

December 6, 2007

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

**Subject: PC 07-38: 19W070 16<sup>th</sup> Street (Montini High 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 subject property:

1. Annex the property to the Village of Lombard immediately following contiguity between the Village corporate limits and the subject property; and upon approval of the annexation of the subject property:
  - a. Grant a conditional use for a planned development for the existing campus which would establish a master campus plan;
  - b. Grant a conditional use for an educational institution (senior high school) and its related educational, social, athletic, theatrical and other attendant uses;
  - c. Grant approval of a conditional use for the accessory uses and buildings located on the subject property; and
  - d. Grant a deviation from Section 155.210(A)(3) to provide for future light poles for the existing ball fields.
2. Grant site plan approval authority to the Lombard Plan Commission.

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition on November 19, 2007. Chairperson Ryan mentioned that the public hearing pertains to zoning actions requested by the petitioner. The Plan Commission does not have the authority to consider any annexation actions will be discussed at the December 6 Village Board meeting. He asked that all comments be restricted to only the zoning actions being requested.

Jim Segredo, President of Montini Catholic High School, 19W070 16<sup>th</sup> Street, Lombard, presented the petition. He indicated that their petition relates to their long-term campus plan which has been worked on over the last several years. This long-term campus plan will occur in a 10-12 year time period which will be broken into three phases. Phase I is the most ambitious. It will include demolishing the building on campus off the back parking lot known as Dominica Hall. Mr. Segredo then gave the history of Dominica Hall. He mentioned that it currently houses the art and guidance center but was not built as an education use. They will demolish this existing building and build a new building which will serve their academic needs and provide security. He then described the uses that would occur in the new building. Phase II would include renovating the HVAC system in the school building and Phase III would occur sometime in 2016 which would include renovating the front of DeLaSalle Hall, building a new student alumni center, building a new physical fitness center off of the gym as well as making improvements to the athletic fields. He believed that the project will not negatively impact the neighborhood and no building will occur on 16<sup>th</sup> Street. The building will be one story and will match the design of the current school campus. The intent of the building is not to increase student enrollment but to include 6 science labs as the existing building was built in 1966. Mr. Segredo provided the current enrollment numbers and mentioned that if this phase is successful their enrollment will be somewhere around 680-700 students. He mentioned that they are a private school who want to remain competitive and have the ability to give their students the very best. He believed that as the enrollment numbers would not significantly change, there would be no impact on traffic. He also stated they would maintain the architectural integrity of the campus.

Addressing stormwater issues, they will provide additional stormwater retention on campus on the northwest corner. Topographical surveys of the area show that Montini is lower in elevation than neighboring properties and stormwater flows down their west drive and along 16<sup>th</sup> Street and the detention will help will the flow before it gets to the detention pond.

Michael Devin, attorney at Deutsch, Levy & Engel and representing Montini High School discussed the zoning actions and provided the Commissioners with an additional response to standards. Mr. Segredo was specific in the plans for Montini. He believed that the conditional use for a planned development for the campus is the proper and appropriate way to address the situation. Their intent is not to change the use but maintain it as it has been since 1966 and to modernize the school and make it vibrant and competitive. The planned development of the campus will not impact the neighborhood properties in any negative fashion but will present a viable enhance to the community. Montini has been the predominant use in the area. The uses surrounding it largely came into place with Montini already operating in that capacity. He asked the Plan Commission to approve the petition.

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting for public comment. Speaking regarding the petition were:

December 6, 2007

PC 07-38

Page 3

Andy Bonomo, 1700 S. School Avenue, Lombard, indicated that he needed clarification regarding the public notice which mentioned a pre-annexation agreement. He referred to the public notice which mentioned the request to annex the property to the Village immediately following contiguity between the Village corporate limits and the subject property. He asked if they would have a chance to ask questions at the Board of Trustees meeting on December 6.

George Wagner, legal counsel to the Plan Commission, answered that there will be a public hearing at the December 6 Village Board meeting. The actions being requested tonight will be incorporated into the public hearing with the pre-annexation agreement. If these actions are approved tonight, you will be able to ask questions at the December 6 meeting. Mr. Bonomo indicated that the residents in the area had other concerns. The first is regarding the flooding issues and the approval from the County for the wetlands and the water runoff. He then asked about the deviation to provide for future light poles for the existing ball fields.

