



## VILLAGE OF LOMBARD

255 E. Wilson Ave.  
Lombard, Illinois 60148-3926  
(630) 620-5700 Fax (630) 620-8222  
[www.villageoflombard.org](http://www.villageoflombard.org)

Date: TBD

**Village President**  
Keith T. Giagnorio

**Village Clerk**  
Liz Brezinski

**Trustees**  
Brian LaVaque, Dist. 1  
Anthony Puccio, Dist. 2  
Bernie Dudek, Dist. 3  
Andrew Honig, Dist. 4  
Dan Militello, Dist. 5  
Bob Bachner, Dist. 6

**Village Manager**  
Scott R. Niehaus

*"Our shared **Vision** for Lombard is a community of excellence exemplified by its government working together with residents and businesses to create a distinctive sense of spirit and an outstanding quality of life."*

*"The **Mission** of the Village of Lombard is to provide superior and responsive governmental services to the people of Lombard."*

Mr. Keith T. Giagnorio,  
Village President, and  
Board of Trustees  
Village of Lombard

**Subject: PC 24-07: 1308-1330 S. Meyers Road**

Dear President and Trustees:

Your Plan Commission transmits for your consideration its recommendation regarding the above-referenced petition.

The petitioner, Afsar Developers, LLC, requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property (1308-1330 S. Meyers Road), located within the Village of Lombard R1 Single-Family Residence District (1308 S. Meyers Road) and the DuPage County R-3 Single Family Residence District (1312-1330 S. Meyers Road) (cumulatively the "subject properties"):

1. Approve a Comprehensive Plan Map amendment for the subject properties from Estate Residential to Low Density Residential;
2. For the property at 1308 S. Meyers Road, approve a map amendment to rezone the property from the R1 Single-Family Residence District to the R2 Single-Family Residence District;
3. For the properties located at 1312-1330 S. Meyers Road, in conjunction with a request for approval of an annexation agreement and annexation into the corporate limits of the Village of Lombard, upon annexation, approve a map amendment to rezone the property from the R0 Single-Family Residence District to the R2 Single-Family Residence District;

4. Pursuant to Section 155.407(C) of Village Code, establish a new planned development for the subject properties to provide for development of 24 detached single-family residences, including relief from the following standards, as set forth more fully as follows:
  - a. Pursuant to Section 155.407(G)(2) of Village Code, approve a conditional use for building height not to exceed 38 feet or three stories;
  - b. Approve the following deviations and variations from Chapter 155 of Village Code (the Zoning Ordinance):
    - i. Pursuant to Section 155.407(D), a deviation in order to allow a development with a density of 6.14 dwelling units per acre where a density of 5.8 dwelling units per acre is allowed within the areas of Lots 1-24 and Outlot A as depicted in the Planned Development Site Plan (this will allow 24 dwelling units where 22.7 dwelling units are allowed, or 106% of the allowed density in the R2 District);
    - ii. Pursuant to Section 155.407(E), which requires a minimum lot width of 60 feet, deviations in order to allow individual lot widths less than 60 feet as depicted in the Planned Development Site Plan;
    - iii. Pursuant to Section 155.407(F)(1)(a)(iv), which requires a front yard of 30 feet, deviations in order to allow front yards of 20 feet on Lots 1-6 and 24 feet on Lots 7-24, as provided for in the Planned Development Site Plan and proposed preliminary plat of subdivision;
    - iv. Pursuant to Section 155.407(F)(2), which requires a corner side yard of 20 feet, deviations in order to allow corner side yards of one (1) foot on Lot 7 and Lot 24, as provided for in the Planned Development Site Plan;
    - v. Pursuant to Section 155.407(F)(3), which requires an interior side yard of six (6) feet, deviations in order to allow interior side yards of three (3) feet (eaves of two (2) feet not closer than one (1) foot from the lot line) on all lots, as provided for in the Planned Development Site Plan;
    - vi. Pursuant to Sections 155.510(A)(1) and Section 155.407(H), deviations in order to allow open space to be calculated across all parcels in the planned development rather than on a parcel-by-parcel basis, and to allow a development with 39% open space where 50% open space is required;
    - vii. Pursuant to Section 155.210 and 155.210(A)(2)(b), a variation in order to allow an above-ground utility cabinet before the principal building and allow the cabinet in front of the south and east walls of the building on Lot 6;
    - viii. Pursuant to Section 155.205(A)(1)(c), a variation in order to allow, as shown in the Landscape Plan and Planned Development Fence Plan, a 6-

foot fence on Outlot A at all locations (a portion of the north fence extends along the abutting front yard to the north) except near the Meyers Road and 14th Street driveways where a 4-foot fence is depicted;

- ix. Pursuant to Section 155.711, variations in order to allow innovative landscaping per the submitted Landscape Plan;
- c. Approve the following variations from Chapter 154 of Village Code (the Subdivisions and Development Ordinance):
- i. Pursuant to Section 154.304(D)(2) and Section 154.306(D)(2), variations in order to allow public improvements to the School Street and 14th Street rights-of-way depicted in the preliminary engineering plan, Planned Development Site Plan and Landscape Plan, as determined upon hearing and decision;
  - ii. Pursuant to Section 154.304(D)(3), Section 154.306(D)(3) and Section 154.309, variations in order to allow improvements to the Meyers Road right-of-way depicted in the preliminary engineering plan, Planned Development Site Plan and Landscape Plan, as determined upon hearing and decision;
  - iii. Pursuant to Section 154.407(A) and Section 154.503(D), variations in order to continue the existing widths of all abutting rights-of-way and pavement widths thereof;
  - iv. Pursuant to Section 154.506(D), variations in order to permit 24 lots with frontage on the private streets within the subdivision;
  - v. Pursuant to Section 154.510 and Section 150.301, variations in order to permit the driveways onto Meyers Road and onto 14th Street as depicted in the preliminary engineering plans and Planned Development Site Plan provided that the gate shall remain operable to allow entry by all vehicles without access control so as not to stack vehicles over the sidewalk or cause backing movements;
  - vi. Such other variations from Chapter 154, including those which exclude final landscape treatment from public improvements required to be completed prior to the initiation of the final ten percent (10%) of units but only to the extent required on lots that have not been certified for occupancy, as deemed necessary and appropriate;
- d. Approve the following deviation from Chapter 153 of Village Code (the Sign Ordinance):
- i. Pursuant to Section 153.232(B), a deviation in order to allow each subdivision sign at a height of six (6) feet, where a height of four (4) feet is permitted; and

5. Approve a preliminary plat of subdivision pursuant to Section 154.203(D).

After due notice and as required by law, the Plan Commission conducted a public hearing for this petition on June 3, 2024 and June 24, 2024. Sworn in to present the petition was Anna Papke, Planning and Zoning Manager, William Heniff, Community Development Director, and the following individuals representing the petitioner: Mark Daniel, attorney; Dan Bazigos, real estate professional; Joseph H. Abel; Jeff Cook, landscape architect; Jiun-Guang Lin, engineer; Hasan Syed; and Ahmed Irfan Khan, developer.

