



Village of Lombard

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

Minutes

Plan Commission

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

Monday, August 17, 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 6 - Donald F. Ryan, Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint
Absent 1 - Ronald Olbrysh

Also present: William Heniff, AICP, 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.

Mr. Heniff 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

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)

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

Sworn in to present the petition was Matt Panfil, AICP, Senior Planner, and the petitioner, Arthur Woods Jr., General Manager of Woods Design Group, LLC.

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. Woods began by stating that like in most communities the Lombard Zoning Ordinance regulates lot width and lot area. Over time, the Village has made many changes to its regulations based on information available, existing conditions, and by consulting best practices of other communities. One of the Village's challenges is to develop a fair and equitable zoning ordinance, which is particularly challenging when applying to areas that may be approximately ninety to one-hundred percent (90%-100%) built out, like the area around the subject property.

The subject property is located within the R2 Single-Family Residence Zoning District. Mr. Woods speculated that the platting of the neighborhood is unique partially due to the anticipation of Martha Street being completed from the south to connect to Martha Court to the north; however, this never happened and the subsequent resubdividing of the area resulted in a variety of lot widths and size. Most of the lots in the area already have been subdivided in such a manner as that no further subdivision may occur.

Mr. Woods referenced a review he conducted that identified the various lot widths of properties from Garfield Terrace on the west to Grace Street on the east and from Washington Boulevard on the south to Ash Street on the north. Mr. Woods found that approximately of the 266 lots he identified, 189 of the lots, or seventy-one percent (71%) are less than sixty feet (60') in width. Thirteen (13), or approximately five percent (5%), of the lots were exactly sixty feet (60') wide, and forty-seven (47), or eighteen percent (18%), of the lots were greater than sixty feet (60') wide.

Mr. Woods continued that Lot One of the proposed plat of resubdivision is compliant with the minimum lot width and minimum lot area standards. The reason Lot Two is proposed to be fifty-six and one-half feet wide (56.5') is to avoid any additional variations required due to the existing structures on Lot One. Lot Two is 14,334 square feet in size, which is almost double the minimum 7,500 square foot

requirement.

In comparison to the surrounding area, Mr. Woods finds that while Lot Two does not meet the letter of the Zoning Ordinance, it does meet the intent and spirit of the Zoning Ordinance, as demonstrated by his findings that seventy-two percent (72%) of the homes in the area are less than required by current code. According to Mr. Woods, the variance request will actually make the property more consistent with the surrounding area.

Mr. Woods stated that the hardship is created solely by the Zoning Ordinance and is not caused by anyone presently having an interest in the property. Furthermore, the granting of the variation will not be injurious in any way to other properties in the area or detrimental to the public welfare. Finally, granting the variation will not alter the essential character of the surrounding neighborhood, but rather it would enhance the character.

Mr. Woods stated that the existing structure could be demolished in order to provide additional width for Lot Two, the home will remain as the owner feels that it still viable housing stock and it contributes to the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Woods concluded by stating that the requested variation will not impair an adequate supply of light or air to the adjacent properties or increase congestion to the public streets. The request, if granted, will not increase the danger of fire, impair natural drainage, endanger the public safety, or be substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.

Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone would like to speak in favor of the petition; and, hearing none, he asked if anyone would like to speak against the petition.

Mr. Brian Walden stated that he is a next-door neighbor of the subject property and he strongly objects to the requested variation because he purchased his home because of the width of the lot and the character of the homes on the street. Mr. Walden did not dispute Mr. Woods' analysis of homes within the area that have a lot width smaller than that required by code, but he guesses that most of the homes within 250 feet of the subject property are at minimum seventy feet (70') wide. Mr. Walden feels the character of the street is beneficial to the Village and he is concerned the proposal would negatively affect property values within the area and increase traffic congestion. Mr. Walden is also concerned about the safety of the children that play in the area. There have been several variances granted within the neighborhood over the years Mr. Walden has lived at his current

residence. Mr. Walden is concerned that there is a trend in the area and cited a neighbor with an oversized garage and associated stormwater management issues. Mr. Walden continued that across the street from the subject property there was a lot that was subdivided and a beautiful home was built on the new lot; however, he finds that it detracts from the appearance of the neighborhood. Mr. Walden stated that there are two (2) other properties in the area that are also considering subdivision and he believes the street will become overcrowded and this trend will negatively impact property values.

Mr. Gary Hull stated that he is a close neighbor to the subject property and he is very familiar with the area. Mr. Hull stated that he feels that if the minimum lot width was established to be sixty feet (60') it was probably done so for a reason. Mr. Hull stated that in the past, a new lot was established to the east of his property and within a matter of hours thirty (30) large trees were removed and he is concerned the same will happen on the subject property. Mr. Hull stated that the street has experienced a great amount of growth and at this point, enough is enough and he is very opposed to the proposal. In regards to a hardship, Mr. Hull stated that he knows the property owner and does not believe the owner has a true hardship. Mr. Hull stated that he could not provide facts or figures pertaining to the proposal, but based on emotion he opposes the request.

Ms. Cari Dinglasan stated that she is also opposed to the requested variation. Ms. Dinglasan disagreed with Mr. Woods' comment that an additional home will not change the character of the neighborhood. According to Ms. Dinglasan, Martha Court is quiet, but Hickory Street is very busy. Ms. Dinglasan stated that a home recently constructed in the neighborhood is beautiful, but it also destroyed the character of the neighborhood in because a lot of trees were removed. Ms. Dinglasan is concerned more trees will be lost with the development of the new proposed lot. In regards to Mr. Wood's statement about the percentage of lots in the neighborhood less than sixty-feet (60') wide, Ms. Dinglasan stated that she feels that this may have been ok when homes were built smaller, but not today. Ms. Dinglasan believes no one will buy the lot. Ms. Dinglasan cited a recent Plan Commission item for a plat of subdivision with a minimum lot area variation at 338 Martha Court and believes that the neighborhood should not change because they have open spaces, trees, and it is safe for their children.

