

VILLAGE OF LOMBARD
INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW GROUP REPORT

TO: Lombard Plan Commission

HEARING DATE: June 21, 2004
(continued from the May 17, 2004 meeting)

FROM: Department of Community
Development

PREPARED BY: William J. Heniff, AICP
Senior Planner

TITLE

PC 04-17; Text Amendment to the Lombard Zoning Ordinance: The Village of Lombard requests a text amendment to Section 155.210 of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to modify the maximum permitted height, yard requirements and overall maximum size of accessory buildings and structures.

BACKGROUND:

The Planning Services Division of the Community Development Department is proposing changes to the Zoning Ordinance as it pertains to the maximum allowable height, size and yard requirements of detached garages in single family residential districts. The amendments are in response to previous Village Board and Plan Commission workshop sessions. The proposed amendments are also intended to ensure that accessory structures, most notably detached garages, are clearly accessory to the principal single-family residential use of properties.

At the May 17, 2004 Plan Commission meeting, staff presented draft text amendments for Plan Commission consideration. The Plan Commission continued the matter to address issues raised at the meeting. Additional information regarding each of these items discussed at the Plan Commission meeting is noted below. A copy of the previous report provided to the Plan Commission is also attached for your reference. Each section concludes with the latest version of the proposed text amendments that includes the initial Plan Commission suggestions as well. To fully illustrate garage standards, staff is providing the Commissioners with a graphic depicting the existing Building Code requirements for garages and an illustrative example of the various roof styles. Staff will be also presenting illustrative examples at the Plan Commission meeting.

Height of Accessory Buildings and Structures

May 17, 2004 Plan Commission Follow-Up Questions

- *Standards for garage door openings and how they may be getting larger to accommodate larger vehicles. If garage doors become larger, the 17 foot height limit may be insufficient.*

Staff Response

Staff believes that the seventeen foot height maximum still allows for flexibility if the garage walls are erected at a nine or ten foot height. This can be accomplished by reducing the roof pitch or decreasing the overall width of the garage. Staff also believes that the limitation could be justified as it can be used as a check against individuals who may use their garages for home occupation uses. Oversized doors can sometimes be used as a “red flag” for Planning staff. However by limiting the height on the second level would help ensure that a full business operation or a secondary dwelling unit does not occupy the garage.

- *What is the standard height for garages – eight foot height limit is not standard anymore and that having a 9' dimension will cause the space to shrink. From a storage standpoint, this could be quite limiting. Other communities had regulations that are higher than 17 feet.*

Staff Response

In discussions and review of recent garage permits, approximately 80 percent of new detached garages have been of a standard design (eight foot walls). Staff believes that the limitation can still provide storage space, but it will limit active use of the second level. Property owners still have the ability to expand onto their principal structure – this change only refers to accessory detached garages. Rafter areas will still need collar ties and support structures, but staff believes that 17' is a good compromise to allow for storage but not to create full second story rooms.

A list of regulations from other selected communities is provided below.

Jurisdiction	Maximum Height	Height Definition	Additional Regulations
Villa Park	15'	Grade to highest structural member	
Wheaton	1.5 stories	Grade to the highest point	
Bensenville	15'	Grade to the highest point	
Oak Brook Terrace	16'	Grade to the highest point	Sheds cannot be more than 10' above grade
Carol Stream	15'	Grade to highest point	
Woodridge	17'	Grade to the highest point	
Naperville	18'	Grade to the highest point	
Downers Grove	20'	Grade to the highest point	
Elmhurst	21'	Grade to the highest point	Gable and hip roofs only, gambrel roof permitted where principal structure has gambrel roof
Glen Ellyn	22'	Grade to the highest point	15' maximum ht. for gazebos and sheds
DuPage County	24'	Grade to the highest point	
Oak Brook starting 1/27/04	25'	Grade to the highest point	Continuous flat roof no higher than 15'. Each additional ft. over 15' has to increase set back by 1'
Darien	14'	Mean height calculation	12' maximum ht. for gazebos and sheds
Bartlett	15'	Mean height calculation	
Lombard	15'	Mean height calculation	
Roselle	15'	Midpoint of rafter	
West Chicago	15' 6"	Mean height calculation	Garage must have a service door
Winfield	17'	Mean height calculation	
Clarendon Hills	20'	Mean height calculation	
Westmont	24'	Mean height calculation	Sheds are maximum 15' high and 10' from other accessory structures.

- *How would a typical garage would look with a 10' clearance with the same type of roof pitch. Has there been any consideration to go with a "no higher than" number ? Is not sure if that would be satisfactory to staff?*

Staff Response

Staff will be providing examples at the Plan Commission meeting. The 17-foot limitation is intended to make sure that detached structures to not overwhelm a property or a neighboring property. Staff still believes that the height limitation does not unduly limit a property owner – substantial flexibility still exists below the 17 foot line.

- *Would the text amendment limit architectural components by only being able to have a flat roof?*

Staff Response

The regulation could increase the number of garages with lower roof pitches. BIS finds that many garage roofs are constructed at a 4/12 pitch. The proposed amendment could still allow for higher roof pitches (i.e., 6/12). Alternatively, owners could also select an alternative roof pitch style (e.g., gable, hip, gambrel, mansard, etc.) to meet their needs instead of a standard flat roof.

