

MINUTES
REGULAR PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
January 28, 2021

Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was convened at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson Mary Loch, who explained the advisory function of the Plan Commission, as well as outlined procedures for conducting the evening's meeting remotely – including public participation – due to the Covid-19 disaster declaration. She introduced meeting participants Village Board Liaison Bill Enright, Community Development Director Staci Springer, Planning Manager Kelly Purvis, Associate Planner Cole Jackson and Recording Secretary Barbara Dutton.

Roll call was taken: Chairperson Loch and Plan Commissioners Lloyd Berry, Laura Brown, Angela Fanella, Tracy Heming-Littwin, John Mulherin, David Rodemann, Mohammed Saeed and Jamie Vondruska were present.

Adoption of Emergency Allowance of Remote Participation by the Plan Commission

A motion to allow remote participation in the meeting was made by Commissioner Saeed and seconded by Commissioner Heming-Littwin. The motion carried with nine (9) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Commissioners Saeed, Heming-Littwin, Berry, 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 Draft Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes of the January 7, 2021 was made and seconded by Commissioners Saeed and Heming-Littwin, respectively. The motion carried with nine (9) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Commissioners Saeed, Heming-Littwin, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Mulherin, Rodemann and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted "yes."

A motion to approve the minutes of the January 14, 2021 as amended was made by Commissioner Heming-Littwin and seconded by Commissioner Brown. The motion carried with nine (9) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Brown, Berry, Fanella, Mulherin, Rodemann, Saeed and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted "yes."

Public Hearing concerning a Special Use Permit to allow the building at 454 Duane Street to be converted from an office use to a single family residence

A motion to open the Public Hearing concerning a Special Use Permit to allow the building at 454 Duane Street to be converted from an office use to a single-family residence was made and seconded by Commissioners Heming-Littwin and Mulherin, respectively. The motion passed with nine (9) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Rodemann, Saeed and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted "yes."

Staff Introduction

Associate Planner Cole Jackson, Planning Manager Kelly Purvis and Community Development Director Staci Springer, 535 Duane Street, were sworn in. Associate Planner Jackson provided an overview of the property at 454 Duane Street, for which a Special Use Permit is sought to allow the property to be converted from an office use – recently as a financial services business – to a single-family residence in the C5B District. He stated that the property backs up to the Prairie Path on the north, and has a short setback in the front; a parking lot sits to the east, a commercial use is on the west, and residences lie to the south. Behind the building is parking, stated Associate Planner Jackson, who related that the Comprehensive Plan defines the section of town as appropriate for small offices and the like. He stated that the Plan mentions the building, which is outside the retail core, as a contributing historic structure. Associate Planner Jackson listed suggested conditions of approval, including removal of a monument sign, should the applicant opt to make the building a single-family use. In the C5B Zoning District, he stated, properties built or altered abutting residentially zoned properties are required to meet the 20 foot setback requirements. Therefore, the neighboring property were it to be redeveloped, would have to meet the 20 foot setback requirement.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if the Petitioner would need approval for commercial rather than residential use, even if the latter application is approved. Planning Manager Purvis said no, as long as the business use is a permitted use in the district. Development Director Springer stated that the ordinance governing this Special Use Permit being requested carries a 24-month time limit to apply for a building permit. She cautioned that an argument could be made that the property is zoned residential due to its listing as a special use in the C5B District, so language should probably be reviewed. Commissioner Berry asked if the response to the action requested by a potential property seller is typical, to which Director Springer said this instance is different as it is pre-emptive, and that the issue is related to the use, not the applicant. Commissioner Berry asked if granting the permit would set additional restrictions on the property to the west. “Yes,” stated Director Springer, unless a text amendment is enacted. Planning Manager Purvis noted that additional restrictions to the westerly property would only come into play if that property was to be redeveloped. Commissioner Rodemann said if the Special Use is granted, and the next buyer is a commercial user, he wants to make sure any restrictions associated with a residential use don’t impact the neighboring property. Director Springer said a variation would be needed if a new commercial owner wanted to do something, such as an addition or an expansion, requiring Plan Commission approval. Plan Commissioners requested that staff bring forth a text amendment to address the setback issue. Planning Manager Purvis stated that modifications to the Code text could be brought before the Commission for consideration. She answered “No” to a question from Commissioner Heming-Littwin as whether the Special Use under consideration would allow turning the 454 Duane property into a multi-family dwelling.

Petitioner’s Presentation

Petitioners Tom and Laura Rose, 557 Carlisle Ct., Glen Ellyn, and Behrnt Aaberg, of the architecture firm Aptus, 325 W. Huron, Chicago, were sworn in. Mr. Aaberg explained that the Special Use Permit is being requested to broaden the pool of potential buyers in the real estate market. He stated that the conversion is a good choice, and that making the property more saleable will hopefully contribute to

downtown vibrancy. Mr. Rose stated that after purchasing the property some 20 years ago he converted it to an office from its original use as a single-family home.

Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if the interior configuration presented was yet to be created. Architect Aaberg said the drawing shown approximated the spatial layout, but that a buyer would determine a plan. No kitchen is in place at present, he stated.

Public Comment

None.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved to close the Public Hearing; seconded by Commissioner Mulherin, the motion passed with nine (9) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Plan Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Rodemann, Saeed and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted “yes.”

Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Fanella said she had no problem granting the Special Use Permit, though was concerned about the impact on the neighbor to the west. Lest the Commission “put the cart before the horse,” she thought it sensible to first craft a text amendment to the code, but can’t vote in good faith for Special Use now. Chairperson Loch asked what could be done this evening relative to amending the text. Director Springer stated that the Commission could ask Staff to delay forwarding the Commission’s recommendation to the Board until after the text is amended, and continue the hearing. But, she pointed to Zoning Code timeframes in place to guarantee “swift action” for a Petitioner. Commissioner Vondruska asked if a text amendment could be created that would solve this problem clearly. Director Springer stated this would need to be examined. Chairperson Loch asked whether there could be a condition unique to these two lots. Director Springer stated there’s no condition that could be placed that would allow the neighbor to the west to not meet a setback that would be required because of a change in use. She explained that the Village regularly allows change of use, sometimes triggering legal non-conforming status. She said she understood the hesitation, and that the discussion could be continued to explore options.

Commissioner Mulherin saw the issue as a “solution in search of a problem,” and said the Village owes it to the Petitioner to move ahead and grant the permit. He said he can’t imagine a situation where, say if the neighboring building were destroyed, the Commission wouldn’t grant a variance to rebuild on this specific footprint or close to it, and added that the Commission should not worry about what may happen in the future. Commissioner Heming-Littwin observed that the direction does not seem the common way the Commission grants special uses, suggesting that the action is premature. Chairperson Loch acknowledged that typically a buyer absorbs the upfront cost, but in this case the Petitioner is absorbing some of the cost currently. Commissioner Heming-Littwin raised a point about approval upon condition of meeting substantial conformance to information presented, when in fact the subject property interior layout is not set. Chairperson Loch said that no variations are being requested, but only

the special use. Director Springer stated that the plan provided is only conceptual, and the Village usually doesn't require conformance with floor plans, anyway.

Commissioner Saeed asked if the Petitioner has only 24 months to fulfill the Special Use Permit, to which Director Springer responded that is the amount of time given to pull a building permit, and that a time period of between a year and a half and two years is generally given for completion of work.

Commissioner Berry declared that he agreed with Commissioner Fanella. Commissioner Rodemann asked if the building would not be residential use until occupied as such. Director Springer stated this is correct, and that the clock for the trigger of the two years before which a building permit needs to be submitted is the date the ordinance is signed – usually the day of the Village Board meeting or the following day.

Commissioner Vondruska asked if granting a Special Use Permit affects the neighbor the same way as if the Village changed the zoning, and whether doing so creates a problem or not. He said he didn't have a problem with converting the building to a residence, but is concerned about how the use might affect the neighbor. Director Springer said she can't imagine the Commission or the Board having a problem with the neighbor converting to single-family home, next to a single-family home, and that it's expected that the buildings might go back and forth between commercial and residential uses. A hardship might come in, she stated, in the case of an addition or a teardown to rebuild, both of which would trigger Plan Commission review. Commissioner Vondruska asked if both properties are currently legally non-conforming, to which Director Springer replied affirmatively. Planning Manager Purvis discussed distinctions between C5B commercial and residential requirements, explaining that the conversion of use yields non-conformance.

Commissioner Brown said she had no problem converting the subject property into residential, but asked if making it mixed-use of residential and office would make it a different use yet again. Planning Manager Purvis stated that this would be a significant alteration and would make it a different use than what is currently proposed. This would require the proposal come before the Plan Commission for further review. Commissioner Brown thought the plan sensible because of demand she cited for housing in Glen Ellyn.

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

After conducting a public hearing and deliberating on the request of the petitioner, Behrnt Aaberg, on behalf of the property owner, Laura Rose, for approval of a Special Use Permit, to allow the property at 454 Duane Street to be used as a single-family residence in the C5B Central Service Subdistrict, the Plan Commission hereby recommends approval based on the findings of fact, as discussed or amended at the Plan Commission public hearing on January 28, 2021, which are hereby incorporated into the Motion by reference as though fully set forth herein, and a copy of which will be attached to the minutes of this 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 building be maintained 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 monument sign located on the south side of the property be removed and replaced with appropriate landscaping;
3. That the parking lot striping be removed from the rear of the property, so as to appear like a residential driveway as opposed to a parking lot.

The motion passed by roll call vote, with six (6) yes votes and three (3) no votes as follows:

Commissioners Saeed, Brown, Mulherin, Rodemann and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted “yes.”

Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Berry and Fanella voted “no.”

Chairperson Loch voiced the need for clarification, or a text amendment.

Public Hearing concerning Zoning Code Text Amendments, a Special Use Permit, Zoning Variations and an Exterior Appearance Application to allow a proposed Food Pantry at 41-55 N. Park Boulevard

A motion to open the Public Hearing concerning Zoning Code Text Amendments, a Special Use Permit, Zoning Variations and an Exterior Appearance Application to allow a proposed Food Pantry at 41-55 N. Park Boulevard was made by Commissioner Heming-Littwin and seconded by Commissioner Mulherin. The motion passed with nine (9) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Rodemann, Saeed and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted “yes.”

Recording Secretary Barbara Dutton, now Barbara Dutton-Thomas, disclosed that she resides in the home just to the north and adjacent to the proposed food pantry.

