

**PLAN COMMISSION
VILLAGE OF DEERFIELD
Minutes**

The Plan Commission of the Village of Deerfield called to order a Public Hearing at 7:30 P.M. on March 22, 2018 at the Village Hall, 850 Waukegan Road, Deerfield, Illinois.

Present were: Larry Berg, Chairman
 Al Bromberg
 Jennifer Goldstone
 Elaine Jacoby
 Stuart Shayman

Absent were: Sean Forrest
 Justin Silva

Also present: Jeff Ryckaert, Principal Planner
 Daniel Nakahara, Planner

Chairman Berg swore in all who plan to testify before the Commission.

Public Comment on a Non-Agenda Item

There were no comments from the public on a non-agenda item.

PUBLIC HEARING

(1) Continued Public Hearing: Request for an Amendment to a Special Use to Allow Renovations to Tennaqua Swim and Racquet Club (Tennaqua Inc.)

Nick Alex, President of Tennaqua Swim and Racquet Club, reported that the club was founded at this location 60 years ago. He stated that as his third time before the Commission on this matter and he will focus on answering questions at the heart of the proposal as well as changes made to the plans since the February 22 Plan Commission meeting.

Mr. Alex first addressed what they can do about reducing noise and lights related to their requests to expand paddle facilities. He stated that it is a priority to be a good neighbor and as such they have included a new landscaping plan with 18 new spruce trees along the eastern and southern boundaries to block lights for the neighbors and also be a partial sound barrier. They have also updated the proposed light fixtures to be direct lighting and have minimal light outside of the courts. They also meet the zero light exposure at the property line. They will also retrofit the existing court lights to these new lights standards. Mr. Alex reported that they also changed the proposed location of the new paddle courts so that they will be 130 feet from the eastern boundary and 177 feet from the southern boundary. Mr. Alex stated that this new location is not ideal for the Club as it adds cost to the project related to removing the berm located there and also causes issues with the Village's tree ordinance as the berm has several trees. He added that Tennaqua membership prefers the original placement of the paddle courts and that this alternate plan is to address neighbor concerns.

Mr. Alex stated that there was also concern over the hours of paddle play, however up until the February 22 Plan Commission meeting, Tennaqua was unaware of the noise impact from

paddle on the neighbors. After understanding this concern, Tennaqua issued a mandatory 11 P.M. end of play and lights out policy to their members. They also reminded members that they are part of a residential neighborhood and to mind their noise level and language. These new rules have been communicated to membership.

Mr. Alex reported that he would also like to address the Briarwood Club Special Use requirement that paddle play must end at 10 P.M. He commented that Briarwood is a golf club compared to Tennaqua which is a tennis and swim club and at Tennaqua paddle is the lifeblood of the club and the most popular program by far. He stated that with the teams that play at the highest level of competition, a single match can last two hours and a 10 P.M. shut down time is not feasible and cannot be managed without significant impact on the paddle program and on club revenue. Mr. Alex reported that they would like to go by the Village noise ordinance of 11 P.M. to govern play as they have for the past two decades during which time they have had rare noise complaints made from neighbors to the police.

Mr. Alex next addressed the Tennaqua Master Plan timeline. He stated that the Master Plan had been revised from 10 years down to seven years based on Plan Commission recommendations. Cost is the main driver of the timeline due to the four to five million dollars that the small membership group of Tennaqua will have to put forward. Mr. Alex reported that they need the Master Plan as a roadmap and to be a complete vision instead of doing one project at a time. Mr. Alex commented that Tennaqua is a hidden gem in the Village of Deerfield and they would like for it to continue to be for another 60 years and without this Master Plan in place, they cannot continue to exist for more than another two or three years. Mr. Alex stated that it is essential to Tennaqua's survival that Master Plan be approved.

Chairman Berg asked for additional details on the revised lighting plan and how it will improve lighting for the neighbors. Doug Mosser with HKM Architects reported that in the revised lighting plan, the cut off range on the fixtures will not cross the property lines at all. When the lights are on they can be seen but the light will not go past the courts. Chairman Berg confirmed that the lights will only be on when the courts are in use.

Commissioner Shayman asked how the sport court is used and for more information on the sport court proposed lighting. Mr. Mosser replied that it is used as a basketball court and also for volleyball which is sometimes played at night and why they are requesting to add lighting. Mr. Alex reported that the lights are on the east side of the court and will be facing west. They will only project toward the Tollway and not toward the neighbors.

Chairman Berg reported that the Commission will entertain public comment on this item.

Richard Rivkin of 484 Castlewood Lane commented that he and his wife Helen are 45-year residents of Deerfield. He stated that Tennaqua was there when they moved in and their home is directly east of the clubhouse and swimming pool area. He commented that he applauds Tennaqua for reaching out the neighbors, however he questions a written comment that Tennaqua was unaware of noise concerns when he believes there are documented complaints of noise made to the Village. He added that they have not been able to address their noise complaints directly with Tennaqua because they have not been able to reach anyone there. Mr. Rivkin stated that his foremost concern regarding the Master Plan is sound. He commented that although Tennaqua has committed to keeping lights and sound facing away from residents; sound reflects off of large flat surfaces on the clubhouse. Mr. Rivkin stated that they would applaud and support Tennaqua engaging an outside firm to study noise, and that this would be

a sign of being a good neighbor. He commented that the paddle end time at Briarwood sets a clear precedent and it is not the same here. He stated that this precedent should not be ignored when the facts are similar, and their homes are closer to Tennaqua than homes are to Briarwood. Mr. Rivkin stated that his next concern is lighting and that the nighttime illumination of the parking lot shines into their bedrooms. He suggested that Tennaqua look into directional lighting and lower pole structures. Mr. Rivkin stated that his third concern is membership growth and whether Tennaqua's parking can support this. Lastly, Mr. Rivkin stated that he is concerned about the timeframe of the Master Plan and the long-term effect of construction noise and debris on the neighborhood. Mr. Rivkin stated that Tennaqua was there when they bought their home 45 years ago and they have invested in their property to be able to enjoy it and they understand that Tennaqua wants to invest and maintain and beautify their property as well. Mr. Rivkin stated that as a good neighbor, they expect Tennaqua and the Village to respect and address the concerns of the neighbors.

Tanya Paler of 390 Castlewood Lane reported that she is reading a statement from Kevin and Sue Beauseigneur of 370 Castlewood Lane and that she echoes their concerns, as well. They would like to thank the Plan Commission for hearing concerns and were not able to attend the meeting. The focus of many neighbors' concerns centers on the impact of lighting and the increase in noise that is invasive, off-color and profane. They lack confidence that Tennaqua will act in the best interest of the neighbors on their own. Paddle is played later than 11 P.M. at times and the Village ordinance states that intrusive noise is not appropriate at any time. They request to have the same restriction placed on Tennaqua that was placed on Briarwood to end paddle at 10 P.M. seven days a week. Ms. Paler added that she is in favor of moving the two new paddle courts to the west, but questions whether this will add to the timeline given that there will be additional cost, and if so how much longer will it take to complete.

