



RIVER FOREST DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING AGENDA

A meeting of the River Forest Development Review Board will be held on Thursday, August 20, 2020 at 7:30 P.M. in First Floor Community Room of the Village Hall, 400 Park Avenue, River Forest, Illinois.

Physical attendance at this public meeting is limited to 36 individuals, with Development Review Board officials, staff and consultants having priority over members of the public. Public comments and any responses will be read into the public meeting record. You may submit your public comments via email in advance of the meeting to: Lisa Scheiner at lscheiner@vrf.us. You may view or listen to the meeting by participating online or via telephone. Join the meeting at <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88662561205> using meeting ID: 886 6256 1205, or call (312) 626-6799 and use meeting ID 886 6256 1205. If you would like to participate online or over the phone, please email lscheiner@vrf.us by 5:00 PM on Thursday, August 20, 2020 with your name and the last four digits of the phone number you will be using to call in.

- I. Call to Order/Roll Call
- II. Minutes of the June 18, 2020 Development Review Board Meeting
- III. Minutes of the July 16, 2020 Development Review Board Meeting
- IV. Approval of Findings of Fact and Recommendation of the Development Review Board (Application #20-01: Application for a Planned Development to Construct a Townhome Development at 1101-1111 Bonnie Brae Place)
- V. Public Comment
- VI. Adjournment

**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
June 18, 2020**

A meeting of the Village of River Forest Development Review Board was held at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, June 18, 2020 in the Community Room of the River Forest Village Hall, 400 Park Avenue, River Forest, Illinois.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:33 p.m. Upon roll call, the following persons were:

Present: Members Fishman, Dombrowski, Kilbride, O'Brien, Crosby, and Chairman Martin

Absent: Member Schubkegel

Also Present: Assistant Village Administrator Lisa Scheiner, Village Attorney Michael Mars

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 2019 DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING

A MOTION was made by Member Fishman and SECONDED by Member Crosby to approve the November 7, 2019 minutes of the Development Review Board meeting.

Member O'Brien briefly left the meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ayes: Members Fishman, Dombrowski, Kilbride, Crosby, and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2020 DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING

A MOTION was made by Member Fishman and SECONDED by Member Crosby to approve the March 5, 2020 minutes of the Development Review Board meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ayes: Members Fishman, Dombrowski, Kilbride, Crosby, and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MAY 7, 2020 DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING

A MOTION was made by Member Crosby and SECONDED by Member Fishman to approve the May 7, 2020 minutes of the Development Review Board meeting.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ayes: Members Fishman, Dombrowski, Kilbride, Crosby, and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

Member O'Brien returned to the meeting.

V. PUBLIC HEARING – APPLICATION #20-01: APPLICATION FOR A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO CONSTRUCT A TOWNHOME DEVELOPMENT AT 1101-1111 BONNIE BRAE PLACE

Chairman Martin opened the continued public hearing for the proposed planned development at 1101-1111 Bonnie Brae Place.

Assistant Village Administrator Scheiner swore in all parties wishing to speak.

Chairman Martin explained the procedure that would be followed for the public hearing.

John Schiess, JCSA Chicago, presented the application for the proposed planned development at 1101-1111 Bonnie Brae Place. He stated that the development team consists of Art Gurevich, Bonnie Brae Construction, LLC, and himself as the Architect and Development Consultant.

Mr. Schiess presented a zoning map surrounding the proposed development site, which is located at the northwest corner of Bonnie Brae and Thomas, and across the street from Concordia University. He also presented photographs of the site demonstrating the approximate boundary lines of the development. He stated that the existing uses consist of a parking lot and a six-unit apartment building.

Mr. Schiess presented an aerial view of the proposed development site to provide further context for the development. He noted that it is bounded on three sides by public rights-of-way, including an alley.

Mr. Schiess displayed copy of the property survey and noted that the proposed development site consists of three separate parcels. He said one parcel contains the apartment building and the existing parking lot covers the other two parcels.

Mr. Schiess presented the proposed revised site plan, which consists of six separate buildings in three columns that run parallel to Bonnie Brae Place, each containing three townhomes, for a total of 18 townhomes. He stated that the site plan has been revised on feedback the applicant has received.

Mr. Schiess stated that each townhome is three stories tall and consists of two garage parking spaces in each unit. He displayed a typical three-bedroom floorplan for each unit. The plans show that the main floor consists of a third bedroom, bathroom and utility spaces, the second floor consists of a great room, dining room, kitchen and bathroom, the third floor consists of two bedrooms and two bathrooms, including a master suite, and a deck located on the roof of each unit. He stated that each townhome building contains two end-units and one middle unit, which provides additional light.

Mr. Schiess continued his presentation with a depiction of the west elevation of the proposed development. He stated the buildings will each consist of limestone and two colors of brick. He stated that the limestone is used to frame the brick. He said some of the units have bays to help with building articulation and limit flat facades. He also explained how green space was incorporated between every third unit to mimic the rhythm of Bonnie Brae Place.

Mr. Schiess displayed depiction of the north and south elevations of the proposed development along Thomas Street. He stated that this depicts the end units and how they have positioned windows to provide more light in the units. He also pointed out the cantilevered balconies off the kitchens on the second floor of each unit.

Mr. Schiess displayed a depiction of the east elevation of the proposed development, which is visible from the alley accessible from Thomas Street. He noted the two car garage on the first floor of each unit.

Mr. Schiess displayed the artist's rendering of the proposed development looking eastbound down Thomas and northbound Bonnie Brae. He pointed out the different brick colors and the use of greenspace between the buildings. He also displayed an artist's rendering looking southbound Bonnie Brae and noted the location of the walkway that facilitates east-west pedestrian movement on the site.

Mr. Schiess continued his presentation and displayed a shadow study to depict the impact of light and shadow on surrounding properties on June 22 at 10 a.m. and 2 p.m., which is when the sun is at the highest angle and is the best case scenario, as well as December 22 at 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. which is the worst case scenario for sun shadows because it is when the longest shadows are cast.

Mr. Schiess then displayed a depiction of the wood fence that is proposed along the northern property line and the waste and recycling corral, which completely contains the trash bins, that is proposed at the northeast corner of the site.

Mr. Schiess presented the landscape plan, noting the greenspace between units and buildings.

Mr. Schiess then displayed a chart describing the zoning requirements regarding bulk and what is proposed for this development. There was a brief discussion regarding the accuracy of the chart and Mr. Schiess acknowledged that some of the information may be incorrect, such as the rear yard area information. He stated he would prefer to eliminate the slide as

an exhibit. Mr. Schiess testified that the site plan was an accurate depiction of the proposed development in relation to the Village's zoning standards and the site development allowances (SDAs) being requested.

Mr. Schiess reviewed information related to the plan including the parcel size (27,681 square feet), 18 townhomes in six buildings, two parking spaces per townhome plus four guest spaces for a total of 40 on-site parking spaces.

Mr. Schiess stated that the compensating benefits of the proposed development include that the project is sustainable development, it is smart growth meaning that they are placing the development in a location that needs this type of growth, but tries to get as much density on the site, and that this is a supportive housing type. He noted that there are not that many townhome developments in River Forest, and that this is a development type that will support property values.

Mr. Schiess addressed the marketability of the townhomes. He stated that he represented the applicant of the townhomes on Madison Street and that that development had the option to rent or buy the townhomes. It effected the architecture, finishes and interior planning of those units. Mr. Schiess said the plan for the proposed development at Bonnie Brae and Thomas is to market these units for sale and that the amenities needed to sell the units will be provided.

Mr. Schiess said the economics of a for-sale product is different than the economics of a for-rent unit. Mr. Schiess said that their consultant, Mario Mollo, is unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Mollo has worked on various projects in surrounding communities but has provided input to the applicant about what product is attractive to buyers. Mr. Schiess noted that this is a privately owned and funded development, the applicant has to make money and get a bank to fund the project that they believe will be successful. He said that, within that framework, it starts to address the question of the marketability of these units. He noted that Mr. Gurevich is taking a calculated financial risk.

