

May 24, 1999

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

Subject: PC 99-18; 849 E. Roosevelt Road (Enterprise Rent-A-Car rental facility)

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. This petition requests Conditional Use approval to allow for motor vehicle sales/rentals in the B3 Community Shopping District.

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition on May 17, 1999.

Mario J. Petrella, Area Rental Manager for Enterprise Rent-A-Car, 880 N. York Road, Elmhurst, presented the petition. He stated that they needed to expand their current area which is located at Heritage Cadillac but Heritage Cadillac wanted them to move because they are currently planning to expand their business. He stated that the proposed site was selected because it has good visibility and has adequate area for parking their rental vehicles.

There was no one present to speak in favor this petition.

There were four people to speak against this petition. They were:

Ray Schuda, 1S051 Chase Avenue, stated that his family has lived in an adjacent home for over 25 years and have enjoyed the quietness of the neighborhood. He stated he was against this petition because it would result in a higher volume of motor vehicles, additional pollution, an outdoor business, and bright lights. He hoped that the zoning laws would prohibit this use and protect the residents. He referred to the staff report, specifically page 3, 2nd paragraph, which refers to rental vehicles being screened from surrounding properties by an eight foot fence. He stated this was an untrue statement as the fence is only 6 feet. He also indicated that since the grade of the homes is

much higher than the adjacent property even a 12' fence wouldn't adequately screen the vehicles.

Peggy Shuda, 1 S 051 Chase, stated that the property at 849 Roosevelt has been poorly maintained and that she has been in contact with the Code Enforcement Division relative to the broken fence. She also confirmed that the fence that was recently installed was only 6 feet tall. She referred to the previous tenant and the unfavorable conditions that resulted. She stated that the landlord doesn't inspect the property nor does he seem to be concerned about his tenants or being a good neighbor. Lastly, she hoped that the Commission would not lose sight of the common good.

Thomas Gross, 639 Rockdale Circle, stated he was a resident in the same subdivision. He indicated he had a number of questions:

1. What would be the maximum number of cars stored at this facility?
2. Will any cleaning, repair and preparation of vehicles be done at that facility? He was concerned about the water/detergent runoff.
3. The impact of traffic on Roosevelt Road.
4. The hours of operation and if it will be open on weekends.

Additionally, he stated the grade on which the homes are located is much higher than that of the adjacent property and therefore, will still be able to see over the fence. He felt that viewing cars was undesirable and he was opposed.

David Bardack, 508 Pine Lane, stated he was head of external development for the co-op. He asked for clarification as to the number of spaces obligated to other businesses in the strip mall out of the 74 that were mentioned. He stated his concern was for future development of the businesses in the strip mall and was concerned about expansion should Enterprise take over the entire space or if other businesses should prosper.

Mr. Petrella, the petitioner, rebutted by stating that the property will only be used for car rentals and not car sales. Business hours would be 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. and not operate on a 24 hr. basis. He stated that no more than 10-15 vehicles would be stored on site at any given time as their business depends on car utilization. He indicated that all vehicles that will be stored on the property are clean, new models and therefore would not detract from the site.

Commissioner Sweetser questioned the petitioner about the activities and maintenance that would be required on site to keep their cars in good looking condition and asked if there would be any cleaning or washing of vehicles that

would result in the flow of water or detergent onto adjoining properties. The petitioner stated that all repairs that needed to be made to the vehicles would be sublet to other businesses and that the extensive cleaning would be done somewhere else like Road Pilot. Mr. Petrella did indicate that they may occasionally use glass cleaner or a vacuum cleaner. Commissioner Sweetser asked what kind of sound might be expected as a result of the business. The petitioner responded by stating that the only noise would be from the vacuum, which would be a normal vacuum cleaner. He stated that the vehicles would be stored in the rear and that employees would be the only ones to have cause to go back there.

David Sundland, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. He gave the location of the property and the names of some of the other tenants located in the shopping center. Mr. Sundland stated that the petitioner was looking for Roosevelt Road properties and it was staff who recommended this particular site because the parking lot was located in the rear and the stored vehicles would not be visible from the street, the vehicles would be screened by an 8' fence, the adjacent vacant property to the east is covered with trees and has a small a creek running along its west property line, which would ensure that a tree buffer would remain after development, and the property to the west does not overlook the rear parking lot. He stated that from staff's viewpoint it seemed like a logical place for this type of business to be located and that a rental business is not considered a nuisance use.

Mr. Sundland stated that he discovered only today that the original 8' fence located at the rear of the property was replaced with a 6' fence. He did indicate that height would still meet the required code height. Mr. Sundland indicated that all vehicles would be parked in the rear of the building. Finally, he indicated that the proposed use is at an acceptable location and staff was recommending approval with conditions.

Chairperson Ryan opened the public hearing for discussion and questions by the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Kramer stated that this was a reasonable use and that the site is acceptable but realized that the residents in the rear do overlook the fence because of the higher grade. She had a concern that when the cars are being released from the building that prospective customers are not allowed to go to the rear of the property and the cars are pulled to the front.

Commissioner Kramer asked if the petitioner had intended to install additional lighting. The petitioner stated that do not have any plans for additional lighting at this time but should the cars get damaged or for any future security reasons, additional lighting might need to be addressed.

Commissioner Kramer addressed the issue of the 6' replacement fence and stated she felt it appropriate that an 8' fence be installed.

Commissioner Sweetser agreed with Commissioner Kramer and stated that this use is a good match. She suggested that the petitioner might consider putting in some trees to provide more of a buffer. Commissioner Kramer and the petitioner indicated that there was no room.

Commissioner Olbrysh also agreed with Commissioner Kramer and stated that an 8' fence should be installed since the posts are 8'.

Commissioner Kramer asked legal counsel if they could insert additional conditions as it relates to limiting the hours of operation, a limitation as to no car sales and a limitation relating to the cleaning/repairs on site. Ms. Petsche stated that would be acceptable.

After due consideration of the petition and the testimony presented, the Plan Commission found that the proposal does comply with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinances and the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the Plan Commission, by a roll call vote of 6 to 0, recommended to the Corporate Authorities, approval of the petition associated with PC 99-18 with the following conditions.

1. That all rental vehicles shall be parked in the parking lot to the rear (south) of the building.
2. That an eight-foot (8') tall wood fence shall be installed and maintained along the full length of the south property line.
3. That all dumpsters on the site shall be enclosed by a six-foot (6') tall wood fence.
4. That no car sales shall take place at the site.
5. That the hours of operation be limited to 7 a.m. to 6 p.m.
6. That no repairs or extensive cleaning shall take place on site.

Re: PC 99-18

Page 5

Respectfully,

VILLAGE OF LOMBARD

Donald F. Ryan
Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission

DAH:jd
att-

c. Petitioner
Lombard Plan Commission

m:\worduser\pccases\99\99-18\reflect.doc