

MINUTES
REGULAR PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
November 12, 2020

Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson Mary Loch, who introduced herself and described the Commission's function and reviewed the evening's meeting procedures, conducted via the Zoom platform due to a disaster declaration related to Covid19. She made a plea for patience with running the public hearing meeting remotely, and outlined procedure, including how public comment would be managed. Chairperson Loch introduced meeting participants Village Community Development Director Staci Springer, Village Planners Kelly Purvis and Katie Ashbaugh, Associate Planner Cole Jackson, Village Trustee Bill Enright, and Recording Secretary Barb Dutton.

Roll call commenced. Present: Chairperson Loch and Plan Commissioners Laura Brown, Angela Fanella, Tracy Heming-Littwin, John Mulherin, David Rodemann, Mohammed Saeed and Jamie Vondruska. Absent: Plan Commissioner Lloyd Berry.

Adoption of Emergency Allowance of Remote Participation by the Plan Commission

A motion to allow remote participation in the meeting was made by Commissioner Heming-Littwin, and seconded by Commissioner Saeed. The motion carried by roll call vote with eight (8) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Saeed, Brown, Fanella, Mulherin, Rodemann and Vondruska and Chairperson Loch voted "yes."

Public Comment Non-Agenda Items

There was no public comment pertaining to non-agenda items.

Approval of October 22, 2020 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Heming-Littwin made a motion to approve the draft minutes of the October 22, 2020 Regular Plan Commission meeting; seconded by Commissioner Mulherin, the motion carried by roll call vote with eight (8) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Brown, Fanella, Saeed, Rodemann and Vondruska and Chairperson Loch voted "yes."

Public Hearing - Public Hearing to consider to consider a Planned Unit Development with Zoning Deviations and a Special Use Permit to allow a 5 story, Mixed Use development at 460 Crescent Boulevard

A motion to open the Public Hearing to consider a Planned Unit Development with Zoning Deviations and a Special Use Permit to allow a 5 story, Mixed Use development at 460 Crescent Boulevard, "Glenwood Station," was made and seconded by Commissioners Heming-Littwin and Mulherin, respectively. The motion carried by roll call vote with eight (8) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Saeed, Brown, Fanella, Rodemann and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted "yes."

Staff Presentation

Village Director of Community Development Staci Springer, Village Planners Kelly Purvis and Katie Ashbaugh, all of the Village of Glen Ellyn, 535 Duane Street, were sworn in. Planner Ashbaugh recounted public outreach notice that was undertaken and the review process relative to the proposed development, including that notice of the public hearing was published in the October 28, 2020, edition of the Daily Herald and mailed to property owners within 250 feet of the subject property, and that a placard was placed on the property, all per state statute and Section 10-10-11 of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code.

She described that 460 Crescent Boulevard and the surrounding properties are all zoned C5B. She then described the existing conditions of the property, which include the former McChesney and Miller grocery store as a vacant building of some 13,500SF and a parking lot. She noted that the property has been vacant for over 6 years. She also noted the topography change on the approximately 8/10ths-acre site and the UP West rail line to the south. She stated that the long-range plan, as outlined in the 2001 Comprehensive Plan, recommended mix use, but primary residential, for the block. The proposed development, she said, is for a five-story building that is 2 feet, 3 inches shorter in height than the concept reviewed on May 14. She said that 1,490SF of commercial space is proposed on the first floor along Glenwood Avenue, an expansion based on previous feedback from the Plan Commission at the pre-application meeting. She said that the lobby size was also increased, but the 1.2 parking stall to dwelling unit ratio remains unchanged. She said that while the site is not in either of the National Register Districts in the Village nor is a local landmark, its downtown location prompted a few members of the Village Board to ask that the petitioner solicit feedback from the historic preservation community regarding the building's design.

Planner Ashbaugh described the changes made from the concept presented at the May 2020 pre-application meeting to the design tonight, which are: the tower elements have been removed, black window and door systems rather than white, three shades of brick, recessed balconies on the north elevation, gas lanterns and awnings. She continued that the second-floor apartments have enlarged balconies consistent in size with the club room balcony. She said that the garage doors now are residential-style with panels compared to the flat commercial-style ones proposed previously, and have been recessed 6-feet into the building. Planner Ashbaugh pointed out the elevator overrun, which is the basis of a height deviation request. A zero-foot setback on the Crescent side is proposed, and a deviation (from a requirement that a 15-ft. setback above 45 feet) has been requested for the Glenwood façade.

