

VILLAGE OF LOMBARD  
REQUEST FOR BOARD OF TRUSTEES ACTION  
For Inclusion on Board Agenda

  X   Resolution or Ordinance (Blue)            *Waiver of First Requested*  
  X   Recommendations of Boards, Commissions & Committees (Green)  
       Other Business (Pink)

TO: PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FROM: Scott R. Niehaus, Village Manager

DATE: December 27, 2016 (B of T) Date: January 5, 2017

TITLE: PC 16-27; Text Amendment to the Sign Ordinance

SUBMITTED BY: Department of Community Development ~~WA~~

BACKGROUND/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. The Village of Lombard proposes the following text amendments to the Sign Ordinance (Section 153 of the Code of Ordinances):

- 1) An amendment to Section 153.242(F), Wall signs, to amend the prohibition against mixed signage as it relates to window signs; and
- 2) An amendment to Section 153.505(B)(6), B3, B4, and B4A Community Shopping District, to amend the permitted area and height of freestanding signs on state right-of-ways.

The Plan Commission recommended approval of this petition by a vote of 5-0.

Fiscal Impact/Funding Source:

Review (as necessary):

Village Attorney X \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Finance Director X \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_


Village Manager X \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: All materials must be submitted to and approved by the Village Manager's Office by 12:00 noon, Wednesday, prior to the Agenda Distribution.



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Scott R. Niehaus, Village Manager

**FROM:** William J. Heniff, AICP, Director of Community Development 

**MEETING DATE:** January 5, 2017

**SUBJECT:** **PC 16-27, Text Amendment to the Sign Ordinance**

Please find the following items for Village Board consideration as part of the January 5, 2017 Board meeting:

1. Plan Commission referral letter;
2. IDRC report for PC 16-27;
3. An ordinance granting a text amendment to Section 153.242(F) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance; and
4. An ordinance granting a text amendment to Section 153.505(B)(6) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance.

The Plan Commission recommended approval of this petition by a vote of 5-0. Please place this petition on the January 5, 2017 Board of Trustees agenda for a first reading.



## VILLAGE OF LOMBARD

255 E. Wilson Ave.  
Lombard, Illinois 60148-3926  
(630) 620-5700 Fax (630) 620-8222  
[www.villageoflombard.org](http://www.villageoflombard.org)

January 5, 2017

**Village President**  
Keith T. Giagnorio

**Village Clerk**  
Sharon Kuderna

**Trustees**  
Dan Whittington, Dist. 1  
Michael A. Fugiel, Dist. 2  
Reid Foltyniewicz, Dist. 3  
Bill T. Johnston, Dist. 4  
Robyn Pike, Dist. 5  
William "Bill" Ware, Dist. 6

**Village Manager**  
Scott R. Niehaus

*"Our shared Vision for Lombard is a community of excellence exemplified by its government working together with residents and businesses to create a distinctive sense of spirit and an outstanding quality of life."*

*"The Mission of the Village of Lombard is to provide superior and responsive governmental services to the people of Lombard."*

Mr. Keith T. Giagnorio,  
Village President, and  
Board of Trustees  
Village of Lombard

### **Subject: PC 16-27, Text Amendments to the Sign Ordinance**

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. The petitioner, the Village of Lombard, requests a text amendment to Section 153.242(F), Wall signs, to amend the prohibition against mixed signage as it relates to window signs; and an amendment to Section 153.505(B)(6), B3, B4, and B4A Community Shopping District, to amend the permitted area and height of freestanding signs on state rights-of-way.

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition on December 19, 2016. Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Senior Planner.

Chairperson Ryan read the Plan Commission procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine and, hearing none, he proceeded with the petition.

Chairperson Ryan 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.

Ms. Papke presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. The petitioner, the Village of Lombard, is requesting a two text amendment to the Sign Ordinance. The first amendment to Section 153.242(F) will remove a prohibition against displaying wall signs in conjunction with window signs. This section currently prohibits displaying wall signs in conjunction with canopy, awning, projecting and window signs. Other sections of the code have

similar prohibitions against mixed signage, but allow for businesses with wall signs to also display window signs. The proposed amendment will eliminate this inconsistency in the code.

The second amendment relates to the size of freestanding signs in the B3, B4 and B4A districts along state rights-of-way. Currently, the Sign Ordinance allows freestanding signs along state rights-of-way to be larger and taller than freestanding signs along non-state rights-of-way. In the summer of 2016, staff conducted a survey of state rights-of-way in the Village and determined that there is variation in the size, speed and traffic volume of state rights-of-way in the Village. While some of these rights-of-way are fairly wide with multiple lanes of traffic traveling at high speeds, others are smaller streets that function similarly to other local streets. Staff therefore proposes to amend the sign ordinance so that increases in sign area and height along state rights-of-way are tailored to the size of the street. Staff proposes to allow larger signs along state rights-of-way that are more than 200 feet wide. Staff also proposes a provision to allow an increase for signs on large pieces of property along the narrower state rights-of-way. The intent is to provide for signage that is in scale with the development along these streets.

