

Chairman Jirik called the June 5, 2001 meeting of the Plan Commission to order at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Mr. Fluck, Mr. McCombs, Mr. McCormick, Mrs. Reynolds, Mr. Waechtler, Chairman Jirik

ABSENT: Mr. Griesbaum, Mr. Matejczyk, Mr. Wlodek

STAFF

PRESENT Kenneth J. Rathje, Director Planning Services
Amanda Browne, Planner

Chairman Jirik stated the draft minutes of the Plan Commission's May 1, 2001 meeting needed to be reviewed. He asked if there were any additions, deletions or corrections to those minutes. There were none. **Mr. McCormick moved, and Mrs. Reynolds seconded that the minutes be approved as prepared. The motion passed unanimously.**

Chairman Jirik outlined the protocol for this evening's three agenda items. Chairman Jirik explained first, the petitioner, who is the individual proposing to do something with a particular parcel of land, will make a presentation. The petitioner will explain what they are seeking to do and how their proposal conforms to what the Village allows or does not allow.

Chairman Jirik continued second, Village Staff would present its technical review and recommendations. Chairman Jirik noted the third step, the public participation portion of the hearing, is the time for those present who desire to speak to be heard. Chairman Jirik pointed out the proceedings will be recorded in the form of minutes. He encouraged those wishing to speak to speak one at a time and to speak clearly and slowly so that detailed minutes can be provided. Those wishing to testify should state their name and address before testifying.

Chairman Jirik explained the final step is the Plan Commission's deliberation of the petition. Plan Commission members can and may ask questions of anyone who spoke regarding the petition so that the Commission members can fully understand an issue or concern. The Plan Commission will hear the petition, discuss it and then make a motion to recommend approval, recommend denial, or recommend approval with changes.

Chairman Jirik explained the purpose of the hearings this evening is to generate a body of information for the Council to consider. The Village Council will make a final decision on each of these petitions.

Chairman Jirik noted that there are petition packets at the sign-in table for those members of the audience who wish to follow this evening's procedures.

FILE NO. 1061 **FINAL PLAT APPROVAL – BRADLEY’S BROOKBANK PRAIRIE SUBDIVISION;** Property is located between Middaugh Road on the west and Brookbank Road on the east, approximately 145 feet north of 60th Place, commonly known as 5941 Middaugh Road, Downers Grove, Illinois (PIN 09-18-407-002); Bradley Land Group, Inc., Owner/Petitioner

Chairman Jirik pointed out that the Plan Commission members’ packet contains a request from the property owner to continue the hearing to a date certain. Mr. Rathje confirmed that the petitioner had made such a request.

Chairman Jirik commented that the regularly scheduled July meeting would be the first Tuesday of the month that is July 3rd. He recalled at the May meeting that there had been discussion about changing the July meeting date to the 10th of July. The recording secretary canvassed the Plan Commission members, and a change to July 10th was found by the Commission to be acceptable. Mr. Rathje advised that a sign would again be posted on the property with the appropriate meeting date of July 10th. Chairman Jirik called for a motion.

MOTION: WITH RESPECT TO FILE NO. 1061 FINAL PLAT APPROVAL – BRADLEY’S BROOKBANK PRAIRIE SUBDIVISION, MR. MCCORMICK MOVED THAT THIS PETITION BE CONTINUED TO THE JULY 10TH, 2001 MEETING. MRS. REYNOLDS SECONDED THE MOTION.

ROLL CALL:

AYE: Mr. McCormick, Mrs. Reynolds, Mr. Fluck, Mr. McCombs, Mr. Waechter, Chairman Jirik

NAY: None

The motion passed unanimously.

Someone in the audience asked if there was a telephone number to call to confirm that the July 10th meeting date would not be postponed. Mr. Rathje responded that Amanda Browne can be called at 630 434-5531

Mr. Rathje advised Chairman Jirik that the petitioner for File No. 1062 has not yet arrived. He suggested that the Commission might want to move on to File No. 1063.

FILE NO. 1063 - LOT SPLIT (Petition includes a request for a lot width exception for each proposed lot) – Property located on the west side of Fairmount Avenue approximately 1,073 feet south of 55th Street, commonly known as 5626 Fairmount, Downers Grove, IL (PIN 09-17-200-042): Kathleen M. Guilfoile, Owner: Michael J. Long, Petitioner

Chairman Jirik asked if a representative of the petitioner were present. Michael Long, 416 E. Ogden Avenue, Westmont, Illinois stated they are asking for the lot on Fairmount to be split down the middle in order to create two lots with dimensions of 65 feet by 301 feet each. They are asking for an exception from the required 75 foot lot width. Mr. Long advised the lot area of the proposed lots would be 19,786 square feet which exceeds the 10,500 square foot minimum.

As Staff's review, Ms. Browne explained the petitioner is seeking approval of a lot split with lot width exceptions for property at 5626 Fairmount Avenue located on the west side of Fairmount Avenue approximately 1,073 feet south of 55th Street.

Ms. Browne stated the subject property currently has a width of 131.30 feet as measured from north to south on its easterly property line along Fairmount Avenue and a depth of 301.67 feet as measured from east to west. The total lot area of the subject property is approximately 39,568.54 square feet, or .908 acres.

Ms. Browne advised that the property is zoned R-3, Single Family Residence and is improved with a two-story, single family residence and a detached frame garage located to the south and west of the residence.

Ms. Browne pointed out the northerly lot and the southerly lot are proposed to have the same lot dimensions as shown on the petitioner's submitted plats of survey. Each lot is proposed to have a lot width ranging from 65.65 feet as measured on its easterly property line along Fairmount Avenue to 65.53 feet as measured on its westerly property line. These lot widths represent reductions from the minimum requirement of 75 feet ranging from 9.35 feet or 12.47% to 9.47 feet or 12.63% for each of the proposed lots. The lot depth of each lot is proposed to be 301.67 feet which exceeds the minimum requirement of 140 feet under the Subdivision Control Ordinance, and the lot area of each lot is proposed to be approximately 19,786.53 square feet which also exceeds the minimum requirement of 10,500 square feet.

Ms. Browne stated because each of the proposed lots is to have lot widths less than 75 feet, the lot width exceptions are being requested under the provisions of Section 20-602 of the Subdivision Control Ordinance. Sub-Section 20-602(c) provides a set of five criteria to be considered when determining whether an exception is warranted. She explained the Commission may consider, but is not limited to, the following:

- (1) THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE PROPOSED EXCEPTION IMPACTS THE VALUE OR REASONABLE USE OF THE SURROUNDING PROPERTIES;**

Ms. Brown stated Staff is of the opinion that the proposed lot split with the associated lot width exceptions will not have a negative impact on either the value or the reasonable use of the surrounding properties. The division of the subject property as proposed will in no way reduce or eliminate the zoning obligations such as required yards or setbacks for any future structures to be constructed on either of the resulting lots.

