

Village of Lombard

*Village Hall
255 East Wilson Ave.
Lombard, IL 60148
villageoflombard.org*



Meeting Minutes

Monday, May 16, 2011

7:30 PM

Village Hall

Plan Commission

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Commissioners: Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke,
Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, Stephen Flint and
John Mrofcza
Staff Liaison: Christopher Stilling*

Call to Order

[Play Video](#)

Chairperson Ryan called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance

[Play Video](#)

Chairperson Ryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call of Members

[Play Video](#)

Present: Chairperson Donald F. Ryan, Commissioner Stephen Flint, Commissioner Ronald Olbrysh, Commissioner Ruth Sweetser, Commissioner Martin Burke and Commissioner Andrea Cooper

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. He noted that SPA 11-02ph would be moved from the business portion of the meeting to the 4th public hearing.

Christopher Stilling read the Rules of Procedures as written in the Plan Commission By-Laws.

Public Hearings

[Play Video](#)

110269

PC 11-11: 23 W. Maple

Requests that the Village approve the following relief for the subject property, located within the R2 Single-Family Residence District:

1. A conditional use (per Section 155.407(C)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance) to allow for a cultural facility/institution (museum); and
2. A variation from Section 155.407(F)(1) to allow an existing twenty-eight (28) foot front yard setback for a principal structure; and
3. A variation from Section 155.210(A)(3)(b) to allow an existing twenty-nine and one-half (29.5) foot high accessory structure; and
4. A variation from Section 155.210(B)(1)(a) to allow the combined area of all accessory buildings to exceed the ground floor area of the principal structure; and
5. A variation from Section 155.210(B)(2)(a) to allow an existing five (5) foot interior side yard setback for an accessory structure; and
6. A variation from Sections 155.407(J) and 155.602(C) to allow for zero off-street parking spaces. (DISTRICT #1)

[Play Video](#)

Commissioner Flint stated that he would be recusing himself from offering any comments or voting on the petition as he may be the potential architect of the project.

George Seagraves, 314 W. Collen Drive, Lombard, provided background on the request. He stated that the Lombard Historical Society operates the museum referred to

as the Victorian Cottage Museum and it is owned by the Village of Lombard. He said the Society is seeking to add a 566 square foot 2 story addition to the existing coach house. The variations being requested are necessary to accommodate existing structures on the site and he asked for their support.

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

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, presented the report. He stated that the Society is seeking to construct a 566 square foot addition to the coach house located at the rear of the property. The addition is intended to improve the experience for museum visitors by providing a logical tour path with new, accessible exhibit space for visitors who cannot navigate the stairs in the Victorian Cottage Museum.

Upon completion, the coach house will house exhibit space, archives, the museum collection, an archive reading room, a restroom, and the gift shop. These improvements will allow the Victorian Cottage Museum gift shop to be converted into an exhibit room. Administrative offices would be relocated from the basement to the second floor of the Victorian Cottage Museum, and the basement and attic would be used for storage. The Society also wishes to construct an additional, small shed on the property so that the Plum shed may be converted into exhibit space or the gift shop.

Mr. Stilling summarized each of the requests and stated that staff finds the standards have been met and that the use is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan and surrounding land uses and therefore staff recommends approval of the conditional use and variations subject to the conditions noted in the staff report.

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

Commissioner Olbrysh stated that he did not have any questions or comments regarding the petition nor did he have any problems with any of the variations.

Commissioner Cooper asked for a timeline for construction. Mr. Seagraves stated that they are in the process of selecting an architect and hope to kick off their fundraising in November. They have already received one grant and expect to get started in the Spring, 2012.

It was moved by Commissioner Olbrysh, seconded by Commissioner Sweetser, that this matter be recommended to the Corporate Authorities for approval subject to conditions. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Olbrysh, Sweetser, Burke and Cooper

Abstain: 1 - Flint

1. The petitioner shall develop the space in substantial conformance with the site plan and elevations attached as Exhibit A.

2. As part of the approval, the petitioner shall also address the comments included within the IDRC Report.

[110273](#)

PC 11-12: 500 E. Roosevelt Road

Requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property:

1. Approve a planned development amendment (Major Change) to Ordinance 5163 for property located in the B4APD Roosevelt Road Corridor District, Planned Development, with the following companion conditional uses, deviations and variations, as follows:
 - a. A conditional use, per Section 155.417 (G) (2) (b) (9) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow for a new motor vehicle service facility; and
 - b. A conditional use, per Section 155.417 (G) (2) (a) (4) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow for outside display and sales of products; and
 - c. A variation from Sections 155.706 (C) and 155.709 (B) of the Zoning Ordinance reducing the required perimeter parking lot and perimeter lot landscaping from five feet (5') to zero feet (0') to provide for shared cross-access and parking; and
 - d. A deviation from Sections 154.406 & 154.507 of the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow for detention areas to not be in an outlot. In the alternative, should an outlot be required, the petitioner requests a deviation to Section 155.417 (G)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot area for detention outlots, a deviation from Section 155.417 (G)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot width for detention outlots, a deviation Section 154.507 of the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow an outlot to not have at least thirty feet (30') of frontage along a public street and a deviation from Section 154.507 of the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance for single ownership of an outlot.
2. Site plan approval with the following deviations from the Lombard Sign Ordinance:
 - a. A deviation from Section 153.235 (F) to allow for a shopping center sign to be located closer than seventy-five feet (75') from the center line of the adjacent right-of-way; and
 - b. A deviation from Section 153.505 (B)(19)(2) to allow for 3 walls signs where 2 wall signs are permitted; and
3. Approve a major plat of subdivision. (DISTRICT #6)

[Play Video](#)

Russ Whitaker, 23 W Jefferson Street, Naperville spoke on behalf of the petitioner. He noted the aerial that was shown on the screen and provided background on the subject location including the history of the car dealership. He stated that the existing West Gate Auto Sales is only using a portion of the site making land available for the proposed Firestone. Mr. Whitaker showed the Plan Commission a number of photos highlighting the existing conditions of the site.

With reference to the proposed Firestone, Mr. Whitaker noted that they have been working with staff for the last several months on a plan that they could conceptually support. He stated that staff and petitioner worked up until 5PM today to come up with conditions that both can support. He referenced his addendum to the petition and noted that it should be part of the record.

