

PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION
SPECIAL JOINT MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 26, 2015

The meeting was called to order by Plan Commission Chairperson Mary Loch at 7:00 p.m. Plan Commissioners David Allen, Craig Bromann, Jeff Girling, Phillip Hartweg, Tracy Heming-Littwin, Ray Whalen and Lyn Whiston were present. Plan Commissioners Angela Fanella, Heidi Lannen and James Ozog were excused. Also present were Architectural Review Commission Chairperson James Burdett and Architectural Review Commissioners Pamela Albrecht, Robert Dieter, Timothy Loftus, Mark Senak, Jennifer Thompson and Sharon Wussow. ARC member Iain Dickie was excused. Also present were Plan Commission Trustee Liaison Tim Elliott, ARC Trustee Liaison Jim Burket, Village Planner Michele Stegall and Recording Secretary Barbara Utterback.

Plan Commission Chairperson Loch explained that this meeting will include both the Plan Commission and Architectural Review Commission members who will discuss building height, the promenade and retail at the southeast corner of the proposed 400-424 N. Main Street project.

One pre-application meeting for 400-424 N. Main Street (Main Street Parking Lot, Giesche and St. Petronille Properties) was on the agenda.

PRE-APPLICATION MEETING – 400-424 N. MAIN STREET (MAIN STREET PARKING LOT, GIESCHE AND ST. PETRONILLE PROPERTIES)

PRE-APPLICATION MEETING REGARDING THE POTENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT OF THE MAIN STREET PARKING LOT, GIESCHE AND ST. PETRONILLE PROPERTIES WITH A NEW MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT. THE PROJECT INCLUDES THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW 5-STORY BUILDING WITH RETAIL ON THE FIRST FLOOR AND RESIDENTIAL ABOVE. A NEW PARKING STRUCTURE IS ALSO PROPOSED. THE SUBJECT SITE IS LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF MAIN STREET AND HILLSIDE AVENUE IN THE C5A AND C5B ZONING DISTRICTS.

(The Opus Group)

Staff Presentation

Village Planner Michele Stegall stated that because there are areas that overlap between the Plan Commission and the Architectural Review Commission for the subject 400-424 N. Main Street project, both of commissions have been invited to jointly discuss the proposal. In addition to building height and its relationship to architecture, the promenade and retail at the southeast corner of the proposed project will also be discussed. Ms. Stegall stated that retail is proposed along a good part of the first floor of the building and behind the remainder of the first floor is parking. Therefore, the architectural treatment and options for enlivening this area was discussed at a recent Architectural Review Commission meeting. Ms. Stegall stated that

there are some significant economic benefits with this project to the Village.

Ms. Stegall stated that the proposed project will be a multi-use building with 7,000 square feet of retail on the first floor which is down from 8,500 square feet which was the square footage approximately one year ago. She stated that the building will be five (5) stories with 125 rental apartment units divided between floors 2 and 5. Ms. Stegall stated there are two options with the parking component being presented and explained that the petitioner would like to submit two formal simultaneous applications (Option A and Option B) for review by the Plan Commission and Architectural Review Commission. Ms. Stegall stated that Option A would include the construction of a parking deck behind the building on the St. Petronille property. With this option, the existing parking and St. Petronille parking will be replaced and there would be a net gain of roughly 188 additional parking spaces. She added that if an agreement cannot be reached between the Village/St. Petronille and the petitioner to proceed with that option, Option B, would include below-ground parking on Main Street, instead of a deck, which would provide a net gain of about four (4) public parking spaces. She added that with that option, the below ground parking garage is not currently proposed to be built out so discussions could be had with the Village Board to build it out further and add some parking back in. Ms. Stegall emphasized that the parking numbers are estimates and will change when the formal plans are developed. She added that typically with a PUD, there is a preliminary review and a final review. She stated that the parking deck is proposed to be reviewed in a combined preliminary/final one-step review process with the building being reviewed using the typical two step review process of the preliminary and final plans. She added that this would allow for the parking deck to be constructed for temporary parking before construction of the building begins.

Ms. Stegall stated that an article in Landmark Illinois magazine and some photos, including one of a promenade/pedestrian way in Wheaton, were distributed to the Commissioners just prior to the meeting.