Staff Introduction

Associate Planner Cole Jackson, Planning Manager Kelly Purvis, Community Development Director Staci Springer, 535 Duane St., were sworn in. Associate Planner Jackson summarized the Food Pantry project activity to date, noting that the current pantry operates at 493 Forest in downtown Glen Ellyn, and that a pre-app concerning relocation was held December 12, 2019. This evening’s hearing is for approval of Zoning Code Text Amendments to allow food pantries as Special Use in the R2 Single-Family Zoning District in accordance with 10-10-13(E) of the Zoning Code. He provided an overview of the new location envisioned – a building on the property of Faith Lutheran Church – and provided an overview of the driveway accesses to the site, including one slated for demolition on the 55 N. Park Blvd. lot. Setbacks and variations are viewed, he explained, in the light of the site’s frontage, on Exmoor Ave., adding that a requested lot consolidation is factored into calculations.

Associate Planner Jackson stated that the subject property has townhomes to the west and east, single-family residential to the north, a commercial district to the south, and is near two bus routes. He stated that the Village’s storm-water engineer reviewed the project and does not have any concerns about storm-water impact on any neighboring properties. The Comprehensive Plan lists the subject property as single-family residential, he noted, but said this was mislabeled as the property was used for church functions at the time the last Comprehensive Plan was adopted. The Plan, he continued, mentions working with support organizations, as well as discusses integrating institutional uses and providing buffers between commercial and residential. He gave an overview of site operations, stating that the Pantry is staffed with nine part-time employees and more than 350 volunteers; operates by

appointment only (other than emergencies); and collaborates with grocery stores, the Northern Illinois Food bank, churches and schools, and the broader community. He stated that the proposed development – to include driveway and pavement demolition, parking updates, alterations to the existing building, and the introduction of a driveway connecting to a loading zone at the east side of the structure and to the existing church parking lot that would connect to Exmoor – would increase Pantry capacity to serve clients.

Associate Planner Jackson reviewed a proposed Zoning Code text amendment to the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code to add a definition for “food pantry;” an amendment to Section 10-4-8(B) to allow them as a special use when accessory to a church in the R2 district, and an amendment to Section 10-4-8(H) to create parking requirements for food pantries. He noted that the Petitioner is requesting approval of zoning variations as well.

A screened refuse and HVAC component, he stated, requires a variation to allow it to be 21 feet from the property line in lieu of the 37-ft. 11-in. setback for the refuse enclosure. A 5-ft. 7-in. building setback and a 2-ft. 6-in. impervious surface setback from the curb of the new driveway to the north property line are proposed, both calling for variations. Crabapple trees are specified for Park Blvd. street trees, and arborvitae and an Eastern Redbud for placement on the north lot line, according to Jackson, acting as screening. A screening variation is requested for the north property line: While an existing fence does provide some screening, stated Jackson, it does not count as screening for the project as it is on the neighboring property, and code requires a 6-7 ft. opaque screen on the Pantry property.

Associate Planner Jackson stated that no signs are proposed facing Park Blvd., but one is specified for the south façade of the building. He displayed elevation drawings showing the exterior appearance envisioned, which he said is traditional in design, and is to feature woodgrain siding and asphalt roof shingles. Two chimneys are to remain, an accessible walkway is to be constructed of concrete block, and the amount of north elevation windows, he stated, was minimized to increase privacy for the neighboring home to the north. The basement will accommodate storage, the first floor will house the warehouse and pantry use, and the second floor will have storage and office space, and a multi-purpose room envisioned to host community nutrition classes.

Associate Planner Jackson read proposed text that defines “Food Pantry” as a standalone use, as well as text amendment language to allow one as an R2 special use, and to add a parking requirement for such. He listed suggested conditions of approval, and explained that the move to the new standalone location prompted Staff to request the Petitioner go through the review process.

After seeking clarification on the proposed driveway demolition, Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if the text amendment language concerning prepared meals applies to meals taken away or served onsite. Associate Planner Jackson said, either. Citing the north elevation, Commissioner Berry asked if the building is currently two-story, to which Associate Planner Jackson explained that this is where the garage, which is one-story, is currently located. Commissioner Berry asked if the elevation is going to be 5 ft. 7 in. from the property line; Associate Planner Jackson stated that it’s currently 5 ft. 2 in. from the property line.

Commissioner Fanella asked for confirmation that most of the variations are due to how the front lot line is being defined. Associate Planner conveyed that the way the setbacks are calculated as a percentage of the lot width, and having Exmoor as the front yard, accounts for most of the variations, including the trash enclosure. Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if there would be an excavation, to which Planning Manager Purvis responded that since the basement is being expanded, the Petitioner will need to excavate to some extent. Relative to the driveway/loading zone depicted, Commissioner Rodemann asked if it was the intent that a commercial truck back in all the way to the structure. Associate Planner Jackson was unsure but thought so. Commissioner Rodemann expressed concern about having a running commercial vehicle to be in such a position next to the property to the north. He said that when deliveries get made and how they get scheduled can make use of other pavement and means by which to unload a truck.

He wondered, too, if the "Food Pantry" definition reference to meal preparation implied that the premises would feature a commercial kitchen. Association Planner Jackson replied, no, that the definition text was written to allow flexibility in application. Director Springer asked how the definition had been developed, to which Cole explained that it was based on definitions from other communities. Director Springer reminded the Commission that it could modify the language. Commissioner Mulherin recalled that discussion of preparing food centered on teaching activities, and indicated that restaurant/food service is beyond the scope of this application.