Mr. John Novak stated that the subject property is not a lot-of-record. Also, Hickory Street is one of the few streets with nice size lots. Mr. Novak believes that there is no hardship associated with the requested variation. Mr. Novak claimed that the requested variation is solely based on a desire to profit from the variation. In regards to the

standards for a variation, Mr. Novak stated that he did not hear the petitioner address standards one through three. Specifically, Mr. Novak repeated his belief that there is no hardship associated with the petition and added that the property is not unique and that the request was based on financial gain. Mr. Novak expressed his surprise that staff supported the petition and glanced over standards one through three. In regards to the three foot (3') wide parcel to the immediate east of the subject property, Mr. Novak identified himself as the owner and stated that he and Mr. Hull partnered together to block the future development of a home on the subject property in order to preserve green space on the street. Mr. Novak stated that based on the standards for a variation, he did not believe the Plan Commission would approve a profit-motivated variation on a non-lot-of-record. Mr. Novak concluded that minimum lot requirements and standards for a variation were established for a reason.

Chairperson Ryan asked if there was anyone else who would like to speak on the petition; and, hearing none, he allowed for the petitioner to address public comments.

Mr. Woods stated that he felt many of the comments were based on suppositions as to what his client may or may not do. In regards to the comment regarding the subject property not being a lot-of-record, Mr. Woods stated his belief that it was a lot-of-record. Mr. Woods stated that the variation is based on the odd platting of the area and lots with varying dimensions. Mr. Woods stated the previously mentioned three foot (3') wide parcel is evidence of the odd lot configurations in the area.

In response to concerns about the size of any new home, Mr. Woods is unaware of what will be built on Martha Court, but in regards to the subject property he stated that it would be subject to the DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance which in effect precludes "McMansions" from being built. Mr. Woods stated that the property owner is examining his options, but may build a home for himself on the new lot and sell the existing home. Mr. Woods also reiterated that they are not demolishing the existing home because they like and want to keep the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Woods stated that he could not speak to the recently built home which was considered to be out of context with the neighborhood, but the homes he has built in Lombard fit within their surroundings.

In regards to the preservation of trees, Mr. Woods believes that within the logical area for the footprint of a home there are there are five (5) to seven (7) trees, two (2) of which are dead. Mr. Woods did not believe any of the parkway trees or trees within the required front yard area would need to be removed.

Chairperson Ryan asked if the Plan Commission had questions, to which Commissioner Burke asked to ensure that all of the public comments had been addressed. Finding that all public comments had been addressed, Chairperson Ryan asked for the staff report.

Matt Panfil, Senior Planner, submitted the staff report to the public record in its entirety. Mr. Panfil began by stating that generally a plat of subdivision similar in size and scope to this request would be approved administratively, but because there is a lot width variation associated with the proposal the Plan Commission has the authority to review the item.

Mr. Panfil reiterated that the existing home will remain in and be located on proposed Lot One. Due to the location of the existing home and deck, Lot One is proposed to be sixty-one feet (61') wide in order to maintain the minimum required six foot (6') side yard setback from the new property line.

Mr. Panfil stated that none of the Inter-Department Review Committee members had any additional issues or concerns regarding the proposed variation.

As proposed, Lot Two would maintain its R2 zoning status; and, according to Mr. Panfil, would therefore be similar and compatible to the surrounding properties. Mr. Panfil also stated that the proposal is consistent with the Village Comprehensive Plan's land use recommendation of low-density residential.

Aside from the previously identified non-conforming lot width for proposed Lot Two, the site complies with all other lot, bulk, and setback standards. Any future development on Lot Two would be subject to full building permit, Village Zoning Ordinance, and DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance review.

In regards to the standards for a variation, Mr. Panfil stated that staff finds the petitioner has affirmed standards one through four and that the hardship is due to the particular physical surroundings, lot shapes, and dimensions that are unique to the neighborhood. The hardship is a result of lots in the surrounding area being created in a piecemeal fashion over a period of time, dating as far back as 1876, rather than if the lots were created as part of a unified subdivision development.

Based on the overall character of lots within the surrounding neighborhood, Mr. Panfil stated that standards five through seven have also been affirmed. Provided both proposed lots remain compliant in all other matters pertaining to Village Code, staff can

support the request. Mr. Panfil added that, based on evidence that the petitioner's neighborhood was developed and has evolved with residential lots similar in width, it can be argued the proposed variation would actually make the proposal more consistent with the essential character of the neighborhood.

In addition to the statistics provided by the petitioner, Mr. Panfil stated that staff prepared their own summary of the lot widths in the surrounding area. For staff's study, every interior lot within a five-hundred foot (500') radius of the subject property was identified and its lot width recorded. Within the study area there were seventy-eight (78) interior lots. Of the seventy-eight (78) interior lots, forty-five (45) have a lot width less than the fifty-six and one-half feet (56.5') proposed for Lot Two. Based on this study, fifty-eight percent (58%) of the interior lots are narrower than the width proposed for Lot Two.

Mr. Panfil added that because the three foot (3') wide lot to the east is undevelopable it essentially serves as an additional length of side yard setback which results in Lot Two appearing to conform to the minimum lot width requirements.

Mr. Panfil concluded by stating that staff finds the proposed variation to be consistent with the surrounding neighborhood land uses, objectives of the Zoning Ordinance, and intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairperson Ryan asked if there were questions of the staff report; and, hearing none, he opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

Commissioner Burke stated that he found the request to be consistent with previously approved variations in the area, as well as throughout the Village, especially when the bulk square footage exceeds the minimum requirement.

Commissioner Flint concurred with Commissioner Burke.

