

Village of Lombard

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



Meeting Minutes

Monday, June 8, 2009

7:30 PM

SPECIAL MEETING

Village Hall

Plan Commission

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

Call to Order

[Play Video](#)

Chairperson Ryan called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Roll Call of Members

[Play Video](#)

Present: Chairperson Donald F. Ryan, Commissioner Stephen Flint, Commissioner Ronald Olbrysh, Commissioner Ruth Sweetser and Commissioner Martin Burke

Absent: Commissioner Richard Nelson and Commissioner Andrea Cooper

Also present: Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development; Michael Toth, Planner I; Stuart Moynihan, Associate Planner; and George Wagner, legal counsel to the Plan Commission.

Chairperson Ryan called the order of the agenda.

Christopher Stilling read the the Rules of Procedures as written in the Plan Commission By-Laws.

Public Hearings

[Play Video](#)

PC 09-08: 331 W. Madison Street (CPSA)

Requests the Village take the following actions on the subject property:

1. Approval of a map amendment to rezone the subject property from CR Conservation Recreation District to R2 Single-Family Residence District.
2. Approval of a conditional use to allow for a School, Private, Full-time: Elementary, Middle and High in the R2 Single-Family Residence District, and;
3. Approval of a conditional use for a planned development with the following deviations:
 - a. To allow a variation from Section 155.407 (H) and Section 155.508 (C) (7), reducing the minimum required open space to 46.85% where a minimum of 62.5% is required; and
 - b. To allow a variation from Section 155.407 (G) to allow for a building height of up to thirty-five feet (35') from grade, where thirty feet (30') maximum height is allowed by right. (DISTRICT #6)

[Play Video](#)

Chairperson Ryan asked Commissioners Olbrysh and Flint if they reviewed the tape and looked at the petition information that was presented during the May 4, 2009 Plan Commission meeting as they were absent during that meeting. Both Commissioners stated that they had reviewed the information.

Michael Toth, Planner I, presented the case background. At the May 4, 2009 Plan Commission meeting, the Plan Commission held a public hearing to consider zoning actions for the CPSA proposed school expansion project. The Plan Commission considered the petition and public testimony raised at the meeting and through its

deliberations recommended approval of the petition, in substantial part, subject to conditions.

Subsequent to the Plan Commission and prior to the Village Board meeting, a neighborhood meeting was held with surrounding property owners where some additional comments and concerns regarding the development proposal and its potential impacts on adjacent properties were generated. The nature of the comments and concerns varied; but seemed to focus on adjacent neighbor impacts such as buffering/screening, traffic, building height and operational activities.

*The Village Board, at their May 21, 2009 meeting remanded this item back to the Plan Commission in its entirety, to allow an opportunity for the issues raised in subsequent discussions to be considered by the Plan Commission in a public hearing format. This action ensures that the public hearing record has been perfected and that the public hearing provisions established in *Klaeren v. Lisle* are satisfactorily addressed. It is noted that all testimony presented at the May 4 meeting is applicable to tonight's hearing. He then discussed the meeting format.*

Mr. Toth then read the meeting format. Staff will outline the reason for the Special Meeting and will note the actions to be considered as part of the meeting. Staff will provide a brief history of the petition and will summarize the zoning actions and development regulations associated with the petition, which he stated that he had already done.

1) The petitioner (CPSA) will be given an opportunity to present their petition and offer additional testimony regarding their use and operation. Once completed, an opportunity to cross-

examine the petitioner by anyone in the public will be provided and shall relate specifically to the petitioner's presentation and the submitted materials.

2) Upon completion of petitioner's cross-examination, if any, any objector will be offered the opportunity to speak. Once completed, an opportunity to cross-examine the objector by anyone in the public will be provided and shall relate specifically to the objector's presentation.

3) Staff will present the remand memorandum. Once completed, an opportunity to cross-examine staff by the petitioner and anyone in the public will be provided.

4) After completion of the cross-examination, if any, the public participation period will be closed. The Plan Commissioners shall then be given an opportunity to discuss the petition. Questions may be asked to staff, objectors or the petitioner. The Plan Commission should provide a response to each of the issues raised by the petitioner and/or objectors.

5) The Plan Commissioners shall then vote to uphold their original recommendation or amend their recommendation as deemed necessary. The Commissioners could amend the language as they deem appropriate, provided that the reasons for approval or denial are tied to the standards for conditional uses, variations, map amendments and planned developments. The Commissioners do have the ability to add any additional conditions they deem appropriate should they recommend approval.

6) The recommendation will be forwarded to the Village Board for consideration at their June 18, 2009 meeting.

Andy Draus, 350 S. Fairfield, Lombard indicated he is the attorney representing CPSA

and presented the petition. He stated that all issues at the May 4, 2009 Plan Commission meeting and the presentations is part of the public record for today so he won't go through all those items, but will highlight some of the major issues and address concerns they received from the neighbors living near the school. The subject building has been a school building since 1930 and was purchased by CPSA in 1994 when they opened 15 years ago. The school is successful, producing many scholars. At the last meeting 11 Lombard residents spoke in favor including former students and parents who moved so their children could attend the school. He stated that the architect and engineer for the school presented the plan for the school, which is a similar request to that of St. John's School and Sacred Heart, private schools approved by the Plan Commission and Village Board for both open space and building height. At the May 4, 2009 Plan Commission meeting the proposed plans were approved and the petition was sent to May 21, 2009 Village Board meeting where it was remanded back to the Plan Commission with no comments. Since that time, the petitioner has received letters from neighbors, including Mr. Glazier and Mr. Doles. CPSA met with staff and Mr. Glazier to address those concerns that weren't explained sufficiently earlier. Tonight CPSA will go through those concerns in greater detail. He introduced Jamshid Jahedi who will give a brief presentation.

Jamshid Jahedi, 105 Ogden Ave., Clarendon Hills, architect and engineer on the project, gave a Power Point presentation.

Mr. Jahedi gave the Power Point presentation as a follow up to the public hearing on May 4, 2009. The presentation is meant to be a continuation of their original presentation.

The first slide addressed some of the issues that were received through letters and complaints from neighbors. Those issues are as follows:

- 1) Refuse enclosure located to south of property.
- 2) Noise from garbage truck and smell of dumpster enclosure.
- 3) Visual screening - privacy for neighbors.
- 4) Traffic - no truck traffic on the southeast portion of the subject property.
- 5) Upper windows - open to neighbors, which creates a lack of privacy for property owners and creates distraction for students.
- 6) Loading dock, which is not needed for the facility, but is a zoning requirement.
- 7) Building height of over 30'. The height of building is counted from the grade to the top of the roof and not to top of the parapet. All the drawings are given to the top of parapet. Parapet is 3-10" so the building has maximum height of 26'.
- 8) Roof top units - noise and view.
- 9) Construction - phases and how long it will take.
- 10) Parking/lights - will light shine onto neighbors and create nuisance. 0.0 foot candles at the property line.
- 11) Parking and open space, which was left unresolved by the Plan Commission.