Petitioner's Presentation

Sean Spellman, Vice President, Opus, Chris Hurst, Architect, and Brian Farquhar of Opus were present on behalf of the subject project.

Mr. Spellman stated that Opus has made a number of concept adjustments since meeting with the Plan Commission approximately one year ago.

Mr. Hurst stated that he planned to review these changes for the Plan Commission and at the same time would point out some recent changes made as a result of the Architectural Review Commission meeting from two weeks prior.

Mr. Hurst displayed a map of the subject site and indicated the different property ownerships. He stated that they will be doing an amalgamation of the Giesche site and the Village site fronting Main Street and that the Village would retain ownership of the property that projects to the west and the church would remain the owner of their site. Mr. Hurst also displayed a master plan and stated they would like to fill in a hole in the urban fabric with the subject project as the downtown needs a gateway as one is entering the downtown from the south. He stated that the building would be stepped back from the corner and that there could be an obelisk that greets people as they enter town and a tower feature that projects out from the building that would basically be a front door—a new cornerstone for Main and Hillside. He indicated the vehicular entry area into the garage and limited residential entrances. Mr. Hurst showed a circulation diagram and stated that there would be a three-level parking deck that will take advantage of the topography of the natural hillside with a ground floor that will raise up to the second level of the project with a ramp to the third level. He added that the church has an easement that runs through the Village parking lot and allows access to Main Street. Mr. Hurst also stated there is a new promenade that will take one from the mid-block of Main to the mid-block of Glenwood and will create more pedestrian access and a more inviting environment to get to the parking deck. He described some ideas for that area that would have a consistent architectural style and would feel like part of the community. He stated that another idea would be to bring lighting into the promenade or have a lighted dining area or other activity to create a more festive European feeling. He also stated that there would be a correlation of the Village Master Plan with what will be done with the promenade which will become a welcome mat for the Village. Mr. Hurst displayed Main Street elevations and stated that character is of utmost importance when developing the elevations of the building. He also stated that some of the ideas of the design of the building are based on an Italianate type of architecture with a 24-50 foot wide retail building with residential units above and a shop below. He added that a rustic flagship type of signage and Italianate cornices will be incorporated into the design so that the design will have depth. He also stated detailing will include bay windows and large stone cladding.

Mr. Hurst displayed the Main Street and Hillside Avenue street elevations and added that they are considering an Italian Renaissance type of entry gateway (portal) that brings one into the downtown from the south. He stated one of the comments from the Architectural Review Commission was asking if the entry could be made more prominent, taller and more ornate with additional cornices so that it has more of a presence. He added that an Italianate building will be located on the corner and the Tudor style would be worked into. He stated that the Architectural Review Commission felt that there is a lack of brick in the Tudors and added that one idea is to introduce brick that comes all the way through the building but still has a more Tudor projection on one building and add another unique building instead of a mirror building. He added that they are looking at enlarging the promenade and adding another access point.

Mr. Hurst indicated the location of and described the main entrance into the building. He stated that the building steps down the hill across the street which allows them to have retail all the way to the corner. He stated that the subject building is a continuous building from Hillside Avenue to the Santa Fe Restaurant; therefore, they cannot step the building down as that creates ADA and corridor issues. He added that the second floor also needs to be flat. He stated that because the Hillside Avenue corner is very important in welcoming people to the downtown, they are considering having double height retail on that corner. He added that although this would require them to eliminate two units in the building, it would create a very dramatic retail space on the corner. He also stated that there could be a 20-foot wide plaza in front of the building that would allow for street furniture or an outdoor seating area for a retailer that would further activate that corner.

