

MINUTES
REGULAR PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
February 24, 2022

Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Tim Loftus announced that the evening's meeting is being held remotely because of a disaster declaration related to Covid-19 and public health concerns, and described remote proceedings. He officially called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m., and gave a rundown of the Plan Commission's function and operation. Mr. Loftus reviewed public hearing procedures, including protocols for public comment, which, he said, would be recorded. Mr. Loftus introduced Village Board Trustee Liaison Steve Thompson, Village Community Development Director Staci Springer, Planning Manager Kelly Purvis, Planner Atrian Fard, Planning Intern Josh Hankins and Recording Secretary Barbara Dutton-Thomas.

Roll was called. Besides the Chairman, Commissioners Lloyd Berry, Laura Brown, Angela Fanella, Matt Halkyard, Peter Cooper and Mohammed Saeed were present. Commissioner Jamie Vondruska was absent.

Motion to Allow Remote Participation

A motion to allow remote participation by the Plan Commission was made by Commissioner Saeed and seconded by Commissioner Halkyard. The motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Public Comment Non-Agenda Items

None.

Approval of January 27, 2022 and February 10, 2022 Draft Minutes

A motion to approve the draft minutes of the January 27, 2022 and February 10, 2022 meetings was made by Commissioner Berry; seconded by Commissioner Saeed, the motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Public Hearing – 764 St. Charles Road – Parkview Community Church

A motion made by Commissioner Halkyard and seconded by Commissioner Fanella to open the Public Hearing passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Staff Introduction

Sworn in, Josh Hankins, Village Planning Intern, 535 Duane St., stated that the Petitioner, Parkview Community Church, seeks a sign variation to install a backlit wall sign in the R2 Residential Zoning District, where illuminated signs are prohibited. The Petitioner, he said, is represented by Michael Bigda, of Divine Signs, and Michael Poorman, operations pastor for the church. The subject property, explained Mr. Hankins, is located on the north side of St. Charles Road, surrounded by Ackerman Park (CR) to the west, north, and east, and to the south, Forest Hill Cemetery (R2 Residential District). He pointed out two homes to the southeast of the church, which, he said, are owned by the church.

Mr. Hankins went on to note that the church currently has two identical freestanding signs on the property – one on the northwestern portion and the other in the south central facing St. Charles Rd. According to the Petitioner, said Mr. Hankins, the church has night-time activities and that signage doesn't do enough to alert drivers on St. Charles of the church. The Petitioner, said Mr. Hankins, proposes installing the sign on the elevation of the church facing St. Charles Road. The sign will be 44SF, continued Mr. Hankins, who explained that Village Code allows up to 100SF, based on the size of the building, so the proposed sign size is compliant. He outlined action to be taken by the Plan Commission and suggested conditions of approval, including one stipulating brightness level. (To a question from the Chairman, Ms. Purvis, who was sworn in, said the narrowest dimension of the sign would be 36".)

Commissioner Fanella asked if the existing signs would have come down; Mr. Hankins replied that they do not. (Planning Manager Purvis interjected that the existing freestanding signs are legal non-conforming, so couldn't be reconstructed without a variation.) Commissioner Halkyard asked how the proposed sign's brightness compares to the backlit Ackerman sign. Ms. Purvis said that, while she imagined the latter to be much brighter, she isn't sure. Commissioner Cooper asked if there are examples of other backlit signs in R2 district. Mr. Hankins said he hasn't seen any but that doesn't mean they don't exist. Ms. Purvis said this would have to be researched, but no such have been requested in her time at the Village. Commissioner Cooper identified some backlit signs, which Ms. Purvis said are permitted in certain districts other than R2 district. Commissioner Brown asked the hours of the backlit feature of the sign. Mr. Hankins advised asking the Petitioner.

