



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: Christopher Stilling

Monday, March 19, 2012

7:30 PM

Village Hall - Board Room

Call to Order

Vice Chairperson Flint called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

Vice Chairperson Flint led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call of Members

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

Also present: Christopher Stilling, AICP, Assistant Director of Community Development; Michael Toth, Planner I; and George Wagner, legal counsel to the Plan Commission.

Vice Chairperson Flint called the order of the agenda.

Public Hearings

[120080](#)

**PC 12-08: 1021 N. DuPage Avenue (DuPage Riding Academy)
(Continued from February 20, 2012) (Request to Withdraw)**

Requests that the Village grant a conditional use, pursuant to Section 155.418 (C) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow for a learning center within the I Limited Industrial District. (DISTRICT #1)

Vice Chairperson Flint stated that this petition was continued from the February 20, 2012 meeting and that the petitioner has now requested that it be withdrawn.

A motion was made by Martin Burke, seconded by Ruth Sweetser, that this matter be withdrawn. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, Stephen Flint, and John Mrofcza

Absent: 1 - Donald F. Ryan

[120140](#)

PC 12-10: 300 W. Roosevelt Road

Requests that the Village grant a conditional use, pursuant to Section 155.417 (G) (2) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, to allow outside service areas for outdoor dining for the subject property located within the B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District. (DISTRICT #2)

Vice Chairperson Flint stated that the petitioner has requested a continuance to the April 16, 2012 Plan Commission meeting.

A motion was made by Martin Burke, seconded by Andrea Cooper, to continue the matter to the April 16, 2012 meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, Stephen Flint, and John Mrofcza

Absent: 1 - Donald F. Ryan

Christopher Stilling read the Rules of Procedure as written in the Plan Commission By-Laws.

[120139](#)

PC 12-09: 640 - 685 N. Charlotte Street and 2 - 23 E. LeMoyné Avenue

Requests that the Village take the following actions for the subject properties located in the R2PD Single-Family Residence District, Planned Development:

1. An amendment to Ordinances 4566 & 4772, for the Providence Glen Planned Development, to provide exceptions to the minimum rear yard setback requirements of the R2 Single-Family Residence District. This amendment would allow for a further deviation from Section 155.407(F)(4), as amended by Ordinance 5083, to reduce the rear yard setback from thirty-five (35) feet to fifteen (15) feet within the Providence Glen Planned Development, for purposes of constructing attached one-story screen porches (three season rooms).
2. A variation from Section 155.508(C)(6)(a) (Planned Development Standards) to allow the rear yards on the perimeter of the planned development to be less than that required in the abutting zoning district and underlying subject properties. (DISTRICT #4)

Matt Berberich, 661 N. Charlotte St., Lombard presented the petition. He stated that he is here tonight to request an amendment to the planned development known as Providence Glen. He stated that he has read the staff report, has met with staff multiple times and complemented staff on the report. He added that he believed

that this was one of the first times staff had to deal with a planned development amendment of this nature and he thinks they did an excellent job. He mentioned that staff conducted a survey of the people in the neighborhood, which is reflected in the report. He added that better than 50% support the amendment to the planned development. He stated that there are some 'unsures' and 'maybes', but anyone who's familiar with statistics realizes that those people probably don't understand the nature of the item at hand and chose to make a decision on lack of information. He added that the statistics show overwhelming support. Previous hearings indicate there has been support for a rear yard setback from people within his neighborhood as well as within the community.

Referring to the staff report, Mr. Berberich wanted to emphasize that the setback within his neighborhood is not thirty five feet, but thirty feet as previously amended when the builder originally placed the homes on the lots. He added that the front and side yard setbacks as well as the 50% open space requirement would not be altered. The staff report includes a recommendation for approval and denial and he would like this hearing to result in a recommendation of approval. He then mentioned the conditions in the staff report noting how important they are as he is in favor of limiting it to a three season room which would not require a foundation. Mr. Berberich then referenced a past variance case in the planned development involving a deck that was granted an exception due to the slope of the property. He stated that the deck is above the three foot average height and the deck abuts a retention pond.