Commissioner Sweetser also stated that the area of the lot was more than adequate to allow for development. Commissioner Sweetser asked if staff concurred with the statistics provided on Exhibit G, to which Mr. Panfil responded that staff created Exhibit G. Commissioner Sweetser then asked if staff concurred with the statistics provided by the petitioner, to which Mr. Panfil stated that staff did not review the petitioner's statistics, but rather chose to perform their own study with a smaller area than that of the petitioner. William Heniff, Community Development Director, added that if you note areas

the petitioner included within their study area, there are blocks such as Craig Place that are predominantly less than sixty-feet (60') in width. Mr. Heniff stated that staff preferred to look at areas within the immediate area of the subject property.

Commissioner Cooper asked for clarification of the location of the three foot (3') wide lot, to which Mr. Panfil referenced an image. Mr. Heniff added that the properties at 203 and 209 E. Hickory Street were subdivided and there was a subsequent tax division filed with DuPage County to create a three foot (3') wide strip that was separate from the plat of subdivision.

Addressing previous comments regarding the status of the subject property as a lot-of-record, Mr. Panfil stated that the subject property is not currently a lot-of-record; however the proposed plat of resubdivision would establish lots-of-record.

Commissioner Cooper asked for clarification regarding a lot-of-record, to which Mr. Heniff replied that it means the lot has ultimately been approved by the corporate authorities and meets local ordinances and regulations. Mr. Heniff added that there is a separate way of dividing land, which is referred to as a tax division. A tax division involves taking a piece of property, designating a certain percentage of the property and identifying it for the purposes of establishing a separate tax bill or separate ownership. A tax division does not have the same legal status as a lot-of-record. The Village's Subdivision and Development and Zoning Ordinances state that development shall only occur on a lot-of-record.

A motion was made by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Mrofcza, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition subject to one (1) condition.

1. That any new residences developed on the subject property shall comply with Village Code.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

Nay: 1 - Andrea Cooper

Absent: 1 - Ronald Olbrysh

[150379](#)

PC 15-22: 18 W. St. Charles Road

Pursuant to Section 155.502 (F)(3), the petitioner requests that the Village grant a conditional use for a planned development for the subject property with a companion deviation from Section 153.228(E) for a projecting sign to project more than four feet from the supporting

wall located in the B5 Zoning District. (DISTRICT #1)

Sworn in to present the petition was William J. Heniff, Director of Community Development and the petitioner, John Dagnon.

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. Dagnon stated the goal of the restaurant is to be consistent with the 1927 time period, when the building was built. The branding and customer facing materials, including this sign, needs to fit the motif. Therefore an art deco neon sign was proposed. A vertical sign was dismissed since it would cast too much light on the second floor apartments. Due to a protruding awning, sight lines were blocked in certain places. Those are the reasons why the variance is needed.

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.

Mr. Heniff presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. He stated the petitioner is in the process of renovations for a first floor restaurant. Signage is one of the final items and the petitioner would like the sign to be consistent with the restaurant and downtown Lombard. He noted the past sign did cast light on the second floor residents. The proposed sign would project approximately one foot beyond Code. The existing awning gives them an extra level of protection. The proposed sign is consistent with the Downtown Lombard Revitalization Guidebook and Comprehensive Plan. The Economic and Community Development Commission and Village Board approved two grant requests for this property and Lombard Town Centre also supported the sign in the grant requests.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the sign is sitting on the awning so you could not see it from below. Mr. Heniff said correct.

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

Commissioner Sweetser said all considerations and standards have been met.

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

1. Any future signs, including this sign, involving the subject property shall

apply for and receive a building permit. Said permit shall be accordance with the sign plan prepared by Grate Signs, with a revision date of June 30, 2015, and made a part of this petition.

2. The white roofing/awning structure must remain on the building while the projecting sign is in place.

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

4. Insurance will be provided per Code, as well as a hold harmless agreement.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Ronald Olbrysh

[150322](#)

SPA 15-02ph: 810 E. Butterfield Road - Site Plan Approval for Modifications to an Existing Shopping Center Identification Sign (Continued from July 20, 2015)

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)

Sworn in to present the petition was William J. Heniff, AICP, Director of Community Development; Matt Panfil, AICP, Senior Planner, and the petitioner Devon Evans, Vice President of Property Management, Sequoia Realty Group.

Chairperson Ryan read the Commission's Procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intends to cross examine, and, hearing none, he proceeded with the petition.

Ms. Evans began by stating that Sequoia Realty Group is the managing agent for the Fountain Square of Lombard property owners association. Sequoia Realty Group works jointly with the Board of Directors and members of the association to manage the association and maintain the common areas of the complex. On behalf of the association, Ms. Evans is requesting site plan approval for the modification of their existing monument sign located at the entrance off the intersection of Fountain Square Drive and Butterfield Road.

Ms. Evans stated that the proposed modification is to allow for multi-tenant identification panels. The request is based on a need for increased visibility along Butterfield Road, which has been a point of discussion among the businesses within the association. Ms. Evans concluded her presentation by listing the businesses that are seeking to have identification panels in order for patrons to more easily find

their location.

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

John Crost, Director of Operations for Weber Grill Restaurant, stated that additional signage has been a point of interest among the association for a while. Mr. Crost stated that his business received many phone calls asking where the business is located. Mr. Crost also stated that he has communicated with several other businesses that feel it is difficult for their customers to locate them. Mr. Crost concluded that his hope is that the modification to the monument sign will provide better sight lines and directions to customers.

Barbara Richards stated that she is a resident who lives across the street from Fountain Square, in Oakbrook Towers, just east of Meyers Road. Ms. Richards asked for confirmation that the only freestanding sign to be modified is the one located on Butterfield Road and not the sign on Meyers Road. Mr. Heniff responded in the positive. Ms. Richards asked if there were plans to modify the entrance road, to which Mr. Heniff responded that there are no plans for modification to traffic circulation.

Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone else would like to speak in favor or against the petition, or for public comment. 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 the proposed modifications are only for the existing freestanding sign specifically located within the 810 E. Butterfield Road parcel, at the southeast corner of Dick's Sporting Goods. No modification are proposed for either of the two (2) other Fountain Square freestanding signs.

According to Mr. Panfil, the Fountain Square planned development does allow for the Plan Commission to approve deviations for site signage in conjunction with site plan approval. During the 1998 public hearing, PC 98-41, for approval of the Fountain Square planned development there was concern expressed regarding the number of shopping center signs as well as the potential for tenant panels on such signs. In response, the petitioner in the case clarified that the shopping center signs would not list the businesses.

Due to the addition of the tenant panels being a specific concern at the time of approval, Mr. Panfil explained that staff decided that it was in the best interest to bring this item to the Plan Commission despite no relief from the Sign Ordinance being required.

Mr. Panfil stated that there were no comments or concerns brought forth by the other members of the Inter-Departmental Review Committee. In regards to the sign's compatibility with surrounding zoning and land uses, Mr. Panfil stated that because the modifications are proposed only for the freestanding sign that is furthest away from residential properties and that the modifications do not increase the overall size of the sign, staff finds there would be a minimal impact on surrounding uses. Mr. Panfil added that because the modifications would maintain compliance with the Sign and Zoning Ordinances and is similar in design to other signs within the area, staff finds the proposal is generally compatible with the Village's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Panfil added that although the use of tenant panels on the freestanding signs was discussed at the 1998 public hearing, no specific regulations were adopted within any of the planned development's establishing ordinances or agreements.

Mr. Panfil stated that there is an extensive history of wall sign size deviations within Fountain Square. While staff can support the request for this specific sign, it would not do so for any of the other freestanding signs.

In regards to the design of the sign, Mr. Panfil stated that staff had suggested for consideration a design with a darker background with contrasting lighter colored text and logos so that the light impact of blank panels would be minimized. However, the petitioner prefers to remain flexible in the design of the tenant panels, and their preference is for a white background with darker colored text and logos.

Mr. Panfil concluded that design preferences aside; staff finds the proposal to be consistent with the Sign and Zoning Ordinances and the Comprehensive Plan and therefore recommends approval of the request.

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

Commissioner Sweetser stated her belief that the proposed sign is reasonable and for people to support the businesses they need wayfinding signage.

A motion was made by Commissioner Sweetser, seconded by Commissioner Flint, that the Plan Commission approve the petition subject to the following conditions.

1. The petitioner shall develop the site in substantial conformance with the signage plan, prepared by Gaytan Signs, Inc., undated and submitted as part of the petitioner's application on June 4, 2015;
2. This approval is limited only to the sign identified on Exhibit B, and not to any other freestanding sign within the planned development; and
3. Should the subject freestanding sign be replaced at any point in the future, new Site Plan Approval shall be required.

The motion carried the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Ronald Olbrysh

At 08:38 p.m. Chairperson Ryan requested a 5 minute break.

Chairperson Ryan reconvened the meeting at 08:46 p.m.

[150380](#)

PC 15-21: 611 E. Butterfield Road - Sam's Club

Requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property located within the OPD Office Planned Development District:

1. Approve a Major Plat of Resubdivision;
2. Approve a Map Amendment rezoning the entire property to the B3 Community Shopping District; and
3. Approve a conditional use for a planned development with the following companion conditional uses, deviations, and variations, as follows:
 - a. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.208 (C) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to increase the maximum number of principal structures on a lot-of-record from one (1) to two (2) to allow for a gasoline sales facility;
 - b. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.415 (C)(9) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance for gasoline sales;
 - c. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.415 (C)(17) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance for motor vehicle service;
 - d. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.415 (C)(18) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance for off-site parking;
 - e. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.415 (C)(19) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance for outside display and sales of products the sale of which is a permitted or

- conditional use in this district;
- f. A variation from Section 155.205 (A)(c)(i) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to increase the maximum fence height in a business district from eight feet (8') to ten feet (10') for a loading dock screening wall;
 - g. A variation from Section 155.210 (D)(1) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow for garbage dumpsters and recycling bins to be located within a corner side yard;
 - h. A variation from Section 15.508 (C)(6)(a) and a deviation from Section 155.415 (F)(2) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum corner side yard setback from thirty feet (30') to twenty-five feet (25');
 - i. A variation from Section 155.706 (B)(1) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum required landscaping of the interior of a parking lot from five percent (5%) to four percent (4%);
 - j. A variation from Section 155.706 (B)(2)(c)(ii) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the required number of shade trees within the parking lot from 125 shade trees to fifty-five (55) shade trees;
 - k. A variation from Section 155.706 (C)(1) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum required perimeter parking lot landscape area width from five feet (5') to zero feet (0');
 - l. A variation from Section 155.708 (A) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum required building foundation landscape area width from ten feet (10') to zero feet (0');
 - m. A variation from Section 155.710 of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to increase the maximum height of refuse disposal and recycling bin fence screening from eight feet (8') to ten feet (10') and to allow for masonry screening where solid wood or an equivalent material is required;
 - n. A deviation from Section 155.415 (G) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to increase the maximum building height from thirty feet (30') to thirty-five feet and four inches (35'4");
 - o. A deviation from Section 155.508 (C)(7) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum required open space in a planned development with deviations from twelve and one-half percent (12.5%) to eight percent (8%);
 - p. A deviation from Section 155.602 (A)(5) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the required length of a parallel parking space from twenty-four feet (24') to