The second slide addressed the revised site plan. The first item to be noted is the new location of the dumpster. Mr. Jahedi stated that this is a good location as it is the existing location of the trash bins. Also, by relocating the dumpsters they are eliminating the truck traffic that would have used the roadway near the adjacent property. He added that only the Fire Department will access that drive aisle. Also, the loading dock was a concern as it was thought that semi trailer trucks would be unloading at that location. As the architect, he has to put a loading dock in to satisfy a Zoning Ordinance requirement. They are putting it in just for satisfying the Zoning Ordinance. There are no trucks coming to the facility to unload. They use catering trucks, vans or smaller trucks that don't require a loading dock. He talked to CPSA and they told him that the loading dock will stay empty forever.

The next item was the screening from the neighbors. Mr. Jahedi added that on the south and east property lines they will have large trees. They plan to use some type of tree that grows over 5-6 feet with would grow high enough and have a large enough canopy to screen the entire length of the property essentially creating a wall. Staff will be diligent to ensure the right tree species is used.

The next item was the southeast corner of the site. Mr. Jahedi stated that he created a view of the southeast corner of the cul-de-sac looking south. The fence will be 6' high all around the south side along the property line. If it makes the neighbors happy, they can go all the way to the end. The larger trees and fence will also be used on the east side. He mentioned the swale and stated that they will eliminate it and put in an underground pipe so the trees will be able to grow.

Mr. Jahedi then discussed the second floor windows of the proposed building. They will be made of a semi-translucent material, which transmits light, but cannot be seen through. As an example, he referred to frosted glass in older bathrooms, which are a translucent material. Previously he used the word "opaque" glass in front of the neighbors and admits to his error. Opaque does not transmit light or view. Gypsum board is opaque. For the record, he wanted to correct himself by stating that the material would be translucent, but it will not be see through. They suggest these windows so there is no way of seeing outside or inside. This is also to the benefit of the school so students won't be distracted in the library and other classrooms. This is a mutual benefit.

Mr. Jahedi then discussed more of the neighborhood concerns such as questions about sunlight and the building being so high as to create a shadow onto neighbor's yard and blocking the sun. He discussed the shadow effect in the winter months and the angle projected and noted that on the south side you will never have a shadow because the sun comes from the south.

Mr. Jahedi then discussed the roof top units and the noise radii and showed how much noise would be generated from various points to the property line.

Mr. Jahedi stated that construction will be completed in one phase. His guess is construction will be less than 18 months and not more than 24 months. He added that the Village will bug the owners when the permit is set to expire.

Jamshid Jahedi discussed parking lot lighting. He stated that there is concern about spreading the light onto adjacent property, creating a nuisance. He then showed the lighting illustration and explained that it meets Village Code.

Jamshid Jahedi addressed the parking/open space issues to the Plan Commission. He stated that he teaches courses at IIT. He mentioned that one of the lessons he teaches deals with zoning ordinance and building codes. This petition is related to the zoning and how the zoning will become a determinant factor in design. He added that zoning was created to preserve the value of the properties in the neighborhood, but it is not a perfect design determinant. That's why they have the conditional use and variation processes. They wish to provide 99 parking spaces because they think it is crucial in order to prevent spillover onto surrounding streets.

He then discussed the KLOA traffic study. He added that they strongly believe the 19 additional parking spaces are needed for this operation and want the members of the Plan Commission to consider the matter.

Mr. Jahedi then ran through the parking slides. He discussed how the parking situation

won't be much different from what they have now.

Mr Jahedi then addressed the open space issue. He pleaded that the Plan Commission members act favorably upon the open space variation. He added that the Village requirements do not allow them to meet the open space.

Referring to the greenish blue box in the presentation, the Village did not give CPSA credit for pervious pavement in the parking lot, which is according to the green building and LEED certification. He added that it helps to create a better environment and they are being punished for only 3% open space.

He concluded his talk and opened the discussion for questions.

Attorney Draus addressed other concerns brought up.

1) Building height and view of building on surrounding streets - the height of building is 30' and is the normal height of a house. CPSA flew balloons on Saturday and Sunday at the southeast corner to a height of 30' high to get a visual of the height.

2) Other activities at the CPSA building - this is a school building and not a church or mosque, which applies to both buildings. There are normal school hours, but students and teachers stay later. It's a religious based school so there are prayers as part of the Muslin religion in which they pray five times a day based on the position of the sun. They conduct prayers at the school, which are not open to public, however, some parents do come in evening. He's been there at night when there are 10-12 people in the classrooms. There are extra curricular activities such as fundraisers and athletic activities.

3) Open space - it is their desire that the Plan Commission consider the original plan for 46.85% open space. At the last meeting they approved 50 percent open space, which is a difference of 3.15%. The difference is CPSA would get 99 parking spaces versus 80 parking spaces. Those extra spaces will be needed for extra curricular activities. They believe it is more advantageous to have them on site. Their desire is to get the plan approved with the building height and open space variations.

To speak in favor of the petition:

Fazal Ahmed, 200 W. 17th Street, Lombard, stated he is a child psychiatrist who moved from Des Plaines so his children could attend CPSA. He has since established his practice in Lombard. His son graduated from CPSA. Their current school is a 1930's building. The learning environment has to be nice so the people can grow and nurture.

Rashid Zaffer, 1719 Porter Court, Lombard, moved from Indiana. His taxes here in Illinois are ten times more so from a business perspective it was not a good decision, but when he sees his kids in this school, it was a good decision. The students are second to none. There should be no reservation to favor this decision to allow children the proper environment needed for the citizens of tomorrow.

Mohammad Azharuddin, 1069 Westmore-Meyers, Lombard, moved from Texas to Lombard because of the school. He mentioned that he doesn't enjoy the smell of skunk or the winters, but he stays because of school. He has two kids that go there. The school is popular so please help it to expand.

Shoeb Jethro Kahn, 414 Harding, Lombard, stated that everyone needs to loosen up and talk to their neighbors. This school has been their for 18 years and graduated over 800 students. He mentioned that the university graduation rate is 100 percent. He had two houses in Oak Brook, but he sold them and moved to Lombard for the school. He has 4 children. He thinks CPSA is a great school. He asked everyone to think outside

of the box. They are only doing an addition to accommodate a few more kids. If you take the school out, 300 families would move out. They have highly educated people who live here and improve the quality of life and neighborhood. The school has a zero crime, drug, and alcohol record. He felt that it was important that the neighbors and the school work together and get to know each other. He exemplified how the school offered a free medical clinic and only two neighbors showed up. They want to open their doors. They should be proud of this school for what it is doing to the community and nation. He asked for the Commissioners' support.

M. Javeed Ansari, 114 Oakton Drive, Lombard, moved here from Massachusetts for the school. He is currently a faculty member at Northwestern University and the sole reason he moved to Lombard was for the school. They waited for two years because there was a waiting list. You've heard how good school is and the reputation of school. At the last public hearing there was a unanimous decision to expand the daycare facility for dogs which is a good thing to take care of animals. At the same time, we should be equally or more generous and welcome people that are trying to be good citizens. He hopes the Commissioners arrive at a favorable decision.

