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"The Park District is being an ‘obstructionist’ in regards to the development of a new Library at Lilacia Park”

PARK DISTRICT RESPONSE: After a year of going back and forth and having requests for Park District property by the Library District, the Board of Park Commissioner's made the ONLY offer to date between the Park District and the Library District. An offer that still stands and is located at the end of this Q & A. That offer was made on November 6, 2017 and rejected by the Library District on January 10, 2018. There was no counter offer by the Library District. The offer the Park District made would have allowed the Library District to build a new facility at Lilacia Park. The offer conveyed would have adjusted the property lines on a north-south basis, and allowed the Library to use air rights that were conveyed to the Park District by the Library District in 1977. They would also have been granted all the appropriate easements necessary for construction and facility use in perpetuity. The Park District’s offer provided them a solution to their dilemma. We have also provided them other alternatives at alternate sites which will be address later.

"We voted for a new Library to be built at Lilacia Park."

PARK DISTRICT RESPONSE: The residents passed a permanent tax increase by approving the following question on the November 8, 2016 ballot:

"Shall the limiting rate under the Property Tax Extension Limitation Law for the Helen M. Plum Memorial District, DuPage County, Illinois be increased by an additional amount equal to 0.2160% above the limiting rate for any purpose of said Library District for the levy year 2015 and be equal to 0.4923% of the equalized assessed value of the taxable property therein for the levy year 2016?"

While it clearly does not state that a building would be constructed or even where that building would be located, it certainly did not require the Lombard Park District to provide property, easements or anything else to the Library District for any reason.

"The Library District came to a March 2016 Park Board meeting and provided the Park Board information regarding the construction plan they were asking the residents to vote on. Because the Park District didn’t ask enough questions, it led the Library Board to rely on their lack of questions as their silent approval of the plan.”

PARK DISTRICT RESPONSE: Unfortunately, when the Library Board’s architect came to the Park District Board in March of 2016, the Library Board had yet to vote on whether or not they were going to referendum and still had not decided on whether or not they were going to renovate/expand the current building or replace the library altogether. At that time, according to the Library Director they would not decide on their preferred type of construction for at least another month or so. The Park Board spent time asking 16 general questions about items such as stormwater, earthwork, elevations, placement of mechanicals, encroachment into Lilacia Park, construction distances to the circa 1870 Coach house and the protection of the historic structure. At no time were the Library District Board members, staff or contractors ever given any suggestion that the Park District was on
board with a plan, because there was no plan, only concept drawings for the Park Board to look at.

"We don’t have a new library due to the actions of the Park District Board of Park Commissioners, they are the reason it has been delayed."

**PARK DISTRICT RESPONSE:** The Park District made every attempt to educate the Library staff regarding our needs and encroachment into Lilacia Park MONTHS prior to the Library District Board voting to go to referendum. The Park District Executive Director in an email dated January 12, 2016 reminded the Library Director that "in light of the air rights over the patio we retain, I think that before your concepts go public, you need to make sure the Park Board is on Board with them." The Library District chose to ignore what they were told and moved forward with absolutely no assurances that the Park District would provide easements, air rights, or any property to the Library District. During their referendum campaign, they chose to provide the community with a conceptual drawing of a building located partially on property they did not own and knew this fact. EVERYTHING that has been discussed SINCE the referendum, should have been discussed and agreed to PRIOR to the Library Board voting to go to referendum and certainly prior to levying a tax on the residents of Lombard. One last item regarding the actions of the Park Board, it is their fiduciary responsibility to protect the assets of the Lombard Park District, including Lilacia Park first and foremost, just as it is the Library’s Board to manage the Library assets. The offer made by the Park District in November 2017 would have pushed the construction away from Lilacia Park and most importantly the circa 1870 Coach House which the Park District Commissioners are responsible for. The delay in progress lays at the feet of the Library District Board and Staff as they certainly have known for decades the restrictions and limitations on construction at their current location as well as the Park District’s position regarding their expansion long before they voted to go to referendum.

"The Park District is trying to make a ‘land grab’ at Lilacia Park."

**PARK DISTRICT RESPONSE:** While the Park District does not believe restoring Lilacia Park to what it was 50 or 90 years ago is a bad thing for the community, the Park District does not need another acre of land if it comes at the perceived expense of “evicting” any one of our neighbors, especially the Helen Plum Library District. To state that they are not under construction because of the Park Board’s intransigence and planned land grab is simply not true. The definition of “intransigence” is the refusal to change one’s view or to agree about something. The mere fact the Park Board did change their mind to allow for an offer of Park District property proves that claim false. Furthermore, the Park District’s offer of November 6, 2017 does not materially affect the percentage of property owned at Lilacia Park between the two agencies. The Park District also on three separate occasions provided additional land to the Helen M. Plum Memorial Library District at Lilacia Park in 1963, 1977 and 2007.

