

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE  
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
PUBLIC HEARING

MARCH 28, 2016, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Rickard called the March 28, 2016 meeting of the Downers Grove Plan Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Plan Commissioners and public in the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance.

**ROLL CALL:**

**PRESENT:** Chairman Rickard, Mr. Cozzo, Mr. Cronin, Ms. Gassen, Ms. Hogstrom, Mrs. Rabatah, Mr. Thoman

**ABSENT:** Ms. Johnson, Mr. Quirk; ex-officios Mr. Livorsi, Ms. Lupesco, Mr. Menninga

**STAFF:** Community Development Senior Planner Rebecca Leitschuh and Planner Mr. Scott Williams

**VISITORS:** Mr. Kent Conness, 1846 Grant Street; Scott and Monica Seger, 5333 S. Kensington, Countryside, IL; Bob Gudmundson, RWG Engineering, 975 E. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, Wheaton, IL

Chairman Rickard announced that the scheduled public hearing for the St. Joseph's (Main and Prairie) case was not taking place due to the applicant withdrawing its application.

**APPROVAL OF MARCH 7, 2016 MINUTES**

**MINUTES OF THE MARCH 7, 2016 MEETING WERE APPROVED, AS PRESENTED, ON MOTION BY MR. THOMAN. SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 5-0-2. (MR. COZZO AND MRS. RABATAH ABSTAIN)**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

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

**FILE 16-PLC-0015** – A petition seeking approval of a Planned Unit Development, Zoning Map Amendment, and Special Use to construct two apartment/condo buildings on one lot. The property is zoned DT, Downtown Transition. The property is located on the southeast corner of Rogers Street and Prospect Avenue, commonly known as 719 Rogers Street, Downers Grove, IL (09-08-206-001, -002). Scott Seger, Petitioner and Owner

Senior Planner Rebecca Leitschuh briefly reviewed the above-referenced case and provided an overview of the area, the surrounding zoning districts, and plat of survey. She stated the two existing lots would have to be consolidated and the current one-story building on the property would be demolished. Lastly, Ms. Leitschuh reported the site's topography was unique due to the steep incline, which was why the petitioner was coming before the Plan Commission for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) request.

Color renderings of the future development were depicted on the overhead, noting there were two (2) three-story buildings being proposed. A site plan followed and included the following: sidewalks, curb and gutter, two access points, and closed curb cuts on Rogers Street (for safety purposes), and a rain garden with natural landscaping. On-site parking, location of trash receptacles and floor plans were reviewed in further detail. Staff was requesting, as one of its conditions for approval, a fee in lieu for future parkway trees.

Because the site was currently zoned as a DT - Downtown Transitional Area, it would require increased aesthetics to the building in order to blend into the surrounding area. Ms. Leitschuh explained how the proposal met those design guidelines and also the village's comprehensive plan. Bulk standards were referenced. Staff found that the proposal met the criteria for the PUD due to: 1) the unique topography of the property, and 2) that two buildings are proposed for one lot.

In summary, staff believed the proposal would not have a negative effect on neighboring properties, the location was desirable and contributed to the general welfare of the neighborhood, and it was an accepted special use.

Confirmation was made with staff that the Comprehensive Plan was looking for the entire block to become small office. Ms. Leitschuh explained that in the Comprehensive Plan, the analysis was that the area was not to be in conflict with each other, but rather, to be transitional in nature, which was why staff recommended supporting the zoning for the area in 2008 as DT-Downtown Transition, and ultimately approved by the village council. However, Ms. Leitschuh mentioned that with the update to the Comprehensive Plan currently ongoing, it could provide an opportunity for reassessing similar areas to ensure they align with the future land use plan.

Mr. Thoman inquired about the square footage of the rain garden, whether an agreement existed that related to on-site water treatment concerns, whether outside management of the properties existed, what the material was on the southern-most parking lot and what mechanicals, if any, were on top of the buildings. Per Ms. Leitschuh, the HVAC mechanicals were located at the top of the buildings. Asked if a special use in a DT-zoned area was necessary for a PUD, Ms. Leitschuh explained it was a requirement. However, she explained that the other option for the applicant was to request a variation but it would be less consistent with the intention of the plan. Ms. Leitschuh explained why the PUD was used in this unique situation.

Mr. Thoman asked whether the proposal would be meeting the flood plain requirements under the conditions of the pending FEMA regulations. Ms. Leitschuh indicated staff had the same concerns but after the applicant's research with the county, it was discovered that the property was improperly mapped and so the culvert size on the railroad easement became moot. Per Mr. Cronin's question, the developer did not pay any school impact fees.

The chairman invited the petitioner to speak.

Mr. Scott Seger, 5333 S. Kensington, Countryside, IL, introduced his wife, Monica Seger, and stated they were the developer and builder for the proposed apartment buildings. Mr. Seger discussed that he currently owns a condominium management company in Chicago, managing 75 buildings. He plans to own the completed buildings. Mr. Seger's professional background in real estate followed.

Per Mrs. Rabatah's question, Mr. Seger stated he would be using an off-site property manger (24/7), a janitorial service for maintenance, a landscaper, and a snow removal service to clear snow and salt sidewalks in the winter. Asked if Mr. Seger would consider using permeable pavers/asphalt in the parking lot, Mr. Seger said the permeable pavers were a consideration but cost would be a factor. Regarding Mr. Thoman's question about the roof-top noise, Mr. Seger indicated the only mechanicals that would be located on the roof would be the condensers and each apartment unit would have its own heater/air conditioning unit to control. Asked how sound between the apartment units would be handled, Mr. Seger explained that a sound absorbent material called Green-Glue, would be used between the drywall and floors to absorb noise.