Petitioner's Presentation

Sworn in were Michael Poorman, 764 St. Charles Rd., Glen Ellyn, Ill., and Michael Bigda, Divine Signs and Graphics, 601 Estes, Ave., Schaumburg, Ill. Mr. Bigda state that the intention of the sign is to be a beacon, not meant to cause harm to the community and the environment, but to create more visibility, particularly at night, in an understated way. Saying that the church wants to be a place where people can find hope and healing, Pastor Poorman explained that the church hosts recovery ministries on Monday evenings and Bible studies and wants the community to know the church is there. He said the guess is that the proposed sign would be lit from dusk to midnight. He said that since the church already has a backlit cross, the proposed sign would be consistent with it and the surroundings. He also stated that "a lot of confusion with Ackerman" arises, so the proposed sign would help distinguish between the two facilities. He added that there are no residential houses adjacent to the church's property, as it owns the two parcels next to it. Listing dimensions associated with the church's property, he indicated that he believes the backlit sign presents less light pollution than would gooseneck lighting.

Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Halkyard asked why the sign is to be placed on the right-hand side of the church face, rather than the left, near the entrance. Noting that the church has two entrances, Mr. Poorman replied that the positioning was chosen to keep the sign clear of foliage. The Commissioner asked if programs go to midnight. The Pastor responded that some do, though most end at 10. Commissioner Halkyard asked the church try to coordinate lighting with the majority if they end by 10. Pastor Poorman replied that this is something the church could do and accommodate.

Chairman Loftus asked which property line the ordinance considers with regard to the 1 foot-candle provision. Ms. Purvis said the Zoning Code treats properties owned by a single entity as one zoning lot of record, so the Village would probably look at it as a whole (i.e., the entirety of the three parcels owned).

Public Comment

Mr. Hankins read into the record the following letter received:

Dan & Anna Wilt, 734 Meredith Place, Glen Ellyn: *We reside at 734 Meredith Place, Glen Ellyn and received a notice in regards to the signage that is being proposed for the Parkview Church location at 764 St. Charles Road. After careful consideration, we do not feel that an illuminated sign is necessary. While the renderings that were provided are in good taste, we do not feel that this fits with the neighborhood and do not support the proposed signage. There is quite a bit of light pollution that is emitted from the Ackerman complex as it is, and we feel that adding to this will increase the light pollution.*

A motion made by Commissioner Berry and seconded by Commissioner Fanella to close the Public Hearing passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Berry expressed hopes that the church, as per Commissioner Halkyard's suggestion, balance operations with the hours the sign is on, but said he's otherwise fine with the proposed sign. Commissioner Halkyard said that he can be supportive of the proposed in the understanding that the church will be a good neighbor, and thought it would be ideal if the church were to install a timer to control the lighting. Commissioner Fanella said she is supportive of the proposal, and agrees with the suggestion to manage lighting. Chairman Loftus said he can support the proposed, remarking that the backlit sign is not going to be that bright. Regarding the concerns expressed by the residents at 734 Meredith, he said the church building configuration would provide blockage to Meredith, which is a great distance away. Mr. Saeed said he is in support of the sign, but asked that the sign be turned once when church activities conclude. Commissioner Cooper said he agreed with everyone, but acknowledged that the subject is in a unique location, so would advise any other houses of worship in R2 district to understand they would not be granted the same variation by the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Brown asked when the Ackerman's exterior lights are turned off. Chairman Loftus said he thinks the center is open until 10:30 p.m., so guesses toward that time, and asked if the Commissioners want to make a 10:30 turn-off a condition of approval. Commissioner Brown urged for 10 p.m., and said that while she is sensitive to neighbors, she understands the wayfinding challenges. Commissioner Halkyard expressed support for a 10 p.m. turn-off, calling the hour "reasonable." Chairman Loftus suggested that 10:30 would afford some leeway, and Commissioner Saeed said he thinks 10:30 is reasonable, and should be part of the conditions. While Commissioner Brown voiced that 10 is "a considerate time" for the neighbors, Mr. Halkyard agreed with making time a condition, but said that he is indifferent as to whether it's 10 or 10:30. Commissioner Fanella asked if the Public Hearing could be reopened so to get the Petitioner's opinion. A motion made by Commissioner Fanella and seconded by Commissioner Brown to reopen the Public Hearing passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Again sworn in, Michael Poorman, 764 St. Charles Rd., Glen Ellyn, Ill., stated that 10:30 would give the church time to clean up after an event, so this would be his preference. He added that the 50-ft. foot candle level is “fairly low.” Commissioner Brown asked if the Petitioner would like a provision for Christmas Eve or other special service. Mr. Poorman responded that, since the church has a Christmas Eve service and a springtime middle school event that have later hours, it would welcome this. Chairman Loftus asked if allowing later lighting for the two days would work. Pastor Poorman responded affirmatively. Commissioner Cooper asked the appropriate sign illumination time for nights when there aren’t events. Mr. Poorman replied that, besides wayfinding relative to Ackerman, in the evening when people are driving by the church wants to let them know that the it’s “here for them and that they can come here to find connection with people, connection with God,” so believes 10:30 would also be an appropriate time for nights when there are no programs. A motion by Commissioner Fanella to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Commissioner Brown, carried unanimously by roll call vote.

