



# 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: Jennifer Ganser*

---

Monday, August 29, 2016

7:30 PM

Village Hall - Board Room

---

### SPECIAL MEETING

#### Call to Order

*Chairperson Ryan called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m.*

#### Pledge of Allegiance

*Chairperson Ryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.*

#### Roll Call

**Present** 7 - Donald F. Ryan, Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

*Also present: William Heniff, AICP, Director of Community Development; Anna Papke, Sr. Planner, and Jason Guisinger, legal counsel to the Plan Commission.*

*Chairperson Ryan called the order of the agenda.*

*Mr. Heniff read the Rules of Procedures as written in the Plan Commission By-Laws.*

*Mr. Heniff read the Plan Commission Opening Comments regarding the two the public hearings.*

#### Public Hearings

[160358](#)

**PC 16-17: Parcel 1 of Yorktown Commons Planned Development (northeast corner of Grace Street and Yorktown Ring Road)**

Pursuant to Section 155.504 (A) (major changes in a planned development) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, amend the Yorktown Commons Planned Development Form Based Code, as stated in Section IV(E)(3) and established by Ordinance No. 7177, as follows:

1. Amend the build-to lines for the proposed multiple-family residential development in the following respects:
  - a. Provide for a major change adjustment to the eastern build-to line to allow for the exterior building elevation to range between 15 feet and 23 feet, where a 13 foot build-to line was established;
  - b. Provide for an minor change adjustment to the southern build-to line to allow for the building elevation to range between 26 feet and 37 feet, where a 30 foot build-to line was established; and
2. Approve a multiple-family residential development based upon the submitted plans, pursuant to Ordinance 7177 and through Section 155.511 of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance (Site Plan Approvals) and as deemed appropriate. (DISTRICT #3)

*Sworn in to present the petition was William Heniff, Director of Community Development; Anna Papke, Senior Planner; and the petitioners/petitioners' representatives: Aaron Roseth, ESG Architects; Tom Runkle, Kimley-Horn; Jared Kenyon, Kimley-Horn; Tom Kiler, Continuum Partners; Michael Miller, ESG Architects; Scott Wilson, Kimley-Horn; and Rory Fancler, Kimley-Horn.*

*Chairperson Ryan read the Plan Commission procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine; and, hearing none, he proceeded with the petition.*

*Aaron Roseth, with ESG Architects, introduced himself as representing the petitioner. He stated that representatives from GreyStar were not able to attend the meeting due to travel complications. He stated that representatives from Kimley-Horn and Continuum were on hand to answer questions if needed.*

*Mr. Roseth noted that the proposed development on Parcel 1 was designed in accordance with the Yorktown Commons Planned Development Design Guidelines (form-based code). Mr. Roseth said the Design Guidelines did a nice job of outlining the Village's vision for the property. He also mentioned that the petitioner's team had held a neighborhood meeting with residents of the Yorktown Condominium at 2201 Grace Street, and received helpful feedback during that meeting.*

*Mr. Roseth provided a brief overview of GreyStar, the proposed developer. He said that GreyStar has been involved in a number of multi-family developments, and showed examples of these projects.*

*Mr. Roseth pointed out that GreyStar's developments are designed to avoid the "fortress" feel that larger buildings can have and to encourage pedestrian activity at the street level. He said the Yorktown Commons Design Guidelines encourage a similar type of development, and that the building proposed for Parcel 1 has been designed to those standards.*

*Mr. Roseth presented the development proposed for Parcel 1. He showed a site plan of the proposed building and highlighted that the parking garage will be surrounded by residential portions of the development and therefore will not be visible from the street. Further, there are four courtyard areas around the site that will serve to break up the building into multiple sections. Each courtyard will provide a different type of amenity for the residents, including a pool and open space. Mr. Roseth stated the portion of the building near the corner of Grace Street and the Yorktown Ring Road will incorporate tenant amenities that will activate the street corner. He also highlighted the auto court drop-off area on the south side of the building. He pointed out that the stormwater pond on the northeast side of the building will be improved as an open area for residents. Finally, he noted that there will be a sidewalk around the perimeter of the development that will help to establish a sidewalk network for the entire planned development.*

*Mr. Roseth showed floorplans of the building. He said that the parking plates in the garage are flat, so residents will have immediate access to the level of their unit without needing to use an elevator.*

