

PLAN COMMISSION
VILLAGE OF DEERFIELD

The Plan Commission of the Village of Deerfield held a Workshop Meeting at 7:30 P.M. on January 26, 2017 at the Village Hall, 850 Waukegan Road, Deerfield, Illinois.

Present were: Mary Oppenheim, Chairperson
Larry Berg
Al Bromberg
Elaine Jacoby
Stuart Shayman

Absent were: Bob Benton
Jim Moyer

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

- (1) Substantial Conformance: Request for Finding of Substantial Conformance to Amend the Final Development Plan for the AMLI West Access Drive at 1525 Lake Cook Road – AMLI Company / JFMC Facilities Corporation

Ivan Kane, attorney, Mayer Brown, LLP, explained that the petitioners are requesting an amendment to the AMLI west access drive. The main intersection that accesses the property is Lake Cook Road and Wilmot Road. He noted the many ways to access the AMLI apartment complex, but residents primarily access the building from the garage entrance on the west side. Mr. Kane presented the approved site plan in which the vehicles exiting from the parking garage travel through the adjoining parcel to the existing drive then exit out onto the Lake Cook Road and Wilmot Road intersection. JFMC Facilities Corporation owns the vacant office building to the west of the AMLI property. The potential redevelopment of that property is the driving force behind the petitioners request to relocate the AMLI west access drive.

Mr. Kane explained that the approved route was designed to take advantage of the existing paving that lead from the parking garage to the intersection. However, the approved route travels through the JFMC site. JFMC is considering potential redevelopment and moving this access drive would open up the site and they would have more flexibility in the center and north side and therefore have approached AMLI about relocating their access drive. AMLI and JFMC have arrived at an agreement to relocate the access route traffic to go around to the north of the JFMC property, rather than having traffic travel directly through their property. Mr. Kane commented that during the construction of the existing access drive, the Village permitted AMLI to temporarily bend the road to the north to maximize the site and create a future staging area for development activity. All of this was done under the condition that AMLI return

to the Plan Commission with a final plan for the access drive. Mr. Kane explained that AMLI and JFMC agree that the proposed route is optimal for both properties. The petitioners are confident that the proposed change to the access drive is a minor amendment to the PUD and the principle remains the same with the access from the AMLI site at the same curb cut to the garage and the entrance to the existing roadway network in the same location, with the route being slightly altered.

Chairperson Oppenheim asked if it would be reasonable to widen the existing curved drive and have vehicles use that road to access the traffic light at Lake Cook Road and Wilmot Road (therefore bypassing the other road to the far west), instead of the route that would have vehicles exiting out of the parking garage and proceeding north and then heading west to access the Lake Cook Road and Wilmot Road intersection. Mr. Kane explained that the curved road, which AMLI refers to as the "eyebrow", functions differently at different times of the day. AMLI residents primarily exit out onto the "eyebrow" road in the morning, since it is a quick way to exit the property. However, the road can become congested in the evening with a lot of corporate employees leaving the property, causing vehicles to stack and making it difficult for vehicles to access the left turn lane. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that the petitioner's route onto the road further to the west makes sense as it allows for stacking. Commissioner Berg asked if the petitioners could justify two paths that end at the same place. Mr. Kane responded that it is their expectation to keep both paths and although both paths end up at the same intersection. The proposed access route allows for more stacking and maneuvering for vehicles turning left onto Lake Cook Road, while vehicles that are going to turn right onto Lake Cook Road would most likely use the "eyebrow". Commissioner Berg asked if there would be any additional signage posted. Mr. Kane commented that the only signage would be the existing signage that prohibits vehicles from turning right from the frontage road.