Commissioner Halkyard suggested a simple condition specifying two nights of the year as permissible for late lighting. Saying that the sign serves as advertising, Commissioner Cooper expressed disfavor with having the sign on until 10:30 nights when the church is unused, so urged for not setting 10:30 as the number. Commissioners Halkyard and Brown expressed a preference for a 10 p.m. turn-off, Commissioners Fanella, Berry and Saeed and Chairman Loftus opted for 10:30. Commissioner Halkyard moved for the following:

After conducting a public hearing and deliberating on the request of the petitioner, Parkview Community Church, for approval of a Sign Variation to allow the installation of an illuminated wall sign in the R2 Residential District, the Plan Commission hereby recommends approval based on the findings of fact, as discussed or amended at the Plan Commission public hearing on February 24, 2022, 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; and
2. That the sign’s brightness shall not exceed 50 foot-candles measured perpendicular to the face of the sign from a distance equal to the narrowest dimension of the sign or one foot-candle on the adjoining residential property lot line closet to the sign, measured three feet above the surface of the ground.
3. Other than the variation requested, the proposed sign shall otherwise be compliant with the Village’s Sign Code.
4. That the sign be programmed to turn off at 10:30;
5. That the church be allowed two special events where they can keep the sign on past 10:30, not to exceed more than two nights a year.

Seconded by Commissioner Fanella, the motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Pre-Application Meeting – 21W140 & 21W164 Butterfield Road – Clarity Strategic Opportunities

Staff Introduction

Village Planner Atrian Fard said the Petitioner, Clarity Strategic Opportunities, represented by Mr. Matt Beary, is requesting a review of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) concept plan for a 24-unit rental townhome development on the properties located at 22W140-164 Butterfield Road. To proceed with the project, explained Ms. Fard, the Petitioner will need to receive approval of a Zoning Map Amendment, a Preliminary and Final PUD Plat and Plan with deviations, and Exterior Appearance reviewed. Staff would suggest the Preliminary and Final PUD plans be reviewed as a one-step process. The subject site is located on the north side of Butterfield Road between Arboretum Road and Illinois Route 53, approximately 488 feet west of Butterfield Road's intersection with Illinois Route 53. The subject site is currently unincorporated and located in DuPage County's R-3 Single-Family Residential District, and surrounded by all unincorporated lots (including commercial uses to the south). Concurrent with the entitlement process, a petition for annexation of the subject property will be submitted for consideration by the Village Board.

The Petitioner is seeking a Zoning Map Amendment to rezone the subject property to the R3 or R4 Residential zoning district to allow the construction of attached single-family developments that are generally encouraged as a transition between commercial and single-family zoning districts. As proposed, she continued, the attached single-families will have four dwelling units per building, permitted in the R3 district; if the Petitioner wishes to change to six dwelling units per building, Staff would be amenable to the R4 zoning district, since six are permitted here by right (with the rest of the standards being similar).

