



RIVER FOREST DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING AGENDA

A meeting of the River Forest Development Review Board will be held on Thursday, September 20, 2018 at 7:30 P.M. in First Floor Community Room of the Village Hall, 400 Park Avenue, River Forest, Illinois.

- I. Call to Order/Roll Call
- II. Minutes of the June 21, 2018 Development Review Board Meeting
- III. Minutes of the June 28, 2018 Development Review Board Meeting
- IV. Minutes of the July 26, 2018 Development Review Board Meeting
- V. Minutes of the August 23, 2018 Development Review Board Meeting
- VI. Approval of Findings of Fact - Application #18-05 – Application for Planned Development to Construct a Senior Care Community at 800-814, 818, 822 and 826 North Harlem Avenue
- VII. Public Comment
- VIII. Adjournment

**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
June 21, 2018**

A meeting of the Village of River Forest Development Review Board was held at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, June 21, 2018 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, O'Brien, and Chairman Martin

Absent: Members Fishman, Ruehle and Ryan

Also Present: Assistant Village Administrator Lisa Scheiner, Planning Consultant John Houseal, Village Attorney Greg Smith

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MAY 3, 2018 DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING

A MOTION was made by Member O'Brien and SECONDED by Member Dombrowski to approve the minutes of the May 3, 2018 Development Review Board Meeting as amended.

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

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

III. PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICATION #18-03 - AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO ADD CELLULAR ANTENNAS TO PARKING GARAGE - CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGUSTA)

Assistant Village Administration Scheiner reminded those who would testify at the public hearing that the River Forest Village Code makes it unlawful for any person to knowingly make a false statement of material fact to the Village in connection with any application, report, affidavit, oath, certification and attestation, and that violations are punishable as a petty offense with a fine. She then swore in all parties wishing to speak.

Glen Steiner, Concordia University, said the purpose of the application is to improve Verizon coverage in the area to benefit the campus, students, faculty, staff and the surrounding community where Verizon coverage is currently limited. He said an amendment was approved in 2010 to increase the height of the southwest corner of the parking garage to allow the installation of antennae from T-Mobile and AT&T. Mr. Steiner said this project will put a stealth enclosure at the southeast corner of the parking structure that will increase its height from approximately 44 feet to 54 feet. He said they believe it will blend in nicely and will not be obtrusive or problematic for neighbors. Mr. Steiner presented a photo of the existing parking structure and a rendering showing what it will look like if the stealth enclosure is installed. He described the configuration of the antenna array and noted that it will not be visible to any surrounding properties. He stated that a smaller stealth enclosure

will also be located on the west staircase on the exterior of the western facing wall of the parking structure and that it will match the existing façade of that stair tower.

Mr. Steiner said that the location that has been selected on level five will eliminate one parking space and that the University will add one parking space elsewhere on campus so they do not impact parking capacity. He said Verizon is requiring its own fiber which will be brought in underground via their own fiber box in the parkway and their own raceway underground, which was the subject of an amendment to the application that was submitted to the Village on June 20, 2018.

Mr. Steiner said there is a letter from Grimes Real Estate in the application which states that the application will have no adverse impact on the surrounding community. He said there will be no increased demand on Village services. Mr. Steiner noted that, during the technical review meeting with Village Staff, the Police Chief noted that improved Verizon coverage in the area would also improve police communications in that area. Mr. Steiner said that Verizon sent a letter indicating that they have the financial capacity to complete the project and that the University is not investing any of its own money in the construction.

Mr. Crosby asked if there is not enough room in the existing west staircase enclosure to locate the new antenna. Mr. Steiner said that Verizon could not install the antenna in the directions needed at that location and that is why they needed to locate them at the southeast corner.

Tom Zimmerman, Terra Consulting Group, stated T-Mobile is located on the inside of the existing stealth enclosure and they have existing cabinets with all of their radio and antenna equipment. He said there is no room for Verizon antennas.

In response to a question from Village Attorney Smith, Mr. Steiner stated that the existing height of the parking garage is approximately 44 feet and will increase by 10 feet to approximately 54 feet. In response to a follow up question from Village Attorney, Mr. Steiner said the exact dimensions are located in the application under Section 8, on the page labeled ANT-1.

Chairman Martin noted that the letter regarding the financial ability of Verizon to complete this project was dated a little more than a year ago and asked that someone update the Development Review Board on whether that has changed. Mark Layne, Insite Real Estate, said Verizon could update the letter and that he believes Verizon's financial position has not decreased since last year, but he cannot speak for Verizon.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Steiner stated that the new parking space would be located on the south edge of the current track stadium where fleet vehicles are currently parked. They will add one stall across from the maintenance building for another car to be parked there.

Ms. O'Brien stated that the Public Works Director noted in his memo that when the door to the enclosure is open it may take up two spaces. Mr. Steiner explained that the door opens into an adjacent parking space and that the door cannot be moved to the north because it is on the edge of an array where it cannot be safely opened when it is turned on. Mr. Steiner

also explained how their agreements with the cellular service providers require 48-hour advance notice to come on campus to conduct non-emergency maintenance and that, in those cases, the University staff reserve parking spaces to provide sufficient access. He said they plan to try to handle it the same way with Verizon in an effort not to impact another parking space.

Assistant Village Administration Scheiner stated that the Village's Police and Fire Chiefs noted that there would be no impact to the Village's ability to deliver services. She said the Public Works Director submitted two memos. The first memo, dated May 30, 2018, raises the question regarding access to the array that Mr. Steiner just discussed. It also says the project will have no impact on the Department's ability to deliver services. In response to the amendment to the application that was made on June 20, 2018, the Public Works Director reviewed it and stated that the change will not significantly impact the Village's infrastructure or right-of-way, and there is no objection to the modification to the application.

John Houseal, the Village's planning consultant, said that from a planning perspective there is no impact as it does not change the intensity or character of the operation of the University. He noted that from a zoning perspective it is 10-foot height increase to the southeast corner and that it is higher than what the zoning district permits, but that the southwest corner is already approximately 64 feet high. He discussed his opinion that previous height amendments to the structure mean that there is no need for a site development allowance for this application. He noted that the bump-out on the west side is de minimis. He also said the new handhole addition has no impact from a zoning perspective. In response to comment from Chairman Martin, Mr. Houseal reviewed the memorandum he drafted and clarified that the height of the southeast corner is changing.

Village Attorney Smith noted that he believes a site development allowance of 10 feet is required to increase the garage height. He stated that relief from the height requirement was previously granted but that it does not allow the University to build within that 65-foot box as they see fit. He said the legal notice and application are sufficient to allow the site development allowance. Mr. Smith continued that the Planned Development Ordinance says modification of a structure subject to a planned development has to come before the Development Review Board, so whether or not the site development allowance is required is irrelevant in some ways. However, the findings of fact include a recitation that a site development allowance should be granted for height. Mr. Houseal stated that he would defer to the attorney's legal interpretation.

There were no additional public comments. Chairman Martin closed the public hearing.

IV. DISCUSSION/DELIBERATION/RECOMMENDATION – AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO ADD CELLULAR ATENNAS TO PARKING GARAGE – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGUSTA)

A MOTION was made by Member Dombrowski and SECONDED by Member Crosby to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees that this amendment to the planned development application be approved.

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

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

V. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT - AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO ADD CELLULAR ANTENNAS TO PARKING GARAGE – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGUSTA)

Chairman Martin stated that he would like to defer the approval of the Findings of Fact to the Development Review Board's June 28, 2018 meeting.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING – APPLICATION #18-04 – AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO CONSTRUCT ONE-STORY WALKWAY BETWEEN CHRISTOPHER CENTER AND WEST ANNEX – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGUSTA)

Mr. Steiner stated that the University recently renovated the first floor of the West Annex which led to the installation of a new exit on the west side of that building and that they intended to put a covered canopy over a pedestrian walkway between buildings to provide shelter from the elements. He said a donor stepped forward and proposed an enclosed walkway with an approximate value of \$400,000. Mr. Steiner said that, in response to a comment at the pre-filing meeting, they visited with the Building Official Clifford Radatz who confirmed that not every entrance to a building must be handicapped accessible. Mr. Steiner said both West Annex and the Christopher Center have alternative entrances/exits with handicapped access.

Mr. Steiner said the new walkway would allow someone to travel from the Christopher Center, which is on the far west end of campus, to the library which is located on the far east edge of the campus, without having to be outside in the elements. Mr. Steiner said the single-story walkway will be 14 feet 11 inches wide and made with glass and bronze metal framing. He said it will be similar to a connection that was recently constructed between the new residence hall and the existing Mary Martha Hall.

