

July 15, 2004

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

**Subject: PC 04-07; 309 & 315 W. St. Charles Road**

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. This petition was heard at the June 21, 2004 Plan Commission meeting.

The petitioner requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property:

1. Approve a map amendment from the B2 General Neighborhood Shopping District to the B5A Downtown Perimeter District;
2. Approve a conditional use for drive-through services;
3. Approve a conditional use for a planned development with the following signage deviations:
  - a) A deviation from Section 153.208 (H) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow for a freestanding sign within the clear line of sight area
  - b) A deviation from Section 153.239 (F) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow for wall signs to be displayed in conjunction with window signs;
  - c) A deviation from Section 153.508 (B) (5) (b) (1) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow for a freestanding sign of 47 sq. ft. where a maximum of 20 square feet is permitted;
  - d) A deviation from Section 153.508 (B) (5) (c) (1) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow for a freestanding sign of 8 feet 3 inches in height where a maximum of 6 feet is permitted;
  - e) A deviation from Section 153.508 (B) (17) (b) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow for two 100-square foot wall signs where a maximum of 50 square feet is permitted;

- f) A deviation from Section 153.508 (B) (17) (c) of the Lombard Sign Ordinance to allow for a total of eight (8) wall signs where one sign per street front exposure is permitted;
4. Approve a variation from Section 155.417 (J) and Section 155.508 (C) (6) (b) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the transitional building setback from 20 feet to 12 feet to allow for a drive-through canopy;
5. Approve a variation from Sections 155.417 (K), 155.508 (C) (6) (b), and 155.707 of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to reduce the transitional landscape yard from 10 feet to 0 feet;
6. Approve a variation from Section 155.508 (C) (6) (a) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow for a 9-foot front yard setback on the perimeter of a planned development where a 30-foot front yard is required in the abutting R4 Limited General Residence District; and
7. The petitioner also requests Site Plan Approval authority to the Lombard Plan Commission.

Eric Stach, attorney for Bradford Real Estate, stated that the proposed Walgreens is at the southwest corner of St. Charles Road and Elizabeth Street. He summarized their request and noted that the site is 1.15 acres and the store will be approximately 13,000 square feet. The surrounding properties are transitional in nature, with single-family residences to the north and west, a shopping center to the east, and railroad tracks to the south. The existing gas station and office building on the site will be demolished and the site will be cleaned and environmentally remediated. He then introduced Wayne Marth of Arcline Associates in Downers Grove.

Mr. Marth presented the landscape plan for the property and proceeded to highlight site design, building elevation, and circulation issues. Typical Walgreens stores have a double drive-through, no canopy, and a glass tower with a neon sign. However, Walgreens did not feel that their standards urban design was appropriate for this site and they attempted to make it sensitive to the adjacent residence. Design elements that were added to soften the building include shingles, a hip roof, stone, arches, capitals, and a continuous cornice.

Mr. Stach concluded their presentation by stating that this proposal would be compatible with the Central Business District. Bradford Real Estate would be very pleased to move ahead with this project and they are happy with the considerable materials upgrades proposed for this downtown cornerstone property.

Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for public comment.

Ed Roberts, 321 W. St. Charles Road, stated that he is not against the concept of a Walgreens on this site, but he does have a number of concerns. He would prefer the drive-through be located along St. Charles Road so that it would not be along his property line. He noted that the existing office building is very quiet and he would like the rooftop mechanicals to be on the eastern side of the roof. He also wants all landscaping to be protected. He noted that most of the lighting concerns seem to have been addressed.

Mr. Stach responded that they would be happy to work with the neighbor on any excavation and landscaping issues.

Chairperson Ryan then requested the staff report. William Heniff, Senior Planner, explained that the Village's traffic consultant would present a summary of the traffic study after the staff report is presented. Jennifer Backensto, Planner I, reviewed the petitioner's request and described the proposed development.

Ms. Backensto addressed the IRDC comments, noting that all comments will need to be addressed prior to the issuance of any building permits. The Comprehensive Plan recommends that this site be developed as part of the Central Business District – Mixed Use Area.

The property is bordered by commercial uses to the east, railroad tracks to the south, and R4-zoned residential uses to the north and west. Staff finds that the proposed use is compatible with surrounding land uses. The petitioner is requesting rezoning of the property to B5A to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Staff believes this designation is appropriate.

Ms. Backensto explained that eight wall signs and additional window signs are requested. Staff recommends approval of the wall signs only, as the property is more oriented toward automobile traffic than most downtown uses. Staff supports the request to place the freestanding sign within the clear line of sight area, as the sign should not negatively impact traffic sight lines because most of the functional clear line of sight area at corner of the property was dedicated as public right-of-way in 1998.

