



# 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, January 28, 2013

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.*

*Chairperson Ryan called the Order of the Agenda.*

### Roll Call of Members

*Also present: William Heniff, AICP, Director of Community Development and George Wagner, legal counsel to the Plan Commission.*

### Public Hearings

[120596](#)

**PC 12-19: 300 W. 22nd Street (Covington/Cove Landing Planned Development) (Continued from December 17, 2012)(Request to continue to February 18, 2013)**

Requests the following actions be taken on the subject property, located within an R5 General Residence District Planned Development:

1. Pursuant to Section 155.504(A) (major changes in a planned development) and Section 155.511 (Site Plan Approvals for planned developments) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, amend the conditional use for the Covington/Cove Landing Planned Development, as established by Ordinance 1174 and as amended by Ordinances 1321, 1390, 2977 and 3183, to allow for the construction of an eighty (80) unit assisted living facility on the subject property, per the submitted plans.

2. Pursuant to Section 155.410 (C) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, grant a Conditional Use for an assisted living facility (convalescent and nursing home). (DISTRICT #3)

*Chairperson Ryan indicated that this petition was continued from the December 17, 2012 meeting. The petitioner has requested that this petition be continued to the February meeting. He reminded the Commissioners that if a motion is made for a continuance, it must include a waiver of the rule limiting petitions to one continuance.*

**A motion was made by Ronald Olbrysh, seconded by Ruth Sweetser, to continue this matter to the February 18, 2013 meeting with a waiver of the rule. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**William Heniff read the Rules of Procedures as written in the Plan Commission By-Laws.**

[130033](#)

**PC 13-01: 416 W. 22nd Street**

Requests conditional use approval to allow for a physical culture and massage establishment (as defined and regulated by Chapter 12, Section 122 of the Code of Ordinances) in the B3 Community Shopping District. (DISTRICT #3)

*Shawn Kim presented the petition on behalf of the petitioner, Rene Reyna. Mr. Kim stated that Mr. Reyna was interested in investing in, and operating, a spa and massage establishment. He thought it would be a lucrative opportunity and beneficial to Village residents and visitors. Mr. Reyna recognizes some of the concerns with this type of business but assures this will be a safe, clean and professional business catering to the local community. He researched and found multi-family residential units, office buildings, and commercial shopping surrounding the proposed location which would be ideal for his business. This establishment will maintain a professional environment and hire certified massage therapists. The business will have an open view so its use is clear to the public.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone was present to speak in favor or against the petition. No one spoke in favor or against the petition, or had any questions about it.*

*William Heniff, Director of Community Development, entered the staff report into the public record in its entirety. The petitioner requests a conditional use for a massage establishment in a B3 Community Shopping District. The proposed use will occupy a 1,200 square foot space within a commercial strip center. The proposed business will be operated by the owner, a manager and licensed massage therapist,*

*with up to two additional therapists. The petitioner submitted a concept plan for the proposed establishment. There will be no external improvements to the property. Prior to commencing the proposed massage establishment, the applicant is required to receive approval for a Village Massage Establishment Business License.*

*In 2006, the Village Board approved a massage establishment at 406 W. 22nd Street as part of PC 06-08. Ownership of that salon changed and massage is not currently offered at that business. Staff believes the petitioner has addressed the standards for conditional use. The request is consistent with past approvals and should not have any negative impacts on the area. Staff recommends approval of the petition with the four suggested conditions.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked if there were any questions regarding the staff report. Hearing none, he opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.*

*Commissioner Sweetser asked if the petitioner was aware of and agreed to the conditions in the staff report. Mr. Kim stated that they were aware of the conditions.*

