



**MEETING MINUTES
OF THE
PLAN COMMISSION
May 10, 2023 – 7:00 P.M.**

**LINCOLNWOOD VILLAGE HALL
6900 NORTH LINCOLN AVENUE
LINCOLNWOOD, ILLINOIS 60712**

Present: Acting Chairman Steven Jakubowski, Commissioners Mark DeAngelis, Adi Kohn, Henry Novoselsky, and Don Sampen

Absent: Chairman Mark Yohanna, and Commissioner Suzanne Auerbach

Staff Present: Community Development Director Scott Mangum, Planning and Economic Development Manager Doug Hammel, Community Development Coordinator Marcos Classen, Village Attorney Greg Smith, Village Engineering Consultant Mike Ziegler and Village Trustee Atour Sargon

I. Call to Order

Planning and Economic Development Manager Doug Hammel noted that Chairman Yohanna would not be available this meeting.

A vote was called to select an Acting Chairman.

Motion for Steven Jakubowski to be the Acting Chairman for tonight's meeting was made by Commissioner Novoselsky and seconded by Commissioner Kohn.

Aye: DeAngelis, Kohn, Novoselsky, and Sampen

Nay:

Abstain: Jakubowski

Motion Approved: 4-0

Acting Chairman Jakubowski noted a quorum and called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Approval of Minutes

Motion to approve April 3, 2023, Plan Commission Minutes was made by Commissioner DeAngelis and seconded by Commissioner Sampen.

Aye: DeAngelis, Sampen and Jakubowski

Nay:

Abstain: Novoselsky, Kohn

Motion Approved: 3-0

IV. Case #PC-06-23: Planned Unit Development Amendment, Special Use, and Zoning Modifications for a Proposed Development at 6995 North Central Park Avenue

Planning and Economic Development Manager Doug Hammel went over the details of the case. The property is in the Town Center Planned Unit Development (PUD). Mr. Hammel went over the history of the Town Center PUD which covers around 75 acres of land.

The subject area was originally conceived as a “flex tech” area, as a result an approval would be needed to allow the intended use of a center/religious institution at the proposed location. While that term “flex tech” was undefined in the original PUD it is staff’s determination that the proposed development would not be considered “flex tech”. The other designated “flex tech” parcels originally included in the PUD have been developed into parking spaces for nearby car dealerships.

A special use would need to be approved for the intended use of open-air parking spaces in the front yard of the facility.

Mr. Hammel spoke about how the requested relief would be considered a zoning modification and not a zoning variation as the action would affect a PUD.

There was some discussion about the legal notice requirements for this type of action as impacting a PUD could have more impact than just the surrounding neighbors.

Mr. Hammel went over requested modifications for this case:

1. Building Setbacks – various building setbacks would require a zoning modification
2. Loading Space Dimensions – the proposed depth of the loading bay is 16 feet with an additional 25 feet in space being added by using a portion of the parking lot for a total of 41 feet. By code a depth of 55 feet is required.
3. Onsite parking capacity – By code a total of 339 parking spaces would be required, but the proposed total capacity is 103 spaces.
4. Parking lot perimeter screening – landscape screening proposed at 6.5 feet in width on the north and south lot lines, by code 8 feet is required
5. Outdoor activities – proposed garden, event/ceremony space, and outdoor dining area. By code all activities must be conducted withing completely enclosed buildings.

6. Exterior Façade Materials – by code not less than 75% of each exterior building elevation shall incorporate high-quality materials, modifications would need to be made for multiple of the proposed elevations.

Mr. Hammel went over the potential parking issues in more detail. Stating with how the Village Code based the parking requirement on all the proposed functions being in use at the same time to arrive at the 339 spaces required number. The petitioner provided a traffic study that supports offset use of the various spaces at the site and suggests that no more than 99 spaces would be needed at any one time. Mr. Hammel also highlighted four public lots in the area that could accommodate overflow parking.

There was some discussion about how busy the four public lots (a total of 231 spaces) currently are. There was discussion about if the streets themselves were considered a part of the PUD and whether the traffic patterns could be adjusted. Commissioner DeAngelis asked about the parking requirements for a commercial property versus that of a religious institution and if those differences could be considered. Mr. Hammel stated that the petitioner's parking study did investigate those variables.

