

May 19, 2005

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

Subject: PC 05-06; 210, 214, 215, 224 and 228 S. Lincoln Street & 205 W. Maple Street (St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church & School)

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. The petitioner requests that the Village take the following actions on the property located within the R2 Single Family Residence District:

1. Amend the Comprehensive Plan to designate the lots at 210, 214, 224 and 228 S. Lincoln Street and 205 W. Maple Street as Public and Institutional Use.
2. Approve an amendment to Ordinance 1816 granting approval of a conditional use for a noncommercial recreational building/community center.
3. Approve an amendment to Ordinances 4363 and 4363A granting approval of a conditional use for a religious institution and for a private elementary school.
4. Approve a conditional use for a planned development for all of the subject properties, with the following deviations and variations from the Zoning Ordinance, as follows:
 - a. A variation from Section 155.508 (C)(6)(a) and a deviation from Section 155.406 (F)(1) to allow for a front yard setback of eighteen feet (18') where thirty feet (30') is required;
 - b. A deviation from Section 155.406 (F)(2) to allow for a corner side yard setback of one foot (1') where twenty feet (20') is required;
 - c. A deviation from Section 155.406 (G) to allow for a building height of up to thirty-five feet (35') from grade, where thirty feet (30') maximum height is allowed by right; (this was withdrawn at the meeting)
 - d. A variation from Section 155.406 (H) and Section 155.508 (C) (7), reducing the minimum required open space below the minimum 75 percent requirement;

- e. A variation from Sections 155.708 and 155.709 reducing the requisite foundation and perimeter lot landscaping along the corner side yard; and
- f. A variation from Section 155.602 (C), Table 6.3 reducing the number of requisite parking spaces.

Chairperson Ryan called the order of the agenda. He indicated that this public hearing was a result of the May 19, 2005 Board of Trustees meeting whereby the Trustees remanded the petition back to the Plan Commission to address specific issues. He read the public hearing request in its entirety and asked staff to state the procedures.

William Heniff, Senior Planner, stated that the meeting will follow a special format due to the remand by the Board of Trustees who asked for specific direction as it relates to three issues:

1. The building elevations and massing represented in the petitioner's and the objector's presentations;
2. The exterior building materials and exterior wall treatments for the proposed school; and
3. The proposed location of the school relative to the Zoning Ordinance bulk requirements.

Mr. Heniff then outlined the format of the meeting:

1. Staff will outline the reason for the Special Meeting and will note the actions to be considered as part of the meeting. Staff will provide a very brief history of the petition and will summarize the zoning actions and development regulations associated with the petition. Once completed, an opportunity to cross-examine staff by anyone in the public will be provided. The cross-examination will be limited to the items as set forth by the Village Board.
2. Upon completion of staff cross-examination, an objector (John DeSalvo) will be offered the opportunity to present his presentation depicting the building height and massing. Once completed, an opportunity to cross-examine the objector by anyone in the public will be provided. The cross-examination will be limited to the items as set forth by the Village Board and shall relate specifically to his presentation.
3. Upon completion of the objector's cross-examination, the petitioner (St. John's) will be given an opportunity to review their petition to the Village as it specifically relates to the Village Board remand. Once completed, an opportunity to cross-examine the petitioner by anyone in the public will be provided. The cross-examination will be limited to the items as set forth by the Village Board and shall relate specifically to the petitioner's presentation.
4. After completion of the cross-examination, the public participation period will be closed. The Plan Commissioner's shall then be given an opportunity to discuss the petition. Questions may be asked to staff, the objector or the petitioner.
5. The Plan Commissioners shall then vote to deny, approve or approve the petition subject to conditions. The Commissioners do have the ability to add any conditions they deem

appropriate (regardless of whether they relate to bulk and mass issues) should they recommend approval.

6. The recommendation will be forwarded to the Village Board for consideration at their June 2, 2005 meeting.

Chairperson Ryan asked Mr. Heniff if he was the only presenter on behalf of the Village. Mr. Heniff answered yes. He was then sworn in.

Mr. Heniff began his PowerPoint presentation, which included an explanation of the case history, the petitioner's requested actions with accompanying diagrams, and the actions that were to be taken. In conclusion, he indicated that any issues beyond the scope of what is outlined tonight must be shared with the Board of Trustees and is not part of the discussion this evening.

Chairperson Ryan asked if there was anyone who wanted to cross-examine staff and his presentation as it pertains to those three items to stand and be sworn in.

