



CITY OF PARK RIDGE

505 BUTLER PLACE
PARK RIDGE, IL 60068
TEL: 847/ 318-5291
FAX: 847/ 318-6411
TDD:847/ 318-5252

URL:<http://www.parkridge.us>

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY
PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting
Tuesday, January 24, 2012
City Hall, City Council Chambers
505 Butler Place
Park Ridge, Illinois

DRAFT MINUTES

NOT FOR
PUBLICATION

MINUTES

Chairman Marr called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

A. Roll Call

Present

Alfredo Marr, Chairman
Aurora Abella-Austriaco
Louis Arrigoni
Joe Baldi (Arrived 7:03 p.m.)
John Bennett
John Kocisko
Chris Zamaites

Staff

Jon Branham
Laura Kleiner

City Council

Alderman Bernick, Council liaison

Absent

Anita Rifkind
Mary Catherine Wells

Others

Approximately 16 citizens

B. Approval of Minutes –January 10, 2012

It was moved by Commissioner Bennett and seconded by Commissioner Kocisko, that the minutes of the meeting held on January 10, 2012, be approved as submitted. Commissioner Zamaites abstained from voting. The remaining Commissioners, by voice vote, unanimously approved the submitted minutes.

Commissioner Baldi arrived at 7:03 p.m., after the minutes were approved.

C. Development Cases

1. Case Number TA-12-01: Text Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance for changes to Section 14.11.B - Hospital District Signs (Tabled at January 10, 2012 meeting)

Chairman Marr explained the public hearing process and swore in all interested in testifying in any of the cases.

Jon Branham summarized his staff memo dated January 10, 2012. He stated that Advocate Health Care, applicant, proposes text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance for changes to Section 14.11.B – Hospital District Signs, in accordance with the requirements of Section 4.8 of the Zoning Ordinance. This case was tabled at the January 10, 2012, meeting. At the meeting, the Commission discussed clarifying the proposed language and possibly reducing the amount of proposed changes to the text. The applicant prepared a revised redlined document which includes the proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance that would allow the applicant to move forward with the current proposal to update signage at the hospital campus. All signs proposed would be only be allowed at a five-acre or larger hospital campus. The three suggested changes include addressing a directional sign plan, increasing the maximum height and surface area for directional signage, and adding a campus identification ground sign.

Douglas Merritt, 115 South Main Street, Mishawaka, IN, representing the applicant, stated that they had met with staff and revised the proposed Zoning Ordinance changes to meet the suggestions from the Planning and Zoning Commission as well as the needs of the hospital and community.

Chairman Marr noted that at the last meeting, they had discussed the possibility that some of the signs may still require a variance. He inquired if this would still be an issue with the proposed revisions. Mr. Merritt responded that if the submitted text amendments were approved, all of the proposed signage would be within the allowed parameters.

Commissioner Abella-Austriaco thanked the applicants for their efforts to work with the City.

No other citizens addressed the Commission.

On a motion by Commissioner Abella-Austriaco, seconded by Commissioner Bennett, the Commission voted to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Bennett thanked the applicants for listening to his comments at the previous meeting and stated that he likes the solutions that they had proposed. The Commissioners agreed that the requested changes to the Zoning Ordinance would meet the requirements for the Findings of Fact.

On a motion by Commissioner Abella-Austriaco, seconded by Commissioner Bennett, the Commission

AGREED to recommend City Council approval of the Text Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance for changes to Section 14.11.B – Hospital District Signs, Zoning Case TA-12-01, as submitted in the memo dated January 18, 2012 from Advocate Health Care.

Vote on the motion was as follows:

- AYES 7 Commissioners Abella-Austriaco, Arrigoni, Baldi, Bennett, Kocisko, Marr, and Zamaites
- NAYES 0 None
- ABSENT 2 Commissioners Rifkind and Wells

The motion passed.