### **June 3, 2024**

*(Commissioners Spreenberg, Sweetser, Invergo, and Chair Giuliano present)*

Chairperson Giuliano read the Plan Commission procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine. She proceeded with the petition.

Mr. Khan introduced the development team. He described previous projects his development firm had undertaken in the region.

Mr. Khan explained the history of the petition, noting that his team had originally sought entitlements from DuPage County. The project design had undergone multiple revisions since the County considered the petition in February 2024. He said he had met with the neighbors in the adjacent York Center neighborhood and made many changes to the plan as a result of neighborhood feedback.

Mr. Daniel presented the petition, and admitted the application and exhibits to the record. He said there had been over 20 revisions to the plans for the proposed development. He described the subject property, located at 1308-1330 S. Meyers Road. He said the property had been a collection of various uses since the 1950s, including a former township equipment building, single-family houses, nonconforming contractor uses, and vehicle parking. He described several nonconformities and code enforcement actions undertaken on the various parts of the subject property over time.

Mr. Daniel said the neighborhoods on each side of School Street are quite different and had developed from two different plats of subdivision. He said the property on the west side is the York Center Co-op neighborhood, most of which is unincorporated. He noted this area cannot be forcibly annexed into the Village because it exceeds 60 acres. He said the property on the east side of School is the subject property with Meyers Road to the east of that. He noted other uses in the area including an elementary school, a Lombard public works facility, and unincorporated Oakbrook Terrace to the east of Meyers Road.

Mr. Daniel said the petitioner proposes an amendment to the Comp Plan and a rezoning of the subject property to R2. The current Comp Plan designation is Estate Residential. He noted the west side of School Street is already within the Village limits and is zoned R0. He described the multiple zoning districts on the block that includes the subject property, including commercial zoning along

Roosevelt Road and residential zoning on the south end of the block. He said that the Meyers Road corridor includes multiple zoning districts along its length within the Village. He said this was because Meyers Road is an arterial. Mr. Daniel said R2 is the most appropriate zoning designation for the Meyers Road corridor.

Mr. Daniel showed an aerial view of the proposed development and explained how it is different from the plan initially presented to DuPage County in February 2024. He said the currently proposed density is around six units per acre compared to 15 units per acre proposed with DuPage County. He said access to the development will be from Meyers Road and 14<sup>th</sup> Street, with no curb cuts on School Street.

Mr. Daniel showed a site plan and said the development will be 24 single-family homes on small lots. He said there would be a large amount of landscaping and fencing around the development. The fence was proposed in response to neighborhood concerns about screening the development. There will be gates at the entrances that will allow traffic to flow into the development without creating backups onto Meyers Road or 14<sup>th</sup> Street. He said there are no entrances from School Street except for a pedestrian gate.

Mr. Daniel showed proposed building elevations for the homes. He said the designs are modern and will include options for customization by buyers. There will be a balcony off a bedroom above the garages, and rear decks on the top floor of the houses. He said the rear decks were smaller than had previously been proposed with DuPage County.

Mr. Daniel showed the landscape plan. He said the landscaping would be controlled and maintained by the homeowners' association. He described the developer's proposal for landscaping adjacent to the development on the east side of School Street. The petitioner proposed to add some trees to neighboring properties on the west side of School Street at the request of those property owners. He showed the design of the proposed fence. Mr. Daniel said the petitioner had applied to amend the facilities planning area from Flag Creek to Glenbard.

He described the proposed stormwater design, including an underground vault for storage below the internal private driveway. There would be an easement over this area to allow the Village access to the stormwater vault if necessary.

Mr. Daniel said the developer proposed a sidewalk on School Street in compliance with Village Code. He said some nearby property owners had expressed a preference for no sidewalks on School Street, but other neighbors prefer a sidewalk. He said the proposed plan reflects what the Village would require for the development. He noted the gates into the development are set back far enough to allow two cars to wait without obstructing the right-of-way. He showed the utility plan for water and sanitary service.

Mr. Daniel showed the proposed sign plans and said the petitioner is requesting variances to permit signs 6' in height, which is higher than would be permitted by right. He said the additional height is necessary to provide visibility to drivers.

Mr. Daniel showed the architectural floor plans, which include a fully finished basement. He showed floor plans for the first, second and third/rooftop floor. The rear balcony was shown. He said these balconies would be above the perimeter of the development. He said the neighbors had expressed concerns about noise coming from rooftop decks. Mr. Daniel said the proposed development would be residential and would generate the same type of noise as the other residential uses in the neighborhood. Mr. Daniel said the developer had revised the plans to include a four-foot-tall solid precast wall plus a two-foot glass partition on top of the precast wall. This was intended to reduce the amount of sound coming from the balconies. He showed some graphics to explain how the barrier would stop sound, and how the amount of sound generated by people talking on the balconies compares to other types of ambient noise.

Mr. Daniel said the petitioner is seeking zoning relief. He said there were a lot of requested pieces of relief, but they are all intended to create a high-quality development. The petitioner is seeking a conditional use to allow buildings with a peak roof height of 38 feet. This will allow for a diversity of building designs. Mr. Daniel said that the property is currently zoned R3 under the DuPage County zoning ordinance, which allows buildings of up to 36 feet, with increases permitted for additional setbacks from the perimeter. Mr. Daniel said the proposed height is in line with what is allowed on other properties in the area of the subject property. Mr. Daniel said there had been a concern that the development would block sunlight on the east side of Meyers Road. He said the development would create a maximum of 11 minutes of shadow. He said there would not be a lot of shadow difference between buildings that are 36 feet and 38 feet high.

