

PLAN COMMISSION  
VILLAGE OF DEERFIELD

The Plan Commission of the Village of Deerfield held a Workshop Meeting at 7:30 P.M. on June 30, 2016 at the Village Hall, 850 Waukegan Road, Deerfield, Illinois.

Present were: Mary Oppenheim, Chairperson  
Bob Benton  
Larry Berg  
Elaine Jacoby  
Jim Moyer  
Stuart Shayman

Absent were: Al Bromberg

Also present: Jeff Ryckaert, Principal Planner  
Dan Nakahara, Associate Planner

(1a) Substantial Conformance: Request for Finding of Substantial Conformance for Approval of Changes to the Previously Approved Plans for Venue One at 550 Lake Cook Road

Mr. Sean Cannon, CEO of Venue One at 550 Lake Cook Road, explained that after the renovation project at 550 Lake Cook Road was started, the owners of Corporate 500 would not allow Venue One to build a cross walk from the Corporate 500 parking lot to the Venue One Building. The crosswalk was a part of the previously approved plans. Chairperson Mary Oppenheim asked if Corporate 500 explained why they did not want a crosswalk from the parking lot to the venue. Mr. Cannon responded that Corporate 500 does not currently have any crosswalks on the property, and would simply like to keep it that way. Corporate 500 is still allowing Venue One to use their parking lot; however, they do not want a cross walk connecting the two properties. Commissioner Jim Moyer asked if the street would need to be blocked off during events for guests to safely cross, without the crosswalk there. Mr. Cannon explained that a valet service would be provided to guests so that guests would not need to walk back and forth from the parking lot.

Mr. Cannon explained that Corporate 500 has new ownership, with the same management company, and the Corporate 500 team decided against allowing a crosswalk between their parking lot and Venue One. Chairperson Oppenheim asked if their plan was to have Venue One guests that were parking their own vehicles to park in Venue One's parking lot, and to have the valet service use the Corporate 500 parking lot to park valeted guest vehicles, so that guests would not have to cross the street from the parking lot to Venue One. Mr. Cannon responded that ideally Venue One would have preferred guests park their own vehicles in the Corporate 500 Parking lot, and

then have guests walk over from the parking lot to the venue (with Venue One employees stationed at the crossing to ensure guests safety), as it is less expensive than having a valet service, and Venue One is losing some business since a lot of customers don't want to pay for valet service.

Chairperson Oppenheim asked if the crosswalk to the Marriott Residence Inn (on the previously approved plans) was also being eliminated from their plans. Mr. Cannon explained that their plan to place a path from Venue One to Marriott Residence Inn was eliminated. The idea was to provide Venue One guests that were staying at the hotel easy access to and from the venue. Chairperson Oppenheim asked if the ownership/management team at the Residence Inn had an issue with Venue One eliminating the access path from their plans. Mr. Cannon assured Chairperson Oppenheim that the Residence Inn management team was not concerned with the elimination of the access path, as the hotel primarily caters to extended stay guests and is usually already booked in advanced, and would likely not have overnight stay availability for Venue One guests. Marriott has actually offered Venue One shuttle service to and from their other surrounding Marriott Deerfield properties.

Commissioner Moyer asked if the thought was that Marriott would shuttle Venue One guests staying at one of their Marriott properties in the area to and from Venue One, so that guests could leave their vehicles parked at the hotel parking lot, and not have to drive to the event at Venue One, in order to relieve some of the traffic. Mr. Cannon confirmed that was correct, and stated that the weddings and bar mitzvahs that have been booked at Venue One so far all have a guest list of between 200 and 300 guests. The petitioner has determined that a bar mitzvah with around 200 guests would have an estimate of 100 vehicles, with about 50 to 60 vehicles needing parking at the venue on the day of the event. Venue One recently had an open house for their industry guests where valet service was provided at the event, and there were no issues with traffic or parking, and everything went very smoothly. Commissioner Shayman asked how many guests attended their open house event. Mr. Cannon responded that there were approximately 400 guests at the event. If a lot of guests arrive in their own vehicles, Venue One has a strategy to stage the guests' vehicles in their parking lot, so as to allow efficient traffic flow, and avoid backup.