*Mr. Roseth presented architectural renderings of the project. He said that the buildings will incorporate a few different materials (brick, stucco), and said these materials will be carried over into the building proposed for Parcel 2 in order to create a cohesive development. Mr. Roseth showed a rendering of the north side of the building, which will be adjacent to the Yorktown Condominiums located at 2201 S. Grace Street. He noted that the developer is exploring a number of options to buffer the proposed building from the 2201 S. Grace Street building, including landscaping and fencing.*

*Mr. Roseth presented a chart summarizing the proposed development. There will be a total of 374 apartment units and 570 parking spaces. There will be a mix of one-, two-, and three-bedroom apartment units.*

*Tom Runkle, landscape architect with Kimley-Horn, presented the landscape plan. Mr. Runkle noted that the majority of the site will receive the Front Yard Type II landscape treatment as defined in the Design Guidelines. This treatment includes trees and hedging. There will also be foundation plantings around the building to soften the*

architecture. The individual courtyards will be landscaped. The north side of the building will incorporate landscaping to screen the building from the adjacent property at 2201 S. Grace Street.

Jared Kenyon, engineer with Kimley-Horn, summarized key engineering elements of the proposed development. Mr. Kenyon said the subject property presently contains a ditch that runs east-west across the property, as well as a sanitary sewer line that cuts across one portion of the property. There is a water main on Grace Street and on the Yorktown Ring Road.

Mr. Kenyon stated that the storm sewer on Grace Street will connect into the proposed development along the north side of the courtyard containing the pool. Stormwater will be routed through the building and into the pond located on the northeast side of the building. The stormwater facilities are designed to Lombard and DuPage County standards. Sanitary sewer will be routed around the southeast corner of the building and connected to the site at the northeast corner. There will be a sanitary sewer lift station located on Parcel 4 of the planned development (northwest corner at Grace Street and Yorktown Ring Road), which will serve development on Parcel 1. Water connections will be made on Grace Street and also the east side of the building. Proper fire protection will be provided.

Mr. Roseth presented a table of the major and minor changes the developer is requesting for this development, and concluded the petitioner's presentation.

Chairperson Ryan asked if any person would like to speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment.

Boris Samovalov, an attorney representing the Liberty Square Condominium Association at 2240-2260 S. Grace Street, addressed the Plan Commission. He said that Liberty Square was a 112-unit condo development, and many of the residents were elderly and not able to attend the meeting. He said his clients wanted to know whether the development will be condos or apartments. His clients also wanted some assurances that Grace Street will not be used extensively for construction activities during construction of Parcel 1.

Pat Kooima, 2260 S. Grace Street (Liberty Square Condo), addressed the Plan Commission. She asked if Grace Street would be narrowed as a result of the proposed development. She was concerned that narrowing the street would be an issue for traffic circulation in the area, especially during the holidays. Ms. Kooima was also wanted to know how many parking spots will be provided on the site on a per-unit basis.

*Gerard Moran, resident at Liberty Square Condo, addressed the Commission. Mr. Moran's main concern was traffic congestion. He said there are several apartment complexes and commercial developments in the area that already generate a lot of traffic.*

*Frank Fencil, board member of the Liberty Square Condominium Association, addressed the Plan Commission. He was concerned about the development of Parcel 4 within the Yorktown Commons planned development, which is directly south of the Liberty Square condo building. Specifically, he was concerned about the height of any building that might be built on Parcel 4.*

*Beatriz Prudden, 2260 S. Grace Street (Liberty Square Condo), addressed the Plan Commission. She asked when construction would begin and finish for Parcel 1. She was also concerned about the traffic impacts of the proposed development. She asked whether the units in the development will owner-occupied or rented. She wanted to confirm the height of the building proposed for Parcel 1. She noted that residents of Liberty Square condos were concerned that future development on Parcel 4 will block views and light.*

*Joan Magnavite, 2240 S. Grace Street (Liberty Square Condo), addressed the Plan Commission. She was concerned about power supply to the area; she said the Liberty Square development had suffered brownouts in the past.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked if any person would like to speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment. Hearing none, he asked the petitioner to respond to the questions and concerns.*

*Mr. Roseth said that the development will be apartment units, not condo units. He said apartments accounted for the majority of GreyStar's portfolio. Mr. Roseth said these will be high-end apartments and he understood the average cost of construction was \$230,000 per unit.*

*Mr. Roseth said he would defer to Village staff on issues related to Grace Street right-of-way improvements and size and scale of the development, as these were dictated by the terms of the Design Guidelines adopted by the Village.*

*Mr. Roseth deferred questions about Phase 4 to the Village and/or Continuum Partners.*

