MEETING MINUTES

PLAN COMMISSION
Wednesday, March 14, 2018
7:00 P.M.

Evanston Civic Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, James C. Lytle Council Chambers

Members Present: Colby Lewis (Chair), Patrick Brown, Terri Dubin, Carol Goddard, George Halik, Peter Isaac, Andrew Pigozzi, Jolene Saul

Members Absent: Simon Belisle

Staff Present: Melissa Klotz, Zoning Planner
Scott Mangum, Planning and Zoning Administrator
Mario Treto, Assistant City Attorney

Presiding Member: Colby Lewis, Chairman

1. CALL TO ORDER / DECLARATION OF QUORUM

Chairman Lewis called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES: February 21, 2018

Chair Lewis provided a minor edit to the minutes. Commissioner Pigozzi made a motion to approve the minutes from February 21, 2018, 2018 as edited. Commissioner Saul seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken and the minutes were unanimously approved with the minor edit, 8-0.

3. NEW BUSINESS

A. PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
1727 Oak Avenue
Trammell Crow Company, developer, proposes to construct a 17-story active adult, age restricted, multi-family rental development with 169 units and 139 parking spaces in the D3 Downtown Core Development District. The applicant seeks site development allowances for: 1) number of dwelling units (169 where 117 allowed); 2) building height (155 feet where 170 feet allowed as a site development allowance); 3) front yard setback (1 foot where a minimum of 3 feet required); and 4) loading (1 short berth where 2 short berths required).

Ms. Klotz presented a brief background on the proposed planned development. She
provided general development characteristics, proposed public benefits and the staff recommendations and suggested conditions for approval.

Katie Janke-Dale, attorney for the developer, stated that the development team is in agreement with the recommendations provided and welcomed questions and feedback from the Commission.

Johnny Carlson, representative for the developer, described development team and concept, requested allowances, public benefits. The building will be for Active Adults with age restricted to 55 years and older. He mentioned changes to the plans regarding loading and parking as well as affordable housing units being provided on site.

Aaron Roseth, architect for the developer, described floor plans, site plan, renderings, materials, bird-friendly measures, stairwell additional 12 feet.

Chair Lewis stated that a request for continuance had been submitted from a resident living within 1,000 feet of the subject property. The Commission would entertain granting the continuance with the hearing being continued to April 11, 2018 after additional public comment is received. He then opened up the hearing to questions from the Public. 12 people spoke which included:

- Submission of a written continuance request. Reasons stated were many residents of 1720 Oak Ave. were not aware of this development or were confused between this proposal and the previous building that was approved (1815 Ridge/Oak).
- At the recent neighborhood meeting, Alderman Braithwaite asked Mr. Mangum to update the traffic study. Mr. Mangum responded the request was for accident data from the police department and would likely be available prior to the next meeting.
- If the proposed dog park is open to the public, how will Trammell Crow ensure dogs are properly licensed and with appropriate shots as required for off-leash dogs in Evanston? Ms. Janke Dale stated that the building will condition resident animals to be licensed and will work with the City regarding non-resident dogs and how to ensure safety and appropriate licensing.
- Request for clarification on the green areas on the plan. Will the 17-20 nice trees on the west side of the embankment near the tracks be removed? What public benefit will there be to require the developer to replace the trees elsewhere for birds and wildlife to use? Tom Runkle, Engineer for the developer, provided information on the building landscaping and stated that the dog park surface will likely be a decomposed granite or pea rock. Turf grass would be installed around it. Trees along the east property line are in different states of health and due to construction, trees will be removed but developer will comply with City...
requirements to replace them and/or provide a fee-in-lieu. Green-roof to be extensive system with shallow rooted plantings.

- The proposed building will block all of the sunlight to neighboring buildings. How was no one notified of this until last weekend when a letter came in the mail but then no other information was provided?

- Why is it necessary for the second and third floor to get so close to the property lines? Other large buildings have done without that. Mr. Roseth clarified that the building is compliant with setbacks on all except the west side of the building. Circulation drove need for relief on west side setback.

