



## **ANALYSIS**

### **SUBMITTALS**

This report is based on the following documents filed with the Department of Community Development:

1. Petition for Public Hearing.
2. Response to Standards.
3. Site Plan Overlay Sketch Plan.

### **DESCRIPTION**

The Walgreens Planned Development was approved by the Board of Trustees at the September 16, 2004 meeting. At that meeting, the abutting property owner requested that the proposed eight-foot high wall on the western edge of the development be extended further toward St. Charles Road to a point at least in line with the Walgreens building. The petitioner is bringing this petition forward to meet the abutting property owner's request. As the building is set back 20 feet from the property line (and, therefore, so is the fence), this will require variations from the Zoning Ordinance fence regulations.

### **INTER-DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW COMMENTS**

#### **Public Works**

Public Works has no comments at this time.

#### **Private Engineering Services**

From an engineering or construction perspective, PES has no comments.

#### **Building and Fire**

The Fire Department/Bureau of Inspectional Services has no objection to this request.

#### **Planning**

##### **Compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan**

The Comprehensive Plan recommends that the subject property be developed as part of the Central Business District – Mixed Use Area. The Walgreens Planned Development is consistent with the land use recommendations and appearance criteria of the Comprehensive Plan.

Compatibility with the Surrounding Land Uses

This petition is being brought forth specifically to improve compatibility with the adjacent residential property. The residential property owner has stated that he would prefer having the wall extended closer to St. Charles Road so that it is at least in line with the approved Walgreens building.

Compatibility with the Zoning Ordinance

The original planned development approval was approved subject to the following condition:

*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.*

Although the wall that was approved as part of the original planned development met all Code requirements, the modification requested by the abutting property owner requires two variations. The Zoning Ordinance requires that fences and walls within a front yard be no more than four feet high. Code also requires fences and walls within the clear line of sight area to be of open construction or no more than two feet tall.

Staff is supportive of this request for two main reasons. First, the wall will not have a great visual impact on the area. The building will be set back 20 feet from the front property line, so the wall would be in line with the building and not will appear as an additional encroachment.

Furthermore, staff does not see that this request would create a safety hazard. Clear line of sight areas are intended to preserve clear visibility. However, the drive-through immediately adjacent to the fence is a one-way drive that operates in a counter-clockwise direction, so there will not be any vehicles pulling out onto St. Charles Road. Vehicles turning into the drive-through would still have an unimpeded view of the sidewalk on either side of the driveway. Also, the wall will not interfere with the abutting property owner's clear line of sight area because the clear line of sight area for residential driveways is only 20 feet.

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the above findings, the Inter-Departmental Review Committee recommends that the Plan Commission make the following motion recommending **approval** of this petition:

Based on the submitted petition and the testimony presented, the requested relief complies with the standards required by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance; and,

Lombard Plan Commission  
Re: PC 04-34  
Page 4

Therefore, I move that the Plan Commission accept the findings and recommendations of the Inter-Departmental Report as the findings of the Plan Commission and I recommend to the Corporate Authorities **approval** of PC 04-34.

Inter-Departmental Review Group Report Approved By:

---

David A. Hulseberg, AICP  
Director of Community Development

DAH:JB:jd

H:\CD\WORDUSER\PCCASES\2004\PC 04-34\Report 04-34.doc