

MINUTES
REGULAR PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
May 14, 2020

Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 7:01 p.m. by Chairperson Mary Loch, who described the Commission's advisory role and functions, and introduced the meeting as a pre-application meeting. She explained that in the interest of transparency, notice of the meeting had been published on the Village website; mailed to property owners within 350 feet of the subject property; appeared in the Village of Glen Ellyn email news blast; and sent by the Chamber of Commerce and the Downtown Alliance via email to their members. To enable public feedback to the Plan Commission and the Village, she continued, instructions on how to participate in the meeting and to provide comment were displayed on the Village website.

Chairperson Loch further explained that, due to the ongoing Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic and, the Governor's statewide stay-at-home order and order suspending certain Open Meetings Act requirements, this meeting would be conducted remotely, via Zoom, in support of maintaining attention to important Village business. The commissioners and staff participating in tonight's pre-application meeting are in different locations, she said, and that social distancing requirements are being met. Chairperson Loch outlined the remote proceedings of the meeting, declaring that formal written comments received will be read, that audience attendees would have an opportunity to speak via the electronic meeting platform, and that all comments would be recorded.

Chairperson Loch introduced the following Village Staff participating in the meeting: Community Development Director Staci Springer, Planner Katie Ashbaugh and Recording Secretary Barbara Dutton; as well as Village Board liaison to the Plan Commission, Trustee Bill Enright. She then asked for the roll call. Plan Commissioners Lloyd Berry, Angela Fanella, Phil Hartweg, Tracy Heming-Littwin, John Mulherin, David Rodemann and Jamie Vondruska were present. Director Springer noted that the name of new Plan Commission member, Laura Brown was not called, as Ms. Brown will not be an official member until June.

Adoption of Emergency Rules of Procedure

A motion to adopt emergency rules of procedure was made by Commissioner Heming-Littwin, seconded by Commissioner Hartweg, and passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Allowance of Remote Participation by the Plan Commission

A motion to allow remote participation in the meeting was made by Commissioner Heming-Littwin, seconded by Commissioner Hartweg, and carried unanimously by roll call vote.

Approval of March 12, 2020 Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved to approve the draft minutes of the March 12, 2020 Regular Plan Commission meeting, seconded by Commissioner Hartweg, the motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Public Comment Non-Agenda Items

None.

Pre-Application Meeting – McChesney & Miller Redevelopment – 460 Crescent Boulevard

Staff Introduction

Village Planner Ashbaugh provided an overview of the review process, including the pre-application meeting, which offers an opportunity for a developer to receive informal feedback on project plans. Aided by photo and map imagery, she described the project site, which is located at the southeast corner of the block bounded by Pennsylvania Avenue, Crescent Boulevard, Glenwood Avenue and Prospect Avenue, and sits at the northwest corner of the intersection of Crescent and Glenwood. To the west of the project site is Lord's Auto Clinic, to the north is Barone's restaurant and the Glen Oak Café, and across the street to the south is the Crescent-Glenwood parking lot owned by the Village. The property is surrounded on the North, West and South sides by the C5B central service sub-district, and to the east across Glenwood by the C5A retail core sub-district. Existing topography features a downward 6-foot slope from the northwest corner to the southeast corner of the site. The property covers 8/10ths of an acre and holds the former McChesney & Miller grocery store building, which has been unoccupied since 2014, along with 42 parking stalls.

Referring to the Village's 2001 Comprehensive Plan, Planner Ashbaugh listed considerations relative to the property: height of nearby buildings, pedestrian scale, site topography, the economics of the Downtown, and sightlines in relation to prominent visual landmarks and historic features. Future land use for the block is identified as "downtown commercial," and, as the property location on the periphery of the downtown indicates a preference for retail and service uses on the first floor, particularly along Glenwood Avenue.

In the Downtown Strategic Plan adopted in 2009, she explained, the Phase III development plans called for mixed use, primarily residential, development in this area, specifying about 18,000SF of retail, and 168 dwelling units for this entire block, and one to two lower levels of parking. Applying that ratio to this site, she said, would mean approximately 8,280 SF of commercial space and 77 apartments, and one to two lower levels of parking.