Mr. Berberich stated that the survey was a good idea. He then discussed the neighborhood layout. He stated that the staff report states that there are residential lots to the east. In previous hearings it has been noted that those people signed a petition and sent emails to the Village in support of the variation. He then described the surrounding commercial land uses to the north and west and mentioned the adjacent retention ponds. He then added that there is a residential neighborhood to the south, but Goebel Drive clearly defines the two separate residential areas, which would reduce the impact of the proposal.

Mr. Berberich then referred to the standards to variations listed in the staff report, specifically the statements referring to additional bulk on the property. He believed these statements are untrue based upon the conditions listed in the staff report that would only

allow for three season rooms.

Vice Chairperson Flint asked if anyone was present to speak in favor or against the petition. No one in the audience spoke in favor or against the petition.

Vice Chairperson Flint then requested the staff report.

Michael Toth, Planner I, presented the staff report. On January 19, 2012, the Village Board denied a variation request (ZBA 11-06) for the property located at 661 N. Charlotte St. to reduce the required rear yard setback to fifteen feet (15') where thirty feet (30') is required, to allow for a screened porch addition. This denial was based on the lack of a demonstrated hardship unique to his property and that the requested relief was not consistent with the existing neighborhood.

In response to the denial, and to ensure that all properties in the neighborhood would be regulated equally, the property owner is now availing himself of another process which would change the setback regulations for all properties within the Providence Glen Subdivision. As such, the property owner is now petitioning, with the Village as a co-petitioner, to amend the planned development for the entire Providence Glen Subdivision to allow all properties within the subdivision the right to a further reduction from the existing thirty foot (30') rear yard setback to fifteen feet (15'), for purposes of constructing a screen porch addition. The proposed changes would not affect the minimum 50% open space requirement.

The Prairie Place Subdivision and Planned Development were approved by the Plan Commission on October 19, 1998, and by the Board of Trustees on November 19, 1998 (PC 09-28; Ord. 4566). The final plat for the subdivision was approved by the Board of Trustees on July 15, 1999, and a revised final plat was approved on November 18, 1999. As part of the final plat, the 32 residential lots within that subdivision were approved to include (30) foot rear yard setbacks, which is five (5) feet less than the thirty-five (35) foot rear yard required on other lots within the R2 Single-Family Residence District. The property was later sold to Concord Homes and renamed as Providence Glen.

Concord Homes had difficulty fitting their standard model homes on some of the lots as flooding conditions affected some of the properties, requiring substantial changes to the engineering,

resulting in minor changes to the subdivision layout. In order to adequately handle stormwater, the detention basins had to be enlarged, reducing the size, but not the configuration, of some of the lots. In 2000 (PC 00-06: Ord. 4772), the Providence Glen subdivision received approval for additional exceptions to the minimum setback requirements. As part of PC 00-06, the petitioner proposed a number of setback exceptions to the front, rear and corner side setbacks of a number of lots. More specifically, a reduction to the rear setback of lots 12 & 13 were proposed at twenty feet (20') and lot 18 was proposed at twenty-five (25) feet. Staff recommended against the reduction of lots 12 & 13 to a reduction of twenty feet (20') because the lots are located on a cul-de-sac and a reduction in depth was an issue because the lots already have narrow front yards.

When presented with a petition to vary a Zoning Ordinance provision (in this case a rear yard setback), the impact of such a proposal is almost exclusively examined through the variation process, on a case-by-case basis. Staff policy is not to first examine the validity of the actual Zoning Ordinance provision, unless deemed appropriate. As the subject properties are governed by a planned development agreement, the option to amend the rear yard setbacks, without amending the Zoning Ordinance, also becomes an option. Furthermore, there are two actions being requested as part of this petition, which would allow for the amendment to the planned development agreement:

1. An amendment to Ordinances 4566 & 4772, for the Providence Glen Planned Development, to provide exceptions to the minimum rear yard setback requirements of the R2 Single-Family Residence District. This amendment would allow for a further deviation from Section 155.407(F) (4), as amended by Ordinance 5083, to reduce the rear yard setback from thirty-five (35) feet to fifteen (15) feet within the Providence Glen Planned Development, for purposes of constructing attached one-story screen porches (three season rooms).

