

June 5, 2008

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

Subject: PC 08-13: 19W471 Roosevelt Road and 351 E. Roosevelt Road (Lombard Crossings):

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition. The petitioner is requesting that the Village take the following actions on the subject property:

- A. Approve an annexation agreement.
- B. Annex the portion of the subject property not currently within the Village of Lombard.
- C. Approve a map amendment rezoning the entire property to the B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District.
- D. Approve a conditional use for a planned development, with the following companion conditional uses, deviations and variations, as follows:
 1. For Lot 1 (Parcel A):
 - a. Conditional uses pursuant to Sections 155.417(G)(2)(b)(2) and 155.417(G)(2)(b)(6) of the Zoning Ordinance for a bank/financial institution with a drive-through facility;
 - b. A deviation from Section 153.505(B)(19)(a)(2) of the Sign Ordinance to allow for more than one wall sign per street frontage;
 - c. A deviation from Section 155.417(G)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot area from 40,000 square feet to 36,400 square feet;

d. A deviation from Section 155.417(G)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot width from 150 feet to 137 feet.

2. For Lot 2 (Parcel B):

- a. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.417(G)(2)(c)(7) of the Zoning Ordinance for a shopping center, consisting of more than one principal business on a zoning lot;
- b. A deviation from Section 155.417(G)(5)(c) of the Zoning Ordinance reducing the required east interior side yard from ten feet (10') to one foot (1').

3. For Lot 3 (Parcel C):

- a. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.417(G)(2)(a)(5) of the Zoning Ordinance for a restaurant outside service/dining area;
- b. A deviation from Section 153.505 (B)(19)(a)(2) of the Sign Ordinance to allow for more than one wall sign per street frontage;
- c. A deviation from Section 155.417(G)(5)(c) of the Zoning Ordinance reducing the required east interior side yard from ten feet (10') to five feet (5').

4. For Lot 4 (Parcel D):

- a. A deviation from Section 154.506 (D) of the Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow for a lot without public street frontage;
- b. A planned development use exception for a storage center in the B4A District with a variation from Section 155.508 (B)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a use exception to exceed 40% of the total floor area for the overall planned development.
- c. A conditional use pursuant to Section 155.417(G)(2)(c)(6) of the Zoning Ordinance for a four story building, between 40 and 45 feet in height;

5. For Lot 5 (detention outlot Parcel E):

- a. A deviation from Section 154.506 (D) of the Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow a lot without public street frontage;

- b. A deviation from Section 154.507 (D) of the Subdivision and Development Ordinance requiring an outlot to have at least thirty feet (30') of frontage along a public street;
 - c. A deviation from Section 155.417 (G)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot area from 40,000 square feet to 19,000 square feet for a detention outlot; and
 - d. A deviation from Section 155.417 (G)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance to reduce the minimum lot width from 150 feet to 131 feet.
6. For each lot, grant a variation from Sections 155.706 (C) and 155.709 (B) of the Zoning Ordinance reducing the required perimeter parking lot and perimeter lot landscaping from five feet (5') to zero feet (0') to provide for shared cross-access and parking.
 7. Grant a variation from Sections 155.417 (G)(7) and (9) of the Zoning Ordinance to eliminate the ten percent (10%) open space requirement for individual lots.
 8. Approve the following Sign Ordinance deviations:
 - a. A deviation from Section 153.235 (A) to allow for two shopping center signs, where one is permitted; and
 - b. A deviation from Section 153.235 (E) to allow for shopping center signs to be located closer than 250 feet from each other.
 - c. A deviation from Section 153.234 (F) to allow for free-standing signs to be located closer than seventy-five feet (75') from the center line of the adjacent right-of-way; and
 9. Approve a preliminary major plat of resubdivision, with an alternate option that combines proposed Parcels B and C into a single lot of record.

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition on May 19, 2008. Chairperson Ryan asked if there was anyone to cross-examine the witnesses. Hearing none, he requested that the petitioner begin their presentation.

Drew Friestedt, Centrum Properties, 225 W. Hubbard Street, Chicago, presented the petition for the Lombard Crossings development in a PowerPoint format. He began by stating that he represents Centrum Properties and he gave the company's background and described the types of projects they do as well as the locations of each.

Referring to an aerial view of the proposed site location (which was highlighted in blue) Mr. Friestedt stated that these properties were former known as the Lombard Lanes and the O'Hare Towing properties and the site is approximately 4.6 acres in size. He then showed site photos before the buildings were razed.

