

Dear Sir or Madam:

I write to encourage you enforce the established zoning ordinances in the new development proposed at 435 Madison. This development abuts one of the few historic districts in south Oak Park and asks for several significant variances. The developer's proposal is 13' too high and a mere 7' in the rear from a modest, historic two-story home.

I am for development on Madison, but only if it is in scale to the adjacent historical district. It is unacceptable to forbid homeowners from making reasonable and practical alterations on their own home, only to put a monstrous development at the end of their block.

With so many empty lots on Madison, surely this developer can take this project elsewhere. The "endcap" of a historic district deserves something that will not overshadow the district itself.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,  
Anna Johnson, Ph.D.

--

Anna Marie Johnson  
Associate Professor of Reformation History  
Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary  
2121 Sheridan Road  
Evanston, IL 60201  
Phone: 847-866-3960

---

December 30, 2019

Oak Park Village Board of Trustees  
Village of Oak Park Plan Commission Members  
Village of Oak Park Clerk  
Craig Failor, Oak Park Village Planner  
Bill McKenna, Oak Park Village Engineer

Ladies and Gentlemen:

We are writing this email and providing comments as taxpayers and residents of Oak Park, living at 528 Gunderson Avenue, and six houses to the south of the proposed 48 unit apartment complex at 435 Madison by Michigan Avenue Real Estate Development Group (the "Developer"), which is asking for five zoning variances to develop the project, including the number of units, height, and rear set back. We have previously joined in writing and signing our block's letter to you expressing our block's views and comments, which were based on the Developer's presentation of the proposed project at a community meeting on October 8,

2019. We are writing now to express our opposition to the proposed development as planned in light of the Developer's filed application given the Developer has made very little effort to take into account the concerns raised by impacted residents and taxpayers at the meeting. Our primary objections are as follows based on the filed application:

1. Size and Density of Development vs Parcel Space and Residential Area. The Developer continues to request a five story apartment facility having 48 units and which is five stories and a height of 62 feet, when zoning permits only 24 units and at most a height of 50 feet. Further, the application requests an additional zoning variances from a rear set back requirement of 25 feet to 7 feet. The Developer's proposed development dimensions would exceed the current building footprint by several feet in multiple directions leaving nominal green space for its residents, their pets, and the community in general. The residents of this proposed building to obtain recreation and outdoor space will be required to encroach on the properties of other residents on the block as the Developer has left no space at all on the parcel. On a larger parcel of land and not a mere seven feet from a two-story historic Gunderson home to the south, the development may be appropriate for Madison Street; however, a development of this size is not appropriate for the parcel of land and location where it is proposed. The development would be the tallest building east of Oak Park Avenue and would tower over not only the single family homes to the south, east, and west, but also be the tallest fully residential complex on Madison itself, including the residential apartment complex previously approved for Madison by the Village at Lyman. The Developer's application requests a variance in the rear set back from 25 feet to 7 feet from a single family home, but the Village has long recognized that the taller the multi-family complex, additional, not less, rear set back space is required to meet the health, welfare, and safety concerns of the area residents. Zoning ordinances require with respect to multi-family housing that for each 2 feet the building goes above 45 feet in height, an additional foot of rear set back from the standard 25 is required in order to ensure that residents in the area, including those in the multi-family housing complex itself, have appropriate light, air and green space. See Table 4-4 of Zoning Ordinance that would apply for Multi-family housing areas. Unlike a commercial facility where the building may be occupied for a limited number of hours during the day and perhaps not even on weekends, a residential facility is open 7 days of week and 24 hours a day, and its occupants need more space for their everyday living and recreational activities, which the Developer has not taken into consideration. We are not sure even the Developer's consultants, the reports of whom the Developer submitted with in it application packet, know the correct size of the parcel on which the Developer plans to build. For example, the Market Feasibility report of Tracy Cross & Associates dated November 2019, states in numerous places that the project "consists of an approximate 20,700 square foot redevelopment parcel" (see page 1 for example of that report); but the application itself to the Village in the petition for public hearing says the parcel is only 18,562 square feet (see petition, page 2 of 3). Perhaps, the market feasibility report was aspirational, indicating that that land size needs to be over 11.5% larger than it really is to support the planned construction in a feasible manner, but given that the land size is not, the report may in fact indicate that the proposed construction project is just too large for the land on which it will sit.

