

DRAFT MINUTES
REGULAR PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
April 28, 2022

Call to Order and Roll Call

Acting Chairperson Angela Fanella convened the meeting at 7:05 p.m. Roll was taken with, in addition to Chairwoman Fanella, Commissioners Arango, Brown, Cooper, Saeed, Thakkar and Vondruska in attendance, and Chairperson Loftus and Commissioner Halkyard absent. Acting Chairperson Fanella described the Plan Commission's advisory role and operation, including procedures for public comment. She introduced Village Board Trustee Liaison Steve Thompson, Interim Community Development Director/Assistant Village Manager Emily Rodman, Planner Atrian Fard and Recording Secretary Barbara Dutton-Thomas.

Public Comment Non-Agenda Items

None.

Approval of Draft Minutes

Following a motion by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Vondruska, the April 14, 2022 Plan Commission Meeting draft minutes were accepted by voice vote.

Following a motion by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Thakkar, the April 28, 2022 Plan Commission Meeting draft minutes were accepted by voice vote.

Public Hearing – 464 Glenwood Avenue (formerly 460 Crescent Blvd.)

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

Staff Introduction

Sworn in, Atrian Fard, Planner, 535 Duane, stated that the Petitioners, Mike O'Connor and Drew Mitchell of Holladay Property Services, on behalf of the property owner, and have submitted a formal application for approval of an amendment to the Planned Unit Development Plans for the Glenwood Station mixed-use development project. Changes to the approved PUD plans, she related, include moving the northwest corner of the below-grade parking structure southeast approximately 10 ft. and modifying the plans for floors 2-5 of the structure to relocate the north facade 9 ft. to the north to align with the north edge of the podium level below. The exterior balconies on the north elevation would be replaced with Juliet balconies, she added. The changes proposed to the plans are largely being requested to off-set the increased costs associated with building materials since the project was approved in 2020, Planner Fard explained. The developers have indicated that without these revisions to the plans or an increased TIF incentive, the project would not be financeable, she said. To proceed with the project as proposed, stated Planner Fard, the Petitioners will need approval of the following:

- An Amendment to the Special Use Permit for a Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Plan for the property located at 464 Glenwood Avenue in accordance with Section 10-10-15 of the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code.
- The following amendment to the parking deviation that was granted by Ordinance No. 6834 from the Glen Ellyn Zoning Code (all other previous deviations granted will be remaining unchanged).

Planner Fard explained that the deviation for the parking lot is to allow 102 parking stalls where 151 are required for a mix of 86 junior one-bedroom, and two-bedroom dwelling units and 1,490SF of commercial spaces. Staff, she said, notes that the applicant previously applied for a deviation from this section of the Code to allow for 104 parking stalls, which is consistent with the approved plans; however, due to a typographical error in the approving Ordinance, approval was granted for 102 parking stalls. Since the approved plans illustrate 104 parking stalls to be provided and the Plan Commission and Village Board approved it, therefore, they need to apply for an amendment to the PUD. The subject property, continued Planner Fard, is located on the north side of Crescent Boulevard between Prospect Avenue and Glenwood Avenue in the C5B Central Service Sub-district, is approximately 0.81 acres in size, and surrounded by other C5 zoning.

The Petitioners, she related, appeared before the Plan Commission on November 12, 2020 for a public hearing, and received recommendation for approval of a preliminary and final PUD, deviations, a Special Use Permit for multifamily dwellings in C5B and exterior appearance. On December 14, 2020, continued Planner Fard, the Village Board considered the Special Use Permit for the Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Plans with Deviations, the Special Use Permit to allow dwelling units in C5B, the Exterior Appearance of the building and a Redevelopment Agreement for the proposed development. In November of 2021, she stated, the developers submitted a building permit application and plans for the project. Staff has completed two reviews of the plans at this point. The building permit plans would need to be revised to reflect the changes proposed to the PUD plans if approved by the Village Board.