(2) WHETHER THE EXCEPTION IS CONSISTENT WITH THE TREND OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE AREA AND THE SURROUNDING USES;

Ms. Browne displayed the locator map showing the lots in the surrounding area. The general trend in the area surrounding the subject property has been that many of the originally platted lots have been divided into smaller sized parcels. The typical form of division was for the lots to be divided down the center and the subject petition would be consistent with this general trend.

Ms. Browne indicated a comparative analysis was done of the lots in the area. On Fairmount Avenue between 55th Street on the north and 59th Street on the south, 15 lots have lot widths less than the minimum requirement of 75 feet, 30 lots have lot widths between 75 feet and 100 feet, and 13 lots have lot widths greater than 100 feet. The narrowest lot is located approximately 280 feet north of the subject property and is 40.25 feet in width, and the two lots immediately to the north of the subject property are each 65.65 feet in width. Approximately 26% of the lots on Fairmount between 55th Street and 59th Street have lot widths less than 75 feet.

Ms. Browne advised that Staff also looked at other properties to the immediate west along Lyman Avenue which carry the same R-3 Zoning designation as the subject property. On the east side of Lyman Avenue between 55th Street and 59th Street, there are seven lots that have lot widths less than 75 feet, 12 lots that have lot widths between 75 and 100 feet, and nine lots that have lot widths greater than 100 feet. Approximately 25% of the lots on the east side of Lyman Avenue between 55th Street and 59th Street have lot widths less than 75 feet. There are four lots located to the immediate west of the subject property which have lot widths ranging from 65 feet to 67.6 feet.

The proposed lot split with the associated lot width exceptions will result in parcels that will have buildable lot widths comparable to the surrounding area.

(3) THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROPERTY WHICH SUPPORT OR MITIGATE AGAINST THE GRANTING OF THE EXCEPTION;

Ms. Browne stated the primary characteristic that supports the granting of the exception is the relationship of the parcel's width to its depth and area. As a single parcel, the subject property is considerably larger than the majority of the surrounding lots, and is 3.77 times as large in area as a lot meeting the minimum requirements of the Subdivision Control Ordinance as it applies in the R-3 Zoning District. If the lot is divided as

proposed, each of the two resulting parcels will have lot areas of approximately 19,786.53 square feet, or 1.88 times as large as the minimum lot area of 10,500 square feet.

(4) WHETHER THE EXCEPTION IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND SPIRIT OF THIS CHAPTER;

Ms. Browne stated Staff is of the opinion that both of the resulting parcels have width, depth and area characteristics that will readily accommodate very reasonable sized residences.

(5) WHETHER THE EXCEPTION WILL ALTER, OR BE CONSISTENT WITH, THE ESSENTIAL CHARACTER OF THE LOCALITY;

Ms. Browne referred back to number (3) above and indicated Staff is of the opinion that the proposal to divide the subject parcel as proposed is consistent with the development of the surrounding area and will not change the essential character of the area in which the subject property is located.

With respect to stormwater engineering, Ms. Brown commented that the Village's Stormwater Engineer, Ms. Chrys Rymas, reviewed the proposed lot split. She has indicated that there appears to be a floodplain area located on the northerly half of the subject property.

Because of the presence of the floodplain, additional submittals will be required prior to the issuance of any construction permit should the lot split be approved. These submittals will include a topographical survey to determine the extent of the floodplain area, as well as additional submittals called riparian wetlands submittals. These will determine if a wetland area is present within the floodplain. If it is determined that a wetland is present, a 50 foot buffer of no construction would be required around the boundary of any wetland.

Ms. Browne advised that she spoke at length with the Stormwater Engineer, and Ms. Rymas indicated that the presence of the floodplain area should not preclude the proposed lot split. Ms. Rymas wants to ensure that the petitioner understands the additional requirements for submittal of a topographical survey, and the additional riparian and wetland submittals, as well as the possible restrictions or limitations of construction that must be resolved prior to the issuance of any construction permits. Ms. Browne pointed out these restrictions would be in place for any new construction on the existing lot whether or not the lot split is approved.

Mr. Browne concluded that Staff recommends that the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation to the Village Council for the proposed lot split which involves lot width exceptions to reduce the minimum lot width requirement of 75 feet to widths ranging from 65.65 feet to 65.53 feet for each resulting lot.

This recommendation is being made subject to the condition that the existing single family residence is to be razed prior to any construction being permitted on either of the resulting parcels.

Chairman Jirik asked if there was anyone present this evening who wishes to speak regarding this petition. Chairman Jirik explained everyone would get an opportunity to speak. He asked that the speaker state their name and address for the record.

Carol Carlquist, 5616 Fairmount Avenue, Downers Grove, thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak. She indicated her home is to the north of the subject property. Mrs. Carlquist explained she has lived on Fairmount Avenue her entire life. Mrs. Carlquist stated for her, as well as for the people who live here, the charm of Downers Grove is the beautiful trees and the variety of types and prices of homes. In her opinion, Downers Grove is one step beyond the other west suburban towns due to the spacing of lots.

Mrs. Carlquist indicated she would speak tonight about what has happened on Fairmount from 55th to 59th. She emphasized that she has lived there over 50 years, and she has seen a lot of changes. Mrs. Carlquist referred to Staff's presentation and noted the one word in that presentation that stayed in her mind was trend. As an example, she noted if you drive on Carpenter Avenue between Maple and the Burlington tracks, there is space; not necessarily the size of the lots, but what is on the lots. On Fairmount, there is a home that is 85 plus years old. Two new homes were built next to it which dwarf the existing home. There is no green space between these homes like you see on Carpenter Avenue. Mrs. Carlquist stated Fairmount Avenue from 55th Street to 59th Street has had the charm, the appeal and the resale value. It has a rural sense because of the green space, yet the area is right in town.

Mrs. Carlquist presented pictures of properties on Fairmount that have changed. These pictures show where one very big, new home was built and there is still green space between it and the neighboring house. Another picture shows the two new homes that were built where you can barely walk between the two lots. Mrs. Carlquist noted there is another older home on the street where the dining room of the new house now looks right into the older home's windows. Mrs. Carlquist said she took these pictures to show that although the lots would need a lot width exception, when the new homes are built they dwarf the existing homes. She stated there is a two story home on the west side of Fairmount that has had a big new house built next to it, and the dining room windows of the existing home now look at the basement wall of the new home because it is so tall. Mrs. Carlquist stated she does not want Downers Grove to be like Hinsdale where the houses are so dwarfed that there is no green space left. Mrs. Carlquist reemphasized that is her only concern over splitting this lot as requested.

Mrs. Carlquist noted the people who request lot splits and the builders who build the new homes on these lots leave the neighborhood. The residents of the neighborhood now are seeing houses too close together. Mrs. Carlquist asked the Plan Commission members to

think about what happens when properties are split. It used to be that homes were built proportionately to the lot size. This is no longer the case.