Mr. Daniel said there had been concerns about parking. There will be up to six parking spaces available for each unit. He said there were concerns expressed about overflow parking on nearby streets. He said that kind of parking on the street was already occurring and showed pictures. This was normal and to be expected in residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Daniel said the subject property is different from the York Center Co-op neighborhood. He said the developer is trying to bring something new to the area, but it will not negatively impact the York Center neighborhood. He showed pictures of some of the nonconforming uses on the subject property and said those uses would be removed, which would be to the benefit of the area.

Mr. Cook, landscape architect, addressed the Plan Commission. He said the revised plan with more space and fewer units [compared to proposal presented to DuPage County] had increased opportunities for landscaping. The proposed plan meets or exceeds the Village landscape requirements. He said the perimeter landscaping was enhanced with trees and perennials. He mentioned the proposed plantings on neighboring properties. He said there would be landscaping between each single-family house.

Mr. Lin, project engineer, addressed the Plan Commission. He said there are no wetlands or floodways on the subject property. He said the project will comply with Village and County requirements for stormwater. Stormwater will be handled by a combination of storm sewers, underground detention, and best management practices. He describe the water and sanitary sewer connections. He described drainage improvements within School Street, including a swale. He mentioned the proposed sidewalk and streetlights in School Street. The Village had already reviewed fire truck maneuvering within the proposed development. He said the Village staff had

already reviewed the engineering and there had been no significant concerns; all outstanding comments would be addressed in final engineering.

Mr. Daniel noted that the development proposed to the County would have been 30 units with six units reserved for workforce housing. He said the revised plan before the Village did not include any workforce housing and would be 24 single-family units. He introduced Mr. Bazigos, real estate agent, to testify to the marketability of the proposed housing.

Mr. Bazigos addressed the Plan Commission. He said available housing inventory is low in Lombard. He said there were a lot of desirable features of Lombard. He said the subject property is different from the surrounding community. He said the developer had addressed a lot of the concerns from the neighborhood. He said the project would provide luxury homes that would be a net benefit to the community. He said taxing bodies would benefit.

Mr. Daniel introduced Joe Abel. He said Mr. Abel would address the proposed zoning of the property to the R2 District.

Mr. Abel, planning and zoning consultant, addressed the Plan Commission. He said he had been involved in this area since 1970 and had been the planning director for DuPage County in the 1970s and 1980s. The subject property had remained underdeveloped since that time. He said the proposed development would redevelop half the block, which would be a positive outcome. He said the development was consistent with the character of surrounding development and was a golden opportunity for the Village.

Mr. Daniel said he had been trying to put together a development on the subject property since 2019. The current petitioner, Afsar Developers, had been able to assemble the land and develop a plan. Mr. Daniel said ordinary zoning would not support redevelopment on the property. He said the petition meets the standards for the zoning entitlements requested by the petitioner. Mr. Daniel concluded the petitioner's presentation.

At the request of Chair Giuliano, Attorney Skrodzki explained the difference between cross examination and public comment.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if any person would like to cross examine.

Albert Rago cross examined the petitioner. He said the sound study was limited to one speaker. Had the petitioner considered the impact of 12 points of sound spread across the development.

Mr. Daniel said multiple points of sound had been considered. Based on his review online regarding sound, the spacing of the homes eliminated the concern for multiple points of sound impacting one resident.

Mr. Rago asked if there had been an acoustic study. Mr. Daniel said they did not retain a sound study for residential development.

Mr. Rago asked if Mr. Daniel had discounted the impact of multiple sound points on the neighborhood. Mr. Daniel said sound was not considered an issue due to the spacing of the proposed houses.

Mr. Rago asked if any of the trees planted along School Street would be tall enough to block vision or sound from residents 30 feet in the air on rooftop decks. Mr. Daniel said some trees would be tall enough and others would not due to proximity of power lines. Trees within the property could be taller. Trees may soften and dissipate sound.

Mr. Rago said it was not a complete narrative to say trees may abate sound because it would not be complete coverage of trees. Mr. Daniel said the petitioner's sound analysis had not accounted for any additional abatement provided by landscaping.

Mr. Rago asked about the height requirement in R2. Mr. Daniel said it is 30 feet, with a requested conditional use up to 38 feet.

Mr. Rago asked about the density limits for R1 and R2. Mr. Daniel said R2 is 5.8 units per acre. R1 is in the range of four units per acre.

Mr. Rago asked about the setback limits for R1 and R2 zoning. Mr. Daniel said density in R2 is 5.8 units per acre, front yard 30 feet, corner side yard 20 feet, rear yard 25 feet, interior side yard six feet. He said there was no issue with setbacks on the perimeter but there was some relief for interior setbacks. Proposed density was 6.14 units per acre.

Mr. Rago asked how many listings there were for units above \$1.4 million. Mr. Bazigos said it would be a small amount.

Mr. Rago asked Mr. Bazigos asked how many people he talked to looking for large homes priced above \$1 million. Mr. Bazigos said there are a lot of individuals looking for that kind of property, but not many such properties.

Sandra Vega cross examined. She asked about the timeline for the development. Mr. Daniel said the development would start as early as September on the north end of the site. The houses would be constructed with pre-cast materials. Mr. Khan provided additional explanation of the construction details. He estimated a two- to three-year timeline.

Ms. Vega asked if there was a possibility the construction would exceed three years. Mr. Khan said he hoped not.

Ms. Vega asked how the developer would assure there were no impacts to access to the York Center neighborhood during construction. Mr. Daniel said there would be limited road closures and they would be controlled by the Village. Construction staging would occur on the subject property. A public improvement agreement would govern some aspects of construction.

Ms. Vega asked about the plans for overflow visitor parking given that there would be six bedrooms in each unit. Mr. Daniel said every household has different experiences and parking



needs. He said you could not assume every bedroom would equal a car. He said the county requires 2.5 parking spaces per unit and the Village's parking requirement is similar.

Ms. Vega asked if there is any plan for guest or overflow parking in the development. Mr. Daniel said there are four parking spaces worth of guest parking in each driveway.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if any person would like to cross examine. Hearing none, she asked if anyone wanted to offer public comment.

Ms. Papke said that staff had received several written comments from members of the public that were included in the Plan Commissioners' packets. Staff had received three additional comments after packet distribution. These additional comments had been provide to the Plan Commission at the beginning of the meeting, and Ms. Papke read them into the record.