In 2014, Planner Ashbaugh relates, Next Generation Development proposed a development concept for a six-story building, with an approximate maximum 64-foot height, and featuring 180 apartments and 234 parking stalls for a ratio of 1.3 stalls per dwelling unit, and 3,774 SF of retail space. The development would include portions of Crescent Boulevard right of way, and the Crescent-Glenwood Parking lot. In November 2015 the Plan Commission heard a pre-application for a mixed-used development concept by Springbank. This one for a six-story building featuring apartments and parking stalls that would yield a 1.67 ratio of stalls per dwelling unit, and 76,000SF of retail space. The concept envisioned including Lord's Auto Clinic Property, Crescent Boulevard and portions of the Crescent-Glenwood lot.

In May 2019, the Plan Commission reviewed a portion of the Draft Comprehensive Plan, Downtown Sub-Area Framework, as an update to the 2001 Plan. Planner Ashbaugh continued that this sub-area framework delineated the property as a “catalyst site,” with nearly 30,000 SF of ground-floor commercial, 144 dwelling units/apartments, and 45,000SF of ground-floor parking and two above-ground levels each of 38,500 SF. The recommended parking stall per dwelling ratio of .87 to 1.27 stalls for this sub-area overall, she said, noting that the Commission was comfortable with the ratio. In modern developments, she said, ground floors typically range from 15 feet to 18 feet in height for commercial uses, and 10 feet to 12 feet for upper floors.

Holladay Properties, the current petitioner, is proposing six-floors (with one below grade) excluding the towers, 86 apartments and 104 parking stalls for a 1.2 ratio, and approximately 1,200 SF each of commercial and apartment building lobby space. In displaying site plans and elevations, Planner Ashbaugh highlighted features including 56 below grade parking stalls and 48 at grade, with access off Crescent; pedestrian access to the apartment and commercial space off of Glenwood. To the north of the building is the loading area and dog run. Setbacks proposed are 5-ft. front yard from Glenwood, 1 ft. 6 in. corner side yard from Crescent, 6 ft. 2 in. rear yard from Lord’s, and 13 ft. 6 in. interior side yard abutting the restaurants. She noted that two deviations relative to the required impervious surface setback for this property will be needed for the project.

The complex will have a fitness center, a clubroom and a patio, and apartment sizes will range from studios to one-bedroom, to two bedrooms and two bedrooms with a den. The top three levels are exclusively apartments, 23 to a floor. Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if anything would be in the setback area adjacent to Lord’s, referring to the existing drop in grade along the west property line. Planner Ashbaugh responded that the petitioner had not proposed anything at this stage in the design, but could be asked about their plans. Fanella asked about which street the 2001 Comprehensive Plan had specified as the street on which retail should sit, to which Planner Ashbaugh replied that the location was implied as being Glenwood, based on the pedestrian shopping area that runs down the center of Glenwood as illustrated in the 2001 Plan. Commissioner Mulherin asked about a retaining wall on the west side. Commissioner Heming-Littwin said there is currently one in place, but is curious about how high the new one will be.

Planner Ashbaugh showed drawings of proposed elevations, the Front/East of which faces Glenwood. For this front façade, a deviation is being sought to eliminate the Village requirement of a 15-foot step back where the building is taller than 45-foot height. The Petitioner’s plans call for the building to be in the same plane all the way up to its top – for which the maximum height is proposed to be 64 ft. 8 in. from average existing grade to the top of the southeast tower and 58 ft. 3 in. at the top of the parapet. The bulk of the building, she pointed out, is under the 60-foot maximum limit.

