Ex. Officio Member Davenport

ABSENT: Mr. Boyle, Ms. Majauskas, Mr. Maurer, Ex. Officio Members Livorsi &
Menninga

Ch. Rickard reminded everyone present to silence any electronic devices during the meeting, and noted that copies of the Agenda are available on the shelves at either side of the Chamber.

STAFF: Jason Zawila, Planning Manager
Flora Ramirez, Planner

VISITORS: Amy Fuller, Wight & Co., 2500 N. Frontage Rd.
David Evans, Wight & Co., 2500 N. Frontage Rd.
Steve Shearer, Wight & Co., 2500 N. Frontage Rd.
Don Remer, Dist. 99 Board, 1304 Maple Ave.
Jim Kolodziej, Dist. 99, 6301 Springside Ave.
Mark Staehlin, Dist. 99, 6301 Springside Ave.
Hank Thiele, Dist. 99, 6301 Springside Ave.
Matt Ozsvath, 4516 Prince St.
Shawn Moore, 4533 Prince St.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 7, 2019 meeting

Ms. Gassen moved, seconded by Ms. Johnson to approve the minutes for the January 7, 2019 meeting.

Ch. Rickard called for a voice vote to approve the minutes as submitted. The Motion passed unanimously.

Ch. Rickard reviewed the procedures to be followed for the meeting, and explained that the Plan Commission is strictly a recommending body. The purpose of the meeting is to gather facts, information and testimony on any items on the Agenda. Their decision is not final, but is strictly a recommendation to the Village Council for the Council's final

APPROVED MARCH 4, 2019

decision. He said a report would be forwarded to the Council with a Motion to recommend approval, approval with refinements, or denial. The Village Council makes all final decisions.

Regarding the meeting procedures, they are as follows: The Petitioner will present its case to the Plan Commission, followed by questions to the Petitioner by Commission members.

The Public will then have an opportunity to make comments before the Commission regarding the case under consideration. Chairman Rickard asked that each speaker provide his or her name and address for the record. Following presentations by the Public, a member of the Community Development Department will present Staff's report.

Upon completion of presentations by the Staff and the Public, the Petitioner will have the opportunity to question statements made or provide a closing statement. The Chairman will then close the public hearing portion of the meeting, and the Commission will review the information provided and ask questions of the speakers. Upon completion of the Plan Commission's deliberation, a Motion will be made containing a recommendation to the Village Council regarding the case.

Ch. Rickard then asked everyone who intended to speak on the petition before the Commission to rise and be sworn in.

PUBLIC HEARING:

18-PLC-0036: A petition seeking approval of the following items: 1) an amendment to Institutional Master Plan for the Downers Grove South High School campus; and 2) an amendment to the Institutional Master Plan for the Downers Grove North High School campus. The subject properties are zoned INP-2 Campus-scale Institutional. The Downers Grove South High School campus is located at the southwest corner of Dunham Road and 63rd Street, commonly known as 1436 Norfolk Street, Downers Grove, IL (PINs 09-19-101-002 and 09-19-200-003). The Downers Grove North High School campus is located at the corner of Grant and Main Streets, commonly known as 4436 Main Street, Downers Grove, IL (PINs 09-05-308-014, 09-05-307-017, 09-05-307-005, 09-05-307-006, 09-05-307-008, 09-05-307-007 and 09-05-309-002) District 99, Petitioner and Owner.

Petitioner's Presentation:

Mr. Hank Thiele, Superintendent for Community High School District 99 explained that the District has been working on the plans before the Commission since 2011. The District requested a referendum from the community that passed by a wide margin of over 62%. These improvements will revolutionize both high schools and prepare them for teaching and learning for the next several decades. It is a revitalization of both campuses to bring them up to current standards and push them well beyond. He

APPROVED MARCH 4, 2019

expressed his appreciation to the Plan Commission for reviewing these plans and providing feedback, and especially the Village Staff that spent many hours studying and reviewing these plans.

Amy Fuller, Project Manager and Architect for Wight & Company representing Community High School District 99 said they were requesting an amendment to the Institutional Master Plan for both North and South High Schools. The School District rezoned 2015 to the INP-2 zoning classification. In March of 2018 they created their multi-year modernization plan, which does not anticipate an increase in the number of students or staff. She said District 99 as a result of the passage of a referendum has promised the community safety and security and parity across both campuses. North High's campus will include a new gymnasium and expanded cafeteria. At South High they anticipate creating outdoor P.E. space and expanding the auditorium. Since March they have been meeting with students, staff and community members to consider the project goals for these schools. Those aspirations include encouraging community, promoting connectiveness, accommodating flexibility and agility, developing transparency as well as creating openness on the campus, fostering choice and independence, becoming environmental stewards.

