

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
Report for the Village Council Meeting
4/11/2017

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| SUBJECT: | SUBMITTED BY: |
| 1030 - 1048 Ogden Avenue - Alley Vacation, Rezoning/Map Amendment, Planned Unit Development, Special Uses, and Final Plat of Subdivision | Stan Popovich, AICP Director of Community Development |

SYNOPSIS

The petitioner is requesting approval of the following items to complete a comprehensive redevelopment at the northwest corner of Ogden Avenue and Main Street, commonly known as 1030-1048 Ogden Avenue:

1. A vacation of the 16-foot wide improved alley at the northeast corner of the property;
2. A Rezoning from existing B-3, General Services and Highway Business to B-3/PUD, General Services and Highway Business/Planned Unit Development;
3. A Planned Unit Development;
4. A Final Plat of Subdivision; and
5. Two Special Uses for two drive through restaurant facilities.

STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

The goals for 2015-2017 include *Strong and Diverse Local Economy*.

FISCAL IMPACT

See Redevelopment Agreement.

UPDATE & RECOMMENDATION

This item was discussed at the March 21, 2017 Village Council meeting. At the meeting, the Council requested a number of items to be addressed by staff:

- Vequity has submitted a revised landscape plan (attached) to the Village and to the adjacent property owner at 4224 Forest Avenue. Vequity met with the adjacent property owner on April 7th. Vequity and the property owner came to an agreement on the landscape plan and fencing. Vequity will install an eight foot tall fence along the north property line and will work with the property owner to identify existing vegetation that may be able to remain. The landscape plan meets the Village landscaping requirements and provides additional fencing as requested by the Plan Commission.
- The revised landscape plan identifies a six-foot tall privacy fence immediately north of the proposed Panda Express building with a four-foot open design fence in front of the building.
- Vequity has requested a meeting with Jewel multiple times since the last Village Council meeting, but Jewel representatives have been unable to meet.
- Should the property at 4240 – 4248 Main Street undergo a redevelopment in the future, Vequity has agreed to provide cross-access to the Main Street curb cut in the future.
- Vequity reached out to Panda Express who wishes to construct their prototypical building on this site. Panda Express maintains their buildings on a regular basis and typically paints EIFS on a 7-10 year cycle.

Staff recommends approval on the April 11, 2017 Active Agenda

BACKGROUND

Property Information & Zoning Request

The proposal is to construct two multi-tenant commercial buildings and a Panda Express building on three lots. The subject properties are zoned B-3, General Services and Business Highway District and currently include a bank, a vacant stand-alone bank drive-through, and two multi-tenant buildings. These buildings include a variety of commercial, business and medical office uses.

The applicant is applying for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) to accommodate a redevelopment that would be difficult to carry out under strict B-3 zoning standards. As part of the PUD approval, a rezoning from B-3 to B-3/PUD is required. The applicant is also requesting two Special Use approvals for restaurant drive-throughs, which are an allowable Special Use in the B-3 zoning district.

Development Plan

The applicant is proposing to construct three commercial buildings over various sizes as shown below:

| Lot | Location | Building | Size |
|-----|-------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Eastern Lot | Retail Building C (Panda Express) | 2,229 sq ft |
| 2 | Middle Lot | Retail Building B (Multi-Tenant) | 6,070 sq ft |
| 3 | Western Lot | Retail Building A (Multi-Tenant, no drive-through) | 10,500 sq ft |
| | | Retail Building A – Option 2 (Drive-through on west) | 9,889 sq ft |
| | | Retail Building A – Option 3 (Drive-through on east) | 6,414 sq ft |

The Panda Express building located on Lot 1 would have a drive through wrapping around the north and western sides of the building. The exterior building material of Panda Express is primarily EIFS with building accent tile and stone cladding at the base of the walls. Other features include parapets and aluminum canopies.

The middle multi-tenant building (Building B) located on Lot 2 has no tenants confirmed yet. The use of different colors of brick and a stone base will be used to break up the façade. A parapet wall extends above the roof-line. Aluminum canopies are also shown over the entrances of the spaces.

Lastly, the multi-tenant building (Building A) located on Lot 3 has three different site plan options. The default plan is a 10,500 square foot building with no restaurant drive-through. Option 2 shows a slightly smaller 9,889 square foot building with a restaurant drive-through and an eight car stacking lane on the western side of the building running parallel and adjacent to the property line. Option 3 has the eight car stacking lane drive-through on the eastern side of the building. Because of the configuration, this option has the smallest building footprint at 6,414 square feet. If approved, only one drive-through for Retail Building A will be permitted. The building materials and design standard are the same as Building B and no tenants as of yet are confirmed.

Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan

The current Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject site as a part of a catalyst site in the *Ogden Avenue Central - Key Focus Areas*. The draft update revision of the Comprehensive Plan continues to identify the subject site as part of the “D8” Ogden Avenue Catalyst site and recommends parcel assembly and aesthetic and functionality improvements.

The proposed development:

- Removes four curb-cuts and improves access and safety onto Ogden Avenue
- Improves connectivity by installing a sidewalk along Ogden Avenue and pedestrian access from Ogden Avenue to the three buildings

- Consolidates multiple lots to improve onsite operations and mitigate stacking onto Ogden Avenue
- Provides enhanced landscaping and screening in order to provide a buffer to the residential areas to the north and a more attractive image at a community gateway intersection.

Compliance with the Zoning Ordinance

The petitioner is requesting a Planned Unit Development with deviations for Panda Express and Building A Option 2 drive-through lane setbacks, the street yard open space requirement, and the existing parking lot setbacks on Lot 3. Furthermore, the applicant is requesting the following deviations from the sign code that are not supported by staff:

| Building | Location | Size |
|----------|-------------|----------|
| A | East Facade | 63 sq ft |
| A | West Facade | 63 sq ft |
| B | West Facade | 63 sq ft |

The proposed development meets all other zoning ordinance bulk requirements including number of parking spaces. The Zoning Ordinance notes that certain types of developments are appropriate for planned unit developments and that these types will also achieve planning goals. These types include:

- Multi-building developments
- Mixed-use developments
- Developments that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan

The proposed multi-lot, multi-use commercial building redevelopment is appropriate for a PUD.

Compliance with the Subdivision Ordinance

The applicant will meet all requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance. The Final Plat of Subdivision includes a blanket easement over the vacated alley, a pedestrian easement leading to the trash enclosures, a 24-foot wide ingress/egress easement through all lots and a separate IDOT conveyance. The proposed development, resulting lots and proposed improvements comply with the Subdivision Ordinance.

Engineering\Public Improvements

The project will meet all provisions of the Stormwater and Floodplain Ordinance, and new stormwater detention is not required. At applicant's expense, the ComEd utility poles will be relocated and buried. The applicant will be dedicating right-of-way along Ogden Avenue to IDOT.

Additional public improvements include the elimination of four curb-cuts onto Ogden Avenue and the replacement of the Ogden Avenue sidewalk. The existing water main which dead-ends in front of the existing US Bank building will be extended within the Ogden Avenue right-of-way to connect to an existing water main within Main Street.

Traffic and Parking

A traffic and parking impact study for the proposed development was completed by the petitioner. Based on the development capturing a large percentage of existing traffic, the study projected minimal impact on the existing traffic in the area. The study states the proposed curb-cuts are sufficient to accommodate the development generated traffic and provides flexible access at the same time reducing the number of Ogden Avenue curb cuts. The eight vehicle drive-through stacking lanes are adequate to accommodate drive-through peak demand without blocking the parking lot drive aisles or stacking into the streets.

The proposed drive-through designs separate them from the flow of drive-aisle and pedestrian traffic. A cross-access easement will be placed over the development's main drive aisle leading to the two external curb-cuts. An existing cross-access easement covers the two connections with the adjacent Jewel property that leads to other external curb-cuts.

Public Comment

Four residential neighbors located on Forest Avenue at the rear of the current US Bank property expressed concern with the impact of trash, noise, traffic (vehicular & pedestrian), deliveries, and light trespass. The petitioner will provide a fence, 100% parking lot perimeter landscaping and will comply with Village of Downers Grove photometric requirements.

The commercial property owner to the west raised concerns including traffic generation/distribution, safety, and offsite parking on their property. The applicant noted that the proposed traffic will be able to exit the property on their site and that the reduction of curb cuts will create a safer Ogden Avenue. They also stated they were willing to work with the neighbor and undertake measures to mitigate offsite parking.

The property owner at 4240-4248 Main Street expressed concern over the alley vacation. A business owner noted some deliveries use the alley and the private property at 1035 Havens Court to drop-off or pick-up. With the vacation of the alley, deliveries can still be accomplished via private property in front of 4240-4248 Main Street.

ATTACHMENTS

Ordinances

Resolution

Maps

Staff Report with attachments dated March 6, 2017

Plan Commission draft minutes dated March 6, 2017

Revised landscape plan

Revised photometric plan

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
COUNCIL ACTION SUMMARY

INITIATED: Applicant DATE: April 11, 2017
(Name)

RECOMMENDATION FROM: _____ FILE REF: 17-PLC-0004
(Board or Department)

NATURE OF ACTION:

STEPS NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT ACTION:

- Ordinance
- Resolution
- Motion
- Other

Motion to Adopt "AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE, ILLINOIS TO DESIGNATE THE PROPERTY AT 1030-1048 OGDEN AVENUE AS PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT #58 AND AUTHORIZE CONSTRUCTION OF A MULTI-BUILDING COMMERCIAL CENTER", as presented.



SUMMARY OF ITEM:

Adoption of the attached ordinance shall designate the property located at 1030-1048 Ogden Avenue as Planned Unit Development #58 and authorize construction of a multi-building commercial center.

RECORD OF ACTION TAKEN:

ORDINANCE NO. _____**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE ZONING
ORDINANCE OF THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE, ILLINOIS
TO DESIGNATE THE PROPERTY AT 1030-1048 OGDEN AVENUE
AS PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT #58 AND AUTHORIZE
CONSTRUCTION OF A MULTI-BUILDING COMMERCIAL CENTER**

WHEREAS, the owner(s) of the property located on the northwest corner of Ogden Avenue and Main Street, commonly known as 1030-1048 Ogden Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (PINs 09-05-300-002; -004, -005 and 09-05-115-009) (hereinafter referred to as the "Property" and legally described below) have requested that such real estate be designated as a Planned Unit Development to be known as "Vequity Planned Unit Development #58" pursuant to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance of the Village of Downers Grove, as set forth in Chapter 28 of the Downers Grove Municipal Code (hereinafter referred to as the "Zoning Ordinance"); and

WHEREAS, the owner(s) have also filed a written petition with the Village conforming to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and requesting approval of the Vequity Planned Unit Development #58 plans for construction of a multi-building commercial center as provided under the Zoning Ordinance; and,

WHEREAS, the Property is to be zoned B-3/PUD, General Services and Highway Business District with a Planned Unit Development Overlay pursuant to the Downers Grove Zoning Ordinance; and,

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission of the Village of Downers Grove has given the required public notice and has conducted a public hearing on March 6, 2017 respecting a final plan for the Vequity Planned Unit Development #58 on the Property in accordance with the statutes of the State of Illinois and the ordinances of the Village of Downers Grove and has reported its findings and recommendations to the Village Council of the Village of Downers Grove pursuant to the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance; and,

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission recommended that the Property be designated as a Planned Unit Development and authorizing a permitted use, with approval of the Vequity planned unit development plans as the documents submitted are consistent with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and the character of the planned unit development; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Village of Downers Grove, in DuPage County, Illinois, as follows:

SECTION 1. That the provisions of the preamble are incorporated into this ordinance.

SECTION 2. The following documents are attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference as a part of this ordinance as Group Exhibit A, and are hereafter collectively referred to as the "Vequity planned unit development plans", all of which are incorporated by reference.

SECTION 3. That the Village Council hereby finds as follows:

- (1) That Planned Unit Development #58 meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance as follows:
- a. the zoning map amendment review and approval criteria of Sec. 28.12.030.I;
 - b. the proposed PUD development plan and map amendment would be consistent with the comprehensive plan and any other adopted plans for the subject area;
 - c. the PUD development plan complies with the PUD overlay district provisions of Sec. 28.4.030;
 - d. the proposed development will result in public benefits that are greater than or at least equal to those that would have resulted from development under conventional zoning regulations; and
 - e. the appropriate terms and conditions have been imposed on the approval to protect the interests of surrounding property owners and residents, existing and future residents of the PUD and the general public.
- (2) That the proposed development conforms with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

SECTION 4. The Zoning Ordinance is hereby amended by adding to the Zoning Map the boundaries of the following described real estate and by designating said real estate as a Planned Unit Development under the title and style "Vequity Planned Unit Development #58" to be stated on the face of said map within the boundaries of the real estate hereinafter described, to wit:

PARCEL 1

LOT 2 IN BESSER'S RESUBDIVISION OF H. BESSER'S PLAT OF SURVEY OF PART OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT OF SAID BESSER'S RESUBDIVISION RECORDED JULY 10, 1956 AS DOCUMENT 807309, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

PARCEL 2

LOTS 10, 11 AND 12 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, EXCEPT THE SOUTH 16.0 FEET THEREOF, BEING A SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT 190965, AND THAT CERTAIN PLAT OF DEDICATION RECORDED AS DOCUMENT R75-48121, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

ALSO, THE SOUTH 8.0 FEET OF THE VACATED ALLEY LYING IMMEDIATELY NORTH OF LOTS 10, 11 AND 12 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT 190965 AND THAT CERTAIN ORDINANCE VACATING PUBLIC ALLEY RECORDED AS R75-48122, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PARCEL 3

LOT 7, (EXCEPT THE EAST 20.0 FEET THEREOF), AND ALL OF LOTS 8 AND 9 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, IN THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE

PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT 190965, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PARCEL 4

LOTS 4, 5, 6 AND THE EAST 20 FEET OF LOT 7 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, IN THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT NO. 190965, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PART OF SAID LOT 4 DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT OF CURVATURE ON THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4, SAID POINT BEING 109 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID EAST LOT LINE A DISTANCE OF 12.67 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 44 DEGREES 45 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST 2.83 FEET; THENCE, SOUTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST ALONG A LINE PARALLEL WITH SAID EAST LINE OF LOT 4 A DISTANCE OF 20.47 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE, BEING THE ARC OF A CURVE CONVCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST, HAVING A RADIUS OF 25.0 FEET, HAVING A CHORD BEARING OF NORTH 11 DEGREES 17 MINUTES 25 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 10.07 FEET TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING

AND ALSO EXCEPTING THEREFROM;

THAT PART OF LOTS 4 AND 5 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, IN THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT NO. 190965, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE SOUTH 0 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4 A DISTANCE OF 97.21 FEET TO A POINT 12.67 FEET NORTH OF THE POINT OF CURVATURE ON SAID EAST LINE OF LOT 4; THENCE SOUTH 44 DEGREES 45 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST 2.83 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 0 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 0 SECONDS EAST ALONG A LINE PARALLEL WITH SAID EAST LINE OF LOT 4 A DISTANCE OF 20.47 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE, BEING THE ARC OF A CURVE CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST, HAVING A RADIUS OF 25.0 FEET, HAVING A CHORD BEARING SOUTH 55 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 55 SECONDS WEST A DISTANCE OF 28.30 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE SOUTH 87 DEGREES 42 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOTS 4 AND 5 A DISTANCE OF 17.83 FEET FOR A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST, HAVING A RADUIS OF 30.00 FEET, HAVING A CHORD BEARING NORTH 43 DEGREES 43 MINUTES 30 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 46.05 FEET FOR A POINT OF TANGENCY, SAID POINT BEING 13.00 FEET WEST OF THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE NORTH 0 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST ALONG A LINE 13.00 FEET WEST OF AND PARALLEL WITH THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4 A DISTANCE OF 105.05 FEET TO THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE NORTH 87 DEGREES 42 MINUTES 00

SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID NORTH LINE A DISTANCE OF 13.01 FEET TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING, ALL IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PARCEL 5

ALL THAT PART OF THE 16.0 FOOT WIDE ALLEY, LYING WEST OF THE WEST LINE OF MAIN STREET, LYING NORTH AND ADJOINING LOTS 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 AND 9 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT 190965, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Commonly known as: 1030, 1032, 1036, 1040 and 1048 Ogden Avenue, Downers Grove, IL 60515
Pins: 09-05-300-002,-004, -005, and 09-05-115-009

SECTION 5. The Vequity Planned Unit Development plans be and are hereby approved to permit a Planned Unit Development authorizing construction of a multi-building commercial center, subject to the conditions and restrictions contained therein, and subject to the following:

1. The Planned Unit Development, Rezoning, Special Uses, Plat of Subdivision and alley vacation shall substantially conform to the staff report; engineering, architectural and landscape drawings prepared by CivWorks Consulting, LLC, Ilekis Associates and LG Workshop dated January 25, 2017 and last revised on February 24, 2017, except as such plans may be modified to conform to the Village codes and ordinances.
2. Building A on Lot 3 shall have only one drive through, either Option 2 or Option 3.
3. Building A shall have landscaping in the landscape islands closest to the front of the building and adjacent to the patio areas.
4. The 8" water line shall be located in the Ogden Avenue right-of-way.
5. The buildings shall be equipped with an automatic fire suppression system and an automatic and manual fire alarm system.
6. The proposed pedestrian easement along the north property line of Lot 2 shall be extended to the trash enclosure on Lot 3.
7. The applicant shall reduce light levels to security level no later than 30 minutes after the close of business.
8. The petitioner shall record an indemnification hold harmless agreement to allow the construction of a building on the proposed Lot 3 in front of a private building setback line.
9. The proposed cross-access easement depicted on the Plat of subdivision shall be extended to the Ogden Avenue curb cut on Lot 3.
10. The petitioner shall add a fence along Forest Avenue and Haven Court, facing the adjacent residential zoning district.

11. The petitioner will guarantee that the average foot candle will be, at a maximum, 0.1 foot candle along the residential district boundaries.
12. Petitioner shall grant a cross access easement to the property at 4240-4248 Main Street to allow access to the Main Street curb cut upon future redevelopment of that property.
13. A landscape and fence plan shall be submitted for approval to the Community Development Director.

SECTION 6. That all ordinances or resolutions, or parts thereof, in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance be and are hereby repealed.

SECTION 7. That this ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and publication in the manner provided by law.



Mayor

Passed:

Published:

Attest: _____

Village Clerk



1030, 1032, 1036, 1040, and 1048 Ogden Avenue- Location Map





**VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE
REPORT FOR THE PLAN COMMISSION
MARCH 6, 2017 AGENDA**

| SUBJECT: | TYPE: | SUBMITTED BY: |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 17-PLC-0004 1030 – 1048 Ogden Avenue | Planned Unit Development, Rezoning, Special Use, Final Plat of Subdivision and Alley Vacation | Scott Williams Planner |

REQUEST

The petitioner is requesting approval of the following items to complete a comprehensive redevelopment at the northwest corner of Ogden Avenue and Main Street, commonly known as 1030-1048 Ogden Avenue:

1. A Planned Unit Development;
2. A Rezoning from existing B-3, General Services and Highway Business to B-3/PUD, General Services and Highway Business/Planned Unit Development’
3. Two Special Uses for two drive through restaurant facilities;
4. A vacation of the 16-foot wide improved alley at the northeast corner of the property; and
5. A Final Plat of Subdivision.

NOTICE

The application has been filed in conformance with applicable procedural and public notice requirements.

GENERAL INFORMATION

OWNERS:

Vequity LLC
400 N. State Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60654

Trust No. 43664
Richard Bradley (POA)
1036 Ogden Avenue
Downers Grove, IL 60515

Sheng-Li Wang
1040 Ogden Avenue
Downers Grove, IL
60515

Harry K. Ishida Revocable
Living Trust
C/o: Blake Horio
1900 S. Highland Avenue #104
Lombard, IL 60148

APPLICANT:

Max Odom
Vequity LLC Series XVII Downers Ogden
400 N. State
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60654

PROPERTY INFORMATION

EXISTING ZONING: B-3, General Services and Highway Business

EXISTING LAND USE: Bank, Vacant Drive-through, & Multi-tenant commercial buildings

17-PLC-0004; 1030-1048 Ogden Avenue
March 6, 2017

Page 2

PROPERTY SIZE: 90,140 sq. ft. (2.07 acres)
PINS: 09-05-300-002, -004, -005, and 09-05-115-009

SURROUNDING ZONING AND LAND USES

| | ZONING | FUTURE LAND USE |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| NORTH: | B-3, General Services and Highway Business R-4, Residential Detached House 4 R-6, Residential Apartment/Condo 6 | Corridor Commercial Single Family Residential Single Family Residential |
| SOUTH: | B-3, General Services and Highway Business | Corridor Commercial |
| EAST: | B-3, General Services and Highway Business | Corridor Commercial |
| WEST: | B-3, General Services and Highway Business | Corridor Commercial |

ANALYSIS

SUBMITTALS

This report is based on the following documents, which are on file with the Department of Community Development:

1. Project Narrative
2. Renderings
3. Plat of Survey
4. Site Plans
5. Architectural Plans
6. Elevation/Sign Plans
7. Landscape Plan
8. Photometric Plan
9. Plat of Subdivision
10. Plat of Vacation
11. Plat of Conveyance (IDOT)
12. Summary of Neighborhood Meeting
13. Traffic Impact Study
14. Alley Appraisal Report

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is proposing to redevelop the existing vacant bank drive-through, two multi-tenant commercial buildings, and the US Bank site at the northwest corner of Ogden Avenue and Main Street. The proposal is to construct two multi-tenant commercial buildings and a Panda Express on three lots. The applicant is proposing three options for Retail Building A on the western lot adjacent to Jewel-Osco. Option 1 includes a building with a maximum square footage of 10,500 square feet, Option 2 includes a drive-through facility on the west side of the building and Option 3 includes a drive-through facility on the east side of the building. Retail Building B is proposed for the middle lot and would be a multi-tenant building at 6,070 square feet. The eastern lot located on the hard corner of Ogden and Main is the Panda Express 2,229 square foot building with the proposed drive-through. The petitioner is requesting approval of the following items:

1. A Planned Unit Development designation to complete a comprehensive redevelopment of the site with a variety of uses. Planned Unit Developments are permitted in the B-3 zoning district.
2. A Zoning Ordinance Map Amendment to rezone from B-3, General Services and Highway Business to B-3/PUD, General Services and Highway Business/Planned Unit Development.
3. A Special Use to permit two drive-through restaurants in the B-3, General Services and Highway Business district, one for the Panda Express and a second for Retail Building A. A drive-through use

is listed in Section 5.010 of the Zoning Ordinance as an allowed Special Use in the B-3 zoning district.

4. Vacation of 16' public right-of-way (alley).
5. A Final Plat of Subdivision to subdivide 10 lots of record into three lots of record.

Existing Conditions

The four subject properties consist of ten lots of record. The properties are zoned B-3, General Services and Business Highway District and include a bank, a vacant stand-alone bank drive-through, and two multi-tenant buildings. These buildings include a variety of commercial and business and medical office uses.

The site contains five curb cuts on Ogden Avenue and one off of Main Street via the alley. The alley runs behind two of the existing properties. The US Bank property has two points of access with the adjacent Jewel-Osco property to the west. An existing reciprocal easement is in place which provides Jewel-Osco access around the current US Bank building and the US Bank Building access through the Jewel-Osco parking lot. This easement is proposed to remain in place and limits the site layout for Retail Building A.

Proposed Development

The petitioner is proposing to demolish all existing structures on the subject site and construct the following buildings:

| Lot | Location | Building | Size |
|-----|-------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Eastern lot | Retail Building C (Panda Express) | 2,229 sq ft |
| 2 | Middle lot | Retail Building B (Multi-Tenant) | 6,070 sq ft |
| 3 | Western Lot | Retail Building A (Multi-Tenant, no drive-through) | 10,500 sq ft |
| | | Retail Building A – Option 2 (Drive-through on west) | 9,889 sq ft |
| | | Retail Building A – Option 3 (Drive-through on east) | 6,414 sq ft |

Panda Express will be located towards the back corner of Lot 1 with the main entrance facing Main Street. The drive-through with the eight car stacking lane will wrap around the side and rear of the building with cars entering aligned with the Main Street access point. A barrier fence will separate it from the patio area to the west. Parking is located at the front of the building in the two street yards. A patio area is proposed to the east of the building just north of the main entrance along with a bike rack. The exterior building material is primarily EIFS with building accent tile and stone cladding at the base of the walls. Other features include parapets and aluminum canopies.

The 6,070 square foot multi-tenant building (Building B) located on Lot 2 will also have parking spaces between it and the street. Although no tenants are confirmed yet for this space, the use of different colors of brick and a stone base will be used to break up the façade. A parapet wall extends above the roof-line. Aluminum canopies are also shown over the entrances of the spaces. This middle lot has no Ogden Avenue curb-cut and relies on a cross-access easement stretching across the adjacent properties for access. The applicant is proposing two patio areas at the ends of the parking row closest to the building. A bike rack is also shown in the western patio area closer to the building.

Lastly, the multi-tenant building (Building A) located on the Lot 3 has three different site plan options. The default plan assumed for this review is a 10,500 square foot building with no restaurant drive-through. Parking is located at the front, side and rear. One Ogden Avenue curb is shown at the front aligned with Forest Avenue along with the two access points to Jewel-Osco and one access point to Lot 2. Option 2 (sheet AS1.2A) shows a slightly smaller 9,889 square foot building with a restaurant drive-

through and a eight car stacking lane on the western side of the building running parallel and adjacent to the property line. With this configuration, cars would enter the drive-through at the northern end and exit at the south into the front parking area. Option 3 (sheet AS1.25) has the eight car stacking lane drive-through on the eastern side of the building. Because of the configuration, this option has the smallest building footprint at 6,414 square feet. Eastbound cars would enter at the front (south) and exit to the north into the rear parking area. Just like Building B, there is no specific tenant going into any of the spaces yet and the developer has requested approval of a flexible plan that accounts for a drive-through at either end of the building but not two together. A condition of approval has been added which permits only one drive-through for Retail Building A. The building materials and design standard are the same as Building B.

IDOT has reviewed the proposed curb-cut locations and will only approve one Ogden Avenue curb-cut as shown on the proposed layout. The applicant is dedicating a portion of the Ogden Avenue street frontage and has prepared a Plat of Conveyance. The conveyed area increases the right-of-way thus matching other properties on Ogden Avenue. The proposed site plans account for this dedication. The DuPage County Division of Transportation (DuDOT) approval of the Main Street curb-cut is forthcoming. The Ogden Avenue sidewalk will be replaced and the external pedestrian access and drive aisle crosswalks to each building is a distinct paving material as required per the Zoning Ordinance.

The petitioner is proposing a total of 117 parking spaces including five handicapped spaces where 76 are required. This number is based on the maximum size of Building A at 10,500 square feet. The two other options have smaller buildings, and, therefore, a reduced parking requirement. Although the majority of the parking is located on Lot 3, there is still enough parking on each lot to meet the requirements and service the two other buildings.

There are four trash enclosures serving the three buildings with three located in middle center of the east side parking for Building A. A single trash enclosure is farther west directly behind Building A. This means all trash enclosures are located on the much larger Lot 3. Trash enclosures are not permitted in the street yard. To account for this, the petitioner is proposing a pedestrian easement behind Build B leading to the three enclosures for all the building tenants.

The petitioner is proposing new landscaping on the property in conformance with Village requirements. A significant amount of landscaping is proposed on the rear and east side property lines adjacent to and facing the residential zoning on Havens Court. In these areas, there is 100% parking lot screening. For the street yard landscaping along Ogden Avenue and Main Street, there is 75% parking lot screening. Foundation landscaping is proposed in front of the buildings to soften the impact of the wide buildings and patios areas. Although trees are not able to be planted in all landscape islands at the end of the parking rows, the applicant is proposing a total of 38 new trees that are placed evenly across both street frontages and concentrated in the rear areas adjacent to residential zoning.

The three proposed shopping center monument signs comply with the zoning code. Furthermore, the wall signs facing the streets on all three buildings will comply based on the lineal frontage of each tenant space. The applicant is seeking a deviation for signage on both Building A and Building B. The petitioner is requesting additional sign square footage for each building and additional signs to be placed on a façade that does not have street frontage as identified below:

| Building | Location | Size |
|----------|-------------|----------|
| A | East Facade | 63 sq ft |
| A | West Facade | 63 sq ft |
| B | West Facade | 63 sq ft |

Staff is not supportive of this deviation because these walls do not face a public drivable right-of-way and is not consistent with other similar developments along Ogden Avenue and other commercial corridors.

A 170' by 16' public alley running east – west at the northwest corner of the property is requested to be vacated. The vacation allows greater flexibility in site design and accommodates an access point and the Panda Express drive-through. Per the Village's Right-of-Way Vacation Policy (Resolution #2003-58), staff contacted the public agencies and determined that the utility providers and the Village do not have any objections to the vacation of the right-of-way as long as a public drainage, utility and access easement is retained along the entire width and length of the alley. The required easement has been provided as noted on the Plat of Vacation. The applicant is also working with ComEd to relocate the utility poles.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The current Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject site as a part of a catalyst site in the *Ogden Avenue Central - Key Focus Areas*. The draft update revision of the Comprehensive Plan continues to identify the subject site as part of the "D8" Ogden Avenue Catalyst site and recommends parcel assembly and aesthetic and functionality improvements. The applicant's proposal aligns with these goals. Both plans note that this area should be redeveloped with attention to pedestrian circulation, reducing the number of curb-cuts, cross-access between lots and overall enhanced appearance at an important intersection.

The proposed development:

- Removes four curb-cuts and improves access onto Ogden Avenue
- Improves connectivity by installing a sidewalk along Ogden Avenue and pedestrian access from Ogden Avenue to the three buildings
- Consolidates multiple lots to improve onsite operations and mitigate stacking onto Ogden Avenue
- Provides enhanced landscaping and screening in order to provide a buffer to the residential areas to the north and a more attractive image at a community gateway intersection.

The plan recommends the corridor commercial area include a blend of neighborhood-oriented commercial retail, offices, smaller regional retail and service uses. The proposed development meets the goals of current and draft updated Comprehensive Plan.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE

The subject property is made up of ten lots of record. The petitioner is proposing to subdivide these ten lots into three lots of record. All new businesses lots must be at least 75' wide by 140' deep for a total area of 10,500 square feet. Lots 1 and 3 meet all of the requirements, while Lot 2 has an existing lot depth of only 126 feet as shown in the table below:

| 1030-1048 Ogden Ave | Lot Width | | Lot Depth | | Lot Area | |
|------------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|---------------------------|
| | Required | Proposed | Required | Proposed | Required | Proposed |
| Lot 1 | 75' | 121' (curved) | 140' | 167' | 10,500 sf | 20,289 sf (.47 acres) |
| Lot 2 | 75' | 131' (angled) | 140' | 126' (existing) | 10,500 sf | 16,995 sf (0.39 acres) |
| Lot 3 | 75' | 119' | 140' | 459' | 10,500 sf | 52,856 sf (1.21 acres) |

The Final Plat of Subdivision includes a blanket easement over the vacated alley, a pedestrian easement leading to the trash enclosures, a 24-foot wide ingress/egress easement through Lots 1 and 2 and a separate IDOT conveyance. The proposed development, resulting lots and proposed improvements

comply with the Subdivision Ordinance.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING ORDINANCE

The property is zoned B-3, General Services and Highway Business. The bulk requirements of the proposed development in the B-3 zoning district are summarized in the following table:

1030-1048 Ogden Avenue Zoning Requirements for Comprehensive Redevelopment

| Lot 1- Panda Express | Required | Proposed |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Building South Setback (Street Yard) | 75' from Ogden Avenue centerline | 101' |
| Building North Setback (Rear Yard) | 0' | 13' |
| Building West Setback (Side Yard) | 0' | 20' |
| Building East Setback (Street Yard) | 25' Non-Ogden Avenue Street Setback | 97' |
| Floor Area Ratio | 0.75 max | 0.11 |
| Building Height | 60' max | 19.5' |

| Lot 2- Building B | Required | Proposed |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| Building South Setback (Street Yard) | 75' from Ogden Avenue centerline | 116' |
| Building North Setback (Rear Yard) | 0' | 5' |
| Building West Setback (Side Yard) | 0' | 5'2" |
| Building East Setback (Side Yard) | 0' | 5'11" |
| Floor Area Ratio | 0.75 max | 0.36 |
| Building Height | 60' max | 18' |

| Lot 3- Building A | Required | Proposed |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|
| Building South Setback (Street Yard) | 75' from Ogden Avenue centerline | 114 ft |
| Building North Setback (Rear Yard) | 20' | 98' |
| Building West Setback (Side Yard) | 0' | 4' |
| Building East Setback (Side Yard) | 0' | 29'3" |
| Floor Area Ratio | 0.75 max | 0.20 |
| Building Height | 60' max | 18' |

| Planned Development Elements | Required | Proposed |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Open Space (Total of Lots 1-3) | 9,014 sf | 13,205 sf |
| 50% Street Yard Open Space (Total of Lots 1-3) | 4,057 sf | 3,507 sf |
| Panda Drive-through Setback (north) | 25' | 1' |
| Panda Drive-through Setback (west) | 25' | 0' |
| Building A Drive-through (west) | 25' | 1' |
| Main Street Parking Setback (special corner street setback) | 8' | 17.5' |
| Ogden Avenue Parking Setback (from ROW Centerline) | 50' | 50' |
| Lot 3 Parking Setbacks | | |
| North Setback | 20' | 1' |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------|------|----------------------|
| | | (existing) |
| East Setback | 20' | 13'11" (existing) |
| Buildings A and B Sign Area Side Elevations | 0 sf | 63.3 sf (each) |

The proposed planned unit development departs from four zoning regulations: the drive-through setbacks, rear and side parking setbacks on Lot 3, the street yard open space requirement, and wall sign area/locations. The Building A (Option 2) and Panda Express drive-through setbacks are necessary to allow the site to meet other bulk requirements and maintain the required 10' wide stacking lanes. These property lines are not adjacent to residential zoning. The Option 3 drive-through conforms to all setbacks but is not optimal for onsite traffic circulation.

The side and rear parking lot setbacks are because the applicant is proposing to use the existing parking lot footprint with no proposed modifications. The parking spaces directly adjacent to residential zoning meet the required setback; however, the rear eastern parking section of Lot 3 where Havens court curves, does not meet the setback. There is no curb-cut onto Havens Court, and the distance between the property line and the sidewalk varies from 2' to 44.' The applicant is proposing to densely landscape the parking lot perimeter in this area of the development.

The landscaping deviation is regarding the street yard open space requirement of 50% (or 5% of the total site area). Due to the site limitations based on the lack of lot depth and the need to provide parking for the appropriately sized buildings, two of the lots cannot meet this requirement. Lot 3 is also "L" shaped with an exaggerated lot depth compared to the other two lots. The applicant is compensating by exceeding the 10% open space requirement for the entire site with landscaping heavily concentrated in the rear Lot 3 parking area closest to the residential zoning.

The applicant is requesting a sign code deviation to allow an extra wall sign on Building A's east and west elevations and Building B's west elevation. These signs are shown at 63.3 square feet-the same size as the southern elevations facing Ogden Avenue. Granting this deviation gives three additional wall signs and additional sign area that does not face a drivable public right-of-way. Although the applicant has made an effort to have the three monument signs meet all area and distance separation requirements, the additional wall signs are not supported by staff because there are no difficulties with the site layout that is visually restrictive.

The petitioner is proposing parking lot lighting that is in accordance requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. All lighting will be directed towards the buildings, driveways and parking areas and away from the adjacent residential areas.

The applicant is applying for a Planned Unit Development in order to redevelop the property with a variety of uses and structures on a site that would not be allowed under general zoning regulations because of the existing conditions on the site. In order for the applicant to apply for a Planned Unit Development, the applicant's proposal must meet one or more objectives identified in Zoning Ordinance Section 4.030.A.2. These objectives work to balance the needs of the applicant and the additional public benefits gained from permitting the Planned Unit Development. The increased safety, onsite circulation, connectivity, reducing curb-cuts and improved landscaping will result in several public benefits that meet the following identified Planned Unit Development Objectives:

- Implementation of and consistency with the comprehensive plan and other relevant plans and policies

- Efficient and economical provision of public facilities and services
- A coordinated transportation system that includes an inter-connected hierarchy of facilities for motorized and non-motorized travel

With all the above analysis considered, the applicant's proposal is consistent with the Village's Zoning Ordinance except for the requested three additional wall signs.

ENGINEERING/PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS

Based on the existing and proposed impervious area on the site, new stormwater detention is not required for the proposed development because impervious area is reduced by 164 square feet. Post Construction Best Management Practices are not required for this property. The project will meet all provisions of the Stormwater and Floodplain Ordinance.

Additional public improvements include the reduction of curb-cuts onto Ogden Avenue and the replacement of the Ogden Avenue sidewalk. The existing water main which dead-ends in front of the existing US Bank building will be extended within the Ogden Avenue right-of-way to connect to an existing water main within Main Street. This main will be upsized to an 8" line. The applicant is working with ComEd to relocate the existing utility poles located in the alley. The Sanitary District has provided conceptual approval for the proposed development.

TRAFFIC

A traffic and parking impact study for the proposed development was prepared by KLOA in January 2017. The primary access to the property will be through an Ogden Avenue curb cut aligned opposite from Forest Avenue (no signal), the Jewel-Osco access drive, and the enlarged Main Street curb cut.

The Ogden Avenue with Main Street intersection level of service (LOS) for the weekday morning peak demand is D and E for the weekday evening peak demand. The Year 2022 conditions indicate the same LOS levels. The study projects a limited impact on the area roadways with the site adding less than three percent of the total traffic traversing this intersection.

The Ogden-Avenue and Forest Avenue is an unsignalized intersection with a full movement access drive. The study found that this intersection can continue to remain unsignalized while providing efficient and flexible access to the site while reducing the traffic load using the Jewel-Osco curb-cut.

The study states the proposed curb-cuts are sufficient to accommodate the development generated traffic and provides flexible access at the same time reducing the number of Ogden Avenue curb cuts. The eight vehicle drive-through stacking lanes are adequate to accommodate drive-through peak demand without blocking the parking lot drive aisles or stacking into the streets. The drive-through stacking design and reduced curb-cuts will not negatively impact the traffic in the surrounding area and staff concurs with the findings of the report.

PUBLIC SAFETY REQUIREMENTS

The Fire Prevention Division has reviewed the proposed plans and determined that the development provides sufficient access for emergency vehicles. As shown in the truck turning plan, the Village's largest emergency vehicle can maneuver through the site and access all three buildings. The buildings will also include a fire alarm system and sprinkler system that meet the Village's code requirements. A fire department connection is provided on the front of each building façade.

NEIGHBORHOOD COMMENT

Notice was provided to all property owners 250 feet or less from the property in addition to posting public

hearing notice signs and publishing the legal notice in the *Downers Grove Suburban Life*. There were three informational inquiries received by staff along with a representative of the adjacent property owner viewing the plans at village hall. Another adjacent owner has objected to the alley vacation due to concern with garbage trucks not being able to access dumpsters at the rear of his building.

As required by the Zoning Ordinance, the petitioner held a neighborhood meeting on February 23, 2017. The property owner to the north with a real estate broker attended and discussed traffic, trash enclosure locations, and general access around the site. A summary of the meeting is attached.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The petitioner is requesting a Planned Unit Development, Rezoning, a Special Use, Plat of Subdivision and an Alley Vacation to redevelop 1030-1048 Ogden Avenue. Staff finds that the proposal meets the standards as outlined below:

Section 28.12.040.C.6 Review and Approval Criteria

The decision to amend the zoning map to approve a PUD development plan and to establish a PUD overlay district are matters of legislative discretion that are not controlled by any single standard. In making recommendations and decisions regarding approval of planned unit developments, review and decision-making bodies must consider at least the following factors:

a. The zoning map amendment review and approval criteria of Sec. 12.030.I.

