



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, April 16, 2012

7:30 PM

Village Hall - COMMUNITY ROOM

Call to Order

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

Pledge of Allegiance

Chairperson Ryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call of Members

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

Absent 1 - Martin Burke

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

Chairperson Ryan called the order of the agenda.

Michael Toth read the Rules of Procedure as written in the Plan Commission By-Laws.

Public Hearings

[120140](#)

PC 12-10: 300 W. Roosevelt Road (Continued from March 19, 2012)

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)

Jim Ramos, 1707 Norman, Park Ridge presented the petition. He stated that Wolfy's is looking to put a patio outside of their restaurant, located at 300 W. Roosevelt Rd. He then stated that the outdoor dining area would be approximately 600 square feet with 6-8 tables.

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Community Development Director, presented the petition. The petitioner is proposing to construct a 600 square foot outdoor dining area on the south side of the side of the existing building. As a result, the petitioner 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 (outdoor dining) for the subject property located within the B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District.

The petitioner is proposing to construct a 600 square foot outdoor dining area on the south side of the existing building. While the petitioner's plan does not show seating, the area would consist of approximately 6-8 tables. As part of their building permit submittal, the petitioner will be required to include a seating plan showing how the tables and chairs meet the required spacing per building codes.

Access to the outdoor area would be via existing doors on both the east and west side of the building. The petitioner's plan does identify some type of perimeter fencing or wall. Traditionally, staff has requested a minimum of a 4 foot high fence to secure the area. As part of their building permit submittal, the petitioner will be required to show details of their enclosure. As a condition of approval, staff recommends that the enclosure be a minimum of 4 feet high.

The petitioner has indicated that the hours of operation outside would be consistent with their current hours of operations which are roughly 10AM -8 PM.

The petitioner is proposing to construct a 600 square foot outdoor dining area on the south side of the existing building. Similar requests have been granted in the past for properties along Roosevelt Road. Staff does not object to this request as it allows for an alternate area for patrons to eat if desired. As the property is not located near any residences, impacts of the outdoor dining function are minimal. The petitioner has submitted responses to the standards for conditional use and staff finds that the standards have been met.

As part of this petition, staff completed a review of the parking requirements for the business. There are 23 parking spaces onsite

and the existing business requires approximately 12 spaces. With the added outdoor seating, an additional 6 spaces are required.

Therefore, the petitioner has a surplus of 5 spaces. It should be noted that the existing handicapped space is substandard per IAC and needs to be increased by an additional 8 feet in width. As a result and as a condition of approval, 1 space will be removed to accommodate the handicapped space.

An additional item for consideration pertains to the existing dumpsters on the premises. Right now, there are 2 existing dumpsters located at the northwest corner of the site. Staff recommends that a trash enclosure area be constructed for the petitioner's dumpsters, with said enclosure being designed per Village Code (solid fence of 6 to 8 feet in height).

The Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject property for Community Commercial Uses. The Roosevelt Road Corridor plan, a supplement to the Comprehensive Plan, provides additional recommendations regarding the request. Comments underlined are part of the Corridor Plan followed by staff's response.

- Restaurants are a preferred land use in the corridor. The existing restaurant use is being maintained and enhanced through this petition.
- Outdoor sales and service areas should be tied to the principal use of the property. The plan meets this goal. The petitioner is providing a fenced/enclosed area which ensures that the dining area does not encroach into the parking spaces.
- Ensuring that compatibility with adjacent residential properties is maintained. The proposed outdoor dining element is proposed on the south side of the building and will abut other commercial uses. The outdoor area will be over 350 feet away from the nearest residence.

Staff finds that this petition is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Roosevelt Road Corridor Plan.

The site is surrounded by other retail on the south, east and west sides. The property to the north is vacant and owned by the Village of Lombard as it is being used as detention. The nearest residences to the north are in excess of 350' away. In addition, dense shrubs and trees to the north provide additional buffer. The intent of the Roosevelt Road Corridor is to provide an commercial retail business; therefore staff finds the proposed outdoor dining is consistent with the surrounding land uses and recommends approval of PC 12-10 subject to the four conditions in the staff report.

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

Commissioner Sweetser stated that it seems like a nice addition and the petition is straightforward.

