MINUTES SPECIAL MEETING OF THE OAK PARK PLAN COMMISSION VILLAGE HALL- COUNCIL CHAMBER

July 27, 2017 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Chair David Mann; Commissioners Lawrence Brozek, Jeremy Burton, Doug

Gilbert, JoBeth Halpin, Greg Marsey, Paul May and Kristin Nordman

EXCUSED: Commissioner Glenn Brewer

ALSO PRESENT: Craig Failor, Village Planner; Jacob Karaca, Plan Commission Attorney; Bill

McKenna, Village Engineer; Tammie Grossman, Development Customer

Services Director

For Applicant: Andrew Yule, Albion Residential; Dr. Hanqing Wu, RWDI wind

study consultant; Ted Wolff, Landscape Architect; Paul Alessandro, HPA

Architecture; Ben Skelton, Cyclone Energy Group Consultant; Mark Duntemann,

Natural Path Urban Forestry Consultant

Cross Examination: Mark Burkland, attorney for the Park District of Oak Park

Roll Call

Chair Mann called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. Roll was called. A quorum was present. Chair Mann congratulated Commissioner Nordman on the arrival of her second child and asked if she reviewed the recording of the previous meeting. Commissioner Nordman agreed.

Non-Agenda Public Comment

None.

Approval of Minutes

None.

Public Hearing(s)

PC 17-01: 1000 Lake Street; Albion Residential LLC, the Applicant, seeks approval of an 18 story mixed use planned development consisting of approximately 9,500 square feet of first floor commercial space, 265 dwelling units, 235 enclosed vehicular parking spaces, and 265 enclosed bicycle parking spaces. The applicant is requesting an allowance to increase the building height from 80 feet as required in Section 3.9.4 E(1) of the Zoning Ordinance to a height of approximately 199 feet, an allowance to increase density from the allowed 40 dwelling units as regulated in Section 3.8.3 A(1)b of the Zoning Ordinance to 265 dwelling units, and an allowance for setbacks and landscaping along the north property line from a required 10 foot setback to zero feet required in Section 3.8.3 B(2) and along the east property line from a required 5 foot setback to zero feet 3.8.3 B(1). The applicant is requesting no landscaping within the required setback areas 6.4.2 A. *Continued from July 11, 2017*

ALBION PLAT OF SUBDIVISION: The applicant is also seeking a subdivision of land as depicted on the Final Plat of Subdivision titled "Albion at Oak Park" submitted with the planned development application

Chair Mann asked all to treat the hearing respectfully and said all who wished to testify would be allowed to do so. He noted an application for cross examination had come in after the start of the hearing; because this did not follow the rules of the planned development ordinance, cross examination would not be

allowed. However, commissioners were given written questions from this person and would be free to ask them if they chose to do so.

Chair Mann reviewed the procedure for the evening with the public. He asked for the additional information from the applicant that was requested at the last meeting.

Dr. Hanqing Wu, from RWDI, prepared a wind study for Albion. In an overview, he explained they used data from O'Hare and Midway airports. He said most of the winds at the development site come from the west, south and northeast. With high rise buildings, wind speed increases with height as wind hits from high and moves down- called downwash flow. Two high rises together with a gap that aligns with the wind can create a channeling effect. Dr. Wu explained design features for wind control including having a low podium around a tower and a stepped façade.

Dr. Wu reviewed three directions of wind at the development site. He said with westerly winds, currently the Vantage building causes a significant downwashing and the proposed Albion development would provide shelter for Forest Avenue as it would create a step and cause the wind to skip and go above the building. He concluded wind speed would decrease from the west with the proposed development. However, he said a small area immediately adjacent to the building in the southeast corner of the park would see an increase in the wind speed.

Dr. Wu said for south and southwest winds the new building would increase the wind speeds along Forest and Lake due to downwashing and channeling around the project but would not travel into the park. The new building would protect the park from south and southwest winds.

Dr. Wu said for northeasterly winds, the wind speeds might increase slightly but any impact would be limited to the southeast corner of the park.