Mr. Hammel spoke about the potential route for pedestrian foot traffic would take if public lots were used. He also spoke about potentially requiring that the petitioner install a sidewalk/crosswalk connecting the UP Trail to the sidewalk on the east side of Central Park Ave. There was some discussion about whether it was fair to place this additional financial burden on the petitioner.

Speaking on behalf of the petitioner:

- Attorney Bernard Citron
- Petitioner Faruk Daudbasic
- Traffic Consultant Steve Corcoran
- Architect Shabbir Chandabhai
- Architect Wei Yu
- Engineer Christopher Fish

Mr. Cintron addressed the commission and spoke about the unique characteristics of this development. He also spoke about the uniqueness of the religious aspects and how the standard multiplier for parking requirements shouldn't apply.

Mr. Daudbasic then addressed the commission and spoke about the history of their congregation. He also spoke about the expected amount of people that would be onsite at a given time and that only during special holidays (2 days a year) would the turnout be expected to be greater than the parking available in the proposed lot. He also spoke about the intended other uses including both the gym and banquet areas. There were questions about whether there would be weddings or other events of that type at the property, but Mr. Daudbasic stated that there would not be any of those types of events. The banquet hall is more intended for smaller internal events.

There was some additional discussion about the crosswalk location on Central Park proposed by staff. Mr. Citron and Mr. Daudbasic both stated that they do not believe that this relief will be

needed on a regular basis but if it turns out that there is an increased need then they would be willing to supply a crossing guard. Commissioner Novoselsky suggested that separate of this development, investing in a crosswalk that has a flashing light system to increase visibility and to increase the safety of pedestrians.

There was additional discussion about including a fence for this property and the additional zoning modifications that would be required if a fence were added to the front yard of the property (currently designated as the parking lot area). Commissioner DeAngelis asked if the petitioner has had any discussions about any safety concerns for any areas that are not currently fenced. Mr. Citron spoke about the included fencing around the playground area, and they would be amenable if a fence were required as a condition of approval. Mr. Hammel stated that the Village recently approved parking lot security gates for a different project on Devon Avenue, however, he noted that that property does not have a fence around the perimeter of the front yard.

Traffic Consultant Steve Corcoran addressed the commission and spoke about how the submitted traffic study was conducted. He spoke about traffic in the area then spoke about the expected parking needs of the facility.

There was some discussion about the potential growth of the congregation and what impacts that could have on expected traffic. Mr. Daudbasic stated that he doesn't foresee any significant growth and their focus is on maintaining the congregation that they currently have.

Mr. Corcoran went on to show the expected parking impacts based on the way the space is intended to be used. There was some discussion about how the prayer space is used and how the overall square footage doesn't fully represent the amount of people that will be in a space at a given time. There was also some discussion about the usage on peak holy holidays (typically 2 days a year) where the amount of traffic could spike but how the expected normal traffic should be much lower than how the zoning code currently calculates the amount of parking spaces needed.

There was some additional conversation looking over the proposed crosswalk for potential pedestrian foot traffic. Commissioners reiterated that they feel that any crosswalk should have additional lighting to increase visibility.

Mr. Chandabhai and Mr. Yu then addressed the commission to discuss the elevations and proposed materials. This included providing a sample of the proposed materials for the Commissioners to handle. Mr. Chandabhai spoke about the unique design of the proposed buildings on the site. Mr. Yu spoke about the aluminum panels being used and why they felt it met the aesthetic they were looking for on this project. The discussion then went towards the durability of the materials as Commissioner Novoselsky asked how these proposed materials compare to other recently approved projects, with District 1860 being used as the primary example. Mr. Yu spoke about the benefits of the proposed materials and why they feel that it will meet the safety standards the Village has.

Commissioner DeAngelis noted that the "high quality materials" discussion is had at almost all public hearings of this type and asked if the Village was looking to update its list of "high quality materials" to better meet the current trends of projects that have recently been submitted to the

Village. Mr. Hammel stated that this is something that staff can investigate at a future meeting for consideration.