He presented the history of the project mentioning that at the August 2007 Plan Commission meeting a proposal was approved and forwarded to the Village Board for final approval. Knowing that they did not have the support of the Village Board, they pulled the petition. Some of the issues that the Village Board had with their proposal were:

- a. did not want a fast food restaurant with a drive through
- b. compatibility with the Roosevelt Road Corridor Study
- c. the number and type of uses outlined in the annexation agreement
- d. the timing of the development outlined in the annexation agreement

They have since gone back and addressed those issues. He showed the site plan previously approved by the Plan Commission and described the drive-through bank with a fast food tenant, Del Taco. At the back of property was a 95,000 square foot storage facility.

They now have two new site plans, Option A and Option B. The difference between the two is in the location of the sit-down restaurant which affects the drive aisle and parking configurations. He then referred to Option A and described the site. The bank is still in the same location. There will be 12,500 square feet of retail with the retail building in the center. They have changed the fast food restaurant to a 5,700 square foot freestanding sit-down restaurant which was one of the issues the Board had. They spent six months negotiating with the team and came back with a plan for marketing purposes and one that was leasable. They still have the four-story storage use at the back of the property noting that they talked to a number of users for this space but could not attract anyone else to take the space. He then referred to other similar storage users in the area. Mr. Friestedt stated that if they do not have this use, they feel the site could not be marketable. Centrum also agreed to center the building and to limit the retail use to five tenants which is similar to what V-land has. Their original proposal asked for seven tenants.

The next issue was one that concerned Trustee Soderstrom - the timing of the development. The worry was having a bank anchored in the center of the site with a storage use in the back with nothing in the front. To address this concern, they added additional timing and building permit restrictions in the Annexation Agreement. With those three concessions they addressed the issues raised by the Board of Trustees.

He referred to Site Plan – Option B. Because they do not know if the restaurant will be freestanding or attached, they are asking for approval of both plans. Option B includes a reconfiguration of the parking areas by sliding the restaurant building down and integrating it with the retail space. The sit-down restaurant would be 6,000 square feet and would still have the outdoor dining component. The square footage of the retail component would stay the same.

He then showed the street view and bird's eye view renderings of the site. The building materials used are very similar but they incorporated some of staff's comments regarding color. They buildings are predominately brick with an EIFS corner and he proceeded to describe the remainder of the materials. He stated that all the building materials will be consistent.

The retail building elevations were shown next. The petitioner passed around the materials board to the Plan Commissioners and described that they are proposing to break up the retail building both vertically and horizontally and will change the brick color from the field color. They will have a cast stone base and a lintel consistent with the front and side of the building. The back will be mostly brick with a continuation of the precast lintel.

The bank elevations would be similar to the retail building. The color of the brick will match. Staff requested that at the base of the bank to replace the soldier coarse brick to stone.

Referring to the sign design slide he stated that this has not changed. It still matches in terms of color and scale and he described the same. The square footage of the signs are less than what is allowed by code-one is 70 square feet and the other is 115 square feet.

Mr. Friestedt then addressed how the site complies with the Roosevelt Road Corridor Study and addresses the concerns raised by Trustee Soderstrom. The site has a common and unified development theme, contains harmonious architectural elements, common materials and design color palette, and a shared parking field and shared access points with adjacent shopping center. It also has four-sided building elevations, provides green/open space, is pedestrian friendly, and contains decorative lighting.

He then turned the rest of the presentation over to Scott Novack.

Scott Novack, Centrum Properties, 225 W. Hubbard Street, Chicago, continued with the slide presentation. He stated that everything they are requesting is consistent with what they previously requested in August, 2007. This includes approval of an annexation agreement, annexing the 19W471 site, a map amendment rezoning the site to B4A which is consistent with the Roosevelt Road Corridor District, approval of a conditional use for a planned development with conditional uses, deviations and variations. They will have to subdivide the property into five lots which results in a need for certain deviations and variations such as side yards setbacks and lot deviations. These items are self imposed so the requested relief meets the standards. A slide depicting the five lots of record were shown and he described them.

Lot 1 or Parcel A is the bank parcel. They are requesting a conditional use for a bank as well as for a drive-through facility; deviation of the Sign Ordinance for more than one wall sign per street frontage. He indicated that they originally requested four signs but took the Plan Commissioners comments into consideration and now are only requesting three, one for the north, west and east elevations. They are also asking for a deviation to reduce the minimum lot

area from 40,000 square feet to 36,400 square feet and a deviation to reduce the minimum lot width from 150 to 137 feet.

Lot 2 or Parcel B is the retail parcel. They are requesting a conditional use for a shopping center consisting of more than one principal business and a deviation. This was a result of the B4A zoning. They are also requesting a deviation to reduce the required east interior side yard from ten feet to one foot.