Mr. Whitaker provided the plans showing how the site could be developed. He stated that staff was initially not supportive of a piecemeal redevelopment of the site and that staff recommended shared access, signage and detention. He showed the Plan Commission a 3D rendering of the site including a concept plan showing how another 10,000 square foot building could be accommodated on the site should Firestone be developed. He noted that the existing car dealership would remain. He referenced the proposed changes to the access drives and access from Roosevelt Road, as shown on their submitted plans.

Mr. Whitaker provided an overview of the stormwater detention facilities. He stated that the plan shows 2 detention ponds designed to serve both Firestone and the West Gate Auto sales. He said they are required to release at a restricted rate to minimize off site discharge.

Mr. Whitaker then talked about signage. He stated that they are proposing a shared shopping center sign in lieu of a single freestanding sign. The proposed shopping center

sign can be used by Firestone, West Gate and any other future user. He referenced their need for the variation to have the sign located closer to the Roosevelt Road right-of-way.

Mr. Whitaker then referenced the site plan and access from Edgewood. He stated that they would like to have full access in and right out only. He proceeded to discuss parking and how they are providing more than what is required by Code. He said there would be limited overnight storage, maybe one day, to accommodate customers. Firestone will only do light service and tire installation.

Mr. Whitaker then referenced the landscape plan. He said they have increased their landscaping along the east elevation to minimize impacts on the adjacent residents. He said the building is oriented to have the bay doors face west to minimize any noise.

Mr. Whitaker then showed the Plan Commission the proposed elevations. He stated that the intent of the building design was to be residential in scale. He noted the materials being proposed and showed photos of a similar building in St. Charles.

Mr. Whitaker then referenced the engineering plans and noted that they continue to work with staff to address stormwater. He stated that they will agree to not discharge into the rear yards to the north and that they will continue to work with staff through final engineering. He then noted the photometric plan which meets ordinance.

Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone was present to speak in favor or against the petition. There was no one to speak in favor of the petition. To speak against the petition were:

Steve Benthine, 1171 S Fairfield, stated he lives directly behind Westgate Auto. His questions were about the water and retention. He asked if only the first retention pond was going to be put in but not the second. Mr. Whitaker stated that they will put in both ponds before an occupancy permit is secured. Mr. Benthine asked where they would drain. Mr. Whitaker stated that it will drain to either Roosevelt Road, Fairfield or Edgewood or a combination of all of the above.

Mr. Benthine mentioned that he was before the Plan Commission two years ago when John Moroni presented a petition. He stated that there is a retaining wall along the south side of his lot which contains drainage holes. Water flows out when it rains and pools into the neighbor's backyards. His concern is the maintenance of the wall. He noted he does not object to the Firestone petition but has issues with the water and maintenance of the wall.

Chairperson Ryan asked the petitioner if the plan will eliminate that totally. Mr. Whitaker stated no; however, the detention they are providing will reduce the amount of run-off.

Chairperson Ryan asked if something can be done to eliminate those holes. Mr. Stilling stated that some of the runoff will be taken away; however, you cannot eliminate it completely. The petitioner's plans will not increase the volume heading north. With reference to the maintenance, staff will bring that to the attention of the property owner as he is responsible for it.

Erica Dumask, 1169 S Fairfield, stated she lives in the 2nd house and gets all the water. She has lived there for 38 years and does not think the plan will help. She also mentioned the weep holes in the wall and if she plugged up those holes their driveways would flood. Chairperson Ryan suggested that they contact staff to address the matter.

Mr. Stilling asked the petitioner what type of shingle will be placed on the roof. Mr. Whitaker stated that it would be an architectural shingle.

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, presented the report. He stated that the IDRC report is being submitted into the public record in its entirety. Mr. Stilling stated that staff and petitioner have been working on the conditions and as a result, staff have submitted the revised IDRC report amended 5/16/11. Mr. Stilling stated Firestone is seeking to construct a new 8,500 square foot facility at the southwest corner of Edgewood and Roosevelt Road. Bismarck Real Estate Partners plan to acquire 1.56 acres of the eastern portion of the dealership site, develop the property and lease it to Firestone. The proposed facility would be primarily dedicated to tire sales and automotive service, but no motor vehicle repair activities, as defined by the Zoning Ordinance. The existing owner would retain the remaining 4 acres and continue the automobile sales, repair and service use.

Mr. Stilling said the proposed building would be one story, with a second level loft. The building is orientated with the bay doors facing the west so as to minimize noise and impacts on the adjacent residential properties to the east. The building will be constructed of primarily concrete blocks known as "Quik Brik". This is different from typical masonry because "Quik Brik" is made from concrete rather than clay and painted to a specific color.

Building staff notes that this product is a colored concrete block that is not a veneer, but rather a smaller block that has a face that looks like brick. The benefits of such an application are that one does not have to install a cement block and then install a clay brick veneer. Issues associated with this approach are:

1. The cement used to make the block has a dye mixed in. Dyed cement such as pavers, red sidewalks, etc. have issues with fading. While sealers can lessen fading, staff is unaware of a way to completely prevent it.
2. With traditional cement block wall that has clay brick installed in front of it (double width system) we have a 1" air space between where moisture can run down. This moisture comes from leaks, and vapor transmission. Vapor transmission occurs from the sun heating the outer surface and causing the wet wall to push the vapor into the wall. This vapor condenses in the surface of the cement block and runs down and out of the weep holes. The quickbrick does not have this airspace. In the areas where the block will be exposed, such as in the shop, there may not be an issue. In areas with drywall, staff will need more information on how that moisture will be controlled to prevent damage to the interior finishes. Staff suggests that should this petition be approved, it may be of assistance if the product manufacturer could give us an address of a job close to us that used the product so we could see it first hand.

The petitioner has provided a material board for staff's review. Staff notes that the building elevations and materials proposed for this site are critical as the intent of planned development amendments and the B4A District regulations are to encourage unified design. Should additional redevelopment occur within the planned development, the intent would be to establish compatibility with the architectural style of the future proposed buildings. This approach has been consistently applied to many other planned developments. The petitioner has submitted photos of a similar building constructed in St. Charles, IL. Staff prefers the color, materials and architectural design elements of that building elevation over the plans submitted. Should the project be approved, staff would recommend that the elevations be revised to substantially conform to the color, materials and architectural design elements depicted in the photographs submitted by the petitioner.

