

MINUTES
REGULAR PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
December 9, 2021

Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairperson Tim Loftus called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. He explained the Plan Commission's function and operations, and reviewed meeting procedures including public comment protocol, saying comments will be recorded. He introduced Village Board Trustee Liaison Steve Thompson, Recording Secretary Barbara Dutton, Planning Manager Kelly Purvis, Planner Atrian Fard, Community Development Director Staci Springer and Consulting Engineer Amy McKenna.

Roll was taken. Along with the Chairperson, present were Commissioners Brown, Fanella, Cooper, Saeed and Vondruska. Commissioners Berry and Halkyard were absent.

Public Comment Non-Agenda Items

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

Approval of Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Vondruska moved to approve the draft minutes of the November 4, 2021 Plan Commission meeting; seconded by Commissioner Saeed, the motion passed by voice vote.

600 N. Main Street – Pre-Application Meeting – Daycare Center

Staff Introduction

Planner Fard said the Petitioner is Mr. Chris Horney, owner of NVS Properties, and contract purchaser for the subject property, is requesting a pre-application meeting regarding a proposed Montessori School at 600 N. Main Street, currently owned and occupied by the First Church of Christ, Scientist. To proceed with the project, she continued, the petitioner is seeking approval of a Special Use Permit for a day care center and variations from the Zoning Code. The subject property, she said, is located at the northwest corner of north Main Street and Hawthorne Boulevard, approximately 0.5 mile southwest of the Forest Glen Elementary School and approximately 0.4 miles northwest of the Glenbard West High School. The property is zoned R2 Residential District and is surrounded by other R2- zoned properties improved with single-family residences, explained Ms. Fard. The site is approximately 33,460 square feet and is improved with a two-story brick building; the existing church building, she said, was constructed about 1956. According to the petitioner, she related, the existing Church on the property has not generated much activity in recent years and intends to sell the property. She said that the site is currently accessible via two driveway approaches: one on Main St. and one on Hawthorne Blvd., leading to an L-shaped asphalt parking lot with 47 parking spaces. The petitioner is proposing to convert the existing building into a daycare center, she said, but that no expansion of the building footprint or changes to the exterior of the building are planned.

The proposal calls for closure of the access driveway on Main Street and complete removal of the parking lot to the north of the building, related Ms. Fard. In its place, she said, two playground areas

with peripheral “trike tracks” will be added. The playgrounds would be covered with a mixture of grass and wood chips, she continued, and a 4-ft.-tall aluminum fence would enclose the play areas, while a vinyl fence is proposed between them. The proposed daycare center would operate Monday through Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., she said. At maximum capacity, she explained, the facility would serve up to 130 students. The day care would employ up to 18 staff, with 13 staff anticipated to be present at any given time. The existing building itself, she said, complies with the setback requirements of the District, but the playground areas will not meet the minimum required interior side yard setback (25 ft. for special uses), so a zoning variation is required.

Citing an ALTA Survey, Ms. Fard said that the existing parking lot does not meet the minimum impervious surface setback of 7.93 ft. at the rear and north side of the site, and existing parking lot covers most of the required rear yard setback, where Code permits only 50 percent or less to be impervious surface, hence the parking lot is considered legal nonconforming; as part of the Special Use Permit process, she said it would be required to be brought into compliance with Code, or Zoning Variations would need to be granted to allow the existing conditions to remain. The petitioner, she continued, hired BLA Consulting Engineers to conduct a traffic impact study, the results of which have been shared with the Village’s Traffic Consultant. Currently, access to the site is provided through one driveway on Main and one driveway on Hawthorne that would allow for a two-way internal circulation. The petitioner is proposing to remove the access to Main Street and use the Hawthorne access drive as the main point of entry to the site. The study, she said, indicates this is an effective access management strategy to improve safety, pedestrian mobility and traffic progression along corridors. This re-configuration will result in a dead-end parking lot that when completely occupied, she said, will require vehicles to drive to the north end of the parking lot and use the stub of the former east-west drive aisle to turn around and proceed south to the exit. At this point, according to Planner Fard, the Village’s Traffic Consultant does not have any issues with this configuration, but the petitioner will need to submit turning movement exhibits as part of the formal application, to confirm adequate space has been provided for vehicles to turn around.

Planner Fard said the traffic study indicates that the Main Street and Hawthorne Boulevard intersection currently operates during the morning peak at a level of service where back-ups become more noticeable, but delays are still within an acceptable range. In the evening peak hour, she said, the intersection currently operates at level of service where long delays are experienced. Conditions are expected to worsen by 2027 with normal growth – which would be exacerbated by a daycare facility. The intersection is currently controlled by four-way stop signs, explained Fard, who added that analysis by BLA suggests that installing a traffic signal control could improve the Main and Hawthorne intersection operations during peak hours. However, she continued, the Village Engineer would not recommend the installation of a traffic control signal without a complete engineering study justifying the need for it. (He has also indicated that the proposed development alone will not be the driving factor for warranting the traffic signal.) The study indicates that the new daycare facility would generate some 94 trips (into and out of the site) during the morning peak hour and approximately 95 trips during the evening peak hour. According to the Petitioner, said Ms. Fard, the daycare’s policy will require all

parents come into the facility to check-in and check-out their children. This means 95 cars will need to park to drop off/pick up children during the peak hours.