Staff recommended approval of both text amendments.

Chairperson Ryan asked for public comment, and, hearing none, opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

On a motion by Commissioner Burke, and a second by Commissioner Flint, the Plan Commission voted 5-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 16-27.

Respectfully,

**VILLAGE OF LOMBARD**

Donald Ryan, Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission

c. Lombard Plan Commission

# PLAN COMMISSION

## INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

### TEXT AMENDMENTS TO THE ZONING ORDINANCE – SIGN ORDINANCE

**December 19, 2016**

#### **Title**

PC 16-27

#### **Petitioner**

Village of Lombard

#### **Property Location**

Village-wide

#### **Approval Sought**

Text amendment to Section 153.242(F), Wall signs, to amend prohibition against mixed signage as it relates to window signs; and text amendment to Section 153.505(B)(6), Community Shopping District, to amend the permitted area and height of freestanding signs on state right-of-ways.

#### **Prepared By**

Anna Papke, AICP  
Senior Planner

#### **DESCRIPTION**

Village staff proposes two amendments to the Sign Ordinance. The first is an amendment to the prohibition against mixed signage in the standards for wall signs. Staff proposes to remove window signs from the list of signs that may not be displayed in conjunction with wall signs. The prohibitions against displaying awning, canopy and projecting signs in conjunction with wall signs will remain. This amendment will clear up an inconsistency in the Sign Ordinance.

The second amendment will amend the provisions in the Sign Ordinance that allow increased signage height and area for freestanding signs fronting state right-of-ways in the B3, B4 and B4A districts. Currently, the code allows larger freestanding signs fronting all state-owned right-of-ways regardless of the width or volume of traffic on those streets. Staff proposes to amend this section to allow the larger signs only fronting state right-of-ways that exceed 200 feet in width. The intent is to allow larger signs only in areas where they will be in keeping with the scale and traffic volume of the adjacent roadways.

#### **INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW**

##### **Building Division:**

The Building Division has no comments regarding the proposed text amendments to the Sign Ordinance.

##### **Fire Department:**

The Fire Department has no issues or concerns regarding the proposed text amendments to the Sign Ordinance.

##### **Private Engineering Services:**

Private Engineering Services has no comment regarding the proposed text amendments to the Sign Ordinance.

##### **Public Works:**

The Department of Public Works has no comment regarding the proposed amendments to the Sign Ordinance.



**Planning Services Division:**

The proposed change to Section 153.242(F) will eliminate an inconsistency in the Sign Ordinance. Currently, this section prohibits businesses with wall signs from displaying awning, canopy, projecting or window signs. However, the sections of the Sign Ordinance that apply to specific zoning districts prohibit wall signs in conjunction with awning, canopy and projecting signs; window signs are not included in these prohibitions. Staff also notes that many businesses in Lombard display window signs in addition to wall signs. The proposed change will reduce the number of businesses that are noncompliant with Section 153.242(F).

The proposed amendment to Section 153.505(B)(6) will reduce the size of freestanding signs permitted along some state-owned rights-of-way in the B3, B4 and B4A districts. Currently, this section allows signs fronting state rights-of-way to be up to 125 square feet in area and 25 feet in height. Freestanding signs that are not fronting state rights-of-way are limited to 25 square feet in area and 20 feet in height.

In the summer of 2016, planning staff conducted a survey of state rights-of-way in the Village. Street widths for state rights-of-way in the Village are as follows:

State Right-of-Way	Approximate Width
North Avenue	200'-230'
Roosevelt Road	100'
Butterfield Road	210'-250'
Route 53	100'

As the above table shows, there is considerable variation in state rights-of-way within the village. Some state rights-of-way are fairly wide (>200'), carry multiple lanes of traffic at high speeds, and have wide shoulders. Businesses along these rights-of-way may require a larger sign in order to be visible to passing traffic. Other state rights-of-way in the Village function similarly to local streets in terms of street width (approximately 100') and traffic volume. Signs along these streets do not need to be larger than signs along other business corridors in the Village in order to be visible to passing traffic. Accordingly, staff proposes to amend Section 153.505(B)(6) so that increases in sign height are permitted only for signs located along state rights-of-way greater than 200 feet wide. Staff also proposes to the following standards for sign area:

PERMITTED AREA OF FREESTANDING SIGNS BY ROW TYPE AND PROPERTY SIZE

	Adjacent Right-of-Way		
	State ROW < 200' in width	State ROW ≥ 200' in width	All other rights-of-way
Freestanding sign	50 square feet	125 square feet	50 square feet
Freestanding sign on parcel with ≥ 150' frontage on state ROW	100 square feet	125 square feet	N/A

Staff notes that the proposed changes would affect signs located on state rights-of-way that are less than 200 feet wide (bolded). The remaining portions of the table reflect current standards.

