

Village of Lombard

*Village Hall
255 East Wilson Ave.
Lombard, IL 60148
villageoflombard.org*



Meeting Agenda

Monday, June 8, 2009

7:30 PM

SPECIAL MEETING

Village Hall

Plan Commission

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Commissioners: Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke,
Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, Stephen Flint and
John Mrofcza
Staff Liaison: Christopher Stilling*

Call to Order

Roll Call of Members

Public Hearings

[090246](#)

PC 09-08: 331 W. Madison Street (CPSA)
Granting a further time extension to Ordinance 6347 extending the time period for construction of the conditional use for a planned development and a school for an additional twelve month period (June 18, 2012).
(DISTRICT #6)

Attachments: [APO LETTER.doc](#)
[Cover Sheet.doc](#)
[DAH referral memo remand.doc](#)
[DAH referral memo.doc](#)
[PUBLICNOTICE.doc](#)
[Referral Letter.doc](#)
[Report 09-08 \(revised\).doc](#)
[Ordinance 6347.pdf](#)
[Ordinance 6346.pdf](#)
[Cover Sheet ext 1.doc](#)
[BOT_ext_331 W Madison.doc](#)
[Ordinance 6481.pdf](#)
[090246.pdf](#)
[090246.pdf](#)
[Letter to Boards, PC & Village Staff.pdf](#)
[BOT_extII.doc](#)
[Cover Sheet ext 2.doc](#)
[Ordinance 6625.pdf](#)
[090246.pdf](#)

Andrew Draus, 350 S. Fairfield Avenue, Lombard, attorney for the petitioner presented the petition. He thanked the public for coming regardless of whether they were in support or against his client stating that it is nice to see they are taking an active role in government.

Mr. Draus indicated that the subject of the petition tonight is the College Preparatory School of American (CPSA) located at 331 W. Madison Avenue. He indicated that the building has been used primarily by the school district since 1930. He provided the history of the site and how CPSA came to be at this location in 1994. He noted that the current zoning of the parcel is CR, which is what the parcel has been zoned the entire time, and how it is operating as a legal nonconforming use. CPSA has 5 legal lots comprising of approximately 4 acres containing a school building, parking lot, a playground and 450 students.

Mr. Draus mentioned how CPSA's curriculum and environment has attributed to the success of its students. He stated that a high percentage of students graduate from CPSA and go on to college. He also mentioned students' achievements and accomplishments such as being National Merit Scholars and being selected to the all American Academic Team, as well as how the students become professional members of the community.

The alumni of CPSA represent various professions and they are now sending their children here. CPSA has strict academic standards with people dedicated to these goals. There is no crime, vandalism, or drugs and there very few discipline issues. There has been an increase in demand for enrollment as a result of families who have moved to Lombard so that their children can attend the school. They have conducted various fundraising events in order for the proposed improvements to come to fruition. Representatives of CPSA have been working with Village staff over a period of time in order to bring this plan before you today.

Mr. Draus then introduced Jamshid Jahedi, Architect-Engineer, from Dome Structural Engineers who would discuss the proposed plan in further detail.

Jamshid Jahedi, Architect and Engineer for the project, 105 Ogden Avenue, Clarendon Hills, thanked everyone. He indicated that he would present a PowerPoint presentation outlining the project.

Two years ago their office was asked to create a necessary drawing and design for a new building on campus. The owners' goals were to create a facility that:

- * Offers higher standard of K-12 education in a more delightful environment*
- * Remains neighbor friendly while responding to steady growth of the students body*
- * Continues adding credential to the school and the Village of Lombard*
- * Increases the land value of the school and neighboring properties*

Mr. Jahedi showed an aerial view of the school as well as a zoning map which indicated the school's current zoning - CR. He stated that the property is really more consistent with the surrounding zoning of R2.

Next was an aerial of the existing conditions. He explained the orientation of the slide in that Madison Street was to the right. The existing building is very old (90 years) and 32,000 square feet. The site has 80 parking spaces and is served by two access drives -one entrance and one exit. The majority of the students are dropped off in the parking area and he indicated the entrance as well as the exit.

The next slide showed the new addition. He explained that it is the same photo, but they superimposed the new building with the existing building. The new building is going to be built where the existing parking is with part of the building extending to the south, which is currently a grass area. The exit and entrance will stay the same. The two buildings will be connected by an underground corridor to facilitate travel between the two buildings. He then showed the next slide which was the proposed site plan. The site plan illustrated the two buildings, new parking areas, detention area and baseball field.

The traffic flow slide showed both the existing and proposed traffic patterns, which were indicated with arrows. He showed the traffic flow on the existing site as well as the proposed site and indicated it is pretty much the same. The

parking has been moved to a different location and there is a new driveway, which will be strictly used by the Fire Department and is not part of the public drive. This drive was required by the Fire Department.

The existing parking is shaded with color and he indicated the location of the 80 parking spaces. The new parking has the same amount of area, but has been moved from the south of the building to the north of the building. They extended the parking to the east and south. Approximately 19 parking spaces will be added. This is a more efficient design of the site. Mr. Jahedi explained that by having these additional parking spaces on site, it would eliminate the need for parking on the street.

He showed a cross section of the property looking from Madison. They will have landscaping similar to a berm about 2 feet high, which will be complemented with another 2-3 feet of shrubbery. This will total approximately 5-6 feet in height, which is acceptable as a screening device by the Village.

The parking space comparison slide superimposed the existing and proposed parking spaces in order to get a visual indication of how much parking they are adding. He acknowledged they were not adding a significant amount of parking.

The Occupancy & Parking Calculations slide - Mr. Jahedi stated that Village Code requires 80 parking spaces on site. He noted that the number of total parking spaces required for the existing building is 43 and they have 80. With the new facility consisting of two buildings, 32,000 square feet for the existing building and 61,000 square feet for the proposed building, the required number of parking spaces per Village Code is 80. If the Village looks strictly at Code, we are adding 60,000 square feet, but are still within Code by providing only the existing 80 parking spaces. If we use common sense, we see that right now the parking never gets full, but it does get close to maximum capacity. The neighbors would feel better and have more experience in determining whether additional parking spaces should be added to the site or not. CPSA proposes to keep the 19 additional parking spaces in order to negate the spillage of parked cars in the neighborhood. They think that having the additional parking helps the community at large in solving some of the parking problems although they respectfully leave this decision to the discretion of the Plan Commission members.

He described the proposed site plan indicating they have an outdoor sports facility shown as a baseball field, which could also be used by the neighbors. The detention pond located in the northwest part of the site will control stormwater on site.

Mr. Jahedi showed the drainage slide and stated that the site will retain the entire run off provided by a 100-year storm. The detention pond is located on the lowest part of property. The 100-year storm is the maximum amount of coverage the jurisdiction asked the engineer to design for. The intensity is very high. There are two detention ponds shown, the lower part will handle the 50-year storm event and if higher there is a second detention pond which is part of the sports field. We are improving the drainage of the site much more than currently exists. The neighbors will not see water run off from this property. The light blue line around the site is a swale, which is designed to bring water off the site to the street and into the sewers.