A motion was made by Ruth Sweetser, seconded by Ronald Olbrysh, that this matter be recommended to the Corporate Authorities for approval subject to the following conditions:

1. The subject property shall be developed in substantial compliance with the site plan, attached to the staff report as Exhibit A.
2. The petitioner shall apply for and receive a building permit for the proposed outdoor dining area. Said permit shall satisfactorily address all IDRC comments and provide a minimum 4 foot high fencing around the outdoor dining area. The fencing shall be of a wrought iron or black aluminum design, in a manner acceptable to the Director of Community Development.
3. The dumpster associated with the petitioner's establishment shall be fully enclosed pursuant to Village Code.
4. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the petitioner shall revise the existing handicapped parking space to meet the minimum required dimensions, striping and signage per the Illinois Accessibility Code.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, Stephen Flint, and John Mrofcza

Absent: 1 - Martin Burke

[120188](#)

PC 12-11: 270 Eisenhower Lane North, Unit #8

Requests that the Village grant a conditional use, pursuant to Section 155.420 (C) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow for a Learning Center (athletic training facility) within the I - Limited Industrial District. (DISTRICT #3)

Luke Kramarski, 149 Heritage Lane, Streamwood and Chris Garcia, 780 Cunningham Dr., Palatine presented the petition. Mr. Kramarski stated that they plan to open a fitness training facility at 270 North Eisenhower Lane. He stated that Crossfit training caters mainly to athletes to improve their performance. He added that they are both highly experienced trainers and athletes and have been training approximately ten years.

Mr. Garcia stated that the facility will generally accommodate small group fitness programs of usually no more than eight people and two trainers. He added that there will be personal training, which is usually 1-on-1 or 2-on-1 so there will be no conflict with too many people in the area. He then stated that a minimal amount of equipment will be used for this type of training which includes body weights for high intensity workouts. The facility will also include pull up racks and smaller equipment such as medicine balls, rowers and rings.

Mr. Kramarski stated that the facility includes a small office space and a matted floor in the fitness area for sound reduction. He referred to sample pictures of other Crossfit gyms which were included in their packet submittal. He added that the industrial area is perfect for their use and made reference to the submitted pictures that show the sample set up. He then stated that parking would be ample as there is space available on both sides of the building. He added that the other tenants and landlord are okay with the proposed use.

Mr. Garcia mentioned that their schedule goes against normal business hours and includes early morning activities conducted before business hours and also a noon class for those who work. The rest will be post work hours from 4:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.. He added that there is no conflict of noise and the parking is complete.

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

Michael Toth, Planner I, presented the petition. The petitioner, referred to as CrossFit Paradox, is proposing to operate an indoor athletic training facility within an existing tenant space on the subject property within the I - Limited Industrial District. CrossFit Paradox plans to utilize the 2,100 square foot tenant space for personal training, small group training and sport-specific training. By Code, the use would be considered a Learning Center which requires conditional use approval.

In 2007, the Village approved text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance for learning centers as conditional uses in the I - Limited Industrial District (PC 07-20) along with a companion request for a learning center located at 1117 N. Main Street (PC 07-21). As noted in PC 07-20, the Zoning Ordinance defines learning centers as including "instruction in art, dance, photography, sculpture, language, student tutoring, testing centers, etc., but do not include adult uses, trade schools, public or private full-time schools." The private, educational nature of athletic training facilities fits in well with the other uses classified as learning centers. Therefore, it was deemed appropriate to amend the definition of learning centers to include athletic training facilities and include learning centers as conditional uses within the I District.

The proposed athletic training facility would occupy 2,100 square feet within an existing multi-tenant industrial building. The facility will be open from 7 a.m. until 10 p.m., Monday through Friday to accommodate clients work schedules. The hours between 7 a.m. through 9 a.m. will be dedicated to small group and personal training (2-3 clients/hour), from 12 p.m. through 1 p.m. will be dedicated to

personal training (1-2 clients/hour) and 5 p.m. through 8 p.m. will be reserved for group training (4-6 clients/hour). Business hours on Saturday include 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. for small group training (3-4 clients/hour). CrossFit Paradox would have a minimal amount of equipment (rowing machines, pull up racks, gymnastic rings, etc.) in the facility and do not anticipate more than 8 members within the facility at any given time.