Planner Ashbaugh continued that the landscape plan includes both deciduous and coniferous shrubbery, a loading space, a dog run and black aluminum fencing. She also said a 6-foot tall opaque fence is proposed to screen mechanical unit view from Glenwood. She said that the building is to contain pet spa in the basement level, and parking with counter-clockwise circulation and 56 stalls including a compact stall that deviates from the minimum length requirement. She said that the at-grade interior parking also has counter clockwise circulation to accommodate 48 stalls (including required ADA stalls), and specifies a configuration deviation relative to drive-aisle width. She said that 104 stalls are proposed where 151 are required, but the relief noticed in the hearing notice is for 102 stalls in the event any stalls are eliminated to ensure compliance with the Illinois Accessibility Code during building permit review. She said that in addition to the proposed commercial space, the at-grade level includes other resident amenities, such as a bicycle studio.

Planner Ashbaugh stated that three deviations are needed for impervious surface setbacks, and also deviations related to the location of the emergency generator and mechanical units to the north of the building. She proceeded to display illustrations of apartment unit layouts, and estimated monthly rents for the range of apartment types. She showed a second-floor plan drawing delineating a fitness center and a clubroom, and imparted that the upper floors – levels 3 through 5 – combined will contain 86 apartments.

Planner Ashbaugh summarized the zoning relief requested, included the various deviations:

- A Special Use Permit for a Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Plan with Zoning Deviations;
- A Special Use Permit for a multi-family residential; and
- Exterior Appearance Approval
- Deviations related to parking:
 - To allow 102 parking stalls where a total of 151 are required for a mix of 86 studio, one-bedroom, and two-bedroom multi-family dwelling units and 1,490 square feet of commercial use
 - To allow 1 parking stall at a 45-degree angle to be 16 feet 10 inches in length where a length of 19 feet is required
 - To allow an approximately 14-foot drive aisle for 1 90-degree parking stall where a 25-foot drive aisle is required
- Deviations related to setbacks:
 - To allow a corner side yard setback of 0 feet where a setback of approximately 39 feet 6 inches is required from the south (corner side) lot line
 - To allow impervious surface setbacks from the north (interior side), east (front), and south (corner side) lot lines of approximately 0 feet where a setback of 5 feet 6 inches is required
 - To allow the emergency generator to be approximately 4 feet 7 inches from the north (interior side) lot line where a setback of at least 5 feet 6 inches is required
 - To allow mechanical equipment as a permitted encroachment in the side yard between the north (interior side) lot line and the north elevation of the proposed building to be approximately 3 feet from said lot line where a setback of 11 feet is required
- Deviations related to building design and features:
 - To allow a corner side yard setback of 0 feet where a setback of approximately 39 feet 6 inches is required from the south (corner side) lot line
 - To allow impervious surface setbacks from the north (interior side), east (front), and south (corner side) lot lines of approximately 0 feet where a setback of 5 feet 6 inches is required
 - To allow the emergency generator to be approximately 4 feet 7 inches from the north (interior side) lot line where a setback of at least 5 feet 6 inches is required
 - To allow mechanical equipment as a permitted encroachment in the side yard between the north (interior side) lot line and the north elevation of the proposed building to be approximately 3 feet from said lot line where a setback of 11 feet is required

Planner Ashbaugh said that should the project request be approved, Staff has recommended several conditions of approval. She said that the first set of conditions are standard for most new construction projects, the next set were specific to Public Improvements and the Public way, and that the last set are unique to this project. She listed them as follows:

Conditions of Approval – Standard

1. That the petitioner construct, maintain, and operate the development in substantial conformance with the plans and testimony presented at the Plan Commission public hearing and before the Village Board of Trustees;
2. That the petitioner shall install, maintain, and replace all landscape materials per the approved landscape plan;
3. That the petitioner prepare a construction management plan for review at a pre-construction meeting with the Police, Fire, Public Works, and Community Development Departments and that said Village staff approve the construction management plan before the issuance of a building permit;
4. That all visible rooftop mechanical units be screened with a height not to exceed that of the overall maximum height deviation granted;
5. That the petitioner secure all required temporary construction and perpetual easements on private property before the issuance of any building permits;
6. That all floor plans, elevations, and other architectural plans be consistent with one another to the satisfaction of the Building & Zoning Official prior to the issuance of any building permits.

Conditions of Approval – Public Improvements/Public Way

7. That the petitioner shall comply with the downtown streetscape improvement plan adopted by the Village Board for the Glenwood Avenue and Crescent Boulevard rights-of-way and coordinate with Public Works on the installation of the materials;
8. That all proposed improvements to the public right-of-way be subject to change per the pending downtown central business district streetscape improvement, per Village Board approval;
9. That the proposed drop-off/pick-up recessed curb area at the northwest corner of the Crescent-Glenwood intersection, should it remain and be incorporated into the Village Board approved downtown streetscape improvement plan, be signed with a time limit of 15 minutes;
10. That the petitioner coordinate with Public Works to install a new bike rack consistent with downtown streetscape furniture in an appropriate location;
11. That any outdoor café seating obtain a license agreement with the Village annually before seating is installed and used;