"The Park District wants the Library District to move, but has only proposed park areas that either flood or are on the outskirts of the community."

**PARK DISTRICT RESPONSE:** The Park District proposed as an option for their consideration that the Library District consider any of the 450+ park acres owned and managed throughout the community. The proposal was never meant to put the Library in a flooded or depressed area. Had the Library District taken the Park District up on that proposal they most likely would have been under construction on a facility that was not hampered by easements, air rights, lot size, parking variances, density variances, and set
back variances. In fact, getting back to the “land grab” comment over, they would potentially have received more land than the property they now have on Maple Street merely to accommodate their parking needs alone. Among the particular park land discussed were property at Lombard Common and Southland, two facilities hardly on the “outskirts” of Lombard.

“The Park District has avoided meeting with the Library to delay the project.”

**PARK DISTRICT RESPONSE:** In the Library’s rejection of the Park District offer on January 10, 2018, their attorney stated “the Library Board intends to move forward with the site diagram the Park Board on October 18, 2017 that adhere to all claimed property and air rights at the existing site. There are a number of items in this plan that require coordination.” In laymen’s terms that meant they were going with their preferred two-pavilion concept off Park District property and did not need the Park District moving forward except in regards to coordination during construction and after. We abided by their decision and did not have a reason to meet until after approval came from the Village of Lombard to proceed. An approval they do not have at this time.

“What is the Library District’s plan to provide protection for the circa 1870 Plum Coach House?”

**PARK DISTRICT RESPONSE:** During the March 2016 Park Board meeting, the Library’s architect informed the Park District Board that “the Coach House is a historic structure having a fairly old foundation and any construction activity in the area poses a potential threat, so we don’t want to endanger that building. Biggest safety measure is to stay away from it. We don’t want to butt up against it. We don’t want to touch anything that is butting up against it now. We want to back away from it. We want to avoid anything that induces vibrations on the site, things that could rattle the foundation. Farther we are, the less we need to worry about shoring up the existing building, but there are no guarantees in life we’re trying to be prudent...and there’s insurance.” Since that initial meeting, the Park District has asked time and time again, what are the plans to provide protection to the building? As late as October 16, 2018 Library architects in two and a half years have come up with the following: Provide insurance per industry standard guidelines, the installation of vibration monitoring devices, a temporary construction barrier (a plastic fence?), have the outside of the coach house laser measured at the beginning of the project to detect damage and “maintain” the Library’s foundations adjacent to the Coach House. None of these items actually guarantee the safety and protection of the Coach House, they merely monitor the actual damage the historic structure takes during construction. The Park District’s offer would have moved the new construction farther away from the structure as opposed to the four to five feet that will take place under the Library District’s current proposed plan.

“Why did the Park District require the Library to perform a parking study?”

**PARK DISTRICT RESPONSE:** The Park District did not require the Library to perform a parking or a traffic study.
"Why did the Park District require the Library to perform a shade study?"

**PARK DISTRICT RESPONSE:** Again, the Park District did not require the Library to perform a shade study. In fact, the Park District provided the 2003 shade study the Library had completed to the Library’s Architects at the beginning of 2017.

"Why did the Park District require the Library to perform an acoustic study?"

**PARK DISTRICT RESPONSE:** The Park District has asked for the better part of three years, even before the Library Board voted to go to referendum, what was going to happen to the noise level in Lilacia Park when trains would be passing through with a new two-story brick wall to the south of the main courtyard. That question was asked in every meeting we spent with them since the tax increase went into effect. We have been consistently told that the building adjacent to the main courtyard will be brick and/or concrete. The Park District is very concerned about the bounce back off that wall from noise from the train tracks. The Park District has consistently asked that the façade of the structure be of sound absorbing material, and/or not flat, maybe something with angles. The current plan is to make it a flat wall of concrete and brick. The Park District never asked the Library District to perform an acoustic study and to-date, have not seen evidence that such a study was performed.

"Why in the Park District’s offer to the Library District did they propose a facility that had a zero set back from the curb on Maple Street? Everyone knows you can’t build a building to the street."

Simply put, the Park District did not make that offer. The Park District’s offer included a building box that would have resulted in the front of the Library being approximately 35 feet from the curb on Maple Street. Per the Village of Lombard, this would not have needed a setback variance approved. However, had the Library District determined they needed additional square feet, they could have applied for a setback variance to the Village Plan Commission to provide a zero setback to the north side of the sidewalk, not the curb. This would have resulted in an additional 5,200+ square feet of space, and the Library building sitting 20 feet from the curb. During a December 14, 2017 meeting with the Village Manager, the Village Community Development Director, the Village of Lombard Business Commissioner, the Library Director and the Executive Director of the Park District, it was noted that although the Edwards-Elmhurst Hospital, located on five-lane Main Street, is 15 feet from the curb, the Village Board may not approve it for the Library District, but would most likely be favorable to a different setback to the sidewalk of five or ten feet. At five feet, the front of the new Library building would be approximately 25 feet from the curb at Maple Street and provide an additional 3,500 square feet for the new library.