Mr. Cannon commented that Kohl Children's Museum previously rented a tent to host their annual event at their property, which would cost them a pricey \$70,000 to \$80,000 dollars; however, the Museum has booked their annual fundraiser at Venue One this year. Chairperson Oppenheim asked if there were any other issues in regards to their parking agreement with Corporate 500. Mr. Cannon explained that there is a parking contract between Venue One and Corporate 500 that is ready to be executed upon their favorable recommendation. Venue One also has 600 parking spaces on reserve with other businesses around the area, in case there was a situation where additional parking was needed. Chairperson Oppenheim asked if the valet service would park guests' vehicles in these overflow parking locations, if there was a need to use the reserved parking areas. Mr. Cannon confirmed that the valet service would be parking

guests' vehicles in these off-site locations. Although they don't think there is going to be a situation where they would need to use the additional reserved parking spaces, Venue One has secured these parking spaces as a backup.

Chairperson Oppenheim asked about the landscaping changes that were also made to their previously approved plans. Mr. Cannon commented that there were some dead ash trees on the property, in which three dead trees were removed from the property, and they wanted to replace those trees with three new trees of a different species. Chairperson Oppenheim applauded their choice in American Lindens (Basswood Trees) as their selection for their new trees, as there are already American Lindens on the property, and the addition of more lindens would complement the existing landscaping on the property. Commissioner Bob Benton commented that although they were dead the trees that were removed were rather large in size, and have left a significant visual gap in the spot where they used to reside, so the replacement of those trees are necessary to add some character to that area by filling in the empty space. Mr. Cannon agreed with Commissioner Benton, and commented that the area is a little sparse without the trees. Venue One would like to plant additional trees on the property in the future; however due to their overage on budget with construction they are not able to do so at this time.

The plan is to start with three trees and eventually plant more trees in the future. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that the planting of the three trees in the front of the building would smooth out the slight berm that was created by the dead trees being taken out. Chairperson Oppenheim also pointed out that there is a tree on the northwest corner of the Venue One property that may need to be removed in the near future, as it is not in the healthiest condition, and that they should consider having their arborist prune some of the dead branches out of it in order to try to save it. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that lindens grow very large in size quickly, and that the trees may initially look skimpy, but they are going to grow to compliment the large size of the building, as well as the existing larger matured trees on the property. Mr. Cannon commented that there is a scheduled landscaping company that comes out to maintain the property.

Commissioner Elaine Jacoby motioned to approve changes to the previously approved plans for Venue One at 550 Lake Cook Road. Commissioner Benton seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Ayes: Benton, Berg, Jacoby, Moyer, Shayman, Oppenheim  
Nays: None

The motions passed and will be on the July 18<sup>th</sup> Village Board of Trustees Meeting agenda.

(2a) Continued Prefiling Conference: Possible Changes to the C-1 Village Center Zoning District to Update Permitted and Special Uses

Chairperson Oppenheim commented that this discussion was a continuation from the June 9, 2016 workshop meeting regarding the possible changes to the C-1 Village Center Zoning District. She added that Mr. Ryckaert is seeking input about the Plan Commission's opinion on possibly changing smaller personal training facilities of 1,500 to 2,000 square feet from its current Class B Special Use to a Permitted Use. Mr. Ryckaert confirmed that he would like to know if the Commissioners were interested in changing smaller Self-Improvement Facilities (between 1,500 and 2,500 square feet) from a Class B Special Use to a Permitted Use. Self-Improvement Facilities include sports training and martial arts facilities and learning centers. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that there were only a few tenant spaces of this size in the C-1 District, and most self-improvement facilities require a larger tenant space. Chairperson Oppenheim asked Mr. Ryckaert if the reason that he wanted to consider allowing smaller self-improvement facilities as a Permitted Use in the C-1 District was because there were a lot of inquiries from potential tenants about opening these types of facilities in the Village Center District. Mr. Ryckaert commented that self-improvement facilities are a popular use today, and this use brings people into the downtown.

Smaller office and service uses (up to 1,500 square feet) are under consideration to be a Permitted Use in the C-1 Village Center District, and Mr. Ryckaert would like the Plan Commission to also discuss adding smaller self-improvement facilities as a Permitted Use in the C-1 District. Commissioner Berg asked Mr. Ryckaert if he thought that a business owner would be more interested in locating their businesses in Deerfield's Village Center if it were a Permitted Use, since Special Uses have to go through a process of seeking approval for a Special Use. Mr. Ryckaert said that business owners would be more interested to locate their businesses in the C-1 District if they did not have to seek the Special Use. Mr. Ryckaert noted that some business owner don't want to spend the time and money to go through a Special Use process, but many do seek the Special Use as they believe their chances of approval are good. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that "Fitness Together" (an existing business in the C-1 District) would be considered a small self-improvement facility as it is 1,700 square feet in size.

