

**VILLAGE OF LOMBARD**  
**INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW GROUP REPORT**

TO: Lombard Plan Commission                      HEARING DATE: May 4, 2009

FROM: Department of                                      PREPARED BY: Michael S. Toth  
Community Development                                      Planner I

**TITLE**

**PC 09-08; 331 W. Madison Street (CPSA):** The College Preparatory School of America (CPSA) requests the Village take the following actions on the subject property:

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

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

Petitioner/Owner: College Preparatory School of America (CPSA)  
Attn: Mohammed Majeed & Attorney Andrew Draus  
331 West Madison Street  
Lombard, IL 60148

**PROPERTY INFORMATION**

Existing Zoning: CR Conservation Recreation District

Existing Land Use: Educational Institution

Size of Property: Approximately 4.22 acres

Comprehensive Plan: Public and Institutional

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:

North:	R2 Single-Family Residence District; developed as Single Family Residence
South:	R2 Single Family Residence District; developed as Single Family Residence
East:	R2 Single Family Residence District; developed as Single Family Residence
West:	R2 Single Family Residence District; developed as Single Family Residence

## ANALYSIS

### SUBMITTALS

This report is based on the following documentation, which was filed with the Department of Community Development on March 17, 2009:

1. Petition for Public Hearing.
2. Response to all applicable Standards.
3. CPSA elevation, site, landscaping and floor plans package, prepared by Dome Structural Engineers, dated December 1, 2008.
4. Use Narrative, prepared by the petitioner, submitted March 27, 2009.

### DESCRIPTION

The College Preparatory School of America (CPSA) has been experiencing an increased demand for classroom space. As such, the school is proposing to construct a second building on the subject property. As proposed, the new building would be approximately 61,000 square feet and located south of the existing building, which would remain. The new building would include a cafeteria, gymnasium, a multi-purpose hall as well as classroom and general office area. To accommodate the increased student population, additional parking would be provided. As a result, the required amount of open space is not being provided. Therefore, the petitioner is seeking a variation to reduce the required amount of open space. In addition, the proposed second building would exceed the maximum allowed building height of thirty (30) feet to thirty-five (35) feet to accommodate a projecting stairway.

As part of their request and at the suggestion of Village staff, CPSA is requesting a map amendment to rezone the subject property from CR - Conservation Recreation District to the R2 - Single-Family Residence District. In addition, the petitioner is seeking a conditional use to establish the property as a planned development.

CPSA obtained a Certificate of Occupancy on February 10, 1993 as an Educational Facility; however, they never obtained conditional use approval to lawfully establish the full-time private school. Therefore, CPSA has been operating under legal non-conforming status since their inception. As part of this petition, CPSA is requesting conditional use approval to legally establish the existing full-time, private school.

## **INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMENTS**

### **ENGINEERING**

The PES Division of Community Development has the following comments on the above petition:

- 1) Per previous comments all watermain shall be centered in a 30' wide watermain easement. The easement needs to be clear of obstructions including buildings, light pole bases, retaining walls, free standing signs, etc., and shall be open (at grade) and accessible. The southwestern portion of the watermain (near the south west corner of the existing building) is in direct conflict with the proposed retaining wall. The watermain through this area shall be redesigned to accommodate this issue.
- 2) A fire hydrant is required in the parkway, near the northwest corner of the existing building.
- 3) As the site is over one acre, the stormwater system design is required to provide Best Management Practices per the DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance for Best Management Practices (BMPs), which will require additional stormwater quality measures and could involve redesigning of the proposed detention system.
- 4) The plans continue to show shrubs and bushes planted along the side and rear swales of the property. These materials cannot be placed in the swale as they will impede the flow path over time.
- 5) Cross sections shall be provided on the final engineering plans.
- 6) Further comments will be provided once engineering plans are submitted.

### **PUBLIC WORKS**

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

- 1) As the watermain loop is not maintainable along the southwest corner of the existing building, the watermain could be split so that there is one portion that comes along the west side of the existing building and feeds the hydrant at the southwest corner of the

building. Then a watermain would need to be constructed along the east property line, east of the existing building that would loop back on itself. This main would provide the services for the hydrants to the south, and the domestic and fire services to the new building. A minimum of three additional valves are required with this main, one on each side of the services and in-between the two pressure connections off of the main in Madison.

