

June 2, 2011

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

**Subject: PC 11-12; 500 E Roosevelt Road (Firestone)**

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. The petitioner requests that the Village take the following actions for the subject property located within the B4A - Roosevelt Road Corridor District.

1. Approve a planned development amendment (Major Change) to Ordinance 5163 for property located in the B4APD Roosevelt Road Corridor District, Planned Development, with the following companion conditional uses, deviations and variations, as follows:
  - a) A conditional use, per Section 155.417 (G) (2) (b) (9) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow for a new motor vehicle service facility; and
  - b) A conditional use, per Section 155.417 (G) (2) (a) (4) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow for outside display and sales of products; and
  - c) 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; and
  - d) A deviation from Sections 154.406 & 154.507 of the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow for detention areas to not be in an outlet. In the alternative, should an outlet be required, the petitioner requests a deviation to Section 155.417 (G)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot area for detention outlets, a deviation from Section 155.417 (G)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot width for detention outlets, a deviation Section 154.507 of the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow an outlet to not have at least thirty feet (30') of frontage along a public street and a deviation from Section 154.507 of the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance for single ownership of an outlet

2. Site plan approval with the following deviations from the Lombard Sign Ordinance:
  - a. A deviation from Section 153.235 (F) to allow for a shopping center sign to be located closer than seventy-five feet (75') from the center line of the adjacent right-of-way; and
  - b. A deviation from Section 153.505 (B)(19)(2) to allow for 3 walls signs where 2 wall signs are permitted; and
3. Approve a major plat of subdivision.

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition on May 16, 2011.

Russ Whitaker, 23 W Jefferson Street, Naperville spoke on behalf of the petitioner. He noted the aerial that was shown on the screen and provided background on the subject location including the history of the car dealership. He stated that the existing West Gate Auto Sales is only using a portion of the site making land available for the proposed Firestone. Mr. Whitaker showed the Plan Commission a number of photos highlighting the existing conditions of the site.

With reference to the proposed Firestone, Mr. Whitaker noted that they have been working with staff for the last several months on a plan that they could conceptually support. He stated that staff and petitioner worked up until 5PM today to come up with conditions that both can support. He referenced his addendum to the petition and noted that it should be part of the record.

Mr. Whitaker provided the plans showing how the site could be developed. He stated that staff was initially not supportive of a piecemeal redevelopment of the site and that staff recommended shared access, signage and detention. He showed the Plan Commission a 3D rendering of the site including a concept plan showing how another 10,000 square foot building could be accommodated on the site should Firestone be developed. He noted that the existing car dealership would remain. He referenced the proposed changes to the access drives and access from Roosevelt Road, as shown on their submitted plans.

Mr. Whitaker provided an overview of the stormwater detention facilities. He stated that the plan shows 2 detention ponds designed to serve both Firestone and the West Gate Auto sales. He said they are required to release at a restricted rate to minimize off site discharge.

Mr. Whitaker than talked about signage. He stated that they are proposing a shared shopping center sign in lieu of a single freestanding sin. The proposed shopping center sign can be used by Firestone, West Gate and any other future user. He referenced their need for the variation to have the sign located closer to the Roosevelt Road ROW.

Mr. Whitaker then referenced the site plan and access from Edgewood. He stated that they would like to have full access in and right out only. He proceeded to discuss parking and how they are providing more than what is required by Code. He said there would be limited overnight storage,

maybe one day, to accommodate customers. Firestone will only do light service and tire installation.

Mr. Whitaker then referenced the landscape plan. He said they have increased their landscaping along the east elevation to minimize impacts on the adjacent residents. He said the building is oriented to have the bay doors face west to minimize any noise.

Mr. Whitaker then showed the Plan Commission the proposed elevations. He stated that the intent of the building design was to be residential in scale. He noted the materials being proposed and showed photos of a similar building in St. Charles.

Mr. Whitaker then referenced the engineering plans and noted that they continue to work with staff to address stormwater. He stated that they will agree to not discharge into the rear yards to the north and that they will continue to work with staff through final engineering. He then noted the photometric plan which meets ordinance.

Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone was present to speak in favor or against the petition. There was no one to speak in favor of the petition. To speak against the petition were:

Steve Benthine, 1171 S Fairfield, stated he lives directly behind Westgate Auto. His questions were about the water and retention. He asked if only the first retention pond was going to be put in but not the second. Mr. Whitaker stated that they will put in both ponds before an occupancy permit is secured. Mr. Benthine asked where they would drain. Mr. Whitaker stated that it will drain to either Roosevelt Road, Fairfield or Edgewood or a combination of all of the above.

Mr. Benthine mentioned that he was before the Plan Commission two years ago when John Moroni presented a petition. He stated that there is a retaining wall along the south side of his lot which contains drainage holes. Water flows out when it rains and pools into the neighbor's backyards. His concern is the maintenance of the wall. He noted he does not object to the Firestone petition but has issues with the water and maintenance of the wall.

Chairperson Ryan asked the petitioner if the plan will eliminate that totally. Mr. Whitaker stated no; however, the detention they are providing will reduce the amount of run-off.

Chairperson Ryan asked if something can be done to eliminate those holes. Mr. Stilling stated that some of the runoff will be taken away; however, you cannot eliminate it completely. The petitioner's plans will not increase the volume heading north. With reference to the maintenance, staff will bring that to the attention of the property owner as he is responsible for it.

Erica Dumask, 1169 S Fairfield, stated she lives in the 2<sup>nd</sup> house and gets all the water. She has lived there for 38 years and does not think the plan will help. She also mentioned the weep holes in the wall and if she plugged up those holes their driveways would flood. Chairperson Ryan suggested that they contact staff to address the matter.

Mr. Stilling asked the petitioner what type of shingle will be placed on the roof. Mr. Whitaker stated that it would be an architectural shingle.

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, presented the report. He stated that the IDRC report is being submitted into the public record in its entirety. Mr. Still said that staff and petitioner has been working on the conditions and as a result, staff has submitted the revised IDRC report amended 5/16/11. Mr. Stilling stated Firestone is seeking to construct a new 8,500 square foot facility at the southwest corner of Edgewood and Roosevelt Road. Bismarck Real Estate Partners plan to acquire 1.56 acres of the eastern portion of the dealership site, develop the property and lease it to Firestone. The proposed facility would be primarily dedicated to tire sales and automotive service, but no motor vehicle repair activities, as defined by the Zoning Ordinance. The existing owner would retain the remaining 4 acres and continue the automobile sales, repair and service use.

Mr. Stilling said the proposed building would be one story, with a second level loft. The building is orientated with the bay doors facing the west so as to minimize noise and impacts on the adjacent residential properties to the east. The building will be constructed of primarily concrete blocks known as "Quik Brik". This is different from typical masonry because "Quik Brik" is made from concrete rather than clay and painted to a specific color.

Building staff notes that this product is a colored concrete block that is not a veneer, but rather a smaller block that has a face that looks like brick. The benefits of such an application are that one does not have to install a cement block and then install a clay brick veneer. Issues associated with this approach are:

1. The cement used to make the block has a dye mixed in. Dyed cement such as pavers, red sidewalks, etc. have issues with fading. While sealers can lesson fading, staff is unaware of a way to completely prevent it.
2. With traditional cement block wall that has clay brick installed in front of it (double wyth system) we have a 1" air space between where moisture can run down. This moisture comes from leaks, and vapor transmission. Vapor transmission occurs from the sun heating the outer surface and causing the wet wall to push the vapor into the wall. This vapor condenses in the surface of the cement block and runs down and out of the weep holes. The quickbrick does not have this airspace. In the areas where the block will be exposed, such as in the shop, there may not be an issue. In areas with drywall, staff will need more information on how that moisture will be controlled to prevent damage to the interior finishes. Staff suggests that should this petition be approved, it may be of assistance if the product manufacturer could give us an address of a job close to us that used the product so we could see it first hand.

The petitioner has provided a material board for staff's review. Staff notes that the building elevations and materials proposed for this site are critical as the intent of planned development amendments and the B4A District regulations are to encourage unified design. Should additional redevelopment occur within the planned development, the intent would be to establish compatibility with the architectural style of the future proposed buildings. This approach has

been consistently applied to many other planned developments. The petitioner has submitted photos of a similar building constructed in St. Charles, IL. Staff prefers the color, materials and architectural design elements of that building elevation over the plans submitted. Should the project be approved, staff would recommend that the elevations be revised to substantially conform to the color, materials and architectural design elements depicted in the photographs submitted by the petitioner and attached as Exhibit C.