Emphasizing the variances they are asking for he showed the proposed site

plan. They are asking for a rezoning from the CR zoning designation to the R2 residential district, a conditional use for a planned development, a variation to the open space and a building height variation to allow 35 feet where 30 feet is allowed.

Simple Rezoning versus PUD - This slide shows a hypothetical analysis of the percentage of open space required when applying for a simple rezoning to the R2 versus applying for a conditional use for a Planned Development. A simple rezoning to the R2 where they connect the two buildings would require they need to meet 50% open space. Their plan provides 47% open space, leaving them 3% short. If we go the other route and apply for a Planned Unit Development with 2 separate buildings, the open space requirement is higher at 62.5%. Their plan proposes 47%, leaving them much shorter. The height restriction of 30' is the same for both routes. The Village prefers they apply for the planned unit development and CPSA prefers the simple rezoning. He asked the Commissioners to think about these two differences, but respectfully leaves this decision to their discretion.

Open Space - Area Calculations - This slide shows the percentage of open space provided by the CPSA's original design versus the percentage of open space needed after factoring in the additional requirements the Village has asked for. By providing impervious roadways and pavement such as the additional driveway the Fire Department requires, as well as the cul-de-sac, this increases the impervious area and result in a larger open space requirement percentage. They are willing to spend additional money and provide green pavement components for the parking lot or the Fire Department access driveway. He mentioned how he is well trained, has appropriate certification and is a very strong advocate of the green building movement. He was disappointed to learn that the Village does not give credit for adding pervious areas. They are still willing to put the pervious pavement in their parking lot in effort to reduce the percentage and increase the open space on site to more than 50%. He asked the Commissioners to look at this concept since they are ready to do it and bring the 50% higher to maybe 62%.

The Height Comparison. Mr. Jahedi stated they are within the 30' height limit for the entire building with the exception of one staircase, which goes up to the roof. The roof consists of fans which blow fresh air into the gym and cafeteria. They will be 3-5' in height and are not included in the building height calculation. They will need a staircase to get up to the roof and this staircase is the result of the extra 5'. They prefer to not incorporate a hatch into the roof, as suggested by Village staff, as the staircase makes easier access. The amount of area that they are taking above 30' is 300 square feet or 1.4% of the footprint. He asked the Plan Commissioners to consider this and compare it for themselves.

The next couple of slides shown were elevations from the northeast, east and south. He commented that they will be 50-70 feet away from the nearest residential property line and the other two sides will see green.

The basement plan includes an area for the gym, which includes a full basketball court with bleachers and a cafeteria with a kitchen as well other things. The gym and cafeteria are two volumetric designs. They have a large height and in an effort to disguise them they were designed in the basement. As a result the neighbors won't see the gym and the building will be visually pleasing.

The first floor plan consists of the upper part of the gym, which is basically open to the basement, a preschool, administrative offices and classrooms. He noted the staircase that goes down to the basement as well as the tunnel that would take students from one building to the other.

The second floor plan consists of amenities for the school including: various labs, a library with an atrium, classrooms and a multi-purpose room.

Concluding, Mr. Jahedi noted the attributes of project.

Attorney Draus noted the storyboards located behind them. Since the Commissioners could not see the storyboards, Mr. Jahedi referred back to his PowerPoint presentation and showed where the height variation would be located on the building. He explained how they calculated the height or average grade of the building. He noted the highest part of the building indicating that this is the stairs, which lead to the roof, are to be used for facilitating the repair and maintenance of the roof. He noted that the stairway was strategically placed in the middle of the building, placed at the furthest distance away from the neighbors.

Attorney Draus mentioned the fact that CPSA held neighborhood meetings and they have been meeting with the Village for two years trying to incorporate concerns voiced by both parties. Concluding, Mr. Draus indicated that the board members from CPSA were in the audience and were available to answer any questions on behalf of the owner.

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting for public comment.

To speak in favor of the petition were:

Fazal Ahmed, 20 W. 17th Street, Lombard, stated that he is a resident of Lombard and has children in the school. The school not only provides an excellent education, but also contributes to a person's physical and mental health. He felt they should not be crammed into a building. He stated the need for a new building, as the existing building is aged. Having the new building is not only advantageous for them, but also for the Village as it will increase property value. He wants to stay in town due to its diversity but they need a better cleaner environment, which will result in making a name for the town.

Mohammed Azharuddin, 1069 S. Westmore Avenue, Lombard, stated he lives in the Westmore Avenue Apartment Complex, having moved from Texas because of the school's teachings and credentials. He has two children in the school and their standards are two years above the public school. He requested that they not deny the opportunity for the children to have more labs and a better learning experience.

Sabet Siddiqui, 531 W. Harding Road, Lombard, noted his profession and mentioned that he was building a house, which is one of the moderate to bigger homes in Yorkshire Woods. He indicated how he used to commute long distances in order to have his children attend the school. He asked the Commissioners to approve the proposal. The school maintains extremely high scores and they need your help to have a decent facility.

Dr. M. Javeed Ansari, 114 Oakton Drive, Lombard, stated that his family consisting of four children moved from Massachusetts for the purpose of attending this school. He mentioned there was a two-year waiting list to get in.

The children's education and reputation of the school is nationwide. He has never seen such a school in this area and noted the product the school puts out. He humbly requests the Plan Commissioners to arrive at a favorable decision to help the community and make its citizens proud.

Fatima Nazeer, 43 W. Ann Street, Lombard, indicated she is an alumni of CPSA as is her husband. She stated she attended Benedictine University and he went to Northwestern. They are proud to have been a member of the CPSA community, as the school has had many accomplishments, as well as a citizen of Lombard. She referred to the Character Counts pillars on the wall and indicated that you will find those qualities mentioned at CPSA. She asked the Commissioners to consider everything said.

Mukarram Sheikh, 1328 S. Rebecca Road, Lombard, noted his profession and stated that four years ago he did not know the Village of Lombard. When his family lived in Tennessee they searched for one of the best school in the country where they could maintain their faith as well as obtain the best academic education. They do not have many facilities from which to choose unlike other religions. The program at CPSA made them move here even though the building was something to be desired. They love CPSA, Lombard, the Park District, and the shopping. They are buying property here. He believes that an education is a holistic process and they want to add community service projects, but don't have the available space. They need to go to the next level. He believed that not only will the new proposal benefit them, but will also benefit the neighbors. The school attracts the best in the community and is a win/win situation. He mentioned Daniel Tani and how proud it makes you feel no matter where you came from that he is a product of Lombard who attended Glenbard East. We must be ready so that when the next leader comes, we will all feel proud. He asked the Commissioners to approve the building in order to attract the best talent to Lombard.