See the analysis of rezoning review and approval criteria below. This standard has been met.

b. Whether the proposed PUD development plan and map amendment would be consistent with the comprehensive plan and any other adopted plans for the subject area.

The proposed project is consistent with the current and draft updated Comprehensive Plan. The Plan identifies this area as a Catalyst Site within the *Ogden Avenue Key Focus Area*. A PUD overlay shall provide the necessary tools to redevelop the property with multiple buildings and uses with creative and modern development to address the key concepts of improved circulation, access, screening, safety, and commercial expansion per the current and draft updated Comprehensive Plan.

c. Whether PUD development plan complies with the PUD overlay district provisions of Sec. 4.030.

The proposed project meets several of the PUD overlay district provisions and objectives as found in Section 4.030 of the Zoning Ordinance. One of the objectives of a PUD is to provide flexible and creative solutions to allow change based on market conditions. This project will advance the objective to enhance the existing transportation system with an inter-connected hierarchy of facilities for both motorized and non-motorized travel by improving off-street parking, stacking, and replacement of a public sidewalk. This standard has been met.

d. Whether the proposed development will result in public benefits that are greater than or at least equal to those that would have resulted from development under conventional zoning regulations.

The proposal will result in the retention and expansion of an existing business in the Village of Downers Grove while attracting new businesses. The consolidation of the smaller parcels into a larger commercial property is a goal for Ogden Avenue corridor development in the current and draft updated Comprehensive Plan. The improved facility as discussed above shall provide numerous public benefits that would not be possible under the conventional zoning regulation, including the removal of four curb cuts onto Ogden Avenue. This standard has been met.

- e. Whether appropriate terms and conditions have been imposed on the approval to protect the interests of surrounding property owners and residents, existing and future residents of the PUD and the general public.*

The petitioner has worked with Village staff to optimize the redevelopment potential of the site as envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan, including elimination of four Ogden Avenue curb cuts, increased additional landscaping and buffering, increased pedestrian access and safety, increased bike parking and more efficient on-site circulation. These elements of the site design protect the interests of the surrounding property owners, businesses, residents and the general public. This project will advance many goals and objective laid out in several adopted documents and the conditions below will ensure that those goals and objectives are advanced. This standard has been met.

Section 12.030.I. Zoning Map Amendment Review and Approval Criteria

The decision to amend the zoning map is a matter of legislative discretion that is not controlled by any single standard. In making recommendations and decisions about zoning map amendments, review and decision-making bodies must consider at least the following factors:

- 1. The existing use and zoning of nearby property.***

The current uses of the subject site includes a bank, a vacant stand-alone bank drive-through, and two multi-tenant buildings with business and medical office uses. The surrounding properties to the north, east, south and west are zoned B-3, General Services and Business Highway District and consist of a variety of commercial uses. Along Forest Avenue, a property to the north is zoned R-4, Residential Detached House and is improved with a single family home. Across Havens Court is zoned R-6, Residential Apartment/Condo 6 and has two apartment buildings. The required building setbacks have been maintained with the adjacent properties. The proposed use and development is appropriate as compared to the surrounding zoning and uses. This standard has been met.

- 2. The extent to which the particular zoning restrictions affect property values.***

The PUD overlay and the proposed project will protect the character and integrity of adjacent properties by requiring subsequent approvals for major changes, which will assist in maintaining property values. Also, the subject property will be improved through site design modifications to improve current site conditions and bring the property closer to compliance and decrease non-conformity. This project will include PUD overlay restrictions which will not negatively affect property values but should protect property values. This standard has been met.

- 3. The extent to which any diminution in property value is offset by an increase in the public health, safety and welfare.***

The proposed rezoning will not impact property values or the public health, safety and welfare of the community or neighborhood. The property will be redeveloped with numerous improvements, features and public amenities to increase the public health, safety and welfare. This standard has been met.

- 4. The suitability of the subject property for the zoned purposes.***

The property is zoned B-3, General Services and Business Highway District. The restaurants with drive-through facilities are allowed Special Uses in the B-3 district. Additionally, the proposed PUD overlay will enhance the suitability of the proposed use for the subject property. The PUD overlay will allow multiple buildings on a single site, improved internal circulation with shared drive-aisles, and attractive and high quality development overall. This standard has been met.

5. *The length of time that the subject property has been vacant as zoned, considering the context of land development in the vicinity.*

Only one of the properties on the subject site is vacant. The rezoning of the property for the PUD overlay will enhance the subject site, provide numerous benefits to the public and allow for zoning flexibility to be offered in order for several property enhancements to take place. This standard has been met.

6. *The value to the community of the proposed use.*

The property is identified within the *Ogden Avenue Key Focus Areas* in the current and draft updated Comprehensive Plan. The proposal is to improve the facility through the enhancement of landscaping, pedestrian access and connectivity, elimination of four Ogden Avenue curb-cuts, and re-configuration of on-site circulation. Rezoning the property for the PUD overlay will allow creative options for the applicant to incorporate the key concepts and objectives identified in the Comprehensive Plan that complements existing uses at a prime location within the Village. This standard has been met.

7. *The comprehensive plan.*

The proposed PUD overlay and the proposed project are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The proposal will develop the property as a Catalyst Site within the *Ogden Avenue Key Focus Area* as desired in the current and draft updated Comprehensive Plan. This standard has been met.

Section 28.12.050.H Approval Criteria

No special use may be recommended for approval or approved unless the respective review or decision-making body determines that the proposed special use is constituent with and in substantial compliance with all Village Council policies and plans and that the applicant has presented evidence to support each of the following conclusions:

1. *That the proposed use is expressly authorized as a Special Use in the district in which it is to be located;*

The property is located in the B-3, General Service and Highway Business zoning district. Under Section 5.010 of the Zoning Ordinance, a drive-through facility is listed as an allowable Special Use in the B-3 zoning district. This standard has been met.

2. *That the proposed use at the proposed location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or a facility that is in the interest of public convenience and will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood or community.*

The proposed redevelopment, which includes the construction of three new commercial buildings and two drive-throughs, are desirable within the Ogden Avenue corridor and will contribute to the general welfare of the community. The proposed drive-throughs meet various Comprehensive Plan goals which include reinvestment, adding to the complement of auto-oriented businesses and adding uses that cater to the nearby residents and to the larger region. This standard has been met.

3. *That the proposed use will not, in the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity or be injurious to property values or improvements in the vicinity.*

The proposed development and drive-through facilities will not be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of persons residing in or working in the vicinity and will not be injurious to property values or improvements in the vicinity. The proposed development will convert a vacant bank drive-through and other older commercial buildings into an active commercial development that will contribute

to the ongoing enhancement of the Ogden Avenue corridor. The development will increase the overall value of this corridor and should increase property values while attracting new business. The drive-through facility has been designed in a manner that will separate the vehicles from the pedestrian areas. Moreover, landscaping and screening will be added which will create a buffer from the adjacent properties. This standard has been met.

Compliance with the Procedure to be followed in the Vacation of Streets, Alleys, and Public Rights-of-Way (Resolution #2003-58)

The Village's alley vacation policy asks the following questions when it comes to determining if an alley can be vacated. These questions and staff's findings are listed below:

1. Is there written consent of at least two property owners who abut the proposed parcel to be vacated?
 - The alley to be vacated includes two current property owners (1030 Ogden Avenue and 1032-1036 Ogden Avenue) that are part of the redevelopment proposal.
2. Whether the Parcel or portion thereof, is no longer necessary for public use and whether the public interest will be served by such vacation request.
 - The alley is improved and provides access to the property at 1030 Ogden Avenue, and secondary rear access to 1032-1036 Ogden Avenue, 1035 Havens Court and 4248 Main Street. The proposed vacation will permit the continued access to redevelopment properties while also permitting redevelopment to occur. As noted above, staff contacted the utility companies and outside public agencies to determine the extent of public interest. Based on their replies, staff has determined the public interests are addressed by placing a public drainage, utility and access easement over the entire vacated alley.
3. Whether the Parcel or portion thereof, should be vacated and whether public utility easements and any ingress-egress easements are to be maintained.
 - A public drainage, utility and utility access easement will be retained over the entire alley length and width. As such, the petitioners will not be able to construct any permanent structure, other than a driveway, drive-through lane or fence, within this easement.
4. The amount and type of compensation, if any, to be required as a condition to the effectiveness of the vacation of the parcel.
 - The right-of-way vacation policy requires petitioners provide the Village with compensation for the alley to be vacated. The petitioner has provided an appraisal report for the alley prepared by Property Valuation Services on February 5, 2017. Based on the appraisal report, the value of the alley is \$10,000. Compensation for the alley shall be up to the discretion of the Village Council.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed Planned Unit Development, Rezoning, Special Uses, Plat of Subdivision and alley vacation for three commercial building at 1030 - 1048 Ogden Avenue is consistent with the current and draft updated Comprehensive Plan, the Zoning Ordinance and surrounding zoning and land use classifications. Based on the findings listed above, staff recommends the Plan Commission recommend the Village Council **approve** the requested Planned Unit Development, Rezoning, Special Uses, Plat of Subdivision and alley vacation as requested in case 17-PLC-0004 subject to the following conditions:

17-PLC-0004; 1030-1048 Ogden Avenue
March 6, 2017

Page 13

1. The Planned Unit Development, Rezoning, Special Uses, Plat of Subdivision and alley vacation shall substantially conform to the staff report; engineering, architectural and landscape drawings prepared by CivWorks Consulting, LLC, Ilekis Associates and LG Workshop dated January 25, 2017 and last revised on February 24, 2017, except as such plans may be modified to conform to the Village codes and ordinances.
2. Building A on Lot 3 shall have only one drive through, either Option 2 or Option 3.
3. At the discretion of the Village Council, the applicant shall compensate the Village \$10,000 prior to the execution of the alley vacation.
4. Building A shall have landscaping in the landscape islands closest to the front of the building and adjacent to the patio areas.
5. The 8" water line shall be located in the Ogden Avenue right-of-way.
6. The buildings shall be equipped with an automatic suppression system and an automatic and manual fire alarm system.
7. The proposed pedestrian easement along the north property line of Lot 2 shall be extended to the trash enclosure on Lot 3.
8. The applicant shall reduce light levels to security level no later than 30 minutes after the close of business.
9. Record an indemnification hold harmless agreement to allow the construction of a building on the proposed Lot 3 in front of a private building setback line.
10. The proposed cross-access easement is extended to Lot 3's Ogden Avenue curb cut.

Staff Report Approved By:



Stanley J. Popovich, AICP
Director of Community Development

SP; sw
-att



real estate. redefined.

Date: January 27, 2017

To: Downers Grove Department of Community Development

From: Vequity LLC Series XVII Downers Ogden ("Vequity")

Subject: Plan Commission Application for PUD

The Plan Commission Application for PUD includes the following:

- Petition for Plan Commission Application
- Owner Acknowledgments of Application
- Application Fees
 - o \$521 for Zoning Map Amendment
 - o \$1,015 for Special Use Permit (Non-Residential)
 - o \$1,739 for Planned Unit Development Amendment
 - o \$218 for Lot Consolidation
- (1) Collated full size 24 x 48 plan set, Including
 - o Plat of Survey
 - o Preliminary Plat of Subdivision
 - o Detailed Siteplan
 - o Photometric Plan
 - o Preliminary Engineering Plans
 - o Building Elevations
 - o Landscaping Plan
 - o Signage Plan with Elevations
 - o Color Renderings
- Twelve (12) collated packets of 11 x 17 plan set
- One (1) Copy of Plans for Downers Grove Sanitary District Review
- Ecological Compliance Assessment
- Kane-DuPage Land Use Opinion application
- Certification of Public Notice & List of Surrounding Properties
- Traffic Study performed by KLOA
- One (1) CD with an electronic version of the plans (pdf version)
- Certification of Public Notice & List of Surrounding Properties
- Siteplan Showing Buildable Areas (outlined in red)

Introduction

Vequity is submitting plans for a proposed redevelopment at the NW corner of Ogden and Main Street along the Ogden Avenue corridor. Vequity owns the corner parcel (1030 W Ogden) and has under agreement 1036 W Ogden, 1040 W Ogden and 1048 W Ogden. Vequity is proposing to construct three separate buildings and a Village entryway feature:

- Retail Building C: An Approximately 2,229 square foot ("SF") Panda Express drive thru restaurant
- Retail Building B: Up to a 7,000 SF multi-tenant retail building
- Retail Building A: Up to a 10,500 SF multi or single tenant building with a non-automotive drive thru
- Marquee signage for Downers Grove

These parcels together represent a very important and strategic aspect to the Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan and this redevelopment will have an extremely positive impact on the Ogden Avenue corridor. Until the main corners of the Ogden Avenue corridor are redeveloped, it is likely the balance of parcels will remain in their current state(s). Typically, redevelopments begin with "prime corners" and expand out. Being one of, if not the most important, intersection along the Ogden Avenue corridor, this redevelopment is expected to bring high-quality tenancy, high-end design – grounds and buildings, increased sales and real estate tax revenue to the Village and daily needs shopping. It will also provide the Village with a marquee entrance, expanded shopping options for citizens and will continue to reinforce to national and local tenants Downers Grove as an important geographic for their stores.

The current properties have either been vacant for several years, are underutilized, or do not present the Village with the highest and best use. Additionally, there are significant impediments to redeveloping these parcels due to environmental contamination, configuration of overhead powerlines, site grading, access, and above market rental rates needed to make the finances work. Further, the timing associated with assembling four properties, some of which are operating businesses, are leased to tenants or have troubled owners, is an extremely difficult exercise. After exhaustive work, we have been able to align all aspects of this proposed development and feel now is the right time to bring this before the Village.

Location

The proposed development spans four existing lots (1030 W Ogden, 1036 W Ogden, 1040 W Ogden and 1048 W Ogden) at the corner of Main Street and Ogden Ave.

Tenants

We are in discussions with several national and local tenants to occupy the various buildings, including recognizable restaurants and retailers. We anticipate having as many as five restaurants occupy the development, greatly expanding the available options in the area and generating significant sales tax revenue for the Village.

Retail building A will be a Panda Express. Tenants for retail building B & C are still being negotiated.

Site Plan

Vequity is proposing to construct three separate buildings (from east to west):

- Retail Building C: An Approximately 2,229 square foot ("SF") Panda Express drive thru restaurant
- Retail Building B: Up to a 7,000 SF multi-tenant retail building
- Retail Building A: Up to a 10,500 SF single or multi-tenant building with a non-automotive drive thru

The development will have two access points – both currently existing – one on Main Street and one on Ogden Ave. Vequity is requesting from IDOT that these access points remain full access.

Retail building C will be a ~2,229 SF Panda Express single tenant drive thru restaurant with the drive thru on the north and west side of the building and an outdoor patio facing Main Street. Of note, there is a food restriction on 1030 W Ogden which restricts food sales of any kind. Due to this restriction and to make the development feasible we have shifted retail building C westward in order to not impact the restriction.

Retail building B is a multi-tenant retail strip center with a buildable area (to be further defined below) of up to 7,000 SF.

Retail building A will either be a single or multi-tenant retail strip center with a buildable area of 10,500 SF. We are in discussions with several tenants and are requesting the village approve a special use drive thru (non-automotive) to allow us the flexibility when negotiating with tenants. The drive thru would be located on either the east or west sides of the building. We have included three plans labeled "Option 2, 3 and 4", highlighting the potential configurations.

We are proposing a landscaped marquee stone entryway feature for the Village that achieves one of the Village's suggestions in the Downers Grove Comprehensive Plan. A rendering of the entryway feature is included in the package.

Architecture

Retail building B & C are designed as full masonry buildings with limestone bases, undulating roof lines, and alternating brick colors, which we believe fits in nicely with the nearby buildings (Starbucks, Chipotle and BMO Harris).

Retail building A is Panda Express and the architecture is based on their national prototype which includes a mixture of stone, EIFS, wainscoting, and accent tile. Full elevations and a colored rendering are provided for reference.

Landscape Plans

The development has landscaping beds of shrubs, ornamental grasses, and perennials all around in keeping with the Village's landscape ordinance. A complete landscaping plan is included for reference.

Signage

Vequity is requesting four masonry base monument signs – one on Main street at the full access point, one at the corner of Main Street and Ogden Avenue that is integrated into the marquee signage, one on proposed lot 2 in front of retail building B, and one on proposed lot 3 in front of retail building A at the entrance of Ogden Avenue. Colored elevations are included for reference.

We have included in our submittal signage “boxes” showing the maximum SF for each tenant/building for retail buildings A and B. Individual tenants will be required to obtain separate signage permits from the Village based on the total allowable SF depicted on the elevations.

Full signage specs for retail building C (Panda Express) are included.

Buildable Areas

Vequity is requesting the Village to approve “buildable areas” for retail buildings B and C. This will allow Vequity the flexibility through administrative methods to adjust the SF of each building depending on tenant dimensional requests and total SF demands. The buildable areas follow the curb lines around each building, allowing Vequity to build within the footprint of the outlined area, but not outside of this area. The buildable areas are highlighted in red on one of the submittal documents.

Special Use

To proceed with this development, Vequity requires two special use permits:

- A special use permit from the Village for a single lane drive-thru for Panda Express for retail building C
- A special use permit from the Village for a drive-thru (non-automotive) for retail building A

In closing, we believe this project would be a major asset to the Village. The proposed use will clean up, beautify, and highlight a prominent corner within the Village, significantly add to Village's retail sales and real estate tax revenue base, and eliminate the underutilization of this strategic corner.

With your approvals we hope construction can begin the 2nd quarter of 2017.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Chris Ileki", with a horizontal line extending to the right.

Chris Ileki, Principal
Vequity
C.Ileki@Vequity.com





Elevations

Scale | NTS



| SIGN | LOCATION | TYPE | HEIGHT | WIDTH | ALLOWED | PROPOSED | BALANCE |
|------|------------------|-------------------------|--------|------------|---------|----------|---------|
| S1 | SHORT STOREFRONT | STACKED WHITE LETTERSET | 2'-6" | 13'-4 1/4" | 82 | 64.54 | 17.46 |



| | |
|-----------------------------------------|---|
| Revisions: | X |
| Left justified letterset / KB / 1.25.17 | X |
| X | X |
| X | X |

| | | |
|---------------------|------|----------|
| File Location: | STND | <u>X</u> |
| Drive/Clients/Panda | CSTM | ___ |
| AS | CR | EN |

Date: 1.16.17
 Designer: KB PM: MC


City/State: Downers Grove, IL
 Address: Main & Ogden

Drawing #
 Site Name

C51523
 -

Elevations

Scale | NTS



Scale | 1/4" = 1'

| SIGN | LOCATION | TYPE | HEIGHT | WIDTH | ALLOWED | PROPOSED | BALANCE |
|------|----------------------|-------------|--------|-------|---------|----------|---------|
| S2 | DRIVE THRU ELEVATION | LOCKUP LOGO | 6'-0" | 6'-0" | 60 | 36 | 24 |



| | | |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| Revisions: | | X |
| changed to 6' / KB / 1.25.17 | | X |
| X | | X |
| X | | X |

| | | |
|---------------------|------|----------|
| File Location: | STND | <u>X</u> |
| Drive/Clients/Panda | CSTM | |
| AS | CR | EN |

| | |
|-----------|---------|
| Date: | 1.16.17 |
| Designer: | KB |
| PM: | MC |

| | |
|-------------|-------------------|
| City/State: | Downers Grove, IL |
| Address: | Main & Ogden |

| | |
|-----------|--------|
| Drawing # | C51523 |
| Site Name | - |

C51523

PLAT OF SURVEY

LOT 2 IN BESSER'S RESUBDIVISION OF H. BESSER'S PLAT OF SURVEY OF PART OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT OF SAID BESSER'S RESUBDIVISION RECORDED JULY 10, 1956 AS DOCUMENT 807309, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

ALSO:

LOTS 10, 11 AND 12 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, EXCEPT THE SOUTH 16.0 FEET THEREOF, BEING A SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT 190965, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

ALSO:

LOT 7, EXCEPT THE EAST 20.0 FEET THEREOF, AND ALL OF LOTS 8 AND 9 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, IN THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT 190965, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

LOTS 4, 5, 6 AND THE EAST 20 FEET OF LOT 7 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, IN THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT NO. 190965, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PART OF SAID LOT 4 DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT OF CURVATURE ON THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4, SAID POINT BEING 109 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4 A DISTANCE OF 12.67 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 44 DEGREES 45 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST 2.83 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST ALONG A LINE PARALLEL WITH SAID EAST LINE OF LOT 4 A DISTANCE OF 20.47 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE, BEING THE ARC OF A CURVE CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST, HAVING A RADIUS OF 25.0 FEET, HAVING A CHORD BEARING NORTH 11 DEGREES 17 MINUTES 25 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 10.07 FEET TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING


AND ALSO EXCEPTING THEREFROM:

THAT PART OF LOTS 4 AND 5 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, IN THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT NO. 190965, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:


BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE SOUTH 0 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4 A DISTANCE OF 97.21 FEET TO A POINT 12.67 FEET NORTH OF THE POINT OF CURVATURE ON SAID EAST LINE OF LOT 4; THENCE SOUTH 44 DEGREES 45 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST 2.83 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST ALONG A LINE PARALLEL WITH SAID EAST LINE OF LOT 4 A DISTANCE OF 20.47 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE, BEING THE ARC OF A CURVE CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST, HAVING A RADIUS OF 25.0 FEET, HAVING A CHORD BEARING NORTH 11 DEGREES 17 MINUTES 25 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 10.07 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE SOUTH 87 DEGREES 42 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOTS 4 AND 5 A DISTANCE OF 17.83 FEET FOR A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST, HAVING A RADIUS OF 30.00 FEET, HAVING A CHORD BEARING NORTH 43 DEGREES 43 MINUTES 30 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 46.05 FEET FOR A POINT OF TANGENCY, SAID POINT BEING 13.00 FEET WEST OF THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE NORTH 0 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST ALONG A LINE 13.00 FEET WEST OF AND PARALLEL WITH THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4 A DISTANCE OF 105.05 FEET TO THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE NORTH 87 DEGREES 42 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID NORTH LINE A DISTANCE OF 13.01 FEET TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING, ALL IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

BLOCK 5
LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION
Document No. 190965

BLOCK 6
LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION
Document No. 190965



STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF DUPAGE) S.S.
THIS PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONFORMS TO CURRENT MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR A BOUNDARY SURVEY THAT I, MICHAEL L. KRISCH, AN ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR, HAVE HAD SURVEYED UNDER MY SUPERVISION THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN THE ABOVE CAPTION AS SHOWN BY THE ANNEXED PLAT WHICH IS A REPRESENTATION OF SAID SURVEY.
GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL AT DOWNERS GROVE, ILLINOIS, THIS 19TH DAY OF MAY A.D. 2016.
Michael L. Krusch
ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR
NO. 35-2501 LICENSE EXPIRES NOVEMBER 30, 2018
REFER TO DEED OR GUARANTEE POLICY FOR BUILDING LINE RESTRICTIONS AND EASEMENTS NOT SHOWN ON THE PLAT OF SURVEY. COMPLETE DESCRIPTION AND POINTS BEFORE BUILDING AND REPORT ANY APPARENT DIFFERENCE TO THE SURVEYOR AT ONCE. THIS SURVEY AND PLAT OF SURVEY ARE VOID WITHOUT OUR EMBOSSED SURVEYOR SEAL HEREON. NO DIMENSIONS ARE TO BE ASSUMED BY SCALING.



Prepared For: VEQUITY



| No. | Date | Revision Description | By: |
|-----|------|----------------------|-----|
| | | | |


KRISCH LAND SURVEYING, LLC
PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE No. 184-006866
P.O. BOX 929 • PLAINFIELD, IL 60544 • Phone: 630.627.5589
Fax: 630.627.5594
SURVEYING - CONSULTING - CONSTRUCTION LAYOUT
Scale: 1"=20' Drawn: Chk'd: MLK/GDK File# CAD File: 16-041-POS

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------------|
| | Sanitary Sewer Manhole |
| | Storm Sewer Manhole |
| | Catch Basin |
| | Curb Inlet |
| | Fire Hydrant |
| | Water Valve in Vault |
| | Water Valve |
| | B-Box |
| | Sign |
| | Street Sign |
| | Gas Valve |
| | Landscape Light / Post |
| | Light Pole |
| | Electric Transformer |
| | Utility Pole |
| | Telephone Manhole |
| | Electric Handhole |
| | Traffic Signal Pole |
| | Pole Anchor |
| | Utility Pole w/ Overhead Wire Direction |
| | Storm Sewer |
| | Sanitary Sewer |
| | Manhole |
| | Conduit |
| | Underground Electric Line |
| | Underground Telephone Line |
| | Underground Cable Television |
| | Underground Fiber Optic Line |
| | Force Main Sewer |

BENCH MARKS
NE BOLT ON FIRE HYDRANT ALONG THE NORTH SIDE OF OGDEN AVENUE OPPOSITE THE SW CORNER OF LOT 2 IN BESSER'S RESUB ELEVATION = 745.70 NAVD 1988
NE BOLT ON FIRE HYDRANT ALONG THE WEST SIDE OF FOREST AVENUE OPPOSITE THE NE CORNER OF LOT 2 IN BESSER'S RESUB ELEVATION = 743.22 NAVD 1988

VEQUITY, LLC OGDEN - MAIN RESUBDIVISION

OF PART OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS




COMMON ADDRESS:
1036-1048 OGDEN AVENUE
DOWNERS GROVE, IL. 60515


EXISTING PIN NO'S
09-05-115-009
09-05-300-002
09-05-300-004
09-05-300-005

- NOTES:
- DISTANCES ARE MARKED IN FEET AND DECIMALS THEREOF.
 - ALL BEARINGS SHOWN ARE REFERENCED TO NAD 83 ILLINOIS STATE PLANE EAST.
 - IRON STAKES, MAG. NAILS OR CUT CROSSES SET AT ALL LOT CORNERS

AREA TABULATIONS
 TOTAL SUBDIVISION AREA = 93,072 S.F.
 LOT 1 = 20,291 S.F.
 LOT 2 = 16,994 S.F.
 LOT 3 = 52,857 S.F.
 RIGHT OF WAY DEDICATION = 2,930 S.F.



Prepared for: VEQUITY



| No. | Date | Revision Description | By: |
|-----|------|----------------------|-----|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

KRISCH LAND SURVEYING, LLC

PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE No. 184-006866
P.O. Box 929 Plainfield, IL. 60544 Phone: 630.627.5589
Fax: 630.627.5594

SURVEYING - CONSULTING - CONSTRUCTION LAYOUT

Scale: 1" = 30' Drawn: MLK Chk'd: GDK File# 16041 CAD File: 16041 SUB

SHEET 1 of 2

Email: m.krish@kls.com

VEQUITY, LLC
OGDEN - MAIN RESUBDIVISION

COUNTY CLERK
STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF DUPAGE)) S.S.

I, _____, COUNTY CLERK OF DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THERE ARE NO DELINQUENT TAXES, NO UNPAID FORFEITED TAXES, NO CURRENT GENERAL TAXES AND NO REDEEMABLE TAX SALES AGAINST ANY OF THE LAND INCLUDED IN THE ANNEXED PLAT.

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I HAVE RECEIVED ALL STATUTORY FEES IN CONNECTION WITH THE ANNEXED PLAT.
GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF THE COUNTY CLERK AT WHEATON, ILLINOIS THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 20____

COUNTY CLERK

OWNER
STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF _____)) S.S.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT VEQUITY, LLC IS THE OWNER OF THE LAND HEREIN DESCRIBED IN THE ANNEXED PLAT, AND HAS CAUSED THE SAME TO BE PLATTED AND RECORDED AS SHOWN HEREON FOR THE USES AND PURPOSES THEREIN SET FORTH AND DOES HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE AND ADOPT THE SAME UNDER THE STYLE AND TITLE THEREON INDICATED.

DATED AT _____, _____

THIS _____ DAY OF _____, A.D. 20____

BY: _____
NAME TITLE

ATTEST: _____
NAME TITLE

NOTARY
STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF _____) S.S.

I, _____, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR SAID COUNTY IN THE STATE AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT

_____ AND _____, PERSONALLY KNOWN TO ME TO BE THE SAME PERSON WHOSE NAME IS SUBSCRIBED TO THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT AND APPEARED BEFORE ME THIS DAY IN PERSON AND ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THEY SIGNED AND DELIVERED THE ANNEXED PLAT AS THEIR OWN FREE AND VOLUNTARY ACT AND AS THEIR FREE AND VOLUNTARY ACT FOR THE USES AND PURPOSES THEREIN SET FORTH AND HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE AND ADOPT THE SAME UNDER THE STYLE AND TITLE THEREON SHOWN.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND NOTARIAL SEAL THIS ____ DAY _____ A.D. 20____

AT _____ ILLINOIS.

NOTARY PUBLIC

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT of TRANSPORTATION STATEMENT

THIS PLAT HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION WITH RESPECT TO ROADWAY ACCESS PURSUANT TO SECTION 2 OF "AN ACT TO REVISE THE LAW IN RELATION TO PLATS," AS AMENDED. A PLAN THAT MEETS THE DRIVEWAY REQUIREMENTS CONTAINED IN THE DEPARTMENT'S POLICY ON PERMITS FOR ACCESS DRIVEWAYS TO STATE HIGHWAYS WILL BE REQUIRED BY THE DEPARTMENT.

BY: _____ DATE: _____
JOHN FORTMANN, P.E.
DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF HIGHWAYS, REGION ONE ENGINEER

UTILITY EASEMENT PROVISIONS

A permanent non-exclusive easement is hereby reserved for and granted to the Village of Downers Grove, Illinois, AT&T, Commonwealth Edison Company and Northern Illinois Gas Company, (collectively "Grantee") and to all public utility and other companies of any kind operating under franchise granting them rights from said village and to their successors and assigns, in, upon, across, under and through the areas labeled "P.U. & D.E." Such Easements shall exist for the purpose of installing, constructing, inspecting, operating, replacing, renewing, altering, enlarging, removing, repairing, cleaning and maintaining sanitary sewers, water mains, electrical, cable television, communication, gas, telephone or other utility lines and appurtenances and such other installations and service connections as may be required to furnish water, public utility and sanitary sewer services to adjacent and other areas, and such appurtenances and additions thereto including manholes, hydrants, pipes, pipelines to carry treated effluent, service connections, catch basins, and, without limitations, such other installations may be required to furnish sanitary sewer and water service as the Grantee may deem necessary, together with the right of access across the real estate platted hereon for the necessary personnel and equipment to do any or all of the above work.

No permanent buildings or fences shall be erected on said easements, but the premises may be used for gardens, shrubs, landscaping and other purposes that do not then or later interfere with the aforesaid uses and rights. The right is also hereby granted to the Grantee to cut down, trim or remove any trees, shrubs or other plants that interfere with the operation of or access to such utility installations in, on, upon, across, over under or through said Easements.

The Grantee shall be responsible for replacement of any such improvements, fences, shrubs, concrete/brick or paved walkways, patios or driveways or landscaping removed during exercise of the herein given rights. Replacement of items so moved shall be the responsibility of the then lot owner.

Where said Utility Easements are also used for electric, telephone, cable television or gas distribution systems or components, such other utility installations shall be subject to the prior approval of the Village of Downers Grove when there is reasonable possibility of interference of gravity or subsurface flow in any drainage ways or water mains or sanitary sewers or stabilization of vegetative groundcover.

Relocation of facilities shall be performed by Grantee at the sole cost and expense of the then lot owner or in any event, the person(s) initiating the relocation, upon receipt by Grantee of written request or relocate such facilities.

COMMON ADDRESS:
1036-1048 OGDEN AVENUE
DOWNERS GROVE, IL. 60515

EXISTING PIN NO'S
09-05-115-009
09-05-300-002
09-05-300-004
09-05-300-005

NOTES:

- 1. DISTANCES ARE MARKED IN FEET AND DECIMALS THEREOF.
2. ALL BEARINGS SHOWN ARE REFERENCED TO NAD 83 ILLINOIS STATE PLANE EAST.
3. IRON STAKES, MAG. NAILS OR CUT CROSSES SET AT ALL LOT CORNERS

AREA TABULATIONS
TOTAL SUBDIVISION AREA = 93,072 S.F.
LOT 1 = 20,291 S.F.
LOT 2 = 16,994 S.F.
LOT 3 = 52,857 S.F.
RIGHT OF WAY DEDICATION = 2,930 S.F.

SURVEYOR
STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF DU PAGE) SS

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT I, MICHAEL L. KRISCH, AN ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR, HAVE SURVEYED, RESUBDIVIDED AND PLATTED FOR THE USES AND PURPOSES THEREIN SET FORTH THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

PARCEL 1
LOT 2 IN BESSER'S RESUBDIVISION OF H. BESSER'S PLAT OF SURVEY OF PART OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT OF SAID BESSER'S RESUBDIVISION RECORDED JULY 10, 1956 AS DOCUMENT 807309, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

PARCEL 2
LOTS 10, 11 AND 12 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, EXCEPT THE SOUTH 16.0 FEET THEREOF, BEING A SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT 190965, AND THAT CERTAIN ORDINANCE VACATING PUBLIC ALLEY RECORDED AS DOCUMENT R75-48121, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

ALSO, THE SOUTH 8.0 FEET OF THE VACATED ALLEY LYING IMMEDIATELY NORTH OF LOTS 10, 11 AND 12 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT 190965, AND THAT CERTAIN ORDINANCE VACATING PUBLIC ALLEY RECORDED AS R75-48122, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PARCEL 3
LOT 7 (EXCEPT THE EAST 20.0 FEET THEREOF), AND ALL OF LOTS 8 AND 9 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, IN THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT 190965, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PARCEL 4
LOTS 4, 5, 6 AND THE EAST 20 FEET OF LOT 7 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, IN THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT NO. 190965, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

EXCEPTING THEREFROM THAT PART OF SAID LOT 4 DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT OF CURVATURE ON THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4, SAID POINT BEING 109 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE NORTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST ALONG SAID EAST LOT LINE A DISTANCE OF 12.67 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 44 DEGREES 45 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST 2.83 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 00 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST ALONG A LINE PARALLEL WITH SAID EAST LINE OF LOT 4 A DISTANCE OF 20.47 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE, BEING THE ARC OF A CURVE CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST, HAVING A RADIUS OF 25.0 FEET, HAVING A CHORD BEARING OF NORTH 11 DEGREES 17 MINUTES 25 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 10.07 FEET TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING

AND ALSO EXCEPTING THEREFROM:

THAT PART OF LOTS 4 AND 5 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, IN THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT NO. 190965, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE SOUTH 0 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4 A DISTANCE OF 97.21 FEET TO A POINT 12.67 FEET NORTH OF THE POINT OF CURVATURE ON SAID EAST LINE OF LOT 4; THENCE SOUTH 44 DEGREES 45 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST 2.83 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 0 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST ALONG A LINE PARALLEL WITH SAID EAST LINE OF LOT 4 A DISTANCE OF 20.47 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTHERLY LINE OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE, BEING THE ARC OF A CURVE CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST, HAVING A RADIUS OF 25.0 FEET, HAVING A CHORD BEARING SOUTH 55 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 55 SECONDS WEST, A DISTANCE OF 28.30 FEET TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE SOUTH 87 DEGREES 42 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOTS 4 AND 5 A DISTANCE OF 17.83 FEET FOR A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE CONCAVE TO THE NORTHWEST, HAVING A RADIUS OF 30.00 FEET, HAVING A CHORD BEARING NORTH 43 DEGREES 43 MINUTES 30 SECONDS EAST, A DISTANCE OF 46.05 FEET FOR A POINT OF TANGENCY; SAID POINT BEING 13.00 FEET WEST OF THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE NORTH 0 DEGREES 15 MINUTES 00 SECONDS WEST ALONG A LINE 13.00 FEET WEST OF AND PARALLEL WITH THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4 A DISTANCE OF 105.05 FEET TO THE NORTH LINE OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE NORTH 87 DEGREES 42 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST ALONG SAID NORTH LINE A DISTANCE OF 13.01 FEET TO THE PLACE OF BEGINNING, ALL IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PARCEL 5
ALL THAT PART OF THE 16.0 FOOT WIDE ALLEY, LYING WEST OF THE WEST LINE OF OGDEN AVENUE, LYING NORTH AND ADJOINING LOTS 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 AND 9 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT 190965, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

AND AS SHOWN BY THE ANNEXED PLAT, WHICH IS A REPRESENTATION OF SAID RESUBDIVISION. ALL DISTANCES ARE SHOWN IN FEET AND DECIMAL PARTS THEREOF. SCALE OF PLAT IS THIRTY (30) FEET PER ONE (1) INCH.

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT THE LANDS DESCRIBED ABOVE LIE WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE, DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS, WHICH HAS AUTHORIZED A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND IS EXERCISING THE SPECIAL POWERS GRANTED BY THE STATE OF ILLINOIS ACCORDING TO ILCS 5/11-12-6 AS HERETOFORE AND HEREAFTER AMENDED.

I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT THE PROPERTY IN THIS RESUBDIVISION IS IN ZONE "X" AS IDENTIFIED BY THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY AS SHOWN ON FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP NUMBER 17043C0901H, EFFECTIVE DATE DECEMBER 16, 2004. ZONE "X" IS DEFINED AS AREAS TO BE OUTSIDE THE 0.2% ANNUAL CHANCE FLOOD PLAIN.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL THIS 26TH DAY OF JANUARY, A.D. 2017 AT DOWNERS GROVE, ILLINOIS.

ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR NO. 35-2501
LICENSE EXPIRES NOVEMBER 30, 2018



COUNTY CLERK
STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF DUPAGE)) S.S.

VILLAGE COLLECTOR
STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF DUPAGE)) S.S.

I, _____ COLLECTOR FOR THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE, ILLINOIS, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THERE ARE NO DELINQUENT OR UNPAID CURRENT OR FORFEITED SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS OR ANY DEFERRED INSTALLMENTS THEREOF THAT HAVE BEEN APPORTIONED AGAINST THE PROPERTY INCLUDED IN THE PLAT HEREON DRAWN.

DATED AT DOWNERS GROVE, ILLINOIS,
THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 20____

VILLAGE COLLECTOR

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF DUPAGE)) S.S.

APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OF THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE, DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS,
THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 20____

DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

VILLAGE CLERK

DOWNERS GROVE SANITARY DISTRICT COLLECTOR
STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF DUPAGE)) S.S.

I, _____ COLLECTOR OF THE DOWNERS GROVE SANITARY DISTRICT, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THERE ARE NO DELINQUENT OR UNPAID CURRENT OR FORFEITED SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS OR ANY DEFERRED INSTALLMENTS THEREOF THAT HAVE NOT BEEN APPORTIONED AGAINST THE TRACT OF LAND INCLUDED IN THIS PLAT.

DATED THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 20____

COLLECTOR

DUPAGE COUNTY RECORDER OF DEEDS
STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF DUPAGE)) S.S.

THIS INSTRUMENT NO. _____ WAS FILED FOR RECORD IN THE RECORDER'S OFFICE OF DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS ON THIS _____ DAY OF _____ A.D. 20____, AT _____ O'CLOCK ____M.

