

**RESOLUTION OF THE VILLAGE OF OAK PARK HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
COMMISSION DENYING A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS TO  
CONSTRUCT A TEN-STORY ADDITION BEHIND AN EXISTING OAK PARK  
LANDMARK KNOWN AS THE BOULEVARD ARCADE BUILDING LOCATED AT  
1035 SOUTH BLVD, OAK PARK, ILLINOIS**

**WHEREAS**, on January 2, 2025, John Schiess, ("**Applicant**") filed an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness seeking approval to construct a ten-story addition behind an existing Oak Park landmark known as the Boulevard Arcade Building located at 1035 South Blvd ("**Subject Property**"); and

**WHEREAS**, on January 9, 2025; May 22, 2025; and July 24, 2025, the Village of Oak Park Historic Preservation Commission ("**Commission**") reviewed the Applicant's applications and determined it did not meet the Architectural Review Guidelines per Section 7-9-12(F) of the Village of Oak Park Village Code ("**Village Code**"); and

**WHEREAS**, on July 30, 2025, the Applicant requested a public hearing before the Commission on its application on August 13, 2025, a legal notice was published in *The Wednesday Journal*, a newspaper of general circulation in the Village of Oak Park ("**Village**") providing notice of the public hearing, and letters were mailed by regular mail on August 11, 2025 to owners of property within two hundred and fifty feet (250') of the Subject Property advising them of the application and the public hearing; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to proper notice, and by agreement of the Applicant, the Commission conducted a public hearing on the application on August 28, 2025, at which time and place a quorum of the Commission was present; and

**WHEREAS**, at the public hearing all persons testifying were sworn and provided testimony and evidence under oath, the Applicant presented evidence and testimony in favor of the application, seven (7) members of the public presented oral testimony opposing the application, and the Commission received five (5) written comments opposing the application; and

**WHEREAS**, at the conclusion of the public hearing the Commission considered all evidence and testimony submitted on the application, deliberated on the application and determined, by 7-0 vote of those Commissioners present, that the proposal does not meet the Architectural Review Guidelines and that the application of a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a ten-story addition behind an existing Oak Park landmark be denied;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE VILLAGE OF OAK PARK HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION:**

**SECTION 1: Recitals Incorporated.** The above recitals are incorporated herein as though fully set forth.

**SECTION 2: Findings of Fact.** The Commission makes the following findings of fact regarding the application:

**Subject Property and Structure**

1. The Subject Property is located at 1035 South Blvd.
2. The Subject Property is located in the DT-3 Pleasant Sub-District.
3. The purpose of the DT-3 Pleasant Sub-District is to “accommodate the pedestrian-friendly, lower-intensity mix of small floor plate retail, personal service, and entertainment uses that support the vitality of the Downtown Central,” per Section 5.1.A. of the Village’s Zoning Ordinance.
4. The structure, a commercial building, was designed by architect Eben E. Roberts and built in 1906 for original owner Charles Anderson.
5. The structure was remodeled into a two-story building by architect Arthur Jacobs in 1922.
6. The Village Board designated the Boulevard Arcade Building as an Oak Park Landmark on June 4, 2007.

**Application**

7. The Applicant attended the public hearing.
8. The Applicant proposes to construct a ten-story addition behind an existing Oak Park landmark known as the Boulevard Arcade Building.
9. The Applicant provided plans, elevations, and 3D renderings showing the proposed ten-story addition behind the existing landmark building.

**Testimony and Evidence**

10. Other than testimony and evidence from the Applicant, no testimony or evidence was presented in support of the application.
11. Five (5) written objections to the application were received by the Commission prior to the public hearing and accepted into evidence.
12. At the public hearing, seven (7) Village residents testified in opposition to the application and no Village residents testified in support of the application.
13. Evidence at the public hearing demonstrated that the structure is an important part of the historic fabric of Downtown Oak Park.

14. The Chair accepted the following exhibits into evidence at the public hearing:

- A. Certificate of Appropriateness application dated May 9, 2025.
- B. "1035 South Blvd HPC Presentation" by John Schiess, architect.
- C. Staff Report dated August 28, 2025.
- D. Staff Reports dated December 12, 2024; January 9, 2025; May 22, 2025; and July 24, 2025.
- E. Minutes from Historic Preservation Commission meetings dated December 12, 2024; January 9, 2025; March 27, 2025; May 22, 2025; and July 24, 2025.
- F. Correspondence from Applicant requesting a public hearing dated July 30, 2025.
- G. Legal Notice, Notice to owners, Notice to property owners within 250 feet.
- H. Photographs of the structure.

#### Comprehensive Plan

15. The Comprehensive Plan provides that the purpose of the Village's Historic Preservation Districts is to "protect historic buildings and maintain the character of historic areas in the Village" and that historic preservation is "an important tool for achieving several of the guiding principles of this Plan."

16. The Comprehensive Plan supports the preservation of the Village's historical and architectural heritage, which preservation ensures one of the Village's defining characteristics and source of pride endures.

#### Architectural Review Guidelines

17. Section 7-9-11(B) of the Village Code provides that the United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the Commission's Architectural Review Guidelines shall be used when considering whether a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition of a contributing resource should be granted.

**SECTION 3: Conclusions.** The Commission made the following conclusions regarding the application based on the testimony and evidence presented at the public hearing, and based on the findings of fact set forth above:

18. The architectural style and heritage of the Subject Property should be preserved.

19. The Subject Property contributes to and reinforces the character of the Village as a whole, the Downtown, and the area in the immediate vicinity of the Subject Property.

20. The Subject Property is a designated Oak Park Landmark.

21. The proposed ten-story addition does not comply with the Village's historic preservation requirements in the Village Code.

22. The proposed ten-story addition does not meet the United States Secretary of the Interior's Standards and does not meet the Commission's Architectural Review Guidelines:

- (1) An addition shall not change the historic character of the historic building.
- (2) An addition shall be compatible with the historic building to which it is attached, including siting, massing, scale, materials and street rhythm.
- (3) An addition shall not remove character-defining features, historic windows, historic siding or other historic material from the historic building that are visible from the street.
- (4) Exterior finish materials of the addition shall be compatible with that of the historic building.
- (5) The size, configuration and massing of all additions shall be such that when viewed from the street, the addition does not visually overpower the historic building.

23. The proposed ten-story addition would frustrate and thwart the policy of the Village as expressed in the Comprehensive Plan by negatively impacting the historic character of the historic area around the Subject Property.

24. The proposed ten-story addition would set a negative precedent for addition projects affecting other contributing resources and designated landmarks in the Village of Oak Park.

25. The proposed structure does not conform to the purposes of the DT-3 Pleasant Sub-District as described in the Zoning Ordinance.

**SECTION 4: Denial of Application.** Pursuant to the authority vested in the Commission by the Village Code, and based on the above findings, the testimony and the

evidence presented at the public hearing, by a 7-0 vote of those Commissioners present, the Commission denies the Certificate of Appropriateness application for the proposed ten-story addition behind the existing landmark building known as the Boulevard Arcade Building.

**SECTION 5: Severability.** If any Section, paragraph, sentence or provision of this Resolution shall be held to be invalid or unenforceable for any reason, the invalidity or unenforceability of such Section, paragraph or provision shall not affect any of the remaining provisions of this Resolution.

**ADOPTED** this 28th day of August 2025, pursuant to a unanimous roll call vote of the Commission.

**APPROVED** by me this 28th day of August 2025.

---

Louis Garapolo, Chair of the Commission