He provided an overview of a wind study for an 80 foot building- which would be allowed by right: westerly winds would cause downwashing and accelerations along Forest Avenue; for south and southwesterly winds, there could be increased wind speeds at intersections but directly behind the building there would be reduced wind speeds.

In summary, Dr. Wu said the development had positive features for wind control including a large podium and tower setbacks. It would decrease wind from west and increase winds from south, southwest and northwest. The park would not be altered in general except for a small area immediately adjacent to the building. Wind conditions would be similar if an 80 foot by-right building was built.

Chair Mann asked for questions. Commissioner Marsey asked about common wind flow patterns and direction. Dr. Wu said winds were from mostly the south direction. Commissioner Marsey noted the drawings in the study were different than the proposed design. Dr. Wu agreed and said they were just for illustration. Commissioner Marsey clarified along the Forest Avenue corridor when winds come from the south the wind effect would be more pronounced due to channeling effect. Dr. Wu agreed and said it would be felt most in the intersection. Commissioner Marsey clarified with an 80 foot by-right building, northeast winds would increase. Dr. Wu agreed saying the 80 foot building would be a box, closer to the park and would increase speed.

Commissioner May asked about the wind probability chart from the airport data and what level would be perceptible to a person on the ground. Dr. Wu said five feet from the ground was where wind would hit a chest; the development site wind speed levels would be lower than airport levels because of exposure and height level. Wind begins to become uncomfortable above 6 miles per hour while sitting but walking can be comfortable up to 12 miles per hour; anything above 12 miles per hour above five feet on the ground could affect footing. Commissioner May asked if urban conditions allowed for a lower ambient level. Dr.

Wu agreed. Commissioner Brozek asked about detrimental wind speeds. Dr. Wu explained wind speeds should be kept from 0-6 miles per hour for more than 80% of the time to be comfortable. Commissioner Brozek said it seemed the south winds would be most detrimental and what would the percentage of those winds. Dr. Wu said the south winds would likely increase but the west winds would improve so the effect would cancel each other.

Chair Mann asked if a wind tunnel study was done. Dr. Wu said no, the report was from experience and airport weather data. Chair Mann asked if the data was generalized from all seasons. Dr. Wu said the data was for the entire year. Chair Mann asked about a seasonal analysis. Dr. Wu said a study could be done at any time of year and even time of day as the data was available. Chair Mann noted wind conditions in the winter can be more detrimental than in better weather. Dr. Wu agreed.

Chair Mann asked for clarity on the downwash and channeling effect on the proposed building and an 80 foot building by-right. Dr. Wu explained for this development, downwash will improve for westerly winds but increase for south winds. The 80 foot building would see west winds increase but south winds would increase as much as the proposed development. Chair Mann asked about design parameters to mitigate downwash. Dr. Wu said podium and step designs, setbacks and other architectural measures. Commissioner Marsey clarified from the airport data that the prevailing winds were from the southwest most of the time. Dr. Wu said southwest winds had higher frequencies than the west direction.

Commissioner Gilbert asked about studies done in urban cities like downtown Chicago with a number of high rise buildings- was it more modeling or calculation studies. Dr. Wu explained there were two kinds of studies; one based on experience and data and one that was a wind tunnel study. The wind tunnel study would build a physical model 300 or 400 times smaller than the development, test it with wind and get results. He said the choice to do each study would depend on how tall the building was, what was surrounding it and what was required by the city. Commissioner Gilbert said he was struggling with understanding the actual impact as they've heard anecdotal stories of increased wind due to Vantage but couldn't understand what that increase meant and also the impact on the park in the corner. Dr. Wu said he couldn't give an exact number of the impact but said it would be very small, regular citizens on the street would not tell the difference; if tested in a wind tunnel they might see 1-2 or 5% difference, which was not significant from his experience. Commissioner Gilbert asked what was wind speed when someone has to really lean into the wind. Dr. Wu said there could be problems with footing and balance with wind gusts- there are criteria that says wind speeds of 56 miles per hour was the limit and that was not allowed to happen more than .1% of the year. He said an 18-20 story building would probably not cause that type of significant speed, typically a 50-60 story building would. Commissioner Gilbert asked about maximum wind speeds for an 18 story building. Dr. Wu said it would not cause safety issues; it would depend on frequencies and the time of the year as winter wind speed was higher but people spend less time outdoors so it wasn't as big an issue. In the summer the park trees would also help reduce wind speed. Commissioner Gilbert asked about the practical impact of the actual massing of the project. Dr. Wu said there was a significant podium on the northwest corner and some setbacks on south and east façade: any setbacks were good as this would confuse the wind so wind speed will not be as high as a smooth façade.