- 2) The main along the western face of the existing building shall be situated so as to maximize the amount of hard surface to allow for maintenance vehicles, maintain a minimum spacing of 15' from the building and 15' from the pond.
- 3) A fire hydrant shall be set in the parkway, off of the proposed western watermain.

## **BUILDING AND FIRE**

BIS and Fire Prevention have the following comment(s) regarding this submittal.

- 1) The fire access lane by Village of Lombard ordinance must be 18' wide and 15' feet off the building. This site plan shows the access lane on the west side of the building at less than 18'.
- 2) Additional comments will be supplied upon submittal of a building permit application.

## **PLANNING**

### Background

As previously mentioned, CPSA has since been operating as an educational facility since obtaining their Certificate of Occupancy in 1993. The school presently has a student body population of 450 students ranging from kindergarten through Grade 12 with a total of 31 teachers and staff. In 2001, CPSA petitioned for a public hearing (PC 01-16) to establish framework for a future expansion plan, receive conditional use approval for the existing school, a conditional use to designate the property as a planned development, a map amendment to rezone the property and certain variations to bring the property into compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. PC 01-16 was later withdrawn; as such, the school currently operates with a legal non-conforming status in the CR District.

Although PC 01-16 was ultimately withdrawn, members of CPSA continued to meet with Village staff to discuss the proposed campus master plan. As the proposed plans became closer to fruition, staff advised CPSA to hold neighborhood meetings where adjacent property owners would have the opportunity to comment on the proposed plans. Staff also introduced the proposed plans to the Plan Commission during a workshop session at the December 15, 2008 Plan Commission meeting. Between the meetings with staff, the neighborhood meeting and Plan Commission workshop, CPSA has had the opportunity to receive valuable feedback regarding their proposed plans.

### Building Operations and Impact

CPSA is located in an established residential neighborhood and is located in close proximity to Madison Elementary School. The hours of operation are similar to the public school hours of 8:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. The school year starts in August and ends in June. The addition of the new building will allow 335 more students to attend the school, which would bring the total student population to 785. With the addition of 335 students on the subject property, the daily operations of the school will need to adapt to the increased capacity. As the property is currently configured, the main parking lot is in the rear of the existing building and there is additional parking on the eastern portion of the subject property (adjacent to the school). The petitioner is proposing plans to change the layout of the subject property to accommodate the increased student population. The proposed building would be constructed in the area of where the main parking lot, play area and ball field currently exist. The proposed parking lots would be located in front of the building (along Madison) and along the eastern portion of the subject property (adjacent to the new and existing buildings). The drop off/pick up functions would occur in an area between both buildings (central to the subject property) through the use of a twenty-two (22) foot drive aisle. The Fire Department requires that all new buildings provide access to three sides of the new structure(s). As such, CPSA would be required to install a drive aisle around the perimeter of the proposed structure. This fire lane will be blocked off at all times, only to be used by the Fire Department.

As proposed, the existing building would not require ADA or Life Safety Code improvements to its interior as part of this petition. The petitioner's have indicated that the existing building would remain "as is".

### Compliance with the Zoning Ordinance

#### *Deviation for Building Height*

The proposed building would have a peak roof height of 35 feet above grade. The R2 – Single Family Residential District permits structures up to 30 feet. The proposed deviation is requested to accommodate an access stairway. The petitioner has stated that the proposed building can be designed without the projecting stairway and still properly function. As such, staff finds that the roof height deviation is a result of an unnecessary desire and therefore, staff does not support the proposed roof height deviation.

#### *Deviation in Open Space*

The underlying R2 – Single Family Residence District regulations require a minimum of 50% open space for each property. Section 155.508(C)(7) requires that open space in a planned development must be at least 25% more than is required in the underlying district if a deviation is associated with the petition. As such, the additional 25% of open space would not be required if the proposed building were to meet the maximum height requirement of thirty (30) feet; however, the 50% minimum open space requirement would still need to be addressed. When combined with the coverage of the existing property improvements, the proposed property improvements would bring the total amount of open space on the subject property to 46.85%.

This equates to roughly 5,793 square feet in open space deficiency based on the 50% requirement and 28,768 square feet on the 62.5% requirement.