Tomas Novickas addressed the Plan Commission. He lives in the York Center neighborhood and drives past the development site daily. He is not generally against development but feels it should be done to a high standard. He said the development proposed to DuPage County would have had adverse effects on the community. He opened a dialogue with the developers and made suggestions for the development. He said the plan had changed over the months in response to this engagement. He said the developer had added quite a few of his suggestions, including removing driveway access from school street, density reduction, making sure parking lots are not adjacent to the neighborhood, increased setback from School Street, perimeter fence, parkway plantings, staggering of units, maximizing shrubs along fence line, redesign of rooftop deck to reduce noise, and construction process considerations. He said the developer had incorporated many of the items that he would have otherwise asked the Plan Commission to consider. He was impressed by the development team and their commitment to working with the community. He did not want to minimize the concerns of any of his neighbors but wanted to point out changes that had already occurred. Mr. Novickas remained concerned about maximizing parkway plantings on 14<sup>th</sup> Street and the possibility of installing streetlights on School Street. He said the York Center neighborhood is dark and he would prefer not to have streetlights.

Tim Murray asked if staff would detail what they had considered with the developments being proposed around the community, including the current proposal as well as a restaurant development that was considered by the Plan Commission in May. He asked how staff had considered neighborhood concerns about light, noise, and other impacts. Attorney Skrodzki said that question would be more appropriately asked after the staff report, as it may be addressed in staff's presentation of the staff report.

Tom Rottmann, 1400 S. Meyer Road, said that he lived to the south of the proposed development. He said the developer met individually with some neighbors but not all, and some changes were made to the plan that did not incorporate all concerns, including moving the driveway to 14<sup>th</sup> Street, near his house. Regarding parking he said that he had a gathering at his house recently and his guests had parked on the street. He was offended that Mr. Daniel had used a picture of street parking in front of Mr. Rottmann's house in his presentation of the petition. Mr. Rottmann said he experienced noise and odor impacts from the Village pump house located next door to his house.

He said development generally brings impacts and he hopes the Plan Commission will consider this. He said he is for the project but not for the density or the height.

Ken Franklin said he lived west of the proposed development. He was concerned about the minimal separation between the buildings and said the density is too great. He asked the Plan Commission to deny the requested variances. He said the York Center neighborhood is dark and a safe neighborhood and there is no issue walking down the street in the dark.

Melissa Schmitz said Mr. Daniel had referred to a boarded-up house in York Center Co-op. She said that house was undergoing restoration after a fire. She asked that the Plan Commission not approve the variances requested.

Doris Dornberger said there had been conflicting information about the number of bedrooms in the proposed houses. She said the Village needed to plan for the houses to be occupied by two people per bedroom. She said there were only two entrances into the York Center neighborhood, one on 14<sup>th</sup> Street and one on School Street. She was concerned about added congestion, and how children in the neighborhood would get to school. She was concerned about the number of units.

Marvin Holt said he owns the house that was damaged by fire and is undergoing repairs. He asked if anyone had considered the compatibility of the proposed development with the surrounding neighborhood.

Kristin Dominguez said she lives across the street from the proposed development. She said the developer had made a lot of concessions in revising the plan from the original proposed plan presented to the County. She said several residents had met with the developer, at which time the developer said their target market was empty nesters. She said the proposed 6,000 square foot homes would be too much development for the site. She said the Co-op included 75 homes on 100 acres. She compared this to the density of the proposed development. She was concerned about the height of the proposed houses and the presence of rooftop decks. She said there would be too much noise from the rooftop decks and patios around the houses. She was concerned about traffic. She was concerned about the pedestrian gate at 13<sup>th</sup> and School and gatherings within the proposed development leading to traffic in the York Center neighborhood. She said the development would change the quality of life in the neighborhood. She asked the Plan Commission to reject the requested variances.

Umar Haque said he has lived in Lombard for six years. He is a member of the Village community promotion and tourism committee and has worked with the Village on community issues. His family chose to live in Lombard because the people in the community are active. He said it was challenging to find a large house that met the needs of his family, and he would have liked something like the houses being proposed. He knew other people looking for similar homes. He was excited about the project. He asked those in the audience to raise their hands if they were interested in seeing the project move forward. He said he understood the concerns expressed but also that he hoped the project would be approved.

Anne Garcia asked for a show of hands from audience members living in the community adjacent to the proposed development. She said Mr. Daniel had referred to the York Center neighborhood

as an HOA. She said it is not a typical HOA. It is a voluntary social organization, and the York Center HOA does not represent the view of the entire community. She said Mr. Daniel and the developer had met with a few neighbors. She said the entire community would have welcomed the opportunity to meet with the developer, and that the neighborhood meeting held by the developer at the York Center Park District facility had not been sufficient. She asked the Village to consider where snow would be stored when the internal drive was plowed. She asked for an analysis of what would happen to the well water of surrounding neighborhoods that could be at risk for well water running dry. She asked for review of the existing trees on the subject property. She asked the Village to respect the quality of life of the York Center residents who had moved to the area for the rural setting. She asked the Village to honor its mission statement by upholding quality of life. She thanked the developer for listening to the community and listening to their concerns. She said the York Center neighborhood welcomes everyone and looks forward to change but wants it done right.

Saleem Waheed said he had lived in Lombard for eight years and was excited by the potential new development in Lombard.

Theresann Purkart said this development did not fit in with Lombard. She expressed concern with the design of the buildings. She was concerned about future residents impacting the community. She said she lived at 14<sup>th</sup> and Addison, and was concerned about safety due to traffic in the neighborhood.

Lila Wasserman said she appreciated the accommodations the developer has made. She felt the proposed density is too high. She said she had seen a large number of cars parked at a house in the surrounding neighborhood during a party. She was concerned about overflow parking of cars from the proposed development. She was concerned about noise and light pollution.

Mannan Syed said he chose to live in Lombard because he has a number of family members living in Lombard. He said he had many family members who would like to move to the area but there is no inventory of available housing. He said houses in the Village sell very quickly. The proposed development would be an opportunity for more people to live in the neighborhood. He was in favor of the proposed development.

Ali Rizavi said he previously lived in Chicago and moved to Lombard for the community and schools. As his family grew they needed a larger house and were unable to find a house to suit them. He said there is a demand for the type of housing the developer is proposing. He appreciated the neighborhood concern about density, but also noted some areas of the Village with higher densities of housing.

Fateh Shams signed up to speak but had to leave the meeting prior to public comment. Ms. Giuliano read the following comment into the record: "As a former Lombard resident and current owner of two properties on 13<sup>th</sup> and Meyers I am in favor of this development. I moved to Lemont due to not having sufficient housing in Lombard."