Eric Arroyo of 424 Castlewood Lane stated that his home will be most affected by lighting on the sport court which concerns him. He stated that he designs indoor and outdoor lighting fields and he would like to see the proposal and provide his professional opinion on it. He also commented that regarding additional shrubbery, he just added a new fence to his property and wants to know how close it will be to the property line along his fence. He commented that his family with two small children is also concerned that between the hours of 10 and 11 P.M. they hear the sound from paddle which carries into their bedrooms.

Dori Brownstein of 640 Constance Lane shared that she is concerned about Tennaqua's Master Plan. Her backyard is Tennaqua Lane and right now cars travel very quickly on this road. And late at night, sometimes until 1 A.M. they see the lights. She is concerned about the increase in size and number of members which could result in more cars driving faster, not respecting the speed limit and not watching out for children. She stated that she is concerned about the growth, the speed of traffic, and the lights shining into their homes.

Mr. Alex replied to the question on the location of new landscaping. He stated that the new trees added will not be right on property line and will have to be set back as there are trees currently along the property line and the new trees will supplement these, they will not remove any existing landscaping. Mr. Mosser added that the new spruce trees will be a minimum of 10 feet from the property line and that they can grow to be 40 to 60 feet at maturity which should alleviate lighting concerns.

Commissioner Bromberg asked if the timeline would be extended with the new location of the additional paddle courts. Mr. Alex replied that this will not impact the timeline. He added that

construction will not be year-round and will not occur over the summer. They will plan to start in September or October and finish in spring for each project in the Master Plan. This includes paddle courts, tennis courts and other projects that are six-week long projects. He stated that they do not intend to have a constant state of construction over the length of time of the Master Plan and that they want to be good neighbors and will alert neighbors on all project start and end dates.

Chairman Berg asked the petitioners to address neighbor concerns about membership growth, driving speed and hours, and lighting.

Mr. Alex stated that they will be happy to look into moving any existing lighting in the parking lot as it is ideal to have as much lighting facing west as possible and he believes this can be improved. Mr. Alex stated that regarding the speed of cars, he does not see Tennaqua Lane as being different than any other road in Deerfield. He added that there is often a police car in the office building next door late at night. He stated that he believes the concerns about speed are opinions and he added that Tennaqua Lane is a Village of Deerfield road and concerned neighbors could ask the Safety Commission to add a speed bump.

Mr. Alex reported that Tennaqua has about 200 member families, most of whom are Deerfield residents who invest their money in the Club and want to make sure it can survive and thrive. Tennaqua will continue to have the same membership cap of 270 families that they have had since it began. They have no intention of growing membership above this maximum.

Commissioner Bromberg asked if they plan to replace any existing lighting. Mr. Alex replied that they can replace lights in the parking lot to make them face west to address neighbor concerns and that they are happy to do this.

Commissioner Shayman asked about storm water drainage plans. Mr. Mosser replied that they will work with Village engineering staff on storm water drainage plans during the permitting process.

Mr. Alex concluded his comments stating that it is very important for Tennaqua that they are able to invest in the Club to continue to have it where it is today. They believe Tennaqua has a positive impact to the Village and the neighborhood. He stated that if they cannot complete the Master Plan then they will have to close. Mr. Alex added that the biggest reason new members join is for the paddle program and they are requesting to use the existing Village noise ordinance to govern this.

Chairman Berg asked for a motion to close the Public Hearing. He stated that the Plan Commission will now meet in an open workshop setting to consider their recommendation on this matter. He stated that a written recommendation will be made to the Village Board who will make the final binding decision on this matter. Commissioner Jacoby moved, seconded by Commissioner Shayman to close the Public Hearing. Said motion passed with the following vote:

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

(2) Public Hearing: Request for an Amendment to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) to Permit A New Parking Structure to be Constructed to the South of the 1717 Deerfield Road Office Building (LSREF4 Rebound, LLC)

Chairman Berg asked for proof of publication from the Petitioners. The Petitioners provided the certified mailing receipts to the Commission.

The petitioner Mariah DiGrino, Attorney at DLA Piper stated that she and her colleague Liz Butler represent the property owners LSREF4 Rebound, LLC for 1717 Deerfield Road. She stated that they are joined by Michael O'Malley, Asset Manager, Don Matthews, Civil Engineer at Gewalt Hamilton, Justin Opitz, Traffic Engineer at Gewalt Hamilton, Gary Cook of Walker Consultants, Chris Berenfeld, Architect at Wright Hereema Architects, Jonathan Smith, Landscape Architect at the Lakota Group, and Tom Thunder of Acoustic Noise Consultants.

Ms. DiGrino reported that the site is 9.25 acres located on the south side of Deerfield Road just north of the Tennaqua Club. The site is currently improved with three-story, 141,000 square foot office building and two surface parking lots. The petitioners wish to provide more parking for current tenants and to attract new tenants with additional parking. They are proposing to construct a new parking structure with 448 spaces in the location of the existing south surface lot. Ms. DiGrino stated that the need for more parking is to meet demands of current office trends which are roughly five (5) spaces per 1,000 square feet of building. With the addition of the proposed parking structure the ratio at this site would be 5.3 spaces per 1,000 square feet. The site is zoned I-1 and is subject to the requirements in the Special Use Planned Unit Development.

Ms. DiGrino stated that based on Plan Commission feedback at the Prefiling Conference, they have made changes to the plans which will be presented and also held a meeting attended by approximately 15 neighbors.

Michael O'Malley, Senior Vice President at Hudson Advisors and Asset Manager of the property addressed the Commission. He reported that Hudson serves as the asset manager to Lonestar funds and investors who are the owners of the property, and CBRE is the day to day manager of the property on their behalf. Mr. O'Malley reported that they are seeking to expand parking availability at the property and add a parking structure. He added that there is no intention now or in the future to expand the physical property. The reason driving the demand for more parking is changing use patterns of office space by any variety of industries including technology, insurance, pharmaceutical, and others. They are seeing companies with anywhere from five to six employees per 1,000 square feet of office space which has increased from past use patterns. He stated that they have seen the precedent set at other properties along the 94 corridor and other Deerfield office buildings where parking has been expanded but buildings have not expanded. Mr. O'Malley stated that they believe that to make 1717 Deerfield a viable option for tenants, they want to expand parking to attract and retain tenants.

Don Matthews, Civil Engineer of Gewalt Hamilton showed the existing site map and pointed out the area where storm water and other engineering improvements are proposed in relation to the existing lot. He stated that the existing parking in the north lot has 209 spaces which will remain. The south lot will be modified so that there will be a total of 710 spaces on the property after the improvements. He reported that the new parking structure will be within the footprint of the existing surface parking lot, which means they will not be creating any more impervious areas.