The proposed planned development amendment would allow all properties within the Providence Glen Subdivision the right to a further reduction from the existing thirty foot (30') rear yard setback to fifteen feet (15'), for purposes of constructing a screen porch addition. The 2009 International Residential Code defines Sunroom as, a one-story structure attached to a dwelling with a glazing area in excess of 40 percent of the gross area of the structure's exterior

walls and roof.

The 32 residential lots within the Providence Glen Subdivision differ in size and shape. As such, the planned development amendment would have different impacts on the different properties. The proposed amendments would provide relief pertaining specifically to the rear yard setback for the purposes of constructing a screen porch addition only, which would require that all other setback requirements and the 50% open space provision still be met. As the relief pertains specifically to screen porch additions, any other type of addition would be required to meet the underlying thirty (30) foot rear setback. Staff notes that the relief pertains only to screen porch additions as the petitioner constructed a structure that is similar to that of a sunroom (as defined by 2009 International Residential Code) - an attached one-story structure that maintains a minimum 40 percent 'open' area. Any other type of addition would require further relief as a standard building addition may consist of solid walls and be greater than one-story in height and contribute to additional bulk on a property.

- 2. A variation from Section 155.508(C)(6)(a) (Planned Development Standards) to allow the rear yards on the perimeter of the planned development to be less than that required in the abutting zoning district and underlying subject properties.*

Section 155.508(C)(6)(a) (Planned Development Standards) states, That all buildings are located within the planned development in such a way as to dissipate any adverse impact on adjoining buildings and shall not invade the privacy of the occupants of such buildings and shall conform to the following:

- a) The front, side or rear yard setbacks on the perimeter of the development shall not be less than that required in the abutting zoning district(s) or the zoning district underlying the subject site, whichever is greater.*

There are a total of nineteen (19) lots within the Providence Glen Subdivision that directly abut properties outside of the development. Furthermore, these lots represent 63% of the 32 total residential lots in the development. The following is a breakdown of those nineteen (19) lots according to adjacent land usage:

- a) Eleven (11) lots (or 34% of the 32 total lots) directly abut single-family residential properties, which are located to*

the east of the subject properties.

- b) *Eight (8) of the lots (or 25% of the 32 total lots) abut the commercial property adjacent to the southwest portion of the development (641 N. Main St.). Staff notes that the Comprehensive Plan designates the property located at 641 N. Main St. (Sid Harvey site) as Low Density Residential; as such, there is the possibility that this property could be redeveloped in the future to accommodate residential uses.*

As previously noted, 34% of the 32 lots that make up the Providence Glen Subdivision directly abut properties in the R2 - Single-Family District, located outside of the subdivision. As such, the rear yard setbacks on the perimeter of the development would be less than that required in the abutting zoning district, which is required to maintain a thirty-five (35) foot rear yard setback.

In order to solicit the opinion of all properties within the Providence Glen Subdivision and to help determine the initial level of support or objection to the planned development amendment, which would affect all properties within the development, Village staff sent a brief survey and map, attached to the staff report as Appendix A, illustrating the proposed amendments to the rear yard setbacks was sent to each respective property owner in the Providence Glen Subdivision on February 24, 2012. The neighborhood survey posed one question; would you support a rear yard setback reduction from thirty feet (30') to fifteen feet (15') for all properties within the Providence Glen Subdivision, to allow for attached one-story screen porch additions (three season rooms)? The responses, as of March 14, 2012, were as follows:

*32 surveys were sent
25 responses were received for a response rate of 78%
13 or 53% responded "yes" while 5 or 20% responded "no"
2 or 8% responded "unsure" while 5 or 20% responded "no opinion"*

The Comprehensive Plan recommends Low-Density Residential uses for the entire planned development. The proposed use conforms to the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan.

