



Village of Lombard

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

Minutes

Plan Commission

Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Commissioners: Ronald Olbrysh, Martin Burke,
Ruth Sweetser, Andrea Cooper, Stephen Flint and
John Mrofcza
Staff Liaison: Jennifer Ganser

Monday, November 23, 2015

7:30 PM

Village Hall - Board Room

SPECIAL MEETING

Call to Order

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

Pledge of Allegiance

Chairperson Ryan led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call of Members

- Present** 5 - Donald F. Ryan, Martin Burke, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint
- Absent** 2 - Ronald Olbrysh, and Ruth Sweetser

Also present: William Heniff, AICP, Director of Community Development; Matt Panfil, AICP, Sr. Planner, and Mallory A. Milluzzi, legal counsel to the Plan Commission.

Chairperson Ryan called the order of the agenda and explained that there was one public hearing on the agenda that will be separated into three (3) sections and there will be a separate vote for each section.

Mr. Heniff read the Rules of Procedures as written in the Plan Commission By-Laws. Mr. Heniff further explained that the presentation and review of the request before the Plan Commission at the public hearing will consist of one petition that will be considered in three (3) parts. The first two (2) presentations, PC 15-27A and PC 15-27B, are primarily actions that are required as precedents to the primary request identified as PC 15-27C.

For their presentation, the petitioner will present the first two (2) parts

and the commissioners will be asked if they have any initial questions regarding these two (2) requests. The petitioner will then present PC 15-27C in its entirety. After their presentations are completed, there will be a short break. After the break, the public hearing will be opened for comments from the public. The public will be able to comment or provide testimony on any of the three (3) parts of the overall petition. After the public comment period, staff will summarize the three (3) companion reports, followed by discussion by the Plan Commission members.

Should the commissioners find that the petition is ready for a final vote, a motion should be offered for consideration by the Plan Commissioners. Given the complex nature of the petition, each sub-petition should be motioned and voted upon separately at the end of the meeting.

Lastly, the proposed Yorktown Commons planned development concept was initially discussed in workshop sessions in June, July and October, 2015. Any materials presented at those workshop sessions were for informational purposes. The Plan Commissioners shall not rely on the items introduced at those workshop sessions in the consideration of this petition and shall base their recommendation based solely upon the testimony and materials submitted to the public record as part of the public hearing this evening.

Public Hearings

[150525](#)

PC 15-27: Yorktown Commons Planned Development

The petitioner requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property located within the B3PD Community Shopping District Planned Development (Yorktown Shopping Center and Yorktown Peripheral Planned Developments):

PC 15-27A: Yorktown Shopping Center Planned Development

Pursuant to Section 155.504 (A) (major changes in a planned development) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, amend the Yorktown Shopping Center Planned Development, as established by Ordinance No. 1172, and any companion zoning approvals, as follows:

1. A change to the geographical extent of the previously approved planned development and any companion zoning approvals;
2. Amend Section 3 (d) of Ordinance No. 1172 (Yorktown Shopping Center Planned Development) to read as follows:

Off-Street Parking. There shall be required in lieu of all other off-street parking regulations of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance the construction and maintenance of a minimum of ~~7,500~~ 6,800 parking spaces; and

3. Approve a Major Plat of Subdivision.

PC 15-27B: Yorktown Peripheral Planned Development

Pursuant to Section 155.504 (A) (major changes in a planned development) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, amend the Yorktown Peripheral Planned Development, as established by Ordinance No. 3962, and any companion zoning approvals, as follows:

1. A change to the geographical extent of the previously approved planned development and any companion zoning approvals; and

PC 15-27C: Yorktown Commons Planned Development

Pursuant to Section 155.502 (F) (3) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, approve a conditional use for a planned development with the following companion deviations, use exceptions, and variations:

1. Deviations and variations from the B3 Community Shopping District's lot and bulk requirements, Sections 155.415 (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), and (K) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, to allow for the establishment of a form-based code based upon lot, bulk, and design standards and guidelines as set forth within the "Yorktown Commons Planned Development Design Guidelines" included within the petitioner's submission;
2. To approved the "Yorktown Commons Planned Development Design Guidelines" as the preliminary plan for the subject property and to extend the timeframe for the final plan approval as set forth in the "Yorktown Commons Planned Development Design Guidelines;"
3. A variation from Section 155.508 (B)(3) of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance to allow for use exceptions, ground-floor residential dwelling units, for more than forty percent (40%) of the site area or more than forty percent (40%) of the total floor area, whichever is less;
4. A variation from Section 155.707 to waive transitional landscape yard requirements where residential uses are

proposed in the B3 zoning district; and

5. A variation from the Planned Development Standards, Article IX of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, to establish the process for administration of the Yorktown Commons Planned Development as forth in Section IV of the "Yorktown Commons Planned Development Design Guidelines" and granting site plan approval authority to the Plan Commission, pursuant to Section 155.511 of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance. (DISTRICT #3)

Sworn in to present the petition was William Heniff, AICP, Director of Community Development, Matt Panfil, AICP, Senior Planner, Donna Blair of KKR Partners, Russell G. Whitaker, III of Rosanova and Whitaker, Ltd. , David Urciuoli and Tom Kiler of Continuum Partners, Dwayne Gillian, P.E., of V3 Companies, Stephen Corcoran, P.E., PTOE of Eriksson Engineering Associates, Ltd., and Erik Aulestia of Torti Gallas and Partners, Inc.

Chairperson Ryan read the Plan Commission procedures and asked if anyone other than the petitioner intended to cross examine, and, hearing none, he proceeded with the petition.

Ms. Donna Blair explained that as a representative for the ownership of Yorktown Center she has been involved in the previous Plan Commission workshops that were held to help work through and understand further development at Yorktown Center. Yorktown Center was purchased approximately three and one-half (3 ½) years ago with the intent to revitalize the shopping center and to create a dynamic retail, entertainment, and dining destination. Yorktown Center was originally built in the 1960s and ownership wants long term sustainability for the center so that it can remain an important part of the community.

Referring to the attached PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Blair then highlighted a list of interior and exterior improvements to Yorktown Center that have been completed in the last two (2) years. Also, there are over thirty (30) new or renovated tenants. Ms. Blair explained that now that many of the improvements to the shopping center are completed, ownership is now looking for redevelopment opportunities for the north end of the site, which is comprised of the convenience center, the former Bamboo Room building, and a vacant parcel of land located between the convenience center and Target. After researching what would be the best use for this area of the site, ownership identified that traditional retail, grocery, fitness, and entertainment uses were not viable uses that would add to the long term sustainability of the shopping center due to limited accessibility to

and visibility of the area.

Ms. Blair continued that in conjunction with their outside consultants and through the workshop process, ownership identified a residential/mixed-use environment as the best use of the area. Concepts important to the residential/mixed-use environment include: connectivity to the shopping center and surrounding community, flexibility in design and residential type, sense of place, walkability, and common public space. The concept is referred to as Yorktown Commons.

Ms. Blair then introduced Mr. Russell G. Whitaker, III, counsel for the zoning and entitlement process. Mr. Whitaker stated that ownership has had discussions with existing tenants and other owners of the mall property about what was possible for the site and how to position it appropriately. These discussions led to ownership assembling a team of consultants to move forward the residential/mixed-use concept. Mr. Whitaker added that the team recently held a public open house and notified residents and homeowners associations within the area. Mr. Whitaker then introduced two (2) other members of the consultant team: David Urcioli and Tom Kiler of Continuum Partners from Denver, Colorado. Continuum Partners have extensive experience in shopping center and urban redevelopment, including a similar redevelopment of a shopping center in Lakewood, Colorado known as Belmar.

Another similar project is the Bayshore Center in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Bayshore Center was a struggling mall of traditional design that was redeveloped into a more urban environment with a wider variety of uses.

Dwayne Gillian, P.E., of V3 Companies was also introduced as a member of the consultant team. V3 Companies is the civil engineer responsible for preparing the surveys, wetland delineation, civil design guidelines, and other documents within the petition. Mr. Whitaker stated that there is not a final engineering plan yet, just a preliminary concept plan. They have identified the engineering obstacles and are working with staff to resolve the obstacles for development to occur.

