

Approved

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
PLAN COMMISSION MEETING

May 17, 2021, 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Rickard called the May 17, 2021 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, Commissioners Boyle, Dmytryszyn, Johnson, Patel, Maurer, Rector, Toth

ABSENT: Commissioner Majauskas

STAFF: Planning Manager Jason Zawila and Development Planner Flora Ramirez

VISITORS: Paul Robertson (Petitioner), Dean Newins, Michael Worthman, Dan Stevens, Craig Kenmotsu, Luke Zizzo, Matt Gallagher, Olga Olejniczak, Joyce Symowicz, John Symowicz, Charlene Klabacha, Scott Richards, Leo Stark, Barbara Morrow, Don Zimmerman, Stacey Brown, Dennis Gonier, Stacey Brown, Pam Berchardt, Lauren Weil, Bill Muth, Jennifer Engel, Michael Gaubatz, Shannon Lucas, Theresa Schulz, Julie Gaubatz, Glenn Hoffman, Katie Callahan, Jordan West, T. Brynes, Dorilda Rucci, Mary Devries, Lisa Stach, Pete Mesha, Lori Mesha, Karla Klinkler, Austin Klinker, Don Stapleton, Lis Stapleton, James Hill, Carol Hill, Todd Smith, Anna Kirby, Tom Weiler, Stefan Wild, Manwai Lai,

MINUTES

Chairman Rickard asked that the minutes reflect his absence in the first paragraph.

MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2021 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING WERE APPROVED, AS CORRECTED, ON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BOYLE. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER RECTOR. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE VOTE.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Rickard reviewed the procedures for the public hearing and swore in those individuals who would be speaking on the following petition:

FILE 21-PLC-0006: Petition seeking approval of a Planned Unit Development, a rezoning from DB to DB/PUD and a special use to construct a 167-unit apartment building. The property is located on the northwest corner of Washington Street and Maple Avenue, commonly known as 932 Maple Avenue, 928 Maple Avenue, and 5240 Washington Street, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 09-08-306-033, -034, and -035). Opus Development Company, LLC, petitioner; Owners Teachbeyond, Inc., LLC Shulz, LLC and First Baptist Church.

Approved

Chairman Rickard reviewed the procedures and protocol for the public hearing, noting the Committee Room was available for overflow seating and that a live stream of the meeting will occur in that room.

Petitioner, Mr. Paul Robertson, Development Director of Opus Development Corporation, 9700 Higgins Road, Rosemont, IL discussed the background of his company noting the company has developed 15 various projects over the years in Downers Grove.

Mr. Dean Newins, part of the architectural group with Opus Development reviewed the vision/purpose of the project, which was to bring a high quality, mixed-use project to the downtown area following the village's comprehensive plan and its design guidelines. Proposed were 167 units comprised of 1 to 3 bedroom units, 234 residential parking spaces (1.4 stalls per resident) and 71 parking spaces for the Baptist Church. Five levels of residential space and two levels for parking would be created by combining a total of three parcels. Parking would be allowed for the First Baptist Church. A review of the site plan followed. Vehicle access for the parishioners to the Church would be off Washington Street.

Mr. Newins addressed the fact that a neighborhood meeting was held in the Church's sanctuary and the four key points came out of that meeting: 1) the design impedes the view of the Marquis in the northeast corner (sight lines were opened up); 2) how would the residents of the new building walk their pets (a dog run around the site has been created); 3) vehicle cueing off of Maple Street (garage door was moved in further to allow the cue so that vehicles could get off of the street); and 4) loading and trash removal (parallel parking spaces were used to create an appropriate pull-off for delivery/garbage trucks). Starting from the bottom up, a review of the garage parking circulation for the church parishioners and residents followed. Next, the amenity deck followed, and then the residential units moving upward. Examples of the various residential units followed as well as an explanation of the how the village's Design Guidelines played into the development of the structure.

Returning, Mr. Paul Robertson provided various images/views of the development and a streetscape for comparison to nearby buildings (Maple and Main and the Marquis). The proposed height of the building at the southwest corner was 6-7 feet below the Marquis and Mr. Robertson noted the building was within the height requirements for the zoning district. The site was identified as a B-11 catalyst site in the comprehensive plan, it was a multi-family residential project, and the building was stepped back to the east, being respectful of the nearby residential/single-family neighborhood. Because the parcel was a redevelopment site Mr. Robertson believed it would bring more residents to the downtown area and add to its vitality. It was walkable and met the transit-oriented development guidelines. The criteria for the planned unit development was also met with the proposed development.