With reference to the site layout, Mr. Stilling said during initial meetings between staff and the petitioner, the petitioner was informed by staff about concerns with a piecemeal development of the site. Specifically, staff referenced the 2007 Roosevelt Road Corridor Plan which calls for uniform development. In addition, staff did emphasize a 'master plan' approach to developing the property and asked that any future plans include information as to how they plan to address the continuity with the entire site. Furthermore, staff expressed concern about the appearance and operation of the Westgate Auto Sales as it relates to the new proposed Firestone. Although this issue is discussed later in the report as part of the compatibility to the Comprehensive Plan, the petitioner's proposed plans have attempted to address these items in the following manner:

- o With reference to access and circulation, the petitioner's plans show the relocation of the existing curb cut onto Roosevelt Road to a more centralized location on the site. This curb cut will now be restricted to a right in/out. A new frontage access drive would be provided along the Roosevelt Road frontage providing access to both the proposed Firestone and existing Westgate Auto Sales. The required curbing and 5' perimeter landscaping is being provided. An additional 10 parking spaces are also being provided along the Roosevelt Road frontage to be shared amongst the Westgate Auto Sales use and Firestone. As noted in the traffic study, this parking area should not be used for the sale and display of automobiles.*
- o The petitioner did submit a 3D rendering (attached as Exhibit B) showing how phase 1 of the site would be developed. As shown on that plan, and the overall site plan, the existing used car sales building would remain. As noted, a curb and 5' perimeter landscaping is being provided to separate that use from the overall development. It should be noted that the used car sales building is currently not being used.*
- o Additional access is being provided via a curb cut along Edgewood Avenue. When the property was being used as Westgate Lincoln Mercury, this curb cut was only used by delivery vehicles and had an automatic gate blocking access during normal business hours. More recently, when Westgate Auto Sales received an extension to their Ordinance in 2010, the Village Board required that this access be permanently closed. Therefore, staff recommended a more restrictive left in only with no exiting movements to minimize the impact on the neighboring residential properties. The petitioner is requesting to have a left in and right in & out.*
- o A new rear access drive connecting Edgewood Avenue and Fairfield Avenue would be provided. This access drive could be used by both businesses and it also provides Firestone customers with access to the signalized intersection at Fairfield Avenue without having to drive through the automobile sales area. The petitioner's plans show that this access drive will only be stripped and the pavement would be patched where necessary. It should be noted that the petitioner is requesting to remove existing fences at both the Edgewood and Fairfield entrances to accommodate the access drive.*
- o The petitioner's future development plan also shows how this access drive would be relocated to align with the existing curb cut on the west side of Fairfield. This is consistent with the recommendations from KLOA.*

Mr. Stilling said the Village's traffic consultant KLOA reviewed the site for its impact on the Village street network and offers several recommendations. Specifically, he said KLOA recommends that the access onto Edgewood Avenue be restricted to a left in only and right out only. Staff can support KLOA's recommendation as a left in only and right out only provided that it is properly designed with appropriate signage per KLOA's report.

With reference to the stormwater detention, Mr. Stilling said the property was initially developed prior to annexation into the Village and prior to the establishment of the current DuPage County Countywide Stormwater and Floodplain Ordinance. Incremental improvements, consisting of underground detention, were done as part of the 2002 expansion project for Westgate Lincoln Mercury.

The petitioner has submitted preliminary engineering plans showing how they plan to address stormwater on the site. Staff has expressed concern about their preliminary plans. Specifically, we have issues with residential property flooding downstream of this parcel. Currently flow from this parcel is divided in a number of different directions:

- o There is some detention provided in the northern (rear) parking lot that discharges onto private, residential property via a 2" pipe.*
- o There is sheet flow to a parking lot structure that is shown to flow to the back of the curb inlet in Edgewood Avenue.*
- o There is sheet flow toward the Roosevelt Road right of way.*

The proposed development is showing detention in the rear of the parcel in two separate ponds and directs all discharge either toward Edgewood Avenue (for the Firestone development), or the rear yards of the homes between Fairfield and Edgewood (partially reflective of existing conditions). Staff notes that sheet drainage from the existing site toward Edgewood would be more controlled, through the detention improvements. However, while they are restricting the water runoff at the same or greater rate than is currently provided, the overall volume of runoff heading downstream may be increasing northward toward Edgewood Avenue. Staff recognizes that the development is improving the current runoff conditions; however, if the site was developed in a unified and comprehensive manner, discharge to the north could be avoided by discharging into the existing stormsewer along Fairfield Avenue or by some other means. As a result, staff has requested that the petitioner make the following changes to their engineering plans:

- o The current flow directed toward the Roosevelt Road stormsewer must be maintained. The flow would need to be detained to current standards, which, should the petitioner not wish to change the overall site plan, could be handled in underground detention if there is a proper grade difference. Additionally, staff has consulted with IDOT on the downstream issues along Edgewood Avenue and requested if IDOT can favorably consider allowing additional runoff to be directed toward Roosevelt Road in lieu of Edgewood Avenue. The petitioner can finalize their plan as part of the requisite final engineering approvals.*

- o The petitioner shows the existing detention area being improved to a more traditional pond, and discharging to the rear yards to the north as it currently does. Again, keeping in mind that this development is a piece of what would be an overall redevelopment, the flow to rear yards should be eliminated. There is a separated storm sewer on Fairfield that is ~200 feet from 500 E. Roosevelt and another 200 feet to the location of the existing outlet. The storm sewer along Fairfield directs stormwater to Central Avenue, avoiding the rear yards along this area. This option or any other like concept that would relieve the discharge of water onto private single family residential property should be provided, as was required in a similar petition (PC 05-42: 218-226 W. St. Charles Road - Pointe at Lombard).*

- o The proposed plan shows the controlled discharge from the pond connecting to the back of a curb inlet in Edgewood Avenue. The petitioner has been asked under §154.402 (C) (2) Chapter 200 section 2B to show where this flow goes. Pipe size, material, condition and ditch capacity will need to be addressed.*

Mr. Stilling highlighted the various conditional uses and variations associated with the petition. He stated Firestone is proposing automobile service which includes the sales and installation of tires and light automotive servicing including brakes, suspension work and tune-ups. No major repairs will take place on site. As this use can be complimentary to the existing use on the property, staff has no objection to the proposed conditional use. The petitioner is also proposing to have a small portion of the site dedicated to outside sales and display of products (such as tires and other vehicle parts). According to the petitioner's plans, the display area will be located in front of the service bays during business hours. They have indicated that they would like to have some flexibility as to where it is located during business hours (i.e. in front of a bay door not being used). As with many other automobile service facilities along the corridor, outside display areas are common. Staff finds that the conditional use for outdoor sales can generally be supported, provided that they meet the conditions.