"At the beginning of October 2018, the Village of Lombard asked that prior to moving forward with the Library District’s plan, they needed “consent” from the Park District as to the access road as it deviates from the 2007 IGA. Why doesn’t the Park District just give that consent?"

**PARK DISTRICT RESPONSE:** On February 18, 2016, the Park District Executive Director emailed the Library Director reminding her that “it appears the library plans to use the Park District’s driveway for their book return. Again, it is something that the Park Board will need to approve and be addressed in any IGA.” Although they continue to use it in their plan, there has never been any agreement allowing the Library District to do so. The 2007 IGA provides for an access road solely on Park District property that “shall be no less than ten (10) feet wide at any point, including site preparation and a gate or other entry control
“The Lombard Park District Board of Park Commissioners rejected the Library’s District offer for paid mediation in March 2018.”

PARK DISTRICT RESPONSE: The Board of Park Commissioners never voted against mediation with the Library. As noted above, on January 10, 2018 the Library District rejected the Park District’s offer to build at Lilacia Park. At that time they stated they would not be using Park District property and the only discussion items between the two agencies would be for construction coordination items. Two months later, according to the Village Manager, during a discussion with the Library’s Construction Manager he mentioned mediation. Evidently that comment was forwarded to the Library Attorney. During a back and forth between the Library and Park District attorney’s, the idea was mentioned. In the Park District attorneys response, mediation was never discussed, however he stated the following three points:

• The Park District is willing to sit down with the Library District, but before doing so, and as a sign of good faith in the process, the Park District would like to see the Library District apply for the variations needed to construct the project pursuant to the Park District’s plan (particularly reducing the set back from Maple). The Park District remains convinced from previous conversations with Village staff that a reduced set back of somewhere between 0 feet and 10 feet along Maple will be granted by the Village, particularly if the application is supported by the Park District. And this relief will allow the Library to build a 50,000+ sq/ft building.

• Once this is done the Park District will sit down with the Library and discuss any other items that need to be sorted out. And if for some reason the variations are denied, or not all needed variations are granted, the Park District is also willing to sit down and discuss alternate strategies at that point as well.

• However, the Park District thinks it is premature to discuss the plans and a range of possibilities and contingencies until the Library District has gotten a clear answer from the Village on the variations it will or will not grant in connection with this project.

December 2018 Developments: At a meeting on November 29, 2018 with Library Executive Director Kruser and Library Board President Jason Brandt, the Park District asked the Library for two things. First, a copy of the preliminary construction documents that were submitted late summer to the Village of Lombard. Although agreed to at the time, the Park District has yet to get a copy of those preliminary construction documents. (UPDATE: 01/28/2019, The Park District received the documents today.) Second, the Park District asked for a list of all actionable items the Library District needs to move forward with the Village of Lombard. Those items were asked to be sent to the Park District for Park Board consideration on December 18, 2018. Unfortunately, what was provided to
the Park District was five bullet points of items that the Library Director wanted the Park District Director to address with the Park Board. There was no back up material, no detail, certainly nothing that the Park Board could minimally consider voting on, no suggestions to move the process forward and absolutely no offer. In light of the lack of information, the Park District Board voted unanimously to limit further discussions with the Helen Plum Library Board to either the reconsideration of the November 6, 2017 offer and/or any potential land swaps within our properties they would be interested in.

The Lombard Park District’s Offer to the Library on November 6, 2017 is viewable on the next page.
November 6, 2017

VIA EMAIL (hmetz@robbins-schwartz.com)
Mr. Howard A. Metz
Robbins Schwartz
55 W. Monroe St. Suite 800
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5144

Re: Helen Plum Library – Proposed Offer

Dear Mr. Metz:

As you know this firm represents the Lombard Park District (Park District”). The Park District has authorized me to make the following offer in an effort to resolve the ongoing dispute between the Helen Plum Library ("Library") and the Park District regarding the construction of a new library building adjacent to Lilacia Park. All references in the following offer refer to the aerial photograph of the existing library building enclosed with this letter and the red and blue boxes imposed on same.

Generally speaking, the Park District’s proposal will realign the boundaries of the parcels on which the existing library building sits. The realignment will shift the location of the new library building slightly to the south and will allow the Library to construct a 50,000 square foot facility.

The details of the Park District’s offer are as follows:

- The enclosed photograph is a rough depiction of the buildable area under the Park District’s proposal. The red box contains approximately 20,500 square feet and the blue box contains approximately 9,800 square feet.

