

**VILLAGE OF RIVER FOREST  
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES MINUTES  
October 15, 2018**

A special meeting of the Village of River Forest Board of Trustees was held on Monday, October 15, 2018 at 7:00 p.m. in the Community Room of the Village Hall, 400 Park Avenue, River Forest, Illinois.

**1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. Upon roll call, the following persons were:

Present: President Adduci, Trustees Cargie, Conti, Vazquez, Henek, Gibbs and Corsini

Absent: None

Also Present: Village Clerk Kathleen Brand-White, Village Administrator Eric Palm, Assistant Village Administrator Lisa Scheiner, Police Chief James O'Shea, Deputy Police Chief Dan Dhooghe, Fire Chief Kurt Bohlmann, Public Works Director John Anderson, Finance Director Joan Rock, Management Analyst Jon Pape, Village Attorney Gregory Smith

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

President Adduci led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3. CITIZENS COMMENTS**

Richard Tavares, 842 N. Harlem Avenue, and Daniel Roche, 815 Bonnie Brae, presented an analysis regarding the proposed development at Chicago and Harlem ("Development") on behalf of several residents that live near the Development. Mr. Roche began by noting that the developers have remained focused on maximizing profits at each stage of the application process. Mr. Roche feels that the community has been reasonable when engaging with the developers; community members have acknowledged that the proposal is a good idea, but feel it is too big for the space. Mr. Roche challenged the developers to list concessions they have made to the community members throughout the application process. Mr. Roche asserted that the developers stand to gain a lot of money by developing a 125-unit building, rather than a 105-unit building.

Mr. Tavares then noted the mass of the proposed building; it would take up approximately 56% of his block. The corner of the building closest to his home would rise approximately 20-feet higher than the average home height on the block. Mr. Tavares then noted his accomplishments as an investment banker to emphasize his firm knowledge of finance. He presented an analysis of the relative returns of various iterations of the development: 106-units v. 125-units. Mr. Tavares shared their initial hypothesis that the 125-unit iteration would have a significantly higher profit rate than the 106-unit iteration. They found, however, that while the 125-unit would net more cash, the profitability rates would be similar between the two iterations. Mr. Tavares shared the assumptions he and Mr. Roche relied on when conducting their analysis. Mr. Tavares shared a sensitivity analysis, which flexed several variables in the building's construction. Mr. Tavares displayed several charts and graphics comparing the relative return rates of the two iterations. Mr. Tavares proffered

alternate methods by which the developers could increase profitability rate without increasing the number of units in the development. Mr. Tavares's analysis indicated that the developers could remove the fourth floor of the building (thereby eliminating 29 units), add four additional rooms elsewhere, and keep the same rate of profit. Mr. Tavares shared alternative designs that would decrease the visual mass of the building. In closing, Mr. Tavares emphasized that there were many options by which the developers could maintain their profit rate while decreasing the scale of the project. Mr. Tavares encouraged the Board to send the project back to the Development Review Board for further consideration.

President Adduci noted that the developers could have sought further profit with a more dense design.

Karin Kuby, 7204 Iowa Street, lamented that the neighborhood has grown more congested over the years. Ms. Kuby fears that this development will lead to further decline in the quality of the neighborhood. She hopes that the ultimate project won't be so large and imposing. She worries that this development will turn the area into a "throw-away" part of the community.

Carolyn Roche, 815 Bonnie Brae, feels that she and her neighbors have been steadfast and vocal in opposition to the size of the development, as well as some of the math included in the economic analysis of the project. The footprint remains the primary concern of the community, which many community members have expressed throughout the application process. Ms. Roche refuted the notion that the developer's offer to plant trees on neighboring property amounted to a "concession" by the developer. Mr. Roche implored the Board to consider the size of the development.

Saskia Bolore, 811 Bonnie Brae, echoed the sentiments of her neighbors, who are unanimously opposed to the size and height of the development. Ms. Bolore asked everyone to stand who was in opposition to the project. Ms. Bolore noted the height of different portions of the building. She does not feel that lowering the sides of the buildings represented a significant concession by the developers. Ms. Bolore asked the Board to take some time to envision what the building would look like. Ms. Bolore highlighted the successes of the recent CVS development in town, in contrast with the Development at issue. Ms. Bolore feels that greater care should be given to the privacy of the surrounding residents. Ms. Bolore feels that the Board's consideration of the Development does not reflect a long-term vision for the development of the Village's corridors. She feels that the Village is answering to the developers, and not vice versa. Many of the meeting attendees are frustrated and tired of the development process; they have only watched the height and size of the project grow throughout. Ms. Bolore proposed alternative designs that could obviate the need for a fourth story, or for ground-level parking. She urged the Board to reject the project, as it stands. She does not feel that the Village should be beholden to these outside developers.

Mael Bolore, 811 Bonnie Brae, shared that his main concern is privacy. The fact that the development cannot include sufficient parking without infringing on neighbors' privacy is a problem. He feels that the project should go back to the DRB for further consideration. He does not feel that the project, as it stands, is acceptable, but is willing to work with the developers to reach a workable solution.