This amendment will provide for signage that is an appropriate scale along narrower state rights-of-way such as Roosevelt Road and Route 53. The Plan Commission conducted a workshop on this issue in August 2016, at which time Commissioners expressed support for the proposed changes. The proposed amendment will not affect the size or height standards for shopping center signs in these zoning districts.

## **EXISTING & PROPOSED REGULATIONS**

Staff proposes the following text amendments in **bold and underline**. Deletions are denoted by a ~~striketrough~~.

### **§153.242 Wall signs.**

(F) Mixed signs prohibited: No wall sign may be displayed in conjunction with an awning, canopy, **or** projecting, ~~or window~~ sign

### **§153.505(B)(6)**

Freestanding signs, in accordance with the provisions set forth in § 153.216. No freestanding sign shall be erected or maintained within any B3, B4 and B4A Community and Corridor Shopping Districts unless it also meets all of the following requirements:

- (a) Display: No business establishment shall display a freestanding sign unless the establishment is directly accessible by car and provides a minimum of four parking spaces on the premises where such freestanding sign is displayed.
- (b) Area: **Area of freestanding signs shall be permitted in accordance with the following table:**

**PERMITTED AREA OF FREESTANDING SIGNS BY ROW TYPE AND PROPERTY SIZE**

	<b><u>Adjacent Right-of-Way</u></b>		
	<b><u>State ROW &lt; 200'</u></b> <b><u>in width</u></b>	<b><u>State ROW &gt; 200'</u></b> <b><u>in width</u></b>	<b><u>All other</u></b> <b><u>rights-of-way</u></b>
<b><u>Freestanding sign</u></b>	<b><u>50 square feet</u></b>	<b><u>125 square feet</u></b>	<b><u>50 square feet</u></b>
<b><u>Freestanding sign on parcel with &gt; 150' frontage on state ROW</u></b>	<b><u>100 square feet</u></b>	<b><u>125 square feet</u></b>	<b><u>N/A</u></b>

- (i) ~~No freestanding sign shall exceed 50 square feet in sign surface area unless specifically regulated below.~~
- (ii) ~~Any freestanding sign fronting on a state right-of-way shall not exceed 125 square feet in sign surface area.~~
- (c) Setback:
  - (i) The leading edge of freestanding signs shall not protrude beyond the edge of the adjacent right-of-way unless specifically regulated below.
  - (ii) The leading edge of freestanding signs shall be set back a minimum of five feet from the street right-of-way.
- (d) Height:
  - (i) The height of a freestanding sign shall not exceed 20 feet unless specifically regulated below. In all cases height shall be measured from grade at the edge of the right-of-way to the top of the sign.

- (ii) The height of any freestanding sign fronting on a state right-of-way **that is more than 200 feet in width** shall not exceed 25 feet. In all cases height shall be measured from grade at the edge of the right-of-way to the top of the sign.
- (e) Number: No more than one freestanding sign shall be maintained on any one parcel of property.
- (f) Distance between signs: All freestanding signs shall be located at least 100 feet apart; provided, however, that if such freestanding signs comply with all other provisions except the requisite distance between signs, and it is not reasonable to so comply with the distance between signs requirement, such freestanding signs shall be allowed to be maintained.
- (g) Freestanding sign design: Unless otherwise prohibited by the Lombard Building Code, the exterior appearance of all freestanding signs located within the B4A District shall be of the same or compatible material as the principal building on the respective property.

### **STANDARDS FOR TEXT AMENDMENTS**

For any change to the Sign Ordinance, the standards for text amendments must be affirmed. The standards and staff comments are noted below:

1. *The degree to which the proposed amendment has general applicability within the Village at large and not intended to benefit specific property;*

153.242(F): The text amendment is generally applicable to all window signage on properties in the Village.

153.505(B)(6): The text amendment is generally applicable to all signs fronting state rights-of-way in the Village.

2. *The consistency of the proposed amendment with the objectives of this ordinance and the intent of the applicable zoning district regulations;*

153.242(F): The proposed text amendment will eliminate an inconsistency in the sign ordinance as it relates to the display of window signs in conjunction with wall signs.

153.505(B)(6): The proposed text amendment will ensure that signage along state rights-of-way is of an appropriate scale, and is consistent with signs along non-state rights-of-way of similar size and traffic volume.

3. *The degree to which the proposed amendment would create nonconformity;*

153.242(F): The proposed text amendment is additive in nature and would allow for businesses to display window signs in conjunction with wall signs. As a number of businesses in Lombard already display both types of signs, the amendment will reduce the number of businesses that are noncompliant with Section 153.242(F).



