

Village of Lombard

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



Minutes

Monday, April 18, 2022

7:00 PM

Village Hall

Plan Commission

Commissioners:

***Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston,
Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo,
Alissa Verson and Robert Spreenberg
Staff Liaison: Jennifer Ganser***

Call to Order

Commissioner Sweetser called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m

Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Sweetser led the Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call of Members

Present 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

Also present: Bill Heniff, AICP Director of Community Development, Jennifer Ganser, AICP Assistant Director of Community Development, and Anne Skrodzki, Legal Counsel to the Plan Commission.

Commissioner Sweetser called the order of the agenda.

Ms. Ganser read the Rules and Procedures as written by the Plan Commission.

Appoint an Acting Chair

A motion was made by Commissioner Invergo, seconded by Commissioner Johnston to appoint Commissioner Ruth Sweetser Chair. The motion passed by an unanimous vote.

Public Hearings

[220133](#)

PC 22-07, 236 E. St. Charles Road, O'Neill's

The petitioner requests a conditional use pursuant to Section 155.414(C) (19) of the Lombard Village Code to allow for outside service areas for other permitted or conditional uses in this district (outdoor dining) to operate on the subject property located within the B2 General Neighborhood Shopping District. (DISTRICT # 4)

Sworn in to present the petition were: Maryann O'Neill, petitioner and Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director of Community Development.

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

Ms. O'Neill stated that her family has owned O'Neill's since 1987. She thanked the Village for allowing outside dining during Covid. She said they have a good relationship with their neighbors and no problems last year with the outside dining. She said she is coming forward to continue the outside dining. She referenced the neighbor letter and noted the neighbor prefers the outside dining to parking. She said they would provide occasional piped in music or acoustic guitar.

Commissioner Johnston said he is concerned with noise and music, and asked if the back door will remain closed. Ms. O'Neill said the door can stay closed. It's a steel door and is sound proof.

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

Ms. Ganser presented the IDRC report for PC 22-07, which was entered into the public record in its entirety. The petitioner proposes to have outside seating. A conditional use is required as the principal use is a tavern, not a restaurant, where outside seating is a permitted use. No other exterior alterations are planned at this time. One email was received and is included in the staff report. Staff notes that the proposed conditions of approval limit the time on the outdoor seating. This is only for the outdoor area. O'Neill's may stay open later, inside, per their liquor license Class D-VG.. Staff has reviewed the petition and finds it meets the standards for conditional uses.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser opened the meeting to discussion by the Plan Commissioners.

The Commissioners discussed condition 2 on the closing timing of the outside dining, however, no changes were made.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser asked if there were any additional comments. Hearing none, she asked for a motion from the Commissioners.

On a motion by Commissioner Johnston, and a second by Commissioner Walker, the Plan Commission voted 7-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 22-07, subject to the following three (3) conditions:

- 1. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report.**
- 2. The outdoor seating shall close by 10:30 PM Monday through Thursday; 11:30 PM Friday and Saturday; and 9:30 PM on Sunday.**

3. This approval shall be subject to the commencement time provisions as set forth within Section 155.103(F)(11).

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

[220134](#)

PC 22-08: Text Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Conference Facility

The petitioner is requesting a text amendment to Sections 155.412(C), 155.415(C), 155.416(C), 155.417(G)(2)(b) and 155.802 of the Lombard Village Code to allow for "conference facility" to be listed as a defined conditional use. (DISTRICT ALL)

Sworn in to present the petition were petitioner Maurice Smith and Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director.

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

Mr. Smith stated that there is no designation for their business type. He said this is a small venue used for private gathering and trainings. It could help companies that downsized and don't have a lot of office space.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser asked for public comment.

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

Ms. Ganser presented the staff report, which was submitted to the public record in its entirety. Over the years, staff has received inquiries from businesses looking to open small spaces for events. Events have ranged from showers and parties, to more office or corporate type functions. Though the Zoning Code has categories for retail, banquet halls, restaurant, etc.; none of those uses fit with the proposed business idea. As such, staff and the petitioner are requesting a text amendment to allow for a new defined use: conference facility. Staff supports the petition.

Commissioner Giuliano asked if they would host events like showers and Mr. Smith said yes. Commissioner Giuliano asked if the food is pre-packaged and clarified they would not have alcohol. Mr. Smith said yes.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser opened the meeting for comments among the Commissioners.

