

# **Village of Lombard**

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



## **Meeting Minutes**

**Monday, April 19, 2010**

**7:30 PM**

**Village Hall**

## **Plan Commission**

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

## Call to Order

[Play Video](#)

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

## Roll Call of Members

[Play Video](#)

**Present:** Chairperson Donald F. Ryan, Commissioner Stephen Flint, Commissioner Ronald Olbrysh, Commissioner Ruth Sweetser, Commissioner Martin Burke and Commissioner Richard Nelson

**Absent:** Commissioner Andrea Cooper

Chairperson Ryan called the order of the agenda.

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

Commissioner Cooper arrived at 7:32 p.m.

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

## Public Hearings

[Play Video](#)

**100198**

### **PC 10-04: Text Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance**

The Village requests a text amendment to Section 155.420(C) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance (and other sections where needed for clarity) allowing "Motor Vehicle Sales" to be listed as a conditional use within the I - Limited Industrial District. (DISTRICTS #1, #3 and #4)

[Play Video](#)

*Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, presented the petition.*

*Recently, Village staff has received a number of requests to establish automotive sales facilities within industrial areas of the Village. As a result, the Planning Services Division is initiating this text amendment to allow "Motor vehicle sales" to be listed as a conditional use within the I-Limited Industrial District.*

*Internal review comments were received from the Building Division and the Fire Department. The Building Division noted that vehicle sales would constitute a change of use in the industrial district, and would require all applicable codes to be met for that new use group. In addition to changes within the building, additional accessible parking may be required to accommodate the new use and occupant loads.*

*The Fire Department noted that storage of motor vehicles inside a building requires that the building be fully equipped with a fire sprinkler system and indoor auto sales show rooms are considered storage of vehicles.*

*The Planning Services Division has been receiving an increased number of inquires*

*from prospective businesses seeking to establish automotive sales facilities within industrial areas of the Village. Currently, "Motor vehicle sales" are neither a permitted or conditional use in the I-Limited Industrial District. As a result, staff has initiated the text amendment to allow "Motor vehicle sales" to be listed as a conditional use within the I - Limited Industrial District. This text amendment, if approved, will allow Village staff to better respond to the requests and accommodate such a use. He referred to a table which illustrates how the various automotive uses are currently being regulated in the Zoning Ordinance and noted that it is considered a conditional use in the B2, B3, B4 and B4A districts.*

*From a land use perspective, motor vehicle sales is very similar to Outside Storage of Motor Vehicles, which is already a Conditional Use in the I-Limited Industrial District. In addition, many of the ancillary uses associated with motor vehicle sales (automobile repair and service) are also listed as a Conditional Use in the I - Limited Industrial District.*

*For reference purposes, staff completed an analysis of surrounding communities that did allow motor vehicle sales in their industrial district(s) to better understand how they regulate the use. Mr. Stilling mentioned each community surveyed and how each regulates motor vehicle sales in their industrial district.*

*Concluding, Mr. Stilling stated that it is staff's opinion that "Motor vehicle sales" as a conditional use in the I-Limited Industrial District is appropriate. Many of the prospective automotive sales businesses seeking buildings in the I-Limited Industrial District generate their sales through the internet rather than from walk-in customers. Therefore, these businesses seek larger warehousing buildings found in the industrial areas of the Village. If the text amendment is approved, the Conditional Use process will allow staff, the Plan Commission and the Village Board the opportunity to review each case to ensure that all the applicable standards are being met. He referred to the standards for text amendments, how they have been affirmed and staff's recommendation of approval of the petition.*

*Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone was present to speak in favor or against the petition. There was no one to speak in favor or against the petition. Chairperson Ryan then opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.*

*Commissioner Sweetser stated that this amendment is needed and makes sense. She agreed with staff's recommendation.*

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

**Aye:** 6 - Flint, Olbrysh, Sweetser, Burke, Nelson and Cooper

## **Business Meeting**

[Play Video](#)

