



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: William Heniff

Monday, March 18, 2013

7:30 PM

Village Hall Board 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

Also present: William Heniff, AICP, Director of Community Development and George Wagner, legal counsel to the Plan Commission.

Public Hearings

There were no public hearings.

Attorney Wagner announced that as of July 1, he would no longer be representing the Plan Commission. Jason Guisinger, who has a background in land use and zoning law, would be taking over the duties as legal counsel for the Plan Commission.

Business Meeting

The business meeting convened at 7:32 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

On a motion by Commissioner Olbrysh and seconded by Commissioner Mrofcza the minutes of the February 18, 2013 meeting

were unanimously approved by the members present.

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

DuPage County Hearings

There were no DuPage County hearings.

Chairperson's Report

The Chairperson deferred to the Director of Community Development.

Planner's Report

The Director of Community Development had no report.

Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

New Business

There was no new business.

Subdivision Reports

[130121](#)

SUB 13-01: 378 E. 17th Street

Requests approval of a three-lot major plat of subdivision. (DISTRICT #3)

William Heniff, Director of Community Development, presented the petition. He stated that the subdivision is being brought forward as the subject property is greater than one acre in size and needs a recommendation by the Plan Commission and approval by the Board of Trustees.

The tract of land is part of the Providence Subdivision, The property is one hundred sixty-nine feet (169') wide and two hundred seventy five (275') deep, with a lot area of 46,490 square feet. The owner of the lot wishes to resubdivide the lot to create three lots in total. There will be no demolition activities associated with this request. The subdivision will break off the eastern seventy five (75) feet of the property in order to create two buildable lots - one facing 16th Place and one facing 17th Street. All lots will meet bulk requirements so there is no companion zoning relief being requested. The proposed lots will include five-foot public utility and drainage easements along

the western and eastern property lines and ten-foot public utility and drainage easements along the southern and northern property lines of Lot 2 and 3. Driveway easements for the use and benefit of Lot 1 on Lot 2 and Lot 3 are also shown. Concluding, Mr. Heniff stated that staff recommends approval of the petition.

Chairperson Ryan asked if there was anyone who wished to speak or had any questions or comments on the petition.

Mimi Nolan from Coldwell Banker, representing the petitioner, stated that she has been working with the Castaldos for quite some time and they are mindful to meet what is currently in the subdivision.

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting for discussion and questions by the Plan Commissioners.

Commissioner Mrofcza referred to the Public Works comment that a storm and sewer drain easement needs to be provided and asked if that would be addressed as part of the building permit process. Mr. Heniff replied there is an existing storm drain located on Lot 1 that drains to the northeast to 16th Place and runs through Lot 2. If the plat is approved, there will need to be an easement recorded in order for the drain to cross over Lot 2.

Commissioner Sweetser asked why the driveway easements are necessary. Mr. Heniff answered that it is to reflect an existing condition. The Castaldos are ensuring that they will be able to continue to use their main lot and not worry about a fence being put on the lot line. They are creating an encumbrance on Lots 2 and 3 for driveway purposes.

A motion was made by Ronald Olbrysh, seconded by Ruth Sweetser, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition. The motion carried by the following vote:

Site Plan Approvals

There were site plan approvals.

Workshops

1. Attention Getting Devices - Text

William Heniff, Director of Community Development, introduced the workshop. The Sign Ordinance allows for pennants and balloons to be located on properties with a permit, but no text can be displayed on any surface of an attention getting device. Staff is bringing forward a concept to remove that limitation.

Showing a picture of an inflatable balloon, he explained that this workshop was initiated as a result of a permit issued to a business that used an inflatable balloon as an attention getting device for a grand opening. The strict application of the Code is what you see in the picture. The balloon draws attention but does not convey any message as to why it is there and renders the device functionally ineffective in meeting its ultimate purpose.

Staff would like the Plan Commissioners' input on allowing some level of text on inflatables only. If text is allowed, it should not be excessive, possibly 32 square feet or a 4 x 8 area, which is the same as the maximum permitted banner size. If this amendment were allowed, it could convey the business name or the event being advertised such as "Grand Opening". This would allow for some level of information to the customer.

The Village has also received requests for attention getting device permits to include corporate branding elements. Staff believes that challenges are posed by corporate offices telling individual businesses what they must include on the pennants, such as a corporate logo. As an example, if a corporate entity would like to have pennants associated with a sale event. Currently, the Code allows multi-colored pennants but not text or graphics on them. Staff believes that corporate graphics frequently upgrade the aesthetics of pennants and are not likely to become faded or weathered in appearance. Currently new structures are advertising events of businesses that have prominence and this would allow for further identification to the proposed special event.

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting to comments and questions by the Commissioners.

Commissioner Sweetser stated she had no objection to allowing text but questioned if the square footage calculations would be challenging for staff.

