

Village of Lombard

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



Meeting Minutes

Monday, May 17, 2010

7:30 PM

Board Room

Village Hall

Plan Commission

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Commissioners: Martin Burke,
Stephen Flint, Ronald Olbrysh,
Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper and Richard Nelson
Staff Liaison: Christopher Stilling*

Call to Order

[Play Video](#)

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

Roll Call of Members

[Play Video](#)

Present: Chairperson Donald F. Ryan, Commissioner Stephen Flint, Commissioner Ruth Sweetser, Commissioner Martin Burke, Commissioner Richard Nelson and Commissioner Andrea Cooper

Absent: Commissioner Ronald Olbrysh

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

Chairperson Ryan called the order of the agenda.

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

Public Hearings

[Play Video](#)

100248

SPA 10-01ph: 1 Yorktown Shopping Center (McDonald's)

Requests Site Plan Approval with the following deviations for the subject property located within the B3 Community Shopping District and Yorktown Center Planned Development:

1. A deviation from Section 153.207 of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow two roof signs of approximately 870 square feet each; and
2. A deviation from Section 153.505(B)(19) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow a total of five wall signs with a total area of approximately 151.75 square feet. (DISTRICT #3)

[Play Video](#)

Henry Stillwell, 300 E. Roosevelt Road, Suite 300, Wheaton, attorney for the applicant, presented the petition. He introduced the other four individuals who would be presenting part of the petition or answering questions.

Mr. Stillwell stated that the petition will be presented in a PowerPoint format. He distributed copies of the presentation which included 24 - 11 x 17 colored sheets referred to as Exhibit 1. Exhibit 2 is a materials board containing samples of materials and colors proposed for the facility. He then began the presentation.

The first slide was an aerial photo which identified the subject property and surrounding properties. The request by McDonald's is to construct a new facility within the Yorktown facility 1-1/2 acres in size and identified in blue. It is an L-shaped parcel with the bulk of the facility located on the southern portion of the site. It is currently zoned B3PD which originated from the original shopping center approval back in 1966. A building currently

exists on this site that would be razed to make way for the construction of a new restaurant facility. The site has no access off Highland Avenue, which is located to the west side. To the south is a private shopping center loop drive, and to the east is an internal private roadway. He noted the surrounding zoning districts identified on the aerial in yellow.

2nd slide (Site Plan) - The plans we are reviewing are the result of a collaborative effort among various groups to achieve satisfaction. Staff has been satisfied and shopping center personnel has signed off as part of their review. The site plan identifies the layout proposed for the property. The application proposes the construction of a 44,000 square foot McDonald's with a drive-through. There is no access onto Highland Avenue to the west. The restaurant will face south toward the private loop drive. Full access will be provided along the east side of the property onto the north side access drive which is adjacent to the eastern boundary of the subject property. Vehicles will circulate in a counterclockwise pattern. The northern part of the site includes parking, dumpster facilities, and two-way traffic. All standards will be complied with as far as parking facilities.

The facility is designed with two primary access points - the main access which is located on the east side and the secondary access which is located on the southwest corner of the building. The pedestrian sidewalk was also noted.

The proposal consists of 71 parking spaces. This is considered an ample supply of spaces as it is not uncommon to have 45-55 spaces adequately serve this type of facility. There are three handicapped spaces, located to the east side of the facility, which will comply with ADA standards as to the size and depressed curb requirements. Twenty-eight of the 71 parking spaces are located on the north part of the site. There are also ten freestanding parking lot directional signs, seven which are located in the main portion or on the southern end of the site and three which are located in the northern section of the site.

Photometrics have been prepared and submitted to staff and lighting will be consistent with Village standards. The dumpster is located in the northerly stem section of the site and will be a masonry enclosure that will match the exterior materials of the main building. One freestanding monument sign is located adjacent to Highland Avenue in the southerly portion of the site. The restaurant will have approximately 85 seats with no plans for outside seating.

Slide 3 (Wall Signage) - The details on this exhibit have been reduced and are more visible in the submittal. The petitioner is asking for a variation for five signs. The location of the signs and their type are noted on this exhibit. There are four different types of signs. The cut sheet identified for sign type #5 is not wall signage but signs that hang down by the drive-up windows and are part of the drive-through signage package. The other four boxes illustrate wall signage. The goal is to identify the name of the organization and the "m" logo. The area of all these signs will total under 152 square feet so they are not large signs and fall within the range of what would be permitted on Highland Avenue. The variance is a result of being located on a private road where permitted signage is less than what is permitted by code if located on a main arterial roadway. It is a situation that has been encountered by other users in the shopping center and based on these circumstances, we believe the variation is warranted.

Slide 4 (Freestanding and Drive-thru Signage) - Identifies the signage that will be used and the locations it will be used in.