The subject site is approximately 3.72 acres and is comprised of two interior lots with a combined frontage of 418.79 feet along Butterfield Road, said Ms. Fard. The east parcel ("140" address) has been vacant since approximately 2007, and the west parcel is occupied by a vacant single-family residence. The subject lot is 411.5' in width and 444' in depth, which, she said, are both well over the minimum lot width and depth requirements for attached single-family dwellings in the R3 and R4 districts. The Petitioner proposes assembling the two individual parcels to construct six freestanding buildings with four townhome units per building for a total of 24 rental townhouses on the site. The unit mix consists of 11 three-story units with 3 to 4 bedrooms and 3.5 bathrooms at 2,406SF; six two-story units with 3 bedrooms and 2.5 bathrooms at 1,974SF; and seven two-story units with 3 bedrooms and 2.5 bathrooms at 2,034SF. Every unit would incorporate an attached one- or two-car garage on the first level of the building. The maximum building height permitted in the R3 and R4 districts is 30 ft., but with a Special Use Permit they may be constructed up to 45 ft., she said, noting that the Petitioner has indicated they will be below 45 ft. The proposal, she said, calls for a two-way access drive to the site on Butterfield Road. The residential development, she continued, will be self-contained and have two cul-de-sac/turnarounds (and that as part of the formal project review the Village's Traffic Consultant would examine access, circulation and increased traffic generated).

Noting that the Code requires a lot area of 4,950SF per unit for attached single-family dwellings in the R3 and R4 districts, Ms. Fard said the project is density is compliant in that 24 units are proposed, when 30 are permitted. Also, she said, the floor-area-ratio is below that permitted for residential PUDs. She reviewed driveway dimensions and parking allotments proposed. Ms. Fard said that, while the proposed parking supply well exceeds the Code requirement of two parking spaces for each dwelling unit, staff suggests the developer consider revising their plan to include two rows of 90-degree visitor parking spaces, for a total of eight stalls, at the center of the northern cul-de-sac island, between the two detention areas. She reviewed setback requirements (which, she explained, are large due to lot width) and the proposed setbacks, explaining that the placement of the buildings is largely due to the wetlands on the property. The spacing between adjacent principal buildings is proposed to be 8 feet, where the Residential PUD standards require 18-feet, she said, therefore, a deviation will be required. Staff, she said, suggests the Petitioner consider rearranging the dwelling units to reduce the number of buildings on the site, creating four buildings of six dwelling units, to allow additional spacing between buildings.

Planner Fard said each townhome unit would include a second-story deck atop a private patio at the back of the building. Per Code, she said, decks are not permitted obstructions in required front and side yards, however, a deck would be allowed in the required rear yard provided it is open, uncovered, not over 7 feet above the average level of the adjoining ground, and not closer to the rear property line than 10 percent of the lot width. From the 3D drawings, she observed that the decks seem to stand higher than the permitted 7-foot-height from the ground. In addition, at a minimum, the decks would be set back approximately 13.5 feet from the rear lot line which will not comply with the required 41.15-foot-setback (or 10 percent of the lot width). Therefore, she said, deviations from Zoning Code will be required to construct decks within required front and side yards and for those in the required rear yard that would violate the permitted height and setback. According to the Code, said Ms. Fard, a patio or terrace shall be only located in the required front and rear yards if the patio is open, uncovered, and not over 3 feet above the average level of the adjoining ground. The private patios as proposed would be open but partly covered by the decks and would encroach into all required yards. Therefore, the Petitioner would need to receive approval of deviations from Zoning Code to construct covered patios, several of which also encroach into the required side yards where patios are not allowed. Planner Fard said that the project seems to comply with the maximum impervious surface coverage requirements.

Pointing on a drawing to a patio located on the northwest of the site that she said appears to be the closest impervious surface to a property line, Ms. Fard said deviations will be needed for impervious surface setbacks if the patios are not removed from the plans (or modified). The development, continued, Ms. Fard, offers amenities such as 65.5-percent open space, enclosed parking garages, a fenced dog run, and benches. (Part of the dog run, she noted, would encroach into a right-of-way, so the Village Engineer has recommended moving the run.) At the request of Staff, she related, the Petitioner has indicated that they plan to construct sidewalks throughout the site: 5-foot-wide sidewalks along the local streets and cul-de-sacs and 4-foot-wide path around the designated detention areas. A modern design is anticipated for the buildings, including first-floor brick masonry, fiber-cement siding on upper floors, and large windows to allow ample light into the units. A monument sign is proposed, she said.