The Comprehensive Plan recommends Planned Business Park at this location. The York Brook Business Park is specifically described in the Comprehensive Plan as being one of the newer, established business park locations within the Village. The York Brook Business Park is also completely developed and generally well maintained. Although described in the Comprehensive Plan, there are no specific recommendations for the types of uses that should occur within the York Brook Business Park. Given this circumstance, the very nature of a business park can be generally summarized as providing light industrial, business and office land uses. The proposed use is not a typical light industrial use, but the space required of the equipment associated with the use is better suited for an industrial space. Furthermore, staff finds that the proposed athletic training facility is compatible with the intent of the York Brook Business Park and ultimately the Comprehensive Plan.

The property is surrounded by light industrial multi-tenant buildings. Other tenants occupying the subject multi-tenant building include a variety of "light" industrial uses, which include warehousing, contractor & general office, auto repair and light machinery production. There are thirty (30) striped parking spaces that line the eastern portion of the subject property and a large paved area on the southwest portion of the property used for parking and delivery. Both parking areas are accessible from Eisenhower Lane and are connected at the rear of the property, allowing for optimal site circulation. As the proposed use is considered to be a learning center, the required parking would be two (2) spaces per three employees plus one space per maximum number of students. With a total of two (2) employees and a maximum number of six (6) customers (students), the proposed use would require a total of eight (8) parking spaces. This parking requirement is consistent with the previous office use in the space which required 4 spaces for every 1000 square feet (8 spaces). The majority of parking demand generated by the proposed training facility will occur after 5:00 p.m. (4-6 clients/hour), which is after the typical operating hours of the surrounding businesses. Furthermore, staff finds that the proposed athletic training facility is compatible with the surrounding land uses and the uses that currently occupy the subject property.

Furthermore, staff is recommending approval of PC 12-11 subject to

the two conditions in the staff report.

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

Commissioner Sweetser stated that this looks like a great facility. She added that it appears that the facility will be open about 78 hours a week. She asked the petitioners if they will both be at the facility at all times. Mr. Garcia answered that he will be there full time and Luke will be there mostly during the night and morning activities.

A motion was made by Andrea Cooper, seconded by Stephen Flint, that this matter be recommended to the Corporate Authorities for approval subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The conditional use for the athletic training facility is exclusively for the tenant space at 270 Eisenhower Lane North, Unit #8. Any expansion of the establishment within the existing building beyond what was submitted as part of PC 12-11, shall require an amendment to the conditional use approval.**
- 2. All business activity associated with the athletic training facility shall be conducted within the existing building.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, Stephen Flint, and John Mrofcza

Absent: 1 - Martin Burke

[120189](#)

**PC 12-12: Text Amendments to the Zoning and Sign Ordinances
(Continued from April 16, 2012)**

The Village of Lombard is requesting the following text amendments to the Zoning and Sign Ordinances:

1. Section 155.205 of the Zoning Ordinance relative to fencing materials.
2. Section 155.212 of the Zoning Ordinance relative to permitted encroachments.
3. Chapter 153 (Sign Ordinance) relative to balloons.

Chairperson Ryan noted that the petition would be presented by the Village.

Michael Toth, Planner I, presented the staff report. The Village has a history of amending its Zoning and Sign Ordinances to address evolving circumstances presented by petition or otherwise. As a result, staff is proposing to amend the Zoning Ordinance requirement that fences or walls within fifteen feet of any multi-family, business, office and industrial buildings must be of a fire resistant type of construction. Staff is also requesting to add generators, and amend new central

air-conditioning units, as permitted encroachments into rear yards. The Sign Ordinance provisions relative to balloons have been examined and are also being requested for amendment accordingly.

There are three text amendments being requested as part of this petition:

Section 155.205 of the Zoning Ordinance relative to fencing materials.

The Zoning Ordinance currently requires that fences or walls within fifteen (15) feet of any multi-family, business, office and industrial buildings be of a fire resistant type of construction. Typically, any requirement relative to the material of a structure (including fences) is specifically addressed in the Building Code. As the current Building Code no longer requires fire resistant type of construction for fencing adjacent to commercial structures, staff is proposing to eliminate this provision. The proposed amendment will also help create consistency in the style and design of the fencing.