With reference to the parking lot landscaping, Mr. Stilling noted that while staff is concerned that the proposed development may be considered piecemeal in nature, the petitioner has attempted to address shared access and circulation. By doing so, this has resulted in the need for the variation. Should this project be approved, this deviation can be supported as it provides for better traffic flow and circulation. Staff has supported such relief for other developments.

As part of the Site Plan Approval process, the petitioner is proposing deviations from the Sign Ordinance. Mr. Stilling noted that staff supported the petitioner's request with reference to signage.

Mr. Stilling said the proposed development is considered both a major plat and major development as defined by the Subdivision and Development Ordinance, which would require full public improvements where they are needed. The petitioner's plans do show sidewalk being provided along the west side of Edgewood as well as parkway trees and streetlights. However the petitioner is seeking the following deviations from the following sections of Subdivision and Development Ordinance:

A deviation from Sections 154.406 & 154.507 of the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow for detention areas to not be in an outlot. The Subdivision and Development Ordinance requires that the entire detention area be located in an outlot, not less than 30' wide, along the Edgewood frontage. This is necessary because it promotes common ownership with shared maintenance responsibilities through some type of agreement or association. The petitioner's plans show two separate detention ponds each located in a drainage easement. One pond would be owned and maintained by Firestone and the other would be owned and maintained by the property owner of Westgate Auto Sales. While both ponds do function independently, until high water stage, they are required for the development to proceed. In keeping with the unified development approach, as stipulated in the 2007 Roosevelt Road Corridor Plan, staff recommends that this relief be denied and recommends that the detention ponds be in a single outlot with shared maintenance. This is consistent with other similar projects such as Lombard Crossings (former Lombard Lanes site), V-Land Development at Highland & Roosevelt, Highlands of Lombard and Fountain Square. It would also be consistent with the issues and concerns raised in the aforementioned narrative regarding stormwater detention improvements. Staff notes that the single outlot minimizes the potential for future maintenance issues and impact to adjacent properties since an association and common ownership would be required to maintain the detention outlot. Also, the intent of a single outlot is consistent with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan and Roosevelt Road Corridor study as a unified development. Therefore, staff finds that standards outlined in 154.203 E (a) and (d) have not been met and recommends denial of this request.

Should this relief be denied and the petitioner is required to put the detention into a single outlot, the following relief is required:

- o A deviation to Section 155.417 (G)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot area for detention outlots; and*
- o a deviation from Section 155.417 (G)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot width for detention outlots*

In an effort to get the detention into a single outlot, staff can support the 2 deviations noted above given that the lot will not be developed in the future.

Alternatively, if the outlots are still required, the petitioner has requested that they have 2 outlots, one for each parcel. To accommodate this request, the following relief is required:

- o A deviation Section 154.507 of the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow an outlot to not have at least thirty feet (30') of frontage along a public street; and*
- o a deviation from Section 154.507 of the Lombard Subdivision and Development Ordinance for single ownership of an outlot*

Staff does not support this option either for the same reasons noted above including the need for common ownership and maintenance responsibilities and unified development. Therefore, staff finds that standards outlined in 154.203 E (a) and (d) have not been met and recommends denial of this request. For clarity purposes, staff recommends that a single outlot be provided with common ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the entire site including the Firestone Parcel and Westgate Auto Sales parcel.

Mr. Stilling summarized by stating that staff has expressed a concern to the petitioner about the piecemeal nature of this development through the development processes. Staff did emphasize a 'master plan' approach to developing the property and asked that any future plans include information as to how they plan to address the continuity with the entire site. This concern goes to the historical purpose and intent of the Roosevelt Road corridor analysis and is intended to minimize past negative impacts of piecemeal development on the corridor. Staff does not support an approach to "break off" a portion of the subject property and consider a proposal for an independent development, as it would also be contrary to the basic intent of the planned developments. Staff has expressed to the petitioner that the Firestone development in of itself would set the tone for future development and absent of knowing how this proposal fits into the overall master plan for the entire 5.5 acre site, it would be difficult to support such a petition.

In response to staff's concerns, the petitioner did revise their plans to incorporate the shared access and frontage roads. Furthermore, the petitioner did provide a conceptual phase 2 plan showing how the balance of the site could be developed should Firestone proceed and the existing Westgate Auto Sales remain. The plan shows how a 10,000 square foot building could be accommodated on the site and still share access and parking. However, staff still notes that under these scenarios, it still assumes the existing auto sales use as remaining. Also, should this petition be approved, it would likely preclude the ability to facilitate a full-scale redevelopment plan for the full 5.5 acre site. However, if the intent is to set the parameters for future development and to facilitate activity within the corridor in the immediate term, common area elements are represented herein. Therefore, staff finds that the petition has met the standards for conditional use for a planned development.

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

Commissioner Sweetser asked about common ownership of the outlot. Mr. Stilling stated that maintenance could be handled by an association.

Commissioner Sweetser asked for clarification about condition 16. Mr. Stilling stated that it sets the tone for future development on the site and staff prefers the red brick rather than what is proposed.

Commissioner Olbrysh questioned the east side of the building and was concerned about the appearance. Mr. Whitaker stated that the picture does not accurately reflect how this site will look. They are providing additional landscaping to break up the mass of the building.

Commissioner Olbrysh asked if the two ponds are connected to function as one pond. Mr. Stilling stated that they will still function independently but the flow can be tweaked.

Commissioner Sweetser emphasized the need to minimize flow to the north.

Commissioner Cooper asked about the balance of the property having to meet code. Mr. Stilling said what they are impacting has to meet current code but what they are not touching is legal nonconforming and will be considered part of future redevelopment.