Commissioner Brown asked if an area had been designated for Village residents and others to park and drop off food. Associate Jackson wasn't sure, but Planning Manager Purvis pointed to a small cut-out area on the south side that she believed could serve this function. Director Springer asked if customers could load their cars from this area. Associate Planner Jackson replied affirmatively. Commissioner Rodemann asked if a ramp would serve this area, and was told one is to connect it to accessible parking.

Commissioner Berry asked what setbacks would apply if the church sold the property to a buyer who wished to replace the building with a new residential structure. Associate Planner Jackson stated that it would depend on how it was subdivided; with the current lot width it would be a large requirement, but that if the parcel was subdivided, presumably the regular R2 setback of approximately 6.6 feet. Director Springer said a subdivision would likely be needed to rebuild.

Petitioner's Presentation

Sworn in, Paula Nugent, 75 Citation Circle, Wheaton, Ill., stated that the Pantry has worked with professionals almost two years to create a facility that not only works for the Pantry but continues to maintain the character of the neighborhood. All the Pantry activities and clients will be to the side and back of the house to minimize disturbing the neighbors, she stated, adding that traffic will be contained to the church property to minimize the impact on Park. Ms. Nugent, president of the Pantry's Board of Directors, stated it was the organization's goal to create a facility that provides needed food and support to the community while being a good neighbor to the homes, the church, and the businesses nearby.

She related that two years ago the Pantry had been urged to look for a new home by the Pastor of Grace Lutheran Church, where the Pantry had operated for nearly 40 years, but faced space constraints. A team was formed to evaluate alternatives, and an initial design finalized in the summer of 2019.

Outreach was made to neighbors in the area of the subject project site, including the direct neighbor, Bruce Thomas, who Ms. Nugent said didn't see a problem with the plan. She recalled a concern voiced by his then-girlfriend, now wife, about garbage attracting raccoons; The Pantry, stated Ms. Nugent, chains its dumpsters to keep varmints out. The Pantry launched a capital campaign, said the Petitioner, but explained that it had to "retool" the fund-raising effort because of the Covid19 crisis which also caused the Pantry to alter operations. By the end of 2020, Ms. Nugent reported, \$809,000 of the Pantry's \$900,000 goal had been raised, and subsequently was awarded a challenge grant by the DuPage Foundation. The Pantry is now in the process of finalizing contractors, she said. During this year the Pantry provided food to more than 3,000 people every month, reported Ms. Nugent, who said that while some previous clients didn't visit the Pantry during Covid, in 2020 the Pantry added two to four families each day it was open. She said the Pantry had partnered with a refugee-support program and as well as with Kiwanis, and emphasized that food distribution stays local.

The Pantry has been paying \$18,000 annually in rent, said Ms. Nugent, but will be paying an additional \$500 a month to Grace, starting in February; Faith Lutheran gave the Pantry the house and will rent it the parking lot for \$55 a year. The new location, said the Petitioner, will allow the Pantry potentially to double the number of client appointments offered, as well as offer classes. She reiterated the desire to be a good neighbor, explaining that other locations considered for the Pantry move were cost-prohibitive.

Commissioner Questions

Chairperson Loch asked about delivery trucks backing up in the driveway. The Petitioner stated that currently a 20-ft. long dairy truck delivers on Tuesday, and a "giant semi" on Thursday as part of a shared delivery, but that a 22-ft or smaller, single-delivery truck has been requested of the Northern Illinois Food Bank, which then can't confirm Thursday delivery. A truck study, she stated, showed the smaller truck can back straight into the driveway. She stated that the truck will enter from Park Blvd., travel between the house and church to the east end of the parking lot, and then back into the delivery drive, and exit south behind the church, out to Park. She also outlined how groceries will be retrieved by clients, who are to park in the lot behind the church.

Commissioner Rodemann asked about garbage pick-up frequency; Petitioner Nugent guessed it will be three times a week. Expressing concern about the neighbor to the north, Commissioner Rodemann thought the weekly large-truck delivery event could be worked out, but that frequent garbage pick-up could become a nuisance and noise issue. The Commissioner asked if large events are expected to be held near that neighbor, to which Petitioner Nugent responded that such events aren't held at the Pantry. Property limitations precluded having a short driveway, she stated, citing the house's high grade, and the need to maintain refugee gardens and handicap parking spaces for the church. Commissioner Mulherin asked if the truck driver could cut the engine while unloading; Ms. Nugent responded that this is reasonable and desirable, and could certainly be requested. He asked to review the location of the air-condition units. The Petitioner said these are sited where the refuse had originally been intended, and that placement options were limited. Commissioner Fanella requested confirmation that the conversation is about only two deliveries per week; Ms. Nugent replied that the Pantry has two truck deliveries per week.

