

Claim #	Pg. #	Neighbors' Claim (as presented in original objection document)	Response by Oak Park Residence Corporation
1	P. 3	The proposed building has inadequate parking spaces for cars	As previously discussed, OPRC will actively market to, and will very intentionally attract, a TOD-oriented resident population, including many who will choose active transportation options and public transportation alternatives rather than car ownership (a number of the neighbors incorrectly stated that this site was not located within the Village's T.O.D. area - though Village Planner Craig Failor clarified that at less than a quarter mile from the CTA Blue Line it is actually well within the Village's TOD area). The annual cost of car ownership in this area is \$10,252/yr. - per the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT) - and this site has an "All Transit" Performance Score of 9.5 meaning the site has a "Superlative combination of trips per week and number of jobs accessible enabling significant number of people to take transit to work" (per CNT - as referenced in the attached TOD file). The proposed building contains 17 parking spaces (all of which meet Village building and zoning standards) for 45 units, a .38 ratio. This ratio is slightly higher than our .32 ratio across our portfolio as a whole, and is almost identical to our current ratio associated with our building located at 514 S. Austin, on the same block as this site (5 cars for 13 units, also a .38 ratio).
2	P. 5	Oak Park Residence Corporation has not provided a parking study supporting their request to decrease the parking spaces below Village code.	This is simply incorrect. The application includes a 65-page Parking and Traffic Study conducted by leading Traffic Engineering Firm KLOA that supports the construction of the development. KLOA Principal, Michael Werthmann, will be available at the Plan Commission meeting to answer any questions. In addition to being a leading parking and traffic engineer, Mr. Werthmann is also a long-standing Oak Park resident.
3	P. 7	This building lacks sufficient loading spaces	We anticipate that loading and unloading (for example related to move-ins and move-outs) will be an infrequent activity. While there are obviously many multifamily buildings up and down this stretch of Austin Blvd., all of which must accommodate loading activity at times, we will commit to schedule such activity during times that will ensure the least neighborhood impact. We will coordinate with the Village Parking staff regarding the establishment of such regulations, and we will work to address and adopt other accommodations so as to minimize any impacts.
4	P. 9	The proposed development is already in an area where on-street, permit parking is at a premium. Tenants should not be obligated to pay for on-street parking permits and the neighborhood should not be forced to accommodate overflow from 7 Van Buren due to lack of planned parking at that development.	Resident behavior regarding car ownership is changing. This is driven by changes in technology and business models that are encouraging car-sharing (Zip Car), Lyft/Uber usage, and short-term car-rental activity. It is also driven by economics, as referenced in the annual cost of car ownership information presented above, and by generational behavioral changes (with Millennials and Generation Z far less likely to own cars) consistent with more emphasis on lifestyle and sustainability considerations. This project will very intentionally attract residents who are less likely to want or need to own cars. Further, updating lot parking availability as of 11/19/2021, the Village has indicated that in the 9 lots identified in the KLOA Parking and Traffic Study, there are 167 active permits for 189 spaces (88% utilization). We are attempting to help advance the shift away from the idea that we need to overbuild parking. This project will help our community to test that concept and to learn from this experience to help us build a more sustainable future for all of us.
5	P. 11	Not having adequate parking at 7 Van Buren poses safety risks to its tenants and other residents that would have their parking distance from home extended.	We will be attracting residents with a much lower propensity for car ownership. The Village's Police and Fire departments reviewed this proposal and did not identify any increase in risk or associated impact to the neighborhood.
6	P. 12	A proper Traffic Impact Study needs to be completed before the development should be reviewed by the Village of Oak Park Planning Commission.	This is simply incorrect. The application includes a 65-page Parking and Traffic Study conducted by leading Traffic Engineering Firm KLOA that supports the construction of the development.
7	P. 13	The request by the petitioner to decrease the minimum setback from 24.5 feet to 1.5 feet creates a safety and traffic hazard to the tenants and surrounding neighbors.	This is incorrect. The requested setback is consistent with the 1-3 foot setback that already exists among the significant majority of buildings that already exist on both sides of this alley. The proposal includes a graphical representation of the turning radius into and out of the proposed garage. The proposed building setback is also substantially similar to the effective existing setback established by parked cars in the current parking lot.