The amendment to the PUD plans, explained Planner Fard, includes moving the northwest corner of the below-grade parking structure southeast approximately 10 ft. This modification to the plans will result in the loss of two parking spaces and requires approval of additional zoning relief, she said, adding that the total parking required for the proposed dwelling units and commercial spaces is 151 stalls. The approved PUD plan included 104 parking stalls, she noted, and the revised plan now shows 102 parking stalls. The proposed plan revisions also include relocation of the north façade for floors 2-5 approximately 9 ft. north, she stated, in line with the north wall of the first-floor podium of the building. The projecting balconies previously proposed would be replaced with Juliet balconies, said Ms. Fard. This change will create additional rentable square footage for all of the units on the north side of the building, she stated. The revised floor plans indicate that all units on floors 2-5 on the north side of the building will feature a den, concluded Planner Fard, who displayed illustrations, and said the developers plan to demolish the exiting building in May 2022, and will be seeking a second building permit, and reviewed construction schedule changes, to yield occupancy in July 2024. She went on to list possible Plan Commission action.

Petitioner's Presentation

Sworn in for the Petitioner were Drew Mitchell, 122 E. 7th St., Hinsdale, Ill.; and Christopher Walsh and Peter Szczelina of Tandem Architecture, 1040 W. Huron St., Chicago. Citing industry challenges, and declaring that the Petitioner is not asking for more money, Mr. Mitchell related that Holliday purchased the subject site and has put a lot of work into the proposed project, but has encountered a “scary situation,” citing inflation and financing difficulties. Saying the developer had “fallen in love” with the McChesney site, Mr. Mitchell related that the Holliday pulled in other architects, as well as trades, to value-engineer the project, to preclude asking for additional TIF funds. He stated that the development will generate significant tax dollars for the Village, and indicated that creative approaches have been hatched to save on construction costs and increase rentable square footage (from 79,799SF to 89,919SF). The approach, explained Mr. Mitchell, entails extending the façade of the second floor to capture square footage from what had been designated as terraced balconies, and replacing these with Juliet balconies, a move, he said, expected to have negligible effect on the unit desirability, according to a market study consultant Holliday engaged. The other variance, stated Mr. Mitchell, is a modification to the foundation structure, due to unanticipated challenges in having to construct below-grade parking in a hole while protecting retaining walls. Necessitating cross-bracing, he said, the approach makes it difficult to get equipment into the work area. He said the development team has worked their “butts off” to deliver the project on time and on budget, and that he is hopeful that the Plan Commission will be receptive to the “modest modifications” proposed.

Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Brown asked the rent range projected for the units, to which Mr. Mitchell replied from \$1,495 to the mid-3,000s. He went on to note that Covid has affected building design, specifically driving more working space opportunities, said EV charges are envisioned, and lauded a collaboration with the Village to yield two “workforce housing units” in the building. Mr. Walsh stated the footprint of the building will not change, nor will the south or east façades. He said some undulation remains on the north façade, and that building colors, trim and windows are the same as previously denoted, and that the units losing balconies would now have dens. Mr. Mitchell estimated that 10,000SF of total living space would be added through the absorption of previously depicted balcony space.

Commissioner Brown asked if the Petitioner had considered tinkering with the south instead of the north façade to assuage any concerns about that might be expressed by residents of The Legacy townhomes. Mr. Mitchell indicated not, explaining that the south façade is considered the most prominent, and insisted that those viewing the north façade will see “a beautiful building,” adding that the site is “tricky.” Commissioner Vondruska noted that a lot of the public comment that happened originally was on the first renderings, but the design evolved and visually what is currently proposed is not different than what was approved by the Village Board. Commissioner Brown said she understands this, but believes it is helpful to articulate the façade treatment decision, a point Mr. Mitchell said he appreciates. He exclaimed that the Petitioner needs to cheapen up the foundation to save money, pull the façade out, and get going on shifting the risk from general owner to general contractor to subcontractor, in what he called a “very weird environment.” Claiming “the volatility is paralyzing,” he emphasized that “there’s a lot riding on this.”