Anjum Mirza, 1306 S. Finley Road, Lombard stated he lives in International Village. He has two children in the school. Prior to them moving, his wife had to travel close to 100 miles a day to bring them to school. He humbly requests that they approve the request and give them a chance.

Muddassir Saeed, 2090 S. Valley Road, Lombard, gave his background and educational history. He stated he attended Peter Hoy School, Lombard Jr. High and Glenbard East High School. He loves the community of Lombard as it has a lot to offer and has three children in the school. DuPage County is an affordable place to live and has a good standard and asks that they support the school.

Rashid Zaffer, 1790 Porter Court, stated she lived adjacent to the school and her husband and other family members attended CPSA. It is a great school located in a great community and asks for approval of the request as it will be great for the whole neighborhood.

M.A. Majeed, 509 W. Wilson Avenue, Lombard, stated that Naperville was recently named the number one city in which to live. He did reside there, but decided to move here instead. He sends his children to CPSA. He emphasized that in the proposed plan there are two issues - the height and the open space. The code requires that they need 80 parking spots and the architect is suggesting 99. We have a choice, as does the Plan Commission and the neighbors, to either contain the parking on the premises or have it spillover onto the streets. There is another school two blocks south and there is no street

parking allowed on Madison. There are other schools in the community such as Sacred Heart where street parking is allowed. It comes down to an issue of parking spilling over on the street or having open space. In his opinion, it is better to have the parking contained on the property so the neighborhood won't be affected.

Mohammed Kothawala, 213 W. Harding Road, Lombard, stated he lives two blocks behind the school. They built a house and are happy to be in the neighborhood. He has two children in the school. He sees parents come from different directions to drop off their children and as a result, he does not see much of a traffic problem.

To speak against the petition were:

Ed Pszanka, 615 S. Edson, Lombard, stated he lives adjacent to the school property. He has lived in Lombard for 40 years. He mentioned the new housing that has recently been constructed in the neighborhood. He's tired of constantly looking at a garbage dump and a blank wall. He complained of issues dealing with water run off onto his property, people raising the topography of their land, houses being built too close to property lines and too high. There is a Building Code in place and it should be followed. He stated he was not notified of any of the meetings. He was worried about the retention pond attracting geese, mosquitoes and bugs as well as being unsightly. He is an organic gardener and he does not want that water overflowing onto his property.

Chairperson Ryan mentioned that he was notified of this meeting, but there is no requirement that he be notified of meetings between the petitioners and Village staff.

Mr. Jahedi responded to Mr. Pszanka's comments about the retention pond. He indicated it will be a dry grassy area with no water. It is engineered to retain water during a storm and within a 24-hour period the water will drain back to the Village system. In this way, we are not overloading the Village system at one time.

Mr. Pszanka indicated that when CPSA bought the building in 1994, there was a ditch by the baseball field that took water and brought it along the property line down to Madison. The ditch is now filled up.

Attorney Draus indicated that the retention area has a drain in it so it is not designed for the water to remain. It collects excess water from neighboring properties. It is a Village requirement.

Candice Rizzo, 308 Harding, Lombard, stated she has been a resident for 25 years and they have recently added onto their home. They have abided by all the Village zoning and guidelines. They are very proud of their home and consider it their major investment. She is also here to speak on behalf of her husband and their neighbors. She has a petition opposing the proposal. Their concerns are:

- * increased traffic on Madison as well as the route that might be taken around the neighborhood to get to the school
- * the height of the building - her house backs up to it so they would be directly affected
- * privacy and the use of her property - her backyard is open and the school will have activity year round.
- * property values haven't increased or decreased, but if they sell their house,

the new owner won't want the view of the proposed parking lot with traffic being routed behind the school.

** garbage that would be generated.*

** they should maintain the residential look and appearance of the neighborhood.*

** the proposal is too large of a building squeezed onto a small piece of property and not becoming to the neighborhood.*

She went to houses within a four block radius of the school and is submitting the petition on their behalf relative to those concerns. She asked the Commissioners to consider these issues.

Joe Glazier, Jr., 304 W. Harding, Lombard, asked if they would be able to build future residences on the site without a public hearing if the rezoning to R2 was approved. The northwest corner of his property would be affected by noise and traffic with more being put on the southeast corner of the site. The placement of rooftop mechanicals would be closer to his home and would generate more noise. The placement of the atrium will overlook the surrounding homes and would have a direct site line to his patio eliminating his privacy. They are asking to double the number of students and reduce the open space. There is too much proposed for the space available.

Attorney Draus responded to the rezoning request. He stated that there are no plans to put residential dormitories on the property. That would require another public hearing. Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director, stated that if the rezoning and the planned development were approved, they would not be allowed to build residences. He explained how a planned development is tied to a specific plan and if they deviated from that plan, they would have to come back to the Plan Commission for an amendment to the planned development, which would entail another public hearing.

Mr. Glazier then asked for an explanation about the zoning regulations between an R2 and the CR. Mr. Stilling stated that the CR zoning is intended to provide for the location of such things as public parks, forest preserves, and other open-space uses and is more in line with a publicly-owned facility. The zoning of R2 is in line with private schools and residential areas and is typical of what has been done in the past. Attorney Draus stated that the conditional use request would provide for having a private school.

Fran Pszanka, 615 S. Edson, Lombard, indicated she lives right behind where the retention pond is planned to go and asked if it will come right up to their property line. Also, she asked if there is anything that states that it has to stay away from them. She noted that if the sewer system is not good enough to take the water away, why have the pond? She mentioned previous meetings whereby it was mentioned that something would be done to remove the water. Also, she was concerned about the safety issue with having a pond on the playfield as she heard it was 5' deep. Mr. Stilling responded to the placement of the detention pond and noted that the petitioner's plan indicates there is a 5' setback. Currently, the property has no controlled detention on site so the water travels with the slope of the property. Water detention is governed by DuPage County as well as the Village.

Mr. Jahedi responded that the detention pond is like a ball so that when there is too much water it is kept in the ball until such time that it drains slowly into the system. This system serves the site better than what it does now. The depth of the pond is 5' and the slope is 3:1, which is the maximum DuPage County

allows a slope to be. The slope is walkable and the children can run up and down it. It makes it a good area for play and is not a safety issue.

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

Michael Toth, Planner I, introduced two items into the public record: the KLOA traffic report, which is the final version not the draft version as it states, and Response to Standards to Deviations. He noted that only three standards were addressed because they were not met by the petitioner.

Mr. Toth then continued stating that staff has drafted this IDRC report to submit to the public record in its entirety. The College Preparatory School of America (CPSA) has been experiencing an increased demand for classroom space. As such, the school is proposing to construct a second building on the subject property. As proposed, the new building would be approximately 61,000 square feet and located south of the existing building, which would remain. The new building would include a cafeteria, gymnasium, a multi-purpose hall as well as classroom and general office area. To accommodate the increased student population, additional parking would be provided. As a result, the required amount of open space is not being provided. Therefore, the petitioner is seeking a variation to reduce the required amount of open space. In addition, the proposed second building would exceed the maximum allowed building height of thirty (30) feet to thirty-five (35) feet to accommodate a projecting stairway.

