

September 6, 2007

Mr. William J. Mueller,  
Village President, and  
Board of Trustees  
Village of Lombard

**Subject: PC 07-03: 19W471 Roosevelt Road and 351 E. Roosevelt Road**

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. The petitioner requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property:

- A. Approve an annexation agreement.
- B. Annex the portion of the subject property not currently within the Village of Lombard.
- C. Approve a map amendment rezoning the entire property to the B4 Corridor Commercial District.
- D. Approve a conditional use for a planned development, with the following companion conditional uses, deviations and variations, as follows:
  1. For Lot 1 (Parcel A) of the proposed resubdivision, approve:
    - a. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.414 (C)(7) of the Zoning Ordinance for a drive-through facility;
    - b. A deviation from Section 153.505 (B)(19)(a)(2) of the Sign Ordinance to allow for more than one wall sign per street frontage;
    - c. A deviation from Section 155.414 (D) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot area from 40,000 square feet to 36,549 square feet;
    - d. A deviation from Section 155.414 (E) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot width from 150 feet to 137.54 feet.

2. For Lot 2 (Parcel B) of the proposed resubdivision, approve a deviation from Section 155.414 (F) of the Zoning Ordinance reducing the required east interior side yard from ten feet (10') to two feet (2').
3. For Lot 3 (Parcel C) of the proposed resubdivision, approve:
  - a. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.414 (C)(7) of the Zoning Ordinance for a drive-through facility;
  - b. A deviation from Section 153.505 (B)(19)(a)(2) of the Sign Ordinance to allow for more than one wall sign per street frontage;
  - c. A deviation from Section 155.414 (D) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot area from 40,000 square feet to 30,799 square feet;
  - d. A deviation from Section 155.414 (E) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot width from 150 feet to 121.03 feet.
4. For Lot 4 (Parcel D) of the proposed resubdivision, approve:
  - a. A deviation from Section 154.506 (D) of the Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow for a lot without public street frontage;
  - b. A planned development use exception for a storage center in the B4 District; and
  - c. A variation from Section 155.508 (B)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the Standards for Planned Developments with Use Exceptions to allow a use exception to exceed 40% of the total floor area for the overall planned development.
5. For Lot 5 (Parcel E) of the proposed resubdivision, approve:
  - a. A deviation from Section 154.506 (D) of the Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow a lot without public street frontage;
  - b. A deviation from Section 154.507 (D) of the Subdivision and Development Ordinance requiring an outlot to have at least thirty feet (30') of frontage along a public street;

- c. A deviation from Section 155.414 (D) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot area from 40,000 square feet to 20,203 square feet for a detention outlot; and
  - d. A deviation from Section 155.414 (E) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot width from 150 feet to 138.17 feet for a detention outlot.
6. For each of the proposed lots, grant a variation from Sections 155.706 (C) and 155.709 (B) of the Zoning Ordinance reducing the required perimeter parking lot landscaping from five feet (5') to zero feet (0') to provide for shared cross-access and parking.
  7. Approve the following Sign Ordinance deviations:
    - a. A deviation from Section 153.505 (B)(6)(e) to allow for more than one freestanding sign on a property;
    - b. A deviation from Section 153.235 (A) to allow for more than one shopping center sign; and
    - c. A deviation from Section 153.235 (E) to allow for shopping center signs to be located closer than 250 feet from each other.
    - d. A deviation from Section 153.234 (F) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow for a free-standing signs to be located closer than seventy-five feet (75') from the center line of the adjacent right-of-way; and
  8. Approve a preliminary major plat of resubdivision.

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition August 20, 2007.

Graham Palmer, a representative with Centrum Properties, presented the petition. Using a power point presentation, he introduced Centrum Properties and explained their focus and mission. He noted some comparable projects which included the Glen Ellyn Crossings which is anchored by Chase Bank.

Mr. Palmer provided some history on the project. He stated that in March 2005 they became the contract purchaser of the Lombard Lanes property, and when they met with staff, they were told to pursue the towing facility to include in the redevelopment project. He noted that there are several significant issues associated with the O'Hare towing property. He mentioned that the towing company was in a long term lease and Centrum Properties had to buy out their lease. He

August 20, 2007

PC 07-03

Page 4

stated that there is also a billboard on the property with a long term lease, which they will let run out and then remove. He also noted the existing access easement for Highland Hills Sanitary District and York Township Highway Department.

Mr. Palmer stated that the total site including the towing facility is approximately 4.6 acres. He referred to the proposed site plan noting the three buildings included as part of phase one- a 15,000 square foot retail building, a freestanding National City bank, and a Del Taco fast food restaurant with a drive-through. He mentioned that the second phase would include a four-story, 95,000 square foot storage center facility in the rear of the site. He stated that the storage center was a use suggested by staff, and that it shouldn't be an issue with the rest of the plan.