Doris Dornberger said a realtor had told her about several homes in Lombard selling for more than \$1 million. She shared some details of those properties.

Sandra Vega said she was actively trying to certify her yard as a wildlife preserve. She said there were people in the area who had chosen to live in the area because of the lack of density. She said she would consider leaving the area if the petition were approved.

Albert Rago said the character of the area would change if the development were approved. He said he believed change is inevitable and the developer had tried to take the opinions of the neighborhood into consideration. He said high density and low density developments should be blended by buffering development, and he did not believe the proposed development would accomplish this. He said the development should be designed to comply with the R2 zoning regulations as written. He said 24 units on the land was excessive and motivated by profit. He asked the Plan Commission to take quality of life and buffering into consideration. He mentioned the impacts of noise and traffic.

John Zeman said the proposed development was incongruous with the existing community. He said communities in the area have high density development near downtowns or commercial corridors. He said six to twelve units would fit on the property. He said the proposed plan is more consistent with Chicago development or downtown Wheaton or Evanston development.

Kenneth Stein said he was concerned about light pollution. He said there had been no mention about a traffic light at 14<sup>th</sup> Street and School Street, but he thought one might be necessary. He questioned Mr. Daniel's statement that York Center could not be annexed by the Village. He suggested that residential development would be more appropriate on Roosevelt Road. He did not support houses that would require a lot of energy.

Theresann Purkart said the Plan Commissioners should consider whether they would want to live next to the proposed development. If the answer was no, then the Plan Commission should reconsider the petition.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if any person would like to cross examine or speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment. Hearing none, she asked for the staff report.

Ms. Papke presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. The subject property is a 3.9-acre tract of land at 1308-1330 S. Meyers Road. There are six parcels of land within the subject property. Existing development includes several single-family residences, nonconforming commercial uses, and vacant parcels. The majority of the subject property is unincorporated. The petitioner is requesting annexation of the property at 1312-1330 S. Meyers Road, rezoning of the entire subject property to R2, and establishment of a planned development to allow for construction of 24 single-family homes on small lots in a gated community. The density of the proposed development is 6.14 units per acre. Individual lots will take access from an interior private drive. Access to the public roadway network will be from driveways on Meyers Road and 14<sup>th</sup> Street.

Currently, the subject property is designated Estate Residential on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map. Estate Residential areas are characterized by single-family homes on large lots, with a net density of four or fewer units per acre. The petitioner is requesting the Comp. Plan designation

be amended to Low Density Residential, which is characterized by single-family homes on moderate sized lots, with a net density of six or fewer dwelling units per acre. The majority of single-family development in the Village is designated Low Density Residential. The existing Estate Residential designation reflects past platting and an expectation on the part of the Village that the subject property would be developed with single-family residences on large lots. However, this development expectation has not come to fruition. Aerial photos show that development on the subject property is largely unchanged since 1956, and staff has consistently received feedback from the development community that there is little market demand for large-lot single-family residential development in this area. In light of these circumstances, the Plan Commission conducted a workshop session in April 2024 in which Commissioners considered future development potential for the subject property. The Plan Commission expressed support for amending the Comp. Plan to allow for increased density on the subject property. Staff finds that the proposed Low Density Residential Comp. Plan designation reflects a more realistic development expectation for the subject property than the present Estate Residential designation. Staff notes that a moderate density development on the subject property can act as a buffer between Meyers Road and the residential development to the west. This is a common development pattern along the Meyers Road corridor.

Along with the Comp. Plan amendment, the petitioner is requesting the property be rezoned to R2. Staff finds this zoning designation will be consistent with other land uses in the surrounding neighborhood. As with the proposed Comp. Plan designation, the R2 zoning will create a transition area between Meyers Road and the low density residential neighborhood to the west.

The petitioner is seeking approval of a planned development with deviations for density and several other bulk requirements to address specific circumstances in the proposed plan. Ms. Papke said that the proposed site layout of the development is different from that of most single-family residential developments in the Village, which are composed of individual homes on standard-sized lots with frontage on public streets. The Zoning Ordinance does not anticipate the type of development proposed by the petitioner, where small lots front a private internal drive and much of the interior and perimeter areas of the development are owned by a homeowners' association. Village Code provides for planned developments with deviations from the bulk requirements as a zoning mechanism to accommodate development that is deemed to be in the public interest but that would not otherwise be permitted by the underlying zoning district. Having reviewed the petitioner's proposal, staff found that it meets the standards for planned developments with deviations and variations.

Ms. Papke summarized the requested bulk deviations as follows:

- *Lot area (density) and lot width.* Lots in R2 are required to be a minimum of 7,500 square feet, which computes to 5.8 dwellings per acre. The proposed plan includes lots ranging from 4,600 to 6,900 square feet. Density will be 6.14 units per acre. Village Code allows planned developments with residential densities greater than allowed in the underlying zoning district so long as the number of dwellings does not exceed by more than 40% the number of units permitted by right. The underlying R2 District would allow 22.6 units on the property; the request for a density increase to allow 24 units is less than 40% over the allowable density. Lot widths range from 38 to 63 feet; minimum lot width in R2 is 60 feet.

Lot area and lot width deviations are driven by the compact nature of the design as well as the proposed subdivision that will put significant portions of the site into an outlot owned by the homeowners' association.

- *Setbacks.* The petitioner is proposing deviations to allow reductions in front yard setbacks. The front yards of the proposed lots face the interior private drive aisle. The reduced front yard setbacks will allow for staggering of front facades and minimum 30-foot rear yard setback adjacent to the perimeter of the development. The petitioner also requests reductions in side yard setbacks between houses. All setback reductions impact lot lines interior to the development. Required setbacks from the perimeters will be maintained.
- *Open space.* The petitioner proposes to provide 39% open space. Required minimum open space is 50%. The requested deviation reflects the compact nature of the development.
- *Fencing, landscaping, and utility cabinet placement.* The petitioner is requesting deviations to accommodate proposed fencing, landscaping treatments, and utility cabinet placement. The petitioner is requesting these deviations to address site-specific concerns.

In addition to the bulk deviations, the petitioner is requesting a conditional use for building height. The R2 District allows buildings to be 30 feet tall by right. Buildings up to 45 feet tall are conditional uses. The petitioner is proposing several potential building elevations, with the tallest having a peak height of 38 feet. The Village Code measures building height to the mean level between the eaves and the peak of a roof. For the sake of clarity given the number and variation among the proposed elevations, the petitioner is requesting a conditional use for a peak building height of 38 feet. Staff has reviewed the request and finds it is consistent with the standards for conditional uses. Staff notes that the buildings are set back between 30 and 40 feet from the perimeters of the development. Further, the development is surrounded by public streets on three sides. These large setbacks will minimize the visual impact of the buildings to adjacent properties.