Mr. Schiess said that, as the project architect, he reviewed the Village's planning consultant's comments regarding the project. Mr. Schiess stated that Mr. Houseal's comments appear to be that the density of the development is not the fundamental issue, but how it relates to the site. In order to address the concerns that were raised regarding setbacks, they have drafted an alternative site plan that has been provided to the Development Review Board today. Mr. Schiess stated that they have eliminated two of the on-site guest parking spaces, decreased the distance between units 3 and 4, 9 and 10, and 15 and 16, and transferred that to increase the setback along the south property line along Thomas Street. He stated that they reduced the courtyards to bring the front yard setback into compliance with the 20-foot required setback. Mr. Schiess stated that they also increased the east setback along the alley to eight feet. He apologized for providing it at late hour and noted that the Village's staff and consultants have not had an opportunity to review and comment on the alternative site plan.

Art Gurevich, the developer and applicant, stated that his firm has had a lot of experience building this type of project. He sated they built a similar type of unit in Oak Park and other

areas and that the developments were successful. He said this is an urban-type townhome that is not huge, but has everything a buyer will want in a townhouse. He stated that he is proposing high quality materials inside and out and that buyers have been happy with his product.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Gurevich replied that the previously approved condominium projects totaled 18 between the new building and existing building.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Schiess stated that there were no other witnesses present to testify for the applicant.

Kurt Bohlmann, Fire Chief, confirmed that he had previously been sworn in to testify. He stated that the Fire Department would seek to have the units numbered south to north to remain consistent with the rest of the Village. They would like to see a detail of the utility layout coming into each unit to avoid having them bunched together in a small area of each building. He said that they received the new site plan a few hours ago and have not had an opportunity to review the proximity of the balconies to the overhead power lines that run along the alley on the east side of the site. They want to confirm that the power lines are not within reach of anyone on the balcony. Fire Marshal Kevin Wiley confirmed that he had not further comments.

John Anderson, Public Works Director, confirmed that he had been previously sworn in to testify. Mr. Anderson stated that his report raised concerns regarding site constraints, including the loading and unloading of material. He asked that anticipated use of the public right-of-way be noted and that a plan be provided by the developer. Mr. Anderson stated that a snow removal plan should also be provided since there are few areas on site where snow can be stored. Mr. Anderson also stated that the primary issues are the locations of utilities on the site. He stated that the IEPA will require that the water main be looped on the site from Bonnie Brae through the site and back out to Bonnie Brae. He said that the current plans do not show that. Mr. Anderson said that the water main infrastructure on the north side of the site is located in an area with a five-foot setback. Any breaks later on will be difficult to repair. The Public Works Department recommends a 10-foot width in order to facilitate repairs to this line. Mr. Anderson concurred with the Fire Department's request to see an approximate layout of on-site utilities.

Ms. Fishman asked how the Public Works Department determines how much snow should be removed from the site. Mr. Anderson replied that after a few inches of snow a few vacant or sectioned-off spaces are typically utilized for snow storage. However, the site plan does not provide for that storage area and all snow on the driveways would need to be removed from the site to preserve parking.

Assistant Village Administrator Scheiner, presented the Police Department's report, which indicated that they have no public safety concerns regarding the proposed development.

John Houseal, Houseal Lavigne Associates, confirmed that he had been previously sworn in to testify. In response to a question from Mr. Houseal, Chairman Martin asked that his

comments be focused on the application that is before them and not the alternative site plan that had been submitted earlier in the day.

Mr. Houseal summarized the comments in his review memo. He noted that the proposed development site is currently zoned R4 and is surrounded by properties that are in the R3, R4 and PRI zoning district. He stated that the proposed development is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, which calls for multi-family use of the site, that it provides high-quality residential housing options, and increases the diversity and range of housing options in the Village. Mr. Houseal said the Comprehensive Plan also calls for the protection and enhancement of historic and architecturally valued structures. The three-story building that would be removed is not historically or architecturally designated, but it is an older, attractive building that adds character to the neighborhood. He continued that the Comprehensive Plan also calls for the improvement and preservation of existing affordable housing. Mr. Houseal stated that he is not sure whether the existing six apartments at 1111 Bonnie Brae Place are considered affordable but wanted to raise the issue.

Mr. Houseal reviewed the seven SDAs requested and noted that that Mr. Schiess summarized his concerns appropriately. Mr. Houseal said that, while the type of development is appropriate (townhomes), and the unit count should not alarm anyone, his concern is how the SDAs reflect how the six buildings are accommodated on the site. Mr. Houseal explained that minimum land area speaks to density and is the amount of land (ground) area that is required for each dwelling unit. In River Forest, 2,800 square feet of ground area is required for each unit, but the proposed development requires a SDA of 1,200 square feet of land area per unit. If the applicant abided by the strict letter of the underlying zoning regulations, nine units would be permitted. He continued that the applicant is requesting a SDA for lot coverage, which is the amount of lot surface that is covered by the footprint building. Maximum lot coverage in the Zoning Ordinance is 70% and they are requesting 76%.

Mr. Houseal stated that the setbacks require SDAs, which is indicative of how the proposed site plan and buildings begin to push out toward the edges of the site. The required front setback along Bonnie Brae is 20 feet and the applicant is proposing 15 feet, so a five-foot SDA is required. The corner front setback off Thomas Street is required to be 25' and they are proposing five feet, so they would require a 20' SDA. The rear setback is another tight configuration along the alley on the east. They are required to be 27.67 feet and they are proposing five feet, requiring a 22.67' SDA. The development is also required to have a certain rear yard area of 4,152 square feet (15%) and they are proposing 839 square feet (3%), requiring a SDA of 3,322 square feet (12%). This is function of the easternmost buildings being pushed toward the alley.

Mr. Houseal stated that the code requires two and a half enclosed garage parking spaces per unit three-bedroom unit, which may be a little antiquated, for a total of 45 on site resident parking spaces. He said they are proposing two spaces per unit for a total of 36 on site spaces, which requires a SDA of nine parking spaces. He stated that this is appropriate for this type of development. Mr. Houseal noted that no SDAs are required for lot area, lot width, floor area ratio, building height and side yard (north) setback and, as proposed, guest parking. He

said circulation, parking, and access to and from the site from Thomas Street and the alley is direct, easy and convenient.

Mr. Houseal stated that the building materials in the rendering appear to be high quality but he has not yet viewed material samples. He also stated that the architectural style is appropriate and the development and landscaping appears attractive, but mostly when viewed head-on from Bonnie Brae. The view of the southern elevation when driving northbound on Bonnie Brae and east/west on Thomas Street has too large a view of the auto courts which gives the impression of row after row of driveways. He noted that the landscaping is deficient along the southern elevation and the lack of setback along the south make it difficult to screen the views of the auto courts and garages. Mr. Houseal stated that the southern elevation needs more detail and architectural enhancement. He added that it is a prominent view and should not be treated like the side of a building. He also commented that there should be greater utilization of vertically oriented landscape materials and that the number of yews along the foundation should be sufficient to create a hedge row along the foundation.

Mr. Houseal stated that, based on the fixtures and locations in the renderings, he anticipates that the lighting plan will comply with the Village's regulations, but asked to see a photometric plan.

Mr. Houseal said that, while the land use is appropriate and the site can accommodate 18 units, it is the way they are configured on the site that is an issue. He said the biggest issues he has are the lack of setback of Thomas, resulting lack of landscaping, the need for a bigger setback along Bonnie Brae and the alley, and the need for improvements to open space and pedestrian mobility on site.

Mr. Houseal said he briefly reviewed the alternative site plan that was provided and noted that it is an improvement over the current proposal in that it increases setbacks along the east (Bonnie Brae), west (the alley), and south (Thomas Street). He noted that by increasing the west setback the driveway pads will be eight feet deep, which will allow a vehicle to park on the pad on private property parallel to the alley. Although this is not a designated parking space, in practical application it can be used as such, which results in six guest parking spaces along the alley for the westernmost townhome units. Mr. Houseal continued that, while the buildings are tighter, it is a better pedestrian site as it provides a continuous pathway from east to west across the site. Mr. Houseal concluded that there is merit to pausing to consider the alternate site plan.

In response to a question from Member Kilbride, Mr. Houseal confirmed that he is not as concerned about density with the new site plan. He reiterated that 18 units is not inappropriate for the site, but it's the fact that it's 18 units distributed over six buildings pushed to the edge of the site. Increasing the setbacks for the development makes it more attractive to the neighborhood and better for the residents of the development.

In response to a question from Member Kilbride, Mr. Gurevich stated that the proposed units are 2,400 square feet each.