2. Traffic Flow and Parking. The proposed development in the application continues to provide for one parking entrance for its 48 units on the residential street of Gunderson Avenue. This was a concern raised by the residents at the community meeting who asked why

that entrance was not on Madison like other developments on Madison as the garage entrance on Gunderson would significantly increase vehicle traffic on a residential street to the detriment of the other street residents, including the numerous young elementary school age children who walk to Longfellow school. The developer acknowledged that concern in its application by indicating it was open to an alternative solution which would impose a traffic control device to prevent the residents of its building from going south on Gunderson when exiting the garage. The Oak Park fire commissioner apparently has provided a letter saying that he did not see a safety concern if this traffic control is in place. The Developer's proposed alternative solution however only means that all the traffic to enter the garage will need to come from the south and drive north on Gunderson Avenue. It will in fact be forcing the residents of the development to use Gunderson Avenue from the south to enter the garage. Further, it will cause a bottleneck at the corner of Gunderson and Madison, extending well past the garage entrance exit itself and further to the south on Gunderson, especially if cars going north from the development's garage would like to turn left on Madison given the traffic restrictions already imposed by the "Madison Diet." If there is still to be only one garage entrance, then to protect the safety of the neighborhood children, we suggest that the parking entrance be on Madison where the building's entry way is already planned and where there is already a curb cut-out. We understand that the Village planners and engineers may have traffic flow concerns with a Madison garage as the now single lane of traffic created by the "Madison Diet" has caused Madison traffic within several blocks of Ridgeland in both directions to often turn into a single lane "parking lot" of idling cars at various points throughout the day, so they would prefer not have additional cars using Madison, but there are numerous other businesses and developments on Madison that are still required to use Madison for both ingress and egress, including the senior center to the west of Oak Park Avenue, so there is no reason that this Developer should get more favorable treatment, especially when that treatment harms the neighborhood. I note that multi-family developments of similar number of units such as the complex at Ridgeland and South have actually two entrances, one on Ridgeland and one on South. That may be the better solution for this issue for not only the residents in the area but also the residents themselves of the development and the community as a whole. Of course, that may mean to accommodate another garage entrance/exit, the Developer may need to reconsider the building's parking availability and perhaps downside the number of units and spaces needed.

- Besides the garage location, the Developer's application accounts for only parking spot per unit even for two bedroom units. Although that may be a feasible approach for the planned residential demographics, it provides no space in the development itself for visitors, maintenance and management personnel parking or for a loading zone parking. Instead visitors will likely park on Gunderson and Elmwood, especially as parking spots on Madison are occupied for customers of Jewell across the street from the planned development. Further, the loading zone itself the Developer plans to be in a dedicated and commandeered space on Gunderson, further impeding traffic and use of the street by all residents in the area. If the parking lot on the east side of the development as shown on page 60 of the application (see attached pdf) is to provide employee parking and delivery space during more than the construction phase, then that lot should have been also included in the Developer's application but it was not, and, at the community meeting on October 8, 2019, it was stated not to be part of the development, including as the result of environmental issues.

The Developer's application did contain a traffic consultant report which indicated no material harm to the traffic situation on Madison and Gunderson and Elmwood. However, we note that this study only analyzed weekday traffic, not weekend traffic, which does not account for the fact that the development is residential, with 24/7 use, not commercial. Having lived on Gunderson Avenue for over 25 years now, we have readily observed that parking and traffic congestion at the area of Gunderson and Madison is often highest on the weekends as those are the days more customers are readily visiting Jewell and the businesses on Madison, immediately west of Gunderson, including the nail salon, the construction contractor, and the day spa. It is often the situation that on a Saturday mid-morning, Gunderson Avenue at Madison becomes a one way as parking for those businesses already on both sides narrows the street to permit only one lane of traffic to actually travel through. Such restricted use occurred even before the Madison Diet took place and has only been exacerbated by the "Diet" changes to Madison. Further, the study is based on features of Madison that do not exist. For example, on page 2 of that report, the report indicates that there is a right hand turn lane from Madison onto Elmwood. That right hand turn lane no longer exists and the Village itself as stated that it was a mistake by the construction company to put in place in the first place. See attached email in pdf. Further, the report says there are sidewalks on both sides of all streets in the area, which is not fully true. The sidewalk on Gunderson north of the parkway was removed by the Village to discourage pedestrian crossing of Madison at Gunderson, even to go to Jewell across the street. There are no crosswalks across Madison at Gunderson or Elmwood, and hopefully the vague descriptions on page 3 of that traffic report describing the crosswalks are not taken to mean otherwise. We suggest further traffic and parking analysis be required before the Village permits the development as planned, especially in light of the Madison Diet which had not been completed when the study was done. Like other parts of the Developer's application, including its architect's drawings which portray features of Madison that no longer exist because of the Madison Diet (e.g., medians), a more valid factual portrayal of the development's 24/7 impact on traffic and parking in light of the Madison Diet should be required to be taken into account.