As part of their request and at the suggestion of Village staff, CPSA is requesting a map amendment to rezone the subject property from CR - Conservation Recreation District to the R2 - Single-Family Residence District. In addition, the petitioner is seeking a conditional use to establish the property as a planned development.

CPSA obtained a Certificate of Occupancy on February 10, 1993 as an Educational Facility; however, they never obtained conditional use approval to lawfully establish the full-time private school. Therefore, CPSA has been operating under legal non-conforming status since their inception. As part of this petition, CPSA is requesting conditional use approval to legally establish the existing full-time, private school.
use approval to legally establish the existing full-time, private school.

CPSA is located in an established residential neighborhood and is located in close proximity to Madison Elementary School. The hours of operation are similar to the public school hours of 8:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. The school year starts in August and ends in June. The addition of the new building will allow 335 more students to attend the school, which would bring the total student population to 785. The drop off/pick up functions would occur between both buildings (central to the subject property) through the use of a twenty-two (22) foot drive aisle. The Fire Department requires that all new buildings provide access to three sides of the new structure(s). As such, CPSA would be required to install a drive aisle around the perimeter of the proposed structure. This fire lane will be blocked off at all times, only to be used by the Fire Department.

As proposed, the existing building would not require ADA or Life Safety Code improvements to its interior as part of this petition. The petitioner's have indicated that the existing building would remain "as is".

The proposed building would have a peak roof height of 35 feet above grade. The R2 - Single Family Residential District permits structures up to 30 feet. The

proposed deviation is requested to accommodate an access stairway. The petitioner has stated that the proposed building can be designed without the projecting stairway and still properly function. As such, staff finds that the roof height deviation is a result of an unnecessary desire and therefore, staff does not support the proposed roof height deviation.

The underlying R2 - Single Family Residence District regulations require a minimum of 50% open space for each property. Section 155.508(C)(7) requires that open space in a planned development must be at least 25% more than is required in the underlying district if a deviation is associated with the petition. As such, the additional 25% of open space would not be required if the proposed building were to meet the maximum height requirement of thirty (30) feet; however, the 50% minimum open space requirement would still need to be addressed. When combined with the coverage of the existing property improvements, the proposed property improvements would bring the total amount of open space on the subject property to 46.85%. This equates to roughly 5,793 square feet in open space deficiency based on the 50% requirement and 28,768 square feet on the 62.5% requirement.

Ninety-nine (99) parking spaces are proposed on site. Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance, 80 spaces are required. The additional 19 spaces can be considered to be a preferential request made by the petitioner, which represents roughly 3,078 square feet of impervious surface that could be dedicated as open space. Also, during the neighborhood meeting conducted by the petitioner, one of the issues brought up by neighbors was the aesthetic view of the front of the property, more specifically the addition of parking spaces in front of the building. As the northernmost row of parking consists of 24 parking spaces, eliminating some of those parking spaces could allow for additional open space and provide additional landscape buffering. Staff will only support a minimum of 50% open space, which meets the underlying R2 zoning district requirement.

The property is currently zoned CR Conservation Recreation District. The CR District, by definition, is intended to provide for the location of public parks, forest preserves, wildlife reservations and ecological sanctuaries and other open-space uses or resources to serve the needs of the citizens of the Village of Lombard. Again, emphasis on public usage.

Staff believes that the CPSA property is more consistent with the R2 Single-Family Residence District requirements. The R2 District is intended to accommodate existing single-family neighborhoods in the core of the Village. This zoning designation is consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods. In addition, similar requests have been granted to other private educational institutions located in the Village such as St. Pius X, St. John's, and Sacred Heart. Staff finds that the CPSA property meets the standards for rezoning.

An educational institution is listed as a conditional use in the R2 Single-Family Residence District. This request is to provide conforming use status for the school, as it pertains to the Lombard Zoning Ordinance. The operations of the school are typical of most educational institutions. Staff finds that CPSA meets the standards for a conditional use to allow for an educational institution in the R2 District.

Establishing a planned development for the CPSA campus is consistent with other private school uses in the Village. The Village previously established planned developments for Christ the King in 2004, St. John's in 2005 and St. Pius X in 2007. As a Planned Development, the site can be brought into closer

compliance with current Zoning Ordinance by allowing greater flexibility in site development. It is noted; however, that the planned development is specifically required in this case as the petitioner wishes to keep both principal structures on the property physically separate of one another. Per Section 155.208(B) of the Zoning Ordinance, more than one (1) principal structure on one (1) lot-of-record is not permitted in the R2 - Single Family Residential District, except as part of a planned development. As the subject property is to be used as a master planned campus for a use other than single-family residential, the establishment of a planned development is deemed appropriate to allow the Plan Commission to have the opportunity to approve any future modifications and/or additions to the subject property.

Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance a total of 80 parking spaces are required. The proposed plans indicate a total of 99 parking spaces, which exceeds the amount of parking required by Code by 19 parking spaces. The petitioner has indicated that the additional parking spaces are needed to accommodate any overflow parking situations and prevent spillover parking onto the adjacent neighborhood streets. The petitioner has indicated that high school students do not drive to school. Staff believes that the minimum amount of parking spaces required by the Zoning Ordinance is sufficient. In order to ensure that the amount of parking is sufficient in the future, the number of high school students allowed to attend the CPSA will be capped at 240 students, which is the total number of high school students indicated on the plan.

Staff has relayed their concern to the petitioner that the increased number of parking spaces is considered to be one of the factors leading to the deficiency in open space. As such, staff presented a parking versus open space scenario to the Plan Commissioners through a Plan Commission workshop on December 15, 2008. During the workshop, a number of the Plan Commission members had indicated that they favored the extra parking spaces in order to prevent the spillover parking onto adjacent residential properties. However, other members stated that they favored the idea of reducing the amount of proposed parking to meet the open space requirement for the underlying zoning district.

The Village's traffic consultant KLOA reviewed the proposed development and conducted traffic counts on the adjacent neighborhood intersections to determine the impacts of the proposed development. They have completed a report which is also transmitted with the staff report. See traffic study.

Based on KLOA's observations, the peak time period for drop-off was between 8:00 and 8:30 A.M. During this half hour, KLOA observed a few back-ups extending onto Madison Street with approximately five to six vehicles temporarily waiting to turn left and access the school driveway thus blocking westbound through traffic on Madison Street.

The peak time period for pickups occurred between 3:15 and 3:45 P.M. The queues at times extended all the way back around the west end of the building. It should be noted that for a few minutes, the backup spilled onto Madison Street and three to four vehicles were temporarily waiting to get in thus blocking Madison Street. The school contracts a Lombard Police Officer to assist in traffic control. The police officer arrived just before 3:15 P.M. to direct approaching vehicle pickups at the back doorway entrance and to safely allow children and adults to use the walkway. Between 3:30 and 4:00 P.M. as many as five vehicles were queuing outside onto Madison Street. It should be noted that pickups were also occurring along the access drives on the west and east side of the building.