AND WAS RECORDED IN BOOK _____ OF PLATS ON PAGE _____

DUPAGE COUNTY RECORDER OF DEEDS

DRAINAGE CERTIFICATE
STATE OF ILLINOIS)
COUNTY OF _____)) S.S.

TO THE BEST OF OUR KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF, THE DRAINAGE OF SURFACE WATERS WILL NOT BE CHANGED BY CONSTRUCTION OF THIS RESUBDIVISION OR ANY PART THEREOF, OR, THAT IF SUCH SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE WILL BE CHANGED, ADEQUET PROVISION HAS BEEN MADE FOR COLLECTION AND DIVERSION OF SUCH SURFACE WATERS INTO PUBLIC AREAS, OR DRAINS WHICH SUCH SUBDIVISION HAS A RIGHT TO USE, AND THAT SUCH SURFACE WATERS WILL NOT BE DEPOSITED ON THE PROPERTY OF ADJOINING LAND OWNERS IN SUCH CONCENTRATIONS AS MAY CAUSE DAMAGE TO THE ADJOINING PROPERTY BECAUSE OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE RESUBDIVISION.

OWNER _____ PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER _____
NAME _____ NAME _____
DATE _____ FIRM _____
DATE _____ DATE _____

SCHOOL DISTRICT CERTIFICATE
PURSUANT TO SECTION 1.005 OF THE PLAT ACT, 765 ILCS 205, THIS DOCUMENT SHALL SERVE AS THE SCHOOL DISTRICT STATEMENT,

FOR "VEQUITY LLC, OGDEN - MAIN RESUBDIVISION" IN THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE, DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

TO THE BEST OF THE OWNER'S KNOWLEDGE THE SCHOOL DISTRICT IN WHICH THE TRACT OF LAND LIES, IS IN THE FOLLOWING SCHOOL DISTRICTS:

GRADE SCHOOL DIST. NO. 58
HIGH SCHOOL DIST. 99

BY: _____ OWNER OR ATTORNEY

Prepared for: VEQUITY, LLC





Table with 4 columns: No., Date, Revision Description, By. Row 1: 1, 2-13-17, PER VILLAGE REVIEW, [blank]

KRISCH LAND SURVEYING, LLC
PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE No. 184-006866
P.O. Box 929 Plainfield, IL, 60544 Phone: 630.627.5589 Fax: 630.627.5594
SURVEYING - CONSULTING - CONSTRUCTION LAYOUT
Scale: 1" = 30' Drawn: MLK Chk'd: [blank] GDK File# 18041 CAD File: 18041 SUB

PLAT of VACATION
 OF
 PUBLIC ALLEY
 AND
 GRANT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES EASEMENT

IN THE
 VILLAGE of DOWNERS GROVE, DuPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

THAT PART OF A 16.0 FOOT WIDE PUBLIC ALLEY LYING WEST OF THE WEST LINE OF MAIN STREET, SAID LINE BEING THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST 13.0 FEET OF LOT 4 EXTENDED NORTH IN BLOCK 8 AND LYING EAST OF THE EAST LINE OF LOT 10 IN SAID BLOCK 8 EXTENDED NORTH AND LYING NORTH OF AND ADJOINING LOTS 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, AND 9 IN SAID BLOCK 8, IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, BEING A SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT 190965, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.



DUPAGE COUNTY RECORDER OF DEEDS
 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
 COUNTY OF DUPAGE) S.S.

THIS INSTRUMENT NO. _____ WAS
 FILED FOR RECORD IN THE RECORDER'S OFFICE OF
 DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS ON THIS
 _____ DAY OF _____ A.D. 20____ AT _____
 O'CLOCK ____M. AND
 WAS RECORDED IN BOOK _____ OF PLATS ON PAGE _____

DUPAGE COUNTY RECORDER OF DEEDS

EASEMENT PROVISIONS

An easement for serving the subdivision and other property with electric and communication service is hereby reserved for and granted to
 Commonwealth Edison Company
 and
 SBC Telephone Company, Grantees,

their respective licensees, successors and assigns jointly and severally, to construct, operate, repair, maintain, modify, reconstruct, replace, supplement, relocate and remove, from time to time, poles, guys, anchors, wires, cables, conduits, manholes, transformers, pedestals, equipment cabinets or other facilities used in connection with overhead and underground transmission and distribution of electricity, communications, sounds and signals in, over, under, across, along and upon the surface of the property shown within the dashed or dotted lines (or similar designation) on the plat and marked "Easement", "Utility Easement", "Public Utility Easement", "P.U.E." (or similar designation), the property designated in the Declaration of Condominium and/or on this plat as "Common Elements", and the property designated on the plat as "common area or areas", and the property designated on the plat for streets and alleys, whether public or private, together with the rights to install required service connections over or under the surface of each lot and common area or areas to serve improvements thereon, or on adjacent lots, and common area or areas, the right to cut, trim or remove trees, bushes, roots and saplings and to clear obstructions from the surface and subsurface as may be reasonably required incident to the rights herein given, and the right to enter upon the subdivided property for all such purposes. Obstructions shall not be placed over Grantees' facilities or in, upon or over the property within the dashed or dotted lines (or similar designation) marked "Easement", "Utility Easement", "Public Utility Easement", "P.U.E." (or similar designation) without the prior written consent of Grantees. After installation of any such facilities, the grade of the subdivided property shall not be altered in a manner so as to interfere with the proper operation and maintenance thereof.

The term "Common Elements" shall have the meaning set forth for such term in the "Condominium Property Act", Chapter 765 ILCS 605/2(c), as amended from time to time.

The term "common area or areas" is defined as a lot, parcel or area of real property, the beneficial use and enjoyment of which is reserved in whole or as an appurtenance to the separately owned lots, parcels or areas within the planned development, even though such be otherwise designated on the plat by terms such as "outlots", "common elements", "open space", "open area", "common ground", "parking" and "common area". The term "common area or areas", and "Common Elements" include real property surfaced with interior driveways and walkways, but excludes real property physically occupied by a building, Service Business District or structures such as a pool, retention pond or mechanical equipment.

Relocation of facilities will be done by Grantees at cost of the Grantor/Lot Owner, upon written request.

VILLAGE BOARD

State of Illinois)
 County of DuPage) S.S.)

THE ABOVE LEGALLY DESCRIBED PROPERTY IS HEREBY VACATED BY THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE AND IS APPROVED BY THE MAYOR AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE, DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

This _____ day of _____, A.D. 2017.

Signed: _____ Mayor

Attest: _____ Village Clerk

SURVEYOR

State of Illinois)
 County of DuPage) S.S.)

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT I, MICHAEL L. KRISCH, AN ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR, HAVE PLATTED FOR VACATION PURPOSES THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN THE ABOVE CAPTION AND AS SHOWN ON THIS PLAT, WHICH IS A REPRESENTATION OF THE PROPERTY SO DESCRIBED. THE AREA TO BE VACATED IS THAT SHOWN WITHIN THE SHADED AREA ON THIS PLAT. SCALE OF THIS PLAT IS 30 FEET TO ONE INCH.

Given under my hand and seal at Downers Grove, Illinois, this 3rd day of February A.D. 2017.

Michael L. Krisch
 Illinois Professional Land Surveyor No. 35-2501.
 My License Expires November 30, 2018.

| |
|----------------------------|
| PROJECT 16-041 |
| CAD NAME 16-041 Vac.dwg |
| SCALE 1" = 30' |
| SHEET 1 of 1 |
| DRAWN BY MLK |

| |
|-------------------------|
| PROJECT |
| PLAT OF VACATION |
| DOWNERS GROVE, IL 60515 |

| |
|---------------|
| PREPARED FOR: |
| VEQUITY, LLC |

| No. | Date | Revision Description | By: |
|-----|------|----------------------|-----|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

KRISCH LAND SURVEYING LLC


P.O. Box 929 PLAINFIELD, IL 60544-0929
 PHONE (630) 627-5589 / FAX (630) 627-5594
 www.krischlandsurveying.com
 IL PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE No. 184-006866
 COPYRIGHT © 2016 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PLAT of CONVEYANCE TO THE ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

U.S. ROUTE 34 CONVEYANCE

THAT PART OF LOTS 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 AND 12 IN BLOCK 8 IN LITTLEFORD'S SUBDIVISION, BEING A SUBDIVISION OF PART OF THE WEST HALF OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED APRIL 9, 1925 AS DOCUMENT 190965, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT OF INTERSECTION OF THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 12 WITH THE NORTH LINE OF OGDEN AVENUE DEDICATED BY DOCUMENT R75-48121; THENCE NORTH 02 DEGREES 14 MINUTES 08 SECONDS WEST, ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 12, 1.0 FEET; THENCE NORTH 85 DEGREES 51 MINUTES 27 SECONDS EAST, PARALLEL WITH THE NORTH LINE OF OGDEN AVENUE, 228.99 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVE; THENCE NORTHEASTERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE LEFT, TANGENT TO THE LAST DESCRIBED COURSE, HAVING A RADIUS OF 30.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 46.10 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WEST LINE OF MAIN STREET, SAID POINT BEING 13.0 FEET WEST OF, MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES, TO THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4; THENCE SOUTH 02 DEGREES 11 MINUTES 26 SECONDS EAST, ALONG A LINE PARALLEL WITH THE EAST LINE OF SAID LOT 4, 17.01 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVE; THENCE SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, TANGENT TO THE LAST DESCRIBED COURSE, HAVING A RADIUS OF 30.00 FEET, AN ARC LENGTH OF 46.10 FEET TO A POINT ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID LOT 6, BEING THE NORTH LINE OF OGDEN AVENUE; THENCE SOUTH 85 DEGREES 51 MINUTES 27 SECONDS WEST, ALONG THE SOUTH LINES OF LOTS 5, 6, 7, 8 AND 9, 138.0 FEET TO THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SAID LOT 9; THENCE NORTH 02 DEGREES 11 MINUTES 26 SECONDS WEST, ALONG THE WEST LINE OF SAID LOT 9, 16.01 FEET TO THE NORTH LINE OF OGDEN AVENUE AS DEDICATED BY DOCUMENT R75-48121; THENCE SOUTH 85 DEGREES 51 MINUTES 27 SECONDS WEST, ALONG SAID DEDICATED LINE, 90.99 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.



ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACCEPTANCE THE PROPOSED CONVEYANCE OF RIGHT-OF-WAY TO THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION IS HEREBY ACCEPTED

BY: JOHN FORTMANN, P.E. DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF HIGHWAYS, REGION ONE ENGINEER DATE

LOT 2 BESSER'S RESUBDIVISION Document No. 807309

FOREST AVENUE

OWNER (50%) STATE OF ILLINOIS)) S.S. COUNTY OF) THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT VEQUITY LLC SERIES XVII DOWNERS OGDEN AI IS THE OWNER OF THE LAND HEREIN DESCRIBED IN THE ANNEXED PLAT, AND HAS CAUSED THE SAME TO BE PLATTED AND RECORDED AS SHOWN HEREON FOR THE USES AND PURPOSES THEREIN SET FORTH AND DOES HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE AND ADOPT THE SAME UNDER THE STYLE AND TITLE THEREON INDICATED.

DATED AT THIS DAY OF A.D.20 BY: NAME TITLE ATTEST: NAME TITLE

NOTARY STATE OF ILLINOIS) COUNTY OF) S.S. I, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR SAID COUNTY IN THE STATE AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT

AND , PERSONALLY KNOWN TO ME TO BE THE SAME PERSON WHOSE NAME IS SUBSCRIBED TO THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT AND APPEARED BEFORE ME THIS DAY IN PERSON AND ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THEY SIGNED AND DELIVERED THE ANNEXED PLAT AS THEIR OWN FREE AND VOLUNTARY ACT AND AS THEIR FREE AND VOLUNTARY ACT FOR THE USES AND PURPOSES THEREIN SET FORTH AND HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE AND ADOPT THE SAME UNDER THE STYLE AND TITLE THEREON SHOWN.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND NOTARIAL SEAL THIS DAY A.D. 20 AT ILLINOIS. NOTARY PUBLIC

OWNER (50%) STATE OF ILLINOIS)) S.S. COUNTY OF) THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT VEQUITY LLC SERIES XVII DOWNERS OGDEN IS THE OWNER OF THE LAND HEREIN DESCRIBED IN THE ANNEXED PLAT, AND HAS CAUSED THE SAME TO BE PLATTED AND RECORDED AS SHOWN HEREON FOR THE USES AND PURPOSES THEREIN SET FORTH AND DOES HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE AND ADOPT THE SAME UNDER THE STYLE AND TITLE THEREON INDICATED.

DATED AT THIS DAY OF A.D.20 BY: NAME TITLE ATTEST: NAME TITLE

NOTARY STATE OF ILLINOIS) COUNTY OF) S.S. I, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR SAID COUNTY IN THE STATE AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT

AND , PERSONALLY KNOWN TO ME TO BE THE SAME PERSON WHOSE NAME IS SUBSCRIBED TO THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT AND APPEARED BEFORE ME THIS DAY IN PERSON AND ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THEY SIGNED AND DELIVERED THE ANNEXED PLAT AS THEIR OWN FREE AND VOLUNTARY ACT AND AS THEIR FREE AND VOLUNTARY ACT FOR THE USES AND PURPOSES THEREIN SET FORTH AND HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE AND ADOPT THE SAME UNDER THE STYLE AND TITLE THEREON SHOWN.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND NOTARIAL SEAL THIS DAY A.D. 20 AT ILLINOIS. NOTARY PUBLIC

STATE OF ILLINOIS) COUNTY OF DuPAGE) S.S. THIS PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONFORMS TO CURRENT MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR A BOUNDARY SURVEY THAT I, MICHAEL L. KRISCH, AN ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR, HAVE HAD SURVEYED UNDER MY SUPERVISION THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IN THE ABOVE CAPTION AS SHOWN BY THE ANNEXED PLAT WHICH IS A REPRESENTATION OF SAID SURVEY. GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL AT DOWNERS GROVE, ILLINOIS, THIS 2nd DAY OF FEBRUARY A.D. 2017. Michael L. Krisch ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR NO. 35-2501 LICENSE EXPIRES NOVEMBER 30, 2018



REFER TO DEED OR GUARANTEE POLICY FOR BUILDING LINE RESTRICTIONS AND EASEMENTS NOT SHOWN ON THE PLAT OF SURVEY. COMPARE DESCRIPTION AND POINTS BEFORE BUILDING AND REPORT ANY APPARENT DIFFERENCE TO THE SURVEYOR AT ONCE. THIS SURVEY AND PLAT OF SURVEY ARE VOID WITHOUT OUR EMBOSSED SURVEYOR SEAL HEREON. NO DIMENSIONS ARE TO BE ASSUMED BY SCALING





Table with columns: No., Date, Revision Description, By:

KRISCH LAND SURVEYING, LLC PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM LICENSE No. 184-006886 P.O. Box 929 Plainfield, IL. 60544 Phone: 630.627.5589 Fax: 630.627.5594 SURVEYING - CONSULTING - CONSTRUCTION LAYOUT Scale: 1" = 30' Drawn: MLK Chk'd: GDK File# 16041 CAD File: 16041 Conveyance

OPTION - 2



NORTH
 1 SITE PLAN - OPTION 2
 AS1.2a SCALE: 1"=30'-0"
 0' 10' 20' 30' 40'

DEVELOPER:

Vequity
 400 N. State
 Suite 400
 Chicago, IL 60654
 312-985-0987
 Email info@vequity.com
 www.vequity.com



ARCHITECT:



223 W. Jackson, Ste 1000
 Chicago, Illinois 60606
 312-419-0009
 Fax 312-899-0965
 Email info@ilekis.com
 www.ilekis.com

Architect of Record


LG Landscape Architecture
 Site Planning
 Illustration
Workshop.LLC
 2324 W. Armitage Ave. Chicago, IL
 773.697.4388 www.LGWLA.com

PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT
 1030-1048 W OGDEN AVE
 DOWNERS GROVE, IL 60515

| REVISIONS | | |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------|
| NO. | DATE | DESCRIPTION |
| 2 | 02/24/2017 | CITY COMMENTS |
| | 02/13/2017 | CITY COMMENTS |
| | 01/25/2017 | PLAN COMMISSION REVIEW |
| DRAWN BY: ILEKIS ASSOCIATES | | |
| SCALE: AS NOTED | | |
| JOB: -- | | |
| FILE: 1614-03 | | |

PROPOSED
 SITE PLAN OPTION 2


DRAWING NO.
AS1.2A




2 SHADE TREE PLANTING DETAIL NOT TO SCALE

NOTES:


NEVER CUT LEADERS
TREE SHALL BEAR SAME
RELATION TO FINISHED
GRADE AS IT BORE TO
PREVIOUS GRADE.




3 ORNAMENTAL TREE PLANTING DETAIL NOT TO SCALE



4 SHRUB PLANTING DETAIL NOT TO SCALE



5 PERENNIAL / ANNUAL PLANTING DETAIL NOT TO SCALE



7 PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE PLAN NORTH PORTION SCALE 1"=20'-0"

*REFER TO SHEET L-2 PLANT LEGEND FOR SPECIES AND TOTAL QUANTITIES

DEVELOPER:

Vequity
400 N. State
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60654
312-985-0987
Email info@vequity.com
www.vequity.com

real estate. redefined.

vequity

ARCHITECT:

ILEKIS ASSOCIATES
Architects Planners

223 W. Jackson, Ste 1000
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312-419-0009
Fax 312-899-0965
Email info@ilekis.com
www.ilekis.com

Architect of Record

LG Landscape Architecture
Site Planning
Illustration
Workshop LLC
2324 W. Armitage Ave. Chicago, IL
773.697.4388 www.LGWILA.com

PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT
1030-1048 W OGDEN AVE
DOWNERS GROVE, IL 60515

REVISIONS

| NO. | DATE | DESCRIPTION |
|-----|------|-------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

01/25/2017 PLAN COMMISSION REVIEW

DRAWN BY: ILEKIS ASSOCIATES

SCALE: AS NOTED



JOB: ---


FILE: 1614-03

PRELIM. LANDSCAPE
PLAN-NORTH /
DETAILS / CALCULATIONS

DRAWING NO.

L.3






Scale: 1 inch= 55 Ft.



| # | Date | Comments |
|-----------|------|----------|
| Revisions | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| | |
|-------------|-----------|
| Drawn By: | |
| Checked By: | |
| Date: | 2/13/2017 |
| Scale: | |

| |
|-------------------------|
| 153694 Downers Grove IL |
| Retail - Ogden/Main |



| Luminaire Schedule | | | | |
|--------------------|-----|-----------------------------|--------------|------------------------------|
| Symbol | Qty | Label | Arrangement | Description |
| | 11 | COS-A017-4K-UN Led (0113 | SINGLE | COS-A017-4K-UN _____ 22 WATT |
| | 3 | EALS01_F4AF750 _____ tcm201 | SINGLE | EALS01_F4AF750 _____ |
| | 2 | EALS01_H4AF750 _____ tcm201 | SINGLE | EALS01_H4AF750 _____ |
| | 1 | EALS01_D3AW750 _____ @90 | 2 @ 90 DEGRE | EALS01_D3AW750 _____ @90 |
| | 1 | LNC2-18LU-5K-3 | SINGLE | LNC2-18LU-5K-3 |
| | 3 | EALS01_J4AF750 _____ | SINGLE | EALS01_J4AF750 _____ |
| | 1 | EALS01_J5SM750 _____ tcm201 | SINGLE | EALS01_J5SM750 _____ |



GE Evolve EALS



Laredo LNC2 Wall Pack



Image File : Acculite COS LED

Calculation Summary

| Label | CalcType | Units | Avg | Max | Min | Avg/Min | Max/Min |
|-----------|-------------|-------|------|-----|-----|---------|---------|
| A1 | Illuminance | Fc | 2.47 | 7.8 | 1.0 | 2.47 | 7.80 |
| A2 | Illuminance | Fc | 2.40 | 4.6 | 0.9 | 2.67 | 5.11 |
| B | Illuminance | Fc | 2.18 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 1.68 | 2.38 |
| C | Illuminance | Fc | 2.07 | 5.4 | 0.9 | 2.30 | 6.00 |
| Perimeter | Illuminance | Fc | 1.05 | 4.1 | 0.0 | N.A. | N.A. |





| # | Date | Comments |
|---|------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |

Revisions

| | | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|--------|
| Drawn By: | Checked By: | Date: | Scale: |
| | | 2/13/2017 | |

153694 Downers Grove IL
Retail - Ogden/Main






| # | Date | Comments |
|---|------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |


Revisions

| | |
|-------------|-----------|
| Drawn By: | |
| Checked By: | |
| Date: | 2/13/2017 |
| Scale: | |


| |
|-------------------------|
| 153694 Downers Grove IL |
| Retail - Ogden/Main |




SU - DELIVERY TRUCK




| SU-30 | feet |
|-------------------|--------|
| Width | : 8.00 |
| Track | : 8.00 |
| Lock to Lock Time | : 6.0 |
| Steering Angle | : 31.8 |




| Garbage Truck | feet |
|-------------------|--------|
| Width | : 8.17 |
| Track | : 8.17 |
| Lock to Lock Time | : 6.0 |
| Steering Angle | : 46.4 |



| Fire Truck | feet |
|-------------------|--------|
| Width | : 7.15 |
| Track | : 7.15 |
| Lock to Lock Time | : 6.0 |
| Steering Angle | : 33.1 |



GARBAGE TRUCK - REAR LOADED



FIRE TRUCK

CIVIL ENGINEERS - PLANNERS - DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS

CIVWORKS
Consulting, LLC

3343 N. NEVA AVENUE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60647
Ph: (312) 637-9570
E-mail: info@civworks.com
Web: www.civworks.com

VEHICLE TURNING EXHIBIT


PROPOSED RETAIL DEVELOPMENT

1030-1048 OGDEN AVENUE, DOWNERS GROVE, IL

| | |
|---------------|------------|
| PROJ. MGR.: | OP |
| DRAWN BY: | OP |
| DATE: | 01-27-2017 |
| SCALE: | 1"=50' |
| SHEET NO. | |
| TR1.0 | |
| PROJ. NUMBER: | 16004 |

| NO. | DATE | DESCRIPTION |
|-----|----------|------------------------------|
| 1 | 02/13/17 | REVISED PER VILLAGE COMMENTS |
| 2 | 02/24/17 | REVISED PER VILLAGE REVIEW |


© CIVWORKS CONSULTING, LLC. THIS PLAN AND DESIGN ARE THE PROPERTY OF CIVWORKS CONSULTING, LLC. NO REPRODUCTION OF ANY PART OF THESE PLANS IS PERMITTED WITHOUT THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF CIVWORKS CONSULTING, LLC.




1
A2.0 SOUTH ELEVATION BUILDING-A
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"
0 2 4 8 16'

| TENANT | SIGN TABLE ALLOWANCE BUILDING - A | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | NORTH | | EAST | | SOUTH | | WEST | |
| | FACADE (L.F.) | ALLOWABLE (S.F.) | FACADE (L.F.) | ALLOWABLE (S.F.) | FACADE (L.F.) | ALLOWABLE (S.F.) | FACADE (L.F.) | ALLOWABLE (S.F.) |
| A | 42'-4" | 63.3 | N/A | N/A | 42'-4" | 63.3 | 103'-5" | 63.3 |
| B | 42'-4" | 63.3 | 103'-5" | 63.3 | 42'-4" | 63.3 | N/A | N/A |
| | <i>Sub-total</i> | 126.6 | <i>Sub-total</i> | 63.3 | <i>Sub-total</i> | 126.6 | <i>Sub-total</i> | 63.3 |


| MAXIMUM AREA OF EXTERIOR WALL OPENINGS - BUILDING - A | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| ELEVATION | ELEVATION AREA | OPENING AREA | ACTUAL OPENING % | ALLOWED OPENING % | OPENING TYPE | FIRE SEPARATION DISTANCE |
| NORTH | 1963 SF | 76.8 SF | 3.90% | NO LIMIT | UNPROTECTED | GREATER THAN 30' |
| SOUTH | 2192 SF | 620.4 SF | 28.30% | NO LIMIT | UNPROTECTED | GREATER THAN 30' |
| EAST | 3107 SF | 684 SF | 22.00% | NO LIMIT | UNPROTECTED | GREATER THAN 30' |
| WEST | 3107 SF | 684 SF | 22.00% | 25% | PROTECTED | GREATER THAN 5' TO 10' |




2
A2.0 WEST ELEVATION BUILDING-A
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"
0 2 4 8 16'



3
A2.0 EAST ELEVATION BUILDING-A
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"
0 2 4 8 16'



4
A2.0 NORTH ELEVATION BUILDING-A
SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"
0 2 4 8 16'



DEVELOPER:

Vequity
400 N. State
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60654
312-985-0987
Email info@vequity.com
www.vequity.com



ARCHITECT:

ILEKIS ASSOCIATES
Architects • Planners

223 W. Jackson, Ste 1000
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312-419-0009
Fax 312-899-0965
Email info@ilekis.com
www.ilekis.com

Architect of Record

LG Landscape Architecture
Site Planning
Illustration
Workshop.LLC
2324 W. Armitage Ave. Chicago, IL
773.697.4388 www.LGWLA.com


PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT
1030-1048 W OGDEN AVE
DOWNERS GROVE, IL 60515

| REVISIONS | | |
|-----------|------------|------------------------|
| NO. | DATE | DESCRIPTION |
| 2 | 02/24/2017 | CITY COMMENTS |
| 1 | 02/13/2017 | CITY COMMENTS |
| | 01/25/2017 | PLAN COMMISSION REVIEW |

DRAWN BY: ILEKIS ASSOCIATES
SCALE: AS NOTED
JOB: --
FILE: 1614-03

ELEVATIONS
BUILDING A


DRAWING NO.
A2.0




1 SOUTH ELEVATION BUILDING-B
A2.1 SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"

| TENANT | NORTH | | EAST | | SOUTH | | WEST | |
|--------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | FACADE (L.F.) | ALLOWABLE (S.F.) | FACADE (L.F.) | ALLOWABLE (S.F.) | FACADE (L.F.) | ALLOWABLE (S.F.) | FACADE (L.F.) | ALLOWABLE (S.F.) |
| A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 41'-7" | 64.4 | 48'-9" | 64.4 |
| B | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 39'-11" | 61.84 | N/A | N/A |
| C | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 44'-9" | 69.3 | N/A | N/A |
| | <i>Sub-total</i> | 0 | <i>Sub-total</i> | 0 | <i>Sub-total</i> | 195.54 | <i>Sub-total</i> | 64.4 |



| ELEVATION | ELEVATION AREA | OPENING AREA | ACTUAL OPENING % | ALLOWED OPENING % | OPENING TYPE | FIRE SEPARATION DISTANCE |
|-----------|----------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| NORTH | 3029 SF | 102.4 SF | 3.38% | 10% | UNPROTECTED | GREATER THAN 5' TO 10' |
| SOUTH | 3213 SF | 1674.6 SF | 52.11% | NO LIMIT | UNPROTECTED | GREATER THAN 30' |
| EAST | 1215 SF | 121.5 SF | 9.99% | 10% | UNPROTECTED | GREATER THAN 5' TO 10' |
| WEST | 1215 SF | 279 SF | 22.90% | 25% | PROTECTED | GREATER THAN 5' TO 10' |



2 WEST ELEVATION BUILDING-B
A2.1 SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"



3 EAST ELEVATION BUILDING-B
A2.1 SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"



4 NORTH ELEVATION BUILDING-B
A2.1 SCALE: 1/8"=1'-0"

DEVELOPER:

Vequity
400 N. State
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60654
312-985-0987
Email info@vequity.com
www.vequity.com



ARCHITECT:



223 W. Jackson, Ste 1000
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312-419-0009
Fax 312-899-0965
Email info@ilekis.com
www.ilekis.com

Architect of Record

LG Landscape Architecture
Site Planning
Illustration
Workshop LLC
2324 W. Armitage Ave. Chicago, IL
773.697.4388 www.LGWLA.com

PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT
1030-1048 W OGDEN AVE
DOWNERS GROVE, IL 60515

REVISIONS

| NO. | DATE | DESCRIPTION |
|-----|------------|------------------------|
| 2 | 02/24/2017 | CITY COMMENTS |
| 1 | 02/13/2017 | CITY COMMENTS |
| 1 | 01/25/2017 | PLAN COMMISSION REVIEW |

DRAWN BY: ILEKIS ASSOCIATES
SCALE: AS NOTED
JOB: --
FILE: 1614-03

ELEVATIONS
BUILDING B

DRAWING NO.

A2.1



PANDA RESTAURANT GROUP INC.
 1683 Walnut Grove Ave.
 Rosemead, California
 91770
 Telephone: 626.799.9898
 Facsimile: 626.372.8288


All ideas, designs, arrangement and plans indicated or represented by this drawing are the property of Panda Express Inc. and were created for use on this specific project. None of these ideas, designs, arrangements or plans may be used by or disclosed to any person, firm, or corporation without the written permission of Panda Express Inc.

REVISIONS:

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |


ISSUE DATE:

| | |
|------------------|----------|
| ORIGINAL RELEASE | 11-21-16 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |



*SEE SHEET A-200 FOR EXTERIOR FINISH SCHEDULE

EAST ELEVATION 2
 Scale= 1/4" = 1'-0" A-201



WEST ELEVATION 1
 Scale= 1/4" = 1'-0" A-201

DRAWN BY:

PANDA PROJECT #: -

ARCH PROJECT #: -

PANDA EXPRESS
 WARM & WELCOME 2200
 STREET ADDRESS
 CITY, STATE ZIP

A-201
 EXTERIOR
 ELEVATIONS
 TRUE WARM & WELCOME 2200



PANDA RESTAURANT GROUP INC.
1683 Walnut Grove Ave.
Rosemead, California
91770
Telephone: 626.799.9898
Facsimile: 626.372.8288

All ideas, designs, arrangement and plans indicated or represented by this drawing are the property of Panda Express Inc. and were created for use on this specific project. None of these ideas, designs, arrangements or plans may be used by or disclosed to any person, firm, or corporation without the written permission of Panda Express Inc.

REVISIONS:

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

ISSUE DATE:

| | |
|------------------|----------|
| ORIGINAL RELEASE | 11-21-16 |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

DRAWN BY:

PANDA PROJECT #: -

ARCH PROJECT #: -


PANDA EXPRESS

WARM & WELCOME 2200
STREET ADDRESS
CITY, STATE ZIP

A-101

FLOOR PLAN

TRUE WARM & WELCOME 2200



FLOOR PLAN 1

Scale= 1/4" = 1'-0"

A-101



VEQUITY

400 N STATE STREET
SUITE 400
CHICAGO, IL 60654

www.vequity.com

+ 312.985.0987

2/16/2017

FROM: Max Odom
Vequity
400 N. State Street Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60654

RE: Neighborhood Meeting Invitation

Vequity is in the process of obtaining a PUD approval from the Village of Downers Grove for a proposed redevelopment at 1030-1048 W Ogden. The Planning Commission will hear our proposal in March.

Prior to that hearing we would like to invite you to discuss our proposed redevelopment on Thursday, February 23 at 12:30pm at the Downers Grove Recreation Center, located at 4500 Belmont Road, Downers Grove, IL. 60515. We will provide an overview of our plans and be available to answer questions.

We look forward to your attendance, however if you are unable to attend but would like to discuss the project, please feel free to contact us by email at m.odom@vequity.com, or by phone at 312.985.0976.

Regards,



Max Odom, COO
On Behalf of Vequity LLC Series XVII Downers Ogden



VEQUITY
400 N STATE STREET
SUITE 400
CHICAGO, IL 60654

www.vequity.com

+ 312.985.0987

Mr. Scott Williams Planner
Village of owners Grove 801 Burlington Avenue
Downers Grove, Illinois 60515

*Re: Neighborhood Meeting Summary for PUD 1030 –
1048 W Ogden*

Dear Scott,

As part of its application for zoning approval, Vequity LLC Series XVII Downers Ogden held a neighborhood meeting on Thursday, February 23, 2017 at 12:30pm. The meeting was held at the Downers Grove Recreation Center located at 4500 Belmont Road. Written meeting invitations were mailed on February 16, 2017 to the owners of all property located within 250 feet of 1030 - 1048 W Ogden. A copy of the meeting invitation is enclosed for reference.

The meeting was attended by Max Odom, Vequity Holdings Chief Operating Officer. Betty Howe and John Howe, owners of 1035 Havens Court, and their broker Stephen Stoner of SC Group, attended the meeting. The attendees asked questions about the flow of traffic, location of trash, and general access around the site and the building they own. After answering their questions about the project the meeting was concluded at 1:00pm.

Please don't hesitate to contact me with questions.

Regards,



Max Odom
On Behalf of Vequity LLC Series XVII Downers Ogden

Traffic Impact Study

Proposed Retail Development

Downers Grove, Illinois



Prepared For:



Prepared By



January 27, 2017

1.

Introduction

This report summarizes the methodologies, results, and findings of a traffic impact study conducted by Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc. (KLOA, Inc.) for the proposed retail development to be located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Ogden Avenue with Main Street in Downers Grove, Illinois. The site, which currently is developed with three retail buildings containing Marks Brothers Gold Buyers, Downers Grove Foot Specialist, Dragon's Life Systems and U.S. Bank, will be redeveloped with three commercial buildings. As illustrated in the site plan included in the Appendix, the three retail buildings are designated as Retail Building A through C from west to east.

As proposed, the westerly retail building (Retail Building A) will contain a 3,000 square-foot quick service restaurant with a drive-through, a 3,600 square-foot fast-casual restaurant and a 3,900 square-foot high-turnover sit-down restaurant. The middle retail building (Retail Building B) will contain 1,200 square-feet of retail space, a 2,550 square-foot fast-casual restaurant and a 2,307 square-foot high-turnover sit-down restaurant. The easterly retail building (Retail Building C) will contain a 2,229 square-foot fast-casual restaurant with a drive-through.

The site is currently served by five curb cuts along Ogden Avenue between Forest Avenue and Main Street and via an east-west alley off Main Street. The proposed access to the development will eliminate four of the existing curb cuts on Ogden Avenue and will maintain the westerly curb cut that is aligned opposite Forest Avenue. Additionally, the east-west alley off Main Street will be used exclusively for the proposed development. Furthermore, the existing cross access connection to the Jewel-Osco site to the west will continue to serve the proposed development.

The purpose of this study was to examine background traffic conditions, assess the impact that the proposed development will have on traffic conditions in the area, and determine if any roadway or access improvements are necessary to accommodate traffic generated by the proposed development. **Figure 1** shows the location of the site in relation to the area roadway system. **Figure 2** shows an aerial view of the site area.

The sections of this report present the following:

- Existing roadway conditions
- A description of the proposed development
- Directional distribution of the development traffic
- Vehicle trip generation for the development
- Future traffic conditions including access to the development
- Traffic analyses for the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours
- Recommendations with respect to adequacy of the site access and adjacent roadway system
- Evaluation of the on-site circulation and drive through stacking
- Evaluation of the adequacy of the proposed parking supply



Site Location

Figure 1



Aerial View of Site Location

Figure 2

2. Existing Conditions

Existing transportation conditions in the vicinity of the site were documented based on field visits conducted by KLOA, Inc. in order to obtain a database for projecting future conditions. The following provides a description of the geographical location of the site, physical characteristics of the area roadway system including lane usage and traffic control devices, and existing peak hour traffic volumes.



Site Location

The site, which is currently occupied by three retail buildings, is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Ogden Avenue with Main Street and contains Marks Brothers Gold Buyers, Downers Grove Foot Specialist, Dragon's Life Systems and U.S. Bank. Land uses in the vicinity of the site are primarily residential and commercial in all directions and includes Jewel-Osco to the west, JBC Beads, HI Pharm, 7-Eleven, Mrs. T's Pizza and Cleaners to the north, Walgreens, Oxford Auto Insurance and Midwest Fertility Center Ambulatory Surgicenter of Downers Grove to the east, and BP, Scooby's Red Hots, Four Seasons of Fun and Downers Grove North to the south.

Existing Roadway System Characteristics

The characteristics of the existing roadways near the development are described below. **Figure 3** illustrates the existing roadway characteristics.

Ogden Avenue (U.S. Route 34) is generally an east-west arterial roadway that in the vicinity of the site provides two through lanes in each direction separated by a two-way left-turn lane. At its signalized intersection with Main Street, Ogden Avenue provides an exclusive left-turn lane, an exclusive through lane, and a shared through/right-turn lane. Ogden Avenue provides high visibility crosswalks on both legs of its intersection with Main Street. At its unsignalized intersection with the Forest Avenue, Ogden Avenue provides a two-way left-turn lane an exclusive through lane, and a shared through/right-turn lane on both approaches. Ogden Avenue is under the jurisdiction of the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) and carries an annual average daily traffic (AADT) volume of 28,400 vehicles east of Main Street and 31,200 vehicles west of Main Street as reported by IDOT in 2012. Ogden Avenue is classified as a Strategic Regional Arterial (SRA) by IDOT and has a posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour (mph).



- LEGEND**
- TRAVEL LANE
 - TRAFFIC SIGNAL
 - STOP SIGN
 - SPEED LIMIT
 - CONTINENTAL CROSSWALK

PROJECT:
Retail Development
Downers Grove, Illinois

TITLE:
Existing Roadway Characteristics

Job No: 16-171
Figure: 3

Main Street (DuPage County Route 9) is a north-south arterial roadway that in the vicinity of the site provides two through lanes in each direction separated by a barrier median. At its signalized intersection with Ogden Avenue, Main Street provides an exclusive left-turn lane, an exclusive through lane, and a shared through/right-turn lane on the northbound approach and an exclusive left-turn lane, two exclusive through lanes, and an exclusive right-turn lane on the southbound approach. Main Street provides a high visibility crosswalk on both legs of its intersection with Ogden Avenue. Main Street is under the jurisdiction of the DuPage County Division of Transportation north of Ogden Avenue and the Village of Downers Grove south of Ogden Avenue and carries an AADT volume of 23,500 vehicles north of Ogden Avenue and 13,900 vehicles south of Ogden Avenue as reported by IDOT in 2015. Main Street is classified as a minor arterial by IDOT and has a posted speed limit of 30 mph north of Ogden Avenue and 25 mph south of Ogden Avenue.

Forest Avenue is a local north-south two lane roadway that extends from its intersection to the north with Ogden Avenue south to its three-way intersection with Sherman Road approximately 250 feet south of Ogden Avenue. At its unsignalized intersection with Ogden Avenue, Forest Avenue provides a shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane under stop sign control. Forest Avenue is under the jurisdiction of the Village of Downers Grove and prohibits parking on both sides of the street

Existing Traffic Volumes



In order to determine current traffic conditions on the existing roads, KLOA, Inc. conducted peak period traffic counts at the following intersections:

- Ogden Avenue with Main Street
- Ogden Avenue with Forest Avenue/U.S. Bank Access Drive
- Ogden Avenue with the Jewel Osco/Four Seasons of Fun Access Drive.

The traffic counts were conducted on Tuesday, June 28, 2016 during the morning (7:00 A.M. to 9:00 A.M.) and evening (4:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M.) peak periods. The results of the traffic counts showed that the weekday morning peak hour of traffic occurs from 7:30 A.M. to 8:30 A.M. and the weekday evening peak hour of traffic occurs from 4:30 P.M. to 5:30 P.M. **Figure 4** illustrates the existing peak hour traffic volumes. Summaries of the traffic counts are located in the Appendix.