With reference to the site layout, Mr. Stilling said during initial meetings between staff and the petitioner, the petitioner was informed by staff about concerns with a piecemeal development of the site. Specifically, staff referenced the 2007 Roosevelt Road Corridor Plan which calls for uniform development. In addition, staff did emphasize a 'master plan' approach to developing the property and asked that any future plans include information as to how they plan to address the continuity with the entire site. Furthermore, staff expressed concern about the appearance and operation of the Westgate Auto Sales as it relates to the new proposed Firestone. Although this issue is discussed later in the report as part of the compatibility to the Comprehensive Plan, the petitioner's proposed plans have attempted to address these items in the following manner:

- With reference to access and circulation, the petitioner's plans show the relocation of the existing curb cut onto Roosevelt Road to a more centralized location on the site. This curb cut will now be restricted to a right in/out. A new frontage access drive would be provided along the Roosevelt Road frontage providing access to both the proposed Firestone and existing Westgate Auto Sales. The required curbing and 5' perimeter landscaping is being provided. An additional 10 parking spaces are also being provided along the Roosevelt Road frontage to be shared amongst the Westgate Auto Sales use and Firestone. As noted in the traffic study, this parking area should not be used for the sale and display of automobiles.
- The petitioner did submit a 3D rendering (attached as Exhibit B) showing how phase 1 of the site would be developed. As shown on that plan, and the overall site plan, the existing used car sales building would remain. As noted, a curb and 5' perimeter landscaping is being provided to separate that use from the overall development. It should be noted that the used car sales building is currently not being used.
- Additional access is being provided via a curb cut along Edgewood Avenue. When the property was being used as Westgate Lincoln Mercury, this curb cut was only used by delivery vehicles and had an automatic gate blocking access during normal business hours. More recently, when Westgate Auto Sales received an extension to their Ordinance in 2010, the Village Board required that this access be permanently closed. Therefore, staff recommended a more restrictive left in only with no exiting movements to minimize the impact on the neighboring residential properties. The petitioner is requesting to have a left in and right in & out.
- A new rear access drive connecting Edgewood Avenue and Fairfield Avenue would be provided. This access drive could be used by both businesses and it also provides Firestone customers with access to the signalized intersection at Fairfield Avenue without having to drive through the automobile sales area. The petitioner's plans show that this

access drive will only be stripped and the pavement would be patched where necessary. It should be noted that the petitioner is requesting to remove existing fences at both the Edgewood and Fairfield entrances to accommodate the access drive.

- The petitioner's future development plan also shows how this access drive would be relocated to align with the existing curb cut on the west side of Fairfield. This is consistent with the recommendations from KLOA.

Mr. Stilling said the Village's traffic consultant KLOA reviewed the site for its impact on the Village street network and offers several recommendations. Specifically, he said KLOA recommends that the access onto Edgewood Avenue be restricted to a left in only and right out only. Staff can support KLOA's recommendation as a left in only and right out only provided that it is properly designed with appropriate signage per KLOA's report

With reference to the stormwater detention, Mr. Stilling said the property was initially developed prior to annexation into the Village and prior to the establishment of the current DuPage County Countywide Stormwater and Floodplain Ordinance. Incremental improvements, consisting of underground detention, were done as part of the 2002 expansion project for Westgate Lincoln Mercury.

The petitioner has submitted preliminary engineering plans showing how they plan to address stormwater on the site. Staff has expressed concern about their preliminary plans. Specifically, we have issues with residential property flooding downstream of this parcel. Currently flow from this parcel is divided in a number of different directions:

- There is some detention provided in the northern (rear) parking lot that discharges onto private, residential property via a 2" pipe.
- There is sheet flow to a parking lot structure that is shown to flow to the back of the curb inlet in Edgewood Avenue.
- There is sheet flow toward the Roosevelt Road right of way.