Code, explained Ms. Fard, requires one parking space for each 800SF of gross floor area for daycares, resulting in a minimum requirement of 12 parking stalls for this particular daycare. The Petitioner is proposing 29 parking stalls, she said, which would provide slightly less than the Institute of Transportation Engineers projected peak parking demand of 30 spaces. She displayed a chart from the Petitioner that showed the distribution of arrivals and departures for their typical daycare, and said it indicates that the highest percentage of children dropped off in the morning within any 15-minute time range is 16 percent, or 21 children, assuming 130 children are enrolled. In the evening, she continued, the highest percentage of children being picked up within any 15-minute time range is 15 percent, or 20 children. Calculating, based on staff presence and car conveyance assumptions, she said about 33-34 parking stalls would be needed, and Staff is concerned that the 29 parking stalls proposed will not meet demand.

The minimum required dimensions for a surface parking lot are a 25-foot-wide drive aisle and a total "wall-to-wall" module width of 63 feet, she said, but the dimensions of the existing parking lot have a total module width of 59.5 feet. Although the existing parking lot dimensions are considered pre-existing nonconforming conditions, as part of the special use process, the Petitioner would need to redevelop the parking lot to comply with Code or seek Zoning Variations to maintain the lot as is. According to the Village Traffic Consultant, she related, when the module width is reduced, turning into the parking spaces becomes more challenging, and that a reduced parking space width can increase potential for minor dents to adjacent parked vehicles. Staff would suggest that the parking lot be redeveloped to conform to the current parking lot dimension requirements, she said, adding that redevelopment to meet Code would reduce the total parking supply to 25 spaces, noting that a few more spaces would be lost to required landscape islands. To accommodate the recommended number of parking spaces, she said, the parking lot will either need to be expanded or the number of students reduced.

The proposed trash enclosure meets the Village setback requirements, said Ms. Fard. However, she noted, at its proposed location the enclosure occupies two parking spaces. Since the proposal lacks sufficient parking supply, she continued, it is recommended that the trash enclosure be relocated to an area of the site that does not reduce the parking supply. The size, location and design of the existing monument sign appears to be in conformance with the Sign Code. The petitioner intends to maintain the existing sign structure and reface it, she said, and it is not anticipated that any variations need to be granted for the signage. To proceed with the project as proposed, the petitioner will need to receive approval of A Special Use Permit and various Zoning Variations.

Chairperson Loftus asked whether it would be permissible to put the trash enclosures west of the striped-off area, or would a variation be required to do so. Planner Fard replied that Code requires trash enclosures to be in the rear yard, but said it could be moved to that location. Mr. Loftus asked if storm water mitigation is needed if parking lot changes are made. Ms. Fard responded that the impervious

surface on the property is being reduced, but a drainage plan would be needed as part of the building permit approval.

Petitioner's Presentation

Chris Horney, who introduced himself as working for Murphy Real Estate Services, said he has been a Glen Ellyn resident since 2015. He related that the subject church building has been on the market for more than a year, and that his business has it under contract. The updated plan being presented, he said, is based on input received. He noted, they shrunk the playground to add Code-compliant parking spaces. Two handicap spaces are to be added, he said.

He said his company is developing daycare centers across the country, and that he is working with a Montessori school, and other groups, but that a tenant for the subject property hasn't yet been defined. Mr. Horney said that the intent is to renovate the existing church building to modern-day standards.

Understanding that traffic is going to be the biggest issue, he said the his traffic consultant is present. Since Main is quite busy, he said, the entrance to the street would be removed from the subject site. He said his company daycare facilities' traffic patterns are nothing like Forest Glen's or St. Pet's or First Pres' day care, which has a defined pick-up/drop-off period, and envisions no stacking or queuing, and that his proposal provides more spaces than other comparable facilities in the area offer. He concluded by saying that Glen Ellyn is a family town but there is not a lot of daycare opportunities.

Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Cooper asked if the facility would house a daycare or a Montessori school, the latter partly characterized by a relatively fixed schedule, while the former type having a fluid one. Mr. Horney said this project would be "a more traditional daycare," without a fixed schedule. Chairperson Loftus observed seven parking spots reserved for staff. Mr. Horney said that while those are earmarked for staff (due to the spaces' location) 13 staff are anticipated at peak hours. Commissioner Fanella said Westminster and Diamonte pre-schools have set hours, so the proposed might be better compared to Childtime or others. The seven staff parking spots, said the Petitioner, would be the hardest to back out of and would be vacated for trash pick-up. Planner Fard noted that Staff was concerned about the number of spaces. Chairperson Loftus said they would still be short during peak hours. Mr. Horney said the assumption is that some families will have two children enrolled, and that some will walk. Noting also the inclusion of handicapped spaces, Chairperson Loftus said that traffic might back up on Hawthorne during peak times.