As previously stated, the Providence Glen Subdivision has historically had difficulty with the placement of the single-family homes on the platted lots. The Providence Glen subdivision received approval to provide for thirty (30) foot rear yards on each

of the 32 residential lots within that subdivision, which is five (5) feet less than the thirty-five (35) foot rear yard required on other lots within the R2 Single-Family Residence District. As reductions to the rear yard have already been reduced below that of the abutting R2 - Single-Family District properties, staff believes that a further reduction could drastically impact the characteristics of the Providence Glen Subdivision as well as the surrounding properties.

In order to be granted a planned development amendment (conditional use) or variation, the petitioner must demonstrate that they have affirmed the applicable standards. The following responses to standards, which have been prepared by staff, are not only intended to provide justification for staff's recommendation, but also validate which standards have not been affirmed by the petition.

As the establishment of the original planned development required conditional use approval and the petitioner is proposing to amend the original planned development agreement, the proposed amendment is required to meet all Standards for Conditional Uses. Staff finds that the following Standards for Conditional Uses have not been affirmed relative to the planned development amendment:

- a. That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the conditional use will not be detrimental to, or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare;*

34% of the 32 lots that make up the Providence Glen Subdivision directly abut properties in the R2 - Single-Family District, located outside of the subdivision. As such, the rear yard setbacks on the perimeter of the development would be less than that required in the abutting zoning district, which is required to maintain a thirty-five (35) foot rear yard setback. Staff believes that the proposed amendment could especially have a detrimental effect on the adjacent single-family neighborhood, located directly east of the Providence Glen Subdivision. Reference has been made regarding the distance of those structures on adjacent residential properties to that of the properties along the perimeter of the Providence Glen Subdivision, more specifically those residential properties located along the eastern boundary of the planned development. While staff recognizes that the single-family residences located directly to the east of the Providence Glen development are located on larger lots, staff believes that those properties should not be held accountable

for the additional fifteen feet of encroachment imposed by the proposed amendments.

- b. That the conditional use will not be injurious to the uses and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood in which it is to be located.*

The proposed planned development amendment would allow for screen porch additions (as previously defined) to be located within an area of the property which would have once been prohibited by Code. As such, a result of the amendment would be additional structural bulk on a property. Additional structural bulk could impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, increase the danger of fire, impair natural drainage, create drainage problems on adjacent properties, endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the subdivision and surrounding neighborhoods.

- g. That the conditional use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may, in each instance, be modified pursuant to the recommendations of the Plan Commission.*

The Providence Glen subdivision received approval in 2000 to provide for thirty (30) foot rear yards on each of the 32 residential lots within that subdivision, which is five (5) feet less than the thirty-five (35) foot rear yard required on other lots within the R2 Single-Family Residence District. The property owner is now petitioning the Village to amend the planned development governing the entire Providence Glen Subdivision to allow all properties within the subdivision the right to a further reduction from the existing thirty foot (30') rear yard setback to fifteen feet (15'), which would be a twenty (20) deficiency to that of the underlying R2 Single-Family Residence District.

Variation Standards

A variation from Section 155.508(C)(6)(a) (Planned Development Standards) to allow the rear yards on the perimeter of the planned development to be less than that required in the abutting zoning district and underlying subject properties.