Chairperson Ryan stated that the petitioner will respond to that shortly.

Bill Neurauter, 1604 S. Meyers Road, Lombard, expressed concern about overflow parking that spills into their neighborhood and how people park on both sides of the street. He indicated that these existing issues happen when there are athletic events especially during football and basketball season. This situation makes it difficult for emergency vehicles to get through because they park on both sides of street. In response, York Township erected temporary no parking signs on one side of the street but this is an issue that should be addressed for the future. The next concern was lights. He asked whether the lights will affect the adjacent communities especially to the north of the football field as there are houses in close proximity to the school property. He was also concerned about the noise being carried through the neighborhood as well the amount of green space. He was concerned about the green space because before the building addition was built, the County came to the neighbors adjacent to the property and asked if there was a flooding problem. At that time, the neighbors indicated to the County there was not. Since the addition was put on, some of the people in the area have now been getting water. Lastly, he mentioned a document he had seen about Lombard not wanting to annex their neighborhood. He indicated he would have that addressed at the December 6 meeting.

Scott Shier, 19W115 17<sup>th</sup> Place, Lombard. Mr. Shier questioned the difference in square footage between the existing structure and the proposed new structure. He also wanted to know the specific number of parking spaces that they would be granted if the variance is allowed. He also was concerned about the current parking situation and stated the difficulties he had getting out of his driveway. Mr. Sheir then asked how much of a variance they are obtaining for green space and drainage in addition to the detention they are being required to put in.

Mr. Segredo then rebutted, noting the following:

- Flooding issues were just recently brought to light relative to the new addition which was built in 2001. He indicated that the past summer and fall has seen an unusually, tremendous amount of rainfall. Montini is below the elevation line and the residents are all higher than us.

- Regarding parking, we intend to follow all the ordinances of DuPage County and Lombard for parking and green space. He indicated that their drives in the parking lot are currently two-way. We will be giving up some spaces due to the detention they put in on the northwest corner of the facility - they will do one way lanes and have parallel parking to pick up additional parking.
- Regarding lighting, they will follow all ordinances as far as diffusing them. He stated that at the north property line, there is mature landscaping and a lot of brush and feel the lighting won't have any effect on these neighbors. The south field is set back from 16<sup>th</sup> Street so that will not effect them either.
- Relative to the on-street parking issues, Mr. Segredo indicated that they are aware of them and they are willing to work the problems. He mentioned that York Township called them and suggested that no parking signs be erected on the east end of the street and they had no problem with that.

Chairperson Ryan asked about the difference in square footage of the existing building versus the new building. Mr. Segredo answered they were adding 14,000 square feet. The building is in the middle of a large area of land and to the south is a courtyard. There is a lot of green space to the south. The area has enough green space to cover that area.

Commissioner Sweetser stated that it would be interesting to know what the required parking spaces would be. William Heniff, Senior Planner, stated that the parking requirements would be tied to the student population. Currently they are following DuPage County regulations. If annexed into the Village the standard would be 1 parking space per employee plus 1 parking space per 8 students. Montini has indicated they are not expecting an increase in students. When their petition comes forward, they will need to provide their student population to ensure that they are in compliance with the ordinance.

William Heniff presented the staff report. The petitioner is seeking approval of an annexation agreement with the Village of Lombard. As the agreement includes provisions to provide zoning approvals as part of this petition, the Plan Commission is being requested to make a recommendation through the public hearing process for the subject property, as noted in the public hearing notice above. The requested zoning actions would only be effective upon approval of the annexation agreement by the Village Board and annexation of the property into the Village Corporate limits, once the property is contiguous to the Corporate limits.

Regarding the IDRC comments, he noted that the Village and DuPage County have each adopted the DuPage County Stormwater and Floodplain Ordinance. If the proposed site improvements are constructed after annexation occurs, the petitioner will be required to provide stormwater detention improvements, per Village Code and permitting requirements. If the campus improvements occur prior to annexation, the petitioner shall meet the DuPage County provisions.

Regarding zoning issues, DuPage County currently regulates the subject property. DuPage County has previously approved a campus plan along with amendments for the existing campus and its site improvements. Upon annexation, the property would be automatically zoned into the Village's new R0 District. The zoning actions included within the petition are intended to address site-specific relief. He then states staff's response to each of the petitioner's requests.