*The business meeting convened at 7:40 p.m.*

## **Approval of Minutes**

[Play Video](#)

*On a motion by Sweetser and seconded by Burke the minutes from the March 15, 2010 meeting were approved by the members present with the exception of Commissioner Cooper who abstained.*

## Public Participation

[Play Video](#)

*There was no public participation.*

## DuPage County Hearings

[Play Video](#)

*There were no DuPage County hearings.*

## Chairperson's Report

[Play Video](#)

*The Chairperson deferred to the Assistant Director of Community Development.*

## Planner's Report

[Play Video](#)

*Mr. Stilling reported on the status of the 1010 Broadway petition. He stated that the case had not been heard yet but was on the Board of Trustees agenda recommended for denial. Staff has been working with the petitioner to correct their issues in a timely manner as there is a tenant involved.*

*With regard to next month's agenda he indicated that we have a couple of items, one of which is a proposed McDonalds on Highland Avenue. We are trying to get in as many public hearings prior to the June Plan Commission meeting as the Board will be on break until their last regularly scheduled meeting in August.*

## Unfinished Business

[Play Video](#)

*There was no unfinished business.*

## New Business

[Play Video](#)

*There was no new business.*

## Subdivision Reports

[Play Video](#)

*There were no subdivision reports.*

## Site Plan Approvals

[Play Video](#)

*There were no site plan approvals.*

## Workshops

[Play Video](#)

*1. Green Handbook Review  
Michael Toth, Planner I, presented the workshop. The Village Board directed staff to pursue actions relative to residential energy enhancements, Building Code updates and*

green initiatives. Similar to the Residential Development Handbook and the Business Resource Handbook, the intent of the Green Building Handbook is to provide information to the public. The Green Building Handbook will include information on the newly-adopted 2009 International Energy Conservation Code, DuPage County Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs) and current 'green' practices. The Green Building Handbook not only provides information on Village, County and State mandated programs; it will also include future text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance that address the green initiatives.

While the Zoning Ordinance does not specifically address alternative energy structures, most of the items can be currently regulated as an "accessory structure" or as part of the principal structure. As a result, staff is seeking the input of the Plan Commission to address the placement of the following structures: solar panels, wind turbines, rain barrels and cisterns and geothermal systems.

Through text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance, these items would be specifically addressed so that the Village can clearly communicate the regulations to residents seeking to take advantage of this growing trend.

Continuing, Mr. Toth stated he would go through each text amendment, but first, would give a brief synopsis of the important points of the Green Building Handbook. He stated that it provides information on green building itself, specifically on LEED standards, which the Village has not formally adopted. The handbook provides basic information on solar energy, geothermal heating and cooling, and wind energy. There were some changes after the adoption of the 2009 Conservation Energy Code, which includes changes to windows, insulation, HVAC, water heaters, lighting and pools. The stormwater remediation portion is taken from the DuPage County Stormwater Best Management Practices in regard to infiltration practices, runoff storage/ conveyance practices, and filtration practices.

This handbook was created for the general public and encompasses everything. There are some important diagrams, examples and information on stormwater runoff.

The handbook includes various incentive programs offered by the Village, which people might not know exist. There is the backyard drainage program, which relates to stormwater remediation. The rain barrel grant and compost bin grant programs are offered through the Public Works Department.

Also included is information on open space, which is derived from the Comprehensive Plan update to the open space. It gives examples on technologies and design standards that helps to increase open space on a property.

The Resource page includes Village of Lombard departments and telephone numbers so if a resident needed to inquire about a particular issue or program, the information was readily available. There is also a listing of different websites that provide additional reading on green building and LEED standards.

Mr. Toth stated that staff is also requesting the Commissioners' feedback on the following proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance, which will come back at a later date as text amendments. Comments received tonight will be incorporated.

