

July 16, 2015

President and Board of Trustees
Village of Oak Park
123 Madison Street
Oak Park, Illinois 60302

Re: Application of Clark Street Development, LLC for a Major Planned Development at 1123-1133 Lake Street 1133-1145, Westgate (Village-owned surface parking lot, building and Village-owned surface parking off of North Blvd., located in the 1100 block).

Dear President and Trustees:

On or about December 15, 2014, Clark Street Development, LLC, through its agent Andy Stein, (the "Applicant") filed for a planned development, seeking approval of a Major Planned Development for two multi-story buildings connected by a private pedestrian walkway with 271 residential rental units, approximately 26,000 square feet of commercial/retail space, 428 public parking spaces and a new public street. The Applicant has also requested two allowances from the Zoning Ordinance: density and height. The applicant has an approved Redevelopment Agreement with the Village of Oak Park. The Village Board has also referred the issue of the vacation of two certain portions of alley-ways adjacent to the proposed project to the Plan Commission for public hearing.

On June 17, 2015, a legal notice was published in *The Wednesday Journal*, a newspaper of general circulation in the Village of Oak Park. A notice was posted at the Subject Property and certified letters were also mailed by the Applicant to taxpayers of record for property within five-hundred (500) feet of the Subject Property, advising them of the proposal and the public hearing to be held. Pursuant to this legal notice, this Plan Commission set a public hearing on the application to be held July 2, 2015.

Pursuant to the legal notice, this Plan Commission conducted a public hearing on the application on July 2, 2014, continued to a special meeting on July 9, 2015, at which times and place a quorum of the members of the Plan Commission was present. At the various continued public hearings, the Applicant presented its evidence and testimony and members of the public presented evidence and testimony either in favor, against, or neither for or against, the Applicant's proposal.

Each voting member of the Plan Commission listened to a recording of any session(s) for which he or she was absent.

Having heard and considered the testimony and evidence at the public hearings, the Commission makes the following findings of fact:

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Subject Property.

1. The proposed development is located within the B-4 Downtown Business District, mid-block between Harlem Avenue and Marion Street between Lake Street and North Boulevard. The development proposal consists of a five story brick and stone and/or cast stone building along Lake Street at a height of sixty-three (63) feet with eighty (80) residential rental units and 23,139 square feet of retail/commercial space.

2. The southernmost building is a twenty (20) story brick and glass building located between Westgate and North Boulevard at a height of 208.26 feet with one hundred ninety-one (191) residential rental units, 2,000 square feet of retail/commercial space and four-hundred twenty-eight (428) shared public parking spaces. The two (2) buildings will be connected by a pedestrian bridge for use by the residents of the development. The development will be constructed on village-owned property consisting of two surface parking lots and one office building at 1133 Westgate (to be razed).

3. The Applicant's request for approval is accompanied by two (2) allowances to the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. These allowances are for height and density.

The Vacation of the Alleys.

4. The Applicant asks the Village, as part of this Application for planned development, to vacate a portion of the public alleys as shown on the submitted plats to be incorporated into the Oak Park Station Mixed-Use Project.

5. The areas requested for vacation measure approximately: (1) 15' x 48.05' (720.75 square feet); and (2) 15' x 75.06' (1125.9 square feet).

6. The first requested vacated parcel is located between Lake Street and Westgate Street, and the second requested vacated parcel is located between Westgate Street and North Boulevard.

7. As a part of this request, the Applicants will grant back to the Village of Oak Park several plats of dedication for a small strip of land along Lake Street.

8. As a part of this request, the Applicants will grant back to the Village of Oak Park an unrestricted easement for the public use of the alley surface and/or underground or overhead uses that benefit or may benefit the public.

9. Because of this easement, no public utilities or public access, or maintenance of any public utilities will in any way be affected by the requested vacation.

10. The public interest would be subserved by vacating this portion of the alley to the Applicants, and no public utilities would be affected because of the easement back to the Village that the Applicants propose.

11. The Plan Commission took no evidence on the issue of compensation for the vacation, as per the referral from the President and Board of Trustees.

The Applicant.

12. The Applicant specializes in the successful development and redevelopment of retail, industrial and mixed-use properties throughout the United States and abroad.