They plan to slightly reduce the impervious areas by adding landscaped islands in parking lots. Mr. Matthews reported that water, sanitary and storm utilities are all adequate to connect to.

Mr. Matthews reviewed the storm water management plan stating that there is an existing detention basin that works on the surface of the existing parking lot. With the improvements they will add a vault below the garage. This will maintain the storage that was previously provided and place it underground. The system will mimic the existing process by taking the water underground. For the addition of the vault, they will abide by all of the County and the Village's requirements for storm water management. Mr. Matthews reported that the existing berm at the south end of the property will be extended to the end of the southern property line and the height will be 14 feet tall which is close to height of existing berm which is 14 to 17 feet. Mr. Matthews stated that the new berm provides for drainage systems at the toe of the east side of the berm on the west side of Tennaqua Lane. He stated that this will adequately intersect any run off from the berm and capture and carry it in conduits back to the site. The berm height will not be taller than 14 feet to allow for these storm water improvements to be added. Mr. Matthews stated that this plan will address drainage on the site and ensure that water will not drain off the site.

Mr. Matthews reported that open space is at 36% and the Village requirement is not less than 10% and lot coverage is at just over 25% while the requirement is 40%. Mr. Matthews reported that the plans have been reviewed by the fire department and they have received preliminary approval. They also expect comments back from the Village Engineer soon and they are confident that they can address any feedback.

Gary Cook with Walker Consultants addressed the Commission. He reported that the parking structure will be a precast construction and will be three bays wide and fit in the current three bays of the surface lot. He stated that they looked at moving the structure to the west, but this was not possible due to setbacks. He stated that they tried to maintain a lower structure and went three bays wide instead of going up higher. The ramp will be in the middle bay with two-way traffic through the structure. The four sides are all flat, pitched 1 to 2% for drainage only. The structure will look like a building and will be flat with no visible ramps. The walls and outside will meet all handrail height requirements of 42 inches which will cover car headlights as they pull in. The first floor allows for accessible parking. The first floor is 11.4 feet high and the next two are each 10.25 feet high. The stair towers which will be a 10 foot by 20 foot box are six feet taller than the height of the rest of the building. Chairman Berg asked what the total height will be. Mr. Cook replied that it will be approximately 33 feet total height.

Mr. Cook reported that for security there will be cameras and intercom stations in all stair towers and within the parking structure. He added that an evening drive through is also suggested for security.

Mr. Cook reviewed the lighting plan stating that they completed foot-candle readings. As the proposed lights hit the bumper walls, it is being cut off with zero spillage outside of 10 feet past the parking deck. He added that the deck is 100 feet from the closest neighbors. He stated that the light fixtures will be on timers and set to go down to security level at night and set to motion detectors for lighting.

Commissioner Shayman asked where the light fixtures will be located. Mr. Cook pointed out the locations on the site plan stated that they previously planned for three sets of poles of two light

fixtures at each end of the ramp. In the current plan, they lowered these poles from 20 feet to 15 feet and added one more set of poles.

Commissioner Bromberg asked for more information on the requested exception for the width of parking spaces from the required 9 feet to 8.5 feet. Mr. Cook replied that 8.5 feet is an industry standard for office and 9 feet is often used for retail. He added that this is long-term parking and a situation where cars are not coming and going frequently. Chairman Berg asked about the parking space length and the width of the aisles. Mr. Cook replied that the spaces are 18 feet deep with 24-foot aisles. He stated that this is service level A which is comfortable level.

Chris Berenfeld, Project Architect with Wright Heerema Architects addressed the Commission. He stated that all outside lighting can be placed on timers and all lighting in the garage itself will be shielded and cut off due to the nature of the deck. Mr. Berenfeld showed the east and west elevations of the structure. He stated that the design attempts to maintain similar proportions to the office building. The majority of the structure is 25 feet in height to the guard rail on the top level with the exception of the stair towers which go to 32 feet, and one stair tower with the elevator goes to 35 feet. The office building on the site is about 30 feet in height which was taken into consideration.

Commissioner Shayman asked how tall the panels are on the sides of the structure. Mr. Berenfeld replied that they are 6.5 feet tall.

Mr. Berenfeld showed the north and south building elevations stating that they are mostly only visible from on the property. He commented that one of the biggest concerns of the Commission at the Prefiling Conference was visibility of the structure from the east and the existing berm and trees. Mr. Berenfeld reported that they plan to extend the berm and plant trees on that berm. The intent is to match or improve on what is there today. Mr. Berenfeld showed renderings of the site lines stating that landscaping will fill in more over time.

Jonathan Smith, Landscape Architect at Lakota Group gave an overview of the landscape plan. He stated that the plan for landscape is to continue the berm that is currently there for use as a screening. And in addition, they will add a double row of evergreens along the east side to create screening from day one. The trees will be 10 feet in height and will grow taller. The trees will be Colorado blue spruce, Norway spruce, and Vanderwolf pine. At the base of the berm they will also continue the ground level landscaping. Mr. Smith stated that there is landscaping already established here and they seek to continue the same feel of the pedestrian scale landscaping by adding dogwood and ornamental grasses. Mr. Smith stated that in the surface parking lots there will be more pervious surface added in new landscaped islands. They will add trees and shrubs to help buffer the parking lots and also add colorful perennials and ornamental grasses.

Commissioner Jacoby confirmed that there will be a double row of trees added to the berm extension. Mr. Smith stated that they will be staggered and fill in and close gaps quickly as they grow. Commissioner Jacoby asked if ivy could grow on the parking deck. Mr. Smith stated that there are types of less vigorous ivy that could grow on the east side of the structure where there is not a great deal of sun. Mr. Smith added that the soil between the structure and the berm make it opportune for this type of ivy and it is not out of the question.

Justin Opitz of Gewalt Hamilton provided an overview of the traffic study. He stated that they concluded that there will be a low level of impact to the surrounding roadways. They took traffic

counts at five surrounding intersections and the Tollway ramps and used two different methods of analysis. They took ratios for square footage of building and number of employees. Number of employees created a higher generation rate with more trips and was more conservative. Using this analysis, they determined that traffic impact is very minimal on all intersections.

Tom Thunder of Acoustic Associates reported that he completed a noise study looking a potential noise sources generated from the new parking structure. He stated that when cars go up the ramp engines noise slightly increases, however car chirps and horns from key fobs would be louder than this. The amplification of the sounds generated from locking cars will spread up in the atmosphere and be redirected off the garage walls. Mr. Thunder reported that this is expected to add two decibels of volume to these noises which already exist on the surface lot and there will hardly be a noticeable difference. The expected noise would be 65 decibels. He stated that this volume being heard by neighbors is relative to other noise in the area. He completed a 24-hour noise assessment. Around the morning and evening rush hours the background noise level was 64 decibels and in the middle of the night it was 57 decibels. This would make the volume of a car horn in the garage more audible in the middle of the night with less background noise. He concludes that because the 65 decibels is in the area of the current noise level that there will be no impact on neighbors of noise generated by cars in the garage. Mr. Thunder added that the new berm will also reduce sound to the east.