Slide 5 shows the freestanding sign located along the west side of the site and identified as sign #9 on the Freestanding and Drive-Thru Signage Exhibit. This sign is designed

to conform with Village sign requirements and has been further modified to conform with the additional requests of the shopping center owner. The height of the monument sign is 10 feet and contains brick which surrounds the panel. The sign face is 8 foot by 6 foot on each side and with the brick surround totals 9 feet by 6 feet.

Slide 6 shows the detail of the double welcome point gateway sign which is part of the drive-through signs associated with McDonald's side by side ordering system. He described how the drive-through aspect has grown substantially and is an extremely important aspect of this use. The result of that demand is to create an internal and exterior circulation pattern using signage. This is an efficient and effective system which is integrated with the use of cameras to make sure orders are right. The double order system is provided for on the northerly portion of the building and is the location of the gateway sign identified as #7 on the Free Standing and Drive-thru Signage Exhibit. It identifies the maximum height of a vehicle allowed. Identified as sign #8 on the Free Standing and Drive-thru Signage Exhibit is a small bollard sign on a post that says "any lane any time", "please have your payment ready" and "thank you". The drive-through will also incorporate two 4-panelled menu boards, one for each drive-through lane and identified as sign #5 on the Free Standing and Drive-thru Signage Exhibit, has a newer designed customer order display. There will also be a small canopy that protects the customer from the elements while ordering. There are also two window signs that say "thank you for having your payment ready" and "thank you" which are identified on the plan.

The second variation being requested is to obtain relief to have what staff believes falls under the definition of a wall sign. This sign is the arch. This sign is a component of the architecture of the building and has been the identity of McDonald's for a long time. The variation is needed because a portion of the sign goes above the roofline. On paper the sign dimensions are much larger due to the Village's calculation method but the actual square footage of the arch itself is 230 square feet. The portion above the roof is actually 63 square feet. The sign would be double faced. He referred to the condition in the staff report which states that the surface area of any individual roof sign above the roof level shall not exceed 64.02 square feet. He thought that number should be doubled to accommodate the same treatment on each side of that element. Ms. Henaghan clarified that the Sign Ordinance does specify that the area of the sign be taken from a single face so the square footage mentioned in the staff report is correct.

Mr. Stillwell referred to the McDonald's Signage Calculation slide prepared by Everbrite which identifies the breakdown of square footage area that utilizes Village standards and provides statistical backup in support of their application.

Referring to the Site Line Exhibit he mentioned that one of the concerns they had is the fact that the site is lower than the adjacent street elevation by eight feet. As a result, there is a different perspective that occurs from people walking along the west side or driving in a vehicle on Highland Avenue. The arch sign perspective view is approximately fourteen feet so there is a lesser visible impact from the roof sign. One of their concerns is to ensure that there is adequate visibility and provide a visible queue on Highland Avenue.

Mr. Stillwell indicated he would turn over the presentation to Ken Sack of Watermark Engineering Resources who would explain the Truck and Fire Truck Circulation Exhibits as well as the Development Plan.

Kenneth Sack, Watermark Engineering Resources, 2631 Ginger Woods Parkway, Aurora, referred to the Truck Circulation Exhibit. This exhibit was prepared to show the truck path that the delivery company will use to circulate the site. He noted the standard delivery truck on the plan as well as the circulation pattern. A minimum 20 foot drive

aisle width will be maintained throughout the site to ensure that a truck can circulate properly. The truck will not hinder or impede any of the parking spaces and will not create any conflicts.

The Fire Truck Circulation Exhibit is based on the same idea and he explained the circulation path. He identified there will be three fire hydrants on site - two of which are already existing and one that is being proposed. This circulation would occur in a counterclockwise pattern around the building.

The Development Plan shows the utilities for the site. There will be a sanitary connection to the existing service and a grease tap connected to that. The watermain connection will provide service to the fire hydrants and they are reusing the 2" copper service for the domestic service. They will tap in on the private road for the fire connection rather than connect on Highland Avenue.

Addressing the detention he stated that it will be provided off site to the east of the shopping center. He mentioned how the Cole Taylor site drains to their site. They propose to pick up Cole Taylor's water and dump into a basin or filter strip which is a Best Management Practice (BMP). They will process their stormwater and filter it. He identified McDonald's drainage pattern which leads to the off-site detention. Noting the southern and western part of the site he identified a storm structure which is a BMP which will filter out oil and cigarette butts and the water will end up in a sewer and be treated and then go off site.

Dan Olson, Watermark Engineering Resources, 2631 Ginger Woods Parkway, Aurora, explained the Landscape Plan. Page L-1 gives an overview of the plants and how they will work. This plant list on the right side of the sheet includes the botanical and common names and abbreviations to identify the location of the plantings on site. Sheet L-2 gives details and specifications for the landscape plan. It touches on the native seed mix. It gives a description of some of the flowering plants and grasses used to filter the stormwater as a BMP before it leaves the site.