John Avila, 225 W. Maple, Lombard, had questions relative to the diagram with the red lines and blue shading and asked if there could be a structure located there. Mr. Heniff answered that yes there could be a building anywhere within the buildable area depicted in blue. He then pointed to the areas that necessitated relief.

Carl Prindiville, 219 W. Ash, Lombard, asked for the names of the institutions that were cited as examples of previously approved projects. Mr. Heniff indicated that he mentioned Christ the King, First Church of Lombard and Sacred Heart.

May Anstee, 219 W. Maple, Lombard, asked if there were any variance requests declined by staff. Mr. Heniff indicated that staff works with petitioners to minimize relief before they submit a petition. When the petition came to public hearing, staff recommended approval subject to conditions.

Ms. Anstee clarified that staff approved every variation. Mr. Heniff stated that staff only makes a recommendation. This petition was recommended for approval subject to conditions and cited staff's desire of masonry as an example.

Ms. Anstee asked about green space and referenced the same diagram. She first clarified that the light blue is where they could have built but staff recommended that they move the building to the east? She then asked what percentage of green space they would have had if they left the building in the light blue. Mr. Heniff answered it was in the 33-34 percent range.

Ms. Anstee asked if the driveway to the north is considered green space. Mr. Heniff indicated that would be counted as part of lot area coverage so it would not be included in the calculation of green space.

Chairperson Ryan asked if there was anyone else that wanted to cross-examine staff. Hearing none he indicated that John DeSalvo's presentation would be next.

John DeSalvo, 115 S. Charlotte, Lombard stated he is also representing his mother who lives at 220 W. Ash, Lombard, which is the property immediately to the west and adjacent to the project. He explained that he had a couple of images and had gotten the information from the neighborhood to make the massing study that he did. In a PowerPoint format, he showed the characteristics of the neighborhood traveling west on Maple Street as well as traveling west on Ash Street toward St. John's. He also showed various three-dimensional views of how the proposed building would appear with a 35' and 28' building height, as well as the footprint of St. John's with a 28' building height.

Mr. DeSalvo indicated that this presentation was prepared after the last public hearing as a result of the petitioner's comments. He knew that his initial presentation would be presented to the Board of Trustees at their meeting and he did not want any misinterpretation regarding the building height. He indicated that having a 28' box in the middle of the block was not characteristic of a residential neighborhood and that setting something back has nothing to do with height. He mentioned that the petitioner used peak heights not roof heights when comparing height differences. In his opinion setbacks and a 7' height difference does not matter with respect to the neighborhood.

Chairperson Ryan asked if there was anyone who wanted to cross-examine Mr. DeSalvo to stand and be sworn in.

Jim Urish, 216 W. Maple, Lombard, referred the slide showing the footprint with the 28' building height. He asked if he was aware that part of the building would be 32' while his presentation represents the whole building at 28'. Mr. DeSalvo answered he was aware that the gymnasium would be 32' in height but since he wasn't sure where the exact location of the gym was with respect to the building, he did not want to make any misrepresentations, so he did the whole building at 28'.

Mr. Avila asked if he had any input or assistance with his diagrams from the project architect or St. John's or if it was something he constructed himself based on the information provided at the meetings? Mr. DeSalvo stated it was his own drawing based on material he had. The elevations, massing, and the footprint did not change.

Mr. Avila commented that since he did this on his own and in order to be completely accurate, would it be necessary to have more resources than what you have had at your disposal? Mr. DeSalvo indicated that based on the information that was made public, yes, he tried to make it as accurately as possible and lower than proposed. The setback and height are most important but he was somewhat expecting that a three dimensional model would have been done. He was not in a position to make a three-dimensional model of the whole site himself.

Patrick Brosnan, of Legat Architects, 2015 Spring Rd., Oak Brook, was next to cross-examine Mr. DeSalvo.

1. Referring to the tour of the neighborhood he commented that it was lopsided as he only shot the residences. He asked what he meant when he said "neighborhood" and asked for his definition of the same.
Mr. DeSalvo answered that the neighborhood is bordered by Lincoln, Ash and Maple. The houses in the area on Maple and to the north are even nicer and grander, east of Lincoln is St. John's which is the largest structure. His definition of neighborhood is the people who live within the area and the fabric of the buildings and the houses.
2. Mr. Brosnan asked if there are any other institutions or large brick buildings in the neighborhood. Mr. DeSalvo answered that there are other buildings, such as the First Church on Main and Maple but that was not comparable. Sacred Heart is there which is an established church but it is contained on one corner near the railroad tracks. Once you cross the tracks it is a different type of neighborhood, which has been built up with condos. The St. John's neighborhood has Lilacia Park as a separation.
3. Mr. Brosnan asked if he attended any of the neighborhood meetings and if he requested a model? Mr. DeSalvo answered that he did not attend those meetings but was given information from his mother. He did not request a model.