Mohammed Kothawala, 213 W. Harding, Lombard, lives two blocks from the school. All the neighbors have been good to him. He has no complaints. He moved to Lombard not only for the school but also for the Village. At 7:57 a.m. the students arrive and by 8 a.m. most of the traffic will be gone so it won't clash with the other schools. In the afternoon CPSA will close earlier than those schools.

Abdul Majeed, 509 W. Wilson, Lombard, stated that Naperville was named the best city in entire country to raise a family. Ironically he lived there, but moved here because of the school so his children can come to the school and grow. CPSA had two neighborhood meetings before the petition was even filed and afterward they had two more meetings. They are asking for a simple variation for 35 feet instead of 30 feet. He used St. Johns and Sacred Heart as examples and stated that both are private schools and St. Johns has high towers beyond 35'. He stated without the 19 additional parking spaces on the premises will result in 19 cars that will have to park on the street. The neighbors won't want the cars parked in front of their houses. He asked the height variation, which is one percent of the entire building be approved. They have got on the south side of property 4,000 square feet, which does not belong to anyone, but does contribute to the open space in the area. It is a no man's land. CPSA is ready to withdraw its claim to the neighbors so that the 4,000 square feet could be considered as part of the petition.

Sayed Zaffer, 119 Collen Drive, Lombard, moved to Lombard 2001. His business practice is located in Elmhurst Memorial and he is a member of the Chamber of Commerce. He has three children that attend CPSA. He believes the zoning can be discussed, but at end of day, it's the conscience of all those benefitting from the school and it's the right thing to do.

Dr. M.T. Alilviazec, 5382 Galloway Drive, Hoffman Estates, is from the west coast. He stated that the school is known throughout the country and some people overseas. This school has put the Village of Lombard on the map.

M. Mukarram Sheikh, 1328 S. Rebecca, Lombard, moved to Lombard from Memphis, TN. He is a physician and is for the school. He came for the school and fell in love with the Village. He has invested in the community and brought financial investments and talent here. He added that people affiliated with CPSA are acquiring new houses in Lombard and they have contributed to this community in different aspects. As the school building has been there since 1930, it is not like CPSA is trying to sneak in a building. They are just asking for help to upgrade the building to a level encompassing

modern education. He mentioned how he covers trauma at Loyola and how he sees the results of street crime on a daily basis. We are being trusted in the emergency room to treat you and your families and now we are asking you to help us. He understands the neighbor's concerns and those issues have been addressed. They feel it's their right and their civil right but maybe it's just a personal thing that they do not want to help us build.

Speaking against the petition were:

Dan Smothers, 560 Green Valley, Lombard, stated that this is not a referendum on CPSA, the school is already there. Local residents do not want the expansion of the school as it will change the face of the neighborhood permanently.

Bill Raysby, 580 S. Edson, Lombard, stated that he has four kids that attended the Green Valley School. Referring to page seven of the staff memo regarding phasing, it mentions two items that he had an objection to - the cost to upgrade Green Valley to keep it as a public school and the asbestos abatement. He has never seen or heard that the Village has issued a permit to remove asbestos tile. He is not aware of anything they plan to do with the windows, air conditioners, or asbestos. Right now with the existing building he said that they may or may not upgrade it. It's been an eyesore for some time. They should take care of what they have right now. He said that there is the possibility of tearing the existing building down after the new building goes up, but what about asbestos abatement. He's not sure if they are aware of it. He would like to see that taken care of before the petition is granted.

Ed Pszanka, 615 S. Edson, Lombard, stated his property joins the school's property. He has never heard of any incidents. He questioned the expansion and believed it will not stop there. Intelligence is the power to reason. Green Valley School was obsolete and they are still using it. Why waste that money there. He stated that the Commissioners are not doing their job. He asked what each of the Commissioners think about the school. He stated that education is the most important thing. He suggested that they take the school and put it on North Avenue and then you can build another College of DuPage or Harper.

Fran Pszanka, 615 S. Edson, Lombard, stated she had issues going back to when the property Joe Schmidt owned, was up for sale. The contractor was going to take the school down and build a few nice houses there, which would bring in tax money for the Village. That project was turned down due to the zoning code. Now we are asking for the Zoning Ordinance to be changed for the school, which doesn't seem right. There are flooding issues in the yards and the retention pond may overflow, which she has seen happen in other places. Is there a guarantee that a child might not fall into it or attract mosquitoes. For the people that have lived here for all these years and all the taxes we have paid for the school, a park should be considered.

Joe Glazier Jr., 304 W. Harding, Lombard, thanked the Plan Commission for reviewing this matter, thanked the staff and CPSA for the opportunity sit down and address their concerns. A number of ideas have come out of this meeting. I feel the school should be commended for their success, but should not negatively impact the neighbors. He wanted clarification on staggered hours of drop off and pick up, the length of school year, how the school will increase the property value, religious based school with prayers and times and dates of prayers. Please take these into consideration and ask yourself, would you want a 61,000 square foot building in your backyard.

Holly Brazleton, 141 W. Park, Lombard, stated that her biggest concern was the nature and care of the present building. Will the new building be cared for when the old building is not cared for. When activities are occurring at the school, paper plates and other

junk can be found on the property to the west of the school. She added that the parking seems to be solved.

Carl Schwebel, 614 S. Elizabeth, Lombard, stated that his house backs up directly to school. CPSA paints a nice picture of being wonderful to the community. If you lived in his backyard you would think different. He stated that there are car alarms that go off at 2 a.m. The snow removal comes at 4 a.m. during the winter. His children are not able to walk up and down the street due to the four schools in the area and adding 600 cars so every school being dropped off will be by vehicles at drop off and pick up. The Village of Lombard cannot put a police officer by Madison, now they want to add another 600 cars. He asked how the school benefits Lombard. Construction will go on for more than two years. When he moved to their house in 2001, CPSA refused to mow their lawn and their crews were there at 6 a.m. They are trying to appease their neighbors by dropping off Christmas gifts at Christmas time. He questioned the traffic study. Referring to the traffic study he added that on January 7 and 8 there is no school. A traffic study in May or June would be more accurate. The reality is this will cause more noise, pollution and traffic in Lombard.

Jerry Debokisky, 598 S Elizabeth, Lombard, stated that he lives across the street from the school. He moved to the neighborhood in 1992 and observed the school for a long time. If they are remodeling, expanding upon that small property is a waste. He also moved from somewhere, but for some reason for those beautiful properties, spaces, peace of life, slow traffic and now we are doing more of what we don't like. He wishes success for them, but not on that property.

Ken Doles, 623 S. Elizabeth, Lombard, has been a resident of Lombard for 39 years. Many of issues have been raised in past and were adequately addressed by the engineer. This is more than a bricks or mortar issue. We are talking about significant skin in this game, more specifically the property investments in the Green Valley area. CPSA's website shows that the school has outstanding credentials and a very successful operation, but it is not meant for that location. Its own success will become its worst enemy. The 785 student cap and open space issues have to be addressed. Progress is necessary, but cannot be made on the backs of the people who have established the neighborhood. He mentioned the Driscoll School. What are the next steps because if they are as successful as they claim, then what about growth, value and quality of life. These are considerations that go beyond zoning, right location, right time and long term consequences.