Mr. Robertson pointed out that apartment/condo buildings are an allowed special use, with prior approval. As for the impact on property values, in speaking with a MAI appraiser, his opinion was that such a development brought exposure and potential buyers to an area, which increased market conditions. For approval purposes, Mr. Robertson relayed he was requesting a reduction in lot area per dwelling unit to achieve the density envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan and was consistent with the Maple and Main structure. In summary, the project met the bulk standards for the zoning district except for the lot area per dwelling unit.

Approved

Mr. Michael Worthman, traffic engineer with KLOA, Inc., reviewed the traffic study for the proposed transit-oriented development, pointing out that because it was a transit-oriented development, there was less reliance on the automobile and the parking demand would be reduced to a typical suburban apartment development. Census data reflected that twenty- to twenty-five percent of residents in such downtown developments commuted to and from work (by train) and walked to nearby restaurants. The two access drives for the site were reviewed and two current access drives on Maple would be removed. Mr. Worthman review traffic counts, noting they were done using pre-pandemic conditions. Background growth was added to count for future growth in the area, reflecting that the roadway had sufficient capacity to handle the traffic generated by the development. The intersections would continue to operate at good levels of service and no improvements were required at the intersections. The parking met the village's parking requirement. Mr. Worthman recommended that the parking garage exit have visual warning devices warning pedestrians of a vehicle's exit.

To address loading/unloading and trash removal, five parallel parking spaces would be added along the Maple right of way; three spaces designated for loading/unloading and two spaces for general use. Details and images followed regarding the process. Mr. Robertson welcomed questions.

Per the Chairman's questions, the village's traffic engineer did review the KLOA findings and he was in agreement with the report. Chairman Rickard invited commissioner input.

In reviewing the images provided by the petitioner and how the project will inter-connect with the character of the downtown area, Commissioner Maurer asked the petitioner to explain how the east elevation related to the downtown pedestrian-oriented character of the downtown. Turning to the front facade, he voiced concern about the current challenges for loading/unloading and delivery trucks already on Maple Avenue and how the tenants would feel about it, wherein Mr. Robertson explained that tenant loading/unloading would be scheduled during off-peak hours whereas trash services were scheduled. Amazon deliveries would drive to the same loading zone but move off from the traffic flow. The five parking spaces would allow for that. An explanation for the perimeter dog walk was also raised.

Mr. Newins also addressed the various types of brick being used on the building. Commissioner Maurer inquired as to why the petitioner was seeking more than double the density (number of units) for the site, wherein Mr. Robertson returned and explained it was the density the Comprehensive Plan called for and it was consistent with the units at the Maple and Main development. An explanation of an alcove apartment was explained, followed by the breakdown of unit types: 28 alcove units; 60% one-bedroom units, 10% two-bedroom units and five three-bedroom units. A market study was completed for the site. Per Mr. Robertson, the Mark of Elmhurst development was well received, was a good benchmark for this development, and he believed the market value for the area was a positive.

Referring to Page 28 of the Comprehensive Plan, Chairman Rickard read text which discussed the type and location of land uses within the downtown area and in the mixed-use areas, pointing out the plan recommended that the ground floor uses be primarily retail, entertainment, personal service with office, and then residential uses located on the upper floors. In this case, he believed,

Approved

from a pedestrian perspective, there was not much activity for pedestrians and it was a “dead zone.” He expected with such plan there would have been some services.

With regard to the commercial space of the project, Mr. Robertson said that village staff was consulted about locating the Maple retail closer to the project. The pedestrian traffic for this area was studied, noting parking was minimal and it was not viable. The topography of the site was also challenging and not much opportunity was available to come in at grade on the one corner. Commissioner Maurer took issue with some of the Mr. Robertson’s responses.

Mr. Newins proceeded to explain why the northwest corner of the building was taken back 12 feet, i.e., the building was extending further into the northeast corner and, as different ways were considered to displace it, the solution was to erode the north tower further. Clarification followed.

Chairman Rickard invited public comment.

Mr. Michael Cassa, President/CEO of Downers Grove Economic Development Corporation, 5159 Mochel, Downers Grove, spoke of his promoting the village’s comprehensive plan to new developers. He stated that Opus had worked closely with the church to address their parking issues and Opus had a reputation for developing quality projects, including many in Downers Grove. He believed this project was a good economic development project for the village and would be a quality project, bringing customers to the downtown area. He further explained the challenges of adding retail to developments when getting closer to the downtown area or near the train station, given it was a market driven factor.