As previously noted, 99 parking spaces would be provided. Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance, 80 spaces are required. The additional 19 spaces can be considered to be a preferential request made by the petitioner, which represents roughly 3,078 square feet of impervious surface that could be dedicated as open space. Also, during the neighborhood meeting conducted by the petitioner, one of the issues brought up by neighbors was the aesthetic view of the front of the property, more specifically the addition of parking spaces in front of the building. As the northernmost row of parking consists of 24 parking spaces, eliminating some of those parking spaces could allow for additional open space and provide additional landscape buffering. Staff will only support a minimum of 50% open space, which meets the underlying R2 zoning district requirement.

#### *Map Amendment*

The property is currently zoned CR Conservation Recreation District. The CR District, by definition, is intended to provide for the location of public parks, forest preserves, wildlife reservations and ecological sanctuaries and other open-space uses or resources to serve the needs of the citizens of the Village of Lombard.

Staff believes that the CPSA property is more consistent with the R2 Single-Family Residence District requirements. The R2 District is intended to accommodate existing single-family neighborhoods in the core of the Village. This zoning designation is consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods. In addition, similar requests have been granted to other private educational institutions located in the Village such as St. Pius X, St. John's, and Sacred Heart. Staff finds that the CPSA property meets the standards for rezoning.

#### *Conditional Use for School, Private, Full-time: Elementary, Middle and High*

An educational institution is listed as a conditional use in the R2 Single-Family Residence District. This request is to provide conforming use status for the school, as it pertains to the Lombard Zoning Ordinance. The operations of the school are typical of most educational institutions. Staff finds that CPSA meets the standards for a conditional use to allow for an educational institution in the R2 District.

#### *Conditional Use for a Planned Development*

Establishing a planned development for the CPSA campus is consistent with other private school uses in the Village. The Village previously established planned developments for Christ the King in 2004, St. John's in 2005 and St. Pius X in 2007. As a Planned Development, the site can be brought into closer compliance with current Zoning Ordinance by allowing greater flexibility in site development. It is noted; however, that the planned development is specifically required in this case as the petitioner wishes to keep both principal structures on the property physically separate of one another. Per Section 155.208(B) of the Zoning Ordinance, more than one (1) principal structure on one (1) lot-of-record is not permitted in the R2 – Single Family Residential

District, except as part of a planned development. As the subject property is to be used as a master planned campus for a use other than single-family residential, the establishment of a planned development is deemed appropriate to allow the Plan Commission to have the opportunity to approve any future modifications and/or additions to the subject property.

### Traffic/Parking Analysis

#### *Parking*

Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance a total of 80 parking spaces are required. The proposed plans indicate a total of 99 parking spaces, which exceeds the amount of parking required by Code by 19 parking spaces. The petitioner has indicated that the additional parking spaces are needed to accommodate any overflow parking situations and prevent spillover parking onto the adjacent neighborhood streets. The petitioner has indicated that high school students do not drive to school. Staff believes that the minimum amount of parking spaces required by the Zoning Ordinance is sufficient. In order to ensure that the amount of parking is sufficient in the future, the number of high school students allowed to attend the CPSA will be capped at 240 students.

Staff has relayed their concern to the petitioner that the increased number of parking spaces is considered to be one of the factors leading to the deficiency in open space. As such, staff presented a parking versus open space scenario to the Plan Commissioners through a Plan Commission workshop on December 15, 2008. During the workshop, a number of the Plan Commission members had indicated that they favored the extra parking spaces in order to prevent the spillover parking onto adjacent residential properties. However, other members stated that they favored the idea of reducing the amount of proposed parking to meet the open space requirement for the underlying zoning district.

#### *Traffic*

The Village's traffic consultant KLOA reviewed the proposed development and conducted traffic counts on the adjacent neighborhood intersections to determine the impacts of the proposed development. They have completed a report which is also transmitted with the staff report (Exhibit A).

