

VILLAGE OF LOMBARD
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW GROUP REPORT

TO: Lombard Plan Commission

HEARING DATE: May 19, 2008

FROM: Department of
Community Development

PREPARED BY: William Heniff, AICP
Senior Planner

TITLE

PC 08-13; 19W471 Roosevelt Road and 351 E. Roosevelt Road (Lombard Crossings): The petitioner requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property:

- A. Approve an annexation agreement.
- B. Annex the portion of the subject property not currently within the Village of Lombard.
- C. Approve a map amendment rezoning the entire property to the B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District.
- D. Approve a conditional use for a planned development, with the following companion conditional uses, deviations and variations, as follows:
 1. For Lot 1 (Parcel A):
 - a. Conditional uses pursuant to Sections 155.417(G)(2)(b)(2) and 155.417(G)(2)(b)(6) of the Zoning Ordinance for a bank/financial institution with a drive-through facility;
 - b. A deviation from Section 153.505(B)(19)(a)(2) of the Sign Ordinance to allow for more than one wall sign per street frontage;
 - c. A deviation from Section 155.417(G)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot area from 40,000 square feet to 36,400 square feet;
 - d. A deviation from Section 155.417(G)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot width from 150 feet to 137 feet.
 2. For Lot 2 (Parcel B):
 - a. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.417(G)(2)(c)(7) of the Zoning Ordinance for a shopping center, consisting of more than one principal business on a zoning lot;

- b. A deviation from Section 155.417(G)(5)(c) of the Zoning Ordinance reducing the required east interior side yard from ten feet (10') to one foot (1').
3. For Lot 3 (Parcel C):
 - a. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.417(G)(2)(a)(5) of the Zoning Ordinance for a restaurant outside service/dining area;
 - b. A deviation from Section 153.505 (B)(19)(a)(2) of the Sign Ordinance to allow for more than one wall sign per street frontage;
 - b. A deviation from Section 155.417(G)(5)(c) of the Zoning Ordinance reducing the required east interior side yard from ten feet (10') to five feet (5').
4. For Lot 4 (Parcel D):
 - a. A deviation from Section 154.506 (D) of the Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow for a lot without public street frontage;
 - b. A planned development use exception for a storage center in the B4A District with a variation from Section 155.508 (B)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a use exception to exceed 40% of the total floor area for the overall planned development.
 - c. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.417(G)(2)(c)(6) of the Zoning Ordinance for a four story building, between 40 and 45 feet in height;
5. For Lot 5 (detention outlot Parcel E):
 - a. A deviation from Section 154.506 (D) of the Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow a lot without public street frontage;
 - b. A deviation from Section 154.507 (D) of the Subdivision and Development Ordinance requiring an outlot to have at least thirty feet (30') of frontage along a public street;
 - c. A deviation from Section 155.417 (G)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot area from 40,000 square feet to 19,000 square feet for a detention outlot; and
 - d. A deviation from Section 155.417 (G)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot width from 150 feet to 131 feet.

6. For each lot, grant a variation from Sections 155.706 (C) and 155.709 (B) of the Zoning Ordinance reducing the required perimeter parking lot and perimeter lot landscaping from five feet (5') to zero feet (0') to provide for shared cross-access and parking.
7. Grant a variation from Sections 155.417 (G)(7) and (9) of the Zoning Ordinance to eliminate the ten percent (10%) open space requirement for individual lots.
8. Approve the following Sign Ordinance deviations:
 - a. A deviation from Section 153.235 (A) to allow for two shopping center signs, where one is permitted; and
 - b. A deviation from Section 153.235 (E) to allow for shopping center signs to be located closer than 250 feet from each other.
 - c. A deviation from Section 153.234 (F) to allow for free-standing signs to be located closer than seventy-five feet (75') from the center line of the adjacent right-of-way; and
9. Approve a preliminary major plat of resubdivision, with an alternate option that combines proposed Parcels B and C into a single lot of record.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Petitioner/Property Owner: Centrum Lombard, LLC
225 W. Hubbard Street, 4th Floor
Chicago, IL 60610

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Existing Zoning: Former O'Hare Towing - DuPage County B1 Commercial District
Former Lombard Lanes – B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District