- twenty feet (20');
- q. A deviation from Section 155.602 (A)(10)(d)(ii) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to decrease the minimum parking lot lighting average intensity from 2.0 foot-candles to 1.0 foot-candles;
 - r. A deviation from Section 155.602 (A)(10)(d)(iv) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to increase the maximum height for light poles used for a parking lot from forty feet (40') to forty-two feet (42');
 - s. A deviation from Section 155.602 (C)(Table 6.3) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum required parking spaces for freestanding stores and neighborhood and community centers (up to 200,000 square feet) from four (4) parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area to 3.93 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area;
 - t. A deviation from Section 155.603 (A)(1) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to not fully screen loading berths from adjacent property in an O Office District;
 - u. A deviation from Section 153.208 (H) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow for a freestanding sign within a clear line of sight area;
 - v. A deviation from Section 153.505 (B)(6)(c)(ii) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to reduce the setback from the property line for the leading edge of a freestanding sign from five feet (5') to one foot (1'); and
 - w. A deviation from Section 153.505 (B)(19)(a)(i)(a) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow for a sixty-four (64) square foot wall sign on a façade without a street front exposure (south façade). (DISTRICT # 3)

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

Sworn in to present the petition was William J. Heniff, AICP, Director of Community Development; Matt Panfil, AICP, Senior Planner, and the petitioner, Rob Gamrath, Partner, Quarles & Brady LLP. Also sworn in were Tracy T. Richard, Engineer, Manhard Consulting Ltd. and Doug Plummer of RHA Architects.

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. Gamrath began by requesting to withdraw three of the requested deviations:

- p. A deviation from Section 155.602 (A)(5) of the Lombard Zoning*

Ordinance to reduce the required length of a parallel parking space from twenty-four feet (24') to twenty feet (20');

u. A deviation from Section 153.208 (H) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow for a freestanding sign within a clear line of sight area; and

v. A deviations deviation from Section 153.505 (B)(6)(c)(ii) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to reduce the setback from the property line for the leading edge of a freestanding sign from five feet (5') to one foot (1').

Mr. Gamrath stated that the project will be revised so that these items will comply with Village Code.

In reference to a visual presentation, Mr. Gamrath reviewed the history of the project, including a workshop session with the Plan Commission on April 27, 2015 in which the petitioner noted the Plan Commission's emphasis on quality architecture, enhanced landscape, and sufficient screening. Mr. Gamrath stated that the petitioner has attempted to incorporate comments from the workshop into the submitted plans.

In regards to the rezoning request, Mr. Gamrath stated his belief that the project is compatible with the surrounding uses and zoning districts. The site is located along a commercial corridor with a regional shopping center to the north, office structures to the west, and a hospitality use to the east.

The proposal includes an approximately 135,000 square feet building and a twelve (12) pump gasoline sales facility. The overall site is approximately nine (9) acres in size and will be developed as a ground lease. Additionally, and unique to this project, there are approximately 1.9 acres just south of the property utilized by Nicor for a natural gas transmission line. Mr. Gamrath stated that Nicor has authorized him to move forward with the requested approvals from the Village, but their property will not be rezoned or included within the planned development. Mr. Gamrath stated that the Nicor parcel would be incorporated into the project only to the extent of off-site parking.

Referencing an aerial image, Mr. Gamrath stated that in addition to the vacant portions of the property where office buildings were demolished, other existing on-site improvements include a TGI Friday's, three (3) one-story office buildings, and various parking lots. The office buildings and TGI Friday's would be razed as part of the proposed project.

Mr. Gamrath reiterated his belief that the proposal is consistent with

the surrounding uses and zoning districts along the Butterfield Road corridor and stated that Interstate-88 to the south functions as a significant buffer to the residential uses to the south.

Concluding his portion of the presentation, Mr. Gamrath stated that the proposed project is also consistent with the Village's Comprehensive Plan, which identified the site as an area for a mixture of commercial and office uses, and the 2011 Economic Development Strategies report which recognized the project area as one (1) of three (3) key sites for substantial economic development within the Village and indicated that the site is suitable for a retail use.

Mr. Gamrath introduced Mr. Richard to discuss the site plan. Mr. Richard stated that the main entrance is at the southwest of the building. The geometry of the property causes a unique layout in regards to the location and orientation of the building and parking and generates some of the requested zoning relief items.

The main access to the site is from Fairfield Ave which provides access to both the gasoline sales facility and also connects to the existing frontage road. There is also a right-in / right-out access point off of Butterfield Road for truck access. The loading docks are located at the north end of the building. The motor vehicle service entrance doors are located at the south end of the building.

Despite layout difficulties from the shape of the site, a parking ratio of 3.93 spaced per 1,000 square feet of floor area is provided. The parking spaces are nine and one-half feet (9.5') wide and eighteen feet (18') deep.

Water and sanitary services are provided via mains on the east side of Butterfield Road. All stormwater is collected on-site and goes to an underground detention chamber located underneath the parking lot and is then released to the storm sewer system along Butterfield Road.

Mr. Richard indicated that grading, utility, and lighting plans have been provided to the Plan Commission. In regards to the lighting, the light poles are thirty-nine feet (39') tall, but are located atop three foot (3') tall concrete bases for a total height of forty-two feet (42'). The lighting plan indicates an average light intensity of one (1) foot-candle.

Mr. Richard stated that it is possible for trucks to access the loading docks via the frontage road, but it is anticipated most truck traffic will access the site from the direct access point on Butterfield Road.

Referencing an image of the landscape plan, Mr. Richard stated a

combination of deciduous shade and ornamental trees and shrubbery has been provided to the maximum extent possible. Attempting to provide for the minimum parking requirements and issues based on the overall shape of the site placed restrictions on the amount of landscaping that could be provided; resulting in several landscape variation requests.