Conditions of Approval – Other

12. That sheets A-101 and A-102, prepared by Tandem Architecture, Inc., dated 11/5/2020, which propose a total of 104 parking stalls, be modified as required by the 2018 Illinois Accessibility Code

and Section 10-5-13(l) of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code, to provide that no less than 102 parking stalls prior to building permit issuance;

13. That the petitioner incorporate some additional design detail into the building as recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission and the Glen Ellyn Historical Society per the memo addressed to the petitioner dated October 21, 2020, including adding details to the building corners, varying the roofline by increasing the cornice heights and incorporating public art and historic light fixtures and any such changes shall be incorporated prior to Village Board review of the project;
14. That the petitioner pay a total of \$171,205.64 in developer donations for dispersal to the Glen Ellyn Park District, School District 41, School District 87, the Glen Ellyn Library, and the Glen Ellyn Volunteer Fire Company before the issuance of any building permits.

Planner Ashbaugh concluded her presentation and asked if the Plan Commission had any questions.

Plan Commission Questions of Staff

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked how many feet the elevation dropped, to which Planner Ashbaugh responded, about 13 from the northeast corner to the south.

Commissioner Rodemann observed that over the last six years public parking was allowed and used in the lot, and wondered if having this space displaced would cause concern about adequate parking. Commissioner Springer explained that while an arrangement with property owners had been made, the parking lot had not been officially designated as Village parking and so represented a benefit, above and beyond the downtown parking inventory.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if there is a retaining wall on the west side of the site. Planner Ashbaugh replied that there is one on the property line, and that it belongs to Lord's Auto.

Commissioner Fanella asked for an example of an existing Glen Ellyn store that could fit in the retail space identified in the proposed project, and also where the proposed building's elevator would be located. She was told by Planner Ashbaugh that the Beer Cellar and Marché were comparable commercial spaces, and that the elevator would be in the middle of the building.

Planner Purvis interjected to clarify Commissioner Heming-Littwin's question regarding the topography change that the elevation change from the northwest to the southeast of the block is about 15 feet to 17 feet.

Petitioner's Presentation

Petitioner Drew Mitchell, partner with Holladay Properties, 324 W. Burlington Ave., La Grange, Ill.; Chris Walsh, Tandem Architecture, 1040 W. Huron St., Suite 300, Chicago; and Javier Millan, principal with KLOA Inc. 9575 W. Higgins Rd., Rosemont, were sworn in for the Petitioner.

Mr. Mitchell expressed thanks for the pre-application meeting opportunity, and said the team has come back with a dramatically improved product. He said the Petitioner had engaged with the preservation community to pay homage to the heritage associated with the project site. He recounted his team's collaborative work and said he hopes the Commission is pleased with the result.

Mr. Walsh conveyed that the team has been working with Staff and people in the village and thinks the Petitioner has “a great product” in the form of the approximately 145,000SF building. Mr. Mitchell said that units were designed to accommodate demographics forecast, as demonstrated by the unit option to command a monthly rent of \$1,450, which he said is considered workforce housing in the region. Mr. Walsh explained that the design keeps public spaces close to the street to enliven the street. Mr. Mitchell elaborated that this concept is applied to activate the pedestrian-level, carried up to the second-floor fitness and club areas. Mr. Walsh pointed out the revised design’s “clipped” entry corner, and the retail component facing Glenwood Avenue, from which the building is now pushed back 5 feet, allowing a wider sidewalk. Mitchell spoke of the lobby design that imitates that of a hotel, as well as modifications to meet lifestyle changes, such as a craft room. Walsh stated that an alley was created in the back of the building, and with its accompanying dog run along an 11-ft. retaining wall, barking will be relegated to below grade. Mr. Mitchell outlined the trash removal plan, which, he said, seeks to avoid commuter traffic. Mr. Walsh said a drop-off spot was added on the Crescent side, on which tree-planting is also envisioned.

Mr. Mitchell stated that leasing levels depend on ample parking, but that parking needs don’t always meet ordinances. He said that while, on average, one car per unit can be expected, for breathing room, the Petitioner is proposing a 1.2 parking ratio, and that ways are sought to mitigate parking demand. For example, an electric vehicle car-sharing program can encourage people to “ditch” their car, he said, adding that the approach is logical for a transit-oriented development (TOD). Referencing industry research and data, Mr. Millan explained that TODs have lower parking requirements than developments not in close proximity to public transportation. He concluded that for the subject development, the demand for parked vehicles would be 74 vehicles on a week day, and 99 on a Saturday, and that the ratio proposed is consistent with other, similar developments. Mr. Mitchell said that electrical vehicle charging stations are to be installed by the Petitioner.

