



# 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, July 20, 2015

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** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Donald F. Ryan

**Absent** 3 - Martin Burke, Ronald Olbrysh, and Stephen Flint

*Also present: William Heniff, AICP, Director of Community Development; Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director of Community Development; Matt Panfil, AICP, Sr. Planner, and Jason Guisinger, legal counsel to the Plan Commission.*

*Chairperson Ryan called the order of the agenda.*

*Ms. Ganser read the Rules of Procedures as written in the Plan Commission By-Laws.*

### Public Hearings

[150321](#)

**PC 15-20: 135 E. Hickory Street - Plat of Resubdivision with Associated Lot Width Variance (Request for continuance to the August 17, 2015 meeting)**

Requests that the Village grant approval of a plat of resubdivision with

a variation from Section 155.407 (E) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the required minimum lot width from sixty feet (60') to fifty-seven and one-half feet (57.5') for proposed Lot 1 located at 135 E. Hickory Street and within the R2 Single-Family Residence Zoning District. (DISTRICT #5)

**A motion was made by Commissioner Sweetser, seconded by Commissioner Mrofcza, to continue this petition to the August 17, 2015 meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Donald F. Ryan

**Absent:** 3 - Martin Burke, Ronald Olbrysh, and Stephen Flint

[150322](#)

**SPA 15-02ph: 810 E. Butterfield Road - Site Plan Approval for Modifications to an Existing Shopping Center Identification Sign (Request for continuance to the August 17, 2015 meeting due to the notice was incorrectly published by the newspaper)**

Requests that the Village grant site plan approval for modifications to the existing shopping center identification sign specifically located at 810 E. Butterfield Road, and within the B3PD Community Shopping District, Fountain Square Planned Development. (DISTRICT #3)

**A motion was made by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Mrofcza, to continue this petition to the August 17, 2015 meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Donald F. Ryan

**Absent:** 3 - Martin Burke, Ronald Olbrysh, and Stephen Flint

[150323](#)

**PC 15-19: 27 W. Grove Street - Single-Family Residential Planned Development**

Requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property located within the R6 Central Residence District:

- A. Approve a Major Plat of Subdivision; and
- B. Pursuant to Section 155.502 (F)(1), approve a conditional use for a planned development for the subject property with companion deviations from the Lombard Subdivision and Development and Zoning Ordinances, as follows;
  1. For Lot 1 and Lot 2 of the proposed resubdivision, approve a deviation from Section 154.506 (D) to allow for a lot without public frontage;
  2. For Lot 1 through Lot 6 of the proposed resubdivision for the detached single-family dwellings, approve the following:
    - a. A deviation from Section 155.212 to reduce the minimum required front yard setback for a roofed-over porch not projecting more than seven feet (7') from the front wall of the principal structure from twenty five feet (25') to six feet (6');
    - b. A deviation from Section 155.411 (D)(1) to reduce

- the minimum required lot area from 7,500 square feet to 2,000 square feet;
- c. A deviation from Section 155.411 (E)(1) to reduce the minimum required lot width from sixty feet (60') to thirty feet (30');
  - d. A deviation from Section 155.411 (F)(a)(i)(b) to reduce the minimum required front yard setback from thirty feet (30') to thirteen (13');
  - e. A deviation from Section 155.411 (F)(c) to reduce the minimum required interior side yard setback from six feet (6') to three and one-half feet (3.5'), exclusive of any publicly recorded easement areas;
  - f. A deviation from Section 155.411 (F)(d) to reduce the minimum required rear yard setback from thirty feet (30') to fifteen feet (15'); and
  - g. A deviation from Section 155.411 (F)(l) to reduce the minimum required open space from fifty percent (50%) to thirty-three percent (33%). (DISTRICT #1)

*Sworn in to present the petition was Matt Panfil, AICP, Senior Planner, and the petitioner, Court Airhart, President of Airhart Construction.*

*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.*

*Mr. Airhart began by identifying the name of the proposed development as Park Place. Referring to an aerial image, Mr. Airhart identified the location of the property and stated the property is unique due to its transitional position between single-family homes to the north, multi-family residences to the east, west, and south. The property is also not far from commercial properties within the downtown area.*