Mr. Hurst displayed a drawing of the Hillside Avenue entrance and suggested incorporating a clock in the building so that it would have a turn of the century feel. He stated that additional ideas that will be looked at as they move forward include extending the parapet, having a more ornate design, extending cornices out or turning the corner at a 45-degree angle. He stated that moving west down Hillside Avenue, the building will be a 4-story building and that the ground floor has submerged itself into grade at this elevation. He added that materials facing Main Street could include masonry blocks and brick which are rich materials. He stated that the Tudor material will basically be stucco/wood battens and that the west elevation could be common brick which will be a reflection of the neighborhood as that material is the same as many of the other buildings in the area. He also stated that the windows will have large frames which will provide an arts and crafts feel. Mr. Hurst said that the roof for the Tudor sections will be slate. Mr. Hurst stated that the subject building is in scale with the other surrounding buildings and matches the scale and character of Hillside Avenue. He also stated the subject building is similar to the buildings across the street once the roofs are factored in. He added that the pitches of the buildings across the street are not unlike the subject building and they are trying to incorporate some of those ideas into the subject building's elevation. He also stated that the 12-foot 1-inch elevation variance that they are requesting will be used to try to articulate the façade to where it becomes more of a piece of architecture that looks like a collection of buildings. He added that there will be five unique elevations on the site and that seven elevations are located across the street. He added that more elevations on the subject site would be out of character and less elevations than across the street would be more natural.

Mr. Hurst displayed slides that were presented to the Plan Commission approximately one year ago and drawings that have evolved to today. He stated that they are now incorporating the church site into their project and that 10 feet has been removed from the north side of their building and the access has been brought through there to get back to the parking structure. He stated that the Architectural Review Commission had requested that the promenade be widened to 15 feet although some parking would need to be removed to accomplish this.

He stated that, with Option A, 85 Village parking spaces would be replaced on the ground floor. He stated that the Architectural Review Commission wondered if it really mattered if some parking spaces were lost if a large parking deck is being built to the west. Mr. Hurst emphasized that they want to see storefronts and people walking down the street—not parking—on Main Street. He added that their building has gone to great lengths to hide the parking and that the parking is not inconvenient at all. He also stated that they would like to have more amenities in their building that would be visible to the public for interaction. He also stated that they are looking at incorporating a lounge and a business center that have a retail appearance in the ground floor space between the lobby and the retail space on the corner.

Mr. Hurst stated that they would like to have as many of their residents as possible park on site and added that 69 resident parking spaces would be located in the basement. He displayed the second level where more residential parking would be located.

Mr. Hurst stated that the subject building is a typical Chicago courtyard building and he described the various portions of the building and site.

Responses to Questions from the Plan Commission and Architectural Review Commission

Architectural Review Commissioner Senak asked why the 5-story design was picked. Mr. Hurst responded that having 5 stories would make the project viable. Architectural Review Commissioner Senak asked the petitioner if they could preserve the number of units and the financial balance with a 4-story project, and Mr. Hurst replied that they would need more land. Mr. Spellman stated that parking has been the driving factor for how project has developed. Mr. Spellman verified for Architectural Review Commissioner Senak that the parking deck was not part of the equation when the project was originally begun. Mr. Spellman also verified that the number of parking spaces will be increased by 188 spaces now that the parking deck is a viable component if changes are made as recommended. Mr. Spellman clarified for Plan Commission Chairperson Loch that if the parking deck moves forward, that would suffice for the parking. He stated that if that plan did not move forward, the basement option would be viable. Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin asked if 20 public parking spaces would be lost if they do not go with the parking deck and added the suggested retail at the corner and the petitioners stated yes and verified that the number of public parking spaces would go from the existing 85 spaces to 65 spaces. Architectural Review Commissioner Senak stated if the current footprint was kept, the height of the building would be lowered but some parking would be given up in the process. Mr. Spellman responded that units would also be given up. Architectural Review Commissioner Senak responded that if the petitioner was willing to trade

the parking at the back side of the building for more units, the parking could be replaced with the units and the size of the building could be lowered or the building could be extended down Hillside Avenue which would involve acquiring more land on Hillside Avenue. He added that either option would lower the height of the building, preserve the number of units and comply with the financial model. Mr. Spellman responded that the Hillside Avenue option is not viable because there is a cost to acquire land and the top floor has more units and is more efficient than other floors in the building. Mr. Spellman responded to Architectural Review Commissioner Senak that the top floor would be the most efficient whether it was the fifth floor, fourth floor, etc. Mr. Hurst pointed out that taking parking out would not necessarily provide more units as removing parking would not create more units as they would need to stay within a certain width for the legs of the building to extend out and that legs cannot be made wider to add units or turn the corner again because another elbow would be created. Architectural Review Commissioner Senak stated that because there is opposition by residents to the size of the building, one of the ways to comply with the financial model while dropping the height of the building would be to add more land and extend the building down Hillside Avenue or extend the building to the west and eliminate the 27 parking spaces behind the existing building on Hillside Avenue. Mr. Spellman responded that they could not go west due to the property line and being landlocked and that making the project smaller by one floor would not be economically viable for the petitioner. Architectural Review Commissioner Dieter added that many people in the Village feel that the proposed height of the building is inconsistent with the openness of the Village. He stated that what is being heard is that the unit number is more economically driven rather than demographically driven due to the design and height of the building which is inconsistent with the Village.