The subject site is impacted by a stream and associated wetland areas starting on the site's western edge and continuing towards the southeast corner, continued Ms. Fard. The Petitioner, she related, has made efforts to design the buildings and roadways around these natural areas and their potential buffer zones to the extent possible. Staff, she indicated, expects that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will have jurisdiction over the stream and wetland area, and that agency will determine how impacts to that area will be mitigated. The Petitioner will also be required to provide stormwater detention for the 100-year storm event. In addition, noted Planner Fard, Post Construction Best Management Practices will be required to reduce stormwater runoff and enhance water quality, and the stormwater management requirements will be further evaluated as part of the formal submittal. The Plan Commission is asked to give comments to help the Petitioner prepare an application, said Ms. Fard, who listed considerations. Commissioner Halkyard asked why 18 feet are required between buildings. Ms. Fard guessed it could be due to Fire Code, while Ms. Purvis thought perhaps to provide green space. Commissioner Halkyard asked if there are any environmental issues for the wetlands related to tree removal. Ms. Fard responded by saying that as part of the formal process, the Petitioner will provide a landscape plan addressing trees, and Ms. Purvis added that submittal of a tree survey and analysis and plan for trees. Commissioner Saeed asked if the impervious surfaces would be within Village limits. Ms. Fard said the impervious surface coverage proposed meets standards, though the impervious surface setbacks for the private patios in the back of the houses do not (and that removal of the patios would diminish the Petitioner's request for relief).

Chairman Loftus asked if annexation would provide a continuous connection to the Village, and if so, how, given the distance from the boundary. Ms. Fard said that properties in between are scheduled to be annexed by March 2023, providing contiguity. Mr. Loftus asked the differential on this project's variations from R3 district to R4 district. Planner Fard replied that R4 district allows greater density by right, but otherwise the two are similar. Mr. Loftus asked the size of the site's non-buildable areas. Ms. Fard said she didn't know, nor does Staff know the quality of the wetlands, which determines the required buffers around them. Consulting Civil Engineer Amy McKenna explained that the wetlands in this case are likely to be regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which will evaluate their quality. She said wetlands can be un-buildable due to soils content, and that a builder would want to put buildings in higher spots. Expressing concern about units being close to neighbors' properties, Chairman Loftus has asked about the setback requirements for RE Residential Estate-zoned properties. Ms. Fard replied that the setbacks won't change upon annexation, but that a 10-ft. landscape buffer and utility easement is required around the property lines. Community Development Director Springer noted the RE Residential Estate zoning classification established for the subdivision to the west. Commissioner Cooper asked if there'd been any discussion of affordable housing with respect to the subject proposal. Ms. Fard replied that as far she knows there wasn't, but as the proposed units are to be high-end rentals, she doubts it.

Petitioner's Presentation

Matt Beary, principal with Clarity Strategic Opportunities; Len Monson, attorney with Kuhn, Heap & Monson, 552 S. Naperville, Naperville; and Eric Mancke, principal/civil engineer, ESM Civil Solutions, introduced themselves. Mr. Monson pointed to neighboring properties to the east of the subject

property, which he said have “a lot of impervious surface.” He also listed what he called “unique features” of the proposed development to consider.

The use, he said, is high-end luxury rental (\$3,500 to \$4,000 a month) townhome units expected to attract young professionals, and empty nesters wanting to simplify their lives and eliminate maintenance. He listed outdoor amenities, and argued that currently in the county there are a limited number of rental townhomes, which he said are much needed. Mr. Monson reviewed the site plan, saying that the proposed development exceeds open space requirements for a PUD, and will provide a nice transition between residential properties of differing densities. He said that “at first blush” the deviations requested may appear excessive, but they are based on lot width, therefore the setbacks imposed are unreasonable on wider sites. He said that while the Petitioner is amenable to the Staff requests concerning relocating the auxiliary parking and the dog run, the suggestion of four six-unit buildings “doesn’t fit.” He called the proposed plan “innovative” in its approach to balancing wetlands protection, storm water management compliance and open space desires, and maintained that the proposed is consistent with existing townhomes, as far as setbacks lines with neighbors. Mr. Monson added that the developer wants to keep as much of the old hardwood trees on the property as possible.

