

October 7, 2004

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

**Subject: PC 04-28; 615 & 617 W. Pleasant (Buckingham Orchard)**

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. The petitioner, The Dearborn-Buckingham Group Inc., requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property.

1. An amendment to the comprehensive plan;
2. Approval of an annexation agreement.
3. Annexation to the Village of Lombard;
4. Rezoning from the R1 Single-Family Residential District to the R4 Limited General Residential District;
5. Approve a five lot major plat of subdivision;
6. Approve a conditional use for a planned development with the following variations:
  - a. For Lots 1 and 4, a variation from Section 155.408 (F)(3)(b) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the corner side yard setback from twenty (20) feet to fifteen (15) feet.

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition on September 20, 2004. Christopher Coleman, of Dearborn-Buckingham Group Inc., presented the petition. Mr. Coleman stated that the Dearborn-Buckingham Group Inc. specializes in infill development in the suburbs. He described the location of the subject property and noted that the development was previously workshopped before the Plan Commission. He stated that the plans submitted for the workshop called for thirty-three units and the current plan has twenty-two units. Mr. Coleman stated that this is approximately less than fifty percent of what is allowed by code.

Mr. Coleman noted that the architectural design would be complimentary to that of the Columbine Glen development. He stated that staff has made suggestions regarding specific elements. He stated that some elements would differ from Columbine Glen considering the Columbine Glen development is eight to nine years old. Mr. Coleman stated that the units would consist of brick and low maintenance vinyl siding. He stated that the first floor master bedroom included in the workshopped floor plans could not be incorporated due to design changes. Mr. Coleman stated that he agreed with all referenced conditions in the staff report and that he believed the use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and should increase the value of neighboring properties. He stated that they were not requesting many variations. Mr. Coleman explained that in the event that he did not acquire the land owned by the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority one unit would be removed on the eastern side of the property as it encroaches into that area. He stated that he believes that the property would be a good addition to the Village and no exceptional burdens would be placed on schools or parks.

Mr. Coleman stated that the cul-de-sac could be extended at some future date if the property to the south were to redevelop. He stated that if that were to happen an additional building could be included within the Buckingham Orchard subdivision. Mr. Coleman then introduced Michael Mondus of Spaceco, Inc.

Michael Mondus, of Spaceco Inc. discussed the drainage of the property. He stated that the property drained from north to south, hence the detention pond was proposed for the southeast corner of the property. He stated that a stub was provided by the Columbine Glen development and they planned to connect to the storm sewer through the Columbine Glen development. Mr. Mondus stated that their previous plan showed the sanitary sewer line traveling through side yards to provide gravity. He stated that the current plan would require the reconnection of 26 sewer services and the reconstruction of the parkway. Mr. Mondus stated that this was more economically feasible than using a lift station in light of staff's indication that utilities within side yards were frowned upon. Mr. Mondus also noted the public improvements that would be included in the project.

Mr. Coleman stated that the original connection proposed through the side yards was within a fifteen foot dedicated public utilities easement. He then introduced Karl Krogstad. Mr. Krogstad discussed the landscaping plan and identified the type and location of the plantings. He stated that hearty plants what would withstand the area conditions were chosen.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for public comment.

Dixie Hahn, managing agent for the Columbine Glen Homeowners' Association, distributed written comments. She stated that the association was concerned that connection to their detention pond could increase flood heights. She stated that they were concerned about how maintenance of the pond would be handled. Ms. Hahn stated that they would like to review the engineer's calculations showing that one hundred percent of the storage for the proposed

development would be completely contained on their site. Ms. Hahn also noted the association's desire to preserve the existing vegetation between the properties.

Mr. Coleman responded that the maintenance of the detention areas could be incorporated into the documents of the homeowner's association. He stated that the chemicals used are probably similar. He stated that the financial numbers mentioned were those that came out of conversations with the Columbine Glen board. Mr. Coleman then requested that Michael Mondus address the technical questions.