13. The Applicant has completed numerous recent large developments in the area, including:

- a. Bedford City Square in Bedford Park, Illinois
- b. Broadview Village Square in Broadview, Illinois
- c. Orland Park Place in Orland Park, Illinois
- d. South Loop Marketplace in Chicago, Illinois
- e. Ontario City Centre in Chicago, Illinois
- f. The Broadway at Surf in Chicago, Illinois

14. Moreover, the Applicant is currently working on the following large developments in the area:

- a. Wingra Point in Madison, Wisconsin
- b. Touhy Marketplace in Skokie, Illinois
- c. Meadows Marketplace in Rolling Meadows, Illinois
- d. Roosevelt Glen Corporate Center in Glen Ellyn, Illinois

15. The Applicant is also currently working with Lennar Multifamily Communities, LLC (“LMC”), which is a multifamily real estate investment company focused on assembling a geographically diversified portfolio of institutional quality multifamily rental properties in selected U.S. markets.

16. LMC has projects in major markets across the U.S., with \$1.6 billion in total development costs and over \$157 million in Lennar Equity.

17. The Applicant is also partnering with FitzGerald Associates Architects (“FitzGerald”), a local architecture firm with significant mixed-use and high-rise residential design experience in the area, including:

- a. 1001 West Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
- b. Arkadia, Chicago, Illinois
- c. Atrium Village, Chicago, Illinois
- d. Gateway at Washington Park, Chicago, Illinois
- e. Midtown Square, Glenview, Illinois
- f. One Place Condominiums & South Loop Shops, Chicago, Illinois
- g. One South Halstead, Chicago, Illinois
- h. Wilson Yard, Chicago, Illinois

- i. E2 Apartments, Evanston, Illinois
- j. 15th & Blue Island, Chicago, Illinois

18. As part of its request, the Applicant submitted the following documentation pursuant to the requirements of Section 2.2.7(D)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance for “Major Planned Developments.”

- (a) Petition for Public Hearing, dated December 15, 2014
- (b) Affidavit of Notice for adjacent property owners, dated November 19, 2014, and Community Meeting Q & A Memo, dated December 2, 2014
- (c) Application Fee
- (d) Project Summary
- (e) Professional Qualifications
- (f) Proposed Financing, dated January 30, 2015
- (g) Legal Current Year Plat of Survey, dated July 8, 2014; and Application of Right-of-Way Vacation
- (h) List and Map of Surrounding Property Owners
- (i) Statement of Restrictions and Covenants (not applicable)
- (j) Construction Schedule
- (k) Construction Traffic Schedule
- (l) Market and Feasibility Report, from Appraisal Research Counselors, dated November 17, 2014
- (m) Traffic Study from KLOA (dated June 1, 2015)
- (n) Parking Study from KLOA (dated June 1, 2015)
- (o) Village Services Letter dated December 15, 2014

- (p) Environmental Reports, from Terracon Consultants, Inc., dated October 31, 2013 and revised January 23, 2015
- (r) Perspective Drawings
- (s) Photos of Surrounding Properties and Buildings
- (t) Location Map
- (u) Site Plan
- (v) Landscape Plan
- (w) Detailed Sign Elevations
- (x) Building Elevations, original
- (y) Floor Plans
- (z) Exterior Lighting Plan
- (aa) Shadow Study
- (bb) Preliminary Engineering Plan from Terracon Consultants, Inc., dated November 14, 2014
- (cc) Historically Significant Properties Statement, dated December 19, 2014
- (dd) LEED Requirements Statement from Green Building, showing a LEED-NC Registration, dated December 18, 2014.
- (ee) Recordation Statement, dated December 19, 2014
- (ff) Power point presentation by Applicant on July 2, 2015
- (gg). Power point presentation by Applicant on July 9, 2015.

Zoning Districts and Overlays.

19. One of the principal objectives of the Zoning Ordinance is to provide for a compatible arrangement of uses of land and buildings that is consistent with the

requirements and welfare of the Village. To accomplish this objective, most uses are classified as permitted or special uses in one or more of the districts established by the Zoning Ordinance. However, it is recognized that there are certain uses that, because of their scope, location or specific characteristics, give rise to a need for a more comprehensive consideration of their impact, both with regard to the neighboring land and the Village in general. Such uses fall within the provisions of the Planned Development section of the Zoning Ordinance and shall only be permitted if authorized as a Planned Development.

20. Planned Developments enable the Village to grant certain allowances or modifications from the basic provisions of the Zoning Ordinance to achieve attractive and timely development in furtherance of the Village's goals and objectives as stated in the Comprehensive Plan.

21. Site-development allowances (i.e., any zoning relief, including any deviation from the Zoning Ordinance provisions for the underlying zoning district) may be approved provided the applicant specifically identifies each site development allowance and how it would be compatible with surrounding development.