Mr. Steiner said the construction timeframe is about 10 weeks and they hope to start construction in the late summer or early fall so the project is complete before the snow flies. He presented a map that showed the location of the proposed enclosed walkway and said it will be located about 315 feet from Augusta Street. He said they do not believe it will be obtrusive, unattractive, or disruptive to surrounding properties. Mr. Steiner noted that, after the pre-filing conference, the contractor noted that one tree is in the way of construction and would need to be removed. Mr. Steiner said they will replace that tree on a caliper inch by caliper inch basis and noted the location of the new trees on the landscape plan. He also presented images and perspectives from and of the new walkway.

In response to a questions from Chairman Martin and Mr. Crosby, Mr. Steiner confirmed that the location of doors from the buildings to the proposed walkway. He also described how existing doors are used for ingress/egress to a children's play area and the security features that are in place. He described the ingress/egress and access plan for those areas to and from the proposed walkway.

Chairman Martin noted that in addition to being 300' off of Augusta, there are two metal fences, trees, and shrubs between the parking lot and where the structure will be.

In response to a question from Member O'Brien regarding the construction crew's impact on parking, Mr. Steiner described the areas where construction crews will park.

In response to a question from Mr. Crosby, Mr. Steiner said the glass will be tinted lightly and coated with low-e.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin regarding the project's financing, Mr. Steiner stated that the University has already received and cashed the donor's check and has the money on hand to complete the project.

Assistant Village Administration Scheiner stated that she has a memo from the Police Chief, Public Works Director and Fire Chief indicating that there will be no impact on the Village's ability to deliver services as a result of the construction of this new building and that any concerns can be addressed through the building permitting process.

Chairman Martin noted that the Fire Chief raised an issue in his memo regarding signage. Ms. Scheiner stated, and Mr. Steiner confirmed, the matter was discussed during technical review and the applicant agreed to comply with what the Fire Chief requested.

Mr. Houseal stated that the proposed walkway does not intensify or change the use of the university and enhances pedestrian environment on campus. It is almost invisible from any adjacent property and public right-of-ways, and has no visual or functional impact on the campus or surrounding properties.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Houseal confirmed that this is considered a building under the Village's code and that it requires a major amendment even though it is not programmable and will not be occupied. In response to a follow-up question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Houseal agreed with Mr. Steiner's analysis that the building has to be ADA compliant but not every single egress has to be. Mr. Houseal said that there are no site development allowances are required. He also confirmed that the structure is in keeping with the PRI Zoning District and complies with the comprehensive plan as it improves pedestrian environment and connectivity of the campus.

There were no additional public comments. Chairman Martin closed the public hearing.

VII. DISCUSSION/DELIBERATION/RECOMMENDATION – APPLICATION #18-04 – AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO CONSTRUCT ONE-STORY WALKWAY BETWEEN CHRISTOPHER CENTER AND WEST ANNEX – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGUSTA)

Mr. Crosby stated that he believes this is appropriate architecturally.

A MOTION was made by Member O'Brien and SECONDED by Member Crosby to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees that this amendment to the planned development application be approved.

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

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

VIII. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT – APPLICATION #18-04 – AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMNT TO CONSTRUCT ONE-STORY WALKWAY BETWEEN CHRISTOPHER CENTER AND WEST ANNEX – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGUSTA)

Chairman Martin stated that he would like to defer the approval of the Findings of Fact to the Development Review Board's June 28, 2018 meeting.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

X. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION was made by Member Crosby and SECONDED by Member Dombrowski to adjourn the meeting of the Development Review Board at 8:16 p.m.

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

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

Ms. Scheiner announced that the June 28, 2018 public hearing will be held at Concordia University and noted that there is a link on the Village's website to the campus map.

Respectfully Submitted:

Lisa Scheiner
Secretary

Frank R. Martin
Chairman, Development Review Board

Date

**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
June 28, 2018**

A meeting of the Village of River Forest Development Review Board was held at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, June 28, 2018 in the Oak Park River Forest Room of the Koehneke Community Center on the Concordia University Chicago campus, 7400 Augusta 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:

Present: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, O'Brien, Ruehle, Ryan (arrived at 7:52 p.m.), and Chairman Martin
Absent: Members Fishman
Also Present: Assistant Village Administrator Lisa Scheiner, Village Engineer Jeff Loster, Deputy Police Chief Dan Dhooche, Fire Chief Kurt Bohlmann, Village Administrator Eric Palm, Planning Consultant John Houseal, Village Attorney Greg Smith

II. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT – APPLICATION #18-03 - AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO ADD CELLULAR ANTENNAS TO PARKING GARAGE – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGUSTA)

A MOTION was made by Member Ruehle and SECONDED by Member O'Brien to adopt the findings of fact and recommend approval of the Planned Development amendment application.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, O'Brien, Ruehle, and Chairman Martin
Nays: None
Motion Passed.

III. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT – APPLICATION #18-04 – AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO CONSTRUCT ONE-STORY WALKWAY BETWEEN CHRISTOPHER CENTER AND WEST ANNEX – CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY (7400 AUGUSTA)

A MOTION was made by Member O'Brien and SECONDED by Member Dombrowski to adopt the findings of fact and recommended approval of the Planned Development amendment application.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, O'Brien, Ruehle, and Chairman Martin
Nays: None
Motion Passed.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING – APPLICATION #18-02 – APPLICATION FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO CONSTRUCT A FIVE-STORY MIXED USE BUILDING WITH RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USES AT 7601-7613 LAKE STREET, 7617-7621 LAKE STREET, AND 423 ASHLAND AVENUE.

Chairman Martin explained the process that would be followed to conduct the public hearing. All who wished to address the Development Review Board regarding application #18-02 were sworn in.

Eric Christman, Sedgewick Developers, presented the development plan for the southwest corner of Lake Street and Lathrop Avenue. He stated that the parcels are currently zoned C-3 Central Commercial and that the area along Lake Street is commercial with residential uses. He said the proposed development site consists of three parcels of land over 36,400 square feet or about $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre. He reviewed the existing landscaping that they plan to keep the same but and noted that they plan to remove one tree along Ashland Avenue. Mr. Christman said the site will feature two residential entrances along Lake Street leading to four private elevators with direct access to the units. He noted that they will provide two vehicle entrances to reduce congestion. One entrance will be located along Ashland Avenue and the other will be located along Lathrop Avenue for retail tenants and some residents. He reviewed the location of the entrances on the site plan. Mr. Christman stated that they have moved the building back off the property line to improve site lines for pedestrian traffic and extending the sidewalk by four to five inside the property line along Lathrop Avenue. He said they will have an outdoor promenade for pedestrian traffic. The development will be about 207 lineal feet long on Lake Street and 100 lineal feet long on Lathrop Avenue.

Mr. Christman discussed the background of Sedgewick properties as a design-builder and developer and other properties they're working on in the Chicagoland area including the Bentham, a 30-unit condominium project at Erie and LaSalle, a 60-unit luxury apartment project at 1325 N. Wells, a 69-unit luxury apartment project at 301 North Avenue, a 30-unit luxury apartment project at 1545 North Avenue, and a 17-unit condominium project at 1611 N. Hermitage.

Mr. Christman said they proposed to demolish the LaMajada building and clean up a contaminated site to EPA standards and bring a lifestyle, mixed-use development that will rejuvenate, energize and brighten Lake Street in River Forest.

He said the five-story mixed use project will include 32 residential units and 86 parking spaces, 32 of which will be for retail and 54 for residential. He said the exterior will be at traditional design with cast stone, fenestrations and accents. Balconies will maximize light and the exterior will blend in with neighboring buildings. There will be eight residential units per floor ranging from two to four bedrooms per unit. He discussed the various amenities in each unit and noted that they have a sales office open on Lake Street and are accepting contracts.

Mr. Christman said that there will be 14,400 square feet of retail space divided between three to eight tenants ranging in size from 800 to 8,000 square feet and will feature boutique shops and dining. He said the retail ceiling height will be 20 feet which will allow a two level

parking garage in the back. He said the addition of on-site parking will ease congestion and traffic along Lake Street, Lathrop and Ashland Avenues.

Mr. Christman reviewed the site development allowance (SDA) requested for density (the number of units). They are allowed 13 and are proposing 32. He discussed the parking 87 parking spaces required for the residential units and visitors well as the fact that no on-site parking is required for the retail tenants. He said they are providing 86 spaces, 32 of which will be for the commercial tenants and 54 for the residential tenants. Mr. Christman also discussed the SDA requested for the proposed building height. He said their intent is to fit into the surrounding area and to satisfy today's demand for 10 foot ceilings. He described a survey they had done showing different buildings within the area and how they compare. He said many of the buildings predate 2000 when eight to nine foot ceilings were the norm.

Mr. Christman concluded his presentation by summarizing his comments as well as their goals for the development.