3. Ally Obstruction During Construction. It appears from the planned development and construction schedule that the public alley to the immediate east of the facility will be obstructed during the approximate 17 month construction period of the project. Although this is understandable given the Developer plans to build the building wall right up to that alley, it was not discussed during the community meeting and represents an *inequitable taking of public property*. The current owner of the property sought an alley vacation before, which the Village had rightfully rejected given among other issues safety needs of the neighborhood and the significant use by residents. These safety needs and use continue and even a 17 month temporary taking is inequitable to the other residents and taxpayers of the area.

4. Lack of Affordable Housing and Transient Occupancy. We understand that the Developer is electing as its right under the Village ordinance to make a payment rather than comply with the 10% affordable housing unit set aside in the development. This election does not assist in promoting the cultural and economic diversity of Oak Park which this Village has long prided itself on fostering. It further limits the diversity of people and ideas in its schools, neighborhoods, and even at its famed block parties. The Developer promotes the project as consistent with enhancing a walkable and green environment, but not even 10% of the units are being set aside for the economic group that is most likely to walk to shops and use public transportation. We think that is a mistake and a detriment to the community as a

whole. Moreover, the Developer's own market feasibility consultant has warned the Developer (see page 11 of feasibility report) that projected rental rates are \$400 higher per month than similarly amenity situated developments and the Developer will need to market aggressively to even achieve the occupancy rates necessary to maintain presumably economic feasibility. Such warnings suggest to us that this proposed development and its rental rates will lead solely to short-term tenancies, including Airbnb type use, and not long-term commitment of the building's residents to the Oak Park community, its businesses, and its residential areas.

In closing, we want to emphasize that we are encouraged by the proposed development of the actual location and improvement from the facilities currently located there which have not been maintained in a manner that fosters community appeal (see, e.g., page 26 of environmental report, boiler room partially filled with water and has been sealed from access), but the community needs responsible development that takes into account the size of the parcel, traffic, parking, long-term commitment to the community, and safety and rights of the neighbors and taxpayers. Our suggestion is a smaller building with a fewer number of units and adequate green space, with some set aside of units for affordable housing to the community.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. We appreciate your service to Oak Park.

Sincerely,

Stephen and Andrea Legatzke  
528 Gunderson Avenue  
Oak Park

## Legatzke, Stephen J.

---

**From:** Andrea Legatzke <alegatzke@sbcglobal.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 25, 2019 9:30 PM  
**To:** Legatzke, Stephen J.; Stephen Legatzke  
**Subject:** Fwd: Madison question

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "McKenna, Bill" <[bmckenna@oak-park.us](mailto:bmckenna@oak-park.us)>  
**Date:** November 7, 2019 at 1:26:00 PM CST  
**To:** "Andrea Legatzke" <[alegatzke@sbcglobal.net](mailto:alegatzke@sbcglobal.net)>  
**Cc:** "Kutz, Byron" <[bkutz@oak-park.us](mailto:bkutz@oak-park.us)>, Chris Baker <[cbaker@ehancock.com](mailto:cbaker@ehancock.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Madison question

That was a mistake. It was not intended to be a right turn lane. We will be having the contractor remove the right turn arrow and lettering this fall and next spring when the weather is better restripe the area to remove and realign the bike line, parking lane, etc.

Bill McKenna, P.E.  
Village Engineer  
Village of Oak Park  
201 South Blvd  
Oak Park, IL 60302  
708.358.5722  
[mckenna@oak-park.us](mailto:mckenna@oak-park.us)

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrea Legatzke [<mailto:alegatzke@sbcglobal.net>]  
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2019 3:10 PM  
To: McKenna, Bill  
Subject: Madison question

Dear Mr. McKenna,

I am curious why there is a right turn lane from Madison to Elmwood. Could you please tell me why it's there? It seems to be encouraging drivers to take Elmwood when traffic backs up at the light. Thank you.