CPSA's hours of operation are 8:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. The drop off/pick up functions would occur in an area between the new and existing buildings (central to the subject property) through the use of a twenty-two (22) foot drive aisle. As the student population will be increasing from 450 to 785 students (max), the proposed twenty-two (22) foot drive aisle would be wide enough to accommodate a drop off/ pick up lane with adequate space to allow cars to pass one another, which should increase traffic flow. KLOA recommended in the traffic study that strong consideration should be given to internal staggering of classroom starting and ending times, which would alleviate drop-off and pick-up parking, queuing, vehicular/pedestrian conflicts, etc. As mentioned below, CPSA does not plan to stagger school hours unless necessary; however, they have made representation that they plan to stagger start/end times in conjunction with the Madison School, which is east of the subject property on Madison Street.

Based upon the above observations and review of the petitioner's proposed site plan, KLOA made several recommendations in their study. Staff would like to focus on four major internal site considerations addressed in the traffic study.

1) Student Enrollment - Staff worked with the petitioner and KLOA to remediate some of the internal site issues. As the student population affects the amount of vehicular traffic to and from the subject property, CPSA has agreed to cap the number of students. The current student population of CPSA is 450 students. With the addition of the new classrooms, future enrollment is expected to reach 785 students. As such, there will be 335 additional students on the subject property during peak enrollment. CPSA has agreed to place a cap on the number of students enrolled in the school at 785.

2) Staggering of School Hours - As previously mentioned, the peak time period for drop-off was between 8:00 and 8:30 a.m. and the peak time period for pickups occurred between 3:15 and 3:45 p.m. To minimize existing and future potential congestion, KLOA recommended in the traffic study that strong consideration should be given to internal staggering of classroom starting and ending times, which would alleviate drop-off and pick-up parking, queuing, vehicular/pedestrian conflicts, etc. CPSA responded by stating, "If future enrollment dictates a need for CPSA to stagger their school start and end times at the different levels of the school (grade, middle, and high school), then CPSA will do so to alleviate traffic congestion". As such, the petitioner has not provided a detailed plan outlining their proposed staggered start/end times.

3) Drive Aisle Width - On the original site plan submitted by the petitioner, the internal drive aisles were proposed to be eighteen (18) feet wide. According to KLOA, the proposed drop-off lane needs to be at a minimum twenty-two (22) feet wide. When used for pickup in the afternoon, the additional four (4) foot width will provide a passing lane when vehicles are parked waiting for the students. CPSA complied with this recommendation and widened the proposed drive aisles to a width of twenty-two (22) feet to provide the passing lane that would allow for an increase in traffic flow on the subject property.

4) Cul-de-Sac Bulb - According to the originally submitted site plan, two-way traffic in the proposed parking lot on the southeast portion of the property would have no way of turning around. In the traffic study, KLOA recommended that a cul-de-sac bulb should be designed to provide turnaround at the south end. CPSA complied with this recommendation and added the cul-de-sac to the proposed plans as a means of allowing an increase in traffic flow on the southeastern portion of the subject property.

As previously mentioned, the petitioner held two neighborhood meetings last year to discuss the proposed plans with adjacent property owners. During the meeting, neighbors had the opportunity to comment on the plans and address their concerns with the proposed project. Some of the specific comments made by the neighboring properties included; the impact of more students on CPSA and traffic on Madison Street, the impact of more students on CPSA on parking on neighboring side streets (since there is no parking allowed on Madison Street, the only public access to the site), the aesthetic view of the front of the property (especially with the addition of parking spaces in front of the building) and concerns regarding the impact of construction of the new building (noise, safety, and parking issues) on the neighboring properties.

While staff finds the use to be compatible with adjacent properties and consistent with the locations of other residentially-located private schools throughout the Village, the plan, as proposed with deviations is not compatible with adjacent properties. The petitioner has worked closely with staff in an attempt to address the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, but staff believes that the proposed project could still be completed without obtaining the building height and open space variations.

The Comprehensive Plan recommends Public and Institutional uses for the subject property. As the principal use of the property is an educational facility, the use of the property adheres to the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan as an institutional use. The petitioner's site modifications are also consistent with the existing institutional nature of the property.

Staff finds that there are no conditions related to the property that prevent compliance with the established regulations. The property does not have physical surroundings, shape, or topographical features that differ substantially from other lots in the neighborhood. It is solely the demands of the petitioner that have warranted the requested relief.

The number of students enrolled in any school directly affects the amount of space needed on the property for classrooms and other ancillary amenities. As the subject school is a private school, the amount of revenue received by the school is dependant upon the number of students enrolled in the school. Under this principle, revenue would be higher with a higher student population

Staff finds that the difficulties have been created by the petitioner as a result of a preference towards keeping the proposed building separate from the existing building, a desire to exceed the amount of required parking, and an architectural preference that does not allow the proposed building to meet the minimum building height requirement

Staff finds that these variations will alter the essential character of the neighborhood by allowing excessive bulk and impervious surfaces on the subject property. Staff has identified ways that the building height and open space could be achieved to meet code.

Standards Not Complied With

1) Any reduction in the requirements of this Ordinance is in the public interest. The R2 - Single Family Residential District permits structures up to 30 feet. The proposed building would have a peak roof height of 35 feet above grade. The proposed deviation is requested to accommodate an access stairway. The petitioner has represented in their response to standards that the deviation

would allow access to the rooftop for maintenance, repair and emergency purposes. However, the petitioner has also stated that the proposed building can be designed without the projecting stairway and still properly function. As such, staff finds that the roof height deviation is a result of an unnecessary desire.

The underlying R2 - Single Family Residence District regulations require a minimum of 50% open space for each property. Section 155.508(C)(7) requires that open space in a planned development must be at least 25% more than is required in the underlying district if a deviation is associated with the petition. As such, the additional 25% of open space would not be required if the proposed building were to meet the maximum height requirement of thirty (30) feet; however, the 50% minimum open space requirement would still need to be addressed. The petitioner has represented in their response to standards that the reduction in open space would allow reduce the amount of on-site parking. Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance a total of 80 parking spaces are required. The proposed plans indicate a total of 99 parking spaces, which exceeds the amount of parking required by Code by 19 parking spaces. The petitioner has indicated that the additional parking spaces are needed to accommodate any overflow parking situations and prevent spillover parking onto the adjacent neighborhood streets. The petitioner has indicated that high school students do not drive to school. Staff believes that the minimum amount of parking spaces required by the Zoning Ordinance is sufficient.

2) The proposed deviations would not adversely impact the value or use of any other property.

Staff finds that these deviations will alter the essential character of the neighborhood by allowing excessive bulk and impervious surfaces on the subject property. Staff has identified ways that the building height and open space could be achieved to meet code.