Commissioner Gilbert said the podium would break up the downwash but that's where the pool was set to be located and would that impact the use of the pool. Dr. Wu said the wind would have to go somewhere and would cause an impact, but as it was only used in the hot summer, wind speed will not be as high; also landscaping and guardrails would help mitigate it. Commissioner Gilbert asked for ways the design could mitigate the wind impact along the north façade as there was no setback. Dr. Wu suggested more setback would confuse the wind, but it wouldn't have an impact for winds coming from the north, mostly for winds coming from the west.

Commissioner Gilbert asked if anything could mitigate the channeling effect. Dr. Wu said all channeling was first caused by downwashing; but sometimes mitigation was local like a canopy to help protect a sidewalk. Commissioner Gilbert asked about wind impact range from the face of a building out. Dr. Wu said it would depend on a building's dimension and geometry; in this case, the middle of the road would get the highest speed. Commissioner Gilbert asked about corners. Dr. Wu said corners typically see winds coming from multiple directions and as you walk from being protected by a building to being exposed the change was more important than wind speed itself.

Commissioner Brozek asked about seasonal intensity and frequency. Dr. Wu said wind speed was much higher in winter than summer. Commissioner Brozek said most of the wind tunnel effect would happen in winter rather than summer. Dr. Wu agreed.

Commissioner Halpin asked about the comfort level of the wind and what would the wind speed be with channeling and downwashing. Dr. Wu said that some wind speed would be higher than existing – it could be 10 or 15%, but he wouldn't have exact numbers to give as he didn't do a wind tunnel test.

Commissioner Gilbert asked for the proposed schedule if more calculations and studies of winds were required. Dr. Wu said it would depend on the firm's scheduling, but typically it would take 6-7 weeks to do a wind tunnel study with a physical model.

Mr. Paul Alessandro, the applicant's architect, addressed questions on massing of the building in the existing context. He reviewed drawings on each of the street views. He reviewed new balcony drawings showing individual balconies. Commissioner Marsey asked why some units have balconies and some don't. Mr. Alessandro said it was due to a mix of amenities.

Mr. Ted Wolff, the applicant's landscape architect, showed pictures of projects they've worked on with green walls. He clarified that a living green wall has plants growing on the wall in a hydroponic type system whereas a green wall has vines planted at that base and vines or shrubs planted at top that can climb up or spill down. The development proposed a green wall. Mr. Wolff showed examples of current walls that use a wire mesh system supported on the ground and tied to the building. He said it would give depth and could have climbing vines like for example, Virginia creeper, Boston ivy, etc. He gave another example of a parking garage with hung planters at varying levels with trailing vines and vines that climb up from planters. He said as the development would be a north wall they would add some evergreen like English ivy to add to coverage.

Commissioner May asked about plant height and maintenance. Mr. Wolff said the plants they would propose were pretty rapid growing and could possibly get leggy at the bottom so they would suggest rejuvenation pruning to cut it down periodically through a rolling pruning program. Commissioner May asked how many years this would be effective. Mr. Wolff said it would depend on plants, attention to maintenance and ownership; Albion was a long term holder and he expected they would keep it in good shape and simple landscape maintenance would accommodate this type of pruning. Commissioner May asked for the time frame to get the appearance they were looking for. Mr. Wolff said five to six years would cover most of the height. Commissioner May asked if all the material would be living. Mr. Wolff agreed.