**A motion was made by Ruth Sweetser, seconded by Stephen Flint, that the Plan Commission adopt certain findings and recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of the petition subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. The petitioner shall operate the tenant space in accordance with the preliminary interior building sketch plan, prepared by petitioner dated December 27, 2012.**
- 2. The conditional use for the physical culture and massage establishment is exclusively for the tenant space at 416 W. 22nd Street. Any expansion of the establishment within the existing shopping center beyond what was submitted as part of PC 13-01, shall require an amendment to the conditional use approval.**
- 3. The massage establishment to be located on the premises shall apply for and receive a license from the Village of Lombard prior to opening. Said establishment shall meet all provisions of Chapter 12, Section 122 of the Village Code and shall keep its license in good standing. Moreover, all massage therapists employed or performing massage activity on the premises must have a current license from the State of Illinois.**
- 4. The petitioner shall be required to apply for and receive a building permit for any improvements to the interior of the tenant space prior to starting the build-out of the tenant space.**

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

**[130034](#)**

**SPA 13-01ph: 1-378 Yorktown Center**

Requests Site Plan Approval for the following signage deviations from the Lombard Sign Ordinance for property located within the B3 Community Shopping District, Yorktown Center Planned Development:

1. A variation from Section 153.208(H) to allow signs to be displayed within the clear line of sight area.
2. A deviation from Section 153.210 to allow for automatic changeable reader boards in excess of nine (9) square feet in area.
3. A deviation from Section 153.218 to allow for informational signs to be greater than six (6) square feet in area and greater than four (4) feet in height.
4. A deviation from Section 153.235 to allow for multiple shopping center identification signs in excess of 150 square feet to be displayed in conjunction with other freestanding signs and less than 75 feet from the centerline of the adjacent right-of-way.
5. A deviation from Sections 153.242 and 153.505 to allow for projecting signs to be located on any building elevation regardless of frontage or entrance location. (DISTRICT #3)

*Donna Blair, 203 Yorktown Center, Lombard, introduced her team members: John Emshwiller of Gensler Design, Steven Kriegel of Yorktown Center and Jerry Cohen of Yorktown Center. They were present tonight to present their master signage plan for Yorktown Center. As relatively new owners she will explain who they are and their vision.*

*Yorktown Center was purchased in April of last year by KRE YTC and developed a great team to look at the asset comprehensively. Jerry Cohen who is the General Manager continued in that capacity in order to help guide the new ownership in the new direction. Steve Kriegel is the head of development and is helping with the construction and repositioning. John Emshwiller is with Gensler Design and is the architect working with the proposed designs. The ownership is KRE YTC but it is a partnership and as an investor they have the financial assets to improve the center and are focusing on making decisions on site. She is the owner representative on site and works with the people on site to make sure objectives are met as well as to help facilitate any development. Ms. Blair explained that they wanted to understand what Yorktown Center is in order to reposition it to be bigger and better. As a result, they conducted multiple focus groups in order to get ideas and understand what the center means to various groups. The theme they heard over and over again was that they needed a fresh look, the common areas needed to be more modern, to create a better identity to meet the needs of all the tenants, and*

*lastly, better wayfinding. As a result, they took those ideas and will be spending a lot of capital to reinvigorate and give Yorktown Center a new look.*

*At 7:56 p.m. Chairperson Ryan requested a short break in order for the petitioner to set up their presentation. Chairperson Ryan reconvened the meeting at 7:57 p.m.*

*Ms. Blair then presented the petition in a PowerPoint format.*

*Slide 1 shows the new welcoming main entry point. The transparency of the upper floors will be visible from Butterfield Road which will better show off the food court on the upper level. They wanted to create a modern look and inviting presence for Yorktown Center and this design also allows better traffic flow to the main entrance.*

*Slide 2 shows the center court. She referenced the old plans, which used to be very open and light, but over the years the additions to the center have made it more enclosed. They decided to go back to the original historical plan and create an open inviting area. They will improve the ponds, elements of water, have great landscaping, and new common area seating.*

*Slide 3 is a rendering of the proposed food court. One of the comments derived from the focus groups was that there are no healthy options. They will now offer fresh healthy alternatives. The architecture of the food court will be changed to have counters, higher tables with charging stations and free Wi-Fi, areas of community tables for families, a new family area that will have children-height tables and chairs and a family lounge. They will also have brand new restroom facilities.*

*Slide 4 shows their branding. The logo that was chosen to identify who they are and have ties to the community. They went back to the roots of Lombard and chose a petal from a lilac plant. The various colors can be used over the seasons.*

