



Village of Lombard

Village Hall
255 East Wilson Ave.
Lombard, IL 60148
villageoflombard.org

Minutes

Plan Commission

Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Commissioners: Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke,
Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, Stephen Flint and
John Mrofcza
Staff Liaison: William Heniff

Monday, June 16, 2014

7:30 PM

Village Hall - Board Room

Call to Order

Vice Chairperson Flint called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

Vice Chairperson Flint led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call of Members

Present 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint
Absent 2 - Donald F. Ryan, and Andrea Cooper

Also present: William Heniff, AICP, Director of Community Development; Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director of Community Development; Matt Panfil, Sr. Planner, and Jason Guisinger, legal counsel to the Plan Commission.

Vice Chairperson Flint called the order of the agenda.

Ms. Ganser read the Rules of Procedures as written in the Plan Commission By-Laws.

Public Hearings

[140242](#)

PC 14-13: 1-378 Yorktown Center (Yorktown Mall) (Request to continue to the July 21, 2014 meeting)
Requests approval of a major change to the approved Yorktown

Center Planned Development, located within the B3 Community Shopping District. The petition seeks approval of an amended roadway configuration for the perimeter ring road and the Fairfield Avenue entrance. (DISTRICT #3)

A motion was made by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Olbrysh, to continue this petition to the July 21, 2014 meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

Absent: 2 - Donald F. Ryan, and Andrea Cooper

[140243](#)

PC 14-14: 1014 S. Main Street (Glenbard East High School)

Requests that the Village approve a conditional use for a planned development for the subject properties located within the CR Conservation Recreation District, with deviations from the Lombard Sign Ordinance, as follows:

1. A deviation from Section 153.210 (E) to allow for the replacement of an existing twenty-seven (27) square foot automatic changeable reader board sign with a new twenty-seven (27) square foot automatic changeable reader board sign where nine (9) square feet is the maximum allowed; and
2. A deviation from Section 153.501 (B)(5)(f)(ii) to allow for a freestanding sign to be set back up to ten feet (10') from the public right-of-way where a minimum of twenty-five feet (25') is required. (DISTRICT #2)

Vice Chairperson Flint asked if any person would like to speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment.

Sworn in to present the petition was William Heniff, Director of Community Development; Matt Panfil, Senior Planner, and the petitioner Rob Wroble, 2015 Spring Road, Oakbrook.

Vice Chairperson Flint read the Commissions Procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intends to cross examine, and, hearing none, he proceeded with the petition.

Mr. Wroble stated he is the District Architect representing School District 87. He explained the sign replacement is part of an annual summer maintenance project. It is the District's intent to replace of the changeable message signs at all of their schools. Replacing the existing sign will give the school more flexibility as to how they display their messages.

Vice Chairperson Flint asked if any person would like to speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment. Hearing none, he asked for the staff report.

Mr. Panfil, Sr. Planner, presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. He noted the petitioner is proposing to replace an existing, fifteen year old, approximately thirty-nine (39) square foot freestanding sign (including twenty-seven (27) square feet of which is an automatic changeable copy display area) with a new 37.5 square foot freestanding sign (including twenty-seven (27) square feet of which is an automatic changeable copy display area). The proposed sign is to be located in the same location as the existing sign on the eastern side of the lot along Main Street.

He cited the proposed sign deviates from the regulations within the Sign Ordinance. The first deviation from the planned development is to allow for the replacement of an existing twenty-seven (27) square foot automatic changeable reader board sign with a new twenty-seven (27) square foot automatic changeable reader board sign where nine (9) square feet is the maximum allowed. The second deviation is to allow for a freestanding sign to be set back up to ten feet (10') from the public right-of-way where a minimum of twenty-five feet (25') is required.

In regards to the square footage, he stated the need for the automatic changeable copy sign is because the petitioner provides information regarding many events to the community and the maintenance of the existing sign is becoming costly, inconvenient and unattractive. A second automatic changeable copy sign on Wilson Avenue is no longer in use and will be removed in summer 2014.

Staff can support the requested size relief due to the consideration that the requested deviation is simply replacing an existing sign with new technology and is smaller than that supported by staff, the Plan Commission, and Village Board in the past instances.

Staff is also supportive to allow for a freestanding sign to be set back up to ten feet (10') from the public right-of-way where a minimum of twenty-five feet (25') is required. If the sign were to be located per code, it would be placed within or very near the drive aisle. As a practical matter, such placement would not be appropriate as it would interfere with the access drive area and would not be centered within the island. The proposed sign is to be located in the same location as the existing sign on the eastern side of the lot along Main Street.