*The property is surrounded by multiple zoning districts: R2, R6, R6PD, and B5. Surrounding land uses include apartments, condominiums, attached single-family townhomes, detached single-family homes, and commercial.*

*Referring to pictures of structures within the immediate area, Mr. Airhart then discussed the architectural characteristics of the existing building and stated that the proposed development is architecturally compatible with the neighborhood.*

*Mr. Airhart stated that the R6 zoning designation allowed for flexibility in what type of residential product could be built. Acknowledging that the existing zoning would allow for a high-rise multi-family residence, Mr. Airhart stated his belief that the property is better suited for the*

*proposed development, which is a hybrid of attached townhomes and detached single-family residences. Mr. Airhart referred to images of a similar product he has developed in Wheaton, College Station, representative of the proposed development. In College Station, the homes are all individual custom detached single-family residences, but the neighborhood has common landscape maintenance, snow removal, etc. An effort was made to create a unique streetscape by providing front porches, individual designs, and rear-loading garages. Like the subject property, the Wheaton location also is located amid a variety of land uses.*

*Displaying an image of the proposed site plan, Mr. Airhart stated that Park Place will also feature prominent front porches, rear-loading garages, heavy landscaping, and a pocket park in the southeast corner of the site. The increased front yard setback on Grove Street is due to an existing stormwater management facility installed by a previous developer. Mr. Airhart then discussed the different model homes that will be available for construction. The styles vary, but include Cape Cod, Dutch Colonial, Prairie, and Greek Revival. There are two (2) customizable floor plans available.*

*In regards to the zoning relief requested, Mr. Airhart stated the proposal is a balancing act between single-family homes and attached townhomes. This product addresses a demographic that does not want to do exterior maintenance and snow removal, but want fee simple ownership of a custom home with an attached garage and near a downtown location.*

*Because of its proximity to the pedestrian-oriented downtown, Mr. Airhart believes some of the zoning relief requested allows for the proposed development to enhance the pedestrian environment by allowing front porches and buildings closer to the street. The lot area, lot width, and side yard setback deviations are more consistent with what is required by Lombard Village Code for attached single-family residences. The requested rear yard and open space deviations allow for more common space, including the proposed pocket park.*

*Mr. Airhart concluded his presentation by reiterating his belief that the proposed development will serve as an excellent transitional use that connects the single-family homes to the north and the multi-family residences to the south.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked for public comment, and, hearing none, he asked for the staff report.*

*Mr. Panfil submitted the staff report to the public record in its entirety. Mr. Panfil stated that project already appeared before the Plan*

*Commission during a workshop session held at the last meeting on June 15, 2015. The petitioner incorporated feedback from the workshop session into the official Plan Commission submission. In summary, each home would be under simple fee ownership; however, the driveway, stormwater detention facility, and open space area would be under common ownership. Unique to this proposal is that in function it is similar to a townhome development; however, there are no common walls.*

*Mr. Panfil then discussed the recent site history to provide additional context to the petitioner's request. In June of 2006, demolition permits were issued for two (2) single-family homes located on the subject property. The single-family homes were demolished for the purpose of constructing the Grove Park Condos, a new eighteen (18) unit condo building. The Grove Park Condos received final approval in 2007 and the developer began making site improvements, including: a full stormwater detention facility, utility improvements, and new sidewalks. The project was put on hold in 2008 due to financial constraints. Starting in 2009, there had been ongoing litigation which precluded any further development on the subject property. Said issues have since been resolved and as the contract-purchaser, the petitioner is ready to proceed with the development of the site.*

*While the proposed dwelling units may function similarly to townhomes, the units are still considered detached single-family residences and are subject to the same regulations as any other detached single-family home. Therefore, there are several items of zoning relief requested. In lieu of restating each item of relief, Mr. Panfil stated that he would like to initially discuss the request for a deviation from Section 155.411 (F)(I) to reduce the minimum required open space from fifty percent (50%) to thirty-three percent (33%). Mr. Panfil referred to Exhibit C that demonstrates that the total open space for the entire development is approximately forty-six percent (46%); however, the fact that the site will be subdivided into separate lots requires the legal notice be published with the parcel with the lowest amount of open space.*

