VILLAGE OF LOMBARD INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW GROUP REPORT

TO: Lombard Plan Commission HEARING DATE: November 27, 2006

FROM: Department of PREPARED BY: William J. Heniff, AICP

Community Development Senior Planner

TITLE

<u>PC 06-34</u>; 543 E. Taylor Road (Madison Meadow Park): In order to provide for the approval of two 100-foot high personal wireless facility monopoles, the petitioner requests approval of the following zoning actions for the subject property located within the C/R Conservation/Recreation District:

- 1. Pursuant to Section 155.404 (C)(6) of the Zoning Ordinance, grant a conditional use for a planned development;
- 2. Grant a use exception and a variation from Section 155.508 (B)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance (Standards for Planned Developments with Use Exceptions);
- 3. Grant conditional uses as referenced in Section 155.206(A)(2) (General Requirements for Personal Wireless Facilities) with relief from the following subsections:
 - a. Section 155.206 (B)(2)(b)(1) (Maximum Height Requirements in Non-Residential Zoning Districts) providing for a monopole of greater then forty-five feet (45') in height;
 - b. Section 155.206 (B)(2)(e)(1) (Separation) to allow for the two monopoles to be located closer than five hundred feet (500').

GENERAL INFORMATION

T Mak:1a

reutioners:	1-MODIIE
	8550 West Bryn Mawr Avenue, Suite 100
	C1 ' II (0.601

Chicago, IL 60631

U.S. Cellular

1 Pierce Place, Suite 800

Itasca, IL 60143

Property Owner: Lombard Park District

Da4:4: a. a. a. a.

227 West Parkside Avenue

Lombard, IL 60148

Page 2

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Existing Zoning: C/R PD Conservation Recreation District, Planned Development

Existing Land Use: Local/Community Park

Size of Property: Approximately 85.79 Acres

Comprehensive Plan: Recommends open space and recreational use

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:

North: R2 Single-Family Residence District; developed as Single-Family Residences

South: R2 Single-Family Residence District; developed as Single-Family Residences

East: R2 Single-Family Residence District; developed as Single-Family Residences

West: R2 Single-Family Residence District; developed as Single-Family Residences;

and C/R Conservation/Recreation District; developed as a public elementary

school building now used for private school/day care purposes

ANALYSIS

SUBMITTALS

This report is based on the petitioner's Site Plan Booklet, which includes the public hearing application, response to the standards for conditional uses and planned developments with use exceptions, real estate analysis, RF analysis, photographs and site plans and details; prepared by KCS Corporation, dated October 9, 2006.

DESCRIPTION

The subject property is owned by the Lombard Park District and operated as Madison Meadow Park. The site includes a variety of recreational activities including ball fields and park/open space. The Park District in the process of considering executing an agreement with the petitioners (T-Mobile and U.S. Cellular) to provide for the construction of two monopole towers (one for each carrier) on the subject property. The petitioners are seeking approval of zoning

Page 3

actions consisting of a planned development and use exception and conditional use approvals to allow for the proposed 100-foot high wireless facility monopoles.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMENTS

ENGINEERING

The Private Engineering Services Division does not have any comments on the petition.

PUBLIC WORKS

Public Works does not have any comments on the petition.

BUILDING AND FIRE

The Bureau of Inspectional Services does not have any comments on the petition.

PLANNING

The development proposal consists of removing two existing 70-foot high light towers (the light poles in right-center field (U.S. Cellular) and in right field (T-Mobile) respectively) at the ball field immediately adjacent to the Taylor Road parking lot. In its place, two new 100-foot high monopole towers of a stealth design would be erected at the same location as the existing light towers. The lighting equipment will be reattached to the new monopoles. Unlike most monopole designs, these facilities will not have a triangular antenna mast. However, this will preclude the ability for co-location of wireless facilities on each tower.

Compliance with the Zoning Ordinance

Conditional Use for a Planned Development/Use Exception

Monopoles are not listed as permitted or conditional uses within the underlying C/R District. Therefore, the only way in which such towers could be erected would be to provide for a text amendment or grant approval of a planned development with a use exception for the towers. Staff is more supportive of the planned development approach as it would provide greater review authority to the Village and it would also allow the Village to consider the monopole request relative to the existing improvements on the subject property. Moreover, by establishing a planned development for the site any future activities on the property could be reviewed relative to any approvals included as part of this petition.

Page 4

The Zoning Ordinance allows cellular telecommunications antennae to be attached to buildings in all of the commercial, office, industrial and the general residence districts, subject to provisions set forth within code. Monopoles are limited in Section 155.206(B)(2)(a) to the I Limited Industrial District. The proposed use exception and companion variation to allow for industrial activities within another district procedurally covers this request.

Conditional Use Requests

Section 155.206(A)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance states that personal wireless service facilities that do not comply with the requirements of Section 155.206 may be authorized only in accordance with procedures for conditional uses.