Displaying renderings of the building, Planner Ashbaugh related that the building’s exterior is primarily brick (of multiple tones), with limestone details and EIFS colored to mimic limestone for the cornice. The balconies, she said, are painted aluminum. She advised the Plan Commission to ask the Petitioner for more information about the screening grate that appears (on the Crescent-side elevation) to feature plant material and covers partial openings to the parking garage on the ground floor. The north side elevation shows a glass railing enclosing the patio amenities. A privacy fence also appears along patios serving

apartments, and the building is to feature a dark metal standing-seam roof. An approximately 13-ft. wide drive leads to the loading dock on the north side of the building. It was noted that the existing retaining wall behind the Glen Oak Café was not shown in the rendering.

Planner Ashbaugh listed the required approvals, including special-use permits for a preliminary and final planned unit development plan with potential deviations and for multiple-family residential, and summarized zoning deviations to allow 104 parking stalls instead of 145; to dispense with parking stalls for commercial space; to allow a height of about 64 ft., exceeding the 60 ft. permitted; to not require a step back from the front façade; and to allow impervious surface setback distances that vary from the requirements. She pointed to areas of focus for Plan Commission exploration to derive feedback. These include the building height, the number of parking stalls, the step-back deviation, whether a one- or a two-step PUD review process would be in order, parking garage design, and architectural appearance.

Petitioner's Presentation

Petitioner Drew Mitchell, Partner and Vice President of Development with Holladay Properties, South Bend, Ind., introduced his team on the call: Chris Walsh, Principal Architect with Tandem Architecture; Javier Millan, a principal with KLOA, a traffic study and parking consultant; and Mike O'Connor, Vice President of Development and Leasing with Holladay. He provided background on Holladay, and expressed an enthusiasm for working on "catalyst" projects. Mr. Mitchell said the development envisioned for the McChesney site is to have living units that are larger than average and expects the rent to range from \$1,200 to \$2,900. He discussed the Burlington Station development in downtown Downers Grove as an example similar to that proposed this evening, as well other project examples. He expressed pride in the Holladay's practice of retaining management of developed residential properties, and explained that the company focuses on the millennial and empty nester demographics, who seek lower-maintenance living, and as such design amenities such as extra storage and laundry facilities in living units. He endorsed the desirability to a walkable lifestyle near public transportation, as well as listed amenities on which his company places value, including fiber-optics, electrical vehicle charging stations and car sharing, smart thermostats, LED lighting, walk-in closets, and conference rooms.

Expressing that the goal of the project is to create a luxury living environment, Mr. Walsh reviewed building component plans and offered rationale for the building's configuration. He discussed how the site slope effectively "lowers" the building, and reviewed traffic flow and parking space design for the garage. Trash, kept in a trash room, would be rolled out to the curb. In remarking that the site was a "tricky" one, he said the back alley would have to be ramped up. The patio, he described as an "energy point," seen as an element that enlivens the street. Mr. Mitchell interjected, suggesting that to create a "presence of hustle and bustle" outdoor televisions or a fire pit can be added to invite people to utilize the space. He mentioned the importance of Holladay's emphasis on access to the outdoors in every unit. Mr. Walsh explained that, following the suggestion from staff, balconies on the Crescent side would be inset, and that side of the building would have planters with plants that grow up screens to create a "green wall" effect. Mr. Mitchell credits the elevation change up Glenwood as a mitigating factor in avoiding blocking sunlight or views.

Regarding the lack of step back, Mr. Walsh related proposing to staff the idea of pushing the building back five feet on the Glenwood side and making the sidewalk wider by, in lieu of designing a façade step back. He is confident that lack of a step back on the Crescent façade would not create a canyon-like effect as there will not be a building to the south. He suggested trees might be added along Crescent if street area is regained (from sidewalk indents). He showed imagery of screens with vegetation and activated streets, as well as of interiors that express a quality in line with a “higher-end clientele” lifestyle. Mr. Mitchell mentioned that the petitioner is exploring ways to address the monolithic appearance of the brick. Mr. Walsh discussed grade-change challenges, which, he said, could be overcome. They are being discussed with engineers, and retaining walls might be a solution. In addressing height, he said that because the site is dropped, the building is technically below maximum height except for the tower peaks.

