

**March 27, 2017**

**Title**

PC 17-08

**Property Owner**

West Suburban Assn. for  
Retarded Children, Inc.; Deicke  
Home, LLC  
1005 E. Division Street  
Lombard, IL 60148

**Petitioner – Developer**

Over the Rainbow Association  
2040 Brown Avenue  
Evanston, IL 60201

**Property Location**

1005-1027 E. Division Street

**Zoning**

R2 – Single-Family Residence  
R3 – Attached Single-Family  
Residence

**Existing Land Use**

Formerly a group home for  
individuals with disabilities

**Comprehensive Plan**

Low and Low-Medium Density  
Residential

**Approval Sought**

Rezone to R4; approval of a  
conditional use for a Planned  
Development with variations and  
deviations; site plan approval  
granted to Plan Commission

**Prepared By**

Anna Papke, AICP  
Senior Planner



**LOCATION MAP**

**DESCRIPTION**

The petitioner, Over the Rainbow Association (OTR), proposes to redevelop the subject property into a 14-unit apartment development serving individuals with disabilities. The subject property was previously operated as the Deicke Home, a group home for individuals with disabilities. The Deicke Home has ceased operations on this site.

The petitioner proposes to rehabilitate an existing building on the property into 14 independent living apartment units. There will be no fulltime staff associated with the new apartment facility. An existing parking lot will be reconfigured to provide on-site parking for the apartments. The building on the east side of the site (1027 E. Division Street), which was previously used for administrative functions by the Deicke Home, will be demolished with the area being reserved for open space (or parking if warranted).

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

There are two buildings and a parking lot on the subject property. The structures on the site were previously used to operate a group home for individuals with disabilities, but are currently vacant.

**Project Details**

Parcel Size: 1.21 acres  
Development Description: Rehab existing group home into 14 apartment units; demolish school/ admin building on east end of site.

**Requested Actions**

1. Approve a rezoning to R4 for 1005 E. Division Street;
2. Approve a rezoning to R4 for 1027 E. Division Street;
3. Approve a conditional use for a planned development with companion deviations and variations; and
4. Grant site plan approval authority to the Lombard Plan Commission.

**Submittals**

1. Petition for public hearing, dated February 13, 2017;
2. Response to standards for map amendments and planned developments with deviations/variations, submitted with petition;
3. Plat of survey, prepared by Krisch Land Surveying, LLC, prepared January 23, 2017;
4. Site plan, prepared by Weese Langley Weese Architects, Ltd., dated January 30, 2017 and February 20, 2017; and
5. Landscape plan, prepared by Weese Langley Weese Architects, Ltd., dated February 14, 2017.

**APPROVAL(S) REQUIRED**

1. For the property at 1027 E. Division Street, approve a map amendment from the R2 Single-Family Residence District to the R4 Limited General Residence District;
2. For the property at 1005 E. Division Street, approve a map amendment from the R3 Attached Single-Family Residence District to the R4 Limited General Residence District;
3. For both properties as noted above, approve a conditional use for a new planned development with the following companion variations and deviations, reflective of existing buildings and structures already located on the premises:
  - a. A deviation from Section 155.409(I) and Section 155.508(C)(6)(b) to reduce the transitional interior side yard building setback for an existing building from fifty feet (50') to fourteen feet (14');
  - b. A variation from Section 155.409(J), Section 155.508(C)(6)(b), and Section 155.707(A) to reduce the depth of the transitional landscape yard;
  - c. A variation from Section 155.707(B) to allow transitional landscape yard improvements;
  - d. A variation from Section 155.706(C)(1) to reduce the required perimeter parking lot landscaping for the south side of an existing parking lot, as depicted on the submitted site and landscape plan;
  - e. A deviation from Section 155.602(A)(3)(e) to allow off-street parking areas open to the sky to be located in a required front yard;
  - f. A deviation from Section 155.602(C), Table 6.2, to reduce the parking ratio for one-bedroom apartment units from one and a half parking spaces per unit to one parking space per unit; and
4. Grant site plan approval authority to the Lombard Plan Commission pursuant to Section 155.511 (site plan approval) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance.