The next page is a colored plan indicating the key elements. They tried to preserve as much of the existing landscape on the site as possible like the mature ash trees and a small conifer. Along the west property line there are planting beds that will function to screen the site and to complement the building. Around the rest of the building, they followed McDonald's standards to make the site colorful, have seasonal interest and emphasize the foundation landscaping.

He mentioned the filter strip which collects the stormwater and how it will run through a notch in the curb and drains through the pond. The area will include deep rooted plants that provide evapotranspiration as well as absorb the pollutants in the stormwater before it is drained off site.

He referred back to the Site Line Exhibit. He stated he visited the site and stood on the sidewalk at the highest point, on the western property line, looking down on the site to make sure that the view provides good visibility. The idea was to provide some landscape relief in that area without totally screening it. He provided shade trees, along with the existing ones, which will give some break but also enable customers to view the site.

Lastly, he talked about the photographs provided on the Existing Landscape Exhibit. These pictures are looking west of the site onto an existing residential area. He noted that there exists mature landscaping which together with the proposed McDonald's landscaping will provide relief along the site. These pictures show a large amount of green which break up the view.

Mr. Stillwell then addressed the exterior building elevations of the facility. The south façade, which is what you see while on the private access road in the shopping center, is primarily a glass wall enclosure for the dining area. The eastern elevation is where you have the arch sign and a large glass wall resulting in a bright airy dining facility. The bottom portion of that exhibit shows the balance of the easterly elevation showing the entry along with the balance of the facility which houses the kitchen, storage facilities and restrooms. He noted that the elevation exhibits includes the location of the signage and he identified it and explained.

The part of the façade, not of a glass element, is masonry construction with brick veneer with a dryvit facility around the entry. The height of the flat portion of the building is approximately 19'3". The building elevations on page 2.1 shows less glass with dryvit material behind that with the arch sign providing a vertical element. Service doors are on the north elevation with an arch logo. McDonald's utilized a variety of exterior materials, textures, and color contrast and described them. He mentioned a metal trellis which runs along the west side above the drive-through window and for architectural relief that trellis was brought around with a banding of the same material to create the leaf. That material is utilized along the fascia, dining room and entry doors as well. He noted the color renderings which better identifies the various perspectives of the facility.

Concluding, Mr. Stillwell identified Exhibit #2 which is the material board. This shows samples of the materials to be used as well as the colors.

He noted that the petitioner submitted written Responses to Standards which identify the justification for the relief they have requested. They believe the use is within the permissible activities of the shopping center and is compatible with the other uses.

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting for public comment. There was no one to speak in favor of or against the petition.

Chairperson Ryan requested the staff report.

Jennifer Henaghan, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. The property at 1 Yorktown Shopping Center is currently improved with the former Cole Taylor Bank building. This building will be demolished and replaced with a new McDonald's restaurant with drive-through. Both the restaurant and drive-through are permitted by right under by the Yorktown Planned Development, so no public hearings are required for the construction of the building or the proposed use. Although no relief is required for the demolition and construction of the restaurant, the petitioner is requesting signage relief to allow two roof signs and a total of five wall signs. This relief is necessary because the property has only one frontage along a public street and roof signs are not allowed by the Sign Ordinance.

In addition to the requested wall and roof signs, the petitioner is proposing a freestanding sign that is within the B3 height and area restrictions. The proposed drive-through related signage is an accessory component of the permitted drive-through use so it also requires no zoning relief. She noted the various inter-departmental review comments provided from Private Engineering and Public Works.

Planning comments include compliance with the Zoning Ordinance and the Yorktown Planned Development. The planned development for the Yorktown Center does not address exterior signage. Therefore, the exterior signage at Yorktown is regulated by the current Zoning and Sign Ordinance. As a planned development, any relief from the Sign Ordinance could be approved by the Plan Commission as part of a site plan

approval application.

The petitioner is proposing two roof signs, each with an area of approximately 870 square feet. The Sign Ordinance prohibits roof signs, which are defined as a sign, constructed and supported in whole or in part upon or over the roof of a building or structure.

The petitioner's arch sign package is intended to combine the arch concepts historically used at McDonald's restaurants in the 1950s and 1960s and were re-introduced into their classic rock and roll themed facilities. The Lombard/Yorktown facility is intended to be a hybrid of their classic design and a more traditional design.

Although the sign area calculation is large (870 sq. ft.), the actual surface area of each arch is much smaller (107 sq. ft.) due to the open design. Sixty-four sq. ft. or 60% of the overall sign will be projecting above the roof. The majority of the arches (43 sq. ft. or 40%) will be below the roof line and against the building, so the visual impact of the sign will be less than is suggested by the area calculation.