Ms. DiGrino gave closing remarks stating that the building is 68% occupied which is not ideal for the ownership or the Village. She added that parking is an issue in the suburban office market as a whole and they are following the trend of increasing spaces per square footage.

Commissioner Bromberg asked where current tenants will park during construction. Ms. DiGrino reported that the capacity exists today to relocate all cars on the site as the building is not fully leased. The north lot will remain available and the expectation is that the garage will be constructed at the request of a new tenant and will be built before they move in.

Commissioner Bromberg confirmed that there is currently enough parking for the tenants there today. Ms. DiGrino agreed that there is.

Mr. Ryckaert reported that if the proposal is approved the petitioners will have one year to begin work or will need to file for an extension.

Commissioner Bromberg inquired about the traffic study commenting that the study states that in peak hours there are currently 50 trips in and out of the site in the morning and this is expected to increase by another 113 trips going from 50 to about 150. He asked the petitioners to clarify that this expected increase will have no traffic impact given that Tennaqua Lane is such a small road. Mr. Opitz confirmed that there is not a significant impact on any intersection around the site. He added that a main concern was people coming from the office building and turning left onto Castlewood. They do see an increase in traffic here on the surrounding side streets, but it is still at a service level of E which is considered normal.

Chairman Berg inquired about the traffic signal at Castlewood asking if it is only recognized when a car is there. Mr. Opitz replied that he believes this is correct and it is tripped as is common in Lake County. Chairman Berg asked if the length of the green light is dependent on the number of cars stacked. Mr. Opitz reported that there are rush hour peak settings in the signal to make them longer at these times, but they are not competently dependent on how many cars are there. Chairman Berg commented that sometimes the green signal is very brief,

and he is concerned there will be times when many cars are stacked and it takes several signals to get through the light. Mr. Opitz reported that at peak hours the signal could be adjusted to accommodate for this and at off peak times it will run freely.

Commissioner Shayman inquired about the architectural color of the parking structure. Mr. Berenfeld replied that it will be a buff color and will be precast. He stated that this will not match the building, but they can consider changing the color to match.

Commissioner Goldstone asked the petitioners if they have had potential tenants look at the space and not rent because of the parking. Mr. O'Malley replied that yes, this has occurred. He stated that they have been in discussions with tenants and parking at the site has not met their corporate parking requirement which has removed this property from their search. Commissioner Goldstone asked if they will reach out to any potential tenants if their proposal is approved by the Village. Mr. O'Malley stated that he is already doing this.

Chairman Berg stated that the Commission will begin public comment on this matter.

Joel Lewis of 716 Constance Lane commented that he appreciates the Plan Commissions questions to the petitioner as he echoes some of their concerns about the size of Tennaqua Lane and the look of prefabricated concrete. He stated that his also concerned about security. The petitioners presented their plans for security, which are focused on the tenants. Mr. Lewis stated that as a neighbor and given that this site has a public access road, he requests that the petitioners limit access to the structure with garage doors so that it cannot be publicly accessed. Mr. Lewis stated that he does not want outside activity in the parking structure. Mr. Lewis commented that this is the first time he has heard Lonestar mentioned as the building owner and also that this project would be a build to suit. Mr. Lewis commented that he would prefer the use of architectural concrete. He is also concerned about storm water drainage across Tennaqua Lane on the other side of the berm. He suggested that the petitioners maintain this road at their expense, as there are already drainage issues there.

Shelly Kaiz of 706 Constance commented that Tennaqua Lane is very narrow and suggested that it be widened as a car cannot pass without going onto the side of the road. Mr. Kaiz shared his storm water concerns stating that at the north end of the berm there are not a lot of trees and water has poured off the existing berm into their yards. He suggested that the petitioners improve the north end of the lot so that it looks more attractive when cars enter here. Mr. Kaiz also commented that there is no building manager on-site at the property and they have no one to reach regarding their concerns. Lastly, Mr. Kaiz commented that if the building is 68% filled and they can accommodate all of these cars in the north lot, then the additional 32% left to be occupied should be accommodated in the other existing surface lot and there would be no need for additional parking.

Greg Grager of 660 Constance Lane stated that he believes that the reason the site is not fully rented is because of the horrible traffic in Deerfield. He commented that he sees all the cars that want to leave the office building and have to go west on Deerfield when traffic is awful. He stated that adding more traffic is not good for the Village or the neighborhood. Mr. Grager commented that he believes the petitioners traffic counts of cars in and out of the site are incorrect and should be looked at again. He stated that he agrees that the proposed parking structure color is too stark and does not match the existing office building.

Judy Sandler of 650 Constance Lane commented that she is concerned about exhaust from cars coming from the garage and right into their backyards. She also questions how this project will affect their property values when the garage will be visible from her backyard. Ms. Sandler added that she believes more companies are adopting work from home programs and questions the need more parking.

Arnie Sandler of 650 Constance Lane stated that his home is 250 feet from where the garage will be. He commented that the east side of the berm is a storm water drainage problem for them and is so swampy that it will not support trees. He commented that he has had thousands of dollars of loss in his basement and his yard is always full of water caused by run off from the berm. He commented that the petitioners talked about a storm water resolution for the new berm, but not for the existing berm.

Dori Brownstein of 640 Constance Lane commented that she is concerned about car exhaust, lights and traffic safety. She stated that there are people walking dogs and children walking to school in the neighborhood and the streets will get more dangerous with the increase in cars. She stated that she has previously asked the Village to add a railing for safety along Deerfield Road. She commented that there was already a neighbor hit by a car in the neighborhood and suffered serious injuries. Ms. Brownstein stated that whether this proposal comes to fruition or not that the entire berm needs to be redone to look uniform and be maintained better. She believes there are dead trees on the berm and it is not maintained well.

Ms. DiGrino reported that they heard many of these comments at the neighbor meeting and they have categorized the concerns. As the neighbors are concerned that there is no one to contact on-site, the ownership is now working with CBRE to have a point of contact for neighbors so that they can be heard and convey messages to the ownership. Regarding the existing condition of berm, the ownership has already begun to develop a beautification plan for the berm as a result of feedback. Ms. DiGrino stated that regarding drainage concerns, any impact from the garage will be addressed with the drainage system. She next stated that Tennaqua Lane is a public roadway and enforcement efforts would help safety concerns. Regarding color of building Ms. DiGrino shared that the petitioners are open to looking at different colors if the aesthetic standpoint is an issue. And lastly regarding security concerns, the suggestion was made to add bar to the entry, however Gewalt Hamilton feels this is not an effective solution. They will continue to use their extensive camera system or implement a comparable monitoring approach to address outsiders accessing the garage.