North High School:

Ms. Fuller explained North High School is an INP-2 zoning classification. She reviewed the boundaries of the school, and displayed the existing building site plan. Adjacent to the stadium, under the bleachers, there will be new bleachers installed with squad rooms below. On site they will provide safety and security along Prince Street, adding an addition to the current loading dock and pushing it toward Prince Street so trucks don't mix with student activities. A new addition will include the gymnasium space. In the center of the building they will include a courtyard to create an educational learning common. Just south of the courtyard infill will be an extension of the learning common. She indicated that the proposed roof structure for the interior courtyard commons space is 52 feet to allow for existing ceiling heights to be maintained while allowing natural light into the surrounding classrooms. The applicant is requesting relief from the required interior height requirements of 42 feet and transition height requirement of 35 feet. Flanking both sides of the building will be a new addition for classroom spaces. She reviewed the changes using the slide presentation.

Referencing the loading dock area, the new location is proposed along the Prince Street side to limit intersecting pedestrian and vehicular traffic while allowing for managed loading drop off and pick up times. She explained that the loading dock and bay will be screened along the Prince Street side with a 10-foot high masonry wall and additional landscaping to adequately screen the truck in the bay. The applicant is requesting relief from the required maximum 6-foot high fence requirements and the transition area setback requirements for the proposed canopy.

Ms. Fuller mentioned that there is an existing stairwell on the west side of the building that will be demolished. It will be replaced to meet code standards. The width and length of the stairwell will be increased to meet code requirements for emergency egress and

APPROVED MARCH 4, 2019

accessibility. She noted that the height of the stairwell will match the height of the replaced stairwell of 44 feet, which requires relief from the transition height requirement of 35 feet and the setback requirement of 25 feet. She displayed slides of the plan for the proposed stairway.

The proposed gymnasium addition doesn't require any relief, as it meets the INP-2 zoning requirements.

Ms. Fuller then addressed what the additions would look like from Main Street, comparing the proposed addition to the existing building. They are attempting to highlight the original building wherever possible. The Atrium area between the original 1928 building and the new athletic loft is proposed for a height of 52 feet, requiring a request for relief from the interior height requirements of 42 feet and transition height requirement of 35 feet.

Ms. Fuller said they expect to begin construction on the project this spring and continue through the end of summer, 2021. The Prince Street loading dock area will begin this summer, with all additional construction completed by summer of 2021.

South High School:

Ms. Fuller then moved attention to the plans for South High School. She noted that the main entrance to the school is on Norfolk, although the school is visible from 63rd Street. The existing main entrance is proposed to be shifted west to be closer to the cafeteria, and will contain a new entrance canopy constructed together with mounted signage to signify the entrance. The canopy addition will comply with current regulations.

The home side stadium grandstand will be replaced with a new grandstand structure and seating, with a proposed height for the new bleachers and press box compliant with current height regulations of 35 feet in the transitional zone. They're requesting relief of the setback requirements from 30 feet to 10 feet from the property line for the bleachers to allow for squad rooms below.

She noted that relief is being requested for signage on the building. Revisions have been made in an effort to reduce the amount of signage. Clear identification for entry points to enhance the security procedures is important and will clarify getting around on the site. They are requesting relief in the form of a deviation from the restriction.

Ms. Fuller then addressed the proposed demolition of the existing auditorium. It will be replaced with a larger 1200 seat auditorium, stage, scene shop, studio theatre and other support spaces. They are requesting height relief for the auditorium to accommodate the auditorium fly tower. The relief is to allow 80 feet when a maximum of 42 feet is permitted. She noted that the fly tower falls entirely in the transitional zone and is surrounded on all sides by the lower portions of the building. She further noted that the audience portion of the auditorium is proposed to be 61 feet tall, to provide proper sight lines and acoustics for musical performances.

APPROVED MARCH 4, 2019

The construction schedule begins this Spring/Summer until the beginning of the 2021 school year.

Ch. Rickard said that the one public hearing is covering the work for both schools. He recommended that questions be covered for North High first, followed by South High. He noted that there will be two recommendations to the Council by the Plan Commission.