Mr. Kane explained that there are many different ways to access the property with three ways off of Lake Cook Road (Wilmot Road, Embassy Way, and Pine Street). Commissioner Berg asked if the concrete barriers going east/west along the south side of the access road were temporary. Mr. Kane explained that the barriers are temporary, and are there for construction staging. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that essentially the petitioners are asking permission to move the road about 100 feet to the north in an area, which was originally approved to be a grassy area. She commented that the final route would still have a small area in between the two roads on the property, and asked if that section of the property would be a turfed area. Mr. Kane commented that it is part of the JFMC property and they may use that area for future parking. The plans for the JFMC property are not certain at this time; however, it is likely that the existing building will be demolished and the property will be redeveloped. Chairperson Oppenheim explained that the reason she asked if any of the initially approved grass area would be retained was because it was the Plan Commission's responsibility to determine if their proposed amendment to the plan was truly a minor change. Mr. Kane explained that during the initial process for the redevelopment of the AMLI property, the petitioners kept that area as a grass area, and used the existing

paving as the access route. He commented that because it was an existing condition and there was not a need to change at that time. He noted that the area being considered is a redevelopment parcel and moving the road will provide flexibility. Commissioner Bromberg asked who is responsible for plowing that area during heavy snowfalls. Mr. Kane explained that it is a private road, and since AMLI is currently the only property using the drive, it is AMLI's responsibility to provide snowplow service. He commented that if the drive isle eventually becomes a part of the active development for the JFMC property, there is an easement agreement that requires that owner to plow the property. This is a private easement between two private properties (AMLI and JFMC). Commissioner Bromberg asked if any of the curbs create an issue for snow plows maneuvering through the area. Mr. Kane assured the commissioners that the original plans as well as the revision were reviewed and no issues were found with the curb cuts.

Chairperson Oppenheim commented that there is an existing easement for the current access route, and asked if both property owners are in agreement for the proposed changes. Mr. Kane confirmed, and commented that the easement was there so that AMLI residents would be able to travel through private property to get from their parking garage to the intersection of Lake Cook Road and Wilmot Road. Commissioner Shayman asked how traffic would be routed during the temporary closure of the access road for reconstruction. Mr. Kane indicated there are many routes in and out of the property, and their easement agreement does allow temporary road closure during construction. He commented that their plan is to have the construction of the final access route done prior to the reconstruction of the JFMC property to ensure minimal road closure during construction and optimal room for construction staging. The commissioners agreed the petitioner's request and agreed that it was a minor change to their original approved plans for the access drive.

Commissioner Berg motioned to approve the request for finding of Substantial Conformance to amend the Final Development Plan for the AMLI west access drive at 1525 Lake Cook Road. Commissioner Bromberg seconded the motion. The vote was as follows:

Ayes: (5) Berg, Bromberg, Jacoby, Shayman, Oppenheim
Nays: (0) None

The motions passed and will be on the February 21st Village Board of Trustees Meeting agenda.

(2) Prefiling Conference: Request for a Special Use for a Autism Therapy Center at 1161 Lake Cook Road and an Amendment to the Sign Plan for the Deerfield Business Center

Kim Garvey Hoehne, Founder/CEO, KGH Consultation and Treatment, Inc, commented that during her sophomore year at Lake Forest College she started working with a little boy with autism for two and a half hours a day, six days a week and continued working with him for about three and a half years. She fell in love with the challenge, and truly enjoyed working with this little boy. After she graduated from Lake Forest College with her undergrad in Psychology, she took a year off to work with other children with autism, before starting her master's program in Communication Sciences and Disorders at Northwestern University. After she earned her Master's degree from Northwestern, she started consulting, and traveled from one client's home to the next, offering in home consultations for her clients. After a year of providing her clients with in home consultations, She decided to open her own clinic in Libertyville. In January 2001, she officially opened and branded her own autism center, KGH. Today KGH has seventy employees, with twenty employees at her Madison, Wisconsin location, and fifty employees at her current Northbrook location.

KGH is a multi-disciplinary organization that provides speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, behavioral services and mental health support. Ms. Garvey Hoehne explained that her mission and goal is to provide wraparound services. She has seen firsthand how autism not only affects the child that has the disorder, but his/her family as well. In addition, her goal was to provide a center and an organization where a family with a child with autism can come and receive free screening and specialized recommendations. KGH not only represents and supports their clients, but their clients' families as well. Their current location in Northbrook has their pediatric center and teen and young adult center. Her goal is to motivate her clients to learn and support their needs, as well as their families' needs. KGH has an A+ rating from the Better Business Bureau (BBB) A+ and as of December 2016 KGH is recognized as a Behavioral Health Center of Excellence.