Commissioner Vondruska encouraged the Petitioner to keep trying as the community could use more daycares but said that the parking and traffic issues at the subject property create an "insurmountable" problem, citing students walking to school and bus traffic in the area. He said the site would lend itself to single-family homes, and that he couldn't support the daycare proposed. Commissioner Fanella said she sees a need for daycare, but agrees with Commissioner Vondruska on the traffic situation, and said she is concerned about cars backing in and out with children about, and said this seems not to be the right site. Chairperson Loftus wondered if the Petitioner had considered moving the playground (to regain parking). Mr. Horney said it can't go in front of the structure without zoning variations, and that playgrounds in the front of the building are not appropriate, and that such would change the character

of the street. Chairperson Loftus asked if landscaping along Main might hide the playgrounds. Mr. Horney said he is open to this.

Commissioner Cooper said he doesn't think traffic flowing onto Main Street is a good idea and that adding a half-dozen more parking spaces will not address his concern about traffic. Chairperson Loftus asked if the flow would be right-in/right-out. Mr. Horney said this hadn't been addressed, but could be. Commissioner Brown asked if the Petitioner was working only with Montessori schools. Mr. Horney replied, "No," saying his company works with multiple daycare operators. She wondered if an end-user with fewer students might be found. Mr. Horney said a 50-student count probably isn't possible economically, but 115 might work. He said he is open to exploring this, explaining that occupancy is based on square footage per student, adjusted by age. Noting that feedback is based on a hypothetical, Ms. Brown said she shares concerns with fellow Commissioners, but supports the idea if traffic is addressed. Though the need for daycare is high, said Commissioner Saeed that, this site is not right for this application.

BLA Senior Traffic Consultant Lynn Means said her firm conducted a conservative traffic impact study for the project. She said that daycare uses are systematic, and that she believes an element of safety is added by parents walking children into the school. She also said that the parking delineated could accommodate the traffic, that barring site access to and from Main is recommended due to current street capacity strains, and that analysis indicated that the daycare envisioned would increase traffic by roughly 5 percent. In response to a question from Commissioner Brown, Ms. Means said a right-out onto Main would require further analysis.

Public Comment

Planner Fard read into the record the following:

Megan Rotter: *I live on Euclid Ave and I say no to this build for the rezoning at Main and Hawthorne. This is too residential of an area and that corner is already too crowded with traffic for that kind of build. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion on this matter.*

Todd Phillips, 616 Euclid Ave.: *I am writing to express my concern and disapproval regarding the proposed daycare facility at the corner of Main and Hawthorne. This corner is already busy, especially during the morning and evening rush hour. Adding a child care facility that additional traffic during those same hours will increase the problem; frustrating drivers and patrons of the facility alike. I would prefer to see this property sold for residential use.*

Anne Weber, 619 Euclid: *My name is Anne Weber and my husband Rob Weber and I are property owners at 619 Euclid Ave. We received the notice regarding the meeting this evening and unfortunately could not reschedule some work commitments and are out of town.*

If I'm examining the proposed rendering correctly, it appears that the entrance/exit will all be on Hawthorne Street?

Many that would attend the daycare would then use the block of Euclid to access the Hawthorne entrance/exit. Hawthorne Boulevard is already a very busy thorough way as it serves both an entrance to

Glenbard West and to Hadley Junior High. We have some concern over the additional traffic entering and exiting such a large scale development in a very residential area.

Please advise of any further steps or actions on this proposal. Also please feel free to contact us regarding our public input and we apologize for not being at the meeting. Thank you.

Jeffrey Jarret, 600 Forest: *We have concerns about the plan to convert the subject church to a daycare center. Our primary concern is the impact this would have on the quality of life in the neighborhood from additional traffic congestion and noise pollution. In addition, we think this would have a negative impact on property values in the neighborhood.*

Both Hawthorne and Main Street are very busy thoroughfares and during peak times during the day they are highly congested. Hawthorne is constantly backed-up from train traffic routed from Park, and from school buses and cars dropping off and picking up students at GBW high school. It is virtually impossible to get out of our driveway (on Hawthorne) during these peak periods. Main Street is also highly congested. As the only North/South thoroughfare through the village, the congestion and noise pollution from cars and trucks during peak periods feels as if we live on a major highway.

In summary, we are against moving forward with this plan to convert the church to a daycare center for the reasons cited above and wanted to voice our opinion for the Glen Ellyn Planning Commission.

Thank you for the opportunity to share.

The following members of the Public made comments in person:

Jennifer Kitun, 601 Euclid Ave., voiced concern about traffic congestion and said that parking is an issue.

Ann Graham, 605 Euclid Ave., who said that having a church in the neighborhood has been lovely, observed that said neighbors can't get in and out of their driveways at current traffic levels. She called the intersection of Main and Hawthorne a gateway to the historic district, saying it provides a sense of awe, and whose charm would be diminished by a daycare center.

