



Village of Oak Park | MMH Zoning Update

Zoning Recommendations

Prepared for: Village of Oak Park

Prepared by: Opticos Design, with support from Sightline Planning and Zoning

1. Understanding

The recommendations in this report are intended to respond to the needs identified in the Village's [Strategic Vision for Housing Plan](#) by removing regulatory barriers to middle housing Village-wide and additional residential development along key corridors. The proposed updates would encourage a broader range of desired housing types and allow existing middle housing types that are currently treated as nonconforming. Updated zoning standards would help the Village align its regulations with current market conditions and construction realities. While there are additional policy and regulatory reforms needed to achieve the Village's broader housing goals, updates to the zoning regulations are a necessary endeavor to set the stage for those future efforts and to ensure they can be impactful.

Key Priorities

- Allow incremental change across Oak Park for future generations by supporting middle housing within our neighborhoods.
- Review and right-size zoning to support housing capacity along key corridors and centers.
- Remove barriers that are adding cost to new development Village-wide and limiting housing choice.

How to Use This Document: We suggest using the recommendations in this document to make zoning text and map amendments to the Zoning Ordinance in the coming months. After discussion among the Village Board and staff, the Village may want to update the Zoning Ordinance article by article or as a single package through one comprehensive amendment. This document should be used in concert with the Zoning Assessment document previously provided to the Village.

Article 2. Definitions & Rules of Measurement

Barrier: The definitions in Article 2 are the fundamental building blocks of the Zoning Ordinance. These terms should be strategically updated to enable a broader range of housing types.

New and revised definitions should be included in Section 2.3 Definitions. Changes to terminology should be applied throughout the Zoning Ordinance, specifically Article 8 Uses. For additional information, see Section 7. Definitions and Rules of Measurement (Article 2) of the Zoning Assessment.

Recommended Amendments:

- Change “single-family dwelling” to “single-unit dwelling.”
- Change “two-family dwelling” to “two-unit dwelling”.
- Change “multi-family dwelling” to “multi-unit dwelling.”
 - **Why?** The above terms are outdated because they assume a “family”-based household, which no longer reflects modern living arrangements. The term “unit” is more appropriate.
- Add new definitions for “middle housing” and specific housing typologies, such as the following. In the updated Ordinance, these terms could be grouped under the term “Dwelling” for greater ease of use.
 - “Middle housing” means buildings that are compatible in scale, form, and character with single houses and contain two or more attached, stacked, or clustered homes including two-unit dwellings, triplexes, fourplexes, fiveplexes, sixplexes, townhouses, courtyard apartments, and cottage housing.
 - “Cottage housing” means a residential development consisting of a group of small, detached dwellings located on a single zoning lot or development site and organized around common open space. “Cottage Housing” does not include “Single-Unit Dwelling,” “Two-Unit Dwelling,” “Triplex,” “Fourplex,” “Fiveplex,” “Sixplex,” “Townhouse,” or “Multiple-Unit Dwelling.”
 - “Courtyard building” means a “Multi-Unit Dwelling” organized around a central shared courtyard, landscaped area, or other common open space. Dwelling units in a courtyard building may share common entrances, exterior walkways, or interior corridors. “Courtyard Building” does not include “Cottage Housing,” “Townhouse,” or “Single-Unit Dwelling.”
 - “Fiveplex” means a residential building with five attached dwelling units that are attached within a single building form and arranged in an integrated configuration where one or more units may be located above or below another unit. “Fiveplex” does not include “Townhouse.”
 - “Fourplex” means a residential building with four attached dwelling units that are attached within a single building form and arranged in an integrated configuration where one or more units may be located above or below another unit. “Fourplex” does not include “Townhouse.”

- “Sixplex” means a residential building with six attached dwelling units that are that are attached within a single building form and arranged in an integrated configuration where one or more units may be located above or below another unit. “Sixplex” does not include “Townhouse.”
 - “Triplex” means a residential building with three attached dwelling units that are attached within a single building form and arranged in an integrated configuration where one or more units may be located above or below another unit. “Triplex” does not include “Townhouse.”
 - **Why?** The above terms will clearly demonstrate to users that the Village allows middle housing types.
- Change definitions of “accessory dwelling unit (ADU),” “accessory structure,” and “coach house” as follows. In addition, remove the term “accessory building” from Article 2 and elsewhere in the Zoning Ordinance.
 - Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). A residential living unit on the same parcel as a principal dwelling unit. The ADU provides complete independent living facilities for one or more persons. It may take various forms: a detached unit (coach house), an attached unit to the principal structure, or an interior unit that is part of a remodeled dwelling.
 - Accessory Structure. A structure located on the same lot as the principal building, which may be detached or attached, that is incidental to the use of the principal building.
 - Coach House. An additional dwelling unit located within a detached garage on the upper floor that is associated with, and incidental to, a principal dwelling unit on the same lot. A coach house includes separate cooking and sanitary facilities, with its own means of ingress and egress.
 - **Why?** Currently, ADUs and coach houses are defined as being accessory to single-family dwellings only, which prevents them from being accessory to middle housing types. Currently, an accessory structure is defined as a structure not constructed with a permanent foundation. ADUs are accessory structures that are constructed *with* a permanent foundation. Lastly, the Village may want to use the term “accessory dwelling unit” for all attached and detached ADUs and consider eliminating the use of the term “coach house” altogether to improve the overall clarity of the Zoning Ordinance. The term “accessory building” should be removed because it is redundant to “accessory structure,” and may cause unnecessary confusion in the Ordinance.
- In Section 2.4.K.2, update the definition of impervious surface coverage to provide additional detail on what is and is not considered impervious. The Village should add language like the following: Impervious surfaces may include, but are not limited to, principal structures, accessory structures, patios, walkways, ball courts, swimming pools, paved parking lots, and paved driveways. Impervious surfaces do not include landscaped areas or approved surfaces that are designed and maintained to allow stormwater infiltration, such as pervious pavers, permeable pavement, permeable concrete, or similar systems.

Additional Considerations

- None.

Article 3. Zoning Districts

Barrier: Many of the existing residential and commercial zoning districts have very similar intent, standards, and outcomes. Several districts are not mapped widely, and it is unclear why different zoning districts are applied to certain locations compared to other similar areas.

Recommended Amendments:

- Consolidate similar residential districts and similar commercial districts to simplify the ordinance and provide clear standards for areas of the Village that have similar characteristics and purposes. The following matrix describes how existing districts could be converted into new districts.