Existing Land Use: Vacant (previously developed as Lombard Lanes and O'Hare Towing)

Size of Property: Approximately 4.57 Acres

Comprehensive Plan: Community Commercial (Roosevelt Road Corridor)

Surrounding Zoning and Land Use:

North:	B4 Corridor Commercial District and Developed as restaurant and retail uses.
South:	Property in Unincorporated DuPage County zoned B2 General Business District and developed as office and storage facility for York Township Highway Department
East:	B3PD Community Commercial Planned Development District and developed as High Point Shopping Center
West:	Property in Unincorporated DuPage County zoned B2 General Business District and developed as a motel and a mini-warehouse facility

ANALYSIS

SUBMITTALS

This report is based on the following documents, which were filed with the Department of Community Development on April 15, 2008:

1. Petition for Public Hearing dated April 15, 2008 with responses to standards.
2. Planned Development Narrative Statement.
3. Petition for Annexation with draft Annexation Agreement.
4. ALTA/ACSM Land Title Survey, prepared by B.H. Suhr & Company and dated August 23, 2006.
5. Site Plan (with alternate Plan B Option), prepared by Hirsh Associates LLC dated April 15, 2008 and April 28, 2008.
6. Landscape Plan (includes preservation plan and development plan), prepared by Hirsch Associates LLC dated March 14, 2008.
7. Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, prepared by B.H. Suhr & Company and dated April 11, 2008.
8. Building Elevations for proposed retail center, prepared by Hirsch Associates LLC dated April 15, 2008.

9. Building Elevations for proposed bank, prepared by Hirsch Associates LLC dated April 15, 2008.
10. Shopping Center Signage Plan prepared by Hirsch Associates LLC dated April 15, 2008.
11. Signage Plan for the proposed bank prepared by Icon Identity Solutions, dated February 15, 2007.
12. Preliminary Engineering (site dimensional and paving plan and utility plan), prepared by Manhard Consulting LTD, and April 11, 2008.
13. Proposed wall and freestanding lighting plan, prepared by Winscape and Hess America, no date.

DESCRIPTION

In 2007, the petitioner submitted an application for approval of an annexation agreement, annexation and planned development approval with companion zoning relief. Prior to final consideration of the petition by the Village, the petitioner withdrew their request. The petitioner is now seeking new approvals based upon an amended annexation agreement and revised site plan. The new plan set proposes a bank with a drive-through, an in-line retail center and a sit-down restaurant. The petition also requests approval of a use exception for a storage center to be located in the rear of the subject properties.

Many of the substantive changes from the 2007 petition were not directly related to the land plan, but rather the annexation agreement provisions itself. However, the principal site plan changes are as follows:

1. On Parcel C, the proposed fast-food restaurant with a drive-through and outdoor dining has been replaced with a sit-down establishment with an alternate outdoor dining option.
2. To facilitate the sit-down restaurant, two options are being proposed – a free standing building and an in-line center (similar to the V-Land Highland Roosevelt Center). Should the in-line center option be pursued, Parcels B & C would be consolidated on the final plat and the parking lot would be modified accordingly, per the submitted plans.
3. The original request included four freestanding signs. The latest proposal requests approval of two freestanding shopping centers being erected.
4. The stormwater detention outlot was slightly reduced in size.

5. The annexation agreement includes provisions pertaining to the order in which the respective buildings and uses shall be permitted to proceed.

As noted in the previous submittal, the subject property includes the former Lombard Lanes property and the adjacent O'Hare Towing property, which is currently within unincorporated DuPage County. The site is currently vacant as the structures on both of the properties were demolished last year. The petitioner is requesting approval of an annexation agreement, zoning and a conditional use for a planned development with associated deviations and variations in order to develop an integrated center.