Commissioner Olbrysh asked if the terms "inflatables" and "balloons" are used interchangeably. Mr. Heniff confirmed that they are used interchangeably in the Sign Ordinance. He noted that consistency will be addressed in order to make them separate and distinct if a series of text amendments occur.

Commissioner Olbrysh asked if the text would apply only to balloons as inflatables or to other shapes such as dinosaurs, elephants, etc. Mr. Heniff responded that it would apply to any shape.

Commissioner Olbrysh commented that the picture of the inflatable

balloon was confusing as it was unclear what the balloon represented, especially since it is located in a big shopping center.

Chairperson Ryan asked if the type of flags that are air blown in an upward direction and have text on them would be considered an attention getting device. Mr. Heniff replied that those are not permitted by Code in Lombard.

Commissioner Mrofcza referred to the provisions in Section 153.209 (3) of Code which states that attention getting devices shall only be affixed to a permanent structure. He asked if the balloon shown on the overhead projector contradicts that requirement. Mr. Heniff answered that a section within the Code requires it to be securely anchored to the ground or a roof. There are additional inconsistencies that need to be addressed in Code as it relates to inflatables.

Commissioner Mrofcza then asked how that relates to pennants - can you take two posts and put them in the ground or use a flagpole and attach pennants? Mr. Heniff responded that they have to be affixed to a permanent device such as a building, hard object, permanent sign or something of that nature. This is similar to temporary signage.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked if they would all require permits and, if so, would they expire. Mr. Heniff answered that they would require permits and the expiration would depend on the nature of the event, but it is usually 14 days.

Commissioner Cooper commented that she is not a fan of inflatable devices. She believes there are issues with aesthetics, safety and they are visually distracting.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked if visibility might be a concern as it might impair the sight of traffic coming from another direction due to the location of the device. Mr. Heniff answered that the balloon meets the clear line of sight issue. Commissioner Mrofcza asked how high they are allowed to be. Mr. Heniff answered the maximum is 25' - this balloon is 21'.

Commissioner Flint stated that he visited the site and did not realize they had moved in. He agrees that there should be text to help identify the businesses that the balloon is targeting. It is important to provide proper identification.

Commissioner Sweetser added that corporations have particular standards and requirements and they should correspond to the distance and readability standards so the public is not trying to decipher print that is unreadable. Mr. Heniff agreed that the text has

to be readable because sometimes the advertisement only has a second or two to get the message across. If there is too much text, it will be more difficult to read. Putting a cap on the size of the text will limit the message.

Commissioner Cooper stated that if the idea of the inflatable is to advertise a new business or something that is not already identified on their existing sign, staff should provide an explanation as to the value of this temporary signage especially when the ordinance is already generous for significant sized signs. Mr. Heniff answered that this signage is a special sign to identify something for a short amount of time in order to identify a specific business. As these types of signs are not cheap or disposable, they usually promote a special event, such as a business addition, a special event or the opening of a new business. This type of signage is used frequently by car dealerships. They are also capped at a 14 day limit.

Chairperson Ryan asked Mr. Heniff if the Commissioners' comments provided direction. Mr. Heniff answered yes.

2. 13th Street & Garfield Street - Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Considerations

William Heniff, Director of Community Development, stated this workshop relates to an ongoing discussion and review of the Comprehensive Plan. Using an aerial of the subject site he indicated the four properties located on the north side of 13th Street, west of Garfield. These properties contain one vacant property and three single family residential lots. The vacant lot is incorporated and the three single family lots are unincorporated. The vacant property is located at the northwest corner of Garfield & 13th Street and the three unincorporated single family residences are located immediately to the west. The vacant lot is zoned B4A, established in 1971, and the three unincorporated lots have a DuPage County single family residential zoning. There are two townhome buildings located at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Giving a brief history of the redevelopment in the area, he mentioned a major block redevelopment located to the northeast known as the V-Land Shopping Center which included a detention pond with berming on the property.

Controlling documents for this area include:

- The 1998 Comprehensive Plan which envisioned the entire block face for townhouses*
- Existing Land Use Designation*
- Existing Lombard Zoning*

The corner vacant lot is currently on the market. It was rezoned to a commercial district with the redevelopment to the north but doesn't function in that capacity as it has a higher elevation, access on both 13th and Garfield Streets, and has remained undeveloped. Recently staff has been getting inquires about commercial uses for this property and is seeking input and direction as to what representations should be made. Any development actions on this parcel would require zoning relief.

There are several land use designation options when determining what is the most appropriate land use for the site:

Single Family Residential - The properties are oriented toward a local residential street, but are definitely impacted by the Roosevelt Road commercial properties to the north. Three of the lots were historically developed as single family residences. If this were the choice, then the need for zoning relief for that tract would require changing that tract from a commercial to a single family residential designation.