Bill McDonald, 803 Bonnie Brae, spoke of Frank Lloyd Wright, who used to live only a few blocks away from the Development. Mr. McDonald noted Wright's school of architecture, which commanded that a house should blend with its environment. Mr. McDonald feels that Wright would reject the Development as too large, and out of proportion with the site. Mr. McDonald noted the number of historically significant properties in the community, and feels that the development would be a blemish on an otherwise rich architectural landscape.

Suzanne Morrison, 7205 Iowa Street, noted that she was recently looking at the current corridor plan, which folds into the Comprehensive Plan. She noted that the plans frequently referenced a "walkable, bike-able" community, even with specific regard to Harlem Avenue. She does not feel that the Development would comport with these plans. She feels the building is much too large for the space; there is no setback, no green space, and not enough parking. She is also very concerned about her property value. She considered commissioning an impact study regarding the same. She advised that she would not have bought her house if she knew this Development was coming. She wondered how her visiting family would be able to park near her house, given the parking predicament the Development presents. She does not feel that the developers have compromised enough throughout the process, as they have never reduced the size of the project. She feels that the community is being reasonable in its requests for compromise. She wondered whether the Board was acting out of fear of losing the developers' interest in the space. Ms. Morrison rejected the notion that the Village would be unable to fill the space, in any event. She asked the Board to send the matter back to the DRB for further consideration.

Joseph Baptist, 825 Bonnie Brae, thanked fellow community members for participating in the development review process. Mr. Baptist expressed that the community does not oppose development in the space, *per se*; the concern is that the developers have not compromised relative to the community's concerns. Mr. Baptist echoed Mr. Tavares and Mr. Roche's sentiments that the developers could implement a viable project at a smaller scale. Mr. Baptist shared that the process feels like a rubber stamp, and asked the Board to extend the review process so that the community's voices and concerns could be integrated into the development.

Mark Daniel, Daniel Law Office, 17W733 W. Butterfield Road, Unit F, Oak Brook Terrace, stated that he represents a group of residents that have filed an objection to the application. Mr. Daniel raised a few concerns regarding the Village's review process. Mr. Daniel noted that he filed a protest with respect to the instant Development. He noted that the Board is entertaining a project that doesn't have any classification as a permitted use; he classified it as a "floating zone situation." He advised that the Village should look to avoid procedural challenges to the Development. He advised that the Village committed clear error when first publishing an impact assessment of the Development with the meeting packet on October 1, 2018; the DRB should have been privy to that information. Mr. Daniel advised that further consideration in the DRB would strengthen and legitimize the Village's procedure. Mr. Daniel advised that the Village was potentially engaging in illegal "contract zoning" under the Illinois Constitution. Mr. Daniel expressed that the parking at the Development is inadequate. Mr. Daniel does not feel that there's enough space to accommodate the size and nature of the project; for example, he noted the amount of parking that would be required to facilitate hospice and health care services at the site. Mr. Daniel advised that the developers' potential recipients of service of the adjoining property owners' protests have evaded service of the same. Mr. Daniel expressed that the Development does not remotely fit within the objectives of the

Village's Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Daniel noted that Harlem is primarily a residential street, and was not intended as a major corridor in the Plan. He thinks it's reasonable to think that the project will be sold by Kaufman and Jacobs. He asked that the Board vote "no," given the neighbors' opposition. He discussed the shadow impact of the Development, as well as its adverse impacts on parking and traffic. Mr. Daniel praised the job done by Mr. Roche and Mr. Tavares in providing a detailed analysis.

Mary Anne Zeh, 836 Bonnie Brae, listed the following characteristics of the development that the DRB viewed as positive: the building's use of materials and massing to break up the bulk of the building; the use of certain elements that were consistent with surrounding designs, and the fact that the building would represent a "good transition" from the commercial node at Harlem and Chicago. Ms. Zeh noted that the building is more than twice the allowed height, and over half of the length of the block; she does not feel that any materials and/or massing can mask the excessive size of the project. Ms. Zeh passed around images showing the visual impact of the building on neighboring properties; she highlighted the privacy concerns presented by the Development's views onto neighboring properties.

Robert Zeh, 836 Bonnie Brae, acknowledged his initial approval of a plan to replace the existing TCF Bank, but soon became disenchanted with the Development. He feels the development will change the character of the neighborhood he bought into. He is not too worried about the long term viability of the lot. He feels this is the wrong project.

Jim Flannigan shared that he believes the Development is a good project for a variety of reasons. Mr. Flannigan pointed out that there are buildings up and down Harlem that are taller than the Development. He feels that Harlem should have been considered a corridor under the plan. He advised that he lives two blocks away from the site, and feels the space needs development. Mr. Flannigan noted that the current building is of no historical significance. He feels it is inappropriate to attack a developer for seeking profitability, and feels that the community is in no place to opine as experts on how to scale down a project. He noted that Harlem is a state highway, and should not be designed for biking and walking, in any event. Mr. Flannigan noted several previous instances where proposed developments engendered worry in the community; Mr. Flannigan noted that such worries were misplaced in each instance. Mr. Flannigan voiced his support for the proposal, and feels that it would be good for the community.