153.505(B)(6): The proposed text amendment will result in some signs along the narrower state-owned rights-of-way, such as Roosevelt Road, becoming nonconforming with respect to size and/or height. Such legal nonconforming signs will be allowed to remain subject to the provisions of Section 153.302, Nonconforming signage. This section also provides for owners of legal nonconforming signs to repair, maintain, and perform face changes on legal nonconforming signs. At such time as these signs are taken down or the properties are redeveloped, new signage would be subject to the amended size provisions.

4. *The degree to which the proposed amendment would make this ordinance more permissive;*

153.242(F): The proposed amendment is more permissive to the extent that will allow businesses to display window signs in conjunction with wall signs. Staff finds this to be acceptable since many businesses already display both types of signs with no negative effects.

153.505(B)(6): The proposed amendment will be less permissive to the extent that it will reduce the size of signs allowed along certain state rights-of-way.

5. *The consistency of the proposed amendment with the Comprehensive Plan; and*

Staff finds that the proposed amendments would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

6. *The degree to which the proposed amendment is consistent with village policy as established in previous rulings on petitions involving similar circumstances.*


The Village has a history of amending its Sign Ordinance to address evolving circumstances presented by petition or by recognizing a desire to amend the code to address desired code regulations. The proposed amendments are consistent with established Village policy in this regard.

## **FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the above findings, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee has reviewed the petition and finds that it meets the standards required by the Zoning Ordinance. As such, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee 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 text amendments **comply** with the standards required by the Village of Lombard Zoning Ordinance; and, therefore, I move that the Plan Commission accept the findings and recommendations of the Inter-Departmental Report as the findings of the Plan Commission and I recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of PC 16-27.

Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report approved by:



William J. Heniff, AICP  
Director of Community Development

Exhibit: Memorandum to Plan Commission re: Freestanding signage in the B3, B4, and B4A Districts –  
Workshop, dated August 15, 2016

H:\CD\WORDUSER\PCCASES\2016\PC 16-27\PC 16-27\_IDRC Report.docx



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** LOMBARD PLAN COMMISSION  
Donald Ryan, Plan Commission Chairperson

**FROM:** Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director  
Department of Community Development

**DATE:** August 15, 2016

**SUBJECT:** Freestanding signage in the B3, B4, and B4A Districts – Workshop

Staff is bringing forward a workshop item on freestanding signs in the B3, B4, and B4A zoning districts. Unlike the other zoning districts, B3, B4, and B4A allow for a freestanding sign to be larger in both height and square feet if the business is on a state right-of-way. State right-of-ways in these zoning districts include: Roosevelt Road, North Avenue, Butterfield Road, Route 53, and portions of Highland Avenue. The current Code is copied below. Freestanding signs on the above state right-of-ways are allowed to be up to one hundred and twenty-five (125) square feet in area and twenty-five (25) feet in height, as opposed to fifty (50) square feet and twenty (20) feet in height.

### **Current Code**

(6) Freestanding signs, in accordance with the provisions set forth in § 153.216. No freestanding sign shall be erected or maintained within any B3, B4 and B4A Community and Corridor Shopping Districts unless it also meets all of the following requirements:

(a) *Display:* No business establishment shall display a freestanding sign unless the establishment is directly accessible by car and provides a minimum of four parking spaces on the premises where such freestanding sign is displayed.

(b) *Area:*

(i) No freestanding sign shall exceed 50 square feet in sign surface area unless specifically regulated below.

(ii) Any freestanding sign fronting on a state right-of-way shall not exceed 125 square feet in sign surface area.

(c) *Setback:*

(i) The leading edge of freestanding signs shall not protrude beyond the edge of the adjacent right-of-way unless specifically regulated below.

(ii) The leading edge of freestanding signs shall be set back a minimum of five feet from the street right-of-way.

(d) *Height:*

(i) The height of a freestanding sign shall not exceed 20 feet unless specifically regulated below. In all cases height shall be measured from grade at the edge of the right-of-way to the top of the sign.

(ii) The height of any freestanding sign fronting on a state right-of-way shall not exceed 25 feet. In all cases height shall be measured from grade at the edge of the right-of-way to the top of the sign.

(e) *Number:* No more than one freestanding sign shall be maintained on any one parcel of property.

(f) *Distance between signs:* All freestanding signs shall be located at least 100 feet apart; provided, however, that if such freestanding signs comply with all other provisions except the requisite distance between signs, and it is not reasonable to so comply with the distance between signs requirement, such freestanding signs shall be allowed to be maintained.

(g) *Freestanding sign design:* Unless otherwise prohibited by the Lombard Building Code, the exterior appearance of all freestanding signs located within the B4A District shall be of the same or compatible material as the principal building on the respective property.

Staff contacted neighboring municipalities to determine if they allow businesses on state right-of-ways increased signage.