Commissioner Gilbert asked about the background color of the wall. Mr. Wolff said it was better to accent and interrupt the wall rather than an entire green façade. Commissioner Gilbert asked what would happen if it was not maintained. Mr. Wolff said no maintenance could be a failure of the irrigation system, but Albion was committed to an automatic irrigation system on all landscape areas; disease or insect infestation could cause setbacks, but he believed Albion would be a long term holder and would take care of it. Commissioner Gilbert asked if it was typical to create maintenance specifications as part of

a contract. Mr. Wolff said they require the landscape contractor to put together the maintenance program and this would require a longer term maintenance contract.

Commissioner May asked if the plants were susceptible to salt damage as it was adjacent to the alley. Mr. Wolff said there would be curbs between the alley and the building; there was always salt spray and splash but there wouldn't be the concentrated draining into the soil. Commissioner Marsey asked if the wall has been designed. Mr. Wolff said it was conceptual right now. Commissioner Marsey said he'd like an assurance from the developer that this would work as it typically doesn't work after a few years and suggested a design in the cage should the plants die. Mr. Wolff said they could provide more information and assurances if needed. Commissioner Marsey said due to the location near the park it was necessary.

Chair Mann asked how much of a base was needed. Mr. Wolff said he preferred 2-3 feet to provide a good growing environment. Chair Mann noted the building was on the property line. Mr. Wolff said they would adjust the building to accommodate it. Chair Mann noted the rendering was not accurate. Mr. Wolff said the example of the Whole Foods building was more likely, the goal would be to have seasonal plantings as well. Commissioner Burton asked if green walls alter the maintenance of the wall itself. Mr. Wolff said if you need to access mortar joints for tuck pointing it could be problematic. Mr. Alessandro said it would be a veneer brick wall on concrete back; tuck pointing would be in the 15-20 year range. This could be altered a few years if water got behind the system but if the air flowed behind the screen it shouldn't affect it significantly.

Mr. Andrew Yule, from Albion, addressed the suggestion of commissioners to possibly move the building lobby to the west and flip the retail. He said they would want the greenway space and the ability to have outdoor dining. Commissioner Brozek said he had concerns about the greenway and the entry into the park: flipping the lobby could increase foot traffic and was an attempt to create a mini plaza and link to Austin Gardens. Mr. Yule said current design had the back of the house for the restaurant hidden by the brick wall and if they were to move the corner the back would be open and exposed. He said the entrance to 1010 Lake was in the walkway and coupled with the restaurant and outdoor dining there would be vibrancy in the area, however, he was open to ideas and options. Commissioner Brozek said from a security standpoint having the lobby entrance was safer and could see that area as dark and ominous if people weren't there. Mr. Yule said there would be light boxes fixed to the facade to shine down and also spotlights on artwork on that wall; they planned to have ample lighting for pedestrians. Chair Mann seconded the safety of area and having eyes on the street either through the lobby or with a lighting program that was more impactful; he asked the applicant to take another look at it. Chair Mann also asked how the development would connect to Austin Gardens. Mr. Yule said they would restore the brick paver alley and walkway and designate the path to the west of the 1010 building. Chair Mann said he would like to see more on that. Commissioner Brozek agreed, saying it could be a major entrance to the park with a covered arcade, for example. Mr. Yule said they proposed using bluestone pavers like in the streetscape, broken up with different materials and an entrance sign with either an arch or a backlit piece. He said they would be working with the Oak Park Area Arts Council on this. Also, benches and seating areas with landscape trees, art work on the wall, lighting packs and strung lights. Mr. Yule said he would provide a drawing at the next meeting for them to comment on.