Lot 3 or Parcel C is the freestanding sit-down restaurant. They are requesting a conditional use for an outdoor dining area, a deviation from the Sign Ordinance to allow for more than 1 wall sign per street frontage and a deviation reducing the required east interior side yard from 10 feet to 5 feet.

Lot 4 or Parcel D is the back parcel storage area. They are requesting a deviation from the Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow for a lot without street frontage, a planned development use exception for a storage center in the B4A district with a variation to allow a use exception to exceed 40% of the total floor area of the overall planned development and a conditional use for a 4-story building between 40 and 45 feet in height.

Lot 5 of Parcel E is the detention area. They are requesting a deviation from the Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow a lot without public street frontage, a deviation to reduce the minimum lot area from 40,000 square feet to 19,000 square feet and a deviation to reduce the minimum lot width from 150 to 131 feet.

Mr. Novack then cited the additional 6 requests from the Zoning and Sign Ordinances. Concluding, Mr. Novack stated that they have a number of consultants available and would be happy to answer any questions they might have.

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

William Heniff presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. Rather than repeating the petitioner's representations, he referenced many of the zoning actions for the project and selected comments included within the staff report.

He noted that upon annexation, the whole property would need to be zoned into a district that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Roosevelt Road Plan. Staff believes the property should be rezoned to the B4A District, consistent with the Roosevelt Road Plan recommendations. He also described many of the design elements encouraged or required within the B4 regulations or the Roosevelt Road Corridor report. Establishing a planned development for the entire development is an appropriate way to address the unique site constraints and phasing of the proposed development.

The B4A District lists financial institutions as conditional uses – this differs from the previous petition when banks were permitted by right. This change allows the Village to review the facility relative to the overall development plan. The Roosevelt Road Report noted that banks could provide value to a community if it is part of an overall planned development. While not attached to the retail building, the proposed plan integrates the use into the overall development through its common building design elements, shared access and integrated design.

When the petitioner was seeking initial approval of the development, the property was zoned B3 and the property met the B3 requirements. However, this relief was created as part of the overall B4A district designation. The issue of lot width and area was discussed as part of the Roosevelt Road Ad-Hoc Committee review. The Committee noted that a number of lots do not meet the lot provisions included within the B4A designation. Staff noted that for lots that do not meet the requirements, they could be designed in a manner that would allow the lots to functionally operate as if it was a larger lot.

Regarding the retail center itself, this use was previously a permitted use, but is now a conditional use within the B4A District. This designation allows the Village to look at the overall design of the facility relative to the overall B4A provisions and determine if the proposed design and layout meets the objectives of the Plan. The petitioner is proposing two options – a separate in-line center of 12,500 square feet and a unified center that includes the retail center component anchored by a sit-down restaurant. To address concerns regarding the tenants and uses in the center, the petitioner is amenable to a cap on the total number of tenant spaces at five, excluding the restaurant end-cap use. This was applied to the nearby V-Land Center and is intended to provide for larger store spaces, which may attract more destination related uses and retail businesses.

This interior yard relief is intended to allow the building to be located closer to the east property line of the abutting bank use. Staff finds this relief to be desirable as it allows for the other side of the center to be better utilized for outdoor dining and additional parking.

At this point in time, the final sit-down restaurant tenant is unknown, but the petitioner is preparing a final list for consideration within the annexation agreement itself. The proposed outdoor seating area location will be a function of the final design plan for the restaurant itself, but it will be located either on the east side of the building (in Plan A) or the west side (in Plan B). As noted in the Roosevelt Road Report, outdoor dining elements associated with restaurant establishments can be considered a desired amenity, provided that they do not create negative impacts on adjacent properties.

The wall sign relief is intended to provide for additional flexibility for the restaurant use, which would likely desire wall signs on the exterior walls visible from Roosevelt Road. Consistent with other restaurant uses and the proposed bank, staff does not object to the request. However such signage would be reviewed as part of the overall restaurant building elevations in the site plan approval process.

Lot 4 requires a deviation from the Subdivision and Development Ordinance to allow a lot without street frontage. Access to Lot 4 will be provided by means of cross access with Lots 1 through 3 of the proposed resubdivision. Lot 5 would be a detention outlot for the stormwater drainage of the project. Given the overall lot configuration, the grade issues and the built-in cross access provisions, and similar relief approved in a couple of other cases, staff does not object to this request.

