Village of La Grange

AGENDA

VILLAGE OF LA GRANGE PLAN COMMISSION

Village Hall Auditorium
53 S. La Grange Road, La Grange, IL

January 8, 2019 – 7:30 p.m.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call of the Plan Commission

2. Approval of Minutes – December 11, 2018

3. Public Hearings

   a. PC CASE #246 – A TEXT AMENDMENT TO ALLOW PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS IN SINGLE FAMILY DISTRICTS, AN AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING MAP, A SPECIAL USE FOR A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, SITE PLAN APPROVAL, AND FINAL PLAT FOR 12 SINGLE FAMILY HOMES AND 58 TOWNHOMES AT 441 9TH AVENUE, MASON POINTE, M/I HOMES CHICAGO, LLC

   b. PC CASE #247 – A TEXT AMENDMENT TO REDUCE THE MINIMUM REQUIRED LOT ARE PER UNIT FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MULTIPLE FAMILY DISTRICTS, AN AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING MAP, A SPECIAL USE FOR A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, A FINAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, SITE PLAN APPROVAL, AND FINAL PLAT FOR 50 CONDOMINIUM UNITS, LA GRANGE CONDOMINIUMS, DTLG INVESTMENT, LLC

4. General Discussion
   (an opportunity for staff or commissioners to raise topics for discussion but not action)

5. Public Comments
   (an opportunity for public comments unrelated to the public hearings)

6. Adjournment

Individuals with disabilities and who require certain accommodations to participate at this meeting are requested to contact the ADA Coordinator at 579-2315, to allow the Village to make reasonable accommodations.

53 South La Grange Road  P.O. Box 668  La Grange, Illinois  60525  (708) 579-2300  Fax (708) 579-0980
A regular meeting of the Plan Commission for the Village of La Grange was held at 7:30 p.m. on Tuesday, December 11, 2018 on the second floor Auditorium Room of the Village Hall, 53 S. La Grange Road, La Grange, Illinois.

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL OF THE PLAN COMMISSION

Chairman Kardatzke called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. He then called for a motion to open the meeting.

Commissioner Weyrauch made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Paice to open the Plan Commission meeting. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Motion passed

Verify Quorum

Upon roll call the following were:
Present: Wentink, Hoffenberg, Paice, Weyrauch, Egan, Schwartz, Kardatzke
Absent: None

Community Development Director Charity Jones, Village Planner Heather Valone, Village Trustee Lou Gale and Director of Public Works Ryan Gillingham were also present.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 11, 2018

Commissioner Wentink, made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Paice to approve the minutes from the September 11, 2018 meeting with a few typographical error changes which were submitted to staff. A voice vote was taken:

Ayes: All
Nays: None
Motion passed

III. PUBLIC HEARTINGS

A. PC CASE #246 – A TEXT AMENDMENT TO ALLOW PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS IN SINGLE FAMILY DISTRICTS, AN AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING MAP, A SPECIAL USE FOR A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, SITE PLAN APPROVAL, AND FINAL PLAT FOR 12 SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES AND
Chairman Kardatzke asked staff to make their presentation.

**Staff Presentation**

Heather Valone, Village Planner, said M/I Homes Chicago, LLC is the contract purchaser of the property at 441 9th Avenue and is seeking approvals for the following items:

1. An amendment to the Zoning Code to allow planned developments in Single-Family Residential Districts.
2. An amendment to the Zoning Map from Institutional Buildings to R-4 Single-Family Residential District and R-6 Two-Family Residential District
3. A Final Planned Development
4. A Special Use Permit
5. Site Plan Approval
6. Final Plat

The subject property was originally home to the Illinois Masonic Children’s Home and has been vacant since July 2017. The applicant is proposing 70 dwelling units which consist of 12 single-family detached homes and 58 townhomes. The proposed single-family homes are situated along 9th Avenue and the townhomes occupy the balance of the site.

The applicant’s first request is for a text amendment to allow Planned Developments in Single-Family Districts. The proposed text amendment is consistent with the Village’s Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan notes that the current character of residential neighborhoods should be preserved and enhanced. While the Plan does not specifically provide guidance as to the use of the Planned Developments for the subject property, it does recommend that if the La Grange Country Club were to ever be redeveloped as a single-family neighborhood, a Planned Development should be implemented. The Plan recognizes at least for a site the size of the Country Club, a Planned Development approach may be beneficial for residential development.

In December of 2017, the Plan Commission heard an application for a text amendment to allow Planned Developments in Single-Family Residential Districts. The application was brought by Pulte Homes, who previously had a contract to purchase the subject property. In 2017, the Plan Commission voted in favor of allowing Planned Developments in all Single-Family Residential Districts, but the text amendment was not heard by the Village Board because Pulte Homes withdrew their application.

Mrs. Valone stated the second request is to rezone the property. The Comprehensive Plan’s current designation for the area reflect the built conditions and uses at the time.
the Comprehensive Plan was originally adopted. The Plan indicates that the subject property to be public and institutional because at the time the property was being used as an institutional use. The Plan notes that future change to these uses will more often come by way of expansion of existing facilities as opposed to new facilities. The current institutional use on the property allows for parks and government facilities as permitted uses, and schools, medical facilities, day cares, religious organizations, and other institutional uses as special uses.

The properties to the west are designated as Single-Family and the properties to the east are High Density Residential for future redevelopment. The property to the north is designated as Public and Institutional, which is Meadowbrook Manor. The property to the south is Open Space Recreational. Although, the proposed rezoning is contrary to the Comprehensive Plan it is consistent with the adjacent land uses to the west and east. The proposed R-6 zoning would act as a medium residential buffer between the existing and the proposed single-family, and the high density residential that is proposed to the east.

Mrs. Valone said the applicant’s current plan includes 70 dwelling units, which consists of 12 single-family detached homes and 58 townhomes. The single-family homes are situated along 9th Avenue, with vehicular access via a private drive in the rear which serves rear-loading attached garages. The townhomes are comprised of 12 buildings, 10 five-unit buildings and two four-unit buildings. The townhomes are also proposed with rear loading garages with drive aisles between the townhome buildings.

The main vehicular access point into the development is located on Bluff Avenue near the south side of the subject property. The second access point is located on Bluff Avenue near the northern boundary, just south of Meadowbrook Manor. The applicant is proposing to maintain all utilities on sight, excluding the water main. The applicant is proposing to landscape all areas that are not used for structures or vehicular circulation.

Mrs. Valone stated the architecture of the proposed single-family and townhomes has been designed to be visually compatible with the traditional architecture of the existing homes in the Village. The single-family homes design incorporates front porches with depths of six to 13 feet. There are three single-family home models with three floor plans. The applicant has agreed to comply that these models and floor plans are not directly adjacent to one another. Staff recommends that any architectural style cannot be located within two lots of the same architectural style and that any model and architectural style combination cannot be used more than three times. The homes will consist of high quality building materials such as fiber cement siding and anchored modular brick and stone veneers. The Village’s current requirements in the zoning code would not require any of these minimal requirements for building materials.
The townhomes will consist of the same high quality building materials. The townhomes will have balconies over the rear loading garages to help reduce the appearance of the garage doors. The applicant is proposing to use decorative garage doors and side lights. Since this is being proposed as a Planned Development all architecture on the site will be controlled by the Planned Development ordinance ensuring that the architecture and building materials do not change in the future without being reviewed.

The proposed single-family lot sizes, front and side yards, building heights and architecture are comparable to the adjacent properties on the west side of 9th Avenue. The proposed townhomes are separated from the existing single-family homes by more than 250 feet. The applicant is proposing only one access point for the single-family homes on 9th Avenue rather than 12 individual driveways. The main entrance to the development is placed on Bluff Avenue to encourage the majority of the traffic to use Bluff Avenue instead of 9th Avenue. The development will increase the pedestrian connections along both Bluff and 47th Street.

Mrs. Valone said the Village has a series of standards for granting special uses and Planned Developments. One is to require adequate public facilities and services for the proposed development. The current public utilities and drainage structures on the subject property are inadequate for the proposed development. The development will include a number of upgrades to the utilities on-site and directly adjacent to the property. These upgrades include stormwater management facilities, water main replacements, sanitary sewer replacements, native landscaping, street lights, and sidewalks within all three adjacent right-of-ways. The proposed stormwater management will reduce the current volume and rate of storm water entering the Village’s sewer system.

The Village commissioned a fiscal impact analysis for the proposed development to ensure that the development will not place undue burden on public services. The subject property is currently designated by Cook County as exempt from property taxes. Therefore, all property taxes received as a result of the proposed development will be new revenues for local taxing bodies. The fiscal impact analysis projected that the increase in tax revenue will enable the Village to offset the cost of public services created by the development. Upon completion of the development and full realization of tax receipts, the annual net impact to the Village will be an additional $69,000 in tax revenue per year. The analysis is also projecting net positive impacts to all other local taxing agencies including the Park District, library and school districts. Upon completion of the development it will result in 22 students to District 102 and eight students to District 204. According to school district representatives, in recent years the Masonic Children’s Home generated 2-10 students annually to District 102 and 10-14 students to District 204. The fiscal impact analysis projects that upon completion, the annual impact to District 102 will be a positive of $176,000 and the impact to District 204 will be a net positive of $96,000.
The Village commissioned a traffic study to determine if there were any adverse impacts related to traffic. The traffic study generally found that the proposed development will have minimal impacts on the level of service on surrounding streets. The traffic study estimates the development will generate 12 additional vehicles on 9th during the morning peak hours and seven additional vehicles during the evening peak hours. Bluff Avenue has an estimated traffic volume increase of 26 vehicles during the morning peak hours and 33 in the evening. The intersections of 9th and 47th Street and Bluff and 47th Street currently have high traffic volumes and the amount of traffic proposed by the development will not have significant impacts on either intersection.

The Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) is proposing a project to improve the 47th Street and East Avenue corridors. The IDOT project will install traffic signals at the intersection of 47th and East that are coordinated with the rail crossing signals, alter the eastbound approach of 47th Street, and convert the two-way slip road on the west side of the railway to a one-way eastbound orientation. Additionally, they will change the orientation of some of the traffic on 47th Street that will extend past Bluff Avenue to provide a dedicated eastbound left-turn lane on 47th and Bluff. Pedestrian improvements are also included with this project. This IDOT project will significantly improve the traffic conditions and pedestrian safety for the area and it will substantially benefit the proposed development.

Mrs. Valone stated the proposed site plan includes the three access points onto the subject property. The Village’s consulting traffic engineer recommends that stop signs at 9th Avenue and Goodman be reversed from its current condition so traffic on Goodman must stop, rather than traffic on 9th Avenue. Additionally, the development is providing more parking for both the single-family and townhomes than what is required by the Village Code.

The Village Code does have standards for Planned Developments that requires landscaping and designated open space. As stated previously, the applicant is providing walking paths around the detention facilities that will be open for public use. They are also providing private amenities within the courtyards between the townhomes to the north and south. Mrs. Valone showed on the overhead the location of the courtyards. The applicant is proposing pedestrian connections throughout and around the development. The landscape plan shows that they are providing perimeter landscaping which is required by Code. Most of the areas they are providing in excess however, along the north side they are required to provide ten feet of landscaping but are only doing six feet. To make up for the four feet they will be providing a fence for better screening. The applicant is proposing to preserve the existing mature parkway trees on 9th Avenue and maintain the existing trees on Bluff and 47th as able. If the trees are damaged during construction, a fee will need to be paid to the Village.

To construct the development as described the applicant is seeking some deviations from the Village Code. The applicant is seeking seven deviations for the single-family homes. These deviations are for building height, minimum interior yards,
minimum rear yard, maximum building coverage, lot coverage and through lots. The applicant is seeking six deviations for the townhomes. They include height, minimum required front, side and rear yards, and balconies. They are also seeking three deviations that relate to the overall site.

The largest requested deviation from the Code is for building coverage for the proposed single-family homes and the required minimum yards for the townhomes. The proposed single-family lots do exceed the minimum size requirements for the R-4 District and are similar to the lots across the street on 9th. The applicant is requesting a deviation to allow up to 39% building coverage versus the 30% maximum. The building coverage request is generally a function of the size of the proposed homes, which include front porches and the option for a three car garage. In an effort to minimize the request for the required yards for the townhomes, the applicant revised their site plan from the original submittal. The applicant altered the end units of the three southern townhome buildings in an effort to gain about 15 feet.

Mrs. Valone stated several of the applicant’s requested deviations relate to the proposed housing product which feature rear loading attached garages. Staff feels that the rear loading garages are more consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood. If the applicant proposed front loading garages, which is permitted by code, the view from 9th Avenue would have been all garage doors.

To offset these deviations, the applicant is proposing numerous on-site improvements relative to the design of the single-family homes and townhomes, architecture, landscaping and protected open space amenities. The design is sensitive to the homes across 9th Avenue; it preserves existing mature parkway trees, and incorporates usable front porches as seen throughout the Village. The townhomes are proposed with rear loading garages and high quality exterior building materials. The applicant is proposing landscaping in excess of Village Code requirements. They are providing protected open space in the form of walking paths and private courtyard areas.

Lastly, the applicant has agreed to dedicate land at the southeast corner of the development for the future installment of a Village gateway sign. The construction of which, is proposed to be funded by the applicant. In addition to the on-site improvements, staff is recommending that the applicant provide a cash contribution to fund improvements near the subject property along the 47th Street corridor. The proposed cash contribution would help fund pedestrian safety, vehicular traffic and streetscape enhancements and also the aesthetics of the area.

In conclusion, the proposed development will improve the subject property with 12 single-family homes and 58 townhomes. The proposed site design seeks to minimize impacts on the existing homes to the west and provide a buffer between the proposed townhomes and existing industrial properties to the east. The applicant is seeking deviations from the Code; however, there are a number of requirements where the proposed development is exceeding code requirements. To account for the requested deviations, the applicant is providing compensating amenities on the property. Staff is
also recommending the applicant provide offsite improvements including enhancements to the directly adjacent 47th Street corridor.

Mrs. Valone said although, the proposed development is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s designation, the proposed development is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s designations for the adjacent properties to the east and west. The proposed rezoning is also consistent with the current zoning of the adjacent properties to the east and west. The proposed text amendment is consistent with the Zoning Code as well as the Comprehensive Plan.

If the Plan Commission determines that the standards for amendments, Special Uses, Planned Developments and site plan approval have been met, staff suggests that the Commission recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval with the following conditions:

1. Revise the engineering plans per the Village Engineer and consulting engineer’s comments per Attachment 4;

2. Revise the landscaping plans per the Village’s consulting landscape architect’s comments per Attachment 3;

3. Comply with the staff recommendation for anti-monotony standard for the single family homes. Specifically, that no particular architectural style can be located within two lots of the same style and that the no model / architectural style combination can be used more than three times.

Chairman Kardatzke asked if there were any questions from the Commission for staff.

Commissioner Hoffenberg said the drawing shows 12 buildings for the townhomes but the report states 10 units. He asked if it has been modified.

Mrs. Valone stated that the report should state that it is 10 five-unit buildings and 2 four unit buildings.

Chairman Kardatzke asked if there were any further questions for staff. None responded. He then asked anyone in the audience that plans on speaking in regards to this public hearing to please stand and raise his/her right hand. He then administered the oath. He then asked the applicant to come up and make a presentation.

**Applicant Presentation**

Matt Pagoria, M/I Homes, thanked staff for doing a great job presenting their proposal. When they first started this process, the one thing they were told over and over again was to try and continue the character of LaGrange. They made sure that they were consistent with what is across the street. The single-family lots are the
same size as to what is existing across the street with the only difference being their product. Instead of having a detached garage in the rear with driveways to the front they decided on having the garages in the rear with a private drive. The entire streetscape on 9th Avenue will be front yards with front porches.

There are three different home plans that range in size from 2,700 square feet to 3,300 square feet. Each of the plans have three different characteristic architectures and are all 3 to 4 bedrooms. They all do have attached two-car garages which are connected by a breezeway. On the east half of the site is the location of the 58 townhomes that have rear loaded two-car garages with private drives. They have three floor plans that range in size from 1,800 square feet to 2,200 square feet. All the units have exterior decks. Some of the units that back to single family homes will have pergolas to give them a little extra character. This will conclude his presentation and he is available to answer any questions.

Commissioner Weyrauch asked how many guest parking spaces are allocated for the townhomes.

Mrs. Valone stated there are 24 dedicated off-street spaces and along the southern road there are 10 on-street parking spaces. The Zoning Code does not have any minimum requirements for guest parking.

Mr. Pagoria said each unit has a two-car garage, the driveway for each unit can fit two cars and then there is off-street parking.

Commissioner Egan asked what is their potential target buyer.

Mr. Pagoria stated it will be a little bit of everything from first time buyers, young professionals, families, or maybe a buyer that does not want the 4,000 square foot house and the upkeep of a yard. There will be a HOA for the townhomes that will maintain the internal roads and the open space.

Commissioner Wentink asked if the HOA will have a manager or office on-site.

Mr. Pagoria said there will not be an office on-site, but there will be a Board of Directors.

Commissioner Hoffenberg asked how the number of additional students was calculated and did they talk to either of the school districts.

Mr. Pagoria stated staff at the Village hired out to do a physical impact study. Part of the study is a population generation and they use the State tables that all of the school districts use to estimate the population that will be driven from a development.

Charity Jones, Community Development Director, said the Village did hire out to provide a physical impact analysis and they use what is called the Naperville Model.
The model is used by many communities throughout the Chicagoland area and has been used by the Village on past projects. The Finance Directors have been contacted for both school districts and she met with them in September and October. They were provided the results of the analysis and they were also present for the neighborhood meeting in October.

Commissioner Hoffenberg asked if there was any data showing that what they are projecting is accurate.

Mrs. Jones stated the model is used by many communities for over 10 years to project student population. She is not aware of any follow-up data. The High School was going to look at other comparable developments but she has not heard anything back.

Commissioner Hoffenberg asked what is the feedback from the school districts and are they able to take on more capacity if these numbers are low.

Mrs. Jones said she has received no feedback of any concerns. If there were any redrawing of attendance zones that would be up to the school district. Cossitt’s enrollment has 100 less students today than they did 10 years ago. She is not sure of what other school factors might impact their school facility planning.

Commissioner Schwartz stated it would be nice to get some feedback from the schools. He then asked if the development will be done in phases or what is the planned buildout.

Mr. Pagoria said they would start out with a single-family model and a townhome building that would have a model in it. They would start building and not stop until they were done. They will do some spec units and some to be built.

Commissioner Schwartz asked what assurance does the Village have to make sure that is what happens.

Mrs. Valone stated as part of the approvals that they receive, they will have to have enter into an agreement with the Village that will have stipulations for a letter of credit. It will have enough in it to hypothetically complete the public improvements to the site. The Village will hold onto that assurance until it is accepted then at that point the Village requires 10% be held in a maintenance letter of credit for two years. This is to ensure that the HOA is properly maintaining the property.

Commissioner Wentink asked if they could discuss similar projects that they have done.

Mr. Pagoria said that M/I Homes was established in 1976 and is a national home builder that is a publicly traded company. They have divisions across the United States and in Chicago alone they have about 20 different communities. Each year they
add about eight new communities as they are finishing out existing ones. The downturns in the economy have not negatively affected M/I Homes.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if the property to the east is a pond or a marsh.

Mr. Pagoria stated it is a natural stormwater facility. It consists of some water elements to it but the majority of it is natural plantings.

Commissioner Paice asked if it will be dry or wet most of the time.

Richard Olson from Gary R. Weber Associates, Inc. said they prepared the landscape plan for this site. They will use plant material that will help water quality as well as wild life habitat. In the future once they are maintained they will be less of a burden for HOA maintenance. He showed a picture on the overhead of what it could possible look like. There are deeper pockets that will be wet and there are dryer areas with vegetation. There are channels that will have continuous water all year round.

Commissioner Paice asked if there will be a lot of retaining walls.

Mr. Olson stated the site general drains west to east. Where it drops off there will be a retaining wall to hold back the water. There will be landscaping on the topside of the detention pond as well as the downside of the detention to try and minimize that retaining wall.

Commissioner Paice asked what is the elevation change from the southeast corner to the corner of Bluff and 47th Street.

Mr. Pagoria said it is about a 10-foot rise.

Chairman Kardatzke stated looking at the drawings it shows that the front yard is 35 feet and the back yard is 20 feet for the single-family homes. He is concerned for families with small children. There is not a lot of room in the back yard for them to play. He is wondering if the houses need to be moved up a little to create more of a back yard. He asked if the homes will all be in a row or will be they be offset a little bit.

Mr. Pagoria said the nature of the front elevations of the homes and the differences in the front porches will all be set at the 35-foot line. Due to the anti-monotony it will not be a straight shot.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if there was parking on 9th.

Mrs. Valone stated that parking is permitted on 9th on one side.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if they could elaborate on the switching of stop signs.
Mrs. Valone said the Village consulting engineer (KLOA) is requesting that the stop signs on 9th be removed and put a stop sign on Goodman and at the private road.

Commissioner Paice asked if they have thought about changing that private road to about the middle by lot #7.

Mr. Pagoria stated they have looked at this and he is sure there will be further comments in regards to this. It was a main issue at the neighborhood meeting. They wanted to present the plans that they have and give everyone an opportunity to comment on it.

Commissioner Weyrauch said she likes the idea of rear loaded garages; however, she is concerned about parking for the townhome development. There is no rear door for people to enter the townhomes so company would have to enter through the garage door.

Mr. Pagoria stated there are sidewalk connections that will lead them back to the front door if needed.

Commissioner Schwartz said he feels that there is not enough open space or a park area for kids. He asked if the southeast corner is needed for water retention or can it be used for open space.

Mr. Pagoria stated the entire area shown for stormwater management is needed for stormwater. There is not your typical open space with a playground, but there are those amenities adjacent to the site. In the townhome area there are the courtyard areas for passive recreation and there are seating areas.

Commissioner Schwartz asked what the target price was for the homes and townhomes.

Mr. Pagoria said based on analysis, it would be about $650,000 for the single-family and $450,000 for the townhomes.

Commissioner Egan stated the single-family homes have an option for a three-car garage, but it will increase the lot coverage. She asked if it was a deal breaker if they were not allowed to have that option.

Mr. Pagoria said they would like to have the option.

Commissioner Hoffenberg stated this is a very high dense project already and there are several deviations being requested. He asked if there were any options that they had explored to bring those numbers down. The Village has had several issues with drainage and water issues.
Mr. Pagoria said one of the positives for this site is that they are providing stormwater management. They are providing more than what is typically required. He believes what they are asking for as far as building coverage is adequately provided for in basins.

Commissioner Hoffenberg asked if all of the single-family lots wanted three-car garages, how many would they be able to accommodate.

Mr. Pagoria stated every single lot could accommodate a three-car garage. The percentage is going to vary because of the different sizes of the homes. With the anti-monotony they would only be able to have their largest home every third lot and it would go down from there.

Commissioner Hoffenberg asked what kind of restrictions would there be in the HOA on leasing.

Mr. Pagoria said it has been discussed with staff about putting restrictions and they have done that with other communities as well.

Commissioner Egan asked how tall are the townhomes going to be compared to the single-family homes.

Mr. Pagoria stated the rear of the unit which has the garage is three-stories. It is then graded from the rear to the front of the home so the front elevation is only two and half stories. He showed on the overhead the difference in height.

Discussion continued in regards to the elevation change.

Commissioner Hoffenberg asked if they only did two-car garages where would that put them in regards to lot coverage.

Mr. Pagoria said in the staff report on page 13 it states it would range from 33.7% to 36.7%.

Chairman Kardatzke stated at this time he would like to give the public a chance to ask questions or make comments.

**Public Comment**

Henry James said his main concern is traffic on Bluff. He is concerned that with this development it will increase traffic. He asked if there was any thought to putting senior housing on the subject property.

Steven Taylor stated he lives on the corner of 9th and Goodman. At the neighborhood meeting it was stated that there would be no variances on property coverage and everything would be built as if they had to build it. There is a family that lives a block
away that was declined a variance for lot coverage. On Goodman there is no parking because of Meadowbrook Manor. He can’t even park in front of his own house. He is concerned with 70 units it might create more of a parking nightmare. He does not agree with removing the stop sign on 9th.

Dan Colantuono said he has some of the same issues as Mr. Taylor. He believes that 9th and Goodman should be a four way stop. He feels that Road C needs to be moved to another location. He does not see where all the cars are going to be able to go with on-street parking. He is a firefighter and he is not sure if EMS equipment will be able to get in and out of this property. The property is way too dense and very little green space. The east side which holds the detention pond seems more like a swamp area. He wanted to thank Commissioner Hoffenberg with his comments in regards to the school and feels this should not be overlooked. The school has a major issue with overcrowding and he does not agree with the number of new students this project will generate. The average home is 3.14 residents which comes to 220 residents for this site. The pricing for the homes can devalue the pricing of homes in town. The residents are excited to see something going in on this property. He does like the single-family homes on the west but feels that the townhomes are over populated.

Donna Prenta stated her concern is water. She currently lives on 9th Avenue and her neighbor put on a very small addition which affected her basement. She is concerned with the number of homes where all the water will go.

Joe Pardo said he lives at 502 10th Avenue. He heard a lot this evening about the neighbors to the west, north and east but did not hear anything about the neighbors to the south. He disagrees with whoever did the traffic study. On an average daily basis between 4 and 6:30 p.m. he cannot get out of his own driveway. As far as the residents enter and leaving on Bluff Avenue, that will last about a week. They will soon realize that they cannot make a left hand turn. Due to the trains, there are times when he cannot get out of his driveway for a half hour because traffic is backed up. People cannot even use the crosswalks because cars blow right through. In regards to the elevation and people seeing the townhomes from 9th Avenue, he asked what about where he lives. He is now going to be looking at a three story building.

Michelle Colantuono asked if the Village had any other HOA’s in LaGrange. The construction at Meadowbrook Manor is just finishing. She thanked the Commission for the park. The one-way road by Meadowbrook Manor is not being followed and people park on the streets. She is concerned that with this construction they are going to have people parking all in their neighborhood again. She feels that there needs to be a four-way stop sign at 9th and Goodman. The children are going to want to use the park over at Meadowbrook Manor but they will not be able to cross safely. Lastly, they need to come up with an alternative for Road C.

Stewart Middendorf stated he just built a house on 9th Avenue and he had to meet all the requirements so he is not sure why they are asking for variances. He is also concerned about flooding and water. Maple and 9th always floods and continues to be
a problem even after it was fixed once already. He feels the density is way too high and they only want to make money. Also, they need to move Road C.

Pam Cianci said her main goal is safety. The stop sign at 9th and Goodman needs to be a four-way stop sign and there needs to be a light on 47th. Nobody seems to care or pay attention to the flashing light on 47th. The density needs to be lowered for the project.

Bob Vear stated he would like to reiterate the issue with homeowners having trouble asking for a variance, but this project can come in and get it for 70 homes all at once. He asked if there will be sidewalks on 9th Avenue and what the square footage was for the common space. He feels that the coverage is too dense.

Jonathan Lawrence said he echoes what his neighbors have said. The concerns about the density are valid and some of the other concerns, like stormwater and environment seem to be less important and thus the reason for the variance. He feels that a balance can be made for the development itself but also prioritizing those variables. He does not feel that there is a hardship for allowing such a significant increase for the lot coverage. He also has concerns with the traffic on 9th and the removal of the stop sign. He would like to know if Road C meets highway and safety standards.

Mike Wegmann stated he also lives on 9th and echoes his neighbor’s concerns. Safety is their biggest concern. He wants to know what kind of assurance do they have that these are going to be high quality homes and the values are going to stay high. He wants to make sure that down the road these won’t be opened up to Section 8 housing.

John Cianci said he lives on 8th Avenue and agrees with his neighbor’s about the traffic issues. He feels this is going to add to the traffic issues and the density is too high. This will add more problems for the school districts. He liked the single-family housing that was proposed here, but understands that they have to make money also.

Brandon Simak stated he lives on 9th Avenue. Generally, he is good with what is planned. His biggest concern is Road C because it is already a confusing intersection. He lives across the street from it and feels that it will affect his home value eventually.

Chairman Kardatzke asked if there were any other questions or comments from the public. None responded. He then stated that Mrs. Valone will go through the questions or comments that the public had made and asked if the applicant can respond.

Mrs. Valone asked if the applicant can describe what they are presenting for the guest parking.
Mr. Pagoria said for the guest parking in the townhome section, there are several off-street parking areas that are located throughout the townhome area. This is in addition to the garage parking and driveway parking. On Road A, which is the main entrance off of Bluff, it is designed wider than the other interior roads. There is on-street parking on that internal road.

Mrs. Valone asked if fire apparatus vehicles are able to maneuver through the proposed streets.

Mr. Pagoria stated they have to prove that they can service the site with all of the emergency vehicles. The engineers provide to staff turning maneuvers of emergency vehicles throughout the site. This has been provided to the Village and there are no issues with it.

Mrs. Valone asked if there is a possibility to move the 9th Street access to more of the middle of the single-family block.

Mr. Pagoria said he is not opposed to having conversations in regards to that. The reason why they choose the north location was because they thought it was the least offensive location.

Mrs. Valone asked if they could explain the difference in how the stormwater is managed on the existing single-family homes as to oppose how it will be managed on the subject property.

Mr. Pagoria stated there was a resident that had talked about having issues with flooding in the basement. One of the issues is that the sewer along 9th is a combined sewer. This means the stormwater management as well as the sanitary are both within one pipe. They don’t do combine sewers.

Mike May from Cemcon, Civil Engineer, said they are going to help with this combined sewer in two ways. One, there are multiple homes that are connected to the combined sewers and those will be removed. They are looking at ways to make sure that connection is clean and working with the Village’s engineer. About half of the site drains to 9th due to a ridge in the site. They are going to remove all that drainage that goes to 9th with the exception of a small portion. They have designed a storm sewer that can handle a “100-year event”, which is the maximum storm event that will convey the water to the stormwater facilities on the east side. This will provide a huge benefit of removing about 5 acres of drainage that goes to 9th to now their stormwater facility.

Mrs. Valone asked how the residents from the townhomes will be prevented from using Road C.

Mr. Pagoria stated it was intended to provide a secondary access for the single-family homes, but they cannot stop them from using that access.
Mrs. Valone said there were a number of questions in regards to lot coverage. She asked if he can explain why the lots are exceeding both the maximum lot coverage and building coverage.

Mr. Pagoria stated a lot of the lot coverage has to do with when you look at the maximums by adding the size front porches in addition to a third car. Also, it is not a detached garage. It is connected which adds a little to the home. If it was a detached garage they could put the garage within three feet of the private drive and eliminate the entire driveway and probably meet all the lot coverage. They saw attaching the garage as a benefit so it does push the lot coverage. However, they are able to manage all the stormwater in the basins that they are providing regardless of whatever lot coverage they have on the single-family homes. They believe they are providing several amenities to help with asking for these variances.

Mrs. Valone said what are the assurances that high quality building materials will be used.