In response to a question from Member Crosby, Mr. Houseal replied that the existing buildings along Bonnie Brae maintain setbacks in the range of 40 to 50 feet. The required setback on the development site is 20 feet and the alternate site plan satisfies that requirement. Member Kilbride noted other, shorter setbacks in the neighborhood.

In response to a question from Member Fishman, Mr. Houseal stated that he does not believe that affordable housing can be worked into this development. He stated that that he doesn't know whether the apartments at 1111 Bonnie Brae are currently considered affordable housing units. Mr. Houseal stated that the Affordable Housing plan was adopted after the application was filed, however, the Comprehensive Plan does call for the preservation and improvement of existing affordable housing units.

Hearing no further questions for Mr. Houseal or staff, Chairman Martin stated that they would typically request public testimony at this time. However, they asked the applicant whether or not they would like to amend the application. Mr. Schiess complimented the review and feedback Mr. Houseal provided. He confirmed that the applicant would like to request that the hearing be continued so the application could be amended to address the outstanding concerns raised by Village staff and Mr. Houseal.

There was a brief discussion regarding submission deadlines for the amended application and continued public hearing. The applicant agreed to a July 2, 2020 deadline at Noon.

A MOTION was made by Chairman Martin and SECONDED by Member Kilbride to continue the public hearing to July 16, 2020.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ayes: Members Fishman, Dombrowski, Kilbride, O'Brien, Crosby, and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION was made by Member Fishman and SECONDED by Member Kilbride to adjourn the meeting of the Development Review Board at 8:58 p.m.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ayes: Members Fishman, Dombrowski, Kilbride, O'Brien, Crosby, and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

Respectfully Submitted:

Lisa Scheiner, Secretary

Frank R. Martin
Chairman, Development Review Board

Date

DRAFT

**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
July 16, 2020**

A meeting of the Village of River Forest Development Review Board was held at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, July 16, 2020 in the Community Room of the River Forest Village Hall, 400 Park Avenue, River Forest, Illinois.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m. Upon roll call, the following persons were:

Present: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, Fishman, Kilbride, O'Brien, Schubkegel, and Chairman Martin

Absent: None

Also Present: Assistant Village Administrator Lisa Scheiner, Village Attorney Carmen Forte, Jr., Secretary Clifford Radatz and Village Planning Consultant John Houseal

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE JUNE 18, 2020 DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING

No action taken.

III. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICATION #20-01: APPLICATION FOR A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO CONSTRUCT A TOWNHOME DEVELOPMENT AT 1101-1111 BONNIE BRAE PLACE

Chairman Martin opened the continued public hearing for the proposed planned development at 1101-1111 Bonnie Brae Place.

Assistant Village Administrator Scheiner read the admonition and swore in all parties wishing to speak who had not previously been sworn in.

Chairman Martin explained that at the last hearing the applicant indicated that they wanted to submit a revised plan for the Board's consideration. That was done in a timely fashion and later amended after consideration of some of the comments from Village staff. Chairman Martin asked the applicant to make a presentation so that all present understand the current plan.

John Schiess, JCSA Chicago, confirmed that since the last meeting they revised the site plan and some building elevations and submitted them on July 2, 2020, as was directed during the meeting. Subsequent to that submittal, Mr. Schiess spoke to Fire Marshal Kevin Wiley in relation to concerns for first responders. They addressed those concerns on the site plan and elevation drawings. Namely, the cantilevered balconies that projected five feet from the rear

of all the units were removed and replaced with “Juliet balconies.” A Juliet balcony allows residents to open the doors for fresh air but the balconies do not project out beyond the face of the building. This provides 22 feet between the buildings to accommodate emergency vehicle access. This change also allowed them to set the fronts of the units on Bonnie Brae to the appropriate zoning-required setback. The revised site plan was submitted on July 10, 2020, reflecting the removal of the balconies and the bridge of units.

Mr. Schiess mentioned that two consultants were present virtually to answer questions. He also stated that the marketing consultant, Avenue One, represented by Mariano Mollo was present on the call and available to answer questions.

Mr. Scheiss presented slides that compare the previous elevations with balconies and the current elevations with Juliet balconies, which improve proximity to power lines. Mr. Schiess stated that the unit floor plans have not changed.

Mr. Schiess presented slides that demonstrate building elevations and noted that the elevations reflect the proposed colors and building materials. He said the rendering was prepared by someone who is now unavailable to update it. He stated that they added more limestone detailing to the elevations, which was a concern outlined in John Houseal’s report.

Mr. Schiess said the changes between the previous elevation and the one presented was a response to John Houseal’s comments about needing to make the building look and act as a whole design. He presented the changes as they were applied to other elevations of the buildings, including the updated colors.

Mr. Schiess presented the revised landscape plan, which takes advantage of the additional space between buildings 1 and 2 and provides additional landscaping. The buildings also are further toward the north, which allows for a greater landscape area between the public walkway and buildings 2, 4, and 6.

Mr. Houseal’s report recommended screening the courtyard so that passersby did not see a series of garage doors. Mr. Schiess stated they created that screening with landscaping. They “pinched” the 22-foot driveway at the entrance along Thomas, with evergreen landscaping so as to provide a visual buffer. He said they increased the setback from five feet to 12 feet, which provides for enhanced landscaping and pedestrian safety along Thomas.

Mr. Schiess reviewed the site development allowances that are being sought for this project.

Bill Grieve, senior transportation engineer for Gewalt Hamilton Associates, stated that they conducted the traffic impact and parking study for the project. He stated the traffic characteristics and traffic counts were conducted pre-COVID-19, in November 2019, while Concordia University and Grace Lutheran were still in session. Peak hours were 7:30-8:30 a.m. and 3:00-4:00 p.m. The peak time in the afternoon is different from the typical 5:00-6:00 p.m. due to the activity from Concordia University.

Mr. Grieve stated the site has the opportunity for about 30% of non-automobile trips, to include walking, bus, and biking, including those who may work at Concordia University. These discounts were not taken into account to ensure they looked at the maximum impact of the development, which is a limited number of trips. In the morning, during peak hours, the townhomes are expected to generate about one trip every six minutes, and about one trip every five minutes in the afternoon peak hour. He stated that there was a previous development proposal of apartments on the site and that the townhomes will generate 30-35% fewer trips than the apartments that were previously proposed would have.

Mr. Grieve stated the intersections right now operate acceptably or better. Traffic engineers rate level of service on a scale from A to F. He stated D is acceptable, and that virtually everything at the site is at a C or better, with the exception of the intersection at Bonnie Brae and Division, which is rated at a D. He said delay increases will be at a second or less. He noted that the townhome neighbors have different peak times, with the University getting busier later in the morning, earlier in the afternoon, and later in the evenings, as opposed to the townhome peaks, which will be 7:30-8:30 a.m. and 4:30-5:30 p.m. He said Grace Lutheran has peak hours from 8:15 to 3:00, so the activity winds down before the other activity starts picking up.

Mr. Grieve stated each of the eighteen townhomes have a two-car garage, equaling 36 spaces. John Houseal's testimony noted that residents and visitors may also park alongside the garages, so the potential number of parking spaces on site ends up being 56 spaces. Mr. Grieve stated the Institute for Transportation Engineer calculates a need of less than 30 spaces. The Village Code requires 49 spaces, so they are providing slightly more than the Code requires. Also, there will be off-site parking for resident-only parking on the north side of Thomas from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. as well as on the south side of Division. He estimated at least six to eight cars may be able to park at these locations. There is already resident-only parking on the west side of Bonnie Brae near Augusta and two-hour parking on the west side of Bonnie Brae. He mentioned residents may also call the Village and ask them for guest passes so that their guests may legally park at these locations.

Mr. Grieve presented two conclusions: that the townhome traffic can be readily accommodated by the adjacent streets and that the Bonnie Brae Townhome parking needs can be easily met with everything that is available on-site and with the available street parking.

Chairman Martin asked if there were any questions for Mr. Grieve.

Chairman Martin asked how many on-site parking spaces there were. Mr. Grieve responded that there is a two-car garage for each of the 18 townhomes, and there are two guest spaces, which totals 38 spaces. He added that there is enough depth where someone may park alongside the garages, which equates to another eighteen spaces. Mr. Grieve stated the total number of on-site parking spaces is 56 spaces.

Chairman Martin asked where the last, additional 18 spaces were coming from. Ms. Scheiner clarified that cars parking along the alley, parallel to the garages, would equal six and not 18 spaces.