He noted the proposed plan would consolidate many diverse functions and activities of Glenbard East High School in a unified development plan. Therefore, staff is supportive of the planned development request as it establishes a framework for review and consideration of

any other subsequent activities or structures that could be developed in the future.

Mr. Panfil summarized staff finds that the proposed sign is consistent with its surrounding context, the Village of Lombard Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and Sign Ordinance.

Vice Chairperson Flint called for any additional testimony. Hearing none, he opened the meeting for discussion from the Commissioners.

A motion was made by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Sweetser, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition subject to the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall construct the sign in substantial conformance with the plans and elevations, prepared by DeSignGroup Signage Corp., dated April 15, 2014 and the relief shall be limited as follows:

a. A deviation from Section 153.210 (E) to allow for a twenty-seven (27) square foot automatic changeable copy sign to exceed the maximum permitted nine (9) square feet; and

b. A deviation from Section 153.501 (B)(5)(f)(ii) to allow for a 37.5 square foot freestanding sign to be setback ten (10) feet from Main Street when a sign shall be setback at least twenty-five (25) feet from the public right-of-way in the CR Zoning District.

2. Any future signs, including this sign, involving the subject property shall apply for and receive a building permit. The permit will be reviewed in connection with the aforementioned conditions.

3. The petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the IDRC Report.

4. This relief shall be valid for a period of one year from the date of approval of the ordinance. If the sign is not constructed and operating by said date, this relief shall be deemed null and void.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

Absent: 2 - Donald F. Ryan, and Andrea Cooper

Business Meeting

The business meeting convened at 7:45 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

Commissioner Sweetser noted there should be a correction changing the word orders to odors on page 5.

On a motion by Commissioner Mrofcza, and seconded by Commissioner Burke, the minutes of the May 19, 2014 meeting were approved with the aforementioned correction. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

Absent: 2 - Donald F. Ryan, and Andrea Cooper

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

DuPage County Hearings

There were no DuPage County hearings.

Chairperson's Report

The Vice Chairperson deferred to the Assistant Director of Community Development.

Planner's Report

Ms. Ganser, Assistant Director of Community Development, asked the Commissioners (in response to a request from another Commissioner) if they would be interested in having the Plan Commission packets emailed to them as well as sent via Community Service Officer. The Commissioners agreed they would prefer to have the packets sent to them and not emailed.

Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

New Business

There was no new business.

Subdivision Reports

There were no subdivision reports.

Site Plan Approvals

There were no site plan approvals.

Workshops

Automatic Changeable Copy Signage Regulations

Ms. Ganser, Assistant Director of Community Development, presented the workshop regarding automatic changeable copy signage regulations. She cited that at the May 19th Plan Commission meeting, staff led a workshop on automatic changeable copy (ACC) signage and it was continued to the June 16, 2014 Plan Commission meeting. She also cited numerous requests for ACC signage have been brought forth to staff and referenced (PC 14-14) from Glenbard East High School discussed at tonight's meeting.

Ms. Ganser reviewed the existing regulations on ACC signage noting they are allowed only within the CR, B3, B4A, B5, and B5A zoning districts. The site must have at least five-hundred (500) combined lineal foot frontage and automatic changeable copy counts toward the total allowable sign area and cannot be more than nine (9) square feet in area.

She explained staff is looking for input from the Plan Commission in regards to amending the regulations allowing for ACC signs in the office, industrial, and education uses which currently have an O, I, or R zoning classification. Staff recommends consideration of further amending the regulations to allow for ACC signs on major and minor arterial roadways. The definitions of a major and minor arterial roadway are from the 2014 Comprehensive Plan update. She cited some examples of major and minor arterial roads in Lombard.

Ms. Ganser noted the five-hundred foot (500') frontage requirement was discussed at the last meeting and said the question exists if it should be maintained, reduced, or disregarded altogether. She also noted the size of automatic changeable signs was discussed at the last meeting. She explained that currently automatic changeable copy signs cannot be more than nine (9) square feet in size and questioned if there is support to a deviation of increased size.

Ms. Ganser asked if the Commissioners if they had any questions or comments.

Commissioner Burke summarized some of the issues discussed at the last meeting and cited examples of major and minor arterial streets that were of concern. He thought combining the two roadways together was too broad especially the minor arterial roads since most of them are residential streets. He also discussed the frontage requirements and brought up the example for First United Methodist Church.