Candice Rizzo, 308 W. Harding, Lombard, lives directly behind the school. She had three concerns that need to be clarified:

- 1) The "no mans land" - CPSA mentioned they don't want to take it, but they will if they have to. Has that been addressed, is that an issue right now.*
- 2) Parking - 99 spaces will help overflow. As it is now, the students and staff cannot park on streets, the same goes for the residents if they parked on the streets. Not even Lombard residents can park on the streets.*
- 3) Building size - it will impact the residents all the way around. We know the school has been there and there was no infringement. The air conditioning unit will be close to their backyard and she hopes it will be as quiet as they say. She is concerned.*

Ed Pszanka asked when the Plan Commissioners will tell their point of view. Chairperson Ryan said they will voice their concerns at the appropriate time similar to the last meeting.

Ken Doles had a question for the architect/engineer. He asked if the utility lines will have the proper clearance from the proposed landscaping.

John Harley, 585 S. Elizabeth, Lombard, asked if there will be security cameras like their school in Villa Park. He personally doesn't like them and feels that is an intrusion into his freedom

Attorney Draus made the following comments in regard to the neighbors concerns:

- 1) He stated that it is nice to speculate on the Driscoll building or North Avenue, but they own this property and they have a right to build on it. It's also their backyard. The plan in front of us today is for this property.
- 2) CPSA is not affiliated with the school in Villa Park, nor are there are plans for security cameras at CPSA.
- 3) Drop off/pick up times - will be specifically staggered to avoid the times of Madison School. They will not be set in the plan itself because they need flexibility to determine year to year. Their intention is to alleviate traffic on Madison and to account for their hours and Madison School hours.
- 4) Length of school year - 168 days long from August or September and ending in June, similar to other schools.
- 5) Property values - interesting argument, it's all relative and very arguable.
- 6) Present building - there is a fundraising plan to build this building, which is a modern building. Fundraising will continue to increase the value of the present building including new windows air conditioning and the like.
- 7) 600 cars - the total increase of students would be 380 over what they have now. It may never happen. They will be capped at 785. There are 400 students now, many of which carpool. There were usually 4-5 students to a car or van that are dropped off and picked up together.
- 8) The "no mans land" - the 3,400 square foot strip of land between the CPSA property and the neighbors. If you surveyed the two properties, no one party owns that property. We don't know why that is and dates way back. Mr. Sayeed stated that he would like the Plan Commission to take into account the land when considering the open space requirement. CPSA is not making a claim on that land, they will release that claim to the neighbors behind there if they could figure it out.
- 9) Only two roof top units on top. The rest of HVAC system is based on different systems, which doesn't require a rooftop unit. He then explained the issue in further detail. The decibels are to the best of his knowledge and he stands behind it. He has enough qualification and has a PhD in engineering.
- 10) The development of the property as single family residences. Jamshid Jahedi explained that the situation would be different if the property was developed with a certain amount of houses. What would happen if the same amount of houses along the east line of his property building were built closer to your property and being at higher elevation because it is not a flat roof. The pitched roof would be higher and the volume of the houses would be much larger and taller than what the CPSA has here farther away from the property line.
- 11) Green space - was not your property to start with and was granted to the previous owner.
- 12) Utility lines - They have not designed the detailed engineering plans yet, but they are committed to good screening with a set number of trees to create privacy. Preserving the utility lines is also crucial.

Attorney Draus stated that he is disappointed by some of the comments from the neighbors tonight. He moved to Lombard because of diversity in this town. He always found people to be friendly and down to earth. He added that CPSA held two neighborhood meetings, a Plan Commission hearing and additional talks with neighbors. They remained civil up to tonight and he is saddened by some of their comments.

Chairperson Ryan asked for a response to the tearing down of the existing building. Andy Draus replied that there are no plans to tear down existing building. Mr. Draus

added that this is their plan for expansion. If there were additional plans for expansion, it would have to come back before the Plan Commission. Referring to the flooding concern, Jamshid Jahedi stated that under the new plan they guarantee that the existing problem will go away and they will handle the run off better than what it is now.

Chairperson Ryan asked about the care of old building, cleaning up after events as being a good neighbors is an important thing. He also asked about the grass cutting. Andy Draus stated that it goes back to 2001. CPSA cuts the grass and maintained the trees and cleans up after themselves. I'm sure there's no garbage out there now.

Chairperson Ryan asked the petitioner to address the issue of activities occurring at 2-3 a.m. Andy Draus stated that he is not familiar with it. Chairperson Ryan asked if late activities are common. Mohammed Syaheed, 1154 Brighton Place, Glen Ellyn, has been involved with the CPSA Board since day one and is responsible to take care of problems. There are no activities at 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. Once in a while if the Village calls us for the alarm, they will go to fix the problem. There is no activity and no contractor comes before school starts before 7 a.m. The garbage comes on Thursday morning around 6:30 once a week, which is a standard time. Referring to lawn mowing, they have a contractor that comes and mows the lawn. They have gone 8-9 years with no problem because since 2001 they have a contractor for snow and grass.

Commissioner Sweetser mentioned some of the other conditions proposed for this petition, which includes trash collection prior to 8 a.m. and other noise-making operations. She asked the petitioner if they were aware that this condition was added. Mohammed Syaheed stated that he was not aware, but the snow cleaning and other such activities begin before school starts, which is 7:30. Attorney Draus stated that trash removal is through the Village and doesn't believe they start before 8 a.m.

Chairperson Ryan stated that they can restrict the time of trash removal similar to St. John's. Commissioner Sweetser asked if lawn mowing and snow removal should be also conditioned.

Chairperson Ryan mentioned the asbestos issue brought up. Mohammed Syaheed stated that because the building built in 1930, the situation was common back then. When they purchased the school, they had an inspector inspect it and so far the state has never told us any complaint.

Village Attorney George Wagner stated that with asbestos, if it's not touched, it doesn't need to be removed. If there is remodeling occurring then it needs to be abated. As long as it's not touched then it's not an issue.

Chairperson Ryan deferred the flooding issue to staff. Chris Stilling asked the petitioner to address the design of the pond. Mr. Jahedi stated that the system for stormwater management includes a detention pond. It appears on the plans to be a wet area, but the slope of the sides is very gentle so children can play in it without danger. When there is a storm event greater than a 100-year event, we still have a safety feature that controls water toward the Village stormwater system. It is a dry detention pond that will have short grass in the bottom of it, which makes it a pleasant view. There is no accumulation of standing water on the bottom so mosquitoes being able to breed in the water is not possible.

Chairperson Ryan mentioned construction time. He added that the petitioner mentioned 18-24 months. Mr. Stilling stated that the Zoning Ordinance requires that a conditional use be substantially completed within 18 months of approval.

Chairperson Ryan mentioned the traffic study. Mr. Stilling stated that the Village hired a

third party consultant, KLOA, to prepare and present a traffic study. Those findings and the study are included in the staff report and one of the suggestions was staggering hours of operation. One of the findings of the report indicate that if they address the staggering issue, there should be no impacts to the surrounding properties.