Chairman Berg inquired about the height of the berm. Mr. Matthews replied that it is 17 feet at the highest point. Chairman Berg asked why the proposed berm extension does not match this height to blend better. Mr. Matthews replied that in the area of the new berm, they have raised it as high as they could give the real estate between the property and where the garage will be to accommodate drainage. In order to do this they had to push the new berm away from the road and in doing so lost a bit of land to get it vertically higher. Mr. Matthews stated that it is a three-foot difference and from the bottom of the road it would be hard to tell the difference especially with the trees at the top mitigating the sight lines.

Chairman Berg asked if it will be a blended sight rather than two berms abutting each other. Mr. Matthews replied that it will be blended and the grading will be continuous although the vegetation will take some time to blend.

Commissioner Bromberg asked if the existing berm has any storm water drainage. Mr. Matthews replied that based in his observations and survey he focused on the area where the improvements are being undertaken so he did not assess these details. However, he does feel there is substandard drainage on Tennaqua Lane by today's standards. Commissioner Bromberg commented that if water is coming off the berm, across road and into yards, this could be a violation of Village ordinance. Mr. Matthews replied that he feels the inefficient drainage is on the road which drains into the wooded area to the south, and then sits there until it evaporates.

Commissioner Shayman asked if Tennaqua Lane has any storm sewer drainage. Mr. Matthews replied that yes it does, but it is not to today's standards in his opinion. Commissioner Shayman asked if in his profession opinion this can be updated. Mr. Matthews replied yes.

Chairman Berg asked Mr. Matthews if it is his testimony that storm water drainage from the proposed berm and the proposed garage will be addressed and improved from what it is today. Mr. Matthews replied yes, absolutely.

Ms. DiGrino reiterated that this proposal is reflective of the needs and demands of the suburban office space market and as was stated, tenants are walking away because of the parking and this is an urgent need.

Greg Grager of 660 Constance Lane showed the Commission images of his rotting fence caused by drainage from the berm.

Chairman Berg asked for a motion to close the Public Hearing. He stated that the Plan Commission will now meet in an open workshop setting to consider their recommendation on this matter. He stated that a written recommendation will be made to the Village Board who will make the final binding decision on this matter. Commissioner Goldstone moved, seconded by Commissioner Bromberg to close the Public Hearing. Said motion passed with the following vote:

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

(3) Public Hearing: Request for a Residential Planned Unit Development (PUD) with Necessary Exceptions; a Rezoning of 702, 662, and 658 Elm Street from R-4, Single & Two Family Residential District to R-5, General Residence District; a Text Amendment to Allow a Residential PUD of Less Than 1 Acre in Size; a Resubdivision of the 702, 662, and 658 Elm Street Properties; and an Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to Allow the Redevelopment of the 702, 662, and 658 Elm Street Properties with Eight Townhomes (1219 Partners, LLC)

Chairman Berg asked for proof of publication from the Petitioners. The Petitioners provided the certified mailing receipts to the Commission.

Mr. Bernard Citron, Attorney with Thompson Coburn LLP reported that he represents the property owners. Mr. Citron commented that after listening to the first two agenda items he will focus on the importance of being a good neighbor.

Mr. Citron stated that at the site of their proposal there is a known water drainage problem from their property and from the surrounding properties. He commented that as a good neighbor they will fix it for this property and will have a positive impact on the neighboring properties. Mr. Citron commented that the properties in this neighborhood were developed before there was storm water detention and the pond on the site is a low spot where water backs up and overflows into other properties. There is no outlet right now for this water and they plan to fix this.

Mr. Citron reviewed the changes in the plans since the Prefiling Conference. He stated that they have worked with the Village Engineer to review their storm water management plan. They have also reduced the height of all buildings to 35 feet which is permitted in R-4 and R-5 zoning. The third major change is that they have taken the two end units and dropped the height down by making these two and a half stories with pitched roofs and no longer three stories. Mr. Citron added that they are also trying to save more trees on the site and they have agreed to add a fence along the property line at the request of neighbors.

Mr. Citron reported that from the back of the buildings to the property edge there are 75 to 84 feet which is a greater distance than other similar projects in Deerfield that staff compared to in their memo. He stated that their early designs had greater side yard setbacks, but the buildings would run the east to west instead of north to south facing Elm Street and there would be a lot more pavement. In the current design the buildings face the street.

Mr. Citron shared that they are requesting a text amendment to allow this site to be approved as a PUD. They feel this suggestion is similar to how Taylor Junction was developed which is also a PUD. This request is to make this a residential PUD allowed in a certain area rather than a text amendment for the entire R-5 District. Mr. Citron stated that as a PUD the only exception or variation they are requesting is the side yard setbacks.

Mr. Citron stated that they plan to solve the water drainage problems on the site and that the Plan Commission can make this a condition of the special use approval.

Project Architect Steve Francis reviewed the building plans. He reported that the buildings front Elm Street giving them a traditional feel that fits in with the single-family homes in the neighborhood. This also pulls the buildings as far forward to maximize the rear yard. Mr. Francis stated that the lot slopes down from the street to the west side of property allowing them to push the buildings slightly into the ground and lessen the impact line. The development is 2, four-unit townhouse buildings with a common driveway off of Elm Street that runs west. The units each have individual garages and stackable parking outside to accommodate four cars per unit or 32 total parking spaces. The site is 0.89 acres and open space is 51% with lot coverage at 25%.

Mr. Francis stated that the building elevations are a mixture of brick and masonry along with composite siding above the brick for a clean looking elevation that is low maintenance. The roof will be architectural shingles. Mr. Francis commented that the finishes tie in well with the neighborhood. The petitioners displayed samples of the building materials as well as a three-dimensional rendering. Mr. Francis stated that the two end units will be two-stories while the others are three-story. This was done because they wanted to make the smallest impact possible with the adjacent properties. These two end units are designed so that the bedrooms are under the roof which lowers the bearing of the gutter line. Mr. Francis showed the side yard sight lines at the north and south elevations stating that they meet the sideyard setback plane.

Mr. Francis described that there are four different unit layout options with two or three-bedroom options. All units have a den and utilities in the lower level, kitchen and living space on the main level, and bedrooms upstairs. Mr. Francis showed the floor plan drawings, and commented that all units have balconies over the garage in back.

Commissioner Bromberg asked to see renderings of the balconies and asked how these are accommodated on the end units. Mr. Francis replied that they will be raised to the first floor level as is done on the neighboring duplexes to the south.