Walter Carlquist, 5616 Fairmount Avenue, Downers Grove stated the Plan Commission may not be familiar with this specific block. The numbers in the Staff report say the two lots north of the subject parcel are two 65 foot wide lots. Mr. Carlquist noted those lots were created 30 years ago, and one is an unbuildable lot. Mr. Carlquist pointed out these are his lots. In actuality, there are not two 65 foot wide lots, there is one 130 foot wide lot. The Staff report refers to a 40 foot wide lot north of the subject property. Mr. Carlquist explained that too is part of a larger parcel. If the Plan Commission just looks at the numbers, they will assume there are already narrow width lots on Fairmount. Mr. Carlquist stated that in fact is not the case.

Mr. Carlquist next referred to the smaller lots on Lyman as noted in Staff's report. He pointed out that Lyman Avenue is 600 feet away. He commented if you are driving down Fairmount, you have no idea there are four 65 foot wide lots 600 feet away

With regard to the lot area requirement of 10,500 square feet, Mr. Carlquist asked what if the petitioner came to the Plan Commission and stated he had a 130 foot wide lot and wants to have three 40 foot wide lots? The subject lot is 300 feet deep and so these three 40 foot wide lots would have an area of 12,00 square feet. Mr. Carlquist stated the Staff report would say the proposed three lots meet the 10,500 square foot requirement.

Mr. Carlquist noted the division of existing lots into smaller lots is not just happening in Downers Grove; it is happening in many towns. Mr. Carlquist stated they are trying to maintain the urban rural feeling of the area. He thanked the Commission for listening.

Jackie Heiniger, 5545 Fairmount, Downers Grove, stated two lots were split right to the north of her property. She was told the lot split occurred in 1969 through DuPage County. Ms. Heiniger stated her home looks like the servants' quarters next to these two homes which were recently built on these lots. There is a minimum five foot side yard between the new home and her home. She now has water runoff from this property into her yard and into her basement.

Ms. Heiniger stated the beauty of their neighborhood is the wide lots. If someone wants a small lot, they should go to the other side of 55th Street and knock a house down over there. She emphasized the charm of their neighborhood is the nice wide, deep lots.

Ms. Heiniger questioned how new homes could be built on the subject property even with a 50 foot buffer to the floodplain.

Chairman Jirik explained the purpose of reporting the possible existence of a floodplain is to advise the petitioner that there could be some other issues on this property that would have to be addressed prior to any permits being issued. Chairman Jirik clarified that floodplain issues are handled through the Engineering Department and not the Plan Commission.

Ms. Heiniger stated she was told the value of the properties on Fairmount would greatly increase with the addition of these new homes. Ms. Heiniger stated that is true only if she sells her property, and she is not planning on selling because she loves the neighborhood and the area. Ms. Heiniger concluded by stating she does not like what is going on.

Todd Sharafinski, 5638 Fairmount Avenue, Downers Grove stated he lives directly south of the subject property. They bought their property in November, 2000. Mr. Sharafinski noted his wife looked at well over 100 houses in the surrounding counties. The reason they fell in love with this house on Fairmount Avenue was the size of the lots, the openness, the quietness and the park. Mr. Sharafinski noted in driving around Downers Grove since they moved in, he has not seen lots as nice as the ones on Fairmount. Mr. Sharafinski commented if someone wants a narrower lot, they can go over to Lyman Avenue. He questioned what Lyman Avenue has to do with the character of Fairmount Avenue. Mr. Sharafinski expressed the hope that if the Plan Commission members have not driven down Fairmount Avenue that they do so before making a recommendation. The Plan Commission members need to see why he and his wife made an investment on Fairmount Avenue versus Lyman Avenue or any other street in Downers Grove.

Mr. Sharafinski indicated he also disagreed with Staff's opinion that the lot split will not have a negative impact on the value. In his opinion, it is wrong to take a lot make it half its size and then build two gigantic houses on the resulting two lots. Such a lot split is not consistent with the Fairmount Avenue locality, but it might be consistent with the Lyman, Washington and Webster localities.

Mr. Sharafinski commented somewhere along the line someone established a minimum lot width of 75 feet. If the trend is towards creating smaller width lots, Mr. Sharafinski expressed the hope that the trend stops here.

Christine Sharafinski, 5638 Fairmount Avenue, Downers Grove agree that she did indeed look at over 100 properties in mostly unincorporated areas because they were the only places in DuPage County that had space around the homes. They quickly identified that they liked Downers Grove. They were looking for a home close to town where they could walk. Fairmount Avenue met their criteria. They love downtown and enjoy the shopping and the restaurants. They formerly lived in Glen Ellyn. Mrs. Sharafinski stated they have three children, and they are not afraid to let their kids roam outside because the area is like a park. Mrs. Sharafinski stated their home feels very private, and they cannot see in either of their neighbors' homes. When they entertain on the front or back porch, it is private. The homes are far enough way that they cannot see or hear their neighbors.

Mrs. Sharafinski pointed out if this lot split is approved, the neighborhood will lose several 100 year old trees. A builder cannot make a comparable replacement. This will change the character of the whole approach to their home.

Mrs. Sharafinski noted there would be additional driveways created. She recalled that was an important factor as to why she was not interested in homes on smaller lots. They

looked at a house on Webster but there was driveway after driveway with a minimum of grass. In her opinion, that is not enough for growing children. The green space on Fairmount is one of the biggest positives for the neighborhood, and it is hard to find. She expressed the opinion that builders love Fairmount Avenue because of the openness and beauty.

Mrs. Sharafinski concluded that there is a very nice easy rhythm especially on the west side of Fairmount. On the east side of the street, there have been some houses built very close together which really changed the feel. Some huge trees were cut down. If this lot split is approved, the new homes will be visually upsetting. They will lose the peacefulness, the calmness and the openness. There are no fences on the west side of Fairmount. She can see two or three lots in each direction from the back of her lot. If a house is built right next door, they will have to put up a fence. A lot of the privacy that was very high on her list will be lost.

John Long stated his sister-in-law, Kathleen Guifoile, lives at the subject property. Mr. Long stated she asked him to come to the meeting this evening to assure that she was represented correctly. Mr. Long remarked it is their belief that the character of the neighborhood will not be changed. If the lot split is approved, each lot would be approximately .44 acres or almost one half acre. That is not a City of Chicago sized lot. Mr. Long noted if someone with a similar sized lot would come before the Plan Commission asking that it be divided into three parcels, he hoped the Commission would have the wherewithal to tell them that it might not be correct for the area even though it meets certain requirements. The requested exception is not that large. With the depth of the property, it is their opinion that two homes could be built very easily keeping everything in the neighborhood looking very nice. Mr. Long advised that Mrs. Guilfoile's home was transformed from a home and a garage to a home with two furnaces and two air-conditioning units. Mr. Long stated the home is approximately 60 years old. The hallways upstairs as well as the stairway are only three feet wide. The home is near its economic end, and something is going to change.