The petitioner is requesting several deviations from the Subdivisions and Development Ordinance, which Ms. Papke summarized as follows:

- *Right-of-way improvements.* The School and 14<sup>th</sup> Street rights-of-way are underimproved streets with roll curbs. There are no sidewalks on either street side abutting the subject property and no streetlights except for a light at the corner of School and 14<sup>th</sup>. Village Code requires the petitioner to bring both rights-of-way up to fully improved status, including streetlights and sidewalks. In response to resident concerns about light spillover, the petitioner is proposing to install streetlights on the sides of the streets adjacent to the development. Sidewalks will be installed adjacent to the development and the roll curbs maintained as an existing condition. The Village has granted similar deviations in circumstances where it is impractical or not feasible for the developer to re-engineer the right-of-way.
- *Variations for lots with frontage on a private drive.* The lots will not front a public street, as required by Village Code. This is due to the petitioner's proposed platting and the design of the development.

- *Driveway connections to 14<sup>th</sup> Street and Meyers Road.* The petitioner has worked with the Village and DuPage County on the design of the 14<sup>th</sup> Street and Meyers Road driveways, respectively. The petitioner has requested deviations to acknowledge the driveway designs.

The petitioner is requesting a deviation for the height of two proposed subdivision signs that have a peak height of six feet. The signs are intended to echo the design of the houses in the development. Staff has no objection to the deviation.

Ms. Papke said that the development meets parking requirements for single-family homes. Each house will have two garage spaces, plus spaces for two to four cars in the driveways connecting to the internal private drive. KLOA, the Village traffic consultant, had evaluated the development proposal and provided a memo summarizing their findings on the impact of the development on local traffic volumes and circulation on adjacent roadways. She introduced Javier Millan of KLOA to summarize the KLOA findings.

Mr. Heniff asked for procedural clarity on whether the petitioner should be allowed to rebut the public comments that were made before the staff report. Attorney Skrodzki said the petitioner could respond either before or after the staff report. Chair Giuliano asked if the KLOA summary was part of the staff report, and upon hearing that it was, directed Mr. Millan to present his findings after which Mr. Daniel would be offered time to respond to public comment on behalf of the petitioner.

Mr. Millan presented the KLOA findings. He said KLOA had conducted a site plan and traffic evaluation on behalf of the Village. As part of the evaluation, KLOA conducted several visits to document existing operation of adjacent roads. Mr. Millan described the existing roadway network. He noted the York Center Elementary School is near the site. Bus queuing occurs along 14<sup>th</sup> Street, and parent pickup/drop off occurs internally on the school property. No significant backups were observed on 14<sup>th</sup> Street. Regarding the proposed development, KLOA recommends outbound movements from the 14<sup>th</sup> Street and Meyers Road driveways be under stop sign control.

Estimated traffic generation is based on proposed land use and size of the development. KLOA conducted a conservative traffic generation evaluation, with no reduction applied for potential use of public transit. Based on the latest Institute of Traffic Engineers data, KLOA estimated a total trip generation of 25 or fewer trips in and out of the site during the weekday morning, afternoon, and evening peak hours. The proposed development is projected to increase traffic within nearby intersections by approximately 1% during all three peak hours. No exclusive turn lanes into the site are necessary. The development will have minimal impact on adjacent roadways and intersections.

Ms. Papke said that in summary, staff found the petition and the development plan met the standards for Comp. Plan map amendments, rezoning, and requested conditional uses, deviations and variations, and recommended approval of the petition subject to the conditions noted in the staff report.

Chair Giuliano invited Mr. Daniel to respond to the public comments. In response to concerns about impact to traffic around York Center School, Mr. Daniel said he had spoken to school staff, who indicated they do not need to alter traffic patterns around the school in the manner that some schools do. As far as children walking to school, Mr. Daniel said there will be a cross walk on 14<sup>th</sup> Street. He said there is also a controlled crosswalk at the stoplight at 14<sup>th</sup> and Meyers. He noted the number of driveways on Meyers Road had been reduced to reduce impact on Meyers.

He said the development team had talked to the neighbors but had not identified anyone as a representative of the entire neighborhood. There was a neighborhood meeting held in May that was attended by 40-50 neighbors. He said snow and waste hauling had been discussed at the neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Daniel said the purpose of showing pictures of street parking was to show that area residents already park in the street on occasion. The proposed development would be no different in that regard.

Responding to statements in some of the written comments read into the record, Mr. Daniel said there are no wetlands on the subject property. He said the density in the York Center Co-op neighborhood is limited by virtue of the amount of floodway in that area.

He said the petitioner did not do a noise study because the proposed development is residential, not commercial or public institutional.

He said prospective purchasers would not intend to have two people in a bedroom. Prospective purchasers are looking for room to spread out. There is no workforce housing proposed as part of this plan. He said the proposed density is 6.14 units per acre. The development would generate taxes for taxing bodies. He said the proposed density is important to the feasibility of the development.

He said the proposed development would remove a number of nonconformities. There should be no impacts from lighting or light pollution.

Mr. Daniel said School Street is a line of demarcation between two subdivisions. The subject property is not part of the York Center neighborhood.

Mr. Daniel asked Mr. Syed to address testimony on price points and market demand. Mr. Syed said there is a single-family residential subdivision under construction on 20<sup>th</sup> Street where homes are being sold for over \$1 million, with less square footage than the proposed homes on the subject property. Mr. Syed said there is a market demand for this price point in Lombard.

Mr. Khan said the development team is trying to bring the type of development to Lombard that has been seen in other communities in the region. He concluded the petitioner's response to public comment.

Mr. Heniff provided a response to the earlier question from Mr. Murray about staff rationale for making recommendations on petitions. He said that the developer had previously proposed a 30-



unit development to DuPage County. At that time, the Village sent a letter expressing concerns about density, curb cuts and how the proposed development would pertain to the Village's Comp Plan and Zoning Ordinance, given that it was within the Village's planning boundary. He said the Village understood a lot of the concerns the neighborhood had with the plan proposed to the County. He said a lot of those issues had been addressed with the revised plan being presented to the Village, with the revised plan having fewer units and being single-family units rather than townhomes. He said the goal was to come up with the best development possible, which was the rationale for the planned development approach. He noted that a lot of the traffic and circulation concerns had been addressed with the revised plan with reduced curb cuts and internal driveways that could accommodate guest parking.