2. Case Number MA-12-01: Map Amendment from the R-5 District to the B-1 District at 111 South Washington Avenue

Jon Branham summarized the staff memo dated January 24, 2012, and stated that K&F Management, applicant, requests a map amendment to change the zoning of the property at 111 South Washington Avenue from the R-5 Multi-Family District to the B-1 Retail and Office District. He noted that this property was rezoned in 2007 from office to residential as part of a multi-family residential planned development proposal that was ultimately not constructed. He stated that a fencing club was recently approved as a special use at this property and by changing to the B-1 zoning, both the professional offices located here and the fencing club would be in compliance.

Commissioner Baldi questioned the recommendations in the Executive Plaza Plan to incorporate office and retail uses within the proposed residential uses. He noted that he was concerned about piecemeal rezoning for such a large parcel of land. Commissioner Abella-Austriaco stated that she remembered that when this area was previously rezoned, it was understood that the current offices would be allowed to remain until redevelopment occurred.

Nicholas Atsaves, attorney for the applicant, reviewed the history of this property and stated because of the change to R-5 zoning, new tenants in the office buildings would not be permitted. He noted that the 2006 Executive Plaza Plan stated that “ it is recommended that Executive Plaza be redeveloped for multiple family residential purposes, with the potential for some office and retail uses incorporated with the residential uses.” He also noted that the redevelopment was proposed to happen in stages, and the existing office uses within the building would be allowed to remain.

No other citizens addressed the Commission.

On a motion by Commissioner Arrigoni, seconded by Commissioner Zamaites, the Commission agreed to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Abella-Austriaco disclosed that she was married to a dentist, but said this would not affect her ability to make a fair decision in this case. She stated that Park Ridge should be supportive of health care professionals interested in bringing their practices to the City. Commissioner Arrigoni noted that since there was no clear vision for Executive Plaza at this time, it did not seem fair to restrict the owner of this building and not allow office uses. Commissioner Baldi stated that it was unlikely that this area would be developed as a high density multi-family residential property for many years. Mr. Branham noted that if this property was rezoned as O-Office, it would cause the recently approved special use for the Fencing Club to become nonconforming. The B-1 designation, he added, would alleviate this issue. Alderman Bernick stated that the economy has changed over time, and he was in favor of the map amendment.

On a motion by Commissioner Arrigoni, seconded by Commissioner Abella-Austriaco, the Commission

AGREED to recommend City Council Approval of the Map Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance from the R-5 District to the B-1 District at 111 South Washington Street, Zoning Case MA-12-01, as submitted.

Vote on the motion was as follows:

AYES 7 Commissioners Abella-Austriaco, Arrigoni, Baldi, Bennett, Kocisko, Marr, and Zamaites
 NAYES 0 None
 ABSENT 2 Commissioners Rifkind and Wells

The motion passed.

3. Case Number MA-12-02 and SP-12-01: Map Amendment from the R-2 District to the R-4 District, and Site Plan Review for Parking Alteration and Building Addition at 1001 North Greenwood Avenue

Jon Branham summarized his staff report dated January 24, 2012. He noted that Resurrection Senior Services, applicant is requesting both a map amendment and a site plan review for the property at 1001 North Greenwood Avenue. He stated that currently this property is zoned R-2, which does not allow a nursing home, therefore the current use is nonconforming. He compared the request for a recently approved map amendment and site plan review granted to St. Matthew’s Center for Health at 1601 N. Western Avenue, zoning case numbers MA-11-01 and SP-11-02. Mr. Branham stated that the proposed parking lot alteration and building addition would not have a significant impact on the area and that all bulk requirements would be met.

Chairman Marr noted that approval of the site plan review would hinge on the approval of the map amendment.

Mark Kupiec, attorney for the applicant, stated that the Resurrection Nursing and Rehabilitation Center had applied for a permit for changes to its parking lot and for a small building entryway addition. The permit had been denied by zoning, because of the nonconformity. He noted that the original building had been built in 1974 when the property was zoned institutional. That zoning designation had changed when the Zoning Ordinance was rewritten in 1975. The property is now nonconforming and needs to be in compliance before any improvements can be made.

Randy Kane, architect for the project, described the proposed plan and distributed copies to the residents attending the hearing. He noted that there would be a new entry to the building and new drop-off point for vehicles. The proposed alterations to the parking lot would reduce the number of parking spaces from 181 to 163, but parking at the site would still be in excess of the 123 parking spaces required for the use.