Commissioner Cooper said he is troubled that the façade push out of the south side of the building, which he argued will create a different appearance in the community. Expressing that the change is in the spirit of what had been presented, Mr. Mitchell said he is saddened to hear the Commissioner's interpretation otherwise, but admitted he's "not trying to say that 9 ft. isn't a big deal." Commissioner Thakkar asked if moving the façade out 9 ft. is saving money or just increasing the potential rents. Mr. Mitchell replied that the action reduces the rents on a per-square-foot basis, but increases it on the whole. And, he continued, while the Petitioner is increasing expense by adding more paint, drywall and trim, it is not increasing the expensive part of the building, and the additional rent helps with financing.

To question from Commissioner Saeed asked about how stormwater is to be managed, Mr. Walsh responded that it will use the existing storm sewer system. Commissioner Vondruska noted that the stormwater component was approved previously, to which Ms. Fard added, no change to the stormwater plan is necessary because the first floor remains unchanged. Acting Chairperson Fanella asked if construction costs less with the flat front. Mr. Mitchell said it actually costs more to build, while Mr. Walsh said they didn't flatten anything, but rather just pulled the façade out 9 ft., and that only balcony railings were pushed back. Mr. Mitchell said that while the inset balconies did create some visual interest, the building is not monolithic."

Planner Fard read into the record the following letter:

Zak Wilson, 716 Crescent Blvd.: "Why is the motion for the Glenwood Station amendment for approval only? Is there a reason a motion to deny wasn't written up as well?"

Planner Fard said Staff generally doesn't provide both, but upon request can produce a motion to deny.

The Public Hearing was closed upon a unanimous roll call vote following a motion made by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Vondruska.

Commissioner Discussion

Commissioner Thakkar said he liked the prior design showing an offset at the back of Barone's and Glen Oak restaurants, and that the balconies gave the building more character. Despite the Juliet balconies preserving the some of the aesthetic, he said, he expressed that he is torn on the issue, though given the circumstances, could see his way to approve the variance. Commissioner Brown said she has no problem with the 102 parking spaces, but wants to make sure the Commission doesn't act in haste due to pressure, and that the building is the best it can be. Admitting she is conflicted, as she likes the balconies all the way around, she said she wants to make sure every option has been checked to reach the project's full potential. Also saying she doesn't want to make a decision in haste, Commissioner Arango said she is sorry to see the balconies go, and wondered if not having balconies in a residence affects its desirability.

Commissioner Cooper said he's not troubled by the reduction in parking spaces, and that, while Juliet balconies could be lovely, they change the nature of the design. He said the move seems rushed and that he doesn't think enough the community has been given enough time to weigh in. In that he is somewhat uncomfortable going with what he sees as a substantial change in design at the 11th hour, he said, he's inclined to table the discussion to make sure the community has sufficient notice. Noting that

the evening's hearing and the pertinent Village Board meeting offer opportunities to elicit feedback, Commissioner Vondruska said it's sad to see the balconies go, but he would not be inclined to vote "No" on the changes. He added that the parking space loss is not a concern to him. Acting Chairperson Fanella stressed that the determination focuses on how the design affects the character of the community. Commissioner Brown wondered if the go-ahead might be given under the condition that the Village Board considers TIF allocation to keep the balconies, to which Chairperson Fanella said this is not in the purview of the Plan Commission, but the suggestion will be noted. After some debate about the implications of the Plan Commission vote on Village Board deliberations and the Petitioner's position, Commissioner Vondruska moved for the following:

After conducting a public hearing and deliberating on the requests of the petitioner, Michael O'Connor, Vice President of Development & Leasing for Holladay Properties, for approval of an amendment to the Special Use for Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Plans with an amendment to the parking deviation, to allow the construction of a 5-story, mixed use building with ground floor commercial space, apartments, and an enclosed parking garage on the property located at 464 Glenwood Avenue in the C5B Central Service Subdistrict, the Plan Commission hereby recommends approval based on the findings of fact, as discussed or amended at the Plan Commission public hearing on May 12, 2022, 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 condition that the developers construct, maintain, and operate the development in substantial conformance with the revised plans and testimony presented at the Plan Commission public hearing and before the Village Board of Trustees.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown, and passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Pre-Application – 799 Roosevelt Road – Roosevelt Glen Redevelopment