*In regards to the other members of the Inter-Departmental Review Committee (IDRC), Mr. Panfil stated that the comments by the Building Division, Private Engineering Services (PES), and Department of Public Works will be reviewed during the building permit review process and although the topics are not the domain of the Plan Commission, they have been provided for the Commissioner's information.*

*Mr. Panfil stated that in regards to the surrounding land uses, the site is located within an area that is adjacent to low-density single-family*

*residential to the north, low- to medium-density residential to the west, high-density residential to the south, and medium-density residential to the east. As expressed by the petitioner, the development will function as a transition from the high-density residential and downtown businesses to the south to the low-density single-family home subdivisions to the north. Also, the rear-loaded two-car garages and front porches create a strong street-front presence that provides a visual transition from the zero foot (0') front yard setbacks of downtown to the deeper front yards of the single-family homes to the north. Staff finds the proposed planned development to be highly compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.*

*Mr. Panfil added that the importance of the transitional aspect of the planned development in terms of aesthetics and density is most noticeable in consideration that the subject property is located within the R6 Central Residence District, which by right would allow for the construction of a multi-family structure up to eight (8) stories or one-hundred feet (100') in height.*

*In regards to the Comprehensive Plan, Mr. Panfil stated that the 2014 update classifies the property as "Medium-Density Residential" which is described as, "a residential area with a net density of eleven to twenty dwelling units per acre." The proposed density is approximately ten (10) dwelling units per acre. Although the product is considered detached single-family residential, which is usually associated with low-density residential, the unique design is near the prescribed density range for medium-density residential. Therefore, staff finds the proposal to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.*

*Mr. Panfil then discussed the specific request for relief from the Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow for two (2) lots without a public street frontage. Mr. Panfil explained that due to the location of the existing stormwater detention facility, if Lot 1 and/or Lot 2 were to have a public street frontage, they would have individual ownership over their respective portions of the stormwater detention facility, which is undesirable. The creation of Outlot A allows for common ownership of the stormwater detention facility while still providing Lot 1 and Lot 2 with functional street frontage.*

*In review of the Final Plat of Subdivision, Mr. Panfil specified that because the subdivision involved more than four (4) separate lots, the proposal is considered a Major Plat of Subdivision. Mr. Panfil identified three (3) revisions required on the Final Plat of Subdivision prior to final Village Board approval.*

*Mr. Panfil stated there are three (3) elements of the planned development, based on Section 155.502 (D) of the Zoning Ordinance,*

*which enable staff to support the requested relief:*

- 1. A maximum choice in the types of developments that would not be possible under the strict application of the terms of other sections of this Chapter;*
- 2. A creative approach to the use of land and related physical facilities that results in better development, design, and the construction of aesthetic amenities; and*
- 3. Innovations in residential, commercial, office and industrial developments so that the growing demands of the population may be met by greater variety in type, design and lay-out of buildings and be the conservation and more efficient use of open space ancillary to said buildings.*

*Mr. Panfil concluded by stating that planning staff finds merit in the proposal, especially in its ability to function as a transitional element from the high-density residences and businesses to the south of the property to the low-density residential to the north.*

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

*Commissioner Sweetser commented her previous questions from the workshop session have been addressed and she believes the proposal is innovative and will meet the needs of home buyers and the Village. Commissioner Sweetser then asked about the stormwater detention facility in Outlot A and whether or not the grade will be at street level or depressed.*

*Mr. Panfil responded, and Mr. Airhart confirmed, that the located of stormwater management facility underground allows for Outlot A to be at a traditional two percent (2%) slope. The area will appear as if to be a normal front yard.*

*Commissioner Cooper stated that she is enthused about the concept and agrees that the proposed development will serve as a good transition from high- to low-density. Commissioner Cooper also appreciates the architectural detailing and various styles as well as the design elements such as the porches and rear-loaded garages. Commissioner Cooper also believes the development will promote more activity in the downtown and she is pleased that sufficient landscaping has been provided. Commissioner Cooper then questioned if there will be a homeowners association (HOA) to maintain the out lot.*