Ray Gianovani, Maintenance Supervisor at Resurrection Nursing and Rehabilitation Center, stated that there was a need at the facility for a separate vestibule and entrance for short time patients that are recovering from surgery or need physical therapy for rehabilitation purposes. These patients would likely stay on site for four to six weeks and would have single room occupancy. The overall use of the facility will remain the same as it is presently.

Bob Novak, 1210 Beau Drive, stated that he was a member of the Board of Directors for the Beau Drive Homeowners Association. He inquired about the site plan for the proposal, stating that it appeared the indicated construction area extended beyond property lines. He expressed concern with the drainage on the property and lighting height and spillage. He asked what kind of landscaping was planned to shield the facility from the Beau Drive residents. He asked about

the accuracy of the plat of survey, stating that he believed a portion of the original facility property had been deeded over to the Beau Drive residents.

Mr. Kane responded that all work would be conducted within the property lines, per City requirements. The lighting on the patio would be low level and turned off at night. He noted the lighting would illuminate the property the same way it is currently lit. He stated that additional landscaping would be provided to screen the patio area which is to be used for a physical therapy space. An engineering firm has designed the drainage plan and it will follow all City regulations. He stated the question about land given to the homeowner’s association would not affect the proposed plans.

On a motion by Commissioner Zamaitis, seconded by Commissioner Kocisko, the Commission agreed to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Baldi stated that one goal of the Planning and Zoning Commission was to bring nonconforming properties into compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. The Commissioners agreed that the Findings of Fact had been met.

On a motion by Commissioner Baldi, seconded by Commissioner Arrigoni, the Commission

AGREED to recommend City Council Approval of the Map Amendment from the R-2 District to the R-4 District at 1001 North Greenwood Avenue, Zoning Case MA-12-02, as submitted.

Vote on the motion was as follows:

- AYES 7 Commissioners Abella-Austriaco, Arrigoni, Baldi, Bennett, Kocisko, Marr, and Zamaites
- NAYES 0 None
- ABSENT 2 Commissioners Rifkind and Wells

The motion passed.

Commissioner Baldi made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Kocisko, to approve the Site Plan Review for 1001 North Greenwood Avenue, Zoning Case SP-12-01, as submitted.

Commissioner Arrigoni made a friendly amendment to include additional requirements to the motion, changing it to read:

AGREED to approve the Site Plan Review for 1001 North Greenwood Avenue, Zoning Case SP-12-01, subject to:

1. The Map Amendment for Zoning Case MA-12-02 must be approved by City Council.
2. The applicant shall be required to satisfy all the requirements for landscaping and screening within the project area.
3. The applicant must satisfy all Engineering Division requirements.

Commissioners Baldi and Kocisko agreed to the suggested changes.

Vote on the motion was as follows:

- AYES 7 Commissioners Abella-Austriaco, Arrigoni, Baldi, Bennett, Kocisko, Marr, and Zamaites

NAYES 0 None
ABSENT 2 Commissioners Rifkind and Wells

The motion passed.

C. City Council Liaison Report

Alderman Bernick, City Council Liaison, reported that at the January 16, 2012 City Council meeting, the Council approved the first readings for the special use at 147 Vine Avenue, SU-11-04 and the special use and map amendment for 1905 South Cumberland Avenue and 814 Higgins Road, SU-11-05 and MA-11-02. He noted that the Council had voted five to one, to allow the 7-Eleven addition, but left the size and location of the building as proposed in the original presentation. He also reported that the intersection at Cumberland and Higgins was to be reconstructed by the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT), improving the appearance of this entry into Park Ridge.

Alderman Bernick stated that a development group had brought design proposals for a grocery store on West Touhy Avenue to the Appearance Commission under a pre-application review. The Appearance Commission offered several design recommendations that were appreciated by the development group. This case will likely be coming before the Planning and Zoning Commission in the near future. The Commissioners discussed the sequence that such cases are heard, recommending applicants submit proposals to the Planning and Zoning Commission before seeking Appearance Commission approval.

