



Applicant:

Perry Vietti: Interfaith Housing Development Corporation
219 W. Chicago Avenue, Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60654

Meeting Date: December 16, 2010

Case: PC 10.01

Owner:

Comcast of Illinois IV, Inc.



VILLAGE OF OAK PARK + PLAN COMMISSION

Staff Technical Review Report

Prepared by Craig Failor, AICP, LEED AP - Village Planner

Interfaith Housing - Mixed Use Planned Development 820-832 Madison Street & 436 Grove Avenue

Planned Development Application; The Applicant seeks approval of a Planned Development for a four-story LEED certified mixed use building with approximately 5,200 square feet of first floor commercial space, fifty-one (51) one-bedroom supportive housing apartments ranging in size from 458 to 501 square feet. The applicant is also requesting eight (8) allowances from the Oak Park Zoning Ordinance as follows: **1.)** Section 3.9.6 (E) (1) (a) requires a front yard setback of not less than three (3) feet and not more than five (5) feet, for structures and buildings between Harlem Ave. and Oak Park Ave; whereas the proposal feature a zero front yard setback due to the location of the existing structure along Madison Street; **2.)** Section 3.8.4 (C) (2) requires that 25% of the lot area must remain open space and be landscaped to provide for the absorption of moisture; whereas the proposal features 20% new open space over the existing 0% open space on the existing site; **3.)** Section 6.2.2 (D) requires 64 residential parking spaces and nine commercial parking spaces (11 spaces total with a 25% reduction per Section 6.2.3) for a total of 73 off-street parking spaces based on 51 one unit bedrooms and 5,233 square feet of commercial space; whereas the proposal features 32 off-street parking spaces.; **4.)** Section 3.6.3 (A) (1) (b), by reference from Section 3.8.4 (A) (1) (a), requires a maximum of 40 dwelling units based on the size of the land; whereas the proposal features 51 dwelling units; **5.)** Section 3.8.4 (A) (2) requires that no building or structure shall exceed 50 feet in height; whereas the proposal features a principle building that is 55.5 feet in height; **6.)** Section 6.4.2 (A) requires a building setback along all public streets be planted with a minimum of one (1) tree and ten (10) shrubs per 40 lineal feet of setback area. This section shall apply along Madison Street where there is a required front yard setback of not less than three feet and not more than five feet. Due to the location of the existing building, landscaping along Madison Street would not be possible; **7.)** Section 6.4.2 (C) requires an eight-foot wide site-perimeter landscaping area adjacent residential uses; the area between the proposed nine parking spaces and the most northern section of the property shall be at least eight-feet wide which is approximately 21 feet out of 150 feet width; **8.)** Section 6.2.8 (B) requires that buildings containing more than 25,000 square feet of floor area to provide at least 2 off-street loading berths; whereas the proposal features 51,677 square feet of floor area, according to the applicant, and provides one off-street loading berth.

Property Information

Existing Zoning:	C Commercial District, Madison Street Overlay District
Existing Land Use:	Vacant (former Comcast Commercial Uses) and parking lot
Property Size:	31,895 Square Feet
Comprehensive Plan:	Business Area / Buffered Parking or Business Extension Development
Business District Plan:	2006 Madison Street Corridor Plan
Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:	NORTH: R-5 Two Family District; Single Family Residential SOUTH: C Commercial District; Retail / Vacant Lot EAST: C Commercial District; Drive-through Bank Facility WEST: C Commercial District; Commercial Use

Analysis

Submittals: This report is based on the documents that have been identified in the submitted proposal binder, which was filed with the Community Planning and Development Department in December 2010.

Description: The proposed development site is located within the C Commercial District, as identified on page 1; at the northeast (building) and northwest (parking lot) corners of Madison Street and Grove Avenue. The subject property abuts the C Commercial District on three sides and the R-5 Two Family District. The proposed development consists of a 55.5 foot tall four-story building with 51 supportive housing one-bedroom residential rental units, 5,233 square feet of commercial space, and various other uses such as a community room, supportive service office, bike storage, laundry, trash and mechanical rooms on the first floor. The development will also contain 32 on-site resident parking spaces. The Applicant's request for approval of a Planned Development is accompanied by eight allowances identified herein.

Waivers: The Applicant has asked for the following waivers from the requirements of the planned development application. 1) Environmental Reports, item 16 ; 2) Energy Analysis, item 29 and, 3) LEED bond requirements, item 31. The following is a formal response to each request.

Environmental Reports: The planned development application submittal requirement number 16 states, "Information about any hazardous pollution on the site is required to ensure that there is no threat to the public safety during construction of the proposed structures or use of the site after construction. Any environmental audits for the site, including Phase I or Phase II Reports, or any information that is on file with the Environmental Protection Agency shall be submitted for review by the Village. This information may not be necessary if a letter from EPA is provided stating that the site is considered clean by EPA's standards." According to their letter, a Phase I report, would be and is included in the application. The Phase I report recommends a Phase II analysis be conducted. The reasons the environmental reports are necessary are to ensure public safety during construction. However, since the Village will require a Phase II report prior to the issuance of a building permit, a delay in the submission of this report is acceptable. It is suggested that the Phase II be conducted prior to the final set of building permits be developed.