Ms. Garvey Hoehne commented that autism is not a disorder that children grow out of; KGH offers services for children from toddlers to young adults. They provide a wide range of services including an assessment diagnostic for autism disorder, early intervention program, young adult socialization skills, and a STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) as well as one-on-one intensive therapy. KGH offers services to clients ranging from nine months old to twenty-nine years old. KGH offers their clients consultation services where clinicians go to their homes, school, work, etc. to assist them with learning socialization skills and adapting to mainstream society. KGH also offers family support services such as free monthly parent support groups. Ms. Garvey Hoehne takes pride in the services that KGH offers their clients' families and finds great importance in providing services that help the family learn and grow together as a whole.

KGH is an evidence-based facility that takes data and has measurable goals for each client and his/her family; providing progress updates every three to six months for each family. The new center is going to have a training center to support and educate families and professionals in the field. Ms. Garvey Hoehne would like to provide free first responder training to help support the community by offering these services. She commented that she is looking for her forever home, and 1161 Lake Cook Road is able to provide her with the space and location that she needs to offer all of the services that she wants to afford her clients, their families and the community.

Chairperson Oppenheim commented that the petitioner is seeking approval for a Special Use to allow a medical facility at the proposed location (1161 Lake Cook Road). She advised the petitioner that the Plan Commission would be reviewing how the building would be used, especially in terms of how their business is going to fit into the office park with traffic, parking and access to ensure that their use is compatible, safe and workable with the other uses that are already in there. Chairperson Oppenheim asked the petitioner to explain how their use would function in the office park and the types of signage needed for their business, as well as their rationale and need for any variations. Chairperson Oppenheim asked the petitioner to explain the access to the property, and the traffic pattern of clinicians and clients coming to and from the property throughout the day. She commented that office parks work well when there are different peak times for the various office uses on the property and advised the petitioner to be particularly sensitive as to not host one of their group events at the same time that the high school or temple is having an event. Ms. Garvey Hoehne explained that she wants to respect the neighbors, and assured the Commissioners that she is willing to adjust her schedule to ensure that the entire office park is able to operate efficiently. Chairperson Oppenheim advised the petitioner that the traffic study would provide information on their neighbors' peak times and the existing traffic flow in the office park, as well as analyze the parking availability and the traffic activity coming in and out of the property from the shared access to Lake Cook Road.

Gary Wool, resident, managing member, Deerfield Business Center, commented that KGH would be a great addition to the community. Mr. Wool informed the Commissioners that the second phase of their traffic study started this week, and traffic counts are currently being conducted. He commented that Deerfield Business Center ownership views KGH as very complementary to the Deerfield Business Park. He commented that originally Deerfield Business Park was comprised of 6 office buildings and 285 parking spots with tenants coming and going throughout the day. Seven years ago, Mr. Wool and Deerfield Business Center supported BJB and were confident that the congregation would fit into the business center, and co-function with the other uses in regards to traffic flow and parking demand; and it has been very synergistic and worked very well over the years.

Mr. Wool explained that ownership is aware that the office center may be short of the parking requirement for a medical use, but after spending time with Kim and talking about her needs and the operation of her business, they came to the realization that

KGH would be very complementary to the business park. KGH's time schedules would differ from BJBE's peak times (which are late afternoon/evening programs and weekend activities). Mr. Wool feels confident that the results of the traffic study should be able to prove that KGH is a complementary use for the center. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that the Plan Commission is looking for that type of fact-based evidence to support the petitioner's use in the business center.