Mr. Jahedi wanted the record corrected. The one page he referred to in his presentation was just one page that had particular information he was noting. The traffic consultant's full report is 30-40 pages and is available to the public.

Commissioner Sweetser asked Attorney Draus to give the IRS tax status of the school. Attorney Draus stated that CPSA is a not for profit - it's a 501 C3 corporation.

Chairperson Ryan wanted to address the number of activities and prayer times as it relates to after hours. Mr. Jahedi stated that the Muslim religion requires everybody to pray 5 times a day. These are based on sun positions or natural appearances. Before sunrise there is a prayer, which will be done at home. The second prayer is at noon which is usually done at work or students perform at school. The third prayer is toward the evening. Some students may or may not be in school. The next two prayers occur in the evening and at night. The night prayer is performed at home, the evening prayer might occur on the school. Mohammed Syaeed stated that there is no prayer that occurs around 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. Chairperson Ryan asked if the students are there at 11 p.m. Mr. Syaeed stated that they may not be there for prayer, but peer tutoring can occur at that time.

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

Mike Toth, Planner I, presented the staff report. He stated that staff has prepared a list of items with responses for the Plan Commission to consider for this petition. These represent some of the various concerns raised by the surrounding residents. He stated that the information is redundant based upon the testimony already provided, but he wanted to read it into the public record.

1. Traffic

A. Increased traffic, particularly at the southeast corner of the site.

CPSA indicated that most of the drop off & pick up for the K-12 classes would occur in the middle of the site (in between the two buildings and in the new parking area north of the existing building). CPSA also stated that the preschool drop off & pick up would occur at the southeast corner of the site.

B. Traffic backup onto Madison.

A detailed traffic study was completed by the Village's consultant (KLOA), which highlights recommendations that are to be incorporated into CPSA's site plan. Staff gave a copy of the traffic study to some of the adjacent property owners to share with neighbors. The petitioner's current plan does incorporate most of the recommendations; however, the Village still recommends a staggered drop off & pick up schedule as a condition of approval. Per the

Village's consultant, this should eliminate any stacking onto Madison. CPSA has indicated they prefer not to publish a set class schedule at this time. CPSA has agreed to stagger start and end times from those of Madison School. The petitioner has indicated that they would like to retain the flexibility to adjust class schedules and start and end times of different ages based on need, as determined by increased enrollment and/or increased traffic issues. Staff would still recommend that as a condition of

approval, the petitioner provide a detailed drop off/pick up schedule based upon the recommendations in the KLOA report and based upon the proposed traffic flow conditions along Madison Street and upon the subject property.

2. Screening

A. Not enough screening/landscaping along the eastern and southern property lines.

CPSA has submitted a revised landscape and site plan showing a new six foot (6') solid fence along the eastern portions of the site. The fence would also be located on the along southern lot line, however it would stop at the midpoint. In addition, the revised landscape does show some additional plantings, however details of the type and size of plantings has not been provided. The petitioner has indicated that they are not sure yet if all the neighbors on the south and east want the fence and/or landscaped screening. The petitioner has indicated a willingness to work with the neighbors to provide screening that meets the desires of the neighbors on those sides. Staff recommends that as a condition of approval, all plantings along the parking lot and drive aisles that directly abuts residentially zoned properties be screened with evergreen and/or dense deciduous shrubs across the entire frontage at a planting height of a minimum of 4 feet. This is consistent with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. In addition, staff recommends that the type of evergreens and/or shrubs shall have the ability to grow to a minimum height of 15 feet.

B. Landscaping shall be dense trees/shrubs that can grow higher than a fence. The proposed drainage swale along the east property line will impede the growth of any landscaping.

The revised site plan submitted by the petitioner does show the addition of a storm sewer with several inlets along the east property line. In addition, staff recommends that the plant material shall meet the provisions outlined above. Please note that additional comments may be generated during final engineering review regarding the use of a storm sewer in lieu of only a swale. In the event the petition is approved with a condition requiring landscape screening that conflicts with the final engineering plans, the petitioner would still be required to provide the necessary screening. It would be up to the petitioner to revise their plan to meet all conditions of approvals and final engineering requirements.

3. Loading Dock

A. Residents along the southern and eastern property lines are concerned about truck traffic and the utilization of the loading dock.

CPSA indicated that they will sparingly use the loading dock and that most of their supplies are provided in vans or small trucks only. Please note that the loading dock is a zoning requirement; however, the location of the loading dock was proposed by the petitioner.

4. Garbage Dumpster

A. Location of the garage dumpster.

CPSA has revised their plans to reflect a new dumpster location. The new dumpster location will be located directly off of the western drive aisle, adjacent to the detention pond. The new location is more centralized on the site, which would place it further away from the residential properties. The Zoning Ordinance requires the dumpster to be fully screened on all four (4) sides. The relocation should mitigate many of the concerns

raised by residents. Also, a condition of approval for St. Johns School (PC 05-06) was that trash collection shall not occur on the school property prior to 8:00 a.m. Staff recommends that the same condition of approval required of St. John's will be added as part of this petition.

5. After School Activities

A. CPSA has nighttime activities.

CPSA has indicated that there will be afterschool activities that would be ancillary to the school, which includes: student projects, sports and awards ceremonies. They do indicate that since it is a religious based school, there are prayer services offered five times a day. However, those participating in prayers are generally students, teachers, administrators, and a few parents who live in the neighborhood. Staff notes that it is the petitioner's intent is to utilize the property as a parochial school as its principal use, similar to other schools in the community. However, if the petitioner were to modify their operations to provide for public assembly for worship purposes, a conditional use for a religious institution would be required. The petitioner has stated that is not the intent of the school addition.

6. Building Height

A. Proposed building height will be higher than the surrounding residences and block sunlight.

CPSA has provided a detailed illustration of how the building height will not cast a shadow on the surrounding properties. The illustration demonstrates that even when the sun is at its lowest point, a shadow would be cast at a maximum of fifty-two feet (52') away from the building, which would still be seventeen feet (17) from the nearest property line. It is noted that a building height variation is still needed for the building height as it relates to the access stairway.

7. HVAC System

A. HVAC units will be loud and they will be visible to the neighbors.

CPSA indicated that the biggest HVAC unit will be located on the ground floor at the northeast corner of the new building. They also stated that two (2) units will be located on the roof of the new building; however, they will be screened per Section 155.221 of the Zoning Ordinance.

8. Atrium Window

A. Residents along the eastern and southern property lines are concerned about the large windows overlooking their homes.

On the newly-submitted elevation plans, CPSA is now proposing semi-translucent windows to block the views onto adjacent properties. The plans now show semi-translucent glass panels on the lower- half of the second story windows and atrium. The petitioner's architect has indicated that this semi-translucent glass will still allow for light to enter the building but will prevent the occupant of the building from looking out onto the adjacent properties.

9. Capped Student Population

A. How will the capping of students be monitored.

As a condition of approval, staff recommends that grade school students shall be capped at 450 students and the number of high school students shall be capped at 240 students. The total student population, including the pre-school, shall not exceed 785 students. To monitor this condition, staff can obtain student population numbers through the Illinois State Board of Education and pre-school numbers through DCFS.