3) That the area of open space provided in a planned development shall be at least 25% more than that required in the underlying zone district.

When combined with the coverage of the existing property improvements, the proposed property improvements would bring the total amount of open space on the subject property to 46.85%. This equates to roughly 5,793 square feet in open space deficiency based on the 50% requirement and 28,768 square feet on the 62.5% requirement. The petitioner stated in their response to standards that they would be unable to meet the 62.5% open space requirement. Although the proposed plans cannot meet the 62.5% open space requirement, staff believes that the petitioner is able to meet the underlying zoning district requirement of 50% open space.

Staff recommends denial of the variation for open space and building height and approval of the planned development, conditional use and rezoning with conditions. He noted that condition #1 should be changed to read:

1. The site shall be developed substantially in accordance with the CPSA elevation, site, landscaping and floor plans package, prepared by Dome Structural Engineers, dated December 1, 2008, except as they shall be changed to meet Village Codes and the 50% open space and thirty (30) foot building height requirements and shall be subject to the review and approval of the Director of Community Development.

Attorney Draus commented on the staff report stating that the petitioner has worked closely with staff for over two years. Those two variations have been part of the plan since that time and they only found out Thursday that the

petition would be approved without the variations. He exampled the St. John's building, which was a similar situation in which there was a new building with a private school being proposed and staff, the Plan Commission and the Board approved the height and open space variation. Their open space was 30 percent and he asks for equitable treatment today. He reiterated that the request for the height variation only applies to a small portion of the building, 300 square feet, which will be contained to the middle of the property and have minimal effect on surrounding properties. This is important because it is an aesthetically better building which would allow stairwell access to the roof for repairs and maintenance and is more practical than a hatch option.

He then commented on the open space variation. This issue came up several times - the open space has been reduced as a result of a request by the Village to install a cul-de-sac bulb, expanding the entryway to 22' and the requirements by the Fire Department to have a full access around the building. All these requests have reduced the open space percentage. In the cost/benefit analysis, CPSA feels that the more parking spaces that are on the property the better it will be for traffic in the neighborhood. They raised this issue the most and they are trying to minimize traffic on the neighborhood. When there is a need for parking spaces they can be used. They believe that the benefit outweighs the 3% percent open space variation.

Lastly, he commented on the issue that came up in the public comment portion about additional traffic on the south side of the building. The area around the new building to the south is only for Fire Department access. If you are a neighbor on the backside you won't have to worry about cars there.

Concluding, Attorney Draus asked the Plan Commission to consider the plan with the two variations as it would be a better contained site.

Mr. Stilling responded to Attorney Draus by stating that the goal of staff is achieve conformance to Village Code. With regard to the requested expansion of the drive aisles and the fire department access, these are things that are part of a functioning site plan.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

Commissioner Burke asked staff to confirm the 30% open space variation that Attorney Draus mentioned in regard to other developments in town like St. John's. Mr. Stilling stated he was not sure of the exact number, but there have been more recent petitions that met the open space requirement. Staff tries to see opportunities and if close would help them achieve it. Commissioner Burke stated that the petitioner makes a compelling argument about the roadway surrounding the building as well as the cul-de-sac. The Village's demands have caused them to require the open space request and has exacerbated the project. Mr. Stilling stated that the Fire Department access roadway is directly related to fire codes and this request is made no matter what. Mr. Toth stated that the petitioner's requests warranted the variations. The petitioner's desire to separate the buildings and add the height variation kicked in the 62.5% open space requirement. It had a trickle effect.

Commissioner Burke commented that the request for the 35' height variation only applies to a 300 square foot portion of building which is insignificant and in line with things we have provided variances for in the past. He asked what the distance is from the location of where the height variation would be on the

building to the nearest property line. Mr. Jahedi stated it was approximately 150 feet from the 35 height to the nearest property line.

Commissioner Sweetser agreed with Commissioner Burke's comments relative to the height variation being a relatively small part of the building and she does not find it objectionable. She does however take exception to the open space. With regard to the petitioner's comments about how the Village's requirements contributed to them not meeting the open space requirement, she believed that you don't start a design until you find out the Village's requirements rather than the other way around. Open space could be met by removing a couple of parking spaces. She referred to KLOA's traffic report about the queuing issues and how adding parking spaces won't help the situation. The increased enrollment will also make it worse. During special events the school might need to have extra parking on the streets but this happens often with most schools. She favored the petitioner meeting the open space and was not concerned about the height requirement.

Commissioner Cooper stated she was concerned about the Village's response about the porous pavement. Mr. Stilling indicated that we have spoken with the Fire Marshall and they discourage that kind of application. If a large tower truck was called to the scene and had to extend its outriggers, there could be a pressure point issue and the outriggers could sink into the pavers. Since the building is a multi-story facility they want to err on the side of caution with the use of pervious pavers. He noted that pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance those pavers, though perceived as open space, would not count toward open space calculations.

Commissioner Burke asked what the cul-de-sac was needed for. Mr. Stilling indicated that it would be used as a turn around. If all the parking spaces are occupied in that area, there would be no way for a vehicle to turn around. This came to be the most reasonable solution. Commissioner Burke asked if this was a Fire Department requirement. Mr. Stilling answered no and that it doesn't meet the radius for that.

Commissioner Burke referenced the issue of queuing in the KLOA traffic report. He stated that he is familiar with the routes taken to get to the school and if there is a backup in front of the school it would be similar to any other parochial school in town. As a neighbor you either wait your turn or you take a different route. He doesn't see this as being too much of an issue.

Commissioner Sweetser confirmed that her previous comment was not tied to the queuing even though it might have sounded like it did.

Chairperson Ryan asked if the parking in the front of the building would be used as a drop off. Mr. Stilling stated it could be and suggested that closing off and designating a couple of parking spaces only for drop off and pick up, similar to what Creative Day did, might help. KLOA reviewed all these issues and made the recommendation of widening the drive aisle and staggering school hours. If the petitioner does stagger the school hours, queuing should be minimized.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if the Village has incorporated LEED standards into Village Code. Mr. Stilling stated that the Village does not have anything specific to that and are not well versed in their building codes or giving bonuses. Commissioner Sweetser commented that LEED standards should be incorporated into Village Code as it is important.

Chairperson Ryan referenced the parking in front of the building and how the queuing could go to the front and that could eliminate one issue. If there is no parking in the front, it can be a hazard. As far as the height issue, if the petitioner eliminated the extra height and went with a trap, the open space percentage could drop to 50%. Mr. Stilling stated that if they meet the height and 50% open space, the variation would not be applicable.

