



# 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, February 20, 2012

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

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

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

*Chairperson Ryan called the order of the agenda.*

### Public Hearings

[120084](#)

#### **PC 12-06: 104 N. Park Avenue (Request to Withdraw)**

Requests that the Village grant a conditional use, pursuant to Section 155.305 allowing for a legal nonconforming two-family dwelling that was lawfully established prior to January 1, 1960 and is located in the R2 Single Family Residence District to continue or be re-established as a legal nonconforming use prior to being subject to elimination under the terms of this ordinance. (DISTRICT #1)

*Chairperson Ryan stated that the petitioner has requested that this petition be withdrawn.*

**A motion was made by Ruth Sweetser, seconded by Martin Burke, that this matter be withdrawn. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

**120080**

**PC 12-08: 1021 N. DuPage Avenue (DuPage Riding Academy)  
(Continued from February 20, 2012) (Request to Withdraw)**

Requests that the Village grant a conditional use, pursuant to Section 155.418 (C) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow for a learning center within the I Limited Industrial District. (DISTRICT #1)

*Chairperson Ryan stated that the petitioner has requested that the petition be continued to the March 19, 2012 meeting.*

**A motion was made by Martin Burke, seconded by Andrea Cooper, to continue this matter to the March 19, 2012 meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:**

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

*Jennifer Henaghan read the Rules of Procedure as written in the Plan Commission By-Laws.*

**120081**

**SPA 12-02ph: 1177 S. Main (Jewel Osco)**

Requests site plan approval of a deviation from Section 153.505(B) (19)(a)(2)(a) to increase the permitted number of wall signs for property located within the B4APD Roosevelt Road Corridor District, Planned Development. (DISTRICT #6)

*Jennifer Wiebesiek of the architectural firm of Camburas & Theodore, 2454 E. Dempster Street, Suite 202, Des Plaines presented the petition. She stated that they are requesting a sign variance for the Jewel/Osco located at 1177 S. Main Street. She explained that they will be remodeling the store this spring and are proposing an updated signage package. Part of the signage package will include a company rebranding, which incorporates the citrus graphics now part of their corporate logo, as well as increasing the permitted number of wall signs. Ms. Wiebesiek then explained the location and square footage of each proposed sign and stated that the variation will not alter the character of the neighborhood as many businesses have multiple signs on the storefront.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone was present to speak in favor or against the petition. There was no one to speak in favor or against the petition.*

*Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.*

*Michael Toth, Planner I, presented the staff report. Jewel Osco is in the process of updating the existing building façade at their Lombard location within the Lombard Pines Shopping Center. As part of the update, Jewel Osco is proposing to modify their current signage plan by replacing a number of wall signs and increasing the overall number of wall signs from six (6) to seven (7).*

*Jewel Osco is located in the Lombard Pines Planned Development; as such, the proposed signage needs to be reviewed in the context of the entire shopping center. There are currently six (6) wall signs located on the Jewel Osco - three (3) on the west building elevation and three (3) on the south elevation. The proposed plan includes a total of seven (7) wall signs - six (6) on the west building elevation and one (1) on the south elevation. Section 153.505(B)(19)(a)(2)(a) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance requires that single tenant users have no more than one (1) wall sign per street exposure; as such, a deviation is needed for the additional wall signage.*

*Staff was able to place together a permit history of the Jewel Osco wall signage in order to explain how a total of six (6) wall signs were permitted on the Jewel Osco building. The Sign Ordinance allows buildings that are set back a minimum of 120 feet from the property line, which the sign shall face, to display a secondary wall sign as long as it does not exceed 50% of the primary sign. As the south and west elevations of the Jewel Osco are located more than 120 feet from their respective property lines, a secondary wall sign was permitted on each elevation. Furthermore, the 'Total Photo' and 'Liquor' wall signs were considered one wall sign as the combined area did not exceed 50% of the primary wall sign when placed together. As the 'Total Photo' and 'Liquor' signs are currently located on both the western and southern building elevations, the Jewel Osco technically has a total of four (4) wall signs - two (2) on each elevation, which is permitted by Code. The proposed signage plan includes wall signs that are spread out across the building façade, which would not allow them to be combined into a size that would consider them as being one sign. For purposes of clarity, staff recognizes that the Jewel Osco currently has a total of six (6) wall signs.*