Mr. Pagoria stated there will be approvals that clearly dictate what it is they are going to be building and all the building materials they will be using. In regards to devaluing the neighborhood, he feels that the $650,000 price is on the low side. He doesn’t understand how a house priced at $650,000 to $700,000 could devalue anything. The pedestrian issue, there is not a whole lot that they can do to stop the situations that are going on out there. They will work on the intersection at 9th and Goodman. They will be adding sidewalks on Bluff and 47th.

Mrs. Valone asked if they had a percentage or range for the proposed number of townhomes that could be rentals.

Mr. Pagoria said they could work with staff on this. At their other locations they had it at 20 to 30 percent. An investor will not want to come in and buy a bunch of $400,000 townhomes. They can definitely minimize the number of rentals here.

Chairman Kardatzke asked Mr. Gillingham from the Public Works Department what he thought of about changing Goodman and 9th to a four-way stop.

Mr. Gillingham stated his recommendation would be to have KLOA to take another look at that intersection. From a traffic engineer standpoint, they do try to have stop signs in the neighborhood at every other block. You don’t want to have a four-way stop that is unwarranted because then you will have people rolling through the stop sign.

Commissioner Hoffenberg said that this is a very dense project. He asked if there was room here to try and bring it down.
Mr. Pagoria stated that density is a relative term. In looking at the attached product in the manor that they are trying to plan this transitional area, he feels that their density is probably inline. They had originally started out with more units, but dropped some to make the setbacks work in the townhome area. He would like the Commission to act on the plan that is in front of them.

Commissioner Egan asked if they had a staging plan as to where the workers are going to park during construction.

Mr. Pagoria said they do not have a plan at this time. Once the dirt is moved and the internal roads are in they will be parking on-site.

Commissioner Egan asked if the water in the detention pond will be moving or will there be a fountain. She also asked if there will be anything to keep the kids out.

Mr. Pagoria stated the water does move. There is not a fence there, but usually the grasses that grow there should deter anyone.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if there were similar developments that they have done.

Mr. Pagoria said this product is brand new for the single-family homes. There are other townhome developments though in Naperville, Woodridge, Warreneville, and Schaumburg.

Commissioner Hoffenberg asked where the discussions with IDOT are at. He is concerned with adding this many more drivers to the area.

Mr. Gillingham stated one of the topics that were brought up was cut through traffic and that will change as part of the proposed IDOT project. The spur road will be one-way southbound. The 47th and East intersection is a very challenging intersection to design and the solution is not going to be ideal. IDOT has come up with this plan to more efficiently move traffic through there in a safer manor. One of the compromises is the elimination of the two-way spur road.

Commissioner Hoffenberg asked if he knew the timing of the project.

Mr. Gillingham said IDOT has completed the phase one of the project, so the design is completed. There are other drainage components that are part of the 47th and East intersection project. His estimate is that the Village and IDOT will work on the plans over the next two to three years and be ready for construction. It is his understanding that the project is funded, but will take some time with some of the other design matters.

Chairman Kardatzke asked if there were any further questions from the Commission. None responded. He said this will close the public portion of the meeting.
Plan Commission Discussion

Chairman Kardatzke asked the Commission their opinion on the project.

Commissioner Hoffenberg stated he likes the idea of the project and it will be improving the site. There is the issue with Road C. He would like to get a better understand on the placement of students and the School Board’s opinion. He feels the density is too high for the area. If he would to support this, he would eliminate the three-car garage.

Commissioner Egan said she agrees with Commissioner Hoffenberg. She would also like more information from the School District. It will take a couple of years for the tax dollars to catch up to the new students and feels the schools need to be prepared for that. She does not like the three-car garage option and feels it creates too much of an issue with lot coverage. She would like to see more of a scale on height as it relates to the townhouses in comparison to the single-family homes and with the existing homes across the street. She would like to know what the lot coverage is on the west side of 9th.

Commissioner Schwartz stated the plan is very nice and the materials are a good quality. He also has concerns with the density. He feels that this would fit in the Downers Grove, Orland Park, or Bolingbrook area and not LaGrange. The only park for kids is across 47th and people don’t always stop. There is a safety concern with having the parallel road to the north. He agrees with his fellow Commissioners in regards to the three-car garage. He would also like to see leasing percentages and get a better understanding of that.

Commissioner Weyrauch also agrees with the Commissioners. She really likes the single-family homes facing 9th. The size of the homes have to be adjusted so that they can meet the maximum building coverage. She likes the townhouse plan but is concerned that there is not enough parking. Overall, the design is good however new construction in LaGrange normally starts at $900,000 to a million and that is why they are concerned it is not going to be good quality.

Commissioner Paice said his concern is the density and the three-car garages. In regards to the density, he feels they need to focus on the number of townhomes and lose some.

Commissioner Wentink stated he agrees with all of the Commissioners.

Chairman Kardatzke said he also agrees that it is a little too dense. He does not like that the backyards don’t have much space. There is more information that the Commission needs. He asked the applicant to take into consideration their comments and to continue the meeting to next month. He then called for a motion to continue the public hearing to next month.
Commissioner Egan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Hoffenberg to continue the public hearing for Case #246 to January 8, 2019. A voice vote was taken:
Ayes: All
Nays: None
Motion passed

IV. GENERAL DISCUSSION
None

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS
None

VI. ADJOURMENT
Commissioner Paice made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Schwartz to adjourn the meeting at 10:12 p.m. A voice vote was taken:
Ayes: All
Nays: None
Motion passed

Minutes prepared by Peggy Halper
STAFF MEMORANDUM

TO: Plan Commission
FROM: Heather Valone, AICP, Village Planner
THROUGH: Charity Jones, AICP, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: PC Case #246 – A Text Amendment to Allow Planned Developments in Single Family Districts, an Amendment to the Zoning Map, a Special Use for a Planned Development, a Final Planned Development, Site Plan Approval, and Final Plat for 12 Single Family Homes and 58 Townhomes at 441 9th Avenue, Mason Pointe, M/I Homes Chicago, LLC
DATE: January 8, 2019

PROPOSAL

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

M/I Homes Chicago, LLC (“the Applicant”), is the contract purchaser of the property at 441 9th Ave. (the “Subject Property”) and is seeking approvals for (1) an amendment to Article XVI, Section 14-501 of the Zoning Code to allow Planned Developments in Single Family Residential Districts, (2) an amendment to the Zoning Map from IB Institutional Buildings to R-4 Single Family Residential District and R-6 Two Family Residential District, (3) a Final Planned Development (“PD”), (4) a Special Use Permit, (5) Site Plan Approval, and (6) Final Plat. The Applicant is proposing to develop the Subject Property with 12 single family detached homes and 58 townhome units (“Mason Pointe”).

At the December 11, 2018 Plan Commission meeting, the application was presented. The public hearing was opened and both the public and the Plan Commissioners provided comments on the application. Residents raised concerns related to the location of the 9th Ave. vehicular access point, arrangement of the townhomes, and the potential impacts on school districts. The Plan Commission provided comments on the application related to the proposed three-car garages on the single family homes and other bulk deviations, the 9th Ave. vehicular access point, and density of the townhomes. The Plan Commission indicated support for the proposed architecture of the townhomes and single family homes, the walking path around the detention facilities, and the size and placement of the single family lots. The Plan Commission expressed concerns about the size of the single family homes, the location of the 9th Ave. access, and the arrangement of the townhomes. The Plan Commission requested more information from the School Districts, alternative designs for the 9th Ave. access, and more exhibits indicating the townhomes arrangement and height. The application was continued to the January 8, 2019 Plan Commission meeting.

Since the December Plan Commission meeting, the Applicant has submitted additional information related to the 9th Ave. vehicular access point, the arrangement of the townhomes, revised architectural plans for the single family homes. Village staff have consulted with the school districts again regarding the projected generation of school aged children. Due to time constraints, the Applicant has not made all revisions as requested by the Village Engineer, consulting engineer, and consulting landscape architect noted in the December staff memo, but has indicated a willingness to comply with the comments prior to the application advancing to the Village Board.
9th Ave. Vehicular Access Point

As a result of resident comments, the Applicant has provided an alternative location for the proposed 9th Ave. vehicular access point (Attachment 1). The Applicant is proposing to shift the access 200 ft. south, roughly mid-block. The general location of the alternate vehicular access point was found to be acceptable by the Village Engineer, consulting engineer (Baxter + Woodman), and consulting traffic engineer (KLOA). Aesthetically, the proposed location of the access point creates views into the townhome courtyards, instead of the rear of the townhome buildings. It further maintains the prior design’s pedestrian connection to the development’s interior network of walking paths. Per KLOA, the proposed relocation of the access point would eliminate the need to revise existing the traffic controls (stop signs) at 9th Ave. and Goodman from their previous recommendation. Additionally, the Village Engineer recommends that the stop sign controls at 9th Ave. and Goodman Ave. be changed to a full stop (four-way).

The Village’s consulting traffic engineer recommends that the access accommodate two-way traffic to provide better circulation for the development. KLOA noted that the 47th St./Bluff Ave. intersection is challenging during peak hours for left-turn movements (level of service E during the morning peak hour and F during the evening peak hour) and the left-turn movement from 9th Ave. onto 47th St. functions with a better level of service (LOS A). KLOA found that requiring all traffic to exit the development onto Bluff Ave. will “add cars to the 47th St./Bluff Ave. intersection and unnecessarily increase traffic delays further along with crash potential.”

The two-way configuration will create a condition in which headlights of vehicles exiting the Mason Pointe development will be directed toward residential properties across the street. KLOA noted examples of other similar “T” intersections in the Village such as: Benton Ave at 9th Ave, 52nd St at 8th Ave, Country Club Dr. at Brainard Ave, Bell Ave at Brainard Ave., Bell Ave. at Ashland Ave., Franklin Ave. at Bluff Ave., Harris Ave. at Bluff Ave., Lincoln Ave. at Bluff Ave., Tilden Ave. at Cossitt Ave., 8th Ave. at Cossitt Ave., Catherine Ave. at Harris Ave., and Glenwood Ln. at Carriage Ln. Further design elements could be incorporated into the proposed road design to minimize impacts to the property owner directly across the street; such changes include shifting the proposed road four feet north of its currently proposed location to better align with the driveway across the street; creating a slight angle in the proposed road to offset “head on” headlight glare; and requiring the Applicant to install bushes around the existing parkway tree across the street to provide screening.

The Applicant also provided information regarding a one-way inbound only configuration for the 9th Avenue access point, which is not KLOA’s recommendation for the traffic management for the reasons noted above. Although not the Village traffic consultant’s preferred alternative for the traffic management reasons noted above. KLOA provided an updated analysis of the number of vehicles accessing 9th and Bluff Avenues based on the alternative designs; Tables 1 and 2 provide a comparison between the alternative designs and the original design.
Table 1
MASON POINTE PUD – TWO-WAY TRAFFIC COMPARISON – 9th AVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Original Projection</th>
<th>New In/Out on 9th Avenue</th>
<th>With In Only on 9th Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning Peak Hour</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Peak Hour</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
MASON POINTE PUD – TWO-WAY TRAFFIC COMPARISON – BLUFF AVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Original Projection</th>
<th>New In/Out on 9th Avenue</th>
<th>With In Only on 9th Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning Peak Hour</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening Peak Hour</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two-way design would increase the proposed traffic on 9th Ave. and reduce the number of vehicles accessing Bluff Ave. The one-way design would decrease the traffic on 9th Ave. and increase the traffic on Bluff Ave.

Townhome Density and Arrangement

The Zoning Code’s density regulations are one of the tools through which the Code regulates intensity of development. Other regulations impacting intensity of development include site design requirements such as lot coverage maximums and minimum required yards (setbacks), building height maximums, and minimum dwelling unit size. In single family residential zoning districts (where only one unit is permitted per lot) density is controlled by minimum lot size. The Applicant has requested R-4 zoning, which has a 6,000 square feet minimum lot size. The proposed single family lots exceed the minimum lot area for the R-4 district. In multi-family districts, Zoning Code section 4-110H7 regulates density of a development by a minimum lot area per unit. For single family attached dwellings (townhomes) the minimum lot area per unit is applied with respect to the entire dwelling; in other words, the lot area is the lot on which the multi-unit townhome building sits, not each individual unit owner’s portion of that lot. In the R-6 district, the minimum lot area per single family attached (townhome) unit is 3,000 square feet.

The Subject Property is 8.84 acres. Of that area, 2.0 ac. (23%) is proposed for the single family homes, 5.48 ac. (62%) is proposed for the townhomes, and 1.36 ac. (15%) is proposed for the stormwater management facility on the east side of the property. The Applicant contends that the stormwater management facility requires a significant portion of the site to be unavailable for the placement of buildings, so the townhome buildings must be clustered in the center of the Subject Property. Clustering of the buildings is permitted for PDs in the R-6 district per Zoning Code section 4-110H6. In PDs, minimum lot size per unit requirements are intended only as a limit on overall development; in other words, units may be clustered together so long as sufficient common open space is provided within the development to meet the average minimum lot size requirement for the development taken as a whole.
The Applicant is proposing a minimum lot area per dwelling unit of more than 3,000 square feet for the townhome component of the property.\footnote{Calculating the lot area per unit using the 5.48 acres for the townhome portion of the site, less area used for vehicular circulation, results in a lot area per unit of 3,147 sf. Calculating lot area based on both the townhome and detention areas, less areas used for vehicular circulation results in a lot area per unit of 3,432 sf.}

In response to questions raised last meeting, the Applicant has submitted updated exhibits (Attachment 1) providing more detail on the proposed arrangement of the townhomes and how they are expected to appear in context of the surrounding area.

**Single Family Bulk Requirements**

The Applicant has revised the single family home plans to eliminate the request for three-car garages; the plans now reflect two-car garages. The maximum permitted building coverage for the R-6 district is 30\% for interior lots and 35\% for corner lots. The change from the three-car garages to two-car garages reduces the requested building coverage deviations from 36.7\% to 39.7\% to 33.68 \% - 36.66\%. Previously, the Applicant was seeking a deviation from the maximum lot coverage. With the change to two-car garages the Applicant no longer needs this deviation. The Applicant is still seeking relief from the minimum required rear and side yards’ requirements. Table 3 indicates the Applicant’s revised deviation requests.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single Family Detached Component</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-110A Height</td>
<td>2.5 Stories, 35 ft. height, and max height 38 ft. as measured from existing grade</td>
<td>2.5 Stories, 35 ft. height, and max height 38 ft. as measured from finished grade</td>
<td>A development of this scale requires mass grading. Measuring height of future buildings from existing grade would be difficult for a mass graded site such as this. The Applicant is proposing to raise the grade of the near the front of the buildings roughly two – three feet above the existing grade. Height of the proposed buildings at finished grade ranges from 30.5 ft. to 34.17 ft. at the front of the single family homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-110C3 Minimum Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>Minimum of 5 ft. with a combined total for both interior yards of 12 ft.</td>
<td>Minimum of 5 ft. with a combined total for both interior yards of 10 ft.</td>
<td>Depending on floor plan, the homes may meet the minimum 12 ft. on some lots, but not others. The request will principally accommodate bay windows, chimneys, and garage offsets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-110C4 Minimum Rear Yard</td>
<td>20% lot depth (29 ft.)</td>
<td>Minimum rear yard of 14% lot depth (20.5 ft.)</td>
<td>The requested deviation enables the proposed rear loading attached garages. If the Applicant had proposed detached garages, the minimum required setback would be 3 ft. from all property lines. The rear loading garages eliminate the need for 12 driveways on 9th Ave., which has a positive impact on tree preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-110E1 Maximum Building Coverage</td>
<td>30% interior lots 35% corner lots</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>The change from the three-car garages to two-car garages reduces the requested building coverage deviations from 36.7% to 39.7% to 33.68 % - 36.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14-505B4</th>
<th>Landscaping and Perimeter.</th>
<th>Perimeter landscaping at a depth of at least 10 ft. on all borders</th>
<th>Landscaping on north property line is 6 ft.</th>
<th>The request is only for the area adjacent to the north property line. The Applicant is proposing a fence along this property line to provide additional buffering from Meadowbrook Manor. The remaining perimeter areas meet or exceed the required 10 ft. The Zoning Code allows this perimeter landscaping to be reduced by up to 50%.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-505B5</td>
<td>Private Streets</td>
<td>All streets be public unless approved by Village Board</td>
<td>Private streets proposed</td>
<td>The Private streets lower ongoing Village operational and capital costs to service the development, but some of the private streets/ drive aisles are also designed as narrower than typical Village streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-505B6</td>
<td>Pedestrian Circulation Systems</td>
<td>Pedestrian circulation on both sides of every street abutting a PD</td>
<td>Sidewalks are not proposed on the east side of Bluff Ave.</td>
<td>There is limited space to construct a sidewalk due to the location of utility poles and parkway trees within the ROW on the east side of Bluff Ave. Additionally, the Comprehensive Plan designates properties east of Bluff Ave. for redevelopment as high density residential use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perimeter.

| 152.25 La Grange Municipal Code: Lot Lines | No lots with double frontage, except only corner lots, shall be created (aka through lots are not allowed) | Lots front on 9th Avenue and have access to the rear via a private drive within the development | The requested deviation enables the proposed rear loading attached garages. The proposed site plan prevents 12 driveways from being placed on 9th Ave. and allows for preservation of existing mature parkway trees. Additionally, garages in the rear of the lots are more consistent with the streetscape on the west side of 9th Ave., where the majority (92%) of the homes have detached garages in the rear of the property. |

### Landscaping and Yard.

| 4-110A – Maximum Building Height | 2.5 stories or 35 ft., whichever is less as measured from existing grade | 3 stories or 42ft. ft., whichever is less as measured from finished grade | A development of this scale requires mass grading. Measuring proposed building heights from existing grade would be difficult for a mass graded site such as this. The proposed finished grades in the townhome portion of the site are generally not higher than the highest existing points on the Subject Property now. There are isolated areas around buildings # 19-23 that will be raised roughly a foot higher than the highest existing grade. |
| 4-110C1 Minimum required front yard | 25 ft. | 10 ft. | The request varies from 19 ft. to 10 ft. based on the building, as measured from the front of the building to the back side of the sidewalk (traditionally the edge of the public ROW). |
| 4-110C2 Minimum required corner side yard | 17 ft. | 10 ft. | The request varies based on the building, but the minimum front yard would be 10 ft., as measured from the building to back of the sidewalk (traditionally the edge of the public ROW). |
| 4-110C3 Minimum required interior yard | Minimum interior side yard of 10% of lot width (12.4 ft.) | 10 ft. | As measured by the minimum distance between building side to building side. This deviation is only requested for two of the 12 buildings. The remaining 10 buildings will have a yard depth of 20 ft. |
| 4-110C4 Rear Yard | 20 ft. | 19.5 ft. | As measured from the building rear to the curb of the rear private drive. |
| 4-110H11(d) Balconies | Maximum balcony projection of 2 ft. | Balcony projection of 5 ft. | The balconies were a suggestion to the Applicant at the pre-application meeting, as a means to improve the appearance of the townhome garages. The proposed rear balconies give the future tenants private outdoor space while softening the appearance of the townhomes’ side by side garage doors. |
School District Impacts

The Village commissioned a fiscal impact analysis to ensure that the development will not place undue burden on public services. In order to estimate the impact to the schools, the Village’s consultant Kane, McKenna, and Associates projected the likely number of residents to be generated by this development, including school aged children by grade level. The formula used for the calculation is commonly referred to as “Naperville Model,” as it was originally developed for the City of Naperville; this model has been employed by numerous municipalities throughout the Chicago suburbs. Kane, McKenna & Associates projects that upon completion, the development will result in 22 students to District 102 and 8 students to District 204. According to school district representatives, in recent years the Masonic Children’s Home generated 2-10 students annually to District 102 and 10-14 students to District 204. Kane, McKenna, & Associates projects that, upon completion, the annual impact to District 102 will be a net positive of $176,554 and the impact to District 204 will be a net positive of $96,861. Representatives from Kane McKenna, & Associates will be available at the January 8 hearing to answer any additional questions.

As noted at the December hearing, staff shared the results of the fiscal impact analysis in October; also in October, School District representatives attended the Applicant’s neighborhood meeting hosted on the Subject Property. Staff shared the Plan Commission staff memo with school district representatives in advance of the December meeting. In follow up to the comments received at the December 11 public hearing, staff extended an invitation to school district representatives to attend the January 8 hearing or send any comments via written correspondence.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant has provided an alternative location for 9th Ave. The Applicant is requesting to cluster the townhome buildings, but is not requesting a reduction in minimum lot area per unit. The Applicant has revised the single family homes to reduce the deviation for building coverage and eliminate the deviation request for the maximum lot coverage. Additionally, the School Districts have been invited to provide any comments.

The Plan Commission has a number of options in recommending approval or denial of the requested text amendment, map amendment, special use, PD, site plan approval, and Final Plat:

1) Approval as presented for substantial conformity with the provisions of the Zoning Code and all other applicable Federal, State and Village codes, regulations and ordinances.

2) Approval as above with modifications or conditions to be accepted by the Applicant.

3) Denial of the Plan as presented for failure to be in substantial conformity with the provisions of the Zoning Code and all other applicable Federal, State and Village codes, ordinances, and regulations.

Upon review of the revised application, should the Plan Commission determine that the standards for Amendments, Special Uses, PDs, and site plan approval have been met, staff suggests that the Plan Commission recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of the Development text amendment, map amendment, Concept/Final Plans, and Site Plan as submitted in Plan Commission Case #246 with the following conditions:
1. Revise the engineering plans per the outstanding comments from the Village Engineer and consulting engineer’s comments dated 12/5/2018;

2. Revise the landscaping plans per the outstanding comments from the Village’s consulting landscape architect’s comments dated 12/5/2018;

3. Comply with the staff recommendation for anti-monotony standard for the single family homes. Specifically, that no particular architectural style can be located within two lots of the same style and that the no model / architectural style combination can be used more than three times.

4. Utilize the two-way traffic alternative design for the 9th Ave. access point and update all plans as necessary.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Revised application submittals
BUILDING & LOT COVERAGE ANALYSIS
2-CAR GARAGE PLANS

M11788 - MASON POINTE, La GRANGE
12-20-18 SCALE; 1"=30'

PLAN 1:
BUILDING = 2,026 SF
FRONT PORCH = 248 SF
REAR PORCH = 168 SF
2-CAR DRIVEWAY = 450 SF
FRONT WALK/STEP = 105 SF
REAR SERVICE WALK = 128 SF
TOTAL COVERAGE = 3,123 SF

BUILDING COVERAGE WITH PORCHES = 2,026 / 7,250 = 27.9%
LOT COVERAGE = 3,123 / 7,250 = 43.1%

PLAN 2 (LARGEST UNIT):
BUILDING = 2,211 SF
FRONT PORCH = 308 SF
REAR PORCH = 65 SF
2-CAR DRIVEWAY = 436 SF
FRONT WALK/STEP = 104 SF
REAR SERVICE WALK = 128 SF
TOTAL COVERAGE = 3,257 SF

BUILDING COVERAGE WITH PORCHES = 2,211 / 7,250 = 30.5%
LOT COVERAGE = 3,257 / 7,250 = 44.9%

PLAN 3:
BUILDING = 2,261 SF
FRONT PORCH = 337 SF
REAR PORCH = 61 SF
2-CAR DRIVEWAY = 369 SF
FRONT WALK/STEP = 105 SF
REAR SERVICE WALK = 129 SF
TOTAL COVERAGE = 3,262 SF

BUILDING COVERAGE WITH PORCHES = 2,261 / 7,250 = 31.2%
LOT COVERAGE = 3,262 / 7,250 = 45.0%
La Grange

9th Ave Building and Lot Coverage: Existing homes on west side of 9th Ave.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lot 1</th>
<th>Lot 2</th>
<th>Lot 3</th>
<th>Lot 4</th>
<th>Lot 5</th>
<th>Lot 6</th>
<th>Lot 7</th>
<th>Lot 8</th>
<th>Lot 9</th>
<th>Lot 10</th>
<th>Lot 11</th>
<th>Lot 12</th>
<th>Lot 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Building Area</td>
<td>1,498.69</td>
<td>1,982.44</td>
<td>1,912.24</td>
<td>2,153.86</td>
<td>1,637.35</td>
<td>2,262.32</td>
<td>2,120.31</td>
<td>1,783.77</td>
<td>1,449.92</td>
<td>1,651.62</td>
<td>1,488.14</td>
<td>1,624.96</td>
<td>2,127.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Area</td>
<td>549.76</td>
<td>1,760.07</td>
<td>1,328.88</td>
<td>1,254.67</td>
<td>1,830.53</td>
<td>1,812.17</td>
<td>1,174.38</td>
<td>1,179.00</td>
<td>1,527.02</td>
<td>1,500.20</td>
<td>1,283.04</td>
<td>1,757.87</td>
<td>1,242.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Coverage</td>
<td>2,048.45</td>
<td>3,742.51</td>
<td>3,241.12</td>
<td>3,408.53</td>
<td>3,467.88</td>
<td>4,074.49</td>
<td>3,294.69</td>
<td>2,962.77</td>
<td>2,976.94</td>
<td>3,151.82</td>
<td>2,771.18</td>
<td>3,382.83</td>
<td>3,369.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Size</td>
<td>6,381</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>7,250</td>
<td>7,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Coverage</td>
<td>23.49%</td>
<td>27.34%</td>
<td>26.38%</td>
<td>29.71%</td>
<td>22.58%</td>
<td>31.20%</td>
<td>29.25%</td>
<td>24.60%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>22.78%</td>
<td>20.53%</td>
<td>22.41%</td>
<td>29.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage (45%)</td>
<td>32.10%</td>
<td>51.62%</td>
<td>44.71%</td>
<td>47.01%</td>
<td>47.83%</td>
<td>56.20%</td>
<td>45.44%</td>
<td>40.87%</td>
<td>41.06%</td>
<td>43.47%</td>
<td>38.22%</td>
<td>46.55%</td>
<td>46.48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Plan Commission  
FROM: Heather Valone, AICP, Village Planner  
THROUGH: Charity Jones, AICP, Community Development Director  
SUBJECT: PC Case #247 – A Text Amendment to reduce the minimum required lot area per unit for Planned Developments in the R-8 Multiple Family District, an Amendment to the Zoning Map, a Special Use for a Planned Development, a Final Planned Development, Site Plan Approval, and Final Plat for 50 condominium units, La Grange Condominiums, DTLG Investment, LLC  
DATE: January 8, 2018  

PROPOSAL  

PROJECT DESCRIPTION  

DTLG (“the Applicant”), is the owner of the properties at 112 E. Burlington Ave. and 5 6th Ave. (the “Subject Property”) and is seeking approvals for (1) an amendment to Article IV, Section 4-110 of the Zoning Code to reduce the minimum required lot area per unit from 910 square feet to 740 square feet for a Planned Development in the R-8 zoning district, (2) an amendment to the Zoning Map from C-1 Central Commercial to R-8 Multiple Family Residential District, (3) a Planned Development (“PD”), (4) a Special Use Permit, (5) Site Plan Approval and (6) Final Plat.

The Subject Property is depicted in Figure 1. The Applicant is proposing to develop the Subject Property with 50 condominium units, named “La Grange Condominiums”. The Applicant is seeking relief from multiple sections of the Zoning Code to develop the Subject Property.

Figure 1 The Subject Property is bound to north by Burlington Ave., to the south by existing residential uses, to the west by 6th Ave., and to the east by 7th Ave.
GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant: DTLG, LLC
Status of Applicant: Owner
Request: An amendment to Article IV, Section 4-110 of the Zoning Code to reduce the minimum required lot area per dwelling unit in an R-8 Planned Development, (2) an amendment to the Zoning Map from C-1 Central Commercial to R-8 Multiple Family Residential District, (3) a Planned Development, (4) a Special Use Permit, (5) Site Plan Approval and (6) Final Plat
Site Location: 112 E. Burlington Ave. and 5 6th Ave.
Existing Zoning: C-1 Central Commercial
Existing Land Use: Jackson Square Mall, Law Offices of Faloon & Kenney, Ltd.
Property Size: Approximately 0.85 acres (37,026 square feet)
Comprehensive Plan: BNSF Core Commercial

Surrounding Zoning and Land Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>BNSF railroad tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>R-8 Multiple Family District and R-6 Two</td>
<td>Multi-family apartment building and a single family residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>C-1CR Core Retail District</td>
<td>Impact Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>C-1 Central Commercial District</td>
<td>Becknell Industrial office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACKGROUND

A pre-application meeting was held on August 24, 2018, at which the Applicant received comments from the Village management team and a selection of Trustees and Plan Commissioners. The comments from the pre-application meeting are contained in Attachment 1. A formal application was submitted to the Village on October 4, 2018. Staff provided comments on the initial submission and the Applicant submitted revised plans on December 12, 2018.

The Applicant is proposing to rezone the Subject Property to R-8 Multiple Family Residential District. The Applicant’s plan includes 50 condominium units: 30 units are two-bedroom and 20 units are three-bedrooms. The Applicant is proposing four stories of condominium units (floors two to five) above an interior garage (floor one), which is located partially below grade. The grade change on the Subject Property makes the west side (6th Ave.) of the building four stories above grade and the east side of the building (7th Ave.) five stories above grade. The proposed building includes 83 parking spaces; 28 tandem parking stalls (total of 56 parking spaces), 24 traditional parking spaces, and three guest parking spaces. The garage parking is proposed to be accessed via a secure garage door located along 7th Ave. The stormwater management facilities are proposed underneath the building.

The proposed building would have zero foot minimum yards on all sides of the property. The proposed
plaza area and the southeast side of the building are the only places where the building will have some setback from the property lines. The second through fifth floors will have a 10 ft. offset along the south and northeast property lines to allow for private terraces and balconies.

The Applicant is proposing a public plaza along Burlington Ave. The plaza is accessible from 6th Ave. and Burlington Ave. The Applicant is proposing a Home Owners Association (HOA) to maintain the plaza and the Subject Property. The Applicant is proposing private amenities for the residents in the form of private patios on the first floors, balconies on the north and south sides of the building, and a common room with outdoor terrace on the top floor of the building.

The right-of-way (“ROW”) along 6th Ave. is also proposed to be modified with an eight-foot sidewalk located immediately behind the curb (five-foot sidewalk is existing) and landscaping between the sidewalk and private property. Parkway trees are proposed within the 6th, 7th, and Burlington Avenues’ ROWs. The HOA will be required to maintain the landscaping and sidewalk. The Applicant is also proposing a pedestrian improvement at the intersection of Burlington Ave. and 6th Ave. to provide more visibility to pedestrians crossing 6th Ave. to reduce potential vehicle and pedestrian interactions.

STANDARDS FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE ZONING CODE

The Applicant is requesting a text amendment to Section 4-110 of the Zoning Code to reduce the minimum required lot area per unit from 910 square feet to 740 square feet for Planned Developments in the R-8 zoning district. The applicant is also requesting a zoning map amendment to change the zoning of the Subject Property from C-1 Central Commercial District to R-8 Multiple Family Residential District.