To clarify, Chairman Jirik stated the Ordinance would provide for a 75 foot lot width. On a 75 foot wide lot, there would be no public hearing before the Plan Commission, and building permits would be applied for, reviewed and approved. Chairman Jirik noted the comments this evening with regard to the character of the neighborhood are appropriate and are what this Commission needs to deliberate on. With respect to some of the other issues raised, for example the wetlands, the Plan Commission had no jurisdiction. Also, trees are owned by the property owner. The issue this evening is the lot width exception of a little more than nine feet which is a 12% exception

Chairman Jirik asked Mr. Rathje if Staff concurred with his comments. Mr. Rathje stated if the petitioner would have requested a lot split for two 75 foot wide lots, the request would have to come before the Plan Commission who would be authorized to grant approval as there would be no request for exceptions. The current petition will have to go on to the Village Council because of the exceptions not because of the lot split itself.

Chairman Jirik explained the size of any structure to be built is determined by the setback requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairman Jirik noted the concern over the Hinsdale issue with regard to tear-downs and the building of much larger homes on existing lots. Chairman Jirik advised the Village does not have a policy with regard to that issue. He pointed out this seems to be national debate right now; urban sprawl versus higher density versus quality of life. Chairman Jirik asked if there were any further comments or questions.

Mrs. Carlquist indicated she was hearing that this Board does have the right to say yes or no and make a recommendation to the Village Council for a variation. If the Plan Commission looks at numbers alone, it sounds like to would be very easy to recommend approval. Mrs. Carlquist stated those present this evening are requesting the Plan Commission to consider more than just the figures. Maybe someone does or does not have the right to talk about the size of the houses, but if you look at the pictures she presented this evening and take into consideration the people currently living on Fairmount, you will recognize the thrust of the residents' objections.

With regard to the floodplain, Mrs. Carlquist stated her concern is how much control is done over how they can build or get around this floodplain. She noted a home was built on Grand Avenue near 55th Street with a big concrete dike and driveway so as not to impact the floodplain. She is also concerned if the lot split is approved, what will be built on the lot with the floodplain.

She concluded by again asking the Commission to consider more than just numbers and percentages.

Mr. Carlquist advised the Plan Commission to consider this split and growth over the whole community, not just Fairmount Avenue. Mr. Carlquist stated the Chairman said there is no policy regarding tear-downs. Mr. Carlquist stated the existing policy is 75 feet in width so if you accept the recommendation for 65 foot wide lots, the Commission is breaking the policy and setting its own policy of less than 75 feet.

Ms. Heiniger asked if Staff has gone down Fairmount Avenue. Ms. Browne responded that she had but she did not know if Engineering had done a field survey as part of their review. Ms. Heiniger asked if the side yards are five feet and does that mean new homes could be 55 feet wide. She commented the new home next to her is three stories tall because they wanted a walk-out basement. Ms. Browne stated all the setbacks in the Downers Grove have a height to setback ratio; essentially, the taller the structure, the further back it has to be set. Ms. Heiniger stated if Ms. Browne has seen the subject property, then she has definitely seen the monstrosity that has been built next to her house. She expressed the opinion that the Plan Commission's attitude is if two more half a million dollar homes can be built, that will be more taxes for the Village. Ms. Heiniger stated she did not want her taxes/assessed value raised because someone else can afford a \$750,000 home. Mrs. Reynolds responded that is not how the Plan Commission functions. Mr. Rathje advised that is not how the assessment of taxes works either.

Chairman Jirik reminded everyone that the issue at hand is the appropriateness of granting of a nine plus foot, or a 12% variation. He acknowledged that has been the sole substantive issue he has heard so far this evening.

Mrs. Sharafinski asked what the setback rules are. Chairman Jirik asked Mr. Rathje to address this issue. Mr. Rathje explained in this zoning district which is R-3, the minimum front yard is 30 feet, the minimum rear yard is 20 feet and the minimum side yards are five feet on either side. Mrs. Sharafinski expressed dismay at these numbers. Mr. Rathje noted these are the rules that have made Downers Grove an attractive place to build homes. He advised that these rules have been in place for a long time and work very well. Mr. Rathje further explained if there is a detached garage there is a 10 foot side yard setback requirement on one side because there has to be room for a driveway. Mr. Rathje pointed out all of these minimum setbacks are based on a building height of 20 feet or less. There is more buildable area if the house is built low versus tall. The side and rear yards must be increased at a rate of one foot for each foot of building height over 20 feet. For every foot in height over 20 feet, you lose two feet of buildable width. The front yard, because it is the largest and has a street in front of it, has to be increased at a rate that is half that of the side yard; one foot for every two feet of building height over 20 feet. The calculated height of a house is the average between the eave and the peak. Because you have convergence of lines and the convergence of bulk, the Ordinance gives some concession when calculating building height. The measurement is taken at the midpoint of the roof, generally at the front of the house. Mr. Rathje summarized the taller you go, the bigger the setbacks and the smaller the buildable area is.

With respect to the comments regarding what is going on in Hinsdale, up until relatively recently, Hinsdale actually allowed homes to be built based on the non-conforming yards of the previous home that existed on the property. They now follow a criteria similar to ours; the taller you go, the smaller your footprint and further away from the neighboring properties your structure has to be. Mr. Rathje commented if you build low, you can build wider; if you build tall, the buildable area decreases. Mr. Rathje emphasized for every foot over 20 feet in height, you lose two feet of buildable width and one and one-half feet of buildable depth. He pointed out it is a fairly substantial reduction.

Mr. Carlquist asked if there is also a requirement about building in front of an adjacent house. Mr. Rathje said no and explained that there used to be a provision in the Ordinance regarding the average setback of the block. However, it was determined to be so patently unfair that the Zoning Commission and the Village Council said the Ordinance was never meant to end up doing the things it was doing. If people arbitrarily chose to go back further, then they were in effect telling the neighbors they would have to give up some of their buildable. If they setback further because they chose to go taller, it took away the rights of the neighbors to build and use their property in a reasonable manner. Mr. Rathje pointed out the Ordinance went back to its real intent of the front setback being defined for each zoning district, and then the taller you go, the further you must be set back.

Mark Morrison stated he was actually here for the Middaugh-Brookbank petition which has been continued, but he decided to stay for the meeting to see how the Plan

Commission functions. He asked if the setback requirements include patios and decks. Mr. Rathje stated an at-grade slab could go into a required yard, a deck can encroach five feet into a required rear yard and there are some additional rules for detached garages.

Chairman Jirik asked if there were any other questions or comments. As there were no further questions or comments, Chairman Jirik declared the public participation portion of the hearing closed.