Mr. Walsh gave a rundown of components to be included in the development, noting that Holladay wants a small office space in each unit in response to the pandemic creating more remote working conditions. He listed a shielded alley and trees around the site, and mentioned the redesigned south face of the building, ironwork, and widened sidewalks that figure into the revised concept. He said that a clock and flags – design elements he calls, “jewelry” – are also visualized. Discussing night lighting patterns, Walsh said, “We feel we got the lighting right, and the building as well.” He expects further research and engagement with the Historical Society as the project evolves, and shared images of buildings around the downtown business district that he indicated provided inspiration for the design. He mentioned carvings, gas lanterns and murals among potential design devices to satisfy Historical Society desires to reflect community heritage. In regard to the height variance sought, Mr. Walsh contended that, as the proposed building would be constructed on a low site, its height is “about the same” as the townhouses across Pennsylvania Avenue.

Plan Commission Questions of the Petitioner

Commissioner Mulherin asked the Petitioner to address safety in terms of building evacuation, as well as wondered about storm water control elements and whether apartments would have separate utility metering. Mr. Walsh responded that egress plans follow all IBC and local fire ordinance codes, and pointed to stairwells and exit pathways. Green space, he suggested, would help with storm water mitigation.

Planner Ashbaugh interjected that the plan was under the threshold of 300 s.f. net new impervious surface, so that no new provide additional storm water facilities were required on the site. Mr. Mitchell said the plan calls for independent meters for electricity, though gas will be sub-metered.

Mike O'Connor, Vice President, Leasing and Development, Holladay Properties, 6370 Ameriplex Drive, Portage, Ind., was sworn in for the Petitioner. He said an emergency generator would support elevator function during an emergency evacuation.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked what type of retail space is envisioned for the development, to which Mr. Mitchell replied that a deli was being considered, but offered as other examples, hair and nail salons and a boutique in the vein of a wine shop.

Commissioner Rodemann sought confirmation that mechanical equipment was the highest building element. This was confirmed by Mr. Walsh, who said they are make-up air units, and that the plan was to use 3D imagery to see if they are visible from the street, and if so, the Petitioner would build screens. Commissioner Rodemann expressed a need to be sensitive to neighbors relative to visibility along with potential noise. He also inquired about safety measures relative to cars entering and exiting the parking garage on the Crescent side. Mr. Walsh said flashing lights would be installed, and possibly a beeping mechanism. He cited the 6-foot recess of the garage door into the building, and explained that the Petitioner has proposed a system whereby window stickers on cars prompt opening of the relatively slow garage doors. Commissioner Rodemann asked if the parking spaces would be assigned, and whether guest parking had been accounted for. Mr. Mitchell responded that all parking is assigned, but that typically in TOD projects underutilized municipal parking lots can be tapped. Planner Purvis stated that the Village allows overnight parking in municipal lots provided cars are removed prior to the morning commute. Planner Ashbaugh cited the suggestion of rooftop mechanical unit screening, to which Mitchell said the Petitioner would be happy to provide screening.

Commissioner Brown asked if an indoor parking spot was provided for the retail space, and whether trash would be able to be collected inside of the building rather than outside. Mr. Mitchell stated there was no provision for retail customer parking, but thought an internal space could be allocated to an employee. He explained that trash would be picked up outside of the building on Crescent, but the area is designed to be the least interruptive as possible.

Public Comment Submitted in Writing

Associate Planner Jackson read the following received written comment into the record:

Kay Quarfoot: *"When you list new apartments being built in Glen Ellyn, it would be informative to state if they will be rentals or condos to purchase. Thank you."*

Samantha Martin, 431 Ridgewood Ave.: *"I am writing to comment on the proposed apartment complex. As a new resident of Glen Ellyn, I am surprised at how many apartment buildings this town is currently building and considering to build. I have nothing against apartment buildings, but I would not have moved here if so many were going up. It will ruin the aesthetic and feel of this town, and crowd the downtown area."*

I vote no on this project. Thank you."

Mike Weiler, 466H Pennsylvania Ave.: *“It is exciting to hear that Holladay Properties has returned to further their proposal for 460 Crescent Boulevard. This property has remained vacant for too long. As a nearby resident I have seen dangerous behavior happening on the current buildings roof and look forward to a new structure that will be cared for by the owner.*

The deviations that are being requested are not beyond reason for a building of this type going into a footprint of this size. The variance on the height is relatively small in comparison to the overall building. The parking stalls should easily service the people living within the building. Especially with so much within walking distance, vehicle sharing programs, and ride sharing.

It is wonderful to see the development on Main Street and Duane Street underway and nearing completion. These areas have definitely drawn the attention of renters and this new development will continue to draw people into the downtown area of Glen Ellyn.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.”