Dave Bender with Carroll Associates Architects discussed the building elevations and materials. He stated that the design of the retail building is compatible with the adjacent building on site. He noted that the

Mr. Palmer

He displayed a site plan approximately 15,000 s.f. building, freestanding national city bank and delTaco restaurant with drive through. Lastly, the second phase is a 4 story 95,000 s.f. storage building in rear of site. Storage was a use suggested and staff supports. Don't think it is an issue with the rest of the site plan. 2 access point on rr. Buildings pushed off street and parking in front of building and showed on the plan.

Dave Bender, Carroll architects, 24 S. Palatine,. Described the 15,000 s.f. retail building which they are doing. Building design compatible with adjacent buildings on site. The main red brick and small eifs cornice around perimeter. They passed around the materials board. Other materials are tan brick to brick up massing of façade and uniform fabric awnings, cast stone lintels and stone bases, anodized bronze, sconce lighting throughout. Using red brick, eifs and stone on monument and pylong signs to tie in. decorate lighting t/out site as well.

Grant – rendering and elevations of bank and del taco. They incorporated similar bricks and designs in the building.

Landscape plan they have met code with plantings . they feature in plaza on west end of building they create an outdoor element with outdoor seating. Rendering looking at del taco and the plaza. The site rendering #2 overview looking at project and showed detention and where the storage facility would go. The real widened for township trucks to go through. Cross access to allow customers to make traffic decisions to ease onto rr.

Some of the highlights of the projects. 1. the cohesiveness of the project. 2. taking what was blighted and create a visually high quality project.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for public comment.

Commissioner Nelson asked if the bank facility is that important to the project? Mr. Palmer stated that the bank is the financial driver for the development.

Commissioner Sweetser asked about the roadway access for the township along the west property line. Mr. Palmer noted that Centrum Properties had acquired the property with an existing easement for the Sanitary District. William Heniff, Senior Planner, explained that Highland Hills Sanitary District and York Township Highway Department have easements whereby they can have direct access onto Roosevelt Road. He noted that the York Township Highway Department is located to the south of the subject property.

Commissioner Sweetser asked whether the petitioner was in agreement with the additional condition that staff recommended in the supplemental memo. Mrs. Velazquez stated that they have discussed the condition with the petitioner. Mr. Palmer stated that he believes that they will be able to accomplish what staff is looking for.

Commissioner Olbrysh referred to the second rendering in the petitioner's presentation. He stated that the petitioners had a challenge with the site because the slope of the property creates a 15' drop from the front to the rear. He noted that the storage center building will not look like a four-story building. He mentioned that the storage facility is a nice use for the property. He also mentioned that the cross access with High Point Center helps the project a lot.

Mr. Palmer pointed out that they originally requested four wall signs for the fast food restaurant and staff recommended that the south wall sign be removed. He stated that they are willing to do that. He also noted that they originally requested four freestanding signs and staff is recommending only two signs be approved. He explained that they would be willing to reduce it to three freestanding signs. He noted that it was important for the storage facility to have their own sign because they are located in the back of the property and are somewhat hidden.

No one spoke in favor or against the petition.

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

Michelle Velazquez, Planner I, presented the staff report and companion power point presentation. She referenced an aerial photo of the subject property noting the former uses included Lombard Lanes bowling alley and O'Hare towing. She noted that all of the structures associated with the previous uses have been demolished. She showed the proposed site plan superimposed on an aerial photo in order to explain the surrounding context and how the development with fit in with the adjacent properties.

Mrs. Velazquez outlined the requests associated with the petition which included approval of annexation agreement, annexation of the property not currently within the Village, rezoning of the annexed property to the B4 Corridor Commercial District, and a conditional use for a planned development with companion deviations and variations.

Mrs. Velazquez then reviewed the companion deviations and variations. She noted that the petitioners are seeking a variation for the whole development, to reduce the perimeter parking lot landscaping from five feet (5') to zero feet (0') to allow for shared parking and cross access. She stated that granting the variation will allow for a more cohesive and unified development. She stated that the petitioners are seeking conditional uses for two drive-through facilities- one associated with the bank and the other associated with the fast food restaurant. The proposed drive-through facility will not negatively impact traffic circulation within the development. She mentioned that a variation is needed for the retail building located on Lot 2 (Parcel B) to reduce the interior side yard from ten feet (10') to two feet (2').