Mr. Houseal agreed that it was only six spaces, and added that they cannot be counted as parking spaces because they do not meet the dimensions required and that anyone parking in those spaces would block others from getting to other parking spaces required for the unit. He added that the current plan, in lieu of providing four guest spaces, only provides two, but that there is the ability to accommodate six extra cars on site if people choose to park parallel to the garages. He said that a car could be parked there, but those spaces are not included in the overall on-site parking space count because they're not large enough and they block in required parking.

Mr. Grieve responded by saying the key is that the ability to accommodate the cars parking parallel to the garages, and that the parking on street will make it easy to accommodate and meet the parking needs of the Bonnie Brae Townhomes throughout the day and night.

Chairman Martin asked if he was still counting the 12 spaces behind buildings 1, 2, 3, and four. He said they previously derived a total of 56 spaces by counting a third space behind each of the buildings, and he wanted to clarify that those spots were not being counted anymore. Mr. Grieve stated they were looking at cars being parked parallel to the garage and other available spaces. He said they were not counting those that you can officially count according to the Code. He acknowledged that parking along the garages would be effectively blocking the alley.

Chairman Martin asked whether the cars being parked parallel to the garages would interfere with firetrucks, which was the reason why they took out the balconies. Mr. Schiess stated the Village Code-complaint spaces came up to 38, with 36 for the townhomes and two guest spaces, and then another "soft six spaces" along the alley. He called them "soft" spaces because they're not compliant. He totaled these at 44, saying they could not count any spaces in the driveway, because it would go against the notions of emergency access.

Mr. Grieve responded that, even after taking out the spaces in the driveway, and especially with the resident-only parking being implemented on the street, that they think what is available on-site and on the street would meet the demands of the residents. The Institute of Transportation Engineers estimates that for 18 townhomes there will probably be a need for 28 parking spaces, according to national average. He said there will be "plenty of spaces" to meet the demand between the on-site and on-the-street parking.

Chairman Martin asked whether there were any other questions for Mr. Grieve. There were none.

Mr. Schiess commented that that was the end for the presentation. He stated Art Gurevich, the developer, was present and suggested he may want to make some comments. He also added that Mariano Mollo is available to answer questions as to the marketing of the townhomes.

Art Gurevich stated there was an issue of affordable housing that was raised by John Houseal. He said he prepared a statement that he could either submit or read into the record. Because Chairman Martin said he hasn't seen it, he told him to read the statement into the record. Mr. Gurevich read the statement into the record, stating that the property was acquired by the developer with the intent of creating market-rate condominium units but the plan was later changed in favor of townhome development. The development's economic performance was based on the market rate unit and the development costs and impact is consistent with the Village's requirements. The Village's affordable housing guidelines take into account that, for practical reasons, only multi-family or mixed-use developments can support affordable units. The proposed townhomes are not suitable for affordable units, since the inclusion of even one affordable townhome would make their plan not economically feasible.

Mr. Gurevich stated that the development would not be eliminating existing affordable units. In 2017, two-bedroom units were rented for \$1,400 per month and three-bedroom units were rented for \$2,000 per month. He noted that both of these amounts were in excess of 2018 affordable guidelines of \$1,143 and \$1,320, respectively.

Mr. Gurevich stated they fully support the Village's affordable housing program and that they have participated in similar programs since 2002. He stated that participation in the program requires the developer to incorporate the program into the planning from the very beginning of the development, in order to factor in the cost of the land and other incentives. He stated that was not the case for this development.

Member Kilbride asked what the average listing price was. Mr. Gurevich stated that it would probably be in the range of \$600,000 to \$625,000. In response to a follow-up question from Member Kilbride, Mr. Gurevich responded that unit size is in the range of 2,500-2,600 sq. ft.

Chairman Martin asked whether the rental rates Mr. Gurevich cited were for the building next door. Mr. Gurevich confirmed that it was and restated the monthly rents. He said that there is one renter remaining in those units.

Chairman Martin asked if there were other questions for Mr. Gurevich. Hearing none, Chairman Martin asked if there were any other presenters for the plan. Mr. Schiess confirmed that their presentation was concluded.

Commander James Greenwood stated he has no comment at this time. Ms. Scheiner confirmed that the Police Department's position on this development has not changed.

Fire Marshal Kevin Wiley stated that he and John Schiess have talked about the proposed bridge, which was taken out of the plan. The other concern was with the full-sized balconies, which have also been taken out of the plan and changed to Juliet balconies. He stated the concern was with how far away the power lines would be away from the building. With the Juliet balconies, people are kept from extending out by the five feet originally planned. He said they have access to all the buildings with the bridge removed.

Fire Marshal Wiley stated the other item they still have to figure out is the one pole in the middle of the property with three transformers on it. Because the pole is not included in the plan, he could not tell how far away from the back of the building it would be. He stated that the addresses in the Village go from south to north, and the Fire Department suggests that the building addresses for this development conform to that south-to-north scheme to make it easier for first responders to locate the property. Ms. Scheiner stated that the Village has an address assignment process it will follow.

Public Works Director John Anderson stated they received a revised utility plan showing new locations for the water main, water services, and the sewer for the site. They were previously too close to the other property, but they moved those and looped it back into the main on Bonnie Brae, and he is satisfied with the current plan.

Director Anderson stated that they have concerns about the material staging plan, but that it can be moved around. Specifically, he stated that the alley to the west was recently constructed with permeable paver materials and Staff wants to ensure that they alley is not disturbed nor used as the primary location for vehicles to enter and exit during construction of the development. He stated they would like it if the staging could be done to avoid the alley.

Director Anderson also stated that they would like to ensure that snow is removed and not placed in the public right-of-way nor guest parking spaces.

Village Engineer Jeff Loster commented that the concrete pad to the garbage enclosure has been turned to face south and may appear to be a parking space for drivers coming in off the alley. He stated the applicant may need to modify the pad so as not to create a large concrete pad that could fit a vehicle.

Planning Consultant, John Houseal, stated there are few changes from his previous report. The revisions from the applicant changing the balconies and the bridge came in on the July 9 and 10, respectively. A lot of the application, however, remained unchanged. He stated the Comprehensive Plan designates land use at this location for multi-family. He said the townhomes provide a residential housing type of which the Village has some but not a lot. He said the three-flat that is to the north of the parking lot is not an architecturally significant landmark building, but it is an attractive, older building that the character of the street would lose in the plan proposed.

On the subject of affordable housing, Mr. Houseal stated that the applicant addressed the fact that the units in the three-flat north of the parking lot do not meet the housing affordability index as established by the State of Illinois, as they exceed the monthly rental fee for what would classify as affordable housing. He mentioned that the Affordable Housing Plan was not adopted at the time the development was submitted and already in process.

Mr. Houseal stated, as for zoning and site development allowances, he noted that the applicant did not include one of the requested allowances and said he will address it. He said, as to density, that the Village calculates density by minimum land area. For every

townhouse or multi-family unit, the Village requires 2,800 square feet of land per unit. He said, based on the size of the property in question, which are at little more than 27,000 square feet, that they are entitled to have nine units. They are proposing eighteen units, which is double their overall permitted density. Thus, they need a site development allowance of 1,344 feet of property per unit.

Mr. Houseal stated the lots comply with the Zoning Code and that there is a lot coverage maximum of 70% and the plan is at 69%. They do not need a variance or a site development allowance for their floor-area-ratio of 1.29, since the maximum they are allowed is 1.5. They are allowed a building height of 45 feet. The renderings show a height of 41 feet, but they're requesting 42 feet.

Mr. Houseal stated the front setback off of Bonnie Brae has been pushed back in their plan to the required 20 feet. Initially the front yard setback was 15 feet. Mr. Houseal said the Thomas Street setback is missing from the applicant's table. The Thomas Street frontage, by Village Code, is required to be 25 feet. Their table shows this is a three-foot side-yard setback, but it's a corner-side setback that requires 25 feet. They are proposing a 12-foot setback, so they need a 13-foot site development allowance for the Thomas Street frontage.

Mr. Houseal stated the rear-yard setback from the alley is supposed to be 27.6 feet. The plan has a rear-yard setback of only eight feet, so they need a site development allowance of 19.6 feet from the alley. Likewise, the area of the rear yard is supposed to be a little over 4,100 square feet. Their rear yard area is at about 1,300 square feet, so they need a site development allowance of 2,856 feet for the rear yard.