Staff Presentation

Planner Fard explained that the Pulte Home Co., contract purchaser of the subject property, is presenting a concept for a 99-unit attached row house PUD. To proceed with the project, she continued, the Petitioner will need to receive approval of a Zoning Map Amendment, a Preliminary and Final PUD Plat and Plan with zoning deviations, a Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision with variations, and Exterior Appearance. Staff, she said, recommends the Preliminary and Final PUD plans be reviewed as a one-step process. The subject site, she said, consists of four lots, with a total area of 7.16 acres; it is bounded by streets on three sides, including Route 53 to the east, Pershing Avenue to the south, and Nicoll Way to the west, leading to two corner lots, an interior lot, and a landlocked lot with no street frontage. The site is located within the boundaries of the Roosevelt Road TIF district, and is zoned C3 Service Commercial District, she said, adding that the surrounding zoning and land uses are C3, C4 and R4. As part of the proposal, related Planner Fard, the Petitioner requests that the property be rezoned to R4 Residential. Although the attached single-family developments are generally encouraged as a transition between commercial and low-density residential zoning districts, she said, Staff believes there is a great potential to incorporate the northern commercial parcels along Roosevelt Road into the northern portion of the development. Therefore, she said, Staff recommends rezoning only the southern portion of the property along Pershing Avenue to R4 and leaving the northern portion as C3 to support

existing commercial and office uses, an approach more closely aligned with the Comprehensive Plan. The lot is approximately 305 ft. wide, compliant with the minimum 90 ft. for attached single-family dwellings in R4 district, and has a frontage of 490 ft. along Rte. 53, 590 ft. along Pershing Ave., and 236 along Nicole Way. The current use is office.

The Petitioner, she related, proposes to assemble the four individual parcels to construct 22 freestanding, three-story buildings. Each building would have three to five attached units for a total of 99 row houses on the site. Ms. Fard stressed that an attached single family development with a maximum of six dwelling units per building is permitted in the R4 District. According to the Petitioner, she continued, the size of each proposed unit starts at 2,175SF. Each unit will feature three bedrooms, 2.5 bathrooms and a mix of attached front- and rear-loaded, two-car garages on the first level of the building. Each dwelling unit will have its own private entrance. Dependent upon the unit's location on the site, some driveways are designed longer to allow for additional surface parking, while others would be shorter and only allow access to the garages. Staff, she related, would suggest the petitioner consider increasing the length of the shorter driveways to allow private surface parking for all units.

The proposal calls for maintaining the existing two-way-in, two-way-out access drives on Pershing Avenue and Nicoll Way. Staff notes that the proposed dead-end streets at the east end of the site would create difficulty for car and truck circulation. While these dead ends provide access to the three 4-unit buildings at the east end of the site, they are too narrow to provide sufficient room for vehicles to turn around. Therefore, small cars will need to use the private driveways to turn around, while refuse trucks, snowplows, and fire trucks would likely need to back out of the dead end. Staff suggests the Petitioners consider turnaround strategies that would afford satisfactory access for daily travels, firefighting, snow removal, and refuse collection. As part of the formal project review, the Village's traffic consultant will review access, circulation, and increased traffic generated by the development to determine if the proposed design is appropriate.

Staff considers the two east-west streets at the center and south of the site to be more than 600 feet long and the rest of the street network to be less than 600 feet long. Under the Residential Subdivision Code, local streets with less than 600 feet in length shall have a minimum ROW width of 60 feet, and local streets longer than 600 feet shall have a minimum ROW width of 66 feet. As proposed, it is anticipated that variations from the required ROW width may be needed. Further determination will be made as part of the formal process. All local streets in residential subdivisions shall maintain a minimum pavement width (back of curb to back of curb) of 21 ft. At a minimum, the project would have a pavement width of 18 ft., therefore, a variation will be required. The project is also out of compliance with the density standards in the Zoning Code, as the Code requires a lot area of 4,950SF per unit, which would allow for approximately 50 units on the subject property, while 99 are proposed at 2,521.5SF per dwelling unit. Under the Residential PUD standards, the number of dwelling units permitted per lot may be increased up to 20 percent (equal to an additional 10 dwelling units) if the development offers amenities such as 25 percent open areas, recreational and pedestrian facilities, provision of enclosed structures for 50 percent of all required parking, etc. Of further note, stated Ms. Fard, the draft Comprehensive Plan recommends a total of 48 units (for multi-family apartments) on the site. Therefore, Staff believes that the development as proposed is *too dense*.