Mrs. Velazquez noted that the petitioners are requesting a use exception for a 95,000 square foot storage center to be located on Lot 4 (Parcel D). She stated the Zoning Ordinance stipulates that use exceptions cannot represent more than 40% of the site area or more than 40% of the total floor area. She mentioned that the proposed storage center does not exceed 40% of the site area, but because it will be a four-story building, it will exceed 40% of the total floor area within the planned development. She stated that the petitioner is requesting a companion variation from the Standards for Planned Developments with Use Exceptions is also needed for the proposed storage center. She noted that the petitioners would like to establish the right for the use exception, but have not submitted any building elevations the storage center. She stated that staff recommends as a condition of approval that site plan approval be required for Lot 4 (Parcel D) to allow the Plan Commission to review building elevations and materials. She noted that staff can conceptually support the storage center use given that the subject property as is adjacent to two other storage uses including the U-Store-It storage center and the York Township Highway Department facility. She mentioned that there is a substantial change in grade with the elevation at the northern property line being as much as fifteen feet (15') higher than the elevation at the southern property line, and the multi-story storage center building will not have as great of an impact when viewed from Roosevelt Road as a result of the grade change.

Mrs. Velazquez stated that the petitioners are requesting variations for the banking facility and the fast food restaurant to allow four wall signs on each of the exterior walls. She noted that the Zoning Ordinance limits businesses to one wall sign per street frontage, and the overall sign size for each of the proposed wall signs meets code requirements for area. She stated that staff does not object to the relief, but recommends that both the wall sign on the south elevation of the bank and the wall sign on the south elevation of the restaurant be removed. She mentioned that staff does not see a value to these wall signs, as it would not be visible to motorists on Roosevelt Road.

Mrs. Velazquez noted that there are a number of deviations required for the proposed freestanding signs. She stated that the Sign Ordinance prohibits freestanding signs in conjunction with Shopping Center Identification signs. She mentioned that only one Shopping Center Identification Sign would be permitted on the subject property by a matter of right as the planned development does not meet the size and frontage requirements for any additional Shopping Center Identification signs. She noted that the Sign Ordinance also requires a distance of at least 250 feet between Shopping Center Identification Signs. The proposed plan only shows a distance of 216 feet. She stated that staff finds four freestanding signs for the subject property to be excessive. She noted that planned developments are intended for a unified and compatible design of buildings, structures and site improvements, and excessive freestanding signage can give the appearance of a piecemeal development rather than an intergraded shopping center. She stated that staff can conceptually support the necessary relief to allow the two shopping center signs located at each of the access drives, and any signage for the bank and storage center should be incorporated into the shopping center signs. She also noted that there is an existing billboard located on the subject property, and the companion annexation agreement will provide for the removal of the billboard by the petitioner in 2014, when the existing lease period expires.

Mrs. Velazquez stated that the petitioner has been working with staff and the Village's traffic consultant to address concerns related to stacking and access drives. She noted that the subject property previously had a full access drive on the Lombard Lanes property and a full access drive on the O'Hare towing property. She pointed out that there are existing cross-access easements with High Point Shopping Center located west of the subject property which will allow vehicles to exit onto Roosevelt Road at the Fairfield Avenue traffic light. She mentioned that there is an existing easement on the O'Hare Towing property that granted York Township Highway Department rights to use a fifteen-foot drive aisle and the full access onto Roosevelt Road, and that the petitioner has worked with both York Township Highway Department to address the easement. She stated that IDOT has reviewed the proposed site plan and finds the full access curb-cut and right-in/right-out curb-cut to be acceptable. However, IDOT will require the petitioner to extend the existing right turn only lane for the right-in/right-out curb cut to the west in the High Point Shopping Center.

Mrs. Velazquez reviewed the landscaping and building elevations. She stated that the petitioner has submitted a landscape plan that is intended to provide perimeter and internal parking lot landscaping similar to that specified in the Zoning Ordinance. She noted that the subject property is not adjacent to any residential zoning districts, and therefore, transitional landscaping is not required. She mentioned that the petitioner has submitted elevation drawings for the proposed banking facility, retail building, and fast food restaurant. She stated that the proposed buildings incorporate similar masonry colors and materials. She explained that the banking facility and the retail building use a red brick and the fast-food restaurant incorporates a red stone, similar in color. She noted that the three buildings also include an EFIS cornice element which helps tie them together, and all three buildings incorporate fabric awnings and wall sconces as decorative elements. She stated that staff finds the elevations to be acceptable overall, but suggests that additional masonry be incorporated into the final design for the fast-food restaurant.