Energy Analysis: The planned development application submittal requirement number 29 states, "A life-cycle energy analysis comparing the costs of heating and cooling the development using a geothermal system with the costs of a conventional heating and cooling system. The annual and cumulative analysis shall use industry approved simula-

tion models to predict operating and maintenance cost, energy consumption, and production of atmospheric carbon dioxide." According to the application, the applicant will be installing a geothermal heating, ventilation, and air condition system. Since they are installing a geothermal system their request for omission is acceptable.

LEED [Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design] Requirements: The planned development application submittal requirement number 31 states, "In order to assure the attainment of LEED certification by each planned development, the applicant or developer shall submit to the Village Planner a performance bond payable to the Village in an amount equal to \$10,000.00 multiplied by the number of LEED points required to obtain LEED certification. The performance bond shall be renewed annually by the Developer until thirty (30) days after such time as the Developer is able to notify the Village in writing that the LEED certification for the project has been approved or denied by the U. S. Green Building Council." According to the applicant, as a private nonprofit organization they cannot afford to provide a \$400,000 performance bond, but that they are committed to achieving 52 LEED points, 12 more than needed for Certification, in hopes of meeting or exceeding a minimum score of 40 points. They also indicated that their funding is reliant on completing development of the subject site as proposed, meaning they must attain the LEED certification or better as designed. They also indicated that other Interfaith Housing facilities have been developed with LEED certification under the guidance of the architect selected for the Oak Park development. Their alternative suggestion is relative to the issuance of a building permit contingent on a thorough understanding of the LEED points detailed in the construction drawings would be acceptable. Staff suggested that a meeting be scheduled, at such time as necessary, prior to building permit approval with the architect of record, Director of Building and Property Standards and the Village Planner to ensure compliance with the minimum LEED certification, and that if the number of LEED points are less than needed for LEED certification, the building application will be determined invalid and shall be re-submitted.

To summarize; all three waiver requests aforementioned are granted per the Village Planner's authority as defined in Section 2.2.7A1c of the Oak Park Zoning Ordinance, contingent upon any noted conditions and/or suggestions.

Compliance with the Zoning Ordinance

The applicant is requesting approval of a Planned Development for a mixed-use development with allowances. The proposed development is meeting all other regulations of the Zoning Ordinance. The C Commercial District lists commercial and residential uses as a permitted uses.

Planned Development:

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

TABLE 1

	<i>Allowance Type</i>	Zoning Ordinance	Proposed Request	<i>Need for allowance</i>
1	Setback—Front Yard	3 Feet	0 Feet	3 Feet
2	Parking	73 Parking spaces	32 Spaces	41 Spaces
3	Density	40 Dwelling Units	51 Dwelling Units	11 Dwelling Units
4	Height	50 feet	55.5 Feet	5.5 feet
5	Lot Coverage	25% Open Space	20% Open Space	5% Open Space
6	Landscaping—Front Yard	3 Feet for Landscaping	0 Feet—no Landscaping	3 Feet for Landscaping
7	Landscaping— Perimeter	8 Feet for Landscaping	5 Feet	3 Feet
8	Loading Areas	2 loading areas	1 Loading Area	1 Loading Area

section of the Zoning Ordinance and shall only be permitted if authorized as a Planned Development.

It is the purpose of Planned Developments to enable the granting of certain allowances or modifications from the basic provisions of the Zoning Ordinance to achieve attractive and timely development in furtherance of the Village's objectives and proposed land uses as stated in the Comprehensive Plan. Site-development allowances (i.e., any zoning relief, including any deviation from the Zoning Ordinance provisions for the underlying zoning district) may be approved provided the applicant specifically identifies each site-development allowance and how it would be compatible with surrounding development.

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

and that such use or combination of uses is shown to be beneficial to the Village. The reason this project is seeking Planned Development approval is that the Zoning Ordinance requires those properties or buildings that are over 10,000 square feet in size to seek Planned Development approval when allowances are required.

Madison Street Overlay District:

The Madison Street Overlay District, which was approved by the Village in January 2008, was established based on recommendations within the Madison Street Corridor Plan. The Overlay District is in place to ensure development is consistent with the Madison Street Corridor Plan. The Overlay district sets forth provisions for use, yard and bulk regulations which override underlying C Commercial District regulations. Some of which are subject to the allowance requests identified in the table and text on the following page.

Allowances: *Site— Development allowances (i.e., any zoning relief, including any deviation from the Zoning Ordinance provisions for the underlying zoning district).*

TABLE 1 above and the following text details the requested allowances from the Zoning Ordinance:

Setback—Front Yard: Section 3.9.6 (E) (1) (a) requires a front yard setback of not less than three (3) feet and not more than five (5) feet, for structures and buildings between Harlem Avenue and Oak Park Avenue. The proposal features a zero front yard setback due to the location of the existing structure along Madison Street. The proposed development will include two additional stories above the existing structure at the existing zero lot line setback along Madison Street. The proposed setback is consistent with the established setback along the corridor. The purpose of the minimum 3 foot setback along Madison Street is to allow a wider sidewalk / pedestrian area as the west end of the corridor is narrower than the eastern

(Continued on page 4)

portion of the corridor. The existing placement of the building prevents the opportunity for this objective.