## **INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW**

### **Building Division:**

The Building Division has no comments on this petition. Should the petition be approved, additional comments may be forthcoming during permit review.

### **Fire Department:**

The Fire Department has the following comments on this petition. Should the petition be approved, additional comments may be forthcoming during permit review.

1. The proposed renovation to the existing two-story building at 1005 E. Division Street and the subsequent use has been reviewed as an Institutional Occupancy, Group 1;
2. Building and fire code requirements will be addressed according to the occupancy use group identified above.

### **Private Engineering Services (PES):**

Private Engineering Services has the following comments regarding the proposed project. Should the petition be approved, additional comments may be forthcoming during permit review.

1. Although the Village code allows for 1-way 90-degree parking, it is highly suggested that if 1-way is desired that angle parking be utilized to help enforce the direction of traffic flow through the parking lot and minimize driver confusion. Otherwise, it is very likely for the lot to actually function as a 2-way drive and would not meet those requirements.
2. The eastern driveway appears that it may not meet the 60-degree angle requirement for driveways. Based on angle in Bluebeam, it appears it is at about 45-degrees.
3. The Village and DuPage County stormwater ordinances would be required to be met. Net new calculations will be required to verify the requirements.

### **Public Works:**

The Department of Public Works has no comment on this petition. Should the petition be approved, additional comments may be forthcoming during permit review.

**Planning Services Division:**

The Planning Services Division notes the following:

**1. Surrounding Zoning, Land Use Compatibility and Request for Rezoning**

	<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Land Use</b>
<b>North</b>	B2 and R5	Car repair business and multi-family apartment buildings
<b>South</b>	R2	Single-family neighborhood
<b>East</b>	R2	Single-family neighborhood
<b>West</b>	R3	Single-family home and duplexes

The neighborhood surrounding the subject property contains a mixture of uses. Property to the northwest, along Westmore/Meyers Road, is zoned B2 and developed with small-scale commercial uses. Property immediately north of the site, across Division Street, is developed with apartment buildings. Property to the southwest is developed with duplexes and the area to the south and east is an established single-family neighborhood.

The petitioner requests the Village amend the zoning designation of the subject property from R2 and R3 to R4 in order to accommodate redevelopment of the site with an apartment building. Given the mix of uses and zoning designations in the immediate area, staff concludes that a zoning designation of R4 on the subject property is an appropriate transition between the higher intensity zoning designations to the north and west and the R2 zoning district located to the south and east. Similarly, the proposed apartment development, which will utilize an existing building, will act as a transition between the commercial and higher intensity residential development to the north and west of the site and the single-family neighborhood to the south and east.

**2. Comprehensive Plan Compatibility**

The Comprehensive Plan designates the majority of the property, at 1005 E. Division Street, as suitable for low-medium density residential development. The proposed apartment building will be located on this portion of the property.

The Comprehensive Plan designates the property at 1027 E. Division Street as suitable for low density residential development. The existing building on this portion of the property will be demolished. No additional structures are planned for this portion of the site.

**3. Zoning Ordinance Compatibility**

Staff notes the following with respect to this petition’s consistency with the Zoning Ordinance:

- As discussed above, the petitioner has requested the property be rezoned to the R4 Limited General Residence District. The proposed 14-unit apartment building is a permitted use in the R4 zoning district.

- The petitioner is repurposing an existing building on the site. The petitioner will reuse many existing features of the property, such as the parking lot, landscaping areas and walking path, with no or slight modifications. Some of these features do not meet current Zoning Ordinance requirements. The petitioner therefore requests approval of a planned development with companion variations and deviations for the subject property to address those features of the site that do not comply with the Zoning Ordinance. These variations and deviations are discussed in Section 4.
- The petitioner will need to provide a parking lot lighting plan at time of permitting. Staff will review to ensure parking lot lighting meets code requirements and does not negatively impact neighboring properties.
- The landscape plan provided by the petitioner lacks transitional landscaping along the east side of the site at the point where an existing building will be demolished but not replaced. This item can be addressed during permit review.