Mr. Francis commented that they revised plans to keep as many existing trees as possible and were able to move things around and keep an additional seven trees compared to the previous plan. Mr. Francis stated that the landscape plan takes this into effect. In the landscape plan they are seeking to intermingle the deciduous plants with new trees and they focused on planting more opaque plants at the north and south ends of the property to screen from the neighbors as best they can. He added that in an effort to be ecologically friendly, the storm water detention basin in the northwest corner will be a bio detention basin. The bottom of the pond will have native grasses and plants to filter silt and contaminants out of the water before it reaches the sewer system.

Steve Maher of Kinzie Brokerage provided an overview of the market analysis. He stated that the critical questions they looked to answer related to economics and if this development will be successful. He stated that they considered the unique location, demographics and price to determine if the development meets a demand. Mr. Maher reported that his career started with developments like this on the North Shore and he knows this market well. He commented that Deerfield is an affluent suburb with tremendous appeal and that a popular recent trend is the concept of downtown lifestyle with affordability and walkability. In Deerfield in the last 24 months there were 127 townhomes sold and only 16 listed as active. In comparison there were 80 active single-family homes but only 69 sold. He stated that the demand for townhomes is a movement in Deerfield as well as Glenview and Northbrook and that there is an under supply and over demand. He stated that single-family home sales on the North Shore have slowed down but there is more demand for maintenance-free, transit-oriented designed living. The suburbs have gone away from the concept of age and place and are moving towards a lifestyle with walkability and a good product that is convenient and maintenance free. He stated that the target market is not only empty nesters later in life but also those in their late 40s, 50s, 60s who want to travel and have a home that meets their current needs. He added that Deerfield has a great supply of this product that is 25 to 35 years old like South Commons, which had 59 units transfer hands in the last two years where buyers are coming in and updating the product. Taylor Junction has provided an additional eight units at the moderate to upper end and there is still ample demand and low supply. Commissioner Jacoby commented that Taylor Junction has not all sold. Mr. Maher stated that they have all sold except for the ones that are still under construction. He added that as with this project there is a 10 to 11 month absorption period that will make it a successful project.

Ben Ahrig of Eriksson Engineering Associates reviewed the storm water management plan. He reported that the existing site has a low spot that about two acres drains to. The majority of the water that drains here is from off site as there is no other outlet. The water then sits there in a pond. Currently on site there is less than 100 cubic feet of water storage capacity and their plan will change this to over 10,500 cubic feet of water storage capacity. They will also add an outlet to allow water to drain out to the Village sewer system. In the storm water management system, they plan to implement, at the end of a rain event, the basin will be dry in 24 hours. Based on

this, it will provide a benefit to the neighbors and it will increase the water storage capacity immensely. Mr. Citron asked Mr. Ahrig to confirm that the system he designed will meet the requirements in terms that there is not more water than today's conditions draining onto neighboring properties; Mr. Ahrig agreed. Mr. Citron asked which direction the water currently drains in a storm event. Mr. Ahrig replied that it drains to the low spot on the site and when it gets high enough it overflows to the northwest corner. Mr. Citron asked if the water in the new detention basin they are providing will prevent water from backing up onto other people's properties. Mr. Ahrig replied that water will not back up onto any other properties. Mr. Citron commented that this project will not cause a detriment in terms of water to any neighbors and that it will solve the current overflow problem.

Mr. Citron reported that a neighbor asked why it is an above ground basin versus an underground basin. Mr. Ahrig reported that the open basin will work better on this site as it allows for more coverage and more capacity. For an underground basin, there would be a concern that it would not be able to handle the capacity and water could start pooling and not let it into the underground basin quickly enough. Underground basins are also significantly more expensive. Mr. Citron added that they need the catch basins above ground and if those are off site they may not be maintained properly. Mr. Ahrig reiterated that in this case an above ground basin will work better.

Mr. Citron reported that Steve Cochran of Eriksson Engineering is in attendance to answer any questions from the Commission related to traffic as well as Mike Laube, the consultant who completed the fiscal impact analysis.

Commissioner Shayman asked what the depth of the basin will be. Mr. Ahrig replied that it will be four feet deep at collection point, but the majority is three feet deep sloping down to the collection point at four feet.

Chairman Berg opened public comment on this matter.

Dreiske Arnold of 856 Osterman Avenue commented that she has one main request to the petitioners. She commented that it sounds like their retention pond will help address the water; however, she requests that they seriously consider if it is possible to do underground water storage instead. She shared that at their house they have an underground water storage tank that works very well. She commented that she loves her block and the neighborhood and walking downtown as do many other kids and families in the neighborhood. She stated that there may be children living in the development as there is a need for this type of housing for people with kids or grandkids and she wants them to have a yard as her children do. She would like there not to be a hole in the middle of the backyard where the basin is so that future residents can have a yard and more green space. She commented that Taylor Junction has a retention pond and she would like this development to have more of a backyard.

Susan Beyer 661 and 701 Chestnut Street shared that she owns two historic homes in this neighborhood and after storms the water goes up to her waist. She commented that she is in favor of historic homes being repurposed and she does not like attached homes and is not in favor of this development. She stated that if the development is built she would not want a huge pond for water detention that could attract mosquitoes. Ms. Beyer commented that they are a neighborhood that looks out for each other and the current footprint for water is a pond of water, that has been there for 22 years and has always been that size. She added that she also

believes the development would have a negative traffic impact and that she feels it is important to maintain the historic part of Deerfield in this neighborhood.

Jeff Brice of 657 Chestnut Street reported that he lives right behind the proposed development on the south side. His backyard is 50 by 200 yards. Mr. Brice questioned if the retention pond, will be in the northwest corner of the lot of the whole length of the backyard. He also questions if the system will collect water for the whole length of the site or just the north portion and then drain it to the pond. He commented that this development will affect his livability. His house has been on the market for a year and bulldozers behind his backyard will make it hard to sell. He commented that if this can be buffered during the construction process he would appreciate it. He commented that this development makes him feel like downtown is creeping towards his house which has a large lot and beautiful backyard. He would like to make sure that the next owners can also enjoy it. He added that the back of the proposed development is not as attractive as the front architecturally and questioned if the balcony will overlook his backyard.

Mike Viner stated that he lives in Glenview and would like to comment on behalf of Susan Beyer. He stated that the petitioners suggested that the water capacity currently is about 100 cubic feet of water, but he questions this and wants to be sure that the proposed detention pond is big enough even with the added townhomes and parking.

Mr. Ahrig stated that currently on the site there is less than 100 cubic feet of storm water storage, however there is more water than that on the area which is why it overflows to neighboring properties. He added that they are increasing capacity on the site from less than 100 to 10,555 cubic feet. This is sized to meet the County and Village requirements. He stated that the location of the basin is primarily on the northern area where the property line juts further west. The land slopes down and that is where the basin is. Mr. Ahrig commented that he heard the word pond used but it will not be a pond with water standing. There will be no water standing there most of the time. When it rains it will collect the water and the water will then leave the basin in 24 hours or less via storm sewer. There will be no standing water in the basin most of the time and when it rains it will be gone in 24 hours.