Rebecca Boltz, 501 Hawthorne Blvd., said she is not a fan of the concept, adding that while the project sounds okay in theory, the reality of the logistics presents a challenge. She is vehemently opposed.

Renée Stephan, 592 N. Main St., who said she lives in the historic Benjamin Gault House, expressed concerns about the project's effect on neighborhood character, as well as about the safety of children. She added that pulling out of her driveway in the morning is already difficult.

Nathan Lamkey, 600 Euclid Ave., who called the community "Rockwellian" and walkable, said the proposal for what is a for-profit venture is driven by greed. He said the concept is inappropriate, the proposal cost tax dollars, and he wondered how the subject even got on an agenda.

Commissioners Fanella and Vondruska interjected to explain that a Petitioner has a legal right to be heard; Commissioner Saeed added that the Board is comprised of volunteers. Planning Manager Purvis explained that the purpose of a pre-application meeting is to elicit feedback on a concepts' viability.

Kelly Phillips, 616 Euclid Ave., said she did not agree with the proposed, and that she echoes the sentiments voiced on traffic. She called the idea a "square-peg-round-hole issue."

Shane Kern, 621 Euclid Ave., said he didn't have much to add to the previous public comments, but said he is opposed to the proposal discussed.

Pete Notter, 611 Euclid Ave., said he has the same opinion as his neighbors and members of the Commission. Citing safety and traffic issues, he said he is opposed to the proposal and that the site should remain residential.

David White, 639 Euclid Ave., declared that he wanted to formally go on record as being opposed to the proposed development, mainly because of congestion.

Lee Marks, 475 Hawthorne, said that Hawthorne has become a "racetrack," and that the proposed site would be the worst possible place in town for a daycare facility. While is in favor of daycare, he said this is the wrong spot for it.

Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Cooper said the proposed is not an outrageous idea, but suggested the Petitioner explore other locations. Chairperson Loftus asked Commissioner Vondruska if he would consider the use if the head count was reduced. Mentioning the location and layout proposed, Mr. Vondruska replied, "No." Thinking the site could be subdivided into three residential lots, Commissioner Fanella wondered if such a proposal would have to come before the Plan Commission. Planning Manager Purvis replied that this is correct.

787 Harding Avenue, 138 IL Route 53, and 3 additional parcels (without addresses) – Public Hearing – Harding Glen Townhomes

A motion to open the Public Hearing concerning a Special Use Permit for Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Plans with Zoning Deviations, Preliminary and Final Plats of Subdivision for a Major Subdivision, Subdivision with Variations, a Zoning Map Amendment, and the Exterior Appearance for the construction of 23-unit townhome development on the subject property was made and seconded by Commissioners Fanella and Vondruska, respectively. The motion passed by voice vote.

Staff Introduction

Sworn in, Planning Manager Purvis, 535 Duane St., said the petitioner is Harding Custom Homes, represented by Marvin Ritter. She stated that the Petitioner is requesting approval of a proposed 23-unit townhome development on property south of Harding Avenue and west of IL Route 53 – a subject presented in three previous pre-application meetings. She explained that the petitioner seeks approval of a Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Plan, zoning deviations, subdivision plats, subdivision variations, a Zoning Map Amendment; and exterior appearance. Besides these, she added, the Village Board will review a right-of-way (ROW) vacation.

The subject site is comprised of parcels totaling 3.367-acres, stated Ms. Purvis. The property is currently zoned R2 Residential zoning district, she said, adding that, as part of the project, the petitioner is requesting that the property be rezoned to the R4 Residential zoning district. The 2001 Comprehensive Plan, she related, recommends low-density attached residential on the property with a density of some 5-10 units per acre. The proposed project has a density of approximately 7-units per acre. The

Comprehensive Plan further designates the lots as potential development site #14 and recommends “*Low-density attached residential* [use of the property]”.

Planning Manager Purvis described the proposed project: The petitioner is proposing the construction of a 23-unit townhome development on the site. As part of the project, a new cul-de-sac would be constructed. The individual townhome units range in size from 2,174 square feet to 2,362 square feet with four-six attached units per building. A total of five buildings are proposed. All of the townhome units would have three bedrooms and 10 of the 23 proposed units are anticipated to incorporate first-floor master bedrooms.

The project complies with the density limitations for a site of this size, she stated, as well as complies with the floor area ratio limitation. Landscape buffering is to be provided, she added, saying that some 44 percent of the site is to be devoted to open space to be maintained by the Homeowners Association. She reported that one type of exterior wall sconce is proposed, as well as one residential development sign; these are Code-compliant. Planning Manager Purvis displayed a rendering of one of the buildings, and explained that masonry, brick and stone materials will be used in the project, which will also feature decorative garage doors. Pairs of units were offset to break up the rooflines, she said, and rear-elevation bay windows and dormers were added. A variety of shrubs, grasses and conifers are specified in the landscape plan, she noted, and three street lights, water and sanitary mains, and storm sewer are to be installed. A gated, permeable-paver emergency vehicle drive is proposed at the south end of the cul-de-sac, to connect to IL Route 53. A sidewalk will be installed along this access route, connecting to the sidewalk at the southeast part of the site, which runs from Sheehan Avenue & Route 53 intersection. Sidewalks will also be installed on both sides of the ROW along Harding Court, and will connect to existing sidewalks on Harding Avenue. The Subdivision Code, she explained specifies a sidewalk be installed along all public ROWs, but the Petitioner is requesting a variation as they are proposing not to install sidewalk along a 400ft. portion of Rt. 53, a request with which Staff is supportive. Existing sidewalk along Rt. 53 is to be cleared and repaired, and included in the scope for the IDOT permit.