**4. Request for Conditional Use Approval for a Planned Development with Companion Variations and Deviations**

The petitioner proposes to make the subject property into a planned development. Staff finds the proposed planned development meets the standards enumerated in Section 155.508 of the Zoning Ordinance for planned developments.

The petitioner also requests a number of deviations and variations in tandem with the planned development in order to address existing conditions on the site. With the exception of the request to reduce the parking ratio, the requested deviations and variations do not arise from the petitioner's plan for redevelopment on the site, but rather through the site's existing conditions.

*A. A deviation from Section 155.409(I) and Section 155.508(C)(6)(b) to reduce the transitional interior side yard building setback for an existing building from fifty feet (50') to fourteen feet (14')*

The west side of the existing building does not meet the transitional yard setback requirement for multi-family buildings in the R4 district that abut properties used for single-family homes. This deviation addresses an existing condition and will have no material effect on neighboring properties. Staff supports the deviation.

- B. *A variation from Section 155.409(J), Section 155.508(C)(6)(b), and Section 155.707(A) to reduce the depth of the transitional landscape yard*

This variation applies to the west and south sides of the property, where the existing site configuration does not provide the requisite transitional landscape yard. Staff supports this variation, which addresses an existing condition.

- C. *A variation from Section 155.707(B) to allow transitional landscape yard improvements*

The walking path and pavilion located in the rear yard of the subject property are within the required transitional landscape yard. The petitioner seeks a variance to allow these improvements to remain for use by future residents. Staff has no objection to this variation.

- D. *A variation from Section 155.706(C)(1) to reduce the required perimeter parking lot landscaping for the south side of an existing parking lot, as depicted on the submitted site and landscape plan*

The petitioner will reuse the existing parking area, with some modifications to striping and circulation. The parking lot currently does not provide the requisite landscaping along its south perimeter due to a lack of space between the parking lot and the property line. Staff supports this variation.

- E. *A deviation from Section 155.602(A)(3)(e) to allow off-street parking areas open to the sky to be located in a required front yard*

The existing parking area is located within the required front yard setback in the R4 zoning district, which requires a deviation. Staff supports this deviation.

- F. *A deviation from Section 155.602(C), Table 6.2, to reduce the parking ratio for one-bedroom apartment units from one and a half parking spaces per unit to one parking space per unit*

The petitioner will reuse the existing parking area on the west side of the subject property. The parking lot is currently configured with seven to eight angled spaces. The petitioner proposes to modify the parking area to provide 14 perpendicular parking spaces. This will result in a parking ratio of 1.0 space per apartment unit. The Zoning Ordinance requires 1.5 parking spaces per apartment unit.

The apartments at this property will be rented exclusively to individuals with disabilities. The petitioner states that many of the residents will not drive or own vehicles, and therefore the parking demand is less than would be expected with most apartment buildings.

The Village retained KLOA, Inc., to conduct a parking evaluation of the site. KLOA concluded the following:

- On average, 27% of residents living at Over the Rainbow properties drive and own vehicles. An additional 25% of residents receive assistance from personal care attendants, some of who may drive to the site.
- Data gathered from eight other properties owned by Over the Rainbow shows that average peak parking demand for these properties is 0.61 spaces per apartment unit. Based on this data, KLOA concludes that 14 spaces will be sufficient to serve the 14 apartment units proposed on the subject property.

Based on the KLOA parking evaluation, staff finds that 14 parking spaces will adequately serve the proposed apartment building. The petitioner has agreed to land bank an area of the site for additional spaces in the event that a demand for additional parking arises. The petitioner has provided a site plan showing that seven additional spaces could be accommodated on the east side of the apartment building. These spaces would bring the parking ratio on the site into conformance with the 1.5 space per unit parking ratio required by the Zoning Ordinance. Staff supports the requested parking ratio deviation on the condition that the petitioner installs the additional seven spaces in the event they are needed.

#### **5. *Request to Grant Site Plan Approval Authority to the Plan Commission***

The petitioner requests the Village grant site plan approval authority for development within the proposed planned development to the Plan Commission. Staff supports this request.