Mr. Heniff responded to the five-hundred (500) lineal feet of frontage requirement. He noted the concern is one could have footage along a major arterial and the rest on a residential street. He said one approach to address this issue is to keep the five-hundred (500) lineal feet but also offer additional provisions that at least three-hundred (300) feet must be on the arterial street. Another provision could be added so the placement of the signage must be on the arterial street.

Commissioner Olbrysh said he would like some legislative history for review to see how the five-hundred foot (500') requirement was agreed upon. He stated we don't want to allow so many automatic changeable signs creating a carnival type atmosphere of visual clutter. He said he likes the five-hundred foot (500') requirement and didn't want to start making exceptions. He referenced the corner lots and thought the requirement must be made on the major arterial street and not include the side property.

Mr. Heniff responded that currently the sign code does allow signage on property with a minimum of five-hundred (500) combined lineal foot frontage. Staff is suggesting five-hundred feet (500') along a public right of way or an alternate is to add a provision that three-hundred feet (300') must be along the arterial street.

Mr. Heniff also noted that we have several religious institutions seeking accommodation for small signage and are coming forward with questions.

Commissioner Olbrysh asked if most of the churches are in residential areas.

Mr. Heniff responded that most of the churches are zoned residential. First United Methodist Church and First Church of Lombard have B zoning but the other churches are zoned residential. He cited the signs for these churches would be prohibited. He explained this why staff is looking at various scenarios where an ACC sign could be considered.

Commissioner Burke stated there are some cases that will need to be presented before the Plan Commission.

Mr. Heniff explained this is why we need to figure out the reasonable standard and what is acceptable.

Commissioner Burke asked if the Commissioners agreed to the five-hundred foot (500') requirement.

Commissioner Sweetser said she didn't see a way to cover all the scenarios with something reasonable so we should start with the five-hundred foot (500') requirement. She thought the three-hundred foot (300') requirement sounded reasonable as long as the provision is added that the sign is to be located along the arterial street. She also said the other cases will need to come before the Plan Commission.

Mr. Heniff gave an example that in DuPage County ACC signs are all a conditional use. The challenge is to determine the criteria to when the sign is or isn't appropriate.

Commissioner Burke said the criteria should be three-hundred feet (300') on a minor or major arterial street and doesn't think the frontage on a residential street should be included.

Commissioner Mrofcza said if we stick to the five-hundred foot (500') requirement it would exclude most of the churches. He cited St. Pius Church as an example. He asked if we are going to open up the O, I and R zoning classification as exceptions or variances.

Mr. Heniff explained staff is looking and at adding office, industrial, and education uses which currently have an O, I, or R zoning classification. He also discussed that with changes in technology the signs are becoming more affordable.

Commissioner Mrofcza said he liked the idea of the three-hundred (300) and two-hundred (200) split requirements. He didn't see a problem giving a corner lot an advantage.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if the five-hundred foot (500') requirement is necessary because of the speed of the street and the ability to read the sign. Mr. Heniff explained the number of street lanes and speed does impact the traffic flow and is being considered when drafting the regulations.

Commissioner Burke cited he doesn't understand why we would give credit to someone on a residential street.

Commissioner Sweetser asked that with the evolution of technology if at some point ACC signs shouldn't be differentiated and not considered separately. Mr. Heniff explained Villa Park allows a certain percentage of their signs to be ACC. He noted we are trying to strike a balance meeting the needs of some of the institutions and the impact the sign will have on other properties.

Commissioner Olbrysh stated he doesn't want the requirements to become too aggressive. He questioned if some of the churches have come forward and expressed interest. Mr. Heniff said they have come forward. Commissioner Olbrysh said he sees the benefit of ACC but expressed concern. He didn't want the Village to become a carnival atmosphere where everyone wants a sign. He is also concerned with the smaller areas and how many signs we are going to permit. He said he would like to keep our requirements and the other cases can be presented before the Plan Commission.

Mr. Heniff said staff could look at the size of the square footage component and that this would address the concern of the carnival type atmosphere.

Commissioner Burke said he would like to see the requirement reduced to three-hundred feet (300') of frontage on a minor arterial with no other calculation involved, and not include side streets or residential property. He doesn't see the benefit of giving someone an advantage because of two-hundred feet (200') of residential property.

Mr. Heniff said staff can formulate a draft ordinance for consideration by the Plan Commission. Staff can also provide some examples of properties in the Village that would meet these criteria.