- The Library would be able to build a two story building in the red box and a one story building in the blue box. The Park District would receive air rights over the red box limiting construction to two stories. The Park District would receive air rights over the blue box limiting construction to one story. This will allow for the construction of a single, 50,000 square foot facility.

- The Library would own all of the property to the south of the red and blue line running east and west on the north side of the existing building. The Park District would own all of the property to the north of the red and blue line. The northern east west boundary line will be located no more than ten (10) feet from the roofline of the existing building.
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- The Park District will retain a portion of the property west of the red and blue boxes to allow for the relocation of the driveway once construction of the new library building commences. The Park District will allow the new driveway to be constructed from permeable pavers to help with any required stormwater calculations. The Park District will also grant an access easement on the driveway to allow the Library to use it for a book return and/or receiving lane.

- The Library will demolish the existing concrete plaza to the north of the existing library building and clean up and address any environmental or other issues with the parcel prior to conveying the parcel to the Park District. The Park District will design a landscaping plan for the parcel that will be paid for by the Library District. The plan will be designed to create an aesthetically attractive connection between the new library building and Lilacia Park. The Park District and Library will agree on a not to exceed budget for the landscaping.

- The Park District will allow the Library to utilize the area under the former plaza for underground stormwater storage. The Library will be responsible for all costs associated with the stormwater management. No pipes, vents, or access areas of any sort will be allowed to extend above ground on Park District property. If the Library ever relocates it will remove the underground storage tanks and will restore the property to the condition that existed prior to the removal.

- The Park District will require input on and approval of the design and construction of the northern façade of the new building. In addition, the new building must be park friendly and attractive to park users. The Library District must also provide some form of acknowledgement of the Henderson’s contributions to Lombard in a prominent location in the new building.

- The Library will pay for all surveys, permits, testing, etc. in connection with the realignment of parcel boundaries and the construction of the new building.

- The Library District will pay all legal fees reasonably incurred by the Park District in connection with the realignment of parcel boundaries and construction of the new building.

- The Park District will not consider any requests for additional encroachment into its air rights or onto its property beyond what is set forth in this letter. Any issues that arise during the design, planning, or construction of the new facility will need to be resolved in such a way so as to ensure that the new facility does not encroach upon the Park District’s air rights or property boundary lines as set forth in this proposal.

- Park District property will not be used for any construction related activities, including for access or staging. Instead, the Plaza area north of the existing building currently owned by the Library will be retained during construction and used for staging purposes and will be conveyed to the Park District once construction is complete.
Construction will be prohibited during Lilac Time events, after 1:00 pm daily during Lilac Time, all weekends during Lilac Time, and during any other events in Lilacia Park, including but not limited to weddings, movies, and concerts during the summer.

The construction area will be surrounded by a privacy fence to keep construction activities hidden from view by park users.

The Library will provide a specific plan for protecting the Coach House during construction and will be responsible for any damage to same.

The Park District and general public will need unrestricted access to the Coach House and Lilacia Park during construction. Short term closures or restrictions will be considered if necessary for safety concerns.

The Park District will not object to any requests for parking or stormwater variances in connection with this project.

The above represents the general framework of the Park District’s proposal and is a good faith effort to resolve this matter. It also represents a win-win for the community. Please forward this proposal to your client for their review. When you do so please ask them to keep in mind that the Park District’s current proposal will allow the Library to build a single, 50,000 square foot facility. The Library’s current, two building design proposal is costly, inefficient, and inappropriate for a park setting. A single building design will reduce construction costs, maintenance costs, and heating and cooling costs. And most importantly, the Park District’s proposal will give the Library Board exactly what it wants – a brand new, state-of-the-art library facility adjacent to Lilacia Park.

As a final matter, the Park District has made it very clear to me that confidentiality is an integral part of this proposal. The Park District believes strongly that prior attempts at resolving this issue have been derailed by misinformation or partial information that has been discussed publicly or shared with the media. As such, this offer is contingent on both parties maintaining strict confidentiality during the negotiation of this matter to the greatest extent permitted under the law. The Park District has informed me that they will take this offer off of the table if the contents of this offer are publicly disclosed or debated.

I look forward to the Library’s response. Please contact me if you have any questions or if you wish to discuss any of the above in more detail.

Very truly yours,

Andrew S. Paine
April 19, 2019

Through their attorney, Howard Metz, the Library District made a land swap offer to the Park District regarding a potential land swap.

May 2, 2019

The Park District through their attorney expressed concerns regarding the Library District’s offer of April 19, 2019.

May 23, 2019

The Library District responded to some of the issues brought up in the Park District’s correspondence of May 2.

June 26, 2019

The Park District rejected the Library District’s land swap offer and provided four options to the Library District.