Zoning District Conversion Table				
Existing		Recommended		Action
Residential Zoning Districts				
R-1	R-1 Single-Family Residential	N-1	N-1 Neighborhood Residential	Change
R-2	R-2 Single-Family Residential	N-2	N-2 Neighborhood Residential	Change
R-3-50	R-3-50 Single-Family Residential			
R-3-35	R-3-35 Single-Family Residential			
R-4	R-4 Single-Family Residential			
R-5	R-5 Two-Family Residential			
R-6	R-6 Multi-Family Residential	N-3	N-3 Neighborhood Residential	Change
R-7	R-7 Multi-Family Residential			
Commercial Districts				
HS	Harrison Street	M-1	M-1 Mixed-Use	Change
NC	Neighborhood Commercial			
RR	Roosevelt Road Form-Based	M-2	M-2 Mixed-Use	Change
GC	General Commercial	M-3	M-3 Mixed-Use	Change
MS	Madison Street			
NA	North Avenue			
DT-1	Downtown Central Sub-District	DT-1	Downtown Central Sub-District	No change
DT-2	Hemingway Sub-District	DT-2	Hemingway Sub-District	No change
DT-3	Pleasant Sub-District	DT-3	Pleasant Sub-District	No change
Special Purpose Districts				
H	Hospital	H	Hospital	No change
OS	Open Space	OS	Open Space	No change
I	Institutional	I	Institutional	No change

Section 3.1.A Residential Districts

- Rename the R-1 Single-Family Residential District to N-1 Neighborhood 1 District.
- Consolidate the R-2, R-3-50, R-3-35, R-4, and R-5 Single-Family Districts and rename them to N-2 Neighborhood 2 District.
- Consolidate the R-6 and R-7 Multi-Family Residential Districts and rename them to N-3 Neighborhood 3 District.

Section 3.1.B Commercial Districts

- No changes to Downtown Districts (DT-1, DT-2, DT-3).
- Consolidate HS Harrison Street and NC Neighborhood Commercial Districts and rename them to M-1 Mixed-Use 1 District.
- Rename RR Roosevelt Road Form-Based District to M-2 Mixed-Use 2 District.
- Consolidate GC General Commercial, MS Madison Street, and NA North Avenue Districts to M-3 Mixed-Use 3 District.

Why?

- Renaming and consolidating zoning districts will make the Zoning Ordinance easier to understand and administer by ensuring that each district has a clear purpose and produces a distinct development pattern.
- As part of the Ordinance update, the Village should also evaluate the zoning map so that district names, district purposes, and mapped locations work together more logically. This process will improve transparency for residents, property owners, applicants, and decision-makers while reducing unnecessary complexity in the code.

Additional Considerations

- None.

Article 4. Residential Districts

Barrier: The purpose statements and dimensional standards of the residential zoning districts do not support the Village's housing goals for increasing access to homeownership opportunities that are more affordable, attracting an economically and racially diverse population, or providing housing choices that support older adults or smaller households. The current standards discourage small units and smaller multi-unit developments.

Strategic Vision for Housing - Recommended Strategy #2 to "Modify Oak Park's Zoning Ordinance to Allow 'Missing Middle Housing.'"

Recommended Amendments:

Section 4.1 Purpose Statements: Include new purpose statements as follows:

- The N-1 Neighborhood 1 District is intended to accommodate residential areas that include properties with historic or architectural significance. The N-1 District provides for medium to large footprint housing types on larger lots while maintaining development standards that reflect the established scale and form of these areas. The N-1 District also allows limited non-residential uses that serve neighborhood needs and are compatible with nearby residential uses.
- The N-2 Neighborhood 2 District is intended to accommodate residential neighborhoods that allow a range of neighborhood-scale housing types. The N-2 District provides for small to medium footprint housing types on moderate-sized lots while maintaining development standards that reflect the established scale and form of these areas. The N-2 District also allows limited non-residential uses that serve neighborhood needs and are compatible with nearby residential uses.
- The N-3 Neighborhood 3 District is intended to accommodate residential neighborhoods that support greater intensity. The N-3 District provides for medium to large footprint housing types on lots that can accommodate a range of moderate to high density residential housing types while maintaining development standards that reflect the established scale and form of these areas. The N-3 District also allows limited non-residential uses that serve neighborhood needs and are compatible with nearby residential uses.
- In Section 4.4, revise Table 4-1 Residential Districts Dimensional Standards as follows:

Table 4-1 Proposed Residential Districts Dimensional Standards

Proposed Districts	N-1	N-2	N-3
Existing Districts	R-1	R-2, R-3-50, R-3-35, R-4, R-5	R-6, R-7
Bulk			
Minimum Lot Width	50 ft	30 ft	50 ft
Maximum Building Height	35 ft and 3 stories	35 ft and 3 stories	55 ft and 5 stories

Proposed Districts	N-1	N-2	N-3
Existing Districts	R-1	R-2, R-3-50, R-3-35, R-4, R-5	R-6, R-7
Maximum Impervious Surface Coverage	Residential: 50% Non-Residential: 70%	Residential: 60% Non-Residential: 70%	80%
Setbacks			
Minimum Front Setback ¹	30 ft	20 ft	15 ft
Minimum Interior Side Setback	6 ft	5 ft	5 ft
Minimum Corner Side Setback ²	9 ft	8 ft	8 ft
Minimum Reverse Corner Side Setback ^{2,3}	9 ft	8 ft	Not Applicable
Minimum Rear Setback	35 ft or 20% of lot depth, whichever is less	25 ft or 20% of lot depth, whichever is less	25 ft or 20% of lot depth, whichever is less
Dwelling Units			
Maximum Principal Dwelling Units Per Lot ⁴	4	4	Not Applicable

Notes for Table 4-1

- Where the front setbacks of the principal buildings on both abutting lots are greater than the required minimum front setback, the required front setback is the average of the front setbacks of the abutting principal buildings. In the N-1 District, a front setback may not be greater than 60 feet. In the N-2 District, a front setback may not be greater than 30 feet.
- In the N-1 District, a minimum corner side setback may be reduced to maintain a buildable width of 35 feet, but in no case less than six feet. In the N-2 District, a minimum corner side setback may be reduced to maintain a buildable width of 30 feet, but in no case less than five feet. In the N-3 District, a minimum corner side setback may be reduced to maintain a buildable width of 25 feet, but in no case less than five feet.
- In the N-1 District, the minimum reverse corner side setback must be increased to one-half of the sum of nine feet plus the existing front setback of the lot whose front lot line is substantially a continuation of the reverse corner side lot line. In the N-2 and N-3 Districts, the minimum reverse corner side setback must be increased to one-half of the sum of eight feet plus the existing front setback of the lot whose front lot line is substantially a continuation of the reverse corner side lot line.
- In the N-2 and N-3 Districts, zoning lots that are at least 50 feet wide and 125 feet deep may contain up to six dwelling units, provided the development complies with all applicable bulk, setback, design, and site development standards.

