

MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE OAK PARK PLAN COMMISSION
VILLAGE HALL- ROOM 201
January 23, 2020
7:00 p.m.

A recording of this meeting is available on the Village of Oak Park Website: <https://www.oak-park.us/your-government/citizen-commissions/commission-tv>

PRESENT: Chair David Mann, Commissioners; Iris Sims, Nick Bridge, Jeff Clark, Jeff Foster, Lawrence Brozek, Paul May and Tom Gallagher

EXCUSED: Commissioner Joseph Flowers

ALSO PRESENT: Craig Failor - Village Planner, Greg Smith - Plan Commission Attorney, Tom Ebsen - Fire Chief, Bill McKenna - Village Engineer, and Rich Van Zeyl, Village Architectural Consultant

Roll Call - Chair Mann called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll was called. A quorum was present.

Non-Agenda Public Participation - None

Approval of Minutes - None

Public Hearings

PC 2019-06: 711-725 Madison Street: Planned Development – Senior Living Community; The Applicant seeks approval of a Special Use - Planned Development to allow for the construction of a 256,725 square foot senior living residential care facility within the MS-Madison Street zoning district consisting of 174 Unit (222 beds) at 7-stories tall. The Applicant is requesting zoning relief for the following; 1.) Increase in density from 48 allowed dwelling units to a not-to-exceed unit count of 174 dwelling units, 2.) Increase in height from an allowed 50 feet to a not-to-exceed height of 90 feet, 3.) A reduction in the rear yard setback from a required 25 feet to a not-to-exceed distance of 16 feet as measured from the property line south of the abutting alley, and 4.) An increase in foot candles at the property line from 1 to not-to-exceed 6.9. The building will be comprised of independent living units, assisted living units, and memory care units.

This hearing was continued from December 19, 2019.

Samantha Eckhout provided a brief introduction.

Applicant Architect John Myefski began the presentation by stating the design changes that were made to the development per the recommendation of the Plan Commission at the December 5, 2019 hearing. The changes consisted of the following: 1). The overall height of the building was reduced. The maximum building height as measured from the roof was reduced by 9 feet, from 88 feet to 79 feet by reducing the floor to floor heights. The height of the fin was reduced from 89 feet-8 inches to 82 feet and brought down to the ground on

the west side into the easement/side yard. Along Wesley Avenue and abutting the neighborhood the building height was reduced to 50 feet and a horizontal setback above 50 feet as measured from the far side of the alley was increase to 50 feet. The eliminated floor area along Wesley was shifted to a center wing of the building to compensate. 2.) They relocated the trash room access doors to the easement side (west) of the building so it does not directly open to the alley and the neighborhood. Trash collection by truck will still occur in the alley. 3.) They shifted the Euclid Avenue cul-de-sac ten (10) feet from the alley to address the fire departments concerns with accessibility of response vehicles. This resulted in the removal an additional tree. 4.) They revised Wesley Avenue at the alley by adding a diverter to stop southbound traffic from entering the neighborhood but allow for emergency access and north bound traffic. 5.) They provided a revised Traffic analysis which still indicated there would be no traffic impact by the development. 6.) They provided a revised landscape plan for the Euclid Avenue cul-de-sac.

Applicant Traffic Engineer Michael Worthman, provided an overview of the changes to the traffic report indicating the results showed little change from the previous report.

Applicant Civil Engineer Andrew Uttan, provided an overview of the changes to the landscape plan and civil engineering plan.

Architect Myefski reviewed the compensating benefits and a few additional changes to the plans, such as relocation of the black iron pipe from the side of the building to the roof.

Fire Chief Ebsen was asked about the Euclid Avenue cul-de-sac and the Wesley diverter by the Plan Commission. Chief Ebsen stated that he did not support a cul-de-sac at Wesley as it would reduce their response times to the neighborhood. Chief Ebsen also stated that by moving the Euclid Avenue cul-de-sac further north nearer the east-west alley, it allows the fire department better access to the houses at the end of that block in case of an emergency. Chief Ebsen concluded with the expectation that the number of ambulance service calls to this development will be consistent with what has occurred at Belmont Village, which was about 200 calls last year.

Mr. Richard Van Zeyl, Wight and Co., provided an overview of their report to the Plan Commission supporting the changes to the development.

Village Engineer Bill McKenna reviewed the modification to the traffic report indicating staff's support.

The Plan Commission discussed and asked questions about the delivery loading area along Madison Street, the cul-de-sac and diverter, compensating benefits, public art, plantings, LEED points, landscape maintenance, window to wall ratios, energy/mechanical systems, sustainability options, and dwelling unit heights.

Cross Examination:

Mr. Robert Niewijk questioned the Applicant on financial matters.

Public Testimony

There were six persons who provided public testimony.

Jason Fetzer. He was in support of the application. He thought this was the best development for the site and indicated it could be worse. He spoke with Belmont Village representatives to determine potential impacts. He stated this would be a very low impact to the neighborhood.

Richard Holland. He focused on the desire for a cul-de-sac at Wesley Avenue and the alley.

David Ubogy. He indicated that he offers qualified support for the project. He still believes a cul-de-sac should be placed at Wesley Avenue and the north portion between the alley and Madison could resemble Westgate Avenue between Marion Street and Westgate cul-de-sac. This would be a good compensating benefit.

Jill Mahaney. She was in support of the application. She wanted to know if other compensating benefits could be considered by the applicant, such as allowing the neighbors to use their gym or possibly opening an intergenerational daycare on site.

Robert Niewijk. He continued to speak to the economic viability of the project and felt the developer was making a higher rate of return than was necessary.

David Walker. He was opposed to the application and felt that more could be done to bring the development closer into compliance with village codes.

Public Testimony was closed.