The documents detailed above, are provided below:
April 19, 2019

Andrew S. Paine  
Tressler LLP  
233 S Wacker Drive, 61st Floor  
Chicago, IL 60606  

VIA E-MAIL

Re: Helen M. Plum Memorial Library Project

Dear Mr. Paine:

This letter will follow up on our telephone conversations related to the Helen M. Plum Memorial Library project. As we discussed, I reviewed your response to the Library’s request that the Park Board agree to the relocation of the access drive and consent to the submission of the project to the Village of Lombard for zoning approval. As an alternative to our current proposal to stay at this location, the Library Board has asked that I reach out to you to discuss the possibility of a potential land swap to see if that could meet the best interests of the community. Towards that end, I previously forwarded the information from the Library’s architect related to the Park District property which would be required in order to construct a new facility. That material is also attached hereto. The proposal would be as follows:

- The Library would transfer ownership of its current facility located adjacent to Lilacia Park, including the two recently acquired vacant lots to the Park District.
- The transfer of the Library property would be “as is” in its current condition.
- The Park District would transfer title of the 5 acres as described in the attached document to the Library.
- The transfer of the 5 acres to the Library would be without restriction of any type related to the Library’s use. We could discuss possible requirements that the property continue to be used for Library purposes or a right of first refusal related to future sales.
- The transfer of property would be subject to the customary due diligence for the proposed site for the new Library building including any required Village approvals.

Please review this with the Park Board at their meeting next week. We are available to meet to discuss this at your convenience.

Very truly yours,

ROBBINS SCHWARTZ

By: Howard A. Metz

Enclosure(s):
cc: Barb Kruser, Helen M. Plum Memorial Library
April 11, 2019

Barb Kruser
Helen Plum Memorial Public Library
110 West Maple Street, Lombard, IL 60148

RE: Helen Plum memorial Public Library District – Lombard Common Land Swap
The information contained or attached relates to ongoing site negotiations by a public entity and as such is privileged information protected under state statutes. Notify the sender if you have received this in error and delete this message and its contents.

Dear Barb,

The following letter is intended to summarize the Lombard Common land swap negotiation approach with the Park District, including the proposed site, site area requirements, zoning requirements, potential opportunities. Through an analysis of the Library’s programmatic requirements and the Village’s zoning requirements we determined that a site area of 5 acres is required to accommodate all requirements. This includes provision for future library expansion and associated parking expansion while maintaining minimum open space and storm water requirements.

The proposed site is on the west side of the Lombard Common just south of an existing children’s play area. Dimensions and location with respect to existing property lines are noted in the attached diagram. The diagram is conceptual: final acquisition should be subject to customary due diligence activities and Village approvals.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Joseph M. Huberty, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Partner

Copied Howard Metz | Robbins Schwartz
Shaun Kelly, Kristin Richardson | Engberg Anderson

EA File Name: P:\Chicago\2015 2398\152403 Helen Plum Memorial Library\1-Project Administration\2-Owner Supplied Info\Park District IGA\Lombard Commons\Land Swap 190411.docx
May 2, 2019

Mr. Andrew Paine
Tressler, LLP
233 S. Wacker, 61st Floor
Chicago, IL 60606

Re: Recent Helen Plum Library Contacts

Dear Mr. Paine,

On Tuesday, April 23, the Lombard Park District Board met to review the correspondences Howard Metz, Helen Plum Library attorney, sent to you and which you then forwarded to me. While there doesn’t seem to be an actual offer from the Library in either of those documents, Mr. Metz’s did discuss what a proposal “would” look like. While the Park Board is excited and generally positive in regards to moving forward with a potential land swap with the Library, the parameters Mr. Metz put forward to start the conversation did have some issues that would need to be further discussed and negotiated. The Park District Board is more than willing to discuss any item that would be beneficial to both parties and more importantly to our community. I am sending this correspondence to you with the knowledge it will be forwarded on to Mr. Metz and the Library Board.

After reading both correspondences, the Park Board would need some clarification on several items. In that regards, I have detailed those issues as follows:

**Five acres of property seem to be excessive.** While the Park Board understands the Library’s want to be autonomous with regards to future expansion, the Park District is not in a position to provide open space for some future event that may or may never take place. The Park District researched 43 suburban libraries and found just four that were on more than four acres, those being Elk Grove, which shares parking and land with other municipalities in their complex, Algonquin and Romeoville which both sit in a rural areas, and the Barrington Library, which sits on at least six acres of property, however much of that land appears to be a forest preserve.

It appears that the average acreage for the libraries in Addison, Bloomingdale, Carol Stream, Downers Grove, Elmhurst, Glen Ellyn, Oak Brook, Roselle, Villa Park, Wheaton and Wood Dale is just over 2.2 acres including parking.

**Location at Lombard Commons would reduce the Park District’s soccer field inventory by 20%.** There are only five locations throughout the park system that can handle 11 on 11 soccer matches. The Grace Street location would reduce the Park District’s ability to provide a service that is currently in high demand by our residents.