Mr. Wool pointed out that in terms of ingress and egress traffic, according to their PUD's declaration of covenants and easements with BJBE, traffic for the congregation enters the property on the east through a shared road, circles the property and exits from the west drive isle. KGH traffic will enter through the west drive isle, loop around to the drop off in front of the 1161 building and then exit the same way they entered. Mr. Wool assured the Commissioners that ownership does not anticipate any of KGH's clients entering through the east side of the property. He stressed that signage is going to be important to direct visitors through the center and their desired destination. Chairperson Oppenheim advised the petitioners that including that information and explanation in their materials for their Public Hearing would be beneficial to their request. She also noted that clarifying how the site is currently used by the other uses and how KGH will use and affect the site would help answer many questions. Chairperson Oppenheim also advised the petitioners to identify the pick-up and drop-off procedure for their clients, emphasizing the fact that their clients will enter the property from the west access drive and park in the lot in front of their building, which affords their clients maximum safety.

Chairperson Oppenheim asked the petitioners to discuss their signage plans. Ms. Garvey Hoehne explained that the biggest complaint that she receives from her families right now is that they cannot find their current location due to the lack of signage. Ms. Garvey Hoehne commented that she is requesting directional signage to help her clients easily find their building by directing visitors to turn right (from Pine Street) onto the frontage road, follow the drive aisle to the second entrance (past the directory) and enter the parking lot. Clients would then follow the drive aisle to the end of their parking lot in front of their building. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that the existing directory for the Deerfield Business Center is not very clear, and that it is difficult to navigate. Ms. Garvey Hoehne commented that she is open to signage suggestions and is willing to comply with any code requirements and adjust her signage accordingly. She commented that her main goal is to be considerate of her clients and provide them with clear directional signage so that they can find the KGH location. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that the Village has sign codes to ensure that the Village is not littered up with so many signs that it is confusing and unsafe. Chairperson Oppenheim acknowledged that the petitioner has an unusual situation in the layout of their site, since their building is tucked behind the other buildings and in the back of the property. She noted that there are compelling reasons for KGH to have additional signage to guide their visitors towards their building. Ms. Garvey Hoehne explained that she is worried that if their signage is only on the existing directory sign then clients are going to

see her signage (KGH) on the directory sign and make the first turn into the parking lot rather than proceeding to the second turn.

Mr. Nakahara informed that Commissioners that he spoke with the traffic consultant and the study would address access, parking, drop-off and overall circulation throughout the campus. The traffic engineer will provide recommendations on the location of the directional signage on the site. Commissioner Shayman suggested a parking count for the entire campus. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that the petitioners provide the total number of parking spaces for the entire site and provide the number of parking spaces in each area of the center.

Mr. Ryckaert commented that the traffic consultant can give a recommendation for the placement of the directional signage; explaining that the signage fits into the code as either directional signage or occupant signage. Directional signs have a maximum sign face area of two square feet, and occupant signs have a maximum of three square feet. An occupant sign is used to identify an occupant and specific to an I-1 Planned Unit Development (PUD). No more than two signs per street frontage are allowed. Mr. Ryckaert asked the Commissioners for feedback on the proposed signage. Commissioner Berg asked if any other occupants in the center have directional signage. Mr. Ryckaert responded that other office uses in the center do not have free standing signs and explained that BJB received a Text Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, which allowed organizations such as a school or a religious organization to have additional signage in the I-1 zoning district. He added that the Village has not typically granted an additional ground sign for a business use in the I-1 Zoning District, but in the past several years the Village has allowed tenants to be listed on the PUD's main ID signs with a variation (eg. Parkway North Center and Corporate 500 Center each now have tenants on their main ID signs at the entrance to the property).

Chairperson Oppenheim asked for clarification on where the signage will be placed, and how it relates to the existing business park sign and existing directional sign. Mr. Ryckaert explained that the petitioners are requesting two additional directional signs and one additional stand alone sign to identify their business; all three proposed signs are twenty-eight square feet. Commissioner Bromberg commented that the proposed signage is too large. He agreed that it is important to direct people on where to go, but suggested signage with less verbiage that simply reads "KGH" with arrow-pointing visitors in their direction, rather than the proposed signage that reads "KGH Consultation Treatment Premier Autism Spectrum Center". Ms. Hoehne commented that she is open to suggestions and willing to change the proposed signage to better fit in with the center.