Mr. Richard then introduced Doug Plummer to discuss architecture. Mr. Plummer indicated that even though he works for RHA Architects, he is representing Ty Holcomb, who is the architect of record for the project. Mr. Plummer expressed his understanding that there were previous concerns about the appearance of the building and then referenced images depicting the exterior upgrades that have been provided. Mr. Plummer provided a sample of the pre-cast panel. Mr. Plummer also provided a sample of Quick-Brik, which is an additional building material provided along the Butterfield Road and Fairfield Avenue façades. Efforts were made to provide additional building articulation. Also, the parapets were raised to screen the rooftop HVAC units.

Referencing images of the proposed signage, Mr. Plummer summarized the size and location of the proposed signage and stated that the proposal is typical of other Sam's Club stores.

Referencing images of proposed building perspectives, Mr. Plummer pointed out the articulated vestibule, stone columns, and wall-mounted light fixtures. The u-shaped screening wall matches the architecture of the building.

Mr. Plummer then referenced an image that displays the new freestanding sign location, which is out of any clear line of sight area.

Mr. Plummer then referenced images depicting the location and perspective views of the gasoline sales facility.

Mr. Plummer concluded by highlighting some of the sustainable practices incorporated into the project, including: a skylight system to provide for daylighting, a reflective roof, LED lighting, and a central energy management system in Bentonville, Arkansas that controls the operations within the store. Other sustainable practices include HVAC units with a 12.7 energy efficiency rating, ozone friendly refrigerants, non-fiberglass reinforced panels, and low-VOC paint.

Prior to opening the public hearing to public comment, Chairperson Ryan allowed the Plan Commissioners to request clarification of any of the information presented.

Commissioner Burke and Commissioner Sweetser both identified an error in the labeling of the elevations. The east and west façades had been misidentified on the submitted elevations. Commissioner Burke concurred with the comment. Mr. Plummer indicated that later revisions have corrected the error, but did acknowledge that the referenced image and paper copies provided to the Plan Commission had mislabeled the façades.

Referencing the four (4) overhead doors for the motor vehicle service, Commissioner Burke asked where they align on the corresponding site plan. Mr. Richard responded that there is a defined entrance to the overhead doors, but it may be difficult to identify the curb line on the site plan. Mr. Plummer further explained the location of the overhead doors, the concrete apron in front of them, and the curb.

Commissioner Flint asked if the petitioner intended to pursue LEED certification, to which Mr. Plummer responded in the negative. However, Mr. Plummer stated that the proposed store is anticipated to perform 28% better than the IECC 2009 baseline building.

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

Sarah Lewis, Director of Operations for the adjacent Embassy Suites, asked for clarification as to what site improvements will be visible from their main parking lot and if there would be screening such as fencing between the two sites. Ms. Lewis stated that there are outdoor dining facilities at the northwest corner of their building.

Mr. Richard responded that the landscape plan depicts plantings and a fence that will help buffer the loading docks from the hotel. Commissioner Burke asked for and received further clarification as to the location of the landscape and plantings referred to by Mr. Richard. Mr. Richard added that the docks are depressed below grade. Mr. Gamrath added that Sam's Club has a "no idling" policy for trucks.

Ms. Lewis asked for clarification regarding the location of the fence. Mr. Gamrath identified the area of the wall screening the truck docks. Ms. Lewis asked for the petitioner to confirm that there is no fence, but just landscaping along the shared property line. Mr. Gamrath responded in the affirmative. Referencing a picture of the existing landscaping along the property line, Mr. Gamrath explained the intention is to maintain the existing landscaping while providing additional landscaping to fill in gaps to provide a high level of screening. Mr. Gamrath added that the focus of the landscaping is away from the mechanical areas of the buildings and more towards higher visibility areas near Butterfield Road.

Commissioner Sweetser asked for the height of the screening wall as well as the landscaping at planting and at maturity. Mr. Richard responded that the screening wall is ten feet (10') tall, but the limited amount of space for the landscape prevented them from providing any berm to increase the height of the landscaping.

Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone else would like to speak in favor or against the petition, or for public comment. Hearing none, he asked for the staff report.

Matt Panfil, Senior Planned, submitted the staff report to the public record in its entirety. Mr. Panfil began by stating that Sam's Club intends to execute a long term ground lease on the property. The existing one-story office buildings at 2801-2821 S. Fairfield Avenue and the TGI Friday's at 601 E. Butterfield Road will be razed to provide for the unified redevelopment of the property.

Approvals requested include a major plat of resubdivision and map amendment rezoning the property from O Office Planned Development Zoning District to the B3 Community Shopping Zoning District. The Nicor parcel will be utilized for off-site parking, but is not included within the planned development or map amendment requests. Mr. Panfil acknowledged the petitioner's request to withdraw the deviations requested under sub-items p, u, and v.

In regards to the Inter-Departmental Review Committee, Mr. Panfil stated that the Fire Department requires the proposed underground detention shall be of a vault design capable of withstanding the loads from the deployed outriggers on their aerial ladder truck. Private Engineering Services has already provided preliminary comments to the petitioner and will continue to work with the petitioner once the depth of the Nicor transmission lines are identified.

Mr. Panfil noted that Public Works had five (5) comments for the petitioner, but the comment most pertinent to the Plan Commission public hearing is the requirement that a public sidewalk be provided along the entire north property line on Frontage Road.

Mr. Panfil stated that staff finds the requested map amendment to the B3 Community Shopping District is consistent with the existing zoning and land uses of the surrounding properties. Concerns regarding the residential properties to the south are mitigated by Interstate-88, which serves as a hard edge to any light or noise concerns that may be emitted from the site. Staff also finds that the petitioner has affirmed all of the standards associated with the requested map amendment. The proposed project is consistent with the trend of development in

the area as evidenced by the site being designated a key development opportunity site in the 2011 Village of Lombard Economic Development Plan. The project is also consistent with the Comprehensive Plan which recommends mixed-use commercial and office.

Regarding the requested major plat of resubdivision, Mr. Panfil stated that it was initially required at the time of submission because the Nicor parcel was going to be part of the overall planned development. However, as that is no longer the case, the plat can be reviewed administratively as a plat of consolidation.