The petitioner requests the right for a 95,000 square foot storage center to be located on Lot 4 (Parcel D). Storage centers are not listed as permitted or conditional use in the underlying B4A District. The petitioner indicated that they have not finalized a tenant for Lot 4 and have not submitted any building elevations or materials for the proposed building. The petitioner would like to establish the right for the use exception. Staff recommends as a condition of approval that site plan approval be required for Lot 4 to allow the Plan Commission to review building elevations and materials. In addition, should the petitioners choose not to move forward with the use exception for Lot 4, they can seek site plan approval for other uses permitted within the underlying B4A District.

Staff can conceptually support the storage center use given that the subject property is adjacent to two other storage uses including the U-Store-It storage center and the York Township Highway Department facility. Furthermore, there is a substantial change in grade with the elevation at the northern property line being as much as fifteen feet (15') higher than the elevation at the southern property line. The multi-story storage center building will not have as great of an impact when viewed from Roosevelt Road as a result of the grade change. Furthermore, the proposed storage center will provide additional screening of the York Township Highway Department facility to the south of the subject property.

A review of the plans estimated that the proposed Parcel B in Plan A would have about eight percent green space. However, given that the site is part of an overall planned development and the lot lines are intended to be more arbitrary, staff notes that this relief could be supported provided that the overall planned development meets the open space requirements of 12.5% of the area. Staff estimates that the open space will be about 15% of the planned development. This approach and requisite relief was also successfully implemented within the Highlands of Lombard planned development.

The petitioner's 2007 proposal requested approval of four freestanding signs proposed within the planned development. The new petition decreased the number from four to two. Staff can conceptually support the necessary relief to allow the two shopping center signs located at each of the access drives. Any signage for the bank and storage center will be incorporated into the shopping center signs.

He then reviewed the access and site design issues that were present in the 2007 petition and that they have not changed since last year. Staff recommends approval of the petition subject to a number of conditions.

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

Commissioner Olbrysh stated that he liked both site plans and the elevations looked good but thought that the south elevation should be spruced up. He liked their explanations as to the Village Board's concerns. He had assumed that the Village Board did not have any objections to the public storage facility. Mr. Friestedt stated that at the Village Board hearing the Board expressed concerns about having a storage use. Afterward, they went back and came up with the current plan by addressing other issues. By going into the market and testing the plan they believe the Board will now support it.

Commissioner Olbrysh indicated that he was on the Roosevelt Road Ad Hoc Committee and would have had a problem if the storage use was located on Roosevelt Road but since it was set back to the rear of the property you don't actually see the building. Mr. Friestedt mentioned the cross section studies they did and how you can only see the top 10-12 feet of the building based on a person being 6 feet tall. Commissioner Olbrysh stated that it will be very difficult to get anyone back there due to the drop in elevation. He thought it was a perfect use for that location on the site.

Chairperson Ryan commented that he was initially against the idea of a storage facility on the site and still was. He questioned the height of parcel B and how high the strip mall was going to be. Also how much will you see from Parcel D. Mr. Friestedt answered that the height of the parcel was 10-15 feet or a story and a half. The top of the parapet of the retail component could be 20-22 feet from grade so due to its height as well as the drop in grade, you will only see the top of the storage facility. He stated that they are aware that they will have to come back to the Plan Commission for site plan approval and will adhere to those requirements. It's a challenging piece of the project. Chairperson Ryan stated that when you come back for site plan approval for the storage facility and site elevations, he asked if the looks of it could be diminished. We are trying to build up Roosevelt Road and don't want to turn it into something not wanted.

Chairperson Ryan then stated his preference for Site Plan Option B. The restaurant and retail combined together make it a better looking facility and you can see the outdoor dining from the street. He then questioned how the south elevation might look having five tenants. Mr. Novack indicated they would update the elevation to show the number of doors. Chairperson Ryan indicated that with their previous proposal there were a larger number of doors for each tenant on that elevation which broke up the mass of the building. With five tenants it will be all brick so there is a need to tie it in with the other elevations. Mr. Novack indicated that using two colors would break up the building similar to the V-land project.

Commissioner Nelson asked about the access into the site when traveling westbound on Roosevelt Road. Mr. Heniff indicated that the center median lets you go either way. Westbound will have a full access or through cross access. Commissioner Nelson asked if there would be a turn lane. Mr. Heniff answered there would not be a dedicated one now just a shared access. IDOT will decide the appropriate striping pattern.

Commissioner Sweetser asked is there is a right turn lane to access the site while traveling eastbound on Roosevelt Road. Mr. Heniff answered that while proceeding east, the full access will not have a right turn lane but the other will. Commissioner Sweetser commented on how the trucks will be using the full access and how unfortunate it is that we cannot change the state route. Mr. Heniff answered that we could look at it as well as IDOT being that York Township would be running tandem trucks from that access. The petitioner will have to secure a permit from IDOT and the turning radii will have to accommodate those trucks.