Fire Chief Kurt Bohlmann stated that he and Fire Marshal Wiley reviewed the proposed development and stated their only concern was about the light shafts in between units since there is no access to them other than through windows. He said that if there is some sort of fire it would be difficult to access, however, installation of fire sprinklers in the shafts should alleviate the problem. In response to questions from Chairman Martin, Chief Bohlmann responded that the entire building will have a sprinkler system. In response to a follow-up question, Chief Bohlmann confirmed that the Fire Department has sufficient personnel and equipment through auto-aid agreements to respond to a disaster at this building.

Deputy Police Chief Dan Dhooghe stated the Police Department has no immediate concerns but suggested camera systems for exterior security and security within the parking garage such as call boxes. In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Deputy Chief Dhooghe stated that to his knowledge the suggestions that were made have been incorporated into the plan.

Village Engineer Jeff Loster stated that the public works-related issues can be addressed during the permitting phase. He said there was some concern about turning radius within commercial parking area. Mr. Loster also said that the Village's consultant reviewed the water infrastructure and determined that it is adequate to support the new development without requiring any off-site improvements. In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Loster stated that the plan shows the development tying into the electrical into the street light system, which would not be allowed, but that it can be cleared up during the permitting phase.

John Houseal, the Village's planning consultant, reviewed the report that he provided to the Development Review Board. He reviewed existing site conditions noting that the property is zoned C-3, Central Commercial District which is intended to be a mixed use district at the heart of the Village with commercial on the ground floor with residential and/or office above. He described the neighboring properties which are zoned C-3, ORIC and PRI, as well as the current uses on those properties.

Mr. Houseal asked the applicant to identify the specific uses or range of uses that they want to be considered in this space so that the Village knows what it is approving, specifically, or an envelope of possibility, and also to prevent the applicant from having to return to public hearing if they have a tenant that is identified as a not permitted or special use. He said the comprehensive plan expresses a preference for retail on the ground floor at this location. While other uses are listed the primary objective of this is to create an exciting pedestrian environment with retail and restaurant and to use this as an economic development engine to bolster sales tax revenue. As a result, Mr. Houseal stated that he prefers that a bank not be approved as part of the development on the ground floor noting that there are other banks nearby. He said if a bank is to be considered as a potential tenant, that the Development Review Board place a condition of approval that a bank not be allowed to occupy the prominent corner spot.

Mr. Houseal presented the zoning analysis portion of his report. He noted the site development allowance sought for density/total unit count. He explained that the zoning code requires 2,800 of land area per unit and they would be allowed 13 units, however, they are proposing 32. This results in 1,138 square feet of land area per unit. He asked for the attorney's recommendation on how the SDA should be noted if the project is approved. In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Houseal clarified that he is not talking about the area within the unit itself but the area of land on the underlying lot. Density is 146% over what the code allows.

In response to a question from Mr. Ruehle, Mr. Houseal noted that previously approved planned developments cannot be used as a justification for a decision later. He said that condominium buildings in the 400 block of Lathrop and Ashland also exceeded the height restriction in the zoning district by three to seven feet. He stated that the building on Lathrop also exceeds the density allowed and that site development allowances were granted. He said other buildings in that area range in height from 45 to 60 feet but he is not certain of the density of the buildings on Central Avenue.

Mr. Houseal said that there is no setback requirement in the Village Center area along Lake Street and the project meets or exceeds those requirements. He said there is an approximately five-foot setback on the east side of the building to provide more visibility on Lathrop.

Mr. Houseal reviewed the bulk of the building, which he describes as the perceived visual impact of the building which is typically a combination of height, floor area ratio, lot coverage, and setbacks. He reviewed the zoning requirements and said the floor area ratio and lot coverage are in compliance. He said the open air balconies and parking on the back side do not count toward the floor area ratio calculation. He said the proposed height of the building, which is measured to the highest point of the building, is 80 feet and exceeds the 50-foot height restriction in this zoning district and a site development allowance of 30 feet is requested. He said the top of the parapet is 74 feet but to the top of the decorative piece at the northeast corner it is 80 feet.

He said there are other buildings in the Village Center and in this area that have been approved at higher densities than allowed by the code, not the same extent, but allowances have been granted.

Mr. Houseal presented his parking analysis. He said the applicant is required to provide 80 off-street parking spaces for the residential units, seven designated off-street guest spaces, and zero off-street spaces for the commercial units. He said that in most downtowns, ground floor retail, commercial, and service uses don't require parking because in most downtowns it can't be built on the site. He said they are proposing a total of 86 off-street parking spaces which requires a de minimis site development allowance of one parking space overall. However, Mr. Houseal said they are designating 54 parking space for residential units, 32 spaces for commercial units, and no spaces for guest parking. As a result, site development allowances are required for the number of residential unit and guest parking spaces. He said that although the commercial parking spaces are not required he thinks it is a good idea to provide them. He noted that the national trend is to provide fewer spaces, however, he is concerned about the allocation of spaces, the provision of fewer than two spaces per unit for three and four bedroom units, and the lack of designated guest parking.

Mr. Houseal also reviewed the requested site development allowance for parking stall depth and aisle width. He said the zoning ordinance in River Forest requires a stall depth of 18.42 feet. The applicant is proposing an 18-foot stall depth, which he said is not a problem. He also said the ordinance requires a 25-foot drive aisle. The applicant is proposing a 22-foot aisle, which also is not a problem.

In response to a question from Ms. Ryan regarding the current uses and parking, Mr. Houseal said surface parking in the rear of existing commercial buildings is a common configuration in the Village Center area. He said he is not concerned about the configuration of retail use in the front and structure parking in the rear. He noted that the ground floor parking coming in off Lathrop houses 42 parking spaces which is a combination of residential, commercial and guest and assumes that residential spaces will be designated. Mr. Houseal said he is concerned that since it is a stubbed parking lot, when a driver enters and sees that there is no parking available, that driver will have to perform a three-point turnaround to exit with cars having pulled up behind that vehicle. He said he is also concerned about the security of residential parking spaces and that most high-end owners demand secure enclosed parking. He stated that there will be a shared parking arrangement for guests and commercial customers. He is concerned that owners who cannot find parking in the garage will park on the street where overnight parking is not allowed.

Mr. Houseal suggested that a rumble strip, mirror, or something else be installed at the parking exit on Lathrop as a safety precaution for the area where vehicles entering/exiting the building and pedestrians intersect. Mr. Ruehle described difficulties turning left onto Lathrop and suggested restricting it to right turn only. Mr. Houseal suggested that restricting the turning movements might have an impact on nearby streets.

Mr. Houseal discussed the character of the development and notes that there are no Village requirements or restrictions regarding the appearance of the building. He said that he applauds many aspects of this proposal such as the investment in the area and the environmental contamination that will be cleaned up. He said there are different opinions on the design of the building and the architect on the Development Review Board can address that.

Mr. Houseal said that other buildings that have been granted relief on the height restrictions in the Village Center area are not right on the sidewalk. He described the heights and conditions of Mark Menna's building and another building on Lathrop Avenue. He said the proposed building will be approximately 200' long on the sidewalk and noted that the Drummond building is a little longer than this but is only about three stories tall. Mr. Houseal said that the visual impact of this building doesn't exist elsewhere in the Village Center. He described the building height and background of the condominium building at Lake and William. He said when the Development Review Board and Village considers the application they don't just look at the existing buildings in the Village Center and that new investment cannot be couched on what's been done in the past, however, the Village should take into consideration the building in the context of the area. He said there may be some modifications and fine-tuning that can be done to help it fit in better, depending on what the definition of "fit" is.

Mr. Houseal addressed the photometric plan that was submitted and reviewed and described the difference between line of sight and illumination. He said all proposed lighting is appropriate, that it will not glare into adjacent properties, and that the photometric plan is consistent with other commercial uses.

In response to a question from Mr. Ruehle, Mr. Houseal said he has not looked at the traffic study in detail but can do so if directed.

In response to a question from Mr. Crosby, Mr. Houseal stated that the applicant submitted the application and then he prepared his report so they have not had an opportunity to incorporate a response to his comments in their submittal.

Ms. Ryan stated that the applicant is not requesting setback variation but there is concern about it being too close to the sidewalk. Mr. Houseal said not necessarily and discussed the length of the building that houses Elan salon. He described the area of tactile perception from the pedestrian perspective being about 18 to 20 feet tall and that nothing is picked up above 35 feet. He said a building at the sidewalk is ok and building length is ok, but the height, setback, etc. is taken into consideration together. He noted that the diversity and quality of buildings is a defining characteristic of the community.

Mr. Ruehle pointed out that the first three bays are an arcade that are open and people can walk in that space. Eric Christman stated that those bays are approximately eight to 13 feet deep.

