

Approved 6/5/2017

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
PUBLIC HEARING

May 1, 2017, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Rickard called the May 1, 2017 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, Ms. Johnson, Mr. Kulovany

ABSENT: Mr. Maurer, Mr. Quirk, Ms. Rollins, Ex-Officios Davenport, Livorsi, Menninga

STAFF: Village Senior Planner Rebecca Leitschuh and Village Planner Scott Williams

VISITORS: Mr. Robert Aument, 4721 Wallbank, Downers Grove; Mr. David Haugen, 4826 Forest Ave., Downers Grove; Charley Smart, 4804 Main St., Downers Grove; Geri Nyboe, 4823 Highland Ave., Downers Grove; Ms. Krista Varsbergs, 4826 Bryan Place, Downers Grove; Mr. Dave Edwards, Highland Ave., Downers Grove; Mr. Bill Sturm, Serena Sturm Architects, Ltd., 930 W. Huron St., Chicago; Mr. Dwayne Gillem (phonetic), V3 Companies, 308 W. Erie St., Chicago; Mr. Louis Buttny, 4828 Forest, Downers Grove;

Chairman Rickard reviewed the protocol for tonight's meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

APRIL 3, 2017

MOTION BY MR. KULOVANY, SECONDED BY MS. JOHNSON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 3, 2017. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

Chairman Rickard explained the protocol for the public hearings and swore in those individuals that would be speaking on the following two (2) public hearings:

PUBLIC HEARINGS

FILE 16-PLC-0054: *(continued from February 27, 2017 and April 3, 2017 meetings)* A petition seeking approval of a Planned Unit Development, Zoning Map Amendment, and a Right-of-Way Vacation. The property is zoned M-2, Restricted Manufacturing and O-R-M, Office Research and Manufacturing. The property is located at Brook Drive between Centre Circle and Downers Drive, commonly known as 1500, 1509, 1515, 1516, 1525, and 1528 Brook Drive, and 1429, 1503, 1505 and 1515 Centre Circle, Downers Grove, IL (PINS 06-30-402-003, -004, -009, -020, and 06-30-

Approved 6/5/2017

403-016, -017, -022). Flavorchem Corporation, Petitioner and Owner.

Chairman Rickard announced that the petitioner has requested to continue the public hearing to June 5, 2017. However, Senior Planner Leitschuh interjected and explained that this will be staff's last time to recommend a continuance for the petitioner.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 16-PLC-0054, MS. GASSEN MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO A DATE CERTAIN, THAT DATE BEING JUNE 5, 2017, PER THE PETITIONER'S REQUEST.

SECONDED BY MS. HOGSTROM. A VOICE VOTE FOLLOWED:

AYE: MS. GASSEN, MS. HOGSTROM, MR. BOYLE, MS. JOHNSON, MR. KULOVANY, CHAIRPERSON RICKARD

NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 6-0

FILE 17-PLC-0010: A petition seeking approval of a Zoning Map Amendment to rezone the property to INP-1, Neighborhood-Scale Institutional and Public Zoning District, and a Special Use with variations to expand an existing parking lot. The property is zoned R-6, Residential Apartment/Condo and R-4, Residential Detached House 4. The property is located along both the east and west side of Main Street, north of Franklin Street, commonly known 4801 and 4832 Main Street, and 4824 and 4832 Highland Avenue (PINs 09-08-109-018 and 09-08-110-017). Diocese of Joliet, Petitioner; Roman Catholic Diocese of Joliet Trust, Owner

Planner, Scott Williams located the site on the overhead and pointed out the surrounding buildings, access points to the site, and existing driveway. Proposed is the demolition of the rectory building and a petition for a rezoning to INP-1 Neighborhood-Scale Institutional and Public Zoning District. The rectory building will be razed and in its place will be added 26 parking spaces for a total of 140 parking spaces. Noted on the site plan were the pedestrian connections to the existing sidewalks, the removal of one access point to Main Street, and the proposed addition of an access point to Franklin Street to the south.

Mr. Williams reminded the commissioners that tonight's focus was on the setbacks for the parking lot, however, with the INP-1 zoning, there were no associated setbacks for such zoning district. Therefore, the bulk requirements from the most restrictive adjacent zoning, which was the R-4 Residential Detached, would be adopted. However, in reviewing the zoning code, Mr. Williams discovered language under "Religious Assembly" where it stated that if there was an existing religious assembly predating 1965, there was the allowance for a five-foot setback from the right-of-way property line. A review of the parcel's setbacks followed. With regard to the existing west side, the required setback was 14.25 feet (based on 10% of lot width), which was the primary structure side setback for the R-4 zoning district because parking lots had to abide by the primary structure setback. However, Mr. Williams said the petitioner was proposing 3.7 feet because it was existing and the petitioner was extending the western setback to the south. The northern setback was 20 feet and the petitioner was proposing 17.9 feet, also existing.

