

May 19, 2005

Mr. William J. Mueller,  
Village President, and  
Board of Trustees  
Village of Lombard

**Subject: PC 05-06; 210, 214, 215, 224 and 228 S. Lincoln Street & 205 W. Maple Street (St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church & School)**

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. The petitioner requests that the Village take the following actions on the property located within the R2 Single Family Residence District:

1. Amend the Comprehensive Plan to designate the lots at 210, 214, 224 and 228 S. Lincoln Street and 205 W. Maple Street as Public and Institutional Use.
2. Approve an amendment to Ordinance 1816 granting approval of a conditional use for a noncommercial recreational building/community center.
3. Approve an amendment to Ordinances 4363 and 4363A granting approval of a conditional use for a religious institution and for a private elementary school.
4. Approve a conditional use for a planned development for all of the subject properties, with the following deviations and variations from the Zoning Ordinance, as follows:
  - a. A variation from Section 155.508 (C)(6)(a) and a deviation from Section 155.406 (F)(1) to allow for a front yard setback of eighteen feet (18') where thirty feet (30') is required;
  - b. A deviation from Section 155.406 (F)(2) to allow for a corner side yard setback of one foot (1') where twenty feet (20') is required;
  - c. A deviation from Section 155.406 (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;
  - d. A variation from Section 155.406 (H) and Section 155.508 (C) (7), reducing the minimum required open space below the minimum 75 percent requirement;

- e. A variation from Sections 155.708 and 155.709 reducing the requisite foundation and perimeter lot landscaping along the corner side yard; and
- f. A variation from Section 155.602 (C), Table 6.3 reducing the number of requisite parking spaces.

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition on March 21, with a continuance to the April 18, 2005 meeting.

At the March 21 meeting, Chuck Wingard, 572 Brewster Avenue, Lombard, began the presentation by introducing the other presenters for the St. John's petition. Those were Scott Czerkies, 254 Weather Hill Drive, Willowbrook; and Joe Jaruseski, 1107 Michelle Lane, Lombard. Mr. Wingard presented their petition in a PowerPoint format.

He gave the history of the school, their mission, and the types of services they provide. He mentioned the reasons for building the new school which included: student safety, accessibility, comfort (no air conditioning), the old inefficient heating system, student life (student restroom only on 1st floor and educational time lost), educational materials, special needs (no room for small group learning or activities), and resource management (lighting and heating are inefficient and are more expensive to run).

Mr. Wingard indicated the congregation's commitment to the project by acquiring property, improving traffic flow, and improving the parking lot and property on Ash Street which will contain a stormwater retention area. They have a dedicated Building Committee who have exercised fiscal management. He mentioned the two good neighbor meetings they held to inform neighbors of their plans.

He showed the design of the first floor plan and described the layout specifically mentioning the gymnasium and kitchen facility. The second floor plan was shown and he described the layout.

Mr. Wingard then introduced Scott Czerkies, Architect with Legat Architects, explained the technical aspects of the project. Mr. Czerkies indicated he would focus on the exterior site plan and proceeded with the presentation. He explained the campus site plan and stated that Maple Street was to the north, Ash Street to the south with Lincoln Avenue connecting the two. The proposed new school is to be located on the west side of Lincoln. One of their main objectives was to maintain the residential feel along Maple Street. They wanted to keep the white house at the corner of Maple and Lincoln so they pushed the building south. It was also their intent to keep the trees on the north and west sides of the site as the west side trees were to act as a buffer. The entry plaza is across the street from the main entrance of the church.

Mr. Czerkies then explained the design for the new school. The elementary school site consists of a receiving area and back entry. The main focus of the design is to locate the gym towards the central location of the site to bring it off of the edge lot lines.

He mentioned the Plan Commission workshop that was conducted on February 21 and the comments that the Commissioners had made. As a result of those comments, they now have a screened area as well as a fence line that will run on the north, west, and south lot lines towards Ash Street. The fence they are proposing is a 6' high cedar fence. Another item noted from the workshop was to screen the play area and he indicated on his diagram where the landscaping will go as a result of the workshop comments. They will still provide some small landscaping and vegetation and are looking to finalize a plan with a professional landscaper.

Another workshop comment they addressed was the best location for the site access drive. One possibility was to bring it in off of Lincoln. However, the concern was the existing house and the mature trees which would cause one or both of those elements to be lost. The other option was to use the existing drive as an access drive and then they would demolish the garage. Mr. Czerkies stated the access drive would be used for lunch drop off (5 times a week) and garbage collection 2 times a week. This would total only 7 movements per week.

He then referred to the elevations which introduce the same masonry element in the darker portions. The petitioner came back with a set budget and does not see the inclusion of masonry as a result. The elements of this have not changed since the workshop except the west elevation.

The west and south elevations reflect the workshop comments which include the incorporation of another color. They are introducing the darker brown color to match the south elevation and the other elements on the east façade.

Mr. Czerkies mentioned the good neighbor meetings and the resulting information provided to the Village as well as to the neighbors. There have been certain requests made by the neighbors and they provided conceptual drawings of the different views which show the cedar fence and large mature trees.

In conclusion, he showed the building perspective from Maple Street running back. He mentioned the entry stairwell and the trees. Mr. Czerkies then turned the presentation over to Joe Jaruseski.

Joe Jaruseski, 1107 Michelle Lane, Lombard, recapped the presentation by mentioning the history of St. John's and his family's involvement, the project's rigorous planning, the mission and ministry, the rounded extracurricular activities and rigorous academic preparation.

Chairperson Ryan then indicated that the public participation period was next. He asked if there was anyone in the audience who was in support of the petition and wanted to speak. He noted the list of names but was unaware of who wanted to speak in favor.

There were five people who spoke in favor of the petition. They were:

Lynn Graham, 2S077 Beaumont, Lombard, explained how he came to live in Lombard, how he wanted a Lutheran School and how he chose St. John's to enroll all six of his children. The reason for his selection of St. John's was that the school met their current educational needs as well as the ability to grow within the community. He is in support of the new school which would allow for the music and science rooms to grow. Having a new facility would attract new students and the amenities offered would be a plus.