*Mr. Airhart responded in the affirmative. An HOA is necessary for maintaining the stormwater management facility, landscaping, and snow removal.*

*Commissioner Cooper asked if the pocket park will be part of the Lombard Park District or a private park.*

*Mr. Airhart responded that will be under control of the HOA.*

*Chairperson Ryan commented that questions from the previous workshop have been addressed and he expressed his belief that the project will be a great addition to the Village.*

*Commissioner Sweetser asked how many units were constructed in the College Station project in Wheaton.*

*Mr. Airhart responded that there will be a total of fourteen (14) units.*

*Commissioner Sweetser asked how long it took to sell the units.*

*Mr. Airhart replied that once they brought it to market it took approximately thirty-six months, which was during a slow real estate market.*

**A motion was made by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Sweetser, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition subject to the conditions.**

- 1. The zoning actions set forth shall be contingent upon the petitioner, Airhart Construction, LLC, taking title to the property no later than December 31, 2015. Shall Airhart Construction, LLC, not take title by the aforementioned date, the relief associated with the petition shall be null and void;**
- 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 Codes and Ordinances;**
- 3. That the building improvements shall be designed and constructed consistent with Village Code and shall address the comments included within the IDRC report, including the Building Division's request that combustible projections (soffits, etc.) are to be five feet (5') apart or greater on adjacent structures per the 2012 International Residential Code;**
- 4. The petitioner shall submit a final engineering plan for review and approval for the proposed site improvements for the project. Said plan shall meet all provisions of Village Code, except as varied by this petition; and**
- 5. The petitioner shall provide an updated Final Plat of Subdivision based on the comments included within the IDRC report**



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

**Aye:** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Donald F. Ryan

**Absent:** 3 - Martin Burke, Ronald Olbrysh, and Stephen Flint

[150324](#)

**PC 15-13: 1125 E. St. Charles Road**

The petitioner requests that the Village grant:

1. a conditional use, pursuant to Section 155.416 (C) (30) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow for Storage centers, provided that the use fronts along an arterial roadway with an average daily trip volume (ADTV) of less than 25,000 within the B4 Corridor Commercial District;
2. a conditional use, pursuant to Section 155.416 (G) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow for a building to exceed three stories or 40 feet within the B4 Corridor Commercial District; and
3. a variance from Section 155.602, Table 6.3, to allow for less than the required spaces for a Warehouse Use. (DISTRICT #5)

*Sworn in to present the petition was Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director, the petitioners Brian Coninx and Gary Delaney.*

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

*Mr. Coninx stated they are proposing to build a self-storage facility with state of the art security. He briefly discussed the current conditions of the property. He noted they would improve the flood management on the site. The project is unlikely to cause much traffic and has few daily trips. Mr. Coninx showed renderings of the proposed building. The building would meet the setback requirements. Currently the site is mostly impervious and they propose to add additional landscaping. He showed the materials board, the proposed EIFS and split faced block. There will be windows on the rear of the building. He went over the past flooding, high ground water table, and poor subsurface soils. He noted that these are reasons why a basement is not possible and therefore a height variance is required. He discussed the height requests and the efficiency of the HVAC and lighting systems, which warrant the additional building height.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked if any person would like to speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment. Hearing none, Chairperson Ryan asked for the staff report.*

*Ms. Ganser presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. She stated the petitioner is requesting two conditional uses and a variance and will be purchasing the property*

for use of a self-storage center. The existing building will be demolished. She noted the use of a self-storage center is supported by staff and currently Lombard is home to three self-storage centers, one of which is in the B4 zoning district. She noted that the existing neighborhood is mostly one-story buildings with a few two-story buildings. The property is also visible from the rear at the Great Western Trail. Staff feels the building height is out of context with the neighborhood. The height to grade to the top of the building is 42'11" and the parapet wall brings the building to 45'. Staff does not support the height request. Ms. Ganser reviewed the parking variance, which other storage centers did also receive. Staff supports this request. She noted that this building is proposed in the B4 district and said that building materials should reflect the commercial area.