#### **SITE HISTORY (NON SIGN-RELATED)**

- PC 77-11: Rezone Property to R-4, with a conditional use to allow a boarding school and educational institution for disabled children**
- PC 79-9: Rezone property to R5, with a conditional use to allow an educational institution for disabled children**
- ZBA 80-2: Variation to reduce rear and interior side yard setbacks for construction of building at 1027 E. Division Street [now 1005 E. Division Street]**
- PC MV 81-1: Variation to Building Moratorium Ordinance #2475 to allow construction of residential care facility for adults with disabilities**

**ZBA 85-15: Variation to front yard setback to allow construction of a canopy/roof over front entrance of building at 1005 E. Division Street**

**FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the above findings, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee has reviewed the petition and finds that it meets the standards for zoning map amendments, conditional use for a planned development with deviations and variations, and granting of site plan approval authority to the Plan Commission, as established by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance. As such, 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 testimony presented, the proposed zoning map amendments, conditional use for a planned development with deviations and variations, and granting of site plan approval authority to the Plan Commission, **comply** with the standards required by the Village of Lombard Zoning Ordinance; and, therefore, I move that the Plan Commission accept the findings of the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report as the findings of the Plan Commission and I recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of PC 17-08, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the approvals for zoning map amendments, conditional use for a planned development with deviations and variations, and granting of site plan approval authority to the Plan Commission, are valid only for the subject property at 1005-1027 E. Division Street;
2. That the petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the following plans submitted as part of this petition and referenced in the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report, except as they may be changed to conform to Village Code:
  - a. Site plan, prepared by Weese Langley Weese Architects, Ltd., dated January 30, 2017 and February 20, 2017; and
  - b. Landscape plan, prepared by Weese Langley Weese Architects, Ltd., dated February 14, 2017.
3. That the deviation to reduce the parking ratio to 1.0 space per apartment unit shall be granted on the condition that the petitioner installs an additional seven parking spaces on the site in the event the Village determines they are necessary;
4. That the petitioner shall submit a lighting plan during permit review;
5. That the petitioner shall submit a plat of consolidation for the two parcels;
6. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report; and



7. Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance, the project construction shall commence within one (1) year from the date of approval of the ordinance, or this approval for a conditional use for a planned development with deviations and variations and granting of site plan approval authority to the Plan Commission shall become null and void unless a time extension has been granted by the Village Board.



William J. Heniff, AICP  
Director of Community Development

**EXHIBIT**

- KLOA parking evaluation

c. Petitioner

H:\CD\WORDUSER\PCCASES\2017\PC 17-08\PC 17-08\_IDRC Report.docx



MEMORANDUM TO: Anna Papke  
Village of Lombard

FROM: Javier Millan  
Senior Consultant

March 1, 2017

SUBJECT: Parking Evaluation  
Over the Rainbow Apartment  
Lombard, Illinois

This memorandum summarizes the results of a parking evaluation conducted by Kenig, Lindgren, O'Hara, Aboona, Inc. (KLOA, Inc.) for the proposed Over the Rainbow Association proposed apartment development for people with disabilities to be located in Lombard, Illinois. The site is located at 1005 – 1027 East Division Street just east of Westmore-Meyers Road and used to be occupied by a residential development for people with mental disabilities. The plans call for redeveloping the site with an apartment building with 14 units for people with disabilities. As proposed, the development is to provide a total of 14 parking spaces for a parking ratio of one to one.

The purpose of this memorandum is to evaluate the parking adequacy of the proposed parking supply.

### **Building Program and Population**

The Over the Rainbow Association Apartment project will provide 14 one-bedroom affordable living units for individuals with disabilities. Some of the residents of the building will be physically-impaired and use wheelchairs for mobility. Similar to other Over The Rainbow properties, only a small proportion of residents (27% on average) will drive and own a vehicle. Another 25 percent of residents, on average, are assisted by personal care attendants, some of whom will drive to the site. The remaining residents will make use of public transportation, taxi services or will use the pedestrian system, to travel to work or for shopping, entertainment, recreation, and other trips.

## Village of Lombard Parking Requirements

The Village of Lombard Zoning Code requires 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit for one bedroom apartments regardless of the number of units. With a total of 14 units, the proposed development is required to provide a total of 21 parking spaces.