Stephen Corcoran, P.E., PTOE of Eriksson Engineering Associates, Ltd., was introduced as a traffic and parking consultant. Mr. Corcoran has recently worked with Yorktown Center on their redesign of the entrance near Fairfield Avenue and Butterfield Road. Mr. Whitaker stated that the Village's traffic consultant has reviewed Mr. Corcoran's traffic and parking reports and has found no substantial issues.

The last member to be introduced was Erik Aulestia of Torti Gallas

and Partners, Inc., an international planning firm from Virginia. Mr. Aulestia is the primary author of the Yorktown Commons Planned Development Design Guidelines that were included within the petition.

Mr. Whitaker proceeded to request that all of the materials associated with the petition be formally entered into the public record. Mr. Whitaker then referenced a PowerPoint presentation regarding the history of development within the area from 1962 to the present. The Yorktown Shopping Center Planned Development was established in 1966 via Ordinance Number 1172. There was no specific site plan associated with the approval, just a general framework for a regional shopping destination with flexible land uses. Buildings were permitted to be approximately eighty-five feet (85') in height, with up to four (4) office buildings of up to approximately one-hundred and twenty-five feet (125'). Regulations for a minimum 7,500 space parking lot, twenty-five foot (25') perimeter setbacks, and a 30% building area maximum were also established. It is unknown as to how the 7,500 parking space demand was estimated. Also, all screening requirements were waived.

The Yorktown Apartments Planned Development was established in 1967 via Ordinance Number 1323. The Yorktown Apartments Planned Development allowed for a maximum of 1,772 residential units, of which only approximately 856 were constructed. Mr. Whitaker stated that the maximum density of the current proposal would barely exceed the density of the previous approval. There were no height or setback regulations, just a maximum 1.5 floor area ratio (FAR) and a minimum twenty foot (20') separation between buildings.

Referencing an undated preliminary concept plan estimated to be from around the time of the original approval, Mr. Whitaker indicated that even at that time there was consideration of residential uses at the location currently being referred to as Lot 1.

The Yorktown Peripheral Planned Development was established in 1995 via Ordinance Number 3962. Target was included as part of this planned development and Lot 1 was planned for a big box retail center.

Moving from the history of the shopping center to the current proposal, Mr. Whitaker introduced the request associated with PC 15-27A. The request includes a change in the boundaries to exclude what is now being referred to as Lot 2, Lot 3, and Lot 4. Approval of a Major Plat of Subdivision is also requested in order to accommodate all of the proposed boundary changes. The final component of PC 15-27A is the request to reduce the amount of parking from 7,500 parking spaces to 6,800. The original number of 7,500 spaces was not based

on specific land uses or associated with a specific ratio of spaces per square feet of floor area. Mr. Whitaker then referenced a table that states the existing number of parking spaces is well over 7,500. Mr. Whitaker added that in consideration of the parking space reduction request, it is important to keep in mind that the original area of the Yorktown Shopping Center Planned Development was reduced in size with the establishment of the Yorktown Peripheral Planned Development and is being reduced again with the current proposal. A 2013 parking study confirms that there is a surplus of parking and that 6,800 parking space will still be more than adequate to serve the site, even during the December peak season. Mr. Whitaker stated that in the parking study Mr. Corcoran even accounted for possible future on-site developments.

Mr. Whitaker then introduced PC 15-27B, which he described as very similar in nature to PC 15-27A. For PC 15-27B, the only request is to exclude what is being described as Lot 1 from the Yorktown Peripheral Planned Development.

Mr. Whitaker paused his presentation to answer any questions specific to PC 15-27A or PC 15-27B. Hearing none, Mr. Whitaker introduced PC 15-27C. Similar to some previously approved planned developments such as the Yorktown Shopping Center Planned Development and the Yorktown Apartments Planned Development, the petitioner is not proposing a specific site plan, but rather a preliminary concept plan and regulations that will establish the rules for future development.

Mr. Whitaker stated that this request is further unique because the petitioner is not seeking to maximize the value of the proposed parcels, but rather the development of those parcels will maximize and protect the value of the shopping center. While the petitioner is maintaining flexibility in land uses and site planning, the proposed planned development contains a sixty (60) page document regulating form and design characteristics in great detail for a predictable environment. The design guidelines are much more specific than both the existing planned developments and the Lombard Zoning Ordinance.

