

January 5, 2006

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

**Subject: PC 05-43; 300-312 South Main Street (Prairie Path Villas)**

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. The petitioner is requesting that the Village of Lombard take the following actions on the Subject Property, located within the B5A Downtown Perimeter District:

1. Approve a conditional use for a planned development with the following companion conditional use, variations and deviations:
  - a) A conditional use from Section 155.417(G) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for a building of three (3) stories in height and an exception to allow for the building height to be forty-six and one-half feet (46.5') where a maximum of forty-five feet (45') is permitted.
  - b) A deviation from Section 155.417(J) and a variation from Section 155.508 (C)(6)(a) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for a reduction in the transitional building setback from twenty feet (20') to zero feet (0') along the west property line;
  - c) A deviation from Section 155.417(K) and a variation from Sections 155.508 (C)(6)(b) and 155.707 (A)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow for a reduction in the transitional landscape setback from ten feet (10') to zero feet (0') along the west property line;
  - d) A variation from Section 155.508(C)(6)(a) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow for a 1-foot corner side yard setback on the perimeter of a planned development where a 30-foot front and/or corner side yard is required in the abutting R5 General Residence District;
  - e) A variation from Sections 155.707(B)(3)(a) through (d) of the Zoning Ordinance eliminating the transitional landscape and fence requirements along the west property line;

- f) A variation from Sections 155.205(A)(2)(e) and 155.207 (A) and (C) to allow for building and fence/wall encroachments into the requisite clear line of sight area;
  - g) A deviation from Sections 153.211(F) and 153.508(B)(19)(a) of the Sign Ordinance to allow for awning and canopy signs to be displayed in conjunction with wall signs;
  - h) A deviation from Section 153.508(B)(19)(c) to allow for more than one wall sign per street frontage.
2. Approve a conditional use per Section 155.417(C)(13) and (I) to allow for an outdoor service (dining) area.
  3. Grant Site Plan Approval authority to the Lombard Plan Commission.
  4. Approve a development agreement for the subject property.

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition on December 19, 2005.

Sander Kaplan of SKJN Architekten Corp., architect for the project presented the petition. He referenced the development team member, including David George, developer and Tom Sanderson, the Civil Engineer. He described the location of the project and their proposal to construct a tudor-style mixed use building. The project will have seven retail units and 36 condominium units. Referencing the building elevations, the plan incorporates key design elements. The building design is intended to break up its perceived length and is separated with parapet walls, different types of chimneys, and three different types of brick. To break up the façade, some of the storefronts will be recessed. An arched passageway that leads to a parking area in the rear will be lit for security and there will be a potential dining area. The site will be landscaped on the back side of the walkway, so when you look through the passageway you see greenery.

The residential entrance at the corner of Main and Ash is at a 45 degree angle. The project has underground and secured parking for residents, consisting of 60 spaces and has access via an exterior ramp. He showed a site plan of the garage and first floor and the ramp on the diagram.

He then showed the materials board and described the building materials. They are trying to create an urban interesting feel. They set the building back about five feet along Main and one foot to the Ash Street side. Stormwater detention will be provided in a vault under the at-grade parking lot. The at-grade parking lot is accessed from Ash and they removed the curb cuts along Main. They are proposing an optional sidewalk access to the Prairie Path and the trash enclosure will be along the back side masonry enclosure with same materials as the building. The type of brick will be changed on back side of building since it is not as visible as the front elevation.

They requested relief in height from 45 to 46'5 due to the height of the Tudor-style roof. Regarding the west side yard, they are asking for a setback variation. The property to the west is zoned R5 - this is a transitional setback because they are different uses. They have a B5A zoning. They are proposing a zero foot setback so they can provide residential exposure along the Prairie Path. The neighboring property has a driveway and parking along the east side of their lot. The setback relief along Ash is in keeping with the B5A requirement and creating an urban feel. The northwest wing of the building is 100' from the adjacent lot line. The clear line of sight variation at Main and Ash will still provide accessibility to the right-of-way. The access driveway will operate in a one-way in and out, clockwise flow to relieve that site issue. The relief for the signage is for wall signs on canopy signage in a mixed format and for business identification purposes. The signage along the Prairie Path is for user identification and for northbound vehicular traffic.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for public comment. There were no comments in favor of or against the proposal. Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

William Heniff, Senior Planner, reiterated the requested actions, summarized the project and submitted the IDRC report to the public record in its entirety. He also passed out the petitioner's response to standards for the requested zoning actions.