The petitioner is requesting site plan approval for the first portion of the development, which consists of a banking facility (financial institution), an in-line commercial shopping center, and a sit-down restaurant. The plan proposes a drive-through facility for the banking facility. In addition, the petitioner is requesting approval of the future right to construct a 95,000 square foot indoor storage center, which requires approval of a use exception to the proposed planned development.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMENTS

ENGINEERING

The Private Engineering Division has the following comments on this petition:

1. Village water main shall be extended across the frontage of the property and shall either connect to the existing main at Highland Avenue, or shall be looped through the development. The current plan shows the water main stopping short of the west property line, which is not acceptable.
2. The existing Highland Hills water main shall be abandoned within the property. Any work to supplement/maintain the Highland Hills loop off of this property is the developer's responsibility.
3. Fire hydrants shall be constructed in front of each building within 25' to 75' of the FDC, which shall be located on the front of the buildings. Subsequent fire hydrants are required every 150'. Show proposed FDC locations for each building.
4. All water main that serves the hydrants, fire suppression lines or water services shall be dedicated to the Village in a 30' easement.
5. No free standing signs or light pole bases are permitted within easements.

6. All valves for water mains, service lines and fire suppression lines greater than 2" shall be in 60" vaults.
7. A guard rail is required around the detention pond for that portion that abuts parking lot (as currently shown on the plan).
8. Any floodplain, wetland or wetland buffer impacts shall be certified by DuPage County.
9. All elevations shall be tied to a Village of Lombard benchmark.
10. Heavy duty pavement is required for all drive areas (or any area that is not a parking stall).
11. Show emergency overflow for pond.
12. Show all proposed easements. For watermain, the easement shall be 30' in width, centered over the main. For stormwater detention, the easement shall be over the pond, plus a 30' access to Village ROW. Further easements may be required over special management areas (wetland or flood plain).
13. Call out all utility crossings. Do not shift watermain up and down, lower/raise other utility.
14. Water quality measures required to satisfy the DuPage County BMP ordinance (effective Aug. 1, 2008).
15. Public sidewalks shall extend through drive aisles.

PUBLIC WORKS

The Public Works Department has no comments at this time but will provide additional comments as part of the permit review process.

BUILDING AND FIRE

The Fire Department/Bureau of Inspectional Services has no comments at this time, but will offer comments through the building permit process.

PLANNING

Compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject property for Community Commercial Uses. Of particular note, a primary goal denoted in the Plan for Commercial and Retail Development is to identify and encourage the improvement or redevelopment of select commercial areas that are or are becoming functionally obsolete. The petitioner's plan removed structures that were developed prior to their annexation in the Village and redevelop the site consistent with the objectives of the Roosevelt Road Corridor and the Plan.

The Roosevelt Road Corridor Study adopted last year, also set forth a number of recommendations, including:

- Encouraging or requiring cross access, cross parking and shared access. The plan will have two access driveways, of which only the west driveway will have full access.
- Common and unified development themes, as required through the annexation agreement and through the Plan Commission review.
- Decorative and non-obtrusive lighting, as shown in the petitioner's plans.
- Four-sided building elevations, which incorporates the common architectural elements on all sides of the proposed building(s). Additional comments are provided elsewhere in the report.
- Pedestrian access/circulation accommodations within the development. The plan set shows the required public sidewalk requirements as well as a separate walkway linking to the retail center and the other proposed buildings. Staff suggests that the striped area within the parking lot be changed to a barrier island with crosswalk in the asphalt driveway.
- The Plan also recommends increased green/open space, particularly in viable areas. This site does pose a significant challenge as the existing grade of the property slopes significantly to the southeast. As such, the open space detention is proposed to the rear of the site. However, as depicted on the plans, the petitioner is proposing to incorporate a number of landscape islands to break up the parking lot mass on the site.

Based on a review of these provisions, the proposed redevelopment is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Roosevelt Road Corridor Plan.

Compatibility with the Surrounding Land Uses

The proposed redevelopment is consistent with the other uses along Roosevelt Road. The subject property is bordered on the north and east by other existing retail commercial uses. To the south of the subject property is an office and storage facility for York Township Highway Department. To the west of the subject property is a motel, which may be subject to redevelopment at some point in the future, and U-Store-It storage center.