22. Planned Developments should generally be limited to those uses or combination of uses currently permitted in the underlying zoning district. However, an applicant may petition for consideration of a use or combination of uses not specifically allowed in the underlying zoning district if the Village Board finds that the conditions, procedures and standards are met and that such use or combination of uses is shown to be beneficial to the Village.

23. The Applicant seeks a Planned Development approval, here, because the Zoning Ordinance requires those properties or buildings that are over 10,000 square feet in size to seek Planned Development approval when allowances are requested.

24. The Subject Property is located within several overlay districts in the Downtown business district: the Perimeter Overlay District, the Transit-Related Retail Overlay District, (“T-RROD”), the Downtown Lake Street Building Height and Massing Overlay District.

25. The Perimeter Overlay District essentially identifies the commercial gateway areas into Oak Park. These areas were established to achieve the following: Improve the visual qualities of the Perimeter areas, encourage a mix of desirable retail uses, protect adjacent residential areas, restrict undesirable signage, and limit undesirable uses.

26. The purpose of the T-RROD is to protect existing retail uses and encourage new retail development on the ground floor of buildings in areas adjacent to and in close proximity to mass transit stations, and to prohibit uses that are incompatible with or detract from the retail vitality.

27. The Downtown Lake Street Building Height and Massing Overlay District is meant to protect the unique and representative character of the existing Village streetscape and prevent the construction of buildings that would disrupt or run contrary to the character of both the street in question and the Village.

Requested Waivers and Allowances.

28. The Applicant requests allowances for height and density.

29. Section 3.8.3 (A)(2) B-4 Downtown Business District height regulations state that no building or structure shall exceed one-hundred twenty-five (125) feet in height.

30. The Applicant is requesting to construct a 208.26 foot tall building requiring an allowance request of 83.26 feet (which represents about eight (8) floors).

31. The tallest building in the adjacent vicinity will be twenty (20) stories and 204 feet tall at Lake Street and Forest Avenue. The next tallest building is in Mills Park which is nineteen (19) stories tall.

32. The Oak Park Apartments (Trader Joes) building is fourteen (14) stories, and the retirement community building on Ontario is thirteen (13) stories tall.

33. As for density, Section 3.8.3 (A)(1)(a) B-4 Downtown Business District bulk regulations reference the need for a mixed use building that would require 700 square feet of land for each dwelling unit after 3,000 square feet is subtracted for the first two (2) dwelling units.

34. However, the Applicant is proposing 271 residential units, which requires a total of 191,300 square feet of land.

35. The Subject Property is 63,212.5 square feet (minus the proposed dedicated street) in size requiring a 128,087.5 square foot allowance. Stated another way, as of right, the Zoning Ordinance would allow only eighty-eight (88) residential units based on the existing land (minus the area to be dedicated for a new street) square footage.

36. One rationale for the planned development regulations is the ability to allow development-needed flexibility that could foster creativity and provide enhancements of the built environment as well as provide compensating benefits to the community.

37. Any relief sought in this regard must meet the standards set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and must be justified by those standards before consideration of the request can be determined.

38. Each of the two above-mentioned allowances should work toward a creative solution as to what could be considered a standard or conventional development, but must be balanced with the negatives and positives to the area.

Other Information Submitted.

39. The Commission also reviewed information from sources other than the Applicants, submitted throughout the course of the Public Hearings and its deliberation.

40. The Commission reviewed e-mails and photographs from concerned residents.

41. The Commission received three letters of support from various organizations; Oak Park Economic Development Corporation, Downtown Oak Park and the Heitman Company who oversees the ownership of the Shops of Downtown.

The Proposed Project.

42. The Applicant proposes a mixed-use development located east of Harlem Avenue, south of Lake Street, west of Marion Street and north of North Boulevard.

43. This proposed project is composed of two buildings with 271 luxury apartment units, approximately 26,000 square feet of ground floor retail space, and a 428 space public parking garage.

44. In addition, a new public street called Maple Avenue will be constructed on the west side of the proposed Project that would link Lake Street to North Boulevard.

45. With the construction of a new street, the new development will offer additional points of connection decreasing the potential congestions for pedestrians, vehicles and bicyclists.

46. The proposed North Building would be a five-story (approximately 63') building that will consist of ground floor retail space (approximately 23,100 square feet) and four stories of residential above. The residential component of this building will have a mix of eighty (80) studio, one, and two bedroom units.

47. The North Building would be constructed as a steel podium for the ground floor retail and would have four stories of wood-frame construction above for the residential. This building is planned to be clad primarily in brick, panel, and stone and/or cast stone. There would be a roof deck on a portion of the second floor that contains a green roof, private terraces, and a common deck area for use by residents.