Crash Data Analysis

KLOA, Inc. obtained accident data for the past five years (2010 to 2014) for the intersection of Ogden Avenue with Main Street and the intersection of Ogden Avenue with Forest Avenue. The accident data for the intersections of Ogden Avenue with Main Street and Ogden Avenue with Forest Avenue is summarized in **Tables 1** and **2**, respectively. A review of the accident data showed that there were no fatalities reported.



LEGEND

- 00 - AM PEAK HOUR (7:30-8:30 AM)
- (00) - PM PEAK HOUR (4:30-5:30 PM)

PROJECT:
Retail Development
Downers Grove, Illinois

TITLE:
Existing Traffic Volumes



Figure: 4

Table 1
OGDEN AVENUE WITH MAIN STREET – CRASH DATA SUMMARY

| Year | Type of Accident Frequency | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|------------|
| | Angle | Object | Rear End | Sideswipe | Turning | Other | |
| 2010 | 1 | - | 3 | - | 3 | - | 7 |
| 2011 | - | - | 4 | - | 6 | - | 10 |
| 2012 | 1 | 1 | 6 | - | 4 | 1 | 13 |
| 2013 | 1 | - | 5 | - | 2 | - | 8 |
| 2014 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| Total | 3 | 1 | 20 | 0 | 19 | 1 | 44 |
| Average/Year | < 1.0 | < 1.0 | 4.0 | 0 | 3.8 | < 1.0 | 8.8 |

Table 2
OGDEN AVENUE WITH FOREST AVENUE – CRASH DATA SUMMARY

| Year | Type of Accident Frequency | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------|-----------|------------|----------|------------|
| | Angle | Object | Rear End | Sideswipe | Turning | Other | |
| 2010 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| 2011 | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | 2 |
| 2012 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| 2013 | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | 2 |
| 2014 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Total | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 7 |
| Average/Year | < 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.2 | 0 | 1.4 |

DISCLAIMER: The motor vehicle crash data referenced herein was provided by the Illinois Department of Transportation. The author is responsible for any data analyses and conclusions drawn.

3.

Traffic Characteristics of the Proposed Development

In order to properly evaluate future traffic conditions in the surrounding area, it was necessary to determine the traffic characteristics of the proposed development, including the directional distribution and volumes of traffic that it will generate.

Proposed Development Plan

As proposed, the plans call for redeveloping the site with three retail buildings that will contain the following:

Retail Building A (westerly building)

- 3,000 square-foot quick service restaurant with a drive-through
- 3,600 square-foot fast-casual restaurant
- 3,900 square-foot high-turnover sit-down restaurant

Retail Building B (middle building)

- 1,200 square-feet of retail space
- 2,550 square-foot fast-casual restaurant
- 2,307 square-foot high-turnover sit-down restaurant

Retail Building C (easterly building)

- 2,229 square-foot fast-casual restaurant with a drive-through

Access to the site is currently provided via five total curb cuts along Ogden Avenue between Forest Avenue and Main Street, one curb cut along Main Street and via cross access to the Jewel-Osco Site. As proposed, the four easterly curb cuts along Ogden Avenue will be eliminated and access will continue to be provided via the westerly curb cut located approximately 350 feet west of Main Street. This access drive provides one inbound lane and one outbound lane with outbound movements under stop-sign control. Additionally, access will continue to be provided via the existing east-west alley off Main Street located approximately 170 feet north of Ogden Avenue. However, the alley will be closed off from other sites and will be used exclusively by the proposed development. This access drive will be widened to provide one inbound lane and one outbound lane and outbound movements should be under stop-sign control.

Furthermore, access will continue to be provided via the cross connection to the Jewel-Osco site located immediately to the west of the proposed development. Access to the Jewel-Osco site is provided via a full movement access drive off Ogden Avenue located approximately 500 feet west of Main Street and via two full movement access drives off Saratoga Avenue located 315 and 515 feet north of Ogden Avenue.

Directional Distribution



The directions from which patrons and employees of the retail development will approach and depart the site were estimated based on existing travel patterns, as determined from the traffic counts. **Figure 5** illustrates the directional distribution of the development-generated traffic.

Estimated Site Traffic Generation

The volume of traffic generated by a development is based on the type of land uses and the size of the development. The number of peak hour vehicle trips estimated to be generated by the proposed commercial development is based on vehicle trip generation rates contained in *Trip Generation Manual*, 9th Edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) and surveys conducted by KLOA, Inc. at similar fast-casual restaurant in the Chicagoland Area.

It should be noted that surveys conducted by ITE have shown that a large number of trips made to restaurant and retail developments are diverted from the existing traffic on the area roadways. This is particularly true during the weekday morning and evening peak hours when traffic is diverted from the home-to-work and work-to-home trips. Such diverted trips are referred to as pass-by traffic. These surveys indicate that 40 to 50 percent of the peak hour trips generated by restaurants and 30 percent of the peak hour trips generated by retail stores are diverted from existing traffic on the adjacent roads. However, based on IDOT guidelines, a pass-by traffic reduction of only 20 percent was applied to the total number of trips generated by the proposed commercial development.

Additionally, a ten percent interaction reduction was applied to the trip generation for development due to the cross access to Jewel-Osco. **Table 3** shows the site-generated traffic volumes for the proposed development.



LEGEND

- 00% - PERCENT DISTRIBUTION
- 00' - DISTANCE IN FEET

PROJECT:
Retail Development
Downers Grove, Illinois

TITLE:
Estimated Directional Distribution



Figure: 5

Table 3
ESTIMATED SITE-GENERATED TRAFFIC VOLUMES

| ITE Land Use Code | Type/Size | Weekday Morning Peak Hour | | | Weekday Evening Peak Hour | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------------------------|------------|------------|
| | | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| <u>Retail Building A</u> | | | | | | | |
| 934 | Quick Service Restaurant with Drive Through (3,000 s.f.) | 69 | 67 | 136 | 51 | 47 | 98 |
| 932 | High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant (3,900 s.f.) | 23 | 19 | 42 | 23 | 15 | 38 |
| | Fast-Casual Restaurant ¹ (3,600 s.f.) | -- | -- | -- | 39 | 32 | 71 |
| <u>Retail Building B</u> | | | | | | | |
| 826 | Specialty Retail (1,200 s.f.) | -- | -- | -- | 11 | 13 | 24 |
| 932 | High-Turnover Sit-Down Restaurant (2,307 s.f.) | 14 | 11 | 25 | 14 | 9 | 23 |
| | Fast-Casual Restaurant ¹ (2,550 s.f.) | -- | -- | -- | 27 | 23 | 50 |
| <u>Retail Building C</u> | | | | | | | |
| | Fast-Casual with Drive-Through ¹ (2,229 s.f.) | -- | -- | -- | <u>24</u> | <u>20</u> | <u>44</u> |
| <u>Total Development</u> | | | | | | | |
| | Subtotal | 106 | 97 | 203 | 189 | 159 | 348 |
| | <i>20% Pass-By Reduction</i> | <i>-20</i> | <i>-20</i> | <i>-40</i> | <i>-35</i> | <i>-35</i> | <i>-70</i> |
| | <i>10% Interaction Reduction</i> | <i>-11</i> | <i>-10</i> | <i>-21</i> | <i>-19</i> | <i>-16</i> | <i>-35</i> |
| | Total New Trips | 75 | 67 | 142 | 135 | 108 | 243 |
| 1 – Trip Generation based off survey conducted by KLOA, Inc. at a fast-casual restaurant in Chicagoland Area | | | | | | | |

4. Projected Traffic Conditions

The total projected traffic volumes include the existing traffic volumes, increase in background traffic due to ambient growth, and the traffic estimated to be generated by the proposed subject development.

Development Traffic Assignment



The estimated weekday morning and evening peak hour traffic volumes that will be generated by the proposed development were assigned to the roadway system in accordance with the previously described directional distribution (Figure 5). The total new traffic assignment for the commercial development is illustrated in **Figure 6**. The total pass-by traffic assignment for the commercial development is illustrated in **Figure 7**.

Background Traffic Conditions

The existing traffic volumes (Figure 4) were increased by a regional growth factor to account for the increase in existing traffic related to regional growth in the area (i.e., not attributable to any particular planned development). Based on ADT projections provided by the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) in a letter dated July 18, 2016, an increase of approximately one-half of a percent per year for six years was applied to the through volumes along Ogden Avenue to project Year 2022 conditions. A copy of the CMAP 2040 projections letter is included in the Appendix.

Total Projected Traffic Volumes

The development-generated new and pass-by traffic was added to the existing traffic volumes accounting for background growth to determine the Year 2022 total projected traffic volumes, shown in **Figure 8**.



LEGEND



- 00 - AM PEAK HOUR (7:30-8:30 AM)
- (00) - PM PEAK HOUR (4:30-5:30 PM)

PROJECT:
Retail Development
Downers Grove, Illinois

TITLE:
Estimated Site Traffic Assignment



Figure: 6



LEGEND



- 00 - AM PEAK HOUR (7:30-8:30 AM)
- (00) - PM PEAK HOUR (4:30-5:30 PM)

PROJECT:
Retail Development
Downers Grove, Illinois

TITLE:
Pass-By Site Traffic Assignment

Job No: 16-171

Figure: 7



LEGEND
 00 - AM PEAK HOUR (7:30-8:30 AM)
 (00) - PM PEAK HOUR (4:30-5:30 PM)

PROJECT:
 Retail Development
 Downers Grove, Illinois

TITLE:
 Total Projected Traffic Volumes

KLOA
 Job No: 16-171
 Figure: 8

5.

Traffic Analysis and Recommendations

The following provides an evaluation conducted for the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours. The analysis includes conducting capacity analyses to determine how well the roadway system and access drives are projected to operate and whether any roadway improvements or modification are required.

Traffic Analyses

Roadway and adjacent or nearby intersection analyses were performed for the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours for the existing (Year 2016) and future projected (Year 2022) traffic volumes.

The traffic analyses were performed using the methodologies outlined in the Transportation Research Board's *Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), 2010* and analyzed using the HCS 2010 computer software. The analyses for the signalized intersection was conducted using actual cycle lengths and phasings.

The analyses for the unsignalized intersections determine the average control delay to vehicles at an intersection. Control delay is the elapsed time from a vehicle joining the queue at a stop sign (includes the time required to decelerate to a stop) until its departure from the stop sign and resumption of free flow speed. The methodology analyzes each intersection approach controlled by a stop sign and considers traffic volumes on all approaches and lane characteristics.

The ability of an intersection to accommodate traffic flow is expressed in terms of level of service, which is assigned a letter from A to F based on the average control delay experienced by vehicles passing through the intersection. The *Highway Capacity Manual* definitions for levels of service and the corresponding control delay for signalized intersections and unsignalized intersections are included in the Appendix of this report.

Summaries of the traffic analysis results showing the level of service and overall intersection delay (measured in seconds) for the existing and Year 2022 total projected conditions are presented in **Tables 4 through 8**, respectively. A discussion of the intersections follows. Summary sheets for the capacity analyses are included in the Appendix.

It should be noted that the capacity analyses conducted are conservative as the traffic generated by the existing commercial developments were not removed from the roadway network and existing access drives.

Table 4
CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS – OGDEN AVENUE WITH MAIN STREET – SIGNALIZED

| | Peak Hour | Eastbound | | | Westbound | | | Northbound | | | Southbound | | | Overall |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|----------|
| | | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | |
| Year 2016 Existing Conditions | Weekday Morning Peak Hour | E 63.6 | B 17.5 | B 18.4 | C 28.8 | E 62.8 | E 65.0 | D 36.7 | E 59.1 | E 60.5 | D 42.0 | D 44.7 | C 23.8 | D – 44.0 |
| | | C – 31.0 | | | E – 61.2 | | | D – 55.0 | | | C – 35.0 | | | |
| Year 2022 Projected Conditions | Weekday Evening Peak Hour | C 27.4 | C 25.3 | C 26.9 | C 26.5 | C 26.5 | C 28.1 | D 49.4 | D 51.6 | D 52.2 | D 41.1 | D 53.5 | F 209.0 | E – 58.6 |
| | | C – 26.2 | | | C – 27.2 | | | D – 51.2 | | | F – 114.9 | | | |
| Year 2022 Projected Conditions | Weekday Morning Peak Hour | E 71.8 | B 19.0 | C 20.1 | C 30.4 | F 92.2 | F 94.4 | D 36.7 | E 61.4 | E 63.0 | D 42.7 | D 45.4 | C 23.1 | D – 53.0 |
| | | C – 34.4 | | | F – 88.5 | | | E – 56.5 | | | D – 35.2 | | | |
| Year 2022 Projected Conditions | Weekday Evening Peak Hour | C 34.8 | C 27.6 | C 29.5 | C 30.0 | C 29.9 | C 31.6 | E 71.1 | D 52.9 | D 53.6 | D 42.9 | E 55.4 | F 215.4 | E – 61.9 |
| | | C – 29.4 | | | C – 30.7 | | | E – 58.9 | | | F – 118.0 | | | |

Delay is measured in seconds.

Table 5
CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - UNSIGNALIZED
OGDEN AVENUE WITH FOREST AVENUE/FULL MOVEMENT ACCESS DRIVE

| Intersection | Weekday Morning Peak Hour | | Weekday Evening Peak Hour | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|---------------------------|-------|
| | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Existing Conditions | | | | |
| • Northbound Approach | B | 14.8 | D | 27.5 |
| • Southbound Approach | A | 5.0 | F | 71.1 |
| • Eastbound Left-Turns | B | 11.6 | B | 12.2 |
| • Westbound Left-Turns | B | 12.3 | C | 17.2 |
| Projected Conditions | | | | |
| • Northbound Approach | C | 17.8 | D | 34.3 |
| • Southbound Approach | E | 37.3 | F | 99+ |
| • Eastbound Left-Turns | B | 12.3 | C | 20.3 |
| • Westbound Left-Turns | B | 14.8 | B | 12.6 |
| LOS = Level of Service Delay is measured in seconds. | | | | |

Table 6
CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - UNSIGNALIZED
OGDEN AVENUE WITH JEWEL-OSCO ACCESS DRIVE

| Intersection | Weekday Morning Peak Hour | | Weekday Evening Peak Hour | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|---------------------------|-------|
| | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Existing Conditions | | | | |
| • Southbound Approach | C | 20.4 | D | 32.8 |
| • Eastbound Left-Turns | B | 11.6 | C | 17.3 |
| Projected Conditions | | | | |
| • Southbound Approach | D | 27.3 | F | 74.6 |
| • Eastbound Left-Turns | B | 12.1 | C | 20.0 |
| LOS = Level of Service Delay is measured in seconds. | | | | |

Table 7
CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS - UNSIGNALIZED
OGDEN AVENUE WITH FOUR SEASON OF FUN ACCESS DRIVE

| Intersection | Weekday Morning Peak Hour | | Weekday Evening Peak Hour | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------|------------------------------|-------|
| | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Existing Conditions | | | | |
| • Northbound Approach | -- | -- | B | 14.3 |
| • Westbound Left-Turns | -- | -- | B | 12.2 |
| Projected Conditions | | | | |
| • Northbound Approach | -- | -- | B | 14.9 |
| • Westbound Left-Turns | -- | -- | B | 12.8 |
| LOS = Level of Service Delay is measured in seconds. | | | | |

Table 8
CAPACITY ANALYSIS RESULTS
UNSIGNALIZED – MAIN STREET WITH RIGHT-IN/RIGHT-OUT ACCESS DRIVE

| Intersection | Weekday Morning Peak Hour | | Weekday Evening Peak Hour | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------|------------------------------|-------|
| | LOS | Delay | LOS | Delay |
| Projected Conditions | | | | |
| • Eastbound Approach | B | 10.3 | C | 18.6 |
| LOS = Level of Service Delay is measured in seconds. | | | | |

Discussion and Recommendations

The following summarizes how the intersections are projected to operate and identifies any roadway and traffic control improvements necessary to accommodate the development traffic.

Ogden Avenue with Main Street

The results of the capacity analysis indicate that overall this intersection currently operates at level of service (LOS) LOS D during the weekday morning peak hour and at LOS E during the weekday evening peak hour. Assuming Year 2022 conditions, this intersection is projected to continue operating at LOS D during the weekday morning peak hour and at LOS E during the weekday evening peak hours with increases in delay of approximately nine seconds and three seconds, respectively.

It should be noted that the southbound approach currently operates at LOS F and is projected to continue operating at LOS F during the weekday evening peak hour with increases in delay of approximately three seconds. This level of service is attributed to the existing high volume of southbound right-turning vehicles and the increase in background growth as the proposed development is not projected to add any significant amount of traffic to the southbound right-turn movement.

Furthermore, the westbound approach is projected to operate at LOS F during the weekday morning peak hour. However, this level of service is a result of the high volume of existing eastbound left-turning vehicles which utilizes approximately 25 percent of the weekday morning cycle length.

The eastbound left-turns currently operate at LOS E during the weekday morning peak hour and are projected to continue operating at LOS E with increases in delay of approximately eight seconds. Field observations show that during the weekday morning peak hour eastbound left-turn queues extend beyond the provided storage lengths and vehicles queue within the two-way left-turn lane along Ogden avenue. Assuming projected conditions, the analysis indicates that the 95th percentile queues for the eastbound left-turn movement are projected to increase by approximately one to two car lengths and that the queues will continue to be contained within the two-way left-turn lane.

Overall, the proposed development will have a limited impact on the operation of this intersection as the development is projected to add less than three percent to the total traffic traversing this intersection.

Ogden Avenue with Forest Avenue/Full Movement Access Drive

The results of the capacity analysis indicate that the northbound approach currently operates at LOS B during the weekday morning peak hour and at LOS D during the weekday evening peak hour. Assuming Year 2022 conditions, the northbound approach is projected to operate at LOS C during the weekday morning peak hour and at LOS D during the weekday evening peak hour. The southbound approach is projected to operate at LOS E during the weekday morning peak hour and at LOS F during the weekday evening peak hour. However, this level of service is expected for an access roadway that has an unsignalized intersection with a major roadway such as Ogden Avenue. Additionally, these analyses do not take into consideration the gaps created in the Ogden Avenue traffic stream by the signalized intersections of Ogden Avenue with Main Street located approximately 350 feet to the east and Ogden Avenue with Saratoga Avenue located approximately 650 feet to the west. Furthermore, eastbound and westbound left-turn movements are projected to operate at LOS C or better during the peak hours with 95th percentile queues of one to two vehicles. As such, the proposed access driveway will be adequate in accommodating the traffic projected to be generated by the proposed development and no roadway or traffic control improvements will be required.

As previously indicated, the proposed development will eliminate four existing curb cuts along Ogden Avenue currently serving the site. Maintaining the existing access drive aligned opposite Forest Avenue will provide efficient and flexible access to the site and will reduce the traffic load experienced at the cross connection to the access drive serving the Jewel-Osco site.

Ogden Avenue with Jewel-Osco Access Drive

The results of the capacity analysis indicate that the southbound approach currently operates at LOS C during the weekday morning peak hour and at LOS D during the weekday evening peak hour. Assuming Year 2022 conditions, the southbound approach is projected to operate at LOS D during the weekday morning peak hour and at LOS F during the weekday evening peak hour. However, this level of service is expected for an access driveway that has an unsignalized intersection with a major roadway such as Ogden Avenue. Additionally, these analyses do not take into consideration the gaps created in the Ogden Avenue traffic stream by the signalized intersections of Ogden Avenue with Main Street located approximately 500 feet to the east and Ogden Avenue with Saratoga Avenue located approximately 525 feet to the west. Furthermore, eastbound left-turn movements onto the access drive maintain the existing LOS C or better during the peak hours with 95th percentile queues of one to two vehicles. As such, the proposed access driveway will be adequate in accommodating the traffic projected to be generated by the proposed development and no roadway or traffic control improvements will be required.

Ogden Avenue with Four Seasons of Fun Access Drive

The results of the capacity analysis indicate that the northbound approach currently operates and is projected to continue operating at LOS B during the weekday evening peak hour with increases in delay of less than one second. Furthermore, westbound left-turns onto the access drive are projected to continue operating at LOS B with 95th percentile queues of one to two vehicles. As such, the proposed development will have a limited impact on the operations of this access drive and no roadway or traffic control improvements will be required.

Main Street with Existing Alley

The results of the capacity analysis indicate that the eastbound approach is projected to operate at LOS B during the weekday morning peak hour and at LOS C during the weekday evening peak hour with 95th percentile queues of one to two vehicles. As such, the proposed widening of the existing curb cut on Main Street will be adequate in accommodating the traffic projected to be generated by the proposed development and will provide efficient and flexible access.

On-Site Circulation and Design

As proposed, the order board and pick-up window for Retail Building A will be located on the west side of the building. Customers will enter the drive-through lane from the northwest side of the building and travel south along the west side of the building. The drive-through lane should be under stop sign control at its intersection with the southern east-west drive aisle. Based on Village of Downers Grove Zoning Ordinance, the proposed drive-through should provide stacking for eight total spaces, with at least three spaces between order and pick-up station. As designed, the drive-through lane will provide stacking for eight vehicles, meeting Village code.

As proposed, the pick-up window for Retail Building C will be located on the west side of the building with the order board located on the north side of the building. Customers will enter the drive-through lane from the northeast side of the building and travel along the north and west sides of the building. The drive-through lane should be under stop sign control at its intersection with the east-west drive aisle. As designed, the drive-through lane will provide stacking for eight vehicles, meeting Village code.

Studies conducted by KLOA, Inc. at other fast-casual restaurants with a drive-through have shown that the average queue observed from the order board was four vehicles and the average queue from the pick-up window was two vehicles with a maximum queue of three vehicles. As such, the proposed design with stacking for eight vehicles at both drive-through lanes will be adequate to accommodating the peak demand of the drive-through operation.

Based on a review of the plan, and in order to provide efficient and adequate internal traffic flow, the following is recommended:

- Wayfinding signs directing traffic to the drive-through lanes should be provided at both access drives, at the cross access to Jewel-Osco and at the entrance of the drive-through lane.
- “Do Not Enter” signs facing south should be posted at the exit throat of both of the drive-through lanes.
- Exiting movements from the drive-through lane should be under stop sign control.
- Clear lines of sight in both directions for vehicles exiting the drive-through lane should be maintained.
- The east-west drive aisles should be under stop-sign control at their respective intersections with the site access drive to prioritize inbound movements from Ogden Avenue.
- “Do Not Block Intersection” signs should be provided on the north side of the east-west drive aisle at the site access drive so that southbound vehicles waiting to turn onto Ogden Avenue do not obstruct the east-west drive aisle for inbound vehicles.

6. Conclusion

Based on the preceding analyses and recommendations, the following conclusions have been made:

- The development-generated traffic will have a limited impact on area roadways.
- The proposed development will eliminate four existing curb cuts along the north side of Ogden Avenue between Forest Avenue and Main Street.
- Maintaining the existing curb cut aligned opposite Forest Avenue will ensure flexible access is provided and will reduce the traffic load experienced at any one access drive particularly the cross connection with the access drive serving Jewel Osco
- The proposed access system will be adequate in accommodating the development-generated traffic and will ensure that efficient and flexible access is provided, particularly for drive-through traffic.
- The drive-through lanes will provide stacking for eight vehicles, which will be adequate in accommodating the projected the peak demand of the drive-through operation.

Appendix

- Site Plan
- Traffic Count Summary Sheets
- CMAP 2040 Projections Letter
- Level of Service Criteria
- Capacity Analysis Summary Sheets

Traffic Count Summary Sheets



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400
Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Ogden Avenue with Main Street
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/28/2016
Page No: 1

Turning Movement Data

| Start Time | Ogden Avenue Eastbound | | | | | | Ogden Avenue Westbound | | | | | | Main Street Northbound | | | | | | Main Street Southbound | | | | | | Int. Total |
|----------------------|------------------------|------|------|-------|------|------------|------------------------|------|------|-------|------|------------|------------------------|------|------|-------|------|------------|------------------------|------|------|-------|------|------------|------------|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | |
| 7:00 AM | 0 | 90 | 223 | 8 | 1 | 321 | 0 | 11 | 179 | 17 | 0 | 207 | 0 | 28 | 90 | 14 | 0 | 132 | 0 | 30 | 48 | 25 | 0 | 103 | 763 |
| 7:15 AM | 0 | 113 | 229 | 14 | 0 | 356 | 0 | 15 | 208 | 24 | 0 | 247 | 0 | 28 | 101 | 29 | 0 | 158 | 0 | 27 | 44 | 26 | 0 | 97 | 858 |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 122 | 313 | 8 | 0 | 443 | 0 | 19 | 218 | 34 | 0 | 271 | 0 | 45 | 138 | 25 | 0 | 208 | 0 | 28 | 55 | 65 | 0 | 148 | 1070 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 125 | 275 | 16 | 0 | 416 | 0 | 21 | 248 | 20 | 0 | 289 | 0 | 35 | 119 | 28 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 23 | 53 | 59 | 0 | 135 | 1022 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 450 | 1040 | 46 | 1 | 1536 | 0 | 66 | 853 | 95 | 0 | 1014 | 0 | 136 | 448 | 96 | 0 | 680 | 0 | 108 | 200 | 175 | 0 | 483 | 3713 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 119 | 277 | 13 | 2 | 409 | 0 | 19 | 206 | 18 | 0 | 243 | 0 | 45 | 104 | 30 | 0 | 179 | 0 | 32 | 55 | 69 | 2 | 156 | 987 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 105 | 260 | 20 | 0 | 385 | 0 | 24 | 215 | 33 | 0 | 272 | 0 | 28 | 110 | 33 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 27 | 45 | 57 | 0 | 129 | 957 |
| 8:30 AM | 0 | 92 | 238 | 17 | 0 | 347 | 0 | 17 | 214 | 24 | 2 | 255 | 0 | 39 | 110 | 22 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 45 | 54 | 55 | 1 | 154 | 927 |
| 8:45 AM | 0 | 93 | 291 | 18 | 1 | 402 | 0 | 34 | 221 | 34 | 0 | 289 | 0 | 45 | 106 | 24 | 0 | 175 | 0 | 35 | 67 | 53 | 3 | 155 | 1021 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 409 | 1066 | 68 | 3 | 1543 | 0 | 94 | 856 | 109 | 2 | 1059 | 0 | 157 | 430 | 109 | 0 | 696 | 0 | 139 | 221 | 234 | 6 | 594 | 3892 |
| *** BREAK *** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 4:00 PM | 0 | 42 | 267 | 26 | 3 | 335 | 0 | 39 | 311 | 25 | 0 | 375 | 0 | 38 | 57 | 37 | 0 | 132 | 0 | 51 | 130 | 134 | 0 | 315 | 1157 |
| 4:15 PM | 0 | 42 | 240 | 28 | 3 | 310 | 0 | 34 | 273 | 20 | 1 | 327 | 0 | 40 | 47 | 30 | 1 | 117 | 0 | 62 | 149 | 129 | 1 | 340 | 1094 |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 47 | 277 | 23 | 0 | 347 | 0 | 46 | 324 | 24 | 0 | 394 | 0 | 44 | 93 | 31 | 0 | 168 | 0 | 54 | 154 | 155 | 0 | 363 | 1272 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 55 | 257 | 23 | 0 | 335 | 0 | 39 | 292 | 21 | 2 | 352 | 0 | 30 | 76 | 24 | 1 | 130 | 0 | 66 | 200 | 168 | 0 | 434 | 1251 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 186 | 1041 | 100 | 6 | 1327 | 0 | 158 | 1200 | 90 | 3 | 1448 | 0 | 152 | 273 | 122 | 2 | 547 | 0 | 233 | 633 | 586 | 1 | 1452 | 4774 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 35 | 295 | 23 | 0 | 353 | 0 | 44 | 274 | 23 | 2 | 341 | 0 | 42 | 56 | 14 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 70 | 173 | 171 | 0 | 414 | 1220 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 43 | 267 | 19 | 2 | 329 | 0 | 45 | 261 | 17 | 1 | 323 | 0 | 42 | 84 | 23 | 1 | 149 | 0 | 62 | 195 | 174 | 0 | 431 | 1232 |
| 5:30 PM | 0 | 69 | 288 | 17 | 2 | 374 | 0 | 31 | 278 | 17 | 1 | 326 | 0 | 49 | 83 | 18 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 61 | 189 | 165 | 1 | 415 | 1265 |
| 5:45 PM | 0 | 52 | 283 | 16 | 0 | 351 | 0 | 21 | 318 | 9 | 0 | 348 | 0 | 40 | 73 | 25 | 0 | 138 | 0 | 62 | 176 | 125 | 1 | 363 | 1200 |
| Hourly Total | 0 | 199 | 1133 | 75 | 4 | 1407 | 0 | 141 | 1131 | 66 | 4 | 1338 | 0 | 173 | 296 | 80 | 1 | 549 | 0 | 255 | 733 | 635 | 2 | 1623 | 4917 |
| Grand Total | 0 | 1244 | 4280 | 289 | 14 | 5813 | 0 | 459 | 4040 | 360 | 9 | 4859 | 0 | 618 | 1447 | 407 | 3 | 2472 | 0 | 735 | 1787 | 1630 | 9 | 4152 | 17296 |
| Approach % | 0.0 | 21.4 | 73.6 | 5.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 9.4 | 83.1 | 7.4 | - | - | 0.0 | 25.0 | 58.5 | 16.5 | - | - | 0.0 | 17.7 | 43.0 | 39.3 | - | - | - |
| Total % | 0.0 | 7.2 | 24.7 | 1.7 | - | 33.6 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 23.4 | 2.1 | - | 28.1 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 8.4 | 2.4 | - | 14.3 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 10.3 | 9.4 | - | 24.0 | - |
| Lights | 0 | 1217 | 4177 | 275 | - | 5669 | 0 | 445 | 3955 | 350 | - | 4750 | 0 | 598 | 1411 | 399 | - | 2408 | 0 | 711 | 1767 | 1592 | - | 4070 | 16897 |
| % Lights | - | 97.8 | 97.6 | 95.2 | - | 97.5 | - | 96.9 | 97.9 | 97.2 | - | 97.8 | - | 96.8 | 97.5 | 98.0 | - | 97.4 | - | 96.7 | 98.9 | 97.7 | - | 98.0 | 97.7 |
| Buses | 0 | 12 | 7 | 2 | - | 21 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | - | 9 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 2 | - | 17 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 12 | - | 20 | 67 |
| % Buses | - | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.7 | - | 0.4 | - | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | - | 0.2 | - | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.5 | - | 0.7 | - | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.7 | - | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 12 | 74 | 8 | - | 94 | 0 | 11 | 67 | 8 | - | 86 | 0 | 13 | 23 | 5 | - | 41 | 0 | 18 | 12 | 23 | - | 53 | 274 |
| % Single-Unit Trucks | - | 1.0 | 1.7 | 2.8 | - | 1.6 | - | 2.4 | 1.7 | 2.2 | - | 1.8 | - | 2.1 | 1.6 | 1.2 | - | 1.7 | - | 2.4 | 0.7 | 1.4 | - | 1.3 | 1.6 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 3 | 21 | 4 | - | 28 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 1 | - | 14 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | - | 6 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | - | 8 | 56 |
| % Articulated Trucks | - | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1.4 | - | 0.5 | - | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | - | 0.3 | - | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | - | 0.2 | - | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.2 | - | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 2 |
| % Bicycles on Road | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 14 | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | - | - |



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400

Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
(847)518-9990

Count Name: Ogden Avenue with Main Street
Site Code:
Start Date: 06/28/2016
Page No: 4

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (7:30 AM)

| Start Time | Ogden Avenue Eastbound | | | | | | Ogden Avenue Westbound | | | | | | Main Street Northbound | | | | | | Main Street Southbound | | | | | | Int. Total |
|----------------------|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|------------|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|------------|------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|------------|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | |
| 7:30 AM | 0 | 122 | 313 | 8 | 0 | 443 | 0 | 19 | 218 | 34 | 0 | 271 | 0 | 45 | 138 | 25 | 0 | 208 | 0 | 28 | 55 | 65 | 0 | 148 | 1070 |
| 7:45 AM | 0 | 125 | 275 | 16 | 0 | 416 | 0 | 21 | 248 | 20 | 0 | 289 | 0 | 35 | 119 | 28 | 0 | 182 | 0 | 23 | 53 | 59 | 0 | 135 | 1022 |
| 8:00 AM | 0 | 119 | 277 | 13 | 2 | 409 | 0 | 19 | 206 | 18 | 0 | 243 | 0 | 45 | 104 | 30 | 0 | 179 | 0 | 32 | 55 | 69 | 2 | 156 | 987 |
| 8:15 AM | 0 | 105 | 260 | 20 | 0 | 385 | 0 | 24 | 215 | 33 | 0 | 272 | 0 | 28 | 110 | 33 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 27 | 45 | 57 | 0 | 129 | 957 |
| Total | 0 | 471 | 1125 | 57 | 2 | 1653 | 0 | 83 | 887 | 105 | 0 | 1075 | 0 | 153 | 471 | 116 | 0 | 740 | 0 | 110 | 208 | 250 | 2 | 568 | 4036 |
| Approach % | 0.0 | 28.5 | 68.1 | 3.4 | - | - | 0.0 | 7.7 | 82.5 | 9.8 | - | - | 0.0 | 20.7 | 63.6 | 15.7 | - | - | 0.0 | 19.4 | 36.6 | 44.0 | - | - | - |
| Total % | 0.0 | 11.7 | 27.9 | 1.4 | - | 41.0 | 0.0 | 2.1 | 22.0 | 2.6 | - | 26.6 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 11.7 | 2.9 | - | 18.3 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 5.2 | 6.2 | - | 14.1 | - |
| PHF | 0.000 | 0.942 | 0.899 | 0.713 | - | 0.933 | 0.000 | 0.865 | 0.894 | 0.772 | - | 0.930 | 0.000 | 0.850 | 0.853 | 0.879 | - | 0.889 | 0.000 | 0.859 | 0.945 | 0.906 | - | 0.910 | 0.943 |
| Lights | 0 | 462 | 1090 | 48 | - | 1600 | 0 | 81 | 859 | 101 | - | 1041 | 0 | 146 | 459 | 114 | - | 719 | 0 | 104 | 202 | 237 | - | 543 | 3903 |
| % Lights | - | 98.1 | 96.9 | 84.2 | - | 96.8 | - | 97.6 | 96.8 | 96.2 | - | 96.8 | - | 95.4 | 97.5 | 98.3 | - | 97.2 | - | 94.5 | 97.1 | 94.8 | - | 95.6 | 96.7 |
| Buses | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 | - | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | - | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | - | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | - | 7 | 24 |
| % Buses | - | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.8 | - | 0.5 | - | 1.2 | 0.2 | 0.0 | - | 0.3 | - | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | - | 0.8 | - | 0.9 | 0.5 | 2.0 | - | 1.2 | 0.6 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 4 | 23 | 6 | - | 33 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 3 | - | 27 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 1 | - | 13 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 | - | 16 | 89 |
| % Single-Unit Trucks | - | 0.8 | 2.0 | 10.5 | - | 2.0 | - | 1.2 | 2.6 | 2.9 | - | 2.5 | - | 3.3 | 1.5 | 0.9 | - | 1.8 | - | 3.6 | 1.9 | 3.2 | - | 2.8 | 2.2 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | 8 | 2 | - | 11 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | - | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | - | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 18 |
| % Articulated Trucks | - | 0.2 | 0.7 | 3.5 | - | 0.7 | - | 0.0 | 0.3 | 1.0 | - | 0.4 | - | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.0 | - | 0.3 | - | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | - | 1 | 2 |
| % Bicycles on Road | - | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | - | 0.2 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - |
| % Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |



Kenig Lindgren O'Hara Aboona, Inc.
 9575 W. Higgins Rd., Suite 400
 Rosemont, Illinois, United States 60018
 (847)518-9990

Count Name: Ogden Avenue with Main Street
 Site Code:
 Start Date: 06/28/2016
 Page No: 6

Turning Movement Peak Hour Data (4:30 PM)

| Start Time | Ogden Avenue Eastbound | | | | | | Ogden Avenue Westbound | | | | | | Main Street Northbound | | | | | | Main Street Southbound | | | | | | Int. Total |
|----------------------|------------------------|------------|-------------|-----------|----------|-------------|------------------------|------------|-------------|-----------|----------|-------------|------------------------|------------|------------|-----------|----------|------------|------------------------|------------|------------|------------|----------|-------------|-------------|
| | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | U-Turn | Left | Thru | Right | Peds | App. Total | |
| 4:30 PM | 0 | 47 | 277 | 23 | 0 | 347 | 0 | 46 | 324 | 24 | 0 | 394 | 0 | 44 | 93 | 31 | 0 | 168 | 0 | 54 | 154 | 155 | 0 | 363 | 1272 |
| 4:45 PM | 0 | 55 | 257 | 23 | 0 | 335 | 0 | 39 | 292 | 21 | 2 | 352 | 0 | 30 | 76 | 24 | 1 | 130 | 0 | 66 | 200 | 168 | 0 | 434 | 1251 |
| 5:00 PM | 0 | 35 | 295 | 23 | 0 | 353 | 0 | 44 | 274 | 23 | 2 | 341 | 0 | 42 | 56 | 14 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 70 | 173 | 171 | 0 | 414 | 1220 |
| 5:15 PM | 0 | 43 | 267 | 19 | 2 | 329 | 0 | 45 | 261 | 17 | 1 | 323 | 0 | 42 | 84 | 23 | 1 | 149 | 0 | 62 | 195 | 174 | 0 | 431 | 1232 |
| Total | 0 | 180 | 1096 | 88 | 2 | 1364 | 0 | 174 | 1151 | 85 | 5 | 1410 | 0 | 158 | 309 | 92 | 2 | 559 | 0 | 252 | 722 | 668 | 0 | 1642 | 4975 |
| Approach % | 0.0 | 13.2 | 80.4 | 6.5 | - | - | 0.0 | 12.3 | 81.6 | 6.0 | - | - | 0.0 | 28.3 | 55.3 | 16.5 | - | - | 0.0 | 15.3 | 44.0 | 40.7 | - | - | - |
| Total % | 0.0 | 3.6 | 22.0 | 1.8 | - | 27.4 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 23.1 | 1.7 | - | 28.3 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 6.2 | 1.8 | - | 11.2 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 14.5 | 13.4 | - | 33.0 | - |
| PHF | 0.000 | 0.818 | 0.929 | 0.957 | - | 0.966 | 0.000 | 0.946 | 0.888 | 0.885 | - | 0.895 | 0.000 | 0.898 | 0.831 | 0.742 | - | 0.832 | 0.000 | 0.900 | 0.903 | 0.960 | - | 0.946 | 0.978 |
| Lights | 0 | 175 | 1078 | 86 | - | 1339 | 0 | 170 | 1140 | 82 | - | 1392 | 0 | 154 | 307 | 91 | - | 552 | 0 | 248 | 719 | 661 | - | 1628 | 4911 |
| % Lights | - | 97.2 | 98.4 | 97.7 | - | 98.2 | - | 97.7 | 99.0 | 96.5 | - | 98.7 | - | 97.5 | 99.4 | 98.9 | - | 98.7 | - | 98.4 | 99.6 | 99.0 | - | 99.1 | 98.7 |
| Buses | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | - | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | - | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | - | 3 | 12 |
| % Buses | - | 1.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | - | 0.2 | - | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.2 | - | 0.1 | - | 1.3 | 0.6 | 0.0 | - | 0.7 | - | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | - | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Single-Unit Trucks | 0 | 2 | 13 | 0 | - | 15 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 2 | - | 16 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | - | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | - | 10 | 43 |
| % Single-Unit Trucks | - | 1.1 | 1.2 | 0.0 | - | 1.1 | - | 2.3 | 0.9 | 2.4 | - | 1.1 | - | 0.6 | 0.0 | 1.1 | - | 0.4 | - | 1.6 | 0.3 | 0.6 | - | 0.6 | 0.9 |
| Articulated Trucks | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | - | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | - | 1 | 9 |
| % Articulated Trucks | - | 0.6 | 0.4 | 2.3 | - | 0.5 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.2 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Bicycles on Road | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 |
| % Bicycles on Road | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |
| % Pedestrians | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

CMAP 2040 Projections Letter



Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

233 South Wacker Drive
Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60606

312 454 0400
www.cmap.illinois.gov

July 19, 2016

Brendan May
Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara and Aboona, Inc.
9575 West Higgins Rd
Suite 400
Rosemont, IL 60018

Subject: Ogden Ave (US 34) @ Main Street
IDOT

Dear Mr. May:

In response to a request made on your behalf and dated July 18, 2016, we have developed year 2040 average daily traffic (ADT) projections for the subject location.

| ROAD SEGMENT | Year 2040 ADT |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Ogden Avenue east of Main Street | 32,000 |
| Ogden Avenue west of Main Street | 34,000 |
| Main Street north of Ogden Avenue | 26,000 |
| Main Street south of Ogden Avenue | 15,000 |

Traffic projections are developed using existing ADT data provided in the request letter and the results from the March 2016 CMAP Travel Demand Analysis. The regional travel model uses CMAP 2040 socioeconomic projections and assumes the implementation of the GO TO 2040 Comprehensive Regional Plan for the Northeastern Illinois area.