Parking : Section 6.2.2 (D) requires 64 residential parking spaces based on 51 one-bedroom units and eleven (11) commercial parking spaces based on 5,233 square feet of commercial space; however Section 6.2.3 of the Zoning Ordinance allows a 25% reduction for commercial parking spaces due to the availability of existing on-street parking spaces in front of the development. With the reduction included, a total of 73 off-street parking spaces are required. The development proposes 32 off-street parking spaces.

Density: Section 3.6.3 (A) (1) (b), by reference from Section 3.8.4 (A) (1) (a), requires a maximum of 40 dwelling units based on the size of the combined parcels of land subject to the planned development application. The proposal features 51 dwelling units, eleven (11) over the allowed limit. This equates to a 28% increase in density. The Zoning Ordinance's density calculation is based on dwelling unit per square feet of land, regardless of whether the dwelling units are one, two, or three bedroom units. One-bedroom units would be on the lower end of the density scale, with three bedrooms on the upper end. If you use a theoretical 1:1 ratio of person to bedroom, a 51 unit one-bedroom development would house 51 persons. A 51 unit three-bedroom development could house 153 persons. The applicant has indicated that there is a possibility that some of the one bedroom units may contain two individuals, a parent and child under 18 years of age, but that it would not be the norm.

Height: Section 3.8.4 (A) (2) requires that no building or structure shall exceed 50 feet in height. The proposal features a building that is 55.5 feet in height. This equates to an 11% increase in height. The bulk of the height is along Madison Street and Grove Avenue, with a lower roof of under 20 feet at the northeast corner of the building. The 55.5 and 20 foot portions of the building are approximately 33 feet from the north property line which abuts a residential property.

Lot Coverage: Section 3.8.4 (C) (2) requires that 25% of the lot area must remain open space and be landscaped to provide for the absorption of moisture. The proposal features 20% of new open space over and above the existing 0% open space on the existing site. In addition to the increase in open space on the ground, the application proposes a pre-vegetated pre-grown modular roof garden atop the 20 foot tall portion of the development as well as new perimeter landscaping within the adjacent parking lot.

Landscaping—Front Yard: Section 6.4.2 (A) requires a building setback along all public streets be planted with a minimum of one (1) tree and ten (10) shrubs per 40 lineal feet of setback area. This section shall apply along Madison Street where there is a required front yard setback of not less than three feet and not more than five feet. Due

to the location of the existing building, landscaping along Madison Street would not be possible.

Landscaping—Perimeter: Section 6.4.2 (C) requires an eight-foot wide site-perimeter landscaping area adjacent residential uses; the area between the proposed nine parking spaces and the most northern section of the property shall be at least eight-feet wide which is approximately 21 feet out of 150 feet width. This area located to the north of the parking spaces that access the alley is five (5) feet wide but still allows an adequate landscaped buffer between the residential property and the parking area. The parking area is adjacent to the residential garage to the north and would be visually blocked from the residence by the proposed landscaping materials.

Loading Dock: Section 6.2.8 (B) requires that buildings containing more than 25,000 square feet of floor area to provide at least 2 off-street loading berths. The proposal features 51,677 square feet of floor area, according to the applicant, and provides one off-street loading berth.

One of the rationale for establishing planned development regulations is the ability to allow development-needed flexibility that could foster creativity and provide enhancements of the built environment as well as provide compensating benefits to the community. Any relief sought in this regard must meet the standard set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and must be justified by those standards before consideration of the request can be determined. Each of the above-mentioned allowances provide a creative solution to what could be considered a standard or conventional development, but must be weighed against the standards for special use/ planned developments.

Compliance with the 1990 Comprehensive Plan

The Oak Park Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property as being within the *Business Area*. The Comprehensive Plan states that, "... in these areas the emphasis is on the preservation and upgrading of existing business structures. Nearly all of the properties in these areas are in good condition and, if properly maintained, are unlikely to require redevelopment in the near future. In the unlikely event that a building is destroyed, for example by fire or natural disaster, the Zoning Ordinance will assume that densities comparable to existing densities will be maintained when the building is replaced. New development or replacement uses should generally be confined to the same land areas presently occupied by existing uses. "

The major goals of 1990 Comprehensive Plan are identified below.

HOUSING: The goal within the Comprehensive Plan is to preserve and enhance the stable residential environment so persons of all ages, races, and income can continue to live in sound, affordable housing. This means that the Village, through development/redevelopment, should support racial integration, *economically diverse housing*, maintain and enhance the quality of housing, maintain and enhance the existing residential character, preserve and maintain significant historical structures, and stabilize population.

TRANSPORTATION and PARKING: The goal within the Comprehensive Plan is to preserve the residential character of neighborhoods and improve the health of business districts while achieving the safe, fuel-efficient and cost-effective movement of people and goods. This means that the Village should maintain the residential nature of

neighborhoods while allowing the safe flow of traffic, provide adequate parking for residents, shoppers, employees, commuters and visitors, enhance public transportation opportunities and encourage more use of public transportation and less dependence on automobiles, and use the mass transit facilities as an economic development tool.