Chairperson Ryan then asked if there was anyone else who wanted to cross-examine Mr. DeSalvo. Hearing none, he indicated that St. John's presentation dated May 23, 2005 would be next.

Joe Jaruseski, 1107 Michelle Lane, Lombard, gave the presentation overview. Their plans have been modified to make them more compatible. All elevations have been modified and they have updated massing renderings. The entire building is to be masonry and they brought material samples. He concluded by stating that Patrick Brosnan would continue.

Patrick Brosnan, Architect for St. John's, then continued and reviewed the various neighbor's 32 and 28' building height views and perspectives, the Ash Street view, the various street elevations, site plan setbacks, height perception, and neighborhood compatibility components.

Chairperson Ryan requested that if anyone wanted to cross-examine the petitioner to stand up and be sworn in.

Sharon Herlache, 123 S. Elizabeth, Lombard, asked if the amount of landscaping shown at the 2.6 feet area located between the sidewalk and the building was the amount of landscaping going in and if the sizes of the trees represented were the actual sizes being installed or was that at maturity.

Mr. Brosnan indicated the 1' foot setback allows 30" of plantings under the windows but the rest is much larger.

Scott Czierkes, Legat Architects, 2015 Spring Rd., Oak Brook, stated he was working with the landscape architect and the plantings shown would be after one year of actual planting of that species. They did not want to show it when it goes in nor 20 years down the road.

Ms. Herlache asked the name of the landscape architect. Mr. Czierkes answered Couture Landscaping.

Linda Bohl, 213 W Ash, referred to Slide 10 and questioned the right to build. That red line shows where the setbacks are. What percentage of that would be included for 75 percent green space and what size building would you truly have if following all variations. Mr. Brosnan stated that the red line shows the setbacks and the area within the red line is the buildable area.

Ms. Bohl asked if they had the ability to build something of that size. Mr. Brosnan stated that in a planned development they might.

Ms. Bohl asked for the definition of buildable area and if anything could be built? Mr. Heniff stated the requirements for lot area coverage in an R2 district. The petitioner is proposing a planned development so there are criteria. So when you look at the red outline if that were to cover a greater portion than green space that would be required. It would be greater than code would allow but no setback variations would be needed.

Jim Urish, 216 W. Maple, Lombard, stated that the gym is small in comparison to the total. He asked if they had the volume and how wide and deep the gym would be. Mr. Brosnan stated that the gymnasium would be 7,100 square feet and the remaining school area would be 43,000 square feet. Mr. Czierkes answered the proportions is 70 x 100 ft.

Mr. Urish referred to slide 8 and asked if that was the Meek residence behind the trees covered up. Mr. Brosnan answered that it was. Mr. Urish asked if that was the house that was left out of the previous presentation. Mr. Brosnan referred to the next slide and indicated that the Meek house was shown and the trees are in front of the house. Mr. Urish asked if they had any slides showing the view from further east. Mr. Brosnan answered that they do not have them tonight.

May Anstee, 219 W. Maple, Lombard, asked when they modified their plans in response to the neighbor's issues, did the length or width of the building change? Mr. Brosnan answered no, just the height and materials have changed. Ms. Anstee asked if they considered lowering the level of the building. Mr. Brosnan answered that they did.

Ms. Anstee asked why that was not accepted or possibly sinking part of the building. Mr. Brosnan stated that there are ways to sink a building but the idea was to build a fully accessible building. He indicated how it would be difficult for someone to access the gym if sunken and described how they would have to access ramps and retrace steps to get to the gym.

Ms. Anstee asked how the height difference was achieved? Mr. Brosnan answered that working with a design committee to decrease the allowable area. They could change the type of steel to be used to accommodate the request.

Ms. Anstee asked what the difference was in elevation height. Mr. Brosnan answered 31' versus 32'.

Ms. Anstee mentioned there was a slope to the property. Mr. Brosnan answered that earth will be removed and the school won't be built on a hill. When they talk about height they refer to it after the grading is finished. He stated they wanted to keep less than 2'.