Ch. Rickard raised a question about the truck loading area, asking if a full sized truck would have to drive north on Prince, pull into the west parking lot and then back into the dock area. Ms. Fuller said they would come in on Prince and turn on Grant Street, and then back up into the loading dock area.

Ch. Rickard questioned the stair improvements, and whether there are specific tread riser dimensions that have to be met. Ms. Fuller said that there were. Right now there is a dead end situation inside the building that goes into a classroom, and then down the corridor. The third floor has two steps to get into the stairwell, which has both a riser height and tread issue.

Concerning the classroom addition adjacent to the older brick, he asked if that brick would be coming down or staying. Ms. Fuller said it is being stained.

Ms. Gassen explained that her husband works for Wight & Company, however he is not working on this job. Therefore she doesn't feel his employment impacts her ability to deliberate or make a recommendation on this petition. Regarding the loading dock, she asked what the delivery situation is to relieve some concerns expressed by neighbors.

Jim Kolodziej, Director of Operations for District 99 explained the delivery schedule. Deliveries begin early in the morning for food service as well as waste and recyclable pickups. The new proposed loading dock area with a recyclable compactor will change the pickups from 3-5 a week to one. Throughout the day there are trailers bringing in supplies and ordered items, so the deliveries will go from about 5:30 AM to about 5:00 PM. He thinks the new proposed dock area is a much shorter time to get in off Grant. The echo off the gymnasium should be lessened as well. He explained the school is open pretty much 24 hours a day and 7 days a week except for Sunday.

Mr. Kulovany asked about the rationale for the 10 foot height of the masonry wall at North High School. Ms. Fuller replied that it is to obstruct views of the trucks, composter and any trash, as well as minimizing the sound. The wall will also serve to enhance the view.

Ms. Fuller explained that there is no request for rezoning of the site, as it was rezoned in 2015. In further explanation to Mr. Quirk, regarding the height relief, she said that the 52 foot height will occur in the courtyard infill and a portion of the Atrium.

Village Planning Manager Jason Zawila added for clarification that if this request is recommended it would not be a carte blanche height for the transitional area or interior,

but is only specific to those improvements represented in these plans. If the Petitioner were to come back two years from now and wanted another type of improvement that would exceed the 35 feet in the transitional area, they'd have to go through the process. In further response, he said the Village was not comfortable with giving carte blanche height relief. Mr. Quirk replied that it is somewhat confusing to understand each individual item they are addressing for the campus plan, and the Standards for Approval sometimes get blended across. In some cases they're asking for setback variations or height variations, and he thinks it might be easier to look at it holistically and revise the transitional requirements that would provide them with flexibility in the future.

Ch. Rickard said if you were to change the regulations for them to use that height in those areas, it could have a lot more impact in different circumstances other than this where it could be an argument for these variations. He would prefer to look at it as is and not change the height in all the areas.

Mr. Quirk said that typically when asking for height variations or variations of any sort, there's a hardship involved, and this is a challenge.

Ch. Rickard said he thought that some of the height variations relate to State regulations for some of the areas that don't meet the height requirements. Mr. Zawila said the underlying standards for approval on this request are based on the Village's PUD Ordinance that has different standards than a strict variance, which does have a hardship connected with the variance. The PUD requirement of the Zoning Ordinance is structured so as to allow a more flexible use for the site.

Mr. Quirk said he understands the explanation, but doesn't want to see the high schools having to come back for some minor variations in a year or two. He said they have an opportunity now to accommodate for newer technology or changes that might be required in two years.

Ms. Fuller explained that this is a long-term plan, and there's not a lot of space on the property right now for other changes. They feel that they have to be mindful and respectful of the community.

A question was raised about the monument sign on 63rd Street. Ms. Fuller said they are asking for 306 square feet additional signage only on the building, and not anything relating to the monument sign on 63rd Street.

Ms. Gassen referred to a new field proposed for the 63rd and Dunham corner that appears to have a fence and safety net. Ms. Fuller said that the safety netting is for the softball field. She said you can see through the safety netting.

There being no other questions from the Commission, Ch. Rickard called for input from the public.