Lea Anne Howell, 713 Kenilworth Ave.: *“Minimal Building setback is not pedestrian friendly, or in keeping with older parts of downtown. Streetscape on south side along Crescent is particularly severe, barren, with no plantings except young trees. It will be terrible to walk along that sidewalk in the summer, heat radiating off that masonry wall. On east side, in addition to minimal setback, and no plantings, what’s with the fencing all along the street? How can drivers let a passenger out of a car? How will the snow be cleared?”*

Janna Sampson, 470 Pennsylvania Ave.: *“My husband and I own and live in a townhouse directly to the north of the proposed development. We will have a direct view of the north side of the building from our 2nd floor living room as well as our 3rd floor guest room and 4th floor family room. I am concerned by the many variances that are requested for this development. While development of this property is desirable, having a development that meets our current zoning requirements would be good for the entire area. Homeowners should be able to rely upon the Zoning Code to protect their investment in their homes. By continually granting many variances to the code, you undermine the integrity of the Zoning Code itself. Continually granting zoning variations undermines the look and feel of our downtown area. I urge you to stick to the zoning requirements as you review this proposed development.*

My first specific concern is parking. This area already has a significant shortage of parking spaces and the developer is requesting to cut the required parking by 47 spaces. Even with the new parking garage on the south side of the tracks, parking on the north side will be very short. Renters, shoppers and diners will not want to park on the south side and walk across the tracks to get to their apartment or other destination. I think it is important that the full requirement of parking spaces be provided in this development. It is reasonable to think that every renter in this proposed development will have a car. Yes, we are close to the Metra station. But even if renters work in downtown Chicago, they will need a car to get basic necessities such as groceries and prescriptions. On Friday and Saturday evenings on Pennsylvania Ave, cars are often double parked and park blocking the entrance and/or the exit of The Legacy Condominiums. The many restaurants in the area make night time parking especially a problem (particularly once we can go back to full capacity inside dining). Currently this property is helping to offset the parking shortage as visitors use

the lot for parking. When developed, this extra parking will no longer be available for visitors and parking will be harder to find for the residents that will occupy this building. Please require the full amount of parking spaces as determined by the zoning code.

My second concern is the lack of normal setbacks for the building. By reducing the setbacks from Glenwood Ave and the back of the building, the building will look much larger from our viewpoint from the north. It will also not allow landscaping around the back that would help beautify, soften and blend the new building into the area. It will also make the area less safe for pedestrians especially along Glenwood Ave. The corner of Glenwood and Pennsylvania will need some traffic control and cross walks added as it is already a difficult corner to cross. The increased traffic this development will bring will make walking even less safe than it is currently. Increased traffic will make an already difficult and dangerous exit from The Legacy even riskier.

I also object to the height variance requested. The size of this building will dwarf most buildings in downtown Glen Ellyn. The current zoning height restriction is sufficiently tall. Why do we have a height restriction if we do not enforce it? The townhouses in our development have rooftop balconies that enjoy the views of the village to the south and are a significant part of the enjoyment and value of our units. Allowing a height variance will impinge on those views especially for the six homes on Pennsylvania Ave. It will lower our property values and decrease our enjoyment of our homes. The massive block style (especially if the request to remove the step back requirement above 45 feet is granted)"

Planner Purvis alerted Associate Planner Cole Jackson that 3 minutes had passed.

Lee Marks, 475 Hawthorne: *"The building design for Glenwood Station should be deemed unacceptable. It is the typical 'anywhere USA' design that most every developer submits to a town. Any building designed for Glen Ellyn should be reflective of our historic architecture, which began as Greek Revival, then on to Italianate in the 1880's & 1890's. In addition, the building is too tall for the site. This is a stand-alone building, & if overly large, will stand out like a sore thumb on the McChesney site. I would ask the developer to take a look at the outstanding design of the office building at 486 Duane Street, 2nd building west of Park Blvd. on the north side of Duane. It's an exceptional, contemporary interpretation of American Federal-Period architecture. It's obvious that the developer who erected this building spent time touring Glen Ellyn prior to presenting his project to the Village. In my over 50 years of involvement in historic preservation in Glen Ellyn, this is the only builder who "hit the nail" on the head as far as outstanding architectural design is concerned! I would ask that the developer for Glenwood Station consider meeting with a local architect & some of the preservation people in Glen Ellyn, to get a better handle on what would be appropriate for the McChesney site. The architecture of Glenwood Station doesn't need to be a copy of a specific style, but it must make sense design-wise, so it contributes to Glen Ellyn's historic streetscapes. Local architect, Jamie Simoneit, said he would be happy to meet & discuss various design improvements. With my work in historic preservation, I hear a tremendous number of comments from residents, who have told me that, while they are not opposed to apartments & condos coming to Glen Ellyn, they absolutely do not want Glen Ellyn to become another Arlington Heights or Lombard, where suddenly, our Town Center becomes a canyon, surrounded by overly tall buildings."*

Lois Walter, 124 Newton Ave.: *“How many of the proposed apartments will be designated Affordable?”*

Adam Kreuzer, 351 Marion, former chair of the Environmental Commission and a current delegate for the International Dark Sky Association: *“Good morning and thank you for the opportunity to comment.*

I am concerned about outdoor lighting. As the Village has tried to do with its fixtures on Roosevelt and within CBD, with commercial developments, the Village should address good outdoor lighting design. The proposed projects at McChesney and on Main Street should include light fixtures and bulbs that minimize outdoor light pollution. All fixtures should direct light down, not out and/or up. Bulbs should not be more than 2700K (Kelvin). Brightness levels should be addressed and controlled.

