DRAFT
PLAN COMMISSION
MINUTES
MAY 10, 2018

The meeting was called to order by Acting Chairperson Tracy Heming-Littwin at 7:00 p.m. Plan Commissioners Angela Fanella, Phillip Hartweg, Tim Loftus, John Mulherin, David Rodemann, Mohammed Saeed and Jamie Vondruska were present. Chairperson Mary Loch was excused. Also present were Trustee Liaison Craig Pryde, Director of Planning and Development Staci Hulseberg, Associate Planner Kelly Purvis and Recording Secretary Barbara Utterback.

No general comments on non-agenda items were made by the public at this Plan Commission meeting.

Acting Chairperson Heming-Littwin welcomed new member John Mulherin to the Plan Commission.

Plan Commissioner Loftus moved, seconded by Plan Commissioner Hartweg, to approve the minutes of the February 22, 2018 Plan Commission minutes. New Plan Commissioner Mulherin recused himself as he is a new member and was not present at that meeting. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

On the agenda was a pre-application meeting regarding the property at 400-418 N. Main Street.

PRE-APPLICATION MEETING – 400 & 418 NORTH MAIN STREET
DISCUSSION REGARDING CONCEPTUAL PLANS FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FEATURING 107 LUXURY APARTMENT UNITS WITH 5,360 SQUARE FEET OF FIRST FLOOR COMMERCIAL SPACE.
(Larry Debb and John Kosich, GSP Development, petitioner)

Staff Introduction

Village Associate Planner Kelly Purvis stated that the petitioners for the property at 400 & 418 North Main Street are Larry Debb and John Kosich of GSP Development and they are the contract purchasers. Ms. Purvis stated that the petitioners have requested a pre-application meeting regarding the potential redevelopment of the Main Street parking lot and Giesche properties with a new mixed use building featuring 107 luxury apartment units and approximately 5,360 square feet of first floor commercial space. Ms. Puvis displayed a map of the subject properties which are located at the northwest corner of Main Street and Hillside Avenue. She stated that the total site is comprised of 1.55 acres and includes a narrow strip of permit parking that extends to Glenwood Avenue.

Ms. Purvis stated that a majority of the subject property is zoned C5A Central Business District, Central Service Subdistrict. She stated that the permit parking off of Glenwood Avenue is zoned C5B which is the Central Service Subdistrict. She also stated that the permit parking lot would continue to be used for parking as a two-story parking garage is proposed for this site. Ms. Purvis stated that the surrounding land uses and zoning are commercial to the north with C5A and C5B zoning, commercial (including a church) to the south with C5B and R2 zoning, commercial to the east with C5A zoning and commercial (including a church) to the west with C5B and R2 zoning.

Ms. Purvis stated that the first floor of the proposed development features 147 parking stalls which would be accessible from Main Street, Hillside Avenue and Glenwood Avenue. She stated that the first floor will also feature 5,360 square feet of commercial space on the south side of the site. She added that the proposed project will require approval of zoning code text amendments and a special use permit to allow accessory uses to the residential uses in the building as a first floor use. She added those uses include a fitness center, a business center, a leasing office and a mail room for a total of 6,500 square feet. Ms. Purvis stated that the petitioners are proposing to bump out the sidewalk approximately eight (8) feet on the southern portion of the site along Main Street to enhance the streetscape and to provide additional landscaping and lighting. She added that, as a result, four on-street parking spaces on Main Street would be removed. Ms. Purvis stated that the Village's streetscape plan recommends wider sidewalks to enhance the pedestrian experience and also to allow for increased outdoor seating. Ms. Purvis also stated that a pedestrian walkway is being proposed that would provide access from Main Street to St. Petronille's parking lot which would create more connectivity within the downtown core.

Ms. Purvis stated that 142 residential parking stalls are proposed on the second story of the development for the 107 apartment units. She added that the second story residential parking would be accessed from Hill Avenue (Kelly—do you mean Hillside Avenue?).