48. The proposed South Building would be a twenty (20) story (approximately 208') building, that would contain a ground floor retail space of approximately 2,000 square feet, five (5) floors of parking, and fifteen (15) floors of residential units, including one (1) partial floor of residential units and amenity areas above the public parking garage.

49. The proposed South Building would have one-hundred ninety-one (191) units that would also be a mix of studios, one and two bedrooms. The outdoor amenities that would be part of the proposed South Building include a swimming pool, barbecue area, plantings. Interior amenities for this building would include a lounge, yoga room and exercise room.

50. The proposed South Building would be constructed of post tensioned concrete and clad in glass, brick, concrete, stucco, and metal panels.

51. Proposed materials for both buildings were circulated by the Petitioner at the Public Hearing and considered by the Commission.

52. The north and south buildings would be connected by an enclosed bridge for residents of the buildings to easily access parking and amenities in the project.

53. In addition to providing convenience to the residents, the bridge would create a unique architectural feature to the project.

54. The Applicant aims to fit the proposal into the overall context of Downtown Oak Park. To that end, the massing of the buildings begins at a lower scale on Lake Street, connected by the pedestrian bridge running north-south linking the two buildings together, while transitioning to a taller building along North Boulevard.

55. To reinforce the transition, the buildings transform from Lake Street to North Boulevard with the differing architecture in each building.

56. The Applicant asserts that the difference in architecture also helps to further break the scale of the buildings down, while emphasizing its stated concept that the project is “a design of its age but also of tomorrow – much like the Village of Oak Park.”

57. The proposed development will be at a minimum LEED Certified.

58. The application provides a checklist of proposed LEED initiatives anticipated for the new buildings and grounds, such as Water Efficiency, Energy, Material Usage, Indoor Air and Material Quality.

59. The proposed development aims to encourage diversity, urban sustainability, respect for Oak Park's history and legacy, collaboration and cooperation, and thriving neighborhoods – all goals of the Comprehensive Plan, as discussed below.

Oak Park Economic Development Corporation.

60. The Oak Park Economic Development Corporation (“OPEDC”) issued a written opinion, dated June 8, 2015, to the Commission in support of the Applicant's proposal.

61. OPEDC expressed its support for the proposal, opining that a twenty (20) story project is appropriate for this key downtown location.

62. OPEDC believes that the economic value of the proposal on the Subject Property would provide property and sales taxes to keep local units of government strong and in a position to provide the level of services that Oak Park residents expect.

63. OPEDC also opines that the development would provide for the expanding housing needs for the future residents of our community.

64. OPEDC trusts in the Applicant and its professional consultants and partners. OPEDC states that the Applicant has been responsive to requests for information and concerns that have been raised.

Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

65. The proposed development mainly affects five (5) recommendation chapters (touches on others) within the newly-adopted Comprehensive Plan:

4. “Land Use & Built Environment”
7. “Neighborhood, Housing and Diversity”
10. “Transportation, Infrastructure, & Communication Technology”
12. “Economic Health & Vitality” and
13. “Environmental Sustainability.”

66. The Comprehensive Plan establishes goals and objectives that set the standards for development. The Comprehensive Plan discusses the idea of strengthening commercial districts as well as noting the symbiotic relationship between economic development and the overall quality of the community.

67. The Comprehensive Plan encourages a mix of uses and businesses that can assist in diversifying the community’s tax-base and provide consumer variety.

68. The Comprehensive Plan also encourages pursuing businesses that address unmet gaps in the local market demand.

69. The Comprehensive Plan encourages transit-oriented development with all types of housing.

70. The future Land Use map supports more commercial/mixed use development that caters to residents, but also attracts visitors from other communities. The proposed development fits these recommendations.

71. The Comprehensive Plan also recognizes that sustainability is increasingly important for the Village. As such, the Comprehensive Plan encourages environmental building materials and methods.

72. The Comprehensive Plan is guided by Five Guiding Principles; Diversity, Urban Sustainability, Respect for Oak Park's History and Legacy, Collaboration and Cooperation, and Thriving Neighborhoods.

Greater Downtown Master Plan.

73. The Greater Downtown Master Plan, ("GDMP"), which includes Downtown Oak Park, the Hemingway District, and the Pleasant District, was adopted in 2005 with a goal to revitalize and attract high quality retail to greater downtown Oak Park.

74. GDMP recognizes the need for additional residential and commercial uses within these areas.

75. GDMP sets forth a capacity diagram which is used to identify potential private investment as compared to public investment.