Commissioner Rodemann hoped that lighting would not be excessive, would be properly shielded, and at lower levels. Ms. Nugent stated that the parking lot is already lit and the Pantry isn't adding to this; that the house currently has six exterior lights that the Pantry is proposing to replace with five residential-style ones; and that the Pantry has no need for any other exterior lighting.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked what time deliveries and garbage pick-up would happen. The Petitioner stated that the Pantry is told when garbage pick-up will occur, but that it's not picked up before 7 a.m. Dairy, she reported, comes at 9 a.m., while food now is around 8. She said that with the new truck arrangement anticipated, the Pantry will be able to specify to the Food Bank a delivery timeframe, though not a precise time. Observing that Park Boulevard traffic backs up during busy times, Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if a traffic study was done to determine the feasibility of deliveries between certain hours. Ms. Nugent thought timing is something to be worked out with the Food Bank, and that a traffic study hadn't been performed, partly, she thought, as it was determined that two trucks wasn't a huge impact to Park Blvd. Associate Planner Jackson confirmed a study wasn't requested. The Petitioner stated that the Pantry is conscious of pre-school drop-off and pick-up needs.

Public Comment

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

Joe Bochenski, 76 N. Park Blvd.: *"Dear Planning Commission*

First, I would like to thank Ms. Nugent and the Food Panty for the continuous work that they do in and for our community. Further, I would like to thank Ms. Nugent for visiting us neighbors near the proposed site, in 2019, to help explain their plans and operations.

The change in use of the subject property is a major change. This will have a significant impact on the surrounding community and should not be taken lightly. The proposed use includes a mini-grocery store and areas for classes. This use brings typical commercial operations to the subject property – which include truck deliveries, loading dock operations and an increase in the number of trips to and from the subject property. In fact, by example the petitioner's plans include demolition of the existing single story garage and the construction of a new larger two-story structure, which is definitely a strong indication that this use change is to a commercial use (loading and warehouse areas). These activities are better suited for the commercial district along Roosevelt Road, which has vacancies or the downtown commercial district,

The petitioner's plans state that this new facility will greatly increase the services that they can provide to the community. These increases in the petitioner's services will result in much higher traffic counts than they currently experience and more importantly much higher traffic counts than an R-2 property experiences. These increased traffic counts will significantly change the character of this particular Glen Ellyn neighborhood. If you have not been submitted a traffic study, I would highly recommend that you request one before you make a final decision to proceed.

Neighborhoods in Glen Ellyn are important to the residents of Glen Ellyn. The Village does an excellent job protecting these neighborhoods through its zoning codes and ordinances. Transitional uses between commercially zoned areas and residential areas tend to be uses such as churches, schools, daycare,

multi-family and parks, which all help buffer the residential neighborhood from commercial uses. These transitional uses allow the home owners to enjoy the neighborhood feeling that the zoning codes and ordinances help protect. This application proposes a use change that requires a text amendment, Special Use and variations that are counter to this important component to the Village planning process.

In our residential zone neighborhood, this application is seeking (1) a Zoning Code Text Amendment (2) a Special Use Permit and (3) no less than nine Zoning Variations. I understand if such extensive requests were being made in a Commercially Zone District but this number of requests/variations within a Residential Zone District clearly indicates that the use should not be located within a Residential Zone District.

I ask that you not allow this commercial use in a residential neighbor. There are so many better places in Glen Ellyn's commercial districts for this user, whereby they can provide such great work for our community within our community.

Should this application proceed, please strongly consider the following enhancements to the development that will assist the applicant with creating a more residential feeling to its commercial development:

- Enhanced Landscaping Screening along the Park Blvd side – including larger evergreen trees to screen the warehouse area, which will also help buffer the sound from the increased traffic;*
- Enhance the Park Blvd side elevations to have more residential character. This change will complement our residential neighborhood; and*
- Request a full traffic study to make certain that everyone understands how best to plan for the increased truck and patron traffic including restricting deliveries to certain day time hours that will not*

Bruce Thomas, 63 N Park Blvd: *"Dear Commissioners,*

My name is Bruce Thomas, I own the property at 63 N Park Blvd.

After looking at the latest revision to the plan for the Glen Ellyn Food Pantry I must make a few objections. The latest plan has moved the refuse and recycling enclosures considerably north of their proposed location that we saw December 12, 2020. I am concerned about their location as the Food Pantry will be dealing with food and must assumedly have waste that could attract vermin. Also now just east of the refuse enclosures are three a/c units which would be quite noisy.

The access drive for semi-trailer deliveries has been widened and as it approaches the back of the property at 55 N Park it widens still. This indicates that large semi-trucks would be loading and unloading foodstuffs very adjacent to me.

So if I may be specific I object to variation requests 3b (5ft 6 inch setback from north lot line), 3c (5 foot tall landscape screening as opposed to opaque screening), 3d (variation to permit loading area without screening) and 3h (variation to HVAC and refuse setback).

I am very concerned about the proximity of all buildings and services being to my property and I hope the commission will consider my opinion before making a decision.

Thank you.”

K.C. Wigle, 64 Exmoor (the property immediately, diagonally northeast of the subject property), was sworn in. Acknowledging the busyness of Park Blvd. and concerns about the traffic impacts discussed, he stated that Exmoor is a quiet street, which is why his family moved there five and a half years ago. He expressed concern over the “two large commercial truck deliveries” and the three garbage pick-ups over the course of a week – five new disturbances he said residents of a quiet neighborhood don’t expect. While he supports the Pantry in its missions, he said he shares concerns voiced by other neighbors and commissioners, and doesn’t believe the use is appropriate for the area or this is the place for it.