Chair Mann moved to staff responses. Mr. Failor reviewed the usage of the public garages. He said Vantage has 300 spaces and was at 54% average capacity just as Cooper's Hawk had opened- so this could change depending on the popularity of the restaurant. Holley Court leases 200 spaces to Oak Park Apartments and has a 90% occupancy rate. He reviewed other developments and space use. Ms. Tammie Grossman clarified the village has a public parking easement for a certain number of spaces in the Emerson and Lincoln developments. Vantage has 300 spaces that were owned by the village. Ms. Grossman said staff would get updated numbers on those developments to the plan commission. Commissioner Brozek asked if the village could get a public parking easement for the Albion

development. Ms. Grossman said the village does not own any of the land in this development and felt it was not appropriate to offer an incentive to do public parking.

Mr. Failor said the village does have the ability to relocate the Divvy site on the east side to another location in the area. Mr. Bill McKenna reviewed the possible Lake Street streetscape improvement schedule but cautioned it has not gone to the Board yet for final direction. He estimated a large chunk would be done in 2018 with downtown and portions of the Hemingway district done in 2019.

Mr. McKenna reviewed the traffic study conducted by the village. He said traffic solutions involved signal timing changes and some pedestrian crossing changes.

Commissioner Marsey asked about the project schedule and the streetscape schedule. Mr. McKenna said they would coordinate on the schedules should they go forward. Commissioner Marsey asked for a draft version of the schedule.

Commissioner May asked if the village did traffic forecasting based on an 80 foot by-right building. Mr. McKenna said they looked at existing conditions and at forecasted conditions with completed developments in the area, but they did not forecast with an 80 foot by-right building.

Chair Mann asked for break at 9:06pm. The meeting resumed at 9:20 pm.

Chair Mann moved to cross examination from the Park District of Oak Park.

Mr. Mark Burkland, attorney for the Park District, started with Dr. Wu:

- Mr. Burkland asked about the wind percentage increase. Dr. Wu said it was possible at certain directions to increase, but westerly winds would decrease and overall, as a whole, the increase would be minor. Mr. Burkland said winds from south, southwest and northeast would increase and could potentially cause adverse impacts. Dr. Wu agreed.

Mr. Burkland moved to questions for Mr. Ben Skelton, who did a solar impact study for Albion:

- Mr. Burkland asked about the study, its data and software. Mr. Skelton said they did the study using software that allowed for latitude and longitude coordinates to place the park district's EEC building. Mr. Burkland asked what time of day the Vantage building cast shadows on the EEC. Mr. Skelton said mostly in the morning. Mr. Burkland asked about the data from airports. Mr. Skelton said the O'Hare data was generally better and that weather data could differ from O'Hare and Midway but with cloudy, partially cloudy and sunny data it didn't differ much.
- Mr. Burkland asked if they looked at the actual PV generated data from the EEC when they prepared their study. Mr. Skelton said he just saw the data that morning. Mr. Burkland asked about the confidence of the kilowatt hour number. Mr. Skelton said he was very confident on the assumptions of the building and location and surrounding buildings; weather data can make a huge fluctuation, however. Mr. Burkland asked about the difference from the study and the actual data, which was 1000 kilowatt hours. Mr. Skelton said he was not surprised by the difference as things like trees could not be simulated perfectly. Mr. Burkland noted if the data was different than the impact numbers would change. Mr. Skelton disagreed, saying the assumptions would still be the same and only one variable would change.
- Mr. Burkland asked if the EEC was net zero. Mr. Skelton said from the data he saw today it was very close to net zero, given assumptions regarding the meters. Mr. Burkland asked if he would agree that the proposed Albion building would not allow the EEC to achieve net zero. Mr. Skelton disagreed, saying he didn't believe it would impact it to the point that it would not be net zero.

Mr. Burkland moved to questions for Mr. Mark Duntemann, Natural Path Urban Forestry consultants, who provided a shade impact study for Albion.