The proposed development is showing detention in the rear of the parcel in two separate ponds and directs all discharge either toward Edgewood Avenue (for the Firestone development), or the rear yards of the homes between Fairfield and Edgewood (partially reflective of existing conditions). Staff notes that sheet drainage from the existing site toward Edgewood would be more controlled, through the detention improvements. However, while they are restricting the water runoff at the same or greater rate than is currently provided, the overall volume of runoff heading downstream may be increasing northward toward Edgewood Avenue. Staff recognizes that the development is improving the current runoff conditions; however, if the site was developed in a unified and comprehensive manner, discharge to the north could be avoided by discharging into the existing stormsewer along Fairfield Avenue or by some other means. As a result, staff has requested that the petitioner make the following changes to their engineering plans:

- The current flow directed toward the Roosevelt Road stormsewer must be maintained. The flow would need to be detained to current standards, which, should the petitioner not

wish to change the overall site plan, could be handled in underground detention if there is a proper grade difference. Additionally, staff has consulted with IDOT on the downstream issues along Edgewood Avenue and requested if IDOT can favorably consider allowing additional runoff to be directed toward Roosevelt road in lieu of Edgewood Avenue. The petitioner can finalize their plan as part of the requisite final engineering approvals.

- The petitioner shows the existing detention area being improved to a more traditional pond, and discharging to the rear yards to the north as it currently does. Again, keeping in mind that this development is a piece of what would be an overall redevelopment, the flow to rear yards should be eliminated. There is a separated storm sewer on Fairfield that is ~200 feet from 500 E. Roosevelt and another 200 feet to the location of the existing outlet. The storm sewer along Fairfield directs stormwater to Central Avenue, avoiding the rear yards along this area. This option or any other like concept that would relieve the discharge of water onto private single family residential property should be provided, as was required in a similar petition (PC 05-42: 218-226 W. St. Charles Road – Pointe at Lombard).
- The proposed plan shows the controlled discharge from the pond connecting to the back of a curb inlet in Edgewood Avenue. The petitioner has been asked under §154.402 (C) (2) Chapter 200 section 2B to show where this flow goes. Pipe size, material, condition and ditch capacity will need to be addressed.

Mr. Stilling highlighted the various conditional uses and variations associated with the petition. He stated Firestone is proposing automobile service which includes the sales and installation of tires and light automotive servicing including brakes, suspension work and tune-ups. No major repairs will take place on site. As this use can be complimentary to the existing use on the property, staff has no objection to the proposed conditional use. The petitioner is also proposing to have a small portion of the site dedicated to outside sales and display of products (such as tires and other vehicle parts). According to the petitioner's plans, the display area will be located in front of the service bays during business hours. They have indicated that they would like to have some flexibility as to where it is located during business hours (i.e. in front of a bay door not being used). As with many other automobile service facilities along the corridor, outside display areas are common. Staff finds that the conditional use for outdoor sales can generally be supported, provided that they meet the conditions.

With reference to the parking lot landscaping, Mr. Stilling noted that while staff is concerned that the proposed development may be considered piecemeal in nature, the petitioner has attempted to address shared access and circulation. By doing so, this has resulted in the need for the variation. Should this project be approved, this deviation can be supported as it provides for better traffic flow and circulation. Staff has supported such relief for other developments.

As part of the Site Plan Approval process, the petitioner is proposing deviations from the Sign Ordinance. Mr. Stilling noted that staff supported the petitioner's request with reference to signage.

Mr. Stilling said the proposed development is considered both a major plat and major development as defined by the Subdivision and Development Ordinance, which would require full public improvements where they are needed. The petitioner's plans do show sidewalk being provided along the west side of Edgewood as well as parkway trees and streetlights. However the petitioner is seeking the following deviations from the following sections of Subdivision and Development Ordinance:

*A deviation from Sections 154.406 & 154.507 of the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow for detention areas to not be in an outlot.*

The Subdivision and Development Ordinance requires that the entire detention area be located in an outlot, not less than 30' wide, along the Edgewood frontage. This is necessary because it promotes common ownership with shared maintenance responsibilities through some type of agreement or association. The petitioner's plans show two separate detention ponds each located in a drainage easement. One pond would be owned and maintained by Firestone and the other would be owned and maintained by the property owner of Westgate Auto Sales. While both ponds do function independently, until high water stage, they are required for the development to proceed. In keeping with the unified development approach, as stipulated in the 2007 Roosevelt Road Corridor Plan, staff recommends that this relief be denied and recommends that the detention ponds be in a single outlot with shared maintenance. This is consistent with other similar projects such as Lombard Crossings (former Lombard Lanes site), V-Land Development at Highland & Roosevelt, Highlands of Lombard and Fountain Square. It would also be consistent with the issues and concerns raised in the aforementioned narrative regarding stormwater detention improvements. Staff notes that the single outlot minimizes the potential for future maintenance issues and impact to adjacent properties since an association and common ownership would be required to maintain the detention outlot. Also, the intent of a single outlot is consistent with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and Roosevelt Road Corridor study as a unified development. Therefore, staff finds that standards outlined in 154.203 E (a) and (d) have not been met and recommends denial of this request.

