

ECKHART PARK COMMUNITY COUNCIL  
ZONING COMMITTEE

- The EPCC intake form noted a request for B1-3 zoning, but as presented, the project is requesting a B2-3. Please explain the change? **After the EPCC intake form was completed we determined that the B2-3 zoning district was a more appropriate underlying zoning district. This is because residential on the ground floor is a permitted use in the B2 districts, but requires a special use in the B1 district. There are no other differences between the districts with respect to bulk, density, parking, etc.**
- EPCC would like to know the unit count by ownership type (market rental, affordable rental, market rate for sale condo), No of bedrooms and baths, size (avg. sq. ft by type, BR) **The entire project will be a well-managed, luxury rental product. The developer will comply with the affordable requirements ordinance (ARO) and the developer will take direction from the Alderman regarding the means by which the terms of the ARO are fulfilled.**

The unit mix is as follows:

Convertible	17%	28 Units
1 Bedroom	64%	102 Units
1 Bedroom + Den	1%	1 Unit
2 Bedroom 2 Bath	16%	26 Units
3 Bedroom	2%	3 Units
<b>Total</b>		<b>160 Units</b>

- The proposed development eclipses many of the maximum requirements of B2-3 zoning (some of them significantly):
  - Building height proposed is 64 feet (per presentation) – max allowable with B2-3 zoning (with no ground floor retail space) is 60 feet. **The proposed development has been revised to be 60', which is consistent with the B2-3 district.**
  - Unit count – please provide the calculations that support the 160 unit count and 310 sf/unit (based on lot area of 49,620)– when the minimum lot area requirements for B2-3 zoning allows only 400 sf/unit? **The minimum lot area (MLA) in the B2-3 district is 400 sf/unit and 300 sf/efficiency with a maximum 20% efficiencies. This results in a blended MLA of 380 sf/unit. The proposed MLA of 310 sf/unit substantially conforms with the 380 sf/unit required in the B2-3 District.**
  - Parking - please comment on how many residents are estimated to occupy the building if it is 100% occupied? What impact on area parking will this have? **We would anticipate approximately 223 residents. See below regarding parking.**
  - Setbacks – B zoning designations offer less setback requirements (compared to R), yet there is no retail space being offered here. Please explain. **The developer has considered incorporating retail into the development and intends to evaluate the future prospects for retail synergies at this location but at least as of now has no plans to include retail in the project.**
- There is a large net loss of green space in the area. As presented, the development is to have a dog run and grass area on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the new development (but will be an amenity for residents use only), but the building will occupy 100% of the lot space (EPCC intake form notes that lot area and developed area are equal, yet page 20 of your submitted plans states 88% site coverage – please provide calculations and supporting documentation for the 88%). EPCC would like to know why there is 0 outdoor space provided via setbacks and public way improvements? If small “dog area” at SE corner of lot is to be considered, please provide its size. **The proposed development has 96% site coverage at grade. This allows for the height of the proposed development to be shorter than it would otherwise be with less site coverage. The development will provide a 260 square foot dog run (26' x 10') for use by residents.**
- The requested zoning for the proposed development is B2-3. EPCC would like to know how the project addresses the core description of the requested zoning and why such a project is appropriate in an area that is predominantly RS-3:  
**B2-5 Neighborhood Mixed-Use District**

Retail storefronts, apartments allowed on the ground floor. Intended to spur development in commercial corridors with low demand for retail. **Although there are other R-zoned properties to the west of the property, there is also significant number of B- and C-zoned properties, including immediately to the east of the proposed development.**