Describing the project as a “transit-oriented development,” (TOD) Mr. Mitchell indicated they are convinced that the ratio they have identified is correct, given ridesharing utilization. Mr. Millan said that TODs are characterized by such things as mixed-use features and a downtown location close to public transit, and have lower parking demand requirements. He cited census data revealing ownership of 1.87 vehicles per owned homes within a quarter-mile distance of the Glen Ellyn train station, and an ownership level of less than one vehicle (.95) per rental unit within that distance. The findings relative to rental units, he said, were applied in analyzing demand for parking at the proposed development. He also said that engineering survey data used to calculate parking demand revealed that for this size of development 74 parked vehicles on a weekday and 99 on Saturday would be needed. The average parking supply ratio for sites within a ½-mile of a train station is 0.8 spaces per bedroom, he said, noting that the proposed ratio for this development is 1.16 spaces per bedroom. Additionally, he said, parking ratios projected for this development are consistent with other TODs, and would be adequate to serve the development.

Addressing guest and retail parking concerns, Mr. Millan said that an apartment building of this size could be expected to have 9-10 visitors at once, typically during evening hours, a demand that can be easily accommodated by the nearby surface lot. The modest retail parking demand generated by the development, he believes, could be served by the on-street parking on Glenwood, Crescent and Pennsylvania. He concluded that the development proposed would provide sufficient parking spaces to meet the apartments’ demand and that public parking in the vicinity is adequate for guest and retail demand. Mr. Millan said that a complete traffic study would be prepared, but maintained that such a development would generate less traffic than the McChesney & Miller grocery store or other types of site use. Downtown residential developments near alternative transportation modes, he continued, tend to generate less traffic than a similar development without accessibility to transit. He referenced census data indicating some 25 percent of Glen Ellyn residents within ¼ mile of the downtown either walk, bike or take public transportation, and said that the proposed residential development would likely experience a 25 percent reduction in street generation, something that a retail or office development would probably not experience.

Mr. O’Connor added that Holladay tenants lease a parking space as a separate transaction from leasing an apartment, a practice that, he said, tends to decrease the demand for parking.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if there was a turnaround area for loading traffic, to which Mr. Walsh said, no. She and Chairperson Loch would like to see the architectural caps present on the building's west side.

Commissioner Rodemann asked if the balconies on the north elevation would be of similar material as the rest of the building, to which Mr. Walsh answered that they would be the same material as the other balconies. Having asked whether the west stairwell would exit through the garage in case of fire, Mr. Walsh responded that would be the case. Mr. Rodemann expressed that such egress would not be acceptable and suggested an engineering solution associated with the grading/piling might enable exit at the first residential level. Commissioner Rodemann recommended the parking layout be analyzed by a parking engineer to ensure functionality.

Commissioner Mulherin asked for comparative information relative to the topography of the proposed development and that of the townhomes across Pennsylvania Avenue. Mr. Walsh said the buildings were pretty much both the same height and showed a diagram illustrating evidence of his statement.

Commissioner Fanella asked what type of retail was envisioned for the building. While Mr. Mitchell said marketing of the space wasn't yet underway, the design was flexible to accommodate a variety of business, and mentioned a restaurant or a nail salon as examples.

Public Comment

Planner Ashbaugh read the following received letters into the record:

Mike Venezia, Owner, Legacy Condominium, Glen Ellyn, 462 Pennsylvania Ave., Apt 2N: *"We believe that a rental development on the former McChesney site may be a good idea IF the completed structure complies with ALL CURRENT zoning laws, rules, and regulation. We do not support the development if it requires adjustments of current codes including height or parking variances. We object to the enormous size & traffic impact, developer's request for Village financial assistance, zero setback from sidewalk. The traffic during peak hours is already dangerous on Pennsylvania Ave. when entering/leaving our community."*

Priscilla Anderson, 616 Davis Ter.: *"Please VERY SPECIFICALLY detail for community members in EXACT terms what Village Code Variances are being sought by the developer. Thank you."*