In determining whether the proposed amendments should be granted or denied, the Plan Commission should be guided by the following standards required in Zoning Code Section 14-605:

1. **The consistency of the proposed amendments with the purposes of the Zoning Code.**

   **Text Amendment**
   Section 1-102 of the Zoning Code lists 21 general purposes of the Zoning Code, with the first being to “implement and foster the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.” The first goal of the Comprehensive Plan is to provide high quality and diverse housing options for Village residents. This goal is intended to encourage housing of various types, sizes, and price points in appropriate locations to effectively serve the housing needs of all segments of the Village population from young families to empty nesters to senior citizens. The Comprehensive Plan seeks to encourage transit supportive development within the BNSF Corridor Subarea, defined as the area bounded generally by Cossitt Ave. to the south, Brainard Ave. to the west, Tilden Ave to the east, and Brewster Ave. to the north.

   The Comprehensive Plan specifies that high density residential development typically consist of four to five story structures with 1,300 sq ft of lot area per dwelling unit. Consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the Zoning Code requires 1,300 square feet of lot area per unit for “by right” development and allows 910 square feet of lot area per unit for PDs in the R-8 district. Stated a different way, the R-8 district allows up to 33.5 dwelling units per acre “by right” and up to 47.8 dwelling units per acre through a PD. The proposed text amendment would allow up to 58.8 dwelling units per acre through a PD.

   The requested text amendment would allow interested property owners within the R-8 District the option to apply for a reduced lot area per unit deviation as part of a PD application. PDs are special uses designed to provide flexibility from the traditional bulk, space, and yard regulations for an
individual property in exchange for an appreciably more desirable environment than could be achieved through strict application of Village land use regulations. The Applicant’s proposed text amendment would allow higher density development (roughly 18.7% more units) than is currently possible via a PD. However, any such proposal would still be subject to the PD standards of Article 14 of the Zoning Code and oversight provided by the Plan Commission and Village Board through the PD review process to ensure that proposed developments are consistent with all relevant purposes of the Zoning Code.

Lot area per unit is the Zoning Code’s density regulation and is one of the tools through which the Code regulates intensity of development. Other regulations impacting intensity of development include site design regulations such as lot coverage maximums and minimum required yards (setbacks), building height maximums, and minimum dwelling unit size. The Applicant contends that the proposed amendment is consistent with the purposes of the Zoning in that it will encourage more efficient site design. The Applicant presents the proposed development as an example of this efficiency in design; by locating required parking in a partially below grade interior garage, more of the site was left available for development as habitable space.

Map Amendment
Section 1-102 of the Zoning Code lists 21 purposes, several of which are applicable to the requested map amendment (“rezoning”) from C-1 to R-8. The first purpose of the Zoning Code is to “implement and foster the goals and policies of the Village’s Official Comprehensive Plan.” The Comprehensive Plan’s future land use designation for the Subject Property is BNSF Core Commercial. The properties to the west and east are likewise designated as BNSF Core Commercial. The property to the north of the BNSF railroad tracts (One North Beacon) is designated High Density Residential. The properties to the south are noted as Medium Density Residential. Although the proposed rezoning is contrary to the Comprehensive Plan’s designation for the Subject Property, it is consistent with the plan’s land use designations for adjacent properties to the south.

The current zoning of the properties in the vicinity of the Subject Site generally mirrors the Comprehensive Plan future land use designations for properties west, east, and southeast of the Subject Property. Figure 2 depicts the current zoning designations and illustrates how the proposed

![Figure 2](image-url)
rezoning affects the surrounding zoning designations. The proposed rezoning would separate the commercially zoned properties to the east and west from one another. The property to the west is zoned C-1CR which is the core retail area of the Core Commercial District. The Subject Property and the property to the east are zoned C-1 Core Commercial District but are not designated as core retail. The proposed rezoning would create a separation between the C-1CR district from the C-1.

2. The community need for the proposed amendments and for the uses and development they would allow.

Text Amendment
The Applicant contends that modern design principles dictate more efficient site planning, which results in a higher overall yield of dwelling units. The Applicant asserts that elements of efficient site design, such as elimination of surface parking lots, also support other Village goals such as transit supportive development.

Map Amendment
Within the current C-1 zoning, the Subject Property could be developed with a three story (45 ft.) building by right, and up to five stories (70 ft.) through a Planned Development approval. A building in the C-1 district may be used wholly for commercial purposes, or may include residential dwelling units on upper stories. There is no minimum lot area per unit for developments in the C-1 District. Properties in the C-1 district generally do not have minimum required yards and the maximum allowable building coverage is 100%. However, floor area ratio (FAR) is limited to 3.0 by right and 4.25 via a PD, which effectively requires some open space for sites containing buildings over 3 stories.

The requested R-8 zoning includes the same overall building height requirements as the current C-1 zoning. The R-8 District does not permit commercial uses. As noted, the R-8 district places limits on residential density via minimum lot area per unit. The R-8 district requires open space through minimum required yards and limits on maximum building coverage (35% for interior lots, 45% for corner lots).

Given that the request R-8 zoning eliminates any requirement for commercial use, the proposed rezoning would allow more area to be used for residential purposes. The Village commissioned a market analysis (Attachment 2) from Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc. (“Tracy Cross”) to ensure that the rezoning application is consistent with current market trends/demand. Tracy Cross found that there is sufficient market demand to accommodate multi-family residential development on the Subject Property, and that there is “adequate demand for new construction lifestyle multifamily for sale housing in La Grange and its near west/southwest suburban environs based upon sales trends in the localized area.” The La Grange Market Area (LGMA), as defined by Tracy Cross, is comprised of areas including Riverside, Lemont, Downers Grove, Burr Ridge, Hinsdale, Indian Head Park, and Western Springs.

Three hundred and fifty-five new multiple family units are projected to be constructed with in the LGMA between 2018-2023, which the market has the ability to absorb. The analysis also found that the new for sale housing construction will average 500 units during the 2018-2023-time period. For sale demand potentials will be distributed between 375 single family detached units yearly and 125 attached single family units.

3. If a specific parcel of property is the subject of the proposed amendment, then the following factors apply:

(a) The existing uses and zoning classifications for properties in the vicinity of the subject property.
(b) The trend of development in the vicinity of the subject property, including changes, if any, in such trend since the subject property was placed in its present zoning classification.

(c) The extent, if any, to which the value of the subject property is diminished by the existing zoning classification applicable to it.

(d) The extent, if any, to which any such diminution in value is offset by an increase in the public health, safety, and welfare.

(e) The extent, if any, to which the use and enjoyment of adjacent properties would be affected by the proposed amendment.

(f) The extent, if any, to which the value of adjacent properties would be affected by the proposed amendment.

(g) The extent, if any, to which the future orderly development of adjacent properties would be affected by the proposed amendment.

(h) The suitability of the subject property for uses permitted or permissible under its present zoning classification.

(i) The availability, where relevant, of adequate ingress to and egress from the subject property and the extent to which traffic conditions in the immediate vicinity of the subject property would be affected by the proposed amendment.

(j) The availability, where relevant, of adequate utilities and essential public services to the subject property to accommodate the uses permitted or permissible under its present zoning classification.

(k) The length of time, if any, that the subject property has been vacant, considered in the context of the pace of development in the vicinity of the subject property.

(l) The reasons, where relevant, why the subject property should be established as part of any overlay district and the positive and negative effects such establishment could be expected to have on persons residing in the area.

The Subject Property is comprised of 3 lots. The primarily lot is current occupied by the Jackson Square Mall on the first floor and storage for Jackson Moving & Storage on upper floors. The portion of the building on the lot facing 7th Ave is also occupied by Jackson Moving & Storage. The building at 5 6th Ave. is occupied by the law offices of Faloon & Kenney. The properties to the south residential buildings that have remained relatively unchanged. The commercial properties to the west have likewise experienced little change. The neighboring property to the north and east has been acquired by Becknell Industrial and is being redeveloped for an office use.

The proposed rezoning would enable the construction of a multi-story, multi-family residential development, which the Applicant contends is more market-feasible than the mixed use or wholly commercial development required by the current C-1 zoning. The proposed R-8 zoning is consistent with the zoning of properties to the south and southwest and therefore would not be expected to have any impacts on the value of those properties. Similarly, it is not anticipated that the proposed residential zoning would generally have impacts on other commercially zoned properties in the area.

STANDARDS FOR SPECIAL USES
La Grange Zoning Code §14-401E.1 states that no special use permit shall be recommended or granted unless the Applicant establishes the following:

A. **Code and Plan Purposes:** The proposed use and development will be in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this Code and with the general purpose and intent of the Official Comprehensive Plan.

Please see the “Authority To Modify Regulations – Standards” section for detailed discussion of this standard.

B. **No Undue Adverse Impact:** The proposed use and development will not have a substantial or undue adverse effect upon adjacent property, the character of the area, or the public health, safety, and general welfare.

The area is characterized by a mix of uses and variety of building scales. Table 1 contains a comparison of the existing proximate multi-family buildings (11 6th Ave. and One North Beacon) and the proposed development. To compare the proposed development with nearby multifamily properties, building coverage, and floor area ratio (“FAR”) are being used as metrics for comparison. Note that the R-8 zoning district does not have a standard for FAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lot Area (sf)</th>
<th>Building Footprint (sf)</th>
<th>Gross Building Area (sf)</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Building Coverage</th>
<th>Number of Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Lot Area Per Unit (sf)</th>
<th>Building Height (ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 6th Ave.</td>
<td>7,471</td>
<td>3,344</td>
<td>13,376</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One North Beacon</td>
<td>81,290</td>
<td>19,678</td>
<td>137,746</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development</td>
<td>37,026</td>
<td>25,175</td>
<td>99,926</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 6th Ave. is located immediately south of the Subject Property; also located adjacent to the Subject Property is 120 E. Burlington Ave. to the northeast and 16 7th Ave. to the southeast. 16 7th Ave. is a single family home, however, it is zoned Two Family Residential and could be developed with attached single family homes (townhomes) in the future.

120 E. Burlington is a two story commercial office building, zoned C-1. Likewise, the properties to the east and west of the Subject Property across 6th and 7th Avenues are zoned C-1. These properties could be developed in the future for commercial or mixed use with building heights up to 45 ft. (or three stories) by right. If the properties were developed as a C-1 PD, height adjustments are allowed up to five stories or 70 ft.

The proposed development will include the demolition of historic existing features but proposes to pay homage to those architectural design elements in the design of the new building. Please see the “No Destruction of Significant Features” section below for a detailed discussion of the proposed
architecture. Additionally, please see the “No Traffic Congestion” section below for detailed discussion of traffic considerations relative to the proposed development.

The building will be required to have fire suppression and alarms. Per the request of the Police Chief and the Village’s consulting traffic engineer, the Applicant has added a pedestrian notification system at the parking garage entry to warn pedestrians of exiting vehicles. Additionally, the Applicant will be making a number of pedestrian improvements within the adjacent ROWs (increased sidewalk widths, bump outs, cross walk enhancements).

C. **No Interference with Surrounding Development:** *The proposed use and development will be constructed, arranged, and operated so as not to dominate the immediate vicinity or to interfere with the use and development of neighboring property in accordance with the applicable district regulations.*

Please see “No Undue Adverse Impact” above for a summary of how the proposed development relates to the scale of other buildings in the vicinity.

Portions of the proposed building will have a zero foot setback. As such, the Building Code requires construction that will not place undue burdens on adjacent properties; for example, portions of the building that are within five feet of the lot line have limitations on openings such as windows. Potential future zero lot line redevelopment of adjacent properties would be held to the same standards but may impact residents of the Subject Property in as much as future multi-story development could be located within four feet of the proposed balconies on the Subject Property.

D. **Adequate Public Facilities:** *The proposed use and development will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as streets, public utilities, drainage structures, police and fire protection, refuse disposal, parks, libraries, and schools, or the applicant will provide adequately for such services.*

The current public utilities and drainage structures on the Subject Property are inadequate for the proposed development. The development will include a number of upgrades to the utilities on and directly adjacent to the Subject Property. Attachment 3 contains comments on the proposed utilities and engineering items from the Village’s consulting engineer Baxter & Woodman. The Public Works Director / Village Engineer have reviewed the comments from the consulting engineer and concurs with all comments.

The Applicant is proposing to construct storm water management facilities per Village and Metropolitan Water Reclamation District (“MWRD”) requirements. These improvements will reduce the current volume and rate of storm water entering the Village’s sewer system. Additionally, per the comments from the Village Engineer and consulting engineer, the Applicant should revise the submitted engineering plans to exceed the MWRD minimum required detention, in accordance with Village policy. The Applicant is proposing to place the detention facilities underneath the building and plaza and incorporate a green roof on a portion of the building. The Applicant has not provided sufficient information on how the 100-year runoff from the entire site will reach the underground detention facility. This information will need to be provided in detail and found acceptable by the Village consulting engineer and Village Engineer prior to Village Board action on the PD application. If changes to the site plan are required to accommodate the runoff, such site plan changes may necessitate re-review by the Plan Commission.

The Village Engineer is requiring that the Applicant provide street lighting with photometric levels per Village standards. Additionally, the Village Engineer is requiring that the Applicant televishe the sewers
on 6th and 7th Avenues and make any required improvements to accommodate the proposed development.

The Applicant is proposing to provide landscaping within the plaza, within the ROW along 6th Ave., and along the southeast side of the building. Attachment 5 contains all comments on the proposed landscaping plans from the Village’s consulting landscape architect Hitchcock Design Group. Hitchcock Design Group commented that the Applicant must submit plans for the proposed green roof.

When the necessary outstanding plan details have been received and found acceptable by Village staff, the improvements, constructed at the Applicant’s cost, will provide adequate public facilities for the proposed development.

E. **No Traffic Congestion:** The proposed use and development will not cause undue traffic congestion nor draw significant amounts of traffic through residential streets.

The Applicant provided a traffic study for the proposed development. The traffic study found that the proposed traffic generation will not cause undue traffic congestion on the adjacent streets. The Village’s consulting traffic engineer, Kenig, Lindgren, O’Hara, Aboona, Inc. (“KLOA”) reviewed the submitted traffic study and generally concurred with the findings that the traffic generated from the development will have minimal impacts on the surrounding streets. Attachment 6 contains all comments on the submitted traffic study. KLOA comments that AUTO-Turn exhibits for the interior garage parking stalls are needed.

The traffic study also provided information on pedestrian traffic. The number of pedestrians utilizing 6th and 7th Avenues is comparable to the vehicle traffic along these roads, thus pedestrian improvements are as significant as vehicle improvements in this area. The Applicant is proposing to place a pedestrian bump out in the ROW at the intersection of 6th and Burlington Avenues to improve the visibility of pedestrians walking through the intersection. KLOA is also recommending crosswalk striping improvements at 6th and 7th Avenues. The Applicant is also proposing to use pedestrian warning systems on the 7th Ave. garage access point to alert pedestrians when vehicles are exiting the garage. Attachment 6 contains all comments on the proposed pedestrian improvements.

Section §10-101F1(a)(i) of the Zoning Code requires one and a half parking spaces per multiple family dwelling unit. The Applicant is proposing to provide 24 standard parking spaces and 28 tandem parking stalls (56 parking spaces) for the building residents. The Zoning Code requires that the Applicant provide 75 parking spaces. The Zoning Code does not consider the tandem (two cars deep) parking configuration as two parking stalls. If the tandem parking configuration is considered acceptable, then the Applicant is providing more parking than is required by the Zoning Code. KLOA noted that tandem parking has been used for some residential developments within the City of Chicago but could not provide examples of similar configurations in area suburbs. The Applicant is proposing to provide three guest parking stalls in the secured garage. KLOA noted that if the tandem parking configuration is considered acceptable, five additional standard parking spaces in the garage could be designated as guest parking spaces and the development would still meet Zoning Code requirements. The Applicant has not provided information on how guests will access parking spaces within the secured garage.

F. **No Destruction of Significant Features:** The proposed use and development will not result in the destruction, loss, or damage of any natural, scenic or historic feature of significant importance.

The Applicant is proposing to demolish all existing buildings on the Subject Property. The Subject Property is currently developed with the Jackson Square Mall, parking lot, and a single family home used for professional offices. The Jackson Square Mall is an iconic building that has architecturally
significant art deco elements ranging from the building materials, color palette, and fenestration. The existing building materials are white terracotta tiles and tan brick lamento. Teal tile accents are used adjacent to the doors and windows on the first floor. The window frames on the upper floors are teal to match the tiles on the first floor.

The Jackson Square Mall building was originally constructed in 1903 to serve Jackson Moving & Storage. Due in part to some of its unique attributes, including low floor to ceiling heights, the Applicant finds that the overall building is not conducive to adaptive reuse. Further, the Applicant’s architect notes that “the existing facade of the building, although interesting with its Moorish, Byzantine and Art Deco influences, is in a relatively poor structural and aesthetic state. Most of the facade is common brick with minimal detail. The first floor facade along Burlington has many different details and materials, but most are not salvageable and are crumbling due to hairline cracks in the decorative pieces.” The Applicant has coordinated with the La Grange Historical Society, which has identified certain elements of the building to be salvaged and donated. The Applicant has stated they will make every attempt to salvage and repurpose certain elements of the building where possible; they plan to incorporate them into the lobby/mailroom of the proposed building.

The Applicant is proposing to replicate significant architectural elements from the existing building on the proposed building. The proposed building materials for the La Grange Condominiums include white/light gray cast stone, burnished block, tan brick veneer, tan and light teal stucco fiber cement panel, and teal metal for the proposed balconies. Attachment 7 contains the colored renderings depicting the building materials. Material samples have been provided for these proposed building. The white/light gray cast stone is intended to mimic the existing terracotta tiles on the first floor of the Jackson Square Mall. The burnished block is the proposed building base/exposed foundation. The stucco fiber cement panel and the tan brick veneer are interspersed throughout the façade of the building. The Applicant has not provided material samples for the aluminum curtain wall on the top of the building, the glazing system at the top of the building, the decorative tile planters, or the fencing in the plaza. However, the renderings indicate that they will all be a teal color similar to the proposed metal balconies.

The Subject Property is located within the Design Overlay District. All developments within the Design Review Overlay are required to comply with the standards contained in Zoning Code section 8-301 for the Design Review Overlay District, and receive a design review permit. For developments that do not include a special use or planned development application, the Design Review Commission (“DRC”) reviews proposed exterior elevations for compliance with Design Review Overlay District requirements. As the Applicant is applying for a special use permit and PD, the Plan Commission acts as the reviewing entity for the Design Overlay District. However, to provide technical assistance to the Plan Commission, the DRC reviewed the preliminary elevation drawings and the proposed building materials. The DRC commented that insufficient information was provided on the brick veneer. The DRC recommended that the Plan Commission require the Applicant to employ a four inch anchored brick veneer. Additionally, the DRC commented that the level of architectural detail and pattern of materials employed on the northwestern portion of the building should be carried throughout all elevations of the building. The DRC further suggested the design and metal copping elements proposed on the northwest corner of the building be carried to other portions of the building. Lastly, the DRC commented that the proposed trees along the ROWs and within the plaza should be shade trees that are comparable to the mature parkway trees along 6th and 7th Avenues.

G. Compliance with Standards: The proposed use and development complies with all additional standards imposed on it by the particular provision of this code authorizing such use.
The Zoning Code does not have any additional standards for the requested special use. Although seeking certain deviations from the Zoning Code as detailed below, the Applicant has shown a willingness to comply with the remaining code requirements.

SPECIAL STANDARDS

When the district regulations in a particular district impose special standards, a special use permit shall not be granted unless the Applicant complies with such special standards, La Grange Zoning Code §14-401E3. Detailed discussion of these standards is included in the “Standards For Small Planned Developments” section.

STANDARDS FOR SMALL PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS

A. Special Use Permit Standards for Small PD: No special use permit for a planned development shall be recommended or granted pursuant to this Section unless the applicant shall establish that the proposed development will meet each of the standards made applicable to special uses pursuant to Subsection 14-401E of this Code.

Please see the section below entitled “Standards for Special Use” for detailed discussion of these standards.

B. Additional Standards for Small PD Development Plans: No special use permit for a planned development shall be recommended or granted unless the applicant shall establish that the proposed development will meet each of the following additional standards:

1. Unified Ownership Required: The entire property proposed for planned development treatment must be, in single ownership or under such unified control as to ensure that the entire property will be developed as a unified whole.

The Applicant has purchased the Subject Property and therefore it is under unified ownership. Additionally, the Applicant is proposing to establish an HOA to maintain the Subject Property once the property is developed.

2. Covenants and Restrictions to be Enforceable by Village: All covenants, deed restrictions, easements, and similar restrictions to be recorded in connection with the planned development shall provide that they may not be modified without the express consent of the Board of Trustees and that they may be enforced by the Village.

The Applicant is proposing to develop the building as condominiums. Consistent with past practice for multi-family developments, the Village will require covenants and restrictions that include general operational and maintenance standards; staff recommends the Applicant be required to submit the covenants and restrictions for review and approval by the Village as part of a development agreement. The Applicant will be required to provide a public access and maintenance easement / agreement for the proposed plaza. Additionally, an agreement for maintenance of the proposed landscaping within the 6th Ave. ROW will be needed.

2. Open Space: The applicant must show that the largest amount of open space reasonably possible has been included in the Small PD Development Plan and that open space has
been assembled and designed to maximize its quality, usefulness, beauty, and value to the development.

The Applicant is proposing to include a public plaza along Burlington Ave. that covers approximately 29% (roughly 10,700 square feet) of the Subject Property. The Plaza will contain benches, art, a water feature, and landscaping. The Applicant is also proposing a terrace on the top floor of the building for the building’s residents to enjoy.

3. **Landscaping and Perimeter Treatment:**  *To the fullest extent possible, any area of the planned development not used for structures or circulation elements shall be landscaped or otherwise improved.*

The proposed site has limited green space (5% of the Subject Property); the six-foot-deep green space along the south property line is proposed to be landscaped with trees and shrubs. The other open space on this site, the plaza, includes a variety of landscaping contained within large planters. The landscape plan also proposes landscaping within a reconfigured 6th Ave. parkway. The Applicant is also proposing to provide parkway trees in the adjacent ROWs where there are no existing trees, which will increase the urban canopy of the Village.

4. **Public Improvements:** *The applicant must provide for all public improvements necessary to serve the planned development, including without limitation streets, sidewalks, lights, signs, underground utilities, and landscaping, to be constructed or installed to Village standards at no cost to the Village.*

The existing public utilities serving the Subject Property are not adequate to serve the proposed development. As indicated in the section “Adequate Public Facilities” the applicant will be required to construct at their cost, adequate facilities.

5. **Excellence of Design:** *The building or buildings within the planned development must be of high architectural quality, with excellence of design considering the context within which the development is being proposed and the general standards stated in the “Urban Design Principles,” “Urban Design Framework,” and “Appendix A” of the Village of La Grange Urban Design Guidelines dated February 2009.*

The Urban Design Guidelines provide recommendations related to height, façade design, building materials, streetscape, and parking facilities. The guidelines recommend that building height not exceed five stories; the proposed development is consistent with this recommendation. Accents to the façade are encouraged; the Applicant is proposing to mimic the architectural features from the existing building on the proposed building. Additionally, the Urban Design Guidelines encourage balconies. The Applicant is proposing balconies on the north and south facades and Juliet balconies on the east and west elevations.

The Urban Design Guidelines encourage articulated rooflines with gable elements. The Applicant is proposing a flat roof. Masonry, stone, and other natural materials are indicated as preferred building materials. The Applicant is proposing cast stone, brick veneer, and stucco fiber cement panels. Staff is suggesting that the elements in the plaza that are currently indicated as burnished block be changed to a different material.
The Urban Design Guidelines encourage off street parking and garage entrances that are concealed from view along the street. The parking area is placed underneath the proposed building with a single access point on 7th Ave. This layout diminishes the visual impact of the proposed parking area from 6th and Burlington Avenues.

Streetscape elements such as street (parkway) trees in grates or planted parkway, planting beds, and coordinated pedestrian amenities (benches, trash receptacles and etc.) are preferred per the Urban Design Guidelines. The Applicant is proposing to incorporate all of these preferred elements into the plaza and adjacent ROWs. The Public Works Director provided direction to the Applicant (see Attachment 9 Project Engineer’s Response) as to necessary elements to ensure design compatibility with the adjacent downtown streetscape.

C. Additional Standards for Specific Small PD: When the district regulations authorizing any planned development use in a particular district impose standards to be met by such planned development in such district, a special permit for such development shall not be recommended or granted unless the applicant shall establish compliance with such special standards.

The R-8 district requires that any request to exceed height restrictions and a reduced lot area per unit requirement must meet the standards for excellence of design. The standards for excellence per section 4-110H7 of the Zoning Code include the following:

(a) the amount of usable open space; and  
(b) the extent of land dedication for public building sites and open space; and  
(c) the quality and extent of landscaping including special elements such as water features and public art; and  
(d) the quality and extent of recreational facilities such as swimming pools, tennis courts, playgrounds, and other residential recreational facilities; bicycle, hiking, and jogging trails; and community centers; and  
(e) the quality of design of vehicular circulation elements and parking lots and areas; and  
(f) the care taken to maximize energy conservation in site design, building design, and building systems; and  
(g) the quality of roof design and finishes in terms of consistency with an attractive residential roof setting and the avoidance of flat roofs.

The proposed development does not include any proposed land dedication. As noted previously, La Grange Condominiums proposes a privately owned public plaza that features public art and water features. Landscaping is included in the plaza, on a portion of the south side of the Subject Property, and within the adjacent ROWs. The parking garage is proposed to be located under the building to conceal its appearance. Additionally, the primary building is designed to incorporate some of the architectural details of the existing building. The building is proposed with a flat roof with decorative coping along portions of the roofline. No specific energy conservation measures have been proposed, but the development will be required to comply with the Illinois Energy Code.

DEVIATIONS FROM THE LA GRANGE ZONING CODE

The Applicant is seeking deviations from the Zoning Code, the table below lists the Applicant’s requested deviations:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-110A – Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>2.5 stories or 35 ft., whichever is less</td>
<td>63 ft.</td>
<td>The PD standards allow increases in the maximum allowable height to no more than five stories of 70 feet in and R-8 PD. Height is measured from grade to the top of the building. The building has a heights of 53 ft. on 6th Ave. and 63 ft. on 7th Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-110B2(c) Minimum Lot Area Per Unit</td>
<td>1,300 square feet</td>
<td>740 square feet</td>
<td>PDs are currently allowed to reduce the lot area per unit to 910 square feet if the standards for PDs are met. The Applicant is proposing a text amendment to allow PD to have a reduced lot area per unit of 740 square feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-110C1 Minimum required front yard</td>
<td>60% of building height or 25 ft. whichever is greater (37.2 ft.)</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-110C2 Minimum required corner side yard</td>
<td>17 ft.</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td>The request varies from 0 ft. to 17 ft. Due to the placement of the plaza, there are portions of the northwest side of the building that meet the required minimum setback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-110C4 Rear Yard</td>
<td>20% of the lot depth of 20 ft. whichever is greater.</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td>The majority of the rear yard is proposed to be 0 ft. There is a portion of the southeast rear yard that is proposed at eight feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-110E Maximum Building Coverage</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>The existing building coverage is roughly 50%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-110f Maximum Lot Coverage</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>The existing lot coverage is roughly the same as the proposed lot coverage. The public plaza represents approximately 25% percent of the proposed lot coverage. The Applicant will be required to provide stormwater management for the entire lot coverage per the Village’s and MWRD’s requirements. This will reduce the rate of water leaving the Subject Property as compared to the existing condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-110H11(d) Balconies</td>
<td>Maximum balcony projection of 2 ft.</td>
<td>Balcony projection of 6 ft.</td>
<td>The balconies are provided for private open space to the residents. Balconies are also a preferred design element per the Urban Design Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-505B4 Landscaping and Perimeter.</td>
<td>Perimeter landscaping at a depth of at least 10 ft. on all borders</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td>The Applicant is not proposing to meet the requirement on private property. The Applicant does have some perimeter landscaping on a portion of the southeast side of the building (six feet). Some landscaping is proposed in the plaza as well. The Applicant is proposing to place a six and a half ft deep landscaping strip in the 6th Ave. ROW.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PDs are a distinct category of special use that allows the Zoning Code to be relaxed if they impose inappropriate limitations on the proposed development or redevelopment of a parcel of land that lends itself to an individual, planned approach.

No modification may be approved unless the Board of Trustees shall find that the proposed planned development:

1. **Will achieve the purposes for which planned developments may be approved pursuant to Section 14-502;**

   Through the flexibility of a PD, the Village seeks to achieve the following seven objectives:

   A. **Encouragement of flexibility in the development or redevelopment of land.**
   
   B. **Creation of an appreciably more desirable environment than would be possible through strict application of Village land use regulations, whether through maximization of open space, or excellence in building and site design, or provision of amenities not possible under the otherwise applicable requirements.**
   
   C. **Promotion of creative architectural and site designs and resulting development.**
   
   D. **Promotion of quality, useful open space and recreational opportunities.**
   
   E. **Promotion of environmentally sound development practices.**
   
   F. **Facilitation of development in harmony with the Comprehensive Plan.**
   
   G. **Promotion of public health, safety, and welfare.**

   The Applicant seeks a variety of deviations to Zoning Code bulk regulations as noted above. The Applicant contends that such flexibility will enable the redevelopment of the Subject Property with a use that comports with the Comprehensive Plan’s guidance for transit supportive development and provides residential population in support of the Village’s economic goals for the central business district.

   The architecture of the proposed building has been designed to replicate significant architectural features of the existing Jackson Square Mall building and incorporates some of the preferred elements contained within the Urban Design Guidelines. The architecture on the site will be controlled by the PD ordinance ensuring that the architecture and building materials do not change in the future without being reviewed by the Village Board.

   The Applicant is proposing public and private open spaces and gathering places in the form of a public plaza and a common room with terrace on the top floor of the building for private use of the building’s residents. The proposed incorporation of a green roof on the Subject Property is an environmentally sound practice.

2. **Will not violate the general purposes, goals, and objectives of this Code and the Official Comprehensive Plan; and**
As noted in the “Standards for Amendments to the Zoning Code” section above, the proposed rezoning differs from the Comprehensive Plan’s future land use designation for the Subject Property. However, the proposed rezoning is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan’s vision for the surrounding adjacent properties.

One of the goals of the Multiple Family Residential District is to provide for a range of housing types. The proposed development will provide more diversity in the available housing stock within the Village. As noted earlier, the Village’s commissioned Tracy Cross to conduct a market analysis of the proposed development to evaluate consistency with current market trends and understand the likely build-out timeframes. Tracy Cross found that “the conceptualized La Grange Condominiums is viewed as a viable development opportunity, providing that a competitive sales price strategy is maintained.” Table 2 contains Tracy Cross’ analysis of average benchmarks benchmark based price for the proposed development to be competitive with other developments the LGMA. The bench mark analysis included assumptions based interior finishes, upgrades, and customization.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Benchmark</th>
<th>Variance From Benchmark Prices</th>
<th>Months 1 - 6 (Conversion of Reservations From Pre-Sale Period Less Cancellations)</th>
<th>Month 7 - Sellout</th>
<th>Total Marketing Life in Months</th>
<th>Average Monthly Sales Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Benchmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$494,594</td>
<td>+$60,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>210.5</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$499,594</td>
<td>+$60,000</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>153.3</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$494,594</td>
<td>+$30,000</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$493,594</td>
<td>+$16,000</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$424,594</td>
<td>- $60,000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$409,594</td>
<td>- $15,000</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$394,594</td>
<td>- $30,000</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$379,594</td>
<td>- $45,000</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$364,594</td>
<td>- $60,000</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.