Dave Freese, 569 Brewster Avenue, Lombard, stated he was a lifelong member of St. John's and went to school there. It is a great school and mentioned that most projects in Lombard need some type of variations. He mentioned the upgrading of his personal business that took place not too long ago and asked that the Plan Commission extend the same courtesy by looking at the whole picture of what they want to add to the community.

Phil Hyssong, 219 E. Prairie, Lombard, indicated he is a community member of St. John's. He is in favor of the proposed plans and asked for their approval. He came to realize that St. John's has been affecting lives for a long time and their longevity is noteworthy especially in today's society. They serve thousands

of meals to needy community members and the students enrolled in the school continue to serve the community. He requested that the Plan Commission support St. John's mission and allow them to continue serving the community for the next 100 years.

Danielle Budig, 35 S. Chase, Lombard, stated that when she chose a school she considered the type of individuals that came out of St. John's, the school itself, and their educational needs. The teachers and staff have provided those needs as well as emotional support. They are currently outgrowing the school and the proposed new school will give them the opportunity to continue to provide education to their congregation.

Tom Geyer, 238 S. Elizabeth Street, Lombard, indicated he lives one block due west, serves as the treasurer, and is in favor of the new building. He mentioned the day school as an outreach and his family's success as a result. He talked about his move to Lombard and how they became actively involved and have since served in volunteer positions working at the school. He stated that the Maple Street corridor is a showcase corridor and exhibits the character of Lombard of which St. John's has been a part. He felt that the proposed improvements would be beneficial to Lombard as a whole and would improve the image at no expense to Lombard taxpayers. He asked for the Commissioners support.

Speaking against the petition were:

John DeSalvo, 113 S. Charlotte, Lombard, indicated he is here on behalf of himself as well as his mother who lives at 220 W. Ash who could not be here tonight. Her property is located directly west of the site. Mr. DeSalvo stated that they have nothing against the betterment of parochial schools. Others tonight have brought up the character of the Maple Street corridor but he questioned why no one was considering the Ash Street corridor. He felt that they were becoming a back door to the St. John's development and have become angry that they are not being considered. He mentioned the removal of houses for a parking lot that became a gym and then a preschool. He is curious about the site plan and felt that something was amiss as every rule is trying to be ignored. He thinks it is professionally wrong. He stated that one of the most historic blocks in the community has been asked to become a commercial area. His mother's house would be 35' away from this building. He asked what will happen to the existing building, feels there has been a lack of planning, and that doing things smaller might help.

John Walz deferred.

Peggy Avila, 225 W. Maple, Lombard, mentioned that she is a former member of St. John's, attended grades 1-8 and was married there. She has five memories of the place and has nothing against them building a new school. The location, type, and impact on the neighborhood bothers her and she proceeded to read her letter already supplied to the Plan Commission into the record.

Linda Bohl, 213 W. Ash, Lombard, stated that they have lived there for 30 years. She has children that went to St. John's and confirmed that it is important that the neighborhood has rights too. This is a residential area and they are asking the Plan Commission to retain their rights. She asked that the school stay on the east side and don't move to the west side. They attended every neighborhood meeting and feels that St. John's is trying to take a 10-pound school and put it on a 5-pound lot. She felt that if this was a developer requesting this relief, they would not be allowed to do this. The development would reduce the property values and that they should reduce the building height to stay within ordinance. She agrees with St. John's as to what will happen with the existing area. They are not allowed to use their own parking because that area is used for recess. They will double the area and not have parking. She checked St. John's website which mentions making the existing building into a for-profit daycare. She asks that the

200 block of Maple and Ash remain residential. She suggested they use the existing structure and renovate it and support the remaining areas over there. The website shows that they have had a flat population growth and therefore it is not urgent to expand their size.

Lois Colby, 211 W. Maple, Lombard, lives on the north border of the site and mentioned the letter she submitted to the Plan Commission. She is not against renovation or expansion but mentioned the points:

1. Access drive to school -this borders her driveway and there is no intermediate grass there. If that becomes their access drive, she will have two points on her property where her children play and the access drive will be extremely close to her property. She mentioned that senior citizens currently park there and will not be able to anymore which will add to congestion. Her request is that the access drive be placed on Lincoln and not on Maple while realizing that trees will have to be cut down.
2. The dumpster is located too close to her property and that of her neighbors. She does not want to have to smell the garbage or hear the garbage truck back up in the wee hours of the night. She requested that the dumpster be relocated.
3. Elevations - she agreed with what has been said already. They need to dig deeper rather than ask to go higher.
4. Landscaping - All the landscaping they have on their plans is existing landscaping. They have added nothing.
5. The current building is a nice school and fits with the character of the neighborhood. She requested that the new building fit into the neighborhood.

Robert Meek, 115 E. Ash, Lombard, stated he owns the property at 210 W. Ash. He was concerned about the parking and the need for a variation after being told at neighborhood meetings they would not need any. He also had concerns about flooding and stated that every time a building has been demolished he gets excess water run off. He referred to the underground water retention and swales mentioned in the staff report. He asked what would happen should this retention system malfunction. Another concern was having a one-foot setback on Ash Street as his house is 10 feet away from the lot line. He referred to the fence and mentioned it would have been best to build it to the east. He stated that the property owner to the east was never approached to see if he would want to sell and, if he had, that would have given them the proper green space requirements and water run off without having to ask for a variation. He thinks that St. John's needs to consider the neighbors' points as their property will be adversely affected.

Ken Bohl deferred.

Lynda Nelson, 207 W. Ash, Lombard, indicated she lives just south of the building. She is for schools whether they are public or private. She commented that should the District 87 referendum fail, they will experience a severe impact on kids coming into the school and they should consider that impact. Secondly, they have invested in their home and are not going anywhere and they would like to see the community stay the same. You will not see any school set up right against residential properties and asked why they could not build on the east side of Lincoln. She understands the good things about a private school but they must consider the community and neighbors thoughts. She mentioned some of the bad experiences she has had with St. John's regarding her children playing on their premises and being asked to leave. She reaffirmed everything said before her and asked them to think about where they are putting their building.

Tammy Urish, 216 W. Maple, Lombard, asked what percentage of and increase in their budget would they experience in order to use higher quality building materials and architectural features.