The following is a summation of the proposed text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance:

Solar Panels and Wind Turbines - Mr. Toth described how these structures are currently regulated in the Zoning Ordinance as accessory structures and are attached to a

structure and protrude from a building. They are treated similarly to how antennas and satellite dishes are currently treated in the Zoning Ordinance. As we are encouraging these types of structures we want, in the future, to have the language in place when the trends become more popular. Staff is suggesting that they be regulated in the following fashion:

#### *Solar Panels*

##### *Roof mounted:*

*Roof mounted solar panels located in any zoning district shall not project higher than ten (10) feet above the maximum height of the structure upon which they are located.*

##### *Ground mounted:*

*Regulated as an accessory structure. Permitted obstruction in the rear yard only. Area determined by the total surface area of the panel(s).*

*Mr. Stilling exemplified a house located around Hammerschmidt, north of Wilson, that currently has a large solar array. The Village treated it as a large accessory structure. We had nothing specific in the code, but instead, had to rely on creative interpretation.*

#### *Wind Turbines*

*Mr. Toth stated they are more complicated, due to the blade. They are separated into residential and non-residential districts and will be permitted as an obstruction in the rear yard only.*

#### *Residential Districts*

##### *Roof mounted:*

*Roof mounted wind turbines located in a residential zoning district shall not project higher than ten (10) feet above the maximum height of the structure upon which they are located and each blade shall be no longer than five (5) feet in length.*

##### *Ground mounted:*

*Ground mounted wind turbines located in a residential district shall not project higher than thirty (30) feet above the established grade with each blade being no longer than five (5) feet in length.*

#### *Non-Residential Districts*

##### *Roof mounted:*

*Roof mounted wind turbines located in all non-commercial districts shall not project higher than ten (10) feet above the maximum height of the structure upon which they are located with each blade being no longer than seven and one half (7.5) feet in length.*

##### *Ground mounted:*

*Ground mounted wind turbines located in all non-residential districts shall not project higher than thirty-seven and one half (37.5) feet above the established grade with each blade being no longer than seven and one half (7.5) feet in length.*

#### *Rain Barrels/Cisterns*

*Both rain barrels and cisterns would be regulated in the Zoning Ordinance as accessory structures. Both would be listed as a permitted obstruction in the interior side yard and rear yard only, not to exceed two (2) feet in diameter in the side yard. There are some larger rain barrel units out there, however, if you have a larger setback you can have a larger barrel.*

#### *Geothermal Systems*

*The technology is explained in the handbook. The infrastructure is placed below grade and they are not regulated by the Zoning Ordinance directly. However, it is important to*

*note that the infrastructure associated with such systems could have an impact on the access to utilities and drainage ways. Therefore, they shall be prohibited in any easements. There are a couple of these systems that already exist in town. Geothermal systems are a permitted obstruction in all requisite yards; however, they shall be prohibited in any easements.*

*Staff is seeking a broad opinion of the Green Building Handbook from the Commissioner's, but more specifically, staff is soliciting specific comments relative to the text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.*

*Chairperson Ryan requested the opinions and thoughts of the Commissioners.*

*Commissioner Burke referred to the picture in the lower left hand corner of the Open Space section and asked if it should be included as he thought that it violated a number of Village codes. Mr. Toth acknowledged that it could be construed as violating Village Code and will be swapped out accordingly.*

*Commissioner Burke referred to the section right across from the picture that notes that the Zoning Ordinance does not recognize pervious pavers as open space and he asked if those benefits are not recognized by the Village. Mr. Stilling explained that while there is nothing in the code that excludes using pervious pavers, it does not count toward open space, but does count toward stormwater runoff and drainage and detention requirements. It's more cost effective to do grass versus pavers.*

*Commissioner Burke commented on the house previously mentioned by Mr. Stilling, located near Hammerschmidt and Wilson, that has the solar panels. He indicated that he couldn't believe how much the panels stick out over everyone's fence and how massive they look in the middle of the yard. They are bigger than any structure on the block with the exclusion of a house and he is surprised that it meets code. Mr. Stilling indicated that it's regulated as an accessory structure and the highest point of the panel when tilted could not exceed 17'. Depending on the size of the lot and yard the structure could be approximately 15 x 15 or 20 x 20. We draw a general box around the highest and widest points. Commissioner Burke indicated that if it was his neighbor it wouldn't make him happy staring at it.*