Section 155.212 of the Zoning Ordinance relative to permitted encroachments.

Staff has witnessed an increased demand for emergency residential generators. As generators are not listed as a permitted encroachment, they are currently required to be placed in the buildable area of a property (must meet current setbacks). Unlike a structure, such as a fence or shed, there are more critical elements involved with the piping and electrical components of a home that make generator placement more complicated. As residential generators are similar to the size and operation to that of a central air-conditioning unit, staff believes that generators should be regulated in the same manner as a new central air-conditioning unit.

Staff believes that it would be in the public interest to allow both generators and new central air-conditioning units within the rear yard area. New central air-conditioning units are currently listed as a permitted encroachment in the rear yard only, as long as the unit does not encroach more than four (4') feet into the rear yard. Staff is proposing provisions that would allow both generators and new central air-conditioning units to encroach up to ten (10') feet into the required rear yard area. The revised setback would allow for greater opportunity for placing such structures away from the principal structures on neighboring properties. This amendment would also benefit non-conforming properties that do not meet the current rear yard setbacks. To ensure minimal impact onto adjacent properties, both new structures would still be prohibited in the side yard.

As previously stated, current code does not specifically make reference to generators and they are therefore regulated as accessory

structures. As part of this amendment, staff is proposing to specifically identify generators within the "Permitted Obstructions" list of Section 155.212. To minimize impact on adjacent properties with noise, staff is proposing to provide a restriction to ensure that emergency generators are for standby electrical power only and not as a primary power source. It should be noted that through staff's research, we have found that emergency generators will turn on for a self-diagnostic check a few times per week for up to 20 minutes.

In 2009 (PC 09-19), the Village approved text amendments to the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to establish replacement central air-conditioning systems as permitted obstructions in certain side and rear yards as long as a) the unit does not further encroach into the requisite yard than the previous unit and b) the unit does not encroach more than four feet (4') into the requisite yard. Staff recognized the costs associated with the relocation of a central air conditioning unit. Therefore, staff found that allowing replacement air conditioning systems to be listed as a permitted encroachment in the interior side yard (with restrictions) would reduce the number of variation requests, encourage residents to obtain a permit, eliminate relocation costs and maintain the existing character of residential properties throughout the Village.

Chapter 153 (Sign Ordinance) relative to balloons.

There has been an increasing demand from the business community to have greater flexibility to effectively advertise their businesses. To address such need, the sign provisions were amended in 2011 (as part of PC 11-16) to allow balloons that are less than two feet when measured in any dimension on a lawfully-established sandwich board. Staff is now proposing further amendments to the signage provisions relative to balloons.

When the Village approved the text amendments as part of PC 09-26, relative to the regulation of temporary signage, the definition of attention-getting devices was amended to include balloons (less than two feet in diameter) as attention-getting devices. Under the attention-getting device regulations such devices (including balloons (less than two feet in diameter)) require a permit and can only be displayed for a certain time period. The permits are restricted to 14 days each with four permits being allowed for the calendar year. As there has been a growing desire by the business community to effectively draw attention to their establishment, staff is proposing to remove reference to 'balloons (less than two feet in diameter)' as an attention-getting device and relocate 'balloons (less than two feet in diameter)' to Section 153.206 'Signs Not Subject to a Permit'. With this amendment, businesses would be able to have balloons, 2' or less in diameter, year round and without needing a permit. Provisions related

to property maintenance and removing deflated balloons would still be applicable.

Staff finds that the proposed amendments will not be detrimental to public safety or neighborhood aesthetics, but rather will provide businesses with another tool to effectively draw attention to their establishments and recommends approval of the petition.

Chairperson Ryan asked if there was anyone present who would like to speak in favor or against the petition or who had questions of the staff report.