Jim Nelson, 207 W. Ash, Lombard, had questions. He stated that in a previous public hearing they mentioned a campus plan. Will St. John's present a campus plan to the Village? He raised concerns regarding this green space within the development.

Chairperson Ryan asked the petitioner if they would like to rebut and noted the questions/comments that needed to be addressed.

What will happen to the old building?

Joe Jaruseski indicated that plans are still being developed but their plan is to use the gym and kitchen space for senior center activities while the second and third floor space would be used for storage.

What about the 30 foot height deviation?

Scott Czerkies responded by indicating the height relief was primarily for the gym, which is located to the center portion of the building. The relief would provide adequate space for volleyball, etc. They are not seeking to go below grade due to accessibility to the space whereby they would need stairs and ramps to the gym. Being below grade also would make the gymnasium susceptible to potential mold and moisture problems.

The footprint being too large for the area

Joe Jaruseski indicated that during the past 20 years they took a long time planning and plans have changed. When they looked at building the school on the same side of the street, renovation costs were 2.8 million. They did not believe that stewardship would result in a smaller space. They also preferred to build a school on the existing site but when they tried to tie in the school to the church the cost was prohibitive. in parking.

Parking reduction

Scott Czerkies indicated that they are not reducing the existing parking now. If St. John's were to take over Lincoln, and they are not asking for this, the current situation and parking requirements per Village Ordinance would only require 29 spaces. They looked at how to go about locating those spaces and they came up with a weekday and weekend plan. The current facility use is for the church itself. As the school will not be used on the weekends there will be no overlap. This will lessen the impact on parking.

Location of Service Drive/Parking Next to Service Drive and Why Not Locate it on Lincoln?

Mr. Czerkies stated that the reasoning in having the drive off Maple was so not to have to take down the trees as well as the white house. The location of the drive off of Maple Street would be for using it for 7 deliveries.

Commissioner Sweetser asked what the ability was for the parking next to the house. Mr. Czerkies answered that the existing driveway is used by the senior center and will be now designed as an emergency lane. Other options to be within the closest location to the school would be along Lincoln or along Maple with diagonal lanes.

Color scheme being a total contrast to church as well as the neighborhood and will not match.

Mr. Czerkies stated that they are showing a darker color with a lighter contrasting color. The exact colors have not been selected yet. They will have the contrasting color as proposed with the new elevations.

Garbage/dumpsters located right next to property line of neighbor

Mr. Czerkies referred to the slide in the PowerPoint presentation "elementary schools site layout" and stated that the main reason is the proximity of the multi purpose room as well as the cafeteria and the kitchen and the ease of dispensing of the garbage in the prime location. They tried to push it off of the north property line as much as possible and located it accordingly.

Chairperson Ryan asked about the dumpster enclosure materials. Mr. Czerkies stated that the enclosure regulations are called out in Village Ordinance - non-combustible and 6' high around the perimeter. There will be perimeter fencing to act as a secondary level of screening. They thought it would be beneficial to the neighbors.

Landscaping - Just the existing landscaping and nothing added

Mr. Czerkies stated that finalized plans are not completed yet and they are trying to show schematics along the west elevation as well as the perimeter of the playground area. They are also looking at low bushes and working with a landscape designer to soften the building.

Fencing around the property line

They are proposing a 6' high solid cedar fence along the portion of the north and west and a portion of south as a screening mechanism in addition to doubling the protection of the children

Day care center

Joe Jaruseski indicated that the plans today are finalized as to what the school space will be used for. He would estimate they would retain the current structure, or something on a smaller scale if they were to replace it and the intent would be to provide an outreach of their ministries. They are tentatively considering a day care use.

Chairperson Ryan asked to show where the children's playground would be located. Mr. Jaruseski referred to the campus site plan and indicated where it would be. He stated that by moving the school on the west side the kids did not have to cross the street. There will be an impervious surface and then some green space right outside the classrooms.

Do they have a campus plan similar to the previous public hearing on Northern Baptist Theological Seminary?

Mr. Jaruseski stated that the overall campus plan is what you see.

Flooding to the residents on the Ash side close to 10' of the property line

Mr. Czerkies stated they are proposing an underground water detention system. The system will be outlet into the Village's storm sewer system on Lincoln Avenue and their engineer's design will meet 100-year stormwater runoff requirements. The swale system has been designed to handle the required storm water should the underground system malfunction. The swale will be further developed and is one of the comments of staff's review.

Why not put the building on the east side why is going to the west side?

Mr. Jaruseski stated that they have spent many years planning the new school structure and it is more financially feasible on an open land.

Referencing Slide #8 showing the campus site plan- The neighbor, Robert Meek, inquired about the flooding with the swales, the gym wasn't cost effective because of problems with the wood floor and the flood control system is not effective or they would not have to worry about putting it in the ground. Mr.

Czerkies stated that any time you put something under the ground, it is a concern with water in the soil. Not so much as to flooding, but more of a damproofing. They are not concerned about the underground vault system failing.

#### Cost of concrete versus masonry

Mr. Czerkies stated they are working with the construction manager and getting cost estimates. Their budget is the main consideration when doing the school. Someone mentioned why it cannot be smaller and it is a matter of the parameters they were given. The church has developed the plan while saving money every year. It costs more and working with the site and the parameters given, this is what the building has been developed into. The precast is a budgetary issue. Current numbers to provide a complete masonry building was close to \$600,000 to provide just masonry along the red portions along the west and south elevations was upward of \$150,000.

Chairperson Ryan then asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Mr. Jaruseski then thanked the audience who spoke in favor of the petition as well as for those who spoke against it. As with any church, the effort to make its ministry expand is a matter of budget and this plan is the best mix of ministry and what they can afford today.

Chairperson Ryan then asked if the Commissioner had any questions.

Commissioner Sweetser clarified that there was no previous hearings before the Plan Commission and that all references were related to the workshop session. This is the first public hearing. She also indicated she was disappointed that the petitioner did not mention tonight, but did at the workshop, that one of the compelling reasons not to demolish the existing building is the fact that the heating unit was located there and wondered now how compelling the reason really was. Mr. Jaruseski stated that it is paramount that the existing building be retained due to the heating unit being there until such time they can replace that structure.