- Mr. Burkland asked about the source of the data for the study. Mr. Duntemann said a portion of the material was provided by HPA, his client. Mr. Burkland referenced page 6-8, and asked who wrote the narrative text. Mr. Duntemann said he wrote everything except for the graphics and attachments. Mr. Burkland asked about the images and who created them. Mr. Duntemann said he created image 2, images 3-6 were from the NOAA website.
- Mr. Burkland moved to the shade tolerance portion of the study. Mr. Duntemann said the tolerance levels were a composite from State DNR, US Forest Service, Morton Arboretum, Botanic Garden and Martin and Gower. Mr. Burkland asked if the age of a tree was a factor when you consider tolerance. Mr. Duntemann said to some extent it might play a role; as a tree begins to senesce, or overmature and starts to decline it might have a role in shade tolerance. Mr. Burkland asked if a tree was a particular age or diseased or stressed in some way may it have less tolerance. Mr. Duntemann disagreed, saying state and federal agency composites were for trees over their lifetime, most of the intolerant trees were species introduced into an area and as they migrate out, more tolerant species migrate in. He later clarified that he didn't mean diseased trees, only overmature trees. The tolerance levels listed were for species as a whole, over a lifetime. Mr. Burkland asked if the tolerance level would be more for a tree in a natural setting than in an urban setting. Mr. Duntemann disagreed, said certain species have known tolerances in urban and rural settings. Mr. Burkland asked if the tolerance list was assumed that the setting was natural. Mr. Duntemann disagreed.
- Mr. Burkland asked about the data in the shade study report, was it given to him or his own research. Mr. Duntemann said it was a combination of both. Mr. Duntemann clarified data from the architect was graphics from sketch up, graphics in the attachment to the report (pages 18-34), and image 7 from page 11 came from the Park District of Oak Park. Mr. Burkland asked if photographs were taken on trees evaluated on February 28. Mr. Duntemann said he did not take photographs. Mr. Burkland asked about the eleven trees focused on in the report. Mr. Duntemann clarified they were a conclusion in his report that the very southeast corner of the park would have the most impact of the heightened hours of shade. He said he did an assessment of the large diameter trees on the site on February 28 and he listed a range of species that were found in the southeast corner, and the 11 established trees would have the most issues with shade. Mr. Burkland asked if he determined the age of the trees, Mr. Duntemann said based on past studies he's done in Oak Park on street trees the Norway Maples are about 40-45 years old, for example. Mr. Burkland asked if he was able to determine the level of distress of the trees as it was in February. Mr. Duntemann agreed and said they inventory trees year round; specifically, the 3 Norway Maples, the one closest to the south property line had a lot of structural issues- it had a high risk of failure or causing harm. The other two have girdling roots and those trees may experience decline over time unless girdling roots were removed.
- Mr. Burkland asked if older trees with distress are more affected by changes in sunlight and shade. Mr. Duntemann said not necessarily, the maples specifically were at mature to semi mature and somewhat stunted but overall the crown looked fine. Mr. Burkland noted in the report the trees were designated to be fair or poor condition but there were no reasons as to why they were designated as such. Mr. Duntemann said he was very familiar with the park and he wrote a composite score based on Council of Tree and Landscape Appraiser's Condition assessment of a tree: trunk, roots, branches, twigs and foliage if present. Mr. Burkland asked if the composite data was in the report. Mr. Duntemann said no. Mr. Burkland asked if soil samples were taken. Mr. Duntemann said no.
- Mr. Burkland asked if in addition to tree species there were factors other than shade that affect a tree's tolerance rating. Mr. Duntemann said sunlight was one variable. Mr. Burkland said plant scientists commonly believe that tolerance to shade and changes to shade conditions was a function of numerous biotic and abiotic factors. Mr. Duntemann agreed there were numerous factors. Mr. Burkland asked if shade in spring can cause the soil to warm more slowly than unshaded soil. Mr. Duntemann agreed but said depending on circumstances, maybe by a short period of time. Mr. Burkland asked if shade at the end of the growing season can cause soil to