*Commissioner Burke referred to the roof mounted section and questioned if the maximum height of the structure is calculated from the roof peak or half way up the slope. Mr. Toth answered the building height. Commissioner Burke thought that seemed generous. Mr. Stilling explained that most houses are significantly less than what the code allows in height so you have generally 5-7' before you meet the maximum building height. In doing research, there are obstructions in the area that need to be elevated slightly. We are still very open in exploring what options we have.*

*Commissioner Burke referred to the next section, ground mounted, where it says that it could be a permitted obstruction in the rear yard only. He asked if that would apply to a roof mounted structure and wanted to know if that would be allowed on the front part of a roof. Mr. Toth answered that, if roof mounted, it could be allowed on the front part of the roof, but if ground mounted, it is only permitted in the rear yard.*

*Commissioner Burke then asked if there was some permissible level of sound that was allowed from the wind turbines. Mr. Toth answered that from his research they don't make a lot of noise and that would revert to the noise ordinance. Also, the wind turbine would have to be located in an area above the tree line to catch the wind speed otherwise it would not be effective. Mr. Stilling indicated that issue would be looked into and tied in.*

Commissioner Sweetser stated that this was a great idea, but the final copy needs page numbers and there are some typos. She had no additional comments or thoughts, but was curious about smart grids as that might lead to some provision of helping people use the smart appliances or by taking part in the smart grid. Mr. Toth indicated he would look into that.

Commissioner Olbrysh asked if wind turbines would be a permitted use in a residential R1 and R2. Mr. Toth answered, yes, we just differentiate residential versus non-residential. Commissioner Olbrysh commented that he noticed on the internet that Target was selling wind turbines and asked if he would be allowed to put six of them on his roof. Mr. Toth answered yes, the number of turbines would not be regulated, just the placement. Our intent is not to create a wind farm on someone's property, that is why we looked at regulating the structures, but we did grapple with that point.

Commissioner Olbrysh expressed concern in having them in the R1 and R2. He indicated that in the R2 the homes are closer together, which should be considered. Mr. Stilling commented that he looks at the wind turbines similar to the old TV antennas on the roof. You don't realize how large they are. The wind turbines are not that large, but they do give that affect. We will take a look at that issue.

Commissioner Olbrysh asked if there were any in Lombard now. Mr. Stilling answered that he didn't believe there were any, but heard that one facility is exploring a larger one on their campus.

Commissioner Flint mentioned that he had the pleasure to go to Indiana and indicated that there are huge wind farms there. The noise needs to be given some thought and where they might be placed on a property as he can see them being a sound nuisance.

Commissioner Sweetser stated that as much as she agrees with the comments on how they can be perceived as a nuisance or unattractive, thought needs to be given to providing a balance. You can't force someone to put a solar panel in the shade or put a wind turbine in an area where it won't be effective due to the position of their house.

Chairperson Ryan referred to the 10' and 5' maximum heights for the solar panels and wind turbines and asked if these are the levels we need because that's what the industry is telling us or is that the norm right now. It sounds like we arbitrarily took 10' because of the antenna height but is that necessary - is the generation of wind at roof level? Have we done any investigation into that? Mr. Toth cited his research on how this technology is evolving every day and how there are so many different types, shapes and locations to put them. For us, it's looking at what's out there. Portland is a big user of this technology and he was online looking at products to see what is out there and the range that is out there. If you are talking about shear energy, more is better. There are development standards out there about catching the lighting of the sun and capturing the warmth. When you look at bulk regulations, these are issues that are being brought up. We are trying to keep up with what people are looking for now.