In response to a question from Ms. O'Brien regarding safety concerns at the Ashland Avenue exit, Mr. Houseal said the same concerns apply. However, he noted that parking circulation geometry for residents can be a little bit tighter because they learn to navigate the movement. He said he is more concerned about customers coming in and out. He said Lake and Lathrop is a controlled intersection and traffic is funneled intentionally because of the signalization, and there is a greater concentration of pedestrian activity. He said there is also activity on Ashland but it is heightened on Lathrop.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin regarding umbrellas, tables, etc. being located in the public right-of-way, Mr. Houseal agreed and said canopies might be as well. He stated that the hallmark of a successful downtown is outdoor dining. He said he would have to review the Village's regulations on outdoor dining. He said if it can be accommodated by providing a three to four foot passage on the sidewalk for ADA compliance, it will be a good thing. In response to a question from Mr. Ruehle regarding whether outdoor dining could be accommodated on Lathrop, Mr. Houseal said it might accommodate something but it's a tight corner he'd have to look at the geometry as well as how it would be approved. Chairman Martin noted that LaMajada had outdoor dining but it's on their property. Mr. Houseal said Panera has it as well but it's on private property. Mr. Ruehle said the cigar shop has seats outside. Houseal noted that they're not eating.

Luay Aboona, Traffic Engineer from KLOA, presented a summary of his traffic report for the proposed development. He said they looked at key intersections surrounding the site as well as its proximity to the church and schools. He said that from 8-8:30 a.m. and 3-3:30 p.m. there is a lot of traffic and children in the area that influence how the intersections operate. He said there are also crossing guards on Lake Street at Ashland and Franklin that also influence how traffic operates. He stated that sometimes they are over eager to stop the traffic to let pedestrians cross or they regulate some of the traffic movements and there are a lot of backups that occur on Lake, Ashland and Lathrop. Mr. Aboona continued that from an overall trip generation standpoint, they don't anticipate it to be a high traffic generator given the number of residential units and given the fact that it's replacing active uses which are already generating traffic. He said that increase in traffic will be 1% or less and this translates into a very low impact development. He said the Village will not see a major change in the operation of those intersections in terms of level of service or delay. Mr. Aboona said that the making a left turn onto Lathrop from the site will be challenging at certain times of the day, particularly during rush hour. KLOA recommends that, rather than imposing a no left turn restriction initially, it should be allowed to operate and restricted through signage during rush hour at a later date. He said it will probably be self-regulated through driver behavior. He agreed that there may be a ripple effect of increasing volumes on other streets and intersections, but given the low volume of traffic they don't consider that to be significant. Mr. Aboona said that KLOA also recommends some sort of warning device at the entrance/exit on Lathrop Avenue that alerts pedestrians to vehicles. He said the entrance/exit on Ashland will have a garage door and primarily be used by residents who will have a fob or remote to open it as they approach. He said it will be a more controlled environment and does not believe there is a need for a warning device.

Chairman Martin asked if there was any benefit of a gate for the exit onto Lathrop that would be operated by pushing a button rather than using a fob to slow the driver and give a pedestrian more of a warning. Mr. Aboona said that could be installed and also suggested that a gate with a sensor that delays the opening could be considered in addition to the visual warning device. In response to a follow-up question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Aboona said he did not consider the impact on traffic during the construction of this building, just at full build out.

Mr. Ruehle asked for clarification and noted the behavior of the crossing guards conflicting with the signalization on Lathrop that can create substantial back-ups. Although it is not related to the development, he asked if it would make sense to provide a flashing pedestrian

crossing signal at Lake and Ashland that is functional during school drop-off and pick-up times and synchronized with the traffic light at Lake and Lathrop. Mr. Aboona said it would have to be determined whether the criteria for the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) have been met to warrant that type of signal.

In response to a question from Mr. Crosby, Mr. Aboona confirmed that the Village and School District 90 have engaged in a safe walking routes to school study. Mr. Crosby asked if any of the results from the changes that will be recommended had been incorporated. Ms. Scheiner said not yet as the study results will be coming in the next month or so.

Mr. Ruehle noted that the four-way intersection at Central and Lathrop might be another point where change might improve traffic flow in the area. Mr. Aboona said they looked at that and it is limited given the width of the bridge.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin regarding the sufficiency of 54 residential parking spaces for 32 units, Mr. Aboona said there is a trend to provide less parking with residential developments. He said they reviewed criteria in other publications such as the Institute of Traffic Engineers *Parking Generation* Manual, which recommends 1.38 parking spaces per unit with a maximum of 1.5 spaces. He said the proposal falls within that range. He noted that retail parking can be shared during off peak hours when there is no demand for it. He said that during the night there is the ability for residents to share spaces when they are not in use by the retail tenants.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Ms. Scheiner stated that there were no further staff or consultant reports.

Chairman Martin invited members of the public to address the Development Review Board.

Matthew Patterson, 7575 Lake Street, states that he thinks it would be appropriate to stay in the height range of the buildings in the area which are approximately 55 to 65 feet tall. He said the proposed building height puts the building out of scale. He said he also does not think it blends in with the aesthetic of the area and that it is not conducive to a pedestrian feel. He said he is concerned about the shadow the building will cast along Lake Street. He said the applicant's statement that buyers expect a ten-foot ceiling height is subjective and there are very nice condominiums in the area that do not have ten foot ceilings. Mr. Patterson said he does not think there is enough room on the sidewalk for outdoor dining.

Julie Patterson, 7575 Lake Street, addressed standard K in section 10-19-3 of the planned development ordinance. She said she and her husband are grateful for the five-foot setback on Lathrop as it will somewhat ease traffic flow. She said she crosses the Lake and Lathrop intersection at least three times a day and has observed pedestrian and vehicle traffic at various times. She said pedestrians include children, adults, and senior citizens and she is concerned that the traffic study did not include the increase in pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the summer. She said crossing at the intersections in this area she needs to pay close attention as many drivers are distracted. Ms. Patterson stated her concerns about pedestrian safety in the areas of the entrance/exit areas for resident parking, the loading dock and garbage pick-up. She said she didn't see any reference to the times for trash pick-up or supply delivery. She also commented on the crossing guards on Lake Street and said if they

waited for four or five people rather than stopping traffic for one or two it might improve traffic flow. Ms. Patterson said she is also concerned about the length of the retail pass-through as it makes her nervous for people passing through during the day and employees at night.

Ed McDevitt, 411 Ashland, said the proposed building abuts their parking lot, almost right up to the lot line, with very little space in between. He said they recently installed safety lights to illuminate the parking lot and he wants to make sure they aren't damaged or removed. He also said turning left onto Lathrop is nearly impossible. He said he also worries about cars leaving/entering the building on Ashland Avenue during times with a lot of activity.

Dan Lauber, 7215 Oak, described his professional planning background, and said that he was impressed by the design portfolio of this developer. He said he is surprised that they would propose such a bulky, bland, drab design for River Forest that doesn't fit within the Village's architectural character or the character of the Village. The only distinctive thing about this building is how much it doesn't fit in. He believes they can do better and have demonstrated their ability to do so with other projects. He distributed images of other developments that illustrate other building designs that show alternating colors and articulation of the façade that break up the bulkiness of the building. Mr. Lauber said he has no problem with the height and density of the proposed development but recommended that the Development Review Board require the developer to allocate 15% of the proposed units for housing that is affordable to modest incomes and at least the median household income in River Forest. He said the Village can also place controls on price so no one makes a windfall if someone sells an affordable unit down the road. He said it is legal to do so because the Village would be giving the developer more than what is allowed and urged the Development Review Board only to grant the requested allowances if they make 15% of the units affordable. Mr. Lauber asked what the Village is doing to ensure that the building is ADA compliant. He discussed litigation with the cities of Chicago and Los Angeles for failure to enforce the ADA in new construction. Mr. Crosby, Ms. Scheiner and Mr. Ruehle explained that ADA compliance is reviewed during the building permit application and review process as well as during the inspection process, and that the Village has no authority to grant exceptions to building code requirements regarding ADA accessibility. Chairman Martin also stated that they can condition approval on compliance with applicable ADA standards.

Mark Broaddus, 538 Lathrop Avenue, doesn't support granting zoning variances. He reviewed a section of Mr. Houseal's report requiring the requested allowances and the statement that the development is an intense utilization of the site in its overall context which, to him, means the building is too big for the site. He stated his concerns regarding the quantity of off-street parking and that residents are going to have to park overnight if they do not have a space. He said he would rather the residents have parking with commercial parking on-street. Mr. Broaddus stated the building will tower over and cast a shadow all the way over St. Luke's church as well as surrounding properties. He said he wants the property developed but wants something reasonable in relation to what's there. He continued that the traffic study makes no sense to him noted that it was done in December. He said the suggestion that it will only result in a 1% increase is absurd. He described the pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the area and said that he does not believe the traffic study was done in the neighborhood he lives in. He suggested that the developer remove two floors

from the building, get the parking and ingress/egress straight, and then revisit it. He said he does not know anyone that is in support of it.