The project is also noncompliant with respect to the maximum allowable floor-area ratio (FAR); the proposed FAR is 0.83 where 0.4 is permitted by Residential PUD standards. As proposed, the Petitioner, she continued, would need to seek approval of deviations from all setback requirements set forth for attached single-family dwellings in the R4 district. Staff would suggest the Petitioner consider revisiting the proposed number of buildings and their arrangement on the site to minimize the number of deviations required for building setbacks; especially in the case of the buildings located at the southeast corner of the site, which maintain only 11 feet of setback from the intersection of IL Rte. 53 and Pershing Ave., where 30 ft. is required. According to the narrative, she continued, every unit would feature a second-story balcony at the back of the building and an open front entry. As proposed, Staff anticipates that the Petitioner would need to receive approval of deviations from setback requirements to construct private front entries and potential patios and balconies. Also, she said, the proposal includes a 300SF optional, habitable attic with a rooftop terrace. With three stories proposed, she added, the Petitioner has indicated that the buildings would not exceed the maximum allowable building height of 45 ft.

The Petitioner, stated Planner Fard, is proposing 34.46 percent and 31.2 percent impervious surface coverage in the western and eastern front yards, respectively, which comply with the impervious surface coverage requirement. An impervious surface setback of 15.23 ft. (5% of lot width) is required on all sides of the site. The front entries/patios located on the southeast corner of the site, near the Rte. 53 and Pershing Avenue intersection, appears to be the closest impervious surface to a property line, with a distance of approximately 4.5 ft. and 5 ft. from the south and east property lines, respectively. On the western edge of the site, the entries and patios are set back 9.9 ft. from the front lot line at the closest point. On the north end of the site, the proposed sidewalks connecting the development to the commercial lots to the north of the site would reduce the impervious surface setback to zero. Therefore, deviations will be needed from impervious surface setback requirements for all sides of the property.

Parking would be provided through a mix of attached two-car garages for all dwelling units (198 spaces), in addition to 88 surface parking spaces on the driveways, two rows of 90-degree visitor parking spaces (10 spaces), and two rows of parallel visitor parking spaces (8 spaces). In total, 304 parking stalls are provided for the development, which translates to a ratio of 3.07 spaces per unit. The proposed parking supply well exceeds the Code requirement of two parking spaces for each dwelling unit. Although compliant in minimum number of parking spaces, Staff would suggest the Petitioner consider more guest parking on the south side of the site. The Preliminary Site Plan does not indicate the location of accessible parking spaces on the site. As part of the formal process, compliance with the Illinois Accessibility Code shall be confirmed.

With respect to open space, said Planner Fard, the PUD standards require that a minimum of 20 percent of the site be maintained as open space. The area of land set aside for common open space shall not be of an isolated or of an unusable size and/or character. The Petitioner has indicated that the development will have 31.4 percent of green space on the site. The amount of common open space has not been provided, but Staff believes the Petitioner would probably be meeting the requirement. With respect to the landscaping, she continued, the preliminary site plan illustrates the addition of trees and some landscape screening for the development. Under Residential PUD standards, a landscape buffer of