Chairman Jirik asked if there were any comments or questions from the Plan Commission members. Mr. McCombs referred to the locator map displayed on the overhead screen and noted it appears there are already six 65 foot wide lots in the enclave. Mr. Waechtler asked how many blocks were encompassed to come up with six 65 foot wide lots. Mr. McCombs advised that he was referring to the property between Fairmount and Lyman. Mr. Waechtler asked for the lot numbers, and Mr. Rathje highlighted the lots on the locator map displayed. Mr. Waechtler asked if there were any other 60 foot wide lots in the immediate area. Mr. Rathje pointed out two lots with 58 foot widths. He noted those were in older subdivisions. The lot to the north of Lot No. 043 scales out to 63-65 feet, and Lot No. 038 is at 65.65 feet. Mr. Waechtler pointed out there are quite a few 80 and 90 foot wide lots in the whole area.

Mr. Fluck stated he was sympathetic to one thing Mr. Carlquist said. Mr. Fluck expressed concern that what we are doing here is supporting a trend to smaller lots. He is concerned that such a trend can feed upon itself and result in a constant movement to smaller lots. Mr. Fluck recalled that Mr. Carlquist referred to the 75 foot wide policy. Mr. Fluck pointed out it is not that simple. The Village has a policy of 75 feet with the possibility for an exception from that standard. If it were an iron-clad rule, it would be one thing, but it is not a iron-clad rule. Mr. Fluck indicated this is a tough call. The Plan Commission has been asked in prior meetings to consider reductions that are less than 1%, and we have actually had trouble with some of those. This is a reduction that in his opinion is getting near the upper limit of what he would regard as still trying to carry forward the 75 foot wide policy and also recognize the character of the community. Mr. Fluck noted every time a lot split is on the agenda, it seems as though a lot of the audience has comments on the character of the buildings that are going to be built. Mr. Fluck expressed his opinion that is not the primary issue. Someone could build a monstrous house on a lot that was 75 feet wide. He concluded that this petition is not an easy call.

Mrs. Reynolds pointed out the style and size of a house is not the business of the Plan Commission.

Mr. Rathje advised that the Village was faced with zoning long after it had a significant establishment of lot patterns that were developed prior to zoning. Zoning is something that started in 1923, and Downers Grove was one of the first, if not the first, community in DuPage County to having zoning. Categories of zoning had to be applied on large areas where every lot was not necessarily identical. In some parts of town you can go block after block and every lot falls within one half of one percent of the size of the rest

of the lots. Mr. Rathje pointed out in those areas the Plan Commission very rarely sees petitions for lot splits because there is an extraordinarily well-established neighborhood. Other neighborhoods have an extraordinary breadth of lot characteristics. The Subdivision Control Ordinance carries the right for the Plan Commission to hear and the Village Council to grant exceptions because every lot does not fit exactly the same size. Mr. Rathje emphasized 75 feet is the minimum lot width in the R-3 zoning district. There has to be a way to review and give consideration to variations short of everything being adjudicated. The Zoning Ordinance and the Subdivision Control Ordinance were set up so that the local jurisdiction has a right to deal with exceptions so matters don't always have to go to court.

Mr. Waechtler stated he read in the petitioner's letter in the packet that Mr. Michael Long is a realtor. He asked Mr. Long if that was true, and Mr. Long responded affirmatively. Mr. Waechtler asked if it was also true that he in a nephew of the owner of the property Mrs. Guilfoile. Mr. Long stated he is her nephew.

Mr. Waechtler indicated he wanted to address a criticism made by a member of the audience earlier. The Plan Commission has dealt with lot splits before, and the same criteria are used to evaluate all proposals that have exceptions. The Plan Commission is not here to increase revenue and get more taxes for the Village of Downers Grove.

Mr. Waechtler then expressed his strong reservations about this particular petition. Mr. Waechtler indicted he drove the whole street from 55th to 59th. He noted he is very familiar with the area as he lives six blocks south of it. He agreed that there is a difference in character between Fairmount Avenue and Lyman Avenue. For clarification, he noted that although 26% of the lots on Lyman are less than 75 feet wide, by the same token 74% of the lots are more than 75 feet wide. Mr. Waechtler noted the Plan Commission hears petitions for lot splits fairly frequently. He looks at the locator maps in each case, and this is the first time that it appears to him that there is not a preponderance of lots in the area that are less than 75 feet.

Mr. Waechtler questioned the use of Lyman Avenue for comparative purposes, but on Lyman Avenue, 67% of those lots are 75 feet wide or more.

Mr. Waechtler commented that he believes clarification and a more thorough investigation are needed on the floodplain issue before the Commission makes a decision to consider the proposed lot split. He does not want to put the cart before the horse. He wants to know whether or not it is even possible to put two homes on this parcel before the Plan Commission even considers a lot split.

Mr. Waechtler stated when he drove the area he saw a creek, and he did see the area north of the proposed house which is being referred to as a floodplain area. Mr. Waechtler stated he looked at the area very closely and drove past it twice.

Mr. Michael Long agreed with Mr. Waechtler that Fairmount Avenue should not be compared to Lyman Avenue.

Mr. Waechtler stated he is more uncomfortable with this lot split than with any other lot split that has come before the Plan Commission because of the preponderance of larger-sized lots. Mr. Waechtler referred to the five criteria the Plan Commission must consider in granting an exception. Number one is the impact on the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Waechtler stated this lot split would have an adverse impact in his opinion. Number two has to do with whether the exception is consistent with the trend of development in the area and the surrounding uses. Because of the very small percentage of small lots, Mr. Waechtler stated this criteria is not satisfied.

Mr. Waechtler advised the residents that regardless of how the Plan Commission votes tonight, they need to be aware that when the Commission's recommendation comes before the Village Council, they still have the right to be heard by the Council. Mr. Rathje asked Mr. Waechtler if he would consider tabling further consideration until some of the floodplain and wetland issues are studied and reported on to the Plan Commission. Mr. Waechtler stated he would still have reservations but would like to know what the floodplain situation is. Mr. Rathje stated for the petitioner's understanding and benefit, if the lot sizes are unacceptable; regardless of the floodplain characteristics, then the matter should be dealt with on the basis of its lot sizes. If the lot sizes are generally acceptable to the Plan Commission, then a message should be given in that respect so that the petitioner could know whether or not he should put forth the additional expense and effort to make determinations of wetlands and floodplain. Mr. Rathje explained in order to do the additional homework, there would be some expense on the part of the petitioners. Mr. Rathje pointed out at some place the petitioners need to establish a foundation with the Village as far as the acceptability of their proposal. If the property was void of floodplain but still unacceptable for the proposed lot split, that is the message that should be conveyed to the petitioners..

Mr. Waechtler stated if the property was high and dry, the proposed lot split would still be unacceptable to him. His point regarding the flood plain is that in the future when such matters come before the Plan Commission, he would like to have that matter resolved before any consideration of a lot split.

Chairman Jirik commented the floodplain issue is not within the Plan Commission's jurisdiction. There are other branches of government as well as the Village's Engineering Department that assure these matters are resolved prior to permits being issued. Chairman Jirik stated he does not want to see the Plan Commission require information that does not fall within our purview and is not something upon which a decision should be based.