Commissioner Sweetser asked for clarification on the use of pervious pavers and the objection by the Fire Department. She questioned if their objection was based on possible damage to the Fire Department vehicle or to the surface of the pavers. If it's based on damage to the surface of the pavers, the petitioner would know that going in so if it had to be replaced it could. Mr. Stilling responded that there were a number of factors. Commissioner Sweetser asked if there were any projections about whether the amount of pervious pavement would cause an inability to use the equipment or be a hazard to the firefighters. Mr. Stilling stated they needed 18' for the outriggers. If the parking spaces are all occupied and they have to use the access drive, they preferred to err on the side of caution.

Commissioner Sweetser questioned that if the drive along the west and south side is not used by anyone other than the Fire Department and that area was designated pervious pavement is there any way the Fire Department would be in danger. Mr. Stilling stated that the Fire Department was adamant to have it all pavement. Commissioner Sweetser confirmed that staff didn't know the specific reason why. If it's just a matter of the surface being damaged, then it might be worth it to gain the extra area.

Commissioner Cooper asked for clarification on the refuse location being in the southeast corner of the building. Mr. Jahedi stated it was to be located in the southwest corner of the building in the middle. Chairperson Ryan indicated it was right before the baseball field. Commissioner Cooper stated her concern for choosing this location due to its close proximity to adjacent properties. She also stated that this location would be in the emergency zone so the Fire Department access driveway would be used on a weekly or biweekly basis. Mr. Jahedi indicated that this road would be chain linked and would have to be opened for trash pickup. Mr. Stilling indicated that this issue was discussed with the Fire Department who indicated that refuse pickup would be okay, but it could not be used for student drop off. Mr. Jahedi stated that the reason that this location was chosen was because of its closeness to the kitchen exit, which would have the most waste.

Commissioner Burke also pointed out that the Fire Department access drive would have to be used for deliveries. Mr. Stilling stated that portion of it would be.

Commissioner Burke questioned condition number 4 and how the numbers shown did not add up to the cap of 785 students. He asked if staff was adding in the daycare facility. Mr. Toth stated that the numbers were taken off the submitted plan, which is on the cover of the site plan. Mr. Jahedi stated that the cap is 785 students including the preschool. Commissioner Burke questioned the cap and indicated that it could be any number on the preschool. Mr. Toth stated that the condition could be changed to clarify.

Commissioner Cooper commented that there is a 5' setback along the site and she questioned the choice of vegetation along the perimeter, which was to act as a buffer. Being that the building is a large structure, it didn't seem that the

choice of vegetation would suffice. Mr. Stilling answered that one of our conditions indicates that it be in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance especially along Madison, which has to be screened.

Mr. Jahedi stated that the east and south property lines are higher than the property so the slope is from the southeast to the northwest. In those two areas you have an advantage with the topography. He offered to install a fence, if needed. Chairperson Ryan commented that it would be up to the discretion of the Community Development Director.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if the screening as it relates to trees on the south and west side would be one every 40 feet. Mr. Stilling explained the Zoning Ordinance requirement as it relates to trees and indicated that the intent is that it be fully screened. If the plant is transparent they will be diligent that the intent of the code is met.

Commissioner Sweetser commented on the issue of the fence. She stated she is not insisting that a fence be the solution, but could be an option. Also, as far as the atrium and the neighbor's privacy being compromised, there could be ways to make the lower level windows opaque.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the perimeter of the detention pit would have to be fenced. Mr. Jahedi answered that it is a shallow slope 3:1 and does not need a fence. It's a workable slope, looks pleasant, and doesn't need a fence.

The Commissioners and legal counsel then discussed how the motion and the conditions should be worded or amended if they wanted to approve the rezoning and conditional use as well as the 35' height variation, but require the petitioner meet 50% open space.

[090080](#)

PC 09-05: 300-312 S. Main Street

Requests that the Village take the following action on the property located within the B5APD Central Business District Planned Development:

Pursuant to Section 155.504(A) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance (major changes to a planned development), amend the conditional use for the Prairie Path Villas Planned Development, as established by Ordinance 5802, to allow for modifications to the approved signage plan. (DISTRICT #1)

Attachments: [APO LETTER FOR 09-05.doc](#)
[Continuance MEMO 09-05.doc](#)
[Cover Sheet.doc](#)
[DAH referral memo.doc](#)
[PUBLICNOTICE.doc](#)
[Referral Letter 09-05.doc](#)
[Report 09-05.doc](#)
[Ordinance 6345.pdf](#)
[090080.pdf](#)
[090080.pdf](#)

Dan Coffey, 1300 S. Finley Road, Suite 103, Lombard, presented the petition.

He explained that he purchased a business condo unit in the Prairie Path Villas for his business. He indicated that about 6 months ago he inquired about signage with the Village and initially thought the panel sign was acceptable. It was not until Mr. Pyter from Olympic Sign submitted details to the Village that the provisions regulating the site came to light. Mr. Coffey explained that David George, the developer of the building, indicated to him that the Planned Development allowed for more signage and awnings. He was not aware of the channel lettering requirement until staff made reference to the planned development ordinance and the Main Street Place requirements. He indicated that these are tough economic times and that the channel letter sign is much more expensive - \$16,500 versus \$3,700. Mr. Coffey said that financing is limited and cannot afford the more expensive sign. He also stated that Mr. George, owner and president of the association, preferred the appearance of the panel sign and having individual letters attached to the wall would create maintenance problems.

He continued that there were concerns about his responses to standards being an obstruction or distraction and don't believe they will do that. He said it is important to have a lit sign because he works late and his patients are accustomed to him staying open until 9 p.m. Without the proper signage, it would make it difficult to find his business. He mentioned the parking being in the back of the building and that his clients may miss the turn onto Ash. He respects Community Development's passion and desires to improve Lombard. He indicated that he plans to be here for many years. He said he is in a bad situation now with financing and so he needs the Commissioners' help. If the petition is denied it will delay his ability to get the proper signage to get downtown going. He added that he cares about Lombard, serving on the Board of Directors for Chamber of Commerce, Rotary and Lombard Town Centre. He said that he would not let a sign go up that doesn't represent Lombard nor will David George. He believes that the panel type sign would look visually better, satisfy the Commissioners and allow him to support his family and employees with the additional savings.

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting for public comment.

Tom Knapp spoke in support of the request and provided additional documents. He indicated that he is the architect for Mr. Coffey's office space and is also the Vice President of the Lombard Town Centre. He also stated that he is representing himself and the Lombard Town Centre. He said that although he was only the architect to assist Mr. Coffey with his build-out, he got involved once he learned about the signage issues. He indicated that he contacted staff inquiring about the signage provisions and was told the sign was acceptable. He said that the petitioner proceeded with a sign contractor to put a formal proposal together and submit it to the Village. The sign was rejected and he set up a meeting with Village staff to discuss the matter. He stated that staff did not provide him with anything in writing explaining the requirements. He said the sign meets the zoning requirements and that the Planned Development was unclear. He suggested a better process for business owners with regards to signage approval.