Ms. Anstee stated that they mentioned perspectives from a bird's eye point of view and asked if they ever considered the neighbor's point of view. Mr. Brosnan stated absolutely and showed the height diagram.

Ms. Anstee asked about the width of the building. Mr. Brosnan stated they showed this at the last meeting.

Ms. Anstee asked about the landscaping plans on the west side of the school. Mr. Brosnan stated that the landscaping plan has been submitted to the Plan Commissioners.

Ms. Anstee asked them to identify which trees they were planting as every drawing that they have shown includes trees that already exist on the lot line. Mr. Brosnan indicated on the diagram what landscaping they were adding.

Ms. Anstee inquired as to whether they added windows on the northwest side. Mr. Brosnan stated since that part of the building would house the mechanical room, windows are not appropriate in those areas.

Ms. Anstee asked about the masonry. Mr. Brosnan stated that there are a variety of masonry products today. The dark areas on the elevation are brick and the lighter areas are precast masonry.

Ms. Anstee asked if they considered the impact on the neighborhood or if he knew the history of the neighborhood. Mr. Brosnan answered that they did.

Karen Ness, 219 W. Ash, Lombard inquired about St. John's right to build a school on this property. She asked what law or document exists that gives St. John's or anyone else the right to build on a single-family property and asked if he was an attorney. Mr. Brosnan answered that he was not an attorney but an architect. He indicated that staff pointed out that in the R1 or R2 District schools can be built, so staff is telling us that it is appropriate.

John Avila 225 W. Maple, Lombard, thanked the Plan Commissioners and architects for being patient. He asked how they have changed their plans since the last Plan Commission meeting on April 18 whereby the petition was denied. Mr. Brosnan indicated that the building design has not changed except for the materials. He stated that the scale is very important. The Commissioners made the suggestion of using more brick and other masonry components to avoid looking at concrete panels. By utilizing texture and rhythm you can change the perceived feel of the building height. The majority of the variances were suggested by staff.

Mr. Avila then summarized that the dimensions have remained the same as has the location but the masonry has been improved. Mr. Brosnan stated that the building is now all masonry.

Chairperson Ryan asked if there was anyone else who wanted to cross-examine the petitioners. Hearing none, he indicated that the meeting was open to questions and comments by the Commissioners.

Commissioner Sweetser indicated that the changes that have been made are in response to some of the issues raised by the public and the Commissioners. Her question was to the architect. She referenced the west elevation and asked him to identify what foliage, if any, that does not currently exist and what would be part of the new landscaping. Mr. Czierkes answered that their intent was to show all of the trees, the ones west of the darker trees are currently existing. They wanted to show how the building would fit into the neighborhood. There will be additional relief such as smaller plantings and there will be lower plantings under the windows as shown on the landscape plan. He then mentioned four shade trees that align the south property line and the 6' cedar fence.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if the two smaller trees are existing. Mr. Czierkes stated that all are there now. All occur around the west property line.

Commissioner Olbrysh commented that feelings are running high on both sides and the Commissioners appreciate the professionalism and demeanor exhibited by all. He stated that he did not have a problem with the proposed exterior materials as the petitioner has made a vast improvement since the initial workshop and in response to the Plan Commissioners' and neighbor's comments. He understands the setbacks and the issue is a big building, massing and elevations. He indicated he has spent many afternoons going around the building and what he sees is the Village Public Library, Calvary Episcopal Church, as well as Sacred Heart and their new parish center. Commissioner Olbrysh agreed that this building would be located in a residential area but a religious residential area and a compromise needs to be reached. After taking another look at what St. John's wants to do and the area surrounding it, he finds the proposed plan acceptable.

Commissioner Burke stated that he had several questions for the architect. The objectors asked the question of what percentage of the footprint is 32' tall versus 28'. Your response was 7,000 square feet, which seem deceiving because it is 7,000 off a footprint, the footprint is not 43,000 square feet. How many square feet is the gym compared to rest of building? Mr. Brosnan calculated that the gymnasium would be about 30.8 percent of the overall ground floor area.

Mr. Brosnan indicated that was correct and went to the slide with the R2 building height requirements and explained the building heights. Discussion then continued as to where the proposed building roof would be 22 feet, 28 feet and 32 feet.

Commissioner Burke answered he was looking for the change from precast to masonry but it is concrete block. Commissioner Burke asked if precast is more expensive than concrete block, requires less maintenance, and is easier to erect. Mr. Brosnan answered no.