**Possibility of a retention/detention area at Lombard Commons.** The Park District currently has plenty of ponds throughout our park system, adding another one to the inventory is not advantageous to the District. The Library architects had planned to utilize permeable pavers as part of their storm water management calculations at Lilacia Park in order to avoid retention/detention areas, our hope is that they could get creative here, provided a Library at Lombard Commons is the agreed upon location.
Park Board's worries about the cost and other unknowns regarding taking possession of the current library building. Although Mr. Metz was able to provide a hazardous materials survey to the Park District recently, there are still many questions that come into play when taking down a facility as old as the current Library. While the Park District would not be against taking ownership of the facility and take responsibility for its demolition and lot restoration, the Park District would ask that part of any agreement would include the Library's willingness to pay for such demolition and restoration. Obviously, the job would be bid out so the lowest, responsible bidder, so it wouldn't matter which agency bid the job out. Simply put, the Park District does not have the financial resources to undertake these expenditures. I assume the budget for any new library at Lilacia Park included those costs.

Location Solutions:

Northeast side of Lombard Commons at St. Charles Place and Edgewood. Unlike recent descriptions of both Lombard Commons and Southland being "swamp land," that is simply not the case. The northeast portion of Lombard Commons could have enough room for a new facility with additional parking. I have attached a Google Earth image of that area and highlighted a 28,000 square foot building footprint in blue. Additional property could be provided to the east where there is currently open space for additional parking. That property could accommodate around 160 additional parking spaces if necessary. That box is designated in purple and is approximately 60,000 square feet. I have also added the green box which encompasses the current 152 space parking lot. This parking lot is just approximately 48,000 square feet.

The light blue, pink and orange lines detail the distance from home plates of the two baseball/softball fields at that location. The light blue line is 441 feet, pink is 378 feet and orange is 341 feet. To hit a baseball or softball those distances are unattainable to the participants who play on those fields.

Additional benefits of this area could include joint programming with our water park such as a summer Learn to Read/Learn to Swim class.

Southside of Southland. With direct access to Roosevelt Road and located one block from both Village Hall and the police station, this park is just two blocks from the largest park in the community and is home to the new Madison Meadows Athletic Center, the community’s new $9 million recreational facility. This location could provide a better solution regarding storm water management and costs, as well as additional land to stage equipment during construction. The Park District understands that the word "Southland" puts a shudder through some of the Library Board members, however, a fresh look at what could be done at that location should be given consideration. Noting there is a pond at that location, there has never been a flooding issue that any staff of the District can remember ever. I have attached another Google Earth image of this area. Three acres provided here as shown in the red box could provide 56,000 square feet for parking, a 30,000 square foot building footprint and over one additional acre of land. The orange box around the pond to the south is approximately 4.73 acres, the pond itself in blue totals 2.32 acres, which could potentially leave 1.5 to 2.0 acres of additional capacity for storm water management. Additionally, the box in pink reflects as area of 1.65 acres that could also be used for staging equipment and materials during construction.
Lastly, the Park Board would like to address a comment that you forward me from Mr. Metz attributed to the Library Board which goes something like "The acreage at Lilacia Park is worth more than the same acreage elsewhere and that is one of the reasons for the large five acre ask." Lilacia Park is a special place in our community not only in geography and history, but also in many of our resident's hearts. Adding an additional acre for passive recreation and outdoor community events at that location would be nice not only for the Park District, but the entire community of Lombard. If that land is acquired, the Park District would most likely look to the history of that space to duplicate its beauty when originally designed by famed landscape architect, Jens Jenson, in July of 1928. However, the land that is discussed in Mr. Huberty's correspondence on the west side of Lombard Commons is as valuable to the Park District because of its ability to host various activities for our residents. I can't stress enough the Park District's reliance on the few locations we have that contain large, open, flat spaces that hundreds of families in our community utilize for soccer annually.

The next meeting of the Park Board will be May 14, I look forward to hearing the Library's response to the comments above so they can be shared with the Park District Board. Please feel free to share my direct office line, 630-953-6016, with Mr. Metz and the Library Board should they have any individual questions, suggestions or comments that I can answer prior to their next meeting or ours.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul W. Friedrichs
Executive Director

encls.

cc. Board of Park Commissioners, Lombard Park District
May 23, 2019

Andrew S. Paine  
Tressler LLP  
233 S Wacker Drive, 61st Floor  
Chicago, IL 60606

Re: Helen M. Plum Memorial Library Project

Dear Mr. Paine:

I reviewed the recent letter you forwarded to me from Paul Friedrichs at the Lombard Park District regarding the Park District’s response to the Library’s request for discussions related to a potential land swap. I also met with the Library Board and architect to review Mr. Friedrichs’ suggestions and comments regarding the location of the property to be exchanged. Please see the attached correspondence from the Library’s architect related to the parameters for any potential land swap considerations. Initially, the site size requirements for the potential land are set forth in detail. The total acreage required for the new library would be approximately 4.82 acres. The architect further addresses the site location considerations and emphasizes the importance that the preferred location would be along Grace Street in the Lombard Common. The suggestion of a potential location at Southland Park is unacceptable for the reasons expressed in his letter.