Commissioner Moyer asked Mr. Ryckaert if the Village would consider creating a process that would allow the Plan Commission to fast track the process for certain petitioners on a case-by-case basis. This would help to avoid losing potential small businesses due to the Special Use approval process. Mr. Ryckaert said that a Permitted Use is the Village's fast-track process, as businesses that are considered a Permitted Use would not be required to petition for a Special Use. If the type of use that a potential business owner is inquiring about is a Permitted Use, the process tends to move quite quickly. The Village provides Permitted Use businesses with a checklist of the next steps required to open their business such as obtaining any necessary building permits and receiving approval for their signage from the Appearance Review Commission. Commissioner Moyer asked if there was any way to condense the

Special Use process. Mr. Ryckaert commented that in the past, the Village has looked into shortening the process and found that the to State law notification requirements, as well as the Village's requirements, it would not allow for the process to be shortened. The Village staff always works closely with the Special Use applicants and guides them through the process, and the Village shortens the process if it can (e.g. waiving the pre-filing conference with the Plan Commission, and waiving the second reading of the ordinance with the Board of Trustees). The Village makes every effort to move petitioners along as quickly as possible; however, there are required steps (a process) to obtain a Special Use.

Commissioner Benton commented that petitioners also have to hire professionals to help them through the process and speak on their behalf in regards to traffic studies, etc. at Village meetings. Mr. Ryckaert commented that the Plan Commission considers the potential impact of the business on the traffic flow in the area and determines if a traffic study is not necessary at the pre-filing/workshop meeting if they believe there will be little traffic impact.

Chairperson Oppenheim commented that the Plan Commission is recommending that smaller offices and restaurants should be changed to a Permitted Use in the C-1 District to attract potential business owners to the area by simplifying the process. This is same reason that Mr. Ryckaert is asking the Commissioners to consider allowing smaller self-improvement facilities as Permitted Uses.

Commissioner Berg asked Mr. Ryckaert if he thought that there were any downsides to changing smaller self-improvement facilities to a Permitted Use. Mr. Ryckaert commented that self-improvement facilities have the potential to affect the traffic, especially if there is not enough of a gap between the classes and they overlap. One class leaving while the next class shows up, which could cause temporary congestion in the parking lot during the time between the start of one class and the end of another class. Commissioner Berg asked if the fire code would restrict the number of customers that can be in the facility at one time, therefore reducing the impact that overlapping classes that would have on the area as the allowable number of customers in a class would be limited to a reasonable size for the facility. Mr. Ryckaert confirmed that the fire code would restrict the maximum number of people allowed in the facility at one time. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that there is a difference in the parking requirements for a restaurant versus retail (approximately 2 to 1), and is under the impression that a self-improvement facility where customers are coming and going could have similar parking demands as a restaurant.

Chairperson Oppenheim commented that she is concerned that self-improvement facilities and restaurants combined impact on parking and traffic could become onerous. If self-improvement facilities continue to be a Special Use then the Plan Commission can consider the impact that a specific business would have on traffic (case-by-case); however, if it becomes a Permitted Use (under 2,500 s.f.) the business owner would not have to appear before the Plan Commission and a traffic study would not be done.

Commissioner Berg asked if the business would still need to meet the parking requirements if it was a Permitted Use. Mr. Ryckaert commented that a Permitted Use would use the existing parking in the development. Commissioner Benton commented that in theory the owners of a shopping center are going to have to focus on renting their tenant space to a variety of businesses that have different peak times, so that the parking is complimentary to the businesses in the center. Commissioner Benton reiterated that the problem with self-improvement facilities is that the classes could overlap, which can cause parking lot congestion.

Commissioner Moyer asked Mr. Ryckaert if the Village ever reaches back out to potential business owners that inquired about opening a business in Deerfield but then never followed back up with the Planning Department. Mr. Ryckaert commented that the Planning Department considers the potential benefits that a specific business would have on the Village and follows up accordingly if it is a business that is desirable, especially those that generate sales tax and bring customers in.