PUBLIC FACILITIES and SERVICES: The goal within the Comprehensive Plan is to provide, in the most efficient manner, those public services and facilities that maintain a desirable community. This means that the Village should maintain public safety operations, maintain and improve public works and services, maintain and improve the high quality of other government services, provide needed government facilities and services in the most cost-effective manner, and to promote an improved and healthier community.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: The goal within the Comprehensive Plan is to expand the Village's tax base in order to maintain a high level of services, programs and facilities. This means that the Village should attempt to maximize the potential for establishing tax-generating commercial and residential development and redevelopment, stimulate increased private investment, encourage a broad range of convenient retail and service facilities, encourage existing businesses to remain and expand and to attract new businesses, and attract a larger proportion of retail purchases.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: The goal within the Comprehensive Plan is to maintain a high and representative level of citizen involvement in village affairs. This means that the Village should attempt to maximize opportunities for citizen involvement in the decision-making process.

Compliance with the Madison Street Corridor Plan

In June 2006, the Village Board of Trustees adopted the Madison Street Corridor Plan. The purpose of the plan is to assist in the revitalization of the corridor by envisioning a mix of uses, aesthetic improvements, gateway enhancements, and business retention and recruitment strategies for the corridor. The Plan contains five main components: Inventory Report and Opportunity Analysis, Vision Alternatives, Preferred Vision, Development and Implementation Strategy, and Development Guidelines. The Plan also contains three companion reports; Market Assessment, Architectural Historical Survey and Key Sites Report.

Inventory Report and Opportunity Analysis

This component discusses the demographic and housing trends which indicate that the Madison Street Corridor area has experienced a decrease in population between 1990 and 2000, but is a slightly more diverse area than

the rest of the Village. This area also contains a higher percentage of rental housing and more affordable housing as compared to the Village as a whole. This component also discusses land use patterns, traffic, transportation, parking conditions, and streetscape and open space. The land use pattern survey indicates that the corridor is predominately commercial, automotive, office, service, and residential uses. Multiple-family to the north and single-family to the south flanks the district. The parking review indicates that parking spaces are in short supply for the entire length of the corridor. However there are bus lines that run along Madison and Harlem and Austin Boulevard which could be utilized by residents in the area. The land use study indicates that there is only 0.4% of park/green space along the corridor. The park on Adams between Ridgeland and Cuyler Avenues is the largest green space

(Continued on page 6)

in the study area, in addition to the park at Village Hall. The remainder of this section details the public participation efforts and opportunity analysis.

Vision Alternatives

This component discusses a broad spectrum of possibilities for the Madison Street corridor. The visions are broken down into Character Districts and Transportation Options. Under the Character Districts section there are three distinct character districts capturing the most realistic options. Under the Transportation Options there are three available for the corridor. The Preferred Vision section is a more refined Vision Alternative section.

Preferred Vision

The Preferred Vision component is the outcome of the public input, steering committee, and Village Board review process. This component incorporates all three Character Districts with detailed nodes, and one Transportation Option, one Streetscape and Open Space option, and one Land Assembly Option. In this particular case, the subject site is located within Segment 2; Home Avenue to Oak Park Avenue which is designated Neighborhood-Oriented and Mixed Use (Character District 2). This neighborhood-oriented district should incorporate mixed-use buildings with ground floor retail and upper floor residential or office. The uses in this segment should be oriented towards the adjacent neighborhoods with small retailers that create a very pedestrian atmosphere.

The boulevard option was strongly supported for the corridor. This option envisions no change to the lane geometry but encourages significant enhancements to the streetscape including trees, lighting, wayfinding signage, benches, public parking structures, and gathering areas to improve appearance and to accommodate pedestrians. As new sites re/development, these elements should be a part of each proposal.

Open space options should enhance the existing right-of-way without significant modification to the existing development pattern to create additional green space. Although, support exists to encourage additional green space in the right-of-way as new projects develop and/or land is assembled.

Character District 2: Neighborhood-Oriented and Mixed Use District focuses on landscaping and open space, historic preservation, small-scale neighborhood commercial uses, and residential units. This area should also focus on "green" building restoration or construction including LEED EB certification or LEED NC certification. Some of the targeted uses are; retail, restaurant, copy centers, office supply stores, computer sales and service, cell phone stores, mailing services, stationary stores, legal services, green building demonstration center, architectural salvage retail and wholesale, specialty hardware and building materials, etc... A full listing of targeted uses can be

found on page 19 of the Preferred Vision section.

Development and Implementation Strategy

This component builds off of the Preferred Vision and adds detail to each segment detail regarding specific desired land uses and business mixes as well as development concerns including proposed changes to zoning regulations along the corridor. In Segment 2: Home Avenue to Oak Park Avenue the Plan indicates that this area should incorporate mixed-use buildings with ground floor retail and upper floor residential or office. This type of use is encouraged in lieu of solely residential developments. The commercial space should be geared toward the residential neighborhood with such uses as restaurants, coffee shops, specialty retailers, home office services, professional services, museums, or small grocers. The *Segment Development Strategies Map* (Figure 1, page 10 of D&IS component) identifies the subject area as a Potential Redevelopment site.

Development Guidelines

The Development Guidelines are intended to help protect and enhance current and future investment in the Corridor, ensure a degree of order, harmony and quality within the built environment, and to encourage the development of attractive individual buildings and projects that together contribute to a unified and distinct Corridor. The Guidelines are organized into two major groups that address "site design" and "architectural" design elements. These two groups define what are "appropriate" and "inappropriate" approaches to design. The core principles of the development guidelines reflect the most significant goals to be achieved within the Corridor. Those principles, found on page 4 of the Development Guidelines section, are Madison Street 'spirit', context and tradition, scale, pedestrian friendliness, sustainability and historic preservation, and green space. Upon review of the application and an inspection of the façade beneath the drivit exterior, the proposed development meets these goals.