#### *Existing Drop Off/Pick Up Conditions*

Based on KLOA's observations, the peak time period for drop-off was between 8:00 and 8:30 A.M. During this half hour, KLOA observed a few back-ups extending onto Madison Street with approximately five to six vehicles temporarily waiting to turn left and access the school driveway thus blocking westbound through traffic on Madison Street. This only occurred three times during the 8:00 to 8:30 A.M. peak time. The traffic flow on the school outbound access drive was operating efficiently with a maximum of six vehicles queuing internally for a short period of time. It should be noted that some parents bypassed the drop-off lanes, parked their vehicle in the parking lot, walked in with their children or just parked in the parking lot to let their children out of their vehicle. There were various instances in which internal congestion was created as

vehicles exiting from the two-drop-off lanes had to merge into a single lane at the stop sign before turning left and proceeding north on the outbound access drive. This situation was compounded when parents that dropped their children off at the parking lot were also trying to merge in to the single file exit lane. It is important to note that this situation might have been more intense the days KLOA conducted their observations due to the heavy snowfall from previous days reducing the number of outbound lanes from two to one.

The peak time period for pickups occurred between 3:15 and 3:45 P.M. The queues at times extended all the way back around the west end of the building. It should be noted that for a few minutes, the backup spilled onto Madison Street and three to four vehicles were temporarily waiting to get in thus blocking Madison Street. The school contracts a Lombard Police Officer to assist in traffic control. The police officer arrived just before 3:15 P.M. to direct approaching vehicle pickups at the back doorway entrance and to safely allow children and adults to use the walkway. Between 3:30 and 4:00 P.M. as many as five vehicles were queuing outside onto Madison Street. It should be noted that pickups were also occurring along the access drives on the west and east side of the building.

#### *Proposed Drop Off/Pick Up Conditions*

CPSA's hours of operation are 8:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. The drop off/pick up functions would occur in an area between the new and existing buildings (central to the subject property) through the use of a twenty-two (22) foot drive aisle. As the student population will be increasing from 450 to 785 students (max), the proposed twenty-two (22) foot drive aisle would be wide enough to accommodate a drop off/ pick up lane with adequate space to allow cars to pass one another, which should increase traffic flow. KLOA recommended in the traffic study that strong consideration should be given to internal staggering of classroom starting and ending times, which would alleviate drop-off and pick-up parking, queuing, vehicular/pedestrian conflicts, etc. As mentioned below, CPSA does not plan to stagger school hours unless necessary; however, they have made representation that they plan to stagger start/end times in conjunction with the Madison School, which is east of the subject property on Madison Street.

#### *KLOA Findings/Recommendations*

Based upon the above observations and review of the petitioner's proposed site plan, KLOA made several recommendations in their study. Staff would like to focus on four major internal site considerations addressed in the traffic study. Those issues are as follows:

##### 1) Student Enrollment

Staff worked with the petitioner and KLOA to remediate some of the internal site issues. As the student population affects the amount of vehicular traffic to and from the subject property, CPSA has agreed to cap the number of students. The current student population of CPSA is 450 students. With the addition of the new classrooms, future enrollment is expected to reach 785 students. As such, there will be 335 additional students on the

subject property during peak enrollment. **CPSA has agreed to place a cap on the number of students enrolled in the school at 785.**

#### 2) Staggering of School Hours

As previously mentioned, the peak time period for drop-off was between 8:00 and 8:30 a.m. and the peak time period for pickups occurred between 3:15 and 3:45 p.m. To minimize existing and future potential congestion, KLOA recommended in the traffic study that strong consideration should be given to internal staggering of classroom starting and ending times, which would alleviate drop-off and pick-up parking, queuing, vehicular/pedestrian conflicts, etc. CPSA responded by stating, "If future enrollment dictates a need for CPSA to stagger their school start and end times at the different levels of the school (grade, middle, and high school), then CPSA will do so to alleviate traffic congestion". **As such, the petitioner has not provided a detailed plan outlining their proposed staggered start/end times.**

#### 3) Drive Aisle Width

On the original site plan submitted by the petitioner, the internal drive aisles were proposed to be eighteen (18) feet wide. According to KLOA, the proposed drop-off lane needs to be at a minimum twenty-two (22) feet wide. When used for pickup in the afternoon, the additional four (4) foot width will provide a passing lane when vehicles are parked waiting for the students. **CPSA complied with this recommendation and widened the proposed drive aisles to a width of twenty-two (22) feet to provide the passing lane that would allow for an increase in traffic flow on the subject property.**