Commissioner Shayman asked if there have been any petitioners that applied for a Special Use in the past and were denied a Special Use by the Village. Mr. Ryckaert said it has been quite a while since the Village denied a Special Use and some applicants end up withdrawing during the process if they believe their chances of obtaining approval are not good. Commissioner Benton commented that the Village had second thoughts about the Special Use that was approved for the former cigarette and tobacco shop that was located in Deerfield Park Plaza due to the issues with the strong smell of tobacco coming from the shop and the unclear regulations in regards to people being allowed to smoke inside the shop. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that in regards to a specific category of business not being allowed in the Village that to the best of her memory, a petition has not been dismissed on the basis that the Village was not interested in a certain type of business.

Mr. Ryckaert commented that the Village's Zoning Ordinance only allows uses that are listed as Permitted Uses or Special Uses. If a specific category of business is not listed as a Special Use, then it is not allowed in that zoning district. Chairperson Oppenheim added that potential business owners look at the list of businesses that are Special Uses and Permitted Uses in the Village of Deerfield, and if the type of business that they are interested in opening is not on the list, they could apply for a Text Amendment. Commissioner Berg asked for clarification that if it's not a Permitted Use or a Special Use that the business would have to apply for a Text Amendment if they are interested in opening their business in Deerfield. He added that if the Text Amendment were granted to the petitioner, if that type of business would then be a Special Use in that District or if the Text Amendment was only for that individual business. Mr. Ryckaert responded that the Text Amendment can be written to include the entire District; however, a Text Amendment can also be written so that it only applies to a specific, individual property. Each Text Amendment makes a change to the Zoning Ordinance. Commissioner Berg asked how the Village would proceed with informing property owners and business owners in the Village Center District of the changes that are made

to the C-1 Zoning District's list of Permitted and Special Uses. Mr. Ryckaert explained that the Village is going to invite the C-1 District property owners to a public hearing to discuss the zoning changes, so that the Village can get their feedback.

Commissioner Berg asked if uses such as tobacco shops and hookah lounges would still be required to apply for a Text Amendment. Mr. Ryckaert confirmed that these uses and any use that is not listed as a Permitted Use or a Special Use for the C-1 District would be required to apply for a Text Amendment; some businesses don't proceed with the process if they don't think their chances of receiving approval are very good. Chairperson Oppenheim added that nail salons are required to apply for a Special Use and a Text Amendment in the C-1 District was made for this use a couple of years ago when a nail shop requested to locate in the C-1 Village Center District.

Chairperson Oppenheim asked the Commissioners if they thought that adding smaller Self-Improvement Facilities as a Permitted Use in the C-1 District would be beneficial to the Village. The Plan Commission determined in their previous meeting that it no longer made sense to restrict the C-1 District to retail uses as Permitted Uses, as there is less demand for retail stores, and decided that adding smaller office uses (up to 1500 sq. ft.) and smaller restaurants (up to 3,000 sq. ft. with no drive-thru) as Permitted Uses in the C-1 District would assist in attracting new businesses to the Village Center. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that the Village is receiving a lot of interest from Self-Improvement Facilities such as fitness studios who are inquiring about locating their businesses in Deerfield, and would like to know if the commissioners thought it is a wise decision to add them as a Permitted Use in the C-1 District. Commissioner Benton commented that although the Village would like to have a downtown area with a prosperous and successful retail focus, the reality is that the types of business that are interested in locating in Deerfield are changing, and new types of Permitted Uses need to be added in order to fill the empty tenant spaces and meet the reality of today's market.

Chairperson Oppenheim commented that Commissioner Jacoby had said she was in favor of having Self-Improvement Facilities as a Permitted Use, and asked if any other Plan Commissioners agreed. Commissioner Berg agreed, and asked Mr. Ryckaert if a Cross-Fit Facility would be considered a Self-Improvement Facility. Commissioner Jacoby commented that a Cross-Fit Facility would need a much larger space than 1500 square feet. Chairperson Oppenheim asked for clarification on the maximum square footage requirement for a restaurant to be considered a Permitted Use in the C-1 District. Mr. Ryckaert responded that the Plan Commission is considering restaurants up to 3000 square feet would be considered a Permitted Use in the C-1 District, and asked for the Commissioners thoughts on the appropriate maximum square footage for a Self-Improvement Facility as a Special Use. Also, a Cross-Fit Facility would be considered a Self-Improvement Facility as it is a work out facility. A work out facility that offers classes and/or individual training is considered a Self-Improvement Facility.