As your local IDA delegate, it would like the opportunity to address these concerns with the Planning Department and the Board. These are simple measures that will not affect price, energy savings or security.”

League of Women Voters: *“Public Comments for the Glen Ellyn Plan Commission Meeting November 12, 2020. In light of the newly published draft of the Glen Ellyn Comprehensive Plan and the positions held by the League of Women Voters of Glen Ellyn, thank you for the opportunity to provide the following comments:*

The League of Women Voters of Glen Ellyn is strongly committed to the act of civic engagement in our community. Based on that important tenet, we are asking the Glen Ellyn Plan Commission to not only evaluate the new Holladay Development, Glenwood Station at the McChesney and Miller location based on the prescribed Village Codes but also whether it meets the present and future housing needs of the Village.

The newly released “Draft of the Comprehensive Plan” speaks to not only opening opportunities for high density development that conform with the surrounding character of buildings but also that it promote attainable housing at a variety of price points to address the financial needs of seniors, young professionals, new families as well as workers in our local retail and service industries.

It is important to provide this Developer and others with the clear message that a variety of price points matter and can be attained in a development through a collaborative effort with the Village.

We include a section of the Village’s Draft of its new Comprehensive Plan that speaks clearly to this issue.

Promote mixed income development. *To provide for affordable attainable housing as future development occurs, the Village should also consider...promote higher density residential development that provides housing for a variety of income levels. Such mixed-income development allows lower income families to be included within and among higher income residents, rather than concentrating into one area. This is supportive of an inclusive, stable, and diverse community and creates desirable attainable housing options that blend into the Village’s urban fabric. Incentives to encourage developers to incorporate a percentage of below market rate, affordable units should be promoted, such as fee waivers, tax abatements, and expedited approval into higher density, mixed-income residential developments.*

Thank you for your consideration,

Kristen B. Malone and Erica Nelson, Co-presidents of the League of Women Voters”

Jamie Simoneit, Z+O Architecture + Interiors, 504 Hillside Ave.: *“I am disappointed that what is proposed is basically a carbon copy of what is currently being constructed on Main Street – Another over-sized apartment complex that does not fit into our Village's downtown vernacular. What I find hard to understand is how far this project progressed when it does not comply with the Village's current C5B zoning or come close to what is described in the Villages Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2001.*

A quick study of the posted first floor plan reveals a project that denies the public pedestrian level along Crescent Boulevard of any retail spaces or storefronts. The south sun facing facade is 318 feet long but does not provide a single public amenity or business opportunity. The developer is using his 60-foot frontage at the prime intersection of Crescent & Glenwood for the apartment lobby. The remaining 258 linear feet is nothing but a blank wall with two exhaust vents and two 25' wide overhead doors providing access to the parking garage that hides below. The only retail space on the property is north on Glenwood off of the boulevard. The 100 linear feet of this facade is divided between the Building's lobby and a miniscule 55 feet of retail.

How can only 12% of the structure's public facade be dedicated to retail in our downtown central business district be deemed acceptable? That's 428.70 feet total of frontage divided by 55 feet of proposed retail.

Please insist that the developer excavate down another level and relocate the proposed street level parking so that the west end of Crescent Boulevard can become a vibrant extension of our downtown in lieu of a lifeless dead end. As a Business Owner here in town I am pro-development, but I ask that the Village enforce our zoning laws and provide variations that are only minor in nature and make common sense when driven by irregularities and pre-existing non-conforming conditions.

Variations awarded to new construction should be far and few between. As a Glen Ellyn homeowner since 1995 I believe we deserve better.

Please do not slam this through like its predecessor.”

Peggy Udelhofen, 771 Revere Road: *“We have been happy residents here for 28 years! I think our town would benefit from this development. The building is attractive and blends well with the existing buildings. Occupants would range from young professionals who need to be near the train to transitioning residents, looking to downsize from their larger Glen Ellyn homes. It will provide additional parking and amenities residents can utilize. Introducing younger residents to our wonderful town and all it has to offer, promotes future home sales as well! Win win Glen Ellyn!”*

Chairperson Loch asked about potential issues concerning the uplighting. Mr. Mitchell said he generally shares concerns about light pollution, but loves “to light buildings that are beautiful.” He doesn't think the uplighting in the design is excessive, but if it's a sticking point could look at it. Mr. Walsh added that the nighttime view is as important as the day, and said that the lights, which are “important to give it a glow,” do turn off at a certain time at night.

It was asked about the project and its impact to affordable housing in Glen Ellyn, related to a couple comments read into the record. Planner Ashbaugh reported that Glen Ellyn is in compliance with the Illinois Affordable Housing Planning and Appeal Act, as the state minimum the Village must provide is 10%, and it is providing 15.9%.