Section 155.508(C)(6)(a) (Planned Development Standards) states, That all buildings are located within the planned development in such a way as to dissipate any adverse impact on adjoining buildings and shall not invade the privacy of the occupants of such buildings and shall conform to the following:

- b) The front, side or rear yard setbacks on the perimeter of the development shall not be less than that required in the abutting zoning district(s) or the zoning district underlying the subject site, whichever is greater.*

The petitioner did provide a response to the Standards for Planned Developments, which have also been made a part of this petition; however, staff finds that the following Standards for Variations have not been affirmed relative to the aforementioned variation from said Planned Development Standards:

- a. Because of the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of the regulations were to be applied.*

Staff finds that there are no physical conditions related to the Providence Glen Subdivision (as a collective whole) that prevent compliance with the rear yard setback regulations. The subdivision does not have physical surroundings, shape, or topographical features that differ substantially from any other neighborhood located within the Village as to be demonstrative of a hardship. The subdivision is relatively flat and the existing topography does not impact the ability of the property owners from meeting the setback provisions, which have already been reduced from thirty-five (35) feet to thirty (30) feet.

- b. The conditions upon which an application for a variation is based are unique to the property for which the variation is sought, and are not generally applicable to other property within the same zoning classification.*

Staff finds that there are no conditions unique to the Providence Glen Subdivision that would differentiate it from the many other neighborhoods with a similar layout and design that have been able to meet the established rear yard

setback regulations.

- d. *The alleged difficulty or hardship is caused by this ordinance and has not been created by any person presently having an interest in the property.*

The Village Board denied variation requests (ZBA 11-06 & ZBA 02-21) for the property located at 661 N. Charlotte St. to reduce the required rear yard setback to fifteen feet (15') where thirty feet (30') is required, to allow for a screened porch addition. This denial was based on the lack of a demonstrated hardship unique to his property and that the requested relief was not consistent with the existing neighborhood. In light of the proposed amendments, there have been no other property owners within the Providence Glen Subdivision who have requested to build a screened porch addition in the required thirty (30) foot rear yard setback.

- e. *The granting of the variation will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood.*

The Providence Glen Subdivision has historically had difficulty with the placement of the single-family homes on the platted lots. Initially they were faced with issues fitting their standard model homes on some of the lots as flooding conditions affected some of the properties, requiring substantial changes to the engineering, resulting in minor changes to the subdivision layout. In order to adequately handle stormwater, the detention basins had to be enlarged, reducing the size, but not the configuration, of some of the lots.

The Providence Glen subdivision previously received approval to provide for thirty (30) foot rear yards on each of the 32 residential lots within that subdivision, which is five (5) feet less than the thirty-five (35) foot rear yard required on other lots within the R2 Single-Family Residence District. As reductions to the rear yard have already been reduced below that of the abutting R2 - Single-Family District properties, staff believes that a further reduction could drastically alter the essential character of the Providence Glen Subdivision, by further increasing structural bulk within the subdivision.

- g. *The proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of*

light and air to adjacent property or substantially increase the congestion of the public streets, or increase the danger of fire, or impair natural drainage or create drainage problems on adjacent properties, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.

A further rear yard setback reduction could drastically impact the amount of structural bulk on the properties within the Providence Glen Subdivision. Additional structural bulk could impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, increase the danger of fire, impair natural drainage, create drainage problems on adjacent properties, endanger the public safety or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.

In conclusion, staff is recommending denial of the petition. Staff did provide the Plan Commission with an alternate recommendation in the event that they were to recommend approval. Mr. Toth stated that revised findings were also distributed to each Plan Commissioner.

Vice Chairperson Flint then opened the meeting for comments on the staff report.

Mr. Berberich stated how the original zoning variation was denied by the Board of Trustees based on his recommendation. Mr. Berberich explained how Trustee Breen came to him with a better option. He then decided that because Trustee Breen could support the Planned Development amendment, he felt it was best to let the zoning variance run its course and ask for a denial. He then stated that Trustee Breen is supportive of his petition but unfortunately could not attend tonight's meeting due to prior commitments.

Referring to the standards, Mr. Berberich stated that his layperson's interpretation of the standards mean that this is a unique situation only to Providence Glen. He disagreed and exemplified another Concord development (off of 22nd Street) built within the Village with similar circumstances. He stated that there is one house within that development that was granted a variance for a similar setback based upon the fact that it was unique.