Sworn in, Joe Yucha, 14 Walnut Rd., a pastor with Faith Lutheran, stated that the church has been part of the Pantry for a long time, and that his congregation is enthusiastic about the move. He said the church is accessible and recently brought its building up to fire code, and that it hosts events and wants to be part of the life of Glen Ellyn. He sees the Pantry as a way of living out this call.

Sworn in, Pete Ladesic, 615 Scott Ave., stated that the Pantry represents a “great repurpose” of the building at the site and that the project impact isn’t going to be great, but a perfect fit. Lighting can be managed through regulations, he stated, and said Faith Lutheran already receives semi deliveries and has garbage pick-up. He looks forward to helping as he can. Regarding the variation for the loading area without screening it from an adjoining property, Chairperson Loch asked him if this could be fixed. Mr. Ladesic said he thinks the Pantry has a landscape plan, and that landscape screening would be the best.

Sworn in, Leonard Swanson, 116 Sunset Ave., said, as a former member of the Plan Commission, he doesn’t see any major adverse effects on neighbors, and the neighborhood isn’t purely residential. He said the Pantry does a wonderful job in trying to route traffic and that the number of deliveries is not significant, and urged Commission approval.

Sworn in, Scott Winterstein, 75 N. Park Blvd., said that while the Pantry provides a great benefit for Glen Ellyn, he has reservations concerning garbage collection, the mini-grocery store, cooking classes, loading dock activities, traffic disruption and delivery timing, which he views as commercial operations that violate zoning. He said he would “like a lot more information” about details behind activities, and if these could be agreed upon, they could be allocated into the permit, he would be more comfortable, but at this point, there is too much uncertainty.

Sworn in, Matt McHale, 69 N. Park, referencing neighbors who have given public comment, he said he echoes the sentiments of his neighbors. Expressing an appreciation for the service the Pantry provides, he voiced reservations and concerns about food waste, noise, and traffic. He would like to better understand the schedule and have input into it, so to achieve one that “makes sense,” allowing the Food Pantry to operate effectively with minimal disruption to the neighborhood.

Sworn in, Rick Scheck, 678 Oak St., said that while he does not reside in the area of the development, he finds joy in seeing those in need helped and sees value in the opportunity the Pantry provides for volunteering. He lauded Faith Lutheran’s participation in the relocation effort, congratulated the Pantry and Village staff for putting together the plan discussed, and hopes the Pantry’s contribution to the community can continue.

Sworn in, Carol Asselmeier, 454 Whittier, thanked the Commission for listening to the “plusses and minuses of what the residents have to say.” A lifetime resident of Glen Ellyn and parishioner of Grace Lutheran, and a volunteer at the Pantry and a member of its board of directors, she said that, as much as the Pantry appreciates concerns raised, it has gone through a “meticulous process” with Staff and believes the Pantry has addressed all of the concerns raised throughout the process. The Pantry, she thinks, has community appeal, and that the property will afford a smooth transition without a lot of direct effect on the neighborhood, and will increase the benefit to people experiencing food insecurity.

Sworn in, Katherine Meagher, 433 Cottage Ave., stated that she, too, is a lifelong Glen Ellyn resident and a member of the Food Pantry board, which she said has been very thoughtful about the necessity of a new home, reiterating that other options were sought. She doesn’t think the Pantry will add much activity to what, between the church and the Pickwick Place commercial space, is already occurring in the area. The Pantry as proposed, she stated, will add value with little disturbance, and that its services are in great need.

Sworn in, John Berg, 22W166 McCarron Rd., stated that truck deliveries rarely exceed 30 minutes, and that garbage trucks are “in and out in minutes,” and will likely be tied to the existing church pick-ups, with maybe a one or two more. A member of the Pantry’s Board and a long-time volunteer, he stated that other options explored for relocating it were too expensive, that it is imperative the community embrace the Pantry, due to the need for its services.

Petitioner Nugent elucidated the screening change requested, stating that the Pantry asked to be allowed to not place arborvitae between the house and the fence and the garage and the fence, as the landscape architect for the project advised that the plants would die due to the north exposure. Also, she stated smaller plants were selected as they are cheaper and said to be healthier and grow faster.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved to close the Public Hearing; seconded by Commissioner Vondruska, the motion passed with nine (9) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Plan Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Vondruska, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Mulherin, Rodemann, Saeed and Chairperson Loch voted “yes.”

Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Heming-Littwin suggested the phrase “prepared meals at no cost” be dropped from the text of the “Food Pantry” definition, as cooking is only intended by the Pantry in the context of teaching. Commissioners Mulherin, Saeed, Brown and Rodemann concurred.

Chairperson Loch invited discussion of the Special Use Permit and the exterior appearance proposed; hearing none, she asked for input on the zoning code variations requested.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin said the screening situation needs to be addressed. Understanding the arborvitae growing issue (though it could be by the curb cut), she thought there might be an alternative buffer for visual and noise, and there should be landscaping all along the driveway between the curb and the fence. A more concrete schedule of deliveries and garbage pick-up with which the neighborhood feels comfortable is needed, she said. Chairperson Loch suggested a condition attached to approval could specify collaboration on scheduling. Commissioner Mulherin opined that too much

stress is being put on this concern, adding that he lives nearby in an area with apartments where garbage pick-up is swift, and that determination of garbage pick-up protocols is between the Village and the Food Pantry. Commissioner Vondruska figured that the church already gets garbage pick-ups, so the Pantry might only necessitate one additional weekly, and though he is sympathetic to the neighbors, he's not sure how much control can be exerted over garbage collection operators. Director Springer said a condition could call for notifying neighbors of the schedule, but the most the Commission could do is specify a number of deliveries a week or a timeframe, which the Village wouldn't enforce unless it received a complaint of violation. Chairperson Loch stated the Pantry will have a bigger problem working around the pre-school, and which they'll have to get right.