Compatibility with Surrounding Land Uses

The mixed use aspect of the development is compatible with the surrounding land uses found along Madison Street as well as those along Grove Avenue. Office and retail uses are prevalent along Madison Street with several multiple family buildings along Grove Avenue and in the immediate vicinity of the proposed development.

The proposed development's consistency with the Madison Plan and underlying zoning also provides support to the idea that the proposed uses are appropriate. A four story building of this magnitude is not the standard along the corridor, but the use of existing (underlying) materials and vertical elements helps diminish the massing of the building. The screened parking lot across from of the building provides a good natural and aesthetic barrier for the residential land uses as well as from the corridor. A thirty foot wide landscape yard along the north property line creates a buffer compatible with a residential neighborhood which exists to the north of the subject site.



Staff Review

Transportation: *Jim Budrick, Village Engineer*

In regards to the Traffic Study prepared for the development, Budrick concurs with the consultants findings that this development will have a minimum impact on the area traffic. Based on his historic knowledge, the previous uses of this building had a much greater impact on the neighborhood.

In regards to the Preliminary Engineering Plans, a pedestrian detour plan needs to be developed to allow for people to get around the site during construction, primarily on the Madison Street Side. The existing parking lane may be used for this detour. Given the work planned on the facade, it is more than likely that the construction fence will need to be placed at the curb and the entire sidewalk area used for the work zone. Also, the plans show that the existing water and sewer services are to be used. An evaluation as to the condition of these lines should be made to make sure they will adequately provide for the completed facility.

NOTE: During a public meeting, there was a request that Grove Avenue be turned into a southbound, one-way street. This request is not reasonable because it would be too cumbersome for tenants, visitors, deliveries and livery services. A restrictor or diverter similar to the one just south of OPRFHS could be placed just north of the alley to

encourage traffic in front of the building to return to Madison Street.

Parking: *Cara Pavlicek, Interim Parking Manager*

Existing Parking Resources Managed by Village Currently, both daytime and overnight parking restrictions exist in the immediate vicinity of the proposed redevelopment site. Specifically, parking is prohibited on-street overnight on all streets adjacent to Comcast Building as well as all streets adjacent to the parking lot. During the daytime, there are no parking restrictions adjacent to the existing Comcast Building on Madison Street. During the daytime, parking is restricted to a maximum of 2 hours between 9 am – 5 pm weekdays on Grove Avenue (both the east and west side of the street) from Madison to Washington.

The subject property is located within an On-Street Overnight Parking Area as established by Ordinance with quarterly On-Street Overnight Parking Permits available to residents only who reside in the area bounded by Oak Park Avenue to east of Home and from Randolph to Madison. On-Street Overnight Parking Permits allow for overnight parking, generally from the hours of 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. in select on-street locations within the described area. Permits are sold quarterly at a rate of \$95 per quarter for 2011.

(Continued on page 8)

LOT #	DESCR	STREET	LESSOR	Spaces	2011 Night Rate per Quarter	# Night Q3 '10 Permits Sold
63	Chase Bank, northwest corner of Madison Street and Oak Park Avenue	431 S OAK PARK	Chase Bank	11	\$109/\$135	8
85	Brooks Middle School, 325 S. Kenilworth Avenue	321 S KENILWORTH	Brooks School	15	\$109/\$135	14
100	Clinton Avenue, north of Madison Street	437 CLINTON AVE	Village of Oak Park	11	\$109/\$135	10

Currently, there are 194 of the 195 available On-Street Overnight Parking Permits sold for this area referred to as the Y4 Zone.

The Village additionally operates to the following off-street parking lots in the area:

Parking Impact of Proposed Redevelopment

Pursuant to the Traffic Impact and Parking Study dated August 9, 2010 submitted as part of the Planned Development Application, parking for the residential component of the development will be provided in the off-street parking lot immediately to the west of the Building at 823 W. Madison and will contain 23 parking spaces (two of which would be for vehicles with a state issued handicapped hangtag/license plate). Another nine parking spaces would be available adjacent to the northeast corner of the building and would be accessed from the public alley off Madison. The total of 32 off-street private parking spaces would serve 51 residential units, all of which are one-bedroom units.

The property also includes 5,200 sf of commercial space (which can be used for retail, office or professional uses). The Planned Development Application does not provide for dedicated off-street parking for this use and proposes that the parking demand that would be generated by the commercial space be accommodated with existing spaces on Madison and Grove adjacent to the subject property.

Parking Related Recommendations

In an effort to consistently support transit oriented development that is accessible to all income levels, it is appropriate to adopt a Planned Development that includes reduced parking requirements.