8	p. 15	The height definition of this building is being incorrectly portrayed	This is incorrect. The application is stated in accordance with the Village's standards.

9	p. 16	The building is too tall to be in keeping with the neighborhood	The Village's own plan for this area calls for new construction building heights on this site of 6-10 stories: " Eastern Gateway (Austin to Taylor) - Node 1: The Harrison - Austin intersection should be treated as an important gateway to the Village. The beautiful eastward vistas provided by Columbus Park will be captured by residents in higher density buildings at the intersection and along Austin Boulevard. The eventual re-location of one or both service stations replaced with high rise mixed use buildings would mark the entry to the district placing the highest density at the edge of a large open park space. Increased density of six to ten stories on the southern block [limited to about half the total area] should encourage pedestrian access to CTA trains and busses. Density increases of six to ten stories north of Harrison should be limited to buildings adjacent to Austin. " This development is a perfect example of exactly what is called for in this provision of the Harrison Street plan: new development, 6 stories (compared to the 6-10 stories provided for in the plan), adjacent to Austin and north of Harrison, within walking distance of the CTA train, and overlooking Columbus Park.
10	p. 18	The building would negatively affect surrounding historic landmarks	The Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the application, was strongly favorable toward the proposal, is recommending the application for approval, and disagrees with this neighbor's assertion.
11	P. 20	The proposed building height is not in keeping with the stated purposes of Oak Park Zoning Ordinances and Historic Preservation Ordinance.	This is incorrect. The Zoning Ordinance allows for Planned Unit Developments that provide compensating benefits and advance objectives of the Village. Nor does the Village's PUD process constitute "Spot Zoning" as was suggested by one neighbor. The proposed development clearly advances numerous objectives formally adopted by the Village in its Comprehensive Plan, the Harrison Street Plan, and the Homes For A Changing Region Plan (please see the 70 specific items previously submitted), provides numerous compensating benefits (as cited in the application and the previously submitted spreadsheets), and has been reviewed and advanced by the Historic Preservation Commission (which has reviewed the application, recommends the application, and disagrees with this neighbor's assertion).
12	p. 21	The Mechanicals for this Building are located inappropriately and in violation of Village of Oak Park Code	The location of the electricity mechanicals box is dictated by ComEd (as evidenced by numerous similar installations throughout the Village) and is ComEd not building equipment and as a result not restricted by the Village's setback requirements.
13	p. 23	The petitioner has not performed a proper light, wind, and shadow study to provide accurate information to the public and to the Planning Commissioners that would demonstrate the impact this proposed development will have on the adjacent & surrounding buildings.	The neighbors were correct, specifically regarding the shadow study, in that the previously presented shadow study contained mistakes regarding the locations of a number of the neighboring buildings and the continued existence of the parking spots on the south side of Van Buren (all of which were oversights that we regret but do not affect the overall accuracy of the study). In accordance with the request of the neighbors, we arranged to have Tom Bassett-Dilley Architects correct, confirm, and run a new shadow study (similar to what they did relative to the Albion project and its potential impacts upon Austin Gardens). The neighbors also requested hour by hour views. TBDA has developed animations that show the shadow effects at any time throughout the day. They also have overlaid the shadow effects from the proposed building with what the shadow effects would be for a similar "by right" building.
14	p. 25	The proposed development violates neighbors' rights at 408-410 S. Austin Blvd. to adequate light.	The Poley building, at 408-410 S. Austin, is located south of the proposed building and therefore is virtually unaffected by any shadow from the proposed building. In addition, the walls of the Poley building facing north on the eastern third and western third of the building clearly show an expectation that an adjacent building would be constructed by virtue of their having no windows. Given the dimensions of the OPRC property, a by-right development today would have a southern set-back requirement of 7.55 feet. The proposed development will have an actual southern set back of 8.3 feet from the property line and closer to 14 feet from the parallel windows on the facade of the Poley building. The existence of the balconies on the southern facade of our proposed building will have the effect of providing additional articulation and further effective setbacks (of appx. 20 feet) from the Poley building's windows to the south. This distance will be significantly greater than the distance between many houses and multifamily buildings all throughout Oak Park. It will also be further than the distance that would be provided for by a building being built "by right".