Tracy Cross found that at a price per square foot of $299.22 the proposed development would likely build-out in a 42.8-month time period. The Applicant is proposing the units be sold at $381.94 per square feet. Based on the Tracy Cross analysis, this higher pricing strategy will increase the build-out period significantly. Tracy Cross is recommending that the Applicant’s marketing efforts for the proposed development include a dedicated outreach program, a staffed on-site sales team, and at least one decorated model to promote sales.

3. Will result in a development providing compensating amenities to the Village. Compensating amenities means features not otherwise required to achieve compliance with the standards of this Code or applicable Village codes and ordinances, including such things as public art, plazas, pedestrian walkways, natural habitats, increased landscaping, buffering or screening, enhanced streetscape, enhanced pedestrian and transit supportive design, underground parking and similar features. Compensating amenities must be proposed as part of a PD application, and all compensating amenities, whether public or private, must be developed and constructed at the applicant’s expense.

The Applicant’s intent, per the submitted application, is to improve the property with a visually appealing, high-end condominium development. The Applicant contends that the
building’s architecture and materials, along with site design incorporating a public plaza with landscaping, art, water feature, and benches constitutes compensating amenities. Discussed in more detail in the Standards for Small Planned Developments “Excellence of Design” section above, the proposed development will meet the Village’s requirements for excellent design for height, façade design, building materials, streetscape and parking facilities.

STANDARDS FOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL

Per §14-402C.2 of the La Grange Zoning Code, site plan approval is required in connection with any development that requires a special use permit. La Grange Zoning Code §14-402F.1 establishes 14 standards for the review of site plan applications. These standards are intended to ensure the proposed development complies with the applicable requirements of the Zoning Code and will not have undue adverse impacts on adjacent property, the character of the area, and public health and safety. If the proposal is found to meet the PD standards, then there would not undue adverse impacts on the adjacent properties, the character of the area, and public health, safety, or welfare.

FINAL PLAT STANDARDS

The Applicant has not yet provided a plat of resubdivision and a condominium plat to the Village for review. The Plan Commission will review the plat of resubdivison prior to approval by the Village Board.

Chapter 152 of the La Grange Municipal Code regulates subdivisions/resubdivisions and final plats. Section 152.16(8) requires that every plat dedicate the equivalent of at least one acre of land for each 75 building sites or family living units. The Applicant is proposing a 50 unit building and therefore is required to provide 0.66 areas of public land to the Village. Per the Municipal Code if the required land dedication is less than an acre, the requirement can be waived by the Village Board. For recent Mason Pointe application, staff has recommend acceptance of a fee in lieu of land to meet the code requirement.

CONCLUSION

The proposed the La Grange Condominiums will allow the construction of a five story building containing 50 dwelling units, which the Applicant contends is supportive to transit oriented design and overall economic health of the downtown. The proposed site design seeks to provide an improved pedestrian experience within and adjacent to the Subject Property through the inclusion of streetscape modifications. The Applicant is seeking deviations from the Zoning Code; however, the Applicant asserts that such relief is warranted by the excellence of building design and incorporation of amenities on the Subject Property in the form of the a public plaza and landscaping.

Although the proposed development is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s designation, the proposed development is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s designations for the directly adjacent properties to the south. The proposed rezoning is also consistent with the current zoning of the directly adjacent properties to the south and north across the BNSF railroad tracks. The proposed rezoning would separate the C-1 CR zoning area from the general C-1 district along Burlington Ave.

The Plan Commission has a number of options in recommending approval or denial of the requested text amendment, map amendment, special use, PD, site plan approval, and Final Plat:

1) Approval as presented for substantial conformity with the provisions of the Zoning Code and all other applicable Federal, State and Village codes, regulations and ordinances.

2) Approval as above with modifications or conditions to be accepted by the Applicant.
3) Denial of the Plan as presented for failure to be in substantial conformity with the provisions of the Zoning Code and all other applicable Federal, State and Village codes, ordinances, and regulations.

Upon review of the application, should the Plan Commission determine that the standards for Amendments, Special Uses, PDs, and site plan approval have been met, staff suggests that the Plan Commission recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of the Development text amendment, map amendment, Concept/Final Plans, and Site Plan as submitted in Plan Commission Case #247 with the following conditions:

1. Incorporate the marketing recommendations from the Tracy Cross report, to include:
   a. a dedicated outreach program
   b. a staffed on-site sales team, and
   c. maintain at least one decorated model.

2. Revise the engineering plans per the Village Engineer and consulting engineer’s comments per Attachments 3 and 4;

3. Revise the landscaping plans per the Village’s consulting landscape architect’s comments per Attachment 5;

4. Revise plans per the Village’s consulting traffic engineer’s comments per Attachment 6;

5. Alter the exterior elevations to incorporate the suggestions from the DRC:
   a. utilize a four inch anchored brick veneer,
   b. the level of architectural detail and pattern of materials employed on the northwestern portion of the building should be carried throughout all elevations of the building,
   c. metal copping elements proposed on the northwest corner of the building be carried to other portions of the building, and
   d. the proposed trees along the ROWs and within the plaza be revised to shade tree species that are comparable to the mature parkway trees along 6th and 7th Avenues.

6. Revised the elements in the plaza that are currently indicated as burnished block be changed to an alternative material;

7. Provide information on the proposed appearance of the retaining wall adjacent to the loading / delivery area on the southeast side of the building; and

8. Provide a plat of resubdivision for the Subject Property.

ATTACHMENTS

1. August 24, 2018 Pre-Application Meeting Minutes

2. Market Study Analysis completed by Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc. dated 12/28/2018

3. Engineering Review Comments from Baxter and Woodman dated 12/21/2018
4. Engineering Comments from the Village Engineer dated October 9, 2018

5. Landscaping Review Comments from Hitchcock Design Group dated 12/21/2018

6. Traffic Report Comments from KLOA dated 12/21/2018

7. Applicant submittal package
Overview

A pre-application meeting was held on August 24, 2018. In attendance representing DTLG Investments, LLC, the owner of the property, were: Phil Fornaro and Vince Mancini of Fornaro Law. Trustee Lou Gale was in attendance, as well as Plan Commission Chairman Wayne Kardatzke and Commissioner Laura Weyrauch. Village staff in attendance included: Andri Peterson, Kurt Bluder, Ryan Gillingham, Lou Cipparrone, Charity Jones, and Heather Valone.

Charity Jones began with a brief introduction to the property, which is currently zoned C-1 and is comprised of the Jackson Storage building and the Falloon & Kenney building. The proposed development would seek a rezoning to R-8 to allow a wholly residential development versus a mixed use building as required in the C-1 district. However, the proposed setbacks, lot coverage, building coverage, and other elements of the proposed development are more similar to those allowed in the C-1 district. The proposed development would be a small planned development.

Phil Fornaro explained that the proposed building is intended to be modeled after the existing Jackson Storage building and that with this new development, along with the renovation of the Burlington Building (136 E. Burlington Ave.) by Becknell Industrial, the whole area will have a new and improved look. Mr. Fornaro went on state that the project is intended to fulfill the Village’s comprehensive planning goal of a vibrant downtown by providing increased residential density within walking distance of downtown attractions. He noted that the project’s architecture, public plaza, and landscaping exceed zoning minimums and are intended to serve as compensating amenities for the development.

Proposed Site Plan

The proposed site plan includes a five story multi-family building, with one story of structured parking and four stories of 2-3 bedroom condominium units. Due the topography of the site, which slopes downward from west to east, the first story is fully below grade at the west end of the building (6th Avenue) and fully above grade at the east end (7th Avenue). The proposed building has no setback on the west and east property lines; due to the irregular lot shape, the setback on the south property line varies from zero to five feet. The stories above the parking garage are proposed to be set back 10 feet from the first floor (parking structure), to accommodate balconies or other outdoor living spaces. The building would abut the Burlington Building at 136 E. Burlington Avenue. Along the north side of the building, the site plan includes a pedestrian plaza facing Burlington Avenue that the developer intends to be open to the public.

Village Comments / Discussion

Chairman Kardatzke asked about the distance between the proposed building and the adjacent buildings to the south. Fornaro Law responded that they will look into it. Commissioner Weyrauch noted that she is not convinced about having zero setback for portions of the building, particularly the side facing another building with zero setback; she recommended that the owner develop renderings that include the proposed building in the context of other surrounding buildings.
Commissioner Weyrauch asked about stormwater management requirements. Public Works Director Ryan Gillingham noted that the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District will require volume control and the Village will require release rate control, similar to other recent developments like 40 S. Ashland. Fornaro Law said the engineers have not yet determined the location of the stormwater detention vault, but the plaza offers plenty of room.

Trustee Gale asked if the site includes any guest parking. Fornaro Law responded that it doesn’t. Trustee Gale noted that this has been an issue with 40 S. Ashland and 40 S. Ashland’s site plan included visitor spaces and a space for deliveries. Trustee Gale states that he believes visitor parking is needed on-site; he suggested maybe this parking area should be in an accessible location, versus the secured garage. Village Manager Peterson noted that although stadium parking is often seen in Chicago buildings, she has reservations as to whether the proposed stadiums style parking will be successful in an urban environment.

Chairman Kardatzke asked about how garbage collection would work with no surface parking lot. Fornaro Law described the site plan, pointing out the dumpster area within the enclosed parking area.

Public Works Director Gillingham noted that the building is at the right of way line; as such he asked that care be given to how the building relates to the streetscape, particularly along 6th and 7th. Fornaro Law noted that the elevations facing 6th and 7th aren’t pedestrian means of ingress/egress and are the narrowest parts of the building; they intend it to just be a passby area. Director Gillingham stated that the streetscape design should be consistent with the rest of the village and contextual to the design of the building.

**Proposed Building Design**

Fornaro Law presented conceptual elevations of the building. They described that the architect took care to mimic architectural elements from the existing Jackson Storage building. A glass atrium on the fourth floor hosts a resident party/meeting room, which Fornaro Law indicated could also be made available for community meetings similar to the facilities at Uptown La Grange.

**Village Comments / Discussion**

Commissioner Weyrauch asked where the main doors into the building were located. Fornaro Law responded that they are located on the plaza, on the easternmost portion of the building. Commissioner Weyrauch suggested the architect reconsider that in light of the recessed glass atrium area to the south of the proposed doors. She suggested that if that area is not an entry it could become an attractive loitering space.

Commissioner Weyrauch asked about the balconies that are proposed near the Burlington Building and any potential fire code issues. Fornaro Law suggested that they may seek to relocate the balconies to face 7th Avenue. Chairman Kardatzke said he felt 7th Avenue and 6th Avenue would probably provide better views for the project’s potential residents than the currently proposed balcony arrangements. Chairman Kardatzke also suggested that the developer may want to explore recessed balconies, particularly on the elevation adjacent to the Burlington Building.
Trustee Gale asked about the proposed materials on the building. Chairman Kardatzke and Commissioner Weyrauch recommended the owner stay away from any use of EIFS or stucco and use high quality building materials.

Community Development Director Jones asked if any of the current building’s materials would be reused. Fornaro Law responded that the property owner has looked into this and although they believe it is going to be difficult to reclaim anything of sizeable value they do intend to incorporate elements from the current building in artistic presentations in the building, as part of the plaza, or as historical monuments. Village Manager Peterson suggested the owner reach out to the historical society.

Commissioner Weyrauch asked if the owner considered a mixed use building with commercial on the first floor. Fornaro Law responded that the owner’s intent is to maximize the residential density while maintaining the open plaza; they prefer to have the open space than a commercial use. Commissioner Weyrauch suggested that if the first floor lobby area was a commercial space with an adjacent plaza, it may be attractive for a restaurant. Fornaro Law responded that their analysis led them to believe the typical commercial tenant in a building like the one proposed would be a dry cleaner or other similar use that services the daily needs of the residents of the building. As the proposed building is intended to be high end residential, they were concerned a small coffee shop or the like would not be able to afford the rents. Commissioner Weyrauch responded that she likes the proposed building’s design but doesn’t want to toss away the commercial/mixed use element.

Chairman Kardatzke asked who the intended demographic is for the building’s residents. Fornaro Law responded that they intend the potential residents are likely to be similar to Uptown La Grange, but people interested in buying instead of renting. They believe the buyers will be people stepping down from large single-family homes and commuters. Chairman Kardatzke asked about potential impacts on local schools. Fornaro Law responded that the buyers will likely be similar to the residents of 40 S. Ashland who, to their knowledge are all empty nesters with no children. Finance Director Cipparrone asked if the proposed price point would be similar to 40 S. Ashland; Fornaro Law responded yes, based on cost per square foot.

**Requested Deviations from Code**

The proposed development would include several requested deviations from code including (1) maximum building height (5 stories and 62 feet) exceeding the 3-story, 45-foot maximum in the R-8 district (but within the maximum allowed by PDs in R-8, 5 stories and 70 feet); (2) lot area per unit, which is currently proposed as approximately 740 sq. ft versus the 1,300 sq. ft allowed in R-8 (which would require a text amendment to the Zoning Code to allow); (3) various setback/yard reductions, as several portions of the building are proposed with no setback; (4) maximum building coverage; and (5) maximum total lot coverage.
ANALYSIS OF THE MARKET POTENTIAL
FOR MODERATE-DENSITY CONDOMINIUM DEVELOPMENT
--- LA GRANGE CONDOMINIUMS ---
LA GRANGE, ILLINOIS

DECEMBER 2018

INTRODUCTION

At the request of the Village of La Grange, Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc. evaluated the market potential for moderate-density, transit-oriented condominium development in downtown La Grange, Cook County, Illinois. Specifically addressing potential redevelopment of the former Jackson Storage building located at 112 East Burlington Avenue, this analysis establishes the following:

- An understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the La Grange area's residential marketplace over the immediate to mid-term (i.e. through 2023). This evaluation is based upon forecasts of economic and household growth throughout the Chicago metropolitan region, with focused emphasis upon its component near west/southwest suburbs, defined for purposes of this analysis as the La Grange Market Area, and the village of La Grange.

- Conclusions regarding the marketability of 50 new construction condominium units to be distributed within a five-story building to include one level of enclosed parking. These conclusions are based upon factors associated with the location of the property specifically, the depth of housing demand, sales trends in the study area's new and existing home sectors, the performance of like developments in the marketplace, and the likely alignment of the residential marketplace over the long term.

- Establish a benchmark sales strategy for DTLG Investments, LLC's conceptualized condominium product line, along with estimated closing prices, required to competitively position the proposed La Grange Condominiums within the context of its competitive environment and in concert with regional demand potentials.

- Forward alternative benchmark sales prices and associated sales forecasts to enable pro forma financial modeling.

GENERAL LIMITING CONDITIONS

Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc. has made extensive efforts to confirm the accuracy and timeliness of the information contained in this study. Such information was compiled from a variety of sources, including interviews with developers and their agents, government officials, and other third parties. Although Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc. believes all information in this study is correct, it does not warrant...
the accuracy of such information and assumes no responsibility for inaccuracies in the information provided by third parties.

Conclusions and recommendations established in this analysis represent a professional opinion and are based upon forecasts into the future which could be significantly altered by outside occurrences. These include, among others, the possible interplay of unforeseen social, economic, physical/environmental, and governmental actions. In this regard, Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc., its owners, and its employees shall be held harmless of changes in conditions that may materially result from these occurrences.

THE SUBJECT PROPERTY AND ITS ENVIRONS

The subject property consists of a 36,760 square foot redevelopment parcel aligning Burlington Avenue, two blocks east of US 12-20/La Grange Road in the Downtown District of the village of La Grange. An existing four-story building, currently home to the Jackson Antique Mall will be razed in conjunction with redevelopment. A one-story office building adjoining the property’s eastern perimeter is not a part of the planned redevelopment. The property is also located two blocks east of METRA’s BNSF-Stone Avenue commuter rail station. Trains from this location reach Chicago’s Union Station in approximately 30 minutes.

The central business district of La Grange has always served as a vibrant commercial center of the near west suburbs. Civic leaders have pro-actively orchestrated major renovation of the central business district over the last several years, maintaining the village’s reputation as a thriving destination for shopping, dining and entertainment. For example, apart from numerous established local merchants, downtown La Grange is also host to a wide variety of national and regional retailers, eateries and specialty shops including Trader Joe’s, Anderson’s Bookstore, and Corner Bakery Cafe, as well as art galleries, casual and fine dining establishments, cinema and performing arts theaters, banks, pharmacy and other daily consumer services. In addition, the lifestyle Oak Brook Center, offering a concentration of upscale retailers such as Neiman Marcus, Bloomingdale’s and Macy’s is a mere 15-minute drive time northwest.

Emergency medical services are provided by Amita Health Adventist Medical Center, a 270-bed Level II trauma center. Also, while it is not expected that La Grange will attract the family market, the community will be served by La Grange School District 102, with future school-aged residents attending Cossitt Elementary (K-6) and Park Junior High School (7-8). Secondary education is provided by the nationally ranked Lyons Township High School.

The property is well-situated relative to regional employment concentrations, as well as major transportation systems. For example, La Grange Road and Ogden Avenue represent major north-south and east-west arterials serving the general area. Within three miles of the site, these roadways link with the I-290/294/55 highway systems thus affording area residents ease of access to corporate campuses in, for example, Westchester, Oak Brook, Naperville, Aurora, Elmhurst, Elk Grove Village, at O’Hare, and of course, the city of Chicago. Not to be dismissed are areas of northwestern Cook County such as the Woodfield area of Schaumburg, as commuting times of approximately 40-minutes are facilitated by I-290/294’s linkage with
the I-355/I-90 highway systems. In aggregate, there are more than 3.0 million private sector jobs, representing nearly 85.0 percent of total metro area private sector employment within convenient commuting distance of La Grange, including some 7,117 private sector jobs in the village itself.

Established in 1879, the village of La Grange is characterized by large vintage homes of diverse architecture, elegant courtyard-style apartment buildings, tree-lined streets, well maintained parks, and excellent public and private schools. During the January-November 2018 time period, for example, existing single family homes sold in La Grange carried a median sales price of $530,000, while in the attached for sale sector a median sales price of $170,000 was represented. Given the very mature nature of the village and its immediate surroundings, it is not surprising that there has been only a modicum of new residential construction locally over the past several years, largely reflecting teardown/replacement single family construction which carry sales prices from the high $600,000s to well over $1.0 million, along with a limited number of moderate-scale condominium and townhome developments. In the attached sector, 40 South Ashland, situated six blocks southeast of the subject site represents the newest condominium development in downtown La Grange. This boutique 17-unit development opened in October 2015 marketing units which ranged in size from 1,200 to 3,628 square feet. Corresponding base sales prices at market introduction extended from $399,000 to $1,299,000 and averaged $722,283 for a 2,215 square foot residence. This translated to a value ratio of $326.09 per square foot. A total of 14 units were sold during the October 2015-September 2018 timeframe, reflecting an overall sales rate of 0.4 units per month. Units remaining unsold at the close of the 3rd Quarter 2018 carry an average asking price of $854,000 for a 2,657 square foot unit or $321.42 per square foot. Prior to Beacon Place, only three other conventional for sale developments were introduced in downtown La Grange. These include Beacon Place Condominiums, situated one block north of the subject site which sold out in March 2006. This 78-unit development achieved an overall sales velocity of 1.5 units monthly and carried average sales prices hovering at the $293,400 mark when a full continuum of plan types were available. The 55-unit Spring Avenue Station, also a midrise condominium project situated four blocks west, sold out in 2000 and carried sales prices from the mid-$100,000s to the $450,000 mark. In addition, the 23-unit Kensington Station rowhomes were marketed between August 1996 and December 1999 at prices extending from the mid- to the high $200,000s. As will be detailed later in this report, at Beacon Place and Spring Avenue Station, units re-sold through the brokerage network during the 2016-November 2018 timeframe carried an average sales prices of $313,077 and $298,333, respectively.
Apart from conventional attached for sale projects, the 30-unit *La Grange Pointe* service-enhanced senior independent living development was introduced in 2008. Restricted to residents 62 years of age and older, the one and two bedroom plan styles range in unit size from $640 to 1,257 square feet. At market introduction, entrance fees extended from $157,000 to $283,000 for single occupancy, with monthly services fees extending from $1,900 to $4,875. Monthly service fees include 24-hour emergency call system, weekly housekeeping, scheduled transportation, common area utilities, water/sewer and trash removal, building maintenance and real estate taxes.

In 2017, Opus Development introduced the Uptown La Grange apartments. Located two blocks north of the subject site at Ogden Avenue and La Grange Road, this community consists of 254 luxury rental apartments distributed within a five-story residential building which includes a private parking structure. As of December 2018, average posted base rents at Uptown La Grange stood at $2,138 monthly which includes a 961 square foot apartment home, yielding a value ratio of $2.22 per square foot. An assigned enclosed parking space carries an incremental monthly fee of $125. Uptown La Grange has generated an average absorption rate of 12.2 units per month since occupancies began in mid-May 2017.

The village of La Grange supports an estimated 2018 population base of 15,385 distributed among 5,643 households. The median age of a household in La Grange is 54 years. By age category, 11.6 percent of resident householders are under the age of 35, while 38.0 percent are aged between 35 and 54. Another 39.4 percent align age categories of 55 to 74, while the remaining 11.0 percent are aged 75 and older.

As might be expected, household distributions in La Grange strongly favor ownership status, equal to 80.7 percent of the community’s household base (or 4,555 households). Overall, householders in La Grange are quite affluent, supporting an estimated 2018 median income of $114,062 annually, with 38.0 percent earning at least $150,000 yearly, while some 16.3 percent of resident households earn in excess of $250,000 per annum.

**THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

As conceptualized by DTLG Investments, LLC, the proposed development would consist of 50 condominium units distributed within a five-story residential building to include one level of structured parking. In aggregate, 83 enclosed parking spaces will be provided, including 52 single space, 28 tandem spaces and three (3) guest parking spaces, translating to an overall parking ratio of 1.66 parking spaces per residential unit. This parking ratio is fully consistent with the transit-oriented nature of the proposed development and is viewed as *more than sufficient*. For perspective, among newer, urban-oriented moderate-density multifamily developments the typical parking ratio stands at 1.54 parking spaces per residential unit. The parking garage will also provide a dedicated bicycle storage area and private storage lockers.

A mail/package center, management office, resident lounge and pet spa will be located off the first floor residential lobby. A club room will be situated on the 4th Floor and provide a fitness studio, social area with service kitchen, and a furnished and landscaped terrace with fireside lounge. It is assumed that the La Grange Condominiums will offer quality interior appointments consistent with new construction condominium development throughout the suburban region. Interior unit standards, for example, should include nine-foot ceilings throughout, wood flooring in main living areas and recessed lighting per plan, and kitchens featuring high-end cabinetry and natural stone or quartz countertops which augment stainless steel appliances, including washer and dryer. In addition, baths should have natural stone or porcelain flooring.
and shower surrounds, separate tubs and shower with frameless glass doors, and stone or quartz countertops with porcelain under-mount sinks. It is expected that some level of Smart-Home technology will also be provided.

Utilizing energy-efficient construction technologies, La Grange Condominiums will feature architectural design aesthetics complimentary to its downtown environs. As summarized in the following text table, residential design concepts include a variety of two, two bedroom plus den, three and three bedroom plus den plan styles which range in unit size from 1,125 to 2,291 square feet. Overall, the conceptualized development will provide 78,676 net saleable square feet, with the average residence containing 1,574 square feet of living area, exclusive of balcony or terrace.

PROPOSED PRODUCT MIX: LA GRANGE CONDOMINIUMS
-- LA GRANGE, ILLINOIS --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Designation</th>
<th>Plan Type</th>
<th>Total Number of Units</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Bedroom/ Bath Mix</th>
<th>Plan Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Net Saleable Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan B1 (2)</td>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2 / 2.0</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>5,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan B2</td>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2 / 2.0</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan B3 (2)</td>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2 / 2.0</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>5,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan B4</td>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2 + Den / 2.0</td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>16,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan B5 (2)</td>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2 / 2.0</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>2,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan C1 (2)</td>
<td>3 BR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3 / 2.0</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>6,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan C2 (2)</td>
<td>3 BR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3 / 2.0</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>6,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan C3</td>
<td>3 BR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3 + Den / 2.0</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>7,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan C4</td>
<td>3 BR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3 + Den / 2.5</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>18,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total/Average: --- | 50 | 100.0 | --- | 1,574 | 78,676

(1) Excludes balcony or terrace.
(2) Indicates a corner-unit.

Source: DTLG Investments, LLC Concept Schematic dated 12/7/2018.

Pre-construction marketing of the development is expected to commence in late-2019 in anticipation of initial deliveries beginning in 2021.
A BENCHMARK SALES STRATEGY

Based upon a thorough analysis of defining factors of influence, the conceptualized La Grange Condominiums is viewed as a viable development opportunity providing that a competitive sales price strategy is maintained. The property is within walking distance of shopping, dining, entertainment and METRA, and proximate to significant sources of employment, health care and regional transportation systems. Moreover, there is adequate demand for new construction lifestyle multifamily for sale housing in La Grange and its near west/southwest suburban environs based upon sales trends in the localized area, while the proposed development will encounter limited direct competition.

In establishing benchmark sales prices for the proposed La Grange Condominiums, our firm considered not only the locational enhancements of the property itself, but also the sustaining depth of profile homebuyer consumer segments which could be attracted to the proposed development. As detailed in later sections of this report, a thorough analysis of age, income, household composition and lifestyle factors reveals that there is sufficient demand for attached for sale housing forms which appeal primarily (although not exclusively) to mature, move-down consumer segments.

Applying these factors to the La Grange development, Exhibit 1 outlines a benchmark sales strategy for the proposed 50-unit development inclusive of floor, terrace and corner-unit premiums. As shown, benchmark sales prices, which are presented in 2018 dollars, extend from $302,400 to $649,000 and average $440,156 which includes a 1,574 square foot residence. This translates to an overall value ratio of $279.64 per square foot. One (1) assigned, enclosed parking space is included in the base sales price. Benchmark sales prices assume a high level of interior appointments and finishes as previously defined, but do not include options, upgrades, or various elements of customization.

As also outlined in Exhibit 1, the prototype 50-unit development would carry an estimated average closing price of $470,970 or $299.22 per square foot. Benchmark estimated closing prices, which are presented in current 2018 dollars, include a 7.0 percent estimate for options, upgrades, and various elements of customization.

At benchmark sales prices, the La Grange Condominiums will generate 1.04 sales per month, enabling the 50-unit prototype development to reach sell-out within a 48.2-month marketing period from start of construction. This expected marketing period assumes extensive pre-construction marketing commence with site improvements. Marketing efforts must include a dedicated outreach program, a staffed on-site sales team, and at least one (1) decorated model. Specifically, it is expected that pre-sales will begin eight (8) to nine (9) months prior to construction start, with 16 units reserved. During this pre-sale time period, however, cancellations will likely result in a net twelve (12) reservations converting to contract during the initial six months of construction. Thereafter, net sales will average 0.9 per month translating to the overall projected sales velocity of 1.04 units per month to sell-out.

It must be reiterated that sales volumes will be highly sensitive to upward and even downward movements in price, as well as economic conditions regionally. For purposes of financial modeling, the following text table provides a forecast of likely sales based upon a variety of alternative pricing strategies. As outlined, for example, a $30,000 reduction in the benchmark sales prices would shorten the overall marketing period to within 32 months.
## Development Summary

**Product:**
Moderate Density, Luxury Condominiums  
Configured Over Structured Parking

**Total Units:**
50

**Total Enclosed Parking Spaces:**
83

**Average Benchmark Base Sales Price**\(^{(1)}\):  
$424,594 @ 1,574 Sq. Ft.

**Average Estimated Closing Sales Price**\(^{(2,3)}\):  
$470,970 @ 1,574 Sq. Ft.

**Average Monthly Absorption (in Units):**
1.04

**Marketing Life (in Months):**
48.2

## Plan Detail

| Plan Designation | Number of Units | Percent Distribution | Bedrooms/ Baths | Plan Size (Sq. Ft.) | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 4th | Average |
|------------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|
| Plan B2          | 8              | 16.0                 | 2 / 2.0         | 1,125              | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | $302,400 | $312,400 | $322,400 | $337,400 | $318,650 |
| Plan B1\(^{(3)}\) | 4              | 8.0                  | 2 / 2.0         | 1,272              | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 349,400 | 359,400 | 369,400 | 384,400 | 365,650 |
| Plan B3\(^{(3)}\) | 4              | 8.0                  | 2 / 2.0         | 1,372              | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 376,000 | 386,000 | 396,000 | 411,000 | 392,250 |
| Plan B4          | 12             | 24.0                 | 2+Den / 2.0     | 1,391              | 3   | 3   | 3   | 3   | 369,500 | 379,500 | 389,500 | 404,500 | 385,750 |
| Plan B5\(^{(3)}\) | 2              | 4.0                  | 2 / 2.0         | 1,482              | --- | 1   | 1   | --- | ---  | 412,900 | 422,900 | ---  | 417,900 |
| Plan C1\(^{(3)}\) | 4              | 8.0                  | 3 / 2.0         | 1,581              | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 434,500 | 444,500 | 454,500 | 469,500 | 450,750 |
| Plan C2\(^{(3)}\) | 4              | 8.0                  | 3 / 2.0         | 1,704              | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 460,900 | 470,900 | 480,900 | 495,900 | 477,150 |
| Plan C3          | 4              | 8.0                  | 3+Den / 2.0     | 1,994              | 1   | 1   | 1   | 1   | 535,900 | 545,900 | 555,900 | 570,900 | 552,150 |
| Plan C4          | 8              | 16.0                 | 3+Den / 2.5     | 2,291              | 2   | 2   | 2   | 2   | 614,000 | 624,000 | 634,000 | 649,000 | 630,250 |
| **Total/Wtd. Avg.** | **50**        | **100.0**            | ---             | **1,574**          | **12** | **13** | **13** | **12** | **$424,833** | **$433,146** | **$443,146** | **$459,833** | **$440,156** |

\(^{(1)}\) The average benchmark base sales price, which is presented in current dollars, reflects first floor (base) units. They include one (1) enclosed, assigned parking space per residence, corner-unit premiums and terrace condition (as appropriate), but do not include options, upgrades, or other premiums.

\(^{(2)}\) The average estimated closing price, which is presented in current dollars, includes floor, corner-unit, and first floor terrace premiums, and assumes a 7.0 percent increase from base sales prices for options, upgrades and some measure of customization. On a first-come basis, an additional enclosed parking space can command an incremental sales price of $25,000 which is not included in the estimated closing prices.

\(^{(3)}\) Reflects a corner-unit condition.