76. GDMP includes a development capacity summary that indicates 207,000 square feet of new retail is appropriate for development in the greater downtown area by the year 2020. To date, 95,000 square feet of new retail/commercial (FFC) has been developed since 2005, with an additional 25,000 coming on line next year at Lake Street and Forest Avenue. This totals 120,000 square feet—a little more than half of what the plan recommends. The proposed development will add an additional 26,000 square feet of retail, with an additional anticipated at Lake and Forest (NWC) and South Boulevard and Harlem Avenue of 16,000 square feet for a grand total of 162,000

square feet of retail/commercial in the greater downtown area (totaling about 8% under recommendation).

77. GDMP also indicates that 1,200 dwelling units and 3,000 parking spaces would be appropriate to support new development in the downtown area.

78. To date, 347 dwelling units have been added since 2005, with an additional 270 coming on line next year at Lake Street and Forest Avenue. This new development of dwelling units total 617 units – a little more than half what the GDMP recommends.

79. The proposed development would add an additional 271 dwelling units, with an anticipated 240 additional dwelling units at South Boulevard and Harlem Avenue, and 140 additional units at Lake Street and Forest Avenue. The new development, inclusive of the proposed development, would bring the total to the recommended number with 1,268 units, which would be six percent (6%) over recommendation.

80. To date, 327 parking spaces have been added since 2005, approximately 11% of what the GDMP recommends.

81. The proposed development would add an additional 247 net parking spaces (428 proposed spaces replacing 181 existing). That would bring the total of new spaces added since 2005, inclusive of the new development, to 574, or approximately 19% of the 3,000 total spaces recommended by the GDMP.

82. The fundamental concept of the GDMP for this area is to revitalize retail, reduce traffic congestion, improve transit usage, provide additional open space, and enhance the pedestrian environment.

83. The proposed development would contribute to each of these concepts. The addition of 26,000 square feet of retail, a new connector street between Lake Street and North Boulevard, 271 apartments next to multiple transit options, open space for pedestrians and green space for residents, and new shopping amenities for pedestrians are all part of the proposal associated with the proposed development.

84. GDMP identifies a large portion of the development site as a catalyst project and recommends the improvement of traffic circulation, viable new retail space, easily-accessible shopper-friendly garage, improved pedestrian access to transit, and reestablished street grid into the Shops of Downtown development. The proposed development meets these standards for this site.

85. While the GDMP focuses on enhancing commercial development, aesthetic improvements, and identification, residential and retail development within a business district, in general, is a key component to good urbanism. More people walking to and within the business district, watching what is happening on the street, encourages spending money locally.

Compatibility with Surrounding Land Uses.

86. The Subject Property is centered within the B-4 Downtown Business District, an area surrounded by existing retail, commercial and residential uses. The proposed uses are compatible and consistent with the surrounding land uses.

87. The Applicant's material choices relate to those building materials found in the immediate area.

88. The placement of the buildings on their respective parcels is appropriate.

89. The massing of the building proposed along Lake Street fits well with those existing buildings along Lake Street.

90. The height along Lake Street for the North Building is less than what is allowed by zoning and in line with the GDMP's recommendation that all new buildings in this area should not be any taller than the former Marshall Fields building at Harlem and Lake.

91. The South Building is taller than the one-hundred twenty-five (125) foot height limit zoning allows, but it is placed appropriately for a building that has additional height and density. This tallest portion of this building is setback from North Boulevard, from the east property line and somewhat from the new Maple Avenue.

Traffic, Parking and Streetscape.

92. The Applicant and the Village have agreed to a shared parking system for the public garage, as part of the related Development Agreement.

93. The proposed garage would be owned by the Village, but operated by the Applicant and its developers.

94. The proposed garage would contain four hundred and twenty eight (428) parking spaces. These spaces would replace the existing surface lot parking spaces as well as provide for use by the residents in the proposed development and retail/commercial patrons of the Downtown area.

95. The existing surface parking lots on the Subject Property contain one-hundred eighty-one (181) surface parking spaces. Replacement of these spaces is not a

zoning requirement, but a requirement of the Redevelopment Agreement with the Village.

96. The Zoning Ordinance exempts parking within the B4 Downtown Business district for two floors of a development (two times the square footage of the lot/s).

97. The Zoning Ordinance requires that the residential portion of the development provide three-hundred fifty-six (356) parking spaces.

98. The Zoning Ordinance requires that the 26,000 square feet of retail provide 52 parking spaces.

99. Because of the B-4 two-floor exemption noted above, the proposed parking garage far exceeds the zoning ordinance requirement. Therefore no zoning relief is necessary regarding the parking proposed by the Applicant.