Ms. Julie Gaubatz, 940 Maple Street, discussed why she and her husband moved to Downers Grove and the fact that the downtown area transitioned into residential neighborhoods. She requested that the developer lower the height of the west portion of the building so that the sun could reach the trees her building had planted in its green space. Secondly, she asked that the building be moved back further from the property line to create space in order to not look into a blank wall. Lastly, she explained that if the building could be moved back an opportunity existed to join the Marquis’s green space and create more green space overall.

Ms. Jennifer Engel, 940 Maple Street, #203, inquired about the hours of construction, suggested that all the parking entrances be removed from Maple Avenue, and place the church parking on Maple during the work week. When the parking study was completed, she asked whether a stop light would be installed at Maple and Washington. She further inquired if a crash rail would be provided for the parking deck. Over-wide vehicles overhanging in the loading zone was another concern of hers. She felt that having low rents for one-bedroom units could lower the values of property. She recommended to add signage on the building to remind patrons to keep quiet in the neighborhood. She hoped that grass would be utilized in the dog park.

Mr. Pete Mesha, 940 Maple, #414, president of the Marquis Homeowners Association, corrected the developer’s comment on the height of the proposed building, noting he was comparing it to the parapet of the Marquis. He referenced his 10-page letter dated April 18th, 2021 which he summarized: Opus’s response to the homeowners of Marquis as it related to the northeastern most portion of the Marquis property and its relationship to the proposed structure. Mr. Mesha stated it did not mitigate the issue because the large wall was still present and it affected 16 residents. He did not believe the four-foot wide paved dog run would work and discussed what the Marquis did

Approved

with their dog run. Other issues he voiced included height. He suggested lowering the building by one story so that the sunlight could be retained and it could shine on the green space. Issues existed with the loading zone and Mr. Mesha suggested the developer create a separate drive-way for the trucks, similar to the Marquis. He suggested creating more guest parking.

Mr. Mesha addressed the standards of approval for the project, specifically that the developer was not sensitive to his building's design, the development did not meet Special Use requirement No. 2 as it relates to the general welfare of the neighborhood or community, and explaining that the developer had to consider the residents of the Marquis and not just another adjacent building. He believed the developer had to prove how Special Use No. 3 was being met and its affect on property values since he and his east side Marquis neighbors paid a premium for their units. He did not feel the appropriate terms and conditions were protecting his and the homeowner association's interests and believed the applicant failed the standards.

Mr. Glen Hoffman, 840 Maple Avenue, suggested that the village increase the amount of feet for the neighbor notification process, voiced concern about the traffic counts for the nearby intersection -- stating that westbound traffic on Maple and Washington (pre-pandemic) can back up to the railroad tracks. He also voiced concern about the building's view of a grammar school below and wanted assurances from the building's management that they would provide background checks on their tenants. He preferred having retail on the first floor also.

Mr. John Symowicz, 940 Maple Avenue, expressed that the building's request for the PUD zoning should not be granted due to its large size on a small parcel. He noted this was a transition area and the building should be modeled after the Marquis. Too much was being placed into one space, similar to a dorm, and where single tenants could start to double-up. Also, the traffic study never mentioned the preschools. Mr. Symowicz believed an off-road loading zone should be built, given the additional traffic that would be created by the various delivery services as well as school buses. He stated the developer failed to mention the Westmont and Lisle developments where their parking ratio was higher than the Marquis.

Ms. Jennifer Engel, 940 Maple Street, returned stating her background was in concrete construction and inquired of the developer if a tower crane was going to be used. She wanted to see the developer's logistics plan, swing radius, etc. She asked if the proposed development would offset the homeowners' property taxes. She supported more retail. She also suggested the developer visit 229 Park site in Clarendon Hills and pointed out that there were unleased apartments in nearby buildings that were available which could affect property values.

Ms. Charlene Klabacha, a resident of the Marquis, explained why she and her husband chose to live in Downers Grove and why they moved into the Marquis – trees and light. As a prior church minister, she questioned why so much land and space was being given to the church for parking when a nearby garage could be used by the church. She voiced concern about security in the parking garage, property taxes, provide more guest parking, and suggested the developer create condos instead of apartments.