Compatibility with the Zoning and Sign Ordinances

The Centrum property within the Village was rezoned to the B4A District last fall. As such, this petition was reviewed in the context of the new development regulations. The petitioner is requesting numerous zoning actions to facilitate the development as proposed, including:

A map amendment rezoning the entire property to the B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District;

The former Lombard Lanes (now Centrum Property) is currently zoned B4A. Upon annexation, the Chrisos property (i.e., the western portion of the property) would need to be zoned into a district that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Roosevelt Road Plan. Staff believes the property should be rezoned to the B4A District, consistent with the Roosevelt Road Plan recommendations. By approving this designation, the special provisions included within the Plan and the district could be applied to the property.

Conditional use for a planned development;

Establishing a conditional use for the entire development is an appropriate way to address the unique site constraints and phasing of the proposed development. Moreover, the planned development process allows the Village to look at all of the proposed structures comprehensively, versus looking at each proposed structure separately. Through this process, staff believes that a better overall design can be achieved.

Conditional uses for a bank/financial institution with a drive-through facility on Lot 1 (Parcel A) of the proposed subdivision;

The B4A District lists financial institutions as conditional uses – this differs from the previous petition when banks were permitted by right. This change allows the Village to review the facility relative to the overall development plan. The Roosevelt Road Report noted that banks could provide value to a community if it is part of an overall planned development (versus stand-alone structures). While not attached to the retail building, the proposed plan integrates the use into the overall development through its common building design elements (shared masonry materials and signage), shared access and integrated design. Therefore when considered in the context of the overall design, it can be supported.

The proposed bank includes a drive-through facility on the south side of the building. Sufficient stacking and a bypass lane are provided. The proposed drive-through facility will not negatively impact traffic circulation within the development. Two cross-access drive aisles with the High

Point Shopping Center are located on the east side of the bank, which will allow the vehicles to exit onto Roosevelt Road at the Fairfield Avenue stop light. Staff does not object to this request.

A deviation to allow for more than one wall sign per street frontage;

The Zoning Ordinance limits businesses to one wall sign per street frontage. Wall signs are proposed for the bank on the north, west and east exterior walls. Per staff's recommendation, the previously proposed wall sign on the south elevation of the bank was removed. The wall sign on the north elevation is 33 square feet and the wall signs on each of the east and west elevations are 18 square feet. The overall sign size for each of the proposed wall signs meets code area requirements for area.

The petitioner also proposes small wall directional signage for the respective drive lanes and permitted companion valance signage. The proposed LED signage does not change copy, so it is not considered to be an automatic changeable copy sign.

A deviation to reduce the minimum lot area from 40,000 square feet to 36,400 square feet and reduce the minimum lot width from 150 feet to 137 feet;

When the petitioner was seeking initial approval of the development, the property was zoned B3 and the property met the B3 requirements. However, this relief was created as part of the overall B4A district designation.

The issue of lot width and area was discussed as part of the Roosevelt Road Ad-Hoc Committee review. The Committee noted that a number of lots do not meet the lot provisions included within the B4A designation. Staff noted that for lots that do not meet the requirements, they could be designed in a manner that would allow the lots to functionally operate as if it was a larger lot. Staff finds that this is the case for this lot.

For Lot 2 (Parcel B), a conditional use for a shopping center, consisting of more than one principal business on a zoning lot;

As with the bank, this use was previously a permitted use, but is now a conditional use within the B4A District. This designation allows the Village to look at the overall design of the facility relative to the overall B4A provisions and determine if the proposed design and layout meets the objectives of the Plan. Additionally, as each center differs in nature and intent, the conditional use allows for a more detailed review of the plan.

The petitioner is proposing two options – a separate in-line center of 12,500 square feet and a unified center that includes the retail center component anchored by a sit-down restaurant. To address concerns regarding the tenants and uses in the center, the petitioner is amenable to a cap on the total number of tenant spaces at five, excluding the restaurant end-cap use. This was applied to the nearby V-Land Center and is intended to provide for larger store spaces, which may attract more destination related uses and retail businesses.

A deviation reducing the required east interior side yard from 10 feet to one foot for Lot 2;

This relief is intended to allow the building to be located closer to the east property line of the abutting bank use. Staff finds this relief to be desirable as it allows for the other side of the center to be better utilized for outdoor dining and additional parking.