Todd Moore, 1402 Monroe, expressed that he would agree with Mr. Flannigan, but for the fact that the neighbors predate the developers in the area, and therefore have a right to stand up for their interests. Mr. Moore expressed his hope that the Board keep its fiduciary duty the Village, while considering the residents' concerns.

Molly Malika Gujrati, 838 N. Harlem Avenue, has considerable policy experience related to long-term care, and challenged the Board to further scrutinize the employer that it was bringing into the community by way of the Development. The annual turnover rate of in-home caretakers at like facilities is anywhere between 40-100%; the average cost of replacing such workers is \$2,000-\$6,000. She feels uncomfortable living 3 houses away from such transient employees. She objected to the proposal, generally.

Adrian Webber, 838 N. Harlem Avenue, advised that he moved to the area out of a his desire to buy a home; he and his wife happened into the neighborhood and really liked it. He noted that he and his wife both have considerable student debt; their current home is their starter home, in which they have very little equity. He is concerned about the impact the Development would have on his investment. He feels that houses like his are valuable opportunities for young families to gain a foothold in the neighborhood, and would hate to see the Development jeopardize those opportunities.

Lydia Manning, 755 William, is a new resident of River Forest, who is in support of the project. She feels that the project would provide a necessary service to the community.

#### **4. ELECTED OFFICIAL COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Trustee Henek thanked residents for attending this and other meetings.

Trustee Conti welcomed those in attendance and thanked them for coming as well as their passion for the community.

Trustee Vazquez welcomed those in attendance. He discussed the Imagine OPRF project, which is having a town hall meeting coming up shortly.

Trustee Cargie stated that the Collaboration Committee met last Wednesday and have drafted a community calendar. Trustee Cargie advised that the calendar still needs a name.

Trustee Corsini congratulated Officer Czernik on his award for elderly services from the Illinois Attorney General's office. At 6 p.m. the Finance Committee met and reviewed the CAFR for 2018 and will be making a recommendation that the Board accept that and that the property tax levy be made and accepted this evening. Trustee Corsini thanked those in attendance for coming, for hosting her in their homes, and putting time and effort into the process.

Trustee Gibbs congratulated Trustee Corsini's son, Andrew, on representing OPRF at the IHSA Golf State Championships. Trustee Corsini added that John Parker of River Forest and Hailey Gladdon also represented the High School at the state level.

President Adduci stated she attended a Changing Aging event staged by River Forest. President Adduci echoed what other Trustees have said about collaborating with residents. She noted her appreciation for all the public comments at these meetings. She noted the challenges associated with similar Developments, and thanked the community for its input.

#### **5. CONSENT AGENDA**

- a. Special Village Board Meeting Minutes (6:00 PM) – September 17, 2018
- b. Special Village Board Meeting Minutes (7:00 PM) – September 17, 2018
- c. Special Village Board Meeting Minutes – October 1, 2018
- d. Executive Session Meeting Minutes – October 1, 2018
- e. Change Order #1 (Final) – 2018 Street Improvement Project - \$17,600.68 – Resolution
- f. Amendment to the FY2019 Village Compensation Plan

- g. Right-of-Way Encroachment Waiver and Agreement for a Bicycle Rack at 7327-7329 W. North Avenue
- h. Monthly Department Reports
- i. Monthly Performance Measurement Report
- j. Financial Report – September 2018
- k. Accounts Payable – September 2018 - \$1,586,103.69
- l. Waiver of Formal Bids (Due to Sole Source Provider) and Award of Purchase to Minuteman Security Technologies for \$34,250.00 for an Additional License Plate Reader for Parking Enforcement
- m. Waiver of Formal Bids (Due to Purchase through the Suburban Purchasing Cooperative) and Award of Purchase of a 2019 Chevrolet Tahoe Police Patrol Package from Currie Motors for \$38,203.61

Trustee Corsini asked that item 5B be removed.

Trustee Gibbs made a motion, seconded by Trustee Henek to approve the Consent Agenda items a, c-m.

Trustee Cargie asked the minutes be amended to correct a reference from the Development Review Board to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Trustee Cargie asked PW Director Anderson about the change order and whether the contractor should have known about asphalt needs.

Roll call:

Ayes: Trustees Cargie, Conti, Corsini, Henek, Gibbs and Vazquez

Absent: None

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

Trustee Gibbs made a motion, seconded by Trustee Cargie to approve the Special Village Board Meeting Minutes (7:00 PM) – September 17, 2018 as amended.

Trustee Corsini asked that the minutes be amended to note that she was out of the country but submitted questions and comments that she hoped had been incorporated into the discussion.

Roll call:

Ayes: Trustees Cargie, Conti, Corsini, Henek, Gibbs and Vazquez

Absent: None

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

## **6. CONSENT ITEMS FOR SEPARATE CONSIDERATION**

- a. Accounts Payable from the Madison Street TIF Fund (\$574.34) and North Avenue TIF Fund (\$3,851.43)

Trustee Cargie made a motion, seconded by Trustee Gibbs to approve Accounts Payable from the Madison Street TIF Fund (\$574.34) and North Avenue TIF Fund (\$3,851.43).