Source: Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.
SALES FORECASTS AT VARYING PRICE POINTS: LA GRANGE CONDOMINIUMS
-- A 50-UNIT DEVELOPMENT --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Benchmark Base Sales Price</th>
<th>Variance From Benchmark Prices</th>
<th>Average Monthly Sales Rates</th>
<th>Total Marketing Life in Months</th>
<th>Average Monthly Sales Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$484,994</td>
<td>+60,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>219.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449,994</td>
<td>+45,000</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>153.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454,994</td>
<td>+30,000</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>103.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439,994</td>
<td>+15,000</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424,994</td>
<td>+0 -</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409,994</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394,994</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379,994</td>
<td>-45,000</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364,994</td>
<td>-60,000</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.

The benchmark pricing structure and sales forecasts can be tied to a number of factors. These include: 1) expectations of household growth in the La Grange Market Area near term; 2) socio-economic characteristics of resident households in La Grange and its near west/southwest suburban environs and their outlook for growth; and 3) trends in residential sales activity in both the existing and new construction single family and attached markets locally. The following paragraphs summarize pertinent market dynamics which inform our benchmark sales strategy:

MARKET SUPPORT

From an overall perspective, the geographic area from which residential demand support for moderate-density condominium redevelopment of the 112 East Burlington property will emanate consists of a five-township area that includes Lyons, Lemont, Palos and Riverside in west/southwest Cook County together with Downers Grove in southeastern DuPage County, generally extending south from Cermak Road/22nd Street to 135th Street and west from Route 43/Harlem Avenue to Interstate 355, and defined as the La Grange Market Area. Within this geographic quadrant, however, primary demand will likely emanate from La Grange itself and the adjoining villages of Burr Ridge, Clarendon Hills, Downers Grove, Hinsdale, Indian Head Park and Western Springs.

Source: Microsoft Streets & Trips and Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.
First and foremost, benchmark base prices expected for the La Grange Condominiums, which (again) extend from $302,400 to $649,000 are in direct concert with resale single family home values in La Grange and its surrounding environs. As summarized in Exhibit 2, for example, single family homes sold in La Grange through the brokerage network in during the 2013-November 2018 period carried sales prices which averaged $527,397, with the median sales price standing at $484,500. During the 2013-November 2018 timeframe, an average of 191 homes were sold annually in La Grange. Also, as detailed in Exhibit 2, homes values in La Grange are generally consistent with values noted elsewhere in the localized area, where the average price of home sold during the six-year period stood at $645,855. However, it must be noted that La Grange represented less than 20.0 percent of all single family closing activity in the selected municipalities during the six-year period, reinforcing the importance of drawing potential homebuyers from throughout the overall area.

On a cautionary note, the average asking price in La Grange and its immediate environs has advanced significantly over the last 23 months (2017-November 2018), with the average price of a home sold in La Grange most recently standing at $559,422, up a strong 9.4 percent from the $511,384 average noted during the previous four years. However, as illustrated in the following text table, the marketing time required to sell a home has also begun to advance to not less than 225 days (on average) or 7.5 months. Representing the principal source of demand for the La Grange Condominiums, the more mature purchaser vacating a single family home in the local area will typically move down or, at best, laterally in price, with the benchmark sales strategy for the prototype community shadowing this market where closings priced between $350,000 and $599,999 accounted for 44.7 percent of all closings in La Grange itself (or 180 units) and 35.1 percent of all sales activity in the larger area, consistent with the benchmark sales strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price Range</th>
<th>Select Communities(1)</th>
<th>Village of La Grange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Closings(2)</td>
<td>Total Listings(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $350,000</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350,000 - 399,999</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400,000 - 449,999</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450,000 - 499,999</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 - 599,999</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600,000 - 699,999</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700,000 - 899,999</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900,000 - 999,999</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000 and Over</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total: 3,221</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Price</td>
<td>$864,955</td>
<td>$980,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Price</td>
<td>$555,347</td>
<td>$754,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Days on Market</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>(4.2 Months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes Burr Ridge, Clarendon Hills, Downers Grove, Hinsdale, Indian Head Park, La Grange and Western Springs.
(2) As of November 2018.

Source: Midwest Real Estate Data, LLC and Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.
### SINGLE FAMILY CLOSINGS BY PRICE RANGE: SELECTED YEARS

**-- SELECT COMMUNITIES\(^{(1)}\) AND THE VILLAGE OF LA GRANGE --**

#### Closings by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price Range</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select Communities</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $350,000</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350,000 - 399,999</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400,000 - 449,999</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450,000 - 499,999</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 - 599,999</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600,000 - 699,999</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700,000 - 899,999</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900,000 - 999,999</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000 - 1,999,999</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000,000 - 2,999,999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000,000 and Over</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1,634 (180) 11.1 1,420 (162) 11.4 1,519 (201) 13.2

Average Price: $622,317 ------ $474,301 ------ $627,933 ------ $526,063 ------ $649,308 ------ $538,245 ------ $532,165 ------ $490,000 ------ $115 ------ $88

### Closings by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price Range</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>YTD NOVEMBER 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select Communities</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $350,000</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350,000 - 399,999</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400,000 - 449,999</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450,000 - 499,999</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 - 599,999</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600,000 - 699,999</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700,000 - 899,999</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900,000 - 999,999</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000 - 1,999,999</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000,000 - 2,999,999</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000,000 and Over</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 1,926 (200) 12.3 1,088 (206) 12.1 932 (1,523) 163.4

Average Price: $646,712 ------ $506,926 ------ $655,387 ------ $559,367 ------ $806,441 ------ $644,481 ------ $666,000 ------ $556,803 ------ $142 ------ $124

---

\(^{(1)}\) Includes Burr Ridge, Clarendon Hills, Downers Grove, Hinsdale, Indian Head Park, La Grange and Western Springs.

Source: Midwest Real Estate Data, LLC and Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.
For added perspective, Appendix A2 details attached closing activity in the localized La Grange area over the 2013-November 2018 timeframe. As shown, sales prices in this housing subset have averaged $231,000 over the last six years, reflecting in large part a significant inventory of pre-1990 townhome, duplex and/or lower-density condominium housing stock. Notably, during the more recent 2017-November 2018 period, the average price of an attached unit in the localized area stood at $251,150, up a sharp 13.7 percent compared to values noted during the previous four years.

The proposed La Grange Condominiums will enter the market at a time of tangible yet reserved economic conditions. As illustrated in the adjacent graphic and detailed in Appendices A5 and A6, while the Chicago metropolitan region has generally mirrored national employment trends, the pace of regional employment growth, while still positive, began to slow in 2016 and continued to soften through 2017, averaging payroll additions of 50,250 workers yearly during the 2016-2017 timeframe, and reflecting an annual growth rate of 1.0 percent. This compares with national employment growth averaging 1.6 percent annually during the 2015-2017 timeframe. Employment gains have continued to moderate during the first ten months of 2018, as evidenced by the year-over-year addition of 34,400 jobs region-wide or a growth rate of 0.8 percent. Employment gains during the 2018-2023 forecast period are expected to continue their moderate upward trajectory and average 1.1 percent advances annually. While the projected rate of employment growth may not directly influence profile mature market area householders purchasing decisions, the combined impact of regional employment trends and rising interest rates will impact upon existing home sale prices and overall marketing time, as already noted in softening home values and extended selling periods throughout the market area. These recent trends add perspective to the benchmark sales strategy.

---

**TRENDS IN NONFARM EMPLOYMENT**

-- CHICAGO METROPOLITAN AREA AND THE U.S. --

![Graph showing year-over-year change in employment](image)

- **U.S.**
- **Chicago Metropolitan Area**

(1) YTD October.
Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
There is adequate residential demand for new construction multifamily for sale development in the La Grange Market Area. Specifically, new for sale housing construction in the La Grange Market Area will average 500 units yearly during the 2018-2023 forecast period. For sale demand potentials will be distributed between 375 units yearly in the single family detached forms and 125 attached for sale idioms yearly. Over the projected 42.8-month marketing life, the proposed development is expected to account for 9.6 percent of total new attached for sale demand, an overall market capture rate that should be considered attainable given the generally built-out nature of the La Grange Market Area as a whole, with future development likely reflecting moderate-scale redevelopment initiatives similar to the La Grange property.

The residential demand forecast for the La Grange Market Area can be reconciled against construction trends witnessed over the last several years. As detailed in Appendix A2 and graphically illustrated below, single family construction volumes (which include single address townhomes and duplexes) in the market area as a whole have averaged 826 units annually since 1990. The strongest periods of new residential construction in the market area occurred during the 1996-2005 timeframe when volumes averaged 1,166 units yearly. Contributing to this period of activity were exuberant single family and attached for sale housing development fostered by relatively low interest rates, shifts in renter to ownership tenure and, as we now know, extremely lax lending practices during the 2003-2005 housing boom. New single family construction slowed thereafter, falling to a low of 145 units in 2009, a period heavily influenced by the impact of the Great Recession and employment losses in the Chicago area which totaled 291,500 during the 2008-2010 timeframe. Residential permit activity began to improve in 2012 with 277 units authorized and showed relatively steady improvement during the 2013-2017 period, averaging 442 units yearly. Single family authorizations advanced modestly through the first ten months of 2018, equating to an annualized 499 units, thus placing the 500-unit annual for sale demand forecast in perspective.

**SINGLE FAMILY PERMIT TRENDS: LA GRANGE MARKET AREA**

![Graph showing single family permit trends in La Grange Market Area](image)

*(1) Annualized estimate
Multifamily authorizations in the five-township area have averaged 221 yearly since 1990. However, as illustrated in the adjacent graphic and also detailed in Appendix A2, market area multifamily construction has been highly cyclical. For example, between 2001 and 2006, an average of 495 units were issued yearly, recording a peak level of 1,180 units in 2001, reflecting spurious condominium for sale development during the six-year period concentrated in the downtown districts of the market area's constituent rail line communities. These include, of course, Beacon Place and Spring Avenue Station in La Grange; four separate projects within the Burr Ridge Village Center; Park Avenue Station in Clarendon Hills; Acadia on the Green, 4929 Forest, Morningside Square, and Station Crossing in Downers Grove; and The Hamptons-Abbeys in Hinsdale. Thereafter, multifamily authorizations began to slide precipitously, averaging a nominal 55 units yearly between 2008 and 2014. During the more recent 2015-2017 timeframe, multifamily authorizations advanced to an annual average of 134 units and reaching the 236-unit mark 2017. Multifamily authorizations during this more recent period reflect authorization of several rental apartment developments such as the aforementioned Uptown La Grange, along with Burlington Station and Maple & Main in downtown Downers Grove, along with a modicum of condominium for sale development including 40 South Ashland in La Grange, Clocktower Pointe in Countryside, Foxford Station in Western Springs and The Marquis on Maple in Downers Grove. Nonetheless, despite accelerated construction of late, the La Grange Market Area has accounted for a nominal 5.0 percent of all multifamily construction in the whole of suburban Chicago since 1980.

**MULTIFAMILY PERMIT TRENDS: LA GRANGE MARKET AREA**

![Graph showing multifamily permit trends in La Grange Market Area.](image)

(1) Annualized estimate
Additional factors contributing to the demand for lifestyle single family development within the Burlington Avenue property include age and income characteristics of householders in the La Grange Market Area as a whole and (especially) in La Grange itself. As highlighted in the adjacent text table, more than one-half of households in the market area as a whole, and in La Grange proper, maintain a household size of two persons or less. With the typical condominium buyer consisting primarily of more mature singles and couples, i.e. empty-nesters, along with a modicum of younger singles, couples and non-traditional households with or without children, the current composition of area households lends support to new condominium development within the Burlington Avenue property.

### HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION: 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>La Grange Market Area</th>
<th>Village of La Grange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>149,654</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Person Household</td>
<td>40,700</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Person Household</td>
<td>48,780</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Person Household</td>
<td>24,334</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Person Household</td>
<td>21,540</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Person Household</td>
<td>10,588</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Person Household</td>
<td>3,871</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or More Person Household</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 1- and 2-Person Households</td>
<td>87,480</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census: Census 2010; and Environics Analytics.

As summarized in the following text table and detailed in Appendices A3 and A4, there are currently more than 25,000 households in the five-township La Grange Market Area aged between 55 and 74 who earn $100,000 or more on an annual basis, with this higher-income age cohort representing the target profile for lifestyle condominium development within the Burlington Avenue property.
Residential Market Analysis  
Village of La Grange  
La Grange Condominiums  
La Grange, Illinois

HOUSEHOLD AGE AND INCOME CHARACTERISTICS: 2018  
-- LA GRANGE MARKET AREA --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>La Grange Market Area</th>
<th>Village of La Grange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>149,644</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$81,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25 Years</td>
<td>3,165</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>45,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34 Years</td>
<td>16,282</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>73,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44 Years</td>
<td>22,551</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>99,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54 Years</td>
<td>28,634</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>109,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64 Years</td>
<td>34,103</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>101,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 74 Years</td>
<td>24,948</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>67,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 84 Years</td>
<td>13,270</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>44,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 Years and Over</td>
<td>5,691</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>32,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households Under 35 Years</td>
<td>19,467</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>$68,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Incomes of $100,000 or More</td>
<td>5,929</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households Aged 55 to 74 Years</td>
<td>59,061</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>$87,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Incomes of $100,000 or More</td>
<td>25,522</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Environics Analytics and Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.

Despite the aging of the general population, householders in their maturing lifecycle move infrequently. In fact, most householders in age categories of 55 and older are completely satisfied with their current residence, with less than 6.0 percent moving on an annual basis, while less than 5.0 percent of those aged 75 and older move each year. Moreover, for the age-qualified households that do move, a number of options are available, including: 1) migration out-of-state or out of the immediate area; 2) into an existing home or condominium; 3) into alternative for sale product found in the new construction sector of the market, including products that are deed-restricted on the basis of age, as well as those that have been designed with a directed, not restricted, appeal to mature consumers (i.e. the La Grange Condominiums); and 4) into some form of rental housing, be it conventional, age-restricted or service-enhanced congregate forms. Hence, since most seniors prefer to age in-place, the market for age-targeted/restricted for sale housing in the La Grange Market Area can be viewed as only so large. Applying mobility, tenure and lifestyle factors to the base of higher-income age-qualifying households (i.e. those earning $100,000 or more per annum) reveals that the La Grange Market Area in its entirety is capable of absorbing 355 new age-targeted multifamily for sale units annually during the 2018-2023 forecast period. The projected sales volume of 12.5 units annually reflects a reasonable and fair 3.5 percent market capture share of this refined household base. Modest upside potential to overall demand levels is acknowledged given likely strong equity positions of resident mature homeowners in the market area which have not been factored in the demand equation.

In this regard, Exhibit 3 outlines recent resale statistics focusing upon twelve newer construction midrise condominium developments built in 2000 or later in La Grange and its neighboring near west/southwest suburban area. As shown, a total of 224 units have been resold during the 2016-November 2018 timeframe, with the average unit on market 139.8 days or 4.7 months. The average price of a unit sold over the last 35 months stood at $346,712 which included a 1,441 square foot residence, yielding a value ratio of $240.61 per square foot. For the most part, and similar to the proposed La Grange Condominiums, these newer developments represent transit-oriented midrise condominium alternatives located in the downtown districts of their respective communities within walking distance shopping, dining and an abundance of daily consumer needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality/Development</th>
<th>Original Marketing Timeframe</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>At Market Introduction</th>
<th>Resale Closings (January 2016-November 2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Base Sales Price</td>
<td>Average Plan Size (Sq. Ft.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Ridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$428,300</td>
<td>1,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center-850 Bldg.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center-Lofts 450 Bldg.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>400,400</td>
<td>1,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center-Lux 801 Bldg.</td>
<td>2007-2013</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>431,233</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Center-Est 1000 Bldg.</td>
<td>2007-2014</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>902,967</td>
<td>2,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Avenue Station</td>
<td>1999-2008</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>252,006</td>
<td>1,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downers Grove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Crossing</td>
<td>2002-2004</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>309,073</td>
<td>1,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningside Square</td>
<td>2000-2002</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>272,067</td>
<td>1,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4929 Forest</td>
<td>2005-2014</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>459,986</td>
<td>1,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acadia on the Green</td>
<td>2005-2012</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>335,257</td>
<td>1,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinsdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hamptons-Abbeys</td>
<td>2011-2017</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>441,111</td>
<td>1,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Grange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Place</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>293,536</td>
<td>1,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Avenue Station</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>289,121</td>
<td>1,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total/Average:</strong></td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>760</td>
<td><strong>$401,921</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,607</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.
The exceptions are The Hamptons of Hinsdale, a planned enclave development located in south central Hinsdale off 58th Street and Grant Avenue, and the Burr Ridge Village Center projects which, while not transit-oriented, are within walking distance of a variety of shopping, dining, and entertainment venues which anchor the mixed-use Burr Ridge Village Center master development. As illustrated in Exhibits 4 and 5, the benchmark base pricing strategy suggested for the La Grange Condominiums appropriately positions the proposed development roughly $48,000 higher for comparable footage than newer resale alternatives in the localized area overall, and a significant $76,270 above Beacon Place and Spring Avenue Station in La Grange itself. In whole dollars, at the suggested benchmark base sales prices, La Grange Condominiums will be positioned at the very high end of this competitive subset, with the forecasted absorption of 1.04 units monthly (or double the 0.5 monthly average resale pace) reflecting the enhancement of contemporary construction efficiencies, and factoring high quality interior appointments, some level of SmartHome technologies and other lifestyle amenities.

The benchmark pricing structure forward for the La Grange Condominiums and the overall projected rate of absorption also fully consider sales trends in the new construction sector of the market in the suburban area as a whole, and in the near west/southwest suburban area in particular. As has been well documented, the Chicago region's for sale housing sector has struggled to gain traction since the implosion of the housing market and the subsequent national recession beginning in 2007. For example, during the 2003-2007 timeframe, the region as a whole averaged 11,917 new construction single family sales annually. Comparatively, regional single family volumes during the more recent 2013-2017 period averaged 2,325 units yearly, a level 80.5 percent below the previous peak selling period. On a seasonally adjusted and annualized basis, single family sales levels remain compressed, equating to 2,405 homes sold region-wide through the first three quarters of 2018.

**QUARTERLY SALES TRENDS**
**SEASONALLY ADJUSTED, ANNUALIZED RATE**
**CHICAGO METROPOLITAN AREA**

Note: DeKalb County, IL, and Kenosha County, WI included starting 2nd Quarter 2003.
Source: Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.
Price/Value Analysis
Condominium Closings: Developments Built in 2000 or Later
Select Near West/Southwest Suburbs
2016 - November 2018

Program (Average Days on Market)
- Park Avenue Station (125.0)
- Burr Ridge Village Center-Estate 1000 Bldg (23.0)
- Burr Ridge Village Center-Luxury 801 Bldg (57.0)
- Burr Ridge Village Center-Condos 850 Bldg (191.0)
- Morningside Square (201.0)
- Spring Avenue Station (16.0)
- 4929 Forest (7.0)
- Station Crossing (242.0)
- Beacon Place Condominiums (28.0)
- Burr Ridge Village Center-Lofts 450 Bldg (646.0)
- Acadia on the Green (30.0)
- La Grange Condominiums

Price/value analysis uses a scatter diagram to graphically represent a set of observations found in today's marketplace, specifically the square footage of models offered and their associated sales prices. Regression analysis is then used to fit a line through the set of market observations that represent the "best fit" or average market line. This market line can then be used to predict the performance of a new, untested product line or offer explanations regarding the sales rate of currently available product lines.

Source: Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.
## Price/Value Analysis

Condominium Closings: Developments Built in 2000 or Later
Select Near West/Southwest Suburbs
2016-November 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Size (Sq. Ft)</th>
<th>Average Market Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>$180,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>202,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>225,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>247,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>270,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>252,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>315,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>337,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>359,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>382,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>404,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>427,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>449,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>472,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>494,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>517,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>539,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>562,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>584,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>607,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>629,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>652,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>674,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>697,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>719,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>742,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development/Location</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Total Closings</th>
<th>Average Plan Size (Sq. Ft)</th>
<th>Average Base Sales Price Dollars</th>
<th>Price Per Sq. Ft</th>
<th>Average Market Price</th>
<th>Price Variance From Market</th>
<th>Average Days on Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hamptons/Hinsdale</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,801</td>
<td>$520,618</td>
<td>$289.07</td>
<td>$427,676</td>
<td>$+92,942</td>
<td>112.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Ridge Village Center-850 Bldg/Burr Ridge</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>423,400</td>
<td>272.81</td>
<td>371,676</td>
<td>$+51,724</td>
<td>191.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Grange Condominiums-Bnmk Base Sales Price</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>424,594</td>
<td>268.75</td>
<td>378,824</td>
<td>$+47,970</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Ridge Vlg Ctr-Estate 1000 Bldg/Burr Ridge</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>466,406</td>
<td>258.83</td>
<td>427,901</td>
<td>$+38,505</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acadia on the Green/Downer Grove</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>344,153</td>
<td>266.17</td>
<td>313,427</td>
<td>$+30,726</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Ridge Village Center-Lofts 450 Bldg/Burr Ridge</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>348,350</td>
<td>254.27</td>
<td>330,744</td>
<td>$+17,606</td>
<td>646.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Total Closings</th>
<th>Average Plan Size (Sq. Ft)</th>
<th>Average Base Sales Price Dollars</th>
<th>Price Per Sq. Ft</th>
<th>Average Market Price</th>
<th>Price Variance From Market</th>
<th>Average Days on Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>224 / 19</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>346,712</td>
<td>240.61</td>
<td>346,712</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>139.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Burr Ridge Vlg Ctr-Luxury 801 Bldg/Burr Ridge | 2008 | 4 | 1,517 | 358,875 | 236.57 | 363,804 | $-4,929 | 57.0 |
- Spring Avenue Station/La Grange | 2001 | 6 | 1,281 | 298,333 | 232.89 | 310,728 | $-12,395 | 16.0 |
- 4929 Forest/Downer Grove | 2005 | 9 | 1,775 | 394,544 | 222.28 | 421,829 | $-27,285 | 7.0 |
- Beacon Place Condominiums/La Grange | 2001 | 13 | 1,488 | 313,077 | 210.40 | 357,282 | $-44,205 | 28.0 |
- Morningside Square/Downer Grove | 2001 | 7 | 1,507 | 300,714 | 199.54 | 361,555 | $-60,841 | 201.0 |
- Station Crossing/Downer Grove | 2003 | 14 | 1,639 | 315,929 | 192.77 | 391,210 | $-75,281 | 242.0 |
- Park Avenue Station/Clarendon Hills | 2001 | 16 | 1,285 | 227,556 | 179.89 | 307,130 | $-79,574 | 125.0 |

Slope: $224.90 per sq. ft

(1) Development not included in derivation of market line.

Source: Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.
As shown in the following text table, similar trends are noted in the suburban condominium housing sector, where sales volumes during the 2013-2017 timeframe averaged 111 sales yearly, down a dramatic 94.1 percent compared to the 1,878-unit annual average noted during the 2003-2007 timeframe. As this table also reveals, over the last nearly six years, per project sales in the suburban condominium sector overall have averaged 7.58 annually (or 0.6 units per month), with the higher projected sales velocities for the Burlington Avenue property in line with recent sales trends in the marketplace when the property’s location and relatively limited localized competitive alternatives are factored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Active Developments</th>
<th>Total Sales</th>
<th>Average Sales Per Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>21.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>1,391</td>
<td>21.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>29.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>26.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>2,273</td>
<td>24.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>22.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>17.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>119.6</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Calculated on the basis of the number of days an individual development was actively marketing during the year.
(2) Seasonally adjusted, annual rate YTD October.

Source: Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.

The benchmark sales strategy, in fact, also considers that the La Grange Condominiums will face limited levels of direct competition. As outlined in Exhibit 6, at the close of the 3rd Quarter 2018, there were only nine moderate-density condominium developments active in the whole of the suburban region. Of these, four developments are found within the more localized near west/southwest suburban area, namely 40 South Ashland in La Grange, The Marquis on Maple in Downers Grove, Foxford Station in Western Springs and District House in Oak Park. The remaining five projects are all located some 12- to nearly 30.0-miles north, northwest or west. Overall, the average the new construction condominium development carries a base sales price of $657,163 which includes a 1,967 square foot unit, yielding a value ratio of $334.09 per square foot. Excluding River Lofts of St. Charles which began pre-construction marketing in 2018, on a since opening basis, the average new construction condominium has generated 0.5 sales per month, with sales volumes during the January-September 2018 period reflecting a seasonally adjusted and annualized 4.00 sales per project, or 0.33 sales monthly. In total, 109 of the 233 new condominium units have been sold.
## COMPOSITE SALES SUMMARY: NEW CONSTRUCTION CONDOMINIUM DEVELOPMENTS
--- SUBURBAN CHICAGO ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location/Development</th>
<th>Opening Date</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Average Plan Size (Sq. Ft.)</th>
<th>Average Sales Price</th>
<th>Total Sold</th>
<th>Average Monthly Since Opening</th>
<th>Sales YTD 3Q2018</th>
<th>Seasonally Adjusted/ Annualized YTD 3Q2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total/Average:</strong></td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>$657,163</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barrington</strong></td>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>Great Haven Builders</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>536,243</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407 East Main</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downers Grove</strong></td>
<td>December 2015</td>
<td>Roman Properties, LLC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>437,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highland Park</strong></td>
<td>May 2016</td>
<td>Fulton Developers, Inc.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>597,850</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Residences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>La Grange</strong></td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Ashland Homes, LLC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>854,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 South Ashland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lake Forest</strong></td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>Focus Development</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>775,500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelmscott Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oak Park</strong></td>
<td>August 2016</td>
<td>Ranquist Development</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>664,900</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Park Ridge</strong></td>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>400 West Talcott, LLC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>499,900</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. Charles</strong></td>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>First Street Development</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>679,059</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Lofts of St. Charles(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Springs</strong></td>
<td>March 2017</td>
<td>Foxford Development</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>775,450</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxford Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Sales represent pre-construction marketing. Units are sold in "shell" condition; average sales prices includes estimated finish costs ranging from $184,250 to $356,400.

Source: Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.
Finally, Exhibits 7 and 8, illustrate that the suggested benchmark sales prices appropriately position the conceptualized La Grange Condominiums, in both whole dollars and for comparable footage, to achieve a sales velocity that is double that of competitive new construction alternatives both locally and throughout the suburban region. For example, in whole dollars, the La Grange Condominiums will represent one of the strongest values in the marketplace, priced on par with units remaining to be sold at The Marquis on Maple which is currently generating an average sales rate of 7.66 or 0.6 sales per month. In both whole dollars, and for comparable footage, the benchmark sales strategy also positions the La Grange Condominiums well below units remaining to be sold at 40 South Ashland and Foxford Station which are currently generating sales rates of less than three sales annually. Collectively, the 59 units remaining to be sold among these three most proximate new construction competitors translates to an overall remaining marketing life of roughly 5.0 years, and place the proposed benchmark pricing strategy in perspective.
Price/Value Analysis
Midrise Condominium Developments
Suburban Chicago Region
3rd Quarter 2018

Program (Sales Per Month Since Opening)

- 407 East Main (0.1)
- The Marquis on Maple (0.5)
- Laurel Residences (0.5)
- 40 South Ashland (0.4)
- Kelmscott Park-Condos (0.3)
- District House (1.0)
- Fairview Station (0.3)
- River Lots of St. Charles (2.2)
- Foxford Station (0.5)
- La Grange Condominiums
- Market Line

Price/Value analysis uses a scatter diagram to graphically represent a set of observations found in today's marketplace, specifically the square footage of models offered and their associated sales prices. Regression analysis is then used to fit a line through the set of market observations that represent the "best fit" or average market line. This market line can then be used to predict the performance of a new, untested product line or offer explanations regarding the sales rate of currently available product lines.

Source: Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.
## Price/Value Analysis
### Midrise Condominium Developments
#### Suburban Chicago Region
#### 3rd Quarter 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Location (Builder)</th>
<th>Average Plan Size (Sq. Ft)</th>
<th>Average Base Sales Price</th>
<th>Average Market Price</th>
<th>Price Variance From Market</th>
<th>Seasonally Adjusted Annualized Rate</th>
<th>Average Monthly Sales Rate Since Opening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelmscott Park-Condos/Lake Forest (Focus Development)</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>$775,500</td>
<td>$393.06</td>
<td>$659,033</td>
<td>$+116,467</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District House/Oak Park (Ranquist Development)</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>664,900</td>
<td>371.66</td>
<td>601,704</td>
<td>+63,196</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407 East Main/Barrington (Great Haven Builders)</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>536,243</td>
<td>372.39</td>
<td>492,666</td>
<td>+43,277</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel Residences/Highland Park (Fulton Developers Inc.)</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>597,850</td>
<td>364.32</td>
<td>555,591</td>
<td>+42,259</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxford Station/Western Springs (Foxford Development)</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>775,450</td>
<td>344.27</td>
<td>746,102</td>
<td>+29,348</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Size (Sq. Ft)</th>
<th>Average Plan Size (Sq. Ft)</th>
<th>Average Base Sales Price</th>
<th>Average Market Price</th>
<th>Price Variance From Market</th>
<th>Seasonally Adjusted Annualized Rate</th>
<th>Average Monthly Sales Rate Since Opening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>854,000</td>
<td>321.42</td>
<td>872,146</td>
<td>-18,146</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>679,059</td>
<td>298.82</td>
<td>752,815</td>
<td>-73,756</td>
<td>24.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>437,000</td>
<td>287.50</td>
<td>517,400</td>
<td>-80,891</td>
<td>7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>1,574</td>
<td>424,594</td>
<td>269.75</td>
<td>534,716</td>
<td>-110,122</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>499,900</td>
<td>249.95</td>
<td>667,445</td>
<td>-167,545</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>321,200</td>
<td>193.49</td>
<td>561,511</td>
<td>-240,311</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>359,900</td>
<td>182.51</td>
<td>658,721</td>
<td>-298,821</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Development not included in derivation of market line. Introduced in 2015; was to consist of four (4) 18-unit buildings (72 units). Building 4 (18 units) sold as condominiums; Building 3 marketed as apartments to be converted to condominium at some later date. Buildings 1 and 2 cancelled.

(2) Development not included in derivation of market line. Introduced in 2006 as 54-unit development; 47 units sold 2006-2017, seven (7) units converted to rentals.

(3) Sales rate reflects initial pre-construction reservations; excluded from market average statistics.

Source: Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.
## ATTACHED CLOSINGS BY PRICE RANGE: SELECTED YEARS
-- SELECT COMMUNITIES(1) AND THE VILLAGE OF LA GRANGE --

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price Range</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Total</td>
<td>Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Total</td>
<td>Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $150,000</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000 - 199,999</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 - 249,999</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000 - 299,999</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000 - 349,999</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350,000 - 399,999</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400,000 - 449,999</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450,000 - 499,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 and Over</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>703</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Price</strong></td>
<td>$203,019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$215,269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$236,049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Price</strong></td>
<td>$179,164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$176,585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$191,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Days on Market</strong></td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2016 - 2017 - YTD NOVEMBER 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price Range</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>YTD NOVEMBER 2018</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Select</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Total</td>
<td>Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Total</td>
<td>Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $150,000</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000 - 199,999</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 - 249,999</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000 - 299,999</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000 - 349,999</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350,000 - 399,999</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400,000 - 449,999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450,000 - 499,999</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 and Over</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>677</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Price</strong></td>
<td>$229,435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$252,996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$249,284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Price</strong></td>
<td>$182,913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$207,201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$206,188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Days on Market</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(1) Includes Burr Ridge, Clarendon Hills, Downers Grove, Hinsdale, Indian Head Park, La Grange and Western Springs.