He noted that Comprehensive Plan recommends that the Subject Property be developed as part of the Central Business District – Mixed Use Area. Staff finds that the petitioner's plan meets the intent of the plan for the downtown and downtown perimeter area in almost all aspects, including providing for a site layout and architecture that is compatible with a pedestrian scale environment.

He noted that this property is located within the B5A Downtown Perimeter Zoning District. This District was created in 2002 to reflect the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and is intended to foster development activity that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan objectives. The B5A district is similar in nature with the downtown B5 District in most respects, including zero foot setback requirements for most requisite yards. The current properties are being used for automotive uses. These automotive uses (car wash and auto repair) have never received conditional use approval from the Village and are therefore legal nonconforming. With the approval of this petition, the proposed development will be in compliance with Village Code.

He then discussed each of the zoning actions requested as part of the development petition. The proposed mixed-use residential/commercial concept is in keeping with the Zoning Ordinance provisions. By establishing a planned development, the Village can review individual components of the development to ensure compatibility with the intent of the downtown perimeter area and surrounding neighborhood. By creating a planned development, the petitioner is provided greater design flexibility while providing the Village with a mechanism to review and approve the design elements associated with the petition.

The petitioner is requesting relief to allow for a building of three (3) stories in height and an exception to allow for the building height to be forty-six and one-half feet (46.5') where a maximum of forty-five feet (45') is permitted. The additional height relief is requested in order to provide for the proposed roof design as shown on the petitioner's submittals. The petitioner's elevations show that the roof pitch is a key element to the overall building design. While the plans could be modified with a flat roof to meet the height limitations, the petitioner desires to incorporate the high pitched, Tudor-style roof design. In consideration of other established buildings and structures in close proximity to the subject property which are three-stories in height, the request for a three-story development can be conceptually supported.

The submitted plan requires relief to allow for a reduction in the transitional building setback from twenty feet (20') to zero feet (0') along the west property line that separates the subject property from the multiple family residential property at 21 West Ash Street. The B5A regulations have a zero foot side yard setback requirement. However, as the west property line abuts an R5 residentially-zoned property, a twenty-foot building setback is required. The relief is requested so that the petitioner will be able to carry the building the entire length of the southern property line, along the Prairie Path. Moreover, the building layout will provide for the below-grade parking structure. The existing one story brick building on the subject property is located 16.3 feet off of the west property line. The adjacent apartment building is located fifteen feet (15') west of the property line. The petitioner has provided elevational renderings of the west wall of the proposed building. To soften the impact of the development staff requested that the petitioner carry the architectural design features proposed for the building on the west wall as well.

He noted that the petitioner is seeking a relief to reduce the transitional landscape setback from ten feet (10') to zero feet (0') along the west property line and eliminate the transitional landscape and fence requirements along the west property line. As with the transitional building setback, the encroachment into the requisite yard is intended to ensure that adequate parking and circulation is provided within the development. The existing transitional landscape yard is non-existent on the subject property. Along the west property line, the existing car wash queue extends to the west property line. On the Yorkbrook Automotive (312 S. Main) site, the rear of the property has been used for storage purposes. Staff finds that the proposed development will not result in the loss of any existing landscaping along the west property line.

As the adjacent property is developed for multiple-family uses (similar to the subject property), the degree of screening between similar uses is not as great. Moreover, as the adjacent property is improved with a parking lot at the far east end of their property, there are no opportunities or need for additional plantings on the adjacent property. Therefore, staff recommends that in consideration of the relief additional solid fencing between six and eight feet in height should be provided along to the western property line, from the south property line to the thirty foot building setback line and adjacent to the entrance ramp and the outdoor parking area.

The B5A District has a zero-foot building setback provision. The rationale for this regulation is to encourage pedestrian oriented development, as opposed to strip commercial development.

The petitioner is intending to abide by the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan and push the building up to the front of the property. For most B5A properties, this can be done as a matter of right. However, the planned development regulations state that setbacks along the perimeter of a planned development should be no less than those required in the abutting zoning district. As such, a variation from Section 155.508(C)(6)(a) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow for a 1-foot corner side yard setback on the perimeter of a planned development where a 30-foot front and/or corner side yard is required in the abutting R5 General Residence District is added to the petitioner's request. Staff notes that the petitioner's plan will place the building close (approximately one foot) to the Ash Street property line, but as this portion of the building will still be located about 107 feet from the west property line, its impact on the adjacent residential property is significantly reduced. Staff notes that from an appearance perspective, the two existing buildings abutting Main Street and East Ash Street are also in close proximity to the property line (229 and 301 S. Main). When viewing the setback in the context of the overall Main Street corridor, the relief is reflective of the intent of the B5A District.