Alderman Bernick also reported that the Council had discussed the liaison’s role when attending Board and Commission meetings. He stated that the liaisons will no longer be allowed to act as a voting member of the Board or Commission if there is not a quorum. He stated that if aldermen have an opinion to express at a Board or Commission meeting, they should do so at the podium as a citizen. Alderman Bernick noted that it was helpful for the liaison to attend the meetings so that the liaison could more accurately report information to City Council. He complimented Chairman Marr on the way he conducted the Planning and Zoning Commission meetings.

D. Other Items for Discussion - None

E. Citizens wishing to be Heard on Non-Agenda Items - None

F. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

Alfredo Marr, Chairman

Date approved

These minutes are not a verbatim record of the meeting but a summary of the proceedings.

BEFORE THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Park Ridge, Illinois

In the Matter of)	
)	
Text Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance)	Case No. TA-12-01
For changes to Section 14.11.B)	
– Hospital District Signs)	

FINDINGS OF FACT

This matter having come before the Planning and Zoning Commission for a hearing on the request of Advocate Health Care, for a text amendment to Section 14.11.B, of the Zoning Ordinance, regarding Hospital District Signs; and the Commission having held public hearings on January 10, 2012 and January 24, 2012, as required by law; and having heard evidence on the matter, based on the evidence presented, as reflected in the minutes of these proceedings, and for the reasons indicated in the minutes of this Commission in this case,

The Planning and Zoning Commission finds that the following facts have been established based on the standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance:

1. The extent to which the proposed amendment promotes the public health, safety, comfort and convenience and general welfare of the City.

The proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance would promote the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the City. The new signage would provide safer movement throughout the hospital campus and make it easier for patients and visitors to navigate and locate their correct destinations. The new signs will promote positive traffic management and identification of the multiple structures and services on the hospital campus.

2. The relative gain to the public, as compared to the hardship imposed upon the applicant.

The proposed amendment would benefit the public by making it easier to find their way to the parking areas and entrances for the hospital. The amendments will allow for a professionally designed sign program for consistent format for directional and identification signage.

3. The consistency of the proposed amendment with the Comprehensive Plan.

The subject property is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. The amendments will encourage excellence in sign design.

4. The consistency of the proposed amendment with the intent and general regulations of this Ordinance.

The proposed amendment will afford the general public a consistent sign program for site identification and way finding to urgent care and public and private transportation.

5. Whether the proposed amendment corrects an error or omission, adds clarification to existing requirements, or reflects a change in policy.

The proposed amendment would clarify what types of signage would be allowed in this unique use within the City. The current sign regulations do not address the signage needs of a hospital campus.

- 6. That the proposed amendment will benefit the residents of the City as a whole, and not just the applicant, property owner(s), neighbors of any property under consideration, or other special interest groups, and the extent to which the proposed use would be in the public interest and would not serve solely the interest of the applicant.

The proposed amendment would benefit the large number of patients and visitors using the hospital by helping them better find the way to their destinations on the hospital campus.

- 7. Whether the proposed amendment provides a more workable way to achieve the intent and purposes of this Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed change would allow the hospital to be in compliance with the Zoning Ordinance while enabling the public to better navigate through the hospital campus. The amendment would not impact the Comprehensive Plan.

- 8. The extent to which the proposed amendment creates nonconformities.

The proposed amendment would not create nonconformities, but would bring the hospital into compliance for the proposed new signage.

- 9. The extent to which the proposed amendment is consistent with the overall structure and organization of this Ordinance.

The proposed amendment would be consistent with how signage in other zoning districts are currently regulated in the Zoning Ordinance.

Therefore, the Commission recommends approval of this text amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, as requested, on the terms and conditions set forth in the minutes of the meeting of January 24, 2012.