Should this relief be denied and the petitioner is required to put the detention into a single outlot, the following relief is required:

- A deviation to Section 155.417 (G)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot area for detention outlots; and
- a deviation from Section 155.417 (G)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot width for detention outlots

In an effort to get the detention into a single outlot, staff can support the 2 deviations noted above given that the lot will not be developed in the future.

Alternatively, if the outlots are still required, the petitioner has requested that they have 2 outlots, one for each parcel. To accommodate this request, the following relief is required:

- A deviation Section 154.507 of the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow an outlot to not have at least thirty feet (30') of frontage along a public street; and



- a deviation from Section 154.507 of the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance for single ownership of an outlot

Staff does not support this option either for the same reasons noted above including the need for common ownership and maintenance responsibilities and unified development. Therefore, staff finds that standards outlined in 154.203 E (a) and (d) have not been met and recommends denial of this request. For clarity purposes, staff recommends that a single outlot be provided with common ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the entire site including the Firestone Parcel and Westgate Auto Sales parcel.

Mr. Stilling summarized by stating that staff has expressed a concern to the petitioner about the piecemeal nature of this development through the development processes. Staff did emphasize a 'master plan' approach to developing the property and asked that any future plans include information as to how they plan to address the continuity with the entire site. This concern goes to the historical purpose and intent of the Roosevelt Road corridor analysis and is intended to minimize past negative impacts of piecemeal development on the corridor. Staff does not support an approach to "break off" a portion of the subject property and consider a proposal for an independent development, as it would also be contrary to the basic intent of the planned developments. Staff has expressed to the petitioner that the Firestone development in of itself would set the tone for future development and absent of knowing how this proposal fits into the overall master plan for the entire 5.5 acre site, it would be difficult to support such a petition.

In response to staff's concerns, the petitioner did revise their plans to incorporate the shared access and frontage roads. Furthermore, the petitioner did provide a conceptual phase 2 plan showing how the balance of the site could be developed should Firestone proceed and the existing Westgate Auto Sales remain. The plan shows how a 10,000 square foot building could be accommodated on the site and still share access and parking. However, staff still notes that under these scenarios, it still assumes the existing auto sales use as remaining. Also, should this petition be approved, it would likely preclude the ability to facilitate a full-scale redevelopment plan for the full 5.5 acre site. However, if the intent is to set the parameters for future development and to facilitate activity within the corridor in the immediate term, common area elements are represented herein. Therefore, staff finds that the petition has met the standards for conditional use for a planned development.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

Commissioner Sweetser asked about common ownership of the outlot. Mr. Stilling stated that maintenance could be handled by an association.

Commissioner Sweetser asked for clarification about condition 16. Mr. Stilling stated that it sets the tone for future development on the site and staff prefers the red brick rather than what is proposed.

Commissioner Olbrysh questioned the east side of the building and was concerned about the appearance. Mr. Whitaker stated that the picture does not accurately reflect how this site will look. They are providing additional landscaping to break up the mass of the building.

Commissioner Olbrysh asked if the two ponds are connected to function as one pond. Mr. Stilling stated that they will still function independently but the flow can be tweaked.

Commissioner Sweetser emphasized the need to minimize flow to the north.

Commissioner Cooper asked about the balance of the property having to meet code. Mr. Stilling said what they are impacting has to meet current code but what they are not touching is legal nonconforming and will be considered part of future redevelopment.

Commissioner Cooper asked about the appearance of the ponds and suggested a more naturalized look. Mr. Stilling stated that the western portion of the pond doesn't have barrier curb but the petitioner can provide an infiltration strip and that could include vegetative plantings.