15	p. 26	The proposed development violates neighbors' on the 700 and 800 block of South Humphrey Avenue the right to adequate light, air and privacy.	Please see the revised shadow study to verify that there are very limited impacts to light for the houses up and down the 700 and 800 blocks of Humphrey from the construction of this building. Regarding privacy, the distance between this building and the houses on Humphrey is much greater than the distance between and among those houses themselves. The windows and views from neighboring houses up and down Humphrey are much closer to each other, than any of them are to this building. We are unaware of any buildings in Oak Park that do not have view lines or lines of sight to any other properties in Oak Park. In that way, this building is consistent with every other building in Oak Park. Expecting the opposite is an unreasonable and impossible standard within a densely populated, fully built-out, inner-ring suburban community like Oak Park.
16	p. 28	The proposed development violates neighbors' rights at 408-410 S. Austin Blvd. to adequate privacy.	Please see the response to #14 above.
17	p. 30	The development as proposed violates the existing homeowners rights to conserve the value of their property.	As the first new multifamily development on Austin Blvd. in more than 50 years, this project is almost guaranteed to add value to the surrounding properties, rather than to reduce such value.

18	P. 32	An increase of the Maximum Lot Coverage will prove problematic in managing water run-off.	This is incorrect. The existing lot, with the exception of the front setback, is almost entirely impervious (covered by the existing building and by a paved parking lot). The new building will have some additional impervious space surrounding it. The area included in the requested vacation is also currently composed entirely of impervious space (sidewalk, curb, gutter, and street). Some planting material will also be included on the roof deck of the project, thereby helping to reduce water run-off, and all proposed stormwater discharge has been reviewed and determined to be in compliance with applicable regulations and not in excess of existing capacity.
19	p. 34	An increase of the Maximum Lot Coverage was perhaps not accurately calculated.	The lot coverage calculations reflect the factors mentioned above.
20	p. 35	The building does not allow for adequate bicycle spaces	The neighbors are correct that the bicycle parking was inadvertently left off of the originally submitted ground level plans. This has been corrected.
21	p. 36	The proposed landscaping is a public safety concern and health risk, creating hazardous conditions.	The proposed landscaping plan incorporates vegetation selections that are widely used throughout the region. We are unaware of any negative implications of these applications in any location anywhere. Nonetheless, we are certainly willing to explore alternative planting choices if this is a priority for the Plan Commission and/or for the neighbors, and we are willing to engage in any discussions regarding the landscaping with any individuals wishing to participate.
22	p. 38	The proposed structure poses serious safety concerns	This is incorrect. The proposed development was reviewed by the Village's police and fire departments and no concerns were identified.
23	p. 40	The petitioner's application does not show the true distance between buildings nor does it properly apply for variance.	This is incorrect. The PUD application calculates and shows all setback distances in accordance with Village code, standards, and direction.
24	p. 41	Request for variances for the proposed building result in a building that is out of scale in relation to 408-410 S. Austin Blvd. and violate the Historic Preservation Ordinances.	This is incorrect. The Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the application, was strongly favorable toward the proposal, is recommending the application for approval, and disagrees with this neighbor's assertion. The Village's own plan for this area calls for new construction building heights on this site of 6-10 stories. This development is a perfect example of exactly what is called for in this provision of the Harrison Street plan: new development, 6 stories (compared to the 6-10 stories provided for in the plan), adjacent to Austin and north of Harrison, within walking distance of the CTA train, and overlooking Columbus Park.
25	p. 42	The proposed building is incompatible with the horizontal and vertical expression on the front elevation in relation to the surrounding buildings.	In serving as the design review body for this application, the Historic Preservation Commission has reviewed the application, recommends the application, and disagrees with this neighbor's assertion.