On a motion by Commissioner Giuliano, and a second by Commissioner Invergo, the Plan Commission voted to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 22-08.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

[220135](#)

PC 22-09: 246 E. Janata Blvd - Divine Suites Conference Facility

The Plan Commission recommends approval of a conditional use pursuant to Section 155.412(C) of the Lombard Village Code to allow for a conference facility to operate on the subject property located within the O Office Planned Development District. (DISTRICT #3)

Sworn in to present the petition were: Maurice Smith and Shaqula Reese, petitioner and Jennifer Ganser, Assistant Director of Community Development.

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

Mr. Smith said he is the manager of Divine Suites and here with the owner Dr. Reese. He said Divine Suites caters to small events, under 75 people. The hours are 9am to 9pm Sunday to Thursday and on the weekends until midnight. Dr. Reese said she has had office space there for 3 years and seen her chiropractor business grow. She also watched other businesses decline and leave due to Covid. She said this is about economic development and growing small businesses.

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

Ms. Ganser presented the IDRC report for PC 22-09, which was entered into the public record in its entirety. The petitioner proposes to lease space in an existing office building to host events. The events are mostly business related and provide the opportunity for small businesses to hold training classes or meetings. A liquor license is not being sought at present time. The petitioner has a companion petition for a text amendment, PC 22-08. The staff report reviews the IDRC comments, which need to be made before the petitioner can operate their business. Staff supports the petition.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser opened the meeting to discussion by the Plan Commissioners.

Commissioner Johnston said this is a great idea and Commissioner Invergo agreed.

Commissioner Spreenberg asked about the building division comments and Ms. Ganser said a permit is required and will be reviewed for code compliance.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser asked if there were any additional comments. Hearing none, she asked for a motion from the Commissioners.

On a motion by Commissioner Spreenberg, and a second by Commissioner Johnston, the Plan Commission voted 7-0 to recommend that the Village Board approve the petition associated with PC 22-09, subject to the following four (4) conditions:

- 1. That the petitioner shall be required to apply for and receive building permits prior to construction;**
- 2. That the petitioner shall satisfactorily address all comments noted within the Inter-Departmental Review Committee Report;**
- 3. This approval shall be subject to the commencement time provisions as set forth within Section 155.103(F)(11); and**
- 4. The relief is limited to Suite 210 and any expansion shall require a new conditional use.**

Aye: 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

[220097](#)

PC 22-05: 855 E. Roosevelt Road (Usmania Prime) (Continuance from the 4-18-22 PC Meeting)

The petitioner, SAFA ENTERPRISES, LLC, requests that the Village take the following actions on the subject property located within the B4A Roosevelt Road Corridor District, to provide for the construction of a new principle building:

1. A conditional use under Sections 155.103(F) and 155.417(G)(2)(a)(vii) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a restaurant, including entertainment and dancing when conducted as part of the restaurant operations and secondary to the principal use;
2. A conditional use under Sections 155.103(F) and 155.417(G)(2)(c)(vii) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow a building containing a restaurant as a principal use that will exceed 40 feet in height;
3. A conditional use under Sections 155.103(F) and 155.417(G)(10)(b) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow outdoor display and sales on a seasonal or periodic basis in the row of parking along the south

- elevation of the building and in the rooftop area;
4. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Sections 155.417(G)(12) and 155.602(C)(Table 6.3) which require 112-132 parking spaces in order to allow 116 parking spaces to serve dining areas not to exceed those shown in the plans and to allow a reduction of eight (8) of these spaces for seasonal outdoor cultural events according to the conditional use noted in Item 3;
 5. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Sections 155.417(G)(12) and 155.603(A) which does not require a loading space, but which requires a voluntary loading space to be constructed with a maneuvering apron (155.603(A)(2)(a)(ii)) in order to allow three (3) employee parking spaces at the entry to a loading zone (155.603(A)(6));
 6. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Sections 155.417(G)(12), 155.417(G)(14) and 155.602(A)(10)(d) which requires parking lot lighting to be directed away from the lot lines and to fall below certain maximum intensities in order to avoid these requirements for lighting adjacent to the access easement serving the subject property and the easterly adjacent property;
 7. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Sections 155.417(G)(12) and 155.706(B)(2)(c) in order to allow landscape islands on the west elevation of the building to host two rickshaws and have less than the number of required shade trees and ground cover;
 8. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Section 155.417(G)(14) which requires lighting to shine down in order to permit evening lighting designed to articulate landscape features and the rickshaws as approved by the Director of Community Development and provided that no perimeter landscaping within 100 feet of the south lot line is articulated with such lighting;
 9. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Section 155.707(B)(4)(d) which requires transition yard areas not planted with trees or shrubs to be maintained as lawn in order to permit the south lot line to be maintained with all trees and understory plant material to remain in the wetland, flood way and floodplain reflected in the plans (affects south transition yard except east +/-45 feet);
 10. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Section 155.708 which requires a ten-foot foundation landscaping area on all sides of a building in order to allow development with a five-foot foundation landscaping area on the north and west sides and no foundation landscaping area on the

east and south;