Date Approved

Alfredo Marr, Chairman

BEFORE THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Park Ridge, Illinois

In the Matter of)
) Case Number MA-12-01
111 South Washington Avenue)

FINDINGS OF FACT

This matter having come before the Planning and Zoning Commission for a hearing at the request of K&F Management, for a Map Amendment from the R-5 Multi-Family Residential District to the B-1 Retail and Office at 111 South Washington Avenue; and the Commission having held a public hearing on January 24, 2012, as required by law, and having heard evidence on the matter, based on the evidence presented, as reflected in the minutes of these proceedings, and for the reasons indicated in the minutes of this Commission in this case,

The Planning and Zoning Commission finds that the following facts have been established based on the standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance:

- 1. The existing use and zoning of the nearby property.

The subject property, as well as the surrounding properties contain multiple tenant office buildings, including medical offices and commercial uses.

- 2. The extent to which property values of the subject property are diminished by the existing zoning.

The property values are diminished because of the existing zoning by not allowing new offices to be opened because of the way the zoning classification of this property was changed. The existing zoning prevents the property, in its current state and configuration, from being utilized for its intended and highest and best use.

- 3. The extent to which the proposed amendment promotes the public health, safety, comfort and convenience and general welfare of the City.

The proposed amendment would not harm the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the City. The proposed zoning would allow professional offices to open in this area where some have existed already for many years. There are currently existing medical offices in the building that were existing before the rezoning of the property in 2007.

- 4. The relative gain to the public, as compared to the hardship imposed upon the applicant.

The public will gain by encouraging medical professionals to locate their offices here, making health care professionals readily accessible to the public. There are already two tenants that would be moving into the facility if the zoning is changed. The medical offices that would locate in this building would then attract patrons to other nearby businesses.

- 5. The suitability of the property for the purposes for which it is presently zoned, i.e. the feasibility of developing the property in question for one or more of the uses permitted under the existing zoning classification.

Given the current economic climate, it is unlikely that this area will be developed as a multi-family residential area. The project proposed for the subject parcel under today's market conditions would not be economically feasible or prudent due to the continued depressed real estate market conditions and inability to secure financing for such a project.

6. The length of time that the property in question has been vacant, as presently zoned, considered in the context of development in the area where the property is located.

The property has been in use for many years as professional offices. The current R-5 Multi-Family Residential zoning for the area does not currently apply since the previous developer has not gone forward with plans for senior housing. About 50% of the above ground available space in the building has been vacant for over a year. The prolonged vacancies are a result of the plans for redevelopment that were abandoned in late 2009/early 2010.

7. The evidence, or lack of evidence, of community need for the use proposed by the Applicant.

There is a need for convenient medical and dental offices providing care for citizens in the City as evidenced by the current offices already located on this property. There are currently two dentists ready, willing and able to lease two of the vacant spaces in the subject property.

8. The consistency of the proposed amendment with the Comprehensive Plan.

The Comprehensive Plan recommends this area for Multi-Family/Mixed Use which would be consistent with the proposed office use.

9. That the proposed amendment will benefit the residents of the City as a whole, and not just the Applicant, property owner(s), neighbors of any property under consideration, or other special interest groups, and the extent to which the proposed use would be in the public interest and would not serve solely the interest of the applicant.

The proposed amendment will benefit City residents by offering convenient health and dental care to the citizens of Park Ridge as well as new businesses and service providers to the local economy.

10. The extent to which the proposed amendment creates nonconformities.

The proposed amendment would not create any nonconformities, it will actually correct existing nonconformities of the existing medical offices on the property.

11. The trend of development, if any, in the general area of the property in question.

The planned development of this property was a victim of the economic problems facing the City of Park Ridge and there appears to not be a need for additional multi-family development in the direct area. Medical professional uses are encouraged and are a consistent use for this property. There are other office uses, including medical offices, in the surrounding areas.

12. Whether adequate public facilities are available including, but not limited to schools, parks, police and fire protection, roads, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and water lines, or are reasonably capable of being provided prior to the development of the uses, which would be permitted on the subject property if the amendment were adopted.

Adequate public facilities are available in the area. The proposed amendment will have no significant impact on public utilities in the area.

Therefore, the Commission recommends approval of the Map Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, as requested, on the terms and conditions set forth in the minutes of the meeting of January 24, 2012.