Mr. Heniff said there had been a workshop on the subject property where the Plan Commission considered the possible future development options for the property. He said that there were also a number of nonconformities on the subject property, and the proposed development would remove nonconformities and replace them with single-family residential development. Mr. Heniff said these were some of the things that the Village considered when looking at the proposed development. He said the proposed development was 6.14 units per acre, which is very close to the 5.8 units per acre in many of the Village's residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Heniff said there had been some references to the proposed development being high density residential. He said the Comp Plan defines high density as 20 units per acre. He said the Village had been concerned with the plan presented to the County, which would have had a density of 15 units per acre.

He said the vision documents guiding development are the Village's Comprehensive Plan and the zoning regulations. The Comp Plan had recommended single-family residential development on the subject property for decades. The proposed development would be single-family residences. In reference to another property on Roosevelt Road which was the subject of a petition considered by the Plan Commission in May 2024, that property had been identified for commercial uses for decades and the proposed development was commercial in nature.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were any questions or comments on the staff report, or if anyone wanted to cross examine staff.

Tim Murray cross examined. He asked if staff had considered the impact of the proposed developments on Roosevelt Road [855 E. Roosevelt] and the subject property on the neighborhood. He said he had not heard an answer to this question in Mr. Heniff's statement.

Mr. Heniff said that any time a development is proposed, staff looks at all aspects of the development, including land use and density and how they related to code provisions. Staff looks at stormwater and makes sure the development will meet stormwater code provisions and not create impacts to the neighborhood. Staff looks at whether the development meets provisions for public improvements like streetlights and sidewalks. He said landscaping was taken into consideration. The petitioner is proposing landscaping that exceeds code requirements in response to neighborhood concerns. KLOA provided an analysis of traffic generation by the development to make sure there would not be adverse impacts. The idea is to go through a list of potential

impacts and also to determine how the development meets or does not meet the standards in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Murray asked if there was any specific time during the staff analysis that staff had considered the impact of the two developments on the community.

Mr. Heniff said he believed staff had done this. Mr. Heniff said the entire Plan Commission process was intended to identify potential impacts and weigh them against the Village's code provisions. The process included notification of residents of the petition so that they have the opportunity to learn about the petition and make public comment as had been done earlier in the proceedings. He said petitions were discussed internally by multiple departments in order to identify potential impacts or issues.

Chairperson Giuliano asked if there were any questions or comments on the staff report. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing. She asked for a motion to continue the proceedings to a future date for Plan Commission discussion.

On a motion by Commissioner Invergo and a second by Commissioner Spreenberg, the Plan Commission voted to continue the petition to June 17, 2024

#### **June 17, 2024**

*(Commissioners Spreenberg, Sweetser, Johnson, Verson, and Chair Giuliano present)*

Chair Giuliano announced the proceedings for PC 24-07, which was a continuation of the proceedings from the June 3, 2024, meeting. She said the public hearing portion of the proceedings had been completed on June 3, and the proceedings this evening would resume at Plan Commissioner discussion.

Attorney Skrodzki re-swore in the witnesses.

Commissioners Verson and Johnston stated that they had each watched the proceedings of the June 3, 2024, meeting and were prepared to engage in Commissioner discussion.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked about the request for a conditional use for peak roof heights of 38 feet. He asked if there are other developments in the Village that have requested this type of entitlement. Ms. Papke said R2 allows heights of greater than 30 feet as a conditional use, but staff is not aware of any petitions seeking that conditional use in the R2 District. However, there are other residential districts where allowable height is greater than 30 feet. The single-family residential development at Park and Grove includes houses with peak heights of around 37 feet. Those houses did not require zoning relief for height because the underlying district on that property permits higher buildings than does the R2 District. She noted that the Park and Grove development shares a number of other similarities to the development proposed for the subject property.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the proposed density on the subject property was unique or if there were other examples in the Village, and had that increased density caused any issues. Ms.

Papke said the development at Park and Grove had received variances for lot area, which is effectively a variance for density. To staff's knowledge, the development was functioning well.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the Park and Grove development had caused any traffic impacts. Ms. Papke said staff was not aware of any traffic impacts.

Commissioner Johnston asked Mr. Millan about the KLOA report. He asked about the finding that the development would increase traffic volume by 1%. Mr. Millan said this is correct. KLOA had looked at traffic counts during peak hours throughout the day. He said the development would not have a significant impact on traffic flow in the area on a normal daily basis. He said the analysis had accounted for the presence of the elementary school.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the development would necessitate the school changing traffic patterns during pickup/drop off. Mr. Millan said the KLOA analysis had not indicated the need to change traffic patterns for the school.

Commissioner Johnston asked the petitioner about snow removal plans. Mr. Daniel said the HOA will maintain exterior areas and will be responsible for snow removal. There will be areas to set snow aside. During a large storm, the snow would be hauled off site.

Commissioner Johnston asked about Mr. Daniel's discussion with the school district. Mr. Daniel said the school district had indicated no plans for altering traffic patterns around the school. He described some of his observations of traffic patterns around the school.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the school district had comments on sidewalks and lights. Mr. Daniel said the school district had not expressed any concerns.

Commissioner Johnston asked about the design of the perimeter fence. Mr. Daniel said it will be a six-foot solid fence around the majority of the development. The fence will drop to four feet in height around the driveways. Fences near the driveways will be metal. In response to additional questions from Commissioner Johnston, Mr. Syed added that the solid fence is a wood plastic composite that will maintain its look over time.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the fence would dampen sound. Mr. Syed said he expected the fence would have some dampening effect on sound.

Commissioner Johnston asked about guest parking for parties and whether the school allowed guest parking on the school parking lot. He noted that people generally do have guests park in the public street when they hold parties or gatherings. Mr. Daniel said there were perpendicular parking spaces on 14<sup>th</sup> Street in the right-of-way in front of the school that could be used. He did not expect there would be any need to park on the school property, and noted this would not be possible without permission from the school district.

Commissioner Sweetser asked whether some of the issues raised by the public could still be addressed. She noted there had been comments about noise from the rooftop decks. Was there an opportunity to change the plans to address these concerns. Ms. Papke said she could not speak to

what changes the petitioner may be willing to consider, though the Commissioners could address those questions to the petitioner directly. She noted that when petitions are brought before the Plan Commission, they are submitted as a fully formulated plan, and the Plan Commission is generally tasked with reviewing the petition as presented.