Approved 6/5/2017

An exhibit reflecting the site's open space was depicted on the overhead with Mr. Williams reporting that 10,100 square feet was planned for open space and the petitioner exceeded the required landscaping for parking lot screening. A diagram of the landscaping plan followed as well as a rendering. Mr. Williams noted the stormwater management area in the southeast corner of the property and the fact that it would include native plantings as required by the stormwater ordinance.

With regard to the zoning designation of INP-1 Neighborhood-Scale Institutional and Public District, Mr. Williams discussed its intention for small scale low intensity public civic and institutional uses that are commonly found in or near residential neighborhood, which he believed the petition met. He further explained how the site met the village's current comprehensive plan as well as its proposed plan, pointing out both plans wanted the property zoned for institutional public use.

Mr. Williams believed all criteria under the zoning map amendment was met: it was a small scale institutional use that was currently operating on-site; it was not properly zoned for the use; staff was bringing the property into compliance with the recommendation and goals of the village's comprehensive plan and the standards for the special use under the INP-1 zoning were being met.

For the variation criteria, Mr. Williams explained that this petition not only was a unique situation because not only was it a religious assembly use with a private school with accessory parking, but there were existing conditions with the parking lot, i.e., when the properties were developed initially no stormwater ordinance existed and so the placement of the stormwater management area impacted the setbacks, placement, and setup of the parking lot. Lastly, even though there was the special street setback of five feet, not many zoning districts that were single-family in nature had that kind of setback. Because the intersection was a corridor to the downtown, staff felt having the larger Main Street setback was in better keeping with the adjacent properties and it provided better vision to the intersection versus having the parking closer to the corner.

The chairman invited questions from the commissioners:

Ms. Gassen questioned whether there was lighting planned for the parking lot wherein staff did not believe so. Per Mr. Kulovany's question regarding additional emails or letters from the public on this matter, Mr. Williams indicated there were none but he did receive two phone calls both expressing concern for stormwater. The only letter he received was from the applicant regarding a summary from the neighborhood meeting that was held last week.

The chairman invited the petitioner to speak.

Mr. Bill Sturm, with Serena Sturm Architects, acknowledged the team of clergy leadership, engineers, and business managers that were present and proceeded to summarize what was included in his packet: the outline of the site, what the property was currently zoned, the intention of the new zoning, photographs of the existing facilities, landscape plan (with plant species), the plan for the removal of the rectory, layout of the parking lot, and water management engineering. Mr. Sturm summarized that the petitioner was keeping parking space (vehicle) searches to on-site versus locating parking spaces on Main Street. It was a matter of safety and, secondly, the parking lot would be landscaped and be an enhancement to Main Street.

Approved 6/5/2017

Per Ms. Hogstrom's question about cuts made into the landscape islands for drainage, Mr. Sturm indicated they would be made. Regarding the suggestion of having a porous asphalt parking lot, Mr. Sturm stated that suggestion had not come up at the neighborhood meeting, but since then, it had come up often. He expanded on the details of a previous parking lot that used porous asphalt. Concerning this proposal and porous asphalt, Mr. Sturm stated there was a cost increase and it was a management issue with the county.

Mr. Sturm addressed Mr. Kulovany's concerns regarding shrubs and their future growth. The proposed shrubs will offer low lying growth and be respectful of some sight lines above the cars, for safety purposes.

Discussion followed by Mr. Sturm regarding the need for the parking lot and the fact that the 8,000 sq. foot rectory was only being used by the pastor. In addition, it was not a good return on investment. A nearby house located on Highland Avenue and owned by the parish, would become a priest residence. Chairman Rickard, speaking from his own experience and living in close proximity to the church, also discussed the need for parking.

A short dialog followed regarding the need for stormwater management on the current parking lot and how Mr. Sturm was addressing that with a small rain garden and best management practices.

Chairman Rickard opened up the meeting to public comment.

Mr. David Haugen, 4826 Forest Ave., Downers Grove, resides across the street from the parking lot. He asked for clarification regarding the jump pit; asked whether the southerly exit from the site was two-way; and expressed concern about the location of the southern exit and its close proximity to the nearby right-turn. He asked these items were considered, wherein Mr. Williams stated the village traffic engineer did review the proposal. Mr. Haugen asked if consideration was taken regarding the low area drainage ending at the intersection of Prince and Franklin and whether the water flow from the parking lot would contribute to water flow to that intersection.

Mr. Williams confirmed the applicant submitted a stormwater report and their engineer could address the matter. However, he explained the stormwater ordinance states that drainage impacts cannot be made worse.

Mr. Haugen thanked the planners for taking advantage of the two signals with walk controls at each corner which improved the current practice of having traffic officers directing pedestrians across a four lane road. He stated that after a site visit he noticed an existing retaining wall which travels north and to the west along Franklin that was originally erected vertical, was now leaning from the top. Since it was a path for students, he voiced concern that it would topple over at some point, being a hazard, and suggested that before the zoning is approved to have the village engineer review it for reinforcement and safety purposes.