Planning Manager Purvis explained that the Petitioner is proposing a 22-wide dedication along the adjacent 33-ft.-wide Harding Avenue ROW, allowing the Village to create a 55-ft. ROW. But, being less than the 66 feet required by Code, this would call for a variation. She said this width is consistent with other similar streets, and that Staff is supportive of this variation. An extension of the ROW connecting the property to the west to a public road (the cul-de-sac) has also been provided, she stated, but being less than 66 feet, also requires a variation. The proposed cul-de-sac street length, she explained, will also need a variation from the Subdivision Regulations Code, as will three lots that are proposed to be “through” lots. Deviations relative to width are requested for two corner lots, she said, and setback deviations sought for three lots, and a deviation for a 6-ft. fence along Rt. 53. She listed requested deviations concerning impervious surfaces.

Though all overhead utility lines within the subdivision limits and in adjacent ROWs are required to be placed underground, Planning Manager Purvis said the Petitioner is requesting a variation to allow three poles (of eight) to remain unburied. While Staff advocates requiring undergrounding, she related, Public Works, is in support of allowing one of these to remain in place. (This one carries lines spanning Rt. 53.)

Public Works also supports access from Harding Avenue with a supplemental right-in, right-out access to Route 53 near Abby Drive, as proposed, she said. The Village Engineer, she continued, prefers a connection to Route 53, but could work with the proposed cul-de-sac design, should the Commission recommend approval of it. According to the Developer's traffic engineer, said Ms. Purvis, 124 trips in and out of the development (and the three already built single-family homes) would be generated on a daily basis, most of which will use the Rt. 53 and Pershing intersection. The traffic study indicated that the traffic generated by the development would not materially impact the intersection. Storm water detention for the 100-year storm event, she said, is being provided in a regional detention basin in Panfish Park, to which the development is tributary, and that the Developer will pay a fee to the Village, based on storage needed. The storm sewer that the Developer is installing, she said, will discharge into the wetland area south and west of the Water's Edge development directly connected to Panfish Park. The developer, she said, has provided an analysis to show that there is no significant impact to this wetland complex as a result of this development. Dry wells/stone beds are to be installed in rear yards to reduce runoff, she noted. She outlined Plan Commission action expected.

Commissioner Fanella asked if sidewalks had been required for the developments to the south, to which Ms. Purvis said it would have been (at Rolling Hedge). Commissioner Cooper said that he is troubled by the sidewalk deviation, as the Village Board has made clear that it wants sidewalks. Ms. Purvis responded by saying said that the Village Engineer prefers the connection goes south to Sheehan, and that given engineering challenges identified, the deviation is a reasonable concession, and that installing sidewalk up to Pershing could be looked at as a public improvement project.

Chairperson Loftus asked what happens if the Village doesn't vacate Harding Avenue, to which Planning Manager Purvis replied, the project would need to be redesigned, but added that it's unlikely that the Board would approve the project but not the Harding Avenue ROW vacation. Commissioner Fanella asked the Staff's view of the benefit to the cul-de-sac vs. the road exit right-in/right-out onto Route 53. Ms. Purvis stated that Staff was supportive of the exit onto Rt. 53 (over the emergency exit), mostly because it allows for multiple points of access to the site. She cited as a positive of the cul-de-sac design is neighbors on Brentwood have fewer units backing up to their lots, and also that there'd be no cut-through traffic from Harding Avenue to Route 53. Sworn in, Amy McKenna, Project Manager, Hampton, Lenzini & Renwick, 380 Shepard Dr., Elgin, Ill., confirmed that the emergency access is for emergency vehicle use only.

Chairperson Loftus asked who, with the right-in /right out option, could make a determination of no-right turns allowed in morning rush hours to limit it as a cut-through. While she replied that she believes the Village has the right to make that determination, Planner Purvis said that the roadway is under IDOT jurisdiction. Citing previous concerns that Amber Ridge would become a cut-through, Commissioner Cooper recalled push back, so wondered what the experience has been. Sworn in, Staci Springer, Community Development Director, 535 Duane St., said the Village hired a traffic consultant, who advised it wouldn't be the case, and that Community Development has not received any complaints. Commissioner Cooper asked if a similar analysis was done for the subject proposal, to which Ms. Springer replied it has not.