Commissioner Vondruska said he "loves the community spirit" the Pantry creates, but would like to see the driveway better screened. Commissioner Rodemann didn't think trucks would back up all the way, and if they would only go part way, further from the neighbor to the north, less noise "might naturally happen." Such limitations along with the likelihood that the Pantry and the church could share a garbage pick-up schedule, he said, can make the situation more palatable and are worth discussion to see what the Commission can do.

Commissioner Fanella conveyed that she is comfortable with the zoning variations and the changes Commissioner Heming-Littwin recommended, and issuing the Special Use Permit, but wants to see increased screening along the lot line and by the loading dock. She likes the residential appearance presented, and believes the Pantry will work out the delivery issues relative to the pre-school, and thinks the frequency of deliveries modest. Commissioner Berry said it's a "pipe dream" to think a 43-ft. trailer as depicted will make its way a winding driveway without hitting material on either side of the driveway, and hopes for a 22-foot truck. He thought trash containers will be need to be wheeled out of the enclosure and lifted, creating six noise events a week, and hence had a concern about the need for screening. Associate Planner Jackson clarified that a 21-foot truck is actually proposed.

Planner Purvis said she would strike a sentence from the "Food Pantry" definition, as per the suggestion by Commissioner Heming-Littwin, who summarized discussion of needing screening along the drive from the building to the east. Commissioner Heming-Littwin, seconded by Commissioner Mulherin, moved for the following:

After conducting a public hearing and deliberating on the requests of the petitioner, Paula Nugent on behalf of the Glen Ellyn Food Pantry, for approval of Zoning Code Text Amendments, a Special Use Permit, Zoning Variations, and Exterior Appearance, all to allow the development of a food pantry at 41-55 N. Park Blvd. in the R-2 Single Family Residential Zoning District, the Plan Commission hereby recommends approval based on the findings of fact, as discussed or amended at the Plan Commission public hearing on January 28, 2021, which are hereby incorporated into the Motion by reference as though fully set forth herein, and a copy of which will be attached to the minutes of this 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 project be constructed in substantial conformance with the plans and testimony presented at the Plan Commission public hearing and before the Village Board of Trustees;

2. That it is the obligation of the owner of the development to install, maintain and replace all landscape materials in accordance with the approved landscape plan, and that additional screening be added along the north property line to act as a buffer between the property to the north; and
3. That if any rooftop mechanical units are visible from the public right-of-way or adjacent properties, that such mechanical equipment shall be appropriately screened from view. Screening material shall be submitted to the Community Development Department for review and approval prior to installation; and
4. That should the fence along the north property line adjacent to the Food Pantry be removed by the property owner to the north at a future date, the Food Pantry would be responsible for installation of a 6 foot-tall opaque screen or fence along the length of the property abutting the single-family residential lot.
5. That additional landscaping be added between the driveway and the north property line.
6. That the text amendment be approved as amended.

The motion carried by roll call vote, with nine (9) yes votes and zero (0) no vote as follows: Plan Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Rodemann, Saeed and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted “yes.”

Commissioner Brown asked if the Pantry and church could give the neighbors to the North a landscape allowance for their side of the fence. Saying that this would have needed to be part of the Commission’s recommendation, Director Springer said the body could *ask* the Petitioners, but not require it. The Commission, she said, could bring it to the Board, an idea with which Chairman Lock was “okay.”

A Public Hearing concerning an Amendment to the Special Use Permit for a Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Plan for the property located at 400, 418-424 N. Main Street

A motion to open the A Public Hearing concerning an Amendment to the Special Use Permit for a Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Plan for the property located at 400, 418-424 N. Main Street was made and seconded by Commissioners Heming-Littwin and Saeed, respectively. The motion carried with nine (9) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Saeed, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Mulherin, Rodemann and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted “yes.”

Staff Introduction

Planning Manager Kelly Purvis and Development Director Staci Springer, 535 Duane St., were sworn in. The former stated that Sam Vlahos, together with property owner 400 Main LLC, are seeking:

1. An Amendment to the Special Use Permit for a Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Plan on the property located at 400, 418-424 N. Main Street in accordance with Section 10-10-15 of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code.
2. The following additional deviation from the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code (all previous deviations granted are to remain unchanged):

- a. A deviation from 10-4-17-1(E) to allow roof top mechanical equipment and any screening that might be needed, to be installed on the building to a height up to 64 feet from the average existing grade exceeding the permitted building height of 61 feet granted by Ordinance No. 6672 and Ordinance No. 6690 and exceeding the limitation of 45 feet permitted in the C5A district.