Ms. Purvis stated that the third floor of the development is comprised mostly of apartment units and some accessory uses, including an open rooftop deck, pool and barbecue area, a 2,000-square foot clubhouse and a sitting area.

Ms. Purvis stated that the fourth and fifth floors would have 107 residential units.

Ms. Purvis stated that in terms of parking, 134 parking spaces currently exist on the subject property, including 82 in the Main Street parking lot owned by the Village , 42 in the Glenwood permit parking lot owned by the Village, four (4) on-street spaces and six (6) spaces on the south portion of the Giesche site. She added that 147 public parking spaces are proposed in the new parking deck on the ground level which would bring a net gain of 13 parking spaces to this area. Ms. Purvis stated that based upon the number of proposed units, if the site was located elsewhere in the Village, the zoning code would require 167 parking spaces which is one (1)

space for each efficiency unit, one-and-one-half (1-1/2) spaces for each one bedroom unit and two (2) parking spaces for each two-bedroom unit. Ms. Purvis stated that while parking is not technically required for developments in the C5A district, the addition of 107 apartments would place a significant burden on the already constrained downtown parking inventory so staff is recommending that the development provide parking for the residential units as required per code. Ms. Purvis added that the lowest residential parking ratio that the Village has previously granted would be for 1.5 spaces per unit (Crescent Station and Glenstone developments). She added that staff recommends that the developer provide some parking research on suburban downtowns similar to Glen Ellyn to verify that the 1.3 parking ratio would be adequate to serve the proposed residential units. Ms. Purvis stated that in order to provide this number of both public and residential units, the developer is proposing 8-1/2 feet in lieu of the required 9 feet wide parking stalls and added that there are some 8-1/2 feet wide parking stalls throughout the Village. Ms. Purvis also stated that deviations would be needed for a 22-foot wide aisle near the Glenwood parking lot in lieu of the typical 24 feet as well as for building height. Ms. Purvis stated that this project will require approval of a height deviation as part of the Planned Unit Development, adding that a total building height of 45 feet and four (4) stories is permitted on these Main Street properties located in the C5A District. Ms. Purvis stated that the site slopes upward from north to south approximately 6-1/2 feet which provides a slight advantage on the north side of the site. She added that the proposed height for the majority of the building is 58-1/4 feet measured from the average grade. Ms. Purvis stated that the high side of the site where the parapet is measures at 63-1/4 feet and based on the current plans, the height deviation requested would be for 18-1/4 feet from the average grade to the top of the parapet on the north side which is the high side of the site. She added that the variation request would be for the highest point on the building. Ms. Purvis stated that the 2009 Strategic Plan recommends that new construction on Main Street be a maximum of two to three stories and the Comprehensive Plan suggests that the Village consider a range of factors when determining the height of new downtown buildings, including the height of nearby existing buildings, the pedestrian scale, orientation to the downtown, the proximity of new buildings to residential neighborhoods, topography, the economics of downtown development, site lines in relation to prominent visual landmarks and historic features. Ms. Purvis added that the Village Board has shown some interest in increasing the heights of buildings allowed in the downtown which may be discussed as part of the Comprehensive Plan update. She also stated that the 2001 Comprehensive Plan and the 2009 Strategic Plan both recommend a mixed use commercial/ residential development of the subject site. She stated that the market study conducted as part of the 2009 Downtown Strategic Plan recommends adding a minimum of 450 residential units to the downtown to help support the existing businesses and increase the vitality of the Central Business District. She stated that the 2013 Streetscape and Parking Study also recommends that the Village partner with a developer to construct a garage in the downtown rather than constructing a stand-alone garage.

Ms. Purvis stated that in order to receive approval of the project, the developer will need to have approval of a planned unit development for the mixed use building which would include

deviations for the parking stall width and the aisle width of the parking garage on the Glenwood site as well as a height deviation, a zoning code text amendment and a special use to allow the first floor residential accessory uses and an exterior appearance review done by staff and approved by the Village Board.