Date Approved

Alfredo Marr, Chairman

BEFORE THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Park Ridge, Illinois

In the Matter of)
) Case Number MA-12-02
1001 North Greenwood Avenue)

FINDINGS OF FACT

This matter having come before the Planning and Zoning Commission for a hearing at the request of Resurrection Senior Services, for a Map Amendment from the R-2 Single Family Residential District to the R-4 Multi-Family Residential District at 1001 North Greenwood Avenue; and the Commission having held a public hearing on January 24, 2012, as required by law, and having heard evidence on the matter, based on the evidence presented, as reflected in the minutes of these proceedings, and for the reasons indicated in the minutes of this Commission in this case,

The Planning and Zoning Commission finds that the following facts have been established based on the standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance:

- 1. The existing use and zoning of the nearby property.

The nursing home facility has occupied this location for over 20 years and this map amendment would eliminate its nonconforming status within the R-2 Single Family Residential District. There are residential uses to the east, south and west.

- 2. The extent to which property values of the subject property are diminished by the existing zoning.

The facility was developed over 20 years ago and needs remodeling for the convenience of the patients and visitors. The existing zoning would not allow for an addition to the facility or changes to the parking lot.

- 3. The extent to which the proposed amendment promotes the public health, safety, comfort and convenience and general welfare of the City.

The proposed amendment would not harm the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the City. The parking lot and vestibule design would better meet the needs of the facility and the public by providing more convenient access to the general parking area and to the facility for patrons recovering from surgeries.

- 4. The relative gain to the public, as compared to the hardship imposed upon the applicant.

The public will gain by the modernization of the facility for the convenience of the public and it addresses the patients' and visitors' needs.

- 5. The suitability of the property for the purposes for which it is presently zoned, i.e. the feasibility of developing the property in question for one or more of the uses permitted under the existing zoning classification.

Resurrection has been at this location for over 20 years and this change would bring them into compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. The change is required for the small addition and modification to the parking lot.

6. The length of time that the property in question has been vacant, as presently zoned, considered in the context of development in the area where the property is located.

The property has been in use for over 20 years as a care center and R-4 Multi-Family Residential zoning would be the best zoning classification for the use. Multi-family residential zoning is also located adjacent to the use. The property is not currently vacant.

7. The evidence, or lack of evidence, of community need for the use proposed by the Applicant.

There is a need for facilities providing convenient and necessary short-term and long-term nursing care services to the community, as shown by the continued demand for the use of this facility for over 20 years.

8. The consistency of the proposed amendment with the Comprehensive Plan.

The Comprehensive Plan encourages the appropriate mix of land uses compatible with the City's residential character, while addressing the needs of the community. This facility has been providing convenient and necessary health care services to the community for over 20 years.

9. That the proposed amendment will benefit the residents of the City as a whole, and not just the Applicant, property owner(s), neighbors of any property under consideration, or other special interest groups, and the extent to which the proposed use would be in the public interest and would not serve solely the interest of the applicant.

The proposed amendment will benefit City residents by offering a facility to care for citizens of Park Ridge and Northwest Chicago and surrounding communities requiring comprehensive long-term and short-term nursing home care and rehabilitation.

10. The extent to which the proposed amendment creates nonconformities.

The proposed amendment would bring the subject property into compliance with the Zoning Ordinance and eliminate the existing nonconformity, as nursing homes are not permitted in the R-2 Single Family Residential District.

11. The trend of development, if any, in the general area of the property in question.

The subject property is located in an established residential neighborhood with some institutional uses such as the fire department station (across the street), as well as multi-family residential directly to the east of the property.

12. Whether adequate public facilities are available including, but not limited to schools, parks, police and fire protection, roads, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and water lines, or are reasonably capable of being provided prior to the development of the uses, which would be permitted on the subject property if the amendment were adopted.

The subject use has been operating successfully at this location for over 20 years. Adequate public facilities are available in the area, as determined by the applicant.

Therefore, the Commission recommends approval of the Map Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, as requested, on the terms and conditions set forth in the minutes of the meeting of January 24, 2012.

Date Approved

Alfredo Marr, Chairman