

MINUTES
REGULAR PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
JANUARY 9, 2020

Call to Order

The regular meeting of the Plan Commission was called to order by Chairperson Mary Loch at 7:00 p.m. Plan Commissioners Lloyd Berry, Angela, Fanella, Phillip Hartweg, Tracy Heming-Littwin, John Mulherin, David Rodemann, Mohammed Saeed and Jamie Vondruska were present. Also present were Community Development Director Staci Springer, Village Planner Kelly Purvis, Village Planner Katie Ashbaugh, Associate Planner Cole Jackson, Trustee Bill Enright and Recording Secretary Debbie Solomon.

Public Comment

No general comments on non-agenda items were made by the public at this Plan Commission meeting.

Approval of December 12, 2019 Plan Commission Minutes

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Commissioner Hartweg, to approve the minutes of the December 12, 2019 Regular Plan Commission minutes. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Pre-Application Meeting – 401 Taft Avenue – Children of America Daycare

Staff Introduction

Village Planner Ashbaugh stated the petitioner is requesting a pre-application meeting to obtain informal feedback on concept plans for the proposed new construction of a one-story 10,000 square-foot, daycare facility and related site improvements on the property located at 401 Taft Avenue. Village Planner Ashbaugh stated the subject property is on the south side of Taft Avenue, and this property is Lot 5 of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) that was approved by the Village Board on November 13, 2017.

Village Planner Ashbaugh showed an aerial view of the site and also showed the existing conditions on the site. Village Planner Ashbaugh explained what would be reviewed once the petitioner submits a formal application for this property. Village Planner Ashbaugh stated the surrounding zoning is C3 Service Commercial to the north, CR Conservation Recreation to the south and west (Village Links) and C4 Office to the east.

Village Planner Ashbaugh provided background on the PUD and stated Andy's Frozen Custard is on Lot 1, under Ordinance 6586, and Lot 3 is Buona Beef, under Ordinance 6610. Village Planner Ashbaugh stated Lot 5 is 0.84 acres, and this was previously an out lot for Enterprise Rent-A-Car to store additional rental vehicles. Village Planner Ashbaugh stated Lot 5 has 277.5 feet of frontage along Taft Avenue, and there are two points of access to Lot 5.

Village Planner Ashbaugh showed the approved preliminary site plan from the entire PUD and the proposed site plan and stated in the PUD, Lot 5 was designed as a two-story 10,000 square-foot office building with 40 parking stalls and is zoned C4 Office. Village Planner Ashbaugh stated the proposed building for the daycare would be one story with the same square footage. Village Planner Ashbaugh stated a daycare is a Special Use in C4 Office. Village Planner Ashbaugh stated the petitioner is proposing 22 parking stalls with a fenced-in outdoor play area. Village Planner Ashbaugh showed the proposed elevations and reviewed the proposed materials.

Village Planner Ashbaugh stated as the Plan Commission is reviewing the project, they may want to provide feedback or clarify the following:

1. Additional operational details
2. The function of the east driveway
3. The total of 7 required deviations for Lot 5 from the Zoning Code, 5 of which are setback deviations
4. The location of the west driveway
5. The additional five 60-degree parking stalls
6. The width of the drive aisle/drive-thru lane for the 60-degree parking stalls
7. The location of the pergola as the required quasi-public open space

Questions from the Plan Commission

None

Petitioner's Presentation

Ken Adams, representing petitioner Storebuild, LLC, stated the size of the building has to do with the classrooms for the different age groups and the amenities the building will have, and

the size is what is needed to serve the community. Mr. Adams stated most of the deviations are due to the size of the building. Mr. Adams stated per the protocol, parents are required to park, bring the children to their classrooms and check the children in. Mr. Adams stated Children of America does prefer 20 parking spaces, and the diagonal spaces are convenient for parents who are bringing their children into the facility.