Ms. Shannon Lucas, a Marquis resident, faced east, and said she moved to Downers Grove because she did not want to live next to a larger development and also paid a premium for her condo. There was no guaranty that property values would not decrease significantly with the development. She found it difficult that the developer continued to compare the proposed building

Approved

to the Maple and Main development, which has never been at capacity, and questioned why more units would be added to the area. Safety issues were also raised. Planning Manager Zawila referenced Ms. Lucas's written comments were also provided on the dais.

Ms. Manwai Lai, 940 Maple, referenced her written letter and asked the developer to provide the numbers for the rental demand for the 167 units. She stated the area was transitional and she was concerned about traffic safety and whether lighting/camera security would be provided on the building.

Mr. Tom Weiler, 709 Maple Avenue, noted the transitions seen on Maple Avenue over the years and talked about the change in character of Maple Avenue especially when the Marquis and Maple and Main buildings came in. Mr. Weiler shared the issues raised back then were the same being raised today. He voiced concern about the proposed building's density and massing stating it did not fit the character of Maple Avenue.

Mr. Jordan West, 940 Maple Avenue, lives on northwest corner of the building and pointed out that school buses currently park in the church parking lot. He asked where would they park in the future. Mr. West stated the developer's building in Lemont sought higher density apartments but Lemont pushed back and asked for less density. He voiced safety concerns for the nearby intersection as he had a child. More guest parking was needed.

Mr. Austin Klinkler, 930 Summit, voiced the changes seen on Maple Avenue during his entire life in the village and stated the proposal did not fit the character of the area.

Mr. Michael Gahbatz, 940 Maple, loved Downers Grove but had hoped the developer would have been more creative in the design of the building. He pointed out the patio and trees located in the existing green space and the fact that some setback was necessary. He agreed the proposal was too dense for the area and it sacrificed other amenities.

Ms. Pam Berchardt, 940 Maple, voiced concern about the developer's graphics not reflecting the true amount of green space for the dogs that will walk the development. In fact the dog owners from Maple and Main used the dog area by the Marquis building. She stated the amount of grass being provided by the developer was not enough for the density. She emphasized that the density was too much and suggested putting in a coffee shop.

Mr. Stefan Wild, 832 Maple Ave., supported having a coffee shop and a grocery store in the development. He did not favor the east facade as it looked like the back side of a building facing the downtown. Other concerns voiced included the current congestion problem and poor visibility in the area. Parking and deliveries would be busy. Having more mixed use would be better and he supported seeing more walkability. He did not support the density.

Ms. Maureen Callahan, 840 Maple, expressed concern about the visibility of the corner when she walks her children to their school due to the traffic. She questioned why there were no markings for a school zone. She asked the developer to take another look at the corner.

Mr. Leo Stark, 930 Curtiss, voiced concern about the traffic traveling toward the Acadia that would be causing traffic issues with the entrance/exit that was being proposed for the building. He did not support luxury apartments because they diluted the market for condo buyers. Mr. Stark

Approved

shared some of the characteristics found in the Comprehensive Plan that should be incorporated into the development, such as front and side setbacks to create open space around the building, parking should be on-street or located in the back of the building with access by entry drives and side streets, etc. He discussed the various sub-areas of the catalyst site and he believed the developer addressed the parking problem first followed by the building.

Mr. Stark read from the comprehensive plan that such developments (in the Edge) should strive to mitigate any negative impacts associated with developments including traffic and parking. He further pointed out that the nearby duplex -- a historic Greek Revival building identified in the village's historic survey -- was not just a building and it should be respected. He asked that the commissioners to take into consideration the true measurements of the plans. He asked commissioners not to buy into the property taxes (\$600,000) that will be paid for the development, pointing out that the corner will eventually get developed.

Mr. Stark further pointed out that the promises being made are by the developer and not the actual property owner. He asked the commissioners to think of the tipping point where such large buildings are developed that eventually strangle the arterial road(s) of the village and people will eventually avoid Downers Grove altogether, reminding the commissioners that those who are seeing it get progressively worse live on Maple Avenue. For the record, Mr. Stark stated the seven floor plans he printed out actually totaled six pages and a doorway existed that led to nowhere. Other comments shared were the fact that the developer's focus was on the amenities and the amenities had become inward-facing and all-inclusive, thereby taking away those patrons who could be visiting the downtown bars, the coffee shop, or gym, etc., which then becomes a challenge for the economic development groups.