10. Parking Lot Lighting

A. Residents are concerned about parking lot lighting spilling over onto the adjacent properties.

CPSA will be required to meet the full provisions of Section 155.602(A)(10)(d) of the Zoning Ordinance, which pertain to parking lot lighting standards. Section 155.602(A)(10)(d) specifically states that in no case shall parking lot lighting exceed 0.5 foot-candles at any property line which is shared by a residentially-zoned property. As such, the Ordinance does not allow for excessive light spillover onto residential properties. Furthermore, CPSA will be required to submit a photometric plan, for Village review, as part of their permit submittal.

11. Phasing & Construction

A. Residents were concerned that the project was going to be built in phases over the years.

CPSA indicated that the entire project would be built in one (1) phase. Any improvements to the existing building (windows and air-conditioning) may come at a later date, after they are done with the project.

B. Construction Hours.

Village Code restricts construction activity Monday-Sunday 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.

12. Surveyor's Gap

A question was raised regarding the surveying gap located south of the subject property. The plans show that the proposed use will not include the gap area and the petitioner does not intend on including this area as part of their petition.

13. Fire Access

On all new buildings the Fire Department requires at least three sided access. In addition, the Fire Chief may require 'continuous access around a building' or four (4) sided access. Fire Lanes must be a minimum of 18' wide and must be set back 15' from the structure. At times parking lots can meet these two requirements such as St. Johns School did (PC 05-06). In the case of CPSA, the area between the proposed new building and the existing building could not be utilized as fire access land since there is not enough building separation and there are overhead obstructions which would prevent fire apparatus from maneuvering aerial ladders.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners

Commissioner Sweetser stated that before we start, it may not be clear to whoever may be listening that we take all the Commissioners take an oath and that oath prevents us from accepting outside issues of the other parties involved. Mr. Stilling stated that when a petition comes forward they have to meet certain standards and criteria, the petitioner

and the Plan Commission has to find that they meet those standards.

Commissioner Sweetser mentioned several things - the height of building at 26 feet and she asked if that means that the height of the extra piece is still considered 35 feet. Mr. Toth stated that the access stairway is in excess of 30 feet. Mr. Stilling stated that the stairway has always been the same height.

Commissioner Olbrysh referred to the large trees on south and east side. He asked if the petitioner was going to bring in mature trees.

Mr. Jahedi replied that he is not the Landscape Architect, but there are certain ages of trees you can bring in. The more mature the tree the less of a survival rate it has at planting time; as such, they will bring in the species of trees considered and will not be a mature height but will grow within a few years from planting. It will take 4-5 years before we get the desired screening that the trees will provide.

Referring to the illustration, Commissioner Olbrysh implied that those size trees will not be brought in. Mr. Jahedi stated that is his is best guess.

Referring to the landscape plan, Commissioner Olbrysh asked if there is landscaping and a berm in front of the building.

Mr. Stilling replied, yes. Based upon the submitted plans a 2' berm is provided along with landscaping that meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Jahedi stated that's exactly correct and mentioned the cross section. The same cross section shows a 2' berm and 4' of plantings, which makes 6' on the Madison side.

Commissioner Sweetser referred to the assertions in the neighborhood correspondence that they received as part of the record stating that CPSA is a "business". She noted that they are inaccurate.

Village Attorney Wagner replied that CPSA is a tax-exempt organization, which you might equate as a business function, but is a school and is tax exempt.

Commissioner Flint stated that he wasn't at the previous public hearing, but he did view the tape, read the minutes and looked over all the correspondence. He added that by coming back here there was a lot of input from the residents to the betterment of the project. One of the improvements to the plan is the moving of the dumpster from the back to the west.

Commissioner Burke asked if we are going to move forward with condition #9.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if the Commissioners should indicate hours of operation. She added that she didn't think it was necessary but would like to speak to one of the concerns raised by the residents. She wanted to make sure the Commissioners were not perceived as not addressing their concerns. Chairperson Ryan stated that the late night issue has been clarified.

Commissioner Olbrysh mentioned the open space issue. He asked if St. Johns was approved for an open space variation. Mr. Stilling stated that it was short on open space. He added that he can't say for certain what that was but mentioned that there were more recent projects that met the open space requirement. In regard to open space deviation, these requests also included parking deviations, but this is a different situation and a balance needs to be maintained. It is staff's goal to achieve conformance in meeting code. The Zoning Ordinance doesn't restrict parking maximums only a

minimum. We want compliance with open space.

Referring to the open space, Commissioner Sweetser asked about the 3,400 square feet of "no man's land". Since it doesn't belong to anyone and the petitioner wouldn't seek any claim to it, it is there. She asked staff if they saw this area as a way to provide them with any sort of resolution. Mr. Stilling replied that we don't have to address that area and are confined to the property's boundaries.

Commissioner Sweetser stated that the subject property is in a residential zoned area which is one of the reasons why staff wanted to limit parking in front and increase open space. Mr. Stilling stated that staff has no preference to where they should remove the parking. He added that the neighbors had concerns about parking in front of the existing building and the appearance it would give so if they removed the parking, it would be good to do it there. Commissioner Sweetser stated that it seems the neighbors would prefer to have the extra parking. Chairperson Ryan stated that they should uphold the open space. From his point of view, he would like it kept at 50 percent.

Chairperson Ryan asked who maintains the "no man's land". Mr. Jahedi stated that the land has maintained by the neighbors. He added that they are grateful to them as it is part of their yard as well.

Commissioner Sweetser stated that last time there were two motions.

Village Attorney Wagner clarified that the recommendation is to provide the variation for the height and then to approve the variation for the open space as to the 25 percent.

Chris Stilling explained how they arrived at 62.5 percent open space. He added that condition #1 should reflect the date of the latest plans.

Commissioner Burke moved to amend the recommendation to adopt Village Attorney Wagner's conditions.

It was moved by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Sweetser, that this matter be Recommended for approval to the Corporate Authorities subject to the amended condition(s) relative to a conditional use for a planned development with deviations for a building height variation of up to 35', an open space variation from 62.5%, provided that a minimum of 50% open space is maintained, rezoning from CR to R-2 and a conditional use for a private school. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Flint, Olbrysh, Sweetser and Burke

Absent: 2 - Nelson and Cooper

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 June 2, 2009, except as they shall be changed to meet Village Codes and provide 50% open space and shall be subject to the review and approval of the Director of Community Development.

2. All comments in the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report shall be satisfactorily addressed as part of a building permit application.

3. The petitioner shall address all recommendations in the KLOA report, which includes a detailed drop off/pick up schedule in a manner acceptable to the Director of Community Development, based upon the proposed traffic flow conditions along

Madison Street and upon the subject property.

4. The number of grade school students shall be capped at 450 students and the number of high school students shall be capped at 240 students. The total student population, including the pre-school, shall not exceed 785 students.