Why?

- Minimum Lot Area:** In contrast to the existing Zoning Ordinance, the updated Ordinance should not include standards for minimum lot area in the N-1, N-2, and N-3 Districts. As a built-out community with established lots in its residential districts, Oak Park does not need minimum lot area standards which can impact reinvestment or require unnecessary variations. The updated standards should also avoid minimum lot area per dwelling unit

requirements for townhouse and multi-unit projects, because those standards function as density limitations that can make compatible middle housing difficult to build.

- **Minimum Lot Width:** Requirements for wider lots exclude typical infill lots and essentially mandate that developers focus on oversized parcels or consolidating lots. The proposed minimum lot width standard for the N-2 District should be reduced to reflect the existing R-4 standard. This standard brings the smallest lots in the Village into conformity while making it unlikely that wider lots would be assembled and subdivided to meet a slightly narrower lot width standard. The N-1 District standard of 50 feet reflects the existing R-1 standard. The N-3 District standard of 50 feet reflects the existing R-7 standard.
- **Maximum Building Height:** Overall, taller buildings can allow for more housing and a wider variety of middle housing types.
 - In the single-family zoning districts, the standard for maximum building height was lowered from 35 feet to 30 feet as part of the 2002 Zoning Ordinance Update. This effort preceded current staff and Village leadership. Restoring a permitted height of 35 feet in the N-1 and N-2 Districts will align with the height of many older homes in the Village as well as nearby peer communities, and more easily accommodates middle housing in the future.
 - In the N-3 District, we recommend a maximum building height of 55 feet to allow more intense multi-unit buildings that maintain the overall built form of the R-7 District while allowing slightly more flexibility in height. Suggestions from the local development community indicate that it is more cost-effective to construct multi-unit projects that are five stories in these areas, rather than four stories. In addition, we recommend eliminating the one-foot setback per two feet of height in all cases. This is an outdated standard that adds complexity without producing better design.
- **Maximum Building Coverage:** We recommend removing the existing maximum building coverage standard from the current Zoning Ordinance. This standard is redundant with the more effective maximum impervious surface coverage standard.
- **Maximum Impervious Surface Coverage:** In general, the Village should maintain its maximum impervious coverage to maintain the existing form of existing neighborhoods. In the N-2 District, we recommend applying a 60 percent standard from the existing R-3-35 and R-4 Districts to better accommodate middle housing and functional site design on existing lots. This would be a slight increase for the R-2 and R-3-50 Districts, which have a standard of 50 percent and a slight decrease for the R-5, which has a standard of 65 percent. This modification provides flexibility for small-scale residential development while still maintaining limits on overall site coverage. This change ensures that additional housing capacity does not come at the expense of stormwater management concerns.
- **Minimum Setbacks:** Overall, existing setbacks in the residential districts are not a major barrier to middle housing, however, the existing setbacks shrink the potential developable footprint for housing which may cause challenges on narrow lots. Notably, the setback standards in the existing Zoning Ordinance are very complicated. Narrative text was moved from individual cells in the table to notes at the end of the table. Generally, the proposed minimum setback standards maintain the standards in the existing Zoning Ordinance. However, the front and rear setbacks for the N-2 District are a bit narrower than the standards for some of the existing single-family residential districts to allow greater flexibility

for middle housing types. In addition, we recommend modifying the minimum reverse corner side setback standard so that it applies district-wide in the N-1 and N-2 and is not applicable in the N-3. This standard should apply to all housing types.

- **Maximum Principal Dwelling Units Per Lot:** This is a new addition to Table 4-1 that indicates the total number of principal dwelling units allowed on a zoning lot. These standards will work in concert with the updated standards of Article 8 Uses and Article 9 Site Development Standards, which would allow greater housing density in certain locations and regulate the relationship between the principal dwelling unit and accessory dwelling units. There is already a cross-reference in Section 4.2 of the existing Zoning Ordinance that points users to Article 8 regarding uses, which would include dwelling units as well.

Additional Considerations

- **Additional Dimensional Standards**
 - If the Village would like to add additional protection around the size and scale of new homes, additional controls may be added to the dimensional standards for each zoning district. Maximum building footprint is a more straightforward metric than building coverage because it focuses on the area occupied by buildings, particularly building width, rather than requiring interpretation of what counts toward “coverage.” Maximum building width and depth standards for each allowed building type can help ensure that new development is similar in size to nearby buildings. This standard is easier to calculate, administer, and understand, while still regulating the overall scale and mass of buildings on a zoning lot.
- **Incentivizing Smaller Units**
 - Middle housing types have additional barriers outside of zoning that tend to favor the development of single-family homes, even when both uses are allowed within a zoning district. While middle housing provides greater attainability, it may need additional incentives to make it feasible compared to a larger, new-construction single-unit home. The Village could consider a more proactive, sliding scale approach to zone standards that allows a greater amount of buildable area when more, smaller units are built on a lot. Incentives could include modest flexibility in dimensional standards, reduced local fees, expedited review, or other tools that lower development costs when a project provides additional smaller units.
- **Middle Housing Pilot Program**
 - The Village could consider piloting a middle housing site study to better understand and visualize how updated zoning standards could work on actual properties in Oak Park. The study would evaluate potential development capacity, physical feasibility, and site design considerations for one or more representative sites. The pilot could focus on either a single neighborhood infill lot that is well-positioned to test two- to six-unit housing scenarios, a larger corridor, or an underutilized site where formerly commercial buildings or parking areas could transition to multiple middle housing types. The focus of this pilot would be to show how new middle housing can maintain an appropriate relationship to nearby homes. The results of the pilot study could also help set the stage for a future request for proposals to help developers

establish a clear vision for these locations. This approach would allow the Village to move from general policy direction to a more concrete implementation strategy.

