



# Village of Lombard

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

## Minutes Plan Commission

**Commissioners:**  
*Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser,  
Stephen Flint, John Mrofcza,  
Leigh Giuliano and Bill Johnston*  
**Staff Liaison:** *Jennifer Ganser*

---

Monday, March 16, 2020

7:00 PM

Village Hall - Board Room

---

### Call to Order

*Vice Chairperson Flint called the meeting to order at 7:20 p.m.*

### Pledge of Allegiance

*Vice Chairperson Flint led the Pledge of Allegiance*

### Roll Call of Members

**Present** 6 - Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofcza, Stephen Flint, Leigh Giuliano, and Bill Johnston

*Also present: William Heniff, AICP, Director of Community Development,*

*Vice Chairperson Flint called the order of the agenda.*

*Mr. Heniff read the Rules of Procedures as written in the Plan Commission By-Laws*

### Public Hearings

[200094](#)

#### **PC 20-10: Text Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, Landscape Requirements**

This item has been continued from the March 16, 2020 Plan Commission meeting.

Request text amendments to the following Section of Village Code, and other relevant sections for clarity:

1. Amend Section 155.703 (B) of the Village Code to replace "American Association of Nurserymen" with "National Standards

- Institute's ANSI A300 Part 6".
2. Amend Section 155.704 (B) of the Village Code relative to the tree species that should be avoided.
  3. Amend Section 155.705 (B) of the Village Code to provide for exceptions to the grading and sodding requirement if determined appropriate by the Public Works Department".
  4. Amend Section 155.705 (C) of the Village Code referencing Section 99.04.
  5. Amend Section 155.706 (C) of the Village Code to replace "Lombard Park District" with "properties located in the CR Conservation/Recreation District".
  6. Amend Section 155.711 of the Village Code to remove "request for a variance" and add "may be approved by the Director of Community Development provided that such designs meet the intent of Section 155.704 and that the alternate species selection and placement of plant materials otherwise does not conflict with this Chapter".
  7. Amend Section 155.712 of the Village Code to remove the term "deviation" and add "or are otherwise not deemed to meet the intent of Section 155.711".
  8. Create a new Section 155.713: Conflict with Other Regulations, to read as follows:  
"In cases in which the provisions set forth within this Chapter conflict with landscape requirements of the DuPage County Stormwater and Floodplain Ordinance or other State of Illinois or federal regulations, the County, State or federal regulations shall apply." (DISTRICT ALL)

**On a motion by Commissioner Sweetser and a second by Commissioner Johnston, The Plan Commission voted 6-0 to recommend the above petition be continued.**

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

**Aye:** 6 - Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofcza, Stephen Flint, Leigh Giuliano, and Bill Johnston

## **Business Meeting**

### **Approval of Minutes**

**A motion was made by Leigh Giuliano, seconded by Martin Burke, the minutes of the February 17, 2020 be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:**

**Aye:** 5 - Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, Stephen Flint, Leigh Giuliano, and Bill Johnston

**Abstain:** 1 - John Mrofcza

## Public Participation

*There was no public participation*

## DuPage County Hearings

*There was no DuPage County hearings*

## Chairperson's Report

*The Chairperson deferred to the Director of Community Development*

## Planner's Report

*Mr. Heniff explained due to the COVID-19 situation the decision was made to defer the Public Hearing of PC 20-10. Mr. Heniff said we are not sure what the April Plan Commission and Board of Trustees meetings will entail. The Village will continue with communication efforts to keep the public aware of all matters that pertain to the Village relative to COVID-19 and how it will effect the Village operations. We are currently open for business and will keep the Trustees aware of any changes and updates. Mr. Heniff said we are not ready at this time to cancel the April Plan Commission meeting, staff will be available to answer any questions you may have.*

## Unfinished Business

*There was no unfinished business*

## New Business

*There was no new business*

## Subdivision Reports

*There was no subdivision reports*

## Site Plan Approvals

[200093](#)

### **SPA 20-01: Bridge Development, 1307 N Lombard Road**

The petitioner requests site plan approval for 1307 N. Lombard Road. The petitioner proposes to build a speculative tenant building of 132,286 square feet with associated parking. (DISTRICT #1)

*Sworn in to present the petition were Nick Siegel and Mark Houser, from Bridge development Partners LLC, and Bill Heniff, Director.*

*Mr. Siegel presented and reviewed the site and landscape plan for a new multi-tenant office - warehouse facility located at 1307 N Lombard Road. Mr. Siegel explained the building is 132,286 S.F. with 181 parking spaces, they expect the structure will attract smaller multi-tenant users.*

*Vice Chairperson Flint asked for public comment. Hearing none, he asked for the staff report.*

*Mr. Heniff presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. The petitioner requests site plan approval for 1307 N. Lombard Road. The property received zoning approval thru Ordinances 5695 and 5794. The petitioner proposes to build a spec building of 132,286 square feet with associated parking. Mr. Heniff explained this is part of a Planned Development that was approved in 2005. The site plan exhibits are consistent with what was initially approved within the Planned Development. Portions of Lombard Road where vacated at the time of the development. The staff report does identify code compliance, and staff recommends approval of the site plan.*

*Vice Chairperson Flint opened the meeting for comments among the commissioners.*