Commissioner Shayman commented that the new system may not only take the water from what they are adding in impervious surfaces but also what is coming across the ground from other properties. Mr. Citron confirmed that the question is whether they can not only take and control their water but also run off from neighboring properties. Mr. Ahrig replied that yes, they cannot stop the natural flow of water from other properties and the system can handle this. Commissioner Shayman asked if the system can fill up and overflow in a major rain event. Mr. Ahrig replied that in a large rain event when water reaches the top, there is a design to take that water and put it into a downstream pipe and let it go into the sewer. Commissioner Shayman confirmed that water will not overflow this area; Mr. Ahrig agreed.

Commissioner Bromberg asked the petitioners to explain again, why an open basin is better than an underground basin. Mr. Ahrig stated that the concern with an underground basin is capacity. An above ground basin can pick up greater area and larger volume. He stated that it makes engineering sense to have it be an open water basin on this site.

Mr. Citron commented that regarding a question about the balconies, they will be 85 feet from the rear yard property line and he believes this is far enough away that is not a major issue.

Mr. Citron reiterated that they are trying to be good neighbors in their proposal while also seeking to have a successful housing development. He commented that maintenance free housing is needed and the Comprehensive Pla has a goal of increasing the variety of housing stock in the Village and this is proper location. He reported that there will be a home owners' association after they are gone and the HOA will mow the grass and maintain the landscaping. He stated that current zoning allows for three two unit buildings on the site and going from six units to eight units is not that different. He commented that the duplex next door is taller than their proposed height and they believe their plans fit into the neighborhood. He suggested that this location is good for people who want to walk to the downtown and take the train. They can do all of those things and not worry about a yard and maintenance. Mr. Citron stated that by asking for the PUD they get minor changes in requirements, as did Taylor Junction. However, they have more open space and less ground coverage than Taylor Junction. He reiterated that they have shortened the two end units to account for the side yard setbacks and that under straight R-5 zoning, they would meet the side yard setback requirement but as a PUD, they are asking for an exception.

In response to a comment, Mr. Francis clarified that the building materials on the back of development will be the same as on the front.

Mr. Nakahara clarified that the petitioners are also asking for the resubdivision of the three existing lots. Mr. Citron stated that they are requesting a resubdivision to two lots so that each building would be one lot and the remainder is an outlot property owned by the association.

Chairman Berg asked for a motion to close the Public Hearing. He stated that the Plan Commission will now meet in an open workshop setting to consider their recommendation on this matter. He stated that a written recommendation will be made to the Village Board who will make the final binding decision on this matter. Commissioner Goldstone moved, seconded by Commissioner Shayman to close the Public Hearing. Said motion passed with the following vote:

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

There being no further discussion, the Public Hearing adjourned at 10:42 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Laura Boll

**PLAN COMMISSION
VILLAGE OF DEERFIELD
Minutes**

The Plan Commission of the Village of Deerfield called to order a Workshop Meeting on March 22, 2018 at the Village Hall, 850 Waukegan Road, Deerfield, Illinois.

Present were: Larry Berg, Chairman
 Al Bromberg
 Jennifer Goldstone
 Elaine Jacoby
 Stuart Shayman

Absent were: Sean Forrest
 Justin Silva

Also present: Jeff Ryckaert, Principal Planner
 Daniel Nakahara, Planner

WORKSHOP MEETING

(1a) Discussion on Tennaqua Master Plan Special Use

Commissioner Shayman commented that he is concerned about the addition of lighting and noise, however, the petitioners are willing to address lighting issues, but noise and the time of paddle play remains concerning. He commented that he is torn on this as the Village noise ordinance states 11 P.M. cut off but Briarwood is restricted to 10 P.M. and Briarwood could come back and ask to have paddle play until 11 P.M.

Commissioner Bromberg stated that Briarwood volunteered to end paddle play at 10 P.M. to appease neighbors and the Commission said "great, thank you". Commissioner Bromberg commented that he does not feel that this sets a precedent that requires everybody else to follow suit. He stated that there is a Village ordinance for no noise after 11 P.M. and he is comfortable with that. He commended Tennaqua and stated that they have tried every way they can to have a plan that is not intrusive on the neighbors, and just like other projects, neighbors must remain diligent and take the appropriate action if, at any time, Tennaqua is not a good neighbor. He commented that moving the additional paddle courts and adding trees are good steps and he is comfortable sticking to the 11 P.M. time per the noise ordinance.

Commissioner Goldstone commented that she has concerns about the length of the project as five to seven years is a long time. She agrees with Commissioner Bromberg that that the petitioner has made a lot of changes for the better, but she is also torn about allowing paddle play until 11 P.M.

Commissioner Jacoby commented that Tennaqua did a very good job of listening to their neighbors and making accommodations to their plans. She suggested to Tennaqua that it would be a good idea to re-educate their members on their language when they are in close proximity to a residential neighborhood. She added that given that Briarwood volunteered to end paddle at 10 P.M., she is comfortable with Tennaqua applying the Village ordinance of 11 P.M.

Chairman Berg also commended Tennaqua for making significant improvements due to neighbor concerns and feedback. He stated that the changes they have made goes a long way and being a good neighbor is key, and this must go both ways. He commented that he visited the site during paddle play and the ball on the court was not loud although this is not to say that language wouldn't be loud which is where internal governance needs to kick in and being a good neighbor is important. Chairman Berg stated that if a big office building was put at this site in lieu of the tennis and swim club, neighbors would likely not be happy. He stated that it is in the best interest of all that Tennaqua succeeds, but there needs to be compromise on both sides. He commended Tennaqua for the changes made in response to neighbor concerns.

Commissioner Bromberg asked Village staff if their vote would be to approve the Master Plan for seven years and if they have adjustments to the plan along the way, staff determines if they must come back and hold another Public Hearing. Mr. Ryckaert confirmed that this is correct.

Commissioner Bromberg moved to approve an amendment to a Special Use to allow renovations to Tennaqua Swim and Racquet Club (Tennaqua Inc.) as proposed for seven years and added that they must abide by the 11 P.M. Village Noise Ordinance. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Shayman. The motion passed with the following roll call:

Ayes: Bromberg, Goldstone, Jacoby, Shayman, Berg (5)

Nays: None (0)

Mr. Ryckaert reported that this matter will go before the Village Board on April 16, 2018.

(2a) Discussion on 1717 Deerfield Road Parking Structure

Commissioner Shayman commented that he sees the desire to increase the parking available at office buildings as they are seeing their space increase in number of people per square foot despite the trend in working off site. He stated that as part of this proposal, it seems that the petitioners need to address drainage needs across the entire site; the entire berm is not operating properly, and this is the time to fix it. He added that appearance of the building can also be made to be more compatible with the office building that is there. He also questioned who should maintain Tennaqua Lane.