Questions from the Plan Commission

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked about turning the drive aisle. Mr. Adams stated originally, they were anticipating queueing, but their client says their protocol is strictly followed with no queueing. Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated it might make more sense if the passenger side of vehicles was along the curb for safety reasons. Commissioner Vondruska asked if the drive aisle is suitable for two cars to which Mr. Adams stated it is not. Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated she feels there might not be enough parking. Mr. Adams stated he will take this concern back to the client.

Chairperson Loch asked about shifting the westernmost curb cut to the east. Mr. Adams stated the main entrance is in the center of the building, and if they do this, it would be right at the curb. Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated someone from the Fire Department needs to review this and say that the curb cuts would be fine.

Commissioner Fanella stated the staff memo says there could be possibly 30 employees, but the petitioner is only proposing 22 parking spaces. Mr. Adams stated he cannot speak to that as he does not know the staffing numbers for this daycare, but he will ensure this information is ready for the formal application. Mr. Adams stated he will ensure there is a better understanding of operations for the formal application as well. Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if there is handicapped parking. Mr. Adams stated there will be one handicapped space in front.

Commissioner Saeed asked how much square footage per child is required by the state. Mr. Adams stated he believes the petitioner has taken this into account as the daycare has to be approved and licensed. Commissioner Saeed stated he thinks they can reduce the size of the building.

Commissioner Fanella stated this daycare will fulfill a need in Glen Ellyn, and she appreciates the petitioner bringing this to Glen Ellyn.

Commissioner Vondruska asked about a retaining wall for the flood plain. Mr. Adams stated there will be a retaining wall in the back.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated she looked up the state requirements for daycares, and there needs to be approximately 45 to 55 square feet per child depending on the ages in the classroom. Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated with what the petitioner is proposing, it is approximately 66 square feet per child, and this does not take in account washrooms, a kitchen and other necessary space.

Commissioner Rodemann stated the amount of kids on this site feels too tight, and he is not crazy about putting signage on Roosevelt Road. Mr. Adams stated when they were there for the PUD, it was agreed two monument signs were fine and that Lot 5 could be on the monument signs. Mr. Adams stated at that time, staff said the sign variations for Lot 5 could wait for variations until a formal application came in.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked what material is proposing to be used in the play area. Mr. Adams stated he is not sure on this.

Chairperson Loch asked if there were any concerns on the setbacks or the placement of the pergola. No Plan Commissioner had issues with these. Chairperson Loch stated this is a good start and the Plan Commission is looking forward to seeing the formal application.

Public Hearing – 552 Crescent Boulevard – Tutto Bene – Construction Necessitated Variations

On the agenda was a public hearing to consider construction necessitated variations to allow multiple pergolas and an arbor on the property at 552 Crescent Boulevard.

PUBLIC HEARING – 552 CRESCENT BOULEVARD – TUTTO BENE – CONSTRUCTION NECESSITATED VARIATIONS

PUBLIC HEARING WITH DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING CONSTRUCTION NECESSITATED VARIATIONS TO ALLOW MULTIPLE PERGOLAS AND AN ARBOR ON THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 552 CRESCENT BOULEVARD.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Commissioner Hartweg, to open the public hearing at 7:49 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Staff Introduction

Sworn in for the Village was Village Planner Purvis.

Village Planner Purvis provided an overview of the project and stated the petitioner is requesting approval of construction necessitated variations to allow commercial accessory

buildings other than a storage garage or parking lot and to allow accessory structures in the front yard instead of the rear yard, to allow five accessory structures, four being of the same type in lieu of the three maximum accessory structures and only one of each type permitted on the lot. Village Planner Purvis stated the petitioner is Paula Basile, owner of Tutto Bene Pizzeria Restaurant, and tenant of 552 Crescent Boulevard. Village Planner Purvis stated the property is a corner lot located on the northwest corner of Crescent Boulevard and Forest Avenue in the C5A Zoning District. Village Planner Purvis stated the lot is improved with a commercial building, four pergolas and an arbor. Village Planner Purvis stated the surrounding land uses are C5A Commercial to the north and west, CR to the south and C5B to the west. Village Planner Purvis stated notice of the public hearing was published in the December 24, 2019 edition of the Daily Herald, mailed to property owners within 250 feet of the property and a placard was placed on the property.