It is recommended that the Alternate Parking Plan submitted in the Planned Development Application under Table 2, page 5 of the Traffic Impact and Parking Study dated August 9, 2010, be accepted with the following conditions:

1. The 32 off-street private parking spaces proposed for the 51 residential units is acceptable, subject to:

a. Within these spaces, two spaces located in the off-street lot at 823 Madison shall be dedicated for a car sharing service, if IHDC and a car sharing service have established that the demand exists for two cars. IHDC shall at a minimum make a concerted effort to establish one car sharing vehicle within the first six months of opening and if the demand exists, two car sharing vehicles within 18 months of opening.

b. During such times as the percentage of residential units with tenant vehicles is less than 60% (31 vehicles) IHDC shall open and designate parking spaces for use by the general public (e.g. the commercial customers and guests) within the parking lot at 823 Madison. The spaces opened up for public use shall be proportionate to the number of spaces not needed for residents.

c. IHDC will comply with existing Village requirement to notify prospective tenants of the Village's On-Street Overnight Parking Ban and advise tenants that private IHDC parking may not be available, due to current demand, and no more than one private parking space is available per unit, if and when they may be available.

d. In the event that the percentage of residential with tenant vehicles is greater than 60% (31 vehicles) IHDC shall petition the Village for creation of additional On-Street Overnight Parking Spaces on Grove adjacent only to their building and/or parking lot.

2. The parking demand generated by the commercial space will be evaluated by IHDC and a report provided to the Village upon leasing of commercial space and six months following the opening of such commercial space. In the event that a full service restaurant is opened, IHDC will make its best efforts upon opening of such a restaurant to obtain off-street evening parking through an agreement with neighboring property owners (e.g. Chase Bank) for after-hour use of private parking.

[Housing: Tammie Grossman, Housing Programs Manager](#)

The Need The Village of Oak Park does have a need for additional affordable one bedroom units with supportive

(Continued on page 9)

services. In 2010, the Village hired an outside consultant to update the Village of Oak Park's Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing (AI). One of the findings of the AI was that there was a lack of affordable accessible housing for persons with disabilities in Oak Park. The Oak Park Housing Authority's waiting list for Mainstream Vouchers (vouchers for persons with disabilities) has 31 single households that have an Oak Park residency preference on the waiting list and there are 206 single individual households with a residency preference on the 2004 regular waiting list. Many of those individuals would be eligible to be housed in the Interfaith Development.

For residents with mobility related disabilities, it is very difficult to find accessible rental housing in Oak Park. Over 85 % of our multi-family housing stock was built before 1978. Many of our rental buildings are without elevators and fully adaptable housing units. The Interfaith Development will be fully accessible to persons with mobility impairments and will have units that will be adaptable for persons with disabilities. Additionally, many persons with other forms of disabilities will benefit from the supportive services that will be provided on site to residents at the Interfaith Development.

On September 7, 2010, the Housing Programs Advisory Committee (HPAC) provided a Report on Affordable Housing Strategies. HPAC's report specifically states the Affordable Housing Report should be read in combination with the updated Consolidated Plan 2010-2014. HPAC's report was a series of strategies that the Village Board of Trustees could consider implementing. The Report was presented to the Board on September 7, 2010, at which time the Board felt it needed more time to review the Report. The Report should not be considered an official statement of Village strategies. At the time of HPAC's report, Interfaith's application had not been filed. However, HPAC was aware of the project and listed it as a proposed project. HPAC did not comment on the project in the Report other than to state its existence.

The Consolidated plan on pages 34-37 provides an overview of the housing problems faced by renter households. The Consolidated plan finds that almost 83% of small low income renter households have a housing problem. The Consolidated plan finds that the majority of low-income renters are cost burdened and would benefit from improved economic opportunities. Additionally the report states that these households need supportive services such as education and job training.

Additionally, the Oak Park Township with the support of the Village of Oak Park and the Oak Park Residence Corporation commissioned a market study to determine the need for additional Senior Housing in the Village of Oak Park. The Market Study concluded that there is an unmet

need for additional 40-49 units of senior housing targeted to one person households earning between 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI) (\$15,800) and 50% of the AMI (\$26,300). While the Interfaith Development is not directly targeting senior citizens, there would be no reason why those residents could not reside in the building. Many of the senior households would benefit from supportive services such as budgeting help and other types of supportive services.

The Village of Oak Park was exempted by the Affordable Housing Planning and Appeals Act from producing an Affordable Housing Plan. A community's status based on the Affordable Housing Planning and Appeals Act does not prevent a developer from obtaining funding from the Illinois Housing Development Authority to build affordable housing in an exempt community. It is not a statement of unmet housing need. The Act simply exempts communities from providing the State with an affordable housing plan where the percentage of rental units affordable to households with incomes below 60% of the Area Median Income combined with the for-sale units affordable to households earning below 80% of the Area Median Income at the time the calculation was made equaled at least 10% of the community's total housing stock. The calculations were performed at the height of the housing market. It is not a current statement of unmet need. It is unlikely that the percentages are even a current indicator of a community's percent of affordable housing. New calculations will be made once the 2010 census information is made available. The Planning and Appeals Act is not relevant to the current Interfaith Development.

Expanding safe and affordable housing options in communities, such as Oak Park, with high economic opportunities is a good use of public funds. Fifty-one units of affordable housing in a high opportunity area such as Oak Park is not imposing a concentration of poverty in one geographic area. Rather it is expanding the economic opportunities of lower-income persons since they are able to live in a community that they otherwise could not afford. The Interfaith Development allows low wage earners working in Oak Park to live in Oak Park. Additionally, the Interfaith Development will be available to senior citizens looking to downsize from their home but earn too much to live in Oak Park's subsidized housing. The Interfaith Development will be available to adults with disabilities currently living with their parents who cannot afford private housing and need on-site services. The Interfaith Development will allow residents to develop a sense of community that would not be present if they resided in scattered site housing. It is also more efficient for Catholic Charities to provide services on-site to a group of individuals rather than having those individuals dispersed through out the community in non-rent controlled rental units.