Petitioner's Presentation

Larry Debb of GSP Development, 1111 E. Touhy Avenue, Des Plaines, IL and Architect Mike Rekla of Fitzgerald Architects were present to speak on behalf of the subject project.

Mr. Debb stated that because the proposed project is located at the main entrance to downtown Glen Ellyn, they would like to make the building as spectacular as possible. He stated that a roof line has been added for differentiation, the windows have been curved at the top, the first floor area has higher ceilings and the apartments now do not go all the way across which is more inviting than previously. He added that some of the parking spaces will be removed along Main Street so that more landscaping and an outdoor dining area as well as other amenities can be added.

Mr. Debb stated that because one of staff's concerns was that the project would become like a canyon because they are asking for an extra floor, they moved the whole front of the building from the center section back 7-1/2 feet to provide differentiation but left the balconies in place. Mr. Debb stated they also intend to use a Tudor style look similar to other buildings in the downtown. He also stated the subject building will be "condo quality" because the building units may become condos at some point in the future. He added that the units will have separate HVAC, water, gas and electricity with many quality extras. Mr. Debb also stated that they will be leasing all available parking spaces as well as providing separate parking for the tenants on the second floor of the parking deck. Mr. Debb stated that the subject building is totally non-combustible with metal studs, stone and brick. He also stated there is a pool on the third floor as well as exercise facilities, golf simulators, office space, a quiet area, a party room and a kitchen.

Mr. Debb stated that the subject building is approximately the same height as the church next door. He stated that the subject building is slightly lower than the larger church to the west and significantly lower than the steeple on that church. Mr. Debb stated that they would like the subject building to be as low as possible and still make the building financially acceptable to a developer.

Questions from the Plan Commission

Mr. Debb responded to Plan Commissioner Loftus that the balconies are at the sidewalk line. He added that they would like to landscape the base of the building along the curve line and/or add a water element on the public sidewalk as there is 15 feet of sidewalk there.

Mr. Debb replied that they have never used anything bigger than 8-1/2 feet on their apartment building parking spaces. He added that they will work with staff regarding how they want the parking lot laid out. He also stated that instead of adding more public parking, they could reserve the parking spaces for their apartments on the first floor and they would then meet code. He added that they would much rather have the public use spaces that they know they are not going to need which is why it has been designed this way. He stated they still would have enough parking on site to give those spaces to the Village and to the public for their use. Mr. Deb responded to Plan Commissioner Fanella that they usually try to achieve a 1.2 parking ratio. He also stated that the apartments are studios and one-bedrooms and generally do not produce children. Mr. Debb verified for Plan Commissioner Loftus that from the sidewalk on the north side, the building height will be 64 feet which is approximately 38 feet above the Santa Fe restaurant. Mr. Debb added that they did not want to build to the minimum height on the parking lot because it is public so it was raised to allow vans and pick-up trucks to get in and out easily. Mr. Debb stated that amenities also include solar panels, trash compactors, bikes and a dog run and dog wash. Plan Commissioner Rodemann stated it is his understanding that there will be a roofed terrace on the second floor and Mr. Debb responded that there will be balconies there. Mr. Debb stated that one can enter and exit the parking area from the east, west and south. Mr. Debb responded that they could take the green space which is now apartment use and the sales office and move them upstairs which would add another 3,500 square feet of retail space. Mr. Debb responded to Plan Commissioner Hartweg that the westernmost part of the proposed building is an open deck.

Persons in Favor of or in Opposition to the Request

Matthew Jones, 463 Ridgewood, Glen Ellyn, IL asked how many parking levels there are in the subject building. Ms. Purvis responded two and Mr. Jones stated that three parking levels are needed as millennials will bring more people into the Village which will require approximately 100 additional parking spaces. He stated that other than the parking, the subject project appears fine.