Staff can also support the requested variation to increase the size of the monument size, as there is and will continue to be a larger freestanding sign at the southeast corner of Elizabeth and St. Charles. However, staff does not feel that there is any justification for an increase in the permitted height of the monument sign. Furthermore, staff suggests that the entire sign structure (including elements outside of the sign cabinet area) should be limited to no more than 10 feet in width.

Ms. Backensto summarized the request for a conditional use for drive-through services, noting that a number of other drive-through facilities are located within the downtown, including Fifth Third Bank and West Suburban Bank. Precautions must be taken to minimize any visual or auditory impact on the neighboring property. This may be accomplished through construction of a masonry wall and careful placement of lights along the western edge of the property.

By creating a planned development, this provides the petitioner with greater design flexibility while providing the Village with a mechanism to review and approve the design elements associated with the petition. Staff is supportive of the planned development request, as well as

the requests to reduce the transitional building setback, transitional landscape yard, and front yard setback.

The proposed project will meet the required number of parking spaces for retail uses (four spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area). This site plan assumes the vacation of a surplus portion of the Elizabeth Street right-of-way, which is necessary to meet parking and perimeter landscaping requirements. In the event the right-of-way vacation does not proceed, this site plan will not be functional.

Ms. Backensto noted that staff has been working with the petitioner for several months to develop building elevations that are both compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and aesthetically pleasing. The proposed elevations combine the typical design for Walgreens stores with more residential, "neighborhood"-style architectural elements to soften its appearance. These elements include the extensive use of brick instead of cast stone, as well as a covered walkway with a pitched roof.

Staff suggests that the smoothface cast stone shown on the upper portion of the building be replaced with the same rockface cast stone that is used on the lower portion of the building. This will avoid an appearance of concrete block that would detract from the overall design and quality of the building. Also, staff would prefer a clock in place of the keystone window over the building entrance, as was done for the Walgreens on Roosevelt Road in Glen Ellyn.

Staff recommends approval of the petition, subject to the conditions noted in the staff report. Ms. Backensto then introduced Tim Doron of Kenig, Lindgrem, O'Hara, and Aboona to present the traffic study that was performed in conjunction with this petition.

Mr. Doron stated that they evaluated the petitioner's site plan, which will eventually play a role in a larger study of traffic movements along St. Charles Road. Their analysis included circulation, access, and the general amount of trips that would be generated by the project. He noted that this is an unusual site and proceeded to explain the existing road network. Traffic flows are significant but not overly heavy. The intersection functions well and will continue to function well after the Walgreens is opened. Vehicles entering the site will likely be primarily from eastbound pass-by traffic. Drive-throughs are not heavy users, which was confirmed by observations of the Walgreens on St. Charles Road in Villa Park. The proposed number of parking spaces should be more than adequate, and he is satisfied that the site will function.

Elsa Roberts, 321 W. St. Charles Road, asked for more information on the drive-through traffic and stated that a drive-through should not be part of a neighborhood establishment. She stated that she is not opposed to the Walgreens, but she is opposed to a drive-through.

Mr. Doron explained that over a 12-hour period, there were only 40 cars that used the drive-through in Villa Park. The study was performed to capture peak hour traffic, and the longest stacking occurred with a maximum of two cars at 5:30 p.m. and at noon.

Chairperson Ryan asked if those results held true with other pharmacies. Mr. Doron said that was very consistent with other pharmacies.

Commissioner Burke asked for clarification on truck circulation. Mr. Doron conformed that the truck will use the main entrance, not the drive-through.

Commissioner Flint asked how the drives along Elizabeth would function. Mr. Doron stated that vehicles will come in at the north drive and exit at the south drive.

Commissioner Burke discussed the appropriateness of one-way versus two-way traffic circulation on the site and asked if the two northeastern parking spaces would present a conflict. Mr. Doron stated that the circulation could be two-way if it was signed properly, and the parking spaces will work.

Commissioner Sweetser asked how trash pickup would occur on the site. Mr. Marth stated that the truck will back in and it will be a front-load vehicle.

Commissioner Sweetser asked about the existing number of lanes on northbound Elizabeth Street between the railroad tracks and St. Charles Road. Mr. Doron stated that there is one lane that transitions into two lanes as it approaches the intersection.

Commissioner Burke asked if the driveway is lined up with that of the neighboring property. Mr. Heniff stated that is was.

Commissioner Olbrysh asked about drive-through traffic coming off of St. Charles. Mr. Doron stated that it will function properly for the site.

Commissioner Burke stated that he was surprised no drive-through entrance sign was proposed along the street. Mr. Heniff stated that a six-square foot directional sign could be erected as a matter of right.

Commissioner Burke noted that the site plan shows a six-foot wall, but the staff report recommends a six- to eight-foot wall be constructed. Mr. Stach noted that the retention wall could be the cause for the confusion, and Mr. Heniff noted that an eight-foot wall was permitted by code. Commissioner Burke stated that the site plan should say that the wall would be eight feet above the elevation of the neighboring property.

