

Kenneth and Sue Gallt
113 S. Westmore- Meyers
Lombard, Illinois 60148

Negative Testimony of 215 S . Westmore Meyers- To be read into the meeting minutes in case I cannot appear in person due to the Covid restrictions

My name is Ken Gallt, I live at 113 S. Westmore-Meyers. My wife and I have been a resident there for the last 20 years. I am Professional Landscape Architect and have operated a business in Lombard for over 40 years. When we moved into our home (which is 115 years old) we saw new single family homes being built across the street from us and across the street from this property. We have seen the Village make improvements in the streetscape of West more- Meyers.

This area of Westmore was at one time a hamlet of "Home Acres" Several of the homes along the street are over 100 years old including the two houses next to this petitioner's property. Because of the large lots developers quickly installed low rise multi-family. This as the Lombard zoning code states has" exercised substantial effect upon Village Services and generates considerable traffic, areas within this district has been designated "areas of critical concern" The districts referred to as R3 and R4

Granting this petitioners request continues the" areas of critical concern " you already identify as problematic.. There are several deficiencies in the plans that need to be modified or denied.

Variance #1 for a transitional building setback of 15' where 50' is required, on the north side. This is a 36 foot tall new building that is being built on their 5 foot hill of excavated soil. Thus the immediate neighbors to the north just 15 feet away will be looking at a wall. They will never see the sun. There is a reason for this setback. The zoning board should ask for a cross section between their proposed building and the neighboring property. This is not an adequate transition. This variance should be denied .

Variance #2 for a reduction of the side yard transition from 30 feet to 15 feet. Again the reason for the transition zone is to provide the buffer between the two uses, The neighbors house to the north is at elevation 711 the proposed 1st floor of the Apartment building is at 716 just 15 feet away. Providing the full 30' transitional landscape yard will provide for the drainage, landscape and fire access to the back of the building. This 30' transition is a minimal amount considering the height of the building.

Variance #3 A variance for perimeter yard landscaping of 0' where 5' is requires on the south side at the parking lot. Again this should be denied. A cross section would show you what you are doing to the 100 year old single to the south. The Board and the petitioner are already treating this as if they were building this parking lot next to a convenience store. This could be your bedroom in the house and a 30 ' set back should be respected as this is still residential use, and has been for 100 years.

Variance #4. A variance for density to allow for 15 units where 14 units are allowed. I would allow the rounding up of the density but not the other three.

Biggest Concerns not addressed:

Board has the right of a plan review. In the plan submitted we have a pretty picture but is that what you get.
#1 There is no detail as to where trash is to be kept for 15 units. How is this managed?
#2 The building height is 36' but the drawing shows parts of the building extending past the 36' ht is that not to be counted? Or is the oicture not what is being built?
#3 The building height is calculated by artificially raising the grade 5' off the normal street level. Thus this building will seem more like a 40 foot building, way out of place along Westmore and adjacent to its neighbors.

#4 The raised grade of excavated soil is piled in the back half of the lot creating a 5' raised backyard for this property. Surrounding residents will not only be looking at a 5' berm but water will be directed toward their property.. Yes there are catch basins and water is supposed to flow to the west but clogged catch basins with leaves or a filled to capacity drywell in front will back up the water into these residential properties.

The site plan looks like a detention basin while in reality it is shedding water to its neighbors.

#5 The Landscape Plan is poor and doesn't match the site plan. We do have local Licenses Landscape Architects in this State that know what plant material will work. 1- 6' Arborvitae every 17 feet is not enough to properly screen this property from the surround neighbors. Nor is it luxury landscape.

I hope the Board see this as too much and can work toward a more amiable plan that fits with the existing properties.

Thank you.

Kenny Gallt