- Oak Park Historic Districts
 - The Village should build on recent work by Village staff that evaluated the relationship between historic preservation review and housing production. Historic districts cover a significant portion of Oak Park, including several larger lots that may be able to accommodate additional housing, as well as properties with more modest or newer homes that may not be central to the Village's preservation goals. The Village should continue reviewing district boundaries and approval procedures to ensure that historic preservation standards protect important historic and architectural resources without adding unnecessary time, uncertainty, or cost to compatible housing development. These considerations should be coordinated with the Zoning Ordinance update so that preservation review and housing policy reinforce one another. The Village may also want to highlight opportunities to utilize the Oak Park Historic Resources Database, particularly the index of non-contributing structures within historic districts. This resource can help property owners, applicants, staff, and decision-makers identify which structures may not warrant the same level of historic preservation review or design scrutiny by the Historic Preservation Commission.
- Test Inclusionary Housing Policy
 - As part of the Zoning Ordinance update, the Village should test whether the revised dimensional standards complement the inclusionary housing requirements and how they can be effectively applied to new multi-unit and mixed-use development. This analysis should evaluate potential set-aside percentages, affordability levels, project-size thresholds, fee-in-lieu options, and incentives such as additional height, density, reduced parking, or expedited review. Inclusionary requirements can affect project feasibility so the Village should test several development scenarios in residential, commercial, and downtown contexts before adopting a final standard. This testing will allow the Village to create a predictable tool that produces affordable units as part of new development projects.

Article 5. Commercial Districts

Barrier: The purpose statements and dimensional standards of the commercial zoning districts do not support the Village's housing goals of supporting additional housing capacity and affordability. The existing dimensional standards do not allow enough units on a lot to support feasible, multi-unit or mixed-use development. The standards of the Commercial Districts are complicated and limit development capacity, often requiring numerous variances and public hearings. The added time and costs from these cumbersome processes are directly passed on to the renters and buyers.

Strategic Vision for Housing - Recommended Strategy #2: "Allow for Additional Multifamily Housing within Oak Park's Business Districts and Other Suitable Development Sites."

Recommended Amendments:

Section 5.1 Purpose Statements: Include new purpose statements as follows:

- The M-1 Mixed-Use 1 District is intended to accommodate small-scale, pedestrian-oriented commercial areas. The M-1 District provides for local-serving retail, service, arts, office, dining, and mixed-use development in a form that supports walkability and complements nearby residential areas. The M-1 District is intended for neighborhood commercial nodes and corridors where development is lower in scale and intensity than the Village's larger scale and more intense commercial districts.
- The M-2 Mixed-Use 2 District is intended to accommodate mixed-use and commercial development along the Village's larger commercial corridors. The M-2 District provides for retail, service, office, dining, and mixed-use development in a form that supports walkability and access to nearby neighborhoods, while also accommodating higher traffic volumes and customer parking demand. The M-2 District is intended for corridor locations where development may be greater in scale and intensity than the M-1 District.
- The M-3 Mixed-Use 3 District is intended to accommodate the Village's higher-intensity mixed-use and commercial corridors. The M-3 District provides for a broad range of retail, service, office, dining, entertainment, higher-density residential, and mixed-use development, including larger-format and more auto-oriented commercial uses where appropriate. The M-3 District is intended for major corridors where development may be greater in scale and intensity than the M-1 and M-2 Districts, while supporting an active public realm and managing impacts on nearby neighborhoods.
- In Section 5.3, revise Table 5-1 Commercial Districts Dimensional Standards as follows:

Table 5-1 Proposed Commercial Districts Dimensional Standards

Proposed Districts	M-1	M-2	M-3
Existing Districts	HS, NC	RR	GC, MS, NA
Bulk			

Proposed Districts	M-1	M-2	M-3
Existing Districts	HS, NC	RR	GC, MS, NA
Maximum Building Height ¹	48 ft and 4 stories; 35 ft and 3 stories when abutting and within 25 ft of the N-1 or N-2 District to the side or rear	60 ft and 5 stories	70 ft and 6 stories; 48 ft and 4 stories when abutting and within 25 ft of the N-1 or N-2 District to the side or rear
Setbacks			
Front Setback: Non-Residential and Mixed-Use	Build-To Zone: 0 to 5 ft	Build-To Zone: 0 to 10 ft	Build-To Zone: 0 to 5 ft
Front Setback: Townhouse and Multi-Unit ²	Build-To Zone: 5 to 10 ft	Build-To Zone: 5 to 15 ft	Build-To Zone: 5 to 15 ft
Corner Side Setback: Non-Residential and Mixed-Use	Build-To Zone: 0 to 5 ft	Build-To Zone: 0 to 5 ft	Build-To Zone: 0 to 15 ft
Corner Side Setback: Townhouse and Multi-Unit	Build-To Zone: 5 to 10 ft	Build-To Zone: 5 to 10 ft	5 to 15 ft
Interior Side Setback: Non-Residential and Mixed-Use	Build-To Zone: 0 to 10 ft	0 ft	Build-To Zone: 0 to 10 ft
Interior Side Setback: Townhouse and Multi-Unit	Minimum: 5 ft	Build-To Zone: 5 to 10 ft	Minimum: 5 ft
Minimum Rear Setback	Alley Present: 10 ft No Alley Present: 15 ft	Alley Present: 10 ft No Alley Present: 15 ft	Alley Present: 10 ft No Alley Present: 15 ft Abutting N District: 20 ft

Notes for Table 5-1

- Where a lot in an M District abuts an N-1 or N-2 District along a side or rear lot line, any portion of a building located within 20 feet of that shared lot line may not exceed 40 feet in height.
 - For courtyard buildings, portions of the building may be set back beyond the build-to zone to accommodate a central shared courtyard, landscaped area, or common open space, provided that the courtyard is framed by building walls or entries and remains visible from the street.
- Update Section 5.4 to right-size the design standards for the former Roosevelt Road Form-Based District to make way for the proposed M-2 Mixed-Use 2 District. In general, Section 5.4 should be reviewed through the larger housing and land use goals of this project to systematically consolidate or eliminate existing standards. Actions should include, but are not limited to, updating Section 5.4.B to remove the RR-P, RR-T, and RR-A subdistricts; updating Section 5.4.D to create more consistent building heights across the corridor; updating Section 5.4.E to remove the maximum density standards for residential development; and updating Section 5.4.K to remove the list of allowed uses.

Why?