Commissioner Sweetser asked if there was flexibility regarding the materials for the wall. Mr. Heniff noted that the condition in the staff report references the approval of the adjacent property owner.

Commissioner Sweetser expressed concern over the wall's impact on the drive-through entrance, noting that there is an existing drive-through in the downtown that does not function well. Mr. Heniff stated that the wall will be pulled back from the street to comply with code and final engineering has not yet been done for the site.

Commissioner Burke asked if the drive-through would use a loudspeaker. Mr. Stach confirmed that there would not be a loudspeaker.

Commissioner Burke stated that there were visual and auditory concerns regarding the rooftop mechanicals and they should be placed as far away from the residence as possible. Mr. Marth explained that there will be a five-foot high parapet wall that is higher than any of the rooftop equipment. None of the mechanicals will be closer than 10 feet to the parapet wall, and the refrigeration unit will be at least 15 feet from the parapet wall. Chairperson Ryan noted that that would place the mechanicals at least 31 feet away from the neighboring property line.

Commissioner Burke asked about noise generation. Mr. Marth stated that the equipment will not be noise-producing, and the parapet wall would block any minimal sound.

Commissioner Sweetser noted that great pains were taken to camouflage the rooftop equipment at Fountain Square. Commissioner Burke noted that even though the residence must experience noise from St. Charles Road and the adjacent railroad tracks, the mechanicals should be moved as far away as possible. Mr. Marth stated that all but the refrigeration unit could be moved and there will be zero decibels at the property line in addition to zero light pollution. He added that they will work with the resident to improve the driveway apron.

Commissioner Sweetser spoke about the possibility of traffic signage to warn vehicles of an upcoming drive-through entrance.

Commissioner Burke asked if everyone was comfortable with the location of the monument sign.

Commissioner Melarkey asked if a right-in, right-out driveway was considered on Elizabeth Street. Mr. Doron said the driveways were one-way due to their width and the need for parking spaces.

Commissioner Burke moved to approve the petition, subject to the amended petitions. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Melarkey.

After due consideration of the petition and the testimony presented, the Plan Commission found that the proposed request complies with the standards of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the

Plan Commission, by a roll call vote of 6 to 0, recommended to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of PC 04-07, subject to the following conditions, as amended:

1. The petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the plans prepared by Arcline Associates, Ltd., last revised June 11, 2004 and submitted as part of this request;
2. The petitioner's building improvements shall be designed and constructed consistent with Village Code and all also address the comments included within the IDRC report;
3. The petitioner shall submit a Plat of Consolidation prior to receiving any building permit;
4. The petitioner shall pay for and install a solid masonry wall along the western property line of eight (8) feet in height. Design and material type of the wall is subject to the approvals of the Director of Community Development and the property owners at 321 W. St. Charles Road. In the event the neighboring property owner is unwilling to grant a construction easement, a board-on-board fence shall be constructed;
5. The lighting plan shall be modified as follows:
  - a.) All light fixtures on the west side of the building shall be mounted at a height no greater than the wall along the western property line;
  - b.) All light fixtures on the drive-through canopy shall be recessed so as not to be visible from adjacent properties;
6. The signage plan shall be modified as follows:
  - a.) The eight (8) red, channel letter signs noted on the exterior elevations shall be approved;
  - b.) The requested variations for a 47-square foot freestanding sign within the clear line of sight area shall be approved;
  - c.) No neon sign shall be visible on the exterior of the building;
  - d.) That the proposed free-standing sign and support shall not be greater than ten feet (10') in width;  
A free-standing directional sign be placed at the entrance into the drive through along St. Charles Road, and elevated four feet in height with a total size of six square feet; and
  - e.) All other signage relief shall be denied.
7. The building elevations shall be modified as follows:
  - a.) The windows at the northeast corners of the covered entry shall be replaced with an analog clock or compatible architectural element, subject to the approval of the Director of Community Development; and
  - b.) The smoothface cast stone noted on the elevations as "3b" shall be replaced with the same rockface cast stone noted as "3a."

Re: PC 04-07  
July 15, 2004  
Page 8

8. Approval of the submitted plans shall be subject to the Corporate Authorities of the Village of Lombard vacating a portion of Elizabeth Street immediately adjacent to the subject property that has been deemed surplus right-of-way.
9. That the rooftop mechanical equipment shall not be audible from the west property line.
10. That the petitioner shall construct necessary improvements to Elizabeth Street which provides for two northbound lanes north of the railroad tracks.

Respectfully,

**VILLAGE OF LOMBARD**

Donald Ryan  
Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission

DR:JB

attachments

c. Petitioner  
Lombard Plan Commission