Commissioner Cooper asked about the appearance of the ponds and suggested a more naturalized look. Mr. Stilling stated that the western portion of the pond doesn't have barrier curb but the petitioner can provide an infiltration strip and that could include vegetative plantings.

Commissioner Cooper asked about the additional 10 parking spaces located on the south side of the frontage road and if this is a Village requirement. Mr. Stilling stated that staff was only seeking the frontage road and the additional parking was provided by the petitioner. Mr. Whitaker stated that the parking would benefit the future development.

It was moved by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Flint, that this matter be recommended to the Corporate Authorities for approval subject to conditions as well as the revised staff report dated May 16, 2011. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Flint, Olbrysh, Sweetser, Burke and Cooper

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. *Elevations and floor plan by Casco attached as Exhibit A; and*
 - b. *Preliminary engineering plans by Intech Consultants dated April 11, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011; and*
 - c. *Overall site plan on an aerial by Intech Consultants dated April 11, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011; and*
 - d. *2 page site plan by Intech Consultants dated April 11, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011; and*
 - e. *Final Plat of Subdivision by Intech Consultants dated April 11, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011; and*
 - f. *Photometric plan by Intech Consultants dated April 11, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011; and*
 - g. *Landscape plan by Charles Vincent George Architects dated April 1, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011; and*
 - h. *Signage plans by Chandler Signs dated November 29, 2011, last revised April 26, 2011.*

2. *That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address the comments included within the IDRC report.*
3. *The conditions of approval outlined in Ordinance 5163 and 6312 shall remain in full effect for the subject property, to the extent not specifically modified by the ordinance granting approval of this petition.*
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 minimize traffic conflicts within the planned development, the developers/owners of the properties shall provide cross-access between each lot within the planned development via a recorded easement document, with the final design and location subject to review and approval by the Village. Additional cross parking may be required as part of a future redevelopment.*
6. *The petitioner shall satisfactorily address the following drainage issues:*
 - a. *The current flow directed toward the Roosevelt Road stormsewer shall be maintained, with the flow needing to be detained to current standards. As an alternative and part of the final engineering submittal, this flow may be directed to Fairfield Avenue in a manner acceptable to the Village.*
 - b. *The final engineering plans shall direct any runoff flow away from the rear yards and toward adjacent public rights of way.*
 - c. *If flow is directed to Edgewood Avenue, the petitioner shall provide documentation regarding the stormwater flow, pursuant to Section 154.402 (C) (2) Chapter 200, Section 2B. Pipe size, material, condition and ditch capacity will need to be addressed.*
7. *Notwithstanding any detention improvements associated with runoff being directed to Roosevelt Road, stormwater detention facilities proposed to be constructed as part of this petition shall be located in a single outlot, with common ownership and shared maintenance responsibilities.*
8. *Barrier curb is required along the south side of the detention pond on the Westgate lot. Staff may permit a filter strip in lieu of the curbing in this area only.*
9. *All comments and recommendations noted in the KLOA report dated May 5, 2011 shall be satisfactorily addressed.*
10. *The parking area located south of the frontage road, along the Roosevelt Road frontage and east of the proposed right in/out shall not be used for the sale and/or display of automobiles or merchandise.*
11. *Outdoor sales and display of merchandise may only occur during normal business hours and at the locations, as depicted on the site, prepared by Intech dated April 11, 2011, last revised April 27, 2011.*
12. *The proposed new shopping center sign, as depicted in the signage plans by Chandler Signs dated November 29, 2011, last revised April 26, 2011, shall be the only freestanding sign within the planned development. This includes both the Firestone parcel and the existing Westgate Auto Sales parcel. Informational signs may be permitted provided that they meet the provisions outlined in the Lombard Sign Ordinance.*
13. *Any new fence associated with the proposed development shall meet the requirements of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance.*

14. *The existing gate on Fairfield Avenue shall be removed upon a written request by the Village of Lombard.*

15. *Such approval shall become null and void unless work thereon is substantially under way within 12 months of the date of issuance, unless extended by the Board of Trustees prior to the expiration of the ordinance granting the conditional use.*

16. *The elevations shall be revised to substantially conform to the color, materials and architectural design elements depicted in the photographs submitted by the petitioner and attached as Exhibit C.*

At 9:05 p.m. Chairperson Ryan requested a short recess.

Chairperson Ryan reconvened the meeting at 9:11 p.m.

[110274](#)

PC 11-13: 889 W. St. Charles Road

Requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property located within the CR Conservation Recreation District:

1. A conditional use, per Section 155.404 (C) (5) of the Village of Lombard Zoning Ordinance, for a municipal facility. (DISTRICT #1)

[Play Video](#)

Justin Frederick, Director of Land Management for the DuPage County Forest Preserve, 3S580 Naperville Rd, Wheaton was the first to speak on the petition. He stated that he has two representatives with him to assist on the petition - one from Gas Technology Institute (GTI) and another from Engineering Resource Associates (ERA). Mr. Frederick began by providing a brief overview of the project. He stated that the Forest Preserve District made a commitment to alternative fuel vehicles, which will generate savings and reduce tailpipe emissions. He added that this would not be possible without grants and intergovernmental agreements. He stated that that the Forest Preserve District is requesting the installation of a Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) fueling station as an addition to their existing fuel station at the Churchill Woods Forest Preserve. He added that the site currently offers propane and E85 ethanol fuel. He then stated that the new CNG fuel station is a small pad site that operates in a similar manner as the existing fuel station. Mr. Frederick stated that they have met with staff. He added that everyone visited the Blackwell Forest Preserve to observe the CNG at that location. Mr. Frederick then turned the discussion over to Tony Lindsay from GTI.

Tony Lindsay, Director of Research and Development for GTI, 1700 S. Mt. Prospect Road, Des Plaines then discussed Compressed Natural Gas. Mr. Lindsay provided a brief background on CNG. He stated that CNG is the same natural gas piped into your home, which is supplied through Nicor Gas. He added that natural gas is methane with a high octane level (130) and makes an excellent fuel source. He stated that CNG is non-toxic, not corrosive and doesn't pose a threat to groundwater or soil contamination. He added that it has much lower ozone greenhouse gas emissions than other forms of fuel, such as diesel. He stated that it is distributed throughout the suburbs through an underground piping distribution network. He stated that CNG provides a similar fuel economy as gasoline.