Mr. Stilling indicated that staff did look at all of that. He exemplified solar panels and how they give flexibility, they will want some low testing, we wanted to give some options. Mr. Toth stated that solar panels are made to follow the sun. We need to look at them from a zoning standpoint - like height and lot coverage. We are currently working with the Building Division and asking the same questions. Mr. Stilling added that when we first looked at satellite dishes they were about 10' in diameter now they are 2' in diameter. This technology will be evolving in the same way.

Chairperson Ryan also mentioned that this should be looked at from a density standpoint of a neighborhood and how restrictions might have to be looked at. He



*exampld apartments with each unit having their own satellite dish. Now one dish can accommodate all the units.*

*Commissioner Sweetser suggested a built-in review cycle every 6 months in order to keep up with the rapidly-evolving technology. Mr. Stilling commented that this is a new code so he didn't see there being a mad rush, especially when there is a significant cost associated with it. As costs decrease, the demand will necessitate how to revisit the code. If it becomes a growing trend and starts presenting situations, we will address it.*

*Commissioner Sweetser added that if you anticipate a review cycle, you could better accommodate people and not make exceptions or have people challenging the rules.*

*Commissioner Cooper stated that this is great, exciting and she appreciates the effort involved. She likes the idea of incentives and acknowledged the existing grant programs. She asked if there were any other incentives being offered to developers or if you would be using this handbook as a tool to encourage this type of development.*

*Mr. Stilling answered that the one big incentive is the DuPage County Stormwater requirements and their Best Management Practices. When there is an impact you need to have bioswales and other ways to naturally treat the water before it gets to its point of filtration. From a zoning perspective (in terms of incentives) it is not our intention at this time to have other incentives. We still support the provisions that green landscaping is the most conservative approach and from a drainage perspective, that is the best approach too. In terms of emerging technology and costs coming down, the Board can decide other incentives in the future.*

*Commissioner Cooper mentioned that she has worked with communities helping them apply for money and grants. They had demonstration projects and this became a tool for the public and developers whereby they could watch and learn. She encouraged demonstrations and promoting developers that want to do these types of projects. Mr. Stilling stated that as part of this, and working with our Building Division, we might have a materials board showing the various options available.*

*Commissioner Cooper confirmed that rain barrels are not permitted in the front or side yards. Mr. Toth indicated that they are not specifically called out as of right now. Mr. Stilling stated that you could not go beyond your setback. If your downspout was located right at the 30' setback you couldn't have it in the front yard but if it's in the corner you could divert it into the side yard. Commissioner Cooper asked if having multiple barrels connected to each other would be allowed. Mr. Stilling responded that staff never went into an allowable number, just how far it could protrude.*

*Chairperson Ryan commented that he liked the idea of having a handbook. We need to investigate the comments brought up here and felt it's a good item to have for the Village. Mr. Stilling stated that this is the first step in identifying text amendments relative to the growing trend.*

*Commissioner Cooper mentioned permeable pavers. She referred to the Zoning Ordinance whereby it states that three sides of any structure are required to have hardscape around it. She asked if that was a discrepancy, as we are talking about reducing pavement, and can see projects coming forward that won't meet fire code but will provide the green solution. Mr. Stilling responded that the Fire Department requirement is for more intensive uses or assembly type uses whereby there is a need to get immediate access. Commissioner Cooper asked if permeable pavers can be used. Mr. Stilling answered that they can look at it on a case-by-case basis, but they want to know their options so if there was a fire and the ladder truck had to respond they would want to know where the outriggers can go and not worry about the potential of*

sinking. Nothing in our code says you can't do it, but those are the concerns.

Commissioner Cooper stated that she learned that there are plates the Fire Department uses to diffuse the pressure points and carries the load over a larger amount of space. Other communities are allowing this and maybe this should be considered. Mr. Stilling stated that we really haven't had a lot of folks propose permeable pavers due to the cost but we will look at these options.