Village Planner Purvis stated the petitioner recently became a tenant in the building located at 552 Crescent Boulevard, and she is the owner of Tutto Bene Pizzeria Restaurant, Inc. Village Planner Purvis stated Mrs. Basile made improvements to the property and also added four pergolas and an arbor within the existing fenced-in patio area. Village Planner Purvis stated three of the pergolas and the arbor are located in the front of the building and one of the pergolas is located on the corner side of the building. Village Planner Purvis stated the pergolas are Code-compliant in terms of their size and their spacing from one another. Village Planner Purvis stated in the application, Mrs. Basile indicated that she was not aware of the Village regulations which prohibit these accessory structures and was trying to make improvements to her business. Village Planner Purvis stated if the variations were approved, the variations would remain with the property.

Village Planner Purvis stated the Village Code does not allow accessory structures or buildings other than parking lots or storage garages in the C5A zoning district, and the Code also prohibits accessory structures in the front and corner side yards in the C5A district. Village Planner Purvis stated the Code limits the number of accessory structures to three on one lot with no more than one of each kind of accessory structure.

Village Planner Purvis showed an overview of the site and stated as typical with construction necessitated variations, staff did request additional materials from the petitioner, including a timeline of events that led to the construction of the structures in violation of the Code as well as a list of alternatives with pricing for each of the options. Village Planner Purvis stated Mrs. Basile has indicated that she had the pergolas constructed in August 2019, and the Village placed a stop-work order on her property on August 30th. Village Planner Purvis stated Mrs. Basile did then discuss alternatives with the staff and determined the best option would be to request variances to allow the accessory structures to remain on the lot. Village Planner Purvis stated staff has suggested the petitioner use umbrellas over the tables and chairs as an alternative to the pergolas.

Plan Commission Questions

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if the pergolas are completed. Village Planner Purvis stated she believes the pergolas are structurally completed, but that painting and some other things are not completed.

Sworn in was Community Development Director Springer.

Community Development Director Springer stated prior to three years ago, there were picnic tables on this property. Community Development Director Springer stated about three years ago, the Village went through a review of plumbing codes, and this property and 15 others were not compliant. Community Development Director Springer stated the Village told the prior lessee on the property that there either needed to be a bathroom available to the public to increase the number of seats allowed, or they would need to reduce the seats outside. Community Development Director Springer stated the lessee decided to go down to 8 seats outside. Community Development Director Springer stated the Village in assisting Mrs. Basile with talking to the state regarding the number of current seats outside when there is no public restroom available. Community Development Director Springer stated the Illinois Plumbing Code states without accessible public restrooms at the establishment, the number of employees on site at any one time plus the number of patron seats shall not exceed 10.

Petitioner's Presentation

Sworn in for the Petitioner was Paula Basile, owner of Tutto Bene Pizzeria Restaurant, Inc. and tenant of 552 Crescent Boulevard.

Mrs. Basile showed prior pictures of the property and stated the pergolas and arbor were put in to add a cozier atmosphere so the space did not look so big and empty. Mrs. Basile stated they also added planters and flowers as to make the property more welcoming. Mrs. Basile reviewed the construction timeline up until the stop-work order.

Plan Commission Questions

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked why they added pergolas. Mrs. Basile stated they wanted to clean up the area while balancing the area out. Mrs. Basile stated the pergolas are not in the walkway and are on private property. Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked what is left to be done for the pergola construction. Mrs. Basile stated it took a month to build the pergolas, and they are currently structurally-sound and only need painting.

