Minutes
Village of Glen Ellyn Board of Trustees
Regular Workshop Meeting
Monday, September 15, 2014

Call to Order

President Demos called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

Roll Call

Upon Roll Call by Clerk Galvin, Trustees Burket, Clark, Elliott, Ladesic, McGinley and O'Shea answered "Present".

Staff present: Village Manager Franz, Assistant Village Manager Stonitsch, Village Attorney Mathews, Planning & Development Director Hulseberg, Police Chief Norton and Interim Finance Director Coyle.

Pledge of Allegiance

President Demos asked Lynn Colby to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Agenda Item E. - The Opus Group Proposed Redevelopment of Main Street Parking Lot, Giesche and St. Petronille Properties: (Presented by Planning and Development Director Hulseberg)

Planning and Development Director Staci Hulseberg presented information about the proposed redevelopment of the Main Street parking lot, Giesche and St. Petronille properties. Director Hulseberg introduced the following representatives from The OPUS Group: Mr. James R. Caesar, Regional Vice President, Mr. Sean T. Spellman, Vice President and General Manager and Mr. Christopher Hurst, AIA, Manager, Architecture.

President Demos clarified this is the first meeting with the Village Board. Previous meetings have been with Village staff.

Over the past few months, staff has continued to work with The Opus Group on the potential redevelopment of the Main Street parking lot and Giesche properties. The scope of the project has recently expanded to include the St. Petronille parking lot and former rectory property on the east side of Glenwood Avenue. The church has been working to gain the approval of the Diocese of Joliet, the owner of the property, to move forward with the project. While there are a number of formal steps necessary to receive official approval from the Diocese, the church has been successful in obtaining the Diocese's permission to move forward in the process.

The general development concept remains the same and continues to include the construction of a 5-story mixed use development with about 8,400 square feet of ground floor retail and approximately 125 upper floor, luxury, rental apartments. However, with the incorporation of St. Petronille's property, the opportunity for a two or three level parking structure is now incorporated into the plans and the originally proposed below grade parking has been eliminated.

Parking

Depending on the number of levels in the parking structure, between 469 and 590 parking spaces could be provided between both the Opus building and the parking structure. Access to the ground floor parking would be provided via Main Street and Glenwood Avenue. Access to the second and third floor parking levels would be via an access drive on Hillside Avenue.

There are currently 98 parking spaces on St. Petronille property. St. Petronille would continue to have 98 spaces in the parking structure on the first level. There are currently 81 surface level public parking spaces in the Village's Main Street lot. Opus would be responsible to pay for the replacement of those 81 parking spaces. Any spaces above and beyond the replacement of the existing spaces would be paid for by the Village.

Depending on the number of levels in the parking structure, between 469 and 590 parking spaces could be provided between both the Opus building and the parking structure. Access to the ground floor parking would be provided via Main Street and Glenwood Avenue. Access to the second and third floor parking levels would be via an access drive on Hillside Avenue.

Building Height

The project would require approval of a height deviation. A total building height of 45 feet and 4 stories is permitted in the C5A zoning district and the 2009 Downtown Strategic Plan recommends that new construction on Main Street be a maximum of 2-3 stories tall. The proposed building would be 5-stories tall with an estimated height of 59 feet 2 inches measured from ground level on level Main Street. The Zoning Code requires building height to be measured from the average existing grade and the preliminary plans shared with the Plan Commission at the March 13, 2014 pre-application meeting showed a height from ground level of 59 feet 2 inches and a height of 53 feet 11 inches measured from the average existing grade to the top of the parapet for an anticipated height deviation of 8 feet 11 inches. Please note that the actual deviation advertised for will need to be to the tallest point of the building which is expected to be the rooftop mechanical equipment which has an estimated height of 57 feet 1 inch.

Block elevation drawings prepared by Opus showing the proposed height of the building in relation to the heights of the buildings in the surrounding area are attached. Based on those block elevations, the proposed building would not be largely out of character with other buildings in the downtown.

The petitioner was also encouraged to step back the upper floor of the building as is required in the adjacent C5B zoning district where a height of 55 feet is permitted.

Retail Space
The total square footage of the first and second floors of the Giesche building that would be demolished is roughly 15,200 square feet. Due to the slope of the property and the need to accommodate a level floor, Opus has indicated that the building height would likely increase if retail is brought closer to the corner or that the retail entrance would need to be located below grade level. The Plan Commission believed it was important that the building be designed to have presence at the Main and Hillside intersection which is a gateway to the downtown.