One of the benefits of such a proposal is that when the petitioner brings the project to the market, the design guidelines provide more certainty of approval for any potential developer, provided they build according to the design guidelines. These form-based regulations are unique to most suburban communities. The proposed Yorktown Commons Planned Development is approximately fifteen (15) acres in size.

Referencing the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Whitaker commented that residential tastes have changed and the demand for suburban mixed-use exceeds the supply. Mr. Whitaker believes that the concept of a compact and walkable neighborhood is one that has withstood the test of time.

Erik Aulestia of Torti Gallas and Partners, Inc., and the author of the Yorktown Commons Planned Development Design Guidelines, then made his presentation. Referencing the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Aulestia introduced basic concepts of placemaking and form. Public space, pedestrian friendly streets, a mix of uses, and human-scaled architecture are all components of good places. Referencing a series of images, Mr. Aulestia outlined the vision for Yorktown Commons. One of the goals of the vision is to create a gateway from Grace Street. The intersection of Grace Street and the Yorktown Ring Road will feature a public space and street trees are also an important part of the vision. Mr. Aulestia concurred with Mr. Whitaker's statements that there is a growing demand for the types of places being proposed. Mr. Aulestia then emphasized that the concepts and graphics shown are not a final design, they are just some of many potential iterations based on the design guidelines.

Mr. Aulestia stated that a form-based code is often used when the regulating jurisdiction wants some assurance as to what outcome may be delivered and the petitioner wants flexibility to respond to the market and changing economic climate. The form-based code aims at providing specific standards for a specific outcome. Referencing examples within the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Aulestia introduced concepts common to a form-based code. Introducing what is referred to as the Regulating Plan within a form-based code, Mr. Aulestia outlined the specific form-based regulations associated with the proposal. Regulations discussed included: permitted and conditional land uses, open space types and requirements, frontage occupancy, building height, and special urban design and architectural features.

Specific front yard types and street sections for Grace Street, Yorktown Ring Road, and future internal streets are also proposed. Mr. Aulestia then stated there are also standards for block configuration, lots, parking and loading, street trees, and walls, fences, and gates. When discussing parking and loading, Mr. Aulestia acknowledged the petitioner's intent to comply with the Village's parking space demand and design standards.

The petitioner is also proposing their own sign standards in conjunction with the Lombard Sign Ordinance.

Specific architectural standards regarding windows, walls, mechanical

equipment, site utilities, and materials are also included within the design guidelines. According to Mr. Aulestia, there will be a privately run Yorktown Commons Architectural Review Board.

Townhouses and commercial, mixed-use, or multi-family buildings have their own specific design standards.

Mr. Aulestia then referenced a flowchart within the PowerPoint presentation that outlines the site and architectural review process.

Mr. Whitaker concluded the petitioner's presentation and Chairperson Ryan stated that there would be a ten (10) minute break before questions or comments from the public.

Chairperson Ryan asked for anyone who would like to speak in favor of the petition, against the petition, or has comments regarding the petition to stand. Sworn in were Ms. Linda Grothendick and Ms. Beverly Chatfield.

Ms. Grothendick stated that she appreciates what the owners of Yorktown Shopping Center have done to revitalize the mall and surrounding area. However, Ms. Grothendick has concerns regarding the density of the proposal and the height of the buildings. According to Ms. Grothendick, the proposal will shift the surrounding area from a suburban experience to a more urban experience. Ms. Grothendick stated that her neighborhood used to be peaceful and quiet, but over the years the increase in retail establishments and apartments has brought increased traffic. Ms. Grothendick is concerned that with the new proposal, there will be even more cars that cut through her street on their way to Yorktown Commons. Ms. Grothendick suggested a higher standard for minimum open space and a reduced maximum height in order to maintain a more suburban experience. Ms. Grothendick concluded by stating she hopes the new development will increase the quality of life in Lombard.

Ms. Chatfield asked for clarification on the requested waiver of transitional landscape yards. Ms. Chatfield stated that she hoped the existing twenty-five foot (25') perimeter setback is to be maintained. Ms. Chatfield then asked for a clarification as to how many feet tall are six (6) stories. Ms. Chatfield also commented that she has concerns regarding traffic and the reduction of Grace Street from four (4) lanes to two (2) lanes. Finally, Ms. Chatfield asked for clarification as to what will happen with the ditch that is located on Lot 1.

Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone else would like to speak for the petition, against the petition, or comment on the petition. Hearing none, he asked the petitioner for a rebuttal to the public comments.

Mr. Whitaker began his rebuttal by addressing the comment regarding density and the proposal changing the suburban character of the area. Mr. Whitaker restated that the original approval for the Yorktown Apartments granted a maximum of 1,772 residential units. The current proposal, if maximized, would barely exceed the number of units approved in 1966. According to Mr. Whitaker, the area has been designated for such a density for a long period of time; therefore the proposal is not out of character with the neighborhood.

In regards to traffic concerns, Mr. Whitaker stated that the subject property is already approved for retail uses, which may generate traffic equal to or more than the residential uses proposed.

Regarding building height, Mr. Whitaker stated that there is no height limitation within the neighboring Yorktown Apartments Planned Development and some of the buildings exceed six (6) stories. The proposed maximum height for the Yorktown Commons Planned Development is six (6) stories or one-hundred feet (100'), whichever is less. Mr. Whitaker emphasized that the petitioner is proposing a change to a more urban form of development, not a significant change to a more urban density.

Discussing the perimeter setback, Mr. Whitaker stated that it is required within the B3 Community Shopping District. However, the intent of this regulation is to separate commercial buildings from residential buildings. When residential buildings are adjacent to other residential buildings, the perimeter setback is not required. Therefore, due to the proposed planned development being predominantly residential, the petitioner has requested that future residential buildings be treated in a similar manner as the current Lombard Zoning Ordinance allows.

In regards to the concern about reducing the amount of traffic lanes on Grace Street, Mr. Whitaker stated that the traffic study demonstrates that Grace Street was overbuilt and there is not a current, or projected, demand for four (4) traffic lanes. The intent is to make Grace Street more pedestrian and bicycle friendly.

Concluding his rebuttal, Mr. Whitaker addressed the question regarding the existing ditch in Lot 1 by stating that the petitioner's team has evaluated stormwater management and prepared a report that is part of the Civil Design Guidelines submitted with the petition. Mr. Whitaker stated that stormwater management will comply with the DuPage County Stormwater Ordinances. Specifically addressing the ditch on Lot 1, Mr. Whitaker stated that the ditch was evaluated and is not considered a wetland, jurisdictional waters, or within a special

management area.

Chairperson Ryan then asked for the staff report. Mr. Panfil then submitted the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report to the public record in its entirety. Mr. Panfil thanked the petitioner for their presentation and summarized the three (3) different parts of the petition. Mr. Panfil emphasized that there are no development actions associated with the petition, but rather the petitioner is seeking to establish rules for future development.

In regards to PC 15-27A, the total size of the land being removed from within the Yorktown Shopping Center Planned Development, identified as Lot 2, Lot 3, and Lot 4, is approximately 8.3 acres. This will result in a net loss of 476 parking spaces. While the loss of 476 parking spaces does not in and of itself reduce the total number of parking spaces below the minimum required 7,500 parking spaces, other improvements to the Yorktown Shopping Center identified within the Parking Memorandum are anticipated to reduce the overall number of parking spaces to approximately 6,928. The petitioner has requested a reduction to 6,800 parking spaces to allow for some level of flexibility moving forward.

Mr. Panfil stated that the Village's traffic consultant, KLOA, Inc., reviewed the request and finds that the reduction in parking spaces should not be detrimental to the operation of the shopping center and there will still be ample parking to accommodate the peak holiday parking demand. Mr. Panfil concluded his comments regarding PC 15-27A by stating that staff finds the proposed amendments to the planned development to be consistent with the objectives of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, Yorktown Shopping Center Planned Development, and the intent of the Comprehensive Plan in general. Therefore, staff recommends approval of PC 15-27A.

According to Mr. Panfil, PC 15-27B is a similar request to PC 15-27A, but in PC 15-27B the petitioner requests to remove the property identified as Lot 1, approximately six (6) acres in size, from the Yorktown Peripheral Planned Development. For the same reasons identified in PC 15-27A, staff finds the proposed amendment to the planned development to be consistent with the objectives of the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, Yorktown Peripheral Planned Development, and the intent of the Comprehensive Plan in general. Therefore, staff also recommends approval of PC 15-27B.