### Compliance with Zoning Ordinance

As previously mentioned, the proposed apartment development will provide 14 off-street parking stalls on the site, including 13 standard stalls and one accessible stall. Based on a review of the Village ordinance, the proposed development will require a variance of 7 parking stalls.

### Projected Parking Demand

While the project is considered a multiple family dwelling, the Village's off-street parking requirement for this land use does not accurately reflect the parking demand from the tenant-type that this affordable apartment project will serve.

To estimate the peak parking demand from the proposed Over the Rainbow Association Apartments, KLOA, Inc. obtained parking information on eight existing and comparable Over The Rainbow Association properties in northern Illinois, including facilities in Evanston, Chicago, Waukegan, Harvard, Matteson, Rockford, and Freeport. As shown in **Table 1**, these facilities, on average, provide 22 dwelling units and 24 parking stalls for a parking supply of 1.09 stalls/unit. The peak demand for the parking stalls, however, ranged from 0.38 stalls/unit to 0.82 stalls/unit with an average peak parking demand ratio of 0.61 stalls/unit. As such, while the 14 parking spaces to be provided as part of the development do not meet the Village's parking requirements, the surveys have shown that the proposed 14 parking spaces will be sufficient to meet the peak parking demand of the supportive housing development.

Table 1

**PARKING DEMAND FROM COMPARABLE OVER THE RAINBOW PROPERTIES**

Location	# Units	Parking Supply	Peak Parking Utilization	Resulting Parking Demand Ratio (spaces/unit)
Hill Arboretum Apartments 2040 Brown Ave., Evanston, IL	33	34	17	0.52
Belden Apartments 754 W. Belden Ave., Chicago, IL	8	8	3	0.38
Gustafson Apartments 2811 Sunset Ave., Waukegan, IL	24	17	14	0.58
Northern Point Apartments 600 S. Howard St., Harvard, IL	17	34	14	0.82
Rainbow Village Apartments 5212 Southwick Dr., Matteson, IL	25	25	17	0.68
Harrison Square Apartments 5488 Wansford Way, Rockford, IL	20	22	14	0.70
Dirck Drive Apartments 1760 S. Dirck Dr., Freeport, IL	23	25	18	0.78
Rolling Prairie Apartments 1746 S. Dirck Dr., Freeport, IL	25	25	18	0.72
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0.61</b>

## **Conclusion**

Given the parking characteristics of supportive housing developments, the 14 parking spaces to be provided by the Over The Rainbow Association apartment development will be sufficient to meet the total parking demands of the supportive housing development. This is due to the very low number of residents that own a vehicle. Further, the parking surveys at similar developments provide further evidence to the limited parking demand experienced at a similar supportive housing development.

Addendum to Zoning Application

1005-1027 Division, Lombard

Over the Rainbow Association

I. Description of Request: The applicant seeks certain approvals to permit the rehabilitation and reuse of the existing 2-story building located at 1005 Division with 14 accessible dwelling units. The approvals include:

- Map Amendment for the subject property from R2 Single-Family Residence District and R3 Attached Single-Family Residence District to R4 Limited General Residence District.
- Conditional Use for a Planned Development.
- Variations as noted below.
- Administrative Plat of Consolidation

II. Map Amendment Standards: The applicant provides the following responses to the standards in Section 155.103(E)(8)(a) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance.

A. Compatibility with existing uses of property within the general area of the property in question.

**Response:** The most recent use of the property was as residential development for people with disabilities. The applicant intends to rehabilitate and reuse the existing residential building to provide 14 units of housing for people with disabilities. Those uses are compatible.

B. Compatibility with the zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question.

**Response:** The property has been used for a similar purpose such that the rezoning will not result in a significant change of use. The property is located across the street from existing multi-family housing in the R5 zoning district that is built to a greater density than the R4 zoning will permit. There is also B2 zoning and commercial uses adjacent to the site. The proposed R4 zoning is compatible with and will provide an appropriate transition to the R2 properties to the south and east of the site.

