

Comprehensive Plan: Recommends Estate Residential (a companion reclassification of the property is included as part of this request)

Existing Zoning: Unincorporated DuPage County

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:

North: Unincorporated DuPage County property zoned R-4 Single Family Residential District; developed as single family residences
South: Unincorporated DuPage County property zoned R-4 Single Family Residential District; developed as single family residences
East: R4 Limited General Residential District; developed as attached residences (Columbine Glen townhomes)
West: North-South Tollway (Interstate 355)

ANALYSIS

SUBMITTALS

This report is based on the following documentation, which was filed with the Department of Community Development:

1. Petition for Public Hearing, received July 19, 2004.
2. Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, updated September 14, 2004, prepared by TFW Surveying & Mapping.
3. Preliminary Geometric Plan, updated September 3, 2004, prepared by Spaceco Inc.
4. Preliminary Site Plan, dated June 9, 2004, prepared by Spaceco Inc.
5. Preliminary Landscape Plan, dated July 19, 2004, prepared by Pugsley & Lahaie Ltd.
6. Plat of Survey, updated June 1, 2004, prepared by TFW Surveying & Mapping
7. Proposed Floor Plans, dated July 13, 2004, prepared by Balsamo, Olson, & Lewis Ltd.
8. Proposed Architectural Rendering, dated February 20, 2001, prepared by Balsamo, Olson, & Lewis Ltd.

9. Illinois Department of Natural Resources Consultation Agency Action Report.

DESCRIPTION

The subject property is currently unincorporated, with continuity to the Village on the eastern side of the property. The petitioner is requesting the annexation of the property into the Village and to allow for attached townhome development. The development will consist of 22 units and a stormwater detention outlot.

Properties annexed into the Village are automatically designated in the R1 Single Family Residential District. The petitioner is requesting a map amendment from the R1 Single Family Residence District to the R4 Limited General Residence District. The petitioner also requests a variation to the corner side yard setback for Lots 1 and 4 as the subject property abuts surplus right-of-way currently owned by the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority (ISTHA).

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMENTS

ENGINEERING

The Private Engineering Services Division (PES) has reviewed the petitioner's preliminary geometric plan and has the following comments from an engineering and construction perspective:

1. Pleasant Lane shall be fully improved adjacent to the subject property per §154.304. Thus, the pavement shall be reconstructed as needed to meet Village specifications including storm sewers and curb & gutter. Also, sidewalks, street lighting and parkway trees shall be required on the north and south sides of the road.
2. Provide sidewalk ramps across the entrance to the cul-de-sac.
3. The existing 15" CMP in the public right-of-way shall be replaced with RCP.
4. A recapture agreement may be submitted for the Pleasant Lane improvements.
5. Move the valve to where the proposed watermain will connect to the existing watermain unless the plumbing contractor will agree to pressure test against the existing valve that is about 115' eastward on the same leg.
6. Add valves to the north and south ends of the water main loop to allow either leg to be isolated in the event of a break.

7. Move the hydrant at the middle of the cul-de-sac to the east side of the road.
8. Replace the 90-degree water main elbows with a plugged tee at the southwest corner and two 45-degree elbows at the southeast corner of the loop.
9. A storm manhole is required at the property line near the southeast corner of Pleasant Lane and the cul-de-sac to separate public and private ownership and maintenance responsibilities.
10. Move the proposed sanitary sewer to run down the center of the cul-de-sac and move the eastern water main to the parkway.
11. An easement shall be required over the outlot for the detention basin.
12. A safety shelf and aerator shall be required in the detention basin if there will be a permanent pool.
13. An emergency overflow weir is required on the detention basin.

PUBLIC WORKS

The Department of Public Works, Engineering Division has no comments regarding the petition at this time.

The Department of Public Works, Utilities Division has the following comments:

- 1) A minimum of 300 feet separation is required between fire hydrants.
- 2) Additional water valves will be necessary.
- 3) A homeowner's association must be formed for the maintenance of the detention pond and storm sewer system.
- 4) The 8" sanitary sewer shown on Pleasant and the 8" water main within the subdivision must be located within the public right-of-way.
- 5) An agreement with the Columbine Glen homeowner's association will be necessary to connect the detention pond to the privately owned sewer system.
- 6) A manhole will be needed at the northeast corner of the property.

FIRE AND BUILDING

The Fire Department/Bureau of Inspectional Services states that the development must comply with the Village's Title 15 Building Code regarding the specific requirements for townhome construction. The plans show multiple buildings containing six residential units. There are unique requirements for buildings with over five units. Where a building exceeds five dwelling units, the initial five units must be separated from adjacent units by an un-pierced four-hour fire rated masonry wall that extends from the foundation to a minimum of thirty-two inches above the roof.

PLANNING

Compatibility with the Zoning Ordinance

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

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

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

Conditional Use – Planned Development

Included with the petition is a request for conditional use approval for a planned development. As the proposed development meets the minimum lot width and area requirements for a planned development, staff recommends the establishment of a planned development for this site. Creation of the planned development will give the Village an opportunity to review any future

modifications of the subject property, as discussed below. Moreover, the planned development will also provide a framework for any future expansions of the development.