If you have any questions, please call me at (312) 386-8806.

Sincerely,

Jose Rodriguez, PTP, AICP
Senior Planner, Research & Analysis

cc: Fortmann (IDOT)
S:\AdminGroups\ResearchAnalysis\SmallAreaTrafficForecasts_CY16\DownersGrove\du-24-16\du-24-16.docx

Level of Service Criteria

LEVEL OF SERVICE CRITERIA


| Signalized Intersections | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Level of Service | Interpretation | Average Control Delay (seconds per vehicle) |
| A | Favorable progression. Most vehicles arrive during the green indication and travel through the intersection without stopping. | ≤10 |
| B | Good progression, with more vehicles stopping than for Level of Service A. | >10 - 20 |
| C | Individual cycle failures (i.e., one or more queued vehicles are not able to depart as a result of insufficient capacity during the cycle) may begin to appear. Number of vehicles stopping is significant, although many vehicles still pass through the intersection without stopping. | >20 - 35 |
| D | The volume-to-capacity ratio is high and either progression is ineffective or the cycle length is too long. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable. | >35 - 55 |
| E | Progression is unfavorable. The volume-to-capacity ratio is high and the cycle length is long. Individual cycle failures are frequent. | >55 - 80 |
| F | The volume-to-capacity ratio is very high, progression is very poor and the cycle length is long. Most cycles fail to clear the queue. | >80.0 |
| Unsignalized Intersections | | |
| Level of Service | Average Total Delay (SEC/VEH) | |
| A | 0 - 10 | |
| B | > 10 - 15 | |
| C | > 15 - 25 | |
| D | > 25 - 35 | |
| E | > 35 - 50 | |
| F | > 50 | |

Source: *Highway Capacity Manual*, 2010.

Capacity Analysis Summary Sheets

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Input Data

| General Information | | | | Intersection Information | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------|--------------------------|------|-----------------|----------|
| Agency | KLOA, Inc. | | | Duration, h | 0.25 | | |
| Analyst | BSM | | Analysis Date | 7/15/2016 | | Area Type | Other |
| Jurisdiction | IDOT | | Time Period | AM Peak Hour | | PHF | 0.94 |
| Urban Street | Ogden Avenue | | Analysis Year | 2016 | | Analysis Period | 1 > 7:00 |
| Intersection | Ogden Avenue with Mai... | | File Name | Ogden and Main AMEX.xus | | | |
| Project Description | AM Existing Peak Hour | | | | | | |



| Demand Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|--------------------|-----|------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Approach Movement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 471 | 1125 | 57 | 83 | 887 | 105 | 153 | 471 | 116 | 110 | 208 | 250 |

| Signal Information | | | | Phase Diagrams | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|----------------|-----|------|------|-----|-----|------|--|--|--|
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | Green | 6.4 | 23.4 | 40.2 | 9.1 | 2.5 | 25.8 | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | | | |


| Traffic Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Approach Movement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 471 | 1125 | 57 | 83 | 887 | 105 | 153 | 471 | 116 | 110 | 208 | 250 |
| Initial Queue (Q _b), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Saturation Flow Rate (s ₀), veh/h | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 2000 | 1900 |
| Parking (N _m), man/h | | None | | | None | | | None | | | None | |
| Heavy Vehicles (P _{HV}), % | 2 | 3 | | 2 | 3 | | 5 | 3 | | 6 | 3 | 5 |
| Ped / Bike / RTOR, /h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Buses (N _b), buses/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Arrival Type (AT) | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Upstream Filtering (I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Width (W), ft | 12.0 | 12.0 | | 12.0 | 12.0 | | 12.0 | 12.0 | | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Turn Bay Length, ft | 225 | 0 | | 225 | 0 | | 220 | 0 | | 230 | 0 | 230 |
| Grade (P _g), % | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| Speed Limit, mi/h | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |

| Phase Information | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Maximum Green (G _{max}) or Phase Split, s | 38.0 | 68.0 | 14.0 | 44.0 | 16.0 | 32.0 | 16.0 | 32.0 |
| Yellow Change Interval (Y), s | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 |
| Red Clearance Interval (R _c), s | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| Minimum Green (G _{min}), s | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Start-Up Lost Time (lt), s | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Extension of Effective Green (e), s | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Passage (PT), s | 3.0 | 7.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| Recall Mode | Off | Min | Off | Min | Min | Off | Min | Off |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Walk (Walk), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance Time (PC), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

| Multimodal Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|---------------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|
| 85th % Speed / Rest in Walk / Corner Radius | 0 | No | 25 | 0 | No | 25 | 0 | No | 25 | 0 | No | 25 |
| Walkway / Crosswalk Width / Length, ft | 9.0 | 12 | 0 | 9.0 | 12 | 0 | 9.0 | 12 | 0 | 9.0 | 12 | 0 |
| Street Width / Island / Curb | 0 | 0 | No | 0 | 0 | No | 0 | 0 | No | 0 | 0 | No |
| Width Outside / Bike Lane / Shoulder, ft | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 |
| Pedestrian Signal / Occupied Parking | No | 0.50 | | No | 0.50 | | No | 0.50 | | No | 0.50 | |

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary

| General Information | | | | Intersection Information | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------|--------------------------|------|-----------------|----------|
| Agency | KLOA, Inc. | | | Duration, h | 0.25 | | |
| Analyst | BSM | | Analysis Date | 7/15/2016 | | Area Type | Other |
| Jurisdiction | IDOT | | Time Period | AM Peak Hour | | PHF | 0.94 |
| Urban Street | Ogden Avenue | | Analysis Year | 2016 | | Analysis Period | 1 > 7:00 |
| Intersection | Ogden Avenue with Mai... | | File Name | Ogden and Main AMEX.xus | | | |
| Project Description | AM Existing Peak Hour | | | | | | |



| Demand Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|---------------------|-----|------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 471 | 1125 | 57 | 83 | 887 | 105 | 153 | 471 | 116 | 110 | 208 | 250 |

| Signal Information | | | | Signal Phases | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------------------|-----|------|------|-----|-----|------|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | Green | 6.4 | 23.4 | 40.2 | 9.1 | 2.5 | 25.8 | Yellow | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | [Signal Diagrams] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | [Signal Diagrams] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | [Signal Diagrams] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
|--------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 36.9 | 73.1 | 9.9 | 46.2 | 15.1 | 34.4 | 12.6 | 31.8 |
| Change Period, (Y+R _c), s | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 |
| Max Allow Headway (MAH), s | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 8.2 | 4.1 | 8.2 |
| Queue Clearance Time (g _s), s | 32.8 | | 6.4 | | 11.5 | 23.7 | 9.0 | 16.9 |
| Green Extension Time (g _e), s | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 7.7 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 | | 1.00 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 1.00 | | 0.31 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.95 |

| Movement Group Results | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate (v), veh/h | 501 | 634 | 624 | 88 | 538 | 518 | 163 | 322 | 303 | 117 | 221 | 266 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate (s), veh/h/ln | 1774 | 1845 | 1813 | 1774 | 1845 | 1776 | 1723 | 1845 | 1718 | 1707 | 1849 | 1533 |
| Queue Service Time (g _s), s | 30.8 | 25.7 | 26.6 | 4.4 | 36.4 | 36.5 | 9.5 | 21.5 | 21.7 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 14.9 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time (g _c), s | 30.8 | 25.7 | 26.6 | 4.4 | 36.4 | 36.5 | 9.5 | 21.5 | 21.7 | 7.0 | 6.6 | 14.9 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | 0.58 | 0.52 | 0.52 | 0.36 | 0.31 | 0.31 | 0.30 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.27 | 0.20 | 0.46 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h | 526 | 952 | 936 | 274 | 571 | 549 | 375 | 402 | 375 | 202 | 735 | 698 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (X) | 0.953 | 0.665 | 0.666 | 0.323 | 0.942 | 0.942 | 0.434 | 0.800 | 0.807 | 0.579 | 0.301 | 0.381 |
| Back of Queue (Q), ft/ln (95 th percentile) | 676.2 | 365.4 | 373.1 | 87.2 | 671.8 | 649.3 | 193.2 | 424.4 | 398 | 146.1 | 142.7 | 242.6 |
| Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile) | 26.6 | 14.3 | 14.9 | 3.4 | 26.2 | 26.0 | 7.4 | 16.6 | 15.9 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 9.3 |
| Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile) | 3.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.39 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.64 | 0.00 | 1.05 |
| Uniform Delay (d ₁), s/veh | 37.5 | 13.8 | 14.7 | 28.1 | 37.1 | 38.5 | 35.9 | 48.1 | 48.2 | 39.4 | 44.4 | 23.3 |
| Incremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh | 26.2 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 0.7 | 25.8 | 26.5 | 0.8 | 10.9 | 12.2 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| Initial Queue Delay (d ₃), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | 63.6 | 17.5 | 18.4 | 28.8 | 62.8 | 65.0 | 36.7 | 59.1 | 60.5 | 42.0 | 44.7 | 23.8 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | E | B | B | C | E | E | D | E | E | D | D | C |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 31.0 | C | | 61.2 | E | | 55.0 | D | | 35.0 | C | |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 44.0 | | | | | | D | | | | | |

| Multimodal Results | EB | | WB | | NB | | SB | |
|----------------------------|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.8 | C | 3.0 | C | 2.9 | C | 2.9 | C |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.9 | A | 1.4 | A | 1.1 | A | 1.0 | A |

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Intermediate Values

| General Information | | | | Intersection Information | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------|--------------------------|------|-----------------|----------|
| Agency | KLOA, Inc. | | | Duration, h | 0.25 | | |
| Analyst | BSM | | Analysis Date | 7/15/2016 | | Area Type | Other |
| Jurisdiction | IDOT | | Time Period | AM Peak Hour | | PHF | 0.94 |
| Urban Street | Ogden Avenue | | Analysis Year | 2016 | | Analysis Period | 1 > 7:00 |
| Intersection | Ogden Avenue with Mai... | | File Name | Ogden and Main AMEX.xus | | | |
| Project Description | AM Existing Peak Hour | | | | | | |



| Demand Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|---------------------|-----|------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Approach Movement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 471 | 1125 | 57 | 83 | 887 | 105 | 153 | 471 | 116 | 110 | 208 | 250 |

| Signal Information | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|--------|-----|------|------|-----|-----|------|--|--|
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | | | | | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Green | 6.4 | 23.4 | 40.2 | 9.1 | 2.5 | 25.8 | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Yellow | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | | |
| | | | | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | | |

| Saturation Flow / Delay | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Lane Width Adjustment Factor (f _w) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (f _{HV}) | 0.980 | 0.971 | 1.000 | 0.980 | 0.971 | 1.000 | 0.952 | 0.971 | 1.000 | 0.943 | 0.971 | 0.952 |
| Approach Grade Adjustment Factor (f _g) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Parking Activity Adjustment Factor (f _p) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Bus Blockage Adjustment Factor (f _{bb}) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Area Type Adjustment Factor (f _a) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Lane Utilization Adjustment Factor (f _{LU}) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.952 | 1.000 |
| Left-Turn Adjustment Factor (f _{LT}) | 0.952 | 0.000 | | 0.952 | 0.000 | | 0.952 | 0.000 | | 0.952 | 0.000 | |
| Right-Turn Adjustment Factor (f _{RT}) | | 0.983 | 0.983 | | 0.963 | 0.963 | | 0.932 | 0.932 | | 0.000 | 0.847 |
| Left-Turn Pedestrian Adjustment Factor (f _{LPB}) | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | |
| Right-Turn Ped-Bike Adjustment Factor (f _{RPB}) | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 |
| Movement Saturation Flow Rate (s), veh/h | 1774 | 3481 | 176 | 1774 | 3237 | 383 | 1723 | 2862 | 701 | 1707 | 3697 | 1533 |
| Proportion of Vehicles Arriving on Green (P) | 0.26 | 0.69 | 0.52 | 0.05 | 0.41 | 0.31 | 0.09 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.07 | 0.20 | 0.20 |
| Incremental Delay Factor (k) | 0.42 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.34 | 0.35 | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.15 |

| Signal Timing / Movement Groups | EBL | EBT/R | WBL | WBT/R | NBL | NBT/R | SBL | SBT/R |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|
| Lost Time (t _L) | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | 0.58 | 0.52 | 0.36 | 0.31 | 0.30 | 0.22 | 0.27 | 0.20 |
| Permitted Saturation Flow Rate (s _p), veh/h/ln | 533 | 0 | 440 | 0 | 1122 | 0 | 767 | 0 |
| Shared Saturation Flow Rate (s _{sh}), veh/h/ln | | | | | | | | |
| Permitted Effective Green Time (g _p), s | 42.2 | 0.0 | 40.2 | 0.0 | 26.8 | 0.0 | 25.8 | 0.0 |
| Permitted Service Time (g _u), s | 3.8 | 0.0 | 38.6 | 0.0 | 19.2 | 0.0 | 4.6 | 0.0 |
| Permitted Queue Service Time (g _{ps}), s | 3.8 | | 0.4 | | 1.3 | | 3.8 | |
| Time to First Blockage (g _t), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Service Time Before Blockage (g _{ts}), s | | | | | | | | |
| Protected Right Saturation Flow (s _R), veh/h/ln | | | | | | | | 1533 |
| Protected Right Effective Green Time (g _R), s | | | | | | | | 33.3 |

| Multimodal | EB | | WB | | NB | | SB | |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| Pedestrian F _w / F _v | 2.107 | 0.00 | 2.224 | 0.00 | 2.107 | 0.00 | 2.107 | 0.00 |
| Pedestrian F _s / F _{delay} | 0.000 | 0.109 | 0.000 | 0.138 | 0.000 | 0.148 | 0.000 | 0.150 |
| Pedestrian M _{corner} / M _{cw} | | | | | | | | |
| Bicycle c _b / d _b | 1032.55 | 15.21 | 618.37 | 31.02 | 436.17 | 39.74 | 397.61 | 41.72 |
| Bicycle F _w / F _v | -3.64 | 1.45 | -3.64 | 0.94 | -3.64 | 0.65 | -3.64 | 0.50 |


--- Messages ---

WARNING: Since queue spillover from turn lanes and spillback into upstream intersections is not accounted for in the HCM procedures, use of a simulation tool may be advised in situations where the Queue Storage Ratio exceeds 1.0.

--- Comments ---

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Input Data

| General Information | | | | Intersection Information | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|--|
| Agency | KLOA, Inc. | | | Duration, h | 0.25 | | |
| Analyst | BSM | Analysis Date | Jan 26, 2017 | Area Type | Other | | |
| Jurisdiction | IDOT | Time Period | PM Peak Hour | PHF | 0.98 | | |
| Urban Street | Ogden Avenue | Analysis Year | 2016 | Analysis Period | 1 > 7:00 | | |
| Intersection | Ogden Avenue with Mai... | File Name | Ogden and Main PMEX.xus | | | | |
| Project Description | PM Existing Peak Hour | | | | | | |



| Demand Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|--------------------|-----|------|----|-----|------|----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Approach Movement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 180 | 1096 | 88 | 174 | 1151 | 85 | 158 | 309 | 92 | 252 | 722 | 668 |

| Signal Information | | | | Phase Diagrams | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|----------------|-----|-----|------|------|-----|------|--|
| Cycle, s | 140.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | Green | 9.7 | 0.3 | 64.5 | 11.5 | 2.6 | 28.9 | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | |


| Traffic Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Approach Movement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 180 | 1096 | 88 | 174 | 1151 | 85 | 158 | 309 | 92 | 252 | 722 | 668 |
| Initial Queue (Q _b), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Saturation Flow Rate (s ₀), veh/h | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 2000 | 1900 |
| Parking (N _m), man/h | | None | | | None | | | None | | | None | |
| Heavy Vehicles (P _{HV}), % | 3 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Ped / Bike / RTOR, /h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Buses (N _b), buses/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Arrival Type (AT) | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Upstream Filtering (I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Width (W), ft | 12.0 | 12.0 | | 12.0 | 12.0 | | 12.0 | 12.0 | | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Turn Bay Length, ft | 225 | 0 | | 225 | 0 | | 220 | 0 | | 230 | 0 | 230 |
| Grade (P _g), % | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| Speed Limit, mi/h | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |

| Phase Information | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Maximum Green (G _{max}) or Phase Split, s | 22.0 | 62.0 | 22.0 | 62.0 | 15.0 | 34.0 | 22.0 | 41.0 |
| Yellow Change Interval (Y), s | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 |
| Red Clearance Interval (R _c), s | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| Minimum Green (G _{min}), s | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Start-Up Lost Time (I _t), s | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Extension of Effective Green (e), s | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Passage (PT), s | 3.0 | 7.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| Recall Mode | Off | Min | Off | Min | Min | Off | Min | Off |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Walk (Walk), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance Time (PC), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

| Multimodal Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|---------------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|
| 85th % Speed / Rest in Walk / Corner Radius | 0 | No | 25 | 0 | No | 25 | 0 | No | 25 | 0 | No | 25 |
| Walkway / Crosswalk Width / Length, ft | 9.0 | 12 | 0 | 9.0 | 12 | 0 | 9.0 | 12 | 0 | 9.0 | 12 | 0 |
| Street Width / Island / Curb | 0 | 0 | No | 0 | 0 | No | 0 | 0 | No | 0 | 0 | No |
| Width Outside / Bike Lane / Shoulder, ft | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 |
| Pedestrian Signal / Occupied Parking | No | 0.50 | | No | 0.50 | | No | 0.50 | | No | 0.50 | |

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary

| General Information | | | | Intersection Information | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------|--------------------------|------|-----------------|----------|
| Agency | KLOA, Inc. | | | Duration, h | 0.25 | | |
| Analyst | BSM | | Analysis Date | Jan 26, 2017 | | Area Type | Other |
| Jurisdiction | IDOT | | Time Period | PM Peak Hour | | PHF | 0.98 |
| Urban Street | Ogden Avenue | | Analysis Year | 2016 | | Analysis Period | 1 > 7:00 |
| Intersection | Ogden Avenue with Mai... | | File Name | Ogden and Main PMEX.xus | | | |
| Project Description | PM Existing Peak Hour | | | | | | |



| Demand Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|---------------------|-----|------|----|-----|------|----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 180 | 1096 | 88 | 174 | 1151 | 85 | 158 | 309 | 92 | 252 | 722 | 668 |

| Signal Information | | | | Signal Timing (s) | | | | | | | | Signal Phases | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------------------|-----|-----|------|------|-----|------|---|---------------|---|---|--|
| Cycle, s | 140.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | Green | 9.7 | 0.3 | 64.5 | 11.5 | 2.6 | 28.9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | Yellow | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | | | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | | | | | | | | | | | | |


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
|--------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 13.5 | 70.8 | 13.2 | 70.5 | 15.0 | 34.9 | 21.1 | 41.0 |
| Change Period, (Y+R _c), s | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 |
| Max Allow Headway (MAH), s | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 7.6 | 4.1 | 7.6 |
| Queue Clearance Time (g _s), s | 9.6 | | 9.3 | | 12.1 | 16.4 | 17.5 | 37.0 |
| Green Extension Time (g _e), s | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 0.1 | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 | | 1.00 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 0.03 | | 0.02 | | 1.00 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

| Movement Group Results | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate (v), veh/h | 184 | 612 | 596 | 178 | 638 | 623 | 161 | 210 | 199 | 257 | 737 | 682 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate (s), veh/h/ln | 1757 | 1863 | 1814 | 1774 | 1881 | 1835 | 1757 | 1881 | 1734 | 1774 | 1885 | 1594 |
| Queue Service Time (g _s), s | 7.6 | 31.3 | 32.3 | 7.3 | 33.4 | 34.4 | 10.1 | 14.0 | 14.4 | 15.5 | 25.5 | 35.0 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time (g _c), s | 7.6 | 31.3 | 32.3 | 7.3 | 33.4 | 34.4 | 10.1 | 14.0 | 14.4 | 15.5 | 25.5 | 35.0 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | 0.53 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.53 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.29 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.35 | 0.25 | 0.32 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h | 270 | 863 | 840 | 274 | 867 | 845 | 234 | 388 | 358 | 375 | 943 | 512 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (X) | 0.680 | 0.709 | 0.710 | 0.647 | 0.736 | 0.737 | 0.689 | 0.541 | 0.556 | 0.685 | 0.782 | 1.330 |
| Back of Queue (Q), ft/ln (95 th percentile) | 152.6 | 475.4 | 483.2 | 145.6 | 506.8 | 517.3 | 219.5 | 280.3 | 268 | 296.8 | 464.8 | 1502.3 |
| Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile) | 6.0 | 18.7 | 19.3 | 5.7 | 20.1 | 20.7 | 8.6 | 11.1 | 10.7 | 11.7 | 18.4 | 59.6 |
| Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile) | 0.68 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.65 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.29 | 0.00 | 6.53 |
| Uniform Delay (d ₁), s/veh | 24.4 | 20.4 | 21.8 | 23.9 | 21.0 | 22.4 | 41.1 | 49.6 | 49.8 | 36.3 | 48.9 | 47.5 |
| Incremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh | 3.0 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 2.6 | 5.5 | 5.7 | 8.3 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 4.8 | 4.6 | 161.5 |
| Initial Queue Delay (d ₃), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | 27.4 | 25.3 | 26.9 | 26.5 | 26.5 | 28.1 | 49.4 | 51.6 | 52.2 | 41.1 | 53.5 | 209.0 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C | C | C | C | C | C | D | D | D | D | D | F |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 26.2 | C | | 27.2 | C | | 51.2 | D | | | 114.9 | F |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 58.6 | | | | | | E | | | | | |

| Multimodal Results | EB | | WB | | NB | | SB | |
|----------------------------|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.8 | C | 2.9 | C | 2.9 | C | 2.9 | C |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.6 | A | 1.7 | A | 1.0 | A | 1.9 | A |

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Intermediate Values

| General Information | | | | Intersection Information | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|--|
| Agency | KLOA, Inc. | | | Duration, h | 0.25 | | |
| Analyst | BSM | Analysis Date | Jan 26, 2017 | Area Type | Other | | |
| Jurisdiction | IDOT | Time Period | PM Peak Hour | PHF | 0.98 | | |
| Urban Street | Ogden Avenue | Analysis Year | 2016 | Analysis Period | 1 > 7:00 | | |
| Intersection | Ogden Avenue with Mai... | File Name | Ogden and Main PMEX.xus | | | | |
| Project Description | PM Existing Peak Hour | | | | | | |



| Demand Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|---------------------|-----|------|----|-----|------|----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Approach Movement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 180 | 1096 | 88 | 174 | 1151 | 85 | 158 | 309 | 92 | 252 | 722 | 668 |

| Signal Information | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|--------|-----|-----|------|------|-----|------|--|--|
| Cycle, s | 140.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | | | | | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Green | 9.7 | 0.3 | 64.5 | 11.5 | 2.6 | 28.9 | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Yellow | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | | |
| | | | | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | | |

| Saturation Flow / Delay | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Lane Width Adjustment Factor (f _w) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (f _{HV}) | 0.971 | 0.980 | 1.000 | 0.980 | 0.990 | 1.000 | 0.971 | 0.990 | 1.000 | 0.980 | 0.990 | 0.990 |
| Approach Grade Adjustment Factor (f _g) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Parking Activity Adjustment Factor (f _p) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Bus Blockage Adjustment Factor (f _{bb}) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Area Type Adjustment Factor (f _a) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Lane Utilization Adjustment Factor (f _{LU}) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.952 | 1.000 |
| Left-Turn Adjustment Factor (f _{LT}) | 0.952 | 0.000 | | 0.952 | 0.000 | | 0.952 | 0.000 | | 0.952 | 0.000 | |
| Right-Turn Adjustment Factor (f _{RT}) | | 0.974 | 0.974 | | 0.976 | 0.976 | | 0.922 | 0.922 | | 0.000 | 0.847 |
| Left-Turn Pedestrian Adjustment Factor (f _{LPB}) | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | |
| Right-Turn Ped-Bike Adjustment Factor (f _{RPB}) | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 |
| Movement Saturation Flow Rate (s), veh/h | 1757 | 3403 | 273 | 1774 | 3461 | 255 | 1757 | 2797 | 818 | 1774 | 3770 | 1594 |
| Proportion of Vehicles Arriving on Green (P) | 0.07 | 0.62 | 0.46 | 0.07 | 0.61 | 0.46 | 0.08 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.13 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Incremental Delay Factor (k) | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.26 | 0.18 | 0.19 | 0.24 | 0.35 | 0.50 |

| Signal Timing / Movement Groups | EBL | EBT/R | WBL | WBT/R | NBL | NBT/R | SBL | SBT/R |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|
| Lost Time (t _L) | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | 0.53 | 0.46 | 0.53 | 0.46 | 0.29 | 0.21 | 0.35 | 0.25 |
| Permitted Saturation Flow Rate (s _p), veh/h/ln | 434 | 0 | 461 | 0 | 711 | 0 | 972 | 0 |
| Shared Saturation Flow Rate (s _{sh}), veh/h/ln | | | | | | | | |
| Permitted Effective Green Time (g _p), s | 64.5 | 0.0 | 64.5 | 0.0 | 28.9 | 0.0 | 30.9 | 0.0 |
| Permitted Service Time (g _u), s | 30.1 | 0.0 | 30.5 | 0.0 | 7.5 | 0.0 | 14.5 | 0.0 |
| Permitted Queue Service Time (g _{ps}), s | 25.3 | | 21.3 | | 6.3 | | 5.9 | |
| Time to First Blockage (g _t), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Service Time Before Blockage (g _{ts}), s | | | | | | | | |
| Protected Right Saturation Flow (s _R), veh/h/ln | | | | | | | | 1594 |
| Protected Right Effective Green Time (g _R), s | | | | | | | | 10.0 |

| Multimodal | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--|--|
| Pedestrian F _w / F _v | 2.107 | 0.00 | 2.224 | 0.00 | 2.107 | 0.00 | 2.107 | 0.00 | 2.107 | 0.00 | | |
| Pedestrian F _s / F _{delay} | 0.000 | 0.120 | 0.000 | 0.121 | 0.000 | 0.152 | 0.000 | 0.147 | 0.000 | 0.147 | | |
| Pedestrian M _{corner} / M _{cw} | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bicycle c _b / d _b | 926.14 | 20.18 | 921.37 | 20.36 | 412.79 | 44.09 | 500.00 | 39.38 | | | | |
| Bicycle F _w / F _v | -3.64 | 1.15 | -3.64 | 1.19 | -3.64 | 0.47 | -3.64 | 1.38 | | | | |

--- Messages ---


WARNING: If demand exceeds capacity, a multiple-period analysis should be conducted.

WARNING: Since queue spillover from turn lanes and spillback into upstream intersections is not accounted for in the HCM procedures, use of a simulation tool may be advised in situations where the Queue Storage Ratio exceeds 1.0.













--- Comments ---

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Input Data

| General Information | | | | Intersection Information | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------|--------------------------|------|-----------------|----------|
| Agency | KLOA, Inc. | | | Duration, h | 0.25 | | |
| Analyst | BSM | | Analysis Date | 7/15/2016 | | Area Type | Other |
| Jurisdiction | IDOT | | Time Period | AM Peak Hour | | PHF | 0.94 |
| Urban Street | Ogden Avenue | | Analysis Year | 2022 | | Analysis Period | 1 > 7:00 |
| Intersection | Ogden Avenue with Mai... | | File Name | Ogden and Main AMPR.xus | | | |
| Project Description | AM Projected Peak Hour | | | | | | |



| Demand Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|--------------------|-----|------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 492 | 1178 | 65 | 85 | 937 | 108 | 173 | 485 | 119 | 114 | 221 | 258 |

| Signal Information | | | | Signal Phases | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | Green | 6.7 | 25.1 | 38.0 | 9.4 | 3.1 | 25.2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | | | | | |


| Traffic Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 492 | 1178 | 65 | 85 | 937 | 108 | 173 | 485 | 119 | 114 | 221 | 258 |
| Initial Queue (Q _b), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Saturation Flow Rate (s ₀), veh/h | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 2000 | 1900 |
| Parking (N _m), man/h | None | | | None | | | None | | | None | | |
| Heavy Vehicles (P _{HV}), % | 2 | 3 | | 2 | 3 | | 5 | 3 | | 6 | 3 | 5 |
| Ped / Bike / RTOR, /h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Buses (N _b), buses/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Arrival Type (AT) | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Upstream Filtering (I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Width (W), ft | 12.0 | 12.0 | | 12.0 | 12.0 | | 12.0 | 12.0 | | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Turn Bay Length, ft | 225 | 0 | | 225 | 0 | | 220 | 0 | | 230 | 0 | 230 |
| Grade (P _g), % | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| Speed Limit, mi/h | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |

| Phase Information | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Maximum Green (G _{max}) or Phase Split, s | 38.0 | 68.0 | 14.0 | 44.0 | 16.0 | 32.0 | 16.0 | 32.0 |
| Yellow Change Interval (Y), s | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 |
| Red Clearance Interval (R _c), s | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| Minimum Green (G _{min}), s | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Start-Up Lost Time (lt), s | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Extension of Effective Green (e), s | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Passage (PT), s | 3.0 | 7.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| Recall Mode | Off | Min | Off | Min | Min | Off | Min | Off |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Walk (Walk), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance Time (PC), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |













| Multimodal Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|---------------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|
| 85th % Speed / Rest in Walk / Corner Radius | 0 | No | 25 | 0 | No | 25 | 0 | No | 25 | 0 | No | 25 |
| Walkway / Crosswalk Width / Length, ft | 9.0 | 12 | 0 | 9.0 | 12 | 0 | 9.0 | 12 | 0 | 9.0 | 12 | 0 |
| Street Width / Island / Curb | 0 | 0 | No | 0 | 0 | No | 0 | 0 | No | 0 | 0 | No |
| Width Outside / Bike Lane / Shoulder, ft | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 |
| Pedestrian Signal / Occupied Parking | No | 0.50 | | No | 0.50 | | No | 0.50 | | No | 0.50 | |

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary

| General Information | | | | Intersection Information | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------|--------------------------|------|-----------------|----------|
| Agency | KLOA, Inc. | | | Duration, h | 0.25 | | |
| Analyst | BSM | | Analysis Date | 7/15/2016 | | Area Type | Other |
| Jurisdiction | IDOT | | Time Period | AM Peak Hour | | PHF | 0.94 |
| Urban Street | Ogden Avenue | | Analysis Year | 2022 | | Analysis Period | 1 > 7:00 |
| Intersection | Ogden Avenue with Mai... | | File Name | Ogden and Main AMPR.xus | | | |
| Project Description | AM Projected Peak Hour | | | | | | |



| Demand Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|---------------------|-----|------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 492 | 1178 | 65 | 85 | 937 | 108 | 173 | 485 | 119 | 114 | 221 | 258 |

| Signal Information | | | | Phase Diagrams | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | Green | 6.7 | 25.1 | 38.0 | 9.4 | 3.1 | 25.2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | | | | | |


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
|--------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 38.8 | 72.6 | 10.2 | 44.0 | 16.0 | 34.4 | 12.9 | 31.2 |
| Change Period, (Y+R _c), s | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 |
| Max Allow Headway (MAH), s | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 8.2 | 4.1 | 8.2 |
| Queue Clearance Time (g _s), s | 35.9 | | 6.6 | | 12.8 | 24.5 | 9.3 | 17.1 |
| Green Extension Time (g _e), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 0.1 | 7.1 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 | | 1.00 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 1.00 | | 0.53 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 |

| Movement Group Results | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Approach Movement | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate (v), veh/h | 523 | 667 | 656 | 90 | 566 | 546 | 184 | 331 | 311 | 121 | 235 | 274 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate (s), veh/h/ln | 1774 | 1845 | 1810 | 1774 | 1845 | 1777 | 1723 | 1845 | 1719 | 1707 | 1849 | 1533 |
| Queue Service Time (g _s), s | 33.9 | 28.7 | 29.8 | 4.6 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 10.8 | 22.3 | 22.5 | 7.3 | 7.1 | 15.1 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time (g _c), s | 33.9 | 28.7 | 29.8 | 4.6 | 38.0 | 38.0 | 10.8 | 22.3 | 22.5 | 7.3 | 7.1 | 15.1 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | 0.58 | 0.51 | 0.51 | 0.34 | 0.29 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.27 | 0.19 | 0.47 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h | 537 | 945 | 927 | 257 | 539 | 519 | 376 | 402 | 375 | 201 | 718 | 714 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (X) | 0.975 | 0.705 | 0.707 | 0.352 | 1.050 | 1.051 | 0.490 | 0.823 | 0.830 | 0.603 | 0.327 | 0.385 |
| Back of Queue (Q), ft/ln (95 th percentile) | 731.6 | 406.6 | 415.5 | 92.3 | 836 | 803.7 | 214.1 | 442.8 | 415.2 | 152.7 | 153.4 | 245.7 |
| Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile) | 28.8 | 15.9 | 16.6 | 3.6 | 32.7 | 32.1 | 8.2 | 17.3 | 16.6 | 5.8 | 6.0 | 9.5 |
| Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile) | 3.25 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.97 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.66 | 0.00 | 1.07 |
| Uniform Delay (d ₁), s/veh | 39.3 | 14.6 | 15.6 | 29.6 | 39.7 | 41.0 | 35.7 | 48.4 | 48.5 | 39.7 | 45.1 | 22.6 |
| Incremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh | 32.5 | 4.4 | 4.5 | 0.8 | 52.5 | 53.4 | 1.0 | 13.0 | 14.5 | 2.9 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Initial Queue Delay (d ₃), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | 71.8 | 19.0 | 20.1 | 30.4 | 92.2 | 94.4 | 36.7 | 61.4 | 63.0 | 42.7 | 45.4 | 23.1 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | E | B | C | C | F | F | D | E | E | D | D | C |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 34.4 | | C | 88.5 | | F | 56.5 | | E | 35.2 | | D |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 53.0 | | | | | | D | | | | | |

| Multimodal Results | EB | | WB | | NB | | SB | |
|----------------------------|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.8 | C | 3.0 | C | 2.9 | C | 2.9 | C |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 2.0 | B | 1.5 | A | 1.2 | A | 1.0 | A |

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Intermediate Values

| General Information | | | | Intersection Information | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|--|
| Agency | KLOA, Inc. | | | Duration, h | 0.25 | | |
| Analyst | BSM | Analysis Date | 7/15/2016 | Area Type | Other | | |
| Jurisdiction | IDOT | Time Period | AM Peak Hour | PHF | 0.94 | | |
| Urban Street | Ogden Avenue | Analysis Year | 2022 | Analysis Period | 1 > 7:00 | | |
| Intersection | Ogden Avenue with Mai... | File Name | Ogden and Main AMPR.xus | | | | |
| Project Description | AM Projected Peak Hour | | | | | | |



| Demand Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|---------------------|-----|------|----|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Approach Movement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 492 | 1178 | 65 | 85 | 937 | 108 | 173 | 485 | 119 | 114 | 221 | 258 |

| Signal Information | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|--------|-----|------|------|-----|-----|------|--|--|
| Cycle, s | 130.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | | | | | | | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Green | 6.7 | 25.1 | 38.0 | 9.4 | 3.1 | 25.2 | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Yellow | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | | |
| | | | | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | | |

| Saturation Flow / Delay | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Lane Width Adjustment Factor (f _w) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (f _{HV}) | 0.980 | 0.971 | 1.000 | 0.980 | 0.971 | 1.000 | 0.952 | 0.971 | 1.000 | 0.943 | 0.971 | 0.952 |
| Approach Grade Adjustment Factor (f _g) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Parking Activity Adjustment Factor (f _p) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Bus Blockage Adjustment Factor (f _{bb}) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Area Type Adjustment Factor (f _a) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Lane Utilization Adjustment Factor (f _{LU}) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.952 | 1.000 |
| Left-Turn Adjustment Factor (f _{LT}) | 0.952 | 0.000 | | 0.952 | 0.000 | | 0.952 | 0.000 | | 0.952 | 0.000 | |
| Right-Turn Adjustment Factor (f _{RT}) | | 0.981 | 0.981 | | 0.963 | 0.963 | | 0.932 | 0.932 | | 0.000 | 0.847 |
| Left-Turn Pedestrian Adjustment Factor (f _{LPB}) | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | |
| Right-Turn Ped-Bike Adjustment Factor (f _{RPB}) | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 |
| Movement Saturation Flow Rate (s), veh/h | 1774 | 3464 | 191 | 1774 | 3248 | 374 | 1723 | 2864 | 699 | 1707 | 3697 | 1533 |
| Proportion of Vehicles Arriving on Green (P) | 0.27 | 0.68 | 0.51 | 0.05 | 0.39 | 0.29 | 0.10 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.07 | 0.19 | 0.19 |
| Incremental Delay Factor (k) | 0.48 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.36 | 0.37 | 0.11 | 0.15 | 0.15 |

| Signal Timing / Movement Groups | EBL | EBT/R | WBL | WBT/R | NBL | NBT/R | SBL | SBT/R |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|
| Lost Time (t _L) | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | 0.58 | 0.51 | 0.34 | 0.29 | 0.30 | 0.22 | 0.27 | 0.19 |
| Permitted Saturation Flow Rate (s _p), veh/h/ln | 505 | 0 | 413 | 0 | 1108 | 0 | 754 | 0 |
| Shared Saturation Flow Rate (s _{sh}), veh/h/ln | | | | | | | | |
| Permitted Effective Green Time (g _p), s | 40.0 | 0.0 | 38.0 | 0.0 | 26.9 | 0.0 | 25.2 | 0.0 |
| Permitted Service Time (g _u), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 34.8 | 0.0 | 18.1 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 0.0 |
| Permitted Queue Service Time (g _{ps}), s | 0.0 | | 0.9 | | 1.7 | | 3.9 | |
| Time to First Blockage (g _t), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Service Time Before Blockage (g _{ts}), s | | | | | | | | |
| Protected Right Saturation Flow (s _R), veh/h/ln | | | | | | | | 1533 |
| Protected Right Effective Green Time (g _R), s | | | | | | | | 35.3 |

| Multimodal | EB | | WB | | NB | | SB | |
|--------------------------------------------------|---------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| Pedestrian F _w / F _v | 2.107 | 0.00 | 2.224 | 0.00 | 2.107 | 0.00 | 2.107 | 0.00 |
| Pedestrian F _s / F _{delay} | 0.000 | 0.110 | 0.000 | 0.140 | 0.000 | 0.148 | 0.000 | 0.150 |
| Pedestrian M _{corner} / M _{cw} | | | | | | | | |
| Bicycle c _b / d _b | 1024.45 | 15.47 | 584.55 | 32.56 | 436.40 | 39.73 | 388.45 | 42.20 |
| Bicycle F _w / F _v | -3.64 | 1.52 | -3.64 | 0.99 | -3.64 | 0.68 | -3.64 | 0.52 |


--- Messages ---

WARNING: Since queue spillover from turn lanes and spillback into upstream intersections is not accounted for in the HCM procedures, use of a simulation tool may be advised in situations where the Queue Storage Ratio exceeds 1.0.