Pat Hegna, address not given, asked what the average height is of the buildings across the street from the subject property. She added that a tall building at the subject location takes away from the old feel of the town. Ms. Purvis responded that it is 51 feet from the top of foundation to the top of the buildings across the street. She added that it is 62-1/2 feet to the top of the parapet and the average height of the building is proposed at approximately 58 feet and across the street is 51 feet. Ms. Hegna felt that the building is too imposing for the proposed location.

Justin Casazza, 386 N. Main Street, Glen Ellyn, IL stated they moved into their current home which is about one-half block south of the subject property approximately one year ago. He stated they are not happy regarding the height of the subject building. Mr. Casazza asked where people visiting the owners of the apartments will park. Mr. Debb responded that they

are paying for the entire public parking lot to be done. He felt that a third level would be great but they would have to raise the building an additional 12 feet. He also stated there will be some guest parking on the upper level. Mr. Debb stated that the Village would have some TIF financing available for this project, however, he feels they can build this project without any governmental assistance and that money could be used for another parking deck in another nearby area.

Stacey Michelopoulos stated she lives on Main Street and wonders if the petitioners took into consideration what the traffic flow will be like as Main Street can barely handle the traffic that is there now. She stated that the restaurants in town are jam-packed every evening and finding parking is difficult, adding that traffic will be a huge problem with this building coming into town. Mr. Debb responded that they will have a traffic study done when this project is submitted to the Village.

Len Swanson, 116 Sunset, Glen Ellyn, IL stated that approximately 15 years ago, a project that was very similar to the subject project was proposed for the Main Street parking lot that had five (5) stories with apartments on the top floor and retail on the bottom floor. He added that parking was included behind the building, including the St. Petronille parking lot with approximately 270 spaces. He stated that this proposal did not pass the Plan Commission or the Village Board. Mr. Swanson suggested that the Plan Commission review meetings and minutes from that proposed project. He stated that reasons the plan was not approved included many people complained that the subject building would change the character of the Village, the building was too high, the building would create a canyon effect on Main Street, the parking lot would be eliminated and the proposed parking was too far away. Mr. Swanson stated that the character of the Village has changed over the years with the elimination of many different types of stores and if the downtown area is to be a viable business district, people who are willing to spend money must be brought into the downtown. He added that surrounding communities have changed with developments in the downtown area and that is what Glen Ellyn needs to do.

John Svalenka, 415 Kenilworth, Glen Ellyn, IL asked that the Plan Commissioners and Village Board members follow the Comprehensive Plan and the parking plan. He felt that the subject submittal is a great project that he would like to see happen and stated his family moved to Glen Ellyn partly because of all of the changes that have occurred in town over the past ten (10) years. Mr. Svalenka felt that the developer seems to be more of a residential developer than a commercial developer. He stated that some of the spaces may be difficult to lease because they are narrow and not as deep as a normal space. He also stated that instead of eliminating the four (4) on-street parking spaces on Main Street for landscaping, pop-up dining as used on Crescent Boulevard should be used so if there is a restaurant that leases that space that wants outdoor dining, they can use those spaces in the summer and have parking in those spaces in the winter. Mr. Debb stated that stores want as much glass as possible in the front of their

stores so the developers are making them thinner, which was forced upon them due to the dimensions of the site, and do not have a problem with the stores. Mr. Debb added that they have already received calls regarding space from stores interested in the subject building.