- **Minimum Lot Area:** In contrast to the existing Zoning Ordinance, the updated Ordinance should not include standards for minimum lot area in the M-1, M-2, and M-3 Districts. As a built-out community with established lots in its commercial districts, Oak Park does not need minimum lot area standards which can impact reinvestment or require unnecessary variations. The updated standards should also avoid minimum lot area per dwelling unit requirements for townhouse and multi-unit projects, because those standards function as density limitations that can make compatible middle housing difficult to build. These lot area per dwelling unit standards create barriers to residential development and diminish the vibrancy of commercial areas. Land costs are generally the same regardless of unit size, so these standards push projects toward fewer, larger, and more expensive units rather than smaller studio, one-bedroom, and two-bedroom units with lower per-unit costs.
- **Building Height:** Overall, modest increases in building height can support additional housing and make a wider range of development types more feasible to build. The existing Zoning Ordinance includes regulations for minimum building height *and* maximum building height in the commercial corridors. The concept behind minimum building height is to prevent underbuilt, suburban-style development. However, this standard has not proven to be effective because it requires a building form that is not financially or physically realistic for many corridors. To facilitate both commercial development and complementary housing development, the updated Zoning Ordinance should focus on revised maximum building height standards that are calibrated to mixed-use development. The updated Zoning Ordinance should include an adjacency requirement that requires building height to step down when it abuts property in the N-1 or N-2 District to the side.
- **RR District:** The RR District is the result of the Roosevelt Road Corridor Plan (2005). This plan was replaced by the new Roosevelt Road Corridor Plan (2026), which was a joint effort between the Village of Oak Park and the City of Berwyn. As noted in that report, one of the biggest barriers to residential development in the RR District is that its dimensional standards are so complex that they inhibit development. For example, building height along the corridor is regulated by three factors, which creates tremendous unpredictability as to the overall height of a building. Similarly, the RR District has its own use table in Section 5.4.K, which is separate from Table 8-1 of the existing Ordinance, and creates an unnecessary level of complexity.
- **Setbacks:** The overwhelming majority of stakeholders, residents, and property owners would like the updated Zoning Ordinance to support more housing opportunities in the Village's commercial corridors. The existing setback regulations for the commercial corridors are incredibly complex and difficult to understand for the average user. The setback standards should be revised to maintain the built form of each corridor, while at the same time allowing flexibility in building location relative to the lot line. This flexibility builds on the use of build-to zones and build-to lines in the existing Zoning Ordinance to facilitate commercial development and context-sensitive housing. Please note, we recommend transitioning from a complicated standard for "Street Setback" in the existing Zoning Ordinance to a more straightforward set of setbacks for front setback and corner side setback to provide greater clarity.

Additional Considerations

- Explore Capacity Through Corridor and Small Area Planning
 - As part of the Zoning Ordinance update, the Village should explore housing and development capacity through targeted small area or corridor planning. These efforts can help determine where additional height, density, mixed-use development, or middle housing may be most appropriate. These projects can also be coordinated with the Public Works Department to identify needed infrastructure improvements, such as streetscape upgrades, sewer and water capacity, stormwater management, transit access, pedestrian safety, and open space. This approach would allow the Village to align land use, zoning, and public investment so that future growth is planned proactively rather than addressed case-by-case through individual development applications.
- Consider Height Bonuses for Public Benefits
 - The Village should consider allowing limited height bonuses in targeted locations, such as near transit, along major corridors, or in larger mixed-use districts. A height bonus could allow additional building height only when a project provides clearly defined public benefits, such as affordable housing units, improved pedestrian connections, or other amenities that advance Village goals. The bonus program should be carefully calibrated so that the additional height is predictable, context-sensitive, and tied to measurable benefits. This approach could help support housing production and community benefits while maintaining clear expectations for the scale and form of development in Oak Park.

Article 7. Design Standards

Barrier: Portions of Article 7 include unclear or subjective standards that make the residential design review process less predictable for applicants, staff, and decision-makers. Generally speaking, the Village needs to right-size design standards for middle housing types to balance construction costs and feasibility along with standards that maintain the established scale, form, and visual quality of Oak Park. Larger projects can often spread the cost of design and development requirements across more units, while smaller middle housing projects may become less feasible if they are subject to standards designed for larger developments. For that reason, middle housing should generally be subject to design review standards comparable to those applied to single-unit dwellings.

Recommended Amendments:

- Remove Section 7.1.A in regard to the purpose of stabilizing and improving property values.
 - **Why?** While design review can be used to promote civic beautification and visual interest, standards around property values have historically been used as a coded justification for excluding certain types of developments and residents.
- Update Section 7.2.A in regard to the applicability of the Ordinance's design standards. Design review should consistently apply to all residential housing types, from detached single-unit dwellings to multi-unit dwellings, including all middle housing types. The Ordinance could be revised to clarify and address the use of certificates of appropriateness for noncontributing structures in historic districts so that it is clear that the zoning ordinance should be the primary driver of outcomes for these parcels.
 - **Why?** In the existing Ordinance, design standards apply to new construction or substantial enlargements of single-family dwellings and multi-family dwellings of three or more units. The Ordinance is silent on two-family dwellings and townhouses, which appear not to require design review.
- Update Section 7.3.A to state, "Development identified in Section 7.2.A is subject to design review by the Zoning Administrator per the procedure in item B below, with the following exceptions."
 - **Why?** This indication should be added for the average reader to ensure they are aware that this is referring to a staff-level review, rather than review by other commissions or review bodies.
- Update Section 7.4 so that building design standards for non-residential, mixed-use, and multi-unit dwellings apply to residential buildings with seven units or more.
 - **Why?** The existing Ordinance treats residential housing types with three, four, five, and six units the same way as it does a large multi-unit development. Triplexes, fourplexes, fiveplexes, and sixplexes fit within the same context and should have similar design standards to detached single-unit dwellings.
- Update Section 7.4 to use a tiered approach to residential design standards so that smaller middle housing types, such as triplexes, fourplexes, fiveplexes, and sixplexes, are regulated separately from larger multi-unit buildings where appropriate.