--- Comments ---

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Input Data

| General Information | | | | Intersection Information | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|--|
| Agency | KLOA, Inc. | | | Duration, h | 0.25 | | |
| Analyst | BSM | Analysis Date | Jan 26, 2017 | Area Type | Other | | |
| Jurisdiction | IDOT | Time Period | PM Peak Hour | PHF | 0.98 | | |
| Urban Street | Ogden Avenue | Analysis Year | 2022 | Analysis Period | 1 > 7:00 | | |
| Intersection | Ogden Avenue with Mai... | File Name | Ogden and Main PMPR.xus | | | | |
| Project Description | PM Existing Peak Hour | | | | | | |



| Demand Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|--------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|------|----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Approach Movement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 196 | 1159 | 102 | 179 | 1227 | 88 | 190 | 318 | 95 | 262 | 755 | 688 |

| Signal Information | | | | Signal Phases | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|---------------|------|-----|------|------|-----|------|--------|-----|-----|
| Cycle, s | 140.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | Green | 10.0 | 0.8 | 63.7 | 11.5 | 3.3 | 28.2 | Yellow | 3.5 | 0.0 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | | | | | | | | | | |


| Traffic Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Approach Movement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 196 | 1159 | 102 | 179 | 1227 | 88 | 190 | 318 | 95 | 262 | 755 | 688 |
| Initial Queue (Q _b), veh/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Base Saturation Flow Rate (s ₀), veh/h | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 1900 | 2000 | 1900 |
| Parking (N _m), man/h | | None | | | None | | | None | | | None | |
| Heavy Vehicles (P _{HV}), % | 3 | 2 | | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Ped / Bike / RTOR, /h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Buses (N _b), buses/h | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Arrival Type (AT) | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Upstream Filtering (I) | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Lane Width (W), ft | 12.0 | 12.0 | | 12.0 | 12.0 | | 12.0 | 12.0 | | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Turn Bay Length, ft | 225 | 0 | | 225 | 0 | | 220 | 0 | | 230 | 0 | 230 |
| Grade (P _g), % | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 0 | |
| Speed Limit, mi/h | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |

| Phase Information | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
|-----------------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Maximum Green (G _{max}) or Phase Split, s | 22.0 | 62.0 | 22.0 | 62.0 | 15.0 | 34.0 | 22.0 | 41.0 |
| Yellow Change Interval (Y), s | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 |
| Red Clearance Interval (R _c), s | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 1.5 |
| Minimum Green (G _{min}), s | 3 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| Start-Up Lost Time (lt), s | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Extension of Effective Green (e), s | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| Passage (PT), s | 3.0 | 7.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
| Recall Mode | Off | Min | Off | Min | Min | Off | Min | Off |
| Dual Entry | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Walk (Walk), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pedestrian Clearance Time (PC), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

| Multimodal Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|---------------------------------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|-----|
| 85th % Speed / Rest in Walk / Corner Radius | 0 | No | 25 | 0 | No | 25 | 0 | No | 25 | 0 | No | 25 |
| Walkway / Crosswalk Width / Length, ft | 9.0 | 12 | 0 | 9.0 | 12 | 0 | 9.0 | 12 | 0 | 9.0 | 12 | 0 |
| Street Width / Island / Curb | 0 | 0 | No | 0 | 0 | No | 0 | 0 | No | 0 | 0 | No |
| Width Outside / Bike Lane / Shoulder, ft | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 12 | 5.0 | 2.0 |
| Pedestrian Signal / Occupied Parking | No | 0.50 | | No | 0.50 | | No | 0.50 | | No | 0.50 | |

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary

| General Information | | | | Intersection Information | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|--|
| Agency | KLOA, Inc. | | | Duration, h | 0.25 | | |
| Analyst | BSM | Analysis Date | Jan 26, 2017 | Area Type | Other | | |
| Jurisdiction | IDOT | Time Period | PM Peak Hour | PHF | 0.98 | | |
| Urban Street | Ogden Avenue | Analysis Year | 2022 | Analysis Period | 1 > 7:00 | | |
| Intersection | Ogden Avenue with Mai... | File Name | Ogden and Main PMPR.xus | | | | |
| Project Description | PM Existing Peak Hour | | | | | | |



| Demand Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|---------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|------|----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Approach Movement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 196 | 1159 | 102 | 179 | 1227 | 88 | 190 | 318 | 95 | 262 | 755 | 688 |

| Signal Information | | | | Phase Diagrams | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|----------------|------|-----|------|------|-----|------|---|---|---|---|
| Cycle, s | 140.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | Green | 10.0 | 0.8 | 63.7 | 11.5 | 3.3 | 28.2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | | | | |


| Timer Results | EBL | EBT | WBL | WBT | NBL | NBT | SBL | SBT |
|--------------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Assigned Phase | 5 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 4 |
| Case Number | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.0 |
| Phase Duration, s | 14.3 | 70.5 | 13.5 | 69.7 | 15.0 | 34.2 | 21.8 | 41.0 |
| Change Period, (Y+R _c), s | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 |
| Max Allow Headway (MAH), s | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4.1 | 7.6 | 4.1 | 7.6 |
| Queue Clearance Time (g _s), s | 10.4 | | 9.6 | | 13.5 | 17.0 | 18.2 | 37.0 |
| Green Extension Time (g _e), s | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Phase Call Probability | 1.00 | | 1.00 | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Max Out Probability | 0.06 | | 0.03 | | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

| Movement Group Results | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|--------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Assigned Movement | 5 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 3 | 8 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 14 |
| Adjusted Flow Rate (v), veh/h | 200 | 652 | 635 | 183 | 678 | 664 | 194 | 217 | 205 | 267 | 770 | 702 |
| Adjusted Saturation Flow Rate (s), veh/h/ln | 1757 | 1863 | 1809 | 1774 | 1881 | 1836 | 1757 | 1881 | 1733 | 1774 | 1885 | 1594 |
| Queue Service Time (g _s), s | 8.4 | 35.4 | 36.6 | 7.6 | 38.2 | 39.2 | 11.5 | 14.5 | 15.0 | 16.2 | 27.0 | 35.0 |
| Cycle Queue Clearance Time (g _c), s | 8.4 | 35.4 | 36.6 | 7.6 | 38.2 | 39.2 | 11.5 | 14.5 | 15.0 | 16.2 | 27.0 | 35.0 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | 0.53 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.53 | 0.46 | 0.46 | 0.28 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.35 | 0.25 | 0.33 |
| Capacity (c), veh/h | 257 | 859 | 834 | 257 | 856 | 836 | 225 | 379 | 350 | 374 | 943 | 521 |
| Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (X) | 0.778 | 0.759 | 0.761 | 0.711 | 0.792 | 0.795 | 0.860 | 0.571 | 0.586 | 0.715 | 0.817 | 1.346 |
| Back of Queue (Q), ft/ln (95 th percentile) | 180.4 | 534.3 | 542.9 | 154 | 577.5 | 587.9 | 293.9 | 290.9 | 278 | 312.1 | 491.8 | 1566.2 |
| Back of Queue (Q), veh/ln (95 th percentile) | 7.0 | 21.0 | 21.7 | 6.1 | 22.9 | 23.5 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 11.1 | 12.3 | 19.5 | 62.2 |
| Queue Storage Ratio (RQ) (95 th percentile) | 0.80 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.68 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.36 | 0.00 | 6.81 |
| Uniform Delay (d ₁), s/veh | 27.5 | 21.4 | 23.0 | 26.4 | 22.5 | 23.9 | 44.2 | 50.4 | 50.6 | 36.6 | 49.5 | 47.1 |
| Incremental Delay (d ₂), s/veh | 7.3 | 6.2 | 6.5 | 3.6 | 7.4 | 7.7 | 26.8 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 6.3 | 6.0 | 168.3 |
| Initial Queue Delay (d ₃), s/veh | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Control Delay (d), s/veh | 34.8 | 27.6 | 29.5 | 30.0 | 29.9 | 31.6 | 71.1 | 52.9 | 53.6 | 42.9 | 55.4 | 215.4 |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C | C | C | C | C | C | E | D | D | D | E | F |
| Approach Delay, s/veh / LOS | 29.4 | C | | 30.7 | C | | 58.9 | E | | 118.0 | F | |
| Intersection Delay, s/veh / LOS | 61.9 | | | | | | E | | | | | |

| Multimodal Results | EB | | WB | | NB | | SB | |
|----------------------------|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|
| Pedestrian LOS Score / LOS | 2.8 | C | 2.9 | C | 2.9 | C | 2.9 | C |
| Bicycle LOS Score / LOS | 1.7 | A | 1.7 | A | 1.0 | A | 1.9 | A |

HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Intermediate Values

| General Information | | | | Intersection Information | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|--|
| Agency | KLOA, Inc. | | | Duration, h | 0.25 | | |
| Analyst | BSM | Analysis Date | Jan 26, 2017 | Area Type | Other | | |
| Jurisdiction | IDOT | Time Period | PM Peak Hour | PHF | 0.98 | | |
| Urban Street | Ogden Avenue | Analysis Year | 2022 | Analysis Period | 1 > 7:00 | | |
| Intersection | Ogden Avenue with Mai... | File Name | Ogden and Main PMPR.xus | | | | |
| Project Description | PM Existing Peak Hour | | | | | | |



| Demand Information | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|---------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|------|----|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|-----|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Approach Movement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Demand (v), veh/h | 196 | 1159 | 102 | 179 | 1227 | 88 | 190 | 318 | 95 | 262 | 755 | 688 |

| Signal Information | | | | Signal Phases | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|---------------|------|-----|------|------|-----|------|--|--|--|
| Cycle, s | 140.0 | Reference Phase | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Offset, s | 0 | Reference Point | Begin | Green | 10.0 | 0.8 | 63.7 | 11.5 | 3.3 | 28.2 | | | |
| Uncoordinated | No | Simult. Gap E/W | On | Yellow | 3.5 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.5 | | | |
| Force Mode | Fixed | Simult. Gap N/S | On | Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.5 | | | |

| Saturation Flow / Delay | EB | | | WB | | | NB | | | SB | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R | L | T | R |
| Lane Width Adjustment Factor (f _w) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Heavy Vehicle Adjustment Factor (f _{HV}) | 0.971 | 0.980 | 1.000 | 0.980 | 0.990 | 1.000 | 0.971 | 0.990 | 1.000 | 0.980 | 0.990 | 0.990 |
| Approach Grade Adjustment Factor (f _g) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Parking Activity Adjustment Factor (f _p) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Bus Blockage Adjustment Factor (f _{bb}) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Area Type Adjustment Factor (f _a) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 |
| Lane Utilization Adjustment Factor (f _{LU}) | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 0.952 | 1.000 |
| Left-Turn Adjustment Factor (f _{LT}) | 0.952 | 0.000 | | 0.952 | 0.000 | | 0.952 | 0.000 | | 0.952 | 0.000 | |
| Right-Turn Adjustment Factor (f _{RT}) | | 0.971 | 0.971 | | 0.976 | 0.976 | | 0.921 | 0.921 | | 0.000 | 0.847 |
| Left-Turn Pedestrian Adjustment Factor (f _{LPB}) | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | |
| Right-Turn Ped-Bike Adjustment Factor (f _{RPB}) | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 | | | 1.000 |
| Movement Saturation Flow Rate (s), veh/h | 1757 | 3376 | 297 | 1774 | 3469 | 248 | 1757 | 2794 | 821 | 1774 | 3770 | 1594 |
| Proportion of Vehicles Arriving on Green (P) | 0.08 | 0.61 | 0.46 | 0.07 | 0.61 | 0.46 | 0.08 | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.13 | 0.25 | 0.25 |
| Incremental Delay Factor (k) | 0.16 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.11 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.39 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.27 | 0.37 | 0.50 |

| Signal Timing / Movement Groups | EBL | EBT/R | WBL | WBT/R | NBL | NBT/R | SBL | SBT/R |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|
| Lost Time (t _L) | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 3.5 | 6.0 |
| Green Ratio (g/C) | 0.53 | 0.46 | 0.53 | 0.46 | 0.28 | 0.20 | 0.35 | 0.25 |
| Permitted Saturation Flow Rate (s _p), veh/h/ln | 402 | 0 | 427 | 0 | 689 | 0 | 962 | 0 |
| Shared Saturation Flow Rate (s _{sh}), veh/h/ln | | | | | | | | |
| Permitted Effective Green Time (g _p), s | 63.7 | 0.0 | 63.7 | 0.0 | 28.2 | 0.0 | 30.2 | 0.0 |
| Permitted Service Time (g _u), s | 24.5 | 0.0 | 25.9 | 0.0 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 13.3 | 0.0 |
| Permitted Queue Service Time (g _{ps}), s | 24.5 | | 25.9 | | 6.0 | | 6.5 | |
| Time to First Blockage (g _t), s | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Queue Service Time Before Blockage (g _{ts}), s | | | | | | | | |
| Protected Right Saturation Flow (s _R), veh/h/ln | | | | | | | | 1594 |
| Protected Right Effective Green Time (g _R), s | | | | | | | | 10.8 |

| Multimodal | EB | | WB | | NB | | SB | |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| Pedestrian F _w / F _v | 2.107 | 0.00 | 2.224 | 0.00 | 2.107 | 0.00 | 2.107 | 0.00 |
| Pedestrian F _s / F _{delay} | 0.000 | 0.121 | 0.000 | 0.122 | 0.000 | 0.152 | 0.000 | 0.147 |
| Pedestrian M _{corner} / M _{cw} | | | | | | | | |
| Bicycle c _b / d _b | 921.90 | 20.34 | 910.11 | 20.79 | 403.38 | 44.61 | 500.00 | 39.38 |
| Bicycle F _w / F _v | -3.64 | 1.23 | -3.64 | 1.26 | -3.64 | 0.51 | -3.64 | 1.44 |

--- Messages ---

WARNING: If demand exceeds capacity, a multiple-period analysis should be conducted.


WARNING: Since queue spillover from turn lanes and spillback into upstream intersections is not accounted for in the HCM procedures, use of a simulation tool may be advised in situations where the Queue Storage Ratio exceeds 1.0.

--- Comments ---

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | | | Intersection | Ogden and Forest | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | | | Jurisdiction | IDOT | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | | | East/West Street | Ogden Avenue | | |
| Analysis Year | 2016 | | | North/South Street | Forest Ave/Access Drive | | |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour | | | Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | | | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|---|------|----|-----------|----|------|----|------------|---|-----|----|------------|----|-----|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Priority | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | T | TR | | LT | | TR | | | LTR | | | | LTR | |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | 2 | 1358 | 16 | | 2 | 1251 | 4 | | 0 | 0 | 19 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | | | | | Left Only | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|------|--|--|--|------|--|--|--|------|------|------|--|------|------|------|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | | | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.10 | | | | 4.10 | | | | 6.80 | 6.50 | 6.90 | | 7.50 | 6.50 | 6.90 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.20 | | | | 2.20 | | | | 3.50 | 4.00 | 3.30 | | 3.50 | 4.00 | 3.30 |


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|--|------|--|--|--|------|--|--|--|------|------|--|--|-----|--|-----|--|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 2 | | | | 2 | | | | | 19 | | | | | 0 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 549 | | | | 494 | | | | | 386 | | | | | 0 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.00 | | | | 0.00 | | | | | 0.05 | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.0 | | | | 0.0 | | | | | 0.2 | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 11.6 | | | | 12.3 | | | | | 14.8 | | | | | 5.0 | |
| Level of Service, LOS | | B | | | | B | | | | | B | | | | | A | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 0.0 | | | | 0.1 | | | | 14.8 | | | | 5.0 | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | B | | | | A | | | |

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | | | Intersection | Ogden and Forest | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | | | Jurisdiction | IDOT | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | | | East/West Street | Ogden Avenue | | |
| Analysis Year | 2016 | | | North/South Street | Forest Ave/Access Drive | | |
| Time Analyzed | PM PEak Hour | | | Peak Hour Factor | 0.99 | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | | | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|---|------|----|-----------|----|------|----|------------|---|-----|---|------------|----|-----|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Priority | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | T | TR | | LT | | TR | | | LTR | | | | LTR | |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | 2 | 1358 | 16 | | 3 | 1945 | 8 | | 4 | 0 | 5 | | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | | | | | Left Only | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|------|--|--|--|------|--|--|--|------|------|------|--|------|------|------|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.1 | | | | 4.1 | | | | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 | | 7.5 | 6.5 | 6.9 |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | 4.10 | | | | 4.10 | | | | 7.50 | 6.50 | 6.90 | | 7.50 | 6.50 | 6.90 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.2 | | | | 2.2 | | | | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 | | 3.5 | 4.0 | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | 2.20 | | | | 2.20 | | | | 3.50 | 4.00 | 3.30 | | 3.50 | 4.00 | 3.30 |


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|--|------|--|--|--|------|--|--|--|------|------|--|--|------|--|------|--|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 2 | | | | 3 | | | | | 9 | | | | | 2 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 298 | | | | 500 | | | | | 169 | | | | | 56 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.01 | | | | 0.01 | | | | | 0.05 | | | | | 0.04 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.0 | | | | 0.0 | | | | | 0.2 | | | | | 0.1 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 17.2 | | | | 12.2 | | | | | 27.5 | | | | | 71.1 | |
| Level of Service, LOS | | C | | | | B | | | | | D | | | | | F | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 0.0 | | | | | | | | 27.5 | | | | 71.1 | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | D | | | | F | | | |

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | | | Intersection | Ogden and Forest | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | | | Jurisdiction | IDOT | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | | | East/West Street | Ogden Avenue | | |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | | | North/South Street | Forest Ave/Access Drive | | |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour | | | Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | | | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----|------|----|-----------|----|------|----|------------|---|-----|----|------------|----|-----|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Priority | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | T | TR | | LT | | TR | | | LTR | | | | LTR | |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | 17 | 1681 | 19 | | 2 | 1295 | 36 | | 0 | 0 | 20 | | 21 | 0 | 15 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | | | | | Left Only | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|--|------|--|--|------|--|--|--|--|------|--|--|--|------|--|------|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 17 | | | 2 | | | | | 20 | | | | | | 36 |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 513 | | | 368 | | | | | 300 | | | | | | 147 |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.03 | | | 0.01 | | | | | 0.07 | | | | | | 0.25 |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.1 | | | 0.0 | | | | | 0.2 | | | | | | 0.9 |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 12.3 | | | 14.8 | | | | | 17.8 | | | | | | 37.3 |
| Level of Service, LOS | | B | | | B | | | | | C | | | | | | E |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 0.1 | | | 0.2 | | | | | 17.8 | | | | 37.3 | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | C | | | | E | | |

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|--|----------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | | | Intersection | Ogden and Forest | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | | | Jurisdiction | IDOT | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | | | East/West Street | Ogden Avenue | | |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | | | North/South Street | Forest Ave/Access Drive | | |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour | | | Peak Hour Factor | 0.99 | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | | | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----|------|----|-----------|----|------|----|------------|---|-----|---|------------|----|-----|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Priority | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Configuration | | L | T | TR | | LT | | TR | | | LTR | | | | LTR | |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | 31 | 1416 | 16 | | 3 | 2015 | 64 | | 4 | 0 | 5 | | 37 | 0 | 21 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | | | | | Left Only | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|--|------|--|--|--|------|--|--|--|------|------|--|--|-------|--|-------|--|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 31 | | | | 3 | | | | | 9 | | | | | 58 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 266 | | | | 475 | | | | | 132 | | | | | 66 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.12 | | | | 0.01 | | | | | 0.07 | | | | | 0.88 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.4 | | | | 0.0 | | | | | 0.2 | | | | | 4.2 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 20.3 | | | | 12.6 | | | | | 34.3 | | | | | 183.6 | |
| Level of Service, LOS | | C | | | | B | | | | | D | | | | | F | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 0.4 | | | | | | | | 34.3 | | | | 183.6 | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | D | | | | F | | | |

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | Intersection | Ogden and Jewel | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | Jurisdiction | IDOT | | | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | East/West Street | Ogden Avenue | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2016 | North/South Street | Jewel Access Drive | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour | Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|---|------|---|-----------|---|------|----|------------|---|---|---|------------|----|----|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Priority | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration | | L | T | | | | T | TR | | | | | | L | | R |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | 2 | 1632 | | | | 1208 | 43 | | | | | | 8 | | 11 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | 0 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | | | | | Left Only | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|------|--|------|--|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | 8 | | 11 | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 551 | | | | | | | | | | | | 154 | | 424 | |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.05 | | 0.03 | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.2 | | 0.1 | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 11.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | 29.7 | | 13.7 | |
| Level of Service, LOS | | B | | | | | | | | | | | | D | | B | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | 0.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | 20.4 | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | C | | | |

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | Intersection | Ogden and Jewel | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | Jurisdiction | IDOT | | | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | East/West Street | Ogden Avenue | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2016 | North/South Street | Jewel Access Drive | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour | Peak Hour Factor | 0.99 | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|---|------|---|-----------|---|------|----|------------|---|---|---|------------|----|----|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Priority | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration | | L | T | | | | T | TR | | | | | | L | | R |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | 7 | 1362 | | | | 1866 | 78 | | | | | | 12 | | 24 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | 0 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | | | | | Left Only | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|-----|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|------|------|--|------|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | 12 | | 24 |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 300 | | | | | | | | | | | | 81 | | 252 |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.02 | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.15 | | 0.10 |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.5 | | 0.3 |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 17.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | 56.8 | | 20.8 |
| Level of Service, LOS | | C | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | C |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 0.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 32.8 | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | D | | | |

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | | | Intersection | Ogden and Jewel | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | | | Jurisdiction | IDOT | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | | | East/West Street | Ogden Avenue | | |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | | | North/South Street | Jewel Access Drive | | |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour | | | Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | | | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----|------|---|-----------|---|------|----|------------|---|---|---|------------|----|----|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Priority | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration | | L | T | | | | T | TR | | | | | | L | | R |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | 19 | 1688 | | | | 1252 | 56 | | | | | | 29 | | 24 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | 0 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | | | | | Left Only | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|-----|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|------|------|--|------|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | 30 | | 24 |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 523 | | | | | | | | | | | | 140 | | 406 |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.04 | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.21 | | 0.06 |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.8 | | 0.2 |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 12.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 37.6 | | 14.4 |
| Level of Service, LOS | | B | | | | | | | | | | | | E | | B |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 0.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 27.3 | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | D | | | |

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | | | Intersection | Ogden and Jewel | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | | | Jurisdiction | IDOT | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | | | East/West Street | Ogden Avenue | | |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | | | North/South Street | Jewel Access Drive | | |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour | | | Peak Hour Factor | 0.99 | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | | | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----|------|---|-----------|---|------|-----|------------|---|---|---|------------|----|----|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Priority | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration | | L | T | | | | T | TR | | | | | | L | | R |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | 37 | 1414 | | | | 1933 | 102 | | | | | | 47 | | 46 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | 0 |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | | | | | Left Only | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|-----|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|------|-------|--|------|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | 37 | | | | | | | | | | | | 47 | | 46 |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | 277 | | | | | | | | | | | | 71 | | 235 |
| v/c Ratio | | 0.13 | | | | | | | | | | | | 0.66 | | 0.20 |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | 3.0 | | 0.7 |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | 20.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | 124.2 | | 24.0 |
| Level of Service, LOS | | C | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | C |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 0.5 | | | | | | | | | | | | 74.6 | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | | | | | F | | | |

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | | | Intersection | Ogden and Four Seasons | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | | | Jurisdiction | IDOT | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | | | East/West Street | Ogden Avenue | | |
| Analysis Year | 2016 | | | North/South Street | Four Seasons Access Drive | | |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour | | | Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | | | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|---|------|----|-----------|---|------|---|------------|---|----|---|------------|----|----|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Priority | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | T | TR | | L | T | | | | LR | | | | | |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | | 1640 | 0 | | 0 | 1251 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | | | | | Left Only | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|-----|------|--|--|-----|--|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 0 | | | | | 0 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 389 | | | | | 0 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 14.3 | | | | | 5.0 | | | | | |
| Level of Service, LOS | | | | | | B | | | | | A | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | 0.0 | | | | 5.0 | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | A | | | | | | | |

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | | | Intersection | Ogden and Four Seasons | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | | | Jurisdiction | IDOT | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | | | East/West Street | Ogden Avenue | | |
| Analysis Year | 2016 | | | North/South Street | Four Seasons Access Drive | | |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour | | | Peak Hour Factor | 0.99 | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | | | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|---|------|----|-----------|---|------|---|------------|---|----|---|------------|----|----|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Priority | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | T | TR | | L | T | | | | LR | | | | | |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | | 1373 | 1 | | 1 | 1944 | | | 0 | | 3 | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | | | | | Left Only | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|-----|------|--|--|------|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 500 | | | | | 390 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | 0.01 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 12.2 | | | | | 14.3 | | | | | |
| Level of Service, LOS | | | | | | B | | | | | B | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | 0.0 | | | | 14.3 | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | B | | | | | | | |

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | Intersection | Ogden and Four Seasons | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | Jurisdiction | IDOT | | | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | East/West Street | Ogden Avenue | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | North/South Street | Four Seasons Access Drive | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour | Peak Hour Factor | 0.98 | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|---|------|----|-----------|---|------|---|------------|---|----|---|------------|----|----|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Priority | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | T | TR | | L | T | | | | LR | | | | | |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | | 1717 | 0 | | 0 | 1308 | | | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | | | | | Left Only | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|-----|------|--|--|-----|--|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 0 | | | | | 0 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 363 | | | | | 0 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 14.9 | | | | | 5.0 | | | | | |
| Level of Service, LOS | | | | | | B | | | | | A | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | 0.0 | | | | 5.0 | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | A | | | | | | | |

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | | | Intersection | Ogden and Four Seasons | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | | | Jurisdiction | IDOT | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | | | East/West Street | Ogden Avenue | | |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | | | North/South Street | Four Seasons Access Drive | | |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour | | | Peak Hour Factor | 0.99 | | |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | | | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|---|------|----|-----------|---|------|---|------------|---|----|---|------------|----|----|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Priority | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | | | T | TR | | L | T | | | | LR | | | | | |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | | 1460 | 1 | | 1 | 2035 | | | 0 | | 3 | | | | |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | 0 | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | | | | | | | | | 0 | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | | | | | Left Only | | | | | | | | 1 | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|-----|------|--|--|------|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | | | 1 | | | | | 3 | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | | | 463 | | | | | 365 | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | | | 0.00 | | | | | 0.01 | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | 0.0 | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | | | 12.8 | | | | | 14.9 | | | | | |
| Level of Service, LOS | | | | | | B | | | | | B | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | | | | | 0.0 | | | | 14.9 | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | | | | | | | | | B | | | | | | | |

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | Intersection | Main with Proposed RIRO | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Downers Grove | | | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | East/West Street | Right-In/Right-Out Access | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | North/South Street | Main Street | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hour | Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----|----|----|-----------|---|---|---|------------|---|------|---|------------|---|-----|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration | | | | R | | | | | | | T | | | | T | R |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | | | 12 | | | | | | | 1085 | | | | 581 | 12 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | Undivided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | | | | | | | |


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|------|--|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | 687 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | 0.02 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | 0.1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | 10.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service, LOS | | | | B | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 10.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | B | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

HCS 2010 Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information | | | | Site Information | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Analyst | BSM | Intersection | Main with Proposed RIRO | | | | |
| Agency/Co. | KLOA, Inc. | Jurisdiction | Downers Grove | | | | |
| Date Performed | 1/26/2017 | East/West Street | Right-In/Right-Out Access | | | | |
| Analysis Year | 2022 | North/South Street | Main Street | | | | |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hour | Peak Hour Factor | 0.95 | | | | |
| Intersection Orientation | North-South | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 | | | | |
| Project Description | 16-171 | | | | | | |

Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound | | | | Westbound | | | | Northbound | | | | Southbound | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|----|----|----|-----------|---|---|---|------------|---|-----|---|------------|---|------|----|
| | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Movement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Priority | | 10 | 11 | 12 | | 7 | 8 | 9 | 1U | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4U | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Number of Lanes | | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 2 | 0 | | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Configuration | | | | R | | | | | | | T | | | | T | R |
| Volume, V (veh/h) | | | | 20 | | | | | | | 602 | | | | 1685 | 21 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (%) | | | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Proportion Time Blocked | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Percent Grade (%) | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Right Turn Channelized | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | | No | | | |
| Median Type/Storage | Undivided | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | | | | 6.9 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Critical Headway (sec) | | | | 6.96 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | 3.3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | | | | 3.33 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|------|--|--|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | | | | 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | | | | 285 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| v/c Ratio | | | | 0.07 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 95% Queue Length, Q ₉₅ (veh) | | | | 0.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | | | | 18.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level of Service, LOS | | | | C | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 18.6 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Approach LOS | C | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

APPRAISAL ASSOCIATES

53 West Jackson Boulevard, Suite 1527, Chicago, Illinois 60604
3 Grant Square, Suite 113, Hinsdale, Illinois 60521
312-236-6600 • Fax 312-235-8400 • www.aaichicago.com



February 9, 2017

Mr. Max Odom
Chief Operating Officer
Vequity LLC
400 North State Street, Suite 400
Chicago, Illinois 60654

RE Public Alley Vacation
West Side of Main Street
Just North of 1030 West Ogden Avenue
Downers Grove, Illinois

Dear Mr. Odom:


At your request, we have personally inspected the above-captioned real estate and completed the analysis necessary to develop an opinion of the Market Value of the fee simple interest as of February 5, 2017. The Appraisal Report that follows sets forth our analysis of the neighborhood, site, comparable data and assumptions and limiting conditions.

The subject real estate is a 2,672± square foot public alley right-of-way located on the west side of Main Street, just north of the property identified as 1030 West Ogden Avenue in Downers Grove, Illinois. The alley is owned by the Village of Downers Grove and is proposed for vacation and a possible sale to the adjoining property owner as described herein.


Based on our inspection, investigation and analysis of the property, it is our opinion that the *Market Value* of the fee simple interest as of February 5, 2017 was \$10,000.

The opinions contained herein are subject to the attached limiting conditions, certification and special assumptions. This appraisal report has been prepared in conformity with, and is subject to the requirements of the Code of Professional Ethics and Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice of the Appraisal Institute, which include the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP).

Respectfully submitted,



Susan A. Enright, MAI
Illinois State Certified General Real Estate Appraiser
(553.000677, Exp. 9/30/2017)



John C. Hereford
Illinois State Certified General Real Estate Appraiser
(553.002449, Exp. 9/30/2017)

Since 1940

SUMMARY OF PERTINENT DATA

| | |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Property Appraised: | Public Alley Vacation West Side of Main Street Just North of 1030 West Ogden Avenue Downers Grove, Illinois |
| Property Rights Appraised: | Fee Simple Interest |
| Land Area to be Vacated: | 2,672± Square Feet |
| Land Area of Adjacent Parcel to South: | 12,244± Square Feet |
| Shape: | Basically Rectangular |
| Frontage: | 16± feet of frontage along the west side of Main Street. |
| Topography: | Generally Level |
| Zoning: | While the subject property is not currently zoned, the parcel to the immediate south is zoned B-3, General Services and Highway Business District. |
| Highest and Best Use: | Assemblage with the adjoining site to the south (currently improved with a shuttered bank building) and potentially other nearby sites for redevelopment. |
| Market Value Conclusion: | \$10,000 |
| Valuation Date: | February 5, 2017 |
| Inspection Date: | February 5, 2017 |

INTRODUCTION

REAL PROPERTY INTEREST APPRAISED

Fee Simple Interest. This interest is defined by the Appraisal Institute as:

An absolute ownership unencumbered by any other interest or estate, subject only to the limitations imposed by the governmental powers of taxation, eminent domain, police power, and escheat.

The property is encumbered by a Commonwealth Edison power line easement and as such can only be used for circulation or parking.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF VALUE

The effective date of value is February 5, 2017 (also the date of inspection).

EXPOSURE TIME

The definition of Market Value requires adequate marketing efforts and reasonable time for exposure in the open market. The exposure time is the length of time the property would have been offered on the market prior to sale as of the effective date of the appraisal. Determination of the required exposure time is based on examination of the marketing times of recently closed transactions and observations of changes in market conditions. Given the location of the subject property and current market conditions, a 12-month exposure time is considered reasonable.

IDENTIFICATION OF THE REAL ESTATE

The subject real estate is a 2,672± square foot public alley located just north of 1030 West Ogden Avenue and extending 167 feet west from Main Street in Downers Grove, Illinois. We do not have a legal description that to our satisfaction would be suitable for use in any conveyance or other legal document. It is our recommendation that a full and complete legal description be secured and verified by legal counsel prior to any use whatsoever. No personal property, trade fixtures, or intangible items are included in the value conclusion.

INTRODUCTION

EXTRAORDINARY ASSUMPTIONS/HYPOTHETICAL CONDITIONS

There were no extraordinary assumptions or hypothetical conditions that may have affected the assignment results.

COMPLIANCE AND COMPETENCY

To the best of our knowledge, the analyses, opinions and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared in conformity with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) of the Appraisal Foundation and the Appraisal Institute. From our understanding of the assignment to be performed, it is our opinion that we are fully competent to perform this appraisal, due to the fact that:

1. The appraisers have full knowledge and experience in the nature of this assignment.
2. All necessary and appropriate steps have been taken in order to complete the assignment competently.
3. There is no lack of knowledge or experience that would prohibit this assignment to be completed in a professional competent manner or where a biased or misleading opinion of value would be rendered.

AREA COMMENT

During the 2000s, the population of the Chicago-Joliet-Naperville MSA experienced continued growth, although at a slower rate than during the 1990s. Most of the growth was in the outlying Illinois counties of DeKalb, Grundy, Kane, Kendall, McHenry and Will that experienced growth rates in excess of 18% in the past decade.

The City of Chicago dominates the MSA with over 28% of the area's population and an equal percentage of the area's total jobs. During the past decade, communities closest to the City core such as the Loop, Near South Side, Near North Side and Near West Side saw population increases while several south side communities saw decreases resulting in an overall City of Chicago population decline of 6.9%.

Commuting patterns in the Chicago area are strongly influenced by the dominance of Chicago's central business district in terms of employment. As with most US metropolitan areas, many more people work in the central business district than live there and workers commute many miles from their suburban homes to work downtown. As a consequence, the region's extensive rail and highway system has developed along a hub-and-spoke pattern. Several employment sub-centers have developed in out-lying suburban communities including Evanston, Schaumburg, Aurora and Naperville.

Income and Employment

The Chicago-Joliet-Naperville MSA has one of the largest metropolitan economies in the world with a 2014 metropolitan gross national product (GDP) of \$610.6 billion, ranking it third in the United States behind Los Angeles and New York. Key elements to the success of the Chicago Metropolitan Area are its central location, skilled work force of almost 5 million and a diverse economy. As a whole, service-related industries are the dominant employment sectors in the greater Chicago metropolitan area. The following chart details employment trends in the Chicago Metropolitan Area:

AREA COMMENT

Professional and Business Services and Financial Activities - The Chicago Metropolitan Area is one of the most influential financial and business centers in the world and is the home of the Chicago Board of Trade and the Chicago Mercantile Exchange. Its position as a world leader in financial and business services has attracted the headquarters and facilities of a substantial number of large and influential global firms. Specifically, the Chicago Metropolitan Area is the global center for trading in commodity and financial products and home to the headquarters of dozens of Fortune 500 companies, including Boeing, McDonald's, Walgreen, Kraft Foods, Sears, Illinois Tool Works, Baxter International, Motorola Mobility, Discover Financial Services, Abbott, and United Continental Airlines. A growing number of foreign multinationals have also located their North American headquarters in Chicago or surrounding suburbs. Professional and Business Services and Financial Activities combined represented almost a quarter of total employment in the MSA.

Education and Health Services - High-caliber educational institutions and health services in the Chicago region have played a central role in attracting world-leading firms and high-value added activities into the region. Chicago's top universities include Northwestern University, University of Chicago, Loyola University Chicago, DePaul University, Illinois Institute of Technology and University of Illinois at Chicago. These and other local institutions of higher education contribute to creating a world center of learning and research. The University of Illinois Chicago and the University of Chicago are among the top employers in the area and have a combined employment of over 25,000. Educational and health services jobs have been notably resilient even during recessionary periods and account for about 15% of total employment.

Leisure and Hospitality - An important asset for the Chicago Metropolitan Area is the richness and diversity of its cultural offerings and urban amenities. Situated squarely in the center of the country, Chicago is easy accessible via a wide variety of airlines, six class-one railroads and a vast network of major highways. Chicago's McCormick Place is the largest convention center in the country. The Chicagoland area has a diverse selection of guest rooms. The MSA also has a wealth of natural resources, including an extensive system of parks, open spaces, trails, and

AREA COMMENT

relatively affordable market in which to live when compared to other major markets. According to the most recent census data, the average household income level in the Chicago Metropolitan area was \$82,593. This is higher than the national average of \$70,173.

In summary, the Chicago Metropolitan Area is one of the largest and most diverse markets in the country, which has helped maintain its consistent and relatively stable economic performance. Chicago's traditional manufacturing industries have declined in importance, but new high technology, finance and service sectors are becoming increasingly important. Innovation in the financial sector has helped maintain Chicago's position as a world-class financial center. Longer term, high-tech industries, the vast transportation and distribution network, a more streamlined manufacturing base, and Chicago's role as the service center of the Midwest are all expected to support the metropolitan area's economy.

VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE DATA

The Village of Downers Grove is located approximately 22 miles southwest of the Loop in the southeast portion of DuPage County. The community generally extends from Butterfield Road on the north to 75th Street on the south and from Fairview Avenue on the east to the North-South Tollway (Interstate 355) on the west. Downers Grove is part of the west suburban corridor that includes Lombard and Glen Ellyn on the north, Oak Brook and Westmont on the east, Lisle and Woodridge on the west and Darien and Bolingbrook on the south.

Downers Grove benefits from its proximity to the expressway system. The East-West Tollway (I-88) bisects the north portion of the community and interchanges are available at Highland Avenue and Route 53. The North-South Tollway (I-355) extends along the west side of the community and interchanges are available at Butterfield Road, Ogden Avenue, Maple Avenue, 63rd Street and 75th Street. The Stevenson Expressway (I-55) is located two miles to the south and interchanges are available at Lemont Road and Cass Avenue.

 AREA COMMENT

There are two older commercial service storefronts to the west of the corner parcel followed by a shuttered former U.S. Bank branch and a Jewel Osco grocery store all fronting along Ogden Avenue.

The northeast corner of Ogden Avenue and Main Street is improved with a Walgreens. The southeast corner is improved with a retail building occupied by an insurance agency. The southwest corner is improved with a BP gas station. There is an older retail strip center located to the north of the subject property.