Mr. Vlahos wants to open a restaurant on the premises, necessitating the variation, Planning Manager Purvis stated, adding that three rooftop units and two black iron exhaust pipes are proposed. She described the area of the development, which is under construction; displayed building concept images from different views, in which rooftop units were not evident; and listed conditions of approval to consider. Commissioner Rodemann asked if the black iron exhaust fans would serve the restaurant; Planning Manager Purvis said, "Yes," and that she understood a height reduction by the Board drove mechanical equipment to the garage, and that the Petitioner hopes to move some of that equipment to the roof and put restaurant HVAC in the garage.

Petitioner's Presentation

Larry Debb, 1049 Edgebrook Lane, Glencoe, Ill., and Sam Vlahos, 15436 Lewis Ave., Lombard, Ill., were sworn in. Mr. Vlahos stated that he operates restaurants in Hinsdale, Downers Grove and Wheaton, and thinks Glen Ellyn would benefit from one of his company's restaurant concepts. Mr. Debb of 400 Main LLC stated that the HVAC units will serve the apartment building hallways. Originally intended for the roof, they were moved to the parking lot area, he stated, though the Petitioner knew that to provide HVAC equipment for a restaurant or another tenant the units would have to be relocated to the roof.

Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked for clarification that the Board's height reduction forced the Petitioner to put the HVAC into the garage. Debb stated that the HVAC equipment was still on the roof when the Petitioner went for the building permit, but disagreed with Staff's opinion that the equipment be counted as part of the roof unit prompted the Petitioner to seek a variance. Commissioner Rodemann said the building always needed make-up air units, for which roof placement would be desired. He said it seems like the Petitioner knew he'd have to come back to request this, but that he (Rodemann) is "not overly concerned" with the placement proposed, and awaits discussion.

Though she understood the model was deemed by Building and Zoning's Steve Witt as not suitable for the application (contrary to Mr. Debb's stated opinion), Planning Manager Purvis displayed a drawing of the exhaust ("mushroom") fan assembly envisioned by the Petitioner. Commissioner Berry asked if the restaurant HVAC could be on the roof and the other three units left where they were proposed, and if so whether additional first-floor retail tenant HVAC requests could be expected. Mr. Debb stated, "No," there will be room if the building units are moved to the roof, and that the two (which, he stated, were advised by Staff so the Petitioner doesn't have to return to request another at a later point) black iron ducts will cover an additional restaurant (which the Petitioner is hoping to have). Planning Manager Purvis stated that when Preliminary and Final PUD plans are submitted to the Village, Staff at that stage doesn't look at mechanical plans and such, so it didn't know what the height of those units would be, and so didn't know that when the Village Board made changes that it would impact what could be put

on the roof; and the issue wasn't realized until the Building Permit phase, the Petitioner not knowing that the rooftop equipment counted toward height (whereas in some communities it doesn't).

Public Comment

None.

Commissioner Berry moved to close the Public Hearing; seconded by Commissioner Heming-Littwin, the motion passed with nine (9) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows: Plan Commissioners Berry, Heming-Littwin, Brown, Fanella, Mulherin, Rodemann, Saeed and Vondruska, and Chairperson Loch voted "yes."

Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Berry thanked Staff for anticipating the potential need for the second unit and taking care of it now. He also thanked the development team designers for pushing the units back so they're not visible from the right-of-way, and indicated he is in support of the project. Commissioner Heming-Littwin agreed and said that she is excited to see another great restaurant come into town. Commissioner Saeed said he is in support of approving the amendment.

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

After conducting a public hearing and deliberating on the requests of the petitioner, Sam Vlahos, together with the property owner, 400 Main LLC, for approval of an Amendment to the Special Use Permit for a Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development plan, as approved by Ordinance No. 6672 and Ordinance No. 6690, to allow roof top mechanical equipment to be installed, exceeding the height deviation previously granted for the development, the Plan Commission hereby recommends approval of the requests based on the findings of fact, as discussed or amended at the Plan Commission public hearing on January 28, 2021, which are hereby incorporated into the Motion by reference as though fully set forth herein, and a copy of which will be attached to the minutes of this meeting and kept on file as part of the permanent records of the Village. The Plan Commission makes this recommendation of approval of the requests with the following conditions:

1. That the project be constructed, maintained, and operated in substantial conformance with the plans and testimony presented at the Plan Commission public hearing and before the Village Board of Trustees;
2. That updated building permit plans for the additional mechanical equipment be submitted to the Village for review and that an amended building permit be issued prior to work on the subject mechanical equipment taking place.
3. That should any of the roof top mechanical equipment, once installed, be visible from the public right-of-way, such equipment shall be appropriately screened from view. In such case, the developer will submit cut sheets for any screening to the Community Development Department for approval prior to installation.

The motion passed by roll call vote, with nine (9) yes votes and zero (0) no votes as follows:
Commissioners Heming-Littwin, Mulherin, Berry, Brown, Fanella, Rodemann, Saeed and Vondruska, and
Chairperson Loch voted “yes.”

Trustee’s Report

Trustee Enright reported that Gary Fasules was sworn in as Acting Village President.

Chairman’s Report

Chairperson Loch had no report.

Staff Report

Planning Manager Purvis announced that the first February Plan Commission meeting is cancelled, but
the second meeting will be the third public hearing for the Draft Comprehensive Plan.

Other Business

None.

Adjournment

Chairperson Loch adjourned the meeting at 10:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Dutton-Thomas

Recording Secretary