*Ms. Blair stated that in addition to the inside, the outside of Yorktown Center also needs to be looked at in regard to signage and parking lot structure. They are asking for consideration of their signage master plan. They have been sensitive to the existing ordinances, but, due to the scale of the site, as well as so many tenants inside the mall that have no direct visibility, and the need to be competitive in the marketplace and secure more tenants into the space, they are requesting variations to the Sign Ordinance. Their three primary goals are:*

1. *Better wayfinding;*
2. *Provide opportunities for signage for all tenants; and*
3. *Create good visibility for Yorktown Center with pylon signage. They are trying to identify all the areas as "Yorktown" instead of referring to the mall as separate entities (The Shops on Butterfield, the convenience center, etc.).*

*John Emshwiller of Gensler Designs stated they were tasked to come up with a comprehensive signage and wayfinding program to tie in the user's needs and address some of the confusing sense of orientation around the property. They came up with a program that examined the major touch points entering the mall and the property itself. One of the key factors was to look at primary pylon signage for the entries. The dimensions and scale of the signs are similar to what currently exist. The materials and color pallets were shown.*

*He displayed a color and signage color palette and a materials board. He explained that they wanted a color palette that would be friendly over the seasons and materials that would last long. They also wanted to capture what the evolution of Yorktown would be.*

*He then displayed the pylon signage rendering and described the materials that would be used. It would be internally lit and the upper part of the leaf would be cut out so you would be able to see the sky. The left panel would list anchor tenant signage. It would allow only six tenants to be listed at one time but gives the inside mall tenants the exposure they need. The panels have flexibility in that they can be swapped out when a tenant name needs to be changed. The lower portion of the sign is an LED modular unit.*

*Next was a rendering of a daytime and nighttime views. Luminosity will determine the strength of the lighting but will meet outdoor standards. This will be static signage which will change every 8-9 seconds.*

*The 3rd pylon sign will be located on the Butterfield Road side. It will not have an LED component but will use materials similar to the other pylon signs and just list the six tenants on the panel.*

*Due to the elevations at the corner of Highland Avenue and Butterfield Road, they wanted a ground sign that would serve as a wayfinding tool but also have a gateway presence. He described the sign, the materials and colors that were being used, and that the sign will be internally lit. Next a daytime and nighttime rendering of the sign was shown.*

*Their philosophy on the project was not to oversign so the majority of*

*the signs will be just replaced. They are proposing smaller signage than currently exists. He showed an elevation of the Yorktown sign. He described the materials of this sign and indicated the materials are the same as the other signs. Daytime and nighttime views were shown. The site lines for this sign are within the property lines and set back from the curbs.*

*Paul Mitchell School will be a new tenant and their signage will be next to the entrance alongside Lucky Strike Lanes. They have been working with Paul Mitchell to equal out and balance the entrance signage alongside the Lucky Strike signage. They want to ensure that Paul Mitchell has the appropriate signage so they decided to create a blade sign about 7-1/2 feet wide which would be secured to the building.*

*Vehicular directional signage will be added towards the inner circle of the mall. Each tenant will be identified and arrows will denote the direction in which the anchor tenants are located. Beyond this they developed a thorough signage and wayfinding package which the Commissioners have.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked if there was anyone presented to speak in favor or against the petition, or had any questions about it.*

*Winnie Lyons, 274 E. Circle Avenue, Lombard, requested that the color lilac be incorporated into the signage plans as that color is more significant to the town. Ms. Blair answered that when they contemplating the logo they wanted to be sensitive to the lilac and chose the petal but wanted to have the ability to take artistic liberty with the petal. They will be doing banners outside and noted they can incorporate some of the color lilac into the banners. They are proud to be part of Lombard and are trying to be sensitive to some of the historical aspects of the community.*

*Cathy Allip, 2015 S. Finley Rd., #902, Lombard, asked how long the renovation work will take. Ms. Blair responded that they will complete the center court, main entry food court and implement part of the signage program in 2013. The rest of the signage program and parking lot and traffic improvements will be completed in in 2014. They will continue to study the traffic issues and make sure we don't rush through that in order to create a safe environment. By the holidays this year, the interior will be done which will include a roster of new tenants.*

*Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.*

*William Heniff stated that the staff report was being submitted to the*

*public record in its entirety. As part of an overall improvement plan for Yorktown Center, the new owners have proposed a comprehensive signage package addressing all types of exterior signs. Several of these fall under the regulations of the Sign Ordinance, including shopping center identification signs, informational signs, and one projecting sign.*

*For informational purposes and in the interest of presenting a more complete picture of their proposed imaging, the petitioner has also included additional information on incidental signs such as parking identification signs, directories, and banners. These signs do not require any action on the part of the Plan Commission.*

*Mr. Heniff provided the history of the planned development and noted the Sign Ordinance deviations:*

*A variation from Section 153.208 (H) to allow signs to be displayed within the clear line of sight area.*

*The Sign Ordinance prohibits signs from being located with clear line of sight areas, which are defined by the Zoning Ordinance as “triangular-shaped areas adjacent to intersecting, improved rights-of-way, private streets, or access drives maintained to preserve clear visibility at the intersection.” The proposed secondary shopping center identification signs where Grace Street ends within Yorktown Center (sign A.02.03) and near the entrance off Majestic Drive (sign A.02.02) are within such areas.*

*As shown in the petitioner’s Sight Line Study, Sign A.02.02 will be along the hypotenuse of the clear line of sight triangle, minimizing its intrusion into the area. The sign will only obstruct the rear 1.5 feet of the area, so its impact on vehicular movements should be minimal.*

*Sign A.02.03 at Grace Street will also be toward the rear of the clear line of sight area. It is replacing an existing sign that has been at that location for numerous years without any demonstrated issues.*

*For these reasons, staff can support the requested clear line of sight variations in these two specific areas.*

*A deviation from Section 153.210 to allow for automatic changeable reader boards in excess of nine (9) square feet in area.*

*Both of the primary shopping center identification signs (A.01.01 and A.01.02) propose a full-color LED display module of approximately 52 square feet. However, since 2011, automatic changeable copy signs have been limited to no more than nine square feet in area. (Prior to 2011, displays were limited to 18 inches in height but were not restricted in terms of overall area.)*



*The stated need for the increase in size is two-part due to the nature of the adjacent roadways (high traffic, multi-lane roadways with relatively high speeds) as well as the function of the signs. Unlike a smaller property that may be entitled to an automatic changeable copy sign, Yorktown Center will be using the signs to advertise hundreds of distinct businesses and numerous special events and promotions throughout the year. The petitioner has represented that the proposed display boards will fully comply with all other regulations associated with the duration of the message and the inclusion of photosensitive equipment.*

*Due to the unique natures of both the Yorktown Center property and the proposed sign locations, staff can support the requested relief for the proposed automatic changeable copy sign.*

*A deviation from Section 153.218 to allow for informational signs to be greater than six (6) square feet in area and greater than four (4) feet in height.*

*To allow for greater mobility and accurate tenant information, informational signs are utilized throughout shopping centers to guide patrons to their destinations. The size and nature of Yorktown Center create a greater need for directional signage than would typically be necessary for a single-tenant property. Staff can support this request as the signs are informational in nature (as opposed to advertising) and are intended to complement or supplement other types of wayfinding signage found in large shopping centers.*

*A deviation from Section 153.235 to allow for multiple shopping center identification signs in excess of 150 square feet to be displayed in conjunction with other freestanding signs and less than 75 feet from the centerline of the adjacent right-of-way.*

*Similar to the rationale for the requested automatic changeable copy sign relief, the stated need for the increase in size is two-part due to the nature of the adjacent roadways (high traffic, multi-lane roadways with relatively high speeds) as well as the function of the signs.*

*Yorktown Center will be using the primary shopping center identification signs (A.01.01 and A.01.02) to permanently feature major anchors in addition to the LED component that will promote smaller tenants and special events. These signs will replace the existing "tombstone"-style shopping center identification signs at the same locations.*