Mr. Houseal said the setback off the north property line complies with code which requires a three-foot setback. They are proposing a five-foot setback.

Mr. Houseal said 2 ½ resident parking spaces are required per unit, for a total of 45 spaces. They are proposing only two spaces per unit, which equates to 36 spaces. Thus, they need a site development allowance for nine spaces for residents. Likewise, they are proposing two guest parking spaces but they are required to have four. They also need a site development allowance for two guest parking spaces.

Mr. Houseal said the proposed architectural façade and detail has been increased on all four sides of the building. He said the Thomas Street frontage façades were bland, but that they modified some of the brick color and included horizontal limestone banding between the floors and vertically running up the corner of the building as well. Now, the side façades have a little more architectural interest, articulation, and a better mix of materials than the previous elevations. On the subject of architectural interest, Mr. Houseal commented that the previous plan of the bridge component added architectural interest to the site, but that it has been removed from the current plan.

Mr. Houseal said access to the site is good. He stated that line-of-sight is a challenge for townhome developments, because it is basically just rows of garage doors that do not look good. He said they mitigated it by increasing the Bonnie Brae setback and decreasing the

width between the buildings. The distance between buildings 1 and 2, on Bonnie Brae, and buildings 3 and 4 behind them, used to be 30 feet. Now, the distance is 22 feet, and the auto-court is narrower. Also, the driveway used to be 24 feet wide as you came into the site, but it is now 16 feet just south of buildings 2 and 4. They increased the setback from Thomas Street from five feet to 12 feet, as well. They increased the landscaping at these areas to block line-of-sight. The line-of-sight to the garage doors from the streets is not completely covered, but has been mitigated to a great degree over previous plans.

Mr. Houseal noted the landscaping plan has improved, but that it was good before. He previously suggested a few things to improve the landscaping, and they have incorporated them into the new plan. Most notably, they pinched the drive and used hydrangea and arborvitae, which is an evergreen and will not lose its leaves in the fall, providing line-of-sight screening in the fall and winter as well. He said it will be an effective screening while still providing safe line-of-sight to the driveway with the increased setback.

Mr. Houseal noted that the density is double what is permitted. He said the concern is not necessarily the proposed density, but that the challenge for the site is the townhomes being proposed at that density. Because the townhomes are separated, the setbacks are pinched, and driveways and line-of sights are more challenging. He said that some of the setbacks have been mitigated to the extent possible.

Mr. Houseal agreed with Mr. Schiess and Mr. Grieve that the parking will be sufficient. The two parking spaces per unit as opposed to the required 2 ½ will be suitable for this product. He added that the Village Code has a high threshold for parking requirements. He said the two guest parking spaces would be concerning if not for the six spaces along the alley where guests can park. He said that, while they cannot count these spaces as parking spots, they will practically be used as guest parking by people frequenting the site, so parking will be sufficient.

Mr. Houseal noted that the Comprehensive Plan states that affordable housing units should be appropriately considered, stating the applicant has addressed and given his answer regarding that issue. He said the access and circulation and landscaping is good, and that overall the land use is the appropriate land use of multi-family or single-family attached.

Member Crosby said he can see how easily integrated affordable housing is for mixed-use, but wanted to know whether it's commonly done or impossible for a townhouse to be integrated into affordable housing.

Mr. Houseal responded that nothing is impossible, but that factoring for affordable housing is difficult to do at the eleventh hour. The Affordable Housing Plan, which was adopted after the development was already in the pipeline, recognizes that the most likely way for the Village to get affordable housing is through mixed-use development or multi-family developments, or single-family detached dwellings, not applicable to townhomes. He said single-family attached developments, such as townhomes, are more difficult because it is a bigger product. The townhomes are approximately 2,500 square feet and there are eighteen units. Thus, it is not impossible, but it would modify the financials for the plan. He added that

the numbers the applicant gave for the existing units at the site exceed the state standards threshold for what is affordable at market rate. The units would have to be significantly lower in price than they are now in order to meet the affordable housing standards.

Member Kilbride asked whether the exception to the density requirement is frequent, or whether density requirements are often not met. Mr. Houseal responded that the density requirements are often not met. He said that in his experience for the past 20 years, he could recall only once or twice where an applicant was not asking for relief from density. Height and density are typically the bulk regulations for which applicants seek relief. He added that there has been a call for the Village to review its commercial and mixed-use and multi-family district density requirements to see if they are tested against market realities.

Assistant Village Administrator Scheiner stated that this concluded reports by the Village's Staff and consultant.

Public Comment

Chairman Martin then opened the Board Meeting up to public comment.

Daniel Lauber, 7215 Oak Avenue, stated he is glad the area is being developed. He pointed out that the developers mentioned the townhomes are for empty nesters, but in their school study they say they are starter homes. He said that there is nothing to suggest that the development complies with ADA accessibility standards and that a staff review is necessary to see if the development does comply with ADA standards.

Mr. Lauber stated he is concerned about all the development allowances sought by the applicant. He is also concerned about the discussion that guests may use the aprons of the garages for parking. He stated he fears the development will worsen an existing, tight on-street parking situation.

Mr. Lauber stated that if the allowances are being sought as variances, they would all have to be rejected because any hardship is created by the developer seeking to double the density that is allowed as of right.

Mr. Lauber stated he is also concerned about the calculation of school-aged children, which affects fees. He stated he cannot make sense of the calculation.

Mr. Lauber asserted that the townhomes are not meeting housing needs in River Forest. He stated the developer itself stated most people in River Forest cannot afford the townhouses. He discussed the median income in the Village and disparity between average home costs. He stated the development will only make the situation worse. He said the development only increases the already huge supply of three-bedroom dwellings. He expressed confusion as to how the development meets the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and meets the housing needs of River Forest residents, when most people cannot afford the townhouses, and the townhouses have the most common number of bedrooms in the Village.

In conclusion, Mr. Lauber urged the Development Review Board to give the matter further thought without voting on the matter that night, and to also think very carefully about the parking. He reiterated the concern of handicap-accessible units and parking, which is not addressed in the application. He stated the Board could use more details on that issue. He also urged the Development Review Board to insist that the developer provide the aforementioned leases for each of the six units.

Pamela Kende, 1115 Bonne Brae Place, stated that zoning regulations are enforced to maintain property values and that they are for the common good. She said the development proposed does not fit into the neighborhood, as evidenced by the need for the six variances, many of which are three times the amount actually allowed. She said the development shows a disregard for the current residents of River Forest and for their rights to enjoy their property under existing zoning regulations. She asked the Board to deny the variance requests and send a clear message as to their commitment toward upholding the zoning regulations.

Ms. Kende mentioned the builder's discussion at the last meeting, regarding the importance of sunlight for each of the proposed units. He said that it was designed so that each unit is provided with the maximum amount of sunlight. Ms. Kende stated the proposed building will block the sunlight to her property in the winter, because of their non-conforming setback on the rear yard. She stated she agrees sunlight is important, and that the proposed property would block out her winter sunlight. She urged the Board to take a closer look at how little sunlight she would get in the winter.

In summation, Ms. Kende said she is in favor of the redevelopment of the area, but that the project must fit within the zoning codes, which are designed to protect residents from non-conforming structures.

Hearing no further comment, Chairman Martin permitted the applicant an opportunity to respond to the comments that were made.

Mr. Schiess, in response to Mr. Lauber's concerns for accessible parking space standards, stated that multi-level, privately-owned housing is categorically exempt by Illinois statute. He continued that the interiors of the units are not required to meet any accessibility standards, either by the ADA or Illinois statute.

Mr. Schiess stated, in response to the empty nester and entry level housing comments, that the townhomes are appropriate for both parties. He stated that there is, as shown by the data, a need for this product type in the neighborhood.

Mr. Schiess then responded to Ms. Kende's statement assertions of property values and rights to enjoy. He stated that there is no support for these standards in her testimony. He stated he believes she is testifying as the neighbor to the immediate north of the project and not necessarily as a professional who can speak to property values, and requested authority for her assertion.

Chairman Martin mentioned an analysis letter that was submitted in the application about the number of school-aged children that were projected to be in the development. He asked if the applicant was asking the Board to waive the contribution to the school district. Mr. Gurevich responded in the affirmative, and confirmed they were asking for such a waiver.