Best regards,  
Andrea Legatzke



NOTE:  
ESTIMATED LOCATIONS ARE BASED ON GENERAL CONTRACTOR'S CURRENT EVALUATION OF SITE CONDITIONS. GENERAL CONTRACTOR  
SHALL FIELD VERIFY, COORDINATE WITH CITY OFFICIALS AND ADJUST AS REQUIRED DURING THE COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION

1 CONSTRUCTION STAGING, DELIVERY, PARKING AND PEDESTRIAN PATH LOCATIONS

SCALE: N.T.S.

November 29, 2019

**VIA US MAIL and EMAIL**

Hon. Anan Abu-Taleb

Mayor/President Village of Oak Park

[mayoranan@oak-park.us](mailto:mayoranan@oak-park.us)

Ms. Cara Pavlicek

Village Manager, Village of Oak Park

[villagemanager@oak-park.us](mailto:villagemanager@oak-park.us)

Ms. Vicki Scaman

Village Clerk, Village of Oak Park

[clerkscaman@oak-park.us](mailto:clerkscaman@oak-park.us)

Mr. Craig Failor

Village Planner, Village of Oak Park

[cfailor@oak-park.us](mailto:cfailor@oak-park.us)

Mr. Michael Bruce

Zoning Administrator, Village of Oak Park

[m.bruce@oak-park.us](mailto:m.bruce@oak-park.us)

Oak Park Village Plan Commission

c/o David Mann, chair

[planning@oak-park.us](mailto:planning@oak-park.us)

Oak Park Zoning Board of Appeals

c/o Michael Quinn, chair

[zoning@oak-park.us](mailto:zoning@oak-park.us)

The Village of Oak Park

123 Madison St.

Oak Park, IL 60302

Re: Proposed Multi-Story Apartment Building Development by Michigan Avenue Real Estate Group at Gunderson Avenue and Madison; Gunderson Residents Perspective

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The signatories to this letter are residents of the 500 block of Gunderson Avenue who would like to share their thoughts and concerns regarding the proposed 48 unit, multi-story apartment building (the "Building") proposed to be developed for Madison Street at Gunderson Avenue (Street Addresses 435-449 by Michigan Avenue Real Estate Group (the "Developer"). We understand that the Developer has or will be requesting a number of zoning variances from the Village of Oak Park to develop the Building, including variances from the Madison commercial zone, and the height and set-back zoning ordinance requirements for multi-family residential units. The Developer presented its initial development proposal to the residents of the 500 blocks of Gunderson and Elmwood on October 8, 2019 at a community meeting at the Maze library. Our thoughts and comments that are contained within this letter were based on the proposal at that meeting.



take place at the proposed site along Madison. The current building at the location has decayed over the years and does not in our view generate the "curb appeal" for residents or visitors to make Madison Street a revitalized area that encourages green pedestrian and non-motorized traffic, commerce and living space as hoped for under the new Madison corridor plan. Therefore, we are not opposed to a multi-family updated residential building that fits with the character of the area, including the Gunderson Historic district, which is immediately adjacent to the Building site to the south.

Our concerns with the Developer's proposed Building, including the requested zoning variances however, center on the following issues:

**Building Size and Density.** The Developer plans to squeeze 48 rental apartment units into a five-story building with a height of approximately 63 feet that will need to encroach through zoning variances to as close to 7 feet from a single family historic district home, that will be approximately half its height. Further, as there are currently 26 single family homes and one two flat on the 500 block of Gunderson Avenue, the proposed 48 residential units significantly increases household population density on the street, adding to enhanced demands on the street, sewers, utility, fire prevention, communication, and other infrastructure. The lot size on which the Developer plans to build the Building is significantly smaller than other 48 unit apartment/condo developments in the Village including that at Ridgeland and South. Moreover, the Village only approved a 23 unit development at Madison and Lyman on a similar or slightly larger lot. The Developer is quite aware that the proposed Building is too large for the lot size and location and is requesting to appropriate to itself a portion of Gunderson Avenue for a commercial loading zone to accommodate even refuse pickup because there will be no space left in the alley at the back of the building or the side of the Building given its dimensions to accommodate refuse pickup, which is against zoning requirements and the rules under which other residents in the area are required to abide by (See Zoning Ordinance 10.7). The Developer also has left no room on the lot site given the Building's dimensions for green space, landscaping, and light for its potential residents, and, therefore, although we believe we are and will be good neighbors, we fear that the Building's residents will be compelled to continually encroach upon the "light, air, and privacy" (see purposes of Zoning Ordinance, section 1.2B) and property of the other residents and taxpayers on the street, whether to walk their dogs, barbecue, play, or get some sun. **In general, the proposed Building is just too large and has too many units for its location.** We understand that current zoning requirements for multi-residential buildings generally require rear setbacks of 25 feet, and additional set back required of 1 foot for each additional 2 feet above 45 feet. See Oak Park Zoning Ordinance table 4-1. There are a number of reasons for these requirements, including public health, safety, and access to light, air, and privacy, and we encourage the Village to compel the Developer to take those purposes into account in developing a building that actually fits within the lot size and the population density of the neighborhood and which allows for the requisite open, green space to serve its residents such that they are not encroaching on their neighbors' properties.

**Traffic Congestion and Safety.** The Developer's plan proposes that there be only one entrance/exit to the 48 space parking lot garage on the first floor of the Building and that the location of such garage entrance/exit be on the residential street of Gunderson Avenue. Ironically, the Developer's architect at the community meeting stressed that the garage door location was for the safety of the Building's residents who otherwise would be required to enter and exit on Madison street (again, there is no space left to make entrances and exits on alleys given the Building's dimensions). We find serious fault with such proposal and it clearly does not take into account the safety of the other residents and taxpayers on Gunderson Avenue and the Building's own residents, who will be funneled in and out of a tight parking lot one entrance garage. The Developer's plan would perhaps double the amount of vehicle traffic that goes down the 500 block of Gunderson Avenue each day, a street where there are a number of young children present and often playing. It would continually disrupt pedestrian and traffic access of Gunderson residents to Madison to the north as the Building's residents use their sole garage entrance, let alone the noise disruption to the neighbors of a garage door going up and down throughout the day or night, accompanied by any lights and warning sounds. Gunderson Avenue itself is a narrow street, and, with parking by customers of the businesses on Madison on the west side of Gunderson and the single lane of traffic on Madison street, the north end of Gunderson is often impassible to two-way traffic already. Adding additional vehicle traffic on Gunderson along with the planned loading zone for the Building will only acerbate this problem, leading to the denial of efficient emergency services if needed to the other residents of the street. Further, the population density of the Building will lead to further congestion caused by visitor parking to the residents of the Building. We suggest that the Village require the Developer to build any garage entrance solely on Madison at the northeast corner of the lot, where there is already a curb cut for the current tenant. We point out that the Senior Living Center on Madison near the hospital uses a Madison street garage entrance and exit, apparently without concern for its residents. We further request the Village to require that the Developer maintain any required loading zone if an internal location cannot be built solely on Madison street to avoid the north end of the 500 block of Gunderson becoming inaccessible to two-way traffic and emergency services.

**Lack of Long-Term Community Commitment and Investment.** Although we appreciate the Developer's plan to own and manage the rental units, this type of structure does not cause the actual residents of the Building to invest in the Oak Park community and the neighborhood for

income residents, and the Developer's ability to use short-term leases or Airbnb type use, to ensure that vacancies are a minimum to maximize its return or to avoid default on its debt, we fear will lead to a continual change-over of tenants whose commitment to respecting and enhancing the neighborhood would be *de minimis*. Accordingly, we would request that the Development commit to only providing at minimum annual rental agreements, with no Airbnb usage or short-term sub-leases. Further, although we appreciate the additional property tax dollars this Building will add to the community (assuming the Developer does not continually litigate any assessments at the cost to the local taxing bodies), the planned development offers the Madison commercial district with no additional services or activities that will augment sales tax revenue or which will provide benefits to the current residents of the neighborhood.

**Incompatibly with Neighboring Historic District.** The Building site buttresses the Gunderson historic district. The Building in our view therefore should take into account or blend in at least some of the characteristics of that district, such as the oak trim, stained glass, and Gunderson style windows. It should take into account some of the elements of the lauded architectural heritages that Oak Park is known for, and which brings visitors to our Village. Most importantly, it should not have a 62 foot, high industrial south wall of continuous cement cinder blocks pocketed with small industrial metal windows as proposed by the Developer to save costs. Such a wall demeans the historic homes that the residents have maintained with care, invested in, and paid taxes on. Such a wall does nothing to "conserve the values of property throughout the Village" and "to protect the character and maintain the stability of the Villages residential and non-residential areas required by the Village ordinance. (See Section 1.2 of the Zoning Ordinance).