*Mr. Roseth said construction is expected to start in March 2017 and will last approximately two years. His past experience with GreyStar*

*suggested that the construction sites were well-managed to avoid negative impacts to the surrounding neighborhood when possible.*

*Regarding the number of floors, Mr. Roseth said the development on Parcel 1 will have five stories.*

*Mr. Heniff offered a response to the public comments on the Grace Street improvements. He stated the Grace Street as currently developed is over-engineered relative to the amount of traffic currently using the street. The street has capacity for a much larger number of vehicles than typically use the street. The Village has developed a Village-wide bike master plan within the previous year. This plan identifies areas within the Village to promote additional bike and pedestrian activities. The Yorktown Commons Planned Development Design Guidelines further identify Grace Street as a location for bike lane improvements.*

*Mr. Heniff noted that street parking and biking are currently allowed on Grace Street. The proposed improvements to the right-of-way would effectively be applying paint to the existing street to define areas for these activities. He said the Village often receives comments from residents expressing interest in developing bike lanes that tie the Yorktown Mall area to bike lanes in other parts of the Village. He noted that these improvements would be undertaken by the petitioner as part of the Parcel 1 development, working in concert with Village staff.*

*Regarding traffic, Mr. Heniff stated that the issue had been studied in 2015 when the Village was in the process of reviewing the petition to create the Yorktown Commons Planned Development. Traffic consultants working on behalf of the Village and Yorktown Mall had studied the area and determined that the existing road infrastructure was adequate to accommodate traffic generated by development within the planned development.*

*Regarding parking for Parcel 1, Mr. Heniff said the development will meet the Village Zoning Ordinance requirement to provide 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling unit. He noted that the petition for Parcel 2 (PC 16-18) does include a request for a variation to the parking requirement. That request would be considered separately as part of the Parcel 2 petition to follow later in the meeting.*

*Mr. Heniff said that any issues regarding utilities such as Nicor, ComEd, and public water and sewer will be worked out between the developer and the relevant entities. There will be adequate capacity to meet the demands of the project.*

*Mr. Heniff stated that development on Parcel 4 will be undertaken at a later date. He could not speculate on what that development will look like. At such time as a petitioner submits plans for Parcel 4, the Village will conduct the appropriate public hearings to consider the development.*

*Bryant Gomez, an attorney representing the Liberty Square Condominium Association, addressed the Plan Commission. He asked if GreyStar would make an effort to divert construction traffic away from residential areas on Grace Street.*

*Mike Miller, with ESG, addressed the Plan Commission. Mr. Miller provided some information regarding which areas of Parcel 1 will be used for construction staging and storage of construction materials. He did not anticipate build-up of materials on the street. There will be truck traffic but it will not be a constant stream. Upon further questioning by Mr. Gomez, Mr. Miller clarified that Grace Street will not be closed; construction activities will occur largely on Parcel 1. He and Mr. Roseth also stated that the contractor will work closely with the Village to manage any impacts of construction.*

*Mr. Gomez asked if the residents of the proposed development will be able to rent out their units on Airbnb. Mr. Roseth said his understanding was that GreyStar prohibits their tenants subleasing units through Airbnb or other channels, but he deferred to GreyStar to confirm this. Mr. Miller noted that GreyStar's developments have high occupancy rates and attract long-term renters.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked for the staff report.*

*Ms. Papke presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. Ms. Papke noted that the Village Board of Trustees approved the Yorktown Commons Planned Development and related Yorktown Commons PD Design Guidelines (FBC) in early 2016. The petitioner, GreyStar, has been chosen as the developer of Parcels 1 and 2 within the Yorktown Commons Planned Development. At this time, the petitioner has submitted a development proposal for Parcel 1. The proposed development consists of a five-story, 374-unit apartment complex. The site will incorporate a number of resident amenities including a leasing office, fitness center and outdoor commons areas. There will also be a 570-space parking garage. Currently, the property is a vacant parcel with constructed ditch.*

*Ms. Papke said the proposed development is subject to the final plan approval process described in the Design Guidelines. Generally, final plans for development in the Yorktown Commons PD are subject to Plan Commission approval. However, final plans that require major*

*deviations from the standards laid out in the Design Guidelines require a public hearing before the Plan Commission and final approval of the site plan and associated major change by the Board of Trustees. The petition for Parcel 1 includes one major change and one minor change, both of which would be discussed later in the staff presentation.*

*The petition was reviewed by the Village's interdepartmental review committee. That review yielded a series of comments from Building, Fire, Engineering and Public Works staff. The petitioner had been made aware of the comments. These comments will be addressed in final engineering review and the building permitting process. In addressing these comments, staff does not expect the site plan to change in any significant way.*