*The total width of the west elevation of Jewel Osco is 342.5 lineal feet. The west building elevation is also setback more than 360 feet from the property line along Main Street. The Sign Ordinance allows for the area of wall signs in the B4A District, setback more than 360 feet, to be two times the lineal frontage of the property, not to exceed 400 square feet. In this case, the lineal frontage of the property is greater than 200 feet; as such, the sign shall not exceed 400 square feet. As previously mentioned, the Sign Ordinance also allows buildings that*

are set back a minimum of 120 feet from the property line, which the sign shall face, to display a secondary wall sign as long as it does not exceed 50% of the primary sign. Under this provision, a second wall sign could be erected, not exceeding 200 square feet. This would afford the western building elevation a total of 600 square feet of signage. The petitioner is proposing a total of six (6) wall signs, totaling 685 square feet, on the western building elevation.

The total width of the south elevation of Jewel Osco is 217.25 lineal feet. The building is also setback more than 120 feet from the property line along Roosevelt Road. The Sign Ordinance allows for the area of wall signs in the B4A District, setback more than 120 feet, to be two times the lineal frontage of the property, not to exceed 200 square feet. In this case, the lineal frontage of the property is greater than 100 feet; as such, the sign shall not exceed 200 square feet.

As already referenced several times, the Sign Ordinance also allows buildings that are set back a minimum of 120 feet from the property line, which the sign shall face, to display a secondary wall sign as long as it does not exceed 50% of the primary sign. Under this provision, a second wall sign could be erected, not exceeding 100 square feet. This would afford the south building elevation a total of 300 square feet of signage. The petitioner is proposing one wall sign, totaling 198 square feet, on the south building elevation.

The petitioner is proposing a total of 883 square feet of wall signage on the Jewel Osco. The Sign Ordinance would allow 600 square feet of signage on the western elevation and 300 square feet on the south elevation, totaling 900 square feet. When only considering the square footage of signage on the building, a seventeen (17) square foot surplus would result under the proposed signage package.

The subject property is located within a commercial shopping center. It is immediately surrounded by multiple commercial uses and is also part of the Roosevelt Road Corridor. The proposed signs will only be visible to individuals along Roosevelt Road and within the center itself. It will not be visible from any residences adjacent to the subject property.

With the exception of the Yorktown Shopping Center, the Roosevelt Road Corridor is the Village's largest shopping area and includes an array of retail, commercial, service and office uses. The Comprehensive Plan recommends Community Commercial Use for the subject property, located within the Roosevelt Road Corridor. As the property is developed as a commercial shopping center, use of the subject property is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

*Similar to Floor & Décor and JoAnn Fabrics, whom both received Site Plan Approval in 2011 for additional wall signs, Jewel Osco is requesting additional wall signage to satisfy corporate branding standards for signage. Hobby Lobby, which is a retail store also located within the Roosevelt Road Corridor District (Sportmart Plaza), received approval in 2007 for four additional wall signs to maintain their corporate branding theme. In summary, staff recommends that this petition be approved as it has met the required standards as submitted by the petitioner, is consistent with wall signage relief granted in the immediate vicinity and would enhance the overall planned development.*

*Lastly, Mr. Toth indicated that staff prepared additional standards for the planned development which he distributed for the Commissioners' review.*

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

*Commissioner Burke asked if they were also being asked to approve the refinish of the façade. Mr. Toth answered they were just addressing the signage.*

**A motion was made by Martin Burke, seconded by Stephen Flint, that this matter be approved with conditions:**

- 1. The petitioner shall develop the site in conformance with the submitted plans, prepared by the C & T Architects, dated July 21, 2011.**
- 2. The Jewel Osco shall be limited to a total of seven (7) wall signs, totaling 883 square feet - (6) wall signs on the western building elevation, totaling 685 square feet and one (1) wall sign on the south building elevation, totaling 198 square feet.**

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

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

**120082**

**PC 12-07: 1135 N. Garfield Street (Village of Lombard)**

The Village of Lombard requests the following actions on the subject property located in the I Limited Industrial District:

- 1. A conditional use per Section 155.420(C)(30) of the Zoning Ordinance for a Planned Development to allow for multiple buildings on a single property; and**
- 2. A deviation from Section 155.420(G) to allow for a building height of up to sixty-five feet (65') for a salt dome, where a maximum of forty-five feet (45') is permitted.**
- 3. A variation from Section 155.420(L)(2) to allow for a storage yard to be screened by a chain link fence where a solid wall or fence is**

required; and

4. A variation from Section 155.709(B) to waive the perimeter lot landscaping requirements. (DISTRICT #4)

*Chairperson Ryan stated that the Village would be presenting the petition.*

*Michael Toth, Planner I, indicated that the Village acquired the subject property in 1989. The site has been identified in past Capital Improvement Plans (CIP) for a salt dome and for other related governmental purposes. The intent of the petition is to ensure that the Village can meet its primary responsibility of providing cost-effective and efficient services to the community. As a result, the Public Works staff has made modifications to the previous site plan requiring the need for new approvals.*

*In 2007, staff brought forward a proposal and zoning petition for developing the site for Public Works purposes (PC 07-12). The proposal included plans to construct a salt dome with a height of 60.5 feet, requiring a height variation. A conditional use for two principal buildings was also sought to provide for a separate operations building that will provide indoor storage and staging functions for on-site Public Works activities. On May 3, 2007, the Village Board adopted Ordinance 6021 granted approval of the zoning actions based upon the submitted site plan.*

*In 2008, the Public Works Department revisited the approved plans and modified the plans to improve the overall site functions and efficiencies by PC 08-19. The plan was revised to relocate the salt dome from the northwest corner to the northeast corner of the subject property. Public Works indicated the new location would be more suitable for site operations and provides for better traffic flow. The storage bins were also to be relocated to the northern property line. The modifications to the plan were deemed to be a major change to the approved plan. The new plans were subsequently brought back to the Plan Commission for additional consideration and amendment to Ordinance 6021 was approved by the Village Board.*

*The Public Works Department has recently revisited the plans approved as part of PC 08-19 and again is proposing modifications to improve the overall site functions and efficiencies. A time extension associated with Ordinance 6021 was never brought forward by staff; as such, Ordinance 6021, which granted the zoning development rights, has since expired. However, the latest plan would still require a conditional use amendment as the approved site plan has changed. To accommodate the revised plan,*

*the Village is proposing to create a planned development for the site. The project will still consist of the following elements:*

- The salt dome will serve as the primary storage center for the Village's bulk salt storage supply. The size (100' diameter, 60.5' in height) and location (northeast portion of the property) of the salt dome will remain the same as approved in 2008.*
- The operations building will provide for indoor storage of selected Public Works equipment. Office activities and all public activities and functions will remain at the Village Hall campus. The 2008 approval included a 3,600 square foot (60'X60') operations building; however, the proposed plans actually indicate a size reduction in the area of the operations building to 2,800 square feet (40'X70'). The operations building will also be relocated to the western portion of the property. The building design and operations will be similar to the newer Sunset Knoll Park District facility.*
- Several storage bins for storage of asphalt, dirt, stone and other materials will still be provided on site, along the northern property line.*
- Four calcium chloride tanks (used as an additional de-icing treatment added to traditional salt applications) are now proposed to the north of the operations building on the western portion of the subject property. The original plan included only two calcium chloride tanks.*

*The stormwater detention facility is located to the southeast corner of the site, and will filter stormwater before it is passed into the wetland area further to the southeast corner of the site. The latest design will employ inlet filters with oil skimmer materials in each catch basin, which will provide for an additional stormwater quality benefit. The current pond and the proposed design meet the previous condition of approval that required adherence to federal, county and local stormwater requirements.*

*The plan shows a designated parking area for Village vehicles. Since this site will not be open to the public, parking spaces are not planned for non-Village vehicles. Vehicles and/or equipment will be parked on an asphalt or concrete surface in accordance with Section 94.05(J) of the Lombard Code of Ordinances. Site lighting fixtures will be attached to the salt dome building.*

*As noted, the Village is requesting to create the site as a Planned Development. As variations are being requested as part of this*

*petition and the subject property meets the minimum lot area and width requirements, the project is required to be established as a planned development under the requested zoning actions. The establishment of a planned development allows for a more unified and cohesive development. Therefore, staff supports this request.*

*The 2007 and 2008 petitions and the current petition include a variation from Section 155.417 to allow for a building height of up to sixty-five feet (65') for a salt dome, where a maximum of forty-five feet (45') is permitted. The proposed salt dome plan will be conical in shape and is typical of domes constructed in surrounding municipalities. Other than salt storage, no other functions will be provided for within the building.*