Commissioner Olbrysh stated he was struggling with a number of things. While trying to look at the whole picture, which was hard to do when the landscaping plans have not finished, final plans for school not finished, there is no overall campus plan, and no further development of the swale system. He indicated he was not in a position to do anything with this petition. He did state he supports a Christian education and does not have a problem with St. John's. They have done a phenomenal job but what bothers him is the size of the building as it takes up a large portion of the block. You are dealing with a historic area of Lombard and need to balance the rights of the residents with the rights of the petitioner. It seems that the balance is lopsided and they need to respect the rights of the neighborhood. He mentioned this was a result of the large audience attendance and stated that opinions differ and he was not in a position to judge that. He does not feel the petitioner knows the final plans and would like to have all the facts before him before he votes.

Commissioner Burke referred to the opening statements of the petitioner stating that the two main reasons they want to replace the existing school and suggested the plans do not wash out - they want to maintain but they are adding and they don't have the budget. Mr. Jaruseski stated that the existing structure contains the heating element for the church but it is their intention not to maintain the infrastructure when the current school is built. It is not in their plans for the 2nd and 3rd floors as they are used today. The overall cost of the school will be less than maintaining the school on a person-by-person basis.



Commissioner Burke stated that they would still have to maintain them if they are used for offices and storage space and there is no savings on operating two systems than one system.

Chairperson Ryan stated that the Commissioners were told at the workshop that the building was to be used for storage and meeting rooms as well as to keep for the heat for the church. The petitioner's opening presentation stated that it would be used for senior citizens and meetings and they are hearing something different why the building is staying up. Mr. Jaruski indicated that it is true but the other issue is they are not sure they can tolerate the disruption of the school and ministry with what would be involved if the existing school stays.

Commissioner Sweetser stated that they understood that but wanted to have that laid out in writing and in their presentation.

Commissioner Burke stated he is not prepared to vote on the petition.

Chairperson Ryan indicated that the Commissioners have not been provided with all the information but will go ahead with the staff report and more discussion.

William Heniff, Senior Planner, indicated that for the record he received a phone call from an individual asking about the proposed plans at the northwest corner of Ash and Lincoln for a gathering area west of the school. What is envisioned? Mr. Czerkies indicated that currently this was designed for a gathering space should students arrive before the school bell. This would eliminate the need to congregate in the building before the teachers arrive so they designed an area on the exterior of the building. That space is being deleted from the project. There are only two gathering spaces and he showed the locations on the PowerPoint slide.

Mr. Heniff then presented the staff report. Within the staff report are the general inter-departmental comments from engineering and fire are being offered for reference. These comments will be addressed as part of the building submittal.

Planning comments include compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan. He explained what the Comprehensive Plan is and the designation for the surrounding areas. Staff included an amendment to address the petition - if the Village Board finds the petition is acceptable, the Plan would be amended.

Mr. Heniff noted the actions taken on the property in the past as they related to the zoning history dating back to 1962. This petition is an expansion of those actions and requires a public hearing.

The first amendment is for the community center. They are going to modify the site plan to provide for a drive aisle and removal of a garage. The drive aisle will be placed in the same location as the garage and will extend the entire length. Parking will be prohibited and is included as a condition in the findings and recommendations.

The petitioner is also requesting an amendment to two ordinances granting approval of a conditional use for a religious institution and for a private elementary school. Mr. Heniff read the definition of a planned development and stated that staff looked at the appropriateness of the school at the location and went point by point through the report.

The conditional use for the planned development is an attractive way to address campus settings or a theme of common ownership and supports them. Staff's recommendation is that all the same properties be reviewed as a unified development.

Mr. Heniff also mentioned a number of zoning relief actions associated with the planned development.

#### Front yard setbacks

Ash Street is considered the front yard and Lincoln Avenue is the corner side yard. The intention was to shift the building to the south to provide greater building separation, which pushed it into the front yard setback.

#### Corner side yard

Village Code requires a 20' corner side yard setback. The petitioner is proposing 1'. Staff thought that it should be pushed as far east as possible therefore, the shifting of the building can be supported.

#### Building height of 30'

Village code allows maximum building height of 30' and up to 45' via a conditional use. Their building shows 33' as roof height. Final engineering does not create additional need for relief. The petitioner noted the need for the relief as it relates to the gym.

#### Open space requirements

There is a distinction between open space and stormwater requirements. This is considered new development and therefore has to meet local and DuPage codes. Open space is green space. They intend to capture to stormwater and this new development will take care of that. Staff researched other institutions within the Village for compliance with this provision. The research shows that a number of schools do not meet the open space requirement as the Village has either granted relief or the use is legal nonconforming. While the open space is reduced there are additional landscaping comments.

#### Foundation landscaping requirements

As the building is proposed to be located one foot off of the corner side yard, there will be little or no room for perimeter landscape treatments or foundation plantings. This is the result of the trade off of pushing the new school further to the east, which offsets the plantings that would be required.

#### Number of parking spaces required

Parking relief has been previously granted. The existing parking lot serves both the church and the school. The church is the highest intensity use and will remain unimpacted. Primary parking demand will be generated from the school on the weekdays and from the church on the weekends. The Village's traffic consultant looked at this issue as well as for excessive parking conflicts. The Lincoln Avenue parking spots are public spaces and cannot be used in their count. Staff conditioned the approval of this variation based on the use of the old school building.

#### Compatibility with the Surrounding Land Uses

The south side is the pick up/drop off area. The Village's traffic consultant, KLOA, looked at the petitioner's plan, which has been submitted and their comments were submitted to the petitioner. Lincoln, Maple and Ash are Village rights-of-way and the Village has the ability to amend parking provisions to work in an efficient matter.

He noted that concept building elevations were precast. After the workshop session, staff suggested that additional masonry be added to the east elevation. Staff believes that the building elevations will be substantial and the masonry component from a neighborhood standpoint merits further discussion.