Mr. Mondus stated that he could not speak to the specifics of the Columbine Glen pond design. He stated that the system currently receives uncontrolled runoff from the subject property. He stated that would be minimized once the controls were implemented.

Ms. Hahn stated that the site is presently undeveloped with no homes or streets. She stated that the water is presently being absorbed into the ground water.

Mr. Mondus replied that the pond would act as a sponge to slow water that accumulates from the development. He stated that more water would come toward them, but it would be controlled.

Ms. Hahn stated that the pond currently fills up and has overflowed. She stated that the development would increase the time that it takes for the water to dissipate.

Mr. Mondus stated that there is no municipal system that they can tie into. He stated that there is no benefit or ability to bypass the Columbine Glen system.

Ms. Hahn stated that they would like the opportunity for their engineers to review any calculations.

Mr. John Ripley, 340 Cimmarron, stated that he was concerned with the eastern border of the property. He stated that he would like the preservation of as much vegetation and foliage as possible. He stated that the foliage was removed in the Buckingham Meadow development and there was no visual barrier left from one house to the next.

Mr. Coleman stated that the subject property was cleared about half way down the eastern border. He stated that they would like to preserve as much vegetation as possible, however there were improvements that have to go into the ground that may prevent that. He stated that Buckingham Meadow is much better than most developers leave a site. He stated that he would provide plant materials that provide year round screening.

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

Angela Clark, Planner I, presented the staff report. Ms. Clark noted that the comments from the Inter-Departmental Review Committee were included within the report for reference. She stated

that the proposed development consists of a five lot subdivision in which there will be three, six-unit buildings and one four unit building within a cul-de-sac design. The remaining lot will be utilized as a detention pond for the development. The cul-de-sac could be removed at a later date to extend the street in the event that the properties south of the subject property are redeveloped. With the exceptions of Lots 1 and 4, each building and unit will meet all setback requirements for residences located within the R4 Limited General Residential District. Lots 1 and 4 encroach into the corner side yard setback area.

The subject property is located south of Pleasant Lane and land that is owned by the ISTHA. ISTHA acquired a tract of land south of Pleasant as part of the initial construction of the North-South Tollway. This strip of land was specifically acquired for drainage and access purposes. However, as the area is not actively used by the ISTHA, negotiations are currently taking place to transfer title of the land to the Village as part of the public right-of-way. The Village would vacate that area to the petitioner. If an agreement is reached, the buildings as shown on the site plan will meet all zoning requirements.

In the event that an agreement is not reached regarding the surplus right-of-way, the petitioner will need a variation to reduce the corner side yard setback from twenty feet to fifteen for the end unit located on Lot 1. The northern end unit of Lot 4 would then need to be removed as it encroaches fully into the setback yard and beyond the fifteen-foot variation requested. Staff can support the variation request as the proposed development will be closely aligned with the corner side yard setbacks of the neighboring Columbine Glen development.

Included with the petition is a request for conditional use approval for a planned development. As the proposed development meets the minimum lot width and area requirements for a planned development, staff recommends the establishment of a planned development for this site. Creation of the planned development will give the Village an opportunity to review any future modifications of the subject property, as discussed below. Moreover, the planned development will also provide a framework for any future expansions of the development.

When the development was workshopped before the Plan Commission in November 2003, the commissioners stated that the development would be suitable if it were consistent with the neighboring townhome development. The minutes of the November workshop are attached as Attachment A. Based on the preliminary rendering submitted as part of the petition, the development is similar to that of the Columbine Glen development.

Staff has advised the petitioner regarding specific architectural embellishments that should be included to match the Columbine Glen development as follows:

- 1) The roof shingles in the development should match those of the Columbine Glen development.

- 2) The windows in the dormer areas should be circular consistent with those within Columbine Glen.
- 3) The recessed wall between the garages can alleviate the appearance of a row of garage doors.

Appropriate right-of-way and transitional yard landscaping is shown within the submitted landscape plan. However, the landscape plan submitted must be modified in conjunction with the final engineering plans. Additional trees will be required around the detention pond area to the equivalent of one per seventy-five feet as required in the Subdivision and Development Ordinance.