*The height variation request is a function of the ultimate need to provide a sufficient salt storage facility to serve the overall needs of the community. With the additional storage facility, the Village may also be able to ensure that sufficient salt supplies for the entire year are readily available at a competitive price. During storm events, the dome may provide additional flexibility to Village crews salting streets on the north side of town. This may also indirectly reduce the overall traffic demand around the Village Hall complex during storm events as well. Overall, staff supports the height request based upon the reasons included within the response to standards.*

*Section 155.420(L)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance requires storage yards to be screened by a solid fence no less than six feet (6') in height and no more than eight feet (8') in height. The proposed plan includes a chain link fence around the perimeter of the subject property, mostly for security purposes. As the proposed chain link fence is not considered by Code to be of solid construction (with or without slats) a variation from the screening requirements around a storage yard is required. The subject property is bound by railroad right of way to the north and wetlands to the east. Furthermore, the detention pond on the southern portion of the property acts as a buffer between the storage yard and the property to the south. The only exposed portion of the storage yard would be on the western portion of the subject property; however, all structures and storage yard functions would be set back a minimum of thirty (30) feet, thus acting as a de facto transitional yard. Furthermore, solid fencing on the west side would have little benefit given the layout of the adjacent properties' building. The relief included within the petition is intended to ensure that the Village continues to meet its public service obligation while providing for a more effective use of the property. Staff finds that the standards for the variation have been*



*met and supports this request.*

*As with all new development activity in the I District, the project requires perimeter lot landscaping improvements. Per Section 155.709(B) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Village would be required to provide shade trees along the perimeter of the property line. The number of trees required would be the equivalent of one tree for every seventy-five (75) feet of lot line length, approximately 23 trees. The intent of the perimeter lot landscaping requirement is to provide physical and visual separation between individual properties. The subject property is bound by railroad right of way to the north and wetlands to the east. Furthermore, the detention pond on the southern portion of the property acts as a buffer between the storage yard and the property to the south. Staff finds that the existing buffering provided on the subject property provides sufficient separation and therefore supports the variation based upon the reasons included within the response to standards.*

*Mr. Toth recited Section 155.217 of the Zoning Ordinance and indicated that it provides a blanket exemption for essential Village governmental services. However, the Village has traditionally developed Village-owned properties in conformance with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance or sought relief accordingly. Staff has also used the public hearing process as a means to solicit public input regarding Village development proposals so that the final development plan addresses neighbor's concerns.*

*Section 155.420(B)(28) of the Zoning Ordinance lists "public utility and service uses" as permitted uses within the I Limited Industrial District. The relief included within the petition is intended to ensure that the Village continues to meet its public service obligation while providing for a more effective use of the property.*

*The property is bordered by light industrial uses to the south and west. As noted in the previous petitions, staff finds that the proposed use will be compatible with other types of uses found within the North Avenue Business Park area and within the I District. The proposed site plan attempts to address the land use compatibility issues in the following respects:*

*The Comprehensive Plan calls for this area to be developed with light industrial land uses. The Village selected the subject property for the salt dome, as the use of the property would function similarly to other light industrial uses and activities.*

*Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for public comment. No one spoke in favor or against the petition.*

*Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners. The Commissioners had no comments.*

*Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, requested that a third condition be added which would give the Plan Commission site plan approval authority for the site.*

**A motion was made by Ruth Sweetser, seconded by Ronald Olbrysh, that this matter be recommended for approval to the Corporate Authorities subject to the amended condition(s):**

- 1. The approval shall be subject to compliance with the submitted site plans prepared by Christopher Burke Engineering, dated January 13, 2012 and made a part of the petition.**
- 2. The proposed development shall meet all federal, county and local stormwater drainage requirements.**
- 3. Site Plan Approval authority shall be herein granted to the Plan Commission.**

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

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

## **Business Meeting**

*The business meeting convened at 7:55 p.m.*

## **Approval of Minutes**

*On a motion by Flint and seconded by Burke the minutes of the January 23, 2012 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 Assistant Director of Community Development.*

## **Planner's Report**

*Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, provided an update on last month's projects indicating that the Board of Trustees had approved them. He then gave an overview of next month's cases. Lastly, he mentioned the Open Meetings Act training that was required of all the Commissioners.*

## **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 - Land Use, Transportation & Annexation Policies Sections*

*Jennifer Henaghan, Senior Planner, indicated that staff is continuing the series of monthly workshops on the Comprehensive Plan. Following up from the last discussion, staff has incorporated the Plan Commissioners' comments on the working draft.*