Commissioner Rodemann asked if the pergolas are moveable. Mrs. Basile stated the pergolas have foundations, are cemented and are either bolted to the building or the ground.

Public Comment

Susan Johanson, who owns the Glen Ellyn Sweet Shoppe at 550 Crescent Boulevard, stated she is a long-time neighbor with Mrs. Basile. Ms. Johanson stated Mrs. Basile has done a great service to Glen Ellyn as the corner is really great. Ms. Johanson stated Mrs. Basile has tried hard to make the property beautiful. Ms. Johanson asked the Plan Commission to do whatever they can to help work these variations out.

Leonard Cada, who resides at 844 Crescent Boulevard, stated he has known the Basiles for a few years. Mr. Cada stated the Basiles did a great job fixing this property up when they put the pergolas in. Mr. Cada stated he has also heard a lot of great comments about the property and the pergolas. Mr. Cada stated he would hate to see these pergolas torn down. Mr. Cada stated the Basiles are dedicated people.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Commissioner Hartweg, to close the public hearing at 8:20 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Plan Commission Comments

Commissioner Mulherin stated he did want to disclose that he has had a professional relationship with Dr. Riazul Haque, the owner of the property, for 25 years but he does feel the need to recuse himself from this vote.

Commissioner Berry stated he is not usually a fan of asking for forgiveness. Commissioner Berry stated if the restroom issue can be fixed, he would support the variations. Commissioner Berry stated he physically inspected the pergolas, and they look good. Commissioner Berry asked that the petitioner finish painting the pergolas, and that all pergolas be the same color. Commissioner Berry requested that the stairway be painted too.

Commissioner Vondruska stated he agrees with Commissioner Berry. Commissioner Vondruska stated the corner was just a slab of concrete and what they have done with the property so far is great. Commissioner Vondruska stated he is fine with recommending approval of the variations.

Commissioner Fanella agreed with Commissioners Berry and Vondruska.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated she personally thinks it looks a bit cluttered and would rather see only two pergolas in front and none on the side. Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if the Vespa is considered an accessory structure. Village Planner Purvis stated the Vespa is not technically considered an accessory structure, but rather public art. Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated the arbor looks nice. Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated she is fine with the arbor and two pergolas staying.

Commissioner Saeed stated the petitioner needs to resolve the plumbing issue with the state. Commissioner Saeed stated he would prefer only two pergolas in front, instead of three.

Commissioner Hartweg stated the property has been improved. Commissioner Hartweg stated three pergolas together may be overdone. Commissioner Hartweg stated he likes the Vespa. Commissioner Hartweg stated it is a positive thing that the Basiles are doing something different. Commissioner Hartweg stated he would recommend approving the variations.

Commissioner Mulherin stated the Basiles have done a great job, and he would be fine with keeping all the pergolas or limiting to two.

Commissioner Rodemann stated the arbor is fine, and he supports keeping the structures.

Chairperson Loch stated she thought it looked cluttered in the pictures, but she did like the look of the property much better once she saw the property in person. Chairperson Loch stated she appreciated the comments from the public as well. Chairperson Loch stated she supports recommending the variations.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if the Plan Commission can add a condition regarding the plumbing code issue. Community Development Director Springer stated they cannot link the two as the plumbing code issue is unrelated to the variation requested. Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if the Plan Commission can add a condition that the painting of the pergolas all be consistent. Village Planner Purvis stated they can add a condition that says that all pergolas must be painted the same color. Commissioner Fanella asked about a maintenance clause in the Code. Community Development Director Springer stated the International Property Maintenance Code does say that any peeling or chipped paint does need to be fixed, so the pergolas would need to be maintained.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Commissioner Mulherin, for the following:

After conducting a public hearing and deliberating on the requests of Paula Basile, owner of Tutto Bene Pizzeria Restaurant to allow four pergolas and an arbor to remain on the property

located at 552 Crescent Boulevard, the Plan Commission hereby makes the following Findings of Fact:

1. In regard to the request for approval of Construction Necessitated Variations from Section 10-4-17-1(C)2 of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code to allow commercial accessory buildings other than a storage garage and parking lot on the subject property; and
2. Section 10-4-17-1(C)3c of the Zoning Code to allow accessory structures in the front and corner side yard of the property; and
3. Section 10-5-4(A)3 to allow five accessory structures instead of the three that are permitted and to allow four of the same type of accessory structure instead of one of each type permitted the Plan Commission finds:

Also, included:

- a. That due to the characteristics of the property in questions there are practical difficulties or particular hardship for the applicant/owner in carrying out the strict letter of the Zoning Code because there is no rear yard available on this property due to the construction of a commercial building to the rear lot line.
- b. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return if permitted to be used under the conditions allowed by the Zoning Code because it would not make sense to only have one pergola on the lot (due to the purpose of its use) and there is no available space in the rear of the property in which to put accessory structures.
- c. The granting of the variations will not alter the essential character of the area because the accessory structures enhance and add character to the property and the neighborhood
- d. That the particular physical surroundings, shape or topographical condition of the property in question would bring particular hardship upon the applicant/owner as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the Zoning Code were to be carried out because other lots that do have rear yards would be permitted to have accessory structures. Since this property has no rear yard the petitioner is at a disadvantage.
- e. The conditions upon which the petition for variations is based would not be applicable generally to other property within the same zoning district because other properties within the same district may have available space in the rear of the property for accessory structures.

- f. That the purpose of the variation is not based exclusively upon a desire to make money out of the property in question because the petitioners have invested their own money in the improvements to enhance their business in order to make a more inviting space for their customers.
- g. The alleged difficulty or particular hardship has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property in question or by the applicant because the petitioners leased the building “as is” in its current location which does not allow for Code compliant construction of the pergolas or arbor.
- h. That the granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located because the purpose of the accessory structures is to enhance the corner and not detract from the neighborhood.
- i. That the granting of the variations will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to the adjacent property, substantially increase the hazard from fire or other dangers to the property in question or adjacent property, otherwise impair the public health safety comfort, morals or general welfare of the inhabitants of the Village because these are open air pergolas that will not affect light, air or increase the hazard of fire or otherwise impair general welfare of the Village and will be constructed in accordance with all applicable Building Codes.
- j. That the granting of the variations will not diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood, unduly increase traffic congestion in the public streets and highways or create a nuisance because the accessory structures will be an improvement to the property. The traffic pattern on and around the site will not be changed due to the construction of the accessory structures.
- k. That the variations requested are the minimum variations that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure because the pergolas are needed to frame the seating area and it would not have a cohesive appearance if there were fewer pergolas.

Therefore, having considered the petition of Paula Basile for improvements to property commonly known as 552 Crescent Boulevard, the Plan Commission recommends that the plans and the presentation which included the findings associated with the Construction Necessitated Variations have been satisfied and therefore recommends that the Village Board approve the variations as requested subject to the following conditions:

1. The accessory structures shall remain constructed in substantial conformance with the plans as submitted and the testimony as presented at tonight's meeting;
2. That the petitioner submit a building permit application and the required plans and documents for the Village staff to review the structural integrity of the accessory structures on the lot.
3. All accessory structures must be consistent in color and care.

The motion carried with nine (9) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Plan Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Berry, Fanella, Hartweg, Rodemann, Saeed, Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted "yes." Motion carried.

Public Hearing – Vape, Tobacco and Smoke Shops – Zoning Text Amendments

On the agenda was a public hearing to consider zoning text amendments for Vape, Tobacco and Smoke shops in the Village.