*The Planning Division reviewed the proposed development and finds it is generally compatible with surrounding development and land uses. Adjacent uses consist of multi-family residential and commercial development; the proposed multi-family development is compatible with those uses. Ms. Papke noted that based on feedback from the residents at the condo building immediately north of Parcel 1, the petitioner is paying particular attention to buffering and landscaping on the north side of the site in order to maximize compatibility.*

*Staff analyzed the proposed development with respect to the development standards contained in the Yorktown Commons PD Design Guidelines. Generally, staff finds the development is consistent with the development envisioned by the Design Guidelines. Specifically, staff notes:*

- Residential uses are permitted in the planned development, which has entitlements for up to 970 residential units spread across the four parcels. The proposed 374 units are well below that threshold.*
- The overall site layout is consistent with the Design Guidelines in that it brings the building façade close to the street and shields the parking garage and service areas from view of public streets.*
- The auto-court drop-off area on south side of building provides a point of access for automobiles but also maintains a pedestrian-oriented environment.*
- The project will provide several open space areas and green spaces, as well as landscaping as required by the Design*



*Guidelines.*

- *Architectural elements required by the Design Guidelines are present in the proposed plan. In particular, the building renderings show a prominent corner element and wrapping of primary façade materials around to secondary facades. The building materials will include stucco, brick, and metal paneling.*

*The petitioner requests a major change to amend the build-to line on the east side of the site from 13 feet as required by the Design Guidelines to a range of 15 feet to 23 feet. In the response to standards for major changes, the petitioner stated that one reason for this adjustment is an irregular jog in the south property line, which will impact placement of the building on the site in relation to the east property line. Village staff also notes that there will be a sanitary sewer line on the east side of the building. In order to maintain proper separation between the sewer line and building, adjustment to build-to line is required. Staff finds the adjustment in build-to line will not significantly impact the ability of the development to meet the intent of the Design Guidelines, and does not anticipate public health, welfare or safety issues to arise. Staff supports the requested change.*

*The petitioner requests a minor change to amend the build-to line on the south side of the site from 30 feet as required by the Design Guidelines to a range of 26 to 37 feet. This change is requested in order to accommodate the irregular jog in the south property line. The Design Guidelines note that build-to lines may vary if needed to accommodate irregular parcel boundaries. Accordingly, staff finds that this change will not significantly alter development on the site. Staff supports the minor change.*

*In summary, staff finds the petition meets the standards for a major change to a planned development and the standards for site plan approval as established in the Yorktown Commons Planned Development Design Guidelines and Lombard Zoning Ordinance. Staff recommends approval of the petition subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.*

*Ms. Papke noted that Aimco Apartment Homes, the owners of the Yorktown Apartments at 2233 S. Highland Avenue, had submitted a letter to the Community Development Department for distribution to the Plan Commission. The letter was included in the materials distributed to the Plan Commission.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked for public comment, and, hearing none, opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.*

*Commissioner Sweetser said she did not have any objection to the requested major and minor changes. She asked if it will be possible to incorporate a green rooftop or smart lights in the development. Mr. Miller said the wood framing of the building makes it difficult to include a rooftop garden. Commissioner Sweetser clarified that a green rooftop would not necessarily include a garden. Mr. Miller responded that the primary purpose of a green rooftop is to provide stormwater control, which is already accounted for in the stormwater pond proposed for the site.*

*Regarding the street lighting, Mr. Heniff said the lighting will need to comply with the Village's standards for right-of-way lighting. The Village's present specification for street lights is for an LED light, not a smart light. Mr. Heniff said he would pass Commissioner Sweetser's comments about the possibility of changing this specification on to the Public Works Department.*

*Commissioner Burke also did not object to the proposed major and minor changes. He said the Village had created the Design Guidelines knowing there might be some changes as projects developed.*

*Commissioner Cooper asked for more information regarding pedestrian features and the location of crosswalks. Mr. Roseth said the project will be connected to adjacent streets via crosswalks. He noted the landscaping provided within the development and the architectural features of the building will create a comfortable pedestrian space.*

*Commissioner Cooper asked how pedestrians will navigate the north side of the site where the driveway to the parking garage is located. Mr. Roseth said there will be a sidewalk around all four sides of the building. The sidewalk will be interrupted by the driveway into the garage, but it will otherwise be present around the whole site.*

*Commissioner Cooper asked if there is a retail component to this project. Mr. Roseth said there is no retail associated with Parcel 1.*

*Commissioner Olbrysh said he had no issue with the major and minor changes. He thought the proposed project would be an attractive addition to the Yorktown Center area. He liked that the parking garage will be concealed by the apartment building.*

*Commissioner Cooper asked if the open spaces on Parcel 1 will be open to the public. Mr. Roseth said they will not be open to the public due to security issues.*

A motion was made by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Cooper, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition subject to following six (6) conditions.