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

Commissioner Mrofcza asked for more details on the parking variance. Ms. Ganser said they are asking for ten parking spaces, with one ADA space. Chairperson Ryan asked if this seems reasonable. Ms. Ganser replied yes.

Commissioner Sweetser said the parapet roof design is most likely for aesthetic reasons and asked if that was removed, would staff feel differently. Ms. Ganser said even without the parapet with building would need a conditional use for the height. Ms. Sweetser asked if staff still feels the building would be out of character with the neighborhood, and Ms. Ganser replied yes.

Commissioner Cooper said she was happy to see less parking. She asked if the windows are real or fake. Mr. Coninx said the windows in the front are real, but the side and rear are faux. She asked if this conformed with any Villa Park documents. Ms. Ganser said staff has not received any comments from the Village of Villa Park or any residents and property owners. Chairperson Ryan asked if staff knew what the height regulations were in Villa Park and Ms. Ganser replied no. Commissioner Cooper said she doesn't have an issue with the extra building height.

Mr. Delaney said he is the President of Banner Storage Group. He said the height is needed partially because of the ductwork inside the building and their high efficiency. He said the geology in the area prohibits a basement from being constructed. The economics of the self-storage facility work with a four story building.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if runoff water will be captured to be used as gray water or similar. Mr. Coninx said it wasn't considered,

*but this use has very little water usage.*

*Commissioner Mrofcza asked if the height is a deal breaker and Mr. Delaney said yes. Commissioner Mrofcza and staff discussed the conditions of approval.*

**A motion was made by Commissioner Sweetser, seconded by Commissioner Cooper, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition subject to the conditions, and amended condition number one to note the number of parking spaces and allow the building to be 42'11" tall:**

- 1. That this relief is limited to the operation of a four story, forty-two foot eleven inch (42'11") high building, as a storage center with a parking variance of ten (10) spaces based upon the submitted site plans and building elevations submitted by the petitioner and made a part of this petition, except as required to be amended to meet to the conditions of approval;**
- 2. That the petitioner shall be required to apply for and receive building permits prior to construction;**
- 3. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report;**
- 4. The petitioner shall not use an insulated metal panel as a building material, and instead substitute that with EFIS/dryvit, precast panels with a stamped masonry component or masonry, with the final approval to be subject to the approval of the Director of Community Development;**
- 5. A plat of consolidation of the two parcels shall be submitted to the Community Development Department and recorded at DuPage County; and**
- 6. This relief shall be valid for a period of one year from the date of approval of the ordinance. If the storage center is not established by said date, this relief shall be deemed null and void.**

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

**Aye:** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Donald F. Ryan

**Absent:** 3 - Martin Burke, Ronald Olbrysh, and Stephen Flint

[150325](#)

**PC 15-17: 215 & 223 E. Roosevelt Rd. and 120 - 124 E. 13th Street (V-Land Planned Development)**

The petitioner requests that the Village:

1. Approve further amendment to an annexation agreement;
2. Pursuant to Section 155.504(A) (major changes to a planned development), further amendment to Ordinances 5122, 5559, and 5878 granting approval of a conditional use for a planned. development, amending the maximum number of tenant spaces within the existing retail center.

## (DISTRICT #6)

*Sworn in to present the petition was Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director, and the petitioner Steve Panko.*

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

*Mr. Panko stated he is the property owner and asked for one space of 3,050 square feet to be broken into two spaces. He has one tenant lined up with letters of intent for the second space. The prior tenant left in October 2014. In 2011 a similar request was granted.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked if any person would like to speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment. Hearing none, Chairperson Ryan asked for the staff report.*

*Ms. Ganser presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. She stated the petitioner is requesting an amendment to an annexation and planned development agreement to allow for the reconfiguration of a multi-tenant building at six (6) tenant spaces on the subject property located within the B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District. The annexation agreement will be reviewed by the Village Board of Trustees. Staff proposes to strike that condition from the agreements as the V-Land shopping center has made multiple requests in the past to increase the number of tenant spaces. The size of the building would be not increased, but rather allow for a greater number of businesses within the V-Land shopping center. There were no comments from the IDRC group and staff feels this would be consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and the Comprehensive Plan. The neighboring retail centers do not have a provision on the number of tenant spaces.*