#### Vacation of Lincoln Avenue

Staff reviewed the issue of vacating Lincoln Avenue and does not support it for three reasons:

1. The Village has existing water and sewer utility lines within the right-of-way;
2. There is a substantial width between Main and Elizabeth Streets. If a vacation was approved the block face would be 1420 feet, which exceeds the maximum block length standard established within Section 154.505 (B)(2) of the Subdivision and Development Ordinance.
3. The right-of-way provides an excellent direct pedestrian link from residential neighborhoods south of Ash to the Plum Library on Maple Street.

#### Subdivision and Development Ordinance

Since the properties west of Lincoln are several lots with buildings and parking lots to be constructed over existing lot lines, a plat of consolidation will be required to make it a single lot of record.

Staff offered a number of conditions associated with approval of the petition but should the Commissioners have additional concerns, the petition could either be continued or addressed through extra conditions. In conclusion, staff recommends approval with seven conditions. Mr. Heniff noted two notations in the findings and recommendations section. Those were add "that the proposed planned development request would be within the public interest" and strike "conditional use and variations".

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for discussion among the Plan Commission members.

Commissioner Sweetser referred to Appendix A, indicating that she does not have it. She thought it would be advantageous to make a list of the things they need before they make a case for continuance.

Commissioner Burke stated he is a supporter of parochial education, his children attended Sacred Heart, and he lives in the neighborhood. This is not a discussion about religious education but a discussion of whether anyone would want to be in a position of being a neighbor and having this building in your back yard next to your single most important investment. This is the physical impact of the neighborhood. This is a residential neighborhood and the impact this school is having on this neighborhood and the determinant being spoken about tonight. If this was a building that was going up and did not require the variances and setbacks, it would be a no brainer but because of the variances being asked, he cannot support the large building, building height, and being that close to the property line. Commissioner Burke indicated that when they met in the workshop, the Commissioners questioned how the neighborhood meeting went and were led to believe there were only minor issues. It was only when he asked the neighbors what the issues were, is where it all came out and every question posed the response is it costs too much. We understand cost concerns are the biggest reason but that burden cannot be put on adjacent residences. If they want to develop they have to bear those costs and he doesn't think it has been.

Commissioner Olbrysh supported Commissioner Burke's comments but was concerned about the cost of the project. He knows that in order for a project to get underway, the Joliet Diocese requires the church to have 75 percent of the money in the bank but is unsure if it is the same with a Lutheran church. Mr. Jaruskeski stated that their model today is that they have 30 percent or 6.8 million in cash on hand.

Commissioner Sweetser commented that this is a situation where a compromise has to occur. She stated she is not totally opposed to the project but needed to decide what percentage of open space is provided and what relief has been granted in other cases. As to the height, she is not disturbed about that and it is reasonable as the building is pulled to the east. As far as the driveway, she is not sure about the seven trips a week and twilight hours but the proximity to the house next door is a concern. Her preference is the keeping the driveway where it is over tearing down the trees. Water/drainage are major concerns and they have been assured that the system will work but want assurances that the swales will also work. As far as fitting in with the neighborhood, it is unclear what factors would have to be modified in order to have it fit in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Zorn indicated she was not present for last month's workshop session and reading through the material was perplexing. She stated she would like more detailed information.

Commissioner Sweetser asked about getting Appendix A, an analysis of open space, information relative to drainage swales, neighborhood compatibility, building factors they could incorporate into the site plan to make the new building more compatible and getting the final landscaping plan versus having the conceptual ones. Commissioner Sweetser also stated that any changes need to be reflected on revised drawings such as eliminating the gathering area.

Commissioner Burke referred to page 13. He indicated that this was a depiction of a fence and how it would affect the neighbors. It would be interesting to show the perspective from someone's second floor in the same direction. Mr. Czerkies mentioned that the view is about 5'6" eye level off the ground. Those depictions were a good will effort on the part of the church.

Commissioner Olbrysh stated he would like to see a campus plan or a final plan for the existing school. Mr. Heniff responded that staff did make a recommendation that should the existing building undergo changes they would have to come back to the Plan Commission for further consideration.

Commissioner Sweetser inquired about the dumpster indicating that sometimes buildings have indentations at ground level and that could accommodate the dumpster to get it out of sight and be more contained.

Mr. Jaruseski asked about parameters for the campus plan. Mr. Heniff indicated that it should be an overall plan or a vision document of what you foresee and what your long-range goals are. Mr. Jaruseski ask the number of years. Mr. Heniff responded at least 10. Mr. Jaruseski asked if it should include the entire campus with the premise that the new school would be built. Mr. Heniff answered yes.

Chairperson Ryan clarified to the audience that staff would not be sending another notice in the mail as to the next meeting on April 18.

*April 18, 2005*

Chairperson Ryan stated that he will try to hold this petition to one hour as there are other petitions that follow. Should that not be enough time, the petition could then be continued to the next Plan Commission meeting. He requested that anyone wanting to speak to keep that in mind while giving their presentation.

Joe Jaruseski, 1107 Michelle Lane, Lombard, indicated he was the Congregation Chairman of St. John's and proceeded to present their responses to the previous Plan Commission meeting in PowerPoint format. He concluded by introducing Patrick Brosnan, Architect with Legat Architects.

Patrick Brosnan, 545 Hillside Avenue, Glen Ellyn, stated he was speaking on behalf of St. John's and would present the neighborhood compatibility portion of the PowerPoint presentation. This included showing architectural features of various homes in the neighborhood and how St. John's has incorporated those features into the new school to make it compatible. He also explained the redesigned elevations comparing them with the previous ones.

Robert Meek who resides at 115 E. Ash and also owns property at 210 W. Ash questioned Page 29 of their PowerPoint presentation which shows the site plan. He stated that the revised south elevation plan has a much better appearance but wondered why they do not show where their lot ends. He stated that there is only 13' between his property at 210 W. Ash and the lot line.

Scott Czerkies, Architect with Legat Architects, 2015 Spring Road, Oak Brook, presented St. John's 10-year master campus plan. His presentation included addressing the site plan, drainage swales, trash enclosure, landscaping plan, gathering area, and open space.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for public comment.

Gerald Moore, Tom Taylor, and Chuck Wingard deferred.

Reverend Dan Wegrzyn, 949 S. Lincoln, stated he is the pastor at St. John's. He is in favor of the petition as the new school building is their desire to add to their ministry and to the community by reaching out and extending beyond themselves.