1. That the major change to a planned development is valid only with for Parcel 1 in the Yorktown Commons Planned Development;
2. That the petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the plans submitted as part of this petition and referenced in the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report, except as they may be changed to conform to Village Code, or as provided as part of the original planned development approval set forth in Ordinance 7177;
3. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report;
4. That the petitioner shall construct improvements in the Grace Street right-of-way as required by the Design Guidelines and approved by the Department of Public Works;
5. That the petitioner shall submit a final landscape plan incorporating screening elements along the north property line of the site, and that such landscape plan shall be subject to the approval of the Director of the Community Development Department; and
6. Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance, the project construction shall commence within one (1) year from the date of approval of the ordinance, or this approval shall be come null and void unless a time extension has been granted by the Village Board.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

[160359](#)

**PC 16-18: Parcel 2 of Yorktown Commons Planned Development (50 Yorktown Center)**

Pursuant to Section 155.504 (A) (major changes in a planned development) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, amend the Yorktown Commons Planned Development Form Based Code, as required by Section IV(E)(3) and established by Ordinance No. 7177, as follows:

1. Provide for a major change to the height standard to allow a seven-story building with a height of 77 feet, where a maximum building height of six stories not exceeding 100 feet was established;
2. Amend the parking ratio for the proposed development to 1.38 spaces per unit, where a parking ratio of 1.5 spaces per unit was established and is required by Section 155.602(C), Table 6 -3 of the Zoning Ordinance;

3. Reduce the parking stall width to a minimum of eight feet, three inches (8'3"), where a minimum parking stall width of nine feet (9') was established and is set forth within Section 155.602(C), Table 6-2 of the Zoning Ordinance;
4. Amend the build-to lines for the proposed multiple-family residential development in the following respects:
  - a. Provide for a major change adjustment to the western build-to line to allow for the exterior building elevation to range between 21 and 26 feet, where a 21 foot build-to line was established, and
  - b. Provide for a major change adjustment to the northern build-to line to allow for the building elevation to range between 21 feet and 68 feet, where a 20 foot build-to line was established.
5. Approve use of Front Yard Type II landscaping treatments along at the perimeter of the development, where the Form-Based Code recommends Front Yard Type I landscaping, and
6. Approve the proposed multiple-family residential development based upon the submitted plans, pursuant to Ordinance 7177 and through Section 155.511 of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance (Site Plan Approvals) and as appropriate. (DISTRICT #3)

*Sworn in to present the petition was William Heniff, Director of Community Development; Anna Papke, Senior Planner; and the petitioners/petitioners' representatives: Aaron Roseth, ESG Architects; Tom Runkle, Kimley-Horn; Jared Kenyon, Kimley-Horn; Tom Kiler, Continuum Partners; Michael Miller, ESG Architects; Scott Wilson, Kimley-Horn; and Rory Fancler, Kimley-Horn.*

*Audience members who intended to speak for or against the petition, or ask questions of the petitioner, were also sworn in. Chairperson Ryan asked the petitioner to proceed with the petition.*

*Aaron Roseth, with ESG Architects, introduced himself as representing the petitioner, GreyStar PG II, LLC. Mr. Roseth provided a brief overview of GreyStar, the proposed developer. He said that GreyStar has been involved in a number of multi-family developments, and showed examples of these projects.*

*Mr. Roseth presented the development proposed for Parcel 2. He said that GreyStar has developed a model for apartment developments catering to active seniors. Mr. Roseth said that GreyStar's active senior developments are not assisted living or nursing homes, and do not provide any skilled nursing care; rather, they provide amenities and programming for residents looking for an active lifestyle. He noted that due to these amenities, rents on the Parcel 2 development will be higher than those in the Parcel 1 development discussed earlier.*

*Mr. Roseth showed a site plan of the proposed building and pointed out that the parking garage will be surrounded by residential portions of the development and therefore will not be visible from the street. The parking garage will interface with the parking lot at Yorktown Mall.*