C. The suitability of the property in question to the uses permitted under the existing zoning classification.

**Response:** The prior use of the property as housing for developmentally disabled persons was not conforming to the existing R3 zoning. The proposed rezoning to R4 will make the property more conforming.

D. Consistency with the trend of development, if any, in the general area of the property in question, including changes, if any, which have taken place in its present

zoning classification.

**Response:** The proposed use is in many ways a continuation of the prior use of the property and is consistent with the trend of development of the property.

E. The compatibility of the surrounding property with the permitted uses listed in the proposed zoning classification.

**Response:** As noted above, the property surrounding the subject site includes a number of zoning classifications, including R5, R2 and B2. The proposed R4 zoning is an appropriate transitional zoning district for the area.

F. The objectives of the current comprehensive plan for the Village of Lombard and the impact of the proposed amendment on the said objectives.

**Response:** The 2014 Village Comprehensive Plan designated the subject property as Low-Medium Density Residential. The subject property was further identified as part of Area 7, with the recommended action to designate the property “as Low-Medium Density Residential to better reflect the existing land uses and surrounding patterns”. Furthermore, one of the visions of the Comprehensive Plan is to foster a diverse housing stock, specifically to develop a variety of housing types.

G. The suitability of the property in question for permitted uses listed in the proposed zoning classification.

**Response:** The proposed use is permitted in the R4 district.

III. Planned Development Standards. The applicant provides the following responses to the standards in Section 155.508(A) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance.

A. Except as modified by and approved in the final development plan, the proposed development complies with the regulations of the district or districts in which it is to be located

**Response:** There are a few deviations that will need to be approved with the final development plan for which the project will satisfy the standards in Section 155.508 (C) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance.

B. Community sanitary sewage and potable water facilities connected to a central system are provided.

**Response:** Community sanitary sewage and potable water facilities connected to a central system are provided at the property.

C. The dominant use in the proposed planned development is consistent with the recommendations of the comprehensive plan of the village for the area containing the

subject site.

**Response:** The use of the property will be residential. The comprehensive plan designates the subject property as Low-Medium Density Residential. The proposed use is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

D. That the proposed planned development is in the public interest and is consistent with the purposes of this zoning ordinance.

**Response:** The applicant proposes to develop the site with 14 accessible dwelling units for people with disabilities. This use is in the public interest. It will provide a needed use to individuals in the community whose needs are not met by conventional housing developments. The general purpose of the zoning ordinance is to protect and promote the health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare of the people. The proposed use will serve this purpose.

E. That the streets have been designed to avoid: (i) inconvenient or unsafe access to the planned development; (ii) traffic congestion in the streets which adjoin the planned development; (iii) an excessive burden on public parks, recreation areas, schools, and other public facilities which serve or are proposed to serve the planned development.

**Response:** This standard is not applicable to the site. The subject property has been used for the proposed use and is located directly on a Village public way.

IV. Standards for Planned Developments with Deviations. The applicant is requesting deviations from the underlying R4 District to: (1) reduce the transitional side yard building setback from 50 feet to 14 feet; (2) reduce the parking ratio from 1.5 per unit to 1 per unit; and (3) allow off-street parking in the required front yard. The applicant provides the following responses to the standards in Section 155.508(C) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance.

A. Any reduction in the requirements of this Chapter is in the public interest.

**Response:** The development of accessible housing for people with disabilities is in the public interest and these deviations as necessary for the development.

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

**Response:** The transitional side yard deviation and the off-street parking encroachment in the front yard are the existing condition of the site. If these deviations remain it will not have any impact on the value or use of other property. The parking reduction is requested because the majority of the residents do not own or drive a car. Therefore, the parking reduction will not have an adverse impact on the surrounding area.

C. That such deviations are solely for the purpose of promoting better development



which will be beneficial to the residents or occupants of the planned development as well as those of the surrounding properties.

**Response:** All of the deviations reflect the existing condition of the site. The purpose of requesting these deviations is to allow for the efficient redevelopment of the site by keeping the existing residential structure and the parking area in place.

D. That the overall floor area of the planned development shall not exceed by more than 40 percent the maximum floor area permitted for the individual uses in each applicable district.