For Lot 3 (Parcel C), a conditional use for a restaurant outside service/dining area;

At this point in time, the final sit-down restaurant tenant is unknown, but the petitioner is preparing a final list for consideration within the annexation agreement itself. The proposed outdoor seating area location will be a function of the final design plan for the restaurant itself, but it will be located either on the east side of the building (in Plan A) or the west side (in Plan B). As noted in the Roosevelt Road Report, outdoor dining elements associated with restaurant establishments can be considered a desired amenity, provided that they do not create negative impacts on adjacent properties. The subject property is separated from residential uses, so anticipated noise and lighting impacts should be minimal. Staff also recommends appropriate fencing, as has been required for other establishments.

A deviation from Section 153.505 (B)(19)(a)(2) of the Sign Ordinance to allow for more than one wall sign per street frontage;

This relief is intended to provide for additional flexibility for the restaurant use, which would likely desire wall signs on the exterior walls visible from Roosevelt Road. Consistent with other restaurant uses and the proposed bank, staff does not object to the request. However such signage would be reviewed as part of the overall restaurant building elevations in the site plan approval process.

A deviation reducing the required east interior side yard from ten feet (10') to five feet (5');

This relief is only needed if Plan A is pursued. As with the other yard relief, this request is intended to address the lot division that is contemplated within the center courtyard area between the restaurant building and the in-line center. This open area could be used as flexible seating space for prospective tenants as well. As such, staff is supportive on the request.

For Lots 4 and 5 (Parcels D and E), a deviation to allow for a lot without public street frontage;

Lot 4 requires a deviation from the Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow a lot without street frontage. Access to Lot 4 will be provided by means of cross access with Lots 1 through 3 of the proposed resubdivision. Lot 5 would be a detention outlot for the stormwater drainage of the project. Given the overall lot configuration, the grade issues and the built-in cross access provisions, staff does not object to this request.

For Lot 4, a planned development use exception for a storage center in the B4A District with a variation to allow a use exception to exceed 40% of the total floor area for the overall planned development and a conditional use for a four story building, between 40 and 45 feet in height;

The petitioner proposes a 95,000 square foot storage center to be located on Lot 4 (Parcel D). Storage centers are not listed as permitted or conditional use in the underlying B4A District. The

Zoning Ordinance includes provisions for use exceptions, which allow for uses in a planned development that are not allowed in the underlying zoning district. The Zoning Ordinance stipulates that use exceptions cannot represent more than 40% of the site area or more than 40% of the total floor area. The proposed storage center does not exceed 40% of the site area, but because it will be a four-story building, it will exceed 40% of the total floor area within the planned development. Therefore, a variation from the Standards for Planned Developments with Use Exceptions is also needed for the proposed storage center.

The petitioner indicated that they have not finalized a tenant for Lot 4 and have not submitted any building elevations or materials for the proposed building. The petitioner would like to establish the right for the use exception. Staff recommends as a condition of approval that site plan approval be required for Lot 4 to allow the Plan Commission to review building elevations and materials. In addition, should the petitioners choose not to move forward with the use exception for Lot 4, they can seek site plan approval for other uses permitted within the underlying B4A District.

Staff can conceptually support the storage center use given that the subject property is adjacent to two other storage uses including the U-Store-It storage center and the York Township Highway Department facility. Furthermore, there is a substantial change in grade with the elevation at the northern property line being as much as fifteen feet (15') higher than the elevation at the southern property line. The multi-story storage center building will not have as great of an impact when viewed from Roosevelt Road as a result of the grade change. Furthermore, the proposed storage center will provide additional screening of the York Township Highway Department facility to the south of the subject property.

A deviation requiring an outlet to have at least thirty feet (30') of frontage along a public street; a deviation to reduce the minimum lot area from 40,000 square feet to 19,000 square feet; and a deviation to reduce the minimum lot width from 150 feet to 131 feet;

These actions are intended to address the unique detention issues associated with the development, as noted within the report, the location of the detention outlet to the southeast end of the development was the result of existing grades and drainage patterns. Providing the 30 foot requisite strip to Roosevelt Road would not provide significant benefit to the development or the Village. However, in consideration of this request, staff will require a cross-access easement to allow the Village to review and inspect the detention facility.