Commissioner Cooper asked about the additional 10 parking spaces located on the south side of the frontage road and if this is a Village requirement. Mr. Stilling stated that staff was only seeking the frontage road and the additional parking was provided by the petitioner. Mr. Whitaker stated that the parking would benefit the future development.

On a motion by Commissioner Burke and a second by Commissioner Flint, the Plan Commission voted 5 to 0 that the Village Board approve the petition based on the finding that the petition had met the required Standards as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance.

Based on the submitted petition and the testimony presented, the proposed ordinance amendment does comply with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, Sign Ordinance, Subdivision and Development Ordinance and that the planned development amendment enhances the development and is in the public interest; and, therefore, I move that the Plan Commission adopt the findings included within the Inter-department Group Report, revised 5/16/11 as the findings of the Lombard Plan Commission, and recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of the PC 11-12, 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) Elevations and floor plan by Casco attached as Exhibit A; and
  - b) Preliminary engineering plans by Intech Consultants dated April 11, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011; and
  - c) Overall site plan on an aerial by Intech Consultants dated April 11, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011; and
  - d) 2 page site plan by Intech Consultants dated April 11, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011; and
  - e) Final Plat of Subdivision by Intech Consultants dated April 11, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011; and

- f) Photometric plan by Intech Consultants dated April 11, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011; and
  - g) Landscape plan by Charles Vincent George Architects dated April 1, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011; and
  - h) Signage plans by Chandler Signs dated November 29, 2011, last revised April 26, 2011.
2. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address the comments included within the IDRC report.
  3. The conditions of approval outlined in Ordinance 5163 and 6312 shall remain in full effect for the subject property, to the extent not specifically modified by the ordinance granting approval of this petition.
  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 minimize traffic conflicts within the planned development, the developers/owners of the properties shall provide cross-access between each lot within the planned development via a recorded easement document, with the final design and location subject to review and approval by the Village. Additional cross parking may be required as part of a future redevelopment.
  6. The petitioner shall satisfactorily address the following drainage issues:
    - a. The current flow directed toward the Roosevelt Road stormsewer shall be maintained, with the flow needing to be detained to current standards. As an alternative and part of the final engineering submittal, this flow may be directed to Fairfield Avenue in a manner acceptable to the Village.
    - b. The final engineering plans shall direct any runoff flow away from the rear yards and toward adjacent public rights of way.
    - c. If flow is directed to Edgewood Avenue, the petitioner shall provide documentation regarding the stormwater flow, pursuant to Section 154.402 (C) (2) Chapter 200, Section 2B. Pipe size, material, condition and ditch capacity will need to be addressed.
  7. Notwithstanding any detention improvements associated with runoff being directed to Roosevelt Road, stormwater detention facilities proposed to be constructed as part of this petition shall be located in a single outlot, with common ownership and shared maintenance responsibilities.
  8. Barrier curb is required along the south side of the detention pond on the Westgate lot. Staff may permit a filter strip in lieu of the curbing in this area only.

9. All comments and recommendations noted in the KLOA report dated May 5, 2011 shall be satisfactorily addressed.
10. The parking area located south of the frontage road, along the Roosevelt Road frontage and east of the proposed right in/out shall not be used for the sale and/or display of automobiles or merchandise.
11. Outdoor sales and display of merchandise may only occur during normal business hours and at the locations, as depicted on the site, prepared by Intech dated April 11, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011.
12. The proposed new shopping center sign, as depicted in the signage plans by Chandler Signs dated November 29, 2011, last revised April 26, 2011, shall be the only freestanding sign within the planned development. This includes both the Firestone parcel and the existing Westgate Auto Sales parcel. Informational signs may be permitted provided that they meet the provisions outlined in the Lombard Sign Ordinance.
13. Any new fence associated with the proposed development shall meet the requirements of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance.
14. The existing gate on Fairfield Avenue shall be removed upon a written request by the Village of Lombard.
15. Such approval shall become null and void unless work thereon is substantially under way within 12 months of the date of issuance, unless extended by the Board of Trustees prior to the expiration of the ordinance granting the conditional use.
16. The elevations shall be revised to substantially conform to the color, materials and architectural design elements depicted in the photographs submitted by the petitioner and attached as Exhibit C.

Respectfully,

**VILLAGE OF LOMBARD**

Donald Ryan, Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission

c. Petitioner  
Lombard Plan Commission