Ed Voci, 624 Lathrop, stated that traffic on Lathrop backs up during peak times to his house and this will aggravate the situation. Their house was built in 1892 and they have gone to great pains to retain its character and it's made for a charming neighborhood. He would not describe this development as charming.

Ken Wiese, 411 Ashland Avenue, said most of his comments have already been covered. He said if the standard for building height has become 60 feet maybe the ordinance should be changed. He suggested fixing the ordinance but keeping the character. He said the community is 62% is single family and this development does not fit in.

Judith McDevitt, 411 Ashland Avenue, shares the concerns that have been stated. She's very concerned about egress from the garage and the traffic pattern in the garage. She said she's just heard that on the Ashland Avenue side, entrance into the building will be only the owners using a fob so it maybe that will control entrance, however, given the lack of setback there is limited visibility for motorists and pedestrians. She wants to be sure whether motorists are exiting onto Lathrop or Ashland they're doing so carefully with controlled egress.

Pat Belke, 534 Lathrop Avenue, discussed the petition regarding the shadow, church bells, and parking, and would like to ask a question regarding the subdivision of units in the condominium papers. She said when she received the post card in January she wasn't interested in a very large building on the corner but she does appreciate something going in there. She said she went door to door and started a petition dedicated exclusively regarding the height because of the shadow it would cast on the church and that it would block the light through the stained glass windows. She thinks that it gravely impacts St. Luke which will be dark, dull and depressing and the children will be in shadow all day long. She said only two people told her they don't care about the height but there are 677 people who signed the petition. She said she addressed it to Frank Martin and delivered it to the Village Hall.

Chairman Martin asked how many of those who signed the petition were River Forest residents. Ms. Belke discussed how respondents enter their information and stated that she believes the signatures represent households, not just individuals. She said all of the handwritten signatures are River Forest residents. She stated that when she circulated the petition that she only asked for people who vote to sign it since it will be presented to the Village Board.

She requested that the developer provide a shadow study. She said she thinks the building design is pretty but belongs in South Beach. She said she does not think the area can tolerate more traffic and discussed her traffic concerns. She asked if apartments could be subdivided.

In response to a follow-up question from Chairman Martin, Ms. Belke stated that to the best of her knowledge everyone that signed the petition is a River Forest resident.

Joan Cusack said she lives in a building with eight foot ceilings and encouraged the developer to lower the ceiling height in order to lower the overall height of the building by eight feet. She also discussed her concerns regarding the parking supply of 1.75 spaces per unit.

Mary Anne Zeh, 836 Bonnie Brae, said she is a registered architect and that supports the proposed uses but she has one concern about the character of the design and the building bulk. She said she is concerned that they are losing three well designed and detailed historic buildings and asked if the applicant considered incorporating the existing one-story commercial storefronts into their new commercial storefront. She discussed the historic building pattern on Lake Street with one story of commercial and two stories of residential above. She said that, given the heights of newer nearby buildings, more than two stories of residential above the retail is appropriate but she would like it limited to three. She asked if they're considering commercial parking spaces to be pay spaces, and whether they have any businesses interested in the retail units yet. Also, she thinks the pedestrian corridor is a potential security risk if they recapture that space they may be able to set the building back.

Carl Bergetz, 507 Lathrop, said he thinks the development is appropriate and should be there. He requested that the traffic study be done again and thinks that it isn't an accurate estimate of the traffic impact in this location. He is concerned about pedestrian safety. He said the traffic study and impact study on the schools needs to be returned to the Board. They want development but the size of this concerns people regarding traffic, congestion, safety and impact on the schools.

Chairman Martin stated that this ends the public comment for this meeting. He said the next step is to let the applicant address the Development Review Board again and asked if his fellow Board members have any more information they'd like the applicant to provide.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Ruehle agreed that a lighting shadow study should be provided. Ms. O'Brien said a schematic of the street and the scale would be helpful. Chairman Martin clarified that the developer should provide a shadow study from a 74-foot building and 6-foot parapet with the sun to the south showing how it will impact Lake Street and the church.

Mr. Ruehle said he would like a façade scale study with adjacent buildings in the block and next block over. Mr. Crosby said that Mr. Houseal provided a diagram that shows that.

Chairman Martin said he is going to ask them who the tenants are that they're talking to and whether they're going to need variations for those uses.

Mr. Ruehle asked if the developer had given any consideration to below grade parking and, if not, asked that they do so.

In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Ms. Scheiner said the traffic study was ordered by the developer. Chairman Martin said that if the concern is the impact that the schools are going to have, the schools won't be back in session until the end of August. He asked if they could make some assumptions that might make the traffic study more meaningful. In response to a question from Chairman Martin, Mr. Houseal said they could look at the traffic patterns and see if they are substantially different now versus then. He

said he does not know if the comment about more activity in the summer months is factual but a study would show that. He said they would have to wait to the fall to study the impact of student pedestrian traffic and he doesn't know if he would advise that. He said the school district may have some data on drop off/pick up that the applicant could obtain.

The members agreed they would like more information. Mr. Ruehle said asked how the safety issues for egress and the intersection of pedestrians and traffic needs to be discussed.

Chairman Martin said the hearing will be continued to give the applicant an opportunity to prepare the information requested.

A MOTION was made by Member Ruehle and SECONDED by Member O'Brien to continue the public hearing to Thursday, July 26, 2018.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, O'Brien, Ruehle, Ryan, and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

V. DISCUSSION/DELIBERATION/RECOMMENDATION – APPLICATION #18-02

No action taken.

VI. APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT – APPLICATION #18-02

No action taken.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

No further public comment.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION was made by Member O'Brien and SECONDED by Chairman Marti to adjourn the meeting of the Development Review Board at 10:05 p.m.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, O'Brien, Ruehle, Ryan and Chairman Martin

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

Respectfully Submitted:

Lisa Scheiner
Secretary

Frank R. Martin
Chairman, Development Review Board

Date

VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
July 26, 2018

A meeting of the Village of River Forest Development Review Board was held at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, July 26, 2018 in the First Floor Community Room of 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: Chairman Martin and Board Members Crosby, Dombrowski, Fishman, O'Brien, Ruehle and Ryan

Absent: None

Also Present: Eric Palm, Village Administrator, Cliff Radatz, Building Official, Lance Malina, Village Attorney

III. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICATION #18-02 - APPLICATION FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO CONSTRUCT FIVE-STORY MIXED USE BUILDING WITH RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USES AT 7601-7613 LAKE STREET, 7617-7621 LAKE STREET, AND 423 ASHLAND AVENUE

All who planned to address the Development Review Board regarding application #18-02 were sworn in.

Eric Christman from Sedgwick Properties took the podium to discuss the planned development at Lake Street and Lathrop Avenue. Mr. Christman advised that the planned development covers 36,000 square feet over three parcels, with approximately 14,000 square feet of retail space, 86 parking spots, and 32 residential units. Mr. Christman shared some of Sedgwick's previous successful projects, before discussing the benefits the new development will bring. Mr. Christman explained that the development includes the demolition of an obsolete retail site, and environmental restoration of the area. Mr. Christman further advised that the development is expected to raise approximately \$1 million in additional annual tax revenue. Mr. Christman shared floor plans and renderings of the development's interior. Mr. Christman then introduced Cory Robertson from Jameson Sotheby's International Realty.

Mr. Robertson discussed the methodologies, studies, and statistics supporting the development's planning and design. Mr. Robertson noted the wide gap between the median prices of single-family homes and condominiums, explaining that the development would take advantage of a market shortage in higher-end condominiums. Mr. Robertson noted that the new residential units would be of particular interest to empty-nesters and divorcees. Responding to several comments regarding the height of the ceilings in the

residential units, Mr. Robertson explained that 10 feet is the standard and recommended height.

Mr. Christman then introduced Eric Russell from traffic consultants, Kenig Lindgren O'Hara & Aboona, Inc. ("KLOA"). Mr. Russell addressed two community questions from the previous meeting. In response to a question about the time frame KLOA used for its study, Mr. Russell advised that they collected data during the surrounding streets' most congested times: before and after school, the week prior to schools' winter breaks. Mr. Robertson noted that, during the study, the weather was clear, and pedestrian traffic was ample. Mr. Robertson advised that, in his opinion, the time period for collecting data was appropriate.

Member Ruehle described existing roadway conditions and potential impacts of the development on traffic flow. He asked that a methodology for controlling departures in terms of timing and direction be considered, if only during peak traffic times.

Additionally, Mr. Russell discussed potential traffic to be generated by the development. Mr. Russell advised that the development would produce relatively low traffic for a project of this kind. He shared that KLOA projected the development to account for approximately 1% of vehicle traffic on the surrounding streets: approximately 20 vehicles per hour, out of 2,000 total vehicles. Chairman Martin asked Mr. Russell to assess the total impact the development would have on traffic; Mr. Russell advised that the development would have a minimal impact, though he advised that he did not review the potential impact the construction efforts might have.