Commissioner Burke addressed the size of the sign from nine (9) square feet to thirteen (13) square feet. Mr. Heniff explained staff could come up with some parameters for the size and the proportions in relation to the property.

Commissioner Flint referenced the First United Methodist Church sign and said it is well proportioned.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if there were any restrictions regarding color, if multiple colors were allowed. Mr. Heniff said sometimes color can add readability. He cited the example of the Lombard Pines sign, when it changed from all red to multi-color he thought it made the sign easier to read.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked if nine feet (9') is still considered a

standard or if signs are getting larger. He asked if we leave the size at nine feet (9') will we see a number of petitions come forward.

Mr. Heniff responded if we leave the size at nine feet (9') we will see a number of petitions come forward. He said most of the requests are in the teens. A nine foot (9') ACC sign works well for gas stations, time or temperature. If you want to convey a message the sign needs to be in the high teens or low twenties.

Commissioner Burke said since we are trying to reduce the number of cases that come before the Plan Commission, he suggested changing the requirement to twelve (12') or to fifteen (15') feet.

Commissioner Olbrysh suggested staff consider a five-hundred foot (500') requirement on major arterial streets because of the speed limit and reduce the footage to three-hundred feet (300') on minor arterial streets where the speed limits are slower.

Commissioner Burke asked if there were any set back requirements. Mr. Heniff responded there are different set back requirements by district.

Mr. Heniff said based on the discussion staff will bring the regulations forward at the next Plan Commission meeting for consideration.

Tattoo Studio Regulations

Ms. Ganser, Assistant Director of Community Development, presented the workshop regarding a tattoo studio text amendment. She explained over the past few years, staff has been contacted by parties interested in opening a tattoo studio in Lombard. As the Zoning Ordinance does not list tattoo studios as a permitted or conditional use in any zoning district, a text amendment would be required. Staff is bringing this item to the Plan Commission to discuss if a text amendment would be appropriate, and if so, what zoning districts could be amended to allow for a tattoo studio.

She noted staff discussed this use with Village legal counsel and that their memo was included with the staff memo for review. She also noted staff completed a survey of nearby communities to see if tattoo studios were a permitted use, conditional use, or a prohibited use. She noted from the survey many of the communities do not mention tattoo studios in their Zoning Ordinance. She said staff found four

nearby communities that permit tattoo studios by right that included Aurora, Plainfield, Villa Park and Wood Dale. Staff also found multiple communities that allowed tattoo studios with a conditional use or special use permit. In addition to DuPage County, this included Franklin Park, Geneva, Naperville and Westmont.

She explained staff then researched the Zoning Ordinance Definitions within these communities. She said their definitions were very similar to the State of Illinois definition.

Ms. Ganser noted staff also looked at business regulations. Per the State of Illinois, the Body Piercing Establishment Registration Act regulates such businesses. Business must register with the State Department of Public Health and an inspection is conducted to make sure the business is in compliance with the Act.

Staff recommends amending the Zoning Ordinance to allow for tattoo studios as a conditional use. Staff finds the B3, B4 and B4A could be suited for this service business due to the larger area of shoppers the district draws from and location on commercial corridors. She noted the zoning map to use for reference distributed before the meeting.

Ms. Ganser asked the Commissioners if they had any questions or comments.

Commissioner Burke asked to review and for clarification of the zoning map. Mr. Heniff explained the areas of consideration on the map are highlighted in red and would include the commercial properties along North Avenue, East St. Charles Road, the Roosevelt Corridor, and select properties along 22nd Street.

Commissioner Burke asked if staff considered the I District. Mr. Heniff questioned since this is a service function if it would be compatible in a manufacturing and industrial district.

Commissioner Burke agreed with the zoning districts.

Commissioner Olbrysh agreed with the Conditional Use process and the liked the strict requirements set by the State of Illinois.

Commissioner Sweetser also agreed with the definitions.

Mr. Heniff referenced the memo prepared by Klein, Thorpe and Jenkins, LTD. He noted the state regulations associated to tattoo parlors and the changing perceptions on tattoo art. Staff recommends amending the Zoning Ordinance to allow for tattoo studios as a conditional use.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Olbrysh, to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofca, and Stephen Flint

Absent: 2 - Donald F. Ryan, and Andrea Cooper

*Stephen E. Flint, Vice Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission*

*William J. Heniff, Secretary
Lombard Plan Commission*