Janna Sampson, 470 Pennsylvania Ave., Unit C: *"While I am happy to see something proposed to redevelop this site, I am concerned by three attributes of this project, Height, Parking and Traffic. I live directly to the north of this development. My townhouse is 4 stories tall. At 5 to 6 stories tall, this development will block my view and decrease the light that will be available in my unit. I urge you to make sure that there is no variance on height approved for this project. I would like to see it limited to maximum of 5 stories or less. I am also concerned that the developer's floor plan states a need for 144 parking spaces for just the apartments but the proposal is only providing 104 spaces. Where will the other 40 cars park? There is no guest parking for residents of the apartments and parking for any retail businesses will be on the street only. There is shortage of parking spaces on weekend nights in this area already. Currently, the*

McChesney lot is being used for public parking so those parking spaces will disappear at a time when residents and retail businesses will be increasing the need for parking. I urge you to require this development to provide more parking for residents, their guests and retail businesses. My final concern is the increase in traffic that this will bring to the area. Pennsylvania Ave is already a traffic mess on weekend evenings as people pick up dinner or dine in at Barones, dine at Two Hound Red, go to the Northside Bar, and seek parking to walk to the many restaurants and businesses to the east on Pennsylvania and on Crescent as well as the north end of Main street. Adding 86 apartments that will likely have 150 or more residents, will make the area less safe if there is insufficient parking and increased traffic. On weekend evening, we currently dodge cars double parked on Pennsylvania Ave., dodge pedestrians jay walking and must wait for drivers to move so we can enter our driveway to get to our home. There needs to be consideration for adding cross walks to all corners of Pennsylvania and Glenwood and Crescent and Glenwood. I urge you to ask the developer to scale back this project to limit its height, make traffic issues less of a concern and provide more parking."

Chris Horney, 684 Highland Ave: *"I'd like to support the new development of the project and believe it will drive further economic development downtown. More density downtown helps the retail activity, and also increases the tax base, while removing a vacant storefront from a prominent site. Concerns about height are overblown, especially given the grade change on the site. It's effectively 1 story lower when viewing from Pennsylvania, and in context of downtown it is a good use for the site."*

Joyce Hothan, 637 Pleasant Ave., Submitted on behalf of the League of Women Voters of Glen Ellyn: *"The League of Women Voters of Glen Ellyn is opposed to having another luxury apartment development be approved in the Village without certain considerations.*

In recent surveys and meetings with residents as part of the Village's planning process, residents underscored their 'desire for a broader variety of housing options to better serve the residents in all stages of life'. Unfortunately with the recent increased opportunity for redevelopment of properties in our downtown corridor, this community's feedback does not seem to have been kept in mind. All three of these developments have focused on the same type of high- income luxury apartments.

While it may not be possible to focus on any other housing types other than apartments at this time, it is important to keep in mind the needs of the community related to at least price points. Now more than ever, having a vibrant downtown is an important goal of the Village and the addition of numerous downtown restaurants has been part of that strategy. Along with that comes the need for additional retail and food service staff. Having close affordable housing is also part of creating a good balance related to transportation and parking needs of workers and residents. This is an essential element for maintaining a vibrant community.

Lastly, the "Illinois Affordable Housing Planning And Appeals Act" passed in 2003, requires that all communities maintain 10% of their housing stock be affordable as defined by the Act. With the recent renovation and upgrading of several existing apartment complexes, the continued trend to tear down smaller older homes and replace them with much larger and more expensive ones, and this one, to

approval high end luxury apartment complexes like Avere, Apex and possibly this one, our compliance with this Act may well be in jeopardy.

Our recommendation is to ask developers who want to build more luxury apartment complexes to include in each development a set-aside of 10% for affordable housing as a way to insure our Village maintains its compliance. Since developers tend to ask for and receive numerous variances and monetary concessions from the Village in this approval process, we must also keep our residents' needs in mind and make sure their input and interests are also heard related to their 'desire for a broader variety of housing options to be sure to better serve the residents at all stages of life'. Thank you for your consideration!"