Chairman Jirik asked Staff to confirm the widths of Lots -040 and -041 to the north of the subject property. Mr. Rathje responded that both lots are 65.65 feet wide. The Carlquists protested that one of those lots is not buildable, and they receive two tax bills for their parcel. The creek is on their north boundary, and their property is 130 feet wide in total. The divided line as shown on the displayed map is their total property. They added the side where the creek is has been declared unbuildable.

Chairman Jirik asked if Lot No. -038 is 65 or 85 feet wide. Mr. Rathje advised that Lot No.-038 is 65 feet wide. Mr. Carlquist pointed out that Lot Nos. -038, -058, -062 and -063 have one owner, and Mrs. Carlquist noted the house is built across these lots. Lots -062 and -063 are in a flood plain.

Chairman Jirik noted on the west side of Lyman Avenue there are two 58 foot wide lots, a 65 foot wide lot and everything else is large.

Mrs. Reynolds commented that it appeared to her that the petitioner intends to raze the existing house so a purchaser could come in and build a gigantic house without splitting the lot. A comment was made by a member of the audience that would be all right because such a house would be located on a large sized property.

Chairman Jirik pointed out that the objectors present this evening have repeatedly stated that 65 foot wide lots are not harmonious with the neighborhood.

Mr. Fluck noted Lot -063 is 150 feet wide so it could be divided into two, 75 foot wide lots. He stated that is the only lot in the area that could be split into two lots with conforming lot widths. Mr. Rathje concurred.

Mrs. Reynolds commented the Plan Commission's recommendation as well as the minutes will convey the message to the Village Council.

Chairman Jirik asked if there were any further comments or questions from the Plan Commission members. There being none, he called for a motion.

MOTION: MRS. REYNOLDS MOVED WITH RESPECT TO FILE NO. 1063 THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL FOR THE PROPOSED LOT SPLIT WHICH INVOLVES LOT WIDTH EXCEPTIONS TO REDUCE THE MINIMUM LOT WIDTH REQUIREMENT FROM 75 FEET TO WIDTHS RANGING FROM 65.65 FEET TO 65.53 FEET FOR EACH RESULTING LOT. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BEING MADE AS THE RESULTING LOTS EXCEED MINIMUM LOT AREA AND DEPTH REQUIREMENTS AND AS THE RESULTING LOTS WILL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE GENERAL SIZE AND NATURE OF THE OTHER LOTS IN THE SURROUNDING AREA. THE PETITIONER ALSO ACKNOWLEDGES THE PRESENCE OF THE FLOODPLAIN AREA ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY AND FURTHER ACKNOWLEDGES THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE ADDITIONAL RIPARIAN AND WETLANDS SUBMITTALS, AS WELL AS THE POSSIBLE RESTRICTIONS AND LIMITATIONS ON FUTURE CONSTRUCTION. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BEING MADE SUBJECT TO THE CONDITION THAT THE EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE ON THE SUBJECT

**PROPERTY BE RAZED PRIOR TO ANY CONSTRUCTION
BEING PERMITTED ON EITHER OF THE RESULTING LOTS.**

Chairman Jirik asked for a second to the motion. There was no response, and Chairman Jirik declared the motion void for lack of a second.

Mr. McCormick advised that he too is struggling with this issue. He suggested that the Plan Commission not act hastily this evening but rather give the matter some further deliberation.

MOTION: WITH RESPECT TO FILE NO. 1063, MR. MCCORMICK MOVED THAT THE MATTER BE CONTINUED TO THE JULY 10, 2001 MEETING IN ORDER TO CONTINUE THE PLAN COMMISSION'S DELIBERATIONS.

Chairman Jirik asked Mr. McCormick if the intent of his motion was to allow the Plan Commission to ask questions of anyone present as part of its deliberation. However, the Plan Commission is not asking for any more information or analysis. Mr. McCormick agreed. Chairman Jirik then asked if there was a second to the motion.

MR. MCCOMBS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Jirik asked if there was any discussion on the motion. There was no response.

ROLL CALL: AYE: Mr. McCormick, Mr. McCombs, Mr. Fluck, Mrs. Reynolds, Mr. Waechtler, Chairman Jirik

NAY: None

The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Jirik stated while the Commission is not asking for any further information from anyone that does not mean the Commission may not have more questions for anyone. Mr. Rathje pointed out the continuation of this petition will be the second item on the July 10, 2001 agenda. He noted the first item on the agenda would have public comment from many of the neighbors.

Chairman Jirik thanked the people in the audience for their attention to the proceedings and their very thoughtful questions and comments.

Mr. & Mrs. Carlquist asked the Plan Commission members to visit Fairmount Avenue if they have not already done so.

Chairman Jirik called for a recess at 8:55 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

FILE NO. 1062

**PUBLIC HEARING – PLANNED DEVELOPMENT #31
ESPLANADE AT LOCUST POINT – FINAL PLANNED
DEVELOPMENT SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE PLAN AND
BUILDING ELEVATION APPROVAL FOR A FREE-
STANDING RESTAURANT AND AN EIGHT STORY
OFFICE BUILDING AND A FIVE LEVEL PARKING DECK**

– Restaurant building located on the south side of Butterfield Road, approximately 230 feet east of Esplanade Road (the site is also bounded by Lacey Road on the south) and the office building and parking deck located on the west side of Lacey Road, approximately 230 feet south of Woodcreek Drive (immediately to the north of the Spiegel Building), Downers Grove, IL (PIN 06-31-103-004, 005, 06-31-300-007, and 06-30-304-001): HP/AG Esplanade at Locust Point Land Limited Partnership, Owner; Gary Mori, Hamilton Partners, Petitioner

Chairman Jirik asked if there was a representative of the petitioner present.

Gary Mori, a partner with Hamilton Partners, 1901 Butterfield Road, Downers Grove. Mr. Mori explained he is the partner who has been in charge of the Esplanade project over the past 16 years.

Mr. Mori stated he has two additional phases of the Esplanade Planned Development to present this evening. One of the phases is on the north end of the planned development at Butterfield Road. They are proposing to build a free-standing restaurant on the easterly portion of the parcel where the tennis courts are currently located. Mr. Mori advised that Hamilton Partners has negotiated a long-term lease with Joseph Carlucci who has a restaurant in Rosemont and is the current owner of Ditka's. Mr. Carlucci recently purchased the Tuscan Grill in Lincolnshire that will be renamed to Carlucci's. The Downers Grove restaurant will be the third Carlucci's restaurant in the Chicago-land area.