As for leaving the (heated) parking garage door open from dawn until dusk, Mr. Stark relayed that it was an invitation for the homeless and outdoor rodents. He did not appreciate the church parking its buses on public property that was paid by the taxpayers of the village. He spoke about the various community church groups that meet in the evening hours and asked what was the use of having a garage open during the day. Mr. Stark relayed he wanted to ensure the development would be ADA compliant, did not believe the parking study was accurate, and said the developer could have used the traffic counts from the Main and Maple building for more accuracy. In the downtown parking study he found that the Marquis was short 11 parking spaces, between guests and residents, and the Maple and Main was short 10 spaces. He presumed the proposed building would also be short parking spaces. Lastly, he addressed the shortcomings of the loading zone, the dog walk, and the landscaping.

Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Rickard invited the village's development planner, Flora Ramirez.

Ms. Ramirez presented her staff report, noting the two requests that were being asked: 1) a special use for the apartment use; and 2) a zoning change from DB to DB/PUD. The site's location, various photographs, and existing conditions were referenced. Floor plans to the building were referenced, as well as the landscaping plan, pet relief area, and elevations. The height of the building met the requirements of the zoning ordinance, the guidelines of the comprehensive plan, and included some of the key ideas from the Downtown Focus Area plan which Ms. Ramirez listed. Both the rezoning criteria and the PUD criteria were referenced as well as the special use criteria for the commission to consider. Staff recommended approval of the development.

Approved

Chairman Rickard asked staff of its understanding of the development's garage and security, and whether the garage would be required to be closed or not. He also asked staff about the public parking garage and its allowance for additional parking and whether a staircase could be created at the northwest corner to make the garage more accessible to the proposed development and other developments. Manager Zawila indicated those items would have to be reviewed in detail. As for the occupancy of the public garage, Manager Zawila relayed why the village's 2019 parking study was conducted, which was to look at parking solutions in the downtown area. Council accepted the study but asked staff to look at it and consider making recommendations, but due to the pandemic, staff's recommendations were placed on hold. However, at that time Mr. Zawila stated the study did reflect that during the peak weekday period (12:00 AM to 1:00 PM) approximately 25% of 2,500-plus parking spaces were available. That amount now increased to 46% for the entire downtown area. The Maple and Main development, he clarified, actually had a small surplus of parking along with minor deficits for Burlington Station and the Marquis. Details followed.

Regarding the 2019 (Walker) parking study, Commissioner Maurer confirmed with staff that the study was commissioned by the village and not the petitioner, wherein Manager Zawila affirmed same. Per Chairman Rickard's question on whether the church's dedicated parking was exclusive 24/7 or a private agreement existed between Opus and the Church, Manager Zawila confirmed it was a private agreement and for church parking only. Per Commissioner Rector's question, Manager Zawila stated commissioners could require more conditions to staff's recommendation if desired. No comments were received from the park district. Ms. Ramirez offer information about the densities for other project. The density (lot area per dwelling unit) for the rental units at Maple and Washington were 353 square feet while Main and Maple was approved for 330 sq. feet. The Burlington Station density was approved at 541 sq. feet and the Marquis was approved for 813 sq. feet.

Commissioner Maurer provided comparisons to the lot area per dwelling unit for the proposed development as compared to the other buildings, pointing out that the Business District zoning that the developer was proposing and in which the commissioners would have to base the PUD on, had no limit on bulk floor area ratio, i.e., the density was driven by the minimum lot area while the bulk was driven by the floor area ratio. Meaning the developer could construct many units at a smaller square footage.

Chairman Rickard confirmed with staff that the definitions of alcove, units, and window requirements would be addressed again at the building department level.

Returning to the podium, Mr. Robertson discussed there were basically four issues raised during public comment: 1) traffic; 2) density; 3) types of units; and 4) amenities. Regarding the amenities, specifically the dog relief area (6 ft. x 150 feet), he expected the residents to utilize the garage for access to the area. An example followed with Mr. Robertson explaining that he would work with the management company so that they understand the process. The Level 1 would also have a corner area for animal relief. Per Mr. Robertson, access to the dog environment would be safe, accessible, and lighted for the tenants.

In addressing the streetscape, Mr. Robertson explained that the development was solving issues for the church parking, the resident parking and solving for grade. There were only two places where the floor lined up with the grade and he pointed them out. To introduce additional (retail) uses was

Approved

a challenge and, therefore, he created active zones in the middle of the building to create interest in architectural detailing and scale, citing the church entrance. The goal of the building was to have residents use the downtown for shopping and to not put shops into the corner of Washington and Maple, especially when there was concern about safety and additional traffic. Having retail was not a goal.