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

*Commissioner Mrofcza asked if the unit in question was the unit at 3,050 square feet and asked if it could be subdivided into three units. Mr. Panko said the intent is to divide it into two units since it is costly to do. Ms. Ganser noted this amendment would allow future spaces to be divided.*

**A motion was made by Commissioner Sweetser, seconded by Chairperson Ryan, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition subject to the conditions.**

- 1. The petitioner shall apply for and receive a building permit for any**

improvements to the interior of the tenant space(s) prior to starting and build-out of the tenant spaces.

2. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report.

The motion carried by the following vote:

**Aye:** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Donald F. Ryan

**Absent:** 3 - Martin Burke, Ronald Olbrysh, and Stephen Flint

[150326](#)

**PC 15-16: Text Amendment to the Subdivision and Development Ordinance**

The Village of Lombard, is requesting the following text amendments to the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance:

An amendment to Sections 154.306 and 154.703 (and any other relevant sections for clarity) of the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance regarding “major development.” (DISTRICTS - ALL)

*Sworn in to present the petition was Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director and William Heniff, Director of Community Development.*

*Chairperson Ryan read the Plan Commissions procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine, and, hearing none, he proceeded with the petition. Chairperson Ryan asked for public comment, and, hearing none, he asked for the staff report.*

*Ms. Ganser submitted the staff report to the public record in its entirety. Ms. Ganser said the current definition has thresholds of a 2,000 square foot addition or twenty percent. This would then require public improvements. The Village completed a comparative analysis of neighboring communities and found that Lombard’s definition was among the most restrictive. Most communities did not have a definition of a major development and reviewed items by a case by case basis. The Village would like to amend our definition allowing the project to go to 50% or 20,000 square feet, whichever is less, within the prior ten years. The Public Works Department added the condition of within the prior then years.*

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

*Commissioner Cooper said she likes that the current definition promotes the building of more sidewalks and the new numbers seem high.*

*Ms. Ganser noted that all the improvements would need to be added*

*and after talking with the development community staff notes that a developer could walk away from a project if the costs are too high.*

*Mr. Heniff reminded the Plan Commission of the Discount Tire petition and how the cost of the public improvements could be similar to the project costs and make a project economically unfeasible.*

*Commissioner Cooper asked if Public Works looked at the petition.*

*Ms. Ganser said they had looked at and added the condition of the ten years.*

**A motion was made by Commissioner Mrofcza, seconded by Commissioner Sweetser, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Donald F. Ryan

**Absent:** 3 - Martin Burke, Ronald Olbrysh, and Stephen Flint

[150329](#)

**PC 15-18: Text Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance**

The Village of Lombard, is requesting the following text amendments to the Lombard Zoning Ordinance:

An amendment to Section 155.103 (and any other relevant sections for clarity) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance adding a new subsection (L) establishing an order of applications for relief for multiple or competing zoning requests for the same property. (DISTRICTS - ALL)

*Sworn in to present the petition was Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director.*

*Chairperson Ryan read the Plan Commissions procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine, and, hearing none, he proceeded with the petition. Chairperson Ryan asked for public comment, and, hearing none, he asked for the staff report.*

*Ms. Ganser submitted the staff report to the public record in its entirety. Ms. Ganser said currently the Zoning Code has no provisions for what would occur if multiple petitions came forward for the same property at the same time. This could place staff, the Plan Commission, the Zoning Board of Appeals, and the Village Board in a difficult situation of being forced to consider competing petitions for approval. Village Counsel has suggested language be added to a new subsection (L). This language would allow the first petition received to go through, but the subsequent petition to not be processed until the first petition is withdrawn or receives final action from the Board. The IDRC had no comments and staff supports the petition.*

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

**A motion was made by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Mrofcza, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Donald F. Ryan