- What will happen to the street parking between Ridge and Church? Will there be less street parking that church patrons use? Did Trammell Crow have any meetings with church staff?

- How many staff members will be hired for this development? Mr. Carlson stated there will be 6 full time staff members on-site plus 2 additional for various activities. Not all will be on-site at the same time.

- What outreach has Trammell Crow done to sit down and hear concerns from neighboring Center for Independent Futures and if so, what dates?

- Allowance for only 1 loading: how can it be ensured there won’t be future congestion with trucks waiting, and how does the developer know 1 loading area is adequate? Mr. Carlson stated he does not anticipate a need for 2 loading spaces; management will manage scheduling of move-in/move-out and trash pickup.

- There is a 1 way alley between Sienna and the 1111 Church St building - how will that traffic flow during and after construction? Luay Aboona, KLOA, stated that the orientation of the alley across the street will not be changed.

- How is active adult defined and what are the age restrictions?

Ms. Janke-Dale provided information on community meetings and the notice that was provided. This included two community meetings and a ward meeting in addition to the standard noticing required by the City for public hearings and community meetings (no mailed notice was required for the Ward meeting).

Chair Lewis then opened the hearing to questions from the Commission. Questions included:

- Mr. Pigozzi - how will trash pickup be handled? Fear dumpsters will end up taking up loading berth area. Will any residents have caregivers, and if so how will parking for the caregivers be handled?

- Mr. Isaac - Regarding parking, 45 spaces for 1007 Church will be lost. The parking requirement for 1007 Church was calculated at 2 per 1000 sq. ft. of floor area. Should that be 5 per 1000 since it is a medical use (question is for staff). What exactly was the Sienna PD requirement and how does that work if 1007 is using the parking? What is the relationship between the Sienna spaces and 1007? How long term is that relationship? Ms. Klotz stated that 1007 Church was previously required to have 245 spaces which then increased to 294 parking
spaces with the addition of medical office. Had more than needed and with new development required parking is not affected.

- Ms. Goddard - has the site always been a parking lot or is there the possibility of ground contamination, and what will be done to address that?
- Ms. Saul - is Transit Tracker available to the public or just the building residents? What about improving the crosswalk midblock? The traffic study that is done 1 year after the building is built could instead be done when the building is 90% occupied to get a better read of the traffic implications. Luay Aboona, KLOA, stated Crosswalks will be restriped. Will take a look at post construction traffic impacts and any needed signage. Crosswalk traffic signals will be upgraded with countdown timers at Oak and Church by the 1815 Ridge/Oak development. Mr. Mangum stated that staff is open to amending the condition regarding the traffic study post occupancy.
- Ms. Dubin – How does the City control the health of dogs at the dog beach? Mr. Mangum provided information on how the City’s dog beach regulates use.
- Has the City considered making the intersection at the curve onto Clark Street a controlled intersection? Mr. Mangum stated that the intersection at Oak and Clark had plans reviewed but no recommendation has come up.
- Chair Lewis - Shadow studies done for the project?
- Mr. Halik - would like architect to explain the “playful” architecture proposed and how that relates to the architecture of Evanston. Mr. Roseth provided clarification on “playful” architecture.

Johnny Carlson answered remaining questions. An Active Adult is someone who wants to live in a rich social environment with activities. Active Adult living does not anticipate having caregivers, tenants would more likely move to a different facility that fits their needs. Parking meters will be taken down and a meter box added to block. 2 additional stalls and 2 ADA stalls will also be added. He anticipates a summer construction start with an 18 month construction period. A Construction Management Plan that addresses impacts to neighboring properties during construction, including the alley, wayfinding signage, and people on-site directing traffic. Transit Tracker board may be able to be located where it is visible both inside and outside the building. The development team will, per City code, handle removal of any soil in need of remediation (have not found this need upon testing). Shadow study will be provided for the next meeting.