Mr. Heniff stated that while the Downtown B5 District does not have a clear line of sight requirement, the B5A District does require compliance with the 30-foot clear line of sight provisions. The petitioner's plan includes proposed encroachments into the clear line of sight area for the entrance/exit driveways as well as the Main/Ash corner. Regarding the Main/Ash corner, staff notes that the petitioner's elevations do provide for a smaller clearance area (21' x 21'). However, in review of the location of the Ash Street cross-section, the roadway is located north of the center-line of the right-of-way. Therefore, the actual clearance area should provide adequate visibility for motorists and pedestrians. The petitioner's plan also encroaches into the areas for the proposed access driveways. The eastern access driveway is proposed as an entrance drive only. As such, an actual conflict point will not exist. Regarding the exit point on the west side of the property, the proposed barrier wall and/or guard rails could create a partial encroachment into the corner side yard. However, staff recommends that stop signs be erected at the property line for each traffic movement exiting the site.

The petitioner has identified a number of locations in which wall signage may be installed on the property, as depicted on the plans. Based upon the submitted elevations, two deviations are required. The petitioner's request for a mixed sign package is intended to break up the scale of the building along Main Street to give it the appearance of multiple structures at a pedestrian level. The awning signage is meant to "frame" the center façade of the Main Street elevation, while the other wall sign elements identify the respective business establishments. Given that the building is over two-hundred feet (200') in length, the varying design of the proposed signage can be conceptually supported by staff.

With respect to the multiple signage request, staff notes that the proposed sign plans also propose signage along the south elevation, to provide an identifier for Prairie Path users as well as traffic heading northbound on Main Street. Staff also notes that while it is not guaranteed that the relief may not actually be utilized, this request is intended to identify those locations where signage may be placed if it is desired by a future tenant. Staff would be supportive of this request provided that the wall signage follows the same guidelines the Village has approved for many

recent developments, including the Main Street Place planned development. These provisions include the requirement that all wall signage to be installed on the building shall be of a uniform design and shall be placed on the building in accordance with the wall sign package as depicted on the submitted building elevations.

While definitive plans for the outdoor dining area would be subject to any future tenants that ultimately occupies the building, a conditional use is requested to allow for an outdoor service (dining) area. As shown on the initial rendering submittals, several tables are proposed to be located along the east side of the building. Moreover, the vaulted passageway provides a unique location for an additional outdoor dining opportunity, should a restaurant establishment lease one of the adjacent tenant spaces. The outdoor dining element is consistent with other outdoor dining elements approved by the Village in the downtown area. Staff can support this request, provided that at least four feet of sidewalk area is available at all times and that the dining component does not inhibit pedestrian traffic flow.

As part of a planned development submittal, the petition includes a request for site plan approval authority to be given to the Plan Commission. This would allow the Plan Commission to review signage or off-site parking deviation requests or to review and approve minor changes to the development plans should they arise. Staff supports this request, as it would allow the Commissioners to address minor changes in an expedient fashion.

As part of this project, a companion development agreement will be created and will be considered by the Village Board concurrent with the recommendation from the Plan Commission relative to the public hearing petition.

The property is located within the Central Business District and is bordered by commercial uses on the north and east. The proposed development orients the project toward Main Street and away from the adjacent multiple-family residential properties. In consideration of the planned development request, staff reviewed the site's design components.

As part of the site plan approval process, the petitioner has prepared building elevations for the project as well as a companion materials board. The elevation will give the Village a sense of what the project will look like upon completion. The building is proposed to incorporate many Tudor-style or later Tudorbethan style building elements. Based upon the initial review of the building elevations, the Plan Commission expressed conceptual support of the elevations at the October 17, 2005 workshop session, as it ties in with the elevations at 301 South Main Street. The submitted plans have been refined to carry the defined elements to each side of the building.

The plans have located the trash enclosure area to be located along the west side of the property. This location was selected as other sites on the property would not provide for easy trash collection, due to vehicle clearance or maneuvering issues. To ensure neighborhood compatibility and to minimize fly-dumping, all outdoor trash collection areas shall be screened on all four sides, with a masonry exterior compatible with the principal building and with a solid door. The dumpster areas shall also meet all Fire Department requirements.