Member Crosby asked about a recent study conducted by River Forest Elementary School District 90 and the Village regarding school children's safe passage to and from school, and whether the development would have any impact thereon. Village Administrator Palm advised that he did not have any updates, but that the Development Review Board was in receipt of the community's concerns regarding student passage, and the Village would make improvements as necessary.

Tim Hague from Keystone Ventures spoke next regarding the commercial portion of the development. Mr. Hague stated that the space was designed consistently with the guidelines in the Village's Comprehensive Plan and Corridor Plan. Mr. Hague advised that the parking was placed to the south of the building, preventing visibility of the parking from Lake Street. Mr. Hague also noted that the development does not include curb cuts on Lake Street, the points of ingress and egress were situated in accordance with the two Village plans. Mr. Hague advised that the retail additions will activate the pedestrian nature of Lake Street, per the express goals of the Village plans.

Mr. Hague advised that they held the building back from Lathrop Avenue by approximately five feet more than required, to preserve the pedestrian ambience of the area. They also included a corridor along the west end of the development, to provide more convenient access for patrons parking in the off-street parking, south of the area. Mr. Hague showed

the Board figures of the square footages of the respective commercial spaces, totaling approximately 14,000 square feet.

Regarding targeted uses, Mr. Hague shared that they aimed to develop the “heart” and “community” aspects of the area with the addition of several restaurants. Mr. Hague suggested they were seeking some casual, sit-down restaurants, small bars, specialty restaurants, and small bakeries/cafes. Mr. Hague also advised that they are seeking small retail and service shops. Mr. Hague showed the Board some examples of the kinds of signage and awnings anticipated on the retail space. Mr. Hague also showed the Board some comparable retail space in the region his team has developed.

Next, Eric Christman introduced Mark McKinney from Sedgwick to discuss the architecture of the project. Mr. McKinney advised that they designed the structures consistent with the classical, traditional designs characteristic of the area. Mr. McKinney advised that the buildings’ bases would have thicker texture, while the upper portions would appear softer.

Mr. McKinney advised the Board that Sedgwick has reduced the height of the previous designs shown on its application, without changing any of the programming of the building. Mr. McKinney showed the Board the shadows the development is expected to yield. Mr. McKinney showed the Board some samples of the stone products being considered for the development’s facade.

Eric Christman then advised the Board that they are seeking four site development allowances: 1) land area; 2) parking; 3) land use (seeking permission to open fast-casual restaurants, open a contiguous retail space of 8,000 square feet, and seeking to extend restaurant hours to 6am to 1am); and 4) building height (seeking 9.5 feet ceilings). Mr. Christman then summarized the goals and overall vision of the development.

Prior to concluding their presentation, Mr. McKinney clarified that the adjusted height figures pertained to the highest visible point from the street level, not certain extensions that might rise above the roof (elevator overruns, stairway access to the roof, *etcetera*).

Chairman Martin advised that tonight’s presentation gave the Board a much better sense of the development than previous presentations. Chairman Martin thanked Mr. Christman for his thorough job. However, Chairman Martin advised that the group’s lack of clarity regarding the final height of the project, as well as the color of the buildings, would make it difficult to make recommendations to the Village Board. Chairman Martin also advised that the application seemed incomplete.

Eric Christman attempted to clarify that the building would be 70-72 feet. Chairman Martin remained uncertain. Mr. Christman advised that he could finalize specific height figures at a later date. Chairman Martin questioned whether they could vote on the site development allowances without finalized specs for the project. Several Board members questioned the team regarding the final height of the development. The Board requested clearer, complete materials reflecting the final specs of the development. The Board asked the presenters to clarify the impact the development would have on the streetscape.

Member Crosby expressed some concern regarding the Beaux-Arts style of architecture used in the designs. He explained that one of its primary objectives was to design the building to appear as small as possible; the Beaux-Arts style has the effect of making the building appear taller. Member Crosby made some suggestions that would help the building appear smaller, including trimming certain stylistic details, and varying the colors of the building.

Cory Robertson noted that, since the prior presentation, the development team altered the plan, setting the corners of the building back an additional five feet from the street.

Member O'Brien questioned whether the Development would cast a shadow on a nearby school, whether the traffic data was reflective of normal traffic conditions, and whether the restaurants would have any outdoor seating located on the public right of way. Mr. Hague advised that there would not be any such seating.

Member Ruehle inquired about the parking plans, specifically, whether the development would include enough parking to service the residents, in addition to the restaurants (if operating at full capacity). He suggested that the development would be better served with additional parking. Chairman Martin asked a follow-up question regarding parking-space assignments for residents of the development. Mr. Christman advised that 10 to 12 parking spaces on the first floor of the parking structure would be designated for residents, along with the entire second floor of the structure.

Member Ruehle asked Cory Robertson how he estimated 1.7 cars per residential unit, where many of the units have three to four bedrooms. Mr. Robertson advised that 1.7 was actually a high estimate; recent developments by Jameson Sotheby's have found that approximately 1.4 is a more accurate projection. Chairman Martin asked whether the 32 spaces designated for retail customers would be open to the public, or reserved for patrons of the development. Mr. Hague advised that the spaces would be regulated "as-needed" through the management of the commercial property. Chairman Martin asked for the location of the "guest parking spaces;" Mr. Hague advised that they would be on the first floor of the parking structure, mixed with the commercial spaces.

Pat Belke, 534 Lathrop Avenue, presented a study conducted by a local math scholar pertaining to the shadows expected from the development. Ms. Belke asserted that, early in the morning, the development would almost completely overshadow the church across the street. Ms. Belke shared her wish that the development be lowered to 62 feet. Ms. Belke also commented that without adequate parking, the restaurants will fail. Ms. Belke suggested that 10 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet is an appropriate number of spaces.

Jan Saeger, 435 William, raised a concern regarding street parking. Ms. Saeger noted that, eight hours after each snowfall of two or more inches, street parking is not allowed. Thus, the development could not always rely on street parking to service residential guests or additional retail customers, in the event the development's parking reaches capacity. Ms. Saeger also suggested that the building's maintenance workers would require assigned

spaces. She asked that the development team consider adding more designated guest spaces to residents.

David Schrodtt, 706 Lathrop, stated that he was very confused by the developer's presentation. He did not believe the project was the best use of the space.

Lynn Higgins, 411 Lathrop, stated that the development's design conflicts with the style of the community.

John Dzuryak shared a concern over the developer's request to allow businesses to open at 6 AM. He speculated that other businesses in the region would seek to open their businesses at 6, instead of 7 AM. He shared a concern over the width of the proposed parking spaces; he would like to see them widened. Mr. Dzuryak also shared his desire that the developers include bike racks. He also wondered whether there would be any restrictions on what residents could hang/place on their balconies.

Mary Ann Zeh, 836 Bonnie Brae, voiced her support for the mixed-use plans. She noted that, as a parent and parishioner at St. Luke's, she is not worried of the traffic impact during the morning drop-off period, but has some concerns about the after-school period. She also feels that the height of the project is out of scale for the community; she feels that eliminating one story of residential units would solve the problem. She also feels that the design conflicts with the style of the community.

Dan Roche, 815 Bonnie Brae, added that another similar application is coming for a nearby intersection, and that it will likely raise many of the same concerns.

Dan Lauber, 7215 Oak, stated that the development's design conflicts with the design style of the community. He opined that the developers offered no factual basis for their assertions that the project complied with the Comprehensive Plan. He also shared concerns that many of River Forest's residents would not be able to afford housing in the new development, but would nonetheless shoulder additional tax burden. He was opposed to subsidizing a development for the community's wealthiest. He suggested that the development include housing that was affordable to more middle class residents. He also noted a concern about parking for the commercial employees.

A MOTION was made by Member Fishman and SECONDED by Member Ryan to continue the hearing to August 23, 2018.

Ayes: Members Crosby, Dombrowski, Fishman, O'Brien, Ruehle, Ryan, and Chairman Martin
Nays: None
Motion Passed.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT (ITEMS NOT OTHERWISE ON THE AGENDA)

None.

A MOTION was made by Member Dombrowski and SECONDED by Member Fishman to adjourn the July 26, 2018 Development Review Board Meeting at 9:47 p.m.

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

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

Respectfully Submitted:

Lisa Scheiner
Secretary

Frank R. Martin
Chairman, Development Review Board

VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES
August 23, 2018

A meeting of the Village of River Forest Development Review Board was held at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, August 23, 2018 in the First Floor Community Room of 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: Chairman Martin and Board Members Crosby, Dombrowski, Fishman, and O'Brien

Absent: Board Members Ruehle and Ryan

Also Present: Lisa Scheiner, Assistant Village Administrator, Cliff Radatz, Building Official, Greg Smith, Village Attorney, John Houseal, Village Planning Consultant.

III. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – APPLICATION FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO CONSTRUCT FIVE-STORY MIXED USE BUILDING WITH RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USES AT 7601-7613 LAKE STREET, 7617-7621 LAKE STREET, AND 423 ASHLAND AVENUE

Chairman Martin explained the process that would be followed at the hearing. All who planned to address the Development Review Board regarding application #18-02 were sworn in.

Eric Christman from Sedgwick Properties took the podium to discuss amendments in their application for the planned development at the southwest corner of Lake Street and Lathrop Avenue. Mr. Christman introduced some other members of the development team, including President, Marty Paris, architect Mark McKinney, and Tim Hague from Keystone Ventures.

Mr. Christman advised that the planned development is a mixed-use, five-story facility, including approximately 14,000 feet of retail space on the first floor, and condominiums on floors two through five. The parking is planned for the rear of the development: two stories of parking, with 86 spots. 54 spaces will be reserved exclusively for residential use; 32 will be shared between the retailers, and residential guests. Floors two through four of the residential component will contain eight condominiums ranging from approximately 2,500 to approximately 15,000 square feet, and floor five will contain six condominiums ranging from approximately 1,911 square feet to 3,360 square feet.

Mr. Christman then discussed changes to the development team's original application, made in response to comments by the Development Review Board, Village staff, and citizen commenters. Mr. Christman advised that the team altered its application regarding unit mix, land-use, height, and rooftop decks. Mr. Christman noted that they have reduced the

number of units from 32 to 30. Mr. Christman noted that they have reduced the perimeter elevation of the building by replacing the original top architectural corner element with a more modest design.

Mr. Christman shared changes to the rooftop plan, which the team implemented following input from potential condominium buyers. The new plan extends the elevator service to the roof, allowing residents to enjoy a more functional roof-top deck. The elevator overruns will reach 85 feet, increasing the highest point of the building structure by five feet from the original plan. However, the overruns will be set back further from the perimeter of the building, decreasing their visibility from the street level. The addition of elevator vestibules will increase the square footage of the building by approximately 1,000 square feet. The high corner of the building is 73 feet, the parapet is 71 feet, and the top of the roof is 66 feet. Mr. Christman advised their studies showed one would have to stand approximately 243 feet from the building to see the elevator overruns.

Mr. Christman advised that the development team sought four site development allowances: 1) density (unit count); 2) parking; 3) land-use; and 4) building height. Regarding density, the team seeks to construct one unit per 1,586 feet of land (instead of one unit per 2,800 square feet). The team proposes 30 residential units, instead of 13.

Regarding parking, Mr. Christman noted that the current zoning code would require 80 parking spaces based on the project's bedroom count; the team proposes 86 spaces, but would allocate 32 of them for retail customers and employees, and guest use (reserving 1.8 spaces per residential unit). Whereas the zoning code requires spaces to be 18.42 feet in length, the team proposes 18 feet for the development. The applicant also requested a site development allowance for drive aisle width. The code requires that the drive aisle be 25-foot wide but the applicant proposes a 22-foot-wide aisle.

Mr. Christman then introduced Tim Hague from Keystone Ventures to discuss the eight land-use allowances the team sought. Mr. Hague shared that the application was amended to include several new categories of businesses, including a dry-cleaner with on-site cleaning, "retail temporary" space (space for pop-up businesses), convenience food-marts, and fast-food establishments (meant to capture "fast-casual" restaurants). Mr. Hague noted that the team seeks an allowance to open businesses at 6 a.m. instead of 7 a.m., in case of any coffee shop or bakery tenants. Mr. Hague noted that the team seeks an allowance to open a restaurant larger than 5,000 square feet. Mr. Hague noted that the team seeks an allowance to open a non-veterinarian pet-care store. Finally, Mr. Hague noted that the team seeks an allowance to open a copying/print-service store.

Chairman Martin noted that, prior to the meeting, the Development Review Board received a letter indicating the team would seek twelve site development allowances; Mr. Hague clarified that the above eight allowances were the only ones sought by the developers.

Mr. Christman then noted the final site development allowance sought (height), which would allow the building to top off at 85 feet, rather than 50 feet. Mr. Christman showed the Board a rendering of the final proposal, concluding the team's presentation.

Next, John Houseal, Village Planning and Zoning Consultant, presented his report on the development application. Mr. Houseal noted that, despite recent changes to the application, the primary characteristics of the project remained the same throughout: five-story mixed-use space, with retail on the first floor, condominiums on floors two through five, and a two-story parking structure. Mr. Houseal proceeded to highlight the recent changes to the application, and the aspects of the project that would deviate from local zoning standards.

Mr. Houseal noted the decrease in units would lower the number of parking spaces required by the code. Mr. Houseal noted that the decrease in units also lessened the extent of the site development allowance sought regarding unit density. Mr. Houseal noted that the building setback plans remained compliant with applicable requirements. Mr. Houseal noted the 3-foot decrease in height of the parapet, the seven-foot decrease in height of the corners of the building, and the 5-foot increase in the highest point of the building (due to the elevator overruns). Mr. Houseal advised that the elevator overruns would be mostly invisible from the street level, excepting a few sight lines from a distance.

On parking, Mr. Houseal noted the team did not change the number of spaces proposed, but decreased the number of residential units. Though the application includes more parking spaces than required, the developers plan to allocate some of the spaces in a way inconsistent with the code. The code would require 74 spaces designated for the residential units; the developers would only designate 54 for such use. Mr. Houseal agreed with the developers' plan to allocate some spaces for commercial use—despite no such requirements in the code—but emphasized that there must be sufficient parking for residents and guests.

Next, Mr. Houseal discussed the land-use allowances sought by the developers. Mr. Houseal recommended that the Board not grant a blanket approval for the requested allowances; he recommended that the Board vet the conditions of each special use on a case-by-case basis, either at this hearing or at a later time. Chairman Martin asked Mr. Houseal if he reviewed the roof plan, and whether the proposed height of the stair/elevator overruns was appropriate. Mr. Houseal replied in the affirmative.

The Village Departments advised that they reviewed the changes to the application, and had no changes to their previous reports on the proposal.

Chairman Martin announced that the Board would then accept comments from those who signed up to address the meeting. Chairman Martin made note of the many letters and communications sent to the Board regarding the development, and advised that those have been distributed among Board members.

Phyllis Wilson, 407 Ashland Avenue, inquired as to whether the building would comply with the ADA's accessibility requirements. Chairman Martin responded that this was a given—all developments had to be ADA compliant.

John Keefe, 407 Ashland Avenue, noted his concern regarding pedestrian visibility at the corner of Lake and Lathrop. Mr. Keefe also inquired as to whether a proposed gangway in the development would be private, or open to the public. Mr. Hague responded that it would be public access; Mr. Keefe shared his concern that a public gangway could be dangerous in that location.

Bill Higgins, 411 Lathrop Avenue, noted that every member of his condominium association wrote to the Board with their input on the development. Mr. Higgins shared that he and his fellow 411 residents are opposed to the size of the development. He also shared concerns regarding off-street parking, and potential difficulties presented by trucks making deliveries to the retail units.

Frederick Heiss, 7575 Lake Street, shared his concern with the number and extent of the allowances sought by the development team.

Sue Beard, 444 Ashland Avenue, shared safety concerns with the development. Specifically, she worries about cars entering and exiting the development on Ashland Avenue, which many kids use to get to and from church and school.

Mindy Credi, 1452 Park Avenue, shared three questions. 1) Why would the Board grant allowances for residential parking exemptions for a new property? 2) What steps will the Village take to prevent parking in residential areas? 3) When the site is developed, what water and soil remediation will the Village require?

Pat Belke, 534 Lathrop Avenue, discussed a survey indicating that over 700 River Forest residents oppose the height of the development. Much of the opposition stems from the views residents will have from the development, looking down into others' backyards, windows, etc. She also worries about the shadows the development will cast. She conveyed concern over increased traffic in the area, where many school children are present. She doubted any restaurant's ability to succeed with such limited commercial parking in the development. She does not want to live near restaurants. She doubts the viability of the residential units on the second floor, directly above potentially loud retail space. She doubts that anyone would want to live on the same grounds as a dry-cleaning facility.

Mark Broadus, 538 Lathrop Avenue, asked whether the development team had a rendering of the new rooftop deck plan. Mr. Broadus wondered whether any rules or regulations apply to such rooftop decks.

Joan Cusack, asked Chairman Martin what was meant by a previous comment that the Village and the developers were partnered regarding this project. Attorney Smith responded that the Village and Developers had entered into a redevelopment agreement providing for financial assistance for the development, timelines for the development and construction, and other terms for the completion of the project. Chairman Martin clarified that the agreement did not guarantee approval of the development. Attorney Smith clarified that some TIF money was used to assist the developers. Ms. Cusack extolled the

value of the 50-foot limit on buildings. Ms. Cusack also advocated for additional parking spaces in the development.