Staff recognizes the unique nature of the proposed arch signs which, while technically roof signs, function almost more as architectural elements than as traditional signs. Due to the unique site constraints and particular sign design proposed, staff can support the requested relief to allow roof signs as they are compatible with the surrounding commercial development.

In pre-application meetings with the petitioner, staff asked them to explore the option of having the arches illuminated externally rather than internally as this would make the signage less prominent. However, the petitioner has represented that external illumination is not an option as it would not provide the desired visibility.

The proposed wall signage the petitioner is proposing is a total of five wall signs. The total sign area of all five wall signs is approximately 108 square feet, which is only slightly greater than the maximum 100-square foot sign area that would be allowed by right for a single sign along Highland Avenue.

Historically, staff has supported signage deviations for businesses along the ring road because a strict interpretation of code could severely restrict or prohibit business entities from placing reasonable signage on their buildings. She noted the five entities that received site plan approval along the ring road.

With only one frontage along a public street, the Sign Ordinance allows only a single wall sign. If the access drives adjacent to the subject property were publicly dedicated streets, a total of three wall signs would be permitted. As customers will be viewing and accessing the site from multiple directions, including the internal drive aisles south and east of the site, the need to have signage on multiple elevations is desirable. As these drives often function as public streets, staff believes the proposed wall signs could be supported. Moreover, as access into the site is provided at the ring road itself and not from Highland Avenue, the need for additional signage is warranted.

The Comprehensive Plan recommends Regional Commercial land uses for the Yorktown Center Planned Development. The proposed restaurant is consistent with this recommendation, as draws its customers from a regional market. Staff believes that the signage is intended to be an additional identifier of the business and would not constitute excessive signage.

The subject property is compatible with the surrounding business uses. Restaurant uses are located within Yorktown Mall to the south and within the Highlands of Lombard

Planned Development to the southwest. Other business establishments in the Yorktown planned development have more than one wall sign even though they may only front on one publicly dedicated street. Therefore, the signage relief is consistent with other established land uses in the area.

Staff recommends approval of this petition subject to the four conditions noted in the staff report.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

Commissioner Sweetser stated she had no objections to the items being proposed but had a comment. She referred to the computer generated pictures of the site, specifically the west entrance that contained a bike rack near the door. She was concerned that customers exiting this door might be distracted while stepping out into traffic and suggested there might be something that could be done to emphasize to the traffic that people might be stepping out in front of their vehicle. Ms. Henaghan stated that this issue came up previously with the McDonald's on Roosevelt, and staff will suggest to the petitioner that they make the crosswalk more visible.

Commissioner Flint indicated he had questions relative to the truck deliveries. He asked when deliveries will be done and how the truck would be staged. Mr. Sack answered that deliveries will occur one to two times a week and will be done on off-peak hours to minimize conflicts.

Commissioner Flint asked if deliveries would occur at night. Rick Dolan, 4320 Ginger Woods Parkway, Aurora, answered they will try to arrange the truck deliveries for off-peak hours but they could occur up to 10 p.m. or sometime early in the morning dependent on the number of stores they are delivering to in the area.

Commissioner Flint asked where the truck would be staged so as not interfere with traffic. Referring to the Truck Circulation Exhibit Mr. Sack identified where the truck would be staged. The truck will be jackknifed so that part of the truck will be located near the gateway sign and the body of the truck will be along the loading area. Deliveries will be taken out of the back of the truck. The truck will sit near the building so there will be plenty of maneuverability for vehicles. The aisle and circulation will be maintained as the primary lane will be closed but the secondary lane will be open for orders. The truck will not impede the site. He also noted two manager parking stalls which are provided near the loading doors. These stalls are advantageous should someone need to move out of the way for the truck's maneuverability.

Commissioner Cooper asked the hours of operation. Mr. Dolan answered that they are proposing a 24-hour drive-through operation and the dining facility hours would be 5 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. during the week and midnight on the weekends. The dining room would be closed off with accessibility provided in the drive through.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the exterior lighting would be operational 24 hours. Mr. Dolan answered that the parking lot lighting will be on 24-hour circuits with some being on and some being off.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the arch lighting would be on 24 hours. Mr. Dolan answered yes. Commissioner Cooper asked staff if that conforms with our lighting code. Ms. Henaghan indicated that the photometrics staff received does not show that the lighting would exceed code if the lighting was left on.

Referring to the landscape plan, Commissioner Cooper commented that it is a nice plan and she appreciated the diversity of plant materials. Her other comment is about

pedestrian traffic and how off-site pedestrians get to the site. She noted there is a lack of sidewalks, connectivity and crosswalks. She asked how people walking or riding their bikes might access the site. Mr. Sack confirmed that there are no sidewalks along Highland Avenue or the convenience center drive so there is not much pedestrian access to the site. He was unsure how much pedestrian walking was occurring as it was mostly vehicular traffic but indicated that striping can be done for crosswalks on site.