Angie Hyssong, 219 E. Prairie, Lombard, stated she has been a resident of Lombard for nine years and a kindergarten teacher for ten years. As representative of the teaching staff, she would like to address the need to move forward with these plans. She indicated that the building will provide new windows and get the children out of the basement. Classrooms would now be on located on the 1st floor and would be easily accessible. They will have a new elevator, wider hallways and a sprinkler system. Bathrooms would be provided on each level and they would have air conditioning. She asked that people in the audience who supported St. John's petition to stand. In conclusion, she stated that the new school would provide for a better quality environment and education and asked the Commissioners for their approval of this petition.

Phil Hyssong deferred.

Bruno Daube, 707 S. Lombard, Lombard, told of how he is the proud recipient of several awards awarded to him for service to the community and for humanity. He stated how St. John's has had an impact on him and how it is a great outreach to this community and others. He offered his services to resolve any concerns in the community.

Speaking against the petition were:

Linda Bohl, 213 W. Ash, Lombard. Ms. Bohl stated that she is in support of St. John's needing a new school but they need to think about the surrounding neighbors. She presented her own PowerPoint presentation and commented on such things as property values, impact of homes in the neighborhood, and the closeness of the proposed new school to the Meek, DeSalvo and Colby's family's properties. She stated that building a new school raises property values but this building is a replacement school. She indicated that one gentleman talked about arbitration and she would be open to that. Not all avenues have been

pursued. She noted that the school's projected enrollment figures are flat and thereby does not necessitate a new building of this size. Ms. Bohl indicated that even though the plan calls for the old school building to be used for storage, occasional use, and bears the heating system to the support the church, it is St. John's decision to use that design and they should bear the impact. She referenced Montini and other schools that did tear downs and rebuilt and how well those projects came out. She stated that the school would fit better on the east side of Lincoln as there is one residential home and everything else is something else. Ms. Bohl stated that they had circulated a petition against this proposal, which was submitted for the record. Ms. Bohl thought that the land around their home has been secretly obtained over the years and they were told that the land would be used for a parking lot, then a gym, and now a new school. She requested that the Plan Commissioners protect the right of the surrounding property owners and deny the petition. In conclusion she stated that they have nothing against a new school but look for a responsible plan.

Mr. Jaruseski responded by asking how property can be acquired in secret.

Carl Prindiville, 219 W. Ash, Lombard, read a letter into the record from Mary Beth Lynch who is an active real estate agent in Lombard representing both buyers and sellers. Ms. Lynch's letter states that should St. John's proposed plan move forward it would have a negative impact on the value of the surrounding residential properties. After reading the letter, he asked the people who stood earlier showing support of the school's plan to again stand but only if they live within one block of the new proposed school. It was noted that only one person stood.

Karen Ness, 219 W. Ash, Lombard, stated that the proposed school will degrade property values and overshadow homes that are less than 3,000 square feet. She referenced the parking spaces along Lincoln that are posted for church use only. She felt that St. John's wants to build on the other side of Lincoln because they cannot tolerate the disruption and wondered what would be built on the east side. Lastly, she stated that the property owners have a right to protect their neighborhood and property values.

Sharon Herlache, 123 S. Elizabeth Street, Lombard, lives in the house on the corner of Elizabeth and did not attend the good neighbor meetings. She mentioned that when they built their addition, they took the neighborhood into consideration and chose materials that blended with their current home. The questions she had were as follows:

1. Page 36 - Referring to the stand of trees St. John's were adamant about saving and wanted to know what kind of trees they were.
2. What are the age of the trees and their life expectancy?
3. Page 26 - There used to be a home where the stand of trees currently exist. Leading to this home was a 10-12' wide driveway and asked if they would consider moving the drive between the two trees off Lincoln.
4. She asked if the petitioners had evidence to support the figures quoted at the last meeting relative to the cost of using brick versus precast.

John DeSalvo who lives at 115 S. Charlotte, and also represents his mother's property at 220 W. Ash, introduced his presentation. He stated he was still anxious after hearing St. John's proposed revisions, which were a result of the last meeting, and felt that they are using a band-aid approach. His presentation began by showing the characteristics of the neighborhood beginning on Maple, going west to Ash to the proposed location of St. John's school. He noted the building's proposed setback and how it would look relative to the context of the neighborhood. He compared the footprint of the building to the homes

surrounding it and indicated that there is something wrong with their scale. Lastly, he asked for the Commissioners' recommendation of denial.

Marilyn Socha, 203 W. Ash Street, Lombard, indicated she has lived there for 37 years and had no problem until they changed the configuration of their parking lot and Lincoln Street. She felt that the proposed building would blend better on the east side of Ash.

John Avila, 225 W. Maple, Lombard, indicated he can understand the need for a modern school. If this building were built on the east side of Lincoln, they would not be here. He thought Mr. DeSalvo's visualization was more appropriate and wondered what relief the school would need if it was on the east side of Lincoln. Mr. Avila indicated that this is not a minor variance but a tremendously big building. He felt that they need to buy more property west of Lincoln in order to have the appropriate open space. The downtown area is a showplace and the Village has moved in that direction with the addition of new buildings. There needs to be compromise and the plan has to be more appealing to the community and its neighbors.

Richard Anstee, 219 Maple, Lombard, stated that St. John's should re-evaluate the location of the new school. He indicated he supports parochial education as well as the development of their programs but their concerns have been consistent - the building is too big, the location of the service drive is not acceptable as it eliminates two mature trees, and the impact on the neighborhood is too immense. They have heard how the church cannot afford other options and felt those were not compelling arguments. He felt they should be required to meet Village code. He mentioned his personal involvement working on a building committee, how they dealt with various issues and concerns of the neighborhood, and ultimately received an award for excellence. He thought the project could be viable but asked for the Commissioners' recommendation of denial for this plan.

Tamara Urish, 216 W. Maple, Lombard, indicated she previously submitted a letter of disapproval regarding this petition. She is a former planner for the City of Highland Park, stated her reasons why the petition should not be approved and stated that asking for special consideration due to monetary reasons was not considered a hardship - there are particular physical surroundings that make meeting code impractical.