At this point, I suggest that if we are going to continue to consider a land swap as a viable option that the parties meet to review all the materials in order to expedite this process. The Library Board President, Executive Director, architect and I can be available to discuss this.

Please review this information with the Park District and call me to discuss.

Very truly yours,

ROBBINS SCHWARTZ

By: Howard A. Metz

Cc: Barb Kruser, Executive Director
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May 20, 2019

Howard A. Metz
Attorney
Robbins Schwartz
55 Monroe St, Suite 800
Chicago, IL 60603-5144
hmetz@robbins-schwartz

RE: Recent Park District Contacts

Dear Mr. Metz,

On May 14th the Board of Library Trustees of the Helen M. Plum Memorial Public Library District met to review the correspondence provided by Andrew Paine, Lombard Park District attorney. As requested by the Library Board, we are providing detail as to the basis of the Library’s requested site size and location.

**Site Size Requirements.** Land needs were calculated as follows:

- Building footprint and overhangs................................................................. 28,000 sf
- Parking and related drive lanes, 156 vehicles per Lombard Zoning.......................... 65,520 sf
- On site sidewalks, exit paths, entrance walkway, bicycle parking, etc.......................... 4,000 sf
- Drive-up return, receiving, equipment pad, trash enclosure, emergency vehicle access
to 3 sides of the library building and similar site elements ................................ 5,000 sf
- Future building addition, 25% plus related on-site sidewalks, exit paths, etc.................. 15,000 sf
- Future parking expansion, 45 vehicles per Lombard Zoning ................................ 18,900 sf
- Subtotal ........................................................................................................ 136,420 sf
- Minimum green space requirement, 35% per Lombard Zoning,
  also used for outdoor Library programs and events ......................................... 73,457 sf
- **TOTAL........................................................................................................ 209,877 sf, OR 4.82 acres**

No allowance was made for separate storm water management areas. The storm water management concept consists of a bioretention basin to satisfy Post Construction Best Management Practices and surface storage within the Village-mandated green space to meet the Surface Runoff Control requirements, both as defined by DuPage County.

**Site Location Considerations.** The identification of the preferred location for the Library along Grace Street is an acknowledgment of several factors related to ease of access and safety. Much of the evaluation was based on the traffic volumes and number of decisions drivers and pedestrians are asked to make at the staggered intersection of St Charles Rd and Grace St.; the entry to Paradise Bay Water Park; and the intersection of St Charles Road with St Charles Place. Related considerations centered on the parking required to support water park and general use at Lombard Common during summer months when peak use of the recreation facilities
coincides with the peak use periods (seasonally and hourly) at the library. Locating the library in proximity to the Park District’s most intense uses of the site would exacerbate these conditions. The overlap of summer reading and swim meets would place substantial strain on the site.

The location proposed by the Library finds a balance by diluting the intensity of use across a larger area (thereby allowing room for the activities of the Park District and the library to occur without impacting the other) while maintaining the synergies desired by locating the library in proximity to the water park.

- There is less decision making than at the St Charles Road – St Charles Place intersection
- There is less strain on Edgewood Avenue
- Library traffic uses Grace Street which is already part of a higher volume traffic pattern through the area.
- The library is closer to Maple Street which offers a convenient east-west connector through the district without adding to the volume of traffic at the north end of Lombard Common

**Southland Park Issues.** Southland Park was reviewed with the Library Board. Several factors were identified, each of which reduces the effectiveness of the library.

- Southland Park is more removed from the higher population areas within the district. While there are residential areas throughout the district, there is a higher concentration of housing units and of people toward the north end of the service area. Locations slightly north of the geographic center of the area will be more convenient to more residents.
- Access to the site is less well developed than at the existing library site or at the Lombard Common site proposed by the Library. Roosevelt Rd, though close to the south edge of the park, does not have direct connection via a signalized intersection. The route to signalized intersections passes through primarily residential areas whereas other sites use routes that have established patterns of traffic going to cultural, recreational or commercial destinations.
- A library at the Southland Park site would be a new level of use within a residential area whereas the other sites under consideration are in areas that already have high levels of non-residential use.
- The site is less visible than the other sites.
- The Village complex, although close to the north edge of Southland Park, offers few synergies.
- The distance from Southland Park to recreational activities at Madison Meadow is greater than that between the library proposed location at Lombard Common and the recreational activities at Paradise Bay and the surrounding Common. We have no opinion as to why the ball diamond and field at Southland Park are of less utility to the Park District than the ball diamond or field at Lombard Common.