Commissioner Cooper asked if there would be bike racks. Mr. Sack answered that they could provide a bike rack.

Commissioner Cooper commented that even though we haven't planned for off-site pedestrian traffic now is an opportunity to keep the pedestrian in mind. She encouraged staff to work with McDonald's to get pedestrians safely to the site and keep them safe.

Commissioner Sweetser referred to the Comprehensive Plan open space hearing and indicated that there appears to be a leg of the bike route planned south of 22nd Street and into the Yorktown area. As this may be the case, she strongly encouraged that they plan for this.

Commissioner Nelson asked if the McDonald's in Yorktown Mall will expect an impact on their business. Mr. Dolan noted that the facility was closed.

It was moved by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Flint, that this matter be approved with conditions. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Flint, Sweetser, Burke, Nelson and Cooper

Absent: 1 - Olbrysh

1. The proposed signage shall be consistent with the submitted sign package prepared by Superior Electrical Advertising dated June 28, 2007 and Everbrite (no date) and made a part of this petition.
2. Approval of the proposed sign deviations shall not constitute a blanket approval for any future signage on the subject property. Any deviation from the specific sign designs as shown on the submitted sign package shall require a separate site plan approval.
3. The petitioner shall apply for and receive a building permit from the Village prior to erecting the proposed signage and any improvements that are constructed on the property.
4. The surface area of any individual roof sign above the roof level shall not exceed 64.02 sq. ft

100247

PC 10-05: Comprehensive Plan Amendment

The petitioner, the Village of Lombard, requests the approval of amendments to the Village Comprehensive Plan pertaining to open space. (DISTRICTS - ALL)

[Play Video](#)

Jennifer Henaghan, Senior Planner, presented the petition. She stated that although public comments had been obtained via an open house and review by the members of the former Ad Hoc Trails Committee, the Open Space Plan was substantially the same as when the Plan Commission initially discussed the document at its March 15, 2010 workshop session.

On March 15, the Plan Commission requested an overview of how neighboring

communities regulate open space. Staff surveyed seven nearby communities and found a wide variety of approaches. Lombard is the only community that requires a minimum amount of open space in every zoning district. Downers Grove, Elmhurst, Glen Ellyn, Oakbrook Terrace, and Wheaton require open space in certain districts (either residential or commercial). Neither Oak Brook nor Villa Park explicitly reference open space within their Zoning Ordinances. Of the five communities that require some sort of open space, two define open space quite differently from Lombard in a way that encourages outdoor living space without requiring "green" space. Elmhurst includes recreational areas and improvements in its open space calculation, including useable roofs, playgrounds, and walkways. Wheaton includes any open area at least seven feet in width, including balconies, porches, or roof decks that can be used for work, play, or outdoor living areas. However, both communities specifically exclude driveways and parking areas from open space calculations. In addition to any open space requirements, six communities (Downers Grove, Elmhurst, Glen Ellyn, Oak Brook, Oakbrook Terrace, and Wheaton) also require a land dedication to the Park District as part of their development approval processes. These requirements are generally intended to serve the immediate and future needs of the residents of the proposed development. However, as these communities are largely built-out and many developments may be physically too small to allow for a land dedication, in many cases the Park Districts will accept a cash contribution in lieu of the land donation.

Although attendance at the Open Space Plan Open House was light, all of the residents and community leaders in attendance expressed positive opinions about the Village's Open Space Plan and planning efforts and agreed that open space is a vital component of the Village. Questions were raised regarding detention basins and bike path improvements. (Specific facility-related comments will be forwarded to the Park District.) Multiple attendees were excited about the proposed Lilac Bikeway. In particular, the National University of Health Sciences felt that it would be a popular amenity for its students due to its proximity to campus and the connections with the Illinois Prairie Path and Great Western Trail.

The draft Open Space Plan contains the text as proposed and rough drafts of the maps that will be included within the final document. The final maps will contain the same information but will have improved readability. The final document will be available at the Village Hall and on the Village's website for public viewing and downloading.

Staff is recommending approval of this petition.

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

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

There were no comments from the Commissioners.

It was moved by Commissioner Sweetser, seconded by Commissioner Burke, that this matter be recommended to the Corporate Authorities for approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Flint, Sweetser, Burke, Nelson and Cooper

Absent: 1 - Olbrysh

Business Meeting

[Play Video](#)

The business meeting convened at 8:54 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

[Play Video](#)

On a motion by Flint and seconded by Sweetser the minutes of the April 19, 2010 meeting were unanimously approved by the members present with corrections as noted by Mr. Stilling.

Public Participation

[Play Video](#)

There was no public participation.