As shown in Attachment B, the Comprehensive Plan recommends Estate Residential for the subject property. Estate Residential is defined as a residential area with a net density of four or fewer dwelling units per acres and primarily consists of single-family detached residences. The proposed development is approximately 6.32 units per acre that is slightly larger than the suggested number in the Comprehensive Plan.

As part of the Plan Commission workshop session, staff noted that single family residential designation within the plan may not be appropriate for the subject property, as it is located between Interstate 355 and the Columbine Glen townhome development to the east. As the subject property borders an area similar in density to the proposed development, staff finds that the proposed development is suitable for the surrounding area. The Plan Commission expressed a conceptual support for a townhouse development plan that is compatible in both architecture and development density the Columbine Glen development.

When reviewing the approved subdivision plan for Columbine Glen, staff notes that dedicated public right-of-way extensions were provided within the development to connect the townhouse development to unincorporated properties both east and west of the development. This strongly suggests that the intention was to have future developments integrated into the Columbine Glen development. As such, establishing development densities and design elements that are compatible with the existing townhouses would be appropriate. Therefore, staff supports the change to the Comprehensive Plan.

As shown in Attachment C, the site borders an attached single family development to the east and detached single family uses on the north and south of the subject property. With inclusion of the architectural elements and landscape improvement changes recommended above, staff believes that the proposed use would be compatible with the existing residential land uses.

The site currently consists of three lots. The petitioner plans to subdivide the lot into four lots and an outlot for detention. Each proposed lot meets the minimum lot width and area requirements. This development is both a major subdivision and a major development as expressed in the Subdivision and Development Ordinance. Therefore, the petitioner will be required to meet the provisions of Section 154.304 and 154.306. This includes, but is not limited to, sidewalks, landscaping, parkway trees and street lighting along the proposed new street as

well as along the portion of Pleasant Lane abutting the site. The companion subdivision plat would be submitted to the Board of Trustees upon approval of final engineering for the subject property. Ms. Clark stated that staff recommended approval of the petition subject to the conditions noted in the staff report.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for discussion among the Plan Commission members.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if it were possible for staff to address the concerns of the Columbine Glen residents regarding the landscaping. She stated that she understood that there are reasons why landscaping may not be able to be saved.

William Heniff, Senior Planner, stated that high priority is placed on storm water management. He stated that staff has attempted to require engineering and detention designs that will not create off site impacts. Mr. Heniff stated that staff is willing to walk the property with the petitioner and the residents to identify what vegetation could be salvaged.

Commissioner Sweetser stated that she would like to see that happen even though there could be reasons that all vegetation could not be saved.

After due consideration of the petition and the testimony presented, the Plan Commission found that the proposed variations comply with the standards of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the Plan Commission, by a roll call vote of 6 to 0, recommended to the Corporate Authorities, **approval** of the relief associated with PC 04-28, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the Geometric Plan, updated September 3, 2004, prepared by Spaceco Inc.
2. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily addresses all of the comments within the IDRC report.
3. That the petitioner shall submit a revised landscape plan in conjunction with the final engineering/geometric plans. Said plan shall meet the landscape planting requirements as required by the zoning and Subdivision and Development Ordinances.
4. That the petitioner shall submit revised architectural drawings depicting the final proposed design palette of the structures, the design of which shall be subject to the approval of the Director of Community Development.
5. That the petitioner shall enter into an annexation agreement with the Village.
6. That in the event that the tract of land currently owned by ISTHA is not conveyed to the petitioner, the site plan shall be amended to remove the northern most townhouse unit on Building 3 as depicted on the submitted plan.

Re: PC 04-28  
October 7, 2004  
Page 7

Respectfully,

**VILLAGE OF LOMBARD**

Donald Ryan, Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission

att-

c. Petitioner  
Lombard Plan Commission

H:\CD\WORDUSER\PCCASES\2004\PC 04-28\Reflet04-28.doc