Incentive Requests
The developer has submitted an incentive request to the Village which includes the Village donation of its land to the project at no cost. Opus is also requesting that the Village assume any environmental remediation costs needed to accommodate the project.

As part of the project the Village would be responsible for the cost of any newly created public parking beyond the existing 81 spaces in the Main Street lot and the replacement of St. Petronille's existing 98 parking spaces.

Comments
Mr. Spellman stated this is a multi-family urban development. Glen Ellyn has a walk score of 83% according to a recent survey of the Brookings Institute.

Trustee McGinley inquired about the number of units, Mr. Spellman responded 127. Mr. Spellman added this will be designed to look like it has always been there. The renters: childless by choice, power singles, millennials, affluent empty nesters, designer divorcees and consultant/executives.

Trustee McGinley asked about the cost of above ground vs. below ground parking. Mr. Hurst responded below ground parking is 3.5 times more expensive. The Village will receive 101 spaces and St. Petronille 98. The Village currently has 130. The residential parking will be heated and secure.

Trustee Burket asked if the walkway between this project and Santa Fe will be covered. Mr. Hurst responded no, and clarified it is a 6' wide walkway.

Trustee O'Shea asked if there will be balconies. Mr. Hurst responded yes, but not on the Main St. side. Trustee McGinley referred to the Historic designation and placing this development next to a smaller building. Mr. Spellman responded they want to be good neighbors.

Trustee O'Shea asked about retail and thought there would be more. Specifically, allowing enough room for outdoor restaurant seating opportunities. Mr. Hurst responded they can look into that. Trustee O'Shea asked who will maintain the Promenade. Director Hulseberg responded that has not been determined yet. Trustee Elliott stated he is anxious to see the exterior design. He has concerns blending the old with the new and the proximity to other buildings.

Ms. Cam Page, 206 Hill Ave., Glen Ellyn, approached the Board and commented that the Village is being asked to give a lot to OPUS. President Demos responded that has not yet been determined. Ms. Page stated the garage is $2.4 million. Furthermore, the Strategic Plan includes affluent and affordable housing; where is the affordable housing, there needs to be a mix.

Ms. Kathy Cornell, 678 Forest Avenue, Glen Ellyn and a Glen Ellyn Forest Preserve District Commissioner is a 36 year Glen Ellyn resident and stated this is an interesting proposal and she has mixed feelings about it. There are already multiple empty storefronts. The size is massive and she has seen some developments in other communities that are massive and so ugly as to be embarrassing. The proportion of the development should be relative to the block and the entire downtown; this proposal may not be an appropriate mix. There needs to be a combination of appropriateness for our downtown.

Mr. Mike Formento, Executive Director, Glen Ellyn Chamber of Commerce approached the Board and thanked OPUS for their interest in developing this property and for their presentation. Mr. Formento commented that this development will overpower the other building on Main Street and will create a tunnel. The proximity to the sidewalk will preclude any new landscaping. Mr. Formento asked where the clock will be moved to. Mr. Formento added he originally asked for a traffic study. The new residents will create much more traffic.

Mr. Bob Davidson, Blackberry Market, 401 N. Main St., Glen Ellyn, approached the Board to express concerns during the construction phase and parking. He is already hurting for parking and commented if a customer does not get a Main St. parking spot they will not stop. Parking spaces need to be salvaged during construction.

Ms. Chris Wilson, 537 Phillips Ave., Glen Ellyn, addressed the Board to express her concerns with this project. Ms. Wilson lives one block away and is concerned with the massive size and the fit with the character of the town. Ms. Wilson asked for a scale model, which will help visualize the scope of the development. Mr. Hurst responded they are not at that point yet.

Ms. Genell Scheurell, 454 Hill Ave., Glen Ellyn, approached the Board and expressed concerns with the height. It is striking in the images shown and 2.5 times the height if Santa Fe and almost at the roof line of St. Petronille. This is extraordinarily high.

Mr. Bob Wahlgren, 675 Euclid, Glen Ellyn, approached the Board and expressed concerns about the lack of affordable housing since Parkside is being lost to gentrification.

Director Hulseberg asked if the Board was able to progress. Trustee Elliott asked to wait a week to review. President Demos responded he is not comfortable providing feedback yet.

A short break began at 8:30 p.m. The meeting resumed at 8:44 p.m.