Commissioner Questions

Chairman Loftus asked the Petitioner if there have been any conversations about the wetlands with the US Army Corps of Engineers. Mr. Mancke said, while the Petitioner has petitioned the Army Corps for a jurisdictional determination (and noting that one of the parcels has already been determined to be under Army Corps jurisdiction, the quality of the wetlands has been found to be low grade – a condition that allows opportunity to enhance the corridor and make it attractive and more environmentally friendly.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the Petitioner what they can do to assist with affordable housing in the community. Mr. Monson said this wasn’t taken into consideration in planning the development, and that the developer is limited to what it can do given the character of the property and as working to appeal to empty nesters.

Chairman Loftus asked the differences between the County and Glen Ellyn regarding impervious surfaces. Mr. Monson said he’s not familiar with the County Code relative to properties to the east, but merely made observations, but that this aspect of the plan would be finalized. In a brief discussion of roof height, Mr. Beary said the developer is not looking to have a “wall of buildings.”

Mr. Loftus asked the nature of the site’s topography, to which Mr. Mancke replied that he would classify it as having a subtle grade change. Commissioner Saeed asked if the patios could be eliminated to increase the impervious surface setback. Mr. Beary said it’s important to have an outdoor area for each house, and a patio fits with the site.

Public Comment

Ms. Fard read into the record the following letters received:

Elina Kasman, 25675 Arboretum Rd.: Dear Glen Ellyn Plan Commission,

My name is Elina Kasman and I'm a resident at 2S675 Arboretum Rd, sharing a property border on the West side of the proposed development at 22W140 and 22W164 Butterfield Road.

A few points that I would like to have considered when the development is planned:

- 1. Effort must be made to preserve the few large old trees on the property; prevent clear-cutting before submission of plans (as developers often do)*
- 2. Access to the future bicycle trail at EBDRT, pedestrian/bicycle crosswalk at Rte 53 and Butterfield. This will aid the future residents of this development, and safe passage to Glenbriar Park of Butterfield Park District, Hidden Lake Forest Preserve, and the businesses on the south side of Butterfield. The current draft plan includes a walking path along Butterfield, but it is not clear how close it is to the roadway and how it can be made to be both attractive and safe.*
- 3. Comprehensive flood evaluation study must be conducted to fully consider impact of this development on existing flooding issues (our neighbors routinely get flooded basements). This might include watershed mitigation planning, where the developers could consider applying for the DuPage County Watershed Grant (typically covers 25% of efforts). I am encouraged with the proposed plan that includes wetlands and detention basins throughout the development.*
- 4. Conservation efforts to aid point 3 above, to include planting of native plants, trees, and bushes to support local wildlife, bird population, beneficial insects, and soil drainage. The Conservation Foundation is an excellent resource. The property is currently home to diverse wildlife that includes multiple coyotes. Efforts must be made to minimize disruptions.*
- 5. Lighting on the development should be Dark Sky compliant.*
- 6. ComEd recently completed repair work to overhead electric lines along the West border of the property. These lines might need to be re-routed with the development efforts.*

Shelly Wass, The Butterfield Club Townhome Association: *Dear Members of Glen Ellyn Plan Commission,*

If the Clarity Strategic Opportunities' project is approved, our Townhome Association will become its immediate neighbor to the west. Looking at the drawings on the village website, the project will be built on a wetland site. We are very concerned about this, as we already incur substantial amounts of water from the Habitat for Humanity complex, our neighbor to the east. When that complex was being built, we were told that Habitat's retention pond would eliminate any water problems for our property but that did not turn out to be true. In light of this, we are asking the Commission to seriously consider what impact this new housing development will have on our property.