11. A variation under Sections 155.102(B)(3) and 155.103(C)(2)(b) from Article XI which imposes several detailed landscaping requirements in Sections 155.701 through 155.710 in order to accomplish innovative landscaping shown in the two-sheet landscape plan on file with the Village for the benefit of natural areas on the site and to the south as well as residential neighbors to the south; and
12. Approval of a site plan and landscaping plan under Section 155.103(I) and Section 155.702 of the Zoning Ordinance (DISTRICT #6)

Acting Chairperson Sweetser asked if any additional person would like to speak in favor or against this petition, or for public comment.

Ms. Purkart suggested a 6' partition around the dining area so the dining doesn't look at the homes, suggested 1 permit for a festival instead of a permanent permit, suggested that the banquet rooms are sound proofed, and is concerned that the off-site parking will go away after a year.

Mr. Purkart noted a research project by Texas Tech on Chernobyl and wildlife. He said you can hear Roosevelt Road on the other side of the park and with the increase of cars the sound will go up. He is concerned about light pollution, and said the lumen test doesn't consider the tree line. He asked why change so many rules for 1 business. He said Lombard is an expensive city and employees will need to be paid over \$21 dollar an hour to afford to live here.

Mr. Richard Thomas said he has concerns that were brought up like flooding. He said he lives on the north side of Roosevelt Road and had issues with Public Storage and this water will feed into Public Storage. He said there are plenty of spaces on Roosevelt Road and around that are vacant. He is concerned about traffic and a building and near a residential area.

Mr. Fritz said he taught in District 45 and is a York Center Park District Commissioner. He said we are under an oath to tell the truth and said the meeting by the York Center Park District was not invalid. He said the park was not neglected and last year they spent \$13,000 on prairie plants and 3-years' worth of maintenance. He said he is fine with the restaurant but not the variances.

Mr. Novickas said he has a PowerPoint. He said the neighborhood was designed as an intentional community and always had a plan included

open space, shelterbelts, curving roadways, etc. He said the park is intentional space, not unmaintained, and contributes to quality of life. He has concerns on development and noted it's a difficult site to development. He referred to section 155.103 on conditional uses and Section 155.417. He said the B4A district was passed to improve Roosevelt Road. He doesn't agree with noise plan, noted the noises are different throughout the day and suggested noise barriers and increased landscaping. He has concerns with outside bazaars, and said they could be moved to the north side of the lot instead of the south side that is closer to residential. He believes there could be more than the 22 employees due to the size and scope of the restaurant. He has concerns about parking in the neighborhood and sees parking on Chase Avenue and people walk to the bacon bar. He questioned where the valet employees park and where the catering trucks would park. He feels the trash area is small for a large restaurant and said he can hear garage trucks at High Point Center and recommended to flip the alleyway to the north side. He said the parking lot doesn't have shade trees and suggested removing the south rickshaw and replace with a shade tree. He said there is an impact on night skies, and proposes dark skies. He said the reduction of foundation landscaping has an impact on wildlife and aesthetics and asked for heavy landscaping around the property. He discussed landscaping layers of bald cypress trees with arborvitae. He said the petitioner should provide landscaping to the York Center Park District. He said the parking lot is higher due to grading and car lights will shine through and discussed glare of lights, the wall sconces on the building, and LED parking lot lights.

Ms. Dornberger said she appreciates what neighbors said. She said the community developed in the late 40s. She is concerned that the neighborhood was misrepresented such as the conditions of the road. She said the neighborhood was always concerned about water flow, more of an issue now as new development occurred. She referenced the three-story Public Storage building and the water issues got worse. She doesn't believe there is adequate parking. She said they will be awakened by the garage trucks and when the trees have no leaves neighbors will see the building and lights. She believes the building will take away the wildlife and is concerned about privacy and noise for her neighbors.