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

Stuart Moynihan, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. Staff drafted the IDRC report to submit to the public record in its entirety. The petitioner, Dr. Daniel Coffey of D.C. Spinal Wellness and Sport Rehabilitation, is proposing to install a box style wall sign on the eastern façade of the Prairie Path Villas

building. Ordinance 5802 (PC 05-43), approved the Prairie Path Villas Planned Development. As part of the approvals, all wall signage associated with the development was to be in accordance with the approved elevation plan as shown on exhibit "A". In addition, as a condition of approval, signage associated with the development was to consist of channel letters. Since the proposed new sign would not be of a design or in a location approved as part of Ordinance 5802, a planned development amendment is required.

Mr. Moynihan stated that the petitioner is proposing to install a box style wall sign at Prairie Path Villas located at 310-312 S. Main St. The wall sign is proposed to be installed on the eastern elevation of the building and will face Main Street. The petitioner is the owner of the far northern commercial condominium unit on the Main Street side of the building. The proposed sign would be installed above the awning just south of the Main Street entrance to this unit. As the sign is proposed to be placed in a location not depicted on the approved building elevations, an amendment to the planned development for signage location would be necessary. In addition, the planned development required that all exterior wall signs on the building be of a channel letter design. As the proposed sign consists of a single interiorly illuminated aluminum cabinet, the petitioner is requesting that the conditional use for a planned development be amended to allow a box style wall sign.

The Comprehensive Plan identifies the site for Community Commercial uses. The existing use is therefore consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

The subject property is bordered by other commercial uses, a recreational pathway, and multi-family housing. The proposed signage is not expected to negatively impact the surrounding land uses. The request is generally compatible with the surrounding land uses.

Compatibility with the Sign Ordinance

In PC 05-43, Prairie Path Villas was granted the following deviations related to signage:

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; and

The deviation for the number of signs was supported by staff to allow a sufficient number of signs to identify the individual commercial tenants in the building. The use of mixed signage was supported by staff to promote the aesthetic effect of breaking up the building's street elevations. The intention was to contribute to the impression of a series of separate buildings, effectively reducing the single, larger building to a more pedestrian scale.

The petitioner's proposed wall sign would be installed on the eastern elevation of Prairie Path Villas. The proposed signage measures four feet (4') by twelve feet (12') for a total of forty-eight (48) square feet. The Sign Ordinance requires that the total sign area of all wall signs on a property in the B5A District shall not exceed one times the lineal front footage of the property and that no one wall sign shall exceed fifty (50) square feet. Therefore, no variation for signage area is necessary as the proposed wall sign does meet the pertinent regulations.

Staff also notes that the petitioner has indicated on his submitted permit plans that his tenant space has sixty feet (60') of frontage along Main Street. The

proposed signage area would only make use of forty-eight feet (48') of frontage along Main Street.

Ordinance 5802 which established the Prairie Path Villas Planned Development requires that wall signage be of a channel letter design. The following conditions are applicable to this petition:

3. As part of the building permit submittal, the petitioner shall satisfactorily address the comments included as part of the Inter-Departmental Review Report.

9. The proposed wall and awning signs on the building shall be designed and located on the building consistent with the submitted plans.

Regarding Condition 3, staff made several comments concerning signage in the Inter-Departmental Review Report of PC 05-43. Among those comments were the following:

" Based upon the submitted elevations, two deviations are required - 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, and a deviation from Section 153.508(B)(19)(c) to allow for more than one wall sign per street frontage."

" 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."

" 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 (SPA 05-05), kitty-corner to the site. 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."

As noted above in the IDRC and as a condition of approval, signage in the Prairie Path Villas Development was to be of a uniform design and placed according to submitted building elevations, same as the guidelines established for Main Street Place at 229 S. Main Street (SPA 05-05). That development was approved with the following condition:

1. All wall signage to be installed on the subject property shall be of a channel letter design and shall be placed on the building in accordance with the wall sign package as depicted on the submitted building elevations.

The approval of Prairie Path Villas was conditioned that it meet the same signage design standards required at Main Street Place, specifically channel letter design, and that the signage be located as depicted on the approved plans. These conditions were recommended by staff and approved by the Village Board as a means to improving the overall quality and uniformity of signage design and to ensure consistency in location. As the approved plans were interpreted during the public hearing to be consistent with the requirement for channel letter signs, there was no condition written as part of Ordinance 5802 which specifically stated that channel letter signs would be required at Prairie Path Villas.

It is the opinion of staff that these amendments could potentially reduce the quality of signage on the building and the quality of the development as a

whole. A future tenant could replace this box style wall sign with one of an inferior quality. If other signs on the building are to be channel letter in design, a box style sign would also degrade the uniformity of the signage package which was preferred in PC 05-43. Staff also notes that the approval of these amendments may set a precedent for other tenants in the Prairie Path Villas building and other nearby buildings, such as Main Street Place, should they desire to install box style wall signs.

The Planned Development was designed to ensure unified and compatible design of buildings and signage, as authorized in Section 155.502 (D) of the Zoning Ordinance. Staff finds that the proposed amendment to the Planned Development will reduce the quality of signage on the building and the quality of the development as a whole. Therefore staff recommends denial of the request.

If the Plan Commission does determine that proposed amendments are desirable, the Commissioners may want to consider similar amendments for the entire planned development, allowing for any future signage to only meet the requirements of the Sign Ordinance. This would avoid the possible situation in which public hearings are necessary on a sign by sign basis, should similar signs be requested. The following condition could be added to any motion for approval:

1. But for the two deviations granted by Ordinance 5802, wall signs installed on the exterior elevations of the Prairie Path Villas Planned Development shall be subject only to the requirements of the Sign Ordinance.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

Commissioner Nelson asked if the sign would be lit. The petitioner indicated it would be lit and that he needed it that way to help direct his customers.

Commissioner Sweetser indicated that since it was not specially stated that channel lettering was required that there might be a good reason for making some adjustments however she was not sure what they would be. She wanted to know if other Commissioners had any thoughts.

Commissioner Cooper suggested that the petitioner consider other types of signage that would be less expensive but still have channel letters such as steel.

Commissioner Burke suggested that the letter be back lit rather than individually lit to save costs. Commissioner Flint agreed and said there could be an alternative cost effective way to light the sign.

Commissioner Burke stated that he would like this to move forward and that he understands the dilemma and confusion, however based on the information they have, the signage is unacceptable and does not go well with the other signage on the building. He indicated that he is sympathetic to the petitioner regarding costs however he felt that the channel letter goes well with the building and other signage and that he was not in favor of the request.

Commissioner Sweetser suggested they grant a time period for this sign to be up and ready to go and be replaced in 2 years. She then stated that the planned development required channel letters and that the box sign appears to be like a billboard on the building. She stated that they should be consistent with the

standards of the planned development since this is the first sign. She suggested to staff to review its process of giving information.

Business Meeting

Approval of Minutes

Public Participation

DuPage County Hearings

Chairperson's Report

Planner's Report

Unfinished Business

New Business

Subdivision Reports

Site Plan Approvals

Workshops

Adjournment