Regarding the width and area requirements, the petitioner is seeking this relief, as the overall detention requirements do not require a lot of a size that would meet code provisions. Staff notes that this relief can be conceptually supported given that the lot will not be developed in the future.

For each lot, variations reducing the required perimeter parking lot and perimeter lot landscaping from five feet (5') to zero feet (0') to provide for shared cross-access and parking;

By establishing a planned development, arbitrary property lines can be ignored in favor of a more unified and cohesive development. In this case, the proposed access aisles are placed where it

makes most sense within the overall project, rather than based upon property lines. This deviation can be supported as it provides for better traffic flow and circulation. Moreover, it also helps minimize traffic on adjacent public streets. Staff has supported such relief for other unified centers.

Grant a variation from Sections 155.417 (G)(7) and (9) of the Zoning Ordinance to eliminate the ten percent (10%) open space requirement for individual lots;

A review of the plans estimated that the proposed Parcel B in Plan A would have about eight percent green space. However, given that the site is part of an overall planned development and the lot lines are intended to be more arbitrary, staff notes that this relief could be supported provided that the overall planned development meets the open space requirements of 12.5% of the area. Staff estimates that the open space will be about 15% of the planned development. This approach and requisite relief was also successfully implemented within the Highlands of Lombard planned development.

A deviation to allow for two shopping center signs, where one is permitted; a deviation to allow for shopping center signs to be located closer than 250 feet from each other and a deviation to allow for free-standing signs to be located closer than seventy-five feet (75') from the center line of the adjacent right-of-way;

The petitioner's 2007 proposal requested approval of four freestanding signs proposed within the planned development. The new petition decreased the number from four to two as follows:

Sign	Height	Sign Copy Area	Max. Sign Area Permitted by Code
Shopping center monument sign	15'7"	70 sq. ft.	150 sq. ft.
Shopping center pylon sign	21'3"	101 sq. ft.	150 sq. ft.

There are a number of deviations required for the proposed freestanding signs. Only one Shopping Center Identification Sign would be permitted on the subject property as a matter of right as the planned development does not meet the frontage requirements (> 500 linear feet) for a second Shopping Center Identification sign. The Sign Ordinance also requires a distance of at least 250 feet between Shopping Center Identification Signs. The proposed plan shows a distance of 220 feet.

As noted in the 2007 petition, planned developments are intended for a unified and compatible design of buildings, structures and site improvements. Staff can conceptually support the necessary relief to allow the two shopping center signs located at each of the access drives. Any signage for the bank and storage center will be incorporated into the shopping center signs.

Staff notes that there is an existing billboard located on the subject property. The companion annexation agreement will provide for the removal of the billboard by the petitioner in 2014, when the existing lease period expires.

Approve a preliminary major plat of resubdivision, with an alternate option that combines proposed Parcels B and C into a single lot of record;

The petitioner has also submitted a preliminary plat of subdivision for the development, based upon the concept plans. The petitioner proposes to resubdivide the property to create five lots of record. As an alternative, should the Plan B concept be pursued, Parcels B and C will be consolidated into a single lot. This would be depicted on the Final Plat of Subdivision. As this development is over one acre in size, the plat will need to be approved by the Village Board. Staff will transmit the final plat to the Board for approval upon approval of final engineering for the development.

Lastly, this project is considered a major development as defined by the Subdivision and Development Ordinance, which would require full public improvements where they are needed. This includes street lighting, sidewalks, parkway trees, storm sewer, landscaping and associated roadway improvements.

Other Issues

The overall petition can also be supported based upon consideration of the following items:

Parking

The proposed plans have the following site plan characteristics:

Use	Plan A	Plan B
Bank	12 spaces	12 spaces
Sit-down Restaurant	91 spaces (detached)	24 spaces (attached)
Retail center	50 spaces	50 spaces
Storage Center	44 spaces	44 spaces
Subtotal (Gross)	197 spaces	130 spaces
Allowable parking deductions (assumed to be 10% of gross area of restaurant and retail center)	14 spaces	7 spaces
Net parking requirement	183 spaces	127 spaces
Parking Provided	186 spaces	201 spaces

The significant difference between the two parking provisions relates to how requisite parking is required within the Zoning Ordinance. Stand alone structures are required to provided parking based on their use, while for shopping centers, an overall 4 spaces per 1000 square feet of gross

floor area is required. This explains the parking requirement discrepancy between the two restaurant plan scenarios.