Robert Meek, 115 E. Ash, Lombard, deferred.

Jim Nelson, 207 W. Ash, Lombard, indicated he lived across the street from the building. He stated this is not about the church but about the school, which is an outreach function. He had questions of staff's comments relative to green space, other religious institutions and schools and their percentage of lot space, the lot coverage, and of those listed in Appendix A. He agreed with others in that they have invested heavily in their properties and should be able to enjoy the neighborhood. Mr. Nelson mentioned the recent school referendum and felt that this might cause new families to move and this should be considered in their future plans. He thought that possibly using Mr. Daube's services as an arbitrator might be beneficial.

Kenneth Bohl, 213 W. Ash, Lombard, clarified that the petition they submitted for the record has 27 signatures. How they obtained them was by drawing a circle around the neighborhood on paper and went to each resident within that circle. These signatures against the petition represent 100 percent participation. He indicated the neighborhood is in support of the modernization of the school but oppose the plan they have presented.

Jim Colby, 211 Maple, Lombard, opposed the plan, specifically stating that the size, height, and elevations will not benefit the neighborhood. He would like to see the historic nature of the neighborhood maintained. The height of the building has a significant negative impact on the neighborhood. He asked that the Plan Commissioners deny the petition and have St. John's return with a more fitting proposal.

Chairperson Ryan stated that now would be a time for rebuttal.

William Heniff, Senior Planner, stated that most of the items listed in Appendix A are religious institutions. Sacred Heart did get zoning relief from open space requirements. He wasn't sure if St. Pius' parking lot was legal nonconforming. Christ the King does meet open space and their site was reviewed by the Plan Commission last year. Trinity Lutheran was annexed into the Village in 2003 so it would be legal non-conforming. The College Preparatory School meets open space requirements.

Joe Jaruseski rebutted to various questions:

1. Montini's addition/tear down and rebuilding - he didn't believe that they did a tear down.
2. Can reduce the mass but at the expense of the senior center. He believed those comments are contrary to their intentions.
3. Weren't aware of their plans - St. John's had good neighbor meetings and they felt they had represented their plans at that time.
4. The types of trees and their ages - he did not know the answer to those questions, they could be maples.
5. Having the service drive off of Lincoln - he believed they covered this issue at the last meeting.
6. Submission of masonry versus precast costs - they chose precast because it is a better quality.
7. Acquiring property west of Lincoln - St. John's have limited needs and have to draw a circle around parameters.
8. Destruction of two large trees - Their intention is not to destroy large trees.
9. The landscape plan was part of their presentation.
10. Visualization - The building height is 32' feet for gym and the rest of the building is 28'.
11. Building a new high school - the closest high school is in Melrose Park.
12. Regarding the secrecy of purchasing properties - all real estate transactions are recorded with DuPage County.
13. Cost of \$125,000 versus \$600,000 and the change of \$200,000 - the original design for the school, the cost was \$600,000. Redesigned as proposed today will cost an additional \$200,000.
14. Page 36 moving the drive off Lincoln - traffic flow would be better off of Maple than Lincoln.



15. 100 percent of neighbors signed the petition in comparison to good neighbor meetings. The neighbors should be commended by pulling together.

16. Mr. DeSalvo's visualization in that their architects didn't bring in houses to compare. Mr. Brosnan indicated that the visualization misrepresented the size and the buildings. The gym is proposed to be 32' high. The drawings are not done in context of the buildings.

Mr. Jaruseski then questioned the process from here.

Chairperson Ryan indicated that staff would present the staff report.

William Heniff referenced the addendum report that was submitted to the public record. He then noted the changes from the initial submittal. The petitioner submitted modified building elevational drawings. The exterior of the school remains a pre-cast structure. However, the petitioner has modified the south and east elevations to incorporate additional window treatments to break up the building mass and to tie it in with the existing church and school buildings. Reveals were also added to the elevations and the gymnasium building height was reduced by one foot. Staff still recommends that additional masonry be added to the east building elevation.

With respect to the west elevation, the Commissioners requested additional information regarding the views and perspectives of the school from neighboring properties to the east. The petitioner's revised submittal includes additional color palette changes. Staff recommends the inclusion of additional treatments at the top of the gymnasium wall elevation.

The petitioner has prepared a ten-year campus plan for the site. Other than the school improvements depicted on the submitted plans made a part of the public hearing request, they are not requesting approval of any other improvements at this time. At the public hearing, they did express a longer-range desire to establish a child-care activity as part of their overall plan.

The petitioner submitted a detailed landscape plan for Plan Commission consideration. The plan, which includes plant species and material locations, includes foundation landscaping consisting of bushes, shrubs along the south and east elevations, and shrub hedgerows along the west property line. The existing tree stand southeast of the Senior Center is intended to remain and serves as an aesthetic enhancement to the Maple Street/Lincoln Avenue visual corridor.

The petitioner revised the location and design of the proposed trash enclosure area. The new location of the enclosure will be farther from adjacent residences and will be made of similar materials as the school building. To ensure neighborhood compatibility, staff recommends the approval be tied to the aforementioned provisions and that trash pick-up shall not occur on the property prior to 8:00 a.m.

The petitioner provided additional details regarding proposed drainage swales on the property to minimize stormwater run-off onto neighboring properties. Staff reviewed the submitted plans relative to the concerns raised at the public hearing meeting. The storm restrictor will be placed at the property line immediately south of the school. As such, in the event that capacity for the vault system is exceeded, the additional stormwater would be discharged south of the school and would empty into the Ash Street and Lincoln Avenue storm drains. Based upon the design of the vault system, the area in which the vault exists will be able to absorb the rain water falling at the vault location (the additional stormwater would filter through

the aggregate material placed around the vault). Therefore, upon approval of final engineering for the site, staff believes that the stormwater run-off will be satisfactorily addressed.

The petitioner's revised plans removed the concrete gathering area depicted on their earlier plans. Moreover, they also propose to remove existing impervious surfaces from the Senior Center driveway area. Staff analyzed other religious institutions/schools in the Village for compliance with this provision. Staff also looked at zoning relief granted in the recent past for other religious institutions in the Village. Many existing institutions are within the 60 percent range of lot coverage. Since the Village has granted relief from this requirement for several other infill sites, staff can support this provision, but suggests that the approval be conditioned to the submitted plans and that no less than thirty percent lot coverage.