Should the Commission approve the CSO project, we are also requesting that the Village receive a commitment from CSO to communicate and work with us before and throughout the project to ensure that our property will not experience any water issues or any other negative effects. We would like the ability to engage with the on-site project manager(s), as we did with Habitat for Humanity, so that our Association will continue to offer the same quality of property and privacy that our residents now enjoy.

Sincerely,

The Butterfield Club Townhome Association

Shirley Wass, President 22 W. 126 Butterfield Rd., Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Michael Krueger, Treasurer 22 W. 136 Butterfield Rd., Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Nicole Stone, Secretary 22 W. 106 Butterfield Rd., Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Colleen Piraino, Director 22 W. 130 Butterfield Rd., Glen Ellyn, IL 60137
Dean Borgens, 22 W. 134 Butterfield Rd., Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Planner Fard related that Ms. Watts asked, “Are these townhome units going to be sold to private individuals or will they be rented out?” Ms. Fard said she told Ms. Watts they’d be high-end rentals.

The following individuals delivered comments during the meeting:

Steve Johnson, 22W381 Stanton Rd., Glen Ellyn, said he lives in Arboretum Estates East, which will be annexed next year. He said the wetlands area is very wet, and that his neighborhood drains into the subject property. He urged the Commission to take into consideration plans for the East Branch DuPage River Trail, as well as to become familiar with the new RE Residential Estate zoning classification.

Colleen Piraino, 22W130 Butterfield Road (Butterfield Club condos), opined that while the wetlands on the subject property might not have been exquisite, the Petitioner is proposing reducing them. She ventured that her community and the Habitat’s were probably approved because the two lots in question were undeveloped and open for drainage. During thaw times, she said, “We are basically a lake.” She requested an engineering study, and asked if there will be requirement of no less than a 12-month lease for the leased townhomes.

Emily Dougherty, 2S645 Arboretum, said she adjoins the subject property Kitty corner and that while she appreciates the idea of having multi-family housing as a transition between other multi-family housing and a single-family residential district, thinks single-family lots might be a better choice, but if it is to be multi-family, requests “each and every” R3/4 zoning requirement be met.” She said she’s an engineer and intends to FOIA storm water conveyance calculations, and asked the Village to look into plans to widen Butterfield Road.

Skip Searcy, 2S610 Arboretum Rd., said he challenges the Commission to come and take a look at the two subject lots and the effect development will have on neighbors. He’s concerned about looming a building, and said there’s already a problem with people driving through the neighborhood, and that it doesn’t need more transient traffic to make things less safe. A traffic analysis needs to be studied.

Stephen King, 22W350 Stanton Rd., Glen Ellyn (Arboretum East Estates), related that almost 20 years the Village was petitioned to create the area of estate zoning, and understood the two subject lots to have been part of this, and that the idea was to maintain the quality of the neighborhood by not breaking up lots. He bemoaned the density of the proposed rental complex and closeness to homes that signed the agreement. He extended an invitation to go through the Estates and imagine a new building.

Melissa Footlick, 2S727 Arboretum, said the three previous speakers hit the “nail on the head,” adding that said she only recently purchased her home and is greatly concerned as to what the proposed development will do to her family’s quality of life and the resale value of their home.

Matt Beary said that his company typically has 12-month leases for all of its properties, but makes some exceptions, such as in the case of a tenant who is trying to buy a house and needs a short-term extension. Chairman Loftus asked who will be the landlord. Mr. Beary said, Clarity Property Management is based in Downers Grove.

Chairman Loftus said permission is needed to walk a private property, and that doing so otherwise is trespassing. (Mr. Beary said tree density on the site is “tough to get through.”)

Mr. Loftus asked if the Village of Glen Ellyn had any say in the Habitat for Humanity installation. Community Development Director Springer said the Village was involved in the approval process for that project, and that a public hearing process was required to obtain subdivision approval. She said that the Village granted variations from the Subdivision Code, and the property would annex once it’s contiguous to the Village corporate limits.