Ms. Sanborn said she walks by the park many days and even on gray days the park has value. She is concerned about architecture and landscaping. She agrees with Doris that it will alter the community.

She believes the developer has solutions to some stated problems. She is concerned about the neighborhood feel. She mentioned Tomas's PowerPoint and pictures from other suburbs. She said Code is there for a reason and wants development to enhance the quality of life.

Mr. Johnson said he lives 150' from proposed development. He referenced the comments from PC 22-07 and families living near O'Neill's and noted we have similar issues. He requested delaying approval until they use sound damping materials, require a year-round permanent screen of landscaping or fencing, improve the water flow in the area, and improve the lighting to require timers and use buffers.

Ms. Pederson said the building is too big. She is a wildlife photographer and said we have amazing wildlife in our community. She said the height makes the lighting more impactful. She mentioned migrating birds and other wildlife that the lights can impact. She said the area could be sprayed with pesticides which would be harmful to wildlife. She said she is glad they are including native plantings.

Mr. Michael Kanarek said he has notes about what others already said which were many important issues. He said he was on a Plan Commission in the past. He asked about the validity of the establishment and how it will benefit Lombard. He said there are over 40 establishments that offer prepared food along Roosevelt Road. He asked if the contractors are from Lombard and are they union. He asked if Lombard vendors be used for materials and supplies. He said Lombard should benefit if this goes forward.

Ms. Wasserman said she wanted to echo what other neighbors said about the neighborhood. She said the wildlife is great. She said she is always shocked by the height of the storage center and don't want another three-story building nearby.

Mr. Daniel was given the opportunity to rebut. He said he had a neighborhood zoom meeting and made changes to the plan over time at the neighbor's request. He noted had a recent meeting with the County on the plantings and that the County will enforce the permit and will allow for spot trees, not a line of trees. They will screen the area with a fence if the trees are not allowed. He addressed sound that travels in a cone, and is concerned that additional trees will amplify the sound from Pep Boys. He said additional parking was removed due to County and Village meetings and the stormwater management area.

He said some lighting was eliminated, the buffer strip is being planted and meets Code. He said the trash dumpster was moved further away from residents. He said they are cleaning up the property. He noted there is no amplified sound outside. The cultural events are limited to 2 per month. They are in parking spaces to the south of the building and prefer the location to the south due to the shade and it's easier for staff to maintain. He said most restaurants have a small lobby and waiting area while the dining room occupies the footprint. In restaurants dining is usually 60% and this restaurant is at 30%. He said the three seats per parking space is a standard benchmark for commercial occupancies for food service. He said the Institute of Traffic Engineers supports 3 seats per parking spaces. There are 116 parking spaces within the lot lines. He is not asking for a conditional use for offsite parking. He said 116 times 3, per ITE data, meets the commercial standards and they are comfortable with 384 seats or a three to one ratio. He said 22 employees is the max peak shift. After application they provided a letter that they have access to 15 parking spaces to the west if needed. The also talked with Pep Boys about the cross easement and discussed shared parking. He asked for the application to be reviewed on its merits within the lot lines. He said he doesn't want to have the loading zone exiting on Roosevelt Road, which could create a poor appearance on a busy street. He said other communities that touch Lombard will approve the parking by right without a public hearing. They did think about a text amendment; however, they are impacted by the wetland and that is the justification for the parking variance. The original plan had 12 extra spaces, however, the County and Village Engineer said that is an excessive use of the floodway. He reviewed the floor plans and how they relate to the variance. He said there is no cross connection to the neighborhood to the south. He said they are preserving the wetland on property and even without the leaves the trees offer screening. He said lights will comply with the ordinance and not be directed towards the neighbors. He mentioned the light pole at the shared access with Pep Boys. He discussed the LED lighting at the sidewalks that points up and is a low level of lighting. He said the rickshaws are cultural features and popular at the existing restaurant. He believes it's better to light the rickshaw from below then above, leading to less light. He said more than 1/3 of property is a wetland that will be maintained and there is additional landscaping in the wetland. He said there are many utilities in Roosevelt Road which prevents large trees along the street. The outside sales are more like bazaars and if done outside a conditional use is needed. This is a cultural aspect and could be an author reading or look at quilts which is a benefit for Lombard. There is no amplified sound and the rooftop will

be closed before the restaurant per the conditions of approval. There are no speakers. The building lights will be on timers, some lights will be on at a lower level for security.