The service driveway is intended to provide rear access to the school for selected deliveries and for emergency access purposes. To further reduce the impact of the driveway and to discourage its use, the petitioner is proposing to reconstruct the driveway using a grasscrete surface. The drive will also be reduced to twelve feet in width. Staff finds this amendment to be acceptable as it will decrease the likelihood that the driveway will be used for any purpose other than its intended use as a service drive for the school. The proposed drive will generate less traffic activity than currently used by the Senior Center. To further address the concerns raised through the public hearing process, staff recommends as a condition of approval that a bollard be placed at the entrance to the driveway to limit non-essential traffic.

Mr. Jaruseski then asked if St. John's were to approve the remaining requirements listed in the staff report would that would satisfy the outstanding issues. Mr. Heniff stated yes, the other things are minor. Mr. Jaruseski stated that if that is the only major request for this proposal then they accept.

Chairperson Ryan asked if the Commissioners had any questions.

Commissioner Burke stated that similar to last month's meeting he commended all participants for their professional and calm demeanor in the presentations. Again he stated that he is supportive of what St. John's does but they are located in a 100 percent residential neighborhood. He has difficulties with the plan and the objectors presented a mass diagram, which defines the height of the building overall which is not compatible with the neighborhood. Some general comments are that the trees we are trying to save could be popular trees, cottonwoods, mulberries, etc. but residents have been cutting them down due to disease or from them falling down, so saving trees that have outlived their lives is insignificant. Most importantly, the people that would be most affected want it built on the east side of Lincoln and he does not see any other alternative.

Commissioner Olbyrsh stated he is sympathetic with the Congregation Chairman of St. John's as he is also on a church building committee and is familiar with the hard work you need to tackle all issues. He commended St. John's as their revised plans took into consideration previous Commissioners' comments but he agrees that the school would be located on the wrong side of the street. He has no problem with the school but his concern is where it will go and how it will impact a historic section of Lombard.

Commissioner Sweetser stated the building is big. She was pleased that the Commissioners' comments and concerns were addressed. Now the masonry has been incorporated and comparing the mass of the second one was more to scale and that was 28' high. Commissioner Sweetser stated that if there is no other petition before the Plan Commission, she felt St. John's has done all they can do. She referenced Slide 15 in their PowerPoint presentation showing another parochial school mass next to a single-family home.

This picture says the situation already exists in the Maple Street corridor. This petition could be approved if it is impossible to have it on the east side.

Commissioner Zorn stated she was torn. She felt bad for the people of St. John's because she understands they need a school but the building looks too big for the property.

Commissioner Flint indicated he was not present at the last Plan Commission meeting but mentioned the previous workshops. This is a difficult decision but this is a big building on a small amount of property and will be impacting the neighbors. He encouraged St. John's to build on the east side and put the parking on the other side even though there might be a disruption.

Commissioner Burke referenced the Sacred Heart slide in the petitioner's PowerPoint presentation. He stated that he also has been in their position working on a building committee. They affected one house and got phone calls on a weekly basis because of the new lights, flooding, and water run off. The situation does exist but that it is not reasonable to make the same mistake over again.

Commissioner Burke stated that based on the submitted petition and the testimony presented, the proposed conditional use and variations do not comply with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision and Development Ordinance and that the planned development would not be within the public interest; and, therefore, I move that the Plan Commission not accept the findings of the Inter-departmental Review Report as the findings of the Plan Commission and therefore, I move that the Plan Commission make the following findings of fact as the finding of the Lombard Plan Commission:

A. The Petition fails to meet the standards for conditional uses for the following respects:

- 1 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed private elementary school as described in Petitioner's Application for Amendment to a Conditional Use and for a Planned Development, would not be detrimental to, or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort or general welfare by creating a negative impact on surrounding residential properties, contrary to Section 155.103(F)(8)(a) of the Lombard Village Code;
- 2 Said proposed private elementary school would be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity of the Subject Property by creating a negative visual impact to be viewed from the surrounding residential properties, contrary to Section 155.103(F)(8)(b) of the Lombard Village Code;
- 3 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that said proposed private elementary school would not substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood in which it is to be located, as required by Section 155.103(F)(8)(b) of the Lombard Village Code;
- 4 That the applicant has failed to demonstrate that said proposed private elementary school will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding properties for single family residential use as permitted within the R2 District regulations;
- 5 That the applicant has not satisfactorily demonstrated that said private elementary school ensures that adequate measures have been taken to provide ingress and egress designed to minimize traffic congestion on public streets;

- 6 That said proposed conditional use is contrary to the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan as the plan does not protect adjacent residential areas from encroachment by land uses which are incompatible or which may create adverse impacts.
- 7 That applicant has failed to demonstrate that the conditional use shall in all other respects conform to the applicable regulations of the R2 District, even if modified by the Plan Commission; and
- 8 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the petition meets the Standards for Planned Developments with Deviations, as set forth in Section 155.508 (A) of the Lombard Village Code. Said standards have not been met for the following reasons:
  - a. The proposed use is not within the public interest and is not consistent with the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance, as required by Section 155.508(A)(4) of the Lombard Village Code;
  - b. The proposed planned development deviations would not be compatible with the primary use of the planned development and that requested reductions to the bulk requirements are not in the public interest, as required by Section 155.508(C)(1) of the Lombard Village Code;
  - c. The proposed planned development deviations are not of benefit to adjacent properties, contrary to Section 155.508(C)(3) of the Lombard Village Code; and
  - d. That the proposed elementary school does not dissipate any adverse impact of adjoining buildings, as the petition seeks relief, contrary to Section 155.508(C)(6) of the Lombard Village Code.

Therefore, the Plan Commission, by a roll call vote of 4-1, recommended to the Corporate Authorities **denial** of the petition associated with PC 05-06 in its entirety.

Respectfully,

**VILLAGE OF LOMBARD**

Donald Ryan, Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission

att-

c. Petitioner  
Lombard Plan Commission