The petitioners identified a hole in their coverage for wireless services as shown on their submitted radio frequency (RF) coverage plan. To address this issue, the petitioners sought locations that could provide for a wireless facility. In review of the area, there were no existing monopoles or tall structures that could provide sufficient coverage to the affected area and meet Ordinance requirements. As such, they are proposing to install new monopoles. Staff notes that there are no I Limited Industrial District zoned properties within the petitioner's RF gap area.

In review of available sites, they represented that they looked for areas with the greatest separation from residences. The Madison Meadows Park District site was selected as a desirable location because of the distance from residences and the ability to "hide" the monopoles within the confines of the existing light towers.

Setbacks

Monopoles have differing setback requirements above those required by other provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, as follows:

Personal wireless service facility towers shall be set back not less that one hundred five percent (105%) of the height of the tower from the nearest property line, except where the applicant provides certification from a structural engineer that the tower is designed to limit the area of damage in the event of collapse to the required setback, or that the tower has been designed to withstand winds to one hundred (100 mph) miles per hour.

The proposed T-Mobile monopole would be located approximately 540 feet from the nearest property line. The proposed U.S. Cellular monopole would be located approximately 649 feet from the nearest property line.

Personal wireless service facility towers shall be set back from the nearest property line of any residentially zoned property, such that the angle from the grade at the property line to the top of the tower shall not exceed fifty-six (56) degrees.

Page 5

Based upon the petitioner's plans, the closest residence is approximately 540 feet from the proposed monopole location, which would calculate to be an eleven percent angle from grade to the top of the monopole.

Personal wireless service facility towers shall not be located closer than five hundred feet (500') from each other.

The proposed monopoles are proposed to be located approximately 130 feet from each other. While the petitioner could meet code and not request relief from this item, it would result in the erection of a traditional co-location tower with a triangular antenna attachment. However, in order to minimize the visual impacts to the park and adjacent properties, the petitioner is seeking this relief in order to facilitate a design that blends the monopoles into the built environment.

<u>Landscaping & Screening</u>

Per code requirements, the area will be secured by a solid six-foot fence. To ensure that baseballs do not fly into the equipment area, the petitioner is also proposing a metal screened cage over the equipment. The petitioner stated their willingness to provide additional landscape plantings to meet the provisions set forth within code and per the requirements of the Park District.

Compatibility with Surrounding Uses

The principal use of the site will still be a community park facility. The stealth design is intended to ensure that the monopoles do not create a negative appearance on adjacent properties. Additionally, to meet the provisions of Section 155.206, the monopole will not be lit and it will be of a neutral color (gray metallic) to decrease its prominence on the property.

Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan

The Long-Range Plan Map of the Comprehensive Plan recommends that the property be used as open space. The principal use of the property will still remain as parks and open space, which is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The monopole, in terms of overall square footage, will remain ancillary to both the existing park facilities for the site.

Past Village Board Actions

Over the past couple of years, the Village considered two other zoning petitions for monopoles in C/R District property. PC 04-09 requested approval for a 100-foot monopole at Sunset Knoll Park. While the Plan Commission recommended denial of the petition, the Village Board approved the petition, noting that the proposed monopole would be located approximately 600 feet away from adjacent residences, and it would be screened by the Park District fleet maintenance building under construction at the time.

Page 6

PC 05-01 included provisions for a monopole at the Western Acres Golf Course. This request would provide for future rights for a monopole if the property was annexed into the Village. As an unincorporated property, the Park District already had rights for a monopole – they just wanted to preserve these rights. Ultimately, through deliberations with the Village Board, the monopole request was withdrawn.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff has reviewed the petitioner's response to standards and finds that the standards are being met. Staff is therefore supportive of the petition, based upon the following factors:

- 1. There are no I District properties within the RF hole in which a monopole could be erected and meet code;
- 2. There are no tall structures within the RF hole that would be able to provide coverage to the area:
- 3. The petitioner selected a site which provides the greatest amount of separation from adjacent residences; and
- 4. The proposed stealth design provides the minimum amount of impact within the park and on adjacent properties.

Based on the above, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee recommends that the Plan Commission make the following motion recommending approval of this petition:

Based on the submitted petition and the testimony presented, the requested conditional uses, use exception and variation included as part of the petition comply with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance and that granting the public planned development is in the public interest; and, therefore, I move that the Plan Commission recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of PC 06-34, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The monopoles shall be located and installed in compliance with the plans prepared by KCS Corporation, dated October 9, 2006 and submitted as part of this petition. Any modification to the petitioner's plan shall be considered a major change to the planned development.
- 2. That the petitioner shall apply for and receive approval of a building permit from the Village prior to starting installation of the monopole. Said monopole shall be subject to all relevant Village, state and federal regulations.

Plan Commission Re: PC 06-34 Page 7

Report Approved By:

3. The petitioner shall provide a final landscape plan showing the proposed landscape planting materials proposed as part of the project. The plan shall also meet the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

David A. Hulseberg, AICP
Assistant Village Manager/Director of Community Development

DAH/WJH:

att-

c. Petitioner