Architectural Components

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

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

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

Landscaping

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

Compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan

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

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

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

Compatibility with Surrounding Land Uses

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

Compliance with the Subdivision and Development Ordinance

The site currently consists of three lots. The petitioner plans to subdivide the lot into four lots and an outlot for detention. Each proposed lot meets the minimum lot width and area requirements. This development is both a major subdivision and a major development as expressed in the Subdivision and Development Ordinance. Therefore, the petitioner will be required to meet the provisions of Section 154.304 and 154.306. This includes, but is not limited to, sidewalks, landscaping, parkway trees and street lighting along the proposed new street as well as along the portion of Pleasant Lane abutting the site. The companion subdivision plat would be submitted to the Board of Trustees upon approval of final engineering for the subject property.

Annexation and Development Agreement

Pursuant to Section 154.602(A), the petitioner will be preparing a companion annexation and development agreement for the subject property. This agreement will be considered by the Village Board in conjunction with the final consideration of Ordinances.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff believes that the proposed use is appropriate at the subject location and is compatible with surrounding uses.

Based on the above considerations, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee recommends that the Plan Commission make the following motion recommending **approval** of this petition:

Based on the submitted petition and the testimony presented, the proposal does comply with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning and Subdivision and Development Ordinances; and, therefore, I move that the Plan Commission find that the findings

included as part of the Inter-department Review Report be the findings of the Plan Commission and therefore, I recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of PC 04-28, subject to the following conditions:

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

Inter-Departmental Review Group Report Approved By:

David A. Hulseberg, AICP
Director of Community Development

DAH/ADC:

att
c. Petitioner

ATTACHMENT A

PLAN COMMISSION WORKSHOP COMMENTS – NOVEMBER, 2003

Pleasant Lane Lots

William Heniff displayed an aerial of the proposed location and the surrounding area. He stated that the Village has been approached by a potential developer, who is in the audience, regarding a potential townhouse subdivision to be located on the south side of Pleasant Lane between Interstate 355 and the existing Columbine Glen town homes. Mr. Heniff, while referring to the aerial, pointed out Route 53, I-355, Pleasant Lane, Cimarron Road and Meadow Avenue as well as the existing townhome developments. The developer is looking for direction on the submitted concept proposal and the associated land use implications. The property he is looking to develop is wedged by townhouses on the east, I-355 on the west and single family residential properties to the north and south. Three of these parcels are unincorporated and the Comprehensive Plan shows these properties to be designated estate residential. He mentioned how the developer was looking to create a public street accessing off of Pleasant Lane with townhomes to be located on both sides of the street. For the first phase, the developer would install a cul de sac bulb at the southern terminus with the possibility of extending it to create a connection to adjacent properties and installing a new cul de sac street back toward Cimarron Road.

The question for the Plan Commissioners to consider would be if the Village would consider townhouses at this location similar to the ones along Cimarron Road. The petitioner has indicated he would be interested in an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to a townhome designation and is flexible about typology and what might be an appropriate design. Mr. Heniff mentioned that the plans they received were very preliminary.

In conclusion Mr. Heniff asked the Commissioners if they would support a site plan similar to the Cimarron Road development.

Chairperson Ryan asked for Commissioners comments.

Commissioner Burke asked for clarification about the three lots which staff indicated and whether or not they were unbuildable. Commissioner Burke also asked about the current zoning. Mr. Heniff indicated that our Comprehensive Plan calls for an estate residential designation or an R1 designation.

Chairperson Ryan asked about the single-family homes to the south. Mr. Heniff stated that one lot is zoned R2 in the Village. The other lots are unincorporated, but have single family residential zoning.

Commissioner Olbrysh asked about the property between 355 and 53 and what the Comprehensive Plan calls for. Mr. Heniff answered that the Comprehensive Plan recognizes for townhome use.

Commissioner Sweetser asked about the property to the south within the R2 and if it includes any County properties that might be annexed. Mr. Heniff stated that should any of these properties be annexed they would come into the Village designated as R1 and could remain that way.

Commissioner Sweetser stated she liked the idea of having estate residential somewhere but this location, due to having an R4 designation down the middle, does not seem to be the ideal place for it as you would want something similar.

Commissioner Sweetser stated that if the proposal would back up to the current west lot line of what is currently built, what about the development of the road. Mr. Heniff suggested that the Village could require a temporary bulb until such time that a connection could be made and then have the street put through.

Commissioner Burke asked about the north side of Pleasant and whether that was all unincorporated. Mr. Heniff stated that it all is with the exception of one property and is planned for single family estate residential. He also stated that you could put in estate residential and use Pleasant as a buffer.

Commissioner Olbrysh indicated that he would support this option if the townhomes would be similar to the existing ones. He felt that since this is an undeveloped area, this proposal is the best way to go with this property.

In conclusion, it was the consensus of the Plan Commission that the proposed land use is compatible and that the developer work on details being mindful of similarities of the adjacent properties and to make it an upscale development.

Commissioner Sweetser added that by upscale they mean either meeting or exceeding what is already existing and having some elements of interest other than just another flat street or a boxy building. She also indicated that they should look at varying the façades and/or the street design.

ATTACHMENT B
AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH OF SUBJECT AREA



ATTACHMENT C

EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION FOR SUBJECT AREA