100. The Village has consistently approved residential developments in the B4 Downtown district with a one-to-one ratio (1:1) of parking spaces to dwelling units.

101. The proposed shared parking concept outlined in the Development Agreement anticipates a cross-use of parking spaces between residents and retail/commercial users. The first and second floors of the parking garage will be dedicated to short-term public parking, with time limits to be determined in a Garage Operating Agreement entered into between the Applicant and the Village. Signage will be used to indicate the short-term nature of the public parking on the first and second floor.

102. The Applicant's parking and traffic report expands on this concept and the anticipated times of use. The zoning ordinance encourages shared parking, in particular where utilization is different depending on the time of day.

103. Regarding traffic patterns, the Applicant has proposed the installation of the new north-south public street, Maple Avenue, which would be two-way street with some on-street parking spaces south of Westgate.

104. Access to Lake Street would be with right turn in and right turn out only restrictions, designed to avoid traffic congestion that might naturally occur if these restrictions were not in place.

105. The new street would provide needed circulation due in part to the proposed development, but also to address current congestion around and within the downtown area.

106. The new street would also provide the opportunity to add street-frontage retail within the development and potential future retail for the neighboring property to the west.

107. Regarding street improvements, the Village Board is currently reviewing its own plans for right-of-way enhancements for Lake Street from Harlem Avenue to Euclid Avenue. The outcome of those discussions will give directions for developing the palette not only for Lake Street but for Maple Avenue as well.

108. The current discussion with the Village Board is to incorporate aspects of the Marion Street palette, including materials such as: bluestone, clay bricks, granite, concrete, and lighting, benches, planters, tree grates, etc.

109. These areas will not look exactly the same as Marion Street, but will have touches of the same palette.

Density.

110. As discussed earlier, the number of dwelling units proposed is in line with the recommendations of the GDMP, although still requiring an allowance from the applicable zoning regulations.

111. Additionally, the Homes for a Changing Region report, adopted by the Village Board in 2012, states the following regarding “Future Rental Needs” in the Village:

“Much like the ownership market in Oak Park, we estimate that about 45% of households making less than \$15,000 find themselves in housing they cannot afford. Oak Park will have an opportunity, therefore, to create housing to meet the needs of these lower income households. Additional senior rental housing is a definite possibility.

“We also expect that some rental housing, currently affordable to renters with incomes in the \$15,000-\$30,000 range may eventually become affordable to lower income families.

“We also note the potential to develop more upscale rental housing which can meet the needs of families with incomes exceeding \$75,000. Transit oriented rental housing may represent the real opportunity here. Although, these households may prefer to minimize housing expenses and save their money for other things.”

112. The report further references Housing Demand by Type of Unit:

“When we combine our projections for new owner-occupied and rental housing in the future, we get a clearer picture of Oak Park’s demand for additional housing units by type in 2030. What emerges is a “balanced housing” profile with demand for about 250 additional single family, 72 townhome and 847 multifamily homes between now and 2030.

“This demand can be accommodated by filling existing vacancies, redevelopment or new construction.”

113. The proposed development identifies with these categories and fulfills a portion of the demand anticipated before 2030.

114. Staff is in support of the proposed development.

Ability of Applicant to Complete Project.

115. The evidence indicated that the Applicant has the financial resources and technical expertise to complete the project, and can begin the project immediately.

116. The evidence indicated that the Applicant has the ability to secure financing and that the market will support the proposed development.

Specific Objectives of the Comprehensive Plan (Section 3.9.1(I)(1)).

117. The two (2) requested allowances for the proposed development, for height (a requested 83.26 foot height allowance to construct a 208.26 foot tall building) and for density (a requested 128,087.5 square foot allowance to allow a total of 271 dwelling units) further the following specific objectives:

- a. Development of a large, underutilized lot in the downtown retail and transit area.
- b. Development that meets the parking requirements of the Village.
- c. Combination and coordination of the character, the form and the relationship of structures to one another, with the proposed buildings, garage, and footbridge respecting Lake Street height and massing as well as the downtown goal of taller and more dense development.
- d. Promotion of economic development within the Village, with an increased tax base.
- e. Promotion of housing stock diversity, meeting a perceived demand for new construction townhome units.

Public Art.

118. Section 3.9.1(F)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that an Applicant provide at least one piece of public art as part of the development. The scope of the public art should be in proportion to the square footage of the development upon review and advice by the Village's Public Art Advisory Commission ("PAAC"). The Applicant and the PAAC have been in discussions regarding the scope, type and placement of the public art.