*The proposed gateway sign at the southwest corner of the property (Sign A.05 at Butterfield Road and Highland Avenue) will be a new sign. Although at 300 square feet it is a large sign, the open, channel*

*letter design minimizes its bulk while still providing a necessary identifier at this prominent gateway into both Yorktown Center and the Village of Lombard.*

*Due to the unique natures of both the Yorktown Center property and the proposed sign locations, staff can support the requested relief for shopping center identification sign size and location.*

*A deviation from Section 153.242 and 153.505 to allow for wall and projecting signs to be located on any building elevation regardless of frontage or entrance location.*

*This relief is specific to the proposed tenant sign for Paul Mitchell: The School (A.04.01). The aforementioned sections denote that signage can only be placed on building elevations that are parallel or perpendicular to the public right-of-way. Technically, Butterfield Road and Highland Avenue would be considered the only street exposures for this tenant space. A strict application of this provision would preclude businesses oriented away from those streets from having signage on the exterior building elevation. To alleviate this issue, the requested deviations would allow this business to erect a sign on any elevation. Staff recommends a condition of approval be added to limit the relief granted to this specific sign.*

*Lastly, staff believes that the proposed signage package is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan and the surrounding land uses as it provides an ancillary function and draws people from a regional market. Also, the petition meets the standards for variations established by the planned development, is in the public interest and is consistent with the underlying provisions. Staff recommends approval of this petition subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.*

*Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting to comments and questions by the Commissioners.*

*Commissioner Sweetser stated she was pleased with the proposed signage and major improvements the new owners are undertaking. Referring to previously discussed cases, the issue of increasing connectivity with the rest of the center always comes up and asked if they planned on doing that. Ms. Blair responded that this issue will be addressed as part of their traffic study. While they will be considering changes to the ring road as well as traffic patterns to develop better connectivity, they are not at the point to present a plan.*

*Commissioner Sweetser stated that she believes this has great potential. While she wasn't expecting to see anything right now, she asked about the potential of future shuttle service and bike traffic*

*including bike paths connecting the entire Village. Mr. Heniff responded that staff has continually been addressing the connection issues from the mall to other entities in various ways. He mentioned the Village's involvement in the circulator study, which was a local transit project, that was never initiated due to a lack of funding by the RTA. Staff is also having discussions on a continual basis with Pace as well as Yorktown representatives trying to develop other concepts like additional transit center operations and structures. From a regional standpoint, we have talked with groups like the Cook DuPage Corridor Committee to find transportation solutions to meet the needs of the Butterfield corridor with the idea of extending some regional transportation planning out to Yorktown Mall. Staff has also been engaged in conversations with Yorktown Mall representatives about bike connectivity across Highland Avenue to reach the neighborhoods to the west. This becomes more important as some of the outlots become developed. The idea is to get people from the perimeter into the mall itself.*

*Commissioner Cooper commented that she thought the submittal package was beautifully laid out and an elegant approach. She liked the creativity and the look of the sign they used to solve the visual problem at the corner of Butterfield and Highland. She referred to the pillars and commented that they seemed very large at 30' tall and asked if the existing pillars were the same height. Mr. Emshwiller answered that the existing pillars are 27' high and the height they have chosen is allowable by code.*

*Commissioner Cooper stated she also had a concern with the digital LED. It is part of their job to protect the citizens and visitors of the mall so she appreciated that it be a continuous message and not be distracting. Ms. Blair indicated that the sign is 5' x 9'8". It is not a billboard size but comparable to the television screen in the Board Room. It will be used for promotions such as when they have events like the Easter Bunny, Pet Photos, Susan G. Kolman, or when a new tenant opens up to display their logo with the words "Grand Opening" or convey what is happening inside the mall. This sign will also eliminate the need to display banners. Ms. Blair stated that tenants are demanding this type of signage and visibility opportunities. Developers have to take a more creative approach but at the same time be sensitive to distractibility. Safety is of utmost concern.*