**Absent:** 3 - Martin Burke, Ronald Olbrysh, and Stephen Flint

## **Business Meeting**

*The business meeting convened at 8:58 p.m.*

## **Approval of Minutes**

**On a motion by Commissioner Sweetser, and seconded by Commissioner Mrofcza, the minutes of the June 15, 2015 meeting were approved.**

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

**Aye:** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Donald F. Ryan

**Absent:** 3 - Martin Burke, Ronald Olbrysh, and Stephen Flint

## **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**

*Ms. Ganser reminded everyone there is a meeting next Monday, July 27, 2015. This is a special meeting of the Plan Commission for a workshop session and that there will be no public hearings.*

## 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

### Oakview Estates Phase II Development Options

*William J. Heniff presented the workshop by stating that the Oakview Estates Planned Development was approved in 2004 with two buildings at forty units each at the northeast corner of St. Charles Road and Grace Street. Phase one was constructed in 2006 through 2007. A senior housing project was proposed for phase two but was not approved by the Village Board. The property has changed hands and currently held by a bank through a foreclosure proceeding. Conditions were placed on the property that future residents are to be market rate or owner occupied. The property owner is considering a row house/townhome concept in lieu of the phase two building. A market analysis has determined that there is not a market for condos currently or for a number of years. Row house/townhomes are permitted in the R4 zoning district however the site is a planned development. The proposal differs from the original approval and intent of the project. The concept includes back loading townhome units from the parking lot area as opposed to individual driveways off of St. Charles Road with approximately ten units. Residential use is still the preferred use of the property.*

*Commissioner Mrofcza stated that he would prefer single family homes with some separation similar to the Grove Street and Park Avenue proposal instead of the row house concept. He asked staff if anyone specifically is interested in developing the project.*

*Mr. Heniff responded that the bank is bringing forward this specific*



*concept of row houses/townhomes. Informal discussions have taken place with some developers.*

*Commissioner Mrofcza questioned the impact of the train noise and asked staff what the occupancy rate is of the phase one building.*

*Mr. Heniff responded that the phase one building with condominiums is fully occupied. While units would not be sound proof, train noise can be addressed through the design of the project.*

*Commissioner Sweetser requested clarification of the rowhouse/townhome concept being two or three stories with a separate walkup entrance to each unit with shared walls.*

*Mr. Heniff responded that a similar project was constructed at Kufirin Way off of Westmore-Meyers Road in 2000.*

*Commissioner Sweetser recommended that the façade of the townhomes incorporate the façade of the phase one building. Commissioner Sweetser stated that single family homes would be inconsistent with the surrounding land use and at a high traffic intersection.*

*Chairperson Ryan stated that the residents living in the phase one building expect a phase two building and apartments or other developments ideas have been a concern in relation to their property values.*

*Mr. Heniff stated that the bank personnel attended a home owner's association meeting. Two factors brought up by the residents were parking and a different housing stock that would not directly compete with the condominium market.*

*Commissioner Cooper stated that she prefers the townhouse concept and questioned if the parking lot on the west end of the development was constructed for phase one or with consideration of both phases one and two.*

*Mr. Heniff responded that the parking lot accommodates both phases.*

*Commissioner Mrofcza stated that a higher value development that targets a different market would not negatively impact the value of the phase one condominiums. A higher density would not be desirable.*

*Commissioner Sweetser stated that the condominium owners should not dictate the conditions considered but the market should determine what potential homeowners would purchase.*

*Mr. Heniff stated that any proposal will need to come before the Plan Commission with building elevations and specific plans for review and approval.*

*Commissioner Cooper asked if the site is in the TIF district.*

*Mr. Heniff responded that the site is located in the TIF 2 East St. Charles Road District which follows St. Charles Road from Westmore-Meyers Road to Grace Street.*

## **Adjournment**

**A motion was made by Commissioner Cooper, seconded by Commissioner Mrofcza, to adjourn the meeting at 9:22 p.m. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 4 - Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Donald F. Ryan

**Absent:** 3 - Martin Burke, Ronald Olbrysh, and Stephen Flint

---

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission*

---

*Jennifer Ganser, Secretary  
Lombard Plan Commission*