DuPage County Hearings

[Play Video](#)

There were no DuPage County hearings.

Chairperson's Report

[Play Video](#)

The Chairperson deferred to the Assistant Director of Community Development.

Planner's Report

[Play Video](#)

The Assistant Director of Community Development had nothing to report.

Unfinished Business

[Play Video](#)

There was no unfinished business.

New Business

[Play Video](#)

There was no new business.

Subdivision Reports

[Play Video](#)

There were no subdivision reports.

Site Plan Approvals

[Play Video](#)

There were no site plan approvals.

Workshops

[Play Video](#)

[100256](#)

Vacant Lot at the Northeast Corner of 14th and School Streets

[Play Video](#)

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, presented the workshop. He explained that staff received an inquiry and request regarding annexation and zoning for the property at 1324 S. Meyers Road. As there would be a number of design and policy issues pertaining to the proposed subdivision, staff and the broker for the subject property are requesting input and direction from the Plan Commission.

The subject property is a single lot of approximately 19,000 square feet in area, is 64.8 feet in width, and approximately 300 feet in depth. The property was originally platted in 1947 as part of the original York Center Co-operative Subdivision and was intended to be a buffer property from adjacent properties. It was also intended to remain as open space for the use and benefit of the York Center Co-op neighborhood. The property is currently vacant, relatively flat in topography, but is improved with a private well serving the property to the north, which was created through a civil agreement between the Co-op and the neighboring property owner. A small driveway encroachment exists at the northwest corner of the property.

He mentioned the surrounding land uses, specifically noting that abutting the property to the north is a parcel of land improved with a residence and a legal non-conforming automotive repair facility. This repair facility was approved in the 1970s by a Court Decree. In 2008, a court decree dissolved the Co-op and among other things mandated the Co-op sell all commonly held properties, including the subject property. A broker for the property is now seeking to sell the property per the Order and is pursuing various development options for the subject property.

The Village Comprehensive Plan identifies the property for single family residential purposes with development densities of 4 units per acre or roughly 10,000 square foot lots. The property is currently zoned for single-family residential in DuPage County. The property owner could construct a single family residence on the property by right. Flagg Creek currently has a sanitary line within the 14th Street right of way. However, they are looking to explore connecting to the existing Village watermain and subdivide the property to make two buildable lots of record. As such, annexation and plat approval with companion zoning relief would be required.

The property abuts annexed land to the west and south, so the property could be readily annexed. The Village approved annexations for other selected residential properties on the subject block between School Street and Meyers Road to the R1 Single Family Residential District. The R1 District mandate lot widths of at least 75 feet in width and at least 10,000 square feet in area. If the property was annexed as a single entity, a variation to the lot width would be required to construct any principal structure. If the property was subdivided into two lots, a variation in lot area would also be required. The lot configurations and gross and net density issues will be determined upon completion of preliminary engineering and design of the residence. It is anticipated that if subdivided, the two lots would be oriented toward 14th Street. However, staff notes that additional relief may also be necessary to minimize the impact of the nonconforming repair garage immediately north of the subject property. The existing well on the property would need to be capped and a new well would need to be placed on the abutting property.

Concluding Mr. Stilling indicated that the broker is seeking action and direction with respect to the following questions:

- 1. If an annexation petition is filed with the Village, would the Plan Commission support R1 zoning on the property, consistent with past Plan Commission recommendations and Village Board actions? If annexation was desired, staff believes that the R1 designation would be most appropriate, as it would be consistent with the remaining residential block face and the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.*

2. *Would the Plan Commission be supportive of lot width relief (from 75 feet to 64.8 feet) for the existing lot and lot area relief (to provide for a lot or lots of less than 10,000 square feet in area) to provide for a two-lot subdivision? Staff notes that as with the lots to the north, the concept of bisecting all lots on the block to turn the through lots into lots with single frontages on Meyers Road or School Street can be supported. A minor lot width variation (75' to 73') was granted on the same block face for the nearby Lund Subdivision in 2003.*

3. *Are there any other considerations the Plan Commission has regarding the properties?*

Chairperson Ryan requested the opinions and thoughts of the Commissioners.

Commissioner Burke stated that this property has a lot of hurdles to overcome to support rezoning to R1. It would require significant lot width relief going from 75 feet to 64 feet. Also, having the semi-commercial use on an adjacent property is problematic as well.

Commissioner Sweetser agreed with Commissioner Burke's comments. Even without being subdividing it would not meet the R1 requirements. She would not be supportive when both the width and square footage would be off.

Chairperson Ryan also agreed with Commissioners Burke and Sweetser. He indicated that it would be difficult to have a residential use adjacent to a business use. Referring to the property to the north of the subject property, he indicated that although he was unsure how wide it was, it is definitely wider than 64'. He added he would have a lot of trouble with these requests.