*Commissioner Mrofcza asked if the sign would be changing on an ongoing basis or if there be a slight incremental pause as he was concerned about driver distraction and safety. Ms. Blair answered that it would go from one image to the next. Mr. Emshwiller indicated that this type of sign can be programed in multiple ways. They desire minimal distraction and can do field studies to achieve it. The quality*

*of the LED is important to producing a high quality product. The LED they will be using has twice the resolution and would be similar to watching a television screen.*

*Commissioner Mrofcza asked how the red brick color was selected and if it was a personal preference for the 30' signs. Mr. Emshwiller answered that the choice was based on keeping true to Yorktown's existing architecture as most of it is brick red. If they introduced a loud color, it would be a distraction so they wanted to keep the color within the existing palette. Some of the new materials being introduced, such as the wood and aluminum, would add a contemporary finish.*

*Mr. Heniff responded to Commissioner Mrofcza's comment by adding that the Sign Ordinance does have a prohibition against scrolling sign messages.*

**A motion was made by Stephen Flint, seconded by Andrea Cooper, that the Plan Commission adopt certain findings and approve the petition subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. The petitioner shall develop the site in substantial conformance with the plans, prepared by Gensler and dated January 9, 2013 and the relief shall be limited as follows:**
  - a. The variation from Section 153.208(H) to allow signs to be displayed within the clear line of sight area shall be limited to the signs identified on the aforementioned plans as Signs A.02.02 and A.02.03.**
  - b. The deviation from Section 153.210 to allow for automatic changeable reader boards in excess of nine (9) square feet in area shall be limited to the signs identified on the aforementioned plans as Signs A.01.01 and A.01.02.**
  - c. The deviation from Section 153.218 to allow for informational signs to be greater than six (6) square feet in area and greater than four (4) feet in height shall be limited to the signs identified on the aforementioned plans as Signs B.01 (all).**
  - d. The deviation from Section 153.235 to allow for multiple shopping center identification signs in excess of 150 square feet to be displayed in conjunction with other freestanding signs and less than 75 feet from the centerline of the adjacent right-of-way shall be limited to the signs identified on the aforementioned plans as Signs A.01, A.02, A.05.**
- 2. Deviations from Section 153.242 and 153.505 shall be granted only relative to the "Paul Mitchell: The School" establishment as shown on page 16 of the submitted plans.**
- 3. Informational signs shall not exceed seven (7) feet in height and thirty-nine (39) square feet in signage area.**
- 4. Any future signs involving the subject property shall apply for and receive a building permit. Those permits will be reviewed in connection with the aforementioned conditions.**
- 5. The petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the IDRC report.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

[120489](#)

**PC 12-18: Village Comprehensive Plan Amendment (1S535 Finley Road - Ken Loch Golf Course)(Continued from December 17, 2012)**

Consideration of amendments to the Village Comprehensive Plan pertaining to the Land Use recommendation for the Ken Loch Golf Course. (UNINCORPORATED)

*Prior to taking public testimony, Chairperson Ryan informed the audience that if they spoke at a previous Plan Commission meeting, their comments are noted as part of the public record. If they had new comments to add, they should do so at this time.*

*Bernard Dudek, 270 W. 17th St., Lombard, thanked the Plan Commission for listening and inviting residents to comment over the past four months on the recommendation to revise the Comprehensive Plan as to our unincorporated neighbor, Ken Loch Golf Course. He mentioned his frustration with the lack of public notification back in September and how a neighbor happened to see the item listed on the Plan Commission agenda a few days before. They have been told off the record that a planned development is a done deal and the neighbors' participation is irrelevant. He said that they offer a united position of opposition to the planned development. Mr. Dudek realizes that the Plan Commission has reiterated that it is a simple land use recommendation and there is no planned development under discussion. Commissioners have also sought to clarify any misunderstandings in regard to the process. But this conversation began last April when a developer and their attorney Bob Schillerstrom, who is powerful and connected, approached the Village Board with specific plans. Mr. Dudek suggested that it cannot be ignored that the desire to develop a project is not connected to this attempt to change the land use. It is known that a decision to change the Comprehensive Plan opens a door that cannot be closed. The property is unincorporated currently but completely surrounded by the Village's boundaries. This proposed development cannot occur without the Village's support of services and utilities. This is a fight over an unwanted development. Residents cannot sit back while key decisions are being made or the battle will have already been lost to the detriment of the Village as a whole. No one except the developer, lawyer and Kensinger Family have voiced anything other than open space. If recommendations are made based on finances, the studies and analysis of the site challenge the fiduciary responsibility of supporting a high density residential development on this land.*