Commissioner Vondruska asked if IDOT gave an opinion on having a connection to Rt. 53. Consulting Engineer McKenna deferred the question to the Applicant. The Commissioner asked for an overview of the storm water findings. Ms. McKenna explained that this site is approximately four acres in the Panfish watershed, so can take advantage of excess storage that exists in Panfish Park for detention, and that large storm sewers are being provided. She named multiple wetlands in the floodplain, and added that there is a large storm sewer on Park Blvd.

Petitioner's Presentation

Property owner Mark White, 227 7th Ave, NE, St. Petersburg, Fla., was sworn in. He stated that his wife grew up on the subject property, on which her father had built two houses. He said he and his wife hired Rite-Way builders and has been working with the Village and neighbors on this development effort.

Marv Ritter, 899 Clifton, Glen Ellyn, with Rite-Way Custom Homes, was sworn in. He stated that this project is different from other projects, as most of the builder's projects are residential infills, and discussed the acreage of the subject property, relative to evolution the project's configuration. He presented a dramatic hypothetical scenario to illustrate pedestrian danger along Route 53, and went on to reference a letter from Rich Daubert of April 29, 2020 suggesting challenges to connecting sidewalk on the west side of Rt. 53 – particularly at the north end of the development, and that it would be appropriate recommend the developer solely connect to the sidewalk south of development. Relating that a right-in/right-out is desired by IDOT, he said it's dangerous to come out on Rt. 53 – even if it were widened, as IDOT has suggested. The cost of this would probably put the project out of business, he said – a position that he believes IDOT understands.

Mr. Ritter said the Petitioner believes that in GE there are 46 cul-de-sacs larger than Code, including four in this particular neighborhood. He stated that he's not sure the setbacks are big issues, and said AC units and decks are technically in front yards. He said the 6-ft. tall fence is a safety item and one to keep the noise down. He discussed driveway and curb cut strategy. Calling the development a potential "destination location," Mr. Ritter pointed to nearby single-family houses that sold for \$900K and \$835K, and said the cul-de-sac configuration would serve to create a "secluded enclave" that would appeal to people with discretionary income, including downsizers attracted to units with first-floor master bedrooms. He said the proposed gazebo in the plans was changed to a pergola. Regarding storm water management, he stated that the site's topography drops and water naturally flows to Panfish Park, displayed a photo of pipe designated for the project, and referenced Best Management Practice Pits.

Alan Carradus, Carradus Land Survey, 191 S. Gary, Suite 180, Carol Stream, Ill., was sworn in. As far as the sidewalk installation along Route 53 goes, he said, there's some design criteria on that part that goes south of the emergency access. Concerning the brush and overgrowth he said there are some grade elevations that have to be dealt with, and drainage issues and ADA requirements, which are difficult to tackle not knowing IDOT's plans. He said connecting to the south makes sense, as it provides access to Glen Crest and its surrounds; anything to the north, he stated, "would just be a design nightmare." He emphasized that water captured on the site will be delivered to Panfish Park and that the project is not intercepting any flow, and submitted that the cul-de-sac design offers a sense of security to residents.

Commissioner Questions

Chairperson Loftus asked if a sidewalk was put in to the north of the emergency route whether it would be required to have a wall on the property side. Mr. Carradus replied that planning would have to go through an entire IDOT process, and it might be, but then you get into a safety and security issue. Commission Cooper asked if a study of had been done to determine how many pedestrians are on Route 53, to which Mr. Carradus responded, "No," and that he's not familiar with people walking it. He said, however, the overgrown vegetation covering the sidewalk makes the sidewalk less utilized, and that it would be cleaned up for use as part of the project.

Public Comment

Planning Manager Purvis read into the record the following:

Andrew & Pam Malone, 795 Parkview Court: *"By allowing a change in zoning on the subject property most of what we found unique about our home purchase in Waters Edge some 15 years ago will be lost. As we made our purchase back then, we took great pains to verify with the village, a number of important items.*

- 1. That the property to the East and South would remain single family.*
- 2. That Harding Road, being used as a construction route would be permanently closed.*
- 3. That all utility poles would be removed and buried underground.*

Up until this point all of the above have been realized.

Twice before zoning changes have been up for review and in my opinion each of those times the plan commission got it right. Most recently, with the first 4 single family homes of Harding Glen have attracted young families with children, a nice addition and balance to the neighborhood. Then once before, in approximately 2008 the plan commission rejected additional townhouses on Nicoll Way and Harding for the construction of 5 single family homes. I request once again you strongly consider leaving this remaining site for Harding Glen, single family. Should single family construction prove not to allow for a successful project and only townhouses are considered, then I believe traffic issues become difficult to manage. As under consideration:

- 1. Opening Harding will only serve to providing a major shortcut for drivers avoiding the stoplight on Pershing and Route 53.*
- 2. To allow the proposed cul-de-sac design, funneling perhaps as many as 50 cars to an already complex intersection on Nicoll Way and Pershing is not advisable.*

While no solution is ideal, perhaps a dedicated intersection to align with Abby Lane would be beneficial. That along with a pedestrian walking/bike path would allow the residents of the town-home development to stay connected with the park, shops and services on Roosevelt Rd. By restricting auto access of this new development to only Route 53, many of the traffic problems presented by the other alternatives disappear. Additionally, this would also allow many of the area's longer-term residents to maintain most of what we believed we bought into.