Source: Midwest Real Estate Data, LLC and Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.
# Residential Building Permit Trends: Suburban Chicago and the La Grange Market Area

## 1990 - September 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Suburban Chicago</th>
<th>La Grange Market Area</th>
<th>Village of La Grange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>25,931</td>
<td>20,002</td>
<td>5,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>22,415</td>
<td>18,294</td>
<td>4,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>27,354</td>
<td>22,410</td>
<td>4,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>26,974</td>
<td>25,125</td>
<td>4,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>31,639</td>
<td>26,051</td>
<td>5,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>30,020</td>
<td>23,969</td>
<td>6,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>32,110</td>
<td>24,320</td>
<td>7,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>28,879</td>
<td>22,188</td>
<td>6,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>30,183</td>
<td>24,668</td>
<td>6,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>34,812</td>
<td>27,789</td>
<td>7,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>32,478</td>
<td>26,475</td>
<td>6,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>34,970</td>
<td>28,072</td>
<td>6,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>37,252</td>
<td>30,469</td>
<td>6,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>37,409</td>
<td>31,402</td>
<td>6,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>36,905</td>
<td>31,200</td>
<td>5,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>38,523</td>
<td>32,181</td>
<td>6,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>29,149</td>
<td>24,216</td>
<td>4,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>17,359</td>
<td>14,868</td>
<td>2,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7,301</td>
<td>6,113</td>
<td>1,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,752</td>
<td>3,263</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,223</td>
<td>3,169</td>
<td>1,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,048</td>
<td>3,213</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6,879</td>
<td>4,283</td>
<td>2,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7,059</td>
<td>5,542</td>
<td>1,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>2,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8,356</td>
<td>5,905</td>
<td>2,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9,008</td>
<td>5,888</td>
<td>3,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>10,719</td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td>4,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual Average**

| 1990 - 2017 | 22,845 | 17,959 | 4,466 |

### Notes


### Sources

### POPULATION, HOUSEHOLDS, TENURE, AND INCOME: 2018

--- LA GRANGE MARKET AREA ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute/Year</th>
<th>La Grange Market Area</th>
<th>Village of La Grange</th>
<th>Attribute/Year</th>
<th>La Grange Market Area</th>
<th>Village of La Grange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>337,860</td>
<td>15,362</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>126,459</td>
<td>5,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>379,199</td>
<td>15,633</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>144,855</td>
<td>5,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>385,377</td>
<td>15,550</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>147,527</td>
<td>5,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>387,553</td>
<td>15,385</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>149,654</td>
<td>5,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>388,177</td>
<td>15,239</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>150,399</td>
<td>5,615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Annual Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>4,134</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2018 Household Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>160,360</th>
<th>6,005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied</td>
<td>149,654</td>
<td>5,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>114,639</td>
<td>4,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>35,015</td>
<td>1,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>10,706</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2018 Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Households</th>
<th>149,654</th>
<th>5,643</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $25,000</td>
<td>20,258</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 - 34,999</td>
<td>10,543</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>15,321</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 74,999</td>
<td>23,484</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000 - 99,999</td>
<td>18,568</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 and Over</td>
<td>61,480</td>
<td>3,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$81,458</td>
<td>$114,062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2018 Household Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>387,553</th>
<th>15,385</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In Group Quarters</td>
<td>3,857</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Households</td>
<td>383,696</td>
<td>15,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>149,654</td>
<td>5,843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Persons Per Household

| Average Persons Per Household | 2.56 | 2.68 |

### 2018 Travel Time to Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Workers Age 16+</th>
<th>175,995</th>
<th>6,573</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 Minutes</td>
<td>85,816</td>
<td>2,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 44 Minutes</td>
<td>44,274</td>
<td>1,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 59 Minutes</td>
<td>22,585</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or More Minutes</td>
<td>23,320</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Minutes to Work

| Average Minutes to Work | 34.5 | 35.0 |

## HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY AGE OF HOUSEHOLDER: 2018 ESTIMATE

### LA GRANGE MARKET AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Householder</th>
<th>2018 Income</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under $25,000</td>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>$100,000 and Over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>Percent of Total Households</td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>Percent of Total Households</td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>Percent of Total Households</td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>Percent of Total Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 24 Years</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34 Years</td>
<td>1,834</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1,971</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3,244</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44 Years</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>3,479</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 64 Years</td>
<td>2,171</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>4,040</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 74 Years</td>
<td>3,771</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>2,742</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4,625</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 84 Years</td>
<td>3,928</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>4,139</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 Years &amp; Over</td>
<td>3,382</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1,921</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20,260</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>10,542</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>15,321</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>23,485</td>
<td>15.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Village of La Grange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Householder</th>
<th>2018 Income</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under $25,000</td>
<td>$25,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>$100,000 and Over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>Percent of Total Households</td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>Percent of Total Households</td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>Percent of Total Households</td>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>Percent of Total Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 24 Years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34 Years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44 Years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 64 Years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 74 Years</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 84 Years</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 Years &amp; Over</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>557</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>12.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Environics Analytics and Tracy Cross & Associates, Inc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonfarm Employment</td>
<td>4,262.1</td>
<td>4,176.8</td>
<td>4,136.9</td>
<td>4,137.4</td>
<td>4,180.8</td>
<td>4,236.7</td>
<td>4,270.6</td>
<td>4,243.7</td>
<td>4,021.6</td>
<td>3,979.1</td>
<td>4,034.4</td>
<td>4,100.4</td>
<td>4,167.3</td>
<td>4,234.4</td>
<td>4,319.7</td>
<td>4,382.4</td>
<td>4,420.2</td>
<td>4,411.1</td>
<td>4,445.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining/Logging/Construction</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>214.2</td>
<td>215.3</td>
<td>221.2</td>
<td>217.3</td>
<td>204.0</td>
<td>194.8</td>
<td>147.3</td>
<td>147.7</td>
<td>148.6</td>
<td>151.2</td>
<td>157.2</td>
<td>168.3</td>
<td>172.8</td>
<td>174.1</td>
<td>173.6</td>
<td>181.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>596.0</td>
<td>548.6</td>
<td>517.0</td>
<td>501.1</td>
<td>498.1</td>
<td>489.4</td>
<td>483.4</td>
<td>469.8</td>
<td>416.9</td>
<td>404.3</td>
<td>411.0</td>
<td>412.5</td>
<td>410.1</td>
<td>410.8</td>
<td>414.5</td>
<td>414.8</td>
<td>415.9</td>
<td>415.1</td>
<td>421.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>257.8</td>
<td>251.0</td>
<td>246.7</td>
<td>243.6</td>
<td>244.9</td>
<td>248.4</td>
<td>250.6</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>233.1</td>
<td>228.6</td>
<td>232.6</td>
<td>237.5</td>
<td>241.7</td>
<td>242.2</td>
<td>245.1</td>
<td>246.5</td>
<td>252.2</td>
<td>251.0</td>
<td>256.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>480.5</td>
<td>470.1</td>
<td>463.0</td>
<td>465.5</td>
<td>467.8</td>
<td>470.2</td>
<td>476.2</td>
<td>470.5</td>
<td>443.7</td>
<td>436.6</td>
<td>443.6</td>
<td>447.1</td>
<td>451.4</td>
<td>457.4</td>
<td>465.4</td>
<td>469.3</td>
<td>464.1</td>
<td>461.8</td>
<td>453.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Utilities</td>
<td>212.8</td>
<td>199.9</td>
<td>196.2</td>
<td>199.0</td>
<td>200.2</td>
<td>202.3</td>
<td>203.5</td>
<td>203.4</td>
<td>190.8</td>
<td>189.2</td>
<td>195.1</td>
<td>200.7</td>
<td>204.9</td>
<td>210.9</td>
<td>221.0</td>
<td>220.0</td>
<td>233.9</td>
<td>232.0</td>
<td>238.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>116.9</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>325.5</td>
<td>322.7</td>
<td>327.1</td>
<td>324.6</td>
<td>328.2</td>
<td>331.9</td>
<td>328.7</td>
<td>316.7</td>
<td>298.5</td>
<td>288.5</td>
<td>285.4</td>
<td>287.3</td>
<td>288.9</td>
<td>289.4</td>
<td>294.0</td>
<td>299.2</td>
<td>304.1</td>
<td>304.0</td>
<td>309.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>706.6</td>
<td>677.6</td>
<td>663.7</td>
<td>681.5</td>
<td>706.4</td>
<td>729.3</td>
<td>743.3</td>
<td>734.7</td>
<td>675.0</td>
<td>683.9</td>
<td>709.9</td>
<td>738.9</td>
<td>773.1</td>
<td>796.9</td>
<td>810.7</td>
<td>820.1</td>
<td>825.0</td>
<td>823.2</td>
<td>824.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>512.8</td>
<td>525.9</td>
<td>536.0</td>
<td>545.7</td>
<td>558.3</td>
<td>571.8</td>
<td>588.5</td>
<td>606.6</td>
<td>619.3</td>
<td>633.7</td>
<td>650.0</td>
<td>663.2</td>
<td>673.8</td>
<td>688.8</td>
<td>701.3</td>
<td>714.7</td>
<td>723.8</td>
<td>722.4</td>
<td>729.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>366.0</td>
<td>369.0</td>
<td>375.5</td>
<td>382.7</td>
<td>388.2</td>
<td>407.5</td>
<td>410.0</td>
<td>397.2</td>
<td>395.6</td>
<td>403.4</td>
<td>416.1</td>
<td>426.4</td>
<td>436.7</td>
<td>452.9</td>
<td>469.5</td>
<td>480.0</td>
<td>481.9</td>
<td>483.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>190.7</td>
<td>191.0</td>
<td>197.7</td>
<td>197.6</td>
<td>196.4</td>
<td>197.7</td>
<td>198.8</td>
<td>200.5</td>
<td>196.0</td>
<td>188.8</td>
<td>189.6</td>
<td>189.0</td>
<td>191.0</td>
<td>193.8</td>
<td>193.9</td>
<td>194.4</td>
<td>195.2</td>
<td>195.5</td>
<td>193.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>557.1</td>
<td>567.2</td>
<td>568.5</td>
<td>561.0</td>
<td>564.0</td>
<td>564.5</td>
<td>555.4</td>
<td>569.3</td>
<td>568.5</td>
<td>565.1</td>
<td>553.9</td>
<td>550.3</td>
<td>546.9</td>
<td>545.8</td>
<td>548.2</td>
<td>548.8</td>
<td>549.6</td>
<td>547.6</td>
<td>555.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Totals may not add due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4,262,100</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4,176,800</td>
<td>-85,300</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4,136,900</td>
<td>-39,900</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4,137,400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4,180,800</td>
<td>43,400</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,236,700</td>
<td>55,900</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4,270,600</td>
<td>33,900</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4,243,700</td>
<td>-26,900</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4,021,600</td>
<td>-222,100</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,979,100</td>
<td>-42,500</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,034,400</td>
<td>55,300</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4,100,400</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4,167,300</td>
<td>66,900</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4,234,400</td>
<td>67,100</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,319,700</td>
<td>85,300</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4,382,400</td>
<td>62,700</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4,420,200</td>
<td>37,800</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First Ten Months**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4,411,100</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4,445,500</td>
<td>34,400</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annual Average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-2017</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>9,881</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2007</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2013</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-9,914</td>
<td>NEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2017</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>63,225</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Figures are preliminary.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics
Memo

To: Heather Valore, AICP, Village Planner
Charity Jones, AICP, Community Development Director
Ryan Gillingham, P.E., Public Works Director

From: Steve Amann, P.E., CFM

Date: December 21, 2018 Project No.: 180969.80

Subject: 112 Burlington Rd – La Grange Condominiums

We have reviewed the following items for this project:

- Preliminary Engineering Plans dated December 11;
- Preliminary Stormwater Management Report dated December 11; and

We have the following comments:

Overall Submittal
1. All aerial cabling needs to be shown and relocated underground. While the details of this can be deferred to final engineering, this should be indicated positively in order to establish the final design parameters.
2. The building needs to be clearly distinguished from other site improvements.

Grading and Storm Water Management
3. Overland flows need to be shown on the grading plan for all areas of the site.
4. The overflow weir used in the storm water management calculations needs to be shown on the plans.
5. Details are needed in the civil plans for the underground reservoir.
6. In the Preliminary Stormwater Management Report:
   a. We continue to recommend against using reduced runoff curve numbers for green roofs, permeable pavers, or any other best management practices. These systems rely on plant matter and soils being completely available for runoff absorption, which cannot occur when the surfaces are already saturated, covered with ice or snow, or frozen.
   b. Times of concentration longer than 5 minutes need calculations and supporting documents. Small tributary areas and higher levels of imperviousness decrease times of concentration.
   c. The proposed curve number exhibit and calculation are missing.
   d. In the tabular stage-storage-discharge calculations, the weir elevation needs to match the plans.
   e. Calculations are needed to show how the 100-year runoff from the entire site (including the building) will reach the underground reservoir. This can impact the overall site plan so it needs to be addressed at this time, not deferred to final engineering.
Utility

7. Existing and proposed fire hydrants and the Fire Department Connection need to be shown on the utility plan to determine if additional water system improvements will be needed.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need any additional information.

C: Richard A. Gallas, P.E., Baxter & Woodman, Inc.
VILLAGE OF LA GRANGE  
Department of Public Works  

MEMORANDUM  

TO: Andrianna Peterson, Village Manager  
Charity Jones, Community Development Director  
Heather Valone, Village Planner  

FROM: Ryan Gillingham, Director of Public Works  

DATE: October 19, 2018  

RE: 112 E. Burlington – La Grange Condominiums  
Site Plan Review  

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide the following preliminary comments related to the proposed development at 112 E. Burlington called La Grange Condominiums. Some of the comments require additional internal discussion or discussion with the applicant.  

1. Streetscape Design – The public right-of-way adjacent to the proposed development should match the Village’s streetscape design in its Central Business District. Specifically, a tree pit with seat walls should be included in the bump out area at the intersection of Burlington and 6th Avenues. The tree pit with seat walls should match the same feature at the northeast corner of Cossitt Avenue and La Grange Road. The tree pits along Burlington Avenue should be raised to promote the growth of trees. The tree pits should match the design in front of 56 South La Grange Road, which includes decorative fencing. The sidewalk design should include brick paver inserts matching others throughout the Village. Bike racks, benches and other streetscape furnishings should also be evaluated for inclusion. The width of the sidewalk, parking lane and driving lane on Burlington should be optimized. The curb and pavement on Burlington adjacent to the development should be replaced. Complete civil engineering drawings detailing these features should be provided.  

2. Traffic and Pedestrian Safety – A bump out should be included at the intersection of 6th Avenue and Burlington Avenue to shorten the distance for pedestrians crossing 6th Avenue. The pedestrian route should be along the south side of Burlington Avenue to La Grange Road. A sight distance analysis should be performed at the intersection of Burlington Avenue and 6th Avenue, and at the intersection of Burlington Avenue and 7th Avenue. If public parking spaces are proposed to be removed, additional public parking spaces should be considered on private property as part of the development.  

3. Street Lighting - A photometric analysis should be provided for the development and the public right-of-way adjacent to the development. New street lights consistent with the Village’s standards should be provided adjacent to the development. This would include both pedestrian oriented and overhead streetlights.
4. **Balconies** – Balconies should not overhang public sidewalks. If balconies overhang public right-of-way, easements should be provided that define maintenance, liability, compensation and other related matters.

5. **Sewer Televising** - The combination sewers on 6th Avenue and 7th Avenue need to be televised to document existing conditions. Any existing or abandoned sewer services need to be disconnected from the existing combination sewers. We recommend that the combination sewer segments adjacent to the development be lined with cured in place pipe.

6. **Sidewalk** – The sidewalk on 7th Avenue adjacent to the development should be replaced.

7. **Existing Water Services** – Existing water services need to be disconnected and abandoned at the water main.

8. **Storm Water Management** – The minimum restrictor size is 3”. The detention volume calculations should be adjusted.

9. **IDOT** - A permit from IDOT is required. While Burlington Avenue generally functions as a local road, we believe the roadway is still under State jurisdiction.

10. **Other utilities** – Gas, electric, communication and any other utilities should be shown on the plans.

11. **Burial of Overhead Utilities** - All existing and proposed utilities on and surrounding the site should be underground.

12. **Storm Water Management Facility Maintenance** - The standards for maintenance of the storm water facility need to be reviewed and included in a binding agreement.
Memorandum

Date: December 21, 2018
To: Heather Valone
Village Planner
Village of La Grange
53 S. La Grange Road
From: Mark Underwood, Hitchcock Design Group (HDG)

RE: La Grange Condominiums (Jackson Storage) PC Case #247

Upon reviewing the Preliminary Landscape Plan developed by BSB Design dated December 7, 2018, we offer the following comments:

1. **Final landscape plans need to be modified to clearly depict and/or indicate the following:**
   a. All property lines and easements.
   b. All existing and proposed civil and electrical improvements.
   c. Clear site lines at all intersections as required by Village of La Grange Ordinance No. 0-09-33 Intersection Sight Lines.

2. **Please provide an Existing Tree Survey for the site depicting the species, condition, size, and action proposed (i.e. whether the tree is to remain or be removed) for all existing trees.**

3. **Final Landscape Plans submitted for permit approval are to be stamped by Illinois licensed landscape architect.**

4. Provide details for the Green Roof as depicted on the Civil Geometric Plan on sheet 07.

5. Regarding the planting design and plant species proposed in the plans, we offer the following:
   a. **Update landscape plan reconciling plant codes, quantities, and plant list.**
   b. **Be sure to maximize the available soil volume for proposed street trees to grow into and help ensure the health and longevity of the trees. For example, use of a larger tree grate or multiple tree grates, structural soil, or soil cell.**
   c. **Do not use Alnus glutinosa as it is invasive.**
   d. Note that most of the trees and shrubs planted in the Plaza are on the north side of 4 story building and will be in shade most of the day. For example, Malus 'Prairie Fire' Crab, Crataegus Phenopyrum, Deutzia 'Yuki Snow', and Rosa 'Scarlet Meidland' are plants that need full sun to bloom and thrive. Keep the light and shade requirements for plants in mind when selecting the groundcover species for this area.

**NOTE:** *Italicized text* indicate comments made in the October 17th previous review.

cc: Andrianna Peterson, Village of La Grange (VLG)
Ryan Gillingham, VLG
MEMORANDUM TO: Heather Valone, AICP  
Village Planner  
Village of La Grange

FROM: Eric D. Russell, P.E., PTOE, PTP, LEED AP ND  
Principal

DATE: December 21, 2018

SUBJECT: Traffic Impact Study & Site Plan Review  
Proposed La Grange Condominiums  
112 E. Burlington Avenue  
La Grange, Illinois

Kenig, Lindgren, O’Hara, Aboona, Inc. (KLOA) has reviewed the revised site plan submission by DTLG Investments LLC and the project’s revised Traffic Impact Study prepared by Gewalt Hamilton and Associates, Inc. (dated December 14, 2018) for the proposed La Grange Condominium development to be located at 112 E. Burlington Avenue in La Grange, Illinois. The revised development will consist of a renovation to the existing Jackson Square Mall building into 50 condominium units supported by 83 parking spaces in a first floor garage accessed from 7th Avenue.

The key findings from this review are noted below.

**Traffic Counts**

1. The GHA response letter from December 14, 2018 indicates that the number of existing pedestrians and bicycles crossing each leg of the intersections are shown in Exhibit 3B of the revised TIS dated December 14, 2018. Are the bicycle volumes in this exhibit combined with the pedestrian volumes?

**Pedestrian Safety**

2. The GHA response letter indicates that the site civil engineer will perform the requested sight distance analysis for the 6th Avenue approach to Burlington Avenue, but the analysis does not appear to be included in the revised submission package. A sight distance analysis for the 7th Avenue approach to Burlington Avenue was also requested by the Village but also does not appear to be included in the submission.

3. GHA concurs with the KLOA recommendation to replace the existing transverse crosswalks on 6th Avenue and 7th Avenue at Burlington Avenue with high-visibility (ladder-style) crosswalks. However, the CEMCON geometric plan only depicts a ladder-style crosswalk on 6th Avenue.
4. The CEMCON geometric plan indicates a pedestrian warning system will be installed at the parking garage exit on 7th Avenue. The petitioner should coordinate with Village staff on an acceptable system in light of the residential nature of the development and adjoining uses.

Parking

5. The BSB garage floor assembly plan indicates that parking spaces 25-27 will be reserved for guest parking. The petitioner should coordinate with Village staff on an acceptable means for residents to provide access to these spaces for their guests.

6. KLOA concurs with GHA’s recommendation for the developer and Village staff to coordinate on the elimination of 3 on-street parking spaces on Burlington Avenue near the front entrance to the building for drop-off/pick-up and small deliveries. This loading zone should be shown on the geometric plan.

Loading

7. The GHA response letter indicates that a moving van and refuse truck will probably back in to the loading dock from 7th Avenue and that the site civil engineer will provide the AutoTurn diagram for this movement. The diagram does not appear to be included in the revised submission package.
APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT

TO THE PRESIDENT AND
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
VILLAGE OF LA GRANGE

Application #
Date Filed:
UARCO No.:

Application is hereby made by: DTLG Investments LLC

Address: 11 S. LaGrange Rd., Unit 202, LaGrange, IL 60525

Phone: Attorney Philip Fornaro – 708/639-4320

Email: philip@fornarolaw.com

Owner of property located at: DTLG Investments, an Illinois limited liability company; the Property is commonly known as 112 E. Burlington Ave, LaGrange, IL 60525, and 5 South 6th Avenue, LaGrange, IL 60525, as described in the legal description that is appended hereto as “Exhibit 1”.

Permanent Real Estate Index No: 18-04-215-001-0000; 18-04-215-002-0000; 18-04-215-011-0000 as set forth in the legal description that is appended hereto as “Exhibit 1”.

(1) REZONING FROM: C-1 (Central Commercial District) to R-8 (Multiple Family Residential District).

(2) AMENDMENT (other than rezoning) OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE, as follows: (Indicate Article, Section, etc. where applicable): Article IV – Section 4-106 of the Code and map amendment pursuant to Article XIV – Section 14-602 of the Code.

(3) PURPOSE of rezoning/amendment: To develop and build a multi-family residence on the property.

STANDARDS: The petitioner should state reasons and submit any pertinent evidence to support the following factors:

(1) The consistency of the proposed amendment with the purposes of this code.

The proposed map amendment (the “Amendment”) is consistent with the stated intent of the Zoning Code as set forth in Section 1-102, which states: “...implement and foster the goals and policies of the Village’s Official Comprehensive Plan”. The intent of amendments, as set forth in Section 14-602 of the Code, is to “adjust the provisions of [this] Code and the Zoning Map in light of changing, newly discovered, or newly important conditions, situations, or knowledge.” Furthermore, the Comprehensive Plan seeks to “identify the strategic competitive advantages of the community and the surrounding region; assess the community’s strengths and weaknesses with respect to attracting and retaining business and industry.” The proposed Amendment, therefore, is narrowly tailored to provide for a multi-family residential development that meets the purpose of the Code and the amendments sought, and the Villages’ goal for the community pursuant to its Comprehensive Plan.

(2) The community need for the proposed amendment and the uses and development it would allow.
The trend in land developments in many municipalities, and as stated in the Comprehensive Plan, is to support, through zoning and legislation, high quality multi-family developments with emphasis on small to mid-size units near commercial districts. These multi-family residential units near commercial district are a driving force in the economic growth of the surrounding businesses and community. Specifically, a zoning map amendment to designate the Property as an R-8 District will enhance and sustain the surrounding retail and commercial service locations by placing higher-income residents close to the commercial districts. The attraction of high-income owners will also in turn attract more businesses and development in the current commercial districts. This is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, which provides that supporting and improving the condition of the existing commercial locations is more desirable than encouraging substantial new commercial areas without addressing the future need of existing businesses in the C-1 District.

Unless the Amendment is adopted, the development of the Property will continue to be hindered within C-1 District. Changing the zoning map to designate the Property as an R-8 District alleviates this issue by allowing for development of new multi-family residences which will have positive a impact on the community and its future.

(3) The following standards related to a particular property:

(a) **Existing Uses and Zoning.** The existing uses and zoning classifications of properties in the vicinity of the subject property.

  Proximately located properties are zoned as Multiple Family Residential Districts (R-6 and R-8). An R-8 designation therefore is well suited for the Property and the intended use as multi-family development. Further, the area to the north of the Property across Burlington Ave is zoned R-8. The Amendment to rezone the Property as an R-8 District, accordingly, simply expands the pattern of the zoning district proximate to the Property.

(b) **Trend of Development.** The trend of development in the vicinity of the subject property, including changes, if any, in such trend since the subject property was placed in its present plan designation or zoning classification.

  As previously noted, proximately located properties are located within the R-6 and R-8 Districts. The Property’s current designation (C-1 Commercial District) limits its option for future development and is not consistent with the surrounding developments and uses, including the multi-family structures on the North side of the railroad tracks. The Amendment, therefore, would simply follow the trend of the surrounding districts.

(c) **Adverse Impact on Subject Property Value.** The extent to which the value of the subject property is diminished by the existing plan designation or zoning classification applicable to it.

  The Property’s current designation (C-1 Commercial District) limits its options for future development and precludes it from being developed to highest and best use, which diminishes the value of the Property. A R-8 District would increase the value of the surrounding property by providing residents to support the retail and commercial districts. The Property’s current designation (C-1 District) limits the Property’s ability to supplement the nearby businesses in the C-1 Districts.

(d) **Presence or Absence of Offsetting Public Benefit.** The extent to which such diminution in value is offset by an increase in the public health, safety, and welfare.
The proposed map amendment will not diminish the public health, safety, and welfare of the community and its residents, rather the Project will be developed in conformity with Village regulations, which will enhance the public health, safety, and welfare. The proposed use will enhance the general welfare by addition of a substantial development to the tax rolls and generating property tax revenue for the Village and its residents.

(e) **Suitability for Use as Currently Zoned.** The suitability of the subject property for uses permitted or permissible under its present plan designation and zoning classification.

The Property is adjacent to and proximately located to Multiple Family Residential Districts and Central Commercial Districts. The Property, as it currently stands, is not suited for uses that are compatible with the surrounding zoning districts.

(f) **Lack of Development as Zoned.** The length of time, if any, that the subject property has been vacant, considered in the context of the pace of development in the vicinity of the subject property.

The Property is not currently used in a manner that is at its highest and best use. The Property is not generating property tax revenue and its use is not compatible with surrounding developments.

* * *

**NOTICE:** This application must be filed with the office of the Community Development Director, accompanied by necessary data called for above and the required filing fee escrow a minimum of thirty days in advance of the public hearing date.

The escrow for the application is $1,500.00. Should the funds in escrow fall below $300 the Village will request that the applicant replenish the escrow funds prior to further processing of said application.

The above filing fee and escrow shall be payable at the time of the filing of such request. Any funds remaining in escrow will be returned to the applicant after the Village Board approval and all staff and consultant work is completed.

The above minimum fee shall be payable at the time of the filing of such request. It is also understood that the applicant shall reimburse the village any additional costs over and above these minimums, which are incurred by the Village, including but not limited to the following:

(a) Legal Publication (direct cost);
(b) Recording Secretarial Services (direct costs);
(c) Court Reporter (direct cost);
(d) Administrative Review and Preparation (hourly salary times a multiplier sufficient to recover 100 percent of the direct and indirect cost of such service);
(e) Document Preparation and Review (hourly salary times a multiplier sufficient to recover 100 percent of the direct and indirect cost of such service);
(f) Professional and Technical Consultant Services (direct cost);
(g) Legal Review, Consultation and Advice (direct cost);
(h) Copy Reproduction (direct cost);
(i) Document Recordation (direct cost); and
(j) Postage Costs (direct cost).

(remainder of this page intentionally left blank)
I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that I am the owner or contract purchaser (evidence of title or other interest you have in the subject property, date of acquisition of such interest and the specific nature of such interest must be submitted with application) and do hereby certify that the above statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I also acknowledge that Village staff will prepare a report with a recommendation to the Plan Commission prior to my hearing. I understand that this report will be available for my viewing the Friday prior to my hearing and it is my responsibility to contact the Village to view this report or obtain a copy.

(Name)

(Address)

(City)

(State)

(Zip Code)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS

17th DAY OF Sept., 2018.

(Seal)

NOTARY PUBLIC

ODETA PASKEVIČIUS

NOTARY PUBLIC

STATE OF ILLINOIS

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES 01/11/20

PLACE SEAL HERE
APPLICATION FOR
ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT

TO THE PRESIDENT AND
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
VILLAGE OF LA GRANGE

Application is hereby made by: DTLG Investments LLC

Address: 11 S. LaGrange Rd., Unit 202, LaGrange, IL 60525

Phone: Attorney Philip Fornaro – (708) 639-4320

Email: philip@fornarolaw.com

Owner of property located at: DTLG Investments, an Illinois limited liability company; the Property is commonly known as 112 E. Burlington Ave, LaGrange, IL 60525, and 5 South 6th Avenue, LaGrange, IL 605252, as described in the legal description that is appended hereto as “Exhibit 1”.

Permanent Real Estate Index No: 18-04-215-001-0000; 18-04-215-002-0000; 18-04-215-011-0000 as set forth in the legal description that is appended hereto as “Exhibit 1”.

(1) REZONING FROM: C-1 (Central Commercial District) to R-8 (Multiple Family Residential District).

(2) AMENDMENT (OTHER THAN REZONING) OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE (THE “CODE”): Pursuant to Article XIV – Section 14-602 of the Code, the applicant seeks to amend Article IV – Section 4-110 (H)(7) of the Code concerning the minimum square footage of land per unit in a multi-family residential district.

(3) PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT:

To allow the Applicant to develop a planned unit development where the minimum lot area per dwelling unit is reduced to less than the minimum lot area per dwelling required by the Code.

Section 4-110 (B) (2) of the Code provides that the average square footage per dwelling unit in an R-8 planned development (calculated by dividing the number of dwelling units in the planned development by the total lot area) shall be 1,300 square feet. The Code allows for a reduced square footage of lot area per dwelling unit to a minimum of 910 square feet. The Applicant requests an amendment to Section 4-110 (H)(7) of the Code to reflect that the minimum lot area per dwelling unit in an R-8 planned unit developments to be 740 square feet per dwelling unit.

STANDARDS: The petitioner should state reasons and submit any pertinent evidence to support the following factors:

(1) The consistency of the proposed amendment with the purposes of this code.