Chairperson Oppenheim commented that directional signage typically has the name of a business and a directional arrow. Commissioner Berg asked what size directional signage has been approved in the past. Mr. Ryckaert commented that directional signage is typically small (two to three square feet), since it is primarily used to identify

exits and entrances to a property. Ms. Hoehne commented that she would go back to the sign company and have them create a signage that reads "KGH" with a directional sign, scaled to three square feet. Chairperson Oppenheim commented that her business name would also be added to the bottom right of the directory for the center. Ms. Hoehne commented that she is also going to have an arrow pointing towards her building on her directory signage, so that it is clear to her visitors on where to go.

Mr. Wool informed the Commissioners that the property owners are researching a sign expert that can provide suggestions to improve their directory signage. He added that their goal is to update the signage to possibly include maps of buildings and directional arrows to be more user-friendly. Commissioner Shayman asked if each building has the address displayed on the building. Mr. Wool responded that each building has the address numbers displayed up above on the façade, and tenants have signage on the glass to identify their tenant space. Ms. Garvey Hoehne commented that she is requesting that signage be displayed in front of their building so that visitors know to enter through the front door. Mr. Ryckaert commented that the petitioner would be allowed to have one building identification ground sign in front of their building and that is what is proposed. Commissioner Shayman commented that he thinks it would be beneficial to upgrade the directory signage for the entire center. Commissioner Bromberg commented that there are only six buildings in the center, three of which are occupied by BJBE and one of which would be occupied by KGH, so only two of the buildings are multi-tenant; and asked if ownership currently receives complaints that visitors have a hard time navigating the property. Mr. Wool commented that visitors are able to locate offices on the directory, and there is very little confusion. Chairperson Oppenheim commended KGH for wanting to make the signage clear and easy to follow for her clients.

Commissioner Jacoby asked if the families were required to park and come into the building for drop-off and pick-up. Ms. Garvey Hoehne responded that in addition to the accessible parking spaces in front of their building, she is also going to propose reserving five to ten parking spaces in front of the building for "five-minute pick-up/drop-off parking". Employees and staff will park in the back of the parking lot, so that clients have access to priority spaces. Staff members escort their clients and families to their vehicles to make sure that everyone gets safely to their car; holding their clients hands through the parking lot. She added that there are situations where the staff member waits inside with the client while their family pulls the car up to the front of the building, and then they walk the child out to the car and help buckle them into the seat.

Commissioner Jacoby inquired as to why there is a bedroom next to the teen living room. Ms. Garvey Hoehne explained that many of their middle school, high school and young adult clients live with their parents and do not have independent skills such as sorting laundry, making the bed, changing sheets, etc., so clients learn and practice those skills with staff. The more independent an individual is, if he or she has to go into a group home, the less likely they are to be abused.

Chairperson Oppenheim brought up the issue of the sidewalk along the frontage road that was mentioned in the staff memo. Mr. Ryckaert commented that in the past, Textura agreed to a sidewalk to be installed on the south side of the frontage road if the sidewalk was requested by the Village. The condition was part of the 2007 Textura ordinance approving an amendment to the property. AMLI also put in a sidewalk on the north side of the frontage road leading up to the intersection of Embassy Way and Lake Cook Road. He also noted that the Rochelle Zell Jewish High School and the former Hellenic American Academy area had a sidewalk put in to benefit pedestrians. Chairperson Oppenheim asked how it would impact this particular project. Mr. Ryckaert explained there could be a requirement for a sidewalk to be installed on the property as was done with Textura. Mr. Wool commented that as a business owner that would be a significant economic hardship, and at this point we are not adding any more employees or increasing traffic to the overall development. Ownership would be open to discussing the sidewalk if there is a need for one, but at this time does not think it should be made a condition. Mr. Ryckaert asked if any of Mr. Wool's employees have to walk down the frontage road coming from the train station. Mr. Wool responded that his employees do not come from the train, but he does believe Textura and Walgreens would benefit from adding a sidewalk in front of their properties.