As one additional comment I would request that for any new work site development, construction traffic be directed into the site from Route 53. The households on Nicoll Way, Parkview Court and Harding have had to deal with dirt and traffic for the last 5 years. It's time to move the access point of this development.

Thank You for taking my viewpoint under consideration.

Mark Adair: *"We have previously expressed concerns that have not been addressed by the developer in the years we have been discussing this project. I believe the commission, in the previous meeting, indicated our concerns had merit.*

1. The addition of 23 townhomes significantly alters the character of our neighborhood so long as the townhomes are accessed through the neighborhood. I'm not opposed to the development of townhomes on the site. I'm opposed to the access for those townhomes through our neighborhood. Currently, we enjoy a unique condition of a very quiet, low-traffic neighborhood juxtaposed with easy access to busy Roosevelt Road businesses. We easily walk from the quiet of the natural wetlands in our backyards to the busy Roosevelt Road restaurants and retailers. That's the neighborhood we all bought into. While we expected the potential for a handful of new single family homes on the site, we did not expect 23 new townhomes and access to an existing single family home. The traffic for 23 townhomes and one single family home will be significantly greater than would be the case for a handful of single family homes as had been zoned. We would prefer that all access for Harding Glen be via Rt 53 and not through our neighborhood. We also want to be sure there is no through traffic from Nicoll Way and Harding Avenue to Rt 53.

2. Water - The Harding Glen site drains to the wetlands associated with our Waters Edge homes. Residents of Waters Edge pay for the maintenance of the wetlands and there has not been an issue with water encroaching on our homes since the townhomes were developed in 2007. The development of the Harding Glen project will add water to the wetlands since the site is currently completely raw and absorbing some water when there is rain. Although the village and the Harding Glen developer have determined there will not be a negative impact from additional water in the wetlands, we remain concerned. Should water in the wetlands begin reaching the Waters Edge buildings any time after Harding Glen development begins, we can reasonably believe there is a connection and the village and Harding Glen developer should be prepared to address it.

3. Aesthetics and function - We would like the village to remain true to its expectations regarding burying utility lines that are currently above ground and adding a sidewalk along Rt 53. The utility lines are currently unappealing and should be buried as the village has been requiring. Utility lines serving Waters Edge were buried as required during development. The village requirement of a sidewalk fronting the Harding Glen east side should be enforced to ensure a safe route for pedestrians as well as a visually appealing end product. Aside from saving the developer money, there seems to be no reason to allow the utility and sidewalk variances.

Thank you for considering these concerns."

The following individuals were sworn in and made comments in person:

Dave Deschamps, 774 Glenbard Rd., said that the townhomes “look great,” but that he thinks single-family homes should be built there, and is worried that with the existing grade, the project will tower over his house. He expressed hopes for a permanent fence.

Eric Hemesath, 780 Glenbard, commented that his lot has a unique shape, and that he has enjoyed attractive green space. He appreciates the work that has gone into the plans for the development, but thinks it will yield “monstrosities in our back yard.” He added that he would not walk his children on a sidewalk along Rt. 53.

Rick Quoss, 85 Waters Edge Ct., said he agrees with the comments made in the letters read. He cited drainage as an issue, in that a large volume of water goes into wetlands before flowing into Panfish Park. He said he is concerned about ingress and egress, and dangers he believes increased traffic would bring.

Jeremy Johnson, 774 Harding Ave., said that his main concern is Harding Avenue being the entry point to the development. With its current width, he said, two cars cannot move past each other, but that widening the street would encroach on his yard.

Chairperson Loftus asked for specifics on landscaping plan, including a description of what will separate the townhomes from neighboring properties to the south. Commissioner Fanella said it looks like arborvitae. Mr. Ritter stated that it is an “enormous amount of landscaping.”

Commissioner Vondruska moved to close the Public Hearing; seconded by Commissioner Fanella, the motion carried by voice vote.

Commissioner Discussion

Chairperson Loftus said he doesn’t see the setback variations as an issue, since the plan seems to have enough space and landscaping. He said he agrees with Public Works staff on the undergrounding of part of that 12KV line. He said connecting to the existing sidewalk seems a safe way to get to Glen Crest, and that he is okay with the project density. Commissioner Vondruska said he agrees on the smaller deviations which relate to the geometry of the property, and has no problem with the setbacks. He said he agrees, too, with the Village that those few western-most utilities should be buried. Observing that not much has happened on Rt. 53 in recent years, he said he is okay with not having a sidewalk on 53 at the north end of project. The proposed solution of connecting the southern bit, he said, is a safer way to walk, so he is okay without the 53 portion of it being involved. Extending the fence would be a nice to see, he added. He said he doesn’t know whether having a cul-de-sac is more of a traffic issue than having people potentially cutting through. He said the density is “pretty decent,” and that he appreciates the time spent on architectural details. Commissioner Cooper said he might be the holdout on the issue of a sidewalk, and that holding off pending IDOT determination on Rt. 53 is a “fool’s errand.” The reality, he said, is that pedestrians use 53, and the question is whether the Village will make it moderately safer by having this developer comply, or instead take the position of leaving it unsafe so to discourage people. He said that the Code requires the developer to install sidewalks, and that he hasn’t heard a good reason to deviate. He said he’d like to see the sidewalk extended to