Mr. Mori noted he very carefully approached the proposed site because it is "a fishbowl location", and it will front the Esplanade Planned Development. Mr. Mori indicated he worked for several months to come up with the right architectural design. Mr. Mori presented a rendering of the proposed building that will include an enclosed courtyard. He pointed out that the parking would not be readily visible from Butterfield Road because they plan to have a landscaped berm. The building will have a Tuscan look to it. Mr. Mori acknowledged that restaurant businesses go through cycles and while Carlucci's itself may not always be with them, an Italian restaurant will probably always be on that site. Mr. Mori stated with that thought in mind, the restaurant building was designed conservatively so it would be viable through several restaurant trends. Mr. Mori highlighted the tower that will be part of the restaurant building and noted it will contain a wine tasting room.

With respect to the second building that is being proposed as part of this petition, Mr. Mori advised the proposed 3250 Lacey Road office building would be eight stories tall. He pointed out the location of this building in relationship to the Spiegel Building and the Day Care Center. Mr. Mori stated the building will reflect some of the Spiegel Building architecture which has a strong grid system on the east side and a curtain wall on the lake side of the building. Mr. Mori advised the proposed building will have a curtain wall on the east and north sides. Mr. Mori noted they are looking at large tenants such as Spiegel and CNA. Mr. Mori advised currently CNA occupies 40% of the Spiegel building. Mr. Mori explained the proposed building would be supported with a five-story parking garage with the main access from Woodcreek Drive.

Mr. Mori concluded by stating the proposed building and parking deck would be in line with Alter's and Opus' high quality buildings that are also located in Downers Grove. Mr. Mori indicated he would be pleased to answer any questions from the Plan Commission members.

As there were no questions, Chairman Jirik asked Mr. Rathje to present the Staff's findings.

Mr. Rathje explained the two buildings proposed by Hamilton Partners would be the sixth and seventh buildings in the Esplanade Planned Development. The first of the two buildings, the restaurant building, sits on a 2.733 acre portion of the Esplanade Planned Development immediately to the south of Butterfield Road and immediately west of I-355. Mr. Rathje stated the proposal calls for the construction of an 11,400 square foot restaurant building that will have a 10,500 square foot floor area with a 900 square foot second floor which is primarily to be used as a storage room. The building will measure 132 feet 11 inches as measured from east to west at the widest point and 107 feet 5 inches from north to south at the deepest point. The main roof will have a height of 26 feet 3 inches, while the tower will have a height of 47 feet 8 inches. In addition to the interior space, there is an outdoor seating area of 1,000 square feet which is to be located within the walled garden area located adjacent to the southeasterly wall of the proposed building.

Mr. Rathje noted the building will be setback a distance ranging from 117 feet 5 inches to 120 feet 5 inches south of the north property line adjacent to Butterfield Road, and will be setback 113 feet 1 inch north of the north line of the Lacey Road property line on the south. Additionally, the building will have a side yard along the east adjacent to the Tollway of approximately 80 feet.

With respect to parking, Mr. Rathje indicated the Zoning Ordinance provides two different parking ratios for restaurants. In general, restaurants are to provide a minimum of one parking space per 100 gross square feet of floor area including any area devoted to outdoor seating. For the floor area of a restaurant occupied by the bar or lounge element of a restaurant, parking at the rate of three parking spaces per 100 square feet of floor area is required. Mr. Rathje noted that parking calculations are being based upon a total floor area of 11,400 square feet and an outdoor seating area of 1,000 square feet. Further,

1,150 square feet of the interior of the restaurant is being proposed as a bar/lounge area. On that basis, the developer must provide 34.5 parking spaces for the bar/lounge portion of the building while the remaining square footage of the restaurant building and outdoor seating area will require 112.5 parking spaces for a total of 147 parking spaces. The petitioner's site plan indicates that there will be 148 parking spaces provided including five handicap parking spaces. Mr. Rathje pointed out the total number of spaces and the number of handicap spaces satisfy the Zoning Ordinance as well as the State of Illinois' Accessibility Code.

With respect to access, Mr. Rathje recalled when the Plan Commission went through preliminary planned development approval for this phase a very careful look was taken at the issue of access to this site as well as a possible future bank that may be built on the property to the west where the tennis courts are currently located. What is being proposed is the southeasterly driveway is to be developed with a left turning lane and will permit right-in, right-out, left-in and left-out turning movements. The driveway near the southwesterly corner of the site will be limited to right in and right out movements only as there is a barrier median centered within the right of way of Lacey Road which will preclude left-in and left-out movements. Mr. Rathje noted the petitioner and the Staff have worked very hard at getting good vehicle circulation for delivery, for patron convenience and for safety. Sight distance issues were very carefully considered as well as other traffic movement.

With respect to landscaping and green space, Mr. Rathje indicated Ms. Von der Heide, the Village Forester, found the proposed landscape plan to be very acceptable.. Mr. Rathje referred to landscape plan included in the Staff report that showed four islands on the south side of the parking lot and noted they have now been eliminated from the site plan. He noted the islands that were eliminated were of no significance.

With respect to the amount of open space, Mr. Rathje recalled that the Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum of 20% of the area of an O-R-M planned development be set aside as landscaped or wet areas. In the case of a planned development, the area is calculated over the entire land area of the planned development in a manner similar to how floor area ratio is assessed over the entire land area of the planned development. This phase will have just about double the minimum of 20% with 48,135 square feet or 40.43% of the area of this phase is to be developed as open space. On an overall basis, it is anticipated that upon the ultimate development of the planned development there will be a significant amount of landscaped area provided above the 20% minimum requirement.

Mr. Rathje explained the second phase that Hamilton is seeking current final approval for is the proposed 3450 Lacey Road office building to be located near the south end of the site. The petitioner's plans call for an eight story, 241,765 square foot office building on approximately 6.377 acres. This development site is to be located just to the south of the Day Care Center and to the north of the Spiegel Building.

Mr. Rathje stated the proposed eight-story office building is to have maximum overall dimensions of 274 feet 2 inches from east to west and 122 feet 9 inches from north to

south. The building is to have a height of 107 feet to the top of the parapet wall with a maximum height of 121 feet to the top of the mechanical penthouse.

Mr. Rathje indicated the building setback minimum is 72 feet 6 inches based on the height of 107 feet. All other yards are internal to the planned development. For reference purposes, Mr. Rathje explained the proposed building will be located approximately 400 feet south of Wood Creek Drive, approximately 870 feet east of the planned development's west property line, approximately 750 feet north of the planned development's south property line and will be sited approximately 250 feet to the northeast of the Spiegel Building. Additionally, the building will be approximately 190 feet to the south of the Day Care building.

Mr. Rathje stated the building is designed to be built with a warm, limestone grey precast with green-tone reflective glazing. Mr. Rathje commented Mr. Mori's colored architectural renderings that he presented earlier are much more attractive than the black and white two-dimensional elevation drawings included in the packet. Mr. Rathje stated these proposed buildings would be typical of the Hamilton Partners' quality. Mr. Rathje emphasized that Hamilton Partners have done an extraordinarily good job on this planned development.