Mr. Loftus asked if a traffic study will be required for the formal submission. Ms. Fard said, “Yes.”

Ms. McKenna said the development of the site will have to conform with the County Stormwater Ordinance as well as the Village’s amendments to that ordinance. And since it’s likely that the Army Corps of Engineers has jurisdiction over the wetlands/stream area, they will work with the developer (who is required to provide “100-year” stormwater detention) to mitigate as needed. She observed that the site is lower than other properties, so doesn’t anticipate a drainage problem for adjoining properties, and added that water quality improvements are required.

Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Fanella said, that although Petitioner did a great job to avoid building on the wetlands, she can’t agree with the layout, which pushes up against single-family homes. She further told the Petitioner that the modern look of the townhomes “is I don’t think helping you here,” saying that she doesn’t feel like it integrates into the neighborhood.

Commissioner Brown said she echoes Ms. Fanella’s comments.

Commissioner Halkyard said that while he’s comfortable with the stormwater management solution proposed, he finds the development “backing into” neighbors’ properties a concern, and is not comfortable with the “current setup.”

Commissioner Berry said he had nothing to add.

Commissioner Saeed recommends getting an opinion from the Army Corp of Engineers relative to mitigation. He also wishes to see the patios eliminated and the size of the buildings reduced to alleviate setback concerns.

Expressing skepticism concerning stormwater and the wetlands disposition, Commissioner Cooper said he hopes the Army Corps of Engineers will be engaged early on. He added that, while multi-family transitional units are important, he’s not sure that, as designed, this concept works.

Chairman Loftus said he is uneasy about the setbacks from neighbors but understands the nature of the property, as far as buildable space goes, so thinks the layout is creative. He said he’s not so concerned about the modern design, as it can be hidden with landscaping. He said he concurs with Commissioner Saeed that there hasn’t been enough investigation with the Army Corps of Engineers to verify the proposed plan, and cited what he called “unanswered questions” regarding the wetlands. He added that he’s not too worried about whether the development is zoned R3 or R4 district.

Discussion Item – Adoption of the 2022 Official Zoning Map

Planning Manager Purvis stated that the only change to the Official Zoning Map, a current version of which needs to be adopted annually (by April 1st) is the annexation and rezoning of 1S724 S. Ellyn Ave., a single-family lot, now 450 S. Ellyn Ave.

A motion made by Commissioner Fanella to approve the 2022 Official Zoning Map, seconded by Commissioner Halkyard, carried unanimously by roll call vote.

Trustee's Report

Trustee Liaison Thompson reported that the US Bank site TIF request was discussed at the recent Village Board Workshop, as were body cameras and cameras for Village police squads by 2025. Mr. Thompson remarked that he “has a problem” with the “TIF ask,” along with some of the design elements, as well as has reservations about the timing of such a project, given that similar others are underway in the Downtown. He recognized, however, the need to balance this against potentially on missing out, and expressed admiration for the developer in point.

Mr. Thompson said the Board will be hosting an open house at the Village Links on March 7th to talk about the Roosevelt Road hotel property, about which he said that, in his mind, “everything is on the table,” as far as potential use goes. Commissioner Halkyard suggested that the meaning of the term “affordable housing” be clearly defined. Director Springer said the Consultant will address this.

Chairman's Report

Chairman Loftus said that a list of candidates was submitted to President Senak for review, since a position will be opening up as Lloyd Berry will be retiring from the Commission. He said the Commission will have one more Zoom meeting before returning to in-person gatherings.

Staff Report

Planning Manager Purvis announced that Connie Arango will be starting as a Commissioner on the Plan Commission. Ms. Purvis said that three items are slated for the March 10th meeting: the 534 Duane Street pre-app, amendments for St. Petronille parking lot improvements, and a subdivision pre-app for 322 Taylor Ave. Recruitment will take place for the Architectural Appearance Commission, she added.

Adjournment

Chairman Loftus adjourned the meeting at 10:27 p.m., following passage by roll call vote of a motion to adjourn made by Commissioner Brown and seconded by Commissioner Halkyard.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Dutton-Thomas
Recording Secretary