Agenda Item F. - 2014 Street Resurfacing Project Update: (Presented by Public Works Director Hansen and Professional Engineer Bob Minix)

Recommendation of the Public Works Department to utilize a portion of unspent dollars in the 2014 Street Resurfacing Project to perform additional paving work.

On March 24, 2014, the Village Board awarded a construction contract to Schroeder Asphalt Services for the 2014 Resurfacing Project with appropriated funds totaling $995,000. The Project included resurfacing approximately two miles of roadways throughout the Village along with ancillary work such as curbs, sidewalk, landscaping and storm water items. The project is essentially complete, with only minimal punch list items remaining, and the final estimated cost of the project is $690,000. Essentially, the project is $300,000 under the budgeted amount.

In light of the severe winter we experienced last year, staff has identified at least twenty areas that are in need of substantial repaving throughout the Village. Some of these needs can be met with our annual Skip Paving Program, but there are significant needs that cannot. We have identified seven locations that we feel are worthy of consideration for full resurfacing this fall.

The unit cost for patching is about 14% more than resurfacing due to the favorable pricing advantage that we have with the 2014 Street Resurfacing Project versus the pricing from the MPI bid Skip Paving. Patching will cost about 55% of the total cost of resurfacing while yielding only 40% of the pavement replaced. Additionally, by resurfacing these roadways, we will be able to reduce our capital expenses.

We are fortunate to have completed the 2014 Street Resurfacing Project with a $300,000 surplus. To capitalize on the pricing, to address some immediate needs, and to reduce future capital expenses, we should increase the scope of the Project to include the above listed corridors with additional funds totaling $200,000.

A recommendation is requested to increase the scope of the existing 2014 Street Resurfacing Project in an amount equal to approximately $200,000 to accommodate the needed resurfacing of the seven sections of roadways that are identified in this memorandum. The scope increase will result in a final project cost of approximately $900,000 and will still be approximately $100,000 under the appropriated amount. The contractor has agreed to maintain their unit prices for the proposed work. Expected completion of the additional work is late October.

President Demos asked why some of the areas failed. Engineer Minix responded due to the mix. Manager Franz stated this will be back on the agenda next week. Engineer Minix responded no additional funding is required.

Agenda Item G. - Budget Preparation for Calendar Year 2015: (Presented by Interim Finance Director Coyle)

Interim Finance Director Christina Coyle led the Calendar Year 2015 Budget Kickoff Discussion.

Each year, in preparation for building the next year's budget, a budget kickoff meeting is held. The purpose of this discussion is to inform the Board of Trustees of any pertinent topics affecting the upcoming budget. The kickoff meeting also gives the Board of Trustees the opportunity to bring forth any topics that they feel are important for the Village to consider while developing the upcoming budget.

At this year's budget kickoff meeting, the following topics will be reviewed:

· **Recap of the prior year's process and switch to a calendar year budget**

The short year 2014 was a transition budget, which allowed the Village to begin the process to switch from an April 30 fiscal year end to a December 31 fiscal year end. The short year budget Is an 8 month budget which stretched from May to December 2014. The process for creating and approving the short year 2014 budget created several challenges and opportunities for the Village.

· **Review of the Home Rule Sales Tax (HRST)**

In 2009 the Village Board approved the 1% Home Rule Sales Tax (HRST). This was in response to significant declines in revenues combined with sharp increases in mandatory pension funding requirements stemming from the recent recessionary period. Although significant cutbacks in spending were implemented, including staff reductions, this new revenue stream was necessary to sustain the level of services provided to the community. Also in 2009, the Village Board adopted an ordinance detailing certain spending categories and calling for an annual review of the tax to confirm that it was still needed. Last year, the spending categories were eliminated, but we are still required to confirm the continued need for the home rule sales tax.

·

Discussion of the process for the Calendar Year 2015 budget

The Village is beginning the process of preparing the Calendar Year 2015 budget. Departments are compiling their budget requests which are due to the Finance Department in the coming week.

Adjournment

At 9:17 p.m. a motion was made by Trustee Clark and seconded by Trustee Burket to adjourn to Executive Session for the purposes of setting the price for sale or lease of property, and discussing the appointment, employment, compensation, discipline, performance or dismissal of specific employees, without returning to open session thereafter.

Upon roll call, Trustees Burket, Clark, Elliott, Ladesic, McGinley and O'Shea voted "Aye." Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Galvin,
Village Clerk