In regards to PC 15-27C, Mr. Panfil reiterated that while there are no definitive plans, structures, or tenants being presented as this time; lot, bulk, and design standards and guidelines are enumerated within the Yorktown Commons Planned Development Design Guidelines

document, which is essentially a regulatory tool for future development. The regulations frequently are more restrictive than what is currently permitted by right. Mr. Panfil stated that the total size of the proposed Yorktown Commons Planned Development is approximately fifteen (15) acres.

The form-based approach found within the design guidelines will provide the Village a level of predictability as to how the subject area will look and function through the establishment of certain lot, bulk, and design standards. Mr. Panfil emphasized that the concept plans depicting building type and location included within the design guidelines are only illustrative in nature and represent just some of the permutations that could occur.

Although phases of construction are not an obligation and can change depending on market conditions, Mr. Panfil stated his understanding that the petitioner has indicated that the anticipated development schedule is the same as the numbers assigned to each relevant lot, with Lot 1 anticipated to be developed first and Lot 4 anticipated to be developed last.

Discussing comments from the Inter-Departmental Review Committee, Mr. Panfil stated that the Wetland Delineation and Assessment Report found no wetland areas, Waters of DuPage, or Waters of the U.S. within the subject property. The report also found that eastern cottonwood and common buckthorn are the most dominant plant species within the subject area, which are not plant species inherently worthy of preservation at the site.

Mr. Panfil stated that the Department of Public Works supports the concept of changing the street lighting standard from the common used cobra-arm commercial lighting to the Village's specified residential lighting standards. Public Works also finds that the street cross sections referenced within the design guidelines are consistent with the concepts being promoted within the Department of Public Works' bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts that are currently underway. Also, the Village will require these right-of-way improvements as part of the development of either Lot 1 or Lot 4, whichever occurs first.

In addition to the petitioner's comments regarding the proposal's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, Mr. Panfil added that the Comprehensive Plan specifically focuses on the improvement and maintenance of existing development and encouraging compatible development and redevelopment. Mr. Panfil stated that there were three (3) specific actions recommended to achieve part of the vision of the Comprehensive Plan that the petitioner has achieved:

1. *Design and facilitate a Village-wide system of commercial development providing for neighborhood, community and regional commercial areas;*
2. *Ensure that commercial and retail development is compatible with neighboring land use areas; and*
3. *Ensure that new development and redevelopment of private properties is in scale with and designed to be complementary to existing development.*

In regards to the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, Mr. Panfil stated that staff supports the requested deviations and variations. Rather than discussing each deviation and variation individually, Mr. Panfil referenced a color-coded table comparing the proposed standards with the underlying B3 Community Shopping District and existing Yorktown Shopping Center / Yorktown Peripheral Planned Developments. Staff supports these requests based on the proposed standards being at least equivalent to and in many cases more restrictive than the underlying zoning or existing planned developments.

To address a public comment regarding transitional yards, Mr. Panfil stated that the support for the waiver is based on the fact that the proposed planned development is predominantly residential in nature and the Village does not require transitional yards when a multi-family residential use is adjacent to another multi-family residential use.

Referencing comments made by the petitioner, Mr. Panfil clarified that where there are differences between the design guidelines and the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, mostly in regards to parking and signage, the design guidelines will be revised to be consistent with the Lombard Zoning Ordinance.

To address a public comment regarding the proposed density, Mr. Panfil stated that the Yorktown Apartments Planned Development approved a density of approximately sixty-three (63) dwelling units per acre. If Yorktown Commons was built out to the maximum 970 dwelling units, the density would be approximately sixty-five (65) dwelling units per acre. Therefore, the proposed density is consistent with the density approved in 1967.

The Village's traffic consultant, KLOA, Inc., also reviewed the Traffic Study and found that the proposed Yorktown Commons Planned Development can be accommodated by the Yorktown Shopping Center's internal roadway and external intersections. There is

sufficient reserve capacity at the studied intersections to accommodate the projected traffic volumes and continue operating at acceptable levels of service.

Mr. Panfil concluded by stating that staff recommends approval of PC 15-27C.