Chair Lewis opened the hearing for public testimony and offered to allow testimony to individuals at either this hearing or at the continued hearing on April 11. A total of 4 people spoke, providing the following comments:

- Speeding around Oak Ave. curve creates a dangerous situation with the midblock crosswalk. If the project moves forward, do not grant the special allowances requested, which just add to the congestion. Sienna was originally marketed for people with mental and physical disabilities.
• Building height is double that of Sienna development. Sienna was in a less congested area and had enough parking for home medical staff and caregivers. Adding 2 new towers in the immediate area without enough parking will increase congestion and affect property values. The addition of 2 new on-street spaces is not enough. Physical limitations of some residents make moving elsewhere difficult, doing so due to issues created by development not an option
• The building would cause more congestion, block views from Sienna, and cast shadows.
• The requested affordable housing does not meet IHO requirements and a shortage of moderately priced senior housing. Market rent for a 1 bedroom in this building is around $2800, which is not moderately priced senior housing. The average Social Security benefit is $1,369. Proposal not an alternative equivalent. It is not equivalent and not in compliance with the AMIs. Also there are no 2 bedroom units proposed as affordable, which is required by the IHO.

Commissioner Saul made a motion to continue the item to April 11, 2018 at 7:00 PM in Council Chambers. Commissioner Isaac seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion was approved, 7-1.

Nays: Pigozzi

B. TEXT AMENDMENT
   Coach House Definition
   A Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment pursuant to City Code Title 6, Zoning, to revise the definition of a coach house.

Mr. Mangum explained the text amendment was a City Council referral, and the proposed text amendment modifies the definition of a coach house so that a coach house could be rented out to a separate tenant unrelated to the owners of the principal structure.

Chair Lewis opened the hearing to questions from the public. One person, Birch Berhardt spoke stating that the proposed regulation does not discuss affordability at all. In talking with Housing staff, coach houses could provide a great deal of affordable units. She then asked if that is possible. Mr. Mangum explained that City Council did not provide direction regarding affordability or restricting income levels so, while it is not proposed at this time, it could be considered in the future.

Chair Lewis opened the hearing to questions from the Commission. Ms. Goddard asked if there is a limit to the number of tenants that could live in the structure, and if there is a definition of dwelling. Mr. Mangum responded each dwelling unit on the property could have a family that complies with the definition of family (no more than 3 unrelated). A dwelling unit is defined by having cooking and eating, sleeping, and living
accommodations.

Mr. Pigozzi asked what the new limit would be – could someone tear down their garage and build a new one with an apartment above it in an R1 District? That would change the nature of the R1 District. Mr. Mangum explained yes, one could do that. Currently you could build the same but only be used by a family member (per the definition of family).

Mr. Isaac noted accessory structures are limited to 20 feet in height so that in itself may prevent new coach houses from being constructed.

Mr. Brown asked how the City currently polices coach houses, and Mr. Mangum explained currently it is on a complaint basis and is handled by Zoning staff and Property Standards staff.

Ms. Saul asked if rented coach houses will have to be registered as rentals, and Mr. Mangum said he believes so.

Chair Lewis noted this change will create a profit availability that could change neighborhoods. Are there limitations to how many per property, etc? Mr. Mangum stated that no additional limitations are proposed regarding the number of units allowed per block but current existing regulations would still provide limitations on the size, required parking, etc.

**Commissioner Pigozzi made a motion to recommend that the proposed amendment be rejected. Commissioner Isaac seconded the motion.**

A roll call vote was taken and the motion failed with a tie vote, 4-4.

**Ayes:** Brown, Dubin, Isaac, Pigozzi.
**Nays:** Goddard, Halik, Lewis, Saul.

The vote was incorrectly tabulated to fail 4-3 during the meeting.

**Commissioner Halik made a motion to recommend that the proposed amendment be adopted. Commissioner Saul seconded the motion.**

A roll call vote was taken and the motion failed with a tie vote, 4-4.

**Ayes:** Goddard, Halik, Lewis, Saul.
**Nays:** Brown, Dubin, Isaac, Pigozzi.

The vote was incorrectly tabulated as approved 4-3 during the meeting.
The text amendment will move forward to City Council without a recommendation.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Goddard made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Saul seconded the motion.

A voice vote was taken and the motion was approved by voice call 8-0. The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,
Meagan Jones
Neighborhood and Land Use Planner
Community Development Department