Pershing. He expressed that he thinks the Commission is in concurrence on the utilities, but said that he is concerned with a Z-curve from Harding Court on to 53 creating more prosaic designs and lots.

Commissioner Saeed said he has a problem with a sidewalk on 53, as the road is dangerous for pedestrians. He said he thinks it should be taken out of the recommendation. Commissioner Brown said she likes the cul-de-sac, and that she worries about a cut-through if it went out to 53. She said she has no concern about the sidewalk. (She said she thinks it is safer to take Nicoll.) She added that she likes the building articulation and shadow lines. Commissioner Fanella said she appreciates the iterations and the architecture. She expressed that she doesn't know how she feels about the sidewalks, and agrees that the power lines except the one that links across 53 should be buried, but suggested that whether the road is a cul-de-sac or a cut-through is immaterial. She said she thinks she could support the project without the sidewalk but would be worried about setting a precedent. Noting that the sidewalk is not a surprise to the developer, Chairperson Loftus said he is okay with a sidewalk being "halfway," in the hopes it will someday be completed. Commissioner Cooper asked if he is the only one objecting to the sidewalk variation. Commissioner Vondruska said the Commission during his time as a member of the Commission it has never generally given leeway on sidewalks because the Village wants them. In this case, however, his rationale is that it is a very busy street, the point in question is where the street narrows, and there's not a lot of room. He said he sees compromise, leaving the door open for later connection, but said it's not warranted to force it in this case.

Following Commission discussion of sidewalk plans, Commissioner Fanella moved for the following:

After conducting a public hearing and deliberating on the requests of the petitioner, Harding Custom Homes, for approval of a Special Use Permit for Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Plans with Zoning Deviations, Preliminary and Final Plats of Subdivision for a Major Subdivision, Subdivision Variations, a Zoning Map Amendment, and the Exterior Appearance for the construction of a 23-unit townhome development on the property located at 787 Harding Avenue, 138 IL State Route 53, two vacant parcels (without addresses) and a 33-ft. Village right-of-way, the Plan Commission hereby recommends approval based on the findings of fact, as discussed or amended at the Plan Commission public hearing on December 9, 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 petitioner construct, maintain, and operate the development in substantial conformance with the plans and testimony presented at the Plan Commission public hearing and before the Village Board of Trustees;
2. That the developer shall install, maintain, and replace all landscape materials per the approved landscape plan until the common areas are turned over to the HOA;
3. That the HOA shall maintain the landscaping within the common open areas in substantial conformance with the approved landscape plan in perpetuity;

4. That the Declaration of Maintenance and Easement Agreement for Harding Custom Townhomes Subdivision Unit 2 shall be recorded against all 5 Lots with the Document No. referenced on the Plat prior to recordation of the Plat;
5. That the developer must post performance security as required by the DuPage County stormwater ordinance and by the Village Code for stormwater management elements and public improvements;
6. That a fee for stormwater detention in the regional detention basin in Panfish Park in the amount of \$132,900.00 per acre foot of required storage shall be submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit;
7. That a soils analysis for each building shall be provided with final permit plans for the project;
8. That a stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and a copy of the IEPA Notice of Intent shall be submitted with permit plans for the project;
9. That the public improvements list be revised to the satisfaction of the Village Engineer prior to Village Board review;
10. That an updated EcoCat be submitted prior to the issuance of a building permit for the project;
11. That any required clearing or sidewalk repair adjacent to the Rolling Hedge Subdivision be included in the scope of work covered by the IDOT permit and that the developer assist with the actual work (with reimbursement by the Village);
12. That no work on the project should commence until an IDOT right-of-way permit has been issued for the project;
13. That the petitioner prepare a construction management plan for review at a pre-construction meeting with the Police, Fire, Public Works, and Community Development Departments and that said Village staff approve the construction management plan prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Seconded by Commissioner Vondruska, the motion carried unanimously by roll call vote, with all Commissioners present voting, "yes."

Trustee's Report

Trustee Thompson had no report.

Chairman's Report

Chairperson Loftus reported that the effort to identify a ninth Commission member continues.

Staff Report

Planning Manager Purvis said two items are already set up for a first meeting in January.

Adjournment

Chairperson Loftus adjourned the meeting at 11:05 p.m. following a voice vote on a motion to adjourn by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Vondruska.

Respectfully submitted,
Barbara Dutton-Thomas
Recording Secretary