Chairman Martin explained that the plan was submitted and began last year before the COVID-19 pandemic. He asked what impact the quarantine and virus had, if any, on their economic ability to complete the plan. Mr. Gurevich said that, economically, they are fine. They have letters from banks that are willing to finance them, and they are well-capitalized themselves to provide equity. Chairman Martin asked for confirmation that the quarantine and virus has had no impact on their economic ability to complete the project. Mr. Gurevich confirmed that the quarantine and virus had no such impact.

Chairman Martin asked if there were any further questions. Hearing no further public comment, Chairman Martin closed the public hearing.

IV. DISCUSSION, DELIBERATION AND RECOMMENDATION - APPLICATION #20-01: APPLICATION FOR A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO CONSTRUCT A TOWNHOME DEVELOPMENT AT 1101-1111 BONNIE BRAE PLACE

Member O'Brien stated that she has a problem with the density and the product itself. She stated that there are 29 townhome units on Madison Promenade, only 17 of which sold, and 12 of which never sold from the developer. Right now, four resales are in the process, and two units were rented just last week. She stated that 12 of the units have never been occupied. In 2020, only one unit sold, on January 30th for \$470,000. In 2019, two units there sold, one for \$470,000 and the other for \$479,000. She stated the proposed new units will be 18 of the same product on a small piece of land, albeit a couple years newer.

Member O'Brien stated she did not understand the parking space count. She asked for clarification that the six spaces on the east side of the property were behind the garages. Receiving confirmation, she stated they cannot be counted as parking spaces. She noted that parking on the east side of Bonnie Brae is not currently permitted; only parking on the west side is allowed. She stated the pictures that were shown from the traffic study showed that Division was already crowded and noted that the residents of the multi-unit dense buildings in the area and on Thomas Street have to park somewhere. She expressed doubt that parking on Division could be counted as guest parking, because of all the other people living in the area. She assessed there are only two true guest parking spots among 18 units. Member O'Brien stated that the plan is too dense and that it is clear from the number of allowances the applicant is seeking.

Member O'Brien stated she also has an issue with the shadow study that was submitted in the prior month. She said it was not addressed at all at the current meeting and that they should look at it in more depth.

Member Crosby stated they did a good job of designing the building, architecturally. He said he had a problem with the south and north elevations, but added that they have improved

on those. About the schematic drawings, he said that they give him hope that the townhomes are of a higher quality than the townhomes that were built on Madison.

Member Crosby said he would like to see the alleyway that runs between building 1 and building 3 and between building 2 and building 4 made with paver brick material as opposed to asphalt and concrete. He said the townhouses on Franklin and Lake have pavers, and that it elevates the whole landscaping. He does not care for the asphalt that is at the townhouses on Madison. He said he would like to see the driveway made of permeable paver brick. He said that, especially because there are permeable paver bricks in the alley, the alley is going to appear to be of higher quality than the driveway.

Member Crosby mentioned past discussion about snow removal. He said he thought the plan was to remove the snow from the site. He said he would like to see that addressed, if they approve the plan. Member Crosby stated he would also like to limit and not allow entry to the site through the alley during construction, as the construction trucks would damage the permeable pavers.

Member Crosby stated he is not concerned about the parking. He stated he is okay with the six spaces contemplated behind the garages.

Member Crosby stated he struggles with the issue of affordable housing. He stated that there is a significant desire in the community for affordable housing. But, he noted the Affordable Housing Plan was approved by the Village Board of Trustees after the applicant submitted the application, and that it would not be right to make the applicant revise its plan and assess for affordable housing after already putting work and money into their plan.

Member Fishman said she agrees that it would be unfair to make the applicant change things around for affordable housing now, because they did apply before the Affordable Housing Plan went into effect. Member Fishman stated she also has no trouble with the parking issue. She stated that, by the presentation, they evaluated the issue and she felt there would be enough parking around the area.

Member Fishman said that she thinks the project is of higher quality than the Madison Street townhomes, as those townhouses were not as well-done as the applicant's townhouses seem to be.

Member Fishman said she is concerned about the shadows. She said the size of the building at the site now is quite sizeable, but she does not know the difference between the height of that building as compared to the buildings in applicant's plans. She said she was not sure whether Ms. Kende's concerns of the development blocking her winter sun were valid.

Member O'Brien stated that she thinks the issue is not necessarily the height of the building but that the frontage of the units of Buildings 4, 5, and 6 are closer to Bonnie Brae to the west.

Member Kilbride mentioned that she has been to the site and the current building is pretty expansive on the whole lot. She said the current building is where Buildings 1, 3, and 5 would

be, and that it's just south of Ms. Kende's property. She noted the current building is very high. She stated that the current building would be the similarly close to Ms. Kende's property, since her driveway abuts against the current building.

Mr. Houseal stated that the setback off the alley is too far east, since it is at eight feet where it should be the 20 feet that is required. He said it would cast a shadow that would be diminished if the required setback was in the plan. He stated the height of the current building is probably similar to the height of the proposed building.

Member Kilbride stated there would be more of a setback with the new construction, and that Ms. Kende's garage won't have as much setback as the new construction will have. She also stated that she was pleased with how responsive the architect and the developer were to respond to their comments and make changes easily. She stated she is not concerned about the parking issues, and that she believes the quality of the construction and the layout appear to be of higher quality than the Madison townhomes. She said the COVID-19 pandemic may be a positive thing for the project, since people are now looking to move out of the City and that there is a demand now for ownership property in River Forest.

Member Fishman asked whether the townhomes at Madison have decks on the roof. It was confirmed that they did not. Member Fishman stated that it is a big deal for homebuyers to have some outdoor space, and that there's nothing like that at the Madison Street townhomes.

Member Crosby confirmed that the condensers for each unit are on the roof for the applicant's project, then noted the Madison Street units have the condensers behind each unit, which looks bad.

Member Dombrowski commented that the townhomes at Madison look very tight, and that, location-wise, the project before them is better than the townhomes at Madison. He stated it is not perfect, and that it is dense, and that he understands the neighbor's concerns. He stated that the architect and developer have put forth a better plan than the townhomes at Madison Street.

Chairman Martin stated that several years ago they went through a similar project with the same developer, and they approved 18 units at the time. He stated that project differed because that was one three-story building and one building that had 15 condominium units in it. He stated that idea worked better on the property, and that the 18 single-family units being proposed now would look like Madison Street. But, he stated Bonnie Brae is not Madison and drew numerous distinctions between the properties, concluding that he does not see how there is any comparison between the two sites. He said he thinks 18 townhouses is way too much for the property and that it is going to be crowded into a very small space, which is not appropriate.

Chairman Martin expressed concerns regarding the applicant's description of the on-site parking. He stated the six spaces on the alley behind the garages are not guest parking spaces. He said he would never agree to a site development allowance of two guest parking spaces

for 18 units. Furthermore, he noted that the streets are heavily parked already, and he thinks it is wrong to say that parking on Division will be sufficient for guests. He said the parking problem is part of trying to cram too many townhouses onto the lot. He said that if this is the only way the project can be economically viable, then the developer has the wrong project.

Chairman Martin said that if the Development Review Board wants to vote on it, then there are a number of conditions that they need to consider as part of a motion to approve. Chairman Martin said he has the following list of conditions to which the Board members may add:

1. Landscaping must comply with the Village Code and be approved by the Village's Landscape Engineer.
2. Village to have an easement for access to the property for maintenance and repairs.
3. Building materials must be those that were presented and included in the proposal.
4. No waiver of contribution to local the school districts.
5. No construction traffic permitted in the alley.
6. No storage of materials on parkway or sidewalk.
7. No use of public right of way or guest parking spaces for storage of snow.
8. Alley/street to be constructed of permeable pavers.

Member Kilbride asked whether the contribution to the school districts is a monetary amount. Chairman Martin responded that it's either a monetary amount or a donation of land, as required by the Village Code. Member Schubkegel asked what the amount is based on. Ms. Scheiner stated there is a formula in the Village's Code to determine the amount. Member Dombrowski asked when they are required to pay it. Ms. Scheiner stated the Village usually asks for payment before the permit is issued, or, in certain situations, the payment may be delayed until the units are occupied. She stated that, based on the formula established by the Code, the 18 townhome units, and the number of bedrooms, the developer's contribution to the school district is \$49,488.10. The developer has the ability to ask that the contribution be waived or recalculated. But, absent a waiver, the developer would be required to pay that amount.