5. A final plat of consolidation shall be submitted to the Village for approval, making the site a lot of record.

6. The designated fire lane adjacent to the western and southern portion of the proposed building shall be blocked off at all times and accessed only by the Village of Lombard Fire Department and the refuse company for trash pickup.

7. The petitioner shall submit a photometric plan as part of building permit submittal showing compliance with Village Code.

8. The Plan Commission shall be granted site plan approval authority for the subject property.

9. Trash collection and deliveries shall not occur on the school property prior to 8:00 a.m.

10. A revised landscape plan shall be submitted in a manner acceptable to the Director of Community Development. All plantings along the parking lot and drive aisles that directly abuts residentially zoned properties shall be screened with evergreen and/or dense deciduous shrubs across the property line at a planting height of a minimum of 4 feet and consistent with Section 155.706 (C) (2) (a) (1) of the Zoning Ordinance. Evergreens and/or the dense deciduous shrubs shall be of a species that can grow to a minimum height of 15 feet.

Commissioner Sweetser commented after motion that the slide presentation should have the date 2009 than 2001. Chris Stilling stated they will ask to keep the CD to enter it into the record.

At 10:17 p.m. Chairperson Ryan requested a 5 minute break.

Chairperson Ryan reconvened the meeting at 10:22 p.m.

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)

[Play Video](#)

Stuart Moynihan, Associate Planner, introduced the petition by relating the background of the petition and the items identified by the Village Board for the Plan Commission's review and recommendation. He then read instructions for the meeting's format.

The format of the Plan Commission meeting will be as follows:

1. Staff will outline the reason for the Special Meeting and will note the actions to be

considered as part of the meeting. Staff will provide a very brief history of the petition and will summarize the zoning actions and development regulations associated with the petition.

2. The petitioner will be given an opportunity to present their petition as it specifically relates to the Village Board remand. Once completed, an opportunity to cross-examine the petitioner by anyone in the public will be provided and shall relate specifically to the petitioner's presentation and the items set forth by the Village Board.

3. Upon completion of petitioner's cross-examination, any objector will be offered the opportunity to speak. Once completed, an opportunity to cross-examine the objector by anyone in the public will be provided and shall relate specifically to the objector's presentation and the items set forth by the Village Board.

4. Staff will present the remand memorandum. Once completed, an opportunity to cross-examine staff by the petitioner and anyone in the public will be provided

5. After completion of the cross-examination, the public participation period will be closed. The Plan Commissioners shall then be given an opportunity to discuss the petition. Questions may be asked to staff, objectors or the petitioner. The Plan Commission should provide a response to the additional signage issues raised in the public hearing.

6. The Plan Commissioners shall then vote to uphold their original recommendation or amend their recommendation as deemed necessary. The Commissioners could amend the language as they deem appropriate, provided that the reasons for denial are tied to the standards for conditional uses, variations, map amendments and planned developments. The Commissioners do have the ability to add any conditions they deem appropriate should they recommend approval.

7. The recommendation will be forwarded to the Village Board for consideration at their June 18, 2009 meeting.

The petitioner, Daniel Coffey, 310 S Main St., Unit E stated that he was at the meeting to present a modified version of the panel sign denied previously. He began with a PowerPoint presentation. The initial slide shows two signs. The one he is proposing is to the right, a stretched-out version, which eliminates the phone number and has a different background.

Dr. Coffey outlined his goals for the meeting. Reading from his presentation slides, he asked, what is your definition of high quality signage? He was inspired to cruise around Lombard and take a close look at the signs around town. Regarding channel letter signs, over time these types of signage will lead to pollution, building stains and the quality is not what it could have been. Why channel letters? As he drove around Lombard, he found that it is filled with these and it didn't create higher quality and aesthetics.

Continuing with his presentation, he discussed red channel letters, random fonts, and random alignments. This office has windows filled with letters. That doesn't depict quality.

He showed examples of channel letter signs and asked if they were attractive. He stated that he doesn't see where it's that simple that canopy and channel letters are the answer.

Channel letters aren't any better. We have no consistency, cursive going diagonal, and

more random red channel letters. He said they were probably installed before the commissioners' tenure. He stated that this will give new businesses a chance to find quality in the middle.

He stated that more exterior wall damage is caused by channel letter signs. He showed the wall of a strip mall with such damage. You can see how the holes are in the building. That was one of the concerns. Having an attractive panel sign would require less damage and would be better for the building.

He stated that channel letter signs can stick out like a sore thumb. He showed a picture standing at the tunnel looking down Main Street. Individual channel letters attached to a raceway stick out farther from the building. It will not look attractive the way it sticks out.

On the Exposed Salon canopy sign, if you look close, you can still see Lombard Financial Services and a hole that was patched. He stated that he was not here to criticize but hopes there are future plans to require that the businesses have to upgrade their signs. He has invested a lot of money in his space but is disappointed to know this is down the street from him.

Dr. Coffey showed a picture of the awning sign at Ciao Bella restaurant on Roosevelt. He said the sign may be appropriate for a restaurant but a canopy sign won't represent him in a classy way.

He showed a picture of Prairie Path Villas at night. The shot was taken of the building at night on purpose. Because of his hours of operation, it's important that he have lights. Is there any sign of life here? He showed where his unit will be. He hopes that today an attractive sign will be approved that will blend in and look nice with Dr. Colletti's sign across the street and not create damage.

He showed pictures of canopy signs at Countrywide Insurance. He stated that is it very dark. If he chose the canopy signage and what he has on his windows his business would not be visible. Last time it was recommended to have hook lights and that this would be attractive.

He showed a picture of exterior lit signs. He showed a plastic surgery office across the street. You can see how visualized it can be with exterior lights. The lights will have a glare on the sign.

He stated that last time it was stated that his sign looked like a billboard. He stated that he disagrees. However, he has come up with another version of the sign in black.

He showed a recently approved panel sign. He stated that this sign at Progressive Physical Medicine was a great choice. This is a backlight panel sign. Hands down if you take a drive down Main Street when its dark, this sign reflects well; it pops; it's clean.

Dr. Colletti's sign, during the day, is a beautiful sign but is not financially realistic. Mr. Coffey stated that he had it quoted and it would have cost close to \$20,000.

Concluding, Dr. Coffey stated that he was hoping to achieve something attractive and cost effective.

Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone was present to speak in favor or against the petition.

Tom Knapp, 320 N. Main Street, stated that he was here representing Lombard Town Centre as the Design Committee Chair. He stated that there are a lot of things about

both sides he supports. *Prairie Path Villas* was a good project and he understands the Commissioners' desire to control the signs. There was some confusion during the public hearing and it did tend to focus people on signage on the canopy itself. It seems to him that the canopy signage is the least preferred signage as they are difficult to see from the street. The development and the signage should be pedestrian oriented. *Prairie Path Villa's* was designed to look like conglomeration of buildings and a variety of signs would be more appropriate to this goal. As Vice President and design chair, he has been to design and signage meetings as part of the Main Street program where the state recommends that villages should have more variety in signage, not less.