Medium Density Residential (Townhomes) - To the far west end of the street, two townhome buildings were constructed around 1993. The Village approved annexation and zoning to reflect this proposed multiple-family use. Townhomes can be considered an appropriate land use as part of a Euclidian zoning approach to transitions between dense commercial areas and traditional single family residential areas. Staff also notes that the 1998 Comprehensive Plan did identify the potential for townhome development along 13th Street. If townhome development is encouraged, it may pose an opportunity for a developer to pick up the entire tract which the Comprehensive Plan allows.

Commercial Uses - As noted, the study area abuts retail commercial properties. These sites were developed more than forty years ago and are substandard with respect to current parking requirements, building transition elements and open space and do present some functional obsolescence. Moreover, we note that the existing commercial tenant spaces along Garfield Street have had sign visibility and tenant occupancy issues in the past. Exhibit F provides an historical chronology about the history of the property and its existing commercial zoning designation. If commercial uses are desired, it should to be tied to the adjacent Roosevelt Road corridor (i.e., additional parking detention and landscaping to be incorporated with future or development of the retail center). This

approach was successfully achieved immediately east of the study area in the V-Land planned development. If this is the development option chosen, staff wants to ensure there are no additional impacts on the single family residences.

Each of the three land uses are challenged by existing site constraints, including existing topographical conditions, lack of lot depth, lack of transitional yards and the surrounding land uses themselves. Compounding this issue is the recognition that the vacant corner lot is annexed into the Village and has historically had commercial zoning. However, its lack of area and minimal arterial street visibility limit development options on the site.

In consideration of the vacant lot as a stand-alone development, it would pose challenges to develop the site for any non-single family residential use without companion zoning relief. Even if a project met the bulk requirements, the tract would not meet the underlying lot width and area requirements for the underlying zoning district. Bulk regulation relief may be a challenge to support, as it would likely be self-created.

Staff notes the representation included within the 1998 correspondence and is seeking input relative to the study area as well as direction on the following issues:

- 1. Under what conditions can a commercial plan designation and companion zoning be supported on a unified or piecemeal basis?*
- 2. Consistent with the existing Comprehensive Plan, would townhome development provide a proper transition between the commercial and single family areas?*
- 3. Should the single family character of the block face be maintained; with consideration of a map amendment to the vacant corner lot to provide for such a use?*

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting for comments and questions from the Commissioners.

Chairperson Ryan commented that townhomes would seem to fit until you look at the property lines. The townhomes to the west of the subject lots are situated toward the back of the lot and if you chose the townhome concept for the four properties to the east of them, the placement of the building(s) would differ from the townhomes resulting in a different look. Also, he would not want to see commercial, detention and/or parking on the lots as that would ruin the character of the whole neighborhood. We need to be

sensitive to the single family homeowners across the street that might experience a decline in their property values if this were done.

Commissioner Sweetser agreed with Chairperson Ryan relative to the issue of the property lines. She preferred that the four properties were consolidated and used for townhomes with a slice of the land possibly becoming available to the commercial use to bring the back lot line closer to 13th Street.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked if staff was interested in bringing the commercial lot line closer to 13th Street. Mr. Heniff answered no, as they were just thinking about corridor options. However, if redevelopment of the existing commercial property to the north happens, so that it has the parking lot in the front, the lot line might be moved.

Commissioner Cooper stated that it is important to preserve the residential feel along 13th Street as it makes good sense for the existing neighbors. She asked if the mall along Roosevelt Road has a plan for stormwater. Mr. Heniff replied that it was developed decades ago and there is minimal green space. Commissioner Cooper commented that in the future there may be a need for the open space.

Commissioner Mrofcza agreed with Commissioner Cooper that the character of the neighborhood appears to be residential so commercial would not fit. His choice would be either single family residential or some sort of expansion of the current townhome concept.

Commissioner Flint suggested that the designation be changed to multi-family residential as it would act as a natural transition from the commercial but he could also possibly see single family residential.

Commissioner Mrofcza indicated that, if a developer was interested in the townhome concept, he would be in favor of it.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if those lots could be consolidated. Mr. Heniff answered yes.

Commissioner Olbrysh agreed that they should not be designated commercial. Those lots need to act as a transition and townhomes would be the best way to go.

Mr. Heniff summarized the Commissioners' consensus as not being in favor of a commercial designation for the vacant lot on 13th and Garfield. He then asked if there would be any support for the vacant lot being designated for single family residential. He noted that it could be big enough based on the concept layout but would need zoning relief.

Commissioner Mrofcza answered that the concept could be considered but he favored consolidating the four lots.

Chairperson Ryan did not favor the concept of a single family home because this would make the neighborhood a hodgepodge. He thought that the entire block should be multi-family. Mr. Heniff questioned if multi-family meant R3 townhomes and not apartments. The Commissioners concurred.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked if there might be interest from a developer for three residential properties on the four lots if the setback was far enough from the street and included a 8' privacy fence as a buffer. Mr. Heniff replied that it would be cost prohibitive and highly improbable in this economy.

Mr. Heniff summarized that the Commissioners reaffirmed the recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission*

*William J. Heniff, AICP
Lombard Plan Commission*