- **Why?** Smaller middle housing types can often fit within the same general scale and neighborhood context as detached single-unit dwellings, while larger multi-unit buildings may require different standards for height, massing, setbacks, frontage, and site design. A tiered approach would allow the Village to calibrate standards based on building scale and form rather than treating all multi-unit housing the same. This would make the Ordinance more supportive of middle housing while still maintaining clear controls for larger residential buildings.
- Update Section 7.4 to clarify how the regulations apply to multi-unit dwellings.
 - **Why?** The design standards for multi-family dwellings are integrated with design standards for non-residential development and mixed-use development. These regulations could be clearer and better tailored to the design of new housing if multi-unit design standards were located separately.
- Update Section 7.4 to add criteria, including objectives and graphic examples, with measurable standards for street frontage (residential ground floor versus commercial), massing, articulation, and adjacency.
 - **Why?** Design standards would help ensure that new mixed-use and multi-unit development contributes to a walkable public realm, relates appropriately to nearby residential areas, and avoids relying on subjective design review. This approach would give applicants, staff, and decision-makers more predictable expectations while still allowing flexibility in architectural design.
- Update Section 7.4.A to clarify the meaning of large façade as opposed to medium façade with a clear metric.
 - **Why?** A clear metric related to the width of the façade would make it easier to understand the meaning of large façade as opposed to medium façade.
- Update Section 7.4.E to clarify that the auto-oriented development standards do not apply to multi-unit dwellings.
 - **Why?** Many of the standards of Section 7.4.E specifically apply to non-residential development and could create a barrier to multi-unit dwellings by adding expense to the construction process. For example, buildings must relate to the character of adjacent structures and the surrounding area, must have consistent architectural character, and must include visually interesting roofs. These standards would be better applied to specific uses or clearly applied to specific zoning districts.
- Update Section 7.5 to establish clear, objective, and right-sized residential design standards for single-unit dwellings and middle housing types. Add the following to Section 7.5, “the Village must not require development regulations for middle housing that are more restrictive than those required for detached single-unit dwellings but may apply any objective development regulations that are required for detached single-unit dwellings.”
 - **Why?** The design standards for single-unit dwellings seek to promote architectural creativity while complementing the visual image of the Village. Generally, Section 7.5 is focused on maintaining the appearance of historic bungalows but lacks specificity or measurable standards on how they apply across different housing types. The Ordinance provides direction for upper-story additions to maintain the appearance of older neighborhoods. These are important considerations, but they could serve as

a barrier to the construction of attached ADUs as part of upper-story additions and are subjective depending on who is interpreting them during design review. Measurable standards would improve clarity and predictability, reduce cost and save time for the homeowner or developer.

- In addition, the Ordinance lacks any design standards that apply to middle housing types, such as duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, fiveplexes, and sixplexes that could be compatible with detached single-unit neighborhoods if the appropriate form, scale, and configuration is allowed.

Additional Considerations

- Building-Type and/or Frontage-Based Design Standards
 - Future updates to the Ordinance should consider supplementing existing residential design standards with clear, simple standards tailored to specific building types, such as ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, small multiplexes, townhomes, courtyard buildings, and multi-unit dwellings. This approach would better reflect Oak Park's varied residential fabric by recognizing that different housing types need different standards for entrances, massing, façade articulation, roof form, and parking placement. The Village could also consider frontage-based standards that focus on how buildings meet the street, including porches, stoops, landscaped front yards, and building entries. This would make design review more predictable while focusing regulation on the elements that most affect neighborhood compatibility.
- Pre-Reviewed Plans for Middle Housing
 - The Village should consider developing pre-reviewed plans or a pattern book for middle housing types. These plans could show how desired housing types can fit on typical Oak Park lots while meeting zoning, building, fire, access, and design standards. Pre-reviewed plans would complement site-specific review and could reduce uncertainty, lower design and permitting costs, and give property owners a clear understanding of what compatible small-scale housing can look like. This approach could be especially useful for ADUs, coach houses, upper-story additions, and modest two- or three-unit buildings that support incremental housing growth.
- Local Incentives for Middle Housing
 - The Village should consider whether targeted local incentives could help make ADUs, duplexes, triplexes, and small to mid-size multi-unit buildings more financially feasible. These incentives could include reducing or waiving certain local fees, such as sewer or water tap fees, or exploring temporary tax abatement tools where available and legally appropriate. The goal would be to lower upfront development costs for housing types that support the Village's housing goals but may be difficult to build because of land costs, construction costs, financing, and small project size. Any incentive program should be clearly defined and tied to desired housing outcomes, such as long-term rental housing, affordable units, adaptive reuse, or projects that add housing without demolition of existing attainable units.
- Summary of Costs Associated with Additional Development Requirements

- The Village should study and summarize the financial implications of adding new development requirements to housing projects, such as electric vehicle charging, building electrification, enhanced sustainability standards, or other infrastructure-related requirements. These goals are important, but they can also increase upfront development costs, especially for ADUs, middle housing, and small to mid-size multi-unit buildings where project budgets are more constrained. The Village should evaluate options for phased implementation or flexibility for smaller projects, based on the number of dwelling units in the project.

Article 8. Uses

Barrier: In Oak Park, five of the Village's eight residential zoning districts only allow single-family homes, including the R-1, R-2, R-3-50, R-3-35, and R-4. This is true despite the fact that a number of middle housing types currently exist in these zoning districts as legally nonconforming uses. The use matrix in Table 8-1 does not provide any use allowances for many middle housing types, such as triplexes, fourplexes, fiveplexes, and sixplexes.

Recommended Amendments:

- In Section 8.3, allow up to four units per zoning lot as permitted uses in the N-1, N-2, and N-3 Districts as long as one dwelling unit is in a principal building. ADUs should count as part of the total number of dwelling units on a zoning lot.
- In Section 8.3, allow up to six units per zoning lot as permitted uses in the N-1, N-2, and N-3 Districts in locations within one-quarter mile walking distance of a major transit stop that are located on zoning lots that are 5,000 square feet or greater, unless the applicable zoning district permits a greater number of units.
- In Section 8.3, allow up to six units per zoning lot as a special use in the N-1, N-2, and N-3 Districts on zoning lots that are 5,000 square feet or greater when at least two of the units on the lot are affordable housing that are reserved for households earning less than 60 percent of area median income (AMI) for renter-occupied units or less than 80 percent of area median income for owner-occupied units.
- In Section 8.3, allow up to six units per zoning lot as permitted uses in the N-1, N-2, and N-3 Districts in locations within one-eighth mile walking distance of primary corridors that are located on zoning lots that are 5,000 square feet or greater, unless the applicable zoning district permits a greater number of units. These corridors would include North Avenue, Division Street, Chicago Avenue, Lake Street, Madison Street, Harrison Street, Roosevelt Road, Harlem Avenue, Home Avenue, Oak Park Avenue, East Avenue, Ridgeland Avenue, Lombard Avenue, and Austin Boulevard.
- In Section 8.3, revise Table 8-1 Use Matrix as follows:

Table 8-1 *Proposed Use Matrix*

Proposed Zoning Districts	N-1	N-2	N-3	M-1	M-2	M-3
Current Zoning Districts	R-1	R-2, R-3-50, R-3-35, R-4, R-5	R-6, R-7	HS, NC	RR	NA, GC, MS
Use						
Children's Home			S			
Community Residence	P	P	P			
Residential Care Facility			S		S	S

Proposed Zoning Districts	N-1	N-2	N-3	M-1	M-2	M-3
Current Zoning Districts	R-1	R-2, R-3-50, R-3-35, R-4, R-5	R-6, R-7	HS, NC	RR	NA, GC, MS
Use						
Retreat House			S			
Dwelling Above the Ground Floor				P	P	P
Live/Work Dwelling				P	S	P
Single-Unit Dwelling	P	P	P			
Two-Unit Dwelling	P	P	P			
Triplex	P	P				
Fourplex	P	P				
Fiveplex			P			
Sixplex			P			
Townhouse Dwelling			S	S	S	S
Multi-Unit Dwelling			P	P	S	P

- Use Standard: Update Section 8.4 Principal Use Standards as follows for Fiveplexes and Sixplexes: Fiveplexes and sixplexes may be permitted on lots in the N-1 and N-2 Districts per the proximity standards of Section 8.3 Use Restrictions.

Why?

- Middle housing should be defined by scale and form in addition to overall unit count. Many duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and small apartment buildings can be designed to fit comfortably within Oak Park's existing neighborhood fabric, especially when standards address building height, massing, entrances, setbacks, and parking location. Allowing up to four units more broadly would recognize housing types that already exist in many neighborhoods and slowly create a more predictable path for modest infill and reinvestment over time.
- The proposed amendments would also direct greater housing capacity to the locations best able to support it, including larger lots, areas near major transit stops, and primary corridors. More housing capacity in these locations can help support transit, local businesses, and walkable neighborhoods. Allowing up to six units in these locations, or where affordable units are provided, creates a measured approach to housing growth that links additional flexibility to the Village's housing goals.

Additional Considerations

- Demolition and Deconversion Control Policy for Affordable Housing
 - The Village should consider a demolition and deconversion control policy that requires a payment into a local affordable housing fund when existing residential buildings are demolished or renovated and not replaced with comparable affordable units. These policies are particularly helpful in regard to rental, multi-unit, or naturally occurring affordable housing. Similar policies are already used in communities such as Evanston, where demolition tax revenue is deposited into the City's Affordable Housing Fund, and Highland Park, where a residential demolition tax helps fund its Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
 - This type of policy would allow redevelopment while recognizing that tear down and deconversion activity can reduce the supply of relatively attainable housing and increase pressure on housing costs. The Village should study a fee structure, exemptions, and replacement-housing options, including exemptions for unsafe structures, owner-occupied hardship situations, or projects that replace demolished and deconverted units with deed-restricted affordable housing. This recommendation should be coordinated with legal counsel and considered alongside the Village's broader inclusionary housing and anti-displacement strategies.
- Bonus Programs vs Base Zoning
 - As a policy decision, the Village should evaluate whether affordable housing goals are best advanced through a bonus program, base zoning changes, or a combination of both. A bonus program could allow increased height, density, or other development flexibility in exchange for affordable housing. However, it can also add complexity and uncertainty because each project must determine whether the bonus is financially feasible and acceptable in context. By contrast, updating the base zoning standards to allow the desired building types and development scale can provide greater predictability for residents, developers, staff, and decision-makers. The Village should carefully weigh whether affordability incentives should be layered onto the zoning system or whether the underlying districts should be recalibrated to better support the intended form of residential neighborhoods and commercial corridors.

Article 9. Site Development Standards

Barrier:

- The regulations for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) in Sections 9.3.A and 9.3.B include unintended impacts that may limit the practical ability to build ADUs.

Recommended Amendments:

- In Section 9.1.A, update the standard to state, “In the N-1 and N-2 Districts, there must be no more than one principal building per lot.”
 - **Why?** This standard should be updated for the new zoning district structure. New middle housing types are located in a principal building. This standard would still allow accessory dwelling units and coach houses.
- In Section 9.3.B, add a standard that indicates which housing typologies allow ADUs. Allow ADUs with detached single-unit dwellings, two-unit dwellings, and triplex dwellings.
 - **Why?** Currently, ADUs are only allowed on zoning lots used for single-family dwellings per Section 2.3 Definitions, which prevents the establishment of ADUs on lots for other middle housing types.
- Remove Section 9.3.B.1 so that both the principal dwelling and the ADU can be renter occupied.
 - **Why?** Allowing renter occupancy in both units would support more flexible household arrangements, create additional small-scale rental housing, and help ADUs function as long-term housing. The Village can still address neighborhood impacts through clear standards for property maintenance and restrictions on the use of ADUs as short-term rentals.
- Change Section 9.3.B.2 to allow up to one attached ADU and up to two detached ADUs with a detached single-unit dwelling and one detached ADU with a two-unit dwelling or triplex dwelling.
 - **Why?** These regulations allow modest additional housing without using the ADU regulations to bypass the Village’s standards for larger multifamily buildings. This provides flexibility for homeowners and supports incremental housing growth, while maintaining clear limits on overall development intensity.
- Change Sections 9.3.A.4, 9.3.B.5.d.ii, and 9.3.B.6.d.ii to allow detached ADUs to be a maximum of 24 feet in height or the height of the principal dwelling, whichever is greater.
- Change Section 9.3.A.6 to exempt detached ADUs from the 20 percent lot coverage standard of the zoning lot.
- Change Section 9.3.B.6.b to remove the standard requiring a detached ADU to be smaller than the principal dwelling. Add a standard allowing ADUs to be 1,200 square feet on zoning lots that have a lot area of 6,000 square feet or more.