*This month staff focused on the Land Use, Transportation and Annexation Policies starting on page 19 of the draft. Staff updated the Comprehensive Plan to reflect new developments since 1998 as well as policy changes from the Board of Trustees.*

*The Land Use section includes updating certain Comprehensive Plan recommendations that do not match the current zoning designations. These are intended to be clean-up issues, not policy changes. Those changes in land use recommendations that would be considered policy changes will be discussed at the March meeting. Other changes*

*to this section were changes to land use categories to make them more streamlined and easier to understand.*

*The Annexation Policy section builds upon the 2009 Annexation Strategies report and identifies and implements the recommendations contained therein.*

*The Transportation section is similar to the recommendations from 1998 but the Lombard Circulator and Lilac Bikeway were added.*

*Last month staff reached out to the Board of Trustees regarding the Comprehensive Plan process as well as the opportunity of having neighborhood meetings or open houses, but there has been no response from them.*

*Ms. Henaghan asked for the Commissioners' input relative to this new information.*

*Commissioner Sweetser stated that her suggestion of having the issue of sustainability infused into the plan has not been addressed sufficiently. Ms. Henaghan answered that she remembered her comment and noted that it is an important part of the Plan and will be incorporated in detail in the Implementation section.*

*Commissioner Sweetser agreed but also added that it needs to be stated as an overarching goal in order to be apparent to all. Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, indicated that when staff looked at this, they identified the actions associated with the sections. The goal is to take a regular look at the Comprehensive Plan and have the actions updated within certain items such as sustainability. He used the Goodwill planned development project as an example and noted that sustainability could be an implemented action because they used LED lighting, pervious pavers and an increased amount of open space. This could then be updated thereafter by other projects to include specific actions that were taken toward sustainability. Staff has conducted extensive research on this topic and it is difficult to include in a broad document. We do not want to be too specific at this point because it needs to be in line with the Comprehensive Plan but staff is open to additional changes.*

*Commissioner Sweetser questioned the purpose of having sustainability showing up at all in these specific implementations if it isn't driven by an overarching goal. Mr. Stilling stated that staff could stress its importance in either the Preamble or the Background section.*

*Commissioner Cooper asked if staff would accept e-mails from the Commissioners if they have comments or suggestions or if it must be done at a Plan Commission meeting. Ms. Henaghan answered that they can send staff comments or suggestions via e-mail at any time.*

*Commissioner Cooper referenced page 41 where improved crosswalks are addressed. She suggested adding the Maple/Main intersection crosswalk as a key location noting its unique design and poor safety record. Mr. Stilling responded that he would forward this issue to the Director of Public Works in order to be addressed by the Transportation & Safety Committee.*

*Relative to traffic, Commissioner Sweetser suggested addressing intersections where stoplights are sensor-driven, resulting in traffic congestion during the evenings. Mr. Stilling answered that the Village is getting away from the loops in the street and going to sensors on the light poles.*

*Commissioner Sweetser stated she didn't see any reference to having an EV (electrical vehicle) charging station in the working document. Mr. Stilling answered that this issue is currently being discussed by staff and there is some debate on where it should be located. The downtown was suggested as a possible location but careful consideration must be given so as not to eliminate any needed parking spaces. He added that when they reference the importance of sustainability in the Preamble this could be used as an example/initiative or something the Village is promoting and avoid specific requirements.*

*Commissioner Cooper suggested adopting the term "pilot project." Mr. Stilling noted that the Sustainability Plan had been adopted by the Village Board and he could e-mail the Commissioners the discussion relative thereto. Ms. Henaghan noted that will be a good transition for the March meeting when the Community Facility section will be discussed.*

*Commissioner Olbrysh agreed with Commissioner Sweetser's comments about traffic congestion and sensor-driven stoplight intersections. He noted the railroad intersection of Grace and St. Charles and asked if something could be done there as it is a bottleneck.*

*Mr. Stilling indicated that, at the next meeting, staff will focus on policies pertaining to specific properties. These policies are important as they drive the zoning and development. We will address the Areas of Concern section noted in the 1998 Plan and provide a brief general update as to their status. We will also think about new areas of*

*concern building upon the past approved Plans which identify future economic drivers for the community. Staff will also look at other parcels and little pieces in the community. Lastly, he added that if they had any thoughts or locations in the community that should be discussed, to let staff know so we can provide background.*

## **Adjournment**

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

---

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission*

---

*Christopher Stilling, Secretary  
Lombard Plan Commission*