Vice Chairperson Flint then opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

Referring to the map on page five, Commissioner Cooper stated that it appears that there could be stormwater drainage impacts if there was to be a build out on every house wanting to take advantage of this proposed opportunity. She then asked what would happen to the stormwater runoff.

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Community Development Director, stated that we would have to review stormwater management on a case-by-case basis. He added that there would be ways to keep control or reduce the stormwater runoff. If all of the property owners jumped on board, there could be some issues even though the chances of everyone doing that are slim so it still concerns staff that we could be giving additional development rights to properties that could possibly have an impact and present a problem.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked if all of the residences within the subdivision are at the thirty-foot rear yard setback right now. Mr. Toth answered that not all of the residences in the Providence Glen Subdivision are set back to the minimum thirty feet.

Commissioner Mrofcza confirmed that there is some room for some of these folks but not all of them. Mr. Toth referred to the red areas shown on the photo on page 5 of the staff report and explained that there are some properties that could do a screen porch addition by right. He added that the properties on the east side of the development have a smaller area of opportunity while the properties along the west side provide larger rear yards for potential improvements.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked what the shaded areas represent. Mr. Toth answered that the shaded red areas represent the potential buildable area in consideration of the proposed fifteen foot setback line.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked if the property located at 661 N. Charlotte is setback to the thirty-foot rear yard. Mr. Toth answered, yes, the petitioner's property is currently setback right to the thirty-foot building line and the screen porch addition extends to the proposed fifteen-foot line.

Commissioner Sweetser stated that survey attachment included in the staff report really shows the density of the building in comparison to the surrounding area. She added that by granting a concession at that time, the builder wanted thirty feet instead of thirty five feet, which enabled even more density. She thought it is

more than fair on how much bulk can already potentially be put into this area.

Commissioner Olbrysh stated that he has mixed feelings about the petition. He stated that this petition came to mind when reviewing the recent Comprehensive Plan update. He stated that Vision #1 of the Comprehensive Plan update talks about developing a strong and positive physical community image through public and private improvements which enhance various physical features of the community and contribute to Lombard's sense of place. He added that the Plan update also talks about quality development. He then stated that this is going to bulk up the neighborhood and he is unsure of whether to permit the screened-in porches. He stated that this is a concern.

A motion was made by Martin Burke, seconded by Ronald Olbrysh, that this matter be recommended to the Corporate Authorities for denial. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, Stephen Flint, and John Mrofcza

Absent: 1 - Donald F. Ryan

Business Meeting

The business meeting convened at 8:08 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

On a motion by Andrea Cooper and seconded by Martin Burke the minutes of the February 20, 2012 meeting were unanimously approved by the members present with minor corrections as noted by Village Counsel.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

DuPage County Hearings

There were no DuPage County hearings.

Chairperson's Report

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

Planner's Report

Christopher Stilling reminded the Commissioners of the Open Meetings Act training and offered assistance if they were having any trouble.

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

Comprehensive Plan Update - Economic Development, Facilities and Areas of Concern Sections

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, indicated that we are in the home stretch. The goal for the next meeting is to have the document formatted and the Implementation section updated. No commitment is being made as to what will be covered next month as we still want to engage the public and give every opportunity for anyone to participate in this process.

For tonight's workshop session, staff is seeking input from the Plan Commission relative to the updated Economic Development, Facilities and Areas of Concern sections.

The Economic Development section is a snapshot of what was previously adopted by the Board of Trustees last year as well as actions staff has taken which has been incorporated into this document.

The Facilities section presents a general overview of community facilities including those which belong to either municipal or other agencies.

Referring to page 11, staff added a section on Ensuring Sustainability

which incorporates how the Village has expanded upon its commitment to sustainability. It provides thoughts, ideas, examples and practices of how the Village is trying to be more sustainable. Reference was also made to the Sustainability Framework policy prepared by the Public Works Department and adopted by the Village Board.

Our main focus for this workshop session is on the Areas of Concern section. These are the areas that warrant further review and discussion with regard to their future long-range land use. Staff identified 11 areas and suggested a change from what is previously noted in the 1998 Comprehensive Land Use Plan to reflect up-to-date development trends.