- **Why?** This series of small changes will add up to new ways to allow ADUs to have slightly more buildable area, which will provide additional opportunities for context-sensitive housing options in Oak Park.
- Change Sections 9.3.B.5.d, 9.3.B.6.d.i, and 9.3.B.7.e.i so that attached and detached ADUs do not have to relate to the principal dwelling. Instead, the Ordinance should state “accessory dwelling units must be designed to be compatible with the principal dwelling and surrounding residential context but are not required to match the architectural style or materials of the principal dwelling.”
 - **Why?** Due to the vintage architecture of many homes in Oak Park, creating an architectural relationship between a principal dwelling and an ADU can add unnecessary expense to a project. It also adds an element of subjectivity to determine what it means to “relate” to the design of the principal dwelling.

Additional Considerations

- Short-Term Rental Regulations
 - Oak Park regulates short-term rentals through Chapter 8, Article 40 of the Village Code, as a business licensing matter rather than through zoning regulations. Short-term rentals apply broadly to dwelling units rented through a hosting platform, including single-family homes, rooms in single-family homes, accessory structures, townhomes, condominiums, rooming house dwelling units, and units in two-unit, three-unit, and multifamily buildings. The purpose of facilitating the development of ADUs is to expand housing options so the Village should consider prohibiting the use of ADUs as short-term rentals through its business licensing regulations.

Article 10. Off-Street Parking and Loading

Barrier:

- Table 10-2 Off-Street Vehicle and Bicycle Parking Requirements of the existing Zoning Ordinance regulates the amount of off-street vehicle parking and bicycle parking required for each use in the Ordinance.

Strategic Vision for Housing - Recommended Strategy #3, "Address Housing and Parking in a Holistic Manner."

Recommended Amendments:

- Update Table 10-2 to remove minimum off-street parking requirements for motor vehicles associated with all uses. Include language that states, "no minimum amount of off-street vehicle parking is required, but if parking is provided, the standards of Section 10.3 (Off-Street Parking Design Standards) apply."
 - **Why?** The requirements of the People Over Parking Act apply to nearly all of the Village. A very limited portion of northwest Oak Park is exempt from these standards and it is so small that it would be more consistent and effective to have these regulations apply throughout the Village. A more detailed explanation of the People Over Parking Act is included in "Additional Considerations," below.
- Add a new section as either Section 10.1.H or 10.4.F re "State Law Limitation" as follows: "Minimum off-street parking requirements do not apply to development projects located within the areas covered by the Illinois People Over Parking Act, 50 ILCS 845/5-1 et seq. However, off-street parking that is provided voluntarily in these areas is subject to all applicable Village parking standards."
- Remove Section 10.5.B.3, which allows parking reductions for development within one-half mile of transit stations (train only).
 - **Why?** The Illinois People Over Parking Act is in effect as of June 1, 2026 and includes all Illinois municipalities. See more information below. Section 10.5.B.3 is now unnecessary.

Additional Considerations

- People Over Parking Act
 - The Illinois People Over Parking Act prohibits municipalities from requiring minimum off-street parking for development projects located within one-half mile of a public transportation hub or one-eighth mile of a public transportation corridor. A "hub" includes a rail transit station or an intersection where two or more frequent bus routes meet, while a "corridor" is a street served by frequent bus service during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods. The Act was passed as part of a broader state transit reform and reflects a policy determination that minimum parking requirements increase housing costs, create unnecessary barriers to building reuse, and result in more parking than needed in areas intended to support

transit access and walkability. This Act will impact Oak Park because the Village is served by stations along the CTA Blue and Green Lines, Metra's Union Pacific West Line, and bus stops along CTA and Pace bus routes. The Village should identify the areas where state law will preempt local minimum parking requirements.

- Overnight Parking Regulations
 - Oak Park's overnight parking ban is a long-standing, much-discussed policy that generally prohibits on-street parking from 2:30 am to 6:00 am, except where allowed by permit or pass. Overnight permit parking is available in designated multifamily areas and other limited locations. The Strategic Vision for Housing previously identified the overnight parking regulations as an issue warranting review.
 - From a housing production perspective, the ban can make it harder to reduce off-street parking requirements because residents, builders, and lenders may assume that each new unit still needs access to private or permitted parking. This can increase development costs, consume limited lot area, and make middle housing more difficult to build. Overnight parking is closely tied to street management, snow removal, and quality-of-life concerns so any changes should be studied carefully and discussed publicly as part of the Village's broader land use goals.

Article 14. Zoning Approvals

Barrier: Section 14.5.D.1 authorizes when the use of planned developments (PDs) are allowed in the Village, as follows.

- *Prohibited:* PDs are not allowed in the R-1, R-2, R-3-50, R-3-35, R-4, and R-5 Districts.
- *Optional:* Outside of the R-1 through R-5 Districts, if a development is at least 10,000 square feet but less than 20,000 square feet and it needs relief from zoning regulations, the PD process is optional.
- *Required:* Outside of the R-1 through R-5 Districts, if a development is 20,000 square feet or more in gross floor area and it needs relief from zoning regulations, the applicant must use the PD process.

Recommended Amendments:

- Update Section 14.5.D to allow PDs as an optional zoning approval in all zoning districts.

Why?

- The existing planned development framework is outdated because it relies on rigid district prohibitions and size-based thresholds, rather than a more flexible evaluation of development quality and community benefit. As the Village updates its Zoning Ordinance, the revised district standards should better reflect the types of development the Village wants to encourage, which will reduce the need to utilize the planned development process. This change would give the Village a flexible process with discretionary review and approval to consider unique projects that do not fit neatly within conventional standards.

Additional Considerations

- None.

Article 15. Nonconformities

Barrier:

- Section 15.2.G allows nonconforming single-family and two-family dwelling uses to continue as long as they comply with the standards of the R-7 District. This provision does not extend to middle housing types.
- Section 15.3.E allows nonconforming single-family and two-family structures that have been destroyed or damaged to be rebuilt to their original condition. This provision does not extend to middle housing types.

Recommended Amendments:

- Update Sections 15.2.G and 15.3.E to either apply to all housing types or no housing types.

Why?

- The existing provisions for nonconformities favor lower-density single-family and two-family housing, but do not extend the same protection to denser middle housing types. The provisions of Section 15.2.G and 15.3.E are narrowly tailored, but unusual. Typically, standards for nonconformities apply throughout the community to gradually eliminate nonconforming uses and structures over time so new development meets the standards of the updated Zoning Ordinance. The Village should make a policy decision to extend this protection to all housing or remove it entirely. As the Village updates its Zoning Ordinance, the revised use list and zoning map should better reflect the types of development the Village wants to encourage, which will reduce the number of nonconforming uses and structures in the Village.

Additional Considerations

- None.