We appreciate the opportunity to present our thoughts to you and thank you for your service to the Village.

Respectively Submitted:

Signed Name	Print Name	Address
<i>Amy Korner</i>	AMY KORNER	512 GUNDERSON
<i>Andrea Legatch</i>	ANDREA LEGATCH	518 GUNDERSON
<i>Stephan J. Legatch</i>	STEPHAN J. LEGATCH	522 GUNDERSON
<i>Amy Starin</i>	AMY STARIN	537 GUNDERSON
<i>Ann C. Schriw</i>	ANN C. SCHRIW	537 GUNDERSON
<i>Edward S. Kozum</i>	EDWARD KOZUM	514 GUNDERSON
<i>Carol J. Kozum</i>	CAROL J. KOZUM	514 GUNDERSON
<i>Alan R. Hinds</i>	ALAN R. HINDS	531 GUNDERSON
<i>Jody Evenson</i>	JODY EVENSON	541 GUNDERSON
<i>Tom Taylor</i>	TOM TAYLOR	571 GUNDERSON
<i>Stanley Birnbaum</i>	STANLEY BIRNBAUM	520 GUNDERSON
<i>Tina Birnbaum</i>	TINA BIRNBAUM	520 GUNDERSON
<i>Lisa Lee</i>	LISA LEE	534 GUNDERSON
<i>Pauline T. Towner</i>	PAULINE T. TOWNER	540 GUNDERSON
<i>Orak Krutizer</i>	ORAK KRUTIZER	540 GUNDERSON
<i>Abunda Murphy</i>	ABUNDA MURPHY	521 GUNDERSON
<i>Geoffrey Harris</i>	GEOFFREY HARRIS	534 GUNDERSON
<i>Adam L. Loebeck</i>	ADAM LOEBECK	512 GUNDERSON
<i>Anne Dickerson</i>	ANNE DICKERSON	533 GUNDERSON
<i>Katrin Malar</i>	KATRIN MALAR	519 GUNDERSON
<i>Michael Berbaum</i>	MICHAEL BERBAUM	519 GUNDERSON
<i>MARILYN STEIN</i>	MARILYN STEIN	525 GUNDERSON
<i>Margaret C. Russ</i>	MARGARET C. RUSS	524 GUNDERSON
<i>THOMAS N. THOMAS, JR.</i>	THOMAS N. THOMAS, JR.	518 GUNDERSON
<i>LORIS THOMAS</i>	LORIS THOMAS	518 GUNDERSON
<i>JEFF D. GORDON</i>	JEFF D. GORDON	571 GUNDERSON

Additional Public Comment.

To the Planning Commission:

We would like to voice my objections concerning the proposed huge apartments on Madison and Gunderson. We live on the 600 block of Gunderson, and Barbara is disabled; we cannot attend the meeting at 7 PM at Village Hall. We are writing to express our opinion.

We are appalled at the huge variances in the village code that are proposed. These variances will have a large impact on the neighborhood as well as have lasting implications for the development of Madison St.

The character of this lovely residential area is at stake. The building's access, on Gunderson, will have a tremendous impact on traffic and on current residents' ability to use our street. Gunderson is a narrow street, and traffic at the corner of Gunderson and Madison is already a problem.

The proposed building will butt up against the yards of existing homes, and balconies will reduce the privacy one expects in your backyard. The density and height of the building are inconsistent with and will irrevocably alter the character of our street and neighborhood.

We urge members of the planning commission to reject the variances, reduce the height and density of the proposed building or to reject the proposal altogether.

Sincerely,

Robert T. Creed Barbara E. Creed

638 Gunderson Ave

---

Dear Village Members -

While we are very much for and extremely excited about many of the current and future development plans for the Madison Street district including a revitalization of the commercial parcel located at Gunderson Ave. and Madison St., we are writing to you today to provide our individual concerns as taxpayers and residents of Oak Park, living at 512 Gunderson Avenue directly south of the currently proposed 48 unit apartment complex project at 435 Madison by Michigan Avenue Real Estate Development Group. Below outlines our four primary concerns and thoughts behind them. Additionally we've attached a copy of letter signed by many of the residence on both the 500 blocks of Gunderson and Elmwood, which we are a part of, for your review.