The estimated 2010 demographics in the one, three and five-mile radius trade area are summarized as follows:

| | <u>1 Mile</u> | <u>3 Miles</u> | <u>5 Miles</u> |
|-------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|
| Population | 13,008 | 87,498 | 258,574 |
| Households | 5,104 | 36,121 | 104,065 |
| Median HH Income | \$93,480 | \$79,441 | \$78,722 |
| Average HH Income | \$125,111 | \$108,781 | \$109,567 |

Source: ESRI and 2010 U.S. Census

The demographics point to a mature and stable suburban population base with the median household income and the average household income both higher than the national averages of \$50,157 and \$68,162, respectively.

In conclusion, the subject property is located on the west side of Main Street, just north of Ogden Avenue in the northern portion of Downers Grove. As a stand-alone parcel, the subject alley is not suitable for development. The parcel to the immediate south is improved with a shuttered bank building. The subject alley is proposed for vacation and assemblage with this parcel and potentially other parcels fronting along Ogden Avenue for a master planned redevelopment. If assembled, the subject property would be well-suited for commercial development or an overall commercial redevelopment in conjunction with the adjoining properties to the south and west.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

- Utilities:** The alley is presently impressed with a Commonwealth Edison utility easement with above-ground poles. The cost to remove the poles and move the electric lines underground is estimated to be in the range of \$250,000.
- At present, the subject alley does not have water, sewer and gas lines extended to the site; however, these utilities are installed and available for service on the adjoining parcel to the south.
- Topography:** The topography of the subject property is generally level but the adjoining parcel to the south slopes downward to the south.
- Flood Hazard:** Unshaded Zone X (FEMA - Community Panel 17043C 0901 H, Effective December 16, 2004).
- No soil or subsoil tests have been provided, however, it is believed and assumed that no adverse soil conditions exist.
- Soil Conditions / Environmental:** No soil or subsoil tests have been provided or reviewed but there is potential that a known adverse environmental condition present on the adjacent parcel may have spread onto the subject property. We are not experts in this field but are aware that any contamination issues would need to be remediated prior to any development or

HIGHEST AND BEST USE

The highest and best use of a property is a function of market forces that are defined by the reactions of buyers and sellers of this type of real estate. This concept underlies the value premise and methodology utilized in valuation of property. Highest and best use is sometimes referred to as the optimum use, however, uses which are dependent upon uncertainties or a combination of events are not usually considered reasonably probable and are excluded as potential uses. Highest and best use is defined by the Appraisal Institute as follows:

The most probable use of a property which is physically possible, appropriately justified, legally permissible, financially feasible, and which results in the highest value of the property being valued.

The highest and best use of the subject is typically considered on two levels if it is improved:

1. The Highest and Best Use of the Land as Vacant
2. The Highest and Best Use of the Property as Improved

In both cases, the highest and best use must meet four criteria. Each highest and best use must be legally permissible, physically possible, financially feasible and maximally productive. The highest and best use of the subject property is summarized as follows:

The subject is currently a public right-of-way in an area that is generally zoned B-3, General Services and Highway Business District. The subject site does not have adequate size and frontage to support development as a stand-alone parcel. Instead, the subject must be assembled with an adjoining parcel to support vertical development. However, even if vacated and assembled with an adjacent parcel there could be no vertical development upon the subject property due to the impressment of the electric utility easement. Rather, the land area below the alley, if vacated, could only be used for circulation and/or parking. Further, it would likely cost \$250,000 to remove the poles and relocate the electrical wires below ground. As such, the highest and best of the subject property appears to be assemblage with the adjoining parcel to the south for circulation or parking use.

SALES COMPARISON APPROACH

Summary of Comparable Data

| Sale No. | Property Address | City | Sale Date | Sale Price | Land Area | Zoning | Price /SF |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| 1 | 1512 Ogden Avenue | Downers Grove | 1/17 | \$1,012,500 | 30,600 | B-3 | \$33.09 |
| 2 | 12800 South Route 59 | Plainfield | 4/16 | \$910,000 | 52,871 | B-3 | \$17.21 |
| 3 | SEC LaGrange Road & 143rd Street | Orland Park | 3/16 | \$2,000,000 | 69,696 | VCD | \$28.70 |
| 4 | 1030 West Ogden Avenue | Downers Grove | 9/15 | \$175,000 | 12,244 | B-3 | \$14.29 |
| 5 | 15890-15898 S. LaGrange Road | Orland Park | 7/15 | \$1,450,000 | 47,574 | VCD | \$30.48 |
| 6 | 1201 East Ogden Avenue | Downers Grove | 1/15 | \$729,000 | 20,620 | B-3 | \$35.35 |
| <i>Subj. Subject Alley Right-of-Way Adjoining Parcel to the South</i> | | <i>Downers Grove</i> | <i>n/a</i> | <i>n/a</i> | <i>2,672 12,244</i> | <i>n/a B-3</i> | <i>n/a</i> |

Sale 1 is located on the north side of Ogden Avenue, just east of Downers Drive. The site was improved with an older restaurant at the time of sale and the buyer intends to demolish the improvements and redevelop the site with a new bank branch.

Sale 2 is located on the west side of Route 59, just south of 127th Street on an outlot of a Target anchored shopping center. The site was vacant at the time of sale and the buyer has developed the site with a 9,500 square foot strip center.

Sale 3 is located at the southeast corner of LaGrange Road and 143rd Street. The site was vacant at the time of sale and the buyer plans to develop the site with a retail strip center.

Sale 4 is the prior sale of the hard corner site to the immediate south of the subject (i.e., the site to assemble with the subject). As previously noted, the site is improved with a shuttered bank building but the buyer (the Client) purchased the site for redevelopment.

Sale 5 is located at the northwest corner of LaGrange Road and 159th on an outlot of a Best Buy anchored shopping center. The site was improved with two older commercial structures at the time of sale and the buyer demolished the existing improvements and has since redeveloped the site with a 14,100 square foot strip center.

SALES COMPARISON APPROACH

3) Conditions of Sale

The conditions of sale adjustment reflects the motivations of the buyer and seller. When conditions are atypical, sale prices may be higher or lower than those of normal market transactions, e.g., a foreclosure sale or a sale between related parties. All of the sales were reported to be “arm’s length” transactions, thus no adjustments were made for conditions of sale.

4) Market Conditions (Time)

Date of sale is typically an important consideration in analyzing comparable sales, especially when inflationary or deflationary conditions are dictating price movements in the economy. Adjustments for time are typically applied to the comparable sales to reflect the date of valuation of the subject. The sales noted above were transacted between January, 2015 and January, 2017. Considering the February 5, 2017 date of value, upward adjustments were made to Sales 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

5) Location Adjustment

Location is perhaps the most important factor affecting value and adjustments are typically applied to comparables that are located in areas superior or inferior to the subject area taking into consideration roadway or transportation route access, neighborhood conditions, etc. The subject property is most similar to Sales 1, 4 and 6 in terms of Ogden Avenue location. The LaGrange Road corridor of Sales 3 and 5 is similar but is located in Cook County. The Plainfield location of Sale 2 is less dynamic and warrants an upward adjustment for location.

6) Size Adjustment

With regard to size, it should be noted that, all factors being equal, larger sites tend to sell at lower unit prices than smaller sites due to economies of scale and limited depth of the market. However, a site too small may have limited utility without assemblage potential as is the case with Sale 4, which is also the site to which the subject property would be

SALES COMPARISON APPROACH

Therefore, we will apply a \$15.00 per square foot unit value to the subject property; however, a lump sum deduction must be made to the derived value to reflect the limited utility of the subject property. The subject property has a long and narrow shape and given the utility easement on the site, the parcel cannot be developed and can only be used for parking or circulation. As such, a 75% discount/deduction is considered reasonable. Based on a unit value of \$15.00 per square foot and utilizing a 75% discount, the value of the subject property was developed as follows.

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------|-----|-----------------|
| 2,672± Square Feet @ \$15.00 Per Square Foot | | \$40,080 |
| | Say | \$40,000 |
| Less 75% Discount For Limited Utility | | \$30,000 |
| Market Value Conclusion | | <u>\$10,000</u> |

MARKET VALUE CONCLUSION

Based on our inspection, investigation and analysis of the property, it is our opinion that the *Market Value* of the fee simple interest as of February 5, 2017 was \$10,000.

UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS & CONTINGENT CONDITIONS

For the purpose of this appraisal, it is assumed:

1. That the legal description is correct.
2. That the title to the property is legally sufficient.
3. That there are no encumbrances or defects of title.
4. That the property is free and clear of all liens.
5. That the property will be efficiently managed and maintained.

The appraisal is made subject to the following contingent conditions:

1. That no liability is assumed because of inaccuracies or errors in said estimate and opinion.
2. That no liability is assumed as a result of matters of legal character affecting the property, such as title defects, encroachments, liens, overlapping boundaries, party wall agreements, and easements.
3. This appraisal is to be used in whole and not in part. Unless, authorized by the appraiser(s), no part of it shall be used in conjunction with any other appraisal and is invalid if so used.
4. The appraiser herein by reason of this appraisal is not required to give testimony in court with reference to the subject property unless otherwise previously arranged.
5. Possession of this report, or copy thereof, does not carry with it the right of publication, nor may it be used for any purpose by anyone but the applicant, without previous written consent of the appraiser.
6. Present worth of the purchase power of the dollar.
7. This appraisal has been made in conformity with the rules of the professional ethics of the Appraisal Institute.
8. Unless otherwise stated in this report, the existence of hazardous material, which may or may not be present on the property, was not observed by the appraiser. The appraiser has no knowledge of the existence of such materials on or in the property. The appraiser, however, is not qualified to detect such substances. The presence of substances such as asbestos, urea-formaldehyde foam insulation, or other potentially hazardous materials may affect the value of the property. The value estimate is predicated on the assumption that there is no such material on or in the property that would cause a loss in value. No responsibility is assumed for any such conditions, or for any expertise or engineering knowledge required to discover them. The client is urged to retain an expert in the field, if desired.

QUALIFICATIONS

JOHN C. HEREFORD

POSITION

Staff Appraiser
 APPRAISAL ASSOCIATES
 53 West Jackson Boulevard
 Suite 1527
 Chicago, Illinois 60604
 312-236-6600

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS & LICENSES

Associate Member of the Appraisal Institute
 Illinois State Certified General Real Estate Appraiser

Classes taken from the Appraisal Institute:

- Basic Appraisal Principles
- Basic Appraisal Procedures
- USPAP-Standards of Professional Practice
- General Market Analysis and Highest and Best Use
- Real Estate Finance Statistics and Valuation Modeling
- General Appraiser Sales Comparison Approach
- General Appraiser Income Capitalization Approach, Parts I & II
- General Appraiser Cost Approach
- General Appraiser Report Writing and Case Studies
- Advanced Income Capitalization
- Advanced Market Analysis and Highest and Best Use
- Advanced Concepts and Case Studies
- Quantative Analysis

EDUCATION

Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa
 B.A. (2010) Liberal Arts curriculum with a major in History.

TYPES OF PROPERTIES APPRAISED

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Industrial Properties | Multi-Family Residential |
| Commercial Properties | Shopping Centers |
| Railroad Rights of Way | Vacant Land |

EXHIBITS



VIEW EAST ALONG THE SUBJECT ALLEY



VIEW WEST ALONG THE SUBJECT ALLEY

EXHIBITS



VIEW OF ADJOINING CORNER PARCEL TO THE SOUTH



VIEW OF ADJOINING CORNER PARCEL TO THE SOUTH

EXHIBITS



VIEW EAST ALONG OGDEN AVENUE



VIEW WEST ALONG OGDEN AVENUE



March 6, 2017

Mr. Donald Rickard, Chairman
Plan Commission
Village of Downers Grove
801 Burlington Ave
Downers Grove, IL 60515

RE: 17-PLC-0004, 1030 – 1048 Ogden Avenue

Dear Chairman Rickard:

I am the Senior Real Estate Manager for Jewel Osco, responsible for the management of the company's real estate portfolio. Jewel Osco is excited with the concept of the petitioner creating a unified development at the Ogden Avenue site. We also support the Village's objective to reduce curb cuts in favor of cross access. We, however, have significant concerns with the plans presented to the Plan Commission this evening and the lack of consultation as an impacted neighbor.

I would like to voice my disappointment with how this project has come to a public hearing without discussion with Jewel Osco. We learned of this project only through the Village's legal notice. The petitioner's invitation to the neighborhood meeting arrived at my office after the meeting took place. I stopped at the Community Development Department and Scott Williams was generous with his time to walk me through the plans and the approval process.

The petitioner and I did meet on March 1, but only because I requested a face-to-face meeting. At that meeting, I shared with the petitioner Jewel Osco's many concerns, as well as ideas that might get Jewel Osco comfortable with the proposed redevelopment plans, but unfortunately there was no resolution. If the petitioner had been more diligent and consulted with Jewel Osco early in its process, we might have been able to resolve Jewel Osco's concerns before this hearing.

Those concerns are as follows-

1. The cross-access easement agreement referenced in the Staff Report is between the Jewel Osco property and the immediately adjacent US Bank property only, not the additional parcels to the east. The document is clear that this private easement is not intended for the benefit of any other persons

Mr. Donald Rickard
March 6, 2017
Page 3

safety of our customers, as well as Village residents travelling on adjacent streets. Residents of Downers Grove have numerous grocery options and this proposed development will encourage them to explore other options in and outside the community. This is unacceptable.

In addition to the foregoing, we point out that the petitioner has failed to show that the proposed development complies with the Village's review and approval criteria including, but not limited to-

PUD- *Whether appropriate terms and conditions have been imposed on the approval to protect the interests of surrounding property owners and residents, existing and future residents of the PUD and the general public. As demonstrated above, development of the plans as presented will significantly harm Jewel Osco's property and longstanding business.*

Zoning Map Amendment- *The value to the community of the proposed use. The proposed development does not complement Jewel Osco as it will have a deleterious effect on our business*

Special Use- *That the proposed use at the proposed location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or a facility that is in the interest of public convenience and will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood or community. The proposed use and resulting traffic and parking will increase inconvenience to Jewel Osco and its customers and have a negative effect on the general welfare of the neighborhood.*

Special Use- *That the proposed use will not, in the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity or be injurious to property values or improvements in the vicinity. The proposed use will be detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of Jewel Osco's business, its customers and the travelling public on Ogden Avenue.*

Tenants of the petitioner's development will be attracted to this location largely due to the close proximity and cross access to Jewel Osco. The petitioner is astute and clearly understands this because it is marketing three separate retail developments, including this one, with Jewel Osco as the headline (see enclosure). Given the value that Jewel Osco brings to the petitioner's proposed development, we should be given a fair opportunity to comment and have meaningful input to protect our business.

Hene, David

From: Vequity <a.cohen@vequity.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 10:18 AM
To: Hene, David
Subject: EXTERNAL: Jewel Pads Available: High Income Chicago Suburbs

*** External Email ***



FOR LEASE

JEWEL PADS AVAILABLE
9800 W. LINCOLN HIGHWAY, FRANKFORT, IL
215-231 E OGDEN AVENUE, NAPERVILLE, IL
1030-1048 OGDEN AVENUE, DOWNERS GROVE, IL

DRIVE THRU AVAILABLE ON ALL THREE (3) PROPERTIES

NEW CONSTRUCTION IN FRANKFORT & DOWNERS GROVE, IL & NEWLY RENOVATED IN NAPERVILLE, IL

CROSS ACCESS AVAILABLE WITH JEWEL IN DOWNERS GROVE & NAPERVILLE

AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN EXCESS OF \$112,000 WITHIN 1 MILE OF ALL THREE (3) PROPERTIES


FOR LEASE JEWEL OUTLOTS

3048.

1000

Document Prepared By and
When recorded return to:

Curtis R. Ward & Associates, P.C.
265 East 100 South, Suite 250
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Attn: Curtis R. Ward, Esq.



J.P. "RICK" CARNEY
DUPAGE COUNTY RECORDER
OCT. 05, 2004 9:10 AM
OTHER 09-05-115-009
014 PAGES R2004-257562

DECLARATION OF RESTRICTIONS AND EASEMENTS

Store No. 3097
Ogden & Saratoga
Downers Grove, IL

THIS DECLARATION OF RESTRICTIONS AND EASEMENTS ("Declaration") is entered into as of the 20th day of Sept., 2004, between Sav-on Realty, Inc., a Delaware corporation ("SRI"), and Superior L.L.C., an Illinois limited liability company ("Superior").

1. PRELIMINARY.

1.1 Purpose. It is the intent of the parties and the purpose of this Declaration to (i) provide for certain access across a portion of the Entire Property (defined later) for the benefit of the Owners (defined later) and their Permittees (defined later), (ii) provide certain temporary construction easements, (iii) create and establish certain restrictions upon and against the Entire Property as hereinafter set forth, subject to which the Entire Property and every portion thereof, shall be improved, altered, held, exchanged, leased, sold and/or conveyed, and (iv) set forth certain other matters and agreements regarding the Entire Property, all as more particularly hereinafter provided.

1.2 Definitions.

(a) "Access Easement Area" means that portion of the Entire Property shown as the "Access Easement" on the Site Plan (defined later).

(b) "Entire Property" means Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 (defined later).

(c) "Hazardous Materials" means any substance or material which is defined as or included in the definition of "hazardous substances", "hazardous wastes", "hazardous materials", "extremely hazardous waste", "acutely hazardous wastes", "restricted hazardous waste", "toxic substances", or "known to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity" (or words of similar import), petroleum products (including crude oil or any fraction thereof) or any other chemical, substance or material which is prohibited, limited or regulated under any federal, state or local law, ordinance,

CHARGE C.T.I.C. DUPAGE 232 2232 UL

21170203

boundary between Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 as shown on the Site Plan, including pavement, curbing, retaining walls, surface water drainage facilities and landscaping as SRI reasonably determines (the "New Drives"). Superior shall, at no cost to Superior, cooperate with SRI in obtaining any governmental approvals necessary for the construction of the New Drives. The New Drives shall be constructed in a good and workmanlike manner and in accordance with applicable code requirements of the City of Downers Grove. Construction of the New Drives shall be performed in a timely manner and in a manner that will (i) allow at least one (1) access drive between Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 to remain open at all times, and (ii) not unreasonably interfere with business operations on Parcel 1. SRI shall exercise commercially reasonable efforts to not close either of the access drives between Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 for more than five (5) days.

2.4 Maintenance and Repair of Access Drives. SRI and Superior shall each, at their sole expense, cause that portion of the Access Easement Area located on their respective property to be maintained in good repair, clean, safe, presentable, reasonably free from ice and snow, with adequate hard surfacing and proper directional signs and striping.

2.5 Temporary Construction Easement. Superior hereby grants to SRI, its contractors, employees and agents, an easement upon, over and across the Temporary Construction Easement Area for construction and construction activities in connection with the proposed redevelopment of Parcel 2. SRI shall repair, at its sole cost and expense, any damage to Parcel 1 caused in connection with its use of the Construction Easement Area for such purposes.

3. USE RESTRICTIONS.

3.1 Restrictions on Parcel 1. No portion of Parcel 1 shall be used (i) for the sale or offer for sale of any pharmaceutical products requiring the services of a registered pharmacist, or (ii) for the retail sale of food for off-premises consumption; provided that this restriction shall not apply to (a) the retail sale of food for off-premises consumption in an area (including aisle space) less than 2,000 square feet, (b) existing tenants and/or occupants of Parcel 1, their successors and assigns, to the extent their existing leases permit them to use their premises for the uses set forth in (i) and (ii) above, or (c) the operation of a sit down and/or take out and/or delivery and/or fast food restaurant. This restriction shall continue in full force and effect for a term of twenty (20) years or so long as a supermarket/pharmacy is in operation on some or all of Parcel 2, whichever is longer. Temporary cessation of operation upon Parcel 2 due to fire or other casualty, acts of God, labor disputes or other causes beyond the reasonable control of the owner of Parcel 2 and the temporary cessation of use for not more than 365 consecutive days for the purpose of making alterations or for reletting shall not be deemed a cessation of operation within the meaning of this paragraph.

3.2 Hazardous Materials. No Owner or occupant shall use or permit the use, handling, generation, storage, release, disposal or transportation of Hazardous Materials on, about or under its Parcel except in the ordinary course of its business and in compliance with all Environmental Laws.

not the obligation) to perform such obligation on behalf of the defaulting Owner and the defaulting Owner shall reimburse the curing Owner for the cost of performing such work within ten (10) days after receipt of billing therefor and proof of payment thereof. In the event the defaulting Owner does not so reimburse the curing Owner within such ten (10) days, the curing Owner shall have: (i) the right to exercise any and all rights which such curing Owner might have at law or in equity to collect the same; and (ii) a lien on the property owned by the defaulting Owner, to the extent of the amount paid by the curing Owner but not reimbursed by the defaulting Owner, which amount shall bear interest at a rate equal to the then published "Prime Rate" of Citibank, N.A., plus ten percent (10%) per annum (the Owners acknowledging that such rate may not be the lowest or "best" rate), or the highest legal rate of interest, whichever is less, from the date of billing until paid. Such lien may be filed of record by the curing Owner as a claim against the defaulting Owner, in the form required by law, in the office wherein mortgages and liens are recorded, which lien shall contain at least the following information:

- (a) The name of the lien claimant;
- (b) The name of the defaulting Owner;
- (c) A description of the work performed on behalf of such Owner and a statement itemizing the cost thereof; and
- (d) A description of the property being liened.

The lien so claimed shall attach from the date of recordation in the amount claimed by the Owner curing the default, and it may be enforced and foreclosed in any manner allowed by law including, but not limited to, suits to foreclose a mechanic's lien, trust deed or mortgage under applicable law. Such lien, when so established against the real property described in such lien, shall be prior and superior to any right, title, interest, lien or claim which may be or is acquired or attached to such real property after the time of recording the claim of lien.

5.2 Injunctive Relief. In the event of any violation or threatened violation of any provision of this Declaration, any Owner shall have the right, in addition to any other remedies herein or by law or equity provided, to enjoin such violation or threatened violation.

5.3 Breach Shall Not Permit Termination. No breach of this Declaration shall entitle any Owner to cancel, rescind or otherwise terminate this Declaration, but such limitation shall not affect in any manner any other rights or remedies which such Owner may have hereunder by reason of any breach of this Declaration.

6. GENERAL PROVISIONS

6.1 Covenants Run With the Land. Each Restriction applicable to a Parcel shall be a burden on that Parcel, shall be appurtenant to and for the benefit of the other Parcel and each part thereof and shall run with the land.

be sent to the appropriate party at the address below via First Class United States mail. If a notice must be given to a person other than one designated below or in a Transfer Notice, such notice shall be sent to the person and address shown on the then current real property tax rolls of the county in which the Entire Property is located. All notices to Superior or SRI shall be sent to the appropriate party at the address or telefacsimile number set forth below:

Superior: c/o MDC Properties, Inc.
907 North Elm Street, Suite 100
Hinsdale, Illinois 60521
Fax No. (630) 325-7308

SRI: c/o Albertson's, Inc.
250 Parkcenter Boulevard
P.O. Box 20
Boise, ID 83726
Fax No.: 208/395-6575
Attention: Legal Department (#74200R)

The person and address to which notices are to be given may be changed at any time by any party upon written notice to the other party. All notices given pursuant to this Declaration shall be deemed given upon receipt.


(b) Receipt. For the purpose of this Declaration, the term "receipt" shall mean the earlier of any of the following: (i) the date of delivery of the notice or other document to the address specified pursuant to subparagraph (a) above as shown on the return receipt, (ii) the date of actual receipt of the notice or other document by the person or entity specified pursuant to subparagraph (a) above, or (iii) in the case of refusal to accept delivery or inability to deliver the notice or other document, the earlier of (A) the date of the attempted delivery or refusal to accept delivery, (B) the date of the postmark on the return receipt, or (C) the date of receipt of notice of refusal or notice of nondelivery by the sending party or in the case of a telefacsimile, the date and time of receipt as shown on the confirmation of the telefacsimile transmission.

6.7 No Limitation of Remedies. The various rights and remedies herein contained and reserved to the Owners, except as otherwise provided in this Declaration, shall not be considered as exclusive of any other right or remedy, but shall be construed as cumulative, and shall be in addition to every other remedy now or hereafter existing at law, in equity or by statute. No delay or omission of the right to exercise any power or remedy shall impair any such right, power or remedy, or be construed as a waiver of any default or nonperformance or as acquiescence therein.

6.8 Attorney's Fees. In the event either party initiates or defends any legal action or proceeding in any way connected with this Declaration, the prevailing party in any such action or proceeding (in addition to any other relief which may be granted, whether legal or equitable), shall be entitled to recover from the losing party in any such action or proceeding its reasonable costs and attorney's fees (including, without limitation, its reasonable costs and attorney's fees on

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Declaration has been executed as of the date first above written.

SAV-ON REALTY, INC.,
a Delaware corporation



By 
Its William H. Arnold
Vice President

"SRI"

Approved as to form
Curtis R. Ward



SUPERIOR L.L.C.,
an Illinois limited liability company

By 
Its 

"Superior"

CONSENT OF MORTGAGEE

Northview Bank & Trust ("Lender"), holder of a note secured by a mortgage dated June 12, 1998, and recorded on June 23, 1998, as Document No. R98-122449, and rerecorded on October 4, 2001, as Document No. R2001-212942, Records of DuPage County, Illinois, as modified by that certain Modification of Mortgage dated June 5, 2003, and recorded on June 23, 2003, as Document No. R2003-236497, Records of DuPage County, Illinois (collectively, the "Mortgage"), hereby consents to the execution and recording of the above and foregoing Declaration of Restrictions and Easements ("Declaration"), and hereby submits and subordinates the Mortgage to the provisions of the Declaration. The Mortgage affects the following real property, which is also described as Parcel 1 in the Declaration:

LOT 2 IN BESSER'S RESUBDIVISION OF H. BESSER'S PLAT OF SURVEY OF PART OF SECTION 5, TOWNSHIP 38 NORTH, RANGE 11, EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT OF SAID BESSER'S RESUBDIVISION RECORDED JULY 10, 1956 AS DOCUMENT 807309, IN DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

Real Estate Tax Index No. 09-05-115-009
Property Address: 1048 Ogden Avenue, Downers Grove, IL

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, said Lender has caused this instrument to be signed by its duly authorized officers on its behalf at 2115 Wheaton Ave, Wheaton, IL, on this 21st day of September, 2004.

Northview Bank & Trust

ATTEST:

By: Kelli D Wheeler
Name: Kelli D Wheeler
Title: Vice President

By: Angela M Hatch
Name: Angela M Hatch
Title: Vice President

STATE OF Illinois)
COUNTY OF DuPage) S.S.

I, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for such County and State, do hereby certify that Kelli D. Wheeler, and Angela M. Hatch, the Vice President and Vice President, respectively, of Northview Bank & Trust, personally known to me to be the same persons whose names are subscribed to the foregoing instrument as such Vice President and Vice President, appeared before me this day in person and acknowledged that they signed, sealed and delivered said instrument as their free and voluntary act, and as the free and voluntary act of said Lender, for the uses and purposes therein set forth.

GIVEN under my hand and Notarial Seal this 21st day of September, 2004.



Theresa H Spizzirri
Notary Public

8-17-04 JES
CHANGED TO EXHIBIT "A"



PROJECT
OGDEN AVENUE
&
SARATOGA
DOWNERS GROVE
ILLINOIS

STORE NO.
3097

ISSUED
DATE 7-10-02
SHEET TITLE
EXHIBIT "A"
SITE PLAN

SHEET
1
OF
1
3097-REV.DWG





EXHIBIT "A" SITE PLAN

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| TOTAL GROSS BUILDING AREA | 53,963 S.F. |
| TOTAL CARPARKS REQUIRED | 269 (1/200) |
| TOTAL CARPARKS PROVIDED | 251 |
| TOTAL SITE AREA | 239,145 S.F. (5.490 AC.) |
| LAND/BUILDING RATIO | 0.00 : 1 |

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------|
| APPROVED BY: JES | DATE: 7-15-04 |
| EXECUTIVE V.P., DEV. | SIGNED 8-16-04 |
| DIVISION PRESIDENT | SIGNED 7-15-04 |
| R.E. REGIONAL V.P. | SIGNED 7-20-04 |
| DIRECTOR OF PROJECT DEV. | SIGNED 8-5-04 |
| STEVE COREN - TRANSPORTATION | 7-20-04 |

LEGEND

- PROPERTY/PARCEL LINE
- EXPANSION LIMIT LINE
- BUILDING ENVELOPE
- BUILDING AREA
- HEAVY DUTY PAVING
- ACCESS EASEMENT

DRAFT

FILE 17-PLC-0004: A petition seeking approval of a Planned Unit Development, Zoning Map Amendment, Right-of-Way Vacation, Special Use to allow a drive-through, and Final Plat of Subdivision to construct a multi-building commercial center. The properties are zoned B-3, General Services and Highway Business District. The properties are located on the northwest corner of Ogden Avenue and Main Street, commonly known as 1030, 1032, 1036, 1040, and 1048 Ogden Avenue, Downers Grove, IL (PINs 09-05-300- 002, -004, -005, and 09-05-115-009). Vequity LLC, Petitioner; Vequity LLC, Blake Horio, Trustee and Richard Bradley, Sheng-Li Wang, Owners

Village Planner Scott Williams, reviewed the site on the overhead and stated the property was located at the northwest corner of Main and Ogden and was “L-shaped.” Surrounding properties were notified based off the following boundary lines: the property lines, the alley, and right-of-way vacation area. The exterior property lines to the site were not changing -- it was the interior property lines that were triggering the plat of subdivision request. The zoning map was referenced and the surrounding properties were noted to have B-3 zoning. The zoning map amendment was being requested by the applicant due to a PUD overlay. To the north, single-family residential and multi-family apartment buildings were pointed out.

Mr. Williams described what was currently located on the site. The alley was pointed out, as were the ComEd utility lines. Staff contacted all major utilities and an easement will be placed over the footprint of the alley. The petitioner had also been in contact with ComEd regarding relocation of its utility lines. Reviewing existing conditions on the plat of survey, Mr. Williams explained that the right-of-way was not equal when following the contour of the sidewalk when going east to west across the Ogden Avenue frontage. He also pointed out that the petitioner was keeping the existing footprint up north but making changes to the south and incorporating the alley for the three new buildings proposed. The cross-access agreement was referenced and would provide access to the Jewel store to the west.

Per staff, the current five curb-cuts located on Ogden Avenue will be reduced to one cut which will align with Forest Avenue. The proposed vacated alley will become a widened curb-cut off of Main Street. The current 10 lots of record will be reduced to 3 large lots with a building on each lot.

To Mr. Quirk’s question about the reason for a PUD, Mr. Williams explained that the PUD was necessary to develop the property since there were multiple buildings as part of the property, deviations from the code being requested, shared parking being involved, and one of the buildings included three site plans being proposed. Ms. Leitschuh also added that the proposal was similar to one large campus.

The proposed plat of subdivision was depicted with Mr. Williams noting that Lot 1 was 20,289 sq. feet, Lot 2 was 16,995 sq. ft, and Lot 3 was 52,856 sq. feet. In addition to the cross access-easement with Jewel, the developer was adding another access easement across the drive aisle that traveled across the three properties. Mr. Williams stated that with B-3 zoning if there was non-residential business adjacent to non-residential business, the building side setback is zero. Pedestrian easements were also pointed out.

Because the IDOT right-of-way had to match up, Mr. Williams explained the petitioner will have to convey a strip of land (one foot) in front of the 91’ feet on the west and 16 feet wide right-of-way, to match it up and bring it in line with other properties located on Ogden Avenue.

DRAFT

Mr. Williams stated the “default” site plan option reflected everything that was to go on the plan including bike racks, landscaping, trash enclosure locations, etc. Currently, the petitioner had a Panda Express proposal, and the two buildings to the west were speculative. Internal pedestrian connections to the sidewalk were noted with Mr. Williams adding that the petitioner would be rebuilding the Ogden Avenue sidewalk. Pedestrian and vehicular circulation were pointed out. Panda Express will have a drive-through. Retail Buildings A and B were also referenced with staff noting that all buildings met the primary structure setbacks.

The proposed trash enclosure was located on the overhead with staff explaining it will serve the entire development and it was located 45 feet from the property line. The distance from the rear of the largest building option for Retail Building A to the rear property line was 258 feet. He described that portion that was considered a street yard and another property line was considered both a rear yard and side yard. Three monument signs were proposed and all met village code.

In reviewing the drive-throughs, Mr. Williams explained that staff’s goal was to ensure that pedestrians and vehicular traffic did not conflict, stacking lines met the minimum 10 feet width, and the stacking lanes were marked. When adjacent to residential, Mr. Williams said the drive-through must be set back 50 feet, which these buildings did. However, 25 feet from all other lot lines was where the deviations from the code occurred in order to fit it in with the site circulation.

Reviewing Option 2 for Retail Building A, Mr. Williams stated the building was smaller with a drive-through on the western side of the building. The petitioner was looking to have a restaurant tenant to utilize the drive-through. Option 3, which was the smallest of the buildings, included a drive-through on the eastern side of the building with appropriate pedestrian crosswalks.

Elevations for the Panda Express were referenced. Mr. Williams stated the facades will be EIFS material with accent tile and a stone base. All sign requirements will be met and the building’s main entrance will face Main Street. Elevations for the middle building on the site were referenced, noting materials will be various brick colored masonry with a stone base. Outdoor patios and retail signs were pointed out. Mr. Williams briefly explained the sign requirements.

A review of the landscaping plan followed. Staff reported the petitioner will provide “one hundred percent screening” adjacent to the residential area. A total of 38 trees will be planted along with maintaining some of those on-site. Internal landscaping was also planned and included landscaped islands with trees. Drive-throughs would also be screened. Mr. Williams indicated that because there were three different site plans, all civil and landscaping plans were based on the default option, without any drive-throughs on the building.

Mr. Williams summarized how the proposal met the village’s comprehensive plan, specifically the D-8 Catalyst Site, citing the requirements for the catalyst site. A review of the bulk requirements followed with Mr. Williams confirming that all three buildings will meet all zoning requirements. A review of the parking lots followed as well as a delineation of the drive-throughs that did not meet the setback requirements – the Option 2 (Bldg. A - west) drive-through and the Panda Express drive-through, as well as the parking setbacks behind Lot 3, adjacent to residential.

Staff stated the sign area being requested was for 63.3 square feet for each sign on the side elevations. Staff marked those signs that did not meet code and stated that if the commission was supportive of the signs, they would have to add it as a condition to staff’s recommendation. The

DRAFT

petitioner was seeking 63 square feet of signage for the western elevation of the middle building, and the east and west elevations of Retail Building A. As an aside, Senior Planner Leitschuh stated the village recently revised its sign ordinance to bring all village signage into conformance with the current zoning ordinance. The petitioner's request was not consistent with the new sign ordinance, therefore, staff was not supportive of the petitioner's signage request.

A photometric light plan was referenced as well as an aerial view of the proposed LED lighting for the site. Dialog followed as to what was permissible at the lot lines, wherein Mr. Williams explained it varied but anything under 2 was good and the lighting differed when adjacent to residential zoning. Ms. Gassen queried staff about "the longer leg on the far north" since the lighting appeared a bit over. Mr. Williams explained that the code requires the measurement for contouring five feet into the property line which was why the number she saw was into the assumed property line of the adjacent neighbor and the figure did not assume landscaping but the applicant and neighbor, per Williams, would work on that if there were concerns. A vehicle turning exhibit was referenced for the commissioners.

Mr. Williams stated the proposal met all subdivision, plat of subdivision, the PUD overlay, and zoning map amendment standards. The special use requirements were also met and staff did not believe the use would be a detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the public. Regarding the right-of-way vacation, the two abutting owners to the south provided consent for the vacation but there were some private issues involving multiple property owners that needed to be addressed by the applicant. Because a redevelopment agreement existed, staff recommended waiving the compensation for the alley vacation (appraisal included in packets).

Mr. Quirk raised concern that this was one of the first alley vacations he had seen of a petitioner submitting their appraisal as justification for compensation, pointing out the village has had many alley vacations prior and that the village determined to be encumbered-valued property. Ms. Leitschuh interjected and stated ultimately it was the village council that determined the final decision regarding appraisals, since the village does not provide an appraisal. Commercial appraisals were to be provided by the petitioner and then reviewed by the village's legal counsel. She cited a couple of prior petitions that included appraisals which were then forwarded to council. Again, she stated that appraisals were always included in staff's report; however, the only difference was that staff had not made prior recommendations to the commission, other than to follow the appraised value in the appraisal report and recommend payment of the appraisal to council.

In summary, staff recommended approval for the request based on the conditions in staff's report.

Ms. Gassen asked for clarification regarding the building that had three different options on it. She understood it was the commission that was making a recommendation for all three options so there would be flexibility for the tenant that came in; staff concurred. As to signage, she also confirmed with Mr. Williams that staff was not recommending approval of the signage on the side of the building because the sign ordinance did not allow signage along an elevation that does not face a right-of-way; staff concurred. Per her question about a village monument sign, Mr. Williams confirmed that the original request for the monument was removed from the proposal. Lastly, Ms. Gassen asked about the parking impact of the alley vacation on the building to the west of the 7-11 building as well as the building dumpster on the south side. Ms. Gassen voiced her concern

DRAFT

about the loss of several parking spaces while Mr. Williams believed it was more of an access issue to the dumpsters. Mr. Williams believed the applicant could best answer her questions.

Mr. Quirk asked about separation between the northern limit of the vacated alley and an area to the west, wherein Mr. Williams was not sure but explained the footprint for the vacated alley was part of the drive-through and because an easement was there, no structure could be located there; however, Mr. Quirk believed a fence could be installed; staff concurred that fencing, landscaping and pavement could be installed.

Noting a fence would be placed along the easement, Mr. Kulovany inquired if the property owner could continue to park in the alley to which Mr. Williams stated he was not sure if there would be private agreements since it was village right-of-way.

Ms. Rollins asked for clarification regarding the open space requirement because to her it looked like the petitioner could not meet it for all lots and were compensating for it on Lot 3, and 30 parking spaces were being added. She believed the landscaping could be improved, to which staff explained the applicant was not increasing the footprint of the parking lot compared to the existing. More green space was being added and parking was being reduced somewhere with landscape islands, etc. that do not currently exist. Per Williams, the petitioner was meeting the open space requirement for the overall site but the village required half of all open space to be located in the street yard between the street property line and building. Unfortunately, with the "L" shape of the site, he said it could not be done. Ms. Leitschuh explained that the applicant could address the issue but in general stated that Ogden Avenue lots were extremely shallow and have special accommodations in the zoning ordinance to allow for that. She said the net gain of open space was superior than the existing.

Mr. Boyle ask staff to discuss the dumpster issues and traffic study, wherein Mr. Williams stated he would defer to the petitioner and the traffic consultant but commented the intersection would not be expanded anytime soon. Ms. Leitschuh also believed the traffic was an improvement because the petitioner was eliminating curb cuts and channeling the on-site traffic with potential to travel to Main and to Ogden, but was limited. Traffic could also travel through Jewel to the light signal, as pointed out by the chairman.

Chairman Rickard invited the petitioner to speak.

Mr. Chris Ilekis with Vequity, the owner and developer of 1030 Ogden Avenue, introduced his team. He discussed the challenges to develop the properties, including environmental contamination, site grading (future retaining wall along the rear property line), multiple property owners and sellers involved in the transaction, and the minimal land sizes and depths of the properties that prohibited much of the functionality for the future properties, which was why he was seeking an alley vacation. In addition, multiple utility issues existed and would be moved underground. Various deed restrictions and easements existed on the properties. Examples of those followed. Mr. Ilekis believed the proposal before the commissioners closely aligned with the village's comprehensive plan for redevelopment and IDOT's vision for consolidation of the curb cuts. Of the five curb cuts on Ogden Avenue, four would be removed.