Municipality	Zoning	Max. Area	Max. Height	Notes
<b>Glen Ellyn – Roosevelt Road</b>	C3, C6, C4	50	15'	
<b>Villa Park</b>				
North Ave.	C-2, C-3			Signage not based on district; based on frontage chart.
Roosevelt	C-2, C-3			
Lot Frontage (width) 0–50'		50	30'	
51-100'		100	30'	
101-200'		150	30'	
Over 200'		200	30'	
<b>Unincorporated DuPage County</b>				

<i>North Ave.</i>	B-1, B2	50	Pole - 20' Ground - 10'	
<i>Roosevelt</i>	B-1, B2	50	Pole - 20' Ground - 10'	
<i>Butterfield</i>	B-1, B2	50	Pole - 20' Ground - 10'	
<b>Downers Grove</b>				
<i>Butterfield</i>	B-3			Monument signs, single pole signs prohibited
<i>&lt; 100 ft lot width</i>		24	8	
<i>100-259 ft lot width</i>		36	10	
<i>&gt; 260 ft lot width</i>		60	15	
<i>Tollway exception</i>		225	20'	Allowed an additional second sign
<b>Oak Brook Terrace</b>				
<i>Roosevelt</i>		200	15	Height: specific exception for Roosevelt/22 <sup>nd</sup>
<i>Butterfield</i>	B-3, O	200	9	Area for all districts: two sq ft per face for every linear foot of building frontage.

As seen in the chart, Glen Ellyn and Unincorporated DuPage County allow for fifty (50) square feet, which is what our Code allows for if not on a state right-of-way. Villa Park and Downers Grove bases the signage on lot width, and excluding the tollway properties, the numbers are close to what Glen Ellyn and Unincorporated DuPage County allow.

This would not impact shopping center signs, which are used frequently along Lombard's commercial corridors. Shopping center signs are allowed at 150 square feet and 35 feet in height. If a shopping center sign is utilized then no other freestanding signs shall be permitted in the shopping center, unless a variance is granted. Shopping center signs are allowed at a larger size due to nature of the sign in that it is advertising multiple businesses.

Staff proposes the square footage should be based on the width of the roadway, not the jurisdiction of the roadway. Roosevelt Road operates similar to Westmore-Meyers Road, portions of Main Street, and St. Charles Road. As noted below, the right-of-way width is much narrower than along North Avenue and Butterfield Road.

<b>State Right-of-Way</b>	<b>Approximate Distance</b>
North Avenue	200' -230'
Roosevelt Road	100'
Butterfield Road	210' -250'
Route 53	100'

Staff proposes amending the area and height to the below language.

(b) Area:

- (i) No freestanding sign shall exceed 50 square feet in sign surface area unless specifically regulated below.
- (ii) Any freestanding sign fronting on a state right-of-way **that is more than 200' in width** shall not exceed 125 square feet in sign surface area.

(d) Height:

- (i) The height of a freestanding sign shall not exceed 20 feet unless specifically regulated below. In all cases height shall be measured from grade at the edge of the right-of-way to the top of the sign.
- (ii) The height of any freestanding sign fronting on a state right-of-way **that is more than 200' in width** shall not exceed 25 feet. In all cases height shall be measured from grade at the edge of the right-of-way to the top of the sign.

### Questions to Consider

1. Does the Plan Commission agree that the provision for a larger sign on state right-of-ways should be amended?
2. Does the Plan Commission agree that the sign square footage should be based on the width of the roadway, not the jurisdiction of the roadway?

### ACTION REQUESTED

Staff is bringing this item to the Plan Commission for discussion and direction. The full Plan Commission case and public hearing petition is intended to be brought forth at an upcoming meeting.





# 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: Jennifer Ganser*

---

Monday, August 15, 2016

7:30 PM

Village Hall - Board Room

---

### Call to Order

*Chairperson Ryan called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.*

### Pledge of Allegiance

*Chairperson Ryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.*

### Roll Call of Members

**Present** 6 - Donald F. Ryan, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint  
**Absent** 1 - Ronald Olbrysh

*Also present: Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director of Community Development; Anna Papke, Sr. Planner, and Jason Guisinger, legal counsel to the Plan Commission.*

*Chairperson Ryan called the order of the agenda.*

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

### Public Hearings

[160199](#)

**PC 16-08A: 400, 406, 412, 420, and 440 S. Finley Road, Single Family Subdivision (Continued from the July 18, 2016 meeting)**  
At the June 16, 2016 meeting of the Lombard Village Board of Trustees, the Board remanded a petition for a map amendment and subdivision approval, previously referred to as PC 16-08, back to the

Plan Commission for an additional public hearing. The remand is intended to consider an amended petition to address modified public improvement plans within the Hickory Street public right of way. As amended, the petitioner now requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property located within the R1 Single-Family Residence District:

1. Approve a Map Amendment rezoning the entire property back to the R2 Single-Family Residence District;
2. Approve a variation from Section 154.304 (D)(3) and Section 154.305 (D)(3)(b) to eliminate the requisite sidewalk on the north side of Hickory Street; and
3. Approve a Major Plat of Subdivision. (DISTRICT #1)

*Sworn in to present the petition was Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director of Community Development and the petitioner Mr. David Cumming of Pulte Homes.*

*Chairperson Ryan read the Plan Commissions procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine, and, hearing none, he proceeded with the petition.*

*Mr. Cumming said after the May Plan Commission final engineering was started. The 90 inch combined sewer on Hickory St is very shallow. Grading would be required and there would not be enough room to provide for a sidewalk. Pulte will complete the sidewalk on the north side of lot 6, but would like to exclude the sidewalk on Hickory Street.*

*Chairperson Ryan 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.*

*Ms. Ganser presented the memo, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. She said at the June 16, 2016 meeting of the Lombard Village Board of Trustees, the Board remanded the petition back to the Plan Commission for an additional public hearing. The remand is intended to consider an amended petition to address modified sidewalk and public improvement plans within the Hickory Street public right of way. The petitioner undertook final engineering activities. Through this research, staff raised concerns with the shallow nature of the existing 90" combined sewer pipe that exists within the Hickory Street right of way. The proposed significant grade change will restrict the ability of the sidewalk being constructed per code on the north side of the street. Per the recommendation of the Community Development and Public Works staffs, the proposed sidewalk, which is required by code, would not be installed. The revised petition will waive the sidewalk requirement on the north side of Hickory, but would require the Lot 6 sidewalk, with a companion*

*crosswalk for Vance Street, if in the event that a sidewalk connection is needed in the future.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked for public comment, and, hearing none, opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.*

**A motion was made by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Flint, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition subject to following two (2) conditions.**

**1. The petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the plans submitted as part of this request from Roake and Associates, Inc. and Signature Design Group, based upon the revised date of June 16, 2016, as applicable; and**

**2. The petitioner shall seek final engineering approval from DuPage County and the Village. Upon such approval, the petitioner shall submit a final plat for Village Board approval and recording.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

**Absent:** 1 - Ronald Olbrysh

160331

**PC 16-16: 837 S. Westmore Meyers Road; WT Café**

Requests that the Village grant a conditional use, pursuant to Section 155.415(C)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow for catering services located within the B3PD Community Shopping District, Planned Development. (DISTRICT #6)

*Sworn in to present the petition was Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director of Community Development and the petitioners Matt and Mimi Tolkin.*

*Chairperson Ryan read the Plan Commissions procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine, and, hearing none, he proceeded with the petition.*

*Ms. Tolkin said she and her husband own the franchise business and live in Lombard. They have owned the business for two years. WT Café promotes healthy living and serves all natural food to children. All orders are done online. More than 50% of their business is from Lombard. She said they have shared space with a caterer but their business grew and they need more space. She said Eastgate Center will benefit from their business location. The space is large enough for their projected growth. She reviewed the standards for a conditional use.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked if any person would like to speak in favor or*

*against this petition, or for public comment. Ms. Nora Mineo asked about traffic and hours. Ms. Tolkin said they are open from 6am to 2:30pm Monday to Friday. Ms. Mineo asked where the trucks will come out, on Jackson or Westmore Meyers Road. Ms. Tolkin said one delivery vehicle and one personal use vehicle are used. Deliveries are from the back of the location two to three times per week and takes about 20 minutes. Ms. Tolkin said the deliveries will be from Jackson. Ms. Mineo asked about their current location. Ms. Tolkin said they are currently sharing space with Notable Events.*

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

*Ms. Ganser presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. WT Café is a Lombard business looking to relocate to 837 S. Westmore-Meyers Road, Eastgate Shopping Center. They are a small business with five employees that make school lunches to several schools in the western suburbs. WT Café is proposed to locate in the space formally occupied by Breadsmith. Breadsmith was open to the public and classified as a bakery. WT Café has a different business model, as a caterer, and therefore Village code requires a conditional use permit. Staff supports the request.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked for public comment, and, hearing none, opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.*

**A motion was made by Commissioner Sweetser, seconded by Commissioner Cooper, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition subject to following five (5) conditions.**

- 1. The petitioner shall be required to apply for and receive building permits for any improvements to the site;**
- 2. The petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report;**
- 3. The relief is only granted to the tenant space at 837 S. Westmore-Meyers Road, Unit #A-2H;**
- 4. All outside trash enclosures shall meet the Village's screen requirements; and**
- 5. Up to three (3) business vehicles for WT Café shall be allowed on site, to be parked in the parking rows abutting the front and back of the tenant space.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