Mr. Louis Buttny, 4828 Forest, Downers Grove, supported the earlier comment regarding the egress coming out onto Franklin Street because the current egress for the rectory was about 50 feet further east and there were no apparent issues there. But he agreed the egress onto Franklin was too close to the corner. Mr. Buttny voiced that while he agreed the church needed the parking, he shared his concern about the starkness of having a parking lot on Main Street. He discussed the idea of the village considering the addition of berms to soften the look of the lot, suggesting to look at what

Approved 6/5/2017

was used at the Downers Grove South High School parking lot. Lastly, he voiced concern about stormwater run-off and recommended consideration of a permeable surface.

No further comments received; the petitioner was asked to respond.

Mr. Dwayne Gillem (phonetic), civil engineer with V3 Companies, remarked that the permeable pavers were considered, as asked by the church, as were costs. In this case, however, Mr. Gillem said the basin at the south end of the site was the solution since the northeast corner of the site was about 11 feet higher in elevation than the southwest corner of the parking lot. Using a permeable paver on the slope would not allow water to infiltrate straight into the ground but would travel into the gravel base and travel along with the grade of the parking lot.

Mr. Gillem proceeded to explain that the water runoff would travel to the southern basin either through the parking lot or through the storm sewer which goes through the parking lot. Native plantings will line the basin to assist with water quality leaving the basin. Any water that does not infiltrate will travel through the storm sewer and exit west out of the basin into the storm structure located at the southwest corner of the site. Details followed. Compliance with the village's and county's stormwater ordinances would be met.

Regarding traffic, Mr. Gillem acknowledged that the access driveway onto Franklin Street would receive more use now than it used to and having one entrance/exit onto Main Street would be more clearer to drivers. He agreed the southern entrance onto Franklin Street was very close to Main Street which was why it was located as far west on the property. He explained the positives of the new access points. He also explained the use of the long jump pit. The retaining wall was not the purview of the commission; however, but he believed church staff heard the concerns. Regarding the addition of berms to the parking lot, Mr. Gillem believed they would not be feasible because of the elevation of Main Street being much higher than the rest of the site.

As for the retaining wall, Mr. Sturm returned and stated he was just told by the parish business manager that there was a proposal for the retaining wall. And, the church had replaced retaining walls up to this point but it was a matter of capital management.

Mr. David Haugen, 4826 Forest Ave., returned and suggested installing small landscaping lights and not the tall pole lighting.

Ms. Leitschuh mentioned that the informal crossing that occurred between the parking lot and to the church, during service time, was on an as-needed, contractual agreement with the police department and was not part of this commission's review. The two pedestrian connections from the parking lot to the sidewalk were installed to encourage the pedestrians to use them.

The chairman closed the public hearing and entertained a motion.

After seeing the landscaping plan, Ms. Hogstrom was pleased to see the rain garden and it would be a nice amenity. On that note, the Chairman Rickard inquired as to who maintains the new landscaping, wherein, Planner Williams stated it was a code enforcement matter. Ms. Gassen confirmed with Mr. Williams that parking lot lighting was not required. Mr. Williams confirmed same and also confirmed there would be no pedestrian crosswalk across Main Street, as it was not allowed and was not part of the proposal in front of the commissioners. He was not aware of any

Approved 6/5/2017

(directional) signage on site either. Ms. Leitschuh also pointed out there were dedicated pedestrian signals.

The chairman believed that with the parking lot extending further south to Franklin it may encourage pedestrians to use the controlled walkway, but the next walkway would be located at Main and Prairie. So two options existed. Furthermore, Chairman Rickard agreed with staff that the standards for rezoning the INP-1 District were met as well as the approval criteria for the special use. He agreed with staff on the variation request, seeing it made sense to maintain the same setback at the parking lot. Ms. Gassen also concurred.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 17-PLC-0010, MS. GASSEN MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL FOR THE REZONING AND THE SPECIAL USE, WITH VARIATIONS, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TWO (2) CONDITIONS:

- 1. THE SPECIAL USE SHALL SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORM TO THE STAFF REPORT DATED MAY 1, 2017, THE DRAWINGS PREPARED BY SERENA STURM ARCHITECTS DATED APRIL 7, 2017 AND LANDSCAPE DRAWINGS PREPARED BY GREEN GRASS LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE & CONSTRUCTION DATED APRIL 6, 2017 EXCEPT AS SUCH PLANS MAY BE MODIFIED TO CONFORM TO VILLAGE CODES AND ORDINANCES; AND**
- 2. THE APPLICANT SHALL ADMINISTRATIVELY CONSOLIDATE THE MULTIPLE LOTS ON THE WEST SIDE OF MAIN STREET PRIOR TO OBTAINING THE PARKING LOT PERMIT.**

SECONDED BY MR. KULOVANY. ROLL CALL:

AYE: MS. GASSEN, MR. KULOVANY, MR. BOYLE, MS. HOGSTROM, MS. JOHNSON, CHAIRPERSON RICKARD

NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 6-0

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:05 P.M. ON MOTION BY MS. GASSEN. SECONDED BY MS. HOGSROM MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE OF 6-0.

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