119. In preparation for the July 2, 2015 Plan Commission hearing, the Applicant met with the PAAC on December 3, 2014, and again on February 4, 2015, to discuss their public art concepts for their project.

120. On December 3, 2014, the following three alternatives for Public Art were presented to the commission:

- 1) North Blvd: Utilizing a blank wall on the South Façade of the South structure install a mural or mosaic piece;
- 2) North Maple Avenue Bridge: Install a lighting element that enhances the pedestrian experience from the Multi-Model Station to Westgate; and
- 3) Mini Mural Project: Donate funding for additionally mini-murals to be installed along the Union Pacific embankment.

121. The PAAC was generally not in favor of approving funds for additional mini-murals, recognizing that the first two (2) options had merit. It was generally agreed that the first option would provide North Blvd with an enhanced look that would be visible from both adjacent train lines, and that the second option would provide a more interactive environment for pedestrians and vehicles along North Maple.

122. PAAC held an informal vote on December 3, 2014, with a slight majority favoring the lighting element along North Maple. The Commission requested that the Applicant return with additional detail about either of the first two (2) options.

123. Upon return at the February 4, 2015. PAAC meeting, the Applicant reintroduced two public art concepts for the development site at Westgate and Lake Street based on the initial discussion with the PAAC in December:.

- 1) Metal screening along the public parking facility at North Blvd that would be capable of holding art.

- 2) A lighting element running along the bridge connecting the North and South structures. The element could have an interactive element with a pedestrian panel to change the light color or pattern.

124. After a detailed discussion the PAAC voted to approve the lighting concept as put forward, but wanted to note the following concerns for the developer to take into consideration:

- (1) Ongoing maintenance needs to be carefully structured as technological advances need to be anticipated and constant care will need to be applied.

- (2) The lighting feature will have to be carefully constructed to take into consideration the pedestrian and residential nature of the area.

Compensating Benefits.

125. In return for the Village providing allowances from Village regulations, the Applicants must provide compensating benefits which advance Oak Park's physical, cultural and social objectives (in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and other approved plans) by having the Applicants provide specific amenities in the planned development. The compensating benefits that would accrue to residents of the area or to

the community as a whole would include: improved streetscapes along Lake Street, Maple Avenue, Westgate Street and North Boulevard, additional shared public parking, and a new north-south street (Maple) assisting traffic flow in the downtown area.

126. Additional benefits of the Applicant's proposal would be:

- a. Meeting the perceived market demand for a new construction retail and residential construction.
- b. Construction of a LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) building.
- c. Adding to local residential density in the area, which would tend to increase foot traffic in the area and support nearby existing and planned retail and other services.

Conditions for Approval of the Planned Development.

127. The Plan Commission proposed including the following conditions on any approval of the Applicant's proposed planned development:

- (1) That the Applicant ensure that all construction debris remains on the Subject Property and is removed on a regular basis. The Applicant shall erect and maintain a screening fence around the perimeter of the Subject Property to minimize blowing debris.
- (2) That the Applicant conform their project substantially to the plans and amendments as submitted to the Plan Commission, unless specified otherwise in these conditions.
- (3) That the Applicant submit its proposed route for construction traffic, its plan for construction parking, and its demolition and construction schedule to the Village Engineer for his/her review and approval.
- (4) That six (6) months after completion of the planned development, the Applicants conduct a post-construction traffic study by a firm selected by the Village. The consultant shall hold a meeting with interested neighbors to determine their concerns with traffic issues, if any, generated by the proposed development. This study shall review traffic within approximately one-quarter mile of the Subject Property. If this post construction traffic study recommends that any measures should be taken

to correct any unforeseen traffic issues that have been caused by the development, the Applicant shall implement said recommendations within six months after the study has been completed. To insure that payment of the costs of the study, the Applicant shall post a bond, letter of credit or other security acceptable to the Village, for the study. The security, or any portion of the security, shall be returned to the Applicant upon full compliance with this condition.

(5) That the Applicant provide a list of exterior building materials to be approved by the Village Board. Such list will be attached as an Exhibit to the Ordinance approving the Planned Development.

(6) That during construction of the proposed development, the Applicant post a conspicuous sign providing a local phone number which interested parties may call to obtain answers to questions about the project and its construction. Such telephone number shall be staffed during normal business hours, Monday through Friday, except legal holidays, by a person with authority to address and remedy problems, including, but not limited to traffic, noise, maintenance and landscaping.

(7) That during construction of the proposed development, the Village designate a staff liaison with whom the Applicant shall reasonably and timely communicate and cooperate.