**Absent:** 1 - Ronald Olbrysh

## **Business Meeting**

*The business meeting convened at 7:51 p.m.*

## **Approval of Minutes**

**On a motion by Commissioner Mrofcza, and seconded by Commissioner Flint, the minutes of the July 18, 2016 meeting were approved.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

**Absent:** 1 - Ronald Olbrysh

## **Public Participation**

*There was no public participation.*

## **DuPage County Hearings**

*There were no DuPage County hearings.*

## **Chairperson's Report**

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

## **Planner's Report**

*Ms. Ganser said that Ms. Papke had a memo that she passed out for the Plan Commission meeting on August 29, 2016. Ms. Papke explained she passed out a copy of the Yorktown Commons form-based codes so the Commissioners can re-familiarize themselves with the document in advance of the meeting.*

## **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

### Freestanding signage in the B3, B4, and B4A Districts - Workshop

*Ms. Ganser introduced the workshop item on freestanding signs in the B3, B4, and B4A zoning districts. She presented the staff report outlining the findings and recommendations. Ms. Ganser said that unlike the other zoning districts, B3, B4, and B4A allow for a freestanding sign to be larger if the business is on a state right-of-way. State right-of-ways include Roosevelt Road, North Avenue, Butterfield Road, Route 53, and portions of Highland Avenue. Freestanding signs on the above state right-of-ways are allowed to be up to one 125 square feet in area and 25 feet in height, as opposed to fifty 50 square feet and twenty 20 feet in height.*

*Staff contacted neighboring municipalities to determine if they allow businesses on state right-of-ways increased signage. These municipalities include Glen Ellyn, Villa Park, Downers Grove, Unincorporated DuPage County and Oakbrook Terrace that share portions of Butterfield and Roosevelt Road with Lombard. Ms. Ganser reviewed the chart in the memo and the various codes for each municipality.*

*Ms. Ganser said the proposed text amendment would not impact shopping center signs. Shopping center signs are allowed at 150 square feet and 35 feet in height. Shopping center signs are allowed at a larger size due to nature of the sign in that it is advertising multiple businesses.*

*Staff proposes the square footage should be based on the width of the roadway, not the jurisdiction of the roadway. Ms. Ganser referenced the chart in the memo with the approximant distances of signage from the state right-of-way.*



*Ms. Ganser asked the Commissioners if the Plan Commission agrees that the provision for a larger sign on state right-of ways should be amended and if the square footage should be based on the width of the roadway, not the jurisdiction of the roadway.*

*Commissioner Sweetser asked how this was brought to staffs attention. Ms. Ganser explained it was brought to their attention based on comments on the size certain signs and the rationale for them.*

*Commissioner Burke asked how many signs on the state right-of-way that would be out of conformance. Ms. Ganser said there would be a handful of signs that would be out of conformance but with the text amendments they would be allowed to keep and maintain the signs.*

*Ms. Ganser concluded that the Plan Commission case and public hearing petition is intended to be brought forth at an upcoming meeting.*

## **Adjournment**

**A motion was made by Commissioner Flint, seconded by Commissioner Sweetser, to adjourn the meeting at 7:59 p.m. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

**Absent:** 1 - Ronald Olbrysh

---

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission*

---

*Jennifer Ganser, Secretary  
Lombard Plan Commission*

**ORDINANCE \_\_\_\_\_**

**AN ORDINANCE APPROVING A TEXT AMENDMENT  
TO THE LOMBARD ZONING ORDINANCE  
TITLE 15, CHAPTER 153, SECTION 153.242(F)  
OF THE LOMBARD ZONING CODE**

PC 16-27: Text Amendments to the Sign Ordinance

WHEREAS, the Village of Lombard maintains a Sign Ordinance which is found in Title 15, Chapter 153 of the Lombard Code; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees deem it reasonable to periodically review said Sign Ordinance and make necessary changes; and,

WHEREAS, a public hearing to consider text amendments to the Sign Ordinance has been conducted by the Village of Lombard Plan Commission on December 19, 2016, pursuant to appropriate and legal notice; and,

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission has filed its recommendations with the President and Board of Trustees recommending approval of the text amendments described herein; and,

WHEREAS, the President and Board of Trustees approve and adopt the findings and recommendations of the Plan Commission and incorporate such findings and recommendations herein by reference as if they were fully set forth herein;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF LOMBARD, DU PAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS, as follows:

**SECTION 1:** That Title 15, Chapter 153, Section 153.242(F), of the Lombard Village Code is hereby amended as follows:

**§153.242 Wall signs.**

(F) Mixed signs prohibited: No wall sign may be displayed in conjunction with an awning, canopy, or projecting, ~~or window~~ sign

**SECTION 2:** That this ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval and publication in pamphlet form as provided by law.

Ordinance No. \_\_\_\_\_

Re: PC 16-27

Page 2

Passed on first reading this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2017.