Mr. Panfil stated that the project's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan is further enforced as the subject property is part of an area designated as Special Area 11, which recommended the redevelopment of the area to mixed-use commercial and office uses.

Describing the planned development in general, Mr. Panfil stated that staff finds it to be in the public interest in that it will redevelop a site already identified by the Village as a critical redevelopment area. Also, the proposal utilizes existing streets that were already designed to avoid inconvenient or unsafe access, traffic congestion, or an excessive burden on parks, recreation areas, schools, and other public facilities.

In review of the additional twenty-five percent (25%) open space requirement for planned developments with deviations, Mr. Panfil stated that in this case twelve and one-half percent (12.5%) open space is required, but only eight percent (8%) has been provided. There is a dilemma in that if the petitioner were to increase the amount of open space, doing so would be at the cost of decreasing parking spaces, of which the petitioner is already deficient based on Village Code. Mr. Panfil noted that if the Nicor parcel was to be included within the planned development, and the parcel was improved as identified on the submitted Landscape Plan, then the total open space would be increased to twelve percent (12%) and near compliance with the minimum open space requirement.

Mr. Panfil stated that there are five (5) conditional uses requested within the petition, all of which staff can support. However, staff requests two (2) conditions of approval pertaining to the conditional use for the outside display and sales of products:

- 1. Outside display and sales areas must not impact pedestrian or vehicular traffic, including automobiles and Fire Department apparatus; and*

2. *Outside display and sales area must remain ancillary to the principal land use.*

Reviewing the requested deviations and variations, Mr. Panfil stated that staff can support the request to decrease the minimum parking lot lighting average intensity from 2.0 foot-candles to 1.0 foot-candles. Staff's support is based on the anticipated overflow lighting onto the site due to its proximity to both Butterfield Road and Interstate-88. However, as a condition of approval, staff requests a full photometric plan be submitted.

In response to Ms. Lewis' landscape and screening questions, Mr. Panfil stated that staff can support the requested deviation to not fully screen loading berths from adjacent properties provided, as a condition of approval, the landscaping along the area including the loading docks and Embassy Suites parking lot and outdoor dining area be enhanced to the extent that it is compliant with Section 155.707 (B)(4)(c) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, which requires shrub plantings at least two (2) rows deep along seventy-five percent (75%) of the length of the area. The shrubs are to be installed at least three feet (3') in height and allowed to reach at least six feet (6') in height upon maturation. Staff encourages the shrubs to be further massed together as they grow.

Mr. Panfil added that staff can support the requested variation to reduce the minimum required perimeter parking lot landscape area width from five feet (5') to zero feet (0') based on the unique physical surroundings of the site. Perimeter parking lot landscaping along the southern property line would create a barrier and impede upon vehicle circulation from the off-site parking area.

In regards to the proposed twenty-five foot (25') corner side yard setback, Mr. Panfil stated that staff can support the requested variation based on the topography of the property. While there is a five foot (5') encroachment into the corner side yard setback, the angle of the northern property line means that the overall amount of the building encroaching into the corner side yard setback is only approximately fifty-five (55) square feet.

Referring to the requested variation to allow for garbage dumpsters and recycling bins to be located within a corner side yard setback, Mr. Panfil stated that staff can support the request based on the unique layout of the site allows for no reasonable alternative location that would not also require some degree of zoning relief. The proposed location ensures that the garbage dumpsters and recycling bins will not be visible from public roadways or the ground level of the adjacent property to the east. Similarly, staff can support the requested

variation to increase the maximum height of refuse disposal and recycling bin fence screening from eight feet (8') to ten feet (10'). The petitioner could opt to comply with code, but has requested the variation to ensure full screening.

Returning to the topic of landscaping, Mr. Panfil stated that the petitioner is proposing only four percent (4%) interior parking lot landscaping where five percent (5%) is required. Mr. Panfil noted that if the Nicor parcel were to be included in the overall calculation, the amount of interior parking lot landscaping would exceed the requirement.

Mr. Panfil stated that the staff does not find the request to eliminate foundation landscaping not to be the result of a true hardship, but in consideration of the great extent of building foundation that will be occupied by either outside display and sales areas, the pedestrian entrance, loading docks, or the motor vehicle service area staff does understand the petitioner's desire to provide landscaping in an area where it will have the most positive aesthetic impact. Therefore, staff can support the requested variation provided the petitioner provides the requisite foundation

landscaping along the base of the freestanding sign, which will be highly visible on the frontage road and Butterfield Road.

In regards to the request for a sixty-four (64) square foot wall sign on a façade without a street front exposure, Mr. Panfil explained that if the Nicor parcel were part of the planned development, the sign would applied by code due to the frontage on Interstate-88. As the Nicor parcel will be used for off-site parking for the development, staff can support the requested deviation based on this unique condition.

Summarizing from the Traffic Impact Study, Mr. Panfil stated that the Village's traffic consultant, KLOA, Inc. found that northbound vehicular traffic on Fairfield Avenue backs up periodically to Frontage Road during the weekday evening peak hours due to the surge in outbound traffic from the office buildings within the business park, but no backups or excessive queuing were observed during the morning and Saturday midday peak hours. No excessive backups were observed on Butterfield Road at either intersection.

In regards to interior site circulation, KLOA, Inc. found the internal access drives as providing efficient ingress / egress accessibility to the site and distributing traffic over various access drives without overloading a specific access drive. The gas station will allow inbound queues to occur mostly internally and with a limited impact on the traffic flow along Fairfield Avenue. KLOA also found that the proposed path for delivery trucks will reduce the interaction between passenger

vehicles and delivery trucks.

Mr. Panfil concluded by stating that staff recommends approval of the petition, subject to the conditions outlined in the IDRC report.