Area 1 is the SE corner of North Avenue and IL Route 53. This was previously identified for commercial and low density residential. Staff thought since most of those parcels are vacant, there was an opportunity to reclassify the properties to a future land use designation of Community Commercial to allow for a full block face redevelopment along North Avenue which would expand the commercial opportunity further to the west.

Area 2 is the NE corner North Avenue and Route 53. Our original focus was the immediate corner where Hometown Motors and single family lots existed. Staff has since come up with a new classification of Industrial/Office/Commercial to allow for a mix of uses that can be complementary to any existing use that may remain. This presents an opportunity for compatibility with adjacent properties and for an assemblage in conjunction with some of the adjacent and existing businesses. By including uses to expand to Lombard Road, it allows for shared access for a larger scale development. This provides more opportunity and should be noted as a gateway parcel to prevent more intense industrial uses.

Area 3 is the NE Corner of North Avenue and Main Street. This area is currently zoned industrial and there are topography challenges associated with this area. Staff has had inquiries from prospective fast food restaurants interested in this site. Staff recommends reclassifying the property to Industrial/Office/Commercial.

Area 4 is 120-218 E. St. Charles Road. This is a two block area located along the north side of St. Charles Road bounded by Garfield Street and west Craig. This area was identified for Neighborhood Commercial. Staff wanted to reclassify it to Community Commercial to be consistent with the adjacent blocks and with the Downtown Plan that was approved by the Board of Trustees last year.

Area 5 is the triangular area at St. Charles Road and Western Avenue. Owl Hardwood and Ace Coatings are located in this area as well as other soft industrial uses. This area is located within a tax increment financing (TIF) district. Staff recommended that it be reclassified to Industrial/Office/Commercial. This classification would allow for many types of uses to complement the existing businesses as well as to address inquiries that have been received in the past from prospective commercial uses.

Area 6 is the SW Corner of Main & Maple Streets. This area comprises of multiple religious institutions, a commercial building, a legal nonconforming 3 flat, single family residences, 2 privately held properties and the Victorian Cottage Museum. Staff thought that in the long term this area is likely to become Institutional and would carry over into the St. John's site.

Area 7 is Westmore-Meyers Road. Although the Commissioners have not yet seen it, staff has been working and is finalizing a separate sub area document which will take a more comprehensive look at this area. When we bring the Plan back to the Commissioners, it will have more specific recommendations and suggestions on some of the specific properties. Currently, staff is showing a cleanup of existing land uses and are making reference to the specific document which will be incorporated as a supplement to the overall Comprehensive Plan.

Area 8 is the Eastgate Shopping Center. Staff has seen some interest in the center for potential redevelopment in the next 10 years. The property owners have inquired about their options. They have viable tenants but also are experiencing high vacancy rates. Staff wants to keep the options open and remain Commercial in nature and include some light professional office or medical offices.

Area 9 is 13th Street, West of Garfield. Located to the north is the Famous Liquors Shopping Center. They expressed an interest in rehabbing the center and this could include an assemblage of the unincorporated properties being included. If this is done, we want to keep that option open. If we changed the designation to allow for commercial expansion, it would be a caveat for a block face redevelopment with full access to 13th Street with buffers.

Area 10 known as City View at the Highlands is a cleanup item. These are the apartments which are part of the Highlands of Lombard Planned Development. Staff is recommending High Density Residential to reflect what currently exists. Staff wants to ensure that there is an opportunity to feed off of other uses in there.

Area 11 is located mostly on the south side of Butterfield Road, north of I-88. Currently it is zoned Office but it is a mix of office, restaurants, and retail, which seems to be the trend. Staff recommends a designation of mixed Commercial and Office.

This area also includes the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary (NBTS) property. Currently staff is in evaluation mode looking at their long term plan and visioning to determine how they can get the best utilization of the property. At this time, staff recommends that the property remain an Institutional use until we know their future plans.