Chairman Martin stated that the request for a waiver is in the plan that was submitted, so they must address it. They can't just approve the application, because that would grant the waiver.

Member Crosby stated he agrees with all the conditions and that the permeable paver bricks on the driveway and the guest parking spots are the big issue for him, as well as snow removal.

Ms. Scheiner referred to her memo from February 28, 2020, which contained other conditions Village staff requested. They were:

1. Surety in a form and amount to be determined by the Village engineer in the case of any damage to the public infrastructure;

2. Surety in the amount of 125% of the engineer's estimate for any public improvements that are required, such as for public sidewalks;
3. Condominium declaration to have a prohibition for Boat/Trailer/RV Parking unless for delivery or service.

Member O'Brien noted that the applicant's bank letter said it was only good for 30 days, and that time is up. She asked if they should get another one. Member Dombrowski stated they should have an updated letter.

A MOTION was made by Member Dombrowski and SECONDED by Member Crosby to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees that the project be approved with the above mentioned eleven conditions.

Chairman Martin asked if there was any discussion. Receiving no response, he asked Ms. Scheiner to take the roll call.

ROLL CALL VOTE:

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, Fishman, Kilbride, and Schubkegel

Nays: Member O'Brien and Chairman Martin

Motion Passed.

V. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION was made by Member O'Brien and SECONDED by Member Dombrowski to adjourn the meeting of the Development Review Board at 9:27 p.m.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, Fishman, Kilbride, O'Brien, Schubkegel, and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

Respectfully Submitted:

Lisa Scheiner, Secretary

Frank R. Martin
Chairman, Development Review Board

Date

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST**

August 20, 2020

RE: Planned Development Permit Application for Amendment –
Townhome Development – 1101–1111 Bonnie Brae Place, River
Forest, Illinois

PETITIONER: Bonnie Brae Construction, LLC

APPLICATION: For a Planned Development to construct a three story townhome development, regarding encroachments in the lot area per dwelling, rear (east) setback, corner front (south) setback, rear yard area, parking spaces per dwelling unit and guest parking spaces, at 1101–1111 Bonnie Brae Place, River Forest, Illinois (“Property”)

BACKGROUND: The Property is a .635 acre parcel of real property in the Village of River Forest (“Village”). The Property is located at the northeast corner of Bonnie Brae Place and Thomas Street in the R-4 Multi-Family Residential Zoning District.

The Petitioner proposes to remove the existing parking lot and multi-family building on the Property and replace it with a townhome development (“Project”). The Petitioner’s initial proposal to the Village on February 26, 2020 was for a 19-unit development, however, the Petitioner lowered the unit count to 18 as the review process continued, which resulted in amendments to the initial application on March 23, 2020 and July 2, 2020 (together the “Amended Application”).

APPLICATION: The Amended Application seeks the following site development allowances (“SDA”) from the Village of River Forest Zoning Ordinance (“Zoning Ordinance”):

	Zoning Ordinance	Proposed	SDA Requested
Lot Area Per Dwelling	2,800 square feet	1,537.83 square feet	1,262.17 square feet
Rear (East) Setback	27.6 feet	8 feet	19.6 feet
Corner Front (South) Setback	25 feet	12 feet	13 feet
Rear Yard Area	4,152 square feet	1,296 square feet	2,856 square feet
Parking Spaces Per Unit	2.5	2 per unit (36)	9 spaces
Guest Parking Spaces	4	2	2

PUBLIC HEARING: At the duly and properly noticed Hearing, testimony was taken and heard by the Development Review Board (“DRB”) on the Application and the Amended Application on March 5, 2020, June 18, 2020 and July 16, 2020. All persons testifying during the Hearing were sworn prior to giving testimony. All persons wishing to be heard were allowed to engage in cross-examination of the witnesses and provide testimony on their own behalf.

Following the Hearing, which included presentations by Petitioner and its agents, reports by various Village staff, ~~and~~ testimony from all who wished to speak and review of documents submitted to the DRB before the conclusion of the hearing, the DRB voted, 5 to 2, to recommend

approval of the Application to the Village President and Board of Trustees so long as the conditions set forth below ("Conditions") are met.

FINDINGS: The DRB, based upon the evidence presented at the Hearing, and pursuant to Section 10-19-3 of the Village Code, makes the following Findings as to the Amended Application, which recite the evidence presented that is relevant to the DRB's recommendation:

A. The proposed use or combination of uses is consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan.

Overall, the Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, the DRB finds that the Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, will help to provide a mix of residential housing types that is appropriate and consistent with the existing scale and character of the neighborhood. Based on the evidence presented, a majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met.

B. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use or combination of uses will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, comfort, morals, or general welfare of the residents of the Village.

Testimony at the Hearing from the Petitioner and the Village's staff demonstrated that the Project would not result in any condition that would be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, comfort, morals, or general welfare of residents in the Village. Testimony at the Hearing from the public, and comments from DRB members raised concerns regarding parking issues around the Property, and an adverse impact on sunlight reaching the neighboring properties. Concern was raised by Village staff and DRB members that construction activity could damage the recently installed permeable paver brick alley to the east of the Property. Some DRB members were concerned about the storage of snow on the public way and on guest parking spaces, further diminishing available parking on the Property.

To address these concerns, the DRB requested Conditions that no construction traffic be permitted in the alley, no storage of construction materials be permitted on the parkway or sidewalk, and that no storage of snow should occur on the public way or guest spaces on the Property.

A majority of the DRB finds that this standard is met, so long as the Conditions are met. A minority of the DRB finds that this standard has not been met.

C. The proposed use or combination of uses will not diminish the use or enjoyment of other property in the vicinity for those uses or combination of uses which are permitted by this zoning title.

The Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, will positively impact nearby uses. The scale of the Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, and the site development allowances requested and needed, make the Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, appropriate for the Property. Members of the DRB exhibited concern about the lack of parking on the Property, and the adverse effect that the density of the dwelling-units on the Property would have on already minimal street parking in the surrounding area. Based on the evidence presented, and recommendations from Village Planner that parking on and near the Property would properly service its density, the DRB finds that the Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, will

not diminish the use or enjoyment of permitted uses on other property in the vicinity. Therefore, a majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met. A minority of the DRB finds that this standard has not been met, given the size and location of the Project and the related increased parking demands that will negatively impact the current parking situation for the neighboring properties.

- D. The establishment of the proposed use or combination of uses will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding properties for uses or combination of uses otherwise permitted in the zoning district.**

The proposed multi-family residential townhome use of the Property, as proposed in the Amended Application, will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding properties. The use is consistent with other properties in the R-4 district. The area surrounding the Property has been developed for several years, and the Project would develop a location that is currently used as a parking lot. A majority of the DRB members find that this standard has been met.

- E. The proposed use or combination of uses will not diminish property values in the vicinity.**

The surrounding neighborhood has been, by and large, fully developed for a number of years. There was no evidence that the Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, once built, would generally result in diminished property values in the vicinity, and no credible testimony or evidence to the contrary was presented to the DRB. A majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met.

- F. Adequate utilities, road access, drainage, police and fire service and other necessary facilities already exist or will be provided to serve the proposed use or combination of uses.**

The Village's Police Department, Fire Department and Public Works Department are generally satisfied with the Project, as proposed in the Amended Application. There is no indication that utilities serving the Property will be inadequate if the Project is built. The DRB included a condition that the Petitioner must grant the Village an easement for access to the property for maintenance and repairs, including to any public utilities servicing the Property. Based on the evidence presented, a majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met, so long as the Condition is met.

- G. Adequate measures already exist or will be taken to provide ingress and egress to the proposed use or combination of uses in a manner that minimizes traffic congestion in the public streets.**

The Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, does not make changes to the ingress and egress to the Property. Evidence presented by the Petitioner suggested that generally there would be no negative traffic impacts due to the Project. No credible testimony was presented that the Project would unduly burden traffic on the public streets adjoining the Subject Property. Testimony at the Hearing from the public raised concern about increased demand for parking on the nearby streets at the Property. Village staff suggested, and the DRB agreed, that a condition be included that no boat, trailer or recreational vehicle parking be allowed at the Property, unless for delivery

or service. Based on the evidence presented, a majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met.