Chairperson Oppenheim commented that it made sense to have a sidewalk for AMLI since it is a residential building. The Commissioners agreed that a sidewalk should not be a condition as there is not a need for the sidewalk in the office park as there is with residential or schools. Mr. Wool reiterated that he would be open to considering it with assistance from the Village; however, he looks at it as a large economic cost that they had not bargained for, and the tenant does not have a need for it. Ms. Garvey Hoehne assured the Commissioners that her staff gets plenty of exercise moving around the facility with their clients all day.

Chairperson Oppenheim commented that there could be an argument made that there should be pedestrian access along Lake Cook Road since pedestrians may want to access the Chicagoland Jewish High School or BJB by sidewalk. She believes that a sidewalk would benefit the other business in the area more so than KGH or the other businesses in the Deerfield Business Center. Mr. Wool reminded that Commissioners that the frontage road is a private road and each property owner is responsible for the paving in front of their respective properties. Commissioner Jacoby commented that students do not walk from the train station to the Chicagoland Jewish High School, but instead take the bus from the train station to the school.

Chairperson Oppenheim explained that pedestrian connectivity is a goal that the Village has in terms of planning; however, if the people in the area do not have a reason to connect with one another then it may not be worth the cost to put the means in to give them what may not get used. Mr. Wool commented that he has seen parents drop their children off at Pine Street, and then have their children cross Lake Cook Road at the stop light to get to school in the morning and the reverse process in the evening. Mr. Wool commented that there is an association for the property, and they have witnessed

the traffic at that intersection at peak times and they are sensitive to what happens at that intersection. They are looking forward to gaining more information from the traffic study. Mr. Wool asked why Textura has not installed their sidewalk. Mr. Ryckaert commented that the Village has not acted on having Textura add a sidewalk to their property because there would be no existing sidewalks along the frontage road for a new side walk to connect to. Mr. Wool told the Commissioners that he would look into the cost, so that he knows what the economic hardship would be if the Village made it a condition; adding that if it is a benefit to the community and to the office park the ownership would be open to it.

Chairperson Oppenheim advised the petitioners that the Village's main concern was that their clients are able to get in and out of the building safely, traffic issues, and sufficient parking. Ms. Garvey Hoehne asked if she would need a parking variance. Mr. Ryckaert commented that they would need a parking variation, but there was a difference between the zoning requirement and the actual demand for the proposed use, and the traffic consultant is going to provide information on what the parking demand will be for KGH. Mr. Nakahara commented that the traffic consultant thought the parking demand would be about fifty to sixty parking spaces during peak times, and not anticipating business growth for KGH. Ms. Hoehne commented that she is planning on growing her business and hiring ten more clinicians.

Mr. Ryckaert commented that about ten spaces would be used for drop-off and pick-up close to the building entrance and these spaces would not be open for long term parking, since these spots would be designated for only short-term parking. Mr. Wool informed the Commissioners that there are eighty-three spots in the parking field in front of the 1161 office building although there is a reciprocal easement for all of the parking amongst the park; each office building has the required number of spaces. He noted that there is room to add four more parking spaces to the parking if needed.

Mr. Ryckaert asked if KGH would be leasing the building or if it would be a sale of the building. Mr. Wool responded that it is a sale of the 1161 building to KGH, and there are going to be three separate parcels created for each building. Mr. Wool commented that when the Declaration of Covenants and Easements was created seven years ago, the parcel was divided into two at the time. The document was approved so that the property could be further subdivided into three properties. There is currently one pin number for the property, but there will be three pin numbers created for each separate parcel. Mr. Ryckaert asked if the property was going to be subdivided. Mr. Wool commented that it is not going to be a formal subdivision, but KGH will have an area described by the by metes and bounds description. Mr. Ryckaert commented that there is not a requirement that a resubdivision would have to be done; however, many developers chose to resubdivide into lots as has been done in the Parkway North Center and other PUDs.

The petitioners are scheduled for a Plan Commission public hearing on Thursday, February 23, 2017.

Workshop Meeting
January 26, 2017
Page 11

There being no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,
Mary Glowacz