Neil Konrardy, 101 E. Prairie, Lombard, spoke regarding generators and the noise they create. He mentioned his previous discussions with Mr. Heniff about the noise levels coming from the generator located next door which is permanently installed and a nuisance. He mentioned that he has researched the topic of sound associated with generators and found that when measuring noise levels you should not only take into consideration decibel levels but also hertz levels. He noted there is a State standard that deals with noise and he asked the following questions:

- 1. Has the Village reviewed the State standard and if so, will these amendments comply with it?*
- 2. Has the Village looked at the operating circumstances associated with this proposed change? He asked what a 10' requisite yard is and if it takes into account noise levels, vibrations, etc. and other issues associated with the permanent generators. He wanted to make sure that staff has taken these things into account.*
- 3. What will happen to the generators that currently exist - will they be grandfathered?*
- 4. Aside from the location of these units, has the Village considered noise containment and to what standard it ought to apply?*

Lastly, he hoped that this text amendment would bring him relief from the existing condition.

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, answered:

- 1. In response to the definition of a requisite yard. A current rear yard setback of a single family lot is 35 feet. Air conditioner units and generators can only be located on a buildable lot and can be no closer than 6' in a corner side yard so for your situation, there would be no code change. This amendment*

focuses on units being able to encroach into the rear yard setback and be allowed as far as 25' from the rear yard setback line. Mr. Stilling stated he is familiar with the home he is referring to and in most cases it is best to locate a generator in the rear yard. This code change will only affect where generators can be located in the rear yard and encourages that they be located there.

- 2. Relative to your situation and the generator being grandfathered, this particular generator is currently located within a side yard that meets the 6' setback and is legal by code. The important thing to note is that the Village is currently trying to alleviate future concerns as the Zoning Ordinance is silent on how generators are currently regulated. This amendment limits operating a generator in emergency situations only and not using it as a power source.*
- 3. As far as a noise nuisance, the State does have requirements with regard to decibel levels. The challenge is that there has to be an ongoing problem. Exemplifying lawnmowers, he explained how it is difficult to enforce a statute when it's a sporadic action. Further, when the action of running a generator is due to a major storm event and people are without electricity, one of the main attractions of having a generator is that it can run a sump pump or a backup.*
- 4. Noise containment - Staff looked at other communities and how they regulated this. Fencing could be an option but it can also make matters worse and actually increase noise levels. From staff's perspective this amendment is making the code more restrictive by limiting the use of generators for emergency purposes only and forcing their placement into the rear yard rather than in the side yard which is closer to neighbors.*

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

Commissioner Sweetser stated she wanted to summarize staff's responses to ensure she understood the amendment correctly:

- 1. A permanent generator can be either located in the rear yard or possibly in the side yard but only if it is located up to the 6' setback.*
- 2. It will only be allowed to run either for a 20 minute, self-diagnostic check a few times per week or in an emergency situation in which case it is exempt.*
- 3. Other than that, the action would be open to some type of monitoring and if someone were to complain about the noise level, it would be checked out.*

Mr. Stilling answered yes because with this amendment there would be provisions in place.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if appropriate measures would be taken to provide relief. Mr. Stilling answered yes. If the generator is running constantly and we can determine through ComEd that there is a pattern as to the generator being used as a primary power source and not an emergency source, we have measures to notify them and correct it.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if there was anything additional that could be used to determine if there was a misuse to ensure that appropriate measures need to be taken. Mr. Stilling answered that staff has looked at noise provisions and tried to minimize reference to those because it is very difficult to enforce. The Village does not have the equipment or the expertise to conduct a noise analysis.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if the Village could subcontract that out or would it be cost prohibitive due to the number of times it might be used. Mr. Stilling answered that the State does have a noise statute which regulates nuisances.

Chairperson Ryan asked if the State governs generator noise. Mr. Stilling answered that it governs any noise coming off a property.

Chairperson Ryan asked if State statutes govern the allowable amount of emitted noise of generators during the manufacturing process so that when the unit is being purchased and placed on a property it passes State regulations. Mr. Stilling answered that he wasn't sure.

Commissioner Cooper asked if using a generator 20 minutes in a week falls into the emergency category. Mr. Stilling answered that a happy medium needs to be reached in order for self-diagnostics to be done.

Commissioner Cooper confirmed that this amendment is focusing on generators being located in the rear yard. Mr. Stilling answered, yes, and in addition they are only to be used for emergency purposes.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the example presented today qualifies as a nuisance and if the proposed amendment would help him in any way to alleviate the problem. Mr. Stilling answered that this amendment will be primarily for future users as we are proposing a level of restriction.