Commissioner Benton inquired if Self-Improvement Facilities would generate sales tax revenue for the Village. Mr. Ryckaert commented that a self-improvement facility would not generate sales tax revenue unless the business sold retail products out of their store. If a business that is considered a service use such as a beauty shop or nail salon also had a retail component in which they sold products to their customers, the business would not be considered a retail use, and under the current ordinance would have to apply for a Special Use to locate their business in the C-1 District, since the retail component is not the primary business. Commissioner Jacoby commented that she thought Self-Improvement Facilities (up to 2500 square feet) should be allowed as a Permitted Use in the C-1 District. Mr. Ryckaert added that the market would likely control the number of self-improvement facilities that would be interested in locating their businesses in one area, so the Village should not be overwhelmed by too many self-improvement facilities moving into every tenant space in the C-1 Village Center District. Commissioner Berg asked if Self-Improvement Facilities would be required to also sell retail in the C-1 District. Chairperson Oppenheim clarified that it would not be a requirement, but some self-improvement businesses may also want to sell retail products to their customers. The Commissioners agreed that Self-Improvement Facilities (but only up to 2500 square feet) should be allowed as a Permitted Use in the C-1 District. A lot of the existing Self-Improvement facilities are over 2,500 according to Village files.

#### Benefits of Downtown Housing and TOD

Chairperson Oppenheim explained that planning articles were provided as background and inquired about the Plan Commissioner's thoughts on transit-oriented development (TOD), which is a modern development trend that allows for mixed-use, residential and commercial development, in an area designed to maximize access to public transit. The reality of modern society is that more and more people are interested in living in the downtown area near public transportation, restaurants, offices and stores. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that the C-1 District would be a prime location for transit-oriented development, as it is near the Deerfield Metra Train Station.

Commissioner Moyer commented that the Village should look into other towns in the area that have moved towards transit-oriented development in their downtown areas to find out if allowing more residential development in their downtown areas has been beneficial to the community (both socially and financially). Commissioner Benton commented that most of the towns that also have Metra Station stops on the Milwaukee District North Line have recently had higher density apartment/condo developments built near their train stations; pointing out Morton Grove and Glenview as two examples of Village's that have apartment developments next to their Metra Stations. Mr. Ryckaert commented that the concept would be to allow for more residential development in the C-1 District so that the Village Center would have a more substantial residential component if the commissioners thought it was appropriate for the Village Center. If the Plan Commission believes a higher customer base is desirable, consideration could be given to changing the building height in a commercial PUD from 55 feet to 65 feet and a

non-PUD property from 35 feet to 45 feet. Research data has found that downtown residents spend 3 to 4 times as much money downtown than downtown employees spend, so their spending habits tend to positively benefit businesses financially. Commissioner Berg commented that the Village of Northbrook rejected The Jacobs Companies, LLC submittal to build an apartment complex in downtown Northbrook, because the Village wanted an even higher density apartment complex than was proposed.

Chairperson Oppenheim asked what the Village's current regulations were in terms of density in the C-1 District for mixed-use development. Mr. Ryckaert explained that the maximum height for a Commercial Planned Unit Development (PUD) in the C-1 District is 55 feet and the mixed-use developments in the Village Center are 4 stories. The setbacks from the street are minimal in order to achieve a downtown feel with the buildings close to the street (e.g. Deerfield Center at southeast corner of Deerfield Road and Waukegan Road) to give the feel of a downtown. In addition to building setbacks and building height, other requirements for a mixed-use development include: parking, minimum land unit per dwelling units, maximum lot coverage, open space requirement, storm water requirements, and the Special Use/PUD standards – all of these are taken into account when approving a development. Commissioner Moyer asked if the buildings at Village Square were at the maximum 55-foot height. Mr. Ryckaert commented that the tallest building in Deerfield Square is the 4 story office building (with retail on the first floor and office on the 3 floors above) at 53 feet to the top of the roof deck, and then to the top of the architectural element is at about 70 feet, and the tallest building in Deerfield Centre is a 4 story building (retail on the first floor with 3 stories of apartments above) that is approximately 51 feet in height.