Public Comments:

APPROVED MARCH 4, 2019

1. Melissa Ellis of 4524 Prince Street asked how visible the loading dock doors will be every day. Currently they don't see or hear the traffic going into the school area. She wants to know if the height of the wall will block the loading dock door, and if the fence will stop vehicle traffic will it stop pedestrian traffic as well. There is a safety concern as there are many small children on that block. She also asked about how far back the sidewalk would be from the street.
2. Matt Ozsvath of 4516 Prince asked about the noise level from the loading dock from delivery trucks and trash collectors starting at 5:30 AM. He asked what is being done to mitigate the sound, or what can be done to mitigate the sound.
3. Shawn Moore of 4533 Prince Street said his concern is also about noise from the loading and unloading, as well as the general truck and bus noise. The proximity of the proposed location versus the present location adds a lot of noise to the neighbors adjacent to the property.

There being no further comments from the public, Ch. Rickard called upon Staff to make its report.

Staff Report dated February 4 2019

Planning Manager Jason Zawila gave background information as to the rezoning that occurred in 2015 for the Downers Grove High School campuses. At the time of those approvals the increase to the footprint of each campus was not provided in the plans. North High School's interior area building height was 42 feet, with the transition area building height at 35'. He noted that at the time of the rezoning, the Comprehensive Plan recommended that the Village promote cooperation with the school districts to maintain high quality school facilities in the Village.

The requested changes that require relief for North High School include the athletic loft and atrium interior which respectively will require deviations to the height of 42 feet to 50 feet, and the transitional height of 35 feet to 52 feet; the stair enclosure will require a deviation to the transitional height of 35 feet to 42 feet with the setback remaining at 25 feet; the courtyard infill interior will require a deviation to the interior height of 42 feet to 52 feet; the loading dock fence will require a deviation from the height of 6 feet to 10 feet, and lastly, the canopy setback will require a deviation from the 25 foot setback to 8.5 feet.

Mr. Zawila then addressed the proposal for South High School, showing the plan presented to the Village in 2015 when the rezoning was approved. He reviewed the petition before the Commission noting that the proposed plan provides for additions throughout the campus, largely already summarized by the petitioner in addition to the request to increase the square footage of signage allowable for the high school. At present, the signage for the high school is 300 square feet, and the request is for 558 square feet to include additional wall signage on the high school buildings once the additions are complete.

APPROVED MARCH 4, 2019

He noted that the criteria are the same as is used for a PUD, and Staff recommends approval to the amendments to the Master Plan as noted in its report dated February 4, 2019.

Ch. Rickard asked about the loading dock area for North High School and what discussion occurred about concerns for noise, safety, etc. It appears as though that area has become much closer to the residential area. Mr. Zawila replied at the staff level they discussed a balance between the truck and vehicle traffic and student traffic, and suggested increasing the height of the wall from 6 feet to 10 feet to help sound buffering, screening and providing additional landscaping to soften the wall placement. Ch. Rickard asked whether the canopy goes up to the wall, or could be extended to the wall to lessen the noise of the trucks by enclosing the dock area on three sides.

Ms. Majauskas asked if the public is unhappy with the height of the wall or with the location of the loading dock. Mr. Zawila responded that the only phone call he received was a residential complaint about the loading dock itself, but not about the wall. As for the canopy there is a required 25 foot setback but they are requesting an 8 foot setback.

Mr. Kulovany said it seemed the way the canopy is configured it would concentrate the sound in that space.

Mr. Quirk referenced the community meeting held in September, and asked what the findings were of the acoustician who conducted the noise studies. Ms. Fuller replied that they measured the existing levels to have baseline information to compare with the proposed changes to assure that the noise levels are not worsened by the changes.

In further response, Ms. Fuller said that if they find that the noise levels have increased, they have a special consultant and acoustician on board who will accommodate the increase with a solution to lessen the additional noise using external baffling or other methods to address the problem.

Mr. Hank Thiele addressed the necessity of relocating the loading block to that side of the building because of safety concerns with the students. The way that the drive is configured it brings all of the traffic up the same drive where the students enter to the student entrance. All day, every day, they have student walking traffic with truck traffic. Plus the amount of time that a truck is backing up now is a much greater distance than the truck would be in this location. This should reduce the amount of time that a truck is actually backing up into that space. They have committed to making sure that the noise levels are the same, and that the duration of those noise levels should also be decreased with the relocation. They want to make sure that the change is visually pleasing, and that the sound issues are not worsened.

Ch. Rickard asked the Petitioner if they wanted to respond to any of the comments made at this time.