Sincerely,

Joseph M. Huberty, Partner
AIA, NCARB, LEED AP

EA File Name: P:\Chicago\2015 2398\152403 Helen Plum Memorial Library\1-Project Administration\8-Correspondence & Reports\Site Study\PD Site Evaluation.Docx
June 26, 2019

Helen Plum Library District Board of Trustees  
110 W. Maple Street  
Lombard, IL 60148

Re: Recent Library Land Swap Proposal

President Brandt and the Library Board of Trustees,

Unfortunately, the Lombard Park District cannot accept the Helen Plum Library District’s recent proposal to swap 1.19 acres of land at Lilacia Park including the current library building “as is” for five acres of land off Grace Street at Lombard Common. The reasoning for our rejection will be addressed below.

On May 2, 2019, Executive Director Friedrichs sent a correspondence which was provided to your attorney that detailed several items of concern the Park District Board of Commissioners had regarding the proposal. As a reminder, those concerns were as follows:

- Five acres of property seem to be excessive for the Library’s use  
- The five acres asked for is one of the few LPD pieces of property we can put a large soccer field on  
- Issues regarding retention/detention at Lombard Common  
- The various issues regarding cost and other unknowns in taking ownership of their current building

Unfortunately, neither Attorney Metz’s May 23, 2019 correspondence, nor Architect Hubert’s May 20, 2019 correspondence in response to the Park District’s concerns discussed anything regarding the existing library building or the excessive square footage the Library District is asking for.

Using Architect Hubert’s calculations from his correspondence of May 20, and without any parking text amendments or sharing of current Lombard Common parking spaces, it appears the Library District needs the following area for their new facility if built at an alternate location:

28,000 sf for the building footprint  
65,520 sf for 156 parking spots  
4,000 sf for on-site sidewalks, exit paths, entrance ways and bicycle parking  
5,000 sf for a book return.

This 2.35 acres is very close to the 2.2 average acres 11 of our neighboring communities utilize for their libraries as discussed in Executive Director Friedrichs’ correspondence of May 2.
The Park District cannot accommodate your additional land request of 33,900 sf to accommodate your future planned 25% expansion of the “new” library building and parking lot. We are confused on how the Library District will handle this in the future if the new building is constructed on your current Maple Street property. The Park District Board is very concerned that there will be a future ask for more property from the Park District at Lilacia Park.

It is disappointing that no Library staff, Board member or any other member of the Library’s development team reached out to Village officials to discuss either the Library’s land swap proposal of April 19 or Executive Director Friedrichs’ May 2 response to it. We would encourage you to do so regarding the necessity of the 73,457 sf (1.69 acres) you have asked the Park District to provide as it relates to meeting the minimum green space requirement of 35% per Lombard Zoning and your plans for outdoor Library programs and events. The Park District has been informed by the Village that the amount of space you may need for this zoning component could be “drastically reduced” as the property asked for sits in a 45+ acres park.

Regarding the 1.19 acres of land the current library sits on as well as the disposition of the current library building itself, the Park District will only accept ownership of the building provided the Library District agrees to pay for the demolition expenses and landscape expenses necessary to provide the Park District a clean piece of property at rough grade.

In an email dated June 17, 2019, from Library Attorney Metz to Park District Attorney Paine he stated that “The Library remains firm in the requested location for the land swap and has very little flexibility in the size of land requested.” We do hope that he is incorrect in that statement and in an effort to once again move your project forward, the Park District Board will provide the Library with options based on common sense, fairness, the Park District’s discussions with Village staff and what the Library District has promised to the community as follows:

For the property at Maple Street and Park Avenue...

**Option #1**

The Park District will provide 2.35 acres of land at Lombard Common in the Northeast corner of the facility.

**Option #2**

The Park District will provide 2.35 acres of land at the Southwest corner of Southland.

**Option #3**

The Park District will provide 2.35 acres at another location that is mutually agreeable.

If those options are not acceptable, then it appears the last option we can provide to you at this time is...

**Option #4**

Revisit the offer made by the Park District on November 6, 2017. Library President Jason Brandt has come out publically and stated that the Park District offer had setbacks that were “inadequate.” We all understand that the Library wants to build closer to Maple Street and Park Avenue and the only thing “inadequate” about the setbacks described in the Park District’s offer is that they are farther from the street than the 10’ setback you are currently requesting from the
Village. Regardless, should the Library want to build as far as up to the sidewalk, they do not need the Park District's approval to do so, just that of the Village Board.

The next meeting of the Park District Board will be on July 23, 2019. If you would like to speak about any of this in person prior to our meeting please feel free to call our Executive Director to set up a meeting.

Regards,

Sarah Richardt

Sarah Richardt, President and the Lombard Park District Board of Park Commissioners

cc: Paul W. Friedrichs, Executive Director