#### 4) Cul-de-Sac Bulb

According to the originally submitted site plan, two-way traffic in the proposed parking lot on the southeast portion of the property would have no way of turning around. In the traffic study, KLOA recommended that a cul-de-sac bulb should be designed to provide turnaround at the south end. **CPSA complied with this recommendation and added the cul-de-sac to the proposed plans as a means of allowing an increase in traffic flow on the southeastern portion of the subject property.**

### Compatibility with Surrounding Land Uses

The subject property directly abuts single-family residences on three sides. As such, special attention should be given to the health, safety and welfare of those surrounding properties. Educational institutions are generally considered compatible with single-family residential uses and in Lombard they are almost exclusively located within residential neighborhoods.

CPSA has worked closely with the Village of Lombard since 2001 to draft the current site plan. Furthermore, the Village has recommended the following:

1. Keep all new structures (principal and accessory) towards the interior of the site to minimize the effect of the structures on the neighboring properties;
2. Reduce the height of the principal new structure to minimize the visual impact on surrounding properties;
3. Hold neighborhood meetings to access the concerns of the neighboring property owners in order to address those concerns.

As previously mentioned, the petitioner held two neighborhood meetings last year to discuss the proposed plans with adjacent property owners. During the meeting, neighbors had the opportunity to comment on the plans and address their concerns with the proposed project. Some of the specific comments made by the neighboring properties included; the impact of more students at CPSA and traffic on Madison Street, the impact of more students on CPSA on parking on neighboring side streets (since there is no parking allowed on Madison Street, the only public access to the site), the aesthetic view of the front of the property (especially with the addition of parking spaces in front of the building) and concerns regarding the impact of construction of the new building (noise, safety, and parking issues) on the neighboring properties.

While staff finds the use to be compatible with adjacent properties and consistent with the locations of other residentially-located private schools throughout the Village, the plan, as proposed with deviations is not compatible with adjacent properties. The petitioner has worked closely with staff in an attempt to address the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, but staff believes that the proposed project could still be completed without obtaining the building height and open space variations.

#### Screening

A number of private fences exist around the perimeter of the subject property, which screens those properties from the subject property. The petitioner is also proposing to add five (5) foot wide landscape buffer strips in certain areas around the perimeter of the subject property. The buffer strips are required to act as screening elements between the subject property and the adjacent residential properties.

#### Setbacks

All setback requirements for the proposed building have been met. Staff notes that if the conditional use approval for the planned development were to be approved, hypothetically the building could be built (minus the variations) as of right.

### Lighting

As part of final site approval, the petitioner will be required to submit a photometric plan, which accurately portrays the amount of illumination projected from the proposed building and parking lot lights. Any new lighting shall meet the full provisions required by Code.

### Stormwater

Currently no stormwater improvements exist on the subject property. The petitioner is proposing to add a detention pond on the northwest portion of the subject property at a depth of five (5) feet. The location of the detention pond is proposed in the northwest portion of the subject property as the natural slope in grade slopes from east to west. When the water collects in the western portion of the property (where the ball field is proposed) it would then be piped into the proposed detention pond. In the event that the detention pond was at capacity, any overflow would then be piped to the Village's stormwater sewer at the northwest corner of the subject property.

### Surveyors Gap

Staff notes that there is an existing surveyor's gap that spans the entire length of the southern portion of the subject property. The gap ranges from six (6) feet wide at the eastern end of the subject property to ten (10) feet at the western end. However, the surveyor's gap is not considered to be part of this petition.

### Compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan recommends Public and Institutional uses for the subject property. As the principal use of the property is an educational facility, the use of the property adheres to the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan as an institutional use. The petitioner's site modifications are also consistent with the existing institutional nature of the property.

### Compliance with the Subdivision and Development Ordinance

Prior to achieving a full Certificate of Occupancy, the petitioner would be required to submit a final plat of consolidation for the proposed development. Also required by the Subdivision and Development Ordinance, the required amount of parkway trees in the right-of-way shall be installed prior to final occupancy. In the event that the petition was to be approved, CPSA shall provide a total of eleven (11) parkway trees. As three (3) parkway trees already exist on the subject property, an additional eight (8) parkway trees shall be required.