26	p. 44	The proposed building is not compatible with the existing historic structure In relation to its architectural style, design and materials.	In serving as the design review body for this application, the Historic Preservation Commission has reviewed the application, recommends the application, and disagrees with this neighbor's assertion.
27	p. 46	The wall mounted solar panels are not arranged as a facade in a way that meets Village Code.	This assertion misinterprets the Village Code. Solar panels are clearly not the façade of this building. Further, the meaning of "faces the street" clearly means on a façade wall that runs parallel (or nearly parallel) to the street. The south façade of the proposed development is perpendicular to the street.
28	p. 47	The request by the petitioner to vacate a portion of the Van Buren right of way abutting the subject property creates parking, traffic and public works issues.	The Village staff's review and recommendation of the project has already contemplated and addressed all parking, traffic, and public works issues, in accordance with the parking and traffic study conducted by KLOA, the findings of which are contained in the 65 page report submitted with the application.
29	p. 49	The request by the petitioner to vacate a portion of the Van Buren right of way abutting the subject property will restrict the Village of Oak Parks future street and sidewalk planning.	The Village staff's review and recommendation of the project has already contemplated and addressed all parking, traffic, and public works issues, in accordance with the parking and traffic study conducted by KLOA, the findings of which are contained in the 65 page report submitted with the application.
30	p. 50	The request by the petitioner for an allowance to vacate the Van Buren right of way is completely without previous merit or statute and would be incongruent with the character of the surrounding structures and area.	The requested vacation is consistent with previous Village approved vacations. The application is being considered through the same process as previous vacation requests. The considerable compensating benefits cited in the PUD application are leading-edge, game changing benefits for the community in advancing affordability, accessibility, diversity, and sustainability. They speak for themselves.
31	p. 52	The request by the petitioner to vacate a portion of the Van Buren right of way abutting the subject property [creates] infrastructure issues.	The Village staff's review and recommendation of the project has already contemplated and addressed all parking, traffic, and public works issues, in accordance with the parking and traffic study conducted by KLOA, the findings of which are contained in the 65 page report submitted with the application.

32	p. 54	The request by the petitioner for an allowance to vacate the Van Buren right of way will set an unbelievable precedent for future developments.	The reference to "precedent" is inconsistent with the Village of Oak Park Zoning Code. The Zoning Code explicitly states that " Each planned development must be presented and judged on its own merits. It is not sufficient to base justification for approval or denial of a development upon an already existing planned development except to the extent such development has been approved as part of a site plan. " Therefore, no future development can rely on any decision made with respect to any previously approved development. Nonetheless, the requested vacation in this case is not novel and is, in fact, consistent with previous Village approved vacations. The application is being considered through the same process as were previous vacation requests. The considerable compensating benefits cited in this development's PUD application proposal are nationally leading-edge, game changing innovations that will provide substantial benefits to our community by advancing affordability, accessibility, diversity, and sustainability, and will serve as a model example of how the Village can encourage additional advances in these critically important areas.
33	p. 55	Actions by the Oak Park Residence Corporation at the existing building on 7 Van Buren are not in line with going through this process in an honest manner.	The Oak Park Residence Corporation is a 501(c)3 not-for-profit organization and the affordable housing partner agency of the Village of Oak Park. OPRC is the second largest provider of multifamily housing in Oak Park, and is the largest provider of housing to those who are economically most challenged here in our community. OPRC has a seven member Board, consisting entirely of Oak Parkers who generously donate their time to serve the people of our community. The entire purpose of this development proposal is to advance OPRC's central mission elements of providing high-quality multifamily housing that advances integrated affordability and diversity, in keeping with the historic goals and objectives of the Village of Oak Park. All of this is consistent with the Village's adopted direction as set forth in its Comprehensive Plan, the Harrison Street Plan, and its Homes For A Changing Region Plan. It is also consistent with the outcomes generated by those thousands of residents who participated in these planning processes, 600 alone in the Harrison Street planning process (Planning Together).