Ms. Fuller said the sidewalk would remain in the same location as currently located. They are looking at landscape improvements along the wall. The platform in the dock

APPROVED MARCH 4, 2019

area is raised above grade, and is accessed by stairs. The loading dock has a level approach for the trucks. The dumpsters are also located in the screened area. Ms. Fuller said they have not decided on what type of trees to plant, whether deciduous or evergreen.

Mr. Thiele said he is reviewing the timing of the early morning activity, and is attempting to see if the morning times can be improved. He explained that he couldn't make promises, as schedules of the companies involved have to be considered. He replied to a question regarding the number of deliveries, saying recycling pickups are three or four times a week, and the compactor three times a week. There are also FedEx, UPS and other deliveries sporadically throughout the day.

There being no further comments, Ch. Rickard closed the public portion of the hearing.

Commission's Deliberations:

A question was raised as to whether the Commission could add a condition to require that the sound levels not be any higher than they are currently. Mr. Zawila replied that there would have to be a motion to amend the conditions of approvals.

Ch. Rickard asked what the standard is for industrial type uses regarding noise, even though this is not a constant noise. Mr. Zawila said they would have to see what is in the Ordinance as it relates to sound, and code enforcement would have to determine whether the decibel levels met the requirement. He said he doesn't know whether a condition to the approval Motion is necessary.

Ms. Majauskas commented that she thinks the variance has to be granted or not granted, and it is inappropriate to place a noise condition on the approval.

Mr. Kulovany said that the Village has a sound Ordinance and code enforcement could be notified if there are complaints.

Mr. Zawila said staff has only received one call from a resident related to this petition regarding the potential noise levels.

Mr. Kulovany said he is satisfied with the Petitioner's attempts to address the noise issue. Regarding the height variances, they make sense, and the requirements for the gym are necessary. The positives that come from the atrium height variance are good.

Ms. Gassen said the conditions for each Motion appear to be different, and she asked if they should be the same. Mr. Zawila said they should refer to the Staff Report and drawings.

Motion for Downers Grove North Campus:

Ms. Gassen said that based on the petitioner's submittal, the Staff report and the testimony presented, she finds that the Petitioner has met the standards of

approval for an Institutional Master Plan Amendment for the Downers Grove North Campus as required by the Village of Downers Grove Zoning Ordinance, and is in the public interest and therefore, she moved that the Plan Commission recommend to the Village Council approval of 18-PLC-0036, subject to the following condition:

1. The Institutional Master Plan shall substantially conform to the Staff Report dated February 4, 2019 and to the drawings prepared by Wight & Company dated November 12, 2018 and last revised on January 10, 2019, except as such plans may be modified to conform to Village Codes, Ordinances and Stormwater and Flood Plain Ordinance.

Mr. Kulovany seconded the Motion.

AYES: Ms. Gassen, Mr. Kulovany, Ms. Johnson, Ms. Majauskas,
Mr. Quirk, Ms. Rollins, Ch. Rickard

NAYS: None

The Motion passed unanimously.

Motion for Downers Grove South Campus:

Mr. Kulovany said that based on the petitioner's submittal, the Staff Report and the testimony presented, he finds that the Petitioner has met the standards of approval for an Institutional Master Plan Amendment for the Downers Grove South Campus as required by the Village of Downers Grove Zoning Ordinance, and is in the public interest and therefore, he moved that the Plan Commission recommend to the Village Council approval of 18-PLC-0036, subject to the following condition:

1. The Institutional Master Plan shall substantially conform to the Staff Report dated February 4, 2019 and to the drawings prepared by Wight & Company dated November 12, 2018 and last revised on January 10, 2019, except as such plans may be modified to conform to Village Codes, Ordinances and Stormwater and Flood Plain Ordinance.

Mr. Quirk seconded the Motion.

AYES: Mr. Kulovany, Mr. Quirk, Ms. Gassen, Ms. Johnson, Ms. Majauskas,
Ms. Rollins, Ch. Rickard

NAYS: None

The Motion passed unanimously.

.....

Mr. Zawila said that there will be Plan Commission meetings scheduled for the next three months. If any Commissioners are unable to attend, he asked that they contact him.

APPROVED MARCH 4, 2019

.....

**Mr. Quirk moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Gassen.
The Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.**

Ch. Rickard adjourned the meeting at 8:37 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Tonie Harrington,
Recording Secretary
(transcribed from mp3 recording)