(Continued on page 10)

Parking One of the recommendations that came out of the Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing was that the Village consider amending its zoning ordinance to ease parking requirements for affordable housing developments serving special needs populations. The Village's current zoning ordinance regarding parking requires that one bedroom units have 1.25 parking spaces. More flexible parking requirements would reduce housing development costs. Developers would not have to request a variance which would increase their costs by potentially requiring a parking study and subjecting the developer to neighborhood disapproval because the development does not meet the zoning requirements.

The Corporation of Supportive Housing in Chicago provided the following information:

The [Indicators of Housing Quality](#) of the most recent (2005) American Housing Survey shows that overall roughly 8.5% of the households surveyed do not own a car. However, only 3% of owner-occupied households don't own a car compared to 20% of renter-occupied households. When household characteristics are factored, 27% of renter-households below the poverty line do not own a car. These figures are supported by the most recent (2001) National Household Travel Survey ([Percent and Characteristics of Zero-Vehicle Households](#)) that shows 20% of households with incomes under \$25k (regardless of tenure) do not own a vehicle. Nearly 18% of all renter-occupied households – regardless of income – do not own a vehicle.

In transit rich communities such as Oak Park, we should be encouraging persons to utilize public transportation alternatives. Housing developments similar to the Interfaith Development support a reduction in the parking requirements. The developments are as follows:

The Oaks – 76 one bedroom units – 50 spaces (19 spaces are leased to a neighboring condominium association, so they use 31 spaces for the Oaks Residents only and routinely have between 5 and 10 vacant each night) Equivalent to .45 spaces per one bedroom unit

Ryan Farrelly House – 21 one bedroom units – 20 spaces (only 10 of those spaces are used on a regular basis) Equivalent to .95 spaces per unit but half of those units are not being used.

Allowing a parking variance in this situation makes sense given the income level of the residents and the probability that they will not have cars. The Center for Neighborhood Technology in its recent study, *PennyWise Pound Fuelish*, (March 2010) estimates that a household living in a transit rich community can save as much as \$3,110 by not having a car and using public transportation. The Village of Oak Park, as a "location efficient" community should encourage use of public transportation by allowing reductions in parking requirements. Interfaith Development Corporation has

agreed to pursue conversations with I-GO about putting a dedicated car in the lot for residents use.

[Sustainably: K. C. Poulos, Sustainability Manager](#)

The request for relief from the height requirements is reasonable in that the request is only for 5.5 feet, and only for a portion of the building. The winter shadowing does affect the apartment building to the northwest, and three single family homes to the north, but only for a few hours each day.

The request for an increase in density is reasonable in that it does not exceed the norm for that neighborhood and is offset by the request for relief from the parking requirements. In other words, 51 residents with restricted incomes will not mean 51 or more additional cars. From a sustainability standpoint, this type of Transit-Oriented Development [TOD] relieves the pressures of parking, emissions and street wear-and-tear, and encourages the use of public transportation, walking and biking.

Based on the Phase I ESA conducted at the sites, in which Underground Storage Tanks [USTs] and hydraulic lifts were present at both sites, it is recommended that a Phase II site investigation be conducted to determine if a release of petroleum or PCBs occurred. Also, it appears that at least two USTs remain on the properties. They may have to be removed or registered with the state; either way, the demolition timeline likely will be longer than predicted. Finally, site surveys should be conducted to determine the presence of lead paint, radon and asbestos (not only on the water pipes but in materials like the vinyl flooring as well). NOTE: A Phase II will be conducted pending approval of the application, prior to building permit issuance.

Exterior Lighting Plan: It is recommended that the use of metal halides be revised to incorporate LEDs or cold cathodes instead.

The landscaping should include bioswales (low vegetated ditches that carry and filter storm water) at the parking lots, if space allows. All plantings should be native to the area to support the local insect and bird populations.

Recycling bins will be available for tenants and retail; however, I suggest the development manager consider offering training to both tenants and retail occupant to ensure full understanding and participation in recycling.

Although there is a bike room for tenants, I would also recommend bike racks be placed along Grove Avenue or in the parking lot for employees and retail customers.

This appears to be the first low-income, multi-family renovation seeking LEED certification – this development will add to Oak Park's reputation as a forward-thinking community committed to sustainability on many levels: transit-oriented development, low-impact environmental measures and housing diversity. Therefore, from a sustainable community standpoint, approval of this development is highly recommended.

[Police: Chief Rick Tanksley, Police Department](#)

The Police Chief and his staff reviewed the Interfaith Hous-

ing Application and stated that the Police Department can not discern any issues that would prohibit them from not supporting this initiative. If, in the future there are any public discussions on this matter the Chief will ensure a Department representative will be present to answer any public safety questions.

Business: Loretta Daly, Business Services Manager

In anticipation of the Planned Development review of Interfaith Housing Development Corporation's proposal by the Plan Commission, staff has reviewed the Retail Assessment which was developed by *STS Real Estate Partners* on behalf of the applicant. Comments below are based on staff's assessment of the commercial space only, and do not reflect an opinion of the housing component of this project. Staff has made a number of observations regarding the proposed commercial component of this development, and have developed a number of recommendations to be considered by the Plan Commission.