Commissioner Cooper asked how many times a week the Village

issues permits on this matter. Mr. Stilling answered there are a few outstanding permits awaiting the outcome of this text amendment.

Mr. Toth added that most people do not have the option of putting an air conditioning unit or generator in their side yard as they will not meet the criteria for putting it there. We have had a few cases presented before the ZBA requesting this be allowed so this amendment will promote putting them in the rear yard by allowing additional space in order to keep them out of the side yard.

Commissioner Flint asked if it is more advantageous to put them in the rear yard relative to noise and sound.

Commissioner Sweetser added that it is reasonable to check and see if the units need to meet State requirements before they are bought in order to eliminate the potential for the types of problems previously described.

Mr. Stilling stated that this item could be tabled so staff can conduct the appropriate research to see what decibel levels are allowable as they relate to State requirements. Mr. Stilling asked Village Counsel if the other amendments can be considered tonight or if the whole petition needs to be continued. Village Counsel Wagner suggested the whole petition be continued.

Commissioner Mrofcza stated that the proposed amendment indicates that we want to ensure minimal impact on adjacent properties and asked if there is new construction, would they automatically have to be located in the rear yard. Mr. Stilling answered that they can still be located in the side yard if it meets the 6' setback.

Commissioner Cooper referenced the proposed balloon amendment. She recalled how they previously discussed this issue and how she was reluctant to allow it. Now they are being asked to reconsider allowing balloons to go everywhere. She thought this amendment goes too far, the issue could get out of control if a permit is not required and wondered how flexible we need to be to allow people to get attention.

Mr. Stilling answered that since the last balloon code amendment; we found that we have less of a problem than we thought we would have. Most businesses take it upon themselves to ensure that the balloons are where they should be and retain an aesthetic appearance, but it is becoming an ongoing code enforcement activity.

Commissioner Cooper suggested that we restrict balloons entirely. Mr. Stilling stated that you will still see people put balloons up. Our

recommendation is to give them the ability to do this and allow them to do a good job regulating themselves. They have been diligent so far and we are trying to be as business friendly as possible. We are trying to provide a balance, and if it becomes a problem in the future, we can revisit the issue. Balloons are still prohibited in a clear line of sight area and cannot be an obstruction for ingress/egress.

Commissioner Cooper asked if this would permit businesses along Roosevelt Road to have balloons every 10'. Mr. Stilling answered they would not likely be found on Roosevelt Road as balloons are usually located off the entrance of a building and attached to something like an entrance sign or a nearby drive through sign.

A motion was made by Ronald Olbrysh, seconded by Ruth Sweetser, that this matter be continued to the May 21, 2012 Plan Commission meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ronald Olbrysh, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, Stephen Flint, and John Mrofcza

Absent: 1 - Martin Burke

Business Meeting

Approval of Minutes

On a motion by Olbrysh and seconded by Sweetser the minutes of the March 19, 2012 meeting were unanimously approved by the members present with non substantive changes as noted by Village Counsel.

Public Participation

DuPage County Hearings

There were no DuPage County hearings.

Chairperson's Report

The Chairperson deferred to the Assistant Director of Community Development.

Planner's Report

Christopher Stilling referred to staff's memorandum outlining four properties that have been designated as a landmark site. Village Code requires that the Plan Commission receive notice of this designation.

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 - Draft Report

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, introduced the workshop. He noted that the document presented for discussion is essentially a final draft although pictures and other graphics will be added to enhance its readability. Staff has reached out to the Village Board for their input in order to facilitate further public discussion. The ultimate goal of this request is to incorporate concerns raised by elected officials and/or the public regarding the draft document as it is being developed before formal public hearings are offered on the Plan. Depending on the extent of the public input process, the Comprehensive Plan may come back to the Commissioners for consideration through the public hearing process.

With reference to the final components, attached is a draft of the Westmore-Meyers Plan that is a supplement to the Comprehensive Plan. The recommended land use was previously covered in the discussion pertaining to Areas of Concern. This Plan includes a history of the area; introduction highlighting key aspects of the area; existing conditions; goals and objectives and policy recommendations.

