

January 6, 2005

Mr. William J. Mueller,
Village President, and
Board of Trustees
Village of Lombard

Subject: SPA 04-09: 2020 St. Regis Drive (Yorkbrook Condominiums)

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition heard at the December 20, 2004 Plan Commission meeting. The petitioner requests that the Village approve a minor change to the approved planned development for Phases 2 & 3 of the Yorkbrook Condominium development.

Chairperson Ryan referred to William Heniff, Senior Planner, who introduced the petition. Mr. Heniff stated that the Yorkbrook Condominium development was originally approved by the Village in 1996, consisting of a single 120-unit condominium development to be constructed in three phases. Phase I of the project (45 units) started in 1999 with construction work continuing through 2001. The original developer, Fox Land Development, was unable to continue with the project and Phases 2 & 3 were placed into foreclosure.

Hartz Construction, the contract purchaser of the two remaining phases of the development, has submitted new plans for Phases 2 and 3 of the development. Their intent is to complete the project as it was initially envisioned in 1996. The footprint of the building will remain essentially the same and the overall number of units will not change. However, they are proposing modifications to the exterior elevations and interior plans and will utilize a similar plan that was approved and constructed as part of the Liberty Square Condominium project south of the subject property.

The petitioner's proposed changes would be classified as minor changes to the planned development, per the Zoning Ordinance. However, given the history of the project and the scope of the changes proposed by the petitioner, staff elected to bring this petition to the Plan Commission and Village Board for consideration. He then introduced the petitioner to discuss their proposed changes in detail.

Elaine Pochiro, General Counsel for Hartz Construction, opened her presentation by giving an overview of the proposed project. She then introduced Bill Mathis of Linden Group Architects, who discussed the proposed changes in detail.

He opened his presentation by noting that the number of units proposed in the development will not change from the initial approval in 1996. The development will meet the parking requirements of the Village and sufficient handicapped parking will be provided both inside and outside of Phases 2 and 3.

He then noted the four major changes to the plan:

1. Building Exterior

The original building was approved with a stamped concrete and dryvit exterior. They propose to use full masonry around the exterior, as shown on the submitted materials board and building elevations.

2. Roof Construction

In lieu of a pitched metal roof, they are proposing a flat roof, with a exterior parapet. This design will be similar to the approved and constructed buildings within the Liberty Square development.

3. Balconies

The original plans had projecting balconies – their plans will include recessed balconies as shown on the submitted plans.

4. Deck Area Over the Parking Structure

In lieu on providing all the rooftop landscaping and furniture as depicted on the 1996 plans, they are proposing to provide a synthetic patio surface.

Commissioners Sweetser and Burke inquired about the durability of the proposed synthetic surface and how it would be laid on top of the parking garage. Mr. Mathis said the material to be supplied will be a wearable surface that will allow for walking and active use. The surface will also provide for furniture if the resident desires to add it in the future.

Mr. Heniff then reviewed the past approvals granted to the property as shown on the 1996 plans and how the petitioner's plans will deviate from the initial approvals. He also referenced the adjacent land uses and how Phases 2 and 3 will be compatible with the built environment. He also discussed site line issues, noting that the single family residences to the north will not see the Phase 2 and 3 addition – the greatest visibility will be from the St. Regis Condominiums to the east of the project.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for public comment. There was no one present to speak for or against the petition.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for discussion among the Plan Commission members.

Commissioner Sweetser asked about the proposed change to the rooftop patio area – should the association propose to add landscaping and/or furniture, will they need to come back to the Plan Commission for approval. Mr. Heniff said the purpose of this requested change is to allow the new developer the flexibility of not providing the additional plantings and furniture as depicted in the 1996 approval. He then noted that all other items associated with the 1996 approval, including the perimeter and foundation landscaping provisions, would still need to be provided as part of the development. Staff will also work with the petitioner accordingly.

Commissioner Melarkey asked about the overall height of the proposed rooftop patio area. Mr. Mathis noted it will be approximately 11'2" above grade. Units around the patio area will either have a fenced area for their individual balconies or a swing gate that would allow for access to the shared patio area.

Commissioner Melarkey then inquired about the stairs to the patio area. Commissioner Sweetser also asked about security issues associated with the stairs from the patio area to grade. Mr. Mathis stated that these steps were needed for life/safety code reasons and it would be a secure environment, which will include fencing to preclude direct access onto the patio area from grade.

Commissioner Flint made a motion to recommend approval of the petition, subject to the conditions in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Melarkey.

After due consideration of the petition and the testimony presented, the Plan Commission found that the proposed requests complied with the standards of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the Plan Commission, by a roll call vote of 6 to 0, recommended to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of SPA 04-09, subject to the following conditions:

1. That Phases 2 & 3 shall be constructed in accordance with the site plan and building elevations prepared by Linden Group, Inc., dated December 8, 2004 and made a part of this petition.
2. That the petitioner shall address all concerns raised by the IDRC as noted within this report.
3. That the petitioner shall meet all other provisions of the approval granted by the Village as part of PC 96-26 (Ordinance 4267) relating to site improvements, parking lot improvements, and landscape improvements.

Re: SPA 04-09
January 6, 2005
Page 4

4. That in the event that Phases 2 and 3 are not constructed simultaneously that the petitioner shall provide a finished south exterior wall for Phase 2, with the design of the exterior wall being subject to the Director of Community Development.

Respectfully,

VILLAGE OF LOMBARD

Donald Ryan, Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission

c. Petitioner
Lombard Plan Commission

H:\CD\WORDUSER\PCCASES\2004\SPC 04-09\Referral Letter SPA 04-09.doc