*Mr. Roseth highlighted the amenity area on the first floor of the building at the corner of Grace Street and the Yorktown Ring Road. He said this area will contain the lobby with room to add a dining area at a later date if desired. Mr. Roseth pointed out that the parking plates in the garage are flat, so residents will have immediate access to the level of their unit without needing to use an elevator. The seventh floor will include a fitness center and pool area and possibly a green roof component.*

*Mr. Roseth presented architectural renderings of the project. He said that the building will incorporate a drop-off area along the Ring Road frontage, which will interface with the building on Parcel 1 and act as a ceremonial entrance for the building on Parcel 2.*

*Mr. Roseth said the petitioner was requesting a major change to allow the building on Parcel 2 to be seven stories tall, rather than six as allowed in the Design Guidelines. Mr. Roseth noted that the proposed building is 77 feet tall, which is still under the maximum height of 100 feet allowed in the Design Guidelines. He pointed out that the building on Parcel 2 will not be directly adjacent to any currently-existing residential buildings.*

*Mr. Roseth detailed some of the features of the building including residential units with entrances directly onto the street and balconies.*

*Mr. Roseth presented a chart summarizing the proposed development. There will be a total of 175 apartment units and 239 parking spaces. This will result in a parking ratio of 1.39 as opposed to the ratio of 1.5 spaces per unit required by the Zoning Ordinance. He said GreyStar is confident that this will be adequate parking for the site based on past experience. He noted GreyStar will be investing approximately \$175 million between Parcel 1 (PC 16-17) and Parcel 2.*

*Tom Runkle, landscape architect with Kimley-Horn, presented the landscape plan. Mr. Runkle said that the majority of the site will be landscaped to the Front Yard Type II standards defined in the Design Guidelines. He noted that the petitioner requested a major change to use Front Yard Type II where the Design Guidelines specified Type I on the west side of the site. The petitioner was proposing this change in order to create more green space and create definition between public and private areas on the site. Mr. Runkle described some of the*

*landscape features of the proposed development, including foundation plantings, landscaped courtyard area, and screening of the site from adjacent sites.*

*Jared Kenyon, engineer with Kimley-Horn, summarized key engineering elements of the proposed development. Mr. Kenyon said the subject property was previously developed with a restaurant and parking lot. The previous development did not include any stormwater detention. The proposed development will drain from the west to the east, and will also utilize permeable pavers to reduce impervious surface area.*

*Mr. Kenyon said the water main will be connected to the water service located on Yorktown Ring Road. The sanitary sewer will connect to the new lift station to be located on Parcel 4 of the planned development. Stormwater will be collected through roof drains and filtered into the existing stormwater sewer system.*

*Mr. Roseth presented a table of the major changes and variations the developer was requesting for this development, and concluded the petitioner's presentation.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked if any person would like to speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment.*

*Boris Samovalov, an attorney representing the Liberty Square Condominium Association located at 2240-2260 S. Grace Street, addressed the Plan Commission. He said his clients are concerned about traffic during construction. He wanted to know if construction on Parcel 1 (PC 16-17) and Parcel 2 will occur simultaneously, and how that will impact the traffic on Grace Street.*

*Beverly Chatfield, a Lombard resident, addressed the Plan Commission. She said her opinion was that there should not be parking in the Grace Street right-of-way at any point north of Parcel 1 (PC 16-17). She noted that her comment pertained more to the discussion of Parcel 1 than of Parcel 2.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked if any person would like to speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment. Hearing none, he asked the petitioner to respond to the questions and concerns.*

*Mr. Roseth said that the development on Parcel 1 and Parcel 2 will occur simultaneously. Construction on both sites will begin in March 2017 and last for approximately two years.*

*Mr. Roseth deferred questions about traffic to the Village.*

*Mr. Heniff said that the proposed improvements for Grace Street essentially amount to putting paint on the existing pavement in order to delineate parking spaces and bike lanes. He said the Village will continue to study the area as the four parcels in the Yorktown Commons Planned Development are built out, and can revisit the improvements identified for Grace Street if necessary.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked for the staff report.*

*Ms. Papke presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. Ms. Papke noted that the Village Board of Trustees approved the Yorktown Commons Planned Development and related Yorktown Commons PD Design Guidelines (FBC) in early 2016. The petitioner, GreyStar, has been chosen as the developer of Parcels 1 and 2 within the Yorktown Commons Planned Development. At this time, the petitioner has submitted a development proposal for Parcel 2. The proposed development consists of a seven-story, 175-unit apartment complex. The site will incorporate a 241-space parking garage and associated tenant amenities. There is presently a vacant building on the site.*