First reading waived by action of the Board of Trustees this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2017.

Passed on second reading this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2017.

Ayes: \_\_\_\_\_

Nays: \_\_\_\_\_

Absent: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Keith T. Giagnorio, Village President

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon Kuderna, Village Clerk

Published in pamphlet from this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon Kuderna, Village Clerk

**ORDINANCE \_\_\_\_\_**

**AN ORDINANCE APPROVING A TEXT AMENDMENT  
TO THE LOMBARD ZONING ORDINANCE  
TITLE 15, CHAPTER 153, SECTION 153.505(B)(6)  
OF THE LOMBARD ZONING CODE**

PC 16-27: Text Amendments to the Sign Ordinance

WHEREAS, the Village of Lombard maintains a Sign Ordinance which is found in Title 15, Chapter 153 of the Lombard Code; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees deem it reasonable to periodically review said Sign Ordinance and make necessary changes; and,

WHEREAS, a public hearing to consider text amendments to the Sign Ordinance has been conducted by the Village of Lombard Plan Commission on December 19, 2016, pursuant to appropriate and legal notice; and,

WHEREAS, the Plan Commission has filed its recommendations with the President and Board of Trustees recommending approval of the text amendments described herein; and,

WHEREAS, the President and Board of Trustees approve and adopt the findings and recommendations of the Plan Commission and incorporate such findings and recommendations herein by reference as if they were fully set forth herein;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE PRESIDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE VILLAGE OF LOMBARD, DU PAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS, as follows:

**SECTION 1:** That Title 15, Chapter 153, Section 153.505(B)(6), of the Lombard Village Code is hereby amended as follows:

**§153.505(B)(6)**

Freestanding signs, in accordance with the provisions set forth in § 153.216. No freestanding sign shall be erected or maintained within any B3, B4 and B4A Community and Corridor Shopping Districts unless it also meets all of the following requirements:

- (a) Display: No business establishment shall display a freestanding sign unless the establishment is directly accessible by car and provides a minimum of four parking spaces on the premises where such freestanding sign is displayed.

- (b) Area: **Area of freestanding signs shall be permitted in accordance with the following table:**

**PERMITTED AREA OF FREESTANDING SIGNS BY ROW TYPE AND PROPERTY SIZE**

	<b><u>Adjacent Right-of-Way</u></b>		
	<b><u>State ROW &lt; 200' in width</u></b>	<b><u>State ROW ≥ 200' in width</u></b>	<b><u>All other rights-of-way</u></b>
<b><u>Freestanding sign</u></b>	<b><u>50 square feet</u></b>	<b><u>125 square feet</u></b>	<b><u>50 square feet</u></b>
<b><u>Freestanding sign on parcel with &gt; 150' frontage on state ROW</u></b>	<b><u>100 square feet</u></b>	<b><u>125 square feet</u></b>	<b><u>N/A</u></b>

- (i) ~~No freestanding sign shall exceed 50 square feet in sign surface area unless specifically regulated below.~~
- (ii) ~~Any freestanding sign fronting on a state right of way shall not exceed 125 square feet in sign surface area.~~
- (c) Setback:
- (i) The leading edge of freestanding signs shall not protrude beyond the edge of the adjacent right-of-way unless specifically regulated below.
- (ii) The leading edge of freestanding signs shall be set back a minimum of five feet from the street right-of-way.
- (d) Height:
- (i) The height of a freestanding sign shall not exceed 20 feet unless specifically regulated below. In all cases height shall be measured from grade at the edge of the right-of-way to the top of the sign.
- (ii) The height of any freestanding sign fronting on a state right-of-way **that is more than 200 feet in width** shall not exceed 25 feet. In all cases height shall be measured from grade at the edge of the right-of-way to the top of the sign.
- (e) Number: No more than one freestanding sign shall be maintained on any one parcel of property.
- (f) Distance between signs: All freestanding signs shall be located at least 100 feet apart; provided, however, that if such freestanding signs comply with all other provisions except the requisite distance between signs, and it is not reasonable to so comply with the distance between signs requirement, such freestanding signs shall be allowed to be maintained.
- (g) Freestanding sign design: Unless otherwise prohibited by the Lombard Building Code, the exterior appearance of all freestanding signs located within the B4A District shall be of the same or compatible material as the principal building on the respective property.

Ordinance No. \_\_\_\_\_

Re: PC 16-27

Page 3

**SECTION 2:** That this ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval and publication in pamphlet form as provided by law.

Passed on first reading this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2017.

First reading waived by action of the Board of Trustees this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2017.

Passed on second reading this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2017.

Ayes: \_\_\_\_\_

Nays: \_\_\_\_\_

Absent: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Keith T. Giagnorio, Village President

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon Kuderna, Village Clerk

Published in pamphlet from this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Sharon Kuderna, Village Clerk