The second building that is to be constructed as part of the office phase is the 4-story, 5-level parking deck that is to be sited to the immediate northwest of the corner of the office building. The deck is to have an east to west dimension of 183 feet and a north to south dimension of 303 feet. The deck is to have a height of 44 feet 5 inches to the top deck, 48 feet 3 inches to the top parapet wall and a maximum height of 56 feet 11 inches to the top of the elevator/stair tower. The deck is to have parking capacity for 905 spaces of which nine are to be handicap-sized spaces. All deck spaces are to be full-sized deck spaces per the provision of the Zoning Ordinance with no compact-sized spaces being proposed.

Mr. Rathje indicated total parking on the site including the deck would be 947 spaces. There are 42 exterior spaces; 32 spaces are to be located in the front of the building and ten spaces are to be located near the southwest corner of the deck. Of that total, there are to be nine handicap parking spaces inside the deck and ten handicap spaces to be located in the surface lot area adjacent to the building's front entrance. According to the State Accessibility Standards, a minimum of 19 handicap spaces must be provided which are indeed going to be provided.

With respect to access, Mr. Rathje explained this phase of development would be served by two existing driveways and one new driveway. The two existing driveways include the Lacey Road driveway that is currently the principal entrance to the Spiegel building. The petitioner's plans propose a "branching" of the driveway that will provide access and egress to the south side of the new parking deck.

The second Lacey Road driveway is to be a right-in, right-out only driveway as there is a barrier median in Lacey Road opposite the proposed driveway's location. This driveway

will provide access to the east side of the parking deck and to the surface spaces at the front entrance to the proposed building.

Finally, the building is to have access via a driveway that intersects Wood Creek Drive. There is a current driveway located approximately 320 feet west of the west right of way line of Lacey Road that serves the Day Care Center. The curb cut is to remain in the same location; however, in order to segregate the Day Care Center traffic from the office traffic, the driveway is proposed to be curved somewhat to the west, and the Day Care Center parking lot is to be expanded by 15 spaces. Access to the Day Care Center will still be via the same driveway, but there will be no traffic to and from the office building traveling through the Day Care Center parking lot. Mr. Rathje noted he and Mr. Mori worked hard to arrive at a solution which avoids the traffic from the parking deck running through the day care center parking lot.

With respect to landscaping and green space for the 3450 Lacey Road office phase, Mr. Rathje noted the landscape plan was found to be acceptable by the Village Forester. .

With respect to the amount of open space, Mr. Rathje explained the minimum amount of open space that is necessary in order to maintain a proportional 20% of the land area devoted to open space when calculated on a proportionate manner for this site would be 49,554 square feet or 1.137 acres. The petitioner's site plan indicates that 86,922 square feet or 35.1% of the area of this phase is to be developed as open space.

With respect to traffic volume, Mr. Rathje recalled when the Village Council approved the planned development in 1990, a traffic management limitation of 2,494,329 square feet of floor area, which was based upon a conservative estimation of the traffic handling capacity of the roadway and intersection infrastructure, was imposed. Mr. Rathje pointed out the construction of the Tollway on the east side of the planned development has been a blessing as well as a curse because it limits any access or egress from the longest property frontage. The presence of the Forest Preserve District to the west is a blessing as it creates a wonderful setting, but it too does not allow for any traffic in or out of the planned development.

Mr. Rathje noted the construction of the proposed 11,400 square foot restaurant building and the 241,765 square foot office building will increase the floor area within the Esplanade Planned Development to a total of 2,093,408 square feet. This will leave 400,921 square feet of additional building floor area that Hamilton Partners may develop prior to having to undertake a traffic study to determine if there is adequate roadway and intersection capacity to handle additional traffic generated from this planned development.

Mr. Rathje stated this is something that Hamilton Partners and the Village have been working on and have been discussing on a rather frequent basis.

With respect to floor area ratio, Mr. Rathje recalled in 1998 Hamilton added the Doubletree Hotel to the Esplanade Planned Development but Hamilton specified that they would not try to take advantage of the additional unused floor area ratio from the

total site when the land was transferred from the Wood Creek Planned Development to the Esplanade Planned Development.

Based on the original 94.951 acres of the Esplanade planned development, Mr. Rathje stated upon the completion of the proposed buildings the resulting floor area ratio sub-total will be approximately 0.5061 out of 1.0.

Mr. Rathje concluded the Planning Staff would strongly recommend that the Plan Commission forward a positive recommendation for the proposed two building phases as the plans have been prepared consistent with all previous approvals. Mr. Rathje commented that Mr. Jungwirth has found the stormwater management issues have been taken care of, and the engineering that will be necessary for the completion of these buildings is advanced enough that Mr. Jungwirth is confident Hamilton Partners will be able to meet all of his criteria.

Chairman Jirik asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak regarding this matter. Hearing no response, Chairman Jirik closed the public participation portion of the public hearing.

Chairman Jirik next asked if there were any questions or comments from the Plan Commission members.

Mr. McCormick stated the Esplanade Planned Development is a feather in Downers Grove's cap. Other Commission members agreed.

Mr. Fluck asked if in the future, could the renderings rather than building elevation drawings be included in the Plan Commission packet. Mr. Rathje responded that he did not know if it would always be possible to get such illustrations in time to include them in the packet, but where possible, they will be included.. Mr. Rathje pointed out the two dimensional building elevation line drawings are the drawings which are normally included in the Planned Development Ordinance.

Hearing no further comments or questions, Chairman Jirik called for a motion.

MOTION: WITH RESPECT TO FILE NO. 1062 – PUBLIC HEARING – PLANNED DEVELOPMENT #31 ESPLANADE AT LOCUST POINT, MRS. REYNOLDS MOVED THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL FOR THE PROPOSED FINAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE PLAN AND BUILDING ELEVATION PLANS FOR THE TWO PROPOSED PHASES, SPECIFICALLY THE PROPOSED RESTAURANT PHASE LOCATED SOUTH OF BUTTERFIELD ROAD, EASTERLY OF ESPLANADE ROAD AND THE OFFICE BUILDING PHASE COMMONLY KNOWN AS 3450 LACEY ROAD. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS BEING MADE AS THESE

TWO PHASES OF THE ESPLANADE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ARE BEING PROPOSED IN A MANNER SUBSTANTIALLY IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE OVERALL PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN FOR THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AND AS THE PROPOSED PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT MAINTAIN CONSISTENCY WITH THE CONDITIONS OF SECTION 28-1607 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE. MR. MCCOMBS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chairman Jirik asked if there were any questions regarding the content or the intent of the motion. There was no response, and he then asked if there was any discussion regarding the motion. Again, there was no response.

ROLL CALL: AYE: Mrs. Reynolds, Mr. McCombs, Mr. Fluck, Mr. McCormick, Mr. Waechtler, Chairman Jirik

NAY: None

The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Jirik pointed out this is a recommendation that will be forwarded to the Mayor and the Village Council for their consideration in approximately one month.

As there was no further business, Chairman Jirik called for a motion to adjourn. **Mr. McCormick moved to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Waechtler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.** The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.