*Ms. Papke said the proposed development is subject to the final plan approval process described in the Design Guidelines. Generally, final plans for development in the Yorktown Commons PD are subject to Plan Commission approval. However, final plans that require major deviations from the standards laid out in the Design Guidelines require a public hearing before the Plan Commission and final approval of the site plan and associated major change by the Board of Trustees. The petition for Parcel 2 includes several major changes and variations, which would be discussed later in the staff presentation.*

*The petition was reviewed by the Village's interdepartmental review committee. That review yielded a series of comments from Building, Fire, Engineering and Public Works staff. The petitioner had been made aware of the comments. These comments will be addressed in final engineering review and the building permitting process. In addressing these comments, staff does not expect the site plan to change in any significant way.*

*The Planning Division reviewed the proposed development and finds it is generally compatible with surrounding development and land uses. Adjacent uses consist of multi-family residential and commercial development; the proposed multi-family development is compatible with those uses.*

*Staff analyzed the proposed development with respect to the*

*development standards contained in the Yorktown Commons PD Design Guidelines. Generally, staff finds the development is consistent with the development envisioned by the Design Guidelines.*

*Specifically, staff notes:*

- *Residential uses are permitted in the planned development, which has entitlements for up to 970 residential units spread across the four parcels. The proposed 174 units are well below that threshold. Staff notes that the total number of units proposed for Parcel 1 (PC 16-17) and Parcel 2 is 549.*
- *The overall site layout is consistent with the Design Guidelines in that it brings the building façade close to the street and shields the parking garage and service areas from view of public streets.*
- *The project provides street-activating uses in the building where adjacent to the Grace Street/Yorktown Ring Road intersection.*
- *The project will provide several open space areas and green spaces, as well as landscaping as required by the Design Guidelines.*
- *Architectural elements required by the Design Guidelines are present in the proposed plan. In particular, the building renderings show a prominent corner element and wrapping of primary façade materials around to secondary facades. The building materials will include stucco, brick, and metal paneling.*

*The petitioner requests a major change to allow a seven-story building with an overall height of 77 feet. The Design Guidelines allow a maximum height of six stories not exceeding 100 feet. Since the total height of the building will be below the 100-foot overall height limit set in the Design Guidelines, staff does not anticipate having a seventh story on this site will impact the surrounding area. Also, as noted by the petitioner, the building on Parcel 2 will be buffered from currently-existing residential development by the development on Parcel 1. Staff supports the requested major change.*

*The petitioner requests a variation to amend the parking ratio for the development from 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit as required by the Zoning Ordinance to 1.38 spaces per unit. A parking ratio of 1.5 spaces per unit would result in 263 spaces for the 175-unit apartment complex. The petitioner proposes to construct 241 spaces on the site.*



*The Village's traffic consultant, KLOA, conducted a parking analysis on the proposed development. The KLOA study found that average parking supply for low- and mid-rise apartments is 1.4 spaces per unit. Average peak demand for such developments is 1.23 spaces per unit. Based on this data and a survey of other properties in Lombard, KLOA concluded the development will have sufficient parking as proposed. The developer also submitted a parking study that reached a similar conclusion. Based on the KLOA parking study, staff is satisfied the development will provide sufficient parking and is supportive of the requested variation.*

*The petitioner requests a variation to reduce minimum parking stall width from 9'0" to 8'3". The underlying zoning district, B3, requires parking spaces to be 9'0" wide. The Design Guidelines further allow up to 30% of the required spaces to be sized for compact vehicles at 8'3" wide. Finally, the Zoning Ordinance allows residential developments in residential districts to construct all parking spaces to a minimum width of 8'3". Since the development on Parcel 2 will be entirely residential, the petitioner proposes to construct parking spaces accordingly, with a mixture of 8'3" and 8'6" spaces. Staff notes this change will only impact the development of the subject parcel, and will result in parking spaces consistent with what the Village allows for other residential developments. Staff does not believe the requested relief will alter the overall development and supports the relief.*

*The petitioner requests a major change to amend the build-to line on the west side of the site to allow a build-to line with a range of 21 to 26 feet as opposed to the 21-foot build-to line required by the Design Guidelines. The petitioner is requesting flexibility in this build-to line to accommodate modulation of the building façade and balconies. Staff notes that these features will add architectural interest to the building. The amended build-to line will not impact the ability of the development to meet the intent of the Design Guidelines. Staff supports this change.*