The proposed text amendment to the Code (the “Amendment”) is consistent with the stated intent of the Code as set forth in Section 1-102, which states: “...[t]o implement and foster the goals and policies of the Village’s Official Comprehensive Plan”. The intent of amendments, as set forth in Section 14-602 of the Code, is to “adjust the provisions of [this] Code ...in light of changing, newly discovered, or newly important conditions, situations, or knowledge.”
Section 4-110(H)(6) of the Code states: “In planned developments, minimum lot size per unit requirements are intended only as a limit on overall development density and not as a requirement that each individual unit be placed on a lot of the specified size. In other words, units may be clustered together so long as sufficient common open space is provided within the development to meet the average minimum lot size requirement of the development taken as a whole.” In this instance, the 740 sq. ft. per unit calculation is an anomaly caused by the use of an underground parking garage, as opposed to a separate open-air parking lot, which provides for the most efficient use of this space. This efficient design is what allowed for the construction of the large plaza to be used by the community and the residents. This property cannot be developed as proposed under the current Code given the relative size of the parcel of land and the lack of parking for residents.

Accordingly, the proposed Amendment is consistent with the intended purpose of amendments to the Code and the intended purpose of average lot area per dwelling unit in planned developments. First, land development trends are increasingly embracing efficient design, e.g. the first floor as an indoor parking garage, as an alternative to open-air parking lots in the interest of developing attractive, yet functional “downtown” residences. Second, the proposed Amendment follows the spirit of the Section 40-110(H)(6) of the Code where an arbitrary calculation of minimum lot area per dwelling unit does not always accurately reflect the density of the development in relation to the infrastructure and amenities of the surrounding area.

(2) The community need for the proposed amendment and the uses and development it would allow.

The trend in land development, and as stated in the Comprehensive Plan, is to support, through zoning and legislation, high-quality, multi-family developments near commercial districts. These multi-family residential units near commercial district are a driving force in the economic growth of the surrounding businesses and community. To this end, open air parking lots often encompass a large area of land (often larger than the development itself), thus creating an unattractive land use in the central economic centers of the community. Modern design principles embrace efficiency in design and convenience for residents and the public. To this end, indoor parking garages are a component of efficient modern design, by doing away with large lots for open air parking lots and constructing a development that serves the residents while preserving land for other uses.

Unless the Amendment is adopted, the Applicant will be unable to adopt these efficient space use and design techniques that have a positive impact on the community and business district.

(3) Standard under Section 4-110(h)(7) for adjustment of minimum lot per unit.

In connection with adjustment of minimum lot per dwelling unit in R-8 zoning districts, Section 4-110(h)(7) of the Code states:

“No such adjustment [of minimum lot per dwelling unit] shall be recommended or authorized except on the basis of the development's excellence in achieving the purposes for which planned developments may be approved pursuant to Section 14-502 of this Code. [I]n determining whether such excellence has been shown, special consideration shall be given to the following factors: The Amount of Usable Open Space; The extent of land dedication for public building sites and open space; the quality and extent of landscaping including special elements such as water features and public art; the quality of design of vehicular circulation elements and parking lots and areas.”
The proposed Amendment meets this standard set forth in the Code. The proposed development complies with the Urban Design Guidelines, providing the Village with a high-end, multi-family structure with varied rooflines, including gable elements, façade accents, and balconies. Masonry and other natural exterior materials are utilized on all sides. The building’s design maintains certain elements of the prior Jackson Storage building, which are unique and have historical value to the Village and surrounding area. The project also includes a public plaza consisting of approximately 15% of the total lot area. This public plaza benefits both the public and the residents of the development by providing an open area to relax and enjoy the outdoors, all walking distance from the iconic downtown LaGrange business district. The plaza also includes a water feature with shade trees near the water feature. On the northeast corner of the building, the proposed development includes an open-air terrace on the fourth floor for use by the residents and the community. Lastly, the landscaping of the development includes shade trees, evergreen trees, flowering shrubs, and perineal planted around the development along Burlington Ave, 6th Street, and in the Plaza.

Additionally, a below grade parking garage fits naturally with the topography of the subject property; this topography is rare in the Village and highly unique to this development. By including a parking garage for residents instead of an open-air parking lot, the minimum lot area per dwelling is naturally reduced to below the minimum required by the Code. This reduction below the allowable minimum, however, is not a product of increased density as the residential units are a good size with 2 or 3 bedrooms, including several large units on each floor. The minimum lot area per unit should be amended to 740 square feet per dwelling unit for this project given the excellent design of the development and the inclusion of additional open space for residents and the public.

4. THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS RELATED TO A PARTICULAR PROPERTY:

(a) Existing Uses and Zoning. The existing uses and zoning classifications of properties in the vicinity of the subject property.

Proximately located properties, which are zoned as Multiple Family Residential Districts (R-6 and R-8), include open air parking lots, making the minimum dwelling square footage consistent with the Code. The proposed text amendment is consistent with the proposed R-8 rezoning classification, as it only reduces the minimum lot area per dwelling in order to avoid an unsightly parking lot in favor of an open plaza. This is a unique circumstance given the topography of the land which make underground parking a natural fit and make an open-air plaza possible.

(b) Trend of Development. The trend of development in the vicinity of the subject property, including changes, if any, in such trend since the subject property was placed in its present plan designation or zoning classification.

The recent trend of development to construct multi-family residential projects within walking distance to the downtown business district and transportation center justifies the requested text amendment since the Code was not originally written for a development such as this one with a self-contained parking garage. Given the unique topography of the land, the construction of an underground parking garage is a natural fit, thereby allowing for the construction of high-end residential units without an unsightly parking lot, along with the construction of a large plaza for the use and enjoyment of the community and the residents.

(c) Adverse Impact on Subject Property Value. The extent to which the value of the subject property is diminished by the existing plan designation or zoning classification applicable to it.
The current code would preclude the construction of this type of multi-family residence near the central business district. This, in turn, would prevent the subject property from achieving its highest and best use, thereby limiting the overall value of the land.

(d) **Presence or Absence of Offsetting Public Benefit.** The extent to which such diminution in value is offset by an increase in the public health, safety, and welfare.

The current zoning and use of the subject property provide absolutely no benefit to the health, safety and welfare of the community. However, after development of the proposed building, the subject property would greatly increase the value of the land, while creating a public plaza which can be the focal point for the Burlington Avenue corridor north of the business district.

(e) **Suitability for Use as Currently Zoned.** The suitability of the subject property for uses permitted or permissible under its present plan designation and zoning classification.

The Property is adjacent to and proximately located to Multiple Family Residential Districts and Central Commercial Districts. The Property, as it currently stands, is not suited for uses that are compatible with the surrounding zoning districts. In order to bring the subject property into harmony with the surrounding properties, but not overwhelm the existing infrastructure (parking), the Code must be amended to allow for a self-contained parking garage, which inadvertently results in a lower minimum square footage per unit.

(f) **Lack of Development as Zoned.** The length of time, if any, that the subject property has been vacant, considered in the context of the pace of development in the vicinity of the subject property.

The Property is not currently used in a manner that is at its highest and best use. The surrounding area, including the business district, call for the continued development of multi-family residences in order to accommodate the growing demand for this type of housing. The current use of the property as a storage facility does not maximize the property’s value to the Village and the community. The proposed development would maximize that value.

* * *

**NOTICE:** This application must be filed with the office of the Community Development Director, accompanied by necessary data called for above and the required filing fee escrow a minimum of thirty days in advance of the public hearing date.

The escrow for the application is $1,500.00. Should the funds in escrow fall below $300 the Village will request that the applicant replenish the escrow funds prior to further processing of said application.

The above filing fee and escrow shall be payable at the time of the filing of such request. Any funds remaining in escrow will be returned to the applicant after the Village Board approval and all staff and consultant work is completed.

The above minimum fee shall be payable at the time of the filing of such request. It is also understood that the applicant shall reimburse the Village any additional costs over and above these minimums, which are incurred by the Village, including but not limited to the following:

(a) **Legal Publication (direct cost);**
(b) Recording Secretarial Services (direct costs);

c) Court Reporter (direct cost);

d) Administrative Review and Preparation (hourly salary times a multiplier sufficient to recover 100 percent of the direct and indirect cost of such service);

e) Document Preparation and Review (hourly salary times a multiplier sufficient to recover 100 percent of the direct and indirect cost of such service);

f) Professional and Technical Consultant Services (direct cost);

g) Legal Review, Consultation and Advice (direct cost)

h) Copy Reproduction (direct cost);

(i) Document Recordation (direct cost); and

(i) Postage Costs (direct cost).

(remainder of this page intentionally left blank)
I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that I am the owner or contract purchaser (evidence of title or other interest you have in the subject property, date of acquisition of such interest and the specific nature of such interest must be submitted with application) and do hereby certify that the above statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I also acknowledge that Village staff will prepare a report with a recommendation to the Plan Commission prior to my hearing. I understand that this report will be available for my viewing the Friday prior to my hearing and it is my responsibility to contact the Village to view this report or obtain a copy.

(Name)  

(Address)  

(City)  

(State)  

(Zip Code)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS  

17th DAY OF Sept., 2018.

ODETA PASKEVICIUS  
NOTARY PUBLIC

OFFICIAL SEAL  
ODETA PASKEVICIUS  
NOTARY PUBLIC - STATE OF ILLINOIS  
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: 01/11/20
APPLICATION FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

TO THE PRESIDENT AND
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
VILLAGE OF LA GRANGE

Application is hereby made by: DTLG Investments LLC

Address: 11 S. LaGrange Rd., Unit 202, LaGrange, IL 60525

Phone: Attorney Philip Fornaro – 708/639-4320

Email: philip@fornarolaw.com

Owner of property: DTLG Investments LLC, an Illinois limited liability company; the Property is commonly known 112 E. Burlington Ave, LaGrange, IL 60525, and 5 S. 6th Avenue, LaGrange, IL, as described in the legal descriptions that are appended hereto as Exhibit “1”.

Permanent Real Estate Index No. 18-04-215-001-0000; 18-04-215-002-0000; 18-04-215-011-0000 as set forth in the legal description that is appended hereto as Exhibit “1”.

Present Zoning Classification: The present zoning classification is C-1 (Central Commercial District) and the applicant is submitting an application for amendment to change the zoning to R-8 (Multi-Family Residential District)

Requested Modifications from the Zoning Code: Article IV of the Zoning Code, regarding R-8 District, Section 4-110 (Bulk, Yard, and Space Requirements):

1) The Proposed structure is 5 stories and a maximum of 62 feet high, which does not comply with the 3-story, 45-foot maximum for R-8 zoning (Section 4-110(A)), but would comply with the height adjustment in R-8 planned developments (Section 4-110(H)(2)), which allows a maximum height of 5 stories and 70 feet;

2) Lot Area Per Unit – the current lot is approximately 37,000 sq. ft. lot with 50 units proposed, for a lot area per unit of 740 sq. ft., which would be less than the required 1,300 sq. ft. per unit allowed under Section 4-110(B)(2);

1 A corresponding text amendment is simultaneously being sought to Section 4-110(B)(7) to allow for an adjustment below the 910 sq. ft. minimum.
3) Minimum Yards and Setbacks — the current structure has Zero foot setbacks on 6th and 7th Avenues and a small portion of the building fronting on Burlington (the remainder of the frontage on Burlington is an open plaza with a minimum of 16-foot setback), and Zero foot and 5 foot setbacks along the Southern lot line, which would require a variance from the required setbacks for front yard (60% of building height or 17 feet, whichever is greater), interior side yard (10% of lot width or 5 feet, whichever is greater), and rear yard (20% of lot depth or 20 feet, whichever is greater), as set forth in Section 4-110(C);

4) Maximum Building Coverage — the maximum allowable building coverage for an interior lot is 35% and for a corner lot is 40% (see Section 4-110(E)), however the proposed building covers approximately 85% of the total lot;

5) Maximum Total Lot Coverage — the maximum allowable total lot coverage is 60% (see Section 4-110(F)), however the proposed building covers approximately 85% of the total lot;

6) Specified Structures and Uses in Required Yards — the current structure has a 10-foot terrace for the second-floor residences and 15-foot balconies for residences on floors 3 through 5, all of which exceed the 3-foot limit imposed in Section 4-110(H)(12)(d); some of the balconies would extend over the public right-of-way on the East and West sides of the building;

7) Side Yards in R-8 District — per Section 4-110(H)(17), the required minimum interior side yard shall be increased by one foot for each two foot of building height over 35 feet; the proposed structure would have no interior side yard.

STANDARDS FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS: The petitioner should state FACTS AND REASONS and submit any pertinent evidence establishing each of the following principles:

A. Special Use Permit Standards. The petitioner will establish that the proposed development will meet each of the standards made applicable to special uses.

(a) **Code and Plan Purposes.** The proposed use and development will be in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this Code was enacted and for which the regulations of the district in question were established and with the general purpose and intent of the Official Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed development (the "Project") is consistent with Article I of the Code as it conforms to the goals of the Village’s Comprehensive Plan and it will establish a rational pattern of land use that is in harmony with proximately located properties. The Project will be developed as a planned development, which provides flexibility to ensure that the Village achieves certain stated objectives, such as flexibility in the redevelopment of land and the promotion of creative architectural designs. A
planned development provides the opportunity to relax certain land use regulations, which promotes the creation of a desirable environment than would be possible through strict application of the Code.

(b) **No Undue Adverse Impact.** The proposed use and development will not have a substantial or undue adverse effect upon adjacent property, the character of the area, or the public health, safety, and general welfare.

The proposed use is consistent with proximately located properties and will not have an undue adverse impact upon adjacent properties; rather, the proposed use will be compatible with adjacent properties and will enhance the aesthetic quality of the area. Nothing contemplated by the proposed use or the Project will adversely impact the public health, safety or general welfare. The proposed use will enhance the general welfare by addition of a substantial development to the tax rolls and generating property tax revenue for the Village and its residents.

(c) **No Interference with Surrounding Development.** The proposed use and development will be constructed, arranged, and operated so as not to dominate the immediate vicinity or to interfere with the use and development of neighboring property in accordance with the applicable district regulations. As previously noted, the proposed use is consistent with the existing use of proximately located properties. The Project will be constructed and arranged to ensure that it is compatible with the existing use and development of neighboring properties. The Project will conform to applicable district regulations.

(d) **Adequate Public Facilities.** The proposed use and development will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as streets, public utilities, drainage structures, police and fire protection, refuse disposal, parks, libraries, and schools, or the applicant will provide adequately for such services.

The proposed use will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services, and the plan will provide on-site parking for residents. The Project site is surrounded by established developments, which provide adequate public utilities schools and parks. The Applicant will work with Village staff to provide any reasonable public facilities, which the Village determines to be lacking.

(e) **No Traffic Congestion.** The proposed use and development will not cause undue traffic congestion nor draw significant amounts of traffic through residential streets.

The proposed use and Project will not cause undue traffic. The Traffic Impact Study is appended hereto as Exhibit 7. Further, sufficient parking exists on Burlington and truck traffic will be directed to the garage entrance located on 7th Street and away from the plaza located on Burlington Avenue.
(f) **No Destruction of Significant Features.** The proposed use and development will not result in the destruction, loss, or damage of any natural, scenic, or historic feature of significant importance.

There will be no destruction of significant features. The design of the new structure incorporates the historic nature of the prior building by adopting many of the same architectural and design features, while also creating new, open space with a plaza.

(g) **Compliance with Standards.** The proposed use and development complies with all additional standards imposed on it by the particular provision of this Code authorizing such use.

The proposed use complies with a majority of the R-8 requirements.

B. **Standards for All Planned Developments.** The petitioner will establish that the proposed development will meet each of the following additional standards:

(a) **Unified Ownership Required.** The entire property will be in single ownership or under such unified control as to ensure that the entire property will be developed as a unified whole.

The Project will be in single ownership and developed as unified whole.

(b) **Covenants and Restrictions to be Enforceable by Village.** All covenants, deed restrictions, easements, and similar restrictions will be recorded in connection with the planned development may not be modified, removed, or released without the express consent of the Board of Trustees and that they may be enforced by the Village as well as by future landowners within the proposed development.

This standard will be satisfied by the proposed use.

C. **Standards for Large Planned Developments.** The petitioner will establish that any project that includes 40,000 square feet or more of total land area or more than one principal building will meet each of the following standards (If the project site is less 40,000 square feet, skip ahead to Section B):

(a) **Protected Open Space.** The protected open space must be held in common ownership or by an entity specifically responsible for the care and maintenance of the space. The protected open space also must be (i) held for use by all residents or other occupants of the development or (ii) dedicated to, and accepted by, the Village of La Grange, the Park District of La Grange, a school district, or another public entity as permanent common open areas for parks, recreation and/or related public uses.

---

1 Protected Open Space may include parks, playgrounds, landscaped green space, community centers, or other similar areas and associated recreational amenities protected permanently as open space.
Not applicable.

(b) **Landscaping and Perimeter.** Any area of a planned development not used for structures or circulation elements shall be landscaped or otherwise improved. The perimeter of the planned development shall be treated so as to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses by means such as provision of compatible uses and structures, setbacks, screening, or natural or man-made buffers. Every planned development having 20 or more acres shall provide a perimeter landscaped open space along each of its boundaries; each such open space shall have a minimum depth equal to the minimum front yard required in the district it is located or it abuts, whichever is greater.

Not applicable.

(c) **Private Streets.** Private streets are prohibited unless expressly approved by the Board of Trustees. If so approved, they shall meet all construction standards applicable to public streets. No such streets shall be approved except upon the condition that they shall be owned and maintained by a hospital or by a property owners' association meeting the requirements set forth in this Section.

Not applicable.

(d) **Pedestrian Circulation System.** Describe the proposed pedestrian circulation system including appropriate walkways, paths, trails, passageways, and other means of movement into, out of, and throughout the development and including private or public sidewalks meeting the standards of the La Grange Subdivision Code on both sides of every street in or abutting the project.

Not applicable.

(e) **Utilities.** All utility lines shall be installed underground.

Not applicable.

(f) **Compensating Amenities.** Describe all proposed compensating amenities.¹

Not applicable.

D. **Standards for Small Planned Developments.** The petitioner will establish that any project that includes less than 40,000 square of total land area (a “Small PD”), will meet each of the following additional standards:

---

¹ Compensating amenities means features not otherwise required to achieve compliance with the standards of this Code or other applicable Village codes and ordinances, including such things as public art, plazas, pedestrian walkways, natural habitats, increased landscaping, buffering or screening, enhanced streetscape, enhanced pedestrian and transit supportive design, underground parking and similar features. Compensating amenities must be proposed as part of a PD application, and all compensating amenities, whether public or private, must be developed and constructed at the applicant's expense.
(a) **Open Space.** Show that the largest amount of open space reasonably possible has been included in the Small PD Plan and that open space has been assembled and designed to maximize its quality, usefulness, beauty, and value to the development. The Village may require recorded restrictions and covenants or dedication of development rights to assure the perpetual care, conservation, and maintenance of the operation of the open space and to prevent the use of common open space for any structure, improvement, or use other than that shown on the approved Small PD Plan. The restrictions must be permanent and not for a given period of years and must run with the land.

The proposed use includes a large plaza fronting on Burlington creating an open space for residents and the community. This plaza greatly increases the amount of open space on this corner since the existing structures provide no open space.

(b) **Landscaping and Perimeter Treatment.** To the fullest extent possible, any area of the planned development not used for structures or circulation elements shall be landscaped or otherwise improved. Include details of landscaped perimeter:

The proposed use includes a large plaza with landscaping, artwork, and water features, along with landscaping at the base of the building on the West and South sides. The project otherwise exceeds the landscape ordinance.

(b) **Public Improvements.** Provide for all public improvements necessary to serve the PD, including without limitation streets, sidewalks, lights, signs, underground utilities, and landscaping, to be constructed or installed to Village standards at no cost to the Village.

The proposed use will improve the sidewalk and lighting in the area. The plaza and water feature currently do not exist and will be a welcoming area for pedestrians and visitors to the Village of LaGrange. The self-contained parking garage will keep the residents’ vehicles off the neighboring streets, preserving sufficient parking spots for residents and visitors coming to the surrounding area.

(d) **Excellence of Design.** Describe the architectural quality of the building, with excellence of design considering the context within which the development is being proposed and the general standards stated in the “Urban Design Principles,” “Urban Design Framework,” and “Appendix A” of the Village of LaGrange Urban Design Guidelines dated February 2009 (available on the

---

1 May be in the form of a cash contribution. If approved by the Board of Trustees, then the contribution must be made by the applicant to the Village prior to the issuance of any permit authorizing construction. Must be designated specifically for use to provide one or more features defined as compensating amenities. The Board may approve a cash contribution only if (a) the project site is inadequate for any physical on-site compensating amenity as a result of its size, shape, or other topographic feature, (b) there is no immediate need for a compensating amenity on public property abutting or adjacent to the project site, and (c) there is a compelling and appropriate compensating amenity, as determined by the Board of Trustees, for which a cash contribution can be designated.
Village website: www.villageoflagrange.com and at the Community Development Department offices).

In compliance with the Urban Design Guidelines, the proposed use provides the Village with a high-end, multi-family structure with varied rooflines, including gable elements, facade accents, and balconies. Masonry and other natural exterior materials are utilized on all sides. The building's design maintains certain elements of the prior Jackson Storage building, which are unique and have historical value to the Village and surrounding area. The plan includes a self-contained parking garage with concealed access along 7th Avenue. The plan also includes an integrated plaza with open space, landscaping, a water feature, and rest areas for pedestrians.

NOTICE: This application must be filed with the office of the Community Development Director together with seventeen (17) 11 x 17 copies of any required drawings, plats of survey, etc, the necessary data called for above a minimum of thirty days in advance of the public hearing and the required filing fee escrow a minimum of thirty days in advance of the public hearing date. The escrow will be utilized to cover all costs incurred by the Village as outlined in Paragraph 14-101D2 of the Zoning Code:

(a) Legal Publication (direct cost);
(b) Recording Secretarial Services (direct cost);
(c) Court Reporter (direct cost);
(d) Administrative Review and Preparation (hourly salary times a multiplier sufficient to recover 100 percent of the direct and indirect cost of such service);
(e) Document Preparation and Review (hourly salary times a multiplier sufficient to recover 100 percent of the direct and indirect cost of such service);
(f) Professional and Technical Consultant Services (direct cost);
(g) Legal Review, Consultation, and Advice (direct cost);
(h) Copy Reproduction (direct cost); and
(i) Document Recordation (direct cost); and
(j) Postage Costs

(direct cost). The escrow for the application is as
follows:

**Planned Development - $**

Should the funds in escrow fall below $300, the Village will request that the applicant replenish the escrow fund prior to further processing of said application.

The above filing fee and escrow shall be payable at the time of the filing of such request. Any funds remaining in escrow will be returned to the applicant after Village Board approval and all staff and consultant work is completed.

(Remainder of this page intentionally left blank)
I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that I am the owner or contract purchaser (Evidence of title or other interest you have in the subject property, date of acquisition of such interest and the specific nature of such interest must be submitted with application) and do hereby certify that the above statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I also acknowledge that Village staff will prepare a report with a recommendation to the Plan Commission prior to my hearing. I understand that this report will be available for my viewing the Friday prior to my hearing and it is my responsibility to contact the Village to view this report or obtain a copy.

(Signature of Owner or Contract Purchaser)

11 S. LaGrange, #202
(Address)

La Grange
(City)
Illinois
(State)

60525
(Zip Code)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS

17th DAY OF September, 2018, here)

Notary Public

(For Village Use Only)

1. Filed with the office of the Community Development Director, 20

2. Transmitted to Plan Commission at their meeting held:

3. Continuation (if any):

4. Notice of hearing published in: on:

5. Findings and Recommendations of Plan Commission referred to Village Board at meeting of:

6. Final action of Village Board for adoption of amending ordinances or denial of applicant's request at meeting held:

7. Payment of expenses satisfied:

REMARKS:
DTLG INVESTMENTS LLC
APPLICATION FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENT
EXHIBIT LIST

EXHIBIT 1 – LEGAL DESCRIPTION

EXHIBIT 2 – AUTHORIZATION TO FILE ZONING APPLICATION

EXHIBIT 3 – PLAT OF SURVEY

EXHIBIT 4 – SITE PLAN

EXHIBIT 5 – FLOOR PLANS

EXHIBIT 6 – UNIT DESIGNS

EXHIBIT 7 – TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

EXHIBIT 8 – PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING PLAN

EXHIBIT 9 – LANDSCAPE PLAN
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Property Address: 112 E. Burlington Ave., La Grange, IL

PARCEL 1: THE WEST 50 FEET OF LOT 9 AND ALL OF LOTS 10 AND 11 IN LEITER’S SUBDIVISION OF LOTS 1-19 INCLUSIVE IN BLOCK 1 IN LEITER’S ADDITION TO LAGRANGE IN THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 4, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 12, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

PARCEL 2: LOT 30 IN BLOCK 1 IN LEITER’S ADDITION TO LAGRANGE IN THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 4, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 12, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Property Address: 5 S. 6th Ave., La Grange, IL 60525

LOT 29 IN BLOCK 1 IN LEITER’S ADDITION TO LA GRANGE IN THE NORTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 4 TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH RANGE 12 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN RECORDER’S OFFICE OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, SEPTEMBER 9, 1881 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER 347057 IN BOOK 16 OF PLATS, PAGE 28, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
SITE BENCHMARK:

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

PANEL 1: THE WEST 20 FEET OF LOT 9 AND ALL OF LOTS 10 AND 11 IN LETIER'S SUBDIVISION OF LOT 1 THROUGH 16 INCLUSIVE IN BLOCK 1 IN LETIER'S ADDITION TO LARAGNE IN THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 4, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 12, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, Lying SOUTH OF THE RAILROAD AND WEST OF BURLINGTON AVENUE, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

PANEL 2: LOT 80 IN BLOCK 1 IN LETIER'S ADDITION TO LARAGNE IN THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 4, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 12, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

ALSO:

LOT 80 IN BLOCK 1 IN LETIER'S ADDITION TO LARAGNE IN THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 4, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 12, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLOT FILED EXHIBITED IN RICHARD'S OFFICE OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, SEPTEMBER 9, 1991 AS DOCUMENT NUMBER 44702 IN BOOK 59 OF PLATS, IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.
Via hand-delivery
Charity Jones, Director
Community Development
La Grange Village Hall
53 S. La Grange Rd.
La Grange, IL 60525

Re: DTLG Investments LLC
Zoning Applications

Dear Ms. Jones,

Enclosed please find the following three (3) applications for consideration by the Village of LaGrange Plan Commission: (1) Application for Planned Development, (2) Application for Text Amendment, and (3) Application for Map Amendment. Included with these applications are 14 sets of exhibits, including color copies (11x17) for the exterior elevations, the site/landscape plan, and the floor/unit plans, along with one larger print (24x36) of each of these plans. Also, the PUD application includes the original traffic study, which will be supplemented later this week to address staff’s memorandum and the requests made therein.

The Application for Map Amendment seeks to rezone the subject property from C-1 to R-8, which constitutes the property’s highest and best use in light of the surrounding properties. As noted in the application, the construction of large multi-family, residential units near commercial district is a potential driving force in the economic growth of the surrounding businesses and community. Specifically, the development will enhance and sustain the surrounding retail and commercial service locations by attracting high-income residents close to the commercial district. The attraction of high-income owners will also in turn attract more businesses and development in the current designated C-1 District. This is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, which provides that supporting and improving the condition of the existing commercial locations.

Furthermore, nearby properties are zoned as “Multiple Family Residential Districts” (R-6 and R-8). Specifically, the zoning classification of the area adjacent to the south of the Property is zoned as an R-6, and the area to the north of the Property, across Burlington Ave is zoned as an R-8 District. The Amendment would simply follow the trend of the surrounding districts.
Concerning the PUD application, the development will require variances from the existing zoning code, specifically regarding (1) the overall height of the proposed building (5 stories and 62 feet) exceeds the 3-story, 45-foot maximum, but complies with the allowable height adjustments in R-8 districts (5 stories and 70 feet); (2) the lot area per unit would be approximately 740 sq. ft., which is less than the 1,300 sq. ft allowed, but given the additional two stories, the lot area per unit is proportional to what the code allows for a 3-story building; (3) three sides of the building are built up to or near the property lines, requiring setback and side yard variances; (4) the maximum building coverage and total lot coverage allowed under the code do not permit the construction of this building at this location, thereby requiring variances; and (5) the building’s inclusion of extended balconies exceeds the 3-foot limit imposed under the code.

We believe these variances are warranted given the quality and design of the proposed building. These features include an exterior design using natural materials, varied rooflines, gable elements, and façade accents which pay homage to the Jackson Storage building, a self-contained parking garage, and a large plaza fronting on Burlington Avenue which creates open space for the community. All of these features will create a unique housing option for the Village and surrounding communities.

Finally, the application for a text amendment addresses an anomaly created within the zoning code related to the lot area per unit for this residential development. The current Code prohibits a reduction in this measurement below 910 sq. ft. per unit; yet, the current proposal results in a measurement of 740 sq. ft. of lot area per unit. Nevertheless, this “low” number results from the fact that there is no surface parking lot servicing the building, which would provide more open area for purposes of this calculation.

Given the unique topography of the land, the parking garage can be built under the residences. Although the lot area per unit measurement is a calculation used to evaluate the overall density of the project, in this case the relative size of the units (1,200 sq. ft. to 2,400 sq. ft) demonstrates that this is not a “dense” residential development. Rather, the topography of this property allows for a more efficient use of the land allowing for the creation of the large public plaza at the front of the building instead of an unsightly parking lot. Accordingly, the minimum lot area per unit set forth in the Code does not accurately measure the overall density of the project given the uniqueness of the land and the quality of the residences proposed.

Below, I address the comments and concerns raised by Village Staff in the Memorandum dated October 19, 2018, as follows:

Applications

1. The maximum lot coverage should be updated to accurately reflect the proposed lot coverage. Based on preliminary calculations, the proposed lot coverage is closer to 95%.

Revised.
2. Page 3 of the Planned Development application item (d) should indicate that the applicant will construct any new required utilities.

Revised.

3. Page 4 of the Planned Development application item (b) should be updated to indicate the CCRs will be crafted to include maintenance requirements for the site landscaping, live wall, green roof, plaza, and etc.

Revised.

Traffic Study

1. To ensure that all vehicles can access the proposed off-street parking spaces, an auto turn exhibit should be submitted. Please review Attachment 1 for a specific listing of off-street parking comments.

The revised traffic study addresses these concerns and comments. The revised traffic study will be delivered to the Village as a supplement to the developer’s application.

2. The traffic study indicates that there is the potential for a second floor of parking. Based on the submitted design this is not accurate. Please update the traffic study accordingly.

Revised.

3. The projected volume exhibit should be updated with the predicted pedestrian and bicyclists increase during peak hours. Please review attachment 1 for additional comments on the pedestrian improvements.

Revised.

4. Please review Attachment 1 for comments related to the traffic analysis and traffic counts.

The revised traffic study addresses these comments.

