

April 7, 2005

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

**Subject: PC 05-05: 610-690 East Butterfield Road (Northern Baptist
Theological Seminary)**

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. This petition requests approval of a major change to a conditional use for a planned development and for an educational institution, as set forth in Ordinances 4362 and 4691. This petition will amend the approved campus master plan to provide for a new administration building located within the OPD Office Planned Development District.

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition on March 21, 2005. Eric Nolin, 260 Coe Road, Clarendon Hills, representative of the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary (NBTS); Bill Sitton, 265 N. Carter Street, Palatine; and Adam Maier, 233 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago, both of Rada Architects, Inc., introduced themselves and presented the petition.

Mr. Nolin began the presentation by indicating that NBTS was requesting a modification of the planned development in order to build a new administration building on campus. He explained that the existing administration building as well as one part of one of the residence halls would be demolished. He referred to a display board showing the existing plan and indicated the buildings to be razed. The new building will be located in the same position as one of the wings of a residence hall and will occupy the corner of the two existing buildings. Mr. Nolin explained that the purpose of having the new building is to update the facilities with a current look and to better connect the campus. He then referred to the displayed elevations and explained that similar materials were to be used for the new building that will match the existing buildings. This included precast for the trim piece.

Mr. Nolin stated that additional changes to the planned development included on their submitted plans include roadway and parking modifications and potential future educational and housing buildings on campus. As each of these additional buildings are designed, NBTS will come back to the Plan Commission for site plan approval. Currently, they are just requesting that they be allowed as part of the planned development in the future.

Bill Sitton concluded the presentation by indicated that the existing parking will be reduced on Maxant Drive and replaced with new parking as shown on the plans.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for public comment. There was no one to speak for or against this petition. He then requested the staff report.

William Heniff, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. He summarized the key points in the staff report and restated their request. He referred to the Inter-Departmental Review comments within the staff report and specifically noted utility rerouting of existing utility lines, which will be coordinated and approved by staff along with the recommended public utility easements.

From a planning standpoint there were four items addressed as part of the requested amendment:

1. The new administration building which will be a 16,000 square foot, more modern two-story building with three elevations.
2. A future chapel building and the potential for another administration building. Staff has placed a condition that any future plans come back to the Plan Commission for site plan approval so specifics can be addressed.
3. Additional student housing to the north of Maxant Drive. The size and number will be a function of demand and currently have not been identified.
4. Minor changes to parking areas and companion landscaping and tweaks to Maxant Drive.

Mr. Heniff noted that in 1997 the master plan proposed a basketball court – they are now proposing a small garage instead.

Mr. Heniff stated that the Comprehensive Plan recommends public and institutional uses for the property and being that the amendment only modifies the layout and design of the buildings and structures on the property, the proposed amendment is compatible. The proposed administration building follows the concept of the surrounding land uses, which includes offices and retail commercial, and therefore is compatible with the surrounding land uses.

Mr. Heniff outlined the planned development history and the initial campus plan, which addressed their existing campus buildings and included the establishment of the Lindner Center.

Re: PC 05-05
April 7, 2005
Page 3

He then addressed the compatibility with the approved planned development noting specific comments about the site plan as they related to traffic circulation and parking. He mentioned that Maxant Drive is proposed to bend to the east and have a drop off lane. The current parking is located off of Maxant Drive which will be removed and a new segregated parking area will be added on the west side. A separate drive aisle running east of Maxant Drive will be added to provide access to 13 new parking spaces. Staff supports this configuration as it removes any parking and traffic conflicts from Maxant Drive.

Noting that the petitioner brought a materials board, he asked them to display the same. He described the brick elevations and glass element tones and stated they are compatible with the brick color. He mentioned the interesting architectural features that they have tied in. The petitioner has also completed a master landscaping plan which includes clustered tree plantings along Maxant Drive as well as within parking lot landscape islands.

Lastly, Mr. Heniff indicated that staff recommends approval subject to the four conditions noted in the staff report.

Chairperson Ryan then asked if there was anyone in the audience who had any questions. Hearing none he opened the meeting for discussion among the Plan Commission members.

Commissioner Olbrysh referred to last month's workshop and commented that there were two things he really liked that the petitioner had incorporated into their plans. The first was the use of similar building materials to make the project flow and the second was the reconfiguration of the parking, which eliminated the need to back up into the main drive, which was always dangerous.

Commissioner Sweetser stated that she thought the plan was interesting and ties well together and questioned how many levels there were. Mr. Nolin indicated that there were three levels, one entryway and two levels.

Commissioner Sweetser noted that there are two sidewalk connections from the administration building to the Lindner Center. However, one of the walkways is not clearly defined and questioned if the north sidewalk could be fully established and demarcated. Mr. Nolin indicated that the main pathway will be marked in front of the building and the other is a secondary pathway. He stated that their intent is that it will be carried through on both.

Commissioner Burke referenced the exhibits presented at the meeting and noted that they differed from the elevations noted in the plans. Mr. Nolin then displayed the elevations and noted the differences in greater detail to the Commissioners.

Chairperson Ryan referred to a previous workshop session that discussed the proposal. He indicated that the petitioner has addressed the Commissions' questions and comments and have done a nice job incorporating those into their plans.

Re: PC 05-05
April 7, 2005
Page 4

Commissioner Melarkey asked if the second level would be set further inside the first level. Mr. Nolin indicated that the second level floor plan is smaller and is set further back. Commissioner Melarkey then asked if there was open access. Mr. Nolin indicated that there is a student lounge which exits onto a terrace with a roof.

After due consideration of the petition and the testimony presented, the Plan Commission found that the requested Plan Development amendment complies with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance; and, therefore, moved to accept the findings of the Inter-departmental Review Report as the findings of the Plan Commission and recommended to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of PC 05-05, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the Master Plan Exhibit, Site Plan of Administration Center Area, First & Second Floor Interior Building Plans, and Massing Studies, prepared by Rada Architects, Inc., dated February 14, 2005, updated March 21, 2005, as well as the Landscape Plans prepared by Hitchcock Design Group, dated March 4, 2005 and submitted as part of this request.
2. That the petitioner's building improvements shall be designed and constructed consistent with Village Code and shall also address the comments included within the IDRC report.
3. That any future proposed buildings approved by the amended master campus plan (i.e., the new residence dwellings and chapel building) shall be submitted to the Plan Commission for review and approval as part of a site plan approval application.
4. That the petitioner shall dedicate a thirty-foot (30') public utility easement to be placed over any existing or proposed public watermain on the subject property, where practicable. The petitioner shall also submit a plat of abrogation for any existing watermain easements that would be located within the proposed building footprints. The final location and placement of the watermains and their corresponding easements shall be reviewed and approved by the Departments of Community Development and Public Works.

Respectfully,

VILLAGE OF LOMBARD

Donald F. Ryan
Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission

c. Petitioner