## *2. Driveway Standards for Single-Family Residences*

Christopher Stilling, Assistant Director of Community Development, began by providing the background of the workshop. He noted that staff is seeking the thoughts and direction of the Plan Commission with respect to the land use and design considerations associated with the Village's driveway standards and their impacts on selected single family residential properties.

Staff received a request to look at whether the driveway standards for single family residences with three car garages should be modified to allow for wider driveway widths at the front property line. While amendments to the Code would be considered by the Public Works Committee, staff also sees the regulation having significant land use and development impacts for residential properties as well. Staff will forward any comments received today to the Public Works Committee in consideration of the request.

Supplementing his presentation, he referred to a PowerPoint presentation

*Current Code Requirements - Currently, Village Code Section 150 regulates how wide a driveway can be at a particular property line. This slide shows the maximum you can be at the property line is 20'. In this diagram with a three car garage you would have to flare the driveway out. Throughout the 1990s and the 2000s, the number of residences with three-car garages has increased. Most of these residences were new construction. The existing driveway width provisions would require that the developer/property owner flare the driveway from a three-car width (often up to 30' feet) to a two-car width (20') at the front property line.*

*The request being made suggests that such flaring can result in awkward vehicle backing movements or create "ruts" on an abutting landscape surface. As such, the request is to allow for greater driveway width at the front property line that would allow for greater flexibility in backing movements.*

*The intent of the twenty-foot driveway width provision is the result of both practical and functional applications. Residents frequently utilize driveways for parking purposes and a twenty foot width would provide for two adjacent cars to be parked on a driveway, along with adequate room to access and maneuver around the vehicle. With the advent of three-car garages, developers and residents would frequently flare the driveway to provide access to the third door, while still meeting the twenty-foot width requirement. Driveway widths beyond the front property line can be greater than twenty feet in width, provided that the property meets open space and other driveway location requirements.*

*Changes for Discussion - The next slide shows the driveway width being increased to 30' at the property line and how that would also include extending the apron.*

*Items for Consideration - The following items are for the Plan Commission to consider as we look at the issue of widening the provisions from twenty feet to thirty feet:*

- 1. Driveway Access & Parking - Twenty-foot driveway widths strongly discourage or preclude parallel parking to the adjacent street. Within parkways, such parallel parking is prohibited, unless the roadway was designed for such parking. Capping the width of*

*driveway approaches at twenty feet would generally preclude parallel parking to the street, defines the access point for vehicles and can minimize sidewalk encroachments.*

*2. Open Space - The intent of this provision is to ensure that driveway approaches onto private residential properties do not encompass significant or excessive amounts of space within the front yard. Currently a twenty-foot wide driveway would cover one-third of the area of a typical sixty-foot lot. However, by providing up to a thirty foot driveway by right, the amount of hard surface would increase to one half (or more if one accounts for front door porches, stoops and adjacent walkways) of the front yard. In these cases, the front yard open space element could be deemed as secondary to the impervious areas.*

*Staff also notes that selected subdivisions have further open space restrictions, such as the Providence planned development's 43% lot area coverage requirement. Larger driveways may also inhibit the property owner to construct other improvements such as a backyard patio or erect an accessory structure without seeking zoning relief.*

*3. Drainage - Providing for an increase in driveway width may not significantly increase stormwater run-off. However, in consideration of the relation of the code, staff also notes that driveways are usually designed to pitch toward the adjacent public street and that the additional width would find its way directly to the curb line. With flared driveways, some of the run-off may run to the adjacent front lawn. While the run-off flow may not be great, the cumulative impact of unfiltered runoff can pose drainage concerns within the Village's right of way. Wider driveways would also result in wider aprons, thereby increasing the amount of impervious area surrounding a property and further increasing run off.*