When looking at regional malls those signs are appropriate, due to being 250 feet back from the roadway. This building is so close to the sidewalk that seeing signage from a car at a tight angle or as a pedestrian down below would be difficult. The canopy signage is a cheap disposable type that weathers quickly and is not a durable, long-lasting thing. In Forest Park, they had a successful downtown renewal. All buildings close to the street that stand out signs and businesses have made a sense of community with signage. In terms of staying with this proposed project, this seems like a very good alternative to where the sign should go on the building while allowing variety. Lombard Town Centre supports this proposal.

No one spoke against the petition.

Mr. Moynihan presented the staff report. Staff has reviewed each of the items identified by the Village Board and offers the following corresponding comments:

1. The petitioner shall present any new information they have in regard to a box sign or other cabinet signs in the Village of Lombard.

The petitioner has provided a copy of their information as part of this memorandum. They will be making a more formal presentation at the Plan Commission meeting.

2. Prepare a building frontage view of the *Prairie Path Villas* utilizing wall signage to all business condominiums so as to develop a more concrete direction for which staff and the Village Board and Plan Commission can take affirmative action.

Proposed New Sign

The petitioner has submitted a revised plan for signage (attached as Exhibit A1 & A2). Although the petitioner is still seeking to only have 1 sign, they are proposing 2 different signs for the Plan Commission to consider. The first sign would be located in the same area as originally proposed. This sign would be 36 square feet in area and consist of a black background with white lettering. The second sign would be 50 square feet in area and located further north on the building elevation. Although this sign is larger, the Zoning Ordinance allows for a maximum of 50 square feet. The design of the second sign is much more linear in nature to accommodate the required wording for the business. In addition, the majority of the sign has a black background with white lettering. In the event the Plan Commission were to recommend approval of the petitioner's sign request, staff would prefer the second sign location and design due to the more linear nature of the sign. In addition, since the petitioner has such a large tenant space, the second sign is more centered on the tenant space giving the appearance that it is fully occupied. For reference purposes, staff has prepared an Exhibit D which shows the sign on the building, as it relates to the existing signage plan approved.

Building Elevation Exhibit

In addition to the revised sign plans, the petitioner has provided an exhibit showing the location where other businesses who occupy the first floor units could have some

additional signage (Exhibit B). The petitioner has indicated that this exhibit is intended to offer businesses an alternative location for signage. Staff also calls the Plan Commission's attention to an additional exhibit which shows the petitioner's proposed sign in conjunction with channel letter signs for the other tenant spaces.

Staff Review and Comments

Staff has met with the petitioner to review and discuss the proposed exhibits and revised signage plans. Although staff previously provided its recommendation as part of the public record in the IDRC report at the April 20, 2009 Plan Commission, the proposed changes could be considered a suitable compromise if deemed appropriate by the Plan Commission and Village Board. However, staff would recommend the following design criteria (attached as Exhibit C) be established to ensure uniformity and compatibility with the original Planned Development approvals:

1. *Zoning- But for the two deviations granted by Ordinance 5802, wall signs installed on the exterior elevations of the Prairie Path Villas Planned Development shall meet the requirements of the Sign Ordinance and the additional provisions below.*
2. *Location- All signage shall either be located in areas identified and originally approved as part of the Prairie Path Villas Planned Development and identified as sign area #1 and/or located in sign area #2, as identified on Exhibit C. Signage located in sign area #2 shall be located at the lowest point of the approved area and shall not exceed 3 feet in height.*
3. *Number of Signs Per Tenant Space- Signage for a single tenant space who have the option of placing a sign in either area #1 or area #2 shall only be allowed one (1) sign as a matter of right.*
4. *Style and Color- Signage located in sign area #1 shall be of a channel lettering design and/or associated with canopy signage. Signage located in area #2 can be either channel lettering or cabinet style. Any cabinet style sign shall have a black background with white lettering, however additional colors may be permitted provided that they do not exceed 25% of the proposed sign area.*

The plans submitted by the petitioner would meet the provisions outlined above.

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting for comments and questions by the Commissioners.

Commissioner Olbrysh stated that the petitioner had done his homework regarding signage in Lombard. He stated that the compromise, the second, more linear sign, looks very attractive.

Commissioner Sweetser agreed that she was fine with the compromise.

It was moved by Commissioner Olbrysh, seconded by Commissioner Sweetser, that this matter be recommended to the Corporate Authorities for approval subject to conditions. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Flint, Olbrysh, Sweetser and Burke

Absent: 2 - Nelson and Cooper

1. *The sign shall be developed in substantial compliance with the plans attached as Exhibit "A" prepared by Olympic Signs dated 1/7/09, last revised 5/8/09, and in conformance with the Exhibit "D" showing the more linear sign, except as they may be changed to meet Village Codes and the following conditions below.*

2. All tenant signage associated with the Prairie Path Villas shall be subject to the following requirements:

a. Zoning- But for the two deviations granted by Ordinance 5802, wall signs installed on the exterior elevations of the Prairie Path Villas Planned Development shall meet the requirements of the Sign Ordinance and the additional provisions below.

b. Location- All signage shall either be located in areas identified and originally approved as part of the Prairie Path Villas Planned Development and identified as sign area #1 and/or located in sign area #2, as identified on Exhibit C. Signage located in sign area #2 shall be located at the lowest point of the approved area and shall not exceed 3 feet in height.

c. Number of Signs Per Tenant Space- Signage for a single tenant space who have the option of placing a sign in either area #1 or area #2 shall only be allowed one (1) sign as a matter of right.

d. Style and Color - Signage located in sign area #1 shall be of a channel lettering design and/or associated with canopy signage. Signage located in area #2 can be either channel lettering or cabinet style. Any cabinet style sign shall have a black background with white lettering, however additional colors may be permitted provided that they do not exceed 25% of the proposed sign area.

Business Meeting

[Play Video](#)

The business meeting convened at 10:53 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

[Play Video](#)

On a motion by Flint and seconded by Burke the minutes of the May 18, 2009 meeting were unanimously approved by the members present with the following amendment:

Village Attorney Wagner referred to page 12, prior to the vote. For clarity purposes, he requested adding a sentence to restate that the motion refers to PC 09-11 Text Amendments to the Lombard Zoning Ordinance.

Public Participation

[Play Video](#)

There was no public participation.

DuPage County Hearings

[Play Video](#)

There were no DuPage County hearings.

Chairperson's Report

[Play Video](#)

The Chairperson deferred to the Assistant Director of Community Development.

Planner's Report

[Play Video](#)

Assistant Director Stilling indicated that previously heard cases, PC 09-11, PC 09-12 and PC 09-15 were approved by the Board of Trustees.

He reminded them that the regularly scheduled Plan Commission meeting is scheduled for next Monday, June 15, and will include two public hearings- text amendments for live entertainment and 404 E. North Avenue. There will also be a DuPage County case relative to a deck and a shed.

Unfinished Business

There is no unfinished business.

New Business

There is no new business.

Subdivision Reports

There are no subdivision reports.

Site Plan Approvals

There are no site plan approvals.

Workshops

There are no workshops.

Adjournment

[Play Video](#)

The meeting adjourned at 10:57 p.m.

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission*

*Christopher Stilling, Secretary
Lombard Plan Commission*