William Heniff, Senior Planner, noted that there is currently a development moratorium placed on the Roosevelt Road Corridor. He stated that the petitioner filed this petition prior to the adoption of the ordinance establishing the moratorium. He mentioned that the petitioners have spent a lot of time working with both staff and IDOT to address access issues.

Chairperson Ryan clarified that staff had referred to Butterfield Road in the presentation, but should have stated Roosevelt Road.

Commissioner Sweetser questioned asked for clarification on condition 5c and which signs the condition is referring to. William Heniff explained that the condition would limit the petitioners to the two shopping center signs. Commissioner asked where the signs would be located. Mrs. Velazquez stated that the signs would be located at the two access points as shown on the site plan. Ruth Sweetser noted that the storage facility would have to be included on one of the shopping center signs.

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting for comments from the Plan Commission.

Chairperson Ryan asked about the height of the four-story storage center building. Mr. Heniff noted that in the B4 District the maximum height permitted is 40 feet, but 45 feet can be permitted as a conditional use. Chairperson Ryan asked if the conditional use for the building height is included as part of the current petition. Mr. Heniff explained that it is not part of the petition.

Commissioner Burke asked where the 40 foot building height is measured from. Mrs. Velazquez noted that the Zoning Ordinance provides some flexibility in the reference level used to measure building height. It can be measured from curb level, or its equivalent, or the average grade in front of the building. She mentioned that it has typically been at staff's discretion. Mr. Heniff stated that if the Plan Commission doesn't want a fifty seven foot (57') building height (as a result of the change in grade) that it should be denoted.

Mr. Heniff noted that the petitioners would like to secure the legal right to the use exception at this time, but if they can't meet the bulk requirements, they will have to come back for the relief.

Ron Olbrysh stated that he didn't have a problem with the storage, and that the elevations for the development are also very attractive.

After due consideration of the petition and the testimony presented, the Plan Commission found that the requested relief does comply with the standards of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the Plan Commission, by a roll call vote of 5-0, recommended to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of the petition associated with PC 07-03 subject to the following conditions:



1. The petitioner shall develop the site and building in accordance with the following plans submitted as part of this request, except as modified by the conditions of approval:
  - a) Site plans prepared by Carroll Associates Architects, dated August 9, 2007
  - b) Landscape plan, prepared by Carroll Associated Architects, dated August 10, 2007,
  - c) Building elevations for proposed retail center, prepared by Carroll Associates Architects, dated July 16, 2007,
  - d) Building elevations for proposed bank, prepared by Carroll Associates Architects, dated July 16, 2007
  - e) Building elevations for the fast-food restaurant , prepared by Hestrup and Associates, dated July 17, 2007.
2. That the petitioner shall enter into an annexation agreement with the Village for the subject property.
3. That the petitioner's building improvements shall be designed and constructed consistent with Village Code and shall also address the comments included within the IDRC report.
4. That any trash enclosure screening required by Section 155.710 of the Zoning Ordinance shall be constructed of material consistent with the principal building in which the enclosure is located.
5. To ensure that the proposed signage, awnings and building elevations present a favorable appearance to neighboring properties, the property shall be developed and operated as follows:
  - a. That channel lettering shall only be used for the wall signs.
  - b. That consistent with the Sign Ordinance, the awnings shall not include text in conjunction with the wall signage.
  - c. The planned development shall be limited to no more than two freestanding shopping center signs, with the signs being in accordance with the shopping center signage plan prepared by Carroll Associates Architects dated August 3, 2007. The final placement of the signs shall be located in a manner that does not conflict with clear line of sight or utility easements.
  - d. That wall signage for the bank building and the fast-food restaurant building shall only be located on the north, east and west elevations.
  - e. That the fabric awnings on each of the proposed buildings shall be compatible.
  - f. That all rooftop mechanical equipment shall be screened pursuant to Section 155.221 of the Zoning Ordinance.
  - g. Prior to consideration by the Village Board, the petitioner shall submit modified building elevations for the fast-food restaurant on Lot 3 (Parcel C) that substitute masonry for the EFIS.

August 20, 2007

PC 07-03

Page 10

6. To minimize parking conflicts on the property and to minimize impacts on adjacent properties, the developer/owner of the property shall allow for cross-access and cross parking between each lot within the proposed development.
7. The use exception for a storage center shall only be for Lot 4 (Parcel D) of the planned development. The development of Lot 4 (Parcel D) shall be subject to site plan approval of the Village.
8. The petitioner shall dedicate to the Village a cross-access easement to provide access to the proposed detention outlot (Lot 5), with the final location to be denoted on the final plat of subdivision for the subject property.

Respectfully,

**VILLAGE OF LOMBARD**

Donald Ryan, Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission

c. Petitioner  
Lombard Plan Commission