*4. Clear Line of Sight - The Zoning Ordinance does regulate structures within the clear line of sight area (defined as a 20' by 20' sight triangle at the edge of the driveway and the property line - often the adjacent sidewalk). By providing for greater driveway widths, the ability for property owners and abutting property owners to erect access structures such as fences could be diminished. As a separate but related issue, expanded driveways may also increase sight obstruction impacts of parkway trees, mailboxes and other permissible structures, as the placement of those structures will be further limited.*

*5. Lot Design - While the majority of lots within the Village are rectangular in shape, a significant number are on curved streets or cul-de-sacs. Increased permissible driveway widths in these locations would further reduce the visual and functional open space for these lots. You can see that there is the potential of having a sea of pavement should all the lots in the cul-de-sac have 3-car garages.*

*6. Home Design - Back in 2007 the Village Board approved text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance that further regulated garage design and capped the amount of garage that can be on the front façade of a residence. As represented to the Plan Commission in 2007, the majority of single-family homes being constructed feature attached - front-facing garages. This trend has caused concern in some communities that garages are beginning to overtake single-family homes as the dominant visual element of residential streets, obscuring the homes' entrances and potentially filling the front yard with vehicles. Through the analysis, new code amendments were established. While not prohibiting three or more car garages, the regulations placed significant restrictions on such elements and limited the ability to construct a three-car garage as a prominent front façade element. While side-loaded garages may minimize the need for wider driveways, an argument can be made that the increased driveway width will run contrary to the garage design restrictions recommended for approval and adopted in 2007.*

*On the following slide, the home on the right - the driveway is flared and shows what that would look like from the street.*

*7. Public Right of Way Issues - While not under the Plan Commission's direct purview, the design of parkways can add to or detract from the overall neighborhood appearance. The Subdivision and Development Ordinance encourages or mandates green parkways through its regulations and tree planting requirements.*

*From a Public Works perspective, specific items within the broader code amendment discussion may include the full design impacts of such an amendment on parkways and the street. Operational issues can include: reduction in the ability to place landscape/parkway enhancements, proper location of mailboxes and fire hydrants, longer-term maintenance costs associated with parkway restoration work, and snow clearing and removal activities, particularly within cul-de-sac areas.*

*Lastly, as existing code also provides for two foot flaring within the Village parkway, the cumulative impact of additional impervious surfaces can be greater than just an increase in driveway width. These items would be further explored by the Public Works Committee.*

*The next example shows the front elevation of a home, aerial view and shows it meets code, and you get a sense of the flaring requirements within our code.*

*Code Administration - Requests to vary the 20' width requirements are currently made to the Public Works Director with appeals of the Director's decisions going to the Village Board. He noted that there have only been a few requests made to appeal the requirements in the last decade of which none have been approved.*

*Action Requested - Should Village Code be amended to allow a maximum driveway width greater than 20' at the front property line be supported. Comments from the Plan Commission will be shared with the Public Works Committee and/or the Village Board.*

*Chairperson Ryan requested the opinions and thoughts of the Commissioners.*

*Commissioner Burke indicated he did not support the request. He thought it was unreasonable that the driveway take up 37-50% of the frontage along the property line. He thought that most of the driveways in and out of Roosevelt Road that are commercial businesses don't even approach 30'. The residential area should be more restrictive and the 30' to 34' minimum at the apron is unreasonable. The examples shown in the PowerPoint of the properties that flared into the garage were objectionable enough but then adding extra pavement in the front along the parkway was over the top. He felt there is absolutely no reason to change.*

*Chairperson Ryan agreed with Commissioner Burke. He indicated that the Plan Commission spent a lot of time on the garage issue because of complaints that front garages were taking over the looks of the whole neighborhood. Now it feels like we are regressing and he doesn't agree with changing it.*

*Commissioner Cooper added that this issue contradicts the Green Building Handbook just discussed and is not in favor of any changes.*

*Commissioners Sweetser, Olbrysh, Flint and Nelson also stated they were not in favor of any changes.*

## **Adjournment**

[Play Video](#)

*The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.*

---

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission*

---

*Christopher Stilling, Secretary  
Lombard Plan Commission*