Mr. Cozzo shared concerns about car headlights shining into some of the first floor units, wherein Mr. Seger explained that after speaking with a landscaper, the landscaper recommended to install a low fence blocking the headlights, followed by planting some softer plants. Mr. Seger said he was open to this recommendation. Chairman Rickard asked the petitioner what the distance was from the parking lot edge of pavement to the front of the buildings. Mr. Seger then proceeded to explain the layout of the grass, fence barrier, retaining wall, and sidewalk and how they would be situated for the southern building, mainly due to the topography of the land. In summary, tenants would park behind their buildings and enter from the rear. Lastly, Mr. Seger explained that curb and gutter would be located around the rain garden.

Mr. Bob Gudmundson, RWG Engineering, 975 E. 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, Wheaton, IL, shared in detail how water would be captured and moved to the catch basin structure at the far corners of the parking lot. From there the water would be piped through the small retaining wall into the rain garden area. The size of the rain garden was 1,650 square feet and storage was about 2,500 cubic feet of water that eventually drained out.

Ms. Hogstrom shared her concerns about the maple trees planned between the two buildings, noting they will become too large. She suggested the petitioner use ornamental trees instead. Mr. Seger said he did speak to the landscaper about the same concerns and he would modify his plan to reflect a "more tall column-like tree." Ms. Leitschuh explained that the landscaper may have been trying to meet the village's requirements for shade trees but agreed that it was probably not the best way to accomplish that. Ms. Leitschuh stated there was some flexibility in the village's zoning ordinance.

Chairman Rickard invited the public to speak.

Mr. Kent Conness, 1846 Grant, Downers Grove, shared his concern about glare from vehicle headlights. He asked where the stormwater flows after being in the rain garden. He hoped it did not go on private property.

No further public comments were received. Public comment was closed by the chairman.

Mr. Gudmundson responded that storm water was not discharged on adjacent private property. The runoff was routed through the rain garden area and traveled to the west end of the site (Prospect Ave.) to be collected in a receiving facility. Or, it percolated down through the amended soil of the garden. Details followed. Mr. Gudmundson also added that the property was not impacted by the flood plain, stating the county's maps were preliminary, and there was an oversight. He shared that he had been working with the county and with the village staff to correct the future map.

As a last comment, Mr. Thoman asked that staff be very clear when presenting to the village council regarding the error on the flood plain map. Other commissioners stated they were pleased to see a 20-unit development being developed versus what was previously proposed, the owners were very committed, and that standards for this project had been met.

**WITH RESPECT TO FILE 16-PLC-0015, MR. COZZO MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING SIX (6) CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE PUD, ZONING AMENDMENT, AND SPECIAL USE SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE STAFF REPORT, RENDERINGS, ARCHITECTURE PLANS PREPARED BY STUDIO 21 ARCHITECTS, AS REVISED AND DATED MARCH 7, 2016, ENGINEERING PLANS PREPARED BY RWG ENGINEERING, LLD, AS REVISED AND DATED MARCH 4, 2016, AND LANDSCAPE PLANS PREPARED BY OUTDOOR UPGRADES, AS DATED MARCH 4, 2016 EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO THE VILLAGE CODES AND ORDINANCES.**
- 2. THE PETITIONER SHALL CONSOLIDATE THE TWO LOTS INTO A SINGLE LOT OF RECORD PURSUANT TO SECTION 20.507 OF THE SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE.**
- 3. THE RAIN GARDEN SHALL BE MAINTAINED AND KEPT FUNCTIONAL.**
- 4. THE BUILDING SHALL BE EQUIPPED WITH AN AUTOMATIC SUPPRESSION AND AN AUTOMATIC AND MANUAL FIRE ALARM SYSTEM IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE VILLAGE'S REQUIREMENTS.**
- 5. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF ANY BUILDING OR DEVELOPMENT PERMITS, THE PETITIONER SHALL PAY TO THE VILLAGE A \$2,000 FEE-IN-LIEU PER VILLAGE APPROVED PARKWAY TREE SUBJECT TO VERIFICATION BY THE VILLAGE FORRESTER.**
- 6. THE PETITIONER IS REQUIRED TO RETURN PROSPECT AVENUE TO VILLAGE STANDARDS IMMEDIATELY ADJACENT TO THE SUBJECT SITE. DUE TO THE POTENTIAL CONSTRUCTION DAMAGE THAT MAY OCCUR, THE VILLAGE WILL REQUEST AN ADDITIONAL BOND TO GRIND AND RESURFACE THE FULL WIDTH OF PROSPECT AVENUE TO BE PROVIDED AT TIME OF PERMIT.**

**SECONDED BY MR. THOMAN. ROLL CALL:**

**AYE: MR. COZZO, MR. THOMAN, MR. CRONIN, MS. GASSEN, MS. HOGSTROM,  
MS. RABATAH, CHAIRMAN RICKARD**

**NAY: NONE**

**MOTION CARRIED. VOTE: 7-0**

APPROVED 5/2/16

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:15 P.M. ON MOTION BY MR. THOMAN  
SECONDED BY MS. GASSEN. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE  
OF 7-0.**

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt

Celeste K. Weilandt

(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)