*Nancy Schukat, 1801 S. Elizabeth St., Lombard, asked Chairperson Ryan if the Commission had made a decision of open space. He responded that no decision has been made. She expressed her desire*

*that the property remain open space.*

*Marymae Meyer, 414 W. Windsor Av., Lombard, stated that her view from the start has been a broader picture, not just about the neighborhood, but concerning vanishing open space in urban areas. She is a farm girl who doesn't have a farm anymore which was taken over by industry. She has done extensive study of the changing land within Lilacia Park. Her observation is that the public record that exists boils down to static, black and white print with a few photos. It is flat and lacks the passion exhibited by the people who came out to speak at each meeting. She understands that the Plan Commission is limited to recommending actions to the Village Board. Ms. Meyer requests with today's technology to consider including the videos of the meetings held over the past several months to be filed with the records of these forums. It would represent a record to historians who will view the true passion, diversity and age groups that have come forward to save this open space. It would be better if our voices are heard the best they can be. She questioned whether decision makers view the proceedings in order to get the true essence of the topic.*

*Mr. Heniff stated that the Plan Commission meetings are televised on local Lombard Channel (TV 6 or 99) and are available on the Village's website anytime. Official minutes and a referral letter are sent to the Village Board outlining the concerns of the participants. It is part of the record that is transmitted to the Village Board for their consideration. Ms. Meyer requested assurance that there will be a link or DVD for the Village Board to view this and past proceedings in order to reflect the passion of the people on this issue. Mr. Heniff stated that all videos of the meetings pertaining to this topic are available.*

*Muzammil Saeed, 230 W. 17th St., Lombard, stated that he lives near the property discussed and is a candidate for Trustee District 3 and would like the property to remain open space.*

*Moon Khan, 562 S. Stewart St., Lombard, stated that he came to the meeting to implore and urge the Plan Commissioners to respect the passion and unanimous support of the Village residents for open space. He hopes there is respect for this support. He believes that it is not simply a District 3 concern but pertains to the Village as a whole.*

*Rafi Hamid, 31 W. 17th St., Lombard, has lived at this address since 1996 and has lived in the Village of Lombard since 1988. Mr. Hamid loves the village and the area and wants to keep the property as open space with no construction.*

*Chairperson Ryan called for any additional testimony. Hearing none, he requested the staff report.*

*Mr. Heniff stated that all previous documents will be part of the public records in their entirety. If something is not mentioned and has been submitted in writing, it is part of the permanent record. This includes all letters, analysis, staff comments, etc. The Comprehensive Plan has been under review by the Plan Commission pertaining to the preferred land use for the Ken Loch Golf Course property. He gave a synopsis of the description and procedures undertaken over the past several months.*

*He stated that the Comprehensive Plan is a visionary document with the intent to represent the desires of the community's property allowances and is not specific. It represents property development for the next generations and provides a framework for property development. The Plan Commission and the Village Board will be examining the goals and responsibilities of the Village as it relates to the use of the land. Fiscal responsibility along with other factors will be balanced with the prevailing opinions of the community. The Plan Commission should be specific in its recommendation.*

*Chairperson Ryan opened the public hearing to the Commissioner's for their questions and comments.*

*Commissioner Sweetser questioned the reference to the property as previously identified as large lot single residential. Mr. Heniff responded that prior to 2010 the subject property was designated as large lot residential. In 2010, the Comprehensive Plan was revised to identify the property as open space. A concept submitted by a developer last year started the process of re-examining the land use of the property. This concept happened to be a high density residential plan and is not the component to be discussed but to be kept at a more generic tone. If it was decided that high density residential land use were appropriate for this property, any specific plans would still need to go through the formal public hearing process of the Plan Commission.*