Concurrent with a site plan approval application, the developer submitted a companion landscape plan. The plan shall meet the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, except as varied as part of this petition. He then references staff's conditions of approval associated with the landscaping. Staff also recommends that the lighting fixtures utilized for all private roadway lighting and parking lot lighting shall be uniform and shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of the Department of Community Development prior to installation.

He then discussed traffic issues. The Village's traffic consultant Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc. (KLOA) has performed an evaluation of the proposed project and offered a number of recommendations that were included within the staff report. Public Works also reviewed the proposed perpendicular parking spaces proposed within the Ash Street right-of-way and states that the angled spaces should not be installed within the public right-of-way. Moreover, the Ash Street right-of-way should maintain its twenty-eight foot (28') standard roadway profile.

The petitioner's submitted plans propose to create a streetscape environment consistent with the downtown area. To this end, staff will require any public improvements (i.e., sidewalk areas, street lighting, parkway trees, etc.) to be consistent with the downtown Lombard specifications. To ensure that sufficient width exists to accommodate pedestrian movements as well as public improvements, staff will also require the petitioner to provide the Village with a public access easement on the subject property for any areas in which the constructed sidewalk is less than four feet in width. Also, staff will request that the bicycle racks be relocated onto private property.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for comments from the Plan Commission members. Commissioner Sweetser stated that she liked how the developer addressed their comments from the workshop session. She asked staff that since the design shows the angle parking lot, is the petitioner aware they are recommending not to have that. Mr. Heniff said yes.

She then asked about the transitional yard relief. Should page 1 be modified to not have the fence? Mr. Heniff noted that item 1.e. in the request mirrors language in PC 05-42. However in this case, we are not requiring them to provide transitional landscaping at all.

After due consideration of the petition and the testimony presented, the Plan Commission found that the petition complies with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning, Sign and Subdivision and Development Ordinances and the planned development would be within the public interest. Therefore, the Plan Commission, by a roll call vote of 5 to 0, accepted the findings of the Inter-departmental Review Report as the findings of the Plan Commission and recommended to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of PC 05-43, subject to the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall enter into a development agreement with the Village setting forth the terms and conditions for development on the subject property, unless the Village Board determines that such an agreement is not necessary.

2. The petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the Preliminary Engineering Plat Packet, prepared by Sanda Consulting Group, LLC, dated October 26, 2005, the Landscape Plan, prepared by Sublime Design, dated November 14, 2005; the Development Plan Packet,, prepared by SKJN Architekten Corp., dated November 14, 2005; and the submitted Materials Board, prepared by SKJN Architekten Corp., dated December 1, 2005 and made a part of this petition; except as varied by the conditions of approval.
3. As part of the building permit submittal, the petitioner shall satisfactorily address the comments included as part of the Inter-Departmental Review Report.
4. The petitioner shall install fencing along the western property line, no greater than eight (8) feet and no less than six (6) feet in height. Design of the fencing is subject to the approvals of the Director of Community Development. The fencing shall meet all Village setback and clear line of sight requirements.
5. The petitioner shall locate any parking lot lighting at a height and location that minimizes neighborhood impact and shall meet the Village's photometric requirements. Moreover, the lighting within the parking garage area shall be recessed so as to not be visible or create a glare onto neighboring properties. Such additional lighting information shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of the Department of Community Development prior to installation.
6. The petitioner shall incorporate the recommendations of the Village's traffic consultant and Village staff into the final development plans for the site.
7. The right-of-way improvements shall be designed and installed to address the comments raised by engineering staff. The petitioner shall provide a public access easement on the subject property for any areas in which the constructed sidewalk is less than four feet in width.
8. The petitioner shall submit a Plat of Consolidation to the Village for review and approval. Said plat shall consolidate the subject properties into a single lot of record and shall be required concurrent with the building permit submittal.
9. The proposed wall and awning signs on the building shall be designed and located on the building consistent with the submitted plans.
10. The outdoor dining area shall be designed and operated in a manner that provide for at least four feet of width for pedestrians at all times.
11. The property shall be developed consistent with Village Code.

Furthermore, the Plan Commission recommends that site plan approval shall be granted for the subject property.



January 5, 2006  
PC 05-43  
Page 9

Respectfully,

**VILLAGE OF LOMBARD**

Donald F. Ryan  
Lombard Plan Commission

att-  
c. Petitioner  
Lombard Plan Commission

H:\CD\WORDUSER\PCCASES\2005\PC 05-43\Referral Letter.doc