*The petitioner requests a major change to amend the build-to line on the north side of the site to allow a build-to line with a range of 21 to 68 feet as opposed to the 20-foot build-to line required by the Design Guidelines. The proposed building includes a drop-off area along the Yorktown Ring Road, which results in the building having a deeper setback than allowed by the Design Guidelines. Staff finds the proposed change will not impact the ability of the development to meet the intent of the Design Guidelines. Staff notes that the drop-off area incorporates a canopy that extends toward the sidewalk, maintaining a pedestrian sense of scale along the street. Staff supports this major change.*

*The petitioner requests a major change to allow the use of the Front Yard Type II treatment along the west perimeter of the development where the Design Guidelines recommend the Type I treatment. The Type I treatment consists of a tree pit and hardscaped area, while the Type II treatment consists of a planting strip and hedge. The petitioner feels the Type II treatment is more appropriate given the residential nature of the development. Staff notes the proposed change will result in increased landscaping on the site, which is an overall benefit. Staff supports the change.*

*In summary, staff finds the petition meets the standards for major changes and variations to a planned development and the standards for site plan approval as established in the Yorktown Commons Planned Development Design Guidelines and Lombard Zoning Ordinance. Staff recommends approval of the petition subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.*

*Ms. Papke noted that Aimco Apartment Homes, the owners of the Yorktown Apartments at 2233 S. Highland Avenue, had submitted a letter to the Community Development Department for distribution to the Plan Commission. The letter was included in the materials distributed to the Plan Commission.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked for public comment, and, hearing none, opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.*

*Commissioner Flynn said he did not object to the requested major changes and variations. He asked for clarification on some of the numbers presented by the petitioner regarding square footages within the building devoted to amenity spaces. Mr. Roseth said that these numbers may flex somewhat as the project is designed, but the overall proposal for 175 dwelling units will not change.*

*Commissioner Olbrysh said he did not object to the requested major changes and variations. He asked for clarification regarding the target market for this development. Information in the package had referred to “active adults” and “seniors.” Mr. Roseth said that the development will be geared toward adults aged 55 and over who want amenities and active programming. Mr. Roseth further said there will not be any skilled care offered at this development.*

*Commissioner Sweetser asked the petitioner to discuss the street-activating uses proposed at the corner of Grace Street and the Yorktown Ring Road. Mr. Roseth said that the overall goal of the planned development is to create an active community, but that in the initial phases of the development there may not be the residential density to support ground-floor retail. Therefore, the petitioner*

*proposes to locate the tenant amenities for the development at the street level in the hope of generating activity. Residential development in the initial phases of the planned development may generate the residential density needed to support other activating uses in future phases of the planned development.*

*Mr. Heniff noted that Parcel 3 in the Yorktown Commons Planned Development is required to be developed with retail uses. Development of Parcels 1 and 2 may provide the impetus for development of Parcel 3. Retail is a possibility for Parcel 4 as well. Mr. Heniff further noted that there are other retail and restaurant uses already located in the Yorktown Mall. The idea is for development in the Yorktown Commons Planned Development to compliment those existing developments and provide continuity between the neighborhoods along 22nd Street and the Yorktown Mall.*

**A motion was made by Commissioner Sweetser, seconded by Commissioner Olbrysh, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition subject to following four (4) conditions.**

- 1. That the major changes to a planned development are valid only for Parcel 2 in the Yorktown Commons Planned Development;**
- 2. That the petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the plans submitted as part of this petition and referenced in the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report, except as they may be changed to conform to Village Code, or as provided as part of the original planned development approval set forth in Ordinance 7177;**
- 3. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report; and**
- 4. Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance, the project construction shall commence within one (1) year from the date of approval of the ordinance, or this approval shall be come null and void unless a time extension has been granted by the Village Board.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

## **Business Meeting**

*The business meeting convened at 9:28 p.m.*

## **Approval of Minutes**

**On a motion by Commissioner Flint, and seconded by Commissioner Mrofcza, the minutes of the August 15, 2016 meeting were approved with Commissioner**

**Olbrysh abstaining citing his absence at the meeting.**

**The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

**Abstain:** 1 - Ronald Olbrysh

## **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**

*Mr. Heniff said he had nothing to report but thanked the Plan Commissioners for taking time out to accommodate this additional public hearing.*

## **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**

*There were no workshops.*

## **Adjournment**

**A motion was made by Commissioner Olbrysh, seconded by Commissioner Flint, to adjourn the meeting at 9:30 p.m. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

---

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission*

---

*Jennifer Ganser, Secretary  
Lombard Plan Commission*