10 feet along all peripheral lot lines is required. It appears that the project may need deviations from this standard. As part of a formal submittal, a landscape plan and tree survey including a variety of trees and plant materials will be required. The development offers amenities such as 31.4 percent of the total site dedicated as green space, landscaped courtyards, enclosed structures for 50 percent of all required parking, an interconnected sidewalk, and benches. The Petitioner, she said, is required to underground all of the public utilities within the corporate limits of the site and as well as the public ROW adjacent. The buildings would be designed to ensure traditional residential character with articulated facades and rooflines and four complementary color schemes providing visual interest. Masonry and fiber-cement siding should prove durable over time. Although the architectural design for the project will be further evaluated by the newly established Architectural Appearance Commission, the Plan Commission may wish to provide feedback on the preliminary elevations. She stated that the Petitioner has indicated that they will not be increasing the amount of impervious surface on the property, therefore it appears that stormwater detention may not be required. Referencing tables listing the variations and deviations, Ms. Fard said that, as it is proposed, it appears the project would require at least 18 deviations from the Zoning Code and 6 variations from the Subdivision Code. She spelled out Plan Commission action.

Commissioner Questions

Thinking that Staff had told the builder the concept was flawed, Commissioner Vondruska seemed bewildered at why the Petitioner still moved forward. Planner Fard replied that, though this case was not hers, she assumed the Commissioner is correct in his assessment as Staff was not fond of the plan – especially the density and zoning change – comments that were shared with the Petitioner. Given the number of things that he sees need to be corrected, citing in particular the proposed positioning of units and traffic concerns, Commissioner Vondruska, said he almost wishes the Petitioner would go back and try again. Acting Chair Fanella asked for confirmation that the Roosevelt Road corridor continues to be the Villages’ “number one source of revenue” in terms of sales tax. Ms. Rodman confirmed that the majority of the Village’s sales tax comes from Roosevelt Road. Acknowledging that she is new to the Commission, Commissioner Arango said that though the Zoning Code should be adhered to, she sensed quickness in the Village to rezone, which she thinks is “disconcerting.” Believing there was a reason the Zoning Code was written in a certain way, she expressed that a change, especially for a property butting up to commercial, makes no sense. Advocating for sticking to principles, she was applauded. Commissioner Vondruska, though, pointed out that feasibility is a consideration in certain cases, but added that the proposed is not manageable, not safe and not esthetically pleasing. Saying the Village needs to grow and change, Commissioner Arango said there is probably a better way to develop the area. Commissioner Cooper asked the current occupancy of the buildings on the property. Planner Fard said she didn’t know. Acting Chair Fanella said she recalls that the owner was moving tenants to a single building so to move forward with redeveloping the parcel. Commissioner Cooper asked how permissibility of an additional 10 units was arrived at. Planner Fard replied that a PUD affords flexibility, if sufficient amenities are provided. Agreeing that the current structures are “not all that visually appealing,” Commissioner Thakkar called the considerations listed and discussed relative to “cramming in” 99 units “non-starters.” He said he’s not opposed to townhouses, but expressed concern about burdening the school district, and other ramifications, and called the plans for the proposed “not being very well drawn up.” Commissioner Arango concurred that the Petitioner has “some homework to do.”

Petitioner's Presentation

Matt Brolley with Pulte reported that currently the builder has 18 active communities in Chicagoland, including several in DuPage County. He said that, while the office buildings on the proposed site are dated, they are not obsolete, and he indicated that the Draft Comprehensive Plan highlights the site's future use as single-family attached. Mr. Brolley asserted that the site is "a great transitional use" in what Pulte is proposing. He said the target consumer group (TCG) for the proposed rowhomes is young professionals who might appreciate the amenities that support a walkable lifestyle, good schools, and the "energy and activity" he identifies with Roosevelt Rd. He maintained that the greater density of the rowhomes makes financial sense. He said that while the internal private roads proposed deviate from Code, an HOA would be established to maintain them. He outlined a mix of front- and rear-loaded units, which he said would be connected by sidewalks to park space and commercial concerns. He pointed to the front entry and patio that he said "kind of enhances the urban neighborhood feel," and described the architecture as more traditional, adding that the siding specified would be offer an upscale appearance.

Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Cooper asked why row houses are envisioned instead of townhouses. Mr. Brolley replied that the location lends itself more to a compact design, with the product specifically aimed at the TCG mentioned. Commissioner Brown asked the price point expected. Mr. Brolley replied that the developer is aiming at about \$500k per unit. Noting the "long list of requests," Acting Chair Fanella asked if a hardship had been identified to justify the volume. Mr. Brolley noted the density and private roads are important deviations for the concept, and said "the R4 zoning standards don't exactly contemplate a rowhome development, thus the laundry list." Commissioner Thakkar asked about the intent of driveway allocation relative to parking. Mr. Brolley said parking would be accommodated on some driveways, but not others. Assuming the setbacks requested are to achieve density, Commissioner Saeed asked if the density could be reduced, as 99 units at 45-ft. height will look like a congested area. Commissioner Thakkar agreed. Mr. Brolley said the units would be more condensed but that he understands the setback concern. Commissioner Brown asked if Mr. Brolley sees the concept as a trend. He replied that on projects on which Pulte is working it is.

Public Input

Saying "density is all about money," Bob Dietch, 705 Kingsbrook Glen, suggested the plan calls for 99 units because it's not 100, and questioned the tax revenue touted. He said the school district is already overcrowded and that vehicle access near the site is limited, and roads are overcrowded and dangerous. He noted that 23 new townhomes have already been approved for Harding Ave, as well as expressed concern about crossing traffic to get to parks or ride bikes, and called the proposed "a horrible idea."

John Skawski, 80 Waters Edge Ct., said that someone who walked along Nicole Way would understand why trying to fit 99 rowhomes in, with its additional traffic, is laughable. He said something like the Kingsbrook and Waters Edge townhomes makes sense in that they would allow for more green space and a healthy environment. Suggesting that the density listed might be a negotiating ploy, Mr. Skawski wondered if a traffic study had been done, and asked that residents in the area be given consideration.

Bob Johnson, Glengarry Apartments (775-785 Pershing), said that multi-family is a good transitional use on the site, but Pershing is the route from Roosevelt to go southbound on 53, and quite a bit of traffic is already generated in the vicinity. Saying that the project is too dense, he suggested a lower density townhouse product with the northern portion of the site designated for commercial activity.

Norris Eber, 701 Kingsbrook Glen, complained that he didn't receive notice of the meeting, and surmised that the TIF district could equate to fewer tax dollars. He said the traffic in the area is "brutal," and called Taft Avenue "the alternate Roosevelt Road" citing 40-ft. semi-trailers and the Fire Department going "up and down all day long."

Discussion

Commissioner Vondruska said the Petitioner has "a lot of things to overcome" with the concept floated, and that with the traffic issues, it would have to get modified quite a bit to get traction. Commissioner Thakkar also indicated traffic is problematic. While suggesting that no commercial development is on the horizon for the lots, and that it's a perfect location for needed multi-family housing, Commissioner Cooper said that this plan is, however, "too dense." He said row houses are great in old urban areas, but "you're not going to really be able to create the feel of an urban community in that spot." He said the comments on traffic are well placed, and that he is supportive using the space for multi-family housing, but "this is not the project" he would envision there. Declaring that Glen Ellyn is not an urban neighborhood, Acting Chair Fanella cited Maryknoll, with its walking paths, as an example of a successful development that integrates into the community. She identified the rezoning and density requests as the two big issues. She said she has concerns about rezoning the entire parcel to residential, citing a need to be protective of the Roosevelt Road corridor tax base. She recommended a traffic study to proceed and identified the need for a plan for sidewalks and trees. Noting that Glen Ellyn is meeting affordable housing levels, she advocated increasing commercial activity, especially abutting Roosevelt.

Trustee's Report

Trustee Thompson reported that the Village Board would be conducting a workshop Monday on the Draft Comprehensive Plan; the Ad Hoc group is to continue to meet about the Roosevelt Road hotel site, for which charrette dates have been floated; the Panfish Park committee continues to meet and provide suggestions; and the streetscape project continues to move forward.

Staff Report

Planner Fard said the next meeting is likely to feature a pre-app for a mixed-use building along Forest Avenue.

Adjournment

Acting Chairperson Fanella adjourned the meeting at 9:40 p.m., following passage by voice vote of a motion to adjourn made by Commissioner Vondruska and seconded by Commissioner Arango.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Dutton-Thomas
Recording Secretary