cool off more quickly. Mr. Duntemann said it was possible. Mr. Burkland asked if there was no value in considering the amount of shade balance in Austin Gardens in October or November. Mr. Duntemann said when considering tree health and the condition of trees, once tree get past dormancy it becomes a nominal point. Mr. Burkland asked if trees go into dormancy in October. Mr. Duntemann said trees transition from the growing season into dormancy and that kicks in in September as once leaves were gone photosynthesis becomes a moot point. Mr. Burkland asked if there was value in the effects of sunlight at different times other than what was in the report on the soil biotic communities. Mr. Duntemann said based on his assessment of Austin Gardens sunlight played a role in soil heating and cooling but the effect would be minimal. Mr. Burkland asked what basis he could make that analysis. Mr. Duntemann said in the area near the Festival Theatre receives 7 hours of direct sunlight in March; taking an hour off or adding an hour the differences would be nominal to the physiological processes.

- Mr. Burkland asked if soil that tends to cool faster in the fall and warm up slower in the spring creates a soil issue or any impact. Mr. Duntemann said he wouldn't say any impact but in Austin Gardens there would not be an impact. Mr. Burkland asked how he could tell without taking studies in those months. Mr. Duntemann said the time when the early part of the growing season was in March where most of the physiological activities in a tree were happening in the stem and root system; if talking about November through January, even February, the tree system is dormant. Mr. Burkland asked if the cumulative impact of an hour or two of lost sun each day over the course of four of five months could be damaging to plants and trees and change the soil biotic community. Mr. Duntemann said he would not agree with that but he would need to know how many hours of total sunlight the soil was experiencing, the loss of one or two if it was still getting 7-9 hours of direct sunlight at very specific times, then that loss would be a nominal point. Mr. Burkland asked if the loss of an hour or two of sunlight would cause a change in soil biotic community. Mr. Duntemann said it was nominal.

Mr. Burkland had questions for Mr. Yule.

- He asked if Albion would consider additional signage or wayfinding measures or mechanisms or things like colored or tactile crossing areas for the entrance into the park. Mr. Yule agreed, saying this would be a great idea and they would work with the Park District on what that could be.
- Mr. Burkland asked about an organization's endorsement that was published in the local newspaper; in the endorsement it was noted that Albion had committed upwards of \$500,000 to various purposes including impacts on Austin Gardens. Mr. Yule said this was included in the public contributions presented at first meeting. Mr. Burkland asked if this amount included money previously offered to the Park District of \$170,000 plus an escrow fund to be used as necessary to repair any damage to Austin Gardens. Mr. Yule said they would be willing to offer the escrow and dollar amount to wherever the Village Board or Plan Commission decided was best. Mr. Burkland asked if they were committed to the dollar amount for park matters. Mr. Yule agreed.

Chair Mann moved to public testimony for those in favor of the project. Commissioner Marsey suggested addressing questions from the person who was not permitted to cross examine; it was determined that questions for the traffic consultant would be addressed in writing.

Chair Mann asked for questions for Dr. Wu.

Commissioner Burton asked if there was a threshold in which to generate wind power. Dr. Wu said it was not his field but generally three or four meters per second. Commissioner Burton asked if the wind effects from this building would be sufficient to generate wind power. Dr. Wu said wind turbines were not ideal to place in the areas where you would get wind speed.

Chair Mann asked for questions for the shade study expert. There were no questions.

Chair Mann asked for public testimony in favor of the development.

Attorney Karaca swore in those wishing to testify.

Mr. John Lynch, the Executive Director of OPEDC, said this project offered a lot of benefits to Oak Park. He said residential growth was the key to vitalization of downtown: in the past there was concern about vacancies; now Marion Street was fully leased, Lake Street was almost full and there was growth in the downtown. He said a big part of the character of the downtown were walkable, vibrant and lively streets. He said this would be threatened if we closed the door to new investment. He said there was no 80 foot building and there would not be one if the commission rejects this development. It would cost more to build a shorter building then the building would be worth; there would not be enough rentable space to cover the construction costs. He said this was not District House, which worked because it was a for sale condo building and fits for that site. It was either this development or the eyesore present today and he urged commissioners to accept this project.