Ronald Davis, 462 Pennsylvania, 4N: *"Three major concerns. The height of the project...6 stories should not even be an option for variance. It will stick out like a sore thumb and block current views at the Legacy...Next, traffic exiting our development at the Legacy is currently, at a minimum, dangerous. Because of allowed street parking right up to our exit gate, we cannot see traffic coming from the east on Pennsylvania. We have approached both the Village and the Police dept about this dangerous situation to no avail. With the increase in traffic volume that this project would bring, this is just a disaster waiting to happen for us. Finally, there is not enough parking allotted for this project. With the new apartments going in across from the library and now this project, parking for visitors to our development will become non-existent."*

Aimee Pacente, 305 Oak Street: *"Please consider Condominiums and perhaps some Apartments for rent. This would be great not only for the aging generation but also for the Millennials who want amenities and no maintenance.*

Look at some of the Chicago high rises, they have built in grocery stores and full time chefs, healthclubs, movie viewing rooms, party rental rooms with bowling and pool tables, business meeting rooms. Perhaps there is a way to generate revenue with added amenities for Glen Ellyn.

Look at the SOHO Club or the NEMA building in Chicago. Also, adequate parking is a must, we already have limited parking.

Mike Weiler, 466 Pennsylvania Ave., Unit H: *"To Whom it May Concern,*

I am really happy to hear that there are some development ideas getting generated for this location. I think that added residential space like high end apartments or condos will be a plus to the community. I know some of my neighbors are concerned about the height of the building.

Personally I am supportive of 6 stories or less. I know there has to be a certain number of units to make the construction project worth the cost.

Traffic flow out of that area is a top concern and something that should be well thought out before construction starts. Barones is always busy in the evening and the intersection of Pennsylvania and Prospect can be dangerous from 4PM to 8PM. Any thought put towards traffic flow will be time well spent."

David Thomson, 462 Pennsylvania Ave, 4S: *"I support the redevelopment of the former McChesney Miller property for an apartment building but only if all current codes and requirements are followed for the project and only if variances and financial incentives are NOT granted, especially related to height, set backs, and required parking spaces. I live in the neighborhood, less than 350 feet from the subject property. Traffic and parking problems start with morning rush hour, subside and then return again before Noon.*

The traffic and parking problems continue to build from Noon until around 9pm. Pennsylvania Avenue frequently backs up in both directions at Prospect, especially when the railroad gates are lowered. And parking in non-pandemic times is essentially nonexistent daily from late morning until area restaurants close.

Avere on Duane and the Apex on Main are already bringing 155 new rental units onto the downtown market. Added to the proposed McChesney project, there will be a total of 241 new rental units within a three block radius. It's hard to see how our current infrastructure will handle the added pressure of these developments while retaining the small town charm that everyone loves about Glen Ellyn.

I am pro-development but it needs to make sense. The current Village building codes and regulations were adopted for a reason: they protect the residents and visitors of the community and support a charming, picturesque, livable village. Seek developments that accentuate the Village, not stick out and up like a desperate symbol of development at any and all costs. Thank you."

Barbara Merrick, 468 B Pennsylvania Ave.: *"Developing on the McChesney Miller site is to be encouraged. However when I look at this proposal from Holladay Properties I see a mammoth structure. 86 units! Just one block away facing the library a 48 unit site is being built. Building 2 large units this close together will create excessive traffic congestion in the area. The Village Plan Commission must have this scaled down."*

Chairperson Loch invited comments from meeting attendees.

Janna Sampson expressed concern that all of the architectural interest of the building is focused to the east and south. She said that her view from The Legacy condominiums to the north has a beautiful view up the hill across the tracks, with trees and church steeples, and that what she's seeing on the north elevation of the proposed development is a solid, one-color brick wall with metal balconies, and lacking architectural interest, which she would like to see introduced to the north side.