**Response:** This standard is met.

E. That in residential planned developments the maximum number of dwelling units allowed shall not exceed by more than 40 percent the number of dwelling units permitted in the underlying district.

**Response:** This standard is met.

F. That all buildings are located within the planned development in such a way as to dissipate any adverse impact on adjoining buildings and shall not invade the privacy of the occupants of such buildings and shall conform to the following:

1. The front, side or rear yard setbacks on the perimeter of the development shall not be less than that required in the abutting zoning district(s) or the zoning district underlying the subject site, whichever is greater.
2. All transitional yards and transitional landscape yards of the underlying zoning district are met.
3. If required transitional yards and transitional landscape yards are not adequate to protect the privacy and enjoyment of property adjacent to the development, the Plan Commission shall recommend either or both of the following requirements:
  - a) All structures located on the perimeter of the planned development must set back by a distance sufficient to protect the privacy and amenity of adjacent existing uses;
  - b) All structures located along the entire perimeter of the planned development must be permanently screened with sight-proof screening in a manner which is sufficient to protect the privacy and amenity of adjacent existing uses

**Response:** This standard is met. The existing residential building will be reused.

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

**Response:** This standard will be met. Open space will be increased with the

development because the existing school building will be demolished.

V. Standards for Variations. The applicant requests the following variations: (1) variation to reduce depth of transitional landscape yard (mainly on the south and west sides of the property); (2) variation to reduce required perimeter parking lot landscaping on south side of existing parking; and (3) variation to allow structures/improvements in transitional landscape yard (walking path, gazebo, etc.) lot. The applicant provides the following responses to the standards in Section 155.103(C)(7) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance.

A. Because of the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience if the strict letter of the regulations were to be applied.

**Response:** All of the requested variations reflect the existing condition of the property. Therefore, in order to comply with the district regulations, there would be a significant hardship to the applicant.

B. The conditions upon which an application for a variation is based are unique to the property for which the variation is sought, and are not generally applicable to other property within the same zoning classification.

**Response:** Because the requested variations are the result to the existing condition of the site, they are unique and would not be generally applicable to other property within the same zoning classification.

C. The purpose of the variation is not based primarily upon a desire to increase financial gain.

**Response:** The applicant is a not-for-profit corporation and is not making this request to increase financial gain.

D. The alleged difficulty or hardship is caused by this ordinance and has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property.

**Response:** As noted above, the requested variations are the result to the existing condition of the site. They were not created by the applicant.

E. The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other property or improvements in the neighborhood in which the property is located.

**Response:** First, the requested variations are the result to the existing condition of the site so that leaving these conditions in place will not create a detriment. Further, the redevelopment of the site with 14 units of accessible housing will be a benefit to the

public welfare.

F. The granting of the variation will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

**Response:** The most recent use of the property was similar to the proposed use. The essential character of the neighborhood will not be altered in any way.

G. The proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property or substantially increase the congestion of the public streets, or increase the danger of fire, or impair natural drainage or create drainage problems on adjacent properties, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.

**Response:** All of these standards will be met by the new development.

**Alka Kapoor**  
**1034 E Woodrow Ave**  
**Lombard Il 20148**

07 March 2017

Village of Lombard Community Development Department  
Planning Commission  
255 E Wilson Ave  
Lombard Il 60148

**REGARDING: 1005 & 1027 West Division ST, Lombard 60148**

**Notice of Public Hearing**

I sincerely object to this project for the following reasons:

1. It does not fit the landscape / environment of the street
2. It is directly behind my house and will block my view.
3. I work from home and cannot be disturbed, the construction will disturb my work.
4. It will spoil the back view from my house.
5. It will infringe on my privacy, people can overlook into my property.
6. This is a very well knit and secure community I fear this project will disrupt the security & damage the spirit of our community.
7. I fear it will devalue the market value of my home.
8. I cannot consent to this building project.
9. I severely object to this planning permission.
10. I am out of town on a business trip on the dates of the hearing and will not be able to attend but hope my comments are taken into serious consideration
11. Please do not carry it forward. This is a community of independent, individual home dwellings.

Yours Sincerely

Alka Kapoor