H. The proposed use or combination of uses will be consistent with the character of the Village.

While the multi-family residential use proposed in the Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, is consistent with the character of the Village and with the zoning district, the scale of the Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, is compatible with the Property and is consistent with the immediate neighborhood. The DRB concurs with the Village Planner's analysis regarding the compatibility of the Project and the Comprehensive Plan and the compatibility of the Project with the character of the Village. After considering the Application, the materials submitted regarding the Project and testimony from the Hearing, the DRB finds that the Project is consistent with the character of the Village. The DRB included a condition that the internal alleyways on the Property, and the guest parking spaces be constructed of permeable paver bricks, similar to that of the alley to the east of the Property. Further, the Project should be completed with building materials that were presented by the Petitioner and included in the Amended Application. Based on the evidence presented, a majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met, so long as the Conditions are met.

I. Development of the proposed use or combination of uses will not materially affect a known historical or cultural resource.

No historical or cultural resources have been identified in the area surrounding the Project, as proposed in the Amended Application. Based on the evidence presented, a majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met.

J. The design of the proposed use or combination of uses considers the relationship of the proposed use or combination of uses to the surrounding area and minimizes adverse effects, including visual impacts of the proposed use or combination of uses on adjacent property.

The Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, is appropriate in massing, scale and other respects in relation to the Property. The design of the Project is complimentary to the surrounding area. Overall, the DRB finds that the Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, will still result in no adverse impacts on adjacent properties and the neighborhood. A minority of the DRB, and members of the public, noted that the Property may negatively impact the sunlight that enter the neighboring properties if the Project were not constructed. Based on the evidence presented, a majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met. A minority of the DRB finds that this standard has not been met.

K. The design of the proposed use or combination of uses promotes a safe and comfortable environment for pedestrians and individuals with disabilities.

The evidence presented established that pedestrians and individuals with disabilities will not be put at risk by the Project. There are no expected pedestrian impacts resulting from the Project. No credible testimony was presented at the Hearing demonstrating that there was any risk to pedestrians or individuals with disabilities based upon the improvements requested for approval in the Application. The project will include some interior green space, and pedestrian walkways that allow free-flow of pedestrians in and around the Property, in no diminished nature than what

would exist from a similar residential development at the Property of a different design. Based on the evidence presented, a majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met.

- L. **The applicant has the financial and technical capacity to complete the proposed use or combination of uses and has made adequate provisions to guarantee the development of any buffers, landscaping, public open space, and other improvements associated with the proposed use or combination of uses.**

The Petitioner is an experienced developer and has the financial and technical capacity to complete the Project, as proposed in the Amended Application. Evidence presented at the Hearing and in the Amended Application demonstrates the Petitioner's financial and technical feasibility to complete the Project. No negative impacts are expected on buffers, landscaping, public open space, and other improvements associated with the Amended Application, and the DRB included a Condition requiring the Petitioner to post a letter of credit or cash in favor of the Village for the costs of construction of any public improvements required as a result of the construction of the Project. Further, the DRB included a condition that all landscaping on the Property must comply with the Village Code and be approved by the Village. Based on the evidence presented, a majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met, so long as the Conditions are met.

- M. **The proposed use or combination of uses is economically viable and does not pose a current or potential burden upon the services, tax base, or other economic factors that affect the financial operations of the Village, except to the extent that such burden is balanced by the benefit derived by the Village from the proposed use.**

There was no evidence that the Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, would burden the Village's financial operations. The Petitioner produced evidence that the construction and operation of the Project are economically viable. The DRB finds that there is no evidence the proposed uses in the Project will increase the burden on Village services, the Village's tax base, or other economic factors that affect the financial operations of the Village. The DRB required a condition the Petitioner make the school impact fee payment required in the Zoning Ordinance. Based on the evidence presented, a majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met. A minority of the DRB finds that this standard has not been met.

- N. **The proposed use or combination of uses will meet the objectives and other requirements set forth in Section 10-19-3.**

The Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, meets the objectives and other requirements of Section 10-19-3, for the reasons set forth above. Based on the evidence presented, a majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met, so long as the Conditions are met. A minority of the DRB finds that this standard has not been met because the Petitioner is seeking a SDA to reduce the number of required parking spaces on the Property per dwelling to an amount that will adversely affect the public parking available near the Property. Based on the evidence presented, a majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met. A minority of the DRB finds that this standard has not been met.

- O. **The application meets the additional standards for multi-family housing in Section 10-19-3(O), except to the extent site development allowances have been granted.**

The Project, as proposed in the Amended Application, meets the additional standards for multi-family housing in Section 10-19-3(O) of the Zoning Ordinance. The total number of parking spaces and land area exceed the additional standards in Section 10-19-3(O) of the Zoning Ordinance. Based on the evidence presented, a majority of the DRB finds that this standard has been met. A minority of the DRB finds that this standard has not been met.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION: Based upon the foregoing findings, a majority of the DRB, by a vote of 5 to 2¹, recommends to the President and Board of Trustees that the Board approve the Application, including the site development allowances, subject to the following Conditions, that:

1. The Project be developed in accordance with the plans in the Amended Application, as most recently amended and supplemented by the Petitioner before the vote of the DRB on July 16, 2020, and presented to the DRB at the Hearing, including the use of proposed building materials.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any portion of the Project, the Property owner shall post a letter of credit in favor of the Village in a form acceptable to the Village Attorney, or a cash deposit with the Village, equal to 125% of the Village Engineer's estimate of the costs of the public improvements of the Project, to secure the completion, maintenance, and/or repair of the public improvements. The letter of credit or cash deposit shall be held, if not already drawn and/or spent, for no less than six (6) months after issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the Project.
3. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any portion of the Project, the Property owner shall post a letter of credit in favor of the Village in a form acceptable to the Village Attorney, or a cash deposit with the Village, in an amount determined by the Village Engineer, to secure the repair of any damage to public property occurring during the construction of the Project. The letter of credit or cash deposit shall be held, if not already drawn and/or spent, for no less than twelve (12) months after issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the Project.
4. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for any portion of the Project, the Property owner shall grant an easement to the Village in a form acceptable to the Village Attorney to enter upon, on and over all common areas of the Subject Property ("Common Areas") for the purpose of allowing for Village inspection of the Common Areas to determine whether the Common Areas have been and are being properly maintained in conformity with applicable ordinances, laws and regulations of the Village or any other governmental entity. If it is determined that the Common Areas are not in conformity with applicable ordinances, laws and regulations, the Village shall give the owner of the Common Areas ("Association") written notice of such determination. Further, the Village shall have the ability, but not an obligation, to correct or to compel the correction of any problem concerning maintenance or any work required by any ordinances, laws or regulations of the Village or any other governmental entity, after providing fifteen (15) days written notice to the Association, provided, however, that no notice shall be required in the event of an immediate threat to public health, safety and welfare. If the Association fails to perform the necessary maintenance or work within fifteen (15) days after the date of notice, the Village

¹ Chairman Martin and Commissioner O'Brien voted no, finding that Standards B, C, G, H, J and M through O were not met.

shall have the right to perform or cause to be performed, such maintenance or work necessary to preserve the Common Areas, to fulfill the requirements of applicable ordinances, laws, or regulations of the Village or any other governmental entity. All the Village's costs, charges and expenses thereof in enforcing its authority under the easement, including its reasonable attorney's fees and court costs, shall thereupon be a lien against the Common Areas.

5. All landscaping proposed and installed at the Property must comply with the Village Code and be approved by the Village.
6. The Village shall not waive the Petitioner's required contribution of funds or land to the local school districts, as required under Section 10-23-4 of the Village Zoning Ordinance.
7. No construction traffic for the Project shall use the alley immediately to the east of the Property, which is constructed of permeable paver bricks.
8. No construction materials for the Project shall be stored any parkway or Village sidewalk, or any other public way or property maintained by the Village.
9. The guest parking spaces on the Property, and the public way shall not be utilize to store snow removed from the Property. The Property shall comply with a snow removal plan that is approved by the Village's Director of Public Works.
10. The internal alleyway at the Property, and the guest parking spaces shall be constructed of permeable paver bricks, similar to that of the alley bordering the Property to the east.
11. Boats, trailers and recreational vehicles shall not be parked at the Property, and the declarations for the Property shall prohibit the parking of boats, trailers and recreational vehicles thereon.

Signed: _____
Frank Martin, Chairman
Development Review Board
Village of River Forest

Dated: _____