Anne Berens, 610 Thatcher, shared safety concerns with the development. Specifically, Ms. Berens is worried about the number of kids in the area, and the potential for sniper fire off the rooftop deck. Ms. Berens also expressed concern over the introduction of new retail space into the community. Ms. Berens questioned the plans for the roof deck, wondering whether it would be shared space for the building, or parceled off to individual tenants. Finally, Ms. Berens commented that the development would not be in keeping with the qualities of the Village.

Daniel Lauber, 7215 Oak, noted the price-point of the proposed residential units, and suggested that the probable wealth of the residents would yield more cars. Mr. Lauber also posited that there would not be enough parking to service the commercial properties. Mr. Lauber expressed concern over the noise retail customers might make. Mr. Lauber also expressed that the design of the building is out of step with the rest of the community.

Mr. Christman then responded to some of the citizen comments. He pointed out loading space in the design for use by the retail properties. Regarding security, Mr. Christman advised that he would be willing to explore security cameras, parking management systems, and other measures to increase security. Regarding shadows, Mr. Christman assured the Board that the shadow studies represented reflected different times of day, at different times of year. Regarding the roof deck, Mr. Christman advised that the decks would be set off from the north and south of the building; he advised that they would be happy to explore setting the decks back on the east and west sides, as well. Regarding environmental concerns, Mr. Christman noted that the development would be required to comply with any and all applicable environmental laws and regulations.

At this time, the Board concluded the public portion of the meeting.

IV. DISCUSSION/DELIBERATION & RECOMMENDATION – APPLICATION FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TO CONSTRUCT FIVE-STORY MIXED USE BUILDING WITH RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL USES AT 7601-7613 LAKE STREET, 7617-7621 LAKE STREET, AND 423 ASHLAND AVENUE

Member Crosby had some questions about the roof deck; specifically, whether the deck would extend to the edge of the building on the east side, and whether the deck's railing would exceed the parapet in height. Mr. Christman confirmed that the deck extends to the east side of the building, and the railing would not exceed the parapet.

Village Attorney Smith asked whether the roof would be accessible to the whole building. Mr. McKinney advised that it would be a private deck, with access for the residents of the units immediately below the roof. It is not a common-area roof. There would be six deck units, corresponding with the six fifth-floor condominiums.

Attorney Smith asked whether roof access would be limited by the condominium declarations regarding time-of-day. Mr. Christman advised that there would not be restrictions on the use.

Member Crosby shared his concerns about the size of the building. He feels that the Beaux-Arts style does not help matters, as it lends a more grandiose appearance to the structure. He feels that the building is too tall.

Chairman Martin shared that he does not have a problem with the aesthetics of the building. Member Fishman agreed. Member Dombrowski then shared his feeling that the Village Board should approve the development, but expressed some concern about the ensuing permitting process. He noted the fiscal benefits the development would bring to the Village.

Member Fishman expressed her support for the project. She shared that she thought it was attractive, and potentially very remunerative for the community. She harbored no concern over the height of the building, or over the rooftop deck. She expressed that she would want to live in the building.

Member O'Brien expressed concern over the parking plan. Chairman Martin noted that the Board could approve the development, subject to the condition that the developers alter the parking plan. Chairman Martin suggested two parking spaces per unit, with six guest spaces, with the remaining spaces used at the discretion of the developer.

Chairman Martin expressed trepidation over the height of the building. He is not comfortable approving an allowance of 85 feet. He wants to ensure that the main portions of the building are capped at 71 feet, and only the overruns extend to 85 feet.

Chairman Martin expressed problems with the developers' request for land-use allowances. Member Crosby suggested prohibiting banks from occupying the retail space.

Chairman Martin expressed his desire to condition approval on the implementation of a plan to maintain safe vehicular and pedestrian traffic on Lake and Lathrop during the construction period.

Chairman Martin stated two conditions for approval requested by Village staff: a letter of credit, and an easement for the Village to enter into the common areas to ensure compliance with applicable building codes.

The Board deliberated over whether to reach a decision on the businesses' hours of operation. Attorney Smith explained the process for approving an allowance to operate restaurants outside the hours of 7 a.m. to 1 a.m.

Member Crosby shared his concerns over the size and appearance of the building. He feels that the building is too monochromatic. Chairman Martin suggested making a more varied façade a condition for approval; Member Crosby thought this would be too difficult to vote

on without seeing a rendering. Another Board member added that she did not want to add darker colors to the building's design. Mr. McKinney offered that the texture of the building materials, as well as the terraces and other building accents, would lend depth to the façade. The Board and Mr. McKinney went back and forth regarding the Beaux-Arts style of the development. Chairman Martin suggested conditioning approval on setting back the upper floors of the development along Lake Street.

Member Dombrowski made a motion to recommend approval of the application as-is, with all of the site allowances requested. The motion failed for lack of a second.

A MOTION was made by Member Fishman and SECONDED by Member Dombrowski to approve the development application, but defer the land-use allowances to the special-use permitting process, and accept the Village's recommended conditions regarding a letter of credit and easement.

Chairman Martin stated that he would not support that motions because he believes there should be additional conditions recommended. He proposed an amendment to the motion to include the following: he would not approve the allowance of 85 feet for the height building; he would only allow 85 feet for the overruns, and 71 feet for the main body of the building; he would grant an allowance for 60 residential parking spaces with six guest spaces; he would add a condition that the developers implement a plan to maintain safe traffic conditions during construction; he would add a condition that the developer work with the Village to develop additional off-street parking at the cost of the developer; he would condition approval on the building being constructed according to the specifications presented at the meeting; he would condition approval on the use of loading docks/trash pickup occurring no earlier than 7 a.m. and no later than 8 p.m. The Board discussed Chairman Martin's proposed amendments one-by-one, and determined that Chairman Martin's first condition was unnecessary, given the additional condition that the developers construct the building according to the specs presented at the meeting.

Member Crosby suggested prohibiting a bank from occupying the retail space as a conditional for approval. Several Board members questioned whether such a condition was within the purview of the Development Review Board. This amendment was not accepted.

Members Fishman and Dombrowski agreed to amend their motion to include the following eight conditions:

1. The Project be developed in accordance with the plans in the Application, as most recently amended and supplemented by the Petitioner before the vote of the DRB on August 23, 2018.
2. The eight (8) Use Site Development Allowances may be operated on the Subject Property only if a special use permit is first granted by the Village President and Board of Trustees in accordance with the procedures in Chapter 10-18 of the Zoning Ordinance with respect to a specifically proposed tenant and/or owner of the commercial space in the Project which requires a Use Site Development Allowance

- in order to operate. Any special use permit granted for a Use Site Development Allowance shall be specific to the tenant and/or owner of the commercial space in the Project for which the special use permit was granted, the special use permit shall not run with title to the Subject Property and the special use permit shall not permit any other tenant and/or owner to operate in the commercial space in the Project for which a Use Site Development Allowance is required to operate.
3. The Off-Street Parking Site Development Allowances be allowed, as modified as follows: there are sixty (60) off-street parking spaces dedicated and set-aside for the residential condominium units, there are six (6) dedicated off-street parking spaces for guests of the residential condominium units, and the remaining twenty (20) off-street parking spaces are dedicated for use by the commercial users, their employees and their customers.
 4. Garbage shall be picked up and the loading dock on the Subject Property shall only be used between the hours of 7:00 AM and 8:00 PM.
 5. The Petitioner shall work with the Village to create and implement a safety program to protect vehicles and pedestrians during construction of the Project.
 6. The Petitioner shall work with the Village to acquire off-site off-street parking for the commercial users, their employees and their patrons, with the acquisitions being at the Petitioner's expense.
 7. 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 months after issuance of the final certificate of occupancy for the Project.
 8. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for any portion of the Project, the Property owner shall grant an easement 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 inspecting such 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 shall have no 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 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.

Ayes: Fishman, Dombrowski, Martin

Nays: O'Brien (Standards for Approval not met: C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O), Crosby (Standards for Approval not met: A and H; he later clarified that standards H and J had not been met)

Motion Passed.

A MOTION was made by Member Fishman and SECONDED by Member Crosby to continue this matter to August 30, 2018 to review and adopt the findings of fact.

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

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT (ITEMS NOT OTHERWISE ON THE AGENDA)

None.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

A MOTION was made by Member Dombrowski and SECONDED by Member Fishman to adjourn the August 23, 2018 Development Review Board Meeting at 10:05 p.m.

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

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

Respectfully Submitted:

Lisa Scheiner
Secretary

Frank R. Martin
Chairman, Development Review Board