Architectural Site Plan

1. The proposed balconies on 7th Ave. should be relocated so they no longer infringe on the public right-of-way. Staff would find the proposed balconies on 6th Ave. acceptable with the following conditions:

   - The applicant agrees to appropriate easements as detailed in Attachment 3, item #4.
   - No portion of the balconies along 6th Avenue overhang the public sidewalk.
- The applicant agrees to configure the sidewalk on 6th Ave. to coordinate with the recommended streetscape design on Burlington Ave.
- Limits on what materials may be placed on the balconies must be included in the CCRs/homeowners’ association documentation. These limitations must be developed to the satisfaction of the Village.

Please see Attachment 3 for more details. It appears that some of the balconies overhang the neighboring private property to the south. Please review the proposed balconies on the rear of the building to ensure they do not overhang the neighboring private property to the south. The proposed development should be fully contained on the subject property.

The revised plans address these concerns, showing Juliet balconies along 6th and 7th, along with revised drawings providing a better representation of the size of the balconies in relation to the property lines.

2. As indicated in the submitted applications, the intent of the proposed plaza is to provide compensating amenities on the subject property. However, the current design of the proposed plaza only provides one access point mid-block. Based on the submitted applications, 6th Ave. is where the highest pedestrian volume occurs. The plaza configuration should be revised to provide a second public access point to the plaza adjacent to the intersection of the Burlington Ave. and 6th Ave. to comply with the intent of the compensating amenities requirement.

The plans have been revised to show a ramp access to the plaza from 6th Avenue.

3. The submitted traffic study indicates that this area has a high pedestrian volume. The traffic study cited a recent pedestrian/vehicle accident in this area. As referenced in Attachments 1-4, additional pedestrian improvements are needed to improve the pedestrian experience in this area. A bump out for pedestrian ease/safety is needed at the southeast corner of 6th Ave. Please see the attachments for more details. Additionally, as indicated in Attachment 1, the submitted traffic study did not include pedestrian and bicyclists projections. Based on these projections, additional pedestrian improvements may be required after the information is reviewed.

The revised plan shows a proposed bump out, but the Developer is willing to construct this area however the Village Staff deems appropriate to address its concerns.

4. The Police Chief is requesting that prior to the issuance of any building permit that the plaza be reviewed to ensure that the design will discourage skateboarders and other similar users from utilizing the space.

The proposed wall design includes an ornamental fence to discourage such activity.

5. Please see the attachments for additional comments.

The revised plans address the additional comments.
Character Elevation

1. Please confirm the proposed building material on the top story of the building. It appears it is proposed as fiber cement board.

Correct.

2. The applications indicate that salvaging portions of the existing building is intended to compensate for the fact that the proposed development would result in the loss of a historic building. An exhibit indicating what materials are proposed to be salvaged from the existing building should be submitted. Prior to the approval of the applications, language requiring these materials can be finalized with the Village Attorney. Additionally, a sign in the plaza should be proposed to pay homage to the historic Jackson Storage building and its history.

The developer has coordinated with the LaGrange historical society, which has identified certain items to be salvaged and donated. However, the building’s current exterior shell is not salvageable and, thereby, not re-usable in the new building. It would not be prudent to list the items prior to demolition since they may not survive the process. The developer will make every attempt to repurpose certain elements of the building, including the “Delivery” tile on the exterior of the old building and metal doors from the interior to be incorporated into the new building’s mailroom, for example. Also, a plaque will be placed in the mailroom detailing the history of the prior building.

3. To-scale exterior elevations are needed to calculate the area of each proposed building material. Alternatively, an exhibit indicating this information can be provided.

The plans have been revised.

4. Please the provide information on the proposed material(s) of the planters in the plaza.

The landscape plan has been revised to show this information.

5. The second page of the character exhibit should include a rendering with Becknell, in addition to the provided rendering without Becknell.

Revised.

6. What is the proposed material at the base of the building on the north elevation, behind the Becknell building?

Concrete block; see revised plans.
7. Garage doors for the maintenance access are shown on the rear elevation of the building (also on the floor plans); how are trucks and vehicles going to access these doors? No access driveway is indicated on the site plan. What would be the proposed slope of the access driveway?

The revised building plans show a new loading/delivery configuration with a separate access point.

8. Are limits being placed on the number of rental units? If so, what are they?

The building is intended to be owner-occupied, so the number of rental units will be limited to less than 20%, or 10 units.

Landscape Plan

1. There are a number of listed plant species on the site map that are not listed in the planting list. Please see attachment 4 for more detailed comments.

Revised.

2. The details on the live wall are not provided, please provide this information. Due to its proximity to the adjacent building, proper measures must be in place to ensure no adverse impacts on adjacent property.

The live wall has been removed; it was only intended to provide a demonstration related to a tenant’s use of the space.

3. The details on the green roof are not provided, please provide this information.

Those details have been submitted.

4. Please label the proposed fence in the plaza more clearly.

Revised.

Please incorporate this letter as part of the applications submitted herein. Contact me if you have any questions. I look forward to working with you to complete this project.

Sincerely,

Vincent C. Mancini

Encl.
December 10, 2018

Ms. Heather Valone
Village Planner
Village of La Grange
53 S. La Grange Road
La Grange, IL 60525

Re: Burlington Rd - La Grange Condominiums
Comment/Response – Site Plan Review
La Grange, IL
904.286

Dear Ms. Valone:

Please find attached our responses to the memo from Steve Amann, at Baxter & Woodman, dated October 17th 2018 and the memo from Ryan Gillingham at Village of La Grange dated October 19th, 2018 along with the following:

- Preliminary Engineering Plans, revised 12/14/18
- Preliminary Stormwater Management Report, revised 12/14/18

Please feel free to contact me with any additional questions or comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Michael A. Jones,
Project Engineer

MAJ/jb
Enc.

cc: Ryan Gillingham, P.E. – Village of La Grange
    Steve Amann, P.E., CFM – Baxter & Woodman
    DTLG Investment, LLC, La Grange
December 10, 2018

Mr. Steve Amann, P.E., CFM
Baxter & Woodman
8840 W. 192nd Street
Mokena, IL 60448

Re: Burlington Rd – La Grange Condominiums No. 180969.80
Comment/Response – Conceptual Grading and Utility Plan
La Grange, IL
904.286

Dear Mr. Amann:

Please find the following responses to your memo dated October 17, 2018.

**Overall Submittal**

**Comment:**

1. The plans suggest that an underground detention reservoir will be constructed within the building footprint. This type of construction is not recommended since it can introduce polluted stormwater into the habitable areas, expose internal concrete and reinforcing to road salts, and will make maintenance and repair access extremely difficult.

**Response:**

1. **Noted.**

**Comment:**

2. Balconies appear to overhang adjacent properties and the public right-of-way. Overhangs into the right-of-way need to provide sufficient clearance for all Village maintenance and emergency vehicles.

**Response:**

2. **Revised.**

**Comment:**

3. The building plans indicate internal loading and trash receptacle areas in the southeast corner. Access to these areas is needed for appropriate vehicles.
Response:

3. Revised.

Comment:

4. A legend clarifying the cross hatching is needed.
   Response:
   4. Revised.

Comment:

5. Clarification is needed regarding the ownership (i.e., public vs. private) of the walkway south of the building.
   Response:
   5. All improvements on private property are privately owned.

Comment:

6. All aerial cabling needs to be shown and relocated underground.
   Response:
   6. Dry utility design will be included with final engineering.

Comment:

7. Complete civil engineering plans and supporting documents (calculations, reports and applications) will be needed for this project. These items will need to address the following issues at a minimum:
   a. Additional outside agency permits (e.g., MWRDGC, IEPA);
   b. A plat of subdivision showing all right of ways, easements, and property pins;
   c. The discrepancy between the atlas location and the surveyed location of the existing utilities;
   d. A demolition plan including abandonment of existing services to the site; and
e. A complete lighting and photometric plan, including Village standards for public lighting.

Response:

7. Noted. These items will be addressed as part of final engineering.

Grading and Stormwater Management

Comment:

8. A Watershed Management Permit will be needed from the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago. Depending on the final scope of improvements, additional storm water management requirements (from the MWRDGC) may apply.

Response:


Comment:

9. If the building requires a sump line, its discharge needs to be located and routed through the storm water management facilities.

Response:

9. Revised.

Comment:

10. The building downspouts need to be located and routed through the storm water management facilities.

Response:

10. Revised.

Comment:

11. Overland flows need to be shown on the grading plan.

Response:

11. Revised.
Comment:

12. Drainage structures need to be shown.

Response:

12. Revised.

Comment:

13. Details are needed for the restrictor structure and the underground reservoir.

Response:

13. Revised. Structural design to be provided with final engineering.

Comment:

14. The minimum restrictor diameter is 3 inches, not the 4 inches in the plan and calculations.

Response:


Comment:

15. Consistency is needed between the plans and the storm water management calculations. For example, the size of the underground reservoir and the type of restrictor outlet do not match. The design engineer needs to verify all such items and correct any discrepancies.

Response:

15. Revised.

Comment:

16. In the Preliminary Stormwater Management Report:

a. AutoCAD or other proprietary software, as discussed in the narrative, is not recommended for storm water management calculations. Calculations need to be independently verifiable.

b. We do not recommend reduced runoff curve numbers for green roofs. This assumption relies on the plant matter and soils being completely available for
runoff absorption, which cannot occur when the roof is already saturated, covered with ice or snow, or frozen.

c. In the tabular stage-storage-discharge calculations:
   i. The discharge calculations need to use orifice, not culvert, equations;
   ii. The weir elevation and calculations need to match the plans; and
   iii. The size of the reservoir and its area need to match the plans.

d. In the proposed conditions TR-20 model input, the discharges at 632.10 and 632.50 need to match the tabular calculations; and

e. Calculations are needed to show how the 100-year runoff from the entire site (including the building) will reach the underground reservoir.

Response:

16. a. Revised.

b. Noted; however this is not different than any other permeable surface used in the NRCS CN calculation and the methodology is standard. See MWRD jurisdictional submittals.

c. i. Revised.
   ii. Revised.
   iii. Revised.

d. Revised.

e. Conveyance calculations will be included with final engineering.

Access and Transportation

Comment:

17. A pedestrian enhanced curb extension is needed at the corner of 6th Avenue and Burlington Avenue. The protective curb extension should enable on-street parking along both 6th Avenue and Burlington Avenue. This area could be used for public amenities such as a decorative seat wall and planters.

Response:

17. Revised.

Comment:

18. The entrance to the underground garage needs to be indicated, and controlled access to the garage needs to be indicated (or not).
Response:
18. Revised. Refer to Architectural Plans for controlled access details.

Comment:
19. Work proposed in the Village right of way needs to be highlighted, including sidewalk, apron and pavement removal and replacements required to construct the facility.
Response:
19. Revised.

Comment:
20. Ground-mounted signage needs to be shown and checked for conflicts with underground utilities and sight distance restrictions.
Response:
20. No signage is proposed.

Utility
Comment:
21. The water service size and location will need to be verified by the building designer.
Response:
21. Noted. This will be included with final engineering.

Comment:
22. Existing and proposed fire hydrants and the Fire Department Connection need to be shown to determine if additional water system improvements will be needed.
Response:
22. Please refer to the survey for existing hydrant locations. No additional hydrants are proposed.

Comment:
23. An inspection manhole is required for the sanitary sewer service.
Response:
23. Revised.

Please feel free to contact me with any additional questions or comments.

Sincerely,
CEMCON, Ltd.

[Signature]

Michael A. Jones
Project Engineer

MAJ/jb
Enc.

cc: Heather Valone, AICP - Village of La Grange
    Ryan Gillingham, P.E., Village of La Grange
    DTLG Investment, LLC, La Grange
December 10, 2018

Mr. Ryan Gillingham
Director of Public Works
Village of La Grange
53 S. La Grange Road
La Grange, IL 60525

Re: Burlington Rd - La Grange Condominiums
Comment/Response – Site Plan Review
La Grange, IL
904.286

Dear Mr. Gillingham:

Please find the following responses to your memo dated October 19th, 2018.

**Streetscape Design**

**Comment:**

1. The public right-of-way adjacent to the proposed development should match the Village's streetscape design in its Central Business District. Specifically, a tree pit with seat walls should be included in the bump out area at the intersection of Burlington and 6th Avenues. The tree pit with seat walls should match the same feature at the northeast corner of Cossitt Avenue and La Grange Road. The tree pits along Burlington Avenue should be raised to promote the growth of trees. The tree pits should match the design in front of 56 South La Grange Road, which includes decorative fencing. The sidewalk design should include brick paver inserts matching others throughout the Village. Bike racks, benches and other streetscape furnishings should also be evaluated for inclusion. The width of the sidewalk, parking lane and driving lane on Burlington should be optimized. The curb and pavement on Burlington adjacent to the development should be replaced. Complete civil engineering drawings detailing these features should be provided.

**Response:**

1. Plan revised. Please refer to landscape plans for planters. Streetscape details will be provided with final engineering.

**Traffic and Pedestrian Safety**

**Comment:**

2. A bump out should be included at the intersection of 6th Avenue and Burlington Avenue to shorten the distance for pedestrians crossing 6th Avenue. The pedestrian route should be along the south side of Burlington Avenue to La Grange Road. A sight distance analysis should be performed at the intersection of Burlington Avenue and 6th
Avenue, and at the intersection of Burlington Avenue and 7th Avenue. If public parking spaces are proposed to be removed, additional public parking spaces should be considered on private property as part of the development.

Response:

2. *Plan revised. Site distances will be evaluated with final engineering. Please refer to the architectural plans for private parking lot layout and counts.*

Street Lighting

Comment:

3. A photometric analysis should be provided for the development and the public right-of-way adjacent to the development. New street lights consistent with the Village’s standards should be provided adjacent to the development. This would include both pedestrian oriented and overhead streetlights.

Response:

3. *A photometric analysis will be provided with final engineering. New street lighting has been shown.*

Balconies

Comment:

4. Balconies should not overhang public sidewalks. If balconies overhang public right-of-way, easements should be provided that define maintenance, liability, compensation and other related matters.

Response:


Sewer Televising

Comment:

5. The combination sewers on 6th Avenue and 7th Avenue need to be televised to document existing conditions. Any existing or abandoned sewer services need to be disconnected from the existing combination sewers. We recommend that the combination sewer segments adjacent to the development be lined with cured in place pipe.

Response:

5. *Revised.*
Sidewalk

Comment:

6. The sidewalk on 7th Avenue adjacent to the development should be replaced.

Response:

6. Revised.

Existing Water Services

Comment:

7. Existing water services need to be disconnected and abandoned at the water main.

Response:

7. Revised.

Storm Water Management

Comment:

8. The minimum restrictor size is 3". The detention volume calculations should be adjusted.

Response:

8. Revised.

IDOT

Comment:

9. A permit from IDOT is required. While Burlington Avenue generally functions as a local road, we believe the roadway is still under State jurisdiction.

Response:


Other Utilities

Comment:

10. Gas, electric, communication and any other utilities should be shown on the plans.
Response:

10.  Noted. Dry utilities will be designed as part of final engineering.

Burial of Overhead Utilities

Comment:

11.  All existing and proposed utilities on and surrounding the site should be underground.
    Response:


Storm Water Management Facility Maintenance

Comment:

12.  The standards for maintenance of the storm water facility need to be reviewed and included in a binding agreement.
    Response:

12.  Noted. The Final Stormwater Management Report will include an operations & maintenance plan as part of MWRD permitting.

Please feel free to contact me with any additional questions or comments.

Sincerely,
CEMCON, Ltd.

Michael A. Jones
Project Engineer

MAJ/jb
Enc.

cc:  Heather Valone, Village Planner – Village of La Grange
     Steve Amann, P.E., CFM – Baxter & Woodman
     DTLG Investment, LLC, La Grange
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Traffic Impact Study and Parking Evaluation

To: Anthony Lamonia  
DTLG Investment, LLC

From: Bill Grieve, P.E., PTOE  
Senior Transportation Engineer

Date: December 14, 2018

Subject: Proposed Condominiums  
112 E. Burlington Avenue – La Grange, Illinois

Part I – Project Context and Summary Statement

Gewalt Hamilton Associates, Inc. (GHA) has conducted a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and Parking Evaluation for the above referenced project. As proposed, the Jackson Square Mall at 112 E. Burlington in La Grange, Illinois would be redeveloped with 50 luxury condominiums. A combination of single and tandem 85 parking spaces are planned to serve residents in a first-floor garage that has access on 7th Avenue.

The following summarizes our findings and provides various recommendations for your consideration. Exhibits and Appendices referenced are located at the end of this document. Briefly summarizing, we believe that traffic generated by the proposed condominiums can be integrated on the adjacent streets. Reasons include:

➢ The site is well located among several major routes, including Burlington Avenue, LaGrange Road, and Ogden Avenue.
➢ Per US Census data, the condominiums will generate a significant portion of non-auto trips, about 30%.
➢ The parking to be provided meets the calculated demands.

Part II - Background Information

Site Location Map, Existing Traffic Operations, and Photo Inventory

Exhibit 1 provides a location map, Exhibit 2 illustrates the existing street traffic operations, and Appendix A provides a photo inventory of the site vicinity. Pertinent comments regarding land uses in the site vicinity and transportation components, both vehicular and non-auto mobility include:

Land Uses
• The approximate 1.3-acre vacant site is on the south side of Burlington Avenue between 6th Avenue and 7th Avenue in La Grange, Illinois.
• The site lies toward the east end of vibrant downtown La Grange, including residential, commercial, institutional, and entertainment uses.
• Single family homes are located to the south.
Street System

Burlington Avenue

- Burlington Avenue is an east-west street that extends from Ogden Avenue (US 34) on the east to Brainard Avenue on the west. Burlington Avenue is classified as a “Major Collector” on the IDOT Functional Classification map. Eastbound left turns onto Ogden Avenue are prohibited.
- Burlington Avenue has one travel lane in each direction.
- On-street angled parking spaces are provided on the north side of the street, with the eastern spaces signed as Decal Zone A and the western spaces have 12-hour meters. Parallel spaces are striped on the south side of the street and are restricted to a 2-hour free limit.

6th Avenue

- 6th Avenue is a local north-south street that has its northern terminus at Burlington Avenue, where it has stop control. The unstriped street has one travel lane in each direction.
- The posted speed limit is 25-mph.
- Parking spaces are striped on the east side of 6th Avenue with a 2-hour time limit from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM. No parking is allowed on the west side of the street.

7th Avenue

- 7th Avenue is a local north-south street that has its northern terminus at Burlington Avenue, where it has stop control. The unstriped street has one travel lane in each direction.
- The posted speed limit is 25-mph.
- No trucks are allowed.
- Parking is allowed on both sides of the street with a 2-hour time limit from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

Non-Auto Mobility

- The LaGrange Road Metra station is just two blocks to the west.
- Sidewalks are provided on the south side of Burlington Avenue and on both sides of 6th Avenue and 7th Avenue. Crosswalks are striped on the northbound approaches at their intersections.
- Pace bus Route 302 operates along Burlington Avenue on weekdays and Saturday with adjacent stops at 6th Avenue and just east of 7th Avenue.
- Pace bus Route 304 operates along Burlington Avenue on weekdays with adjacent stops at 6th Avenue and just east of 7th Avenue.

Existing Traffic

GHA conducted weekday morning (6:00-9:00 AM) and evening (4:00-7:00 PM) peak period turning movement counts at the Burlington Avenue intersections with 6th Avenue and 7th Avenue on Tuesday, July 17, 2018 (see Appendix B). Exhibit 3 illustrates the existing weekday morning and evening peak hour traffic volumes and the number of pedestrians crossing the intersections, which occurred from 7:00-8:00 AM and from 5:00-6:00 PM. The 24-hour or Average Daily Traffic (ADT) volumes are also provided as published on the IDOT website. No unusual events occurred during the traffic counts, such as road construction, excessive emergency vehicle activity or severe weather, that would have affected the traffic volumes or travel patterns.

Discussion Point. Parking maneuvers along Burlington Avenue led to some of the traffic volumes not “balancing” between 6th Avenue and 7th Avenue.
Accident History

IDOT provided the most recent crash data along Burlington Avenue, 6th Avenue, and 7th Avenue in the site vicinity, from 2014-2016. Pertinent comments include:

- There were 19 total incidents; 6 in 2014, 8 in 2015, and 5 in 2016.
- 9 of the crashes involved parking maneuvers, 5 were turning, and 3 were rear end. All of these crashes were limited to property damage.
- There was 1 head-on incident that occurred during daylight hours when a vehicle was driving the wrong way on Burlington Avenue.
- There was 1 incident that involved a pedestrian, who was hit during daylight by a vehicle traveling westbound on Burlington Avenue straight ahead. This suggests that the pedestrian may have been crossing from the parking spaces on the north side of the street.

Discussion Point. From the information provided by IDOT, it does not appear that none of the incidents were potentially correctible by a design treatment.

Part III – Project Traffic Characteristics

Site Plan

Exhibit 4 depicts the site plan prepared by BSB Design. As proposed, there will be 50 luxury condominiums along with 85 parking spaces in a first-floor garage. The garage will have one access drive on 7th Avenue.

Project Traffic Generations and Trip Distribution

Exhibit 5 – Part A tabulates the traffic and pedestrian generation calculations for the proposed residential development. Traffic generations are based on historically observed trip rate data published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) in the most recent, 10th Edition of the manual Trip Generation. As can be seen, the condominiums are expected to generate 17 and 23 (combined entering and exiting) during the weekday morning and evening peak hours respectively, and 270 trips on a daily or 24-hour basis.

Discussion Point. Exhibit 5 – Part A also shows the anticipated volume reductions associated with published US Census data. As can be seen, there could be an approximate 30% reduction for multi-modal trips. However, this discount was not taken to help ensure that the maximum site traffic impacts are tested.

The anticipated traffic and pedestrians that would be generated by the 8,000 square feet of office space in the adjacent Burlington Building are also shown in Exhibit 5 – Part A. The Burlington Building is expected to generate 9 and 10 trips during the weekday morning and evening peak hours, and 92 daily trips. The ITE trip generation pages for the condominiums and office space are provided in Appendix C.

Exhibit 5 – Part B presents the anticipated trip distribution, which is primarily based on the expected vehicle patterns, as well as the site access location on 7th Avenue.
Part IV – Traffic and Parking Evaluation

Traffic Assignments

IDOT and other agencies generally require that the existing volumes be increased to reflect other growth in the area for a “Buildout + 5 year” analysis. Assuming a buildout year of 2019, the analysis would be for the Year 2024. The Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) was contacted and provided Year 2040 traffic projections (see Appendix D). As can be seen, Burlington Avenue is projected to have very minimal growth, from 2,200 vehicles per day (vpd) to 2,400 vpd. A 3% increase was applied to the existing through volumes on Burlington Avenue.

Site traffic was assigned to the adjacent streets based on the project characteristics (see Exhibit 5) and is illustrated in Exhibit 6. Site traffic, the existing volumes (see Exhibit 3) adjusted for growth and occupancy of the Burlington Building were added to produce the Year 2024 total traffic assignment, which is illustrated in Exhibit 7.

Discussion Point. Existing traffic generated by the Jackson Square Mall was not subtracted. And the 30% multi-modal trip discount was not taken for site traffic. Thus, the total traffic volumes (see Exhibit 7) are probably overstated.

Intersection Capacity and Queue Analyses

Capacity analyses are a standard measurement in the transportation industry that identifies how an intersection operates. Exhibit 9 – Part A lists the analysis parameters, as published in the Transportation Research Board’s (TRB) Highway Capacity Manual – 6th Edition, 2016 (HCM). They are measured in terms of level of service (LOS). LOS A is the best rating, with LOS F being the worst. LOS C is considered appropriate for “design” purposes and LOS D is usually considered as providing the lower threshold of “acceptable” operations. LOS E and F are usually considered unacceptable.

Exhibit 8 - Part B summarizes the intersection capacity and queue analysis results. The capacity analysis summary printouts are provided in Appendix E. As can be seen from Exhibit 8, site traffic will have a minimal impact on operations at the Burlington Avenue intersections with 6th Avenue and 7th Avenue, as the additional delays will be less than 1 second.

Traffic Impact Discussion

Site traffic will represent the following volumes traveling through the Burlington Avenue / 7th Avenue intersection:

- During the morning peak hour (see Exhibit 3), there are currently about 300 vehicles or about 5 vehicles per minute. The condominiums would add only 8 trips or about 1 trip every 7-8 minutes.
- During the evening peak hour, there are currently about 420 vehicles or about 7 vehicles per minute. The condominiums would add only 13 trips or about 1 trip every 4-5 minutes.
Key Finding. Based on the above, it can be concluded that no street or intersection improvements would be necessary to specifically accommodate site traffic. Thus, our recommendations focus on the on-site planning elements (e.g. access operations and parking) and on enhancing pedestrian mobility.

On-Site Planning Elements

Streets and Site Access

7th Avenue
- One drive will be provided to access the parking garage on 7th Avenue. It will be located about 140 feet south of Burlington Avenue.
- Exiting site traffic should have Stop control at 7th Avenue.
- Sidewalks should be replaced where existing driveways are removed.
- Due to the close proximity of the garage door to the sidewalk, a pedestrian warning (audible and/or visual) indicator should be provided, similar to many other urban buildings.

6th Avenue
- A curb extension or “bumpout” will be constructed in the southeast corner of the 6th Avenue / Burlington Avenue intersection.
- The bumpout will reduce the walking distance across 6th Avenue for enhanced pedestrian mobility.

Burlington Avenue
- Consideration should be given to removing 2 to 3 parking spaces on the south side of Burlington Avenue for a drop-off / pick-up zone for visitors and small deliveries (e.g. food orders and FedEx).
- Appropriate signage and striping should be installed.

Parking

Village Code
- Per Village Code Article 10-101, 1.5 parking spaces per unit is required for a total of 75 spaces.
- 83 parking spaces are proposed; 52 primary (4 ADA), 3 guest, and 28 tandem.
- Per the BSB site plan, 53 lockers will be provided to help ensure that the parking spaces will not be used for storage.

Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE)
- The ITE publication Parking Generation, 4th Edition has parking demand data for Land Use #230 – Condominium / Townhouse, The ITE variable is dwelling units (DU).
- For 50 dwelling units, the average parking ratio and demand calculates as follows:
  - Weekday = 50 DU X 1.38 = 69 spaces
- For 50 dwelling units, the 85th percentile parking ratio and demand calculates as follows:
  - Weekday = 50 DU X 1.52 = 76 spaces

Key Finding. The proposed parking supply of 85 spaces (83 spaces if ADA requirements are met) exceeds the calculated demands for both Village code and ITE.
Design
- The parking spaces should meet or exceed the Village requirement of 8.5 feet wide and 18-feet long. The two-way parking aisle should be 24-feet wide.
- The parking garage will have a mix of single loaded and tandem spaces. Whenever possible, the tandem spaces should be used by residents with two cars. AutoTurn should be run for parking space numbers 30, 57, 58, and 85 to ensure walls and stairs don't interfere with vehicle maneuvers.

Part V - Technical Addendum

The following Exhibits and Appendices were previously referenced. They provide technical support for our observations, findings, and recommendations discussed in the text.

Exhibits
1. Site Location Map
2. Existing Traffic Operations
3. Existing Traffic
4. Site Plan
5. Project Traffic Characteristics
6. Site Traffic
7. Total Traffic
8. Intersection Capacity Analyses

Appendices
A. Photo Inventory
B. Traffic Count Summaries
C. ITE Trip Generation Pages
D. CMAP Correspondence
E. Capacity Analysis Worksheets
EXHIBITS
Proposed Condominiums – La Grange, Illinois

Exhibit 1
Site Location Map
Note: Volumes between intersections do not balance due to Metra parking maneuvers.

Sources: 1) GHA July 17, 2018
2) IDOT Website
Exhibit 4 - Site Plan
### Part A. Traffic and Pedestrian Generation Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>ITE Code</th>
<th>ITE Morning Peak Hour</th>
<th>ITE Evening Peak Hour</th>
<th>ITE Daily Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums</td>
<td>50 Dwelling Units</td>
<td>#221</td>
<td>In: 4, Out: 13, Sum: 17</td>
<td>In: 14, Out: 9, Sum: 23</td>
<td>Sum: 270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Modal Reduction @ 30% =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Modal Reduction @ 30% =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>8,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>#710</td>
<td>In: 8, Out: 1, Sum: 9</td>
<td>In: 2, Out: 8, Sum: 10</td>
<td>Sum: 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Modal Reduction @ 30% =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Modal Reduction @ 30% =</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vehicle Trip Totals = 12, 14, 26

Multi-Modal Trip Totals = 16, 17, 10

### Discussion

The discount for multi-modal trips was not taken, to help ensure that the maximum site traffic impacts are tested.

Notes:
1) Source: Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (10th Edition).
2) Per US Census for Tract 8195, about 30% of residents and employees carpool, take public transportation, or walk.
3) Multi-modal trips include public transportation, walk, and bicycle trips.

### Part B. Trip Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route &amp; Direction</th>
<th>Percent Use To/From Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Avenue</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- West of Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- East of Site</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Avenue</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South of Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Avenue</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- South of Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals =</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Part A. Parameters - Type of Traffic Control


### I. Traffic Signals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Delay (sec / veh)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>All signal phases clear waiting vehicles without delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt;10 and &lt; 20</td>
<td>Minimal delay experienced on select signal phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt;20 and &lt; 35</td>
<td>Some delay experienced on several phases; often used as design criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt;35 and &lt; 55</td>
<td>Usually considered as the acceptable delay standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt;55 and &lt; 80</td>
<td>Very long delays experienced during the peak hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>Unacceptable delays experienced throughout the peak hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Stop Sign

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Delay (sec / veh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt;10 and &lt; 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt;15 and &lt; 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt;25 and &lt; 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt;35 and &lt; 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Part B. Results

### 1. Burlington Ave. @ 76th Ave.

#### A. Weekday Morning Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Traffic (See Exhibit 3)</th>
<th>Total Traffic (See Exhibit 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95th Queue Length (veh)</td>
<td>95th Queue Length (veh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Weekday Evening Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Traffic (See Exhibit 3)</th>
<th>Total Traffic (See Exhibit 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95th Queue Length (veh)</td>
<td>95th Queue Length (veh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Burlington Ave. @ 7th Ave.

#### A. Weekday Morning Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Traffic (See Exhibit 3)</th>
<th>Total Traffic (See Exhibit 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95th Queue Length (veh)</td>
<td>95th Queue Length (veh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Weekday Evening Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Traffic (See Exhibit 3)</th>
<th>Total Traffic (See Exhibit 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95th Queue Length (veh)</td>
<td>95th Queue Length (veh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. 7th Ave. @ Site Access

#### A. Weekday Morning Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Traffic (See Exhibit 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95th Queue Length (veh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Weekday Evening Peak Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Traffic (See Exhibit 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95th Queue Length (veh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

Photo Inventory
Looking north along 6th Ave at Burlington Ave

Looking east along Burlington Ave at 6th Ave

Looking west along Burlington Ave at 6th Ave

Looking south through Burlington Ave at 6th Ave
Looking south across Burlington Ave at the Site

Looking east along Burlington Ave at 7th Ave

Looking west along Burlington Ave at 7th Ave

Looking north along 7th Ave at Burlington Ave