Public Comment Spoken on the Record

Kelli Mildren, 313 Hill Ave., who was sworn in, said she was interested in the development plans and sees the project as a real value added. She stated that she has a strong feeling that it is a good thing for the community, to which, she believes, it could attract young potential homebuyers.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved to close the Public Hearing; seconded by Commissioner Mulherin, the motion carried by roll call vote with eight (8) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Plan Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Brown, Fanella, Rodemann, Saeed and Vondruska and Chairperson Loch voted “yes.”

Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Mulherin stated that he was very much in favor of the project, believing that parking is adequate and that he has no difficulty with the building height. He said the spirit of the height condition is met, and the corner side yard set-back poses no problem. He is fine with the emergency generator equipment and the lot-coverage ratio. He said the project adds a great deal to this challenging site.

Referencing a memo regarding input solicited from the historic community, Planner Ashbaugh suggested the Commission provide thoughts on design elements – such as parapet wall height, lighting enhancement, iron work and possible public art – and which might be incorporated into any conditions of approval. Planner Purvis said that adding detail to the building corners, varying cornice heights, further deviating parapets, and adding intricate detail to cornices might also be considered.

Commissioner Rodemann said that although some of these design ideas had been addressed, he didn’t think the roofline will be varied enough to make an impact (though doing so along with varying the profile cornices might). While he acknowledged that the steps the Petitioner has taken have made for quite an improvement to the building design previously presented and is moving in the right direction, he still feels the building is too big for the site. The concept is for a massive building for the size of site, he continued, saying that while the Petitioner had improved the concept considerably, allaying concerns he had about the pedestrian experience, he thinks the retail space component is lacking and that he is still uneasy about the building’s bulk.

Commissioner Fanella said she like the way the project has turned out, and that it has a “city feel” she admires. She is in favor of the 15-minute parking designation for pickups/drop-offs, and sees the project as contributing to the goal of adding new residential units to the downtown. She is comfortable with the conditions for the plan.

Commissioner Vondruska conveyed that these projects are difficult, and recognized the challenge of this property (though thought the low site is an advantage when considering building height). He touched on the balance needed to retain the Village’s feel and grow it economically. He said he appreciates the efforts to accommodate input and incorporate some of the Village’s character into the design, and that overall

he is in support of the project, though sees the retail end of it as “tough,” pointing to parking challenges. Softening the Crescent side “would be great,” he said, mentioning adding historical elements.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin concurred that the developer’s response to input is appreciated, recalled discussion about the need for these types of units in Glen Ellyn, and said that developing the site would increase tax revenue. She responded to one of the comments that suggested further reducing the overall height by going a second level below ground so the entire first floor could also be more retail space, and that has shown to be not desirable and poses construction difficulties—which then limits the retail piece. She further commented, though she thinks a high-end deli or bakery at the site would be a way to bring people into the location. She said she likes colors, window treatments and iron elements presented. While she would favor more detail on the Crescent side, she cautioned that murals need upkeep. Commissioner Heming-Littwin remarked that she is okay with the lighting, thinks the widened sidewalk along Crescent will be helpful, and endorses the recommendation of more detail at the roofline. She is disinclined to dictate that historic light fixtures be incorporated into the design.

Commissioner Saeed stated that he is in support of the project as it meets the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, though he thinks the commercial space is inadequate. He did express a concern about commercial parking, anticipating difficulties for customers with no parking on Glenwood. Despite the long appearance of the building on Crescent, he complimented the architect’s and developer’s work.

Also voicing support for the project, Commissioner Brown acknowledged the work that had been done since May to further develop the design. She thought the north-side alterations and the Crescent-side step-back added appeal to the project, which she believes offers options for residents looking to downsize and young newcomers exploring the suburbs.

Commissioner Loch praised the 10-foot building step-back from the second floor up along Crescent, and expressed enthusiasm about the aforementioned idea of naming a deli in the building after the McChesney grocery concern. She thanked the Petitioner for the work invested in the proposal, specifically the willingness to work with the historic preservation group, and stated that she supports the project.

Commissioner Mulherin complimented the Staff on their work. And, after some discussion about language concerning incorporating input from the Historic Society and Historic Preservation Commission, Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved for the following:

Commission Action

After conducting a public hearing and deliberating on the requests of the petitioner, Michael O’Connor, Vice President of Development & Leasing for Holladay Properties, for approval of a Special Use for a Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development with zoning deviations, a Special Use to allow Multi-Family Dwellings and Exterior Appearance, all to allow the construction of a 5-story, mixed use building with ground floor commercial space, apartments, and an enclosed parking garage on the property located at 460 Crescent Boulevard in the C5B Central Service Subdistrict, the Plan Commission hereby recommends approval based on the findings of fact, as discussed at the Plan Commission public hearing on November 12, 2020, and a copy of which will be attached to the minutes of the meeting and kept on file as part of the permanent records of the Village. The Plan Commission makes this recommendation of approval with the following conditions:

1. That the petitioner construct, maintain, and operate the development in substantial conformance with the plans and testimony presented at the Plan Commission public hearing and before the Village Board of Trustees;
2. That the petitioner shall install, maintain, and replace all landscape material per the approved landscape plan;
3. That the petitioner prepare a construction management plan for review at a pre-construction meeting with the Police, Fire, Public Works, and Community Development Departments and that said Village staff approve the construction management plan before the issuance of a building permit;
4. That a proposed drop-off/pick-up recessed curb area at the northwest corner of the Crescent-Glenwood intersection, should it remain and be incorporated into the Village Board approved downtown streetscape improvement plan, be signed with a time limit of 15 minutes;
5. That the petitioner shall comply with the downtown streetscape improvement plan adopted by the Village Board for the Glenwood Avenue and Crescent Boulevard rights-of-way and coordinate with Public Works on the installation of the materials;
6. That any outdoor café seating obtain a license agreement with the Village annually before seating is installed and used;
7. That the petitioner coordinate with Public Works to install a new bike rack consistent with downtown streetscape furniture in an appropriate location;
8. That sheets A-101 and A-102, prepared by Tandem Architecture, Inc., dated 11/5/2020, which propose a total of 104 parking stalls, be modified as required by the 2018 Illinois Accessibility Code and Section 10-5-13(I) of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code, to provide that no less than 102 parking stalls prior to building permit issuance;
9. That all visible rooftop mechanical units be screened with a height not to exceed that of the overall maximum height deviation granted;
10. That all proposed improvements to the public right-of-way be subject to change per the pending downtown central business district streetscape improvement, per Village Board approval;
11. That the petitioner secure all required temporary construction and perpetual easements on private property before the issuance of any building permits;
12. That the petitioner work with staff to incorporate some additional design detail into the building as recommended by the Historic Preservation Commission and the Glen Ellyn Historical Society per the memo addressed to the petitioner dated October 21, 2020, which might include adding details to the building corners, varying the roofline by increasing the cornice heights, incorporating public art and historic light fixtures; any such changes should be incorporated prior to Village Board review of the project;
13. That the petitioner pay a total of \$171,205.64 in developer donations for dispersal to the Glen Ellyn Park District, School District 41, School District 87, the Glen Ellyn Library, and the Glen Ellyn Volunteer Fire Company before the issuance of any construction building permits; and

14. That all floor plans, elevations, and other architectural plans be consistent with one another to the satisfaction of the Building & Zoning Official prior to the issuance of any building permits.

Seconded by Commissioner Saeed, the motion carried by roll call vote with seven (7) yes votes and one (1) no vote as follows: Plan Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Saeed, Brown, Fanella, Mulherin and Vondruska and Chairperson Loch voted “yes.” Plan Commissioner Rodemann voted “no.”

Planner Ashbaugh said she expects the project proposal to go before the Village Board on December 14.

Trustee’s Report

Village Trustee Enright remarked that the evening’s meeting had been interesting. He reported that the Village Board has been focused on the budget, which is running about \$65 million for this year. This figure, he stated, is less than last year’s \$77 million, and is mostly due to building the parking garage. The final reading will be December 14. Also a topic of attention has been the McKee House, and whether donations can be garnered for remodeling it.

Chairman’s Report

Chairperson Loch offered a reminder of the upcoming Civic Betterment Party elections for candidates for community posts. She said that she felt the voting environment set up was safe, but that two drive-through locations have also been established for voting. In light of the Covid19 situation, she advised everyone to be safe, thinking a “real test” is happening.

Staff Report

Planner Ashbaugh related that Mortenson, the design-build firm constructing the Village Parking Garage, submitted final plans and an amendment concerning some utilities, and to expect discussion of the project at the December 17 meeting.

Planner Purvis reported that new sample streetscape materials had been installed at the corner of Crescent and Main, with scanner-enabled voting to elicit public preference. She also said that the full Comprehensive Draft Plan was received from the consultant and has been posted on the Village website. The Draft Plan is to be presented at a November 18 open house in the Village Hall gymnasium, followed by a Zoom presentation the next evening. The Draft Plan is tentatively scheduled for Public Hearing at the December 10 Plan Commission meeting. A December 7 Board workshop is to discuss recreational cannabis vending.

Development Director Springer complimented Planners Ashbaugh on her work relative to tonight’s Public Hearing. Director Springer also announced that Planner Purvis has been promoted to the position of Planning Manager. Plan Commissioners applauded Planning Manager Purvis’ achievement.

Other Business

None.

Adjournment

Following a motion to adjourn by Commissioner Heming-Littwin, Chairperson Loch concluded the meeting at 10:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Dutton
Recording Secretary

Reviewed by,

Katie Ashbaugh, AICP
Planner