Anne Gould, 609 Newton Ave., said that aspects of the proposed development should not be considered in the context of the Draft Comprehensive Plan, as the Draft Plan hasn't yet been approved, and that concerns have been expressed about elements of it, and that it was felt that the Vision needed more clarity and public input. She believes that current code specifications relative to height and setbacks work in unison and, hence, the building concept should be considered in a holistic manner. She asked that a 3D model be requested. She asked if there were sufficient drop-off zone in the concept; expressed the hope that Crescent setbacks would not be taken from the street ROW but rather the lot; wondered if any consideration had been given to the Pandemic's long-term effects on demand, so thinks additional analysis would be useful; and said she would not like to see TIFF funds granted to the project, especially

for a building that doesn't meet requirements to minimize bulk. Chairperson Loch remarked the Plan Commission doesn't have purview over TIFF funds.

Laura Brown, 695 Plumtree Rd., asked if units in these luxury developments are being rented for use other than residential, such as for office space, and whether there were regulations governing use. Mr. Mitchell responded that they would be concerned about vacation-rental use and they wouldn't allow use of a unit for a business (however, work-from-home amenities are included in developments).

Mr. Mitchell acknowledged that Covid has entered Holladay's thinking, that they are trying to stay abreast of the issue, and that they want people to feel safe in their homes. He expressed a willingness to consider aesthetic concerns expressed by Ms. Sampson.

Chairperson Loch thanked the public for the feedback.

Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Berry agreed that a 3-D model bird's eye view rendering would be helpful. He would like to understand the parking flow; a delta of 20-40 spaces could be significant, he said, especially with the parking garage being over on the east side of Main Street and presumably there would be additional traffic flow. He complimented the presentation team and said he would encourage Holladay to pursue the project, given demand projections, though did recognize that they were made in the "pre-Covid world."

Commissioner Fanella said she is excited to see prospective development on this site and is confident in the developer that this the project would come out as proposed. She likes the developer's build-and-manage approach, and is fine with the parking situation. She thinks that now people will be more comfortable having goods delivered, so doesn't think there will be the need for many cars, and emphasized the value of a drop-off space. She likes the aesthetic of having a corner lobby, encourages continued collaboration with Village staff, would like to see more retail space included in the plan, and agrees with the desire for more attention to architectural details. She likes the suggestion of taking the 5 feet available from reducing the front-yard setback to 0 and applying it to pushback along the top levels. Garage screening should be a focus to increase the attractiveness, and said that if the staff is comfortable with a one-step PUD review process, she is, as well.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin would like to see more done architecturally on the building's north side. She said she would like to see more retail and is fine with the parking. She understands the Pennsylvania Avenue issues, but pointed out that the street is a thoroughfare to Wheaton so it tends to have more traffic than Crescent other than at certain times of the day. She favors the idea of recovering the parking spaces cut into the sidewalk on Crescent and putting trees there, as well as likes the idea of grates featuring plants to increase natural beauty. She doesn't have a problem with the building height and thinks the architectural corners are important on the building. She is fine with a one-step PUD review process.

Commissioner Vondruska said the petitioner was thorough, and that he is comfortable with the parking ratio, but hopes the layout can be fine-tuned. Commissioner Vondruska added that he doesn't believe

that the retail component will need dedicated parking spaces. He thinks five stories are okay, and that the towers on the ends make the height more palatable. He thinks the north and west sides of the building look “slab sided,” and that extending architectural elements around the building would be a nice change. He is fine with a one-step review process, if the staff is. He would prefer more of a lattice-look than a metal mesh screen on the ground floor along Crescent, and said that greenery/plantings would increase the street appeal.

Commissioner Hartweg said the height is no problem, the step backs seem to be appropriate, and the parking spaces are probably a good sign of what can be expected in the future. He liked the idea of the electric charging stations, and thought even more might be desirable. He thought a one-step review process seems to be a logical way to go. The biggest issue he saw was breaking up the “bulk” appearance of the north façade.

Commissioner Mulherin “wholeheartedly” endorsed the project, and said that the challenges presented by the site ought to be appreciated. He said the concept put forward accommodates the site nicely, and that he was impressed with Holladay’s philosophy of building ownership. Glen Ellyn needs this development, he said, expressing satisfaction with the height and saying that the parking plan is realistic. And while affordable housing is a concern to the community, he said, the project proposed is not of the type of development that can accommodate that market. He said he expects the market analysis submitted with the formal application will likely show that the community needs the kind of apartments in the project proposed.