The IHDC proposal calls for the inclusion of 5,233 square feet of ground level commercial space fronting along Madison Avenue. The development site is in a commercial zone and such uses as retail, service, office, and restaurant are appropriate. The Madison Street Corridor plan developed in 2006 calls for a mixed use development with commercial space on the first floor and residential or office above to maintain the commercial feel of the corridor. The addition of commercial space to this development is consistent with the Madison Street Corridor Plan and should be encouraged. It should however be noted that a number of challenges to successful tenant recruitment exist, and as such careful planning of these efforts is required.

The following are staff's observations and recommendations for consideration by the Plan Commission:

1. *A detailed examination of the demographic data provided gives a clear and accurate reflection of the Oak Park market from a demographic perspective; and in general correctly identifies the factors that are unique to this physical site from a commercial recruitment perspective.*
2. *The Market Retail Value Analysis is consistent with comparables in the area and a target lease rate of \$15 – 18 SF is feasible.*
3. *The compiled list of potential tenants is comprehensive however it does not acknowledge the potential for office tenancy.*
4. *The target list should be expanded to include all tenancies that are zoning eligible as the widest recruitment net should be cast.*

After the on-street parking credit, this commercial development requires 9 parking spaces immediately adjacent to the development site. While staff acknowledges that the required parking spaces can be found on street in close proximity to the development site the lack of dedicated parking for both customers and employees could

add to the challenge of successful retail recruitment.

1. *As the development matures the usage of the parking lot to the West should be monitored to determine if employee parking can be assigned in this lot. Business Services agrees with the recommendation of the Parking Division which utilizes a 60% or below usage threshold for this lot by the residents to trigger these discussions.*

2. *Staff would recommend that active negotiations with neighboring property owners begin immediately in an effort to secure off site employee parking to assist in recruitment efforts.*

Staff concurs with the Retail Analysis conclusion that the successful leasing of this space has challenges; however we do recommend moving forward with the plan as presented including the development of the commercial space. We would make the following recommendations regarding commercial recruitment efforts:

1. *A detailed marketing plan for commercial recruitment should be developed including the development of outreach efforts to non-retail users such as profession service providers and office uses.*

2. *Acknowledging the potential leasing challenges of this space a plan should be developed to address the potential for "dark" space along the corridor if initial leasing efforts are not successful. Plans can and should include temporary uses and displays as well as the use of window screening to soften the vacancy.*

3. *Staff recommends the development of a site specific marketing sheet highlighting the assets that this site enjoys including – high traffic counts, new development on the South side of Madison, development potential at Oak Park Ave and Madison, institutional daytime traffic, and the historic renovation of this property.*

Attached for review by the Plan Commission is the Madison Street Retail Strategies Report developed by *4Insights*.

Commission Reviews:

The **Madison Street Coalition** has met and reviewed the planned development application. They have provided a memorandum to the Plan Commission indicating the proposed development meets the intent of the Madison Street Corridor Plan.

The **Historic Preservation Commission** has met and reviewed the proposed development. They have issued a memorandum relative to their support of the application.

The **Public Art Advisory Committee** has met and reviewed the proposed art which is intended to satisfy the Compensating Benefit as required by the Zoning Ordinance. They have provided a memorandum indicating their acceptance of the proposed art.

The **Housing Programs Advisory Committee** has met with the applicant and will be issuing a memorandum after their meeting on December 15th.

The **Universal Access Commission** has met with the applicant and may provide a written statement. As of this writing, confirmation could not be made.

The **Oak Park Development Corporation** met with the applicant and will be forwarding a memorandum of their analysis of the project.

Board of Trustees' Referral

The Village Board referred this application to the Plan Commission at their November 22, 2010 Special meeting. The Village Board suggested to the Plan Commission that they should consider review by other commissions, such as the Universal Access Commission, Community Relations, Community Design Commission, Housing Programs Advisory Committee, and Historic Preservation. Members of the Village Board felt the need for the Plan Commission to pay attention to the Retail analysis section of the application. Some Trustees felt that the PC should consider whether or not first floor commercial is appropriate or valid for this development. The Board also wanted the Plan Commission to recognize the negativity that has been stated in the community relating this development to CHA Housing and believes it should not be allowed to percolate in the public hearing process.

Recommendation:

Based on the details in this staff report, the district and village-wide plans, the Applicant's planned development application as reviewed through the Project Review Team process, staff supports this application, but asks that the Plan Commission further investigate those issues raised in this staff report.

End of Report

Copies:

Plan Commission Attorney, Jacob Karaca—Klein, Thorpe, Jenkins, LTD
Ray Johnson, Village Trustee / Commission Liaison
Jim Kelly, CIC Chairperson / Commission Liaison
Project Review Team

Staff Technical Review Team — Department Representation

Building and Property Standards (Building, Property Standards, Administration)
Planning and Community Development (Planning, Zoning, Historic Preservation, Administration)
Fire Department (Fire Prevention)
Health Department (Environmental Services)
Police Department (Administration)
Public Works (Engineering, Forestry, Refuse/Waste, Administration)
Business Services
Parking Administration
Village Clerk