Questions from the Plan Commission

Plan Commissioner Mulherin asked the petitioner for information regarding the census of the subject property. He stated that he works in Wheaton and one of the buildings there has many divorced residents and he wondered if that was typical for this type of building. Mr. Debb responded that statistically younger people will reside in this building, however, there also will be divorced people and older couples residing there who may also have a home in Florida where they reside during the winter months. Mr. Debb responded to Plan Commissioner Mulherin that the price point will be $255-260 per foot per month and that the tenant pays utilities and a parking fee. He added that there are many extras in the units that millennials will enjoy. Mr. Debb responded to Plan Commissioner Fanella that they always have extra parking spaces available in their buildings. Mr. Debb responded to Acting Chairperson Heming-Littwin that they have bikes that have no fees attached which have become very popular. Plan Commissioner Rodemann asked if the public parking spaces will be leased back by the Village. Mr. Debb responded that they will pay for and build the parking spaces and the Village will pay for cleaning, etc. Mr. Debb added that they will give the Village a perpetual easement. Plan Commissioner Mulherin asked if the Village would meter the parking spaces. Director Hulseberg stated that some of the meters would be coin-operated and some would be available at the rear of the lot for leasing and permit parking. Plan Commissioner Mulherin stated he would like to prevent commuter parking which he does not feel is appropriate. Director Hulseberg stated that lot is not desirable for commuter parking because of the distance and that apartment renters and business owners would use those parking spaces. Mr. Debb stated they now have chargers for the tenants' cars which is generally 10 percent of the total spaces. Director Hulseberg responded to Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin that there will be a time limit on the parking spaces.

Comments from the Plan Commission

Plan Commissioner Rodemann stated he appreciated the petitioner bringing this project forward as it has been talked about and considered for many years. He also stated it is hard to envision a project of the subject scale in the downtown, however, thinks the time may now be right. Plan Commissioner Rodemann stated that his concerns about the project include the height of the looming wall, trying to maximize the frontage of the building and having the sidewalk given back to the Village to re-animate that part of the downtown. He also felt that the overall number of units makes sense but he does worry about the height and the parking count.

Plan Commissioner Mulherin stated that he supports the subject project. He also stated that the downtown is suffering because of the lack of residents in the downtown. He stated that the subject density is necessary to make the project financially viable. He stated that he likes the architectural feel of the building which is Chicago style. He also stated that a traffic study needs to be done. He also added that he supports this project.

Plan Commissioner Vondruska stated that most businesses are now restaurant or other types of businesses because retail has decreased. He stated that car dealerships in Glen Ellyn have disappeared. He added that density would be great in the Village which is why he feels the proposed project would be good. He stated that regarding the square footage, to a certain extent, staff should be consulted on the current amount of retail space in the Village and the ability of the Village to fill it up and if it makes sense to have that as part of the program. He added that he would rather see retail at that location than people on exercise bikes as he walks by. Plan Commissioner Vondruska stated that overall this is a good project and he appreciated that the petitioner is working with the Village.

Plan Commissioner Fanella stated she thinks the proposed project is something that Glen Ellyn needs. She stated that compromises need to be made and not everyone will like this project, however, this is exactly what needs to happen for the Village to move forward and pull younger generations in. She added that there are a lot of restaurants in town, we need people to fill them and this is a great idea. She stated she knows people who have grown up in Glen Ellyn but have moved to other towns because there is no place for them to rent here. She also stated that if residents of this proposed project are added in, hopefully, they will support the retail. She also felt that the petitioner has done an excellent job with trying to meet the Village's parking needs. She also stated she would be in favor of less residential and more public parking if the petitioner and staff supported both as well. She liked the idea of the bike availability. She also stated she was comfortable with the height of the proposed building and appreciated the architectural elements that will be added. She also felt that the variations in front of the building will help eliminate a canyon-like feeling.

Plan Commissioner Hartweg felt the proposed plan is good and has been a long time in coming. He stated he likes the idea of the bump-out. He also agreed with another Plan Commissioner that it is not a good idea to have people exercising next to a restaurant and felt the exercise equipment could be moved up to the pool deck. He stated that Glen Ellyn needs a mix of buildings, however, most residents would prefer to use the most economical process. He stated that the Village has been working on this site for 10-15 years, and he feels it is about time to do something there. He added that the subject proposal is the best he has seen so far and encouraged the petitioner to return with plans in the future.