PUBLIC HEARING – VAPE, TOBACCO AND SMOKE SHOPS – ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS

PUBLIC HEARING WITH DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS FOR VAPE, TOBACCO AND SMOKE SHOPS.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Commissioner Hartweg, to open the public hearing at 8:35 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Staff Introduction

Sworn in for the Village were Community Development Director Springer and Village Planner Purvis.

Village Planner Purvis provided background on these zoning text amendments and stated the Plan Commission discussed Zoning Text Amendments for Vape, Tobacco and Smoke shops at the November 14, 2019 meeting. Village Planner Purvis stated at this meeting, the Plan Commission asked staff for more information about how other communities regulate these types of uses and asked for a legal opinion relating to the Village's ability to require a special use permit. Village Planner Purvis stated Associate Planner Jackson did survey eight peer communities, and the survey showed that all of the peer communities allow tobacco stores by-right in at least one commercial zoning district. Village Planner Purvis stated none of the peer communities regulate tobacco and vape shops through a special use permitting process.

Village Planner Purvis stated per the Plan Commission's direction, staff also obtained a legal opinion from Village counsel, and this memo was included in the Plan Commissioners' packets. Village Planner Purvis stated as indicated in the memo, counsel believes that the Village has the authority to regulate retail tobacco and vaping shops as special uses and to evaluate their impact on surrounding properties consistent with the special use standards in Section 10-10-14(E) of the Zoning Code.

Village Planner Purvis stated with these findings, staff believes that it could be appropriate to regulate the location of vape and tobacco shops either through the special use process or by narrowing down what zoning district(s) would be most suitable to allow them as a permitted use. Village Planner Purvis stated staff suggests allowing Vape and Tobacco shops by-right in the C3 Service Commercial District to minimize potential conflicts with sensitive uses such as schools.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if this is for stores that only sell vape, tobacco and smoke. Village Planner Purvis stated it is, and this is clearly stated in the definition. Village Planner Purvis stated if the Village allows these shops by-right in the C3 Commercial District along Roosevelt Road, then they would be clear of all the schools.

Village Planner Purvis stated Findings of Fact do not need to be made for Zoning Code text amendments.

Questions from the Plan Commission

Commissioner Mulherin asked about the shop at Five Corners. Village Planner Purvis stated this shop is in C2 Commercial and not C3.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated the State says if it is a tobacco-only business, you are allowed to smoke in it.

Chairperson Loch stated she is fine with C3.

Commissioner Berry asked about existing shops in other districts. Village Planner Purvis stated these shops would be legally nonconforming and permitted to remain, and if they left that space in the future, a new store would not be allowed to re-open in that location without prior Village approvals.

Public Comment

Anne Gould, who resides at 609 Newton Avenue, stated if they use C3 as a permitted district, then these smoke shops could be close to the Children of America Day Care that was just

discussed. Village Planner Purvis stated there is no specific buffer proposed for these shops. Ms. Gould stated the Plan Commission should then consider a Special Use. Ms. Gould asked if THC products are a part of this to which Village Planner Purvis stated THC products are not included in these Zoning Text Amendments.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Commissioner Hartweg, to close the public hearing at 8:55 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Deliberations from the Plan Commission

There were no deliberations as the Plan Commission was in consensus on allowing vape, tobacco and smoke shops as a by-right use in the C3 Service Commercial District only.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Commissioner Mulherin, to recommend the following:

After conducting a public hearing and deliberating on the Zoning Code Text Amendments dated January 9, 2020, the Plan Commission hereby recommends for approval to the Village Board the Zoning Code Text Amendments as written, which includes the definition of tobacco, vape and smoke shops, adding tobacco, vape and smoke shops as a permitted use in the C3 Service Commercial District and removing tobacco shops as a permitted use in the C5A Central Retail Core Sub-District and C5B Central Service Sub-District.

The motion carried with nine (9) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Plan Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Berry, Fanella, Hartweg, Rodemann, Saeed, Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted "yes." Motion carried.

Chairperson Loch called for a break at 8:59 p.m.