Trustee Vazquez stated that he has a common law conflict of interest and asked that the Clerk not call his name during the vote.

Roll call:

Ayes: Trustees Cargie, Conti, Corsini, Henek, and Gibbs

Absent: None

Nays: None

Abstain: Trustee Vazquez

Motion Passed.

- b. Accounts Payable from the General Fund to Anderson Elevator for \$236.00.

Trustee Corsini made a motion, seconded by Trustee Cargie, to approve Accounts Payable from the General Fund to Anderson Elevator for \$236.00.

Trustee Gibbs stated that he will not be participating in the vote.

Roll call:

Ayes: Trustees Cargie, Conti, Corsini, Henek, and Vazquez

Absent: None

Nays: None

Abstain: Trustee Gibbs

Motion Passed.

## **7. RECOMMENDATIONS OF BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES**

- a. Development Review Board – Planned Development Permit for a Senior Living Residential Facility at Chicago Avenue and Harlem Avenue (800 - 826 N. Harlem Avenue, River Forest, Illinois) – Ordinance

Trustee Gibbs made a motion, seconded by Trustee Cargie to approve an Ordinance granting a Planned Development Permit for the Chicago Avenue and Harlem Avenue Development (800-826 N. Harlem Avenue) subject to the conditions listed in the Ordinance.

President Adduci invited the applicant to come to the podium. She thanked residents for their comments and reminded residents that this is the opportunity for the Board, staff and attorney to discuss this matter.

David Shaw, attorney for the applicant, began by addressing Mr. Daniel's comment regarding ultimate ownership of the project. Mr. Shaw noted that the Development is operated as a partnership between Kaufman Jacobs and Senior Lifestyle. He asserted that the project will not be sold. He noted that the developers first presented the project to the Village in August, 2017. He noted

the developers' many meetings with the Village Board, the DRB, community members, and various consultants.

Bob Gawronski, Vice President of Development for Senior Lifestyle, thanked the Village staff for its help throughout the process. Mr. Gawronski noted that his many interactions with members of the community have led to several reassessments by the developers. Mr. Gawronski believes the ultimate proposal will be worthwhile. He touted the community's involvement in the process. Mr. Gawronski noted that Senior Lifestyle is Chicago-based, but operates many senior-living facilities around the country. This Development would be the fourth joint venture between Kaufman Jacobs and Senior Lifestyle. Residents will enjoy the Development's many amenities, including meals, laundry, transportation, entertainment, etc. The Development will provide necessary care-based services to seniors, while significantly increasing the real estate tax base of the area. Mr. Gawronski noted that their proposed use of the site is about the least intense use of the site conceivable. He lauded the Village's current efforts to assist seniors, including those with dementia; he hopes the Development will help serve those goals.

Michael Fitzgerald, OKW Architects, reviewed the architecture, building scale and site plan of the proposed project. Mr. Fitzgerald noted that the project and site have evolved since the beginning of the process. The proposal is a building that varies between three and four stories. Previously, there was a proposal on the table for a uniformly four-story building on a smaller piece of property. After receiving input from the community, the developers lowered the north and south wings of the building. Mr. Fitzgerald noted that the building fits, aesthetically, with surrounding buildings in the community.

Wendy Schulenberg, Landscape Architect of Daniel Weinbach Partners, presented the landscape plan that was revised based on the condition recommended by the Development Review Board. Ms. Schulenberg noted that there would be new street trees on Harlem, as well as on Chicago Avenue if needed. The street frontages would include various ground cover and plant materials. Ms. Schulenberg noted where the developers have added additional trees throughout the process. There is a wooden fence along the north and west sides of the property.

Luay Aboona, Traffic Consultant of KLOA, discussed the results of the traffic study. Mr. Aboona noted that this would not be an impactful use of the property, from a traffic perspective. The intersection of Harlem and Chicago will not see increased congestion from the project. The project would eliminate three curb cuts with an access drive further north of the intersection at Chicago and Harlem.

Mike Hoffman, Teska and Associates, presented highlights of the economic impact study. Mr. Hoffman noted that the Development would lead to a significant increase in property tax revenue to the Village - \$19,000 annually to the Village, alone (other taxing bodies would also see a boost). Mr. Hoffman noted that local schools would see an increase in over \$400,000 in annual property taxes stemming from the Development, without an influx of additional students. All told, the proposal is a net economic positive for the Village.

David Shaw thanked the development team, and reiterated the quality of the project. He feels this



Development is a great opportunity to provide a needed resource in the community, and asked the Board to approve it as proposed.

In response to questions from Trustee Cargie, Mr. Shaw noted that this is a planned development, and not “contract zoning;” the Village is free to place whatever conditions it wants on the approval of the project. Mr. Shaw reiterated that the parking plan is based on well-established, national standards. Mr. Shaw also pushed back against the notion that the project is a “multi-family residential” project, as described in various opposition documents.