Mr. Lindsay then presented a Power Point presentation on CNG.

Slide #1 provided basic information on natural gas.

Slide #2 described the different vehicles available using natural gas - light, medium and

heavy duty. Mr. Lindsay added CNG is a popular fuel for transit and waste hauling.

Slide #3 discussed the benefits and considerations of using CNG. Mr. Lindsay stated that some of the benefits include lower greenhouse gas emissions, lower particulate pollution and lower carcinogens. He added that there is enough natural gas to sustain the U.S. for 200 years. He added that when using CNG, the driving difference has shorter range than gas, but it is comparable in power and speed. He then stated that the U.S. is behind the rest of the world with regard to the number of vehicles using CNG.

Slide #4 discussed the project objectives. Mr. Lindsay stated that \$15 million in 2009 stimulus funding was earmarked for 25 cities selected for funding. He added that this is one of those projects that were funded.

Slide #5 discussed additional project objectives. Mr. Lindsay stated that one objective is to increase the number of alternative fuel vehicles and hybrids, which would include 260 gasoline hybrids, 230 CNG vehicles and 10 heavy duty diesel hybrids. He stated that another objective would be to develop fueling and changing infrastructure to support growth of alternative fuel. He then discussed the combined benefits of the project and used data, relative to the emissions displacement, to discuss the environmental benefits.

Slide #6 outlined the Project Partners which included the City of Chicago taking the lead, as well as the 16 projects. He added that GTI will be providing the infrastructure.

Mr. Frederick spoke again about the overall benefits of the project. He added that this project will help them meet their infrastructure needs for potential intergovernmental agreements to provide a fuel that only costs \$1.40 per gallon. He added that this project will be a cost savings that will also improve air quality.

One stipulation of the report that he addressed was condition #3 regarding the sign to be installed near this location. He stated that he does not have the authority (at this point) to authorize the approval of the Village sign. He then mentioned that he will be taking the sign issue to the Forest Preserve Board tomorrow morning (5/17/2011) where he will get direction to see where to take it from there.

Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone was present to speak in favor or against the petition.

Karen Oldfield, 1050 Crescent Blvd., Glen Ellyn, stated that she lives on the north side of Crescent Blvd. and her backyard backs up to Churchill Woods. She added that she is the seventh house on right side of Crescent, west of I-355. She stated that her neighbors contacted her about the Forest Preserve project. She stated that the fuel pumps have been there in the past and this sounds like a housekeeping issue. She is concerned about opening Pandora's Box as to what kind of vehicles will be brought to the site. She mentioned the intergovernmental agreements and then made reference to the City of Wheaton using the pumps. She stated they would be using a small area of a large parcel, but what if they wanted to further expand the use. She referenced the categories of vehicles and was concerned about the industrial-sized vehicles being brought to the site. She then asked about ingress/egress on St. Charles. She asked how many vehicles would be brought to the site. She added that this could be the start of something bigger and wanted something in writing before she could go along with this. She then stated that this could be very industrial in a Forest Preserve area.

Mr. Frederick stated that the Forest Preserve did look at that issue. He added that the Churchill Fleet Maintenance Facility was constructed in the 1960's and has been the repair facility for all that time. He added that 80 percent of the fleet is stored at Blackwell. He stated that 70-75 vehicles come in and out of Churchill right now, which

would actually lessen once the fleet building goes away.

Ms. Oldfield rebutted. She asked if Churchill Woods is the only site where the fuel will be offered.

Mr. Frederick stated that Blackwell, Churchill Woods and the Danada headquarters in Wheaton will all have fueling stations. He added they have an agreement with DuPage County and Wheaton and they will use the facilities in a manner that is most effective and efficient.

Ms. Oldfield asked if the Forest Preserve will have to come back to the public for approval.

Chairperson Ryan stated that this petition is just for the Lombard facility. How they deal with the other sites in the future is up to those other cities.

Ms. Oldfield stated that she is concerned about the pumps and how the Forest Preserve all of a sudden needs approval to operate.

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Community Development Director, stated that the existing fueling station has been operating in this capacity since the 1960's when the property was annexed into the Village. As the existing facility did not receive approval in the past the expansion requires conditional use approval. In the future should they want to do anything different they would have to come back to the Plan Commission for an amendment to the conditional use. This petition is for a 468 square foot pad with a filling station.

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report.

The subject property is owned and maintained by the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County and is known as the Churchill Woods Forest Preserve. A portion of the Churchill Woods Forest Preserve is utilized as a fleet maintenance facility. The petitioner plans to modify their vehicle fueling capabilities of the fleet maintenance facility by adding a compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling station, which will supplement the existing gasoline fueling facility already located on the premises. The Zoning Ordinance classifies 'municipal facilities' as a conditional use in the underlying CR - Conservation Recreation District. The existing facility did not receive approval in the past; therefore, the expansion of the municipal facility requires conditional use approval.

The District received a U.S. Department of Energy grant to initiate a CNG program in the Chicago area. The overall grant recipient was the City of Chicago, but the plan and program is to locate about 12 such facilities, strategically placed through the metropolitan area and the district, which their large fuel size and operations was identified as a key beneficiary of the effort. The initial focus was to place the facilities for the use and benefit of entities with large pools of vehicles.

The Churchill Woods Forest Preserve is located on West St Charles Road, directly west of I-355. A portion of the Churchill Woods Forest Preserve is utilized as a fleet maintenance facility. The fleet currently utilizes a gasoline fuel pump island, which is located in close proximity to the fleet maintenance building. The existing facilities would be considered legal non-conforming and any expansion to the facility would require conditional use approval.

The petitioner is proposing to create a new fueling pad site for compressed natural gas (CNG) fueling directly south of the existing fuel pump island. The proposed fueling station will contain the proper electrical and mechanical components to provide the

petitioner the ability to provide natural gas to their vehicles. The actual service pump for the natural gas will be located within seven (7) feet to the north of the existing fuel station to allow for ease of use. The existing fuel station is to remain on the property. The proposed CNG facility will not include an overhead canopy. The facility will operate similarly to a recently constructed CNG facility in the Blackwell Forest Preserve in Warrenville. The Churchill Woods facility is intended to provide a fueling center for vehicles in eastern DuPage County.