Mr. Stilling asked the Commissioners if their opinions would differ if the lot was used as a single family lot and not subdivided.

Chairperson Ryan stated that you would have to be down on the southeast side where it's closer to the 75' and enter from that way. He didn't think you can have it on the west side and don't see the house being there. Just abutting up to a business he has a problem with that.

Commissioner Sweetser stated that it is clear that the land was intended for something else. As stated it was to be a buffer and now it's hard to go back and make something out of it. The 2' variation that we approved is probably the maximum and the Plan Commission has turned down things for less than a foot and don't see it going beyond 2'.

[100255](#)

[Play Video](#)

Sandwich Board Signs

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, presented the workshop. He referred to the hard copy of the PowerPoint presentation he prepared as a reference.

In 2009, staff undertook a comprehensive review of various temporary banners, election and real estate sign regulations. The result of this effort was an adoption of new provisions that create greater content neutrality and places additional provisions on such signs. Village staff has been requested by the Lombard Chamber of Commerce to discuss and review aspects of the Sign Ordinance, particularly relating to sandwich board signage. Additionally, staff notes that there have been other practical concerns

pertaining to the Village's regulations that warrant additional discussion. Staff is seeking input from the Plan Commission in order to get direction on this issue.

Mr. Stilling noted that most sandwich board signs had an "A" frame design and mentioned the definition of sandwich board signs as noted in the Sign Ordinance. Mr. Stilling then showed examples of various sandwich board signs within the community. The first sign exists on Main Street, the second sign is located in front of Praga Restaurant on St. Charles Road and the third sign belongs to Christ the King Church, which currently doesn't meet code. It is for this reason, as well as others, that have led staff to having this discussion. It is meant to be a temporary sign giving information that is present for 1-2 hours and then pulled back.

The 6th slide shows various examples of sandwich board designs which were found online. The next two slides show examples of signs that do not meet the intent of the Sign Ordinance. In the first example the sign is portable and hard to read. The second example shows signs stacked along Roosevelt Road.

Currently, the Sign Ordinance allows sandwich board signs on public sidewalks, but are not permitted on private properties. The existing intent of this regulation is to ensure that businesses do not have excessive signage on their respective property. Staff has observed such signs on private property, private sidewalks, abutting front doors to stores, entrances to restaurants denoting specials and as part of short-term visitor information signs.

The Sign Ordinance currently states that if you want a sandwich board sign it has to be on the public right of way, within 10' of the building and/or store front. No mixed signage is allowed, so if you have a temporary banner, you cannot have a sandwich board sign. There are also time limitations, which state that a sign must be brought in before 9 p.m.

Some of the issues associated with sandwich board signs include:

- 1. Regulations which originated in the 1990's*
- 2. Request for additional flexibility from the Chamber of Commerce*
- 3. Addressing emerging trends, and*
- 4. Addressing special events and activities on private properties many of which are non profit.*

We also need to look at striking a balance between commercial business needs and the public interest, design aesthetics and safety issues.

Currently sandwich board signs do not provide for signage on private property and are restricted by hours of operation.

Mr. Stilling noted that there are four basic questions staff would like input and thoughts from the Plan Commission on. He suggested addressing the questions one by one in order to get the Commissioners' comments.

- 1. Are there instances where the Plan Commission would support provisions for sandwich board signs on private properties? Mr. Stilling added that it is important to address shopping centers such as Fountain Square, Highpoint Center and the Highlands of Lombard which are pulled off the right of way to draw the attention of pedestrians.*

Commissioner Burke answered that he thought there might be certain instances in which it would make sense to have signs off the right-of-way, but it would be specific to certain developments within the community. Staff has named a couple of obvious ones but there would also be opportunities in certain shopping centers up and down

Roosevelt Road.

Chairperson Ryan thought the intent of the signs should be taken into consideration. He exemplified a pizza business and stated that if their signs were allowed on private property, you might end up with sandwich board signs up and down Roosevelt Road. The signs should be for announcing specials for that day or for a specific intent.

Mr. Stilling stated that the intent of the signs would be for businesses that are located right up along the right of way or a pedestrian-oriented environment, such as the downtown. This would benefit buildings that are set back less than 10' from the right of way. We are finding that certain events are taking place more and more and businesses want to draw pedestrian attention to something even if it's only for 2 hours. They want the ability to have a temporary sign or an A-frame sign to indicate specials for the day.

Commissioner Burke asked if the intent is to allow the signs on private property within 10' of the building. Mr. Stilling noted that right now they are not allowed on private property. Commissioner Burke clarified that staff is asking should we now allow these types of signs on private property within 10' of the building. Mr. Stilling answered, yes.

Chairperson Ryan exemplified the McDonald's petition just heard earlier. He asked where they could or could not place their sign if they were allowed to have one.