Village Administrator Palm presented a comparison of the River Forest zoning process to the state law. Mr. Palm explained that the local zoning process has stricter requirements (including notice requirements) than provided under state law. The process began in November 2017 with a preliminary submittal by the developer; at the end of March, the developer submitted the project for feedback from the economic development commission; in April, the developers had a pre-filing meeting with the DRB; thereafter, the developers had several meetings with residents. After those meetings, the developers mailed notices of upcoming public meetings. The DRB returned a recommendation on September 6; the DRB approved findings of fact on September 20; a week later, the developers provided notice of the instant meeting.

Village Attorney Smith responded to Mr. Daniel’s letter and comments. Mr. Smith described the process by which neighboring property owners could raise the vote threshold for a zoning item to 4 of 6 of the Board of Trustees, rather than 4 of 7 of the Village President and Board of Trustees. Mr. Smith noted that the application before the Village President and Board of Trustees does not request a map amendment or a text amendment, thus, the objection to the development has not raised the vote threshold in this case. Mr. Smith refuted the notion that a planned development such as this one could be considered an illegal “floating zone.” Mr. Smith reminded the Board that its review is limited to the record created below, by the DRB. Mr. Smith also refuted the notion that the development application process has amounted to illegal “contract zoning;” the Village Board is not accepting remuneration for zoning allowances, but is simply holding the developer to the promises made throughout the process.

In response to a question from Trustee Henek, Mr. Smith reiterated that the Board should be considering the evidence gathered by the DRB, and applying the same to applicable standards.

President Adduci invited John Houseal, the Village’s Planning Consultant from Houseal Lavigne and Associates, to the podium. Mr. Houseal invited questions, but did not receive any. Mr. Houseal echoed Mr. Palm’s comments regarding the Village’s robust development review process.

In response to a question from Trustee Corsini, Mr. Smith clarified that the DRB exists to gather evidence, and submit it for the Board’s consideration. Mr. Smith noted that new evidence should not be considered at this stage.

In response to a question from Trustee Cargie, Mr. Fitzgerald clarified that the total length of the building is, along Harlem, 325 feet. Along Chicago, the building is 135.5 feet.

Trustee Corsini asked if the building was as deep as the TCF building; Mr. Fitzgerald replied that it

is “about the same” as the existing building in terms of depth.

Trustee Henek asked whether the developers had considered moving units to the west side of the building to the Chicago side to address surrounding neighbors’ concerns. Mr. Gawronski advised that of all the different iterations the team looked at, the instant iteration was the least impactful on neighbors to the west. Mr. Gawronski feels the current plan is the best option, given the teams’ conversation with the various stakeholders.

Trustee Henek noted her experience living next to a large, four-story building. She feels that the project is generally a good one, but still has concerns regarding height. Mr. Gawronski reiterated that the current plan struck the most effective balance of applicable interests.

President Adduci asked about various discussions regarding the project’s height before the DRB. Village Administrator Palm advised that the application currently before the Board reflected some of those discussions before the DRB; he noted that the earlier public comments indicate that the developer didn’t go far enough in incorporating those discussions.

Trustee Henek asked if the developer could remove the seven fourth floor units on the west side of the building. She asked if the project could proceed without those units.

Mr. Gawronski stated that the project could not proceed without those units. He refuted Mr. Roche and Mr. Tavares’s analysis during public comment; he noted that the 106-unit concept for the project was never economically viable. Mr. Gawronski individually refuted several of the assumptions upon which the analysis was based.

Trustee Henek asked about the November, 2017 plan that was presented to the Village Board of Trustees and how it evolved. Mr. Gawronski noted that the original plan, as presented in November, 2017, contemplated independent living, rather than assisted living. Mr. Gawronski advised that the Development evolved with changing market conditions and other variables. Mr. Gawronski advised that all changes were made to keep the project economically viable. Mr. Gawronski noted that the current plan was approved by the DRB after countless meetings with various members of the community.

Trustee Vazquez stated that residents he met with cautioned him about relying on the Teska report. He asked the Village’s consultant, Jennifer Tammen, principal of Ehler’s and Associates, what the Village’s net revenue will be from the Development. Ms. Tammen replied that she was engaged to review the Teska report. She advised that she “substantially concurred” with the Teska report, which predicted net positives for the Village stemming from the project. Ms. Tammen even indicated that some of the developers’ assumptions were understated. In terms of property taxes alone, Ms. Tammen anticipates a net increase of \$581,000 (which applies to all of the Village’s taxing bodies). Ms. Tammen noted that estimates of fees related to ambulance transportation represented the biggest difference between the two respective reports. Ms. Tammen advised that River Forest is particularly well-equipped to accommodate the project as proposed, and feels that the project will fill a need for age-in-place living.

Trustee Vazquez asked about the Village expenses associated with the project. Ms. Tammen replied

that Teska's method in analyzing the expenses was appropriate, though she noted that she felt the Teska report overstated them by approximately \$30,000. Ms. Tammen noted several expenses that she feels would not be as impactful as the developers suggest, including expenses related to government staffing, public safety, and sanitation.

Trustee Vazquez asked about Teska's suggested \$400,000 tax boon for the local schools; Ms. Tammen replied that she substantially concurs with Teska's assessment.