Mr. Heniff provided additional comment as to the nature of the request at hand being to establish rules of the game for future development. Mr. Heniff added that when the respective phases are ready, they will come before the Plan Commission through the Site Plan Approval process. This is a similar process to that used for the Fountain Square and Highlands of Lombard planned developments. When a future development is submitted for consideration, one of the first steps will be to review the development's compliance with the rules established within the design guidelines. If there are any proposals that constitute a major change to the planned development they would be reviewed through the public hearing process.

Chairperson Ryan asked if anyone had comments or questions for the staff report. Hearing none, he opened the public hearing to the Plan Commissioners.

Commissioner Mrofcza identified a typo in the IDRC Report for PC 15-27A regarding the percentage of parking spaces that will exceed peak holiday demand. Mr. Whitaker suggested that instead of 256%, the number is actually 25%. Mr. Panfil stated that the IDRC Report and parking memorandum will be updated accordingly.

Noting the 25% excess parking, Commissioner Cooper asked if the petitioner considered reducing the number of parking spaces even lower than 6,800. Mr. Whitaker responded that the number was specifically identified by the petitioner based on minimum parking space agreements with tenants.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked for clarification if the 6,800 parking spaces included parking at the Westin hotel to which Mr. Whitaker responded in the negative.

Commissioner Burke commented that he felt that the proposal is a unique opportunity for a community like Lombard and thanked the petitioner and staff for their efforts.

Commissioner Mrofcza asked about the potential displacement of tenants from the convenience center on Lot 4. Mr. Whitaker responded that the intent is for Lot 4 to be the last developed, and while there are no guarantees of it occurring as such, the petitioner

has had meetings and discussions with the tenants about retaining them on the property in some fashion.

Commissioner Cooper commented on the proposed spacing of the street trees and minimum required open space. Commissioner Cooper stated her preference for street trees to be spaced every thirty-five feet (35') instead of every forty feet (40'). Commissioner Cooper also stated her understanding that while there is a minimum open space standard, said open space does not necessarily require any vegetation. Commissioner Cooper stated her belief that the more vegetation provided, the better environment that is created.

Mr. Aulestia responded that while in other projects they have recommended trees to be planted in tree pits with a spacing of approximately thirty feet (30') their recommendation of forty foot (40') spacing for this project is based on the fact that in most cases trees will be located within a planting strip, which allows trees to grow larger than when planted in tree pits.

In response to Commissioner Cooper's comment about open space, Mr. Aulestia stated that the intent is to give flexibility to any future landscape architect. Mr. Whitaker added that for the Yorktown Commons Planned Development, open space is viewed not as strictly green space, as defined by the Lombard Zoning Ordinance, but more as a public gathering space.

Commissioner Cooper asked if the Plan Commission wanted to consider requesting a minimum standard for the amount of vegetation. Commissioner Burke also asked if the petitioner would consider reducing the tree spacing to one every thirty-five feet (35') and include a minimum standard for green space within the minimum open space standard.

In regards to tree spacing, Mr. Whitaker responded that there is probably language that can be incorporated into the design guidelines to provide for thirty-five foot (35') to forty foot (40') spacing depending on the surrounding design. Mr. Whitaker stated that while it is expected that there will be green space throughout the development, but without knowing at this time how the lots will ultimately be developed, he is wary of specifying a specific minimum amount of green space. Mr. Whitaker offered to incorporate general language into the design guidelines that requires some level of green space. Mr. Whitaker added that the petitioner will work with staff to incorporate these concerns into the final draft of the design guidelines. Chairperson Ryan concurred with this approach.

Commissioner Flint asked if the petitioner anticipated constructing

parking structures in the future to provide more space for further development. Ms. Blair responded that while parking structures have been discussed, they are not preferred, and in fact are excluded by the reciprocal operating easement agreement with the anchor tenants. Ms. Blair added that Yorktown Shopping Center does review their parking ratios in comparison to other shopping centers and finds that Yorktown Shopping Center is over-parked compared to many other shopping centers. Parking garages are also not preferred from a customer experience perspective.

Commissioner Cooper asked if it is likely that there will be parking garages in the Yorktown Commons Planned Development. Mr. Whitaker responded that it is anticipated there will be parking structures for multi-family residential uses. In these instances, the design guidelines provide standards that require any parking structure to be wrapped so as not to be visible from roadway frontages. Mr. Heniff cited City View Apartments on Highland Avenue as an example of this type of design.