Commissioner Burke asked why the senior center lot is being used in the calculations. Mr. Heniff answered that they have the same property ownership and do not have to have separate lots. This lots consists of several lots of record and proceeded to show them on the diagram.

Commissioner Burke asked about the right to build with a conditional use in an R2 district and not having to adhere to those setbacks and restrictions. He then noted the Citgo station on Madison and Main and the restrictions placed on them. Mr. Heniff answered that conditional uses are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. The Village has looked at how the impact will be on adjacent properties. If they stayed in the buildable area of the lot, but for the open space requirements, there would be no variations needed for the property. If meeting all building setback requirements, the Village does not have the authority to look at design elements. Village Counsel suggested that as relief to the requested yards is part of the petition, this would enable us to look at the aesthetic attributes in order to make recommendations about the building design.

Commissioner Burke also commented on the professionalism of all and apologized to the petitioner stating that he was not inferring that they were trying to be deceptive about the footprint.

Mr. Heniff referenced Exhibit A.4.00, which shows the building heights north of the gym in the St. John's submittal packet. He stated there is a small segment shown that drops down to 22' but the lion's share is 28'.

Chairperson Ryan asked if that was the lower part of the structure? Mr. Heniff indicated yes it would require several steps up.

Chairperson Ryan asked for confirmation from the petitioner that what is represented in the darker color on all four sides of the building will be brick. Mr. Brosnan answered yes.

Commissioner Flint commended St. John's for their efforts in breaking up the building mass. He asked if there was any way they would reduce the gym height to 30' even though he understands about being accessible. He stated that the building is positioned that least impacts residents. He stated that using the masonry has helped reduce the impact. Mr. Brosnan stated that if the Commissioners felt that 30' was more appropriate, they would agree to lower the gym height.

Commissioner Burke indicated that while he appreciates the masonry, he still believes that the building is too big for the site, the mass is too great and the variances requested for setbacks, landscaping and building height are too numerous for an R2 district. He believes it is a wonderful project and would be a great asset to the community but not at the expense of the neighbors as it will have a big impact on the lives and the value of their homes.

Commissioner Sweetser stated that this is a challenging petition and explained that the Commissioners need to look at the entire community. As much as we would like to put ourselves in individual situations, we cannot because we are bound to say what is best for the community. She agreed with the description that Commissioner Olbrysh expressed relative to the Maple/Ash corridor. How one experiences a building is the ultimate measure and while a bird's eye view is important for some, rarely is anyone going to see the building from that sustained point of view. She agreed that although masonry helps to minimize the building mass, landscaping also accomplishes the same and suggested that the petitioner provide more trees that, when mature, would grow to the height of the west elevation so that the building would be further buffered.

Chairperson Ryan restated to the Commissioners that they could make a motion of approval based on the conditions set forth previously, add conditions, recommend denial, or not even use the prior recommendation.

On a motion by Commissioner Olbrysh and seconded by Commissioner Flint, the petition by a 4-1 vote, was recommended for **approval** to the Board of Trustees subject to the 8 conditions set forth in the staff report dated April 18, 2005 as well as adding conditions relative to additional landscaping on the west elevation, the building height of the gym be reduced to 30 feet, and that masonry be used on all four sides of the building.

Mr. Heniff then referenced the petitioner's material boards showing the brick styles and colors. He indicated that staff had not had the opportunity to look at the samples prior to the meeting and given the amount of context of this petition, asked for direction about the design or any comments that could be related back to staff or the Board of Trustees.

The Commissioners discussed the issue and felt there should be contrasting colors. Commissioner Flint suggested they look at a 4' base to break down the scale and also incorporate some banding. Commissioner Sweetser felt they should not get into specific colors but should have something that would blend with the St. John's campus as well as the neighborhood. If the split masonry is harder to maintain then that should be minimized. Mr. Heniff thanked the Commissioners for their input and stated he would share those comments with the Board of Trustees. He will match up those shades with the church and school to see if there is some unifying theme.

Chairperson Ryan personally thanked both sides for their professionalism and politeness to each other while working through trying times and he complimented all for what has been done. He stated they all handled themselves very well and hoped St. John's will work with the neighbors and try to come up with the best project possible.

Respectfully,

VILLAGE OF LOMBARD

Donald Ryan, Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission

att-

c. Petitioner
Lombard Plan Commission