Vice Chairperson Flint opened the meeting for the Commissioners comments and questions.

Commissioner Sweetser applauded staff's attempt to cover the Westmore area and she looks forward to seeing it.

Commissioner Cooper commented that Area 8 currently looks somewhat industrial with all the heavy equipment that has been on site so she is grateful that it is being looked at as it is a long necked visible corridor. Mr. Stilling stated that ownership is the key to this site. If they build upon what is there and use the assets that they have, there is some opportunity to improve.

Commissioner Olbrysh asked if the Village received official word of The Great Indoors closing. Mr. Stilling answered yes but we are not sure of the timeframe.

Commissioner Olbrysh stated that with the development of the site and with new tenants located in front of the store, they are not as visible as they used to be. Mr. Stilling stated that it is an issue with the property owners so a revised unified signage package will be a driving factor. They will need to be creative and think outside the box to help draw attention to that area.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked if that parcel could be subdivided. Mr. Stilling answered that it was possible and exemplified how other communities have dealt with The Great Indoors' vacancies. Mr. Stilling then explained how the economic development process occurs and how brokers drive a lot of the deals.

Commissioner Cooper stated she had some general comments:
1. Referring to the Transportation section she had a few more thoughts. On Page 53 under the Bike Routes and Amenities section it mentions how projects such as the Lilac Bike Way need to be scaled back if funding is not fully available in order to provide a link between the Great Western Trail and the Downtown. She asked if there was a

way to phase it in instead of scaling it back. Mr. Stilling stated that using the words "scale back" might not be the best use of words but it was intended to mean that we are exploring other cost alternatives.

2. The same section, next paragraph talks about exploring possible locations for bike lockers. She commented that Villa Park has them, they take up a lot of room, are an expense to upkeep and wondered if they are even being used. Mr. Stilling answered that he thought there might be some changes with that due to the underpass.

3. On Page 54 it mentions the need to improve the Public Works parking situation. She suggested that might be an opportunity for the Village to think about a demonstration parking lot. When we talk about sustainability mechanisms, that could be somewhere we could send the developers to take a look. Mr. Stilling stated he can bring that to their attention but staff also thought about other options such as a board of examples. Mentioning the Public Works Garfield site, he stated that Public Works was trying to incorporate sustainable items such as a wind turbine on top of the salt dome. There are grants out there that can be explored.

4. On Page 17 there is a picture of a wind turbine. She asked if it was located somewhere in town. Mr. Toth answered that it was just an example but not located in town. Commissioner Cooper asked if the Village had an example that could be put in its place. Mr. Stilling answered no.

5. Does the Village have a plan analysis and inventory of street trees? She referred to Page 42, second bullet, and volunteered to help.

6. Referring to Page 11, she had one last big comment about sustainability. She asked if there was something like this on our website and if not, suggested it be done. She would love to see initiatives out there that the Village is doing and for people that are interested.

Commissioner Olbrysh commented that the synchronization of the traffic lights at Grace and St. Charles needs to be improved so when a train goes through it doesn't reset the whole process resulting in traffic backups.

Commissioner Sweetser agreed with Commissioner Cooper relative to having a sustainability page on the website. She endorses the idea of engaging people on how to do it themselves. She suggested something more than a laundry list of items - something that includes how you can use them across the board no matter if you are a

resident, business, etc. Mr. Stilling mentioned that staff will send out an e-mail that includes the Sustainability Policy.

Commissioner Cooper referred to the new car wash on Roosevelt Road and the condition of the street behind it. She wondered if repairing the street ever come up at the time of development. Mr. Stilling answered that we do have a provision in code but unfortunately, they fell 100' short of what would be considered a major development which would have required them to repair the street. Public Works is currently analyzing what they can do along the street as well as the alleyway. The base is not in good shape and they are working diligently to resolve the issue as quickly as possible.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Stephen Flint, Vice Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission

Christopher Stilling, AICP, Secretary
Lombard Plan Commission