Chairperson Ryan reminded the Plan Commission that a recommendation is to be done in a series of three (3) separate votes for each item, PC 15-27A, PC 15-27B, and PC 15-27C.

A motion was made by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Flint, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of PC 15-27A, subject to three (3) conditions:

- 1. That this relief is valid only with the subsequent approval of both PC 15-27B and PC 15-27C;**
- 2. That this relief is limited to a change in the geographic boundaries and reduction in the amount of minimum required parking spaces for the Yorktown Shopping Center Planned Development; and**
- 3. That the petitioner shall submit a Final Plat of Subdivision prior to or concurrent to any proposed development activity associated with PC 15-27C.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Martin Burke, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

Absent: 2 - Ronald Olbrysh, and Ruth Sweetser

A second motion was made by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Mrofcza, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of PC 15-27B, subject to three (3) conditions:

- 1. That this relief is valid only in conjunction with the approval of both PC 15-27B and PC 15-27C;**

2. That this relief is limited to a change in the geographic boundaries for the Yorktown Peripheral Planned Development and any physical site improvements or alterations require approval through the Village; and

3. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Martin Burke, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofca, and Stephen Flint

Absent: 2 - Ronald Olbrysh, and Ruth Sweetser

A third motion was made by Commissioner Burke, seconded by Commissioner Flint, to recommend to the Corporate Authorities approval of PC 15-27C, subject to five (5) conditions:

1. That this relief is valid only with the approval of both PC 15-27A and PC 15-27B;

2. That this relief is limited to the establishment of a planned development with a preliminary plan and design guidelines. Any physical site improvements or alterations require approval through the Village through the established Site Plan Approval process or through a separate zoning public hearing petition, whichever is applicable;

3. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report that pertain to the proposed form-based code regulations prior to final consideration of the petition by the Village Board;

4. That the petitioner work with staff to amend the minimum required street tree spacing; and

5. That the petitioner work with staff to amend the percentage of green space required within open space areas.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Martin Burke, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofca, and Stephen Flint

Absent: 2 - Ronald Olbrysh, and Ruth Sweetser

Business Meeting

The business meeting convened at 10:06 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

On a motion by Commissioner Mrofca, and seconded by Commissioner Flint, the minutes of the October 5, 2015 and October 19, 2015 meetings were approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Martin Burke, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

Absent: 2 - Ronald Olbrysh, and Ruth Sweetser

Public Participation

Chairperson Ryan asked if there was anyone that would like to make a comment. Mr. Tom Diedrichs asked if as buildings are approved within the Yorktown Commons Planned Development will there be improvements made at the intersection of the Yorktown Ring Road where the McDonald's is located because he finds there to be significant problems with the design of the intersection. Mr. Whitaker referenced an exhibit described in the traffic study and acknowledged that there are problems with the intersection. Mr. Whitaker stated that the petitioner has found that the problems are largely a function of how drivers are reacting in the intersection and they tend not to follow the existing traffic signage and pavement markings. A plan has been devised to reconfigure some of the vehicular flow of the intersection. Other changes to traffic signage and street markings are also included in the reconfiguration.

DuPage County Hearings

There were no DuPage County hearings.

Chairperson's Report

The Chairperson deferred to the Director of Community Development.

Planner's Report

Mr. Heniff stated there was a memo included in the packet regarding the January 18, 2016 Plan Commission meeting. Since that is a holiday staff proposes changing the date to January 25, 2016 as the Plan Commission has done in the past. Chairperson Ryan asked for comment, and hearing none, stated the meeting date will be changed to January 25, 2016.

Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

New Business

There was no new business.

Subdivision Reports

There were no subdivision reports.

Site Plan Approvals

There were no site plan approvals.

Workshops

There were no workshops.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Commissioner Mrofcza, seconded by Commissioner Burke, to adjourn the meeting at 10:12 p.m. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Martin Burke, Andrea Cooper, John Mrofcza, and Stephen Flint

Absent: 2 - Ronald Olbrysh, and Ruth Sweetser

*Donald F. Ryan, Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission*

*Jennifer Ganser, Secretary
Lombard Plan Commission*