The petitioner is also proposing an outdoor dining component associated with the restaurant use. Staff notes that the parking requirements can be met for this activity, provided that the overall parking provisions are met. Staff also notes that while the overall planned development would meet the parking requirements, the cross-access and parking provisions should memorialize the cross parking rights as well (particularly if Plan A is pursued).

Staff also notes the parking spaces along the west and east property lines as well as in front of the retail center are depicted to be 16 feet in length. The Zoning Ordinance allows for 16' long spaces if those spaces encroach into a landscape area that is not a required landscape area. Compliance can be achieved by lengthening the stall spaces, shifting the adjacent drive aisle or adjusting the abutting walkway.

Traffic Analysis

As part of the submittal, the Village's traffic consultant KLOA reviewed the site for its impact on the Village street network. The petitioner has been working with staff and the Village's traffic consultant to address concerns related to stacking and access drives.

The subject property previously had a full access drive on the Lombard Lanes property and a full access drive on the O'Hare Towing property. There are existing cross-access easements with High Point Shopping Center located west of the subject property. The cross-access will allow vehicles to exit onto Roosevelt Road at the Fairfield Avenue traffic light.

Staff notes that there is an existing easement on the O'Hare Towing property that granted York Township Highway Department rights to use a fifteen-foot drive aisle and the full access onto Roosevelt Road. The petitioner has worked with both York Township Highway Department to address the easement. IDOT has reviewed the proposed site plan and finds the full access curb-cut and right-in/right-out curb-cut to be acceptable. However, IDOT will require the petitioner to extend the existing right turn only lane for the right-in/right-out curb cut to the west in the High Point Shopping Center.

Landscaping

The petitioner has submitted a landscape plan that is intended to provide perimeter and internal parking lot landscaping similar to that specified in the Zoning Ordinance. The subject property is not adjacent to any residential zoning districts. Therefore, transitional landscaping is not required. Many of the existing trees along the southern property line will remain. The petitioner is proposing six additional trees to be located along the southern property line and along the detention facility. Other trees will be interspersed within the development to meet parking lot landscape and perimeter lot requirements.

Trash Enclosures

The refuse disposal areas must be screened on all four sides to a height between six and eight feet. Staff recommends that the trash enclosure be constructed of the same masonry materials that are used for the building.

Elevation Drawings

The petitioner has submitted elevation drawings for the proposed banking facility and the retail building, and fast food restaurant. The proposed buildings attempt to incorporate similar masonry colors and materials. The banking facility and the retail building will use a red brick incorporating a red stone, similar in color. The retail building will use a red brick as well as a lighter alternate brick on the interior recesses. The buildings will also include an EIFS cornice element, which helps tie them together. All three buildings incorporate fabric awnings and wall sconces as decorative elements. Staff recommends that the fabric awnings be compatible as a condition of approval.

To tie the buildings together more closely, staff also suggests that the base of the bank replace the soldier course brick with the stone base proposed for the retail center and incorporate the center stone veneer proposed for the retail center.

Regarding the retail center, staff suggests that the secondary stone piers be compatible stone, rather than EIFS. To address the Roosevelt Road Report objectives, staff also suggests that the south building elevation of the retail center incorporates the similar alternating colored brick pattern as depicted on the north elevation and the stone veneer base, in order to break up the building mass. Lastly, the petitioner is proposing to cap the number of retail spaces in the center at five, excluding the proposed sit-down restaurant. Staff recommends as a condition of approval that the final building elevations limit the number of door entrances to the minimum required by Village Code.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above findings, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee has reviewed the petition and finds that it meet the standards required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, the Sign Ordinance and the Subdivision and Development Ordinance, subject to conditions of approval. As such, the IDRC recommends that the Plan Commission make the following motion recommending **approval** of this petition:

Based on the submitted petition and the testimony presented, the requested relief **complies** with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning, Sign and Subdivision and Development Ordinances; and, therefore, I move that the Plan Commission accept the findings and recommendations of the Inter-Departmental Review Report as the findings of the Plan Commission and that establishing a planned development is in the public interest; and

therefore, I recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of PC 08-13 subject to the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall develop the site and building in accordance with the following plans submitted as part of this request, except as modified by the conditions of approval:
 - a. Site Plan (with alternate Plan B Option), prepared by Hirsh Associates LLC dated April 15, 2008 and April 28, 2008.
 - b. Landscape Plan (includes preservation plan and development plan), prepared by Hirsch Associates LLC dated March 14, 2008.
 - c. Preliminary Plat of Subdivision prepared by B.H. Suhr & Company and dated April 11, 2008.
 - d. Building Elevations for proposed retail center, prepared by Hirsch Associates LLC dated April 15, 2008.
 - e. Building Elevations for proposed bank, prepared by Hirsch Associates LLC dated April 15, 2008.
 - f. Shopping Center Signage Plan prepared by Hirsch Associates LLC dated April 15, 2008.
 - g. Signage Plan for the proposed bank prepared by Icon Identity Solutions, dated February 15, 2007.
 - h. Preliminary Engineering (site dimensional and paving plan and utility plan), prepared by Manhard Consulting LTD, and April 11, 2008.
 - i. Proposed wall and freestanding lighting elements, prepared by Winscape and Hess America, no date.
2. That the petitioner shall enter into an annexation agreement with the Village for the subject property.
3. That the petitioner's building improvements shall be designed and constructed consistent with Village Code and shall also address the comments included within the IDRC report.
4. That any trash enclosure screening required by Section 155.710 of the Zoning Ordinance shall be constructed of material consistent with the principal building in which the enclosure is located.
5. To ensure that the proposed signage, awnings and building elevations present a favorable appearance to neighboring properties, the property shall be developed and operated as follows:
 - a. That channel lettering shall only be used for the wall signs.
 - b. That consistent with the Sign Ordinance, the awnings shall not include text in conjunction with the wall signage.

- c. The planned development shall be limited to no more than two freestanding shopping center signs. The final placement of the signs shall be located in a manner that does not conflict with clear line of sight or utility easements.
 - d. That the fabric awnings on each of the proposed buildings shall be compatible.
 - e. All rooftop mechanical equipment shall be screened pursuant to Section 155.221 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - f. The bank elevations shall replace the soldier course brick with the stone base proposed for the retail center and incorporate the center stone veneer proposed for the retail center.
 - g. The south building elevation of the retail center shall incorporate the similar alternating colored brick pattern as depicted on the north elevation and the stone veneer base, in order to break up the building mass.
 - h. The final building elevations for the retail center shall be limited to the minimum number of door entrances required by Village Fire Marshal.
6. To minimize parking conflicts on the property and to minimize impacts on adjacent properties, the developer/owner of the property shall allow for cross-access and cross parking between each lot within the proposed development.
7. The proposed sidewalk link shall be placed on a ramped island, with pedestrian crossing markings across the drive aisles.
8. The final development plan shall be modified to ensure that the parking stall space overhangs are in compliance with Village Code.
9. The use exception for a storage center shall only be for Lot 4 (Parcel D) of the planned development. The development of Lot 4 (Parcel D) shall be subject to site plan approval of the Village.
10. The building elevations for the proposed sit-down restaurant shall also be subject to site plan approval by the Village. The sit-down restaurant shall be permitted to have one wall sign on the north, west and east elevations, with the final design subject to site plan review.
11. Any outdoor dining areas shall be fenced around the perimeter of the dining area. The final design of the fence shall be subject to Village review and approval.
12. The petitioner shall dedicate to the Village a cross-access easement to provide access to the proposed detention outlot, with the final location to be denoted on the final plat of subdivision for the subject property.

Plan Commission
Re: PC 08-13
Page 19

Inter-Departmental Review Group Report Approved By:

David A. Hulseberg, AICP
Assistant Village Manager/Director of Community Development

att
c. Petitioner

H:\CD\WORDUSER\PCCASES\2008\PC 08-13\Report 08-13.doc