(8) That in the event the Applicant or its successors or assigns fails to comply with one or more of the foregoing conditions and restrictions after 30 days written notice by the Village or its agents, the President and Board of Trustees may thereafter revoke or limit this planned development, provided, however, that the Applicant or its successors shall be deemed to have complied if they promptly commence a cure and diligently pursue that cure to completion where such cure is not reasonably susceptible to completion within such 30-day period.

(9) That all signage related to the proposed development shall be submitted to Village staff for review, input and comment.

(10) That final lighting, paving and streetscape design shall be reviewed by Village staff to ensure that such design compliments the Village's Lake Street Streetscape Project.

(11) That design work for the parking garage screen design, pedestrian bridge design, element connections, cornices on the North Building, and the North Boulevard and Maple Street corner be revised to reflect the various concerns regarding same expressed by members of the Plan Commission. Final designs shall be brought back to the Plan Commission

for final approval, following intermediate review by staff and the Village's design consultant.

(12) For the north building, all venting for possible first floor restaurant uses be through the roof. For the south building only, sidewall venting into the alley and/or through the roof will be allowed.

(13) That the Applicant continue to work with the PAAC on the pedestrian bridge lighting design, and seek input on possible artistic designs for the metal screening on the parking garage.

(14) That the design of the north façade of the south building be revised to better integrate it into the overall streetscape of Westgate from a material and design standpoint. The revised design shall be brought back by the Applicant to the Plan Commission for final approval, following intermediate review by staff and the Village's design consultant.

(15) That the Applicant provide the Village with the study referenced at the public hearing on July 9, 2015, relative to the safety of the stucco application proposed for higher elevations on the South Building.

(16) That as design details are finalized going forward, the Applicant make good faith efforts to create a "sense of place" for the proposed development as it relates to its surroundings.

(17) That the Applicant submit its final proposed tenant design guidelines to the Village for staff review, input and comment.

(18) That the Applicant incorporate all residential louvers into the fenestration.

(19) That only brick of standard or modular size be used.

The Planned Development Standards.

128. Section 3.9.1(l) of the Zoning Ordinance sets forth the following numbered standards, which were met by the Applicant here:

Comprehensive Plan Standards.

The proposed use or combination of uses is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and has been considered in relation to any other plans adopted by the Village Board.

B. Municipal Services Standards.

1. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use or combination of uses will not be materially detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, or general welfare of the residents of the Village.
2. Adequate utilities, road access, drainage, police and fire service and other necessary facilities already exist or will be provided to serve the proposed use or combination of uses, including access for fire, sanitation, and maintenance equipment.
3. Adequate ingress and egress to the proposed planned-development site already exists or will be provided in a manner that adequately addresses additional traffic congestion in the public streets and promotes a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment.

C. Vicinity Standards.

1. The proposed use or combination of uses will not substantially diminish the use or enjoyment of other property in the vicinity for those uses or combination of uses that are permitted by the Zoning Ordinance of the Village.
2. The proposed use or combination of uses will not have a substantial or undue adverse effect upon property values in the vicinity.
3. The proposed design, use or combination of uses will complement the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

D. Economic Development Standards.

1. The Applicant has the financial and technical capacity to complete the proposed use or combination of use.
2. The proposed use or combination of uses is economically feasible and does not pose a current or potential burden upon the services, tax base, or other economic factors that affect the financial operations of the

Village, except to extent that such burden is balanced by the benefit derived by the Village from the proposed use.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- I. Pursuant to the authority vested in it by the statues of the State of Illinois and the ordinances of the Village of Oak Park, and based on the above findings, the testimony and the evidence presented at the public hearing, this Plan Commission, sitting as a Zoning Commission, hereby recommends to the President and Board of Trustees that the planned development, as presented to the Village, be GRANTED to the Applicant, its successors and assigns, under the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance to permit construction of the proposed planned development at the Subject Property, by a vote of six (6) in favor and two (2) against, pursuant to the conditions described herein.

- II. Pursuant to the authority conferred to the Plan Commission by the referral of the President and Board of Trustees of the Village of Oak Park to hold a public hearing on the vacation of the portions of alleys in question, and based on the above findings, the testimony and the evidence presented at the public hearing, this Plan Commission hereby finds and recommends to the President and Board of Trustees that the public interest would be subserved by vacating the portions of the alleys to the Applicant, as the requested vacation was presented to the Village, and that no public utilities would be affected by the requested vacation, approved by a vote of seven (7) in favor and zero (0) against.

This report adopted by the Plan Commission,
sitting as a Zoning Commission, this 16th day of
July, 2015.