### Standards to Variations

In order to be granted a variation the petitioner must show that they have affirmed each of the "Standards for Variation." The following standards have not been affirmed:

1. *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.*

Staff finds that there are no conditions related to the property that prevent compliance with the established regulations. The property does not have physical surroundings, shape, or topographical features that differ substantially from other lots in the neighborhood. It is solely the demands of the petitioner that have warranted the requested relief.

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

The number of students enrolled in any school directly affects the amount of space needed on the property for classrooms and other ancillary amenities. As the subject school is a private school, the amount of revenue received by the school is dependant upon the number of students enrolled in the school. Under this principle, revenue would be higher with a higher student population. Staff finds that the size of the proposed expansion could be reduced, which would alleviate the need for an open space variation, if a lower number of students was to be anticipated and eventually admitted. Furthermore, the number of students attending school should reflect an appropriate carry capacity for the subject property and not be based upon revenue. In the 'Use Narrative' provided by the petitioner it states, "CPSA expects that the construction of the new school will lead to increased enrollment at the school, which will lead to increased funds for capital projects, both from tuition and donations."

4. *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.*

Staff finds that the difficulties have been created by the petitioner as a result of a preference towards keeping the proposed building separate from the existing building, a desire to exceed the amount of required parking, and an architectural preference that does not allow the proposed building to meet the minimum building height requirement. Staff had informed the petitioner of the possible alternatives to alleviate the variations. As mentioned within this report, the open space requirement could be met if the additional 25% of open space was not be required (if the proposed building were to meet the maximum height requirement of thirty (30) feet) and an additional 5,800 square feet of open space was provided.

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

Staff finds that these variations will alter the essential character of the neighborhood by allowing excessive bulk and impervious surfaces on the subject property. Staff has identified ways that the building height and open space could be achieved to meet code.

## **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff has reviewed the petition and finds that petition does not meet the Standards for Variations set forth in the Zoning Ordinance. As such, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee recommends that the Plan Commission make the following motion for **denial** of the open space and building height variations associated with PC 09-08. However, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee finds that petition does meet the Standards for Planned Developments, Conditional Uses and Map Amendments as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and recommends that the Plan Commission make the following motion recommending **approval** of the conditional use for a planned development, a School, Private, Full-time: Elementary, Middle and High and map amendment associated with PC 09-08, subject to the conditions as outlined:

Based on the above findings, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee recommends that the petition as presented does not meet the Standards for Variations set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and recommends that the Plan Commission accept the findings of the Inter-departmental Review Report as the findings of the Plan Commission and recommend to the Corporate Authorities **denial** of the open space and building height variations associated PC 09-08.

Based on the submitted petition and the testimony presented, the proposal does comply with the Standards for Planned Developments, Conditional Uses and Map Amendments required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance; and, therefore, I move that the Plan Commission accept the findings of the Inter-departmental Review Report as the findings of the Plan Commission and that establishing conditional use for a planned development, conditional use for a School, Private, Full-time: Elementary, Middle and High and map amendment is in the public interest, and therefore, I recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval**, in part, of the requests associated with PC 09-08, subject to the following conditions:

1. The site shall be developed substantially in accordance with the CPSA elevation, site, landscaping and floor plans package, prepared by Dome Structural Engineers, dated December 1, 2008, except as they shall be changed to meet Village Codes and the 50% open space and thirty (30) foot building height requirements.
2. All comments in the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report shall be satisfactorily addressed as part of a building permit application.

3. The petitioner shall address all recommendations in the KLOA report, which includes a detailed drop off/pick up schedule in a manner acceptable to the Director of Community Development, based upon the proposed traffic flow conditions along Madison Street and upon the subject property.
4. The number of grade school students shall be capped at 450 students and the number of high school students shall be capped at 240 students.
5. A final plat of consolidation shall be submitted to the Village for approval, making the site a lot of record.
6. The designated fire lane adjacent to the western and southern portion of the proposed building shall be blocked off at all times and accessed only by the Village of Lombard Fire Department.
7. The petitioner shall submit a photometric plan as part of building permit submittal showing compliance with Village Code.
8. The Plan Commission shall be granted site plan approval authority for the subject property.

Inter-Departmental Review Group Report Approved By:

---

William J. Heniff, AICP  
Director of Community Development

WJH:MST:jd  
att  
c. Petitioner