Mr. Ilekis asked the commissioners to consider the following when reviewing their proposal: 1) the proposal will significant improve the appearance of an important entryway into the community;

DRAFT

2) the proposed plan provides for consolidation/removal of multiple access points; 3) cross-access is being provided between neighboring lots for better traffic flow between properties; 4) enhanced landscaping, screening, and monument signage will improve the appearance of the intersection; 5) the development is pedestrian-friendly which includes the addition of bike racks, sidewalks and sidewalk connections; 6) there is visual improvement to the intersection by relocating the utility poles; and 7) high-quality tenants and building construction will be provided with full masonry buildings with limestone bases and alternating brick colors.

Mr. Ilekis stated all of the requested dates were imperative to attracting tenants to move forward with the project and the proposal before the commission offered site plan flexibility to attract high quality tenants. He explained the building signage was requested in order to attract high quality local and national tenants which was standard for them to have two sides of signage on ends of buildings which was why the request was for a very limited sign versus a maximum allowable on the sides. Regarding access from Main Street to the Panda Express site, he stated there was an existing barrier median on Main Street and the existing alley would function as the entrance/exit for Panda Express as a right-in/right-out, as there was no way to head north unless a driver came out of the site and went to the full access point that was provided on the property for Ogden Avenue.

Mr. Ilekis said there were multiple access points throughout the property with the proposal providing two full access points on the property from 1030 to 1048 Ogden Avenue. There was the cross access easement with Jewel, providing connection between two signals – Saratoga Avenue and Main Street -- as well as the Ogden Avenue access point on both Jewel's property and the developer's, serving as the secondary access point.

Mr. Quirk asked when a decision for Site Plan A or Site Plan B would be made, wherein Mr. Ilekis stated it was tenant driven but he was close to signing a lease with Panda Express and also negotiating with other potential local and national retailers for the remaining tenants. He envisioned within the next 30 to 60 days he would have a better idea of which direction he would be moving forward. He also envisioned the building with the drive-through to be a food use.

Mr. Quirk commented that he wanted to ensure that it was not commonplace for the commission to transact right-of-ways based on an applicant's appraisal in the review process; however he believed the sign use was appropriate. He also appreciated the investment the developer was making.

Regarding Mr. Kulovany's question as to who was paying the \$250,000 cost for burying the utilities, Mr. Ilekis stated the developer was paying that amount. As for the neighbor's issue with access to the garbage dumpster, Mr. Ilekis explained he was made aware of the issue about a week or two ago and after speaking with someone tonight there were some arrangements being made but for his company it was difficult to incorporate other's trash into a project because there is a sharing agreement that was part of a shopping center. While he stated he would like to provide a solution, it was challenging. After viewing the property he said there were other areas where trash could be received and stored, i.e., to the north of the shopping center where some dumpsters exist. He was not sure of the agreement regarding that.

Chairman Rickard opened up the meeting to public comment and swore in those individuals who would be speaking on this case.

DRAFT

Mr. Cassa, Downers Grove Economic Development Corp. (DGEDG) shared that when he went through the comprehensive plan in 2011 and saw the catalyst sites, he recalled that the northwest corner of Ogden and Main would be an issue, citing in the past six years only one development company came close to a proposal. He described how difficult it was to market the site to other developers, with some saying it was an “obstacle course.” He pointed out the petitioner has developed in the village previously and the DGEDC made this site a high priority. Main and Ogden were the center of the village. The challenges were not only physical to the site but the developer also tried to balance the needs of the multiple stakeholders: the village, county, IDOT, tenants, owners, and others. He emphasized one of the most important reasons to move forward with the project was its impact on the corridor, east and west. He stated that staff and Vequity worked together very well and he looked forward to the project moving forward as it was an important catalyst site and a net benefit to the community.

Mr. David Henning, 150 Pierce Road, Itasca, Illinois, senior real estate manager for Jewel Osco distributed information to the commissioners (Jewel Attachment to staff report) and read it in detail. He oversees all of Jewel Osco’s real estate across 187 stores. He is excited to see the petitioner create a unified development next to his store and support the village’s objective to reduce curb-cuts in favor of cross-access. However, there were concerns with the plans submitted to the commissioners and a lack of consultation with Jewel Osco, i.e., learning about the development through the village’s legal notice. The petitioner’s invitation to the neighborhood meeting arrived at his office after the meeting took place. Mr. Henning did stop in and speak with Mr. Williams at the village’s planning office wherein Mr. Williams walked him through the plans. He also met with the petitioner on March 1st only when he (Mr. Henning) requested a face to face meeting. Discussed at the meeting he shared Jewel’s concerns as well as ideas that may get Jewel comfortable with the proposed redevelopment plans. No resolution was determined.

Jewel Osco’s concerns were as follows: 1) the cross access agreement is between the Jewel Osco property and the immediate adjacent U.S. Bank property; not the additional parcels to the east, and is a private easement not intended for the benefit of any other persons or properties, e.g., the petitioner does not have the unilateral right to connect the east parcels to the agreement; 2) the petitioner’s January 27, 2017 submission cover memo does not indicate the document was shared with the village (Jewel Attachment); 3) the traffic study did not evaluate weekend peak times which account for 40% of Jewel’s business, the development will focus on local residents, not on large weekday office employment base and peak traffic will most likely occur on weekends; 4) the development will generate an unacceptable amount of traffic on Jewel Osco’s property during PM hours. Per Mr. Henning, the traffic study states that the delay time at the Jewel Osco driveway during PM peak hours increases from 32.8 seconds to 74.6 seconds reducing the level of service from D to F. Furthermore, he read that 55 vehicles leave the cross-access driveway at the PM peak hours at the driveway, and that vehicles will most likely block incoming traffic from Ogden Avenue, creating an unacceptable safety risk. Approximately 83 vehicles enter the Jewel property at the shared access point at the PM peak hour and only 93 vehicles enter Ogden Avenue from the Jewel Osco driveway. Some may “crush up.” He said it was clear with a busy store many of the vehicles were using Jewel Osco’s property to get to Saratoga Avenue which was an unacceptable amount of traffic in front of Jewel Osco and a safety hazard to its customers. Further data followed in Mr. Henning’s letter.

Mr. Henning summarized that much of Jewel Osco’s success is predicated on convenience for its customers and the traffic study and a review of the site plan options demonstrate that the proposed

DRAFT

development will negatively impact the convenience and safety of Jewel's customers as well as village residents traveling on adjacent streets, which will lead them to explore other grocery store options in and outside of the community.

Per Mr. Henning, the petitioner failed to show that the proposed development complied with the village's review and approval criteria of the PUD -- *whether appropriate terms and conditions have been imposed on the approval to protect the interests of surrounding property owners and residents, existing and future residents of the PUD and the general public*, citing that the development of the plans, as presented, will significantly harm Jewel Osco's property and long-standing business.

As it relates to the requested Zoning Map Amendment - *the value to the community of the proposed use* – the proposed development does not complement Jewel Osco as it will have a deleterious affect on Jewel's business.

As it relates to the Special Use -- *the proposed use at the proposed location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or a facility that is in the interest of public convenience and will contribute to the general welfare of the neighborhood or community* – the proposed use and the resulting traffic and parking will increase inconvenience to Jewel Osco and its customers and have a negative affect on the general welfare of the neighborhood.

Also, as it relates to the Special Use -- *the proposed use will not, in the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity or be injurious to property values or improvements in the vicinity* -- the proposed use will be detrimental to health, safety and general welfare of Jewel Osco's business, its customers, and the traveling public on Ogden Avenue.

Mr. Henning stated that tenants of the petitioner's proposal will be attracted to the location because of the close proximity and cross access to Jewel Osco, which he believed the petitioner fully understood because it was marketing three separate retail developments, including Jewel Osco, as the headline (Jewel Attachment). Mr. Henning stated that given the value that his company brings to the proposal, it was only fair that Jewel be given a fair opportunity to comment to protect Jewel.

Based on the foregoing reasons, Jewel Osco requested that the case be continued until such time the petitioner is able to resolve Jewel Osco's concerns. Jewel was amenable to working with the petitioner to reach a mutual satisfactory development plan that did not negatively impact its business.

Mr. Brian Frankie, 4224 Forest Avenue, resides next to the "L" on the map (rear of parking lot) and stated it was distressing not to receive notice nor was he invited to the developer's neighborhood meeting. He did not have a chance to speak to the developer until tonight. He voiced concern about the north end of the "L" and the easement being located behind the existing parking lot. He stated in the documents presented some were inconsistent where the developer was planning to install the fence and what his landscaping plans were. He explained what the current conditions were leading to his house. He further expressed concern about trash on the development's property and the fact that the developer has moved the garbage from the two eastern sites to the property on the west and behind the building, relocating it near the residences on Forest Avenue and Haven's Court and his property. He asked why the garbage had to be in the middle of the parking lot when it could be relocated up against a building and moving it further away from the residences. Mr. Frankie voiced

DRAFT

concern that it looked as if there was more lighting than what currently existed in the rear near his home. Regarding the two drive-throughs, he voiced concern about noise and air pollution. He voiced further concern about the development's uses and the traffic generated from them spilling over to Ogden Avenue and creating cut-through traffic into the neighborhood. Regarding earlier comments at the meeting, Mr. Frankie agreed improving the buildings at the northwest intersection were needed but "lumping in" the U.S. Bank property was unfair because it was a nice looking building.

Mr. Frankie stated he wanted to share his wife's, Martha Pike's, 4224 Forest Ave., comments. She had to leave the meeting. She voiced concern about the expedited schedule for the project approval because homeowners were notified of the February 23rd meeting and it was the first look at a project that would affect our quality of life and property values. She voiced concern about two drive-throughs and the air safety of not only her child but other children who resided in the Haven's Court apartment building. Noise was another concern. The idea of approving several options was confusing and uncommon. She wanted to know exactly what was going into the development.

Ms. Annmarie Schuster, 4213 Forest Ave., addressing Lot 3, stated that in addition to the landscaping being installed she asked to consider installing a fence on the north side and on the east side in order to have a sound/privacy barrier which would be consistent with what was behind the Jewel Osco. It would look nice and add to the privacy.

Ms. Candy Duehana, owner of Mrs. T's Pizza at Main and Ogden, stated her concern was with the alley and trucks making deliveries to her business which, she explained, will exit onto Main Street or cut through another piece of property. She did not believe it was wise for the trucks to use the parking lot for front door deliveries because parking was limited already and no specific times existed for those deliveries to take place. In addition Candy stated her dumpster sits on the property behind her with the large office building on Haven and that owner is upset because she is no longer included in the sale of the new redevelopment and therefore does not want any dumpsters or Mrs. T's employees parking on her property. As a result, Candy stated her employees have to park in her parking lot while she loses parking spaces for the public. The delivery trucks will be accessing the parking lot also to make deliveries via her front door.

While her dumpster and grease trap could be relocated to the north end of the building, there was not much room available there. She asked the commissioners to keep the alley as part of the village property, commenting her employees do not use the alley for parking – they use the neighbor's parking lot but now that neighbor will not allow it. While she understood the developer's plans for improving Ogden Avenue and Panda Express wanting a drive-through, she stated not everyone can have everything. The alley is used significantly by others. Her dumpster is now in front of her store and is unsightly. She believes the village would not like drivers on Main or Ogden to see a dumpster sitting against a railing that separates the building and the alley. Her grease trap will be out there shortly because if her employees have to a walk to the north end of the building, she now has a liability. She asked the commissioners to consider some options.

Ms. Carol Balanoff, 4221 Forest, stated that because Havens Court turns into Forest, when one drives up Forest, the view is of the parking lot and the bank building. However, when additional vehicles show up and it becomes the rear of a restaurant, it will become a problem. Many of the residents would like a fence back there. Addressing the issue of trash, Ms. Balanoff stated those residences four to five deep are constantly cleaning their yards from the Jewel, the dumpsters on

DRAFT

Haven Court, and the 7-11. So many dumpsters are in the area that all of the dumpsters for the proposed buildings will be saturated in the same area. Viewing the site today she stated all the dumpsters were left open. She stated that if the applicant could provide more protection it would help with noise, pollution and keeping trash out of the neighborhood. She noted the village area is never cleaned up unless someone calls the village. Trash was a major concern.

Hearing no further comments the chairman invited the petitioner to respond.

Mr. Javier Milan senior consultant with KLOA, Inc. stated his firm provided the traffic study for the development and he wanted to address four issues raised: 1) regarding the study not evaluating the weekend conditions, Mr. Milan reported the weekend was not included because in general the Jewel and restaurants during lunch time will generate more traffic than during the PM peak hour. Traffic on the adjacent roads seem to be lower because there is no rush period of vehicles going to work. Saturday volume tends to be lower and for that reason it tends to even out, i.e., one increases while the other decreases and it was not necessary to evaluate it. 2) Regarding the delay increase that was raised in the report, it was one of the limitations of traffic engineering software. Mr. Milan proceeded to explain that the software views the intersection as an isolated intersection where the Ogden traffic never stops and there is never a gap in the traffic stream even though there are signals at Saratoga and at Main Street that create gaps. The analysis does not take that into account. So when the additional traffic is added the delay count does increase, as mentioned. Mr. Milan shared that it was not uncommon but it could happen. However, he stated there were other access points to the site. 3) Regarding the cross access, Mr. Milan stated it is always good planning to either maintain or enhance cross access between businesses because if not then vehicles are making trips outside the road rather than internally. The cross access will also allow Jewel to exit onto Main Street. 4) Regarding the traffic generation from the many restaurants, Mr. Milan stated that with these types of restaurants, normally fifty percent of the trips are “pass-by” and are already on the street. He used a gas station as an example. He explained there is an interaction where customers of Jewel will travel to the restaurants and those at the restaurant will go to Jewel which reduces traffic volume. Not everything will be new to the area.

Returning, Mr. Chris Ileki with Vequity, stated he felt he was abiding by the current cross access agreement with Jewel. Vequity’s redevelopment plan included two full primary entrances at 1030 through 1048 W. Ogden Avenue. The KLOA traffic study stated the proposed development would have a very limited impact on area roadways. Jewel’s main access point was the Saratoga traffic signal, giving them another full access point. The access point that would be shared was a secondary access point. Mr. Ileki stated that Mr. Henning did mention that the two of them met two weeks ago and although he did bring up some of the solutions that were presented tonight, Mr. Ileki stated he brought up solutions that would be helpful between the properties to clean up the current easement agreement. He clarified that Jewel does not have cross access between 1030 and 1040 Ogden Avenue; they have cross access between 1048 (U.S. Bank) and Jewel. Mr. Ileki further stated that he presented, as a solution, that allowing Jewel cross access among all the properties would tie the two main intersections together – Main Street and Saratoga – allowing access for customers of both Jewel and the proposed development to have cross access to two fully signalized intersections, with other secondary full entrance on both properties. He believed the better solution was to provide full cross access which was confirmed by the comprehensive redevelopment agreement within Downers Grove, IDOT, and DuPage County Department of Transportation’s suggestions. Also, Mr. Ileki stated he proposed other solutions that would be beneficial to make the development more functional overall, which included an overall maintenance

DRAFT

agreement between Jewel and the new development for debris, replacement/repair, snow plowing, etc. which would have made much sense. Additionally, since there was mention that generating new traffic benefited both projects, it created issues which everyone was aware of. Specifically, there was parking that aligns with Jewel's property and he was willing to put within the leases tow language, signage, directional signage throughout the property to restrict parking that would impact Jewel. He believed his firm made the effort and were abiding by the current agreement that was in place. He asked the commission to approve the request considering the current time constraints with the contracted sellers.

Chair Rickard asked if there was opportunity to accommodate a six-foot wide strip of the alley to park a grease container and dumpster by vacating the alley and leaving just enough for the two containers to be accessed by the Mrs. T's tenant without impeding the drive-through, Ms. Leitschuh stated that dumpsters and grease traps were not allowed to be placed in public alleyways unless through a legal license process. They could not sit in an alley but could be accessed from an alley.

Mr. Ileki believed the issue was access to the current grease trap location and the alley was being used to access the trap, which was located in the rear of the property. Ms. Candy Duehana commented that not only were the dumpster and grease traps the issue, but the various delivery trucks used the alley behind her and exited through the alley and she was not able to use the property behind the plaza but was forced to have front door deliveries. Ms. Candy clarified there was a six-foot strip of property at the rear of the building where the containers were sitting but the only way the garbage men could get to them was by driving up on the property behind her and the other owner was no longer allowing that because she was upset with the development occurring.

Mr. Kulovany stated the property owner at 1035 Havens was blocking access then. He inquired how trash was being picked up currently wherein Ms. Candy explained the trash company accesses by coming up through the 1035 Havens property to the dumpsters. Also she explained the issue with the dumpsters in the present location was that there are multiple dumpsters placed at the north end of the building. The chairman asked whether there could be a common trash area managed by one company, citing the proposed project had many positives but it appeared to be a simple solution somewhere to be worked out. However, Ms. Candy stated that moving hot grease was a liability issue and placing a (grease) container at the north end of the building was not a good idea. She was open to another solution.

In response, Mr. Kulovany stated if the other owner did not solve the problem for Mrs. T's Pizza the vacation of the alley had nothing to do with it. Ms. Candy concurred but stated it was good access for the trucks who were sitting in the alley for 30 to 40 minutes but now they were going to be sitting in the front parking lot making deliveries. She reiterated it was an inconvenience for the public and for the business owners.

Ms. Leitschuh spoke up stating there were separate private property management issues, some of which may have been generated by what was being proposed while others were not. She believed shared parking agreements could be created to reduce the number of required parking spaces for each use, especially if one of the concerns was for limited parking for employees due to changing conditions. Also, the fence issue was raised. Leitschuh pointed out that these items could be placed as conditions.

DRAFT

If the project were approved as is and Mrs. T's restaurant had to house some containers, Chairman Rickard asked if the village would allow such enclosure in the front yard of Main Street, wherein Ms. Leitschuh stated containers were not allowed in the street yard and not knowing when it was originally approved, if it had been approved it would not have been allowed to have off-site storage of the grease traps – it would have had to have been on their own property.

Dialog followed by the chairman that it had never complied, which staff suspected. At the same time, Chairman Rickard did not believe it was fair to hold up this petition for something that was not necessarily their doing but it did create an issue that would have to be dealt with and was an example for some type of exception since there were no options.

It was noted by staff that the site was a catalyst site since 2011 and only one proposal for the site was received since that time. Mr. Cassa with the DGEDC came forward stating he did many small developments on Ogden Avenue which tended to have the shared trash areas and sometimes restaurants paid more because they generated more trash. It was common, especially on Ogden Avenue where there was no luxury to give every tenant its own trash area. He believed it was the responsibility of that shopping owner to provide areas for tenants' trash which he believed could be the solution by everyone sharing the cost.

Ms. Rollins asked the developer if there was consideration for a fence along the rear bordering Havens Court wherein Mr. Ilekis stated he was fine with installing a fence there but it was up to the commission to make the suggestion. He clarified that portion of the current site plan reflected increased landscaping and trees as screening for the neighbors and he did not know if a new fence was proposed and if there was an existing one today.

Planner Scott Williams stated there was no fence proposed for the property lines bordering Havens Court, and the fence is located near what is currently the rear property line of the US Bank property.

Ms. Balanoff returned and stated her concern was that there were some existing bushes in the area but were broken by people cutting through them to get to Jewel and if bushes were planted again, people would walk through them again. She believed a fence was more protective as it would block the view of the rear buildings. She reiterated that the area was on a curve and the "homes look right into that."

Ms. Rollins asked that if the fence issue was placed as a condition in the motion would the developer install it, wherein Mr. Ilekis stated there was a potential grade change and the site sat up higher than the neighborhood. Vequity did propose significant landscaping in the area for screening but if they wanted less landscaping and more fencing, he was open to the proposal. Ms. Leitschuh suggested placing the fence as a condition for approval and if at the time of permitting there were grading changes, staff would address it with the petitioner to ensure it was with the same intent as the commission required; the chairman concurred.

Mr. Kulovany asked if the petitioner had a contingency agreement with Panda Express and whether it required a drive-through wherein Mr. Ilekis stated it does require a drive-through.

Mr. Henning, for Jewel Osco, returned and expressed his disappointment regarding the traffic consultant's comments about the conclusion not being what the case was about because it did not account for different factors. As for the comment about Saratoga being Jewel's main entry, whether

DRAFT

it was true or not true, he stated the petitioner had no basis for which to make the claim because the intersection was not studied nor was there a study of Jewel's driveway to Saratoga Avenue. As for the access from Jewel's site through and to Main Street, it was highly circuitous and of little to no value so it did not represent a benefit to Jewel or offset the challenges and burden that would be put on Jewel's property. In addition, the towing language, signage and overture to purchase property from Jewel to park, Mr. Henning stated that Jewel values its property and parking and it was not for sale nor would it make the problem go away. Instead, it would cause his ability to be upset to go away. He asked the commission to consider what was a very well written and tightly crafted easement document and while he understood it was not the commission's job to interpret legal documents that are recorded against the properties he would continue to rely on it going forward.

Ms. Pat Gregory, stated that Mr. Henning was correct in that the document provides cross access between the Jewel property and the 1048 only. However, he was incorrect in saying that it does not give us the right to share that easement with any adjoining properties. It is common for such agreements to have that type of language but this agreement did not have that language and there was no restriction in the petitioner's ability to enter into cross-access easement agreements with 1036 and 1030 down the road.

Chairman Rickard closed the public hearing. He summarized some of the issues raised that may or may not want to be included with the motion, i.e., the signage proposed for the side walls.

Mr. Quirk was in support of the proposal but uncomfortable approving site plans in three different forms and not understanding which one. Having the two drive-throughs were very intensive for traffic and for the site but not a challenge. While he sympathized with the comments made, doing business would probably change with the development coming in. He disagreed with Jewel and believed the proposal would be valuable to them. He did not believe additional traffic was being created with the development coming in, seeing that the developer and the retailers were capturing the market. It was an overall improvement to the corner and in reviewing the standards for approval, he did not find any that he objected with.

Ms. Johnson believed the consideration for the fence should be added to the motion seeing that the residents had issues about seeing the backs of restaurants and trash. It would be located at the north end of the fence down and around Havens Court; other commissioners concurred.

Ms. Gassen asked that the lighting be a condition to ensure that it meets the ordinance.

Mr. Williams stated that the average 5 feet north of the property line was between .3 and .4. Ms. Leitschuh stated the average would be taken at the property line and to Gassen's question; currently the lighting plan was not meeting the ordinance.

Mr. Kulovany agreed with the comments being voiced by fellow commissioners. Regarding the signage, he understood how it made business sense to do it, but the village just forced many business owners to comply with the sign ordinance with zero exceptions including a lawsuit that was lost by a plaintiff. He supported the project since it was a tough catalyst site. Also, this was the only proposal that came forward and there was a private property issue that needed to be resolved but it was not on the village.

As to the fencing, Mr. Boyle recommended consideration for the connection since the neighbors were using it as a path and suggested some sort of opening in the fence.

DRAFT

Mr. Quirk stated he was fine with the elevations stating they were appropriate and were in good taste.

The chairman stated it appeared the commissioners were in consensus for the fencing and the light level but split on the signage. Ms. Leitschuh asked that whomever makes the motion to justify why this would be different than other sign situations and why it was unique to the property, wherein Mr. Quirk stated it was “personal preference” and thought it was appropriate and in good taste.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 17-PLC-0004, MR. QUIRK MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL FOR THE PUD, ZONING MAP AMENDMENT AND RIGHT OF WAY VACATION AND SPECIAL USE TO ALLOW A DRIVE-THROUGH AND FINAL PLAT OF SUBDIVISION TO CONSTRUCT A MULTI-BUILDING COMMERCIAL CENTER, SUBJECT TO STAFF’S NINE (9) CONDITIONS LISTED IN ITS STAFF REPORT, INCLUDING: 1) THE ADDITION A FENCE ALONG FOREST AVE AND HAVENS CT WHERE IT FACES AN ADJACENT RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT; AND 2) THE PETITIONER WILL GUARANTEE THAT THE AVERAGE FOOT CANDLES WILL BE, AT A MAXIMUM, 0.1 FOOT CANDLES ALONG THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES.

NO SECOND VOICED. (MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.)

The chairman entertained another motion to be considered.

WITH RESPECT TO FILE 17-PLC-0004, MS. GASSEN MADE A MOTION THAT THE PLAN COMMISSION FORWARD A POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE COUNCIL FOR THE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENT AND RIGHT OF WAY VACATION AND SPECIAL USE TO ALLOW A DRIVE-THROUGH AND FINAL PLAT OF SUBDIVISION TO CONSTRUCT A MULTI-BUILDING COMMERCIAL CENTER, SUBJECT TO STAFF’S NINE (9) CONDITIONS LISTED IN STAFF’S REPORT, WITH THE ADDITION OF: ITEM 10) ADDING A FENCE ALONG FOREST AVE AND HAVENS CT WHERE IT FACES AN ADJACENT RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT; AND ITEM 11) THE PETITIONER WILL GUARANTEE THAT THE AVERAGE FOOT CANDLES WILL BE, AT A MAXIMUM, 0.1 FOOT CANDLES ALONG THE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES.

SECONDED BY MR. KULOVANY. ROLL CALL:

**AYE: MS. GASSEN, MR. KULOVANY, MR. BOYLE, MS. JOHNSON, MR. QUIRK,
MS. ROLLINS, CHAIRMAN RICHARD**

NAY: NONE

MOTION PASSED. VOTE: 7-0


THE MEETING WAS CALLED ADJOURNED BY CHAIRMAN RICKARD AT 11:10 P.M.

DRAFT

/s/ Celeste K. Weilandt
(As transcribed by MP-3 audio)

GENERAL LANDSCAPE NOTES

- CONTRACTOR SHALL OBTAIN ALL NECESSARY LOCAL PERMITS AND PERMISSIONS TO INSTALL THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS
- ALL LANDSCAPE MATERIALS SHALL BE INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE VILLAGE OF DOWNERS GROVE MUNICIPAL CODE.
- ALL PLANT MATERIALS (EXCEPT FOR GROUNDCOVER, ANNUALS, AND PERENNIALS) SHALL BE BALLED AND BURLAPPED STOCK AND MEET CURRENT STANDARDS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NURSERYMEN'S STANDARD FOR NURSERY STOCK (ANSI 260.1-1986) OR EQUAL. CONTRACTOR MAY SUBSTITUTE CONTAINER STOCK FOR SHRUBS IF SIZES ARE EQUAL TO SPECIFIED B&B STOCK, WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT.
- IF SPECIFIED PLANTS ARE NOT AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF ORDERING, PLANTS WITH SIMILAR WHOLESAL VALUE AND LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISTICS MAY BE SUBSTITUTED UPON THE APPROVAL OF THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT.
- SOIL IN PERENNIAL AND GROUNDCOVER BEDS SHALL BE AMENDED USING 2 INCHES OF MUSHROOM COMPOST INCORPORATED INTO THE TOP 6 INCHES OF SOIL.
- AREAS TO RECEIVE SOD SHALL BE TILLED TO 6" DEPTH AND FINE GRADED TO PROVIDE SMOOTH BASE SURFACE. IF EXISTING SOIL IS A MAJORITY OF CLAY OR UNSUITABLE, 2" OF FINE GRADED TOPSOIL SHALL BE ADDED PRIOR TO TILLING.
- TREE AND SHRUB BACKFILL MIXTURE SHALL BE 2 PARTS EXIST. NATIVE TOPSOIL AND 1 PART SPHAGNUM PEAT MOSS W/ DECOMPOSED MANURE.
- ALL SHRUB BEDS AND INDIVIDUAL TREE PLANTINGS SHALL RECEIVE A 3 INCH LAYER OF SHREDDED HARDWOOD MULCH. ALL GROUNDCOVER, ANNUAL AND PERENNIAL BEDS SHALL RECEIVE A 2 INCH LAYER OF THE SAME MULCH MATERIAL. COSTS FOR MULCH SHALL BE CONSIDERED INCIDENTAL AND SHALL BE INCLUDED IN THE COST OF PLANTINGS.
- NURSERY TAGS (SPECIES, SIZE) FOR ALL SHADE TREES SHALL REMAIN ATTACHED TO TREES UNTIL APPROVAL FROM VILLAGE.
- CONTRACTOR SHALL OBTAIN A TREE REMOVAL PERMIT FOR TREES MARKED FOR REMOVAL. TREES 12" CAL. AND LESS SHALL BE CUT AND STUMPS REMOVED, TREES OVER 12" CAL. SHALL BE STUMP GROUND TO 4" BELOW GRADE AND BACK FILLED WITH TOPSOIL.
- THE LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE THE OWNER A BONDED WRITTEN ONE-YEAR WARRANTY AGREEMENT (BEGINNING ON THE OWNER'S POSSESSION DATE). THIS AGREEMENT SHALL COVER MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, AND REPLACEMENT OF ALL LANDSCAPING TO PRESERVE THE SAME QUANTITY AND QUALITY AS INITIALLY APPROVED.
- CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE OWNER WITH A SEPARATE PROPOSAL FOR INSTALLATION OF AN AUTOMATIC UNDERGROUND IRRIGATION SYSTEM FOR COMPLETE EFFECTIVE COVERAGE OF ALL LAWN AREAS AND SHRUB BEDS.



PROPOSED PLANT LIST



| SYM | SIZE | TYPE | BOTANICAL NAME | COMMON NAME | COMMENT |
|------------------------------|-----------|------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| DECIDUOUS SHADE TREES | | | | | |
| ACM | 2.5" CAL. | COL. | ACER MIYABEI 'MORTON' | MIYABE MAPLE | B&B |
| ARC | 2.5" CAL. | COL. | ACER RUBRUM 'COLUMNARE' | COLUMNARE RED MAPLE | B&B |
| GTS | 2.5" CAL. | SH. | GLEDITSIA TRI. 'SHADEMASTER' | SHADEMASTER HONEYLOCUST | B&B |
| GDE | 2.5" CAL. | SH. | GYMNOCLADUS DIOIC. 'ESPRESSO' | ESPRESSO KENTUCKY COFFEETREE | B&B |
| TCR | 2.5" CAL. | COL. | TILIA AMERICANA 'REDMOND' | REDMOND LINDEN | B&B |
| ULH | 2.5" CAL. | SH. | ULMUS 'REGAL' | REGAL ELM | B&B |
| ORNAMENTAL TREES | | | | | |
| ALG | 6' HT. | ORN. | ALNUS GLUNTINOSA | EUROPEAN BLACK ALDER | B&B/MULT. |
| AGP | 6' HT. | ORN. | AMELANCH. GR. 'PRINCESS DIANA' | PRINCESS DIANA SERVICEBERRY | B&B/MULT. |
| DECIDUOUS SHRUBS | | | | | |
| ARM | 24" HT. | MED. | ARONIA MELAN. 'BRILLIANTISSIMA' | BRILLIAN RED CHOKEBERRY | B&B |
| CAB | 24" HT. | MED. | CORNUS ALBA 'BAILHALO' | IVORY HALO REDTWIG DOGWOOD | B&B |
| HYA | 24" HT. | MED. | HYDRANGEA ARBOR. 'ANNABELLE' | ANNABELLE HYDRANGEA | B&B |
| ITV | 18" HT. | MED. | ITEA VIRGINICA 'HENRY'S GARNET' | HENRY'S GARNET SWEETSPIRE | B&B |
| POB | 30" HT. | LRG. | PHYSOCARPUS OPUL. 'RED BARON' | RED BARON NINE BARK | B&B |
| RAG | 18" W. | LOW | RHUS AROMATICA 'GRO-LOW' | GROW LOW SUMAC | B&B |
| SBT | 18" W. | LOW | SPIRAEA BETUL. 'TOR' | TOR BIRCHLEAF SPIREA | B&B |
| SYM | 18" HT. | MED. | SYRINGA MEYERI 'PALABIN' | DWARF KOREAN LILAC | B&B |
| VIC | 18" HT. | MED. | VIBURNUM CARLESII 'CAYUGA' | CAYUGA KOREANSPICE VIBURNUM | B&B |
| VIP | 24" HT. | LRG. | VIBURNUM PRUNIFOLIUM | BLACKHAW VIBURNUM | B&B |
| VOC | 18" HT. | MED. | VIBURNUM TRILOBUM 'COMPACTA' | COMP. CRANBERRY VIB. | |

| SYM | SIZE | TYPE | BOTANICAL NAME | COMMON NAME | COMMENT |
|--------------------------------------------|---------|-------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|
| EVERGREEN SHRUBS | | | | | |
| JHP | 18" HT. | MED. | JUNIPERUS CHIN. 'SEAGREEN' | SEAGREEN JUNIPER | B&B |
| TMD | 18" W. | MED. | TAXUS X MEDIA 'DENSIFORMIS' | DENSE YEWE | B&B |
| TME | 18" W. | MED. | TAXUS X MEDIA 'EVERLOW' | EVERLOW DENSE YEWE | B&B |
| GROUNDCOVERS / PERENNIALS / GRASSES | | | | | |
| ACH | 1 QT. | PER. | ACHILLEA MILLEF. 'MOONSHINE' | MOONSHINE YARROW | 18" O.C. |
| ALS | 1 QT. | PER. | ALLIUM TANGUT. 'SUMMER BEAUTY' | SUMMER BEAUTY ORN. ONION | 18" O.C. |
| ASA | 4" POT. | PER. | ASTILBE ARENDsii 'FANAL' | FANAL FALSE SPIREA | 18" O.C. |
| CAA | 1 GAL. | GRASS | CALAMAGROSTIS A. 'OVERDAM' | OVERDAM FEATHER REED GRASS | 24" O.C. |
| COP | 1 QT. | PER. | COREOPSIS PALMATA | PRAIRIE COREOPSIS | 18" O.C. |
| DIL | 1 QT. | PER. | DICENTRA 'LUXURIANT' | LUXURIANT BLEEDING HEART | 18" O.C. |
| GEM | 4" POT. | PER. | GERANIUM SANGUINEUM 'MAX FREI' | MAX FREI BLOODY CRANESBILL | 18" O.C. |
| HEM | 3" POT. | PER. | HEMEROCALLIS 'STELLA DE ORO' | STELLA DE ORO DAYLILY | 18" O.C. |
| LAV | 1 QT. | PER. | LAVANDULA 'MUNSTEAD STRAIN' | MUNSTEAD ENGLISH LAVENDER | 18" O.C. |
| NFW | 1 GAL. | PER. | NEPETA FASSENI 'WALKERS LOW' | WALKERS LOW CATMINT | 24" O.C. |
| PAV | 1 GAL. | GRASS | PANICUM VIRGATUM 'SHENANDOAH' | SHENANDOAH RED SWITCH GRASS | 24" O.C. |
| SED | 1 QT. | PER. | SEDUM x 'AUTUMN JOY' | AUTUMN FIRE STONECROP | 18" O.C. |
| SON | 1 QT. | GRASS | SORGHASTRUM NUTANS | INDIAN GRASS | 18" O.C. |
| SOD | S.Y. | | SOD LAWN | SOD LAWN | |

* - DENOTES TREE / SHRUB SPECIES WHICH WILL BE UTILIZED, IN PART, TO BE COUNTED TOWARDS REPLACEMENT VALUE FOR REMOVED TREES - SEE SHEET L-1

1 PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE PLAN SOUTH PORTION SCALE 1"=20'-0"

LANDSCAPE PLAN LEGEND



DEVELOPER:
 Vequity
 400 N. State
 Suite 400
 Chicago, IL 60654
 312-985-0987
 Email info@vequity.com
 www.vequity.com

ARCHITECT:
 ILEKIS ASSOCIATES
 Architects Planners
 223 W. Jackson, Ste 1000
 Chicago, Illinois 60606
 312-419-0009
 Fax 312-899-0965
 Email info@ilekis.com
 www.ilekis.com
 Architect of Record

LG Landscape Architecture
 Workshop Site Planning
 Illustration
 2324 W. Armitage Ave. Chicago, IL
 773.697.4388 www.LGWLA.com


PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT
 1030-1048 W OGDEN AVE
 DOWNERS GROVE, IL 60515

| REVISIONS | | |
|---------------|------------|------------------------|
| NO. | DATE | DESCRIPTION |
| Δ | 04/04/2017 | CITY COMMENTS |
| Δ | 02/24/2017 | CITY COMMENTS |
| Δ | 02/15/2017 | CITY COMMENTS |
| | 01/25/2017 | PLAN COMMISSION REVIEW |
| DRAWN BY: LCG | | |
| SCALE: LCG | | |
| JOB: -- | | |
| FILE: 1614-03 | | |

PRELIM. LANDSCAPE PLAN - SOUTH

DRAWING NO.
L.2






| # | Date | Comments |
|---|------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |

Revisions

Drawn By:
Checked By:
Date: 4/3/2017
Scale:

153694 Downers Grove IL
Retail - Ogden/Main



| Luminaire Schedule | | | | |
|--------------------|-----|-----------------------------|--------------|------------------------------|
| Symbol | Qty | Label | Arrangement | Description |
| | 11 | COS-A017-4K-UN Led (0113 | SINGLE | COS-A017-4K-UN _____ 22 WATT |
| | 4 | EALS01_F4AF750 _____ tcm201 | SINGLE | EALS01_F4AF750 _____ |
| | 2 | EALS01_H4AF750 _____ tcm201 | SINGLE | EALS01_H4AF750 _____ |
| | 1 | EALS01_D3AW750 _____ @90 | 2 @ 90 DEGRE | EALS01_D3AW750 _____ @90 |
| | 1 | LNC2-18LU-5K-3 | SINGLE | LNC2-18LU-5K-3 |
| | 2 | EALS01_J4AF750 _____ | SINGLE | EALS01_J4AF750 _____ |
| | 1 | EALS01_J5SM750 _____ tcm201 | SINGLE | EALS01_J5SM750 _____ |



GE Evolve EALS



Laredo LNC2 Wall Pack



Image File : Acculite COS LED

| Calculation Summary | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|-------|------|-----|-----|---------|---------|
| Label | CalcType | Units | Avg | Max | Min | Avg/Min | Max/Min |
| A1 | Illuminance | Fc | 2.28 | 7.7 | 0.8 | 2.85 | 9.63 |
| A2 | Illuminance | Fc | 1.99 | 3.5 | 0.7 | 2.84 | 5.00 |
| B | Illuminance | Fc | 2.18 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 1.68 | 2.38 |
| C | Illuminance | Fc | 2.06 | 5.4 | 0.9 | 2.29 | 6.00 |
| Perimeter | Illuminance | Fc | 1.07 | 4.1 | 0.0 | N.A. | N.A. |
| Perimeter _ | Illuminance | Fc | 0.17 | 1.2 | 0.0 | N.A. | N.A. |





| # | Date | Comments |
|---|------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |

Revisions

| | | | |
|-----------|-------------|----------------|--------|
| Drawn By: | Checked By: | Date: 4/3/2017 | Scale: |
|-----------|-------------|----------------|--------|

153694 Downers Grove IL
Retail - Ogden/Main



| # | Date | Comments |
|---|------|----------|
| | | |
| | | |

Revisions

| | |
|-------------|----------|
| Drawn By: | |
| Checked By: | |
| Date: | 4/3/2017 |
| Scale: | |

| |
|-------------------------|
| 153694 Downers Grove IL |
| Retail - Ogden/Main |