Commissioner Sweetser said making changes to the petition did not seem to be a simple thing given comments during the last meeting. Ms. Papke said that the Plan Commission could not entertain changes to the submitted plans that would require a zoning entitlement that had not been previously advertised. Even changes that would not require re-advertisement were best avoided as there would not have been time for staff or the public to review such changes. Occasionally petitioners offered small changes based on an issue that was identified during public comment. Generally, however, staff recommended the Plan Commission consider the plans as submitted.

Commissioner Sweetser said there had been a lot of public comment about noise from balconies, and would it be possible to address these concerns at this point. Mr. Daniel said the petitioner had made changes to the barrier surrounding the rooftop decks in response to comments received at the neighborhood meeting. They now proposed a six-foot high barrier around the decks. He noted there would be landscaping that would further mitigate sound.

Mr. Heniff said noise from single-family homes is regulated by distancing requirements for AC units and other improvements within the Zoning Ordinance. He said many times excessive noise from AC units is a maintenance issue. He said there is always some noise in single-family neighborhoods, which is to be expected. The Village does have nuisance provisions that would be applied if noise exceeded typical levels expected from a single-family home.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked if the internal drive counts toward the open space requirement. Ms. Papke said the drive does not count as open space.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked if the Zoning Ordinance was concerned with the setup of a homeowners' association. Ms. Papke said the Zoning Ordinance does not speak to whether an HOA is required, nor to what elements of a development might be controlled by an HOA.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked if the interior drive will be permeable pavers and would that impact stormwater design. Mr. Lin said the development team had not determined if the drive would be permeable, but the development would meet stormwater requirements in any event.

Mr. Heniff said that HOAs are not uncommon in Lombard. Stormwater detention facilities are often maintained by HOAs. HOAs may also maintain other elements of the development. If the HOA fails to maintain any element under its control, the Village's property maintenance codes would be applied to the HOA.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked about the reason for having an internal drive and limited curb cuts on School. Mr. Daniel said this design choice was made in response to neighborhood preferences for limited curb cuts on School Street.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked if there were other neighborhoods in Lombard with gates similar to the petitioner's proposed plan, and did staff foresee any issues with the gates. Ms. Papke said there were not any gated communities in the Village at present. However, the Village's emergency service personnel are familiar with the technology of such gates and how they operate to allow access in case of an emergency. There are also other communities nearby that have gated communities, so the concept is familiar to both emergency service personnel and residents. She noted that the development cannot create a traffic impact to adjacent roads. If in the future it was determined that the presence of the gates was creating a backup or other traffic impact on 14<sup>th</sup> Street or Meyers Road, the Village (14<sup>th</sup> Street) or DuPage County (Meyers Road) would have the authority to require the property owner to make changes to the gate to mitigate those impacts.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked the petitioner why the gate was part of the design. Mr. Daniel said the gate would create a sense of security and affect value. He said the gate will accept all traffic in.

Commissioner Johnston asked if the gate will be activated by a car approaching, and someone would be able to exit if they accidentally drive into the development. Mr. Daniel said this is correct. Commissioner Johnston asked if there will be cameras at the gates. Mr. Daniel said there may be cameras.

Commissioner Sweetser asked Mr. Daniel to speak to the issue of overflow parking and how that would be handled. Mr. Daniel said there would be six parking spaces per unit. He said there may be provisions for temporary extra parking internally on the private drive, which would be controlled by the HOA and would not affect public streets. He said that residents may rely on informal arrangements with neighbors to allow temporary parking for guests in neighboring driveways. He noted the parking spaces on 14<sup>th</sup> Street as a potential option for overflow parking. He said there could be parking on the east side of School Street. He did not think this would be a common occurrence. He said the developer had contemplated having a parking lot and club house at the south end of the development, but this had not been supported by the neighbors.

Commissioner Sweetser said it was impossible to anticipate every scenario that might arise that could affect parking. Mr. Daniel said this was true of any single-family home. He said there were plenty of alternatives in the area if someone were to have a party in the future.

Mr. Heniff noted that the proposed houses would have two car garages plus room for up to four cars in the driveway. This exceeded the number of cars that could fit into many driveways of single-family homes in the Village.

Commissioner Sweetser said it was nice to have an alternative in mind in the event that additional parking was needed.

Mr. Heniff noted for the record the School Street does not have parking restrictions aside from restrictions around intersections and fire hydrants.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked about the requested front yard setbacks and would those apply to the perimeter of the development or the interior. Ms. Papke said the front yard is the lot line

adjacent to the internal private drive. The requested deviations are related to that property line. All setbacks to the perimeter of the development meet or exceed code requirements.

Commissioner Spreenberg said the development was denser than normal but not exceptionally so. He said the buildings were tall but not creeping up onto the rights-of-way.

Commissioner Sweetser asked about snow removal plans. Mr. Daniel said snow removal would be delineated in the HOA documents. The HOA would be responsible. Mr. Daniel identified some possible stacking areas for snow within the development.

Chair Giuliano asked if the garbage removal would be handled similarly to snow removal, with no centralized location. Mr. Daniel said this is correct. Cans will be wheeled out to the ends of each driveway.

Commissioner Verson said it had been interesting to hear about the various revisions that the petitioner had completed in order to arrive at the proposed plan.

Commissioner Johnston said he would not want to see this type of development in the middle of a park property or other low-density development. However, he felt this was an appropriate development on the subject property because it is located on a major four lane roadway.

Commissioner Spreenberg said the Plan Commission had previously discussed the possibility of allowing more density on Westmore Meyers Road, but trying to eliminate the number of curb cuts.

On a motion by Commissioner Johnston, and a second by Commissioner Verson, the Plan Commission voted 5-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 24-07 subject to the four (4) conditions in the staff report:

1. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report;
2. That the petitioner shall develop the site in accordance with the plans submitted as part of this petition and referenced in the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report, except as they may be changed to conform to Village Code;
3. That the petitioner shall apply for and receive building permits for the proposed improvements; and
4. That this approval shall be subject to the commencement time provisions as set forth within Section 155.103(F)(11).

Respectfully,

**VILLAGE OF LOMBARD**

PC 24-07  
Date: TBD  
Page 23

Leigh Giuliano, Chairperson  
Lombard Plan Commission