Commissioner Rodemann concurred that the site is challenging. At first glance, he said, it seems like there’s too much building on the site, and he’d almost rather see more space on the Crescent side than a setback at the rear. He worries that the amount of retail is a token, and while Glenwood seems to be the right place for retail, it doesn’t allow for much. He’d like to see an opportunity to activate the street more successfully, but is okay with the numbers presented for parking. Height is always a challenge, he said, but this site benefits from being down in a well, so the impact on Pennsylvania is mitigated. He doesn’t like the idea of seeing trash containers stacked on Crescent, but looks forward to seeing the project moving forward.

Chairperson Loch indicated that she didn’t have anything unique to offer, but thanked the petitioner for the willingness to invest in Glen Ellyn. She said that she was okay with the height, but thinks the north side looks plain and that something has to be done to make it look “more respectable” and the building more elegant. She is fine with a one-step PUD process.

Commissioner Berry recalled that a previous potential developer had the option to purchase the Lord’s Auto site and wondered if Holladay was pursuing this. Director Springer replied that preliminary discussions about that property are taking place, but doesn’t know at this point if that property could be incorporated or not.

Trustee’s Report

Village Board Trustee Bill Enright thanked residents for practicing social distancing, the Plan Commission for getting ready for this meeting, and the Village staff for its work to keep things moving. He conveyed that he's pleased to see something happen with the McChesney site. He related that with current pandemic, tax revenue was a concern, but so far the Village is in good shape, mentioning that the golf course has reopened and that sidewalk repair continues. He mentioned discussions relative to the Civic Center parking garage decision but that the walkway between the Village parking lot and Main Street has been opened up. He said grants approved for the train station are proceeding as is the streetscape project, though the Frida Kahlo exhibit has been postponed to 2021, he reported. Funds are expected through the CARES Act, and the Village is in discussion with the state and county regarding potential other revenues from the Act, and waiting for Congress to approve additional funding for state and local governments.

Commissioner Heming-Littwin inquired as to revitalization funds she said the Governor has talked about to help with projects. Trustee Enright said he doesn't have initial concerns about projects, but does for the long term, but offered assurance that Trustee McGinley and Village Manager Franz are on top of funding matters.

Chairman's Report

Chairperson Loch thanked the staff for pulling this meeting together, and the Plan Commission for making it work.

Staff Report

Planner Ashbaugh reported receiving an application for preliminary planned unit development amendment for the Leslie's Car Wash lot for JetBrite, a site redevelopment concept that was given first-review comments; and the Harding Glen Townhomes submittal, which has gone through first-review comments. Also the department has an extra-territorial subdivision plat for the redevelopment of the BP Wash and Go at the southwest corner of Butterfield Road and IL-53, which might be the subject of a Plan Commission public hearing via Zoom in June. Also on deck is a pre-app for a possible day care facility on three vacant lots at 844 Forest Avenue.

Planner Purvis described the Duane Street Townhomes project, currently in second review and expected to come forward in the next month or so. Also possible is a special use permit for outside storage at Jewel. She also mentioned some small cell site 5G text amendments expected.

Director Springer said the focus now is on having meetings only when essential. She anticipates continued Zoom use, and is trying to keep the agenda to one item for the first few Zoom meetings. Chairperson Loch would like to see a break worked in to Zoom meetings. Planner Kelly Purvis said intern Laura Kenney is finishing up her internship with the Village and a new intern, Adrian Diaz, is coming on board in June. Director Springer reported that the Shonkwiler building is down, to allow a pedestrian connection to the Civic Center parking lot, on which the Civic Center parking garage is planned. She said the Civic Center is closed to the public, but Village business continues, and that development and building permits are up over previous years for this time.

Adjournment

After Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved to adjourn the meeting, the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Hartweg, the motion carried and the meeting concluded at 9:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Dutton
Recording Secretary

Reviewed by,

Katie Ashbaugh, AICP and Kelly Purvis, AICP
Village Planners