We thank you in advance for taking these concerns into account as you review this development and look forward to hearing more from the developer, residence and village in this matter on January 9th.

1. Project Planned Density vs Parcel Size and Historic Residential Area

Zoning variance relief requests:

- I. Increase in density from 24 allowable units to 48
- II. Increase the building height from allowable 50ft to 63ft
- III. Reduction in lot setback from 25ft to 7ft
- IV. Reduction in on-site load areas to Zero (0)

- Both the setback and height proposed zoning changes for this development will cause long-term harm including, but not limited to, property value, the residential family environment within a traditional single family home community, and the encroachment to light, air, and privacy to the adjacent historical Gunderson homes to the direct south and south-east on Elmwood. Their proposal not only requests a change to the current zoning but also asks for further leniency per Oak Park Zoning Ordinance table 4-1 proposed set back requirement of 1 additional foot for each additional 2 feet above 45 feet which is also not being met. The proposed building is simply too large and the ill effects onto the neighboring homes are too great for the planned parcel. I encourage the Village to compel the developer to take the current zoning requirements into account in developing a building that actually fits within the lot size and the population density of the neighborhood and which allows for the requisite open, green space to serve its residents such that they are not encroaching on their neighbors' properties within the current zoning rules in place.

- The proposed building will significantly increase the number of residence and approximate density by an estimated 250% by creating 48 units at the end of a block with only 26 residences. This will add safety concerns to the residents, most notably small children, and demands to the quiet neighborly street of Gunderson, traffic, sewer, utility, public infrastructure and outdoor space for both human and pet accommodations. This development is out of proportion with the surrounding neighborhood and, in my belief, contradicts the Village's "Envision Oak Park" goal to "strengthen the community's urban fabric through context sensitive infill development that is complementary to the scale and character of surrounding residential neighborhoods" (4.1.2).

- Not providing refuse relief within the building and allowing garbage collection, service vehicles, etc. to the exterior of the building on Gunderson will only further add to traffic congestions, noise pollution, environmental concerns, trash spray on to the community and the de-valuation to the neighboring single family homes.

2. Traffic

- The addition of 48 units and the proposal for a garage entrance and exit onto Gunderson, a quiet single-family residential street with many young families, is simply irresponsible.

- The intersection and the ¼ block of Gunderson to the south from Madison is already a bottle neck from business parking and moving car traffic with a heavy traffic alley on the west side of the street spilling onto Gunderson, a high volume business at the south west corner of Gunderson/Madison, the

high volume Jewel grocery store across the street and central location to 3 schools (Julian, Longfellow & Fenwick) all within blocks of the proposed density rich development.

- I find fault with the traffic study as it was conducted while the Madison Street project was still under construction. The photos submitted by Gewalt Hamilton clearly show orange construction cones still present, and the street paint markings are not yet complete. While the street had re-opened to traffic, it was not up to its normal volumes. Further, the busy Shell gas station on the corner of Madison and Ridgeland was closed due to tank replacement. Finally, school schedules were abnormal the week of the study. On the date given for the data in that report (October 23, 2019), the local high school had a late start and the local elementary schools had early dismissal. It is also important to note that there was no school at the high school and only half-days in all elementary and middle schools on the following two days (October 24 and 25). Given these schedule abnormalities, it is likely that many families in Oak Park were not in their typical traffic patterns on those days.