Mr. David King, from David King and Associates. He said he grew up in the town and has been selling commercial real estate for 34 years in town. He said the 1980s and 1990s were not good for downtown Oak Park: large commercial businesses were lost, there were foreclosures and vacancies. He said the last year and a half have been mind-boggling: now there was a Cooper's Hawk and a Target coming; this could not have been envisioned 30 years ago. He said the increased density and demand was why larger and smaller companies have come to Oak Park. He asked commissioners to keep the demand going and help bring more business to Oak Park. He was strongly in favor of the development.

Mr. Jack French, said the development will bring in property tax, sales tax, permit fees and construction workers who will be shopping here. He said to him, it was a no-brainer. He said the developer was friends with the parks as parks would provide views and views would sell apartments. He said schools were denser in the 1970s then they are now and he liked the mentoring program through the developer. He urged the commission to give the project the green light.

Ms. Colette Lueck said she was in favor of the project. She said the project has things she was in favor of and things she was not, but big decisions were not black and white. There will be evidence on both sides when making the final decision and the overriding decision was how was Oak Park improved or diminished by this development. She said the project would increase the population in a state, region and village that was losing population. She said this development was unique in that no public dollars were being spent and the village provided substantial benefits to developers in past projects. This project would appeal to a younger demographic who eats out and that would create sales tax. It will create shade and that issue will be debated. She said the project offered support for affordable housing. She said the change within downtown was too late- one more tall building will not have much of an impact. She said she was part of the committee for the downtown master plan and the mall concept was highly contested as it was expensive land and expensive to maintain. The village and the park district had the opportunity to purchase the land and did not. She said development will not ruin Austin Gardens, downtown or schools and services. She said it will also not lower taxes and will not solve business issues and will not solve open space needs. She said she would put up with height, traffic and shade to bring more people to the community.

Ms. Mary Ludgin said she supports the project. She said she was an 18-year resident and head of a global investment research firm. One of her clients is The Shops of Downtown Oak Park and she sits on the board of Downtown Oak Park and Oak Park Economic Development Corporation; she is also a trustee for the Urban Land Institute. She said she supports the project because it would expand modern apartments in Oak Park at an opportune time. Employment patterns in the Chicago region were changing- Google and McDonalds were both locating on the western portion of Chicago along the Green Line. Some of those employees will live in downtown Chicago and some will look to Oak Park. She said the development was

key to Oak Park's future; the development was complementary to the existing inventory of apartments that are well leased. As 50% of units were studios or convertibles this was well suited to 20-somethings and Oak Park teachers as these will be affordable. She said this was also affordable for active seniors, a population that has doubled in Oak Park. She said this project was supportive of a strong property tax base.

Mr. Bill Planek, a 45 year resident, lives in the 300 block of N Forest Ave, said he supports the project and thinks this will have a great impact on community. He said he was involved in the management of multifamily housing, the ripple effect Vantage has put out and the nationwide marketing program has brought other people to Oak Park. He said it exposes a lot of people to Oak Park, offering something not offered in Oak Park. H said other building owners were in support. He said the village has lost 11,000 residents since 1970; it was important to recognize that and population growth was important for long term viability.

Mr. Paul Veckler, 721 Ontario, said he loves Oak Park, he walks all over and was proud of his grandkids and proud of the Park District, the best library and he wanted to keep it going. He said he lived in a condo and his taxes have doubled and doesn't think it is sustainable. He likes to live in a diverse community. He said he was a self-employed business person but we also need people who buy things: 580 of businesses in Oak Park need consumers. He wants this to continue for his grandkids, and as a past president of the Park District he realized you need balance. He said in 20 years there was not going to be anything but restaurants and services and this project would bring taxes. He said he loves the parks but doesn't think this building would affect Austin Gardens. He asked commissioners to stay rational.

Adjournment

Commissioner Burton moved to continue the meeting and adjourn. Commissioner Halpin seconded. The next meeting will be August 3, 2017. The meeting adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Angela Schell, Recording Secretary