The petitioner has indicated that the proposed use will not increase the fleet's size or level of traffic activity to/from the site. The CNG fueling station will only be made available to Forest Preserve District fleet and any other fleets that enter into a use agreement with the district. As of this date, only DuPage County government has entered into such an agreement. The facility will be open for use on a 24/7 basis (as the current fueling center), it will not be open to the public. Access to the facility will remain unchanged. In discussion regarding this matter, the District did note that the existing District fleet garage is slated to be relocated to Warrenville and the existing garage will be razed in the next few years. However, the fueling center would remain.

The fuel pumps and other appurtenances associated with the proposed fueling station will not exceed eight (8) feet in height. The proposed fueling station meets all other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

The subject property is approximately 56.52 acres. When combined with the surrounding parcels that make up the Churchill Woods Forest Preserve, the total land area is 254 acres. The proposed fueling station is centrally located within the Forest Preserve property and will therefore be screened from surrounding properties by acres of land. The actual pad site, which would contain the fuel pumps and other appurtenances, would be 468 square feet. As the subject parcel of land is 56.52 acres, the amount of land being improved as part of the proposed project would only be 0.0002% of the total parcel. The CNG fueling center would operate no differently than the existing center, so the impacts on adjacent properties would not be significant. Natural gas fuel would be delivered to the site via an existing gas line within the St. Charles road right of way, thereby minimizing truck deliveries of fuel product.

The Comprehensive Plan recommends open space and recreational uses for the subject property. The current open space and recreational use of the property is compatible with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed use would serve as a supplemental function of the current use. As such, staff believes that the proposed use is also compatible with the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan.

As part of past intergovernmental considerations pertaining to the site, the Village has been seeking approval of an agreement to provide for an entryway sign immediately adjacent to the subject property. The proposed location of the signage would not be impacted by the CNG facility. However, in consideration of this request, the Village requests that as a condition of approval, the District make accommodation for the Village entrance sign to be placed on or abutting the subject property. This can be addressed by providing an approximate 5' by 10' area for the sign along St. Charles Road, through an easement or an intergovernmental agreement. The Village would be responsible for providing and installing the sign itself.

Staff believes the standards have been met and therefore staff recommends approval of the conditional use subject to the conditions noted in the staff report.

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

Commissioner Sweester referred to condition #3 listed in the staff report. She questioned whether or not the Forest Preserve still needs to gain some approval in order to place the sign on the property.

Mr. Stilling stated that the Forest District Board meets tomorrow. He stated that by the time the petition goes to the Board of Trustees, they could ask for the condition to be removed or if they agree, then it's a non-issue (if the condition were to remain). If not, they might have to come back through the process. He added that the petition will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees based on what happens at the Forest District Board tomorrow.

It was moved by Commissioner Sweetser, seconded by Commissioner Olbrysh, that this matter be Recommended for approval to the Corporate Authorities subject to the amended condition(s). The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Flint, Olbrysh, Sweetser, Burke and Cooper

1. The petitioner shall develop the space in substantial conformance with the site plan, prepared by Engineering Resource Associates, Inc., dated April 12, 2011
2. As part of the approval, the petitioner shall address the comments included within the IDRC Report.
3. As part of the approval for the facility, the petitioner shall provide the ability for the Village to install a Village entry sign to be located on or abutting the subject property.

110277

SPA 11-02ph: 85 Yorktown Center

Requests Site Plan Approval with the following deviations for the subject property located within the B3 Community Shopping District and Yorktown Center Planned Development:

1. A deviation from Section 153.505(B)(19)(a)(2)(a) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow a total of four wall signs where a single wall sign is permitted; and
2. A deviation from Section 153.505(B)(19)(a)(1)(a) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow a total wall sign area of approximately 168.22 square feet. (DISTRICT #3)

Play Video

Jerry Cohen, General Manager of Yorktown, presented the petition. He stated that the proposed signage is compatible with Yorktown's standards, and it provides a clear indication of the bank's presence. He believes the additional signage is necessary to provide safer access to the bank.

Timothy Meseck, The Architects Partnership, presented the proposed plans and summarized the petition. They are requesting a total of four wall signs because traffic may approach the site from four different directions, and the additional signage will allow for better visibility and efficient use of the roadways.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for public comment. There was no one present to speak for or against the petition.

Jennifer Henaghan, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. The property at 85 Yorktown Shopping Center is currently improved with the Firestone building. This building will be demolished and replaced with a new, single-story Chase bank with four drive-through lanes. Both the bank and drive-through are permitted by right under by the Yorktown Planned Development, so no public hearings are required for the construction of the building or the proposed use. However, the petitioner is requesting signage relief to allow four wall signs totaling 168 square feet.

Private Engineering and Public Works had a number of comments that will need to be addressed as part of the building permit process. Planning found that the proposed land use is compatible with the surrounding business uses. However, the Village's traffic consultant reviewed the proposed site plan and made a number of comments and suggestions with regard to site access and circulation. These comments and suggestions are incorporated into the recommended conditions of approval.

The Comprehensive Plan recommends Regional Commercial land uses for the Yorktown Center Planned Development. The proposed bank is consistent with this recommendation. However, the Comprehensive Plan specifically states that signage for outlots should be consistent and coordinated with the overall signage program for the development and complement, rather than compete for, motorists' attention. The degree of the proposed signage relief does not comply with this recommendation. The planned development for the Yorktown Center does not address exterior signage. Therefore, the exterior signage at Yorktown is regulated by the current Zoning and Sign Ordinance. As a planned development, any relief from the Sign Ordinance could be approved by the Plan Commission as part of a site plan approval application.

The petitioner is proposing a freestanding sign along Butterfield Road, which is permitted by right, and a total of four wall signs. The south elevation facing Butterfield would have a 58- square foot channel letter sign, and the other three elevations that face Yorktown internally would each have a 37-square foot channel letter sign. The total area of all four wall signs is approximately 168 square feet, which exceeds the maximum total 160-square foot sign area that would be permitted by right for all wall signs on the property. The property has only one frontage along a public street, which entitles it to a single wall sign.

Although in the past the Village has granted signage deviations for a number of businesses along the ring road, those businesses had unique site considerations that do not apply to the subject property. The proposed building would be located only 80 feet from Butterfield Road, a regional arterial roadway that is traversed by more than 47,000 vehicles per day. Due to its placement on the lot (and within Yorktown Center) that offers high visibility and access to a signalized intersection, the proposed building would effectively function as a sign in and of itself. There are no unique site considerations in this case that would warrant the need for additional signage above and beyond what is already permitted by the Sign Ordinance.