Interestingly, many of the garage builders in the community (i.e., Blue Sky, Danley) have incorporated the Village's specifications into their prototype design plans.

- *Would the code change promote more flat roofs?*

Staff Response

While that is theoretically possible, the Building Division notes that flat roofs are generally undesirable as the structural members of the roofs must be able to accommodate snow loads. Right now, Village codes allow for flat roofs for garages, however the loading limitation required for flat roofs have made this design less desirable.

- *Is 17 feet the most desirable - is 18 or 19 feet out of the question?*

Staff Response

BIS reviewed this issue and finds that the 17 foot limitation as being a reasonable limit based upon what we are trying to accomplish. Per the request of the Commissioners, staff will be providing more examples as to how the 17 foot provision can be met while still providing for storage area.

Suggested Amendments

3. Height of Accessory Buildings and Structures

Unless otherwise provided for in this ordinance, the height of accessory buildings and structures shall meet the following requirements:

- a. No detached accessory building or structure shall exceed the height of the principal structure or use, ~~or~~ and
- b. ~~No detached accessory building or structure shall exceed a height of 15 feet, whichever is lower.~~ The vertical distance measured from the average grade to the highest point on the roof or parapet for any detached accessory building or structure shall not exceed seventeen (17) feet.

Area Requirements for Accessory Buildings and Structures

May 17, 2004 Plan Commission Follow-Up Questions

- What are the impacts of the 750 square foot limit or 10 percent of the buildable lot limit on lots narrower than 60'.

Staff Response

Staff notes that the 750 square foot limit should be sufficient for a standard R2 lot whether the lot meets code (i.e., 60 feet or greater in width) or is substandard. If an owner of a legal non-conforming lot wants to erect a garage, they can modify their respective plans to reflect the nature of their narrower lot.

- Would it be more desirable to eliminate the percentage factor and just have a 750' cap?

Staff Response

Staff has incorporated this change into the draft amendment. However, staff proposes to keep the ten percent of lot provision for other accessory structures, as deleting these items could have unintended consequences (i.e., limiting the size of decks, pools, etc.) not germane to this issue.

Suggested Amendments

Section 155.210 (B)(1)

B. Restrictions in Residential Districts

The controls over accessory structures and uses described below shall apply only to Residential Districts.

(1) Maximum Area

(a) General Requirements

A single accessory building or structure in a residential district shall not occupy more than 10% of the zoning lot. The combined area of all accessory buildings

and structures shall not exceed the total ground floor area of the principal residence. No accessory use, except for surface parking spaces, shall cover more than 30% of the zoning lot.

(b) Detached Garages

~~In addition to the provisions expressed in Section 155.210(B)(1)(a) above, n~~No building footprint of a detached garage shall exceed ~~1,000~~ seven-hundred fifty (750) square feet in ground floor area on a lot within a R1 or R2 Single-Family Residential District.

Setback Requirements for Accessory Buildings and Structures

May 17, 2004 Plan Commission Follow-Up Questions

- Would this amendment affect other open space provisions in the Ordinance?

Staff Response

This amendment would only affect the location of the structures rather than the lot coverage provisions.

Suggested Amendments

Section 155.210 (B)(2)

2. Yard Requirements

a. ~~General Requirements~~

~~In all residential districts (R1 through R6), accessory structures shall be set back a minimum of three (3) feet from the rear property line and, if the entire structure is located in the rear 25 percent of the lot, accessory structures shall be set back a minimum of three (3) feet from an interior side property line. If any portion of the accessory structure is not located within the rear 25 percent, then a minimum of six (6) foot setback from the interior side property line must be maintained.~~

b. ~~Detached Garages~~

~~In all residential districts (R1 through R6), detached garages shall be set back a minimum of three (3) feet from the rear property line. Detached garages shall be set back a minimum of three (3) feet from the interior side property line and a minimum of twelve (12) feet from the principal structure on any adjoining lot.~~

Unless otherwise provided for in this ordinance, accessory buildings and structures in all residential districts (R1 through R6), shall meet the following requirements:

a. Rear Yard Setback Requirements

Detached accessory buildings or structures that require a foundation, footings or piers shall be set back a minimum of ten (10) feet from the rear property line. All other accessory structures shall be set back a minimum of three (3) feet from the rear property line.

b. Interior Side Yard Setback Requirements

- i. Detached accessory buildings or structures that require a foundation, footings or piers shall be set back a minimum of five (5) feet from the interior side property line.
- ii. If an accessory building or structure does not require a foundation, footings or piers and is located in the rear 25 percent of the lot, the building or structure shall be set back a minimum of three (3) feet from an interior side property line.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the above considerations, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee recommends that the Plan Commission make the following motion recommending **approval** of the request as initially proposed and as modified in the Plan Commissioner's comments:

Based on the information and testimony presented, the proposed text amendments comply with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, and, therefore, I move that the Plan Commission accept the finding and recommendation of the Inter-departmental Review Report as the findings of the Plan Commission and therefore, I recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of the text amendments, as amended and described in PC 04-17.

Inter-Departmental Review Group Report Approved By:

David A. Hulseberg, AICP
Director of Community Development

DAH: WJH