Village Engineering Consultant Mike Ziegler stated that he feels that the proposal has covered all the parking concerns raised by an initial engineering review. He gave the caveat that if the congregation does in fact grow, however, that the parking needs of the facility may need to be revisited.

There was additional discussion about the inclusion of a condition regarding the proposed crosswalk on Central Park. Commissioner DeAngelis stated that he wanted to make sure that the petitioner would be ok with the potential financial burden of implementing the additional crosswalk. Acting Chairman Jakubowski pointed out that a new business project may include some public improvements, however Commissioner DeAngelis stated that he wasn't sure about holding a religious institution to the same financial standards as a for profit venture. Mr. Hammel pointed out that adding a condition requiring a crosswalk should consider a scenario where it is later determined by the Village that a crosswalk is not feasible due to safety reasons or other concerns.

Mr. Hammel noted that there is a masonry wall on the plans for the parking lot. This proposed wall would negate the need for one of the zoning modifications related to parking lot screening (listed earlier in the minutes as zoning modification #4).

Mr. Fish spoke about the stormwater measurements that were incorporated into the proposal. He spoke about the capacity of stormwater that could be accommodated and stated that he felt that it would accommodate the needs of the facility.

Chairman Jakubowski asked if anyone from the public wished to speak. Let the record show that no one came forward.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Novoselsky to approve the proposal with 2 conditions. Condition one would be that the petitioner include the crosswalk proposed by staff with a flashing light system, so long as, the crosswalk is deemed feasible via a by a staff review. Condition two would be that the staff determines that the proposed materials are of the same quality that has been approved during other recent public hearing cases over the past 5 years.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sampen.

Aye: DeAngelis, Kohn, Novoselsky, Sampen and Jakubowski

Nay:

Abstain:

Motion Approved: 5-0

This item will go to the Village Board on June 6th, 2023

V. **Case #PC-04-23: 6731-35 North Lincoln Avenue – Final Plat of Consolidation and Subdivision Variation**

Planning and Economic Development Manager Doug Hammel spoke about how the preliminary plat of consolidation has not been completed as the petitioner is awaiting information regarding an IDOT review of the property.

No Public Comment.

A Motion to amend was made by Commissioner Sampen to continue this case until the June 7th Plan Commission hearing.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Novoselsky.

Aye: DeAngelis, Kohn, Novoselsky, Sampen and Jakubowski

Nay:

Abstain:

Motion Approved: 5-0

VI. Case #PC-10-22: Zoning Code Text Amendment – Permissibility of Certain Use in Various Zoning Districts Throughout the Village

Planning and Economic Development Manager Doug Hammel stated that after the approval at the previous meeting it came to staff's attention that there was a potential legal consideration regarding the previously approved motion. The Religious Land Use and Institutional Persons Act (RLUIPA) is a piece of federal legislation that prohibits discrimination based on religion in land use and zoning decisions. Due to this piece of legislation the previous approval that would allow entertainment venues and community facilities as Special Uses in the M-B district would be a violation of RLUIPA. Staff is looking for the commission to either amend its previous motion to include religious institutions as a special use in the M-B district, or the commission could determine that entertainment venues, community facilities, and religious institutions should not be permitted in the M-B zoning district and remise the previous recommendation as needed.

A Motion was made by Commissioner Sampen to amend the previous motion of the Plan Commission to include religious institutions as a Special Use in the M-B district.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Novoselsky.

Aye: DeAngelis, Kohn, Novoselsky, Sampen and Jakubowski

Nay:

Abstain:

Motion Approved: 5-0

VII. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Plan Commission is scheduled for Wednesday June 7, 2023.

VIII. Public Comment

Acting Chairman Jakubowski announced the opportunity for additional comments from the public. Let the record show that no one came forward.

IX. Adjournment

A motion to recommend adjournment was made by Commissioner Sampen and seconded by Commissioner Kohn.

Aye: DeAngelis, Kohn, Novoselsky, Sampen and Jakubowski

Nay:

Abstain:

Motion Approved: 5-0

The meeting was adjourned at 9:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marcos Classen
Community Development Coordinator