Trustee Corsini asked about underground parking. Mr. Gawronski replied that it is financially infeasible. Trustee Corsini asked about the general use of the building; she wants to know what portions will be furnished. Mr. Gawronski discussed what will and won't be furnished. Trustee Corsini asked how residents would get their furnishings in; Mr. Gawronski advised that residents could use the loading dock and schedule move-ins during certain times. Mr. Gawronski noted that delivery hours are restricted by conditions. Mr. Gawronski stated that they don't want to move more than two residents in each day (one in the morning, one in the afternoon), even during the initial lease-up. Mr. Gawronski advised that they have a 24 month leasing schedule.

Trustee Corsini confirmed that the apartments are not equipped with kitchens; Mr. Gawronski agreed, stating that they are outfitted with kitchenettes.

Trustee Corsini asked for the average length of residency of a particular person; Mr. Gawronski advised that the historical average is approximately 2.5 to 3 years. It varies widely and can be anywhere from a half a year to up to 10 years. Mr. Gawronski advised that turnover is less than in multi-family apartments, but more than independent living.

Trustee Cargie asked whether leases start on the first of the month; Mr. Gawronski advised that they will follow the industry-wide standard of setting initial leases to expire at the end of the calendar year, facilitating January 1 renewal dates for all units.

Trustee Corsini expressed that she is trying to get a feel for traffic patterns around the development. Mr. Gawronski advised that all of these conditions were accounted for in the KLOA parking study.

Trustee Corsini asked whether any of the homes implicated by the proposal are historically significant homes; President Adduci clarified that there are no historic homes as part of the proposed development site.

Trustee Corsini asked about resident transportation accommodations; Mr. Gawronski advised that the facility will have a 14-passenger vehicle, as well as a luxury sedan, for moving residents to planned activities. Mr. Gawronski reiterated that it is the team's goal to encourage residents to be active members of the community; he does not want the facility to feel isolated. Promoting an active and engaging lifestyle is a significant priority. Mr. Gawronski also noted the team's commitment to inter-generational engagement. Trustee Corsini expressed her hope that the developers would be able to work with the Board moving forward regarding any concerns or issues that arise from the project.

Trustee Henek asked whether about the difference in overhead costs for the developers between a

96 and 125-unit project. Mr. Gawronski clarified that a 96-unit plan would not support the cost of development. Mr. Gawronski assured the Board that they considered all possible alternatives for reducing the size, while maintaining economic viability of the project.

Trustee Conti discussed her frustration with the inability to reduce the number of units. She asked how the developers come up with the unit mix (memory support vs. non-memory support). Mr. Gawronski replied that the decision was driven by several variables, including staffing ratios, market needs, and costs. Trustee Conti asked if they use the same formula for all of their projects; Mr. Gawronski replied that they do not. Mr. Gawronski noted the importance of tailoring each project to its respective community.

In response to a question from Trustee Conti, Jay Patel of Kaufman Jacobs, replied that the Park Ridge community consists of 100 units. Mr. Gawronski stated that the team's Northbrook project consists of 196 units, after growing from its initial design of 156 units.

In response to a question from President Adduci regarding the independent living concept, Mr. Gawronski indicated that those who live in the team's independent living units are typically close to requiring assisted living arrangements. Mr. Gawronski noted the team's development in Green Oaks, which is much larger, and includes many independent living apartments. Mr. Gawronski noted that the independent living apartments are good feeders into assisted living units, as residents' needs change with age.

Trustee Cargie asked about the analysis on surrounding property values. Mr. Gawronski indicated that the team hired an appraiser to examine the project's impact on surrounding property, but that it was not considered by the DRB. Mr. Gawronski stated that it was in the team's best interest to keep property values high in the area. He noted that several neighbors of the team's other developments were willing to share positive feedback about living near the developments. He thinks the project will make a good neighbor.

Trustee Henek noted that this property is located more closely to single family homes than some of their other projects. Mr. Gawronski noted the influx of cash from the project's property taxes into the school district; he suggested this would also help protect property values.

Village Administrator Palm reviewed the conditions that were included in the draft ordinance: 1) so long as the ordinance remains in effect, the conditions are covenants that run with the title to the property, and binding on all future interested parties; 2) the project shall be built in accordance with the most recent plans submitted to the Village; 3) only right turns shall be allowed onto Harlem Avenue; 4) the Village's traffic and safety commission will conduct a study to review the possibility of resident permit-only parking on the 800 block of Bonnie Brae, Iowa (between Bonnie and Harlem) and other nearby streets; 5) the off-street parking plan shall be revised regarding the eight parking spaces (as reflected in the landscape plan); 6) snow shall not be stored in parking spaces on the property or on public rights of way; snow that cannot be stored on the property will be removed by the petitioner; 7) deliveries and trash collection shall be limited to the hours between 6AM and 5PM; 8) petitioners will plant trees on adjacent properties at the request of the homeowners within twelve months; 9) and 10) deal with letters of credit and were omitted from discussion; 11a) states that the property will remain fully taxable; 11b) the petitioner shall not seek