Chairperson Ryan asked if there were questions of the staff report; and, hearing none, he opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

Commissioner Burke asked if staff anticipated the photometric plan to reach an average of two (2) foot-candles if the existing lighting from Interstate-88 and Butterfield Road were taken into account. Mr. Heniff responded that the petitioner is indicating that there may be areas on the property that do not meet the minimum requirement, but staff is also taking into consideration a unique challenge in that the petitioner is attempting to provide sufficient light while respecting the restraints of not erecting light standards within the Nicor parcel. Mr. Heniff also acknowledged the significant amount of light that will spill over from Butterfield Road and Interstate-88. Commissioner Burke replied that he felt a modification to the wording of the condition of approval was appropriate. Commissioner Burke added that in terms of safety he was concerned that the far reaches of the Nicor parcel would be the most vulnerable areas of site and should be sufficiently lighted. Mr. Heniff responded that while he felt that the lighting from the gasoline sales facility will also make for a sufficient level of light for the site, a modification to the wording could be made that allowed for a photometric study that incorporated the existing light sources.

Commissioner Burke then commented that the request within the IDRC report for the landscaping between Sam's Club and Embassy Suites to be along at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the area seemed to him insufficient and there should not be any gaps in the screening. Commissioner Burke suggested a condition of approval that would require evergreen screening, at least six feet (6') in height at time of planting, along one-hundred percent (100%) of the identified area. Mr. Heniff referenced photographs that depict the existing landscape conditions along the shared property line. There is already a fairly sizable amount of fairly mature evergreens along the western side of Embassy Suites' parking lot. Staff is seeking to maintain the existing landscaping but also incorporating additional landscaping materials. Staff is also concerned with providing sufficient screening between Sam's Club and Embassy Suites, but because they are located within office or commercial zoning districts a transitional landscape yard is not required by code. However, as a condition of approval, staff has recommended that for this area of the property Embassy Suites should be treated as if it were an apartment building, thus the seventy-five percent (75%) screening recommendation. Mr.

Heniff felt that the combination of the existing landscaping and adding the higher standard of the transitional landscaping along Embassy Suites' parking lot and outdoor dining area will provide sufficient screening.

Commission Burke stated his concern regarding the wording of the condition of approval because it could allow for the petitioner to remove existing landscaping and result in only partial screening. Mr. Panfil recommended language be added to the condition of approval that required the existing landscaping to be incorporated into the proposed landscaping.

Commissioner Sweetser asked to confirm that the mislabeled elevations would be revised to which the response was affirmative.

Commissioner Burke asked if compliance with the recommendations within the Traffic Impact Study made by KLOA, Inc. was part of any condition of approval to which Mr. Heniff responded that the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT), as the approval authority, is in accordance with KLOA's recommendations. Therefore, the recommendations will be incorporated into the plan.

A motion was made by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Sweetser, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of this petition subject to the conditions within the IDRC report, with the exception of items p, u, and v, which were withdrawn by the petitioner, and amending the condition of approval identified as 4 (f) within the IDRC report to read, "a full photometric plan, to be in compliance with Village Code, which may incorporate existing light emanating from adjacent properties" and amending the condition of approval identified as 4 (g) to include, "and incorporating existing landscaping" to the end of the condition, and adding condition of approval number 6 stating, "The petitioner will incorporate the recommendations of KLOA, Inc., subject to staff and IDOT approval."

- 1. The petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the plans and material board 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;**
- 2. Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance, project construction shall commence within one (1) year from the date of approval of the ordinance, unless a time extension been granted by the Village Board. This conditional use approval shall become null and void eighteen (18) months from the date of approval if the proposed site improvements are not completed or an extension has been granted;**
- 3. The petitioner shall be required to apply for and receive building permits for any improvements to the site; and**
- 4. The petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report, including but not limited to**

providing the following:

- a. Final Engineering Plan for review and approval for the proposed site improvements for the project;
 - b. Revised plans depicting a public sidewalk along the entire north property line on Frontage Road, Pursuant to Section 154.304 of the Subdivision and Development Ordinance;
 - c. Revised Plat of Resubdivision based on the comments included within the IDRC Report;
 - d. Evidence of deed or long-term lease for off-site parking;
 - e. Revised Site Plan depicting a twenty-four foot (24') long parallel parking space;
 - f. A full photometric plan, to be in compliance with Village Code, which may incorporate existing light emanating from adjacent properties;
 - g. Revised Landscape Plan depicting landscape along the eastern property line that screens the adjacent parking lot from the loading docks in compliance with Section 155.707 (B)(4)(c) and incorporating existing landscaping;
5. As the petitioner has provided revised plans depicting the proposed freestanding sign in compliance with Village Code the requested relief for a freestanding sign in a clear line of sight area and relief to allow the leading edge of a freestanding sign less than five feet (5') from the property line is unnecessary and is not granted.
6. The petitioner will incorporate the recommendations of KLOA, Inc., subject to staff and IDOT approval.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Ronald Olbrysh

Business Meeting

The business meeting convened at 10:08 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

On a motion by Commissioner Sweetser, and seconded by Commissioner Cooper, the minutes of the July 20 and July 27, 2015 meeting were approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Ronald Olbrysh

Public Participation

There was no public participation.

DuPage County Hearings

There were no DuPage County hearings.

Chairperson's Report

The Chairperson deferred to the Director of Community Development.

Planner's Report

The Director of Community Development had no report.

Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

New Business

There was no new business.

Subdivision Reports

There were no subdivision reports.

Site Plan Approvals

There were no site plan approvals.

Workshops

There were no workshops.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Commissioner Flint, seconded by Commissioner Mrofcza, to adjourn the meeting at 10:10 p.m. The motion carried by the following vote:

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

Absent: 1 - Ronald Olbrysh

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission*

*Jennifer Ganser, Secretary
Lombard Plan Commission*