*Commissioner Burke stated he worked for the company that currently owns the this site but he is no longer employed there.*

**On a motion by Commissioner Burke, and second by Commissioner Sweetser, the Plan Commission voted 6-0 to approve the petition associated with SPA 20-01, subject to the following six (6) conditions:**

- 1. The petitioner shall develop the site in conformance with the submitted plans.**
- 2. The petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments raised within the Inter-Departmental Review Report as part of their building permit application.**
- 3. The petitioner shall apply for and obtain a building permit for any development activity on the subject property.**
- 4. The petitioner shall apply for a building permit denoting the proposed parking lot lighting for the site. The light poles shall be of a uniform design and shall meet Village specifications for parking lot lighting.**

5. All provisions associated with Ordinances 5695 and/or the approved development agreement for the subject property shall remain in full force and effect.

6. All outdoor trash collection areas shall be screen on all four (4) sides, with materials that complement the principal building

Aye: 6 - Martin Burke, Ruth Sweetser, John Mrofcza, Stephen Flint, Leigh Giuliano, and Bill Johnston

## Workshops

*Mr. Heniff presented the workshop memo about United Home Builders 20th Street Subdivision. Staff is bringing this item to the Plan Commission to review a 2020 Refined Site Plan and provide a status update and discuss some policy question. Mr. Heniff reviewed the following:*

- *Subject properties map and the ranch townhome concepts with primary living on the first level.*
- *2020 Refined Site Plan consist of 30 townhomes, R3 Zoning with 2 and 3 unit buildings, buffered wetland, depressional areas to funnel water, stormwater ponds.*
- *Setbacks and building separation in terms of density and dwelling type. Allow for reduced set backs and reduction in building separation.*
- *Fencing and decks, builder will install small patios behind each unit prohibit installation of decks or fencing.*
- *Stormwater Outlot Considerations, 30' frontage required, depressional areas and outlot around stormwater on south lot will provide required frontage.*

*Mr. Heniff concluded by stating that Village staff and the developer are seeking feedback from the Plan Commission regarding potential deviations, variations, and to other site design elements and compatibility of proposed development with adjacent land uses.*

*Commissioner Burke asked if the rear set back is adjacent to one of the flood or detention area that is for the home owners' purpose or use that is that is what the buffer is for, in some of the homes that is not the case in the first couple of buildings. What is the required set back for a rear set back? Mr. Heniff advised 25 feet. Commissioner Burke pointed out some the cases are less than 25 feet. Mr. Heniff explained in some cases the set back is to green space or the detention pond. Commissioner Burke said in some cases the lower set back is not to green space. The first building to the right has a 9.8 rear set back to*

*the lot line that it shares with another lot line. That is a lot of relief, they are asking for a lot of variances. The back yards and patios are very close what are the side variances in R3? Mr Heniff said in a normal R2 district it is 6 ft, the question you are proposing is are the variances they are asking for are extraordinary relative to an R3 district.*

*Commissioner Burke said yes they are extreme especially with the side yards considering these are 2 unit buildings. Commissioner Burke asked if this will be done as a PUD? Mr. Heniff said yes.*

*Commissioner Burke stated the concept for easements to the storm facilities is so vehicles can get back there? Mr. Heniff said yes, the easements are to allow access for vehicles and equipment.*

*Commissioner Burke said there are areas that will not be possible. Mr. Heniff, we have brought that up to the developer and also the low spots would need to be preserved in the final engineering plan.*

*Commissioner Burke commented that the setbacks on the some the of side and back yards is excessive.*

*Commissioner Flint stated they could possibly eliminate one of the units from the buildings that have 3 units for additional space. Mr. Heniff said the builder wants to keep the townhouse concept we will discuss the possibility of staying with 2 unit buildings.*

*Commissioner Sweetser stated she agreed that the concept was for single family buildings and a 3-unit building may make people like they are living right on top of each other. There may be a different area to build maybe two 3-unit buildings that would not seem to close.*

*Commissioner Mrofcza asked if there is any way to reduce the setbacks in the cul-de-sac to open more area in the back? Mr. Heniff said we did look at that the bulb is the standard spec for emergency fire.*

*Commissioner Burke said the homes on Norbury have a 30 ft set back, it seems manic to keep going back and forth on the setbacks, can they have a consistent 20 ft setback through out the subdivision on Norbury? The area is very dense.*

*Commissioner Sweetser stated on the area south of 20th has 3 units? And is the out lot detention or retention? Mr. Heniff said that is detention so it drains out towards Main St.*

*Commissioner Mrofcza asked what the rectangular box on the east is is that part of the building. Mr. Heniff said it is part of the 3rd unit.*

*Commissioner Sweetser asked is there a conceptual drawing the 3-unit building? Mr, Heniff said we do not have on yet. Some of the designs may have a 2nd floor.*

*Mr., Heniff summarized the concerns about the general bulk density seem to be with the area with the 3-unit buildings there should be some modification or possible removal of a unit to allow for more separation between the buildings and the undulating 20 ft -30 ft setbacks on Norbury. I will share the feedback with the developer.*

## **Adjournment**

A motion was made by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Mrofcza, to adjourn the meeting at 8:18 p.m. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.