- Why is there no retail space whatsoever for this development – especially considering the zoning type being requested and the fact that there’s 160 units in the building? **The developer has considered incorporating retail into the development but has determined that the market will not support retail in the project.**
- This entire project is situated outside of Transit Oriented Development (“TOD”) boundaries, yet it appears to be a TOD style development. There are other projects in the immediate vicinity whose developers have communicated that projects utilizing existing zoning (RS3) would be more than profitable. EPCC is confused as to why such a VERY large/dense project has been proposed on this small residential street (Walton Street is a one way street and cannot even accommodate snow plows/garbage trucks except in the alley)? **The proposed development has been designed to minimize the impact on Walton Street by having all traffic and loading access the site via the alley to the north. The project scale is dictated by the level of amenities provided in the project, which is unique for this proposal and will meet an unmet need in the neighborhood.**
- EPCC would like to make you aware that the neighborhood residents near the St. Boniface church (most of whom reside within the boundaries of this development notification area) have been presented numerous ultra-dense project options for the redevelopment/razing of the existing St. Boniface church (and outlying lots) and are actively working to keep the zoning of the church property intact as RS3 while seeking a family friendly, owner-occupied development plan that provides continuity for the community. Given all of the many years of hard work to ensure the church remains standing and is redeveloped in a meaningful way, the residents in the immediate area would like to know how this development adds to community? **The proposed development will provide amenities that do not have a comparison in the immediate area – including 24/7 security, on-site maintenance, etc. This will provide a unique product type that is not currently available in the neighborhood.**
- The community would like to know if a market feasibility study was performed regarding supply/demand of current area housing – if so, EPCC would like to obtain a copy. Due to numerous other TOD and similar style projects, this area is being overwhelmed with new supply (over 1000 new apartment units from TOD projects alone – within 1 mile of the subject property are available or under construction now). EPCC and community members do not want to be in the center of the next housing bubble and have our neighborhood full of empty buildings if/when the bubble bursts again (i.e. south loop back in 2008-2009). **A market feasibility study has not been conducted. There are no comparable projects in this neighborhood. The proposed development is providing amenities and more parking than other projects in the neighborhood and believes that it will fill a currently unmet market demand.**
- Given such a large proposal - has a traffic analysis been performed to estimate the impact on the area by adding traffic to/from the building and parked cars to already busy area (stand at the subject property on any weekday morning at rush hour and note how Augusta Blvd backs up to the west, as cars wait to enter the Eastbound Kennedy expressway)? If so, please provide an electronic copy to EPCC. **A traffic study is in process. As a planned development, the proposed project will undergo review by the Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) and obtain its sign-off prior to proceeding to Plan Commission.**
- How will the project impact local parking availability? Given the proximity to the expressway, there are physical constraints to residents’ street parking options and EPCC would like to know how the development would impact/mitigate this to local residents. **The developer appreciates that the property is currently providing parking for neighbors and visitors. The developer is very interested in working with the neighborhood to mitigate the impact on the neighborhood of this loss of parking. When developed, the property will have more than sufficient parking spaces to accommodate the residents of the development. If there are additional spaces, the developer will work with the community to see excess spaces can be made available for use by other residents.**  
**In order to alleviate any other community concerns regarding the proposed development impacting the availability of on-street parking, the developer would cooperate and support any effort by the alderman and/or the community to restrict on-street parking for neighborhood residents and agree to provide in its tenant leases and vis-à-vis the alderman’s office that no residents of the development be issued such neighborhood parking permits.**

- How can 160 units be serviced by only 111 parking spaces (will some still be used for the Polish Roman Catholic Union)? If parking is to be heavily reduced (especially in comparison to the unit count), please comment on if residents of this project will be required to sign any legally binding agreements to not own cars and/or park them on the street. If not, why? **The proposed .7 parking spaces per unit is consistent with and indeed far in excess of other recently-approved urban projects and the Applicant is confident that 111 parking spaces will be more than adequate for the proposed residential project. The developer will be establishing additional parking for the Polish Museum. Spaces not used by residents or by the museum may be made available local residents.**
- There are currently a number of organizations utilizing the existing parking lot where the site is to stand – can the developer please provide a list of lessees that currently use that lot, as well as indication of which of those lessees will be displaced (and need alternative parking arrangements) if this project moves forward? **There is only one existing lease for the parking lot with an engineering firm in the neighborhood. Those users will utilize the existing and future parking lots on the north end of the property. There are no other organizations that have leases to utilize the parking lot.**
- At what stage do you plan to hold a community meeting? Given the fact that zoning documents have been filed and residents nearby have already been notified, EPCC would like to know that the community has the ability to ask questions before this project moves any further along. **We remain available to answer questions at any time. A community-wide meeting has been scheduled for May 30 at 6:00 on-site in the community room at the Polish Museum.**
- EPCC would like to formally request an invitation and copy of any proposed community meeting announcement (should this project move forward) at least 1 week prior so that we may advertise the meeting via EPCC communication channels. **See above. We have also attached a flyer prepared by the development team.**