a reduction or otherwise cause the property's assessed valuation for the 2020 tax year or such later to be reduced by an assessed valuation of \$2,313,852 (which represents the base AV); petitioner shall not seek a reduction or otherwise cause the valuation to dip below this number; 11c) the petitioner shall not seek a reduction or otherwise cause the valuation to dip below the base AV through the 2051 tax year; 11d) any appeal regarding these assessments requires all related documents sent to the Village; 11e) deals with the petitioner not appealing the assessed valuation of the property in the interim building period; 11f) in the event of an administrative error, the petitioner can seek any necessary changes from the Village; 12) the project shall be operated under an assisted and shared housing act license issued by the state of Illinois; 13) to insure standards of the zoning ordinances are met, the following additional items are inserted regarding paramedic responses: the petitioner shall utilize reasonable best efforts to insure that private ambulances are used for non-emergency calls; the petitioner shall prohibit the use of sirens from private ambulances when sirens are not needed; if the number of ambulance calls exceeds 130 within a year, any subsequent calls will result in a graduated, fire department impact fee; 14) the petitioner has a contract to purchase the property at 830 Harlem Avenue, in addition to other properties in the area; the petitioner shall maintain the properties in compliance with the Village code, and cause them to be sold for no less than 10% less than fair market value; 15) the petitioner will pay a \$10,000 annual senior services impact fee to the River Forest Township's Senior Services Department.

Trustee Corsini commented on the conditions; she confirmed that 830 Harlem Avenue is to be sold as a house, and not demolished. She thinks the additional conditions were thoughtfully assembled pursuant to the residents' concerns.

Trustee Gibbs thanked all of the meeting attendees and community members who engaged with the Board throughout the process. Trustee Gibbs discussed the various citizen comments regarding Frank Lloyd Wright; he wonders what Mr. Wright would think about some of the buildings in the community that are much larger than the proposed development. Trustee Gibbs noted that the parking issue was raised earlier and addressed to his satisfaction. He is disappointed with comments calling the Board a "rubber stamp;" the Board simply hopes to serve the Village to the best of its ability. Trustee Gibbs noted the difficult nature of the decision before the Board. Trustee Gibbs noted that many of the Board members campaigned on promises to promote development. He feels that the instant development would have the fewest negative impacts on the community.

Trustee Corsini asked about possibly burying some cables.

President Adduci asked the Trustees say why they are voting yay or nay.

Trustee Gibbs voted "yay," for the above-mentioned reasons.

Trustee Corsini voted "yay;" she noted that she weighed the decision very carefully, trying to take into consideration all possible factors. She feels that the development will serve a clear need of the community, and be a valuable member of the community. She noted that it will be a low-impact development.

Trustee Cargie voted "yay." He noted that he struggled with the decision, and lauded the efforts of

the community members who voiced their concerns and opposition. Trustee Cargie noted that he campaigned on bringing a senior-living facility to River Forest, as well as reducing the tax burden on the residents; he feels this development serves both goals. Trustee Cargie also fears what the alternative might be if the developers walk away.

Trustee Vazquez voted “yay.” He thanked all the residents who contributed to the process. He noted that the development was a good opportunity to raise tax revenue, and provided necessary accommodations for the community’s seniors. He noted that he represents the entire Village, and not just a subset of concerned citizens.

Trustee Conti voted “yay.” She thanked the community for being respectful in its opposition to the development. She noted her commitment to helping seniors in the community. She feels that this development is sensitive to the community. She feels that the benefits to the community outweigh the negatives.

Trustee Henek voted “yay.” She noted her struggles in deliberation. She noted some of the additional benefits that will accompany the influx of new residents and families into the community. She looks forward to community partnerships with the development. She echoed the positives highlighted by the other trustees. She noted her disappointment with the height.

Roll call:

Ayes: Trustees Gibbs, Corsini, Cargie, Vazquez, Conti, and Henek

Absent: None

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

President Adduci thanked the community members, other Boards, and the trustees for their thoughtful input.

The Village Board took a brief recess.

b. Finance and Administration Committee – Acceptance of the FY2018 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report

Trustee Corsini made a motion, seconded by Trustee Conti to accept the Village's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended April 30, 2018.

Trustee Corsini stated that the Finance Committee voted unanimously to accept this report.

Kim Marshall, BKD, discussed the Village’s CAFR for 2018. She described the documents before the Board, including the government-wide financial statements for the Village. Ms. Marshall also discussed and described the post-audit communication letter before the Board.

Trustee Corsini touted the quality of the report, and thanked Joan and her staff for doing a great job for the Village.

Roll call:

Ayes: Trustees Cargie, Conti, Corsini, Henek, Gibbs and Vazquez

Absent: None

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

- c. Finance and Administration Committee – Acceptance of the Estimate of the 2018 Corporate (Aggregate) Property Tax Levy - \$7,955,642

Trustee Corsini made a motion, seconded by Trustee Conti to accept the estimate for the 2018 corporate (aggregate) Property Tax Levy in the amount of \$7,955,642.