The commissioners discussed increasing the maximum height for PUDs in the C-1 District which could attract developers interested in building apartment/condo developments in the downtown. Prior to tonight's meeting, Chairperson Oppenheim asked Mr. Ryckaert to check into the zoning requirements for mixed-use developments in some of the surrounding communities. Mr. Ryckaert indicated that height is usually an issue that causes a lot concern with new development. Other local communities' maximum height requirements vary. For example: Highland Park has a maximum height of 63 feet with a maximum of 5 stories in the downtown area, as well as specific height requirements that range from 4 to 6 stories in areas surrounding the downtown district. Glenview has a maximum height requirement of 65 feet with a maximum of 5 stories. Lincolnshire has a maximum height requirement of 40 feet with a maximum of 3 ½ stories. Arlington Heights has a maximum height requirement of 90 feet in the downtown district. Northbrook has a maximum height requirement of 45 feet with a maximum of 3 stories in the Central Business District; a maximum height requirement of 55 feet with a maximum of 4 stories in the Regional Shopping District; and a maximum height requirement of 45 feet with a maximum of 3 stories in the Boulevard Commercial District. Mr. Ryckaert commented that the recent new construction of apartment developments on Skokie Boulevard in Northbrook probably went through a variation

process as the buildings exceed Northbrook's maximum height requirements in the zoning ordinance.

Chairperson Oppenheim commented that research data has shown that there is a real value to promoting more residential development in the downtown area. The Village's regulations are currently controlled by the bulk regulations which determine the setbacks, the maximum lot coverage and the maximum height requirements.

Chairperson Oppenheim commented that raising the maximum height requirement in the C-1 District would allow the Village to make a statement and promote more density in the Village Center District; reiterating that the maximum height requirement in the C-1 District is currently 55 feet. Mr. Ryckaert commented that, under the current regulations, if a developer was interested in building a development with more than 4 stories in the C-1 District, they are able to apply for a variance and make their case to the Village to allow for a larger/denser development. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that 5 stories is not an exorbitant height and that a building of that height could fit in with the existing architecture in downtown Deerfield. Commissioner Jacoby commented that residential areas surrounding the C-1 District may have an issue with the visual obstruction that a taller 5 story building could create.

Mr. Ryckaert pointed out that even if the zoning ordinance were changed to allow taller building in the C-1 District, the developer would be required to apply for a Special Use/PUD, in which the Village would take careful consideration of the proposed project. Commissioner Moyer commented that a parking garage would likely be necessary for a mixed-use development with retail spaces on the ground floor and residential units on the upper floors. Mr. Ryckaert explained that Special Use/PUDs have bulk requirements and PUD standards to meet. The commissioners also discussed recent trends in urban planning and development is to have less parking in downtown areas, as these areas can be easily accessed by public transportation or by foot.

Chairperson Oppenheim pointed out that the Village considered TOD in the northwest quadrant many years ago in Request for Proposals and also recently Tucker's TOD in the northeast quadrant of the Village Center. Commissioner Moyer commented that downtown Deerfield has less space for larger developments than our neighboring communities' have in their downtown areas. Commissioner Jacoby commented that she doesn't feel there is a need to increase the height requirements for buildings in the C-1 District, since developers have the option of applying for a variation to the Special Use/PUD if their proposed project is larger than the allowable 55 feet that gives them a 4 story building. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that the Village's zoning restrictions for the C-1 District are held as standards for the image that the Village wants to maintain in its downtown area, and acts as an overall guideline for the type of developments that the Village is interested in having in its downtown area. She added that by keeping the existing height requirements for the C-1 District, the Village is communicating a message to developers about the kind of developments the Village wants in its downtown area. Chairperson Oppenheim feels that it would be beneficial to the development of the Village's C-1 District to increase the height requirements. Commissioner Shayman commented that he feels that the height requirements should

remain the same, and that developers should make their case for the additional height when they bring a project to the Village. He believes that the upper stories of taller buildings should be terraced back to minimize the impact on the adjacent neighborhood and that can be addressed as part of the approval process. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that she understood the Commissioners' apprehensions about allowing additional height to buildings in the C-1 District, and pointed out neighbors' resistance to the development of the townhouses by the train station due to their height. The Plan Commission determined that it was best not to increase the height requirements in the C-1 District, as developers have the option of petitioning the Village for a taller building with more stories.

Commissioner Shayman asked if a mixed-use development in the C-1 District would be required to apply for a PUD. Mr. Ryckaert stated that any major redevelopment would need to be done as a PUD. There is a minimum lot requirement of 1 acre for a Commercial PUD in the C-2 District; however, there is not a minimum lot requirement for a Commercial PUD in the C-1 District.

Chairperson Oppenheim explained that the next step was for Mr. Ryckaert to put together a summary of the changes to the C-1 Village Center Zoning District that the Plan Commission is considering. The Village is then going to notify all of the property owners in the C-1 District of the proposed updates and invite them to a public hearing to get their reaction.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Mary Glowacz