*Commissioner Cooper asked about preservation of open space in the report and requested clarification. Mr. Heniff responded that to maintain the property as open space only may limit preservation to being privately funded without specific clarification of ancillary type support or it may have to be publicly supported. Commissioner Cooper questioned the need for a precise percentage at this point. Mr. Heniff responded that it is a policy guide post.*

*Commissioner Olbrysh stated that he would like to hear from the Park District. He also supports the open space designation and noted that the attendees should voice their concerns when this matter is brought*

*before the Board.*

*Commissioner Sweetser asked for clarification regarding whether seventy-five percent open space still qualifies as open space. Mr. Heniff responded that the qualification is outlined in the Village of Lombard's ordinance and has been commonly used in the past.*

*Chairperson Ryan stated that the overall opinion of the Commission is in favor of open space and the reality of financing it as such is a challenge. The property owners could still make developments without the Village if the land use is too restrictive.*

*Commissioner Flint expressed the unique opportunity the property presents as a possible public venture.*

*Commissioner Sweetser considered the compromise of allowing an accessory use on a portion of the land and that it may be the only way to maintain the majority of the property as open space.*

*Commissioner Cooper asked if amending the property to allow twenty-five percent as accessory uses would increase the property's value. Mr. Heniff responded that the Comprehensive Plan designation does not indicate property value.*

*Commissioner Mrofcza stated that allowing a percentage of accessory development would improve the likelihood of the site achieving an attractive outcome as opposed to becoming an eyesore. It would keep options open in the long term.*

*Commissioner Sweetser suggested reducing the twenty-five percent based on specific proposals.*

*The Commissioners debated the allowable open space percentage available for development. The higher number allows for flexibility and projects can be approved on individual merit. It also alerts developers that the particular portion is required to be an accessory and supportive use only.*

**A motion was made by Ronald Olbrysh, seconded by John Mrofcza, Jr., that this petition be recommended to the Corporate Authorities for approval as follows:**

- 1. That Ken-Loch Golf Links should be designated primarily Open Space with a preference for golf course and an option of accessory land uses that complements and facilitates the preservation of the property, not to exceed 25% of the principal open space use, which designation is consistent with the Goals, Objectives and Policies and the overall Comprehensive Plan, does not affect the adequacy of existing or planned facilities and services of the Village**



or planning area generally, and results in reasonably compatible land-use relationships; and

2. The the Recommendations section of the Open Space Plan Component of the Comprehensive Plan, as it relates to Ken-Loch Golf Links, be amended to clarify the phrase "open space/golf course amenity", to be and read in its entirety as follows:

Regarding Ken-Loch Golf Links, the Village should amend its annexation recommendations to ensure that the property remains in use as open space. The previously offered alternative of large-lot single family development would result in an irreplaceable loss of open space. Accordingly, the property should only be annexed as part of a request and companion plan to enhance the open space/golf course amenity for the Village. The golf course amenity shall be preferred, but any other open space amenity is acceptable as the primary use. In addition, accessory land uses that complement and facilitate the preservation of the primary use, not to exceed 25% of the principal open space use, may be appropriate.

The motion carried by the following vote:

*Chairperson Ryan requested a break at 9:44 p.m.  
Chairperson Ryan reconvened the meeting at 9:45 p.m.*

## **Business Meeting**

*The business meeting convened at 9:45 p.m.*

## **Approval of Minutes**

*On a motion by Commission Flint and seconded by Commissioner Cooper the minutes of the December 17, 2012 meeting were unanimously approved by the members present.*

## **Public Participation**

*There was no public participation.*

## **DuPage County Hearings**

*There were no DuPage County hearings.*

## **Chairperson's Report**

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

## **Planner's Report**

*William Heniff thanked three of his former staff members, who have*

*since moved on with their careers, for their contributions to the Village including their recommendations to this Commission and others.*

### **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**

*There were no workshops.*

### **Adjournment**

*The meeting adjourned at 9:47 p.m.*

---

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission*

---

*William J. Heniff, Secretary  
Lombard Plan Commission*