### 3. Development Design and Usage Concerns

- The proposed garage entrance and exit onto Gunderson is a major concern and will have long-term effects to the adjacent property values on both the east and west side tax paying single family homes on the 500 block of Gunderson. Additionally the traffic concerns as stated above and more importantly the safety of the residence and small children on Gunderson with the added traffic due to this garage location. The proposed location of this garage will also cause additional noise pollution/disruption to those homes and the Gunderson community. I see a simple solution, moving the garage entrance and exit to the north/east corner of this development where the ally between Gunderson and Elmwood meets Madison St and where there is already a curb cut-out and garage door with the existing structure.
- No clear design specifics have been presented to the property owners within 300ft of the development as to the rear structure (south facing wall) of the proposed development which will face and adjoin itself to the Historical Gunderson district and those architecturally significant single family homes. The current design of brick and stone does not appear to carry thru to the rear of the building. Will this be cinder block which has been so readily used the last decade and a half? How will utilities such as gas meter, electrical lines, etc. be integrated into the rear of the structure? They ask to change zoning to a 7ft set-back, how will the remaining 7 feet be designed and what effects will this have to the single family Gunderson home adjacent to the south? What design features have been made with the dense 48 units many multi-bedroom and pet friendly development with an rear entry and exit spilling out to the homes on Gunderson to the south and Elmwood to the south-east to protect the privacy, security, cleanliness, along with enhancing, benefit and integrity of the adjacent community.
- Tax paying residents in such historic districts of Oak Park are prevented from making even minor changes to the exterior of their homes, even if such changes would benefit their home's value or make maintenance easier. The goal is to maintain a consistent historical appearance, and residents are expected to make financial and personal sacrifices to further this goal. Outside developers that adjoin themselves to such historical districts should be held to same standards as local residents

- The development design is simple, remedial, boring and does not align, enhance or benefit the adjacent Gunderson Historical District to which it butts up against. As a property owner raising a family here and someone who was born and raised in Oak Park myself, the son of an Architect who was also an involved former Village Trustee, I have been most proud of our rich history, culture and forward thinking with respect to Architecture and Design in our community. This has been lost over the years and the proposed development will only add to the mundane new norm. I'm for proper and proportionate development on this site. Let's start now with this location to find a correctly sized, innovative and forward thinking architectural design to benefit the public and community at large. The Madison corridor needs architecturally significant development to advance future prosperity of this area perhaps more than any other part of our community.

#### 4. Zoning

- My understanding is the current zoning regulations were enacted in 2017, when the area in question was re-zoned as the "Madison Street Zoning District." My assumption is these zoning regulations were developed to reflect and further the current comprehensive plan ("Envision Oak Park") and the Madison Street Corridor Plan. To be direct, these regulations are current, up to date and were approved with full knowledge of the situation and future development goals of this district. As a result, they should be upheld. No leniency should be provided for this site and the development currently under consideration.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. We very appreciate your service to Oak Park and the advancement of our village.

Kind regards,

Adam & Amy Korchek – 512 Gunderson Ave.

---

Dear Village Planner,

I'm writing to you today not only as an Architect myself, but as a concerned resident and future neighbor of the above proposed development.

The proposed project poses many difficulties and idiosyncrasies which are not yet well thought out. Primarily, 1st floor prime Madison Street frontage is not active; the main vehicular entrance is off of a narrow residential street; and loading/garbage are planned to happen street side.

The zoning code allows 50' max height on the non-historic MS site. The project we saw was 63'. The base zoning calls for a minimum 25' rear setback. The project presented had a 7' set back abutting a residential home on Gunderson Ave.

Of greater concern is the proposal's lack of consideration for the budding Madison street pedestrian experience (with the new Mad St Diet) and maintaining the residential street character. The First floor largely composed of parking and dead spandrell storefronts on Madison. No active use.

Of further concern is the idea that the multi tenant rental project consisting of 48 units would not house loading internally, which the zoning code would require one of for MF Resi. Rental loading is proposed to happen curbside on the residential Gunderson street near the already cramped Madison intersection. The project also proposes garbage would be picked up by building rolling dumpsters onto Gunderson Ave whilst the garbage/recycling trucks load street side. These are non starters. The idea that the residential street would be burdened with trash and recycling trucks + moving trucks for the rental apartments is not sustainable. We recommend the developer raises the first floor to allow for the 14' clearance required at loading and that all garbage/recycling happen via Alley access.

The adjacent existing 10' alley is not being utilized for main vehicular traffic, loading, and garbage due to its limited size. The Architects proposed the main parking entrance would be off of Gunderson 7' away from a single family home. In our mind, this is a non-starter. The developer is proposing to have pedestrian visual and audible alarms at the garage door which would pose a hardship to the quiet neighboring residential street. We recommend the developer widen the 10' portion of the alley, and ALL vehicular traffic be off the alley and Madison Street,

These are elementary planning problems which need to be solved elegantly. The proposal is not there yet, but I am hoping with planning's help, they can get there. A good start would be to move vehicular entries and garbage and loading to Madison or the alley.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Romina Tonucci, AIA

540 Gunderson Ave

---