Mr. Miller said there are zero-foot candles at the property line and it meets the ordinance. He said lights will be seen but not spill over the property line. He said the buffer is 35' instead of the required 30'. He mentioned the massive area of mature trees that is existing and staying native. The natural wetland is staying. He said they met with DuPage County on the extra bald cypress screening. He said they met with Lombard and DuPage county's requirements on volume control and is providing extra area. The permeable pavers are part of the required water quality element.

Mr. DaVito said the buffer to the south has been discussed. There is a lot of area that is being preserved as trees and only the scrub material will be removed. He noted the bald cypress will lose their leaves in the winter. He referenced the arborvitae and said that area is very narrow and the road salt may damage it. He said the plan originally had shade trees, and changed that due to the lighting plan. He feels the south buffer will create the same screen effect. He said they don't have room for foundation plantings instead added more landscaping around the islands.

Mr. Daniel noted the east side has 100% landscaping. He said the foot candles are zero also in the wetland area. He said the height is 40' by Code, the parapet will be 45' and wraps part of the glass enclosure on the third floor. Only a part of the building rises above Code, and they will need a structural engineer to review. A conditional use is requested and is allowed unless there is a special circumstance that would not allow it. He said there is no outside amplified sound. He believes Lombard will benefit from this project in ways beyond tax revenue. He noted the parking hardship due to the wetlands and the ITE tables.

Mr. Kanarek asked how much is expert law versus opinion. He said the petitioner showed views from the north only. He asked how will this benefit Lombard and other businesses.

Mr. Daniel discussed his background and noted he showed many pictures last month for different angles and the neighborhood to the south. He said this property is zoned commercial and could be many other things. He said they will add jobs.

Acting Chairperson Sweetser asked for the staff report.

Ms. Ganser presented the IDRC report for PC 22-05, which was entered into the public record in its entirety. The petitioner proposes to build a restaurant and banquet hall, which are permitted uses. The property is currently vacant. The property abuts two commercial properties on Roosevelt Road. To the south is undeveloped passive open space owned by the York Center Park District. The property is located within a floodplain and serves as detention. There is a park, owned by the York Center Park District, on the south side of 13th Street. Per the project narrative, the homes to the south are more than 320 feet from the proposed building.

A restaurant is a permitted use, meaning a restaurant can be built by right without a Plan Commission meeting and without neighbor notification. Outside seating at a restaurant, such as the rooftop patio, is also a permitted use. Therefore, a restaurant can have outside seating by right without a Plan Commission meeting and without neighbor notification. The property has been zoned for commercial development since it was annexed into Lombard in the late 1990s.

The petitioner noted the restaurant would not be seeking a liquor license. For the record, liquor licenses are reviewed by the Village Board, not the Plan Commission. Should the owner or a future owner request a liquor license that request would go thru the Village Board at that time.

Staff reviewed the requests for entertainment, building height, and outdoor sales conditional uses and are supportive of the relief. The staff report provides for a condition of approval limiting the days, Saturday and Sunday, and the hours for the outside sales. There is also a condition of approval for the hours of rooftop patio and a condition for no amplified sound on the rooftop patio. The petitioner noted on the March 21st meeting that he would be agreeable to a condition stating there shall be no amplified sound for the outside sales. If the Plan Commission makes a motion to approve they can add such a condition. The requested entertainment conditional use is for inside the building and ancillary to the restaurant use. Building height is regulated in the Zoning Ordinance to be 40 feet in the B4A District. Therefore, a building can be built up to 40' in height by right without a Plan Commission meeting and without neighbor notification. The petitioner is asking for relief for a taller building that will be less than 45' tall, as the parapet wall is at approximately 45' in height.

A landscape plan was provided that incorporate parkway trees, perimeter landscaping, and detention basin landscaping. The petitioner is requesting landscaping variances in order to facilitate better design and provide for innovative and unique features. During the neighborhood meeting questions were raised about additional trees. The petitioner submitted updated plans and plans to add 11 trees. However, such tree planting is under the review and approval of DuPage County. Staff recognizes that the County has the authority to request a different tree planting, and as such, the petitioner would be allowed to amend their plan. Lombard is a partial waiver community, therefore, DuPage County has review authority over some engineering and landscaping items. The petitioner met with DuPage County again on April 14th to discuss landscaping. Per a memo given to the Plan Commission the petitioner noted an additional condition of approval can be on the project for a fence in lieu of trees per an attached drawing.