Chairman Rickard pointed out how the Marquis compensated for having no retail by a providing a passive area for its residents and he questioned whether this developer could provide something between the sidewalk and the building, such as benches, landscaping, planters, so that residents could hang out, wherein Mr. Robertson pointed out those spaces that backed away from the sidewalk where such seating provided an opportunity. Next, Mr. Robertson addressed the two alcove (studio) units that were being offered and the affordability of such unit, where eventually someone moves from an alcove unit into a larger one-, two- or three-bedroom unit.

As for traffic, Mr. Robertson relayed there were challenges and drivers were generally distracted. However, the proposal would not change that. Mr. Robertson believed that it was a problem that already existed and it would take working with planning staff and the public works department to address safe ways to maneuver the intersection. Lastly, he addressed the many groups that meet at the church and the fact that the groups were at various times throughout the day which was appropriate for the project and it provided a different way to activate the site. Regarding the parking arrangement between the church and the developer, Mr. Robertson explained the agreement between the developer and the church was that the developer would be purchasing the church's property while the church would control the 71 spaces with a perpetual easement.

Regarding the heated garage, Mr. Robertson explained that a separation of space existed where the resident-side of the garage would be heated while the church space would not and the church would control the entry of vehicles and visitors with a grounds person to secure the door at night. Directional signage would be on the building to guide visitors. Further details were shared regarding the parking of buses. Per questions, no management staff would live on the site.

Mr. Robertson stated the proposed development will abide by the village's requirements as it pertains to construction noise. It will have a staging plan and a worker parking plan. Regarding the real estate taxes, he stated the church does not pay taxes and the other two parcels currently pay approximately \$12,000. The new development would bring upwards of \$600,000 a year with donations to the park and school districts as part of the approval.

Hearing no further comments from the applicant, Chairman Rickard closed the public comment. He invited further commissioner comment.

Commissioner Maurer voiced his appreciation to the Opus team and their players but pointed out the Village has an agreement with the developer that if a permit is granted to construct the building, the developer will donate \$867,000 to the park district, \$73,000 to School District #58 and \$28,000 to School District #99. He explained the previous developments that Opus created in Downers Grove but did not believe this specific proposal was just there yet. Mr. Maurer explained how true urban environments differ from suburban environments and knew other, better options existed in the village. Furthermore, he spoke about the negatives of on-street loading/unloading for 167 units and the fact that the density being asked was too high (37%), given the average, and recommended lowering the number of units. He appreciated the public input on this development.

Approved

Commissioner Rector concurred and noted the fact that the commission had to be concerned about the precedent it will set. Secondly, she voiced concern about the increase in traffic with poorly operating intersections already and the fact that another future development will come to fruition that will add even more traffic congestion.

It was pointed out by a commissioner that the zoning map may have to be amended based on what was discussed -- to the extent the zoning restrictions affect property values -- he was not convinced they were not going to affect property values and the development would have a decrease in the public's health, safety, and welfare for all of the reasons voiced by Commissioner Maurer. While some commissioners believed it was a unique opportunity for the site, it just met some of the criteria, and still needed some fine-tuning. The traffic reports needed to be more current. Still, other commissioners had concerns of density, property values, and figuring out the loading/delivery area.

Planner Zawila explained the options before the commission since the public comment period was closed: 1) table to a date certain in order for the developer to address certain items; 2) put additional conditions in staff's recommendations; or 3) vote on the matter as staff has recommended. Discussion followed on how the commission wanted to proceed. Per staff, the applicant was fine with the first option.

The commissioners agreed to table the matter to June 14th so that the applicant could address the following matters: 1) propose a new solution for the loading/receiving dock to lessen the impact of traffic; 2) provide relief and treatment of the western façade of the building so it fits better within the community and hide the mechanicals; 3) reduce the density; 4) further define the dog run area with better security and provide a rendering; and 5) provide further review of pedestrian and traffic safety at the intersection and on Maple Street.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER RECTOR TO TABLE FILE 21-PLC-0006 TO JUNE 14, 2021. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER DMYTRYSZYN. ROLL CALL:

AYE: RECTOR, DMYTRYSZYN, BOYLE, JOHNSON, MAURER, PATEL, TOTH, RICHARD

NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 8-0

Chairman Rickard announced that the public will not receive another notice on this matter.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:00 P.M. UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER TOTH. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER BOYLE. A VOICE VOTE FOLLOWED AND THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

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