Commissioner Bromberg stated that he agrees with many of Commissioner Shayman's comments. He stated that this is a tough one for him, as the new drainage plan in the berm extension should improve drainage on the berm, but if the existing berm is not operating as it should then this should also be fixed now. He feels the berm should also be maintained in appearance. He added that he has concerns about traffic on the small road and side streets. It's a small road.

Commissioner Goldstone agreed with Commissioner Shayman and Commissioner Bromberg's comments.

Commissioner Jacoby also agreed. She added that she is not convinced that the petitioners answered all concerns and might not be comfortable voting in favor of this proposal.

Chairman Berg asked staff if suggesting that the petitioners fix drainage issues on the existing berm can be part of the motion. My Ryckaert replied that they could ask the petitioners to look into it as this berm was designed 30 years ago and there are different standards today. Mr.

Ryckaert said the peititoners need to address the landscaping on the berm as there is an approved landscaping plan for the property that needs to be adhered to.

Commissioner Shayman asked if they can suggest that the entire property be brought up to current standards on drainage. Mr. Ryckaert replied that they can suggest this, but it is an existing condition, and nothing requires them to bring it up to today's standards if they are not making changes to that part of the property in their proposed improvements. He stated that it could not be required, but the Plan Commission could make it a strong suggestion.

Commissioner Goldstone asked what the process is if the neighbors want to address the road drainage issues with the Village. Mr. Ryckaert replied they would work the Village's engineering department who keeps records on road maintenance. Mr. Ryckaert stated that he does not believe this road is due for resurfacing in the Village's Capital Improvement Plan. He added that it was publicly dedicated when the property was annexed in the 1980s.

Chairman Berg commented that he sees standing water on both sides of Tennaqua Lane and the neighbors rear yard fences seem to be under water more than they are dry, but he is aware that they do not have the purview to address these existing conditions and it is also not up to the petitioner to make improvements to a public roadway. Chairman Berg stated that it sounds like the improvements requested by the petitioner are not going to make matters worse and may improve somewhat, and that is an important aspect of the Plan Commission's decision. He added that the petitioner has made considerable efforts since the Prefiling Conference and he believes many concerns were addressed regarding noise, sight lines and the extension of the berm.

Commissioner Shayman stated that he would like to recommend that the petitioners look at the color of the building and the building materials to make them more compatible and not as institutional looking. Mr. Ryckaert stated that this can be added with the motion and will go to the Village Board. Commissioner Bromberg agreed.

Commissioner Shayman commented that he would also like to be sure the Village Board is aware of concerns about drainage on the property brought up tonight.

Commissioner Shayman moved to approve Amendment to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) to permit a new parking structure to be constructed to the south of the 1717 Deerfield Road office building (LSREF4 Rebound, LLC) with the recommendations that drainage east of the existing berm be looked into, that the building materials for the new parking structure be compatible with the existing office building on the site, and that any dead trees be removed and replaced on the existing berm. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bromberg. The motion passed with the following roll call:

Ayes: Bromberg, Goldstone, Shayman, Berg (4)
Nays: Jacoby (1)

Mr. Ryckaert reported that this matter will go before the Village Board on April 16, 2018.

(3a) Discussion on 658, 662, and 702 Elm Street Development

Chairman Berg inquired what the side yard setbacks are under R-4 zoning. Mr. Ryckaert replied that under R-4 zoning there is a minimum of 8 feet on each side and a combined total of 20 feet and in a residential PUD the minimum perimeter setback is 25 feet.

Commissioner Goldstone asked if it is compliance if it is not a PUD. Commissioner Bromberg replied that it would not be in zoning compliance at this location because what is proposed is multiple family, and the property is zoned R-4, for a duplex so they need to rezone to R-5 and become a PUD which is what they are requesting.

Commissioner Shayman commented that in an ideal world the houses in this neighborhood would stay historic. However, he thinks this is a reasonable proposal and the footprints of the individual units are small enough that they will not have a tremendous impact on the neighbors to the west. He is glad they reduced the north and south end unit heights and the setbacks given that if they stayed R-4 they could have less side yard setbacks. Commissioner Shayman stated that he is overall in favor of this proposal and he is glad they are addressing drainage in a very positive way.

Commissioner Goldstone agreed that she thinks the changes are positive and she likes the landscaping on the sides as well as the drainage plan. She commented that there does not seem to be much opposition from neighbors.

Commissioner Jacoby commented that she likes what they are doing, but not on this block and not in this neighborhood. She thinks it is a massive scale for this neighborhood and this is not the intention of the Comprehensive Plan when it talks about the fit of the neighborhood, this is a single-family neighborhood with large yards with the exception of the duplex next door. She added that in the rendering the buildings do not look right in this location.

Commissioner Bromberg stated that he thinks it is a very nice development and that the petitioners addressed drainage well. However, he finds it tricky because he agrees that it should be a PUD, but he is not in favor of the 10-foot side yard setbacks. He commented that when Taylor Junction was approved the neighbors voiced their loud opposition and they made changes their plans and moved setbacks. For another current proposal on Elm Street, the neighbors had opposition and they changed their plan. Commissioner Bromberg commented even though many neighbors have not come out against this, the Plan Commission should still be consistent, and he has a problem with the 10-foot setback. It is just too big of an exception for him to vote in favor of.

Chairman Berg commented that the petitioner made a good effort and they heard Plan Commissioner and neighborhood concerns. He commented that he is surprised that there was not more opposition expressed and he agrees that this does not mean they should vote in favor. He stated that the Commission needs to be guided by PUD standards for this proposal and he is not sure the standards have been met. It is attractive and the drainage plan is good and will improve the conditions, but he does not think it is the right development for this block or this neighborhood. He is not convinced the standards have been met to substantiate this.

Commissioner Shayman moved to approve the request for a residential Planned Unit Development (PUD) with necessary exceptions; a rezoning of 702, 662, and 658 Elm Street from R-4, Single & Two Family Residential District to R-5, General Residence District; a Text

Workshop Meeting

March 22, 2018

Page 5

Amendment to allow a residential PUD of less than one acre in size; a resubdivision of the 702, 662, and 658 Elm Street properties; and an Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to allow the redevelopment of the 702, 662, and 658 Elm Street properties with eight townhomes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Goldstone. The motion was denied with the following roll call:

Ayes: Goldstone, Shayman (2)

Nays: Jacoby, Bromberg, Berg (3)

There being no further discussion, Commissioner Bromberg moved, seconded by Commissioner Jacoby to adjourn the Workshop Meeting at 10:59 P.M. Said motion passed with a unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,
Laura Boll