Commissioner Flint stated he did not have a problem with the storage use being on the site. He mentioned that there is a storage facility to the west. He stated his preference for Option B as it will look better traveling eastbound, he preferred the location of the outdoor dining area and it has a more open feeling.

After due consideration of the petition and the testimony presented, the Plan Commission found that the petition does comply with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning, Sign and Subdivision and Development Ordinances and that granting approval of the planned development is in the public interest; and, therefore, I move that the Plan Commission accept the findings of the Inter-departmental Review report as the findings of the Plan Commission, and therefore recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of PC 08-13 subject to the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall develop the site and building in accordance with the following plans submitted as part of this request, except as modified by the conditions of approval:
 - a. Site Plan (with alternate Plan B Option), prepared by Hirsh Associates LLC dated April 15, 2008 and April 28, 2008.
 - b. Landscape Plan (includes preservation plan and development plan), prepared by Hirsch Associates LLC dated March 14, 2008.
 - c. Preliminary Plat of Subdivision prepared by B.H. Suhr & Company and dated April 11, 2008.
 - d. Building Elevations for proposed retail center, prepared by Hirsch Associates LLC dated April 15, 2008.
 - e. Building Elevations for proposed bank, prepared by Hirsch Associates LLC dated April 15, 2008.
 - f. Shopping Center Signage Plan prepared by Hirsch Associates LLC dated April 15, 2008.
 - g. Signage Plan for the proposed bank prepared by Icon Identity Solutions, dated February 15, 2007.
 - h. Preliminary Engineering (site dimensional and paving plan and utility plan), prepared by Manhard Consulting LTD, and April 11, 2008.
 - i. Proposed wall and freestanding lighting elements, prepared by Winscape and Hess America, no date.

2. That the petitioner shall enter into an annexation agreement with the Village for the subject property.
3. That the petitioner's building improvements shall be designed and constructed consistent with Village Code and shall also address the comments included within the IDRC report.
4. That any trash enclosure screening required by Section 155.710 of the Zoning Ordinance shall be constructed of material consistent with the principal building in which the enclosure is located.
5. To ensure that the proposed signage, awnings and building elevations present a favorable appearance to neighboring properties, the property shall be developed and operated as follows:
 - a. That channel lettering shall only be used for the wall signs.
 - b. That consistent with the Sign Ordinance, the awnings shall not include text in conjunction with the wall signage.
 - c. The planned development shall be limited to no more than two freestanding shopping center signs. The final placement of the signs shall be located in a manner that does not conflict with clear line of sight or utility easements.
 - d. That the fabric awnings on each of the proposed buildings shall be compatible.
 - e. All rooftop mechanical equipment shall be screened pursuant to Section 155.221 of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - f. The bank elevations shall replace the soldier course brick with the stone base proposed for the retail center and incorporate the center stone veneer proposed for the retail center.
 - g. The south building elevation of the retail center shall incorporate the similar alternating colored brick pattern as depicted on the north elevation and the stone veneer base, in order to break up the building mass.
 - h. The final building elevations for the retail center shall be limited to the minimum number of door entrances required by Village Fire Marshal.
6. To minimize parking conflicts on the property and to minimize impacts on adjacent properties, the developer/owner of the property shall allow for cross-access and cross parking between each lot within the proposed development.
7. The proposed sidewalk link shall be placed on a ramped island, with pedestrian crossing markings across the drive aisles.
8. The final development plan shall be modified to ensure that the parking stall space overhangs are in compliance with Village Code.

June 5, 2008

PC 08-13

Page 12

9. The use exception for a storage center shall only be for Lot 4 (Parcel D) of the planned development. The development of Lot 4 (Parcel D) shall be subject to site plan approval of the Village.
10. The building elevations for the proposed sit-down restaurant shall also be subject to site plan approval by the Village. The sit-down restaurant shall be permitted to have one wall sign on the north, west and east elevations, with the final design subject to site plan review.
11. Any outdoor dining areas shall be fenced around the perimeter of the dining area. The final design of the fence shall be subject to Village review and approval.
12. The petitioner shall dedicate to the Village a cross-access easement to provide access to the proposed detention outlot, with the final location to be denoted on the final plat of subdivision for the subject property.

Respectfully,

VILLAGE OF LOMBARD

Donald F. Ryan
Lombard Plan Commission

c. Petitioner
Lombard Plan Commission