Chairperson Loch reconvened the Plan Commission meeting at 9:02 p.m.

Discussion Item – Architecture Review by the Plan Commission

Village Planner Purvis provided background on Architecture Review and stated from 1975 to 2017, the Village's Architectural Review Commission (ARC) would review any new construction, additions, exterior rehabilitation or exterior remodeling of non-residential principal buildings, multi-family residential principal buildings, attached single family residential buildings and parking lots as well as reviewing any sign variations. Village Planner Purvis stated in July 2017, the Village Board decided it was in the best interest of the Village to

streamline the review process by reducing the number of meetings applicants would need to attend by reallocating the responsibilities of the ARC and dissolving the Commission. Village Planner Purvis stated since then, the Plan Commission has reviewed all applications for sign variations, and the Village staff has conducted the exterior appearance review for the types of projects that the ARC used to review, with final approval from the Village Board.

Village Planner Purvis stated with some of the larger projects that have been reviewed recently, some concerns have been raised that the architecture is not being examined closely enough. Village Planner Purvis stated following internal discussions, the staff has initiated an interim Architecture Appearance Group (AAG) which is an informal group that would evaluate a project's conformance to the Architecture Review Guidelines and provide ideas about how to improve projects in the downtown.

Village Planner Purvis stated the question has been raised if a better long-term solution would be for the Plan Commission to take on the review of exterior appearance.

Village Planner Purvis stated four different options have been discussed:

1. The Plan Commission could choose to review all projects that are required to have an exterior appearance review; or
2. The Plan Commission could choose to review all projects that are required to have exterior appearance review, that are already required to appear before the Plan Commission; or
3. The Plan Commission could review all projects in the downtown that are required to have an exterior appearance review; or
4. The Plan Commission could choose to review only new construction projects that would require exterior appearance review.

Village Planner Purvis reviewed the breakdown of any additional pieces for the Plan Commission and stated there would be approximately six exterior appearance reviews per year to come before the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Fanella asked what the Plan Commission would look at for an exterior appearance review. Village Planner Purvis stated this would include materials used, garbage enclosures and any other details in the design guidelines.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated everyone has their own taste.

Community Development Director Springer stated some of the Village Trustees think the Architecture Review guidelines need to be reviewed.

Commissioner Mulherin stated he likes the idea of some professional review and thinks the AAG would be good. Commissioner Mulherin stated he would like to see a professional assessment, and the professional assessor could then come to the Plan Commission to review the professional's report.

There was a discussion regarding the Plan Commission's options.

Community Development Director Springer stated she like Option #2 where the Plan Commission would review all projects that are required to have exterior appearance review, that are already required to appear before the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Vondruska stated when you look at the aesthetics of the buildings in the Village, Glen Ellyn is a patchwork of architectural styles. Commissioner Rodemann stated it can be subjective, and he likes the eclectic nature of how the Village is.

Commissioner Hartweg stated he served on ARC, and it was very valuable. Commissioner Hartweg stated it helps to have common sense and architectural knowledge. Commissioner Hartweg asked why the Village Board is asking for this.

Chairperson Loch stated the Plan Commission would need to be educated on this, and then they could try this for a year to see how it goes.

Community Development Director Springer stated the Plan Commission's consensus is to go with Option #2 with the staff gathering professional expertise. Community Development Director Springer stated the Plan Commission will get guidelines on exterior appearance review at an upcoming meeting.

Trustee's Report

Trustee Enright stated the Civic Center Parking Garage is coming before the Village Board at the January 13th meeting.

Chairperson's Report

Chairperson Loch thanked everyone for being at the meeting.

Staff Report

Village Planner Purvis stated there will not be a meeting on January 23rd, but there will be items coming to the Plan Commission in February.

Other Business

None

Adjournment

Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Plan Commissioner Hartweg, to adjourn the meeting at 9:43 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

Debbie Solomon
Recording Secretary