Commissioner Burke stated that it would be acceptable to have the sign on a sidewalk near the store, but not at the edge of the parking lot. There would have to be specific conditions and specific developments in which this would apply. Mr. Stilling noted that maybe the sign should be located within 10' of the front door or entrance.

Chairperson Ryan exemplified Roosevelt Road and stated that parking lots are usually located between the buildings and the sidewalk which results in more than 10' from the front door.

Commissioner Burke questioned if the objective for the location of the sign is to be under a canopy. Chairperson Ryan pointed out that if it's allowed to be on private property, it has to be thought through because part of their private property includes the parking lot which could extend all the way to the sidewalk. Mr. Stilling clarified that if the sign is located within 10' of the front door on private property it would be acceptable, but not on Highland Avenue or Roosevelt Road. The intent is to capture pedestrian traffic as they are already in the development or walking from one store to another.

Commissioner Cooper suggested that there be a limitation as to the width of the sign so as not to create a barrier on the sidewalk. Mr. Stilling answered that a 4' sign width would be maintained.

Commissioner Sweetser indicated that private property includes homes. Mr. Stilling answered that this is restricted to the business districts. Commissioner Sweetser asked if staff had gotten interest to display sandwich board signs in order to advertise a garage sale or a party. She noted that private property should be further distinguished by zoning districts. Mr. Stilling answered that it would be.

Commissioner Cooper asked what a church is zoned. Mr. Stilling answered, residential planned development. He stated that staff will have to develop language to ensure they are associated with non residential uses. Churches are examples where the signs will not be near the front door or within 10' of the building so staff is working with them to possibly address their signage by amending their planned development. Another possibility would be to have provisions for entities that are non residential and non

business uses.

Commissioner Sweetser stated that the key to keep in mind is that the signage is intended for pedestrian traffic.

2. As sandwich board signs are (by intent) designed to serve a different purpose than banners, should businesses be precluded from any other type of temporary signage if they have a sandwich board sign?

Mr. Stilling clarified that a business that has a permit for a temporary banner is not allowed to display their sandwich board signs as it results in mixed signage.

Commissioner Burke stated probably not. He has no objection to sandwich board signs even though they are somewhat of a nuisance and unattractive, but he objects to mixed signage.

Chairperson Ryan stated that if an entity is allowed to have a temporary sign for 120 days, the two signs shouldn't be the same as their intent is different. A business should be allowed one or the other but not both.

Commissioner Sweetser noted that if staff is not careful there could be multiple signs within 10' of the entrance. You have to give thought to whether you want to allow multiple sandwich board signs for one business.

Mr. Stilling confirmed that the consensus of the Commissioners was to allow either a temporary sign or a sandwich board sign, but not both.

3. Rather than setting a 9:00 p.m. time limitation, should the removal limitation be adjusted to tie to the business operation and/or a later time period?

Mr. Stilling exemplified Praga Restaurant and how they are now advertising that their business is open after 9:00 p.m. He stated that the removal cap could be extended to midnight or 1 a.m.

Chairperson Ryan questioned why we need to address this issue. If sandwich board signs are intended for foot pedestrians what is the point in allowing them 9:00 p.m. as no one would see them especially on Roosevelt Road. Mr. Stilling answered that this would be specifically for downtown businesses and language would be included specifically referring to that zoning district.

Commissioner Sweetser indicated that the sign doesn't have to be out until the business closes.

4. Are there other consideration the Plan Commission has regarding sandwich board sign regulations?

Commissioner Burke noted safety aspects associated with sandwich board signs, exemplifying a tripping hazard as one, but also mentioned the affect of the wind on untethered signs. Mr. Stilling indicated that we currently have design provisions within the Sign Ordinance. He explained that businesses have to submit insurance, which states that they hold the Village not liable.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if a business can request sandbags from the entity where they get their signs from. Mr. Stilling answered that the code would require some sort of control mechanism so they don't get blown over.

Commissioner Burke noted that the process must be managed properly so there shouldn't be a problem. His fear is that the groups we would like to see take advantage of the new code won't and the areas in which we don't want to see the signs will - so we must be careful. Mr. Stilling answered that a business would be required to get a permit and would have to go through the permit process. This would result in monitoring to ensure things are done properly.

Commissioner Cooper asked what the process is when businesses do not follow the ordinance. Mr. Stilling answered that Village policy would involve the Code Enforcement Division, who would work to get the business to come into compliance by working to correct any violations. He explained the Code Enforcement process, which begins with an advisory letter being sent to the property owner notifying them of the violation, progressing to the end step of issuing a ticket. He noted that most violations are easily correctable.

Adjournment

[Play Video](#)

The meeting adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission

Christopher Stilling, Secretary
Lombard Plan Commission