

MEMORANDUM

TO: LOMBARD PLAN COMMISSION
Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson

FROM: Nancy Hill, AICP
Planner II

DATE: January 11, 1999

SUBJECT: PC 98-40: 111 S. Park Avenue (Lombard Bible Church)

At the December meeting, the Plan Commission continued the above-referenced public hearing until the January 18, 1999 meeting because the petitioner was not present. A copy of the staff report for that meeting is attached for your reference.

In the report, staff recommended denial because the proposed garage would block an access drive to the adjoining property, it would not fully meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, and it would not be compatible with the surrounding land uses. Also in the report, staff stated we initially believed the garage could be moved to a location which would meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, not block the drive aisle, and yet have minimal impact on the surrounding property. Staff examined moving the garage to different locations within both the East parking lot and the South parking lot. In each instance, the garage could not be put in these various locations because it would conflict with the existing storm sewer or because parking spaces would be eliminated and variations would be necessary. Since the petitioner had not requested any variations for parking, and staff did not advertise for any variation requests, the Plan Commission could not grant any variations. Therefore, staff determined, given the petitioner's request, if the garage was to be provided, the best location was the proposed location, but moved closer to the side property line. This location would require no variations, but the drive aisle would still be blocked and the building would still be visible from Main Street.

Since the public hearing was continued to another meeting, the staff re-advertised the petitioner's request, adding a statement requesting variations to the parking and parking lot landscaping standards. Given the new request, staff then re-examined alternative locations for the garage.

The garage could be placed at various locations in the South parking lot (zoned R2). This would reduce its visibility from Main Street. However, even the best locations in the South parking lot are not appropriate. The South parking lot is not as wide as the east parking lot. (The total width of the East parking lot is 64 feet, while the total width of the South parking

lot is 58 feet.) Given the proposed length of the garage and the setback standards in the R2 District, a variation for drive aisle width or setback standards would be necessary. While the staff would be somewhat willing to recommend a variation for the number of parking spaces, the staff would not support variations to the setback standards (which were not advertised) or drive aisle width, as no hardship is being demonstrated and it would create a dangerous situation.

The staff examined various locations within the East parking lot (zoned B5). The East parking lot and the drive aisle are wider in dimension, so drive aisle width is not a factor. At the same time, because this parking lot is located in the B5 District, there are no side or rear yard setback standards for the garage. Therefore, no variations for setback standards or drive aisle width are necessary. However, even the best locations within the East parking lot are not appropriate. The garage would be highly visible from Main Street, so it should be placed as far back in the parking lot as possible. The garage can not be placed in the Southwest corner of the East parking lot because it would conflict with an existing storm sewer.

Another alternative is to place the garage just to the East of the existing landscape island in the East parking lot, preferably set back three feet (3') from the side lot line (See Figure 2). If a garage is to be allowed, staff believes that this is the most acceptable alternative. Staff would then also recommend ten feet (10') of foundation landscaping be provided on the East side of the garage to screen the view from Main Street. Additionally, this area should be curbed to meet the parking lot specifications. With this alternative there would be a net loss of two (2) parking spaces. While the drive aisle would still be accessible, it would be difficult for Southbound traffic to see around the garage. It would also be difficult for the bus driver to back out of the garage, especially if there was traffic maneuvering through the two properties or if the parking lot was occupied.

Therefore, the staff still believes the proposed garage is not appropriate at the subject location and is not compatible with surrounding uses. Based upon the above considerations, the staff recommends the Plan Commission make the following motion recommending **denial** of this request.

Based on the submitted petition and the testimony presented, the proposal does not comply with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance; and, therefore, I move that the Plan Commission recommend to the Corporate Authorities denial of the Planned Development Amendment associated with PC 98-40.

NH/jd

attachments: Staff report
Figure 1
Figure 2

January 11, 1999

PC 98-40

Page 3

If the Plan Commission wishes to approve this request with the condition the garage is moved to the location shown in Figure 2, the following motion could be made:

Based on the submitted petition and the testimony present, the proposal does comply with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance; and therefore, I move the Plan Commission recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of the amendment to the Conditional Use approval and variations to the parking and parking lot landscaping standards associated with PC 98-40 with the following conditions:

1. The garage shall be built in substantial compliance with the site plan shown in Figure 2.
2. Ten feet (10') of foundation landscaping shall be provided on the East side of the garage.
3. The dumpster in the South parking lot shall be removed.
4. The dumpster in the East parking lot shall be enclosed with a board on board fence eight feet (8') in height.
5. The garage shall be built of noncombustible construction, due to its location in a fire district.
6. The petitioner shall pay into a regional detention pond, if the Private Engineering Services Division requires detention.