The property is accessed from Roosevelt Road. Cross Access with the property to the east (Pep Boys) has been previously established and will continue. KLOA has reviewed the plans and a memo is attached. The property contains special management area and wetlands which restrict development. As such a parking variance is requested. The traffic report also covered the parking variance and finds that sufficient parking is being provided.

Lighting variances are requested for two areas: at the rickshaws for aesthetic up lighting and possibly for the cross-access area. Neither are near residential areas. The photometric plan provided does meet Code as developed on the preliminary submittal. Should the project be approved, this plan will be reviewed again during permit submittal.

Preliminary engineering plans were provided. Stormwater is required to meet the provisions of the DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance and Village Code. The applicant's engineer has met with DuPage County for a pre-application meeting and adjusted the plan accordingly. The Village does not have the authority to review wetlands, as such, DuPage County will also review the engineering plans. As stormwater was brought up at the virtual meeting, Village staff emailed County engineering staff to alert them to the issue in case residents of York Center contacted the County with questions about their individual properties.

As noted in the staff report, the IDRC committee reviewed the preliminary plans submitted and gave comments which are also noted in the staff report. The comments, such as fire or building code items, are not under the purview of the Plan Commission. These items are addressed preliminarily in this report and such the project be approved, they will be addressed as a staff issue during building permit review. Fire Code, Building Code, and stormwater regulations are not under the purview of the Plan Commission.

Staff supports the requests for the petitioned zoning relief based on the submitted materials and the standards.

Mr. Javier Millan said he worked for KLOA and is retained by the Village. He looked at survey data by ITE and KLOA surveys of banquet facilities throughout Chicagoland. ITE is preferred and relied upon by many. He said ITE says the number of seats is a more reliable variable than square footage for restaurant parking. 115 to 118 parking spaces is suggested per ITE data. He reviewed KLOA surveys, and based on that 2.5 passengers per vehicles is reasonable. He also considered uber and taxis. That shows a 125 peak parking demand.

Mr. Heniff spoke on the current parking Code. He said when Fountain Square were constructed in 1999 and 2000 there was a lot of excitement over the restaurants. The parking standard was lower. The thought was that the demand for the restaurants was so great that the parking standard was amended from 16 to 18.5. He said now we are finding that parking demand is not as high. He reminded the Plan Commission that parking standard review is on the work program for staff and discussed past review of hotel and library parking standards. He noted the petitioner discussed their unique businesses model and discussed other communities. He said valet parking is a business regulation, and not in the Zoning Code. It is an administrative process done by staff, per Section 127. He said staff can offer additional conditions on parking if desired.

Acting Chair Sweetser opened the meeting to discussion by the Plan Commissioners.

Commissioner Johnston said a lot of information was presented. Commissioner Guilano said there is a lot to absorb and others agreed.

Mr. Heniff clarified that the next meeting will start with Commissioner comments.

On a motion by Commissioner Johnston, and a second by Commissioner Invergo, the Plan Commission voted 6-0 to continue the petition associated with PC 22-05 to the May 16, 2022 Plan Commission meeting.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 6 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, and Alissa Verson

Abstain: 1 - Robert Spreenberg

Business Meeting

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Verson, seconded by Commissioner Johnston, that the minutes of the March 21, 2022 meeting be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 7 - Ruth Sweetser, Leigh Giuliano, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, Robert Spreenberg, and Alissa Verson

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnston, seconded by Commissioner Walker, that the minutes of the March 28, 2022 meeting be approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 5 - Ruth Sweetser, Bill Johnston, Kevin Walker, Tony Invergo, and Alissa Verson

Abstain: 2 - Leigh Giuliano, and Robert Spreenberg

Public Participation

There was no public participation

DuPage County Hearings

There was no DuPage County Hearings

Chairperson's Report

The Chairperson deferred to the Director of Community Development

Planner's Report

There was no Planners report

Unfinished Business

There was no Unfinished Business

New Business

There was no New Business

Subdivision Reports

There was no new Subdivision Reports

Site Plan Approvals

There was no Site Plan Approvals

Workshops

There was no Workshops

Adjournment

A motion was made by Commissioner Johnston, seconded by Commissioner Invergo, to adjourn the meeting at 10:16 p.m. The motion passed by an unanimous vote.

*Ruth Sweetser, Vice Chairperson
Lombard Plan Commission*

*Jennifer Ganser, AICP, Assistant Director
Community Development*