The regulations of the Zoning Ordinance shall not be varied unless findings based on the evidence presented are made in each specific case that affirm each of the seven standards set forth in the Lombard Zoning Ordinance. Staff finds that there is no physical hardship associated with the property. The design and layout of the petitioner's property is typical of many of the B3 Community Shopping District parcels throughout the Village, and the proposed building would be highly visible from the adjacent public right-of-way. The petitioner can meet code and communicate the services and products that are available at the bank by installing alternative signage that is consistent with the Sign Ordinance, including a single 100-square foot wall sign and a freestanding sign of up to 125 square feet.

Staff also finds that the conditions are not unique to the subject property or the B3 Community Shopping District. In further consideration of the overall Yorktown Center planned development, there is nothing unique to this property to warrant the requested relief. In summary, staff recommends that this petition be denied as it has not met the Standards for Variations.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for discussion among the Commissioners.

Commissioner Burke stated that the request is not out of the ordinary from past approvals. He noted that the signage along Butterfield would not be visible from the interior of Yorktown.

Commissioner Sweetser stated that, since not all traffic would be coming from Butterfield, at least one additional sign would be warranted.

Commissioner Olbrysh stated that something is needed for the interior of the site.

Commissioner Burke asked if the petition could be continued to allow the petitioner to work with staff. Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, stated that staff can only support what is allowed by code.

Chairperson Ryan stated that one sign is not appropriate given the precedent that has been set in Yorktown. He suggested that the Plan Commission make a recommendation.

George Wagner, legal counsel, stated that if the Plan Commission wants to allow a total of two signs, staff and the petitioner should work out the location of the two signs.

Commissioner Burke asked the petitioner which two wall signs would have the highest priority. Tina Calhoun of Chase Bank indicated that the sign on the west side of the building could be foregone, if necessary.

Commissioner Cooper stated that three signs would be a good middle ground between the request and code.

Commissioner Burke repeated his request for the petitioner to identify the two most important wall signs. Ms. Calhoun stated that, if there were to be only two wall signs, the east elevation and south elevation would be their preference.

It was moved by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Cooper, that this matter be approved, in part, subject to the following amended conditions:

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Flint, Olbrysh, Sweetser, Burke and Cooper

1. A total of two wall signs shall be allowed, which may be displayed on the south elevation and the east elevation. No wall signs may be displayed on the north or west elevations.
2. The requested relief pertaining to total wall area is denied.
3. The petitioner shall develop the site in substantial conformance with the submitted plans prepared listed below and made part of this request, except where modified by the conditions of approval:
 - a. Existing Conditions, Preliminary Site Plan, and Preliminary Grading/Utility Plan, prepared by Gewalt Hamilton and dated March 25, 2011.
 - b. Landscape Plan, prepared by 3D Design Studio and dated April 8, 2011.
 - c. Proposed Elevations, prepared by The Architects Partnership and dated January 26, 2011.
 - d. Photometric Plan, prepared by The Architects Partnership and dated April 11, 2011.
 - e. Signage Plans, prepared by NW Signs and dated February 19, 2011, last revised March 19, 2011.

4. *As part of the approval, the petitioner shall also address all comments included within the IDRC Report, including all recommendations and suggestions made by the Village's traffic consultant.*

Business Meeting

[Play Video](#)

The business meeting commenced at 10:15 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

[Play Video](#)

On a motion by Flint and seconded by Sweetser the minutes of the April 18, 2011 meeting were unanimously approved by the members present.

Public Participation

[Play Video](#)

There was no public participation.

DuPage County Hearings

[Play Video](#)

There were no DuPage County hearings.

Chairperson's Report

[Play Video](#)

The Chairperson deferred to the Assistant Director of Community Development.

Planner's Report

[Play Video](#)

Christopher Stilling provided an overview of next month's agenda. The Commissioners did a cursory review of who would be absent and/or attending to ensure a quorum.

Unfinished Business

[Play Video](#)

There was no unfinished business.

New Business

[Play Video](#)

There was no new business.

Subdivision Reports

[110275](#)

SUB 11-01: 355 Eisenhower Lane South

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

[Play Video](#)

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Community Development Director, referenced the companion staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of a plat of consolidation for a 2.1 acre tract of land located at 355 Eisenhower Lane South, entitled "355 Eisenhower Resubdivision". The plat proposes to make the tract of land a lot of record, as defined by the Zoning Ordinance. Ultimately this division is being requested in order to facilitate the construction of a building addition (greater than 350 square feet) to the existing building on the subject property. Most of these types of consolidations can be approved administratively; however, the subject property is greater than one acre in area, which would classify it as a major plat of consolidation. Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance, all major plats of subdivision must be reviewed and approved by the Plan Commission and Board of Trustees.

The subject property is currently improved with an existing industrial warehouse use. The petitioner one day plans to construct a dock enclosure (building addition) greater than 350 square feet, therefore, a plat of consolidation is required.

Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance, any building addition greater than 350 square feet must be constructed on a lot of record. The lots will exceed the 80-foot minimum lot width and 20,000 square foot area requirements of the underlying I Limited Industrial District. Twenty (20) foot public utility and drainage easements already exist along the western and southern property line while a ten (10) foot public utility and drainage easement exists along the northern property line. Under the proposed consolidation, the lot would now also include a five-foot public utility and drainage easement along the eastern property line, as depicted on the plat. Furthermore, this consolidation meets all of the other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and Subdivision and Development Ordinance.

No one in the audience had comments about the proposed plat.

Chairperson Ryan opened the meeting for discussion and questions by the Plan Commission. The Commissioners had no comments.

It was moved by Commissioner Olbrysh, seconded by Commissioner Sweetser, that this matter be recommended to the Corporate Authorities for approval. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Flint, Olbrysh, Sweetser, Burke and Cooper

Site Plan Approvals

There were no site plan approvals.

Workshops

[Play Video](#)

There were no workshops.

Adjournment

[Play Video](#)

The meeting adjourned at 10:22 p.m.

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission*

*Christopher Stilling, Secretary
Lombard Plan Commission*