Finance Director Rock explained that the Village is required to determine the estimate of the levy at least 20 days prior to the approval of the levy, because if the estimate of the levy is over 105% of the 2017 extension, the Village is required to publish a black border notice and hold a public hearing. The requested increase in the 2018 levy is 2.6%; 2.1% attributable to the increase in CPI, and an additional increase included for new property. The average resident should see about a 2.1% increase in the Village portion of their property tax bill. The levy includes the police and fire fighter pension fund levies, which are based on annual actuarial reports; both funds now use the same actuarial assumptions. The required contributions exceed the amounts budgeted for both funds. The 2018 levies for public safety pension contributions are \$333,000 higher than the 2017 extended levy, and \$130,000 higher than the budgeted amounts. Ms. Rock anticipates that a budget amendment will be necessary. The debt service and library levies are also included. The approval of the levy will be on the agenda for the next Village Board meeting of November 26, 2018.

In response to a question from President Adduci regarding the shortfall on pension funding in the budget, Finance Director Rock stated that she based the budget amount on figures provided during their study; when the actual report came in, the numbers were a little bit higher.

Roll call:

Ayes: Trustees Cargie, Conti, Corsini, Henek, Gibbs and Vazquez

Absent: None

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

- d. Traffic and Safety Commission – Amend Title 9 of the Village Regarding a Two-Way Stop Intersection on William Street at its intersection with Iowa Street – Ordinance

Trustee Gibbs made a motion, seconded by Trustee Conti to accept the recommendation from the Traffic and Safety Commission and install a 2-way stop intersection on William Street at its intersection with Iowa Street.

Trustee Gibbs asked whether the proposed stop was 2-way or 4-way; it is a 2-way stop.

Roll call:

Ayes: Trustees Cargie, Conti, Corsini, Henek, Gibbs and Vazquez

Absent: None  
Nays: None  
Motion Passed.

- e. Traffic and Safety Commission – Amend Title 9 of the Village Code Regarding a “No Parking Zone” on the east side of the 1500 block of Ashland Avenue – Ordinance

Trustee Gibbs made a motion, seconded by Trustee Vazquez, to accept the recommendation from the Traffic and Safety Commission and install a No Parking zone on the east side of the 1500-block of Ashland Avenue, from North Avenue to the south end of the Loyola Urgent Care Facility property.

In response to a question from Trustee Henek, Mr. Palm advised that parking on Ashland had previously come up as a concern for residents. There was a brief discussion about parking concerns in the area.

Public Works Director Anderson said this will be addressed at an upcoming Traffic and Safety Commission meeting.

Roll call:

Ayes: Trustees Cargie, Conti, Corsini, Henek, Gibbs and Vazquez  
Absent: None  
Nays: None  
Motion Passed.

- f. Economic Development Commission – TIF Incentive Policy

Trustee Gibbs made a motion, seconded by Trustee Corsini to accept the Economic Development Commission's recommendation to adopt the proposed TIF Incentive Policy.

Trustee Vazquez stated that he will not be participating in the vote on this matter due to the reasons he stated previously and asked that the Clerk not call him for the vote.

Village Administrator Palm discussed the recommended addition from the Economic Development Commission.

Roll call:

Ayes: Trustees Cargie, Conti, Corsini, Henek, and Gibbs  
Absent: None  
Nays: None  
Abstain: Trustee Vazquez  
Motion Passed.

- g. Zoning Board of Appeals – 346 Park Variation – Garage height
- h. Zoning Board of Appeals – 346 Park Variation – Side Yard Setback

Trustee Cargie made a motion, seconded by Trustee Vazquez to continue these matters to the



November 26, 2018 meeting of the Village Board of Trustees.

Roll call:

Ayes: Trustees Cargie, Conti, Corsini, Henek, Gibbs and Vazquez

Absent: None

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

## **8. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- a. Review of Proposed Ordinance Amending Section 4-1-9 of the Village Code with Regard to Single-Family Fire Sprinklers and Alarm Monitoring

President Adduci stated that there is no action needed, but the Board agreed to discuss the issue.

Trustee Gibbs thought that, during the September meeting, the Board instructed Village staff to eliminate sprinkler requirements completely from existing homes, and continue the requirements for new homes. Trustee Gibbs noted that some requirements for existing homes still appear to be in place.

Management Analyst Pape advised that the proposed new ordinance was tailored after that of Oak Park—it is almost verbatim. President Adduci noted that, while the Board likes to review neighbors' ordinances, River Forest is unique.

Village Administrator Palm read the reference: R313.3 (New "Number 1" – "Where required").

President Adduci suggested drafting the ordinance to state the Board's intent that new builders are not to try to circumvent the requirements.

Management Analyst Pape clarified that the Board was discussing the floor area above the foundation level. There was extended discussion about the effects and application of the proposed ordinance. The Board agreed that it was a very confusing topic.

The consensus was 90%; the Fire Chief expressed his desire for 50%.

## **9. NEW BUSINESS**

None.

## **10. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

None.

## **11. ADJOURNMENT**

Trustee Cargie made a motion, seconded by Trustee Gibbs, that the Special Meeting of October 15,

2018 be adjourned at 11:22 p.m.

Roll call:

Ayes: Trustees Cargie, Conti, Corsini, Gibbs, Henek and Vazquez

Absent: None

Nays: None

Motion Passed.

---

Kathleen Brand-White, Village Clerk