As with other larger-scale private educational institutions in the Village, establishing a planned development is an appropriate way to address the long range planning issues for such facilities. Additionally, with the establishment of a planned development provides for a systematic way to review all development on the respective campus. From the petitioner's perspective, it provides assurances that they can undertake large-scale capital improvements and funding programs with assurances that they have approvals in place to proceed with such improvements.

He stated that the school use is well established and they have received past zoning approvals by DuPage County to operate the high school in its current state. Other than minor nonconformities (i.e., parking lot landscape islands), the site meets DuPage County regulations. The intent of this petition is to essentially grant the same zoning approvals that they currently enjoy.

As part of the long-range plan for the site, the petitioner notes that they plan on remodeling/reconstructing Dominic Hall, located on the northwest corner of the existing high school building, chapel modifications and a student fitness center. The addition would meet all setback requirements and would not encroach into the existing parking lot. A definitive timetable has been not set for this improvement – it would only come under building permit review of the Village if the addition occurs after the property is annexed into the Village.

The petitioner has submitted concept building floor plan drawings of the remodeling project. Staff suggests that the exterior building elevations be of compatible building materials as the existing elevations (i.e., combination of masonry and pre-cast) so that the addition is in harmony with the existing building and subject to Plan Commission review and approval.

The petitioner has requested is the right to erect light poles at some point in the future for the existing ball fields on the site. The lighting would be used for high school sporting events in a manner that other public and private schools use such lights. There are no definitive plans or timetables to erect the light poles.

The Zoning Ordinance regulates height of poles for parking lots, but is silent on other types of light poles. As such, staff would consider the light poles accessory structures. This interpretation is similar to the opinion offered to the Lombard Park District in its consideration of lighting at Sunset Knoll Park in 1993. In review of this request, staff notes that the primary concern directly related to lighting would be light glare concerns. Staff recommends as a condition of approval that the petitioner still be required to meet the required foot candle level at the adjacent residential property lines (i.e., 0.5 foot candles).

Lastly, granting site plan approval authority was included as part of the request in order to allow the Plan Commission to review and approve signage deviations or consider other site specific elements (such as the exterior building elevations) that do not require zoning relief or planned development/annexation agreement amendments.

Mr. Heniff noted that the property is designated within the Comprehensive Plan for public and institutional uses, reflecting the use of the property at the time the Plan was adopted. The petitioner's request is intended to reflect the institutional use of the property and provide for their future needs on their property. Therefore the existing use is compatible with the Plan.

Regarding neighborhood compatibility, the north, south and west sides of the property are designated for low density residential uses. East of the subject property is public owned land owned by the York Center Park District and York Township and used for open space and institutional purposes. The historic presence of the school relative to the adjacent residences provides some level of compatibility. From a physical standpoint, the relationship of the school to the adjacent properties would be unaffected by the approval of the annexation and zoning actions itself, as the improvements could be constructed under County regulations.

Staff recommends approval of the petition, subject to conditions

Chairperson Ryan then opened the hearing for discussion by the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Sweetser clarified that the foot candle requirement noted within the staff report does not need to be a condition of approval as it is already within Village Code. Mr. Heniff said yes. If they would need relief, it would have to come back before the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Burke stated that as they would be required to meet Village codes for the future request, the petition seems reasonable as proposed.

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 Ordinance and is compatible with the standards for planned developments and that granting such an amendment is in the public interest. Therefore, the Plan Commission, by a roll call vote of 4-0, recommended to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of the petition associated with PC 07-38, subject to the following conditions:

1. The approval of any associated zoning actions as part of the petition is subject to approval of an annexation agreement between the petitioner and the Village. Moreover, the zoning actions shall not be effective until such time that the subject property is annexed into the Corporate limits of the Village and Ordinance granting approval of the aforementioned zoning relief.
2. The petitioner shall develop and operate the site essentially in accordance with site plan prepared by John Weis Architects, dated October 16, 2007 and made a part of this petition.

December 6, 2007

PC 07-38

Page 7

3. That any additions to the exterior elevations of the school building addition shall be compatible with the exterior of the existing high school building, with the design subject to the review and approval by the Plan Commission.

Respectfully,

**VILLAGE OF LOMBARD**

Donald F. Ryan

Lombard Plan Commission

c. Petitioner

Lombard Plan Commission

H:\CD\WORDUSER\PCCASES\2007\PC 07-38\ReferralLetter 07-38.doc