Plan Commissioner Loftus stated that this is a good start, however, felt that the building is too tall and should be reduced by a story. He stated that the idea in the Strategic Plan for the subject portion of Main Street is actually a 3-story building. He also stated that one of the

differences between the proposed plan and the buildings on the other side of the street is that the subject building is as long as a football field so it covers between one-half and two-thirds of the block. He also stated that the buildings on the east side of the street vary in height and the proposed building will be 300 feet in length and 64 feet in height. He added that the change in height from the Santa Fe restaurant to the proposed building is 38 feet on one side which is virtually three stories. He also stated he thinks the subject architecture is a nice modern style but is not compatible with a downtown that is on the National Historic District. He stated he agreed with other Commissioners about adding more retail on the ground level at the subject site. He also stated he has concerns with balconies right at the property line with the sidewalk as something could fall off from a balcony and injure someone on the sidewalk below. He added that there is another building with balconies on Main Street, however, they are set back 15 feet from the sidewalk. Plan Commissioner Loftus stated he agreed with others that something needs to be done with the subject space.

Plan Commissioner Saeed stated that the subject project which is a mixed use of residential and retail is long overdue. He stated that his concern regarding this property is the limited amount of retail space. He stated the existing retail space is 15,000 square feet and the petitioner is showing 5,000 square feet and stated that another 3,500 square feet can be added. He stated that it would be good if the petitioner can reduce or eliminate the exercise spaces and bring more retail into the downtown and if that can be done, he would support the project.

Acting Chairperson Heming-Littwin stated she is fine with the four spaces coming off of Main Street. She also stated that as much retail as possible on the first floor would be good. She stated that Glen Ellyn has some stores in town that compete with some large retailers so some of those types of stores can be pulled in. Acting Chairperson Heming-Littwin believes this is the right time to do this type of project in the Village. She stated she has chosen to remain in the Village even though many changes have been made over the years. She stated a development such as that proposed here would enhance the downtown and she hopes the petitioner will return with a formal application.

Mr. Debb believes Glen Ellyn is a Tier A community and stated he does not believe Glen Ellyn would want to be a downtown Naperville. He also introduced his partners, John Kosich and Barry Missner. Mr. Debb stated they will move the health equipment, offices and leasing space upstairs and convert that space to commercial space. He stated that the ceiling heights are 16 feet and higher on the corner where an apartment is lost. He also stated they can add more brick and use earthy tones as well as stone on the first floor. He stated they want to take what is great about Glen Ellyn and improve upon it. Mr. Debb stated that there are currently 122 parking spaces and they are adding 25 parking spaces.

Trustee Report

Trustee Liaison Pryde stated that at a workshop last week, the Village Board talked about potential changes to the sign code. He also stated they will soon begin the process to update the Comprehensive Plan specifically in the downtown and plan to finish that within nine months. He stated that the Village Board has passed a Tobacco 21 ordinance and a resolution recommending restrictions on the use of certain weapons. Trustee Liaison Pryde also stated there seems to be a consensus among the Village Board that the best location to build a parking garage would be within the lot behind the Civic Center that would add 200-280 spaces so that will be studied further.

Chairperson Report

Acting Chairperson Heming-Littwin asked that everyone be sure to respond regarding Monday night. She also stated that Plan Commissioner Loftus will be leaving the Plan Commission after the next meeting. She also mentioned that secretary Barbara Utterback is leaving the Plan Commission after over 20 years.

Staff Report

Director of Planning and Development Hulseberg stated that she was not sure if there would be a Plan Commission meeting in two weeks. She also stated that approximately five text amendments and 13 sign code amendments will be coming before the Plan Commission in the near future. She also stated that a Request for Proposal for the Comprehensive Plan will be released next week. She also stated they are receiving some quotes on the valet study.

Plan Commissioner Hartweg moved, seconded by Plan Commissioner Fanella, to close the public hearing at 8:41 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Utterback
Recording Secretary

John Sterrett
Village Planner