As part of this workshop session the final document includes the Implementation section. This section presents a number of key actions which the Village should undertake to implement the Comprehensive Plan. This section also describes the procedures to amend the Plan. By establishing these procedures it will promote consideration of the implications presented by the amendments and establishes guidelines under which amendments should be considered. The main component that comes out of this is to provide

an annual update and implementation for projects consistent with the Comprehensive Plan or for improvements that are occurring. He exemplified the Downtown Plan and how an update would be provided outlining the investment, improvements and results that have occurred since the project was approved.

Lastly, Mr. Stilling referred to the Sustainability Plan. He mentioned that the pocket drives the Commissioners had previously received contained this Plan along with all the other documents.

Chairperson Ryan asked the Commissioners for their comments and questions.

Commissioner Sweetser indicated she was pleased with the progress but had a few comments in terms of the whole structure:

- Page 12, under Vision 1, the section labeled the Distinctive Downtown.
She agreed with it but thought the intent of the words “civic activity center” needed to be modified after reading over point 4. While it sounded as if to mean a place where people are getting together to discuss changes it actually means a place to have things such as craft fairs and restaurants.*
- Page 17, Vision 5, the first guiding principle - Ensuring Sustainability
Change the word “sustain” in the sentence following the principle as it has a different meaning than the word sustainability used in the guiding principle.*

Commissioner Olbrysh referred to the Westmore-Meyers Plan. He stated that the corridor is unique to Lombard unlike Roosevelt Road or St. Charles Road as it includes residential and commercial uses. He liked the approach staff took by stating that the area could be cleaned up just by adding landscaping. He confirmed that the area has a lot of asphalt and agreed that landscaping would definitely be the first step.

Commissioner Mrofcza referenced the section about Westmore Supply Company. He noted that at the bottom of the page it says that the continuation of “South Broadway” leads into the subject property and questioned if that should say “North Broadway”. Mr. Stilling confirmed he was correct and it should say North Broadway.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked if there currently was access from North Broadway into the back of the contractor yard now. Michael Toth, Planner I, answered that he thought there might be access but was not sure to what extent and if they maneuver their vehicles using the

7-11 property. Their main point of access is off of Westmore-Meyers.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked if the long term goal was to eliminate traffic coming off of Westmore-Meyers. Mr. Toth answered that the Plan was derived prior to the land use map changes. The map now includes a recommendation for that property to transition to a designation of low to medium residential. It is a non-confirming use in a quasi-residential commercial area. That map would have to be updated as well.

Mr. Toth clarified that the Plan is a synopsis of the current state of the property.

Commissioner Sweetser asked staff what they thought their chances of success would be with the business and property owners accepting these various policy recommendations. Mr. Toth replied that some of these changes have already taken place but as these are just recommendations, they cannot be enforced. On the other hand, the Plan will give us leverage when the time comes for a property to be redeveloped and will enable staff to refer to a document that already has recommendations in place.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if staff thought that those recommendations will be received fairly well. Mr. Toth answered that this differs in that it is more reactionary so when they come to us for a conditional use we can use the recommendations from the Plan accordingly.

Mr. Stilling stated that as we progress and talk about the Plan as a component of the Comprehensive Plan, there will be additional outreach to the area in order to gauge their appetite for specific enhancements.

Commissioner Cooper described a previous experience whereby business owners from a specific area pooled their money and accumulated enough of it over time so when the time came to do improvements, they used that money. She suggested that might be a realistic approach to this area.

Referring to Westmore Supply, Commissioner Flint suggested that the access could be paved as it is currently gravel. Any landscaping or improvements would soften the current façade and the one property located to the north of his office is a perfect example.

Chairperson Ryan suggested that Westmore Supply's access might be researched as it appears that they might not own the property they currently use and we couldn't expect them to improve the property if in

fact it is not even theirs.

Mr. Stilling indicated these were all goods points and as staff begins to finalize the Comprehensive Plan we will see areas in which to create dialogue. This has been a good opportunity to have conversation, explore options, and see how little enhancements can go a long way.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

*Donald Ryan, Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission*

*Christopher Stilling, AICP, Secretary
Lombard Plan Commission*