The Plan Commission discussed and had questions about a cul-de-sac at Wesley and the alley indicating they can't predict the future traffic issues. They questioned Chief Ebsen on other possible configurations of a diverter / cul-de-sac. Chief Ebsen stood by his support of a diverter only at this location. The Plan Commission discussed terrace landscaping and lighting where the applicant indicated that low-level light will be used, no overhead lighting. They discussed the tax status, where the applicant indicated they were set at a 20 year commitment to stay on the tax rolls. The Plan Commission discussed further compensating benefits, donations to other taxing bodies, art, the River Forest senior development, height and massing, LEED, and they debated the need for independent living units.

Closing Statement.

Samantha Eckhout provided a closing statement thanking the Commission and indicating their desire to be in Oak Park.

Commission Deliberation.

Commissioner May supported the application. He was still interested in seeing a cul-de-sac at Wesley and the alley.

Commissioner Foster supported the application, but wanted more building setback from the alley side of the development to provide a greater separation between the development and the residential to the south.

Commissioner Sims supported the application. It will bring more vibrancy to the street and all of her initial concerns were satisfied.

Commissioner Bridge agreed that the rear yard setback should be increased.

Commissioner Clark supported the application. There were significant changes made.

Commissioner Gallagher supported the application. He indicated that Madison Street is ready for development. The proposal was attractive and an asset. Commissioner Gallagher stated that he had reviewed all of the pertinent information and watched the video of the previous public hearings.

Chair Mann appreciated the use and all that the applicant achieved, but he was still concerned about the size of the development and that the height would set precedence along Madison Street.

Planned Development Application.

Commissioner Brozek motioned to recommend approval of the proposed application with conditions as amended. The Motion was seconded by Commissioner Bridge.

Roll Call Vote:

Motion by Commissioner Brozek – yes
Seconded by Commissioner Bridge - yes
Commissioner Clark – yes
Commissioner Foster - no
Commissioner Sims–yes
Commissioner Gallagher – yes
Commissioner May - yes
Chair Mann - no

The motion passed with a 6-2 vote in favor of the application.

Findings of Fact.

The Plan Commission reviewed the draft findings of fact report. They made some minor changes to the recommendations.

Commissioner Brozek motioned to recommend approval of the findings of fact report. The Motion was seconded by Commissioner Sims.

Roll Call Vote:

Motion by Commissioner Brozek – yes
Seconded by Commissioner Sims - yes
Commissioner Clark – yes
Commissioner Foster - yes
Commissioner Gallagher–yes

Commissioner Bridge – yes
Commissioner May - yes
Chair Mann - yes

The motion passed with an 8-0 vote in favor of the findings of fact report.

Street Vacation Application: The Applicant is also requesting the vacation of a portion of South Euclid Avenue right-of-way between Madison Street and the east-west alley abutting the development parcels to the south

This hearing was continued from December 19, 2019.

Attorney Smith stated the procedure and purpose of the review.

There was no discussion.

Street Vacation.

Commissioner Brozek motioned to recommend approval of the proposed vacation application. The Motion was seconded by Commissioner Gallagher.

Roll Call Vote:

Motion by Commissioner Brozek – yes
Seconded by Commissioner Gallagher - yes
Commissioner Clark – yes
Commissioner Foster - yes
Commissioner Sims–yes
Commissioner Bridge – yes
Commissioner May - yes
Chair Mann - yes

The motion passed with a 8-0 vote in favor of the application.

Findings of Fact.

The Plan Commission reviewed the draft findings of fact report.

Commissioner Clark motioned to recommend approval of the findings of fact report. The Motion was seconded by Commissioner Gallagher.

Roll Call Vote:

Motion by Commissioner Clark– yes
Seconded by Commissioner Gallagher - yes
Commissioner Sims – yes
Commissioner Foster - yes
Commissioner Brozek –yes

Commissioner Bridge – yes
Commissioner May - yes
Chair Mann - yes

The motion passed with an 8-0 vote in favor of the findings of fact report.
This matter was continued from January 16, 2020 to present and review the findings of fact report.

PC 2020-01: Oak Park Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment: The Village is proposing an amendment to the Oak Park Zoning Ordinance: Article 8 (“Uses”), Section 8.3 (“Use Restrictions”), Table 8-1 (“Use Matrix”), amending “Recreational Cannabis Establishment” from a permitted use to possibly a special use (“S”) in the “Use” column for the DT- Downtown, HS – Harrison Street, GC-General Commercial, MS-Madison Street, NA-North Avenue, NC-Neighborhood Commercial, and RR-Roosevelt Road Zoning Districts with a prohibition on consumption lounges and potential restrictions on separation distances from like uses, distances from sensitive land uses and such other regulations regarding recreational cannabis establishments as the Plan Commission and/or Village President and Board of Trustees may determine are appropriate. *Findings of Fact Review.*

Village Planner reviewed the Finding of Fact exhibit modifications regarding the clarification of craft growers.

Findings of Fact and Exhibit.

The Plan Commission reviewed the draft findings of fact report.

Commissioner Sims motioned to recommend approval of the findings of fact report. The Motion was seconded by Commissioner Foster.

Roll Call Vote:

Motion by Commissioner Sims– yes
Seconded by Commissioner Foster - yes
Commissioner Clark – yes
Commissioner Gallagher - yes
Commissioner Brozek –yes
Commissioner Bridge – yes
Commissioner May - yes
Chair Mann - yes

The motion passed with an 8-0 vote in favor of the findings of fact report.

Village Planner Failor provided an update of the upcoming meetings.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:17 p.m. – Motioned by Commissioner May, Seconded by Commissioner Brozek.

Prepared by: Craig Failor, Village Planner / Staff Liaison