Plan Commission Chairperson Loch requested that the Plan Commissioners be allowed to ask questions as they had not had a chance to do so since approximately one year ago at which time they were supportive of the project. She added that some of the Plan Commissioners have come on board recently and this is the first time they are seeing the project.

Plan Commissioner Whiston stated that his biggest concern is the west side view of the building which he feels has not had the same attention as the south and east sides of the building and looks like a parking garage or a factory. Mr. Spellman stated that the west side concept is more visually for St. Petronille's to view and added that more architectural significance could be added in the future.

Plan Commission Chairperson Loch asked that the Plan Commission comment on the widening of the promenade and the inclusion of retail on the southeast corner as it relates to the loss of parking.

Commissioner Allen asked about two spaces on the plan, and Mr. Hurst clarified that the "red" area is additional retail space and the "green" area is an amenity or residence. Mr. Hurst responded that the retail space on the corner comprises approximately 2,000 square feet and the amenity/residence space has an area of approximately 1,200 square feet. Mr. Hurst also showed Plan Commissioner Allen how far to the west the two-story retail space would extend. Mr. Hurst responded to Plan Commission Chairperson Loch that the corner retail would be in addition to the other retail on the site. Mr. Hurst responded to Architectural Review Commissioner Wussow that the two-story retail area will be approximately 20 feet in height. Mr. Spellman also confirmed for Architectural Review Commissioner Wussow that the floor inside the retail establishment will be at the level of the existing sidewalk and will actually be 1-1/2 stories. Architectural Review Commissioner Wussow asked if there is a possibility of having both a parking deck and below grade parking in the Main Street building, and Mr. Spellman replied yes. Architectural Review Commissioner Wussow also asked if parking could be added by locating it on a parking deck and below grade and if it would be feasible to bring the height of the building down one level where the basement was all parking, the first level was parking and retail, the second floor was parking and single-loaded residences and the third and fourth floors were all residences. Mr. Spellman responded that the building could be pushed down one floor, however, approximately 18 units would be lost. Mr. Spellman responded to Architectural Review Commissioner Wussow that he could review this plan and get back to staff but added that he felt this would be a challenge because losing 18 units would be difficult. He also added that there is a significant amount of common area space required by residents which is non-income producing.

Mr. Hurst responded to Plan Commissioner Allen that the potential extension of the corner tower feature was an idea that came from the Architectural Review Commission and has not yet been explored. Mr. Spellman added that due to the grade change across the site, the majority of the development is four stories instead of five stories. Ms. Stegall responded to Plan Commissioner Girling that the only deviation being requested by the petitioner is for height at 12 feet 1 inch in lieu of 8+ feet last year. Ms. Stegall added that the numbers shown in the Staff Report distributed to the Plan Commissioners are more accurate and the increase was more due to how the code measures height which is from the average existing grade. She noted that the 4 points that the height is measured from changed with the addition of the St. Petronille property, but that from ground level, the height is about the same as what was seen before. Ms. Stegall clarified for Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin that the height being discussed does not include the mechanicals.

Plan Commissioner Girling asked the petitioner to prepare an image with photographs taken looking straight north and straight south down Main Street and to superimpose a building of the proposed height on the photos with a 20-foot setback. The petitioner agreed to do so. Plan Commissioner Hartweg suggested that the Santa Fe Restaurant add more windows to their

building and/or a door on the south side of their building, to allow access to the promenade and the petitioner was very supportive of that suggestion. Mr. Spellman added that the grades at the subject site and Santa Fe will be brought together.

Architectural Review Commissioner Loftus stated that one of the comments from the ARC was that the three buildings were near the same height and very long, however, there are multiple heights across the street. Architectural Review Commissioner Dieter stated that the Architectural Review Commission discussed the loss of natural light coming into the region due to a tunnel effect and it was suggested that the Village have a consultant review the amount of natural light that could be lost with the project. Plan Commission Chairperson Loch asked if the petitioner had thought about stepping pieces of the building back as the building would be more than 55 feet tall, and Mr. Hurst stated that there would be a loss of square footage and that stepping the building back 15 feet did not work structurally for the building and the type of construction that will be done. He stated that they previously had talked about and will study adding a sloped façade to make it feel more like a sloped roof with dormers and make it appear to be four stories with dormers. Architectural Review Commission Chairperson Burdett stated that the petitioner has been very responsive to the design comments, however, the height of the building is a stumbling block. He requested that the petitioner provide a drawing where the height of the building is lowered.

Architectural Review Commissioner Loftus asked about changing the Hillside corner from Italian Renaissance to Italianate, and Mr. Hurst replied that he would consider putting the Italianate architecture rather than the Italian Renaissance on the corner building. Architectural Review Commissioner Wussow suggested making the corner element more prominent without having it be overly tall by giving it a very strong cornice or architectural features. She added that she did not feel that height is the only way to have it be significant and that it could be eye-catching with the features of the architecture. Architecture Review Commission Chairperson Burdett also felt that the 45-degree angle should be explored for clipping the corner and felt it would be consistent with the Italianate style. Architectural Review Commissioner Senak asked what the length of the Italianate façade is on the current plan, and Mr. Hurst replied 50 feet. Architectural Review Commissioner Senak also asked how many apartments there are in that section, and Mr. Hurst replied there are two per floor in that façade. Architectural Review Commissioner Wussow viewed a promenade in Wheaton and stated that a 15-foot wide promenade is the minimum size that she would like to see for that space. After some discussion, Mr. Hurst stated that they could build the project in 3-D, and Architectural Review Commissioner Wussow stated she would appreciate a 3-D model or a video of the project. Mr. Spellman responded that a video would not work because there is work that is not yet completed.

Mr. Hurst indicated that a recessed walkway would be proposed with the upper floors of the building projecting 5-feet into the 15-foot wide promenade which would allow people to walk under cover versus out in the rain from the parking structure to the promenade. Mr. Hurst also stated that perhaps planter boxes above with vines hanging down and lights could be used. He also felt perhaps another ceiling could be created in conjunction with the Santa Fe restaurant. Architectural Review Commissioner Wussow stated that the 10-foot expanse this would cross is 2-1/2 sidewalks wide which is very narrow. Mr. Spellman added that no one will spend a lot of time on the promenade, however, it will be a good space to showcase some artwork and must be well lit and safe. Mr. Spellman stated they will look at pulling the upper floors back at least five feet.

Plan Commission Chairperson Loch asked for comments from the Plan Commission regarding the project and particularly the height. Plan Commissioner Allen stated he was curious what the corner might look like from a height perspective and what the height might be. He stated he has been more focused on the parking allotments. He also stated that he prefers Option A. Plan Commissioner Whalen stated he was okay with the height. He also stated that massing is critical and the petitioner is continuing to work on that. He felt that the promenade is a good idea and really liked the corner retail space with the tower feature which he feels is a key feature. Plan Commissioner Girling was supportive of the height and stated he likes the retail at the corner. He added that if the corner tower poses any more height concerns, he would prefer not to see anything there. Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin appreciated the parking changes made by the petitioner from a year ago. She stated she was okay with the height due to the grade of the property. She liked having retail on the corner and doing something unique there. She also stated that she liked the promenade and stated she has seen smaller promenades that are cozy that people become used to. Plan Commissioner Bromann stated he was not totally comfortable with the height. He stated that the angle design will help make it more aesthetic and added that he does like the promenade. Plan Commissioner Hartweg stated there are two things going against the petitioner with the height—that the plan is all being done at one time, therefore, it is changing and that the space is open and that is being changed. He stated the petitioner has done and continues to do a good job addressing all the problems with the project. He stated that the idea of having double spaces on the corner is very good and having prime space for retailers has been talked about for the past 10-12 years. He added that the height is on the borderline but he saw no problem with adjusting to the height. He stated he is in favor of the subject project. Plan Commissioner Whiston acknowledged the work the developer has done in response to conversations one year ago—in particular, to vary both the height and the styles of both the south and east facades which is a real improvement. He stated that overall he would accept the height but had difficulty visualizing the promenade. He stated that having the corner retail with the two-floor aspect is an excellent idea. He added that overall he is in favor of the project. Plan Commission Chairperson Loch applauded St.

Petronille's for stepping in and working with Opus to come up with an improved parking solution over what was looked at last year. She stated that she feels Option A is great. She also applauded the ARC's recommendations, including the retail space in the southeast corner of Main and Hillside, the widening of the promenade and all of the architectural features that were asked to be included. She added that the height needs to be made visually less bulky but was okay with the height assuming that additional improvements and details will be made and that it doesn't look as towering as it could. She stated that although the other areas appear to be four stories, the north half of the building looks like five stories and would appreciate it if that could be minimized even more.

Ms. Stegall stated that at the previous Plan Commission meeting regarding this project, a majority of the Plan Commissioners felt that five stories was fine but they wanted to see some setbacks on the upper floor or for the building to be dropped down in different places. She stated that she is now hearing that the Plan Commission no longer believes this is necessary in light of some of the changes requested by the Architectural Review Commission and asked the Plan Commission to confirm if this was the case. Architectural Review Commission Chairperson Burdett stated that the petitioner was discussing reducing the apparent height but not talking about setbacks on the upper floors. Plan Commissioner Girling stated that it was his perception that the Architectural Review Commission suggested breaking up the front using the different roof line which is why he is supportive of the project now. Mr. Spellman stated that they are investigating losing some parking stalls in an effort to increase the promenade and retail. He added that they have been discussing the temporary parking situation during construction with retailers and hope to break ground this fall with approval of the parking deck and beginning construction of the building in spring of 2016.

Architectural Review Commissioner Wussow stated that the developer has talked about making the three Tudor buildings on Main Street have different presentations so they do not look like copies of each other. She stated that more variety while staying within the building styles will make it look like old buildings developed over time. She also stated that she would like to see the tower developed by architectural features rather than height and added that she especially liked the clock which should remain in the Italianate style. She also was in favor of taking the Italianate architecture to the corner property because it much more reflects the style in Glen Ellyn than the Italian Renaissance. She was very supportive of the increase of the first floor retail especially if it continues around Hillside Avenue for the entire width of the first of the building and stated she likes the section for the building amenity. She stated that she would encourage the developer in their proposal to vary the frontage of the building so that it is not all exactly at the line of the lot. She stated that she is very concerned that if every building is exactly all lined up, it will appear to be numerous facades pasted onto a box. She stated that setting back a building even a foot will greatly increase the appearance that these buildings

were built over a period of years and will break up some mass of the building. She also encouraged the developer to rethink who they are targeting as renters.

Architectural Review Commissioner Dieter stated that increasing the retail space is very important in the downtown area. He recommended increasing space at the promenade as the promenade is very important to the structure. He added that a lot of attention needs to be given to the walkway for egress into a parking structure as it will be part of the downtown. He also felt that the architectural appearance at the back of the garage needs to be enhanced. He also felt that the height needs to be reduced due to the sheer mass of the building.

Architectural Review Commissioner Loftus appreciated that the petitioner took into consideration the ARC's request for retail space. He also recommended that the façade could be dressed up which would make a nice transition from Glenwood to Main Street and stated quality architecture is very important to the Village. He did not feel that the length of the building fits in the downtown.

Architectural Review Commissioner Thompson was pleased that the petitioner was open to putting retail on the corner space. She stated that she became supportive of the height of the building when the amenities were brought forward. She felt that the promenade was a great opportunity area but felt that the design should be detailed

Architectural Review Commissioner Senak felt that the progress for the project has been positive and in keeping with the historic character of Glen Ellyn. He appreciated the slate expression on the roof, the double height retail and the staggering of the retail space across the front of the building. He also appreciated the retail that extends around the corner of the building as it will increase activity in that area, benefit the retailers across the street and provides a long-term sales tax base for the Village. He also felt that the promenade should be developed more or eliminated with new businesses located there that can grow into larger spaces in the Village. He stated that if the promenade is to be kept in its smaller space, it should be eliminated and the height of the building should be lowered. He also felt that extending the development up Hillside Avenue should also be looked into. He stated that he would accept the height of the building but feels there are alternatives available.

Architectural Review Commissioner Albrecht liked the retail space ideas and the direction that the petitioner is going. She stated that by softening the massing of the building, perhaps some of the massing, articulation and roof lines will get the petitioner's attention. She stated that the building is very large and the promenade seems tiny.

Architectural Review Commission Chairperson Burdett stated that the retail is great and the 15-foot promenade is adequate. He stated he will wait until he sees the update rendering regarding the building height.

Comments from the Public

Mike Formento, Executive Director of the Chamber of Commerce, 65 Exmoor, Glen Ellyn, Illinois stated that he is delighted to see increased retail as was brought up one year ago. He felt that a traffic study needs to be done to determine the impact of traffic brought on by the new building. He stated that internal safety is a major issue from a pedestrian versus vehicle standpoint within the building and he stated we don't want to see traffic move away from the downtown because of entrances and exits. He also agreed with a Commissioner that a hard look should be taken at the air and light issue and that the Plan Commission should determine if they will move forward with Option A as the gain of four parking spaces in Option B is unacceptable in his view. He stated that he wanted to be assured that public parking will be increased.

Genelle Scheurell, 454 Hill Avenue, Glen Ellyn, Illinois asked what about the retail square footage of the Giesche Shoes building and the proposed new building. Ms. Stegall responded that the Giesche space has 12,000 square feet and the new building will have 8,500-9,000 square feet. Ms. Scheurell added that the height of the proposed building is overwhelming and will have a negative effect on the character of the downtown. She stated there is a development in Hinsdale that is smaller in size and she would prefer a smaller development in Glen Ellyn.

Al Phelan, 684 Highland Avenue, Glen Ellyn, Illinois stated that he was on the St. Pet's committee that worked with Opus. He reminded everyone that 525 children are dropped off at St. Petronille's school in the morning and picked up in the afternoon and stated that the original option will not work. He therefore recommended the option where the parking is incorporated all in one.

Kathy Cornell, 678 Forest Avenue, Glen Ellyn, Illinois stated that her biggest concern regarding the project is the height. She added that the mass is a problem but could be acceptable with acceptable setbacks and varying roof heights. She stated that she appreciated the two Commissions working together at this meeting.

Ken Kloss, 350 Ridgewood, Glen Ellyn, Illinois presented a document that he presented to the Village Board last week.

Comments from the Plan Commission

Plan Commissioner Bromann requested a traffic study, which Mr. Spellman responded they will provide. Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated she would have a problem if the parking deck is not installed due to losing parking spaces. Plan Commissioner Allen stated that one of the elevations of the parking deck had parking in the basement, however, in the staff report,

most of that parking was eliminated and moved to other floors. Mr. Hurst stated that if one doesn't have a basement, the unit renters' parking spaces will be located in the public deck. Mr. Hurst verified for Plan Commissioner Allen that Option A is no basement. Mr. Spellman responded to Plan Commissioner Allen that the number of parking spaces available for Option A would be 65-70% for one-bedroom units and that 20% of the units will not have cars. Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin stated that there is no grocery store in town and therefore more parking spaces would be needed as people will need to drive to the store. Plan Commissioner Allen stated that using a 1.5 metric for parking spaces would be in line with a precedent previously set and would be approximately 43 spaces more than the petitioner is at now. Ms. Stegall stated she looked at for Glenstone and Crescent Station condominium buildings and 80% to 90% of the units in those developments were two bedroom units.

Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Plan Commissioner Allen, to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 p.m.

Trustee Report

No Trustee Report was given.

Chairperson's Report

No Chairperson Report was given.

Staff Report

No Staff Report was given.

Plan Commissioner Heming-Littwin moved